UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 99—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1953, TO FEBRUARY 25, 1953
(PAGES 1 TO 1440)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1953

J
11
.R
v.99
pt.1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
1-12-54

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1953

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Eighty-third Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this hour of solemn convocation as, with reverent spirits, we open, in a new year, a new volume in our Nation's history, we would first of all in humble contrition lift our hearts to Thee in whom we live and move and have our being. Save us from the supreme hypocrisy of making this holy moment of communion with the Unseen and Eternal but a conventional gesture of unfelt piety. At this high altar of the national life, preserve us from praying with our lips only and not with our hearts and minds.

We come vividly aware that with the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path to peace and plenty through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. Lead, Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom. Be Thou the guardian and the guide of the unbeaten way our feet must take. Grant that those who by the people's choice have been called to high places of state in this fateful day, assuming responsibilities as heavy as the servants of the Commonwealth have ever borne, may be filled with Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Thee. Facing unafraid the threat of malignant forces arrayed against the precious things we hold nearest our hearts, may we here merit the crowning benediction for our part in bringing a just peace in our time: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

In Thy might we march on to meet the issues of this day of destiny as, in the name of the Lord our God, we set up our banners. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two letters of resignation from the United States Senate—an almost unheard-of proceeding. The Secretary will read the letters.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
November 25, 1952.

The Honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of my letter of resignation from the United States Senate which, as you will note, is effective at the close of business January 1, 1953.

With very best regards,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
November 8, 1952.

The Honorable EARL WARREN,
Governor of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR WARREN: I herewith tender my resignation as United States Senator from California effective at the close of business January 1, 1953. This will enable our newly appointed Senator from California to obtain the same advantages of seniority which I received when you appointed me to the Senate upon Senator Downey's resignation in 1950.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 23, 1952.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose copy of communication to the Governor of Maine notifying him of my resignation as United States Senator as of December 31, 1952.

Respectfully,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

December 23, 1952.

Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Governor of Maine,
State House, Augusta, Maine.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Will you please accept my resignation as United States Senator from Maine effective at the close of business on December 31, 1952, for reasons stated in my letter of December 19, 1952, to the Secretary of State of the State of Maine.

Copy of this communication is also going to the Vice President of the United States.

Respectfully,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No action is required on these letters of resignation, but they will be placed on file.

DEATH OF SENATOR McMAHON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of the senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MCMAHON. Later in the day a formal resolution will be offered, after the two new Senators from Connecticut have taken the oath of office. Sometime in the next week or two, on a day to be agreed upon, statements may be made by individual Senators in eulogy of the deceased Senator.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certificates of appointment and of election of Senators for unexpired terms.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Connecticut, I, John Lodge, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM A. PURTELL a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of BRIEN MCMAHON, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, John Lodge, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 29th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1952.

JOHN LODGE,
Governor.

[SEAL] ALICE K. LEOPOLD,
Secretary.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of California, I, Earl Warren, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint THOMAS H. KUCHEL a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of RICHARD NIXON, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Earl Warren, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the case of the Senator from Connecticut and the

Senator from California, no oath need be taken, since the terms expired.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1952, PRESCOTT BUSH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, ending January 3d, 1957.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, John Lodge, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

JOHN LODGE,
Governor.

[SEAL] ALICE K. LEOPOLD,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, November 25, 1952.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, DWIGHT GRISWOLD was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending on the 3d day of January 1955, at 12 noon.

Witness: His excellency, our Governor, Val Peterson, and our seal thereto affixed at the Capitol in the city of Lincoln, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

VAL PETERSON.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] JAMES S. PITTENGER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, CHARLES E. POTTER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending on the 3d day of January 1953, at 12 noon.

Witness: His excellency, our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

WM. C. VANDENBERG,
Lieutenant and Acting Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] F. M. ALGER, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

I, Lawrence W. Wetherby, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby certify that the vote for the office of United States Senator (unexpired term) cast in the general election held on Tuesday, November 4, 1952, as certified by the secretary of state, Commonwealth of Kentucky, indicates the following totals:

Democratic Party: Thomas R. Underwood, Lexington, Ky., 465,652.

Republican Party: JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Somerset, Ky., 494,576.

Kentucky Revised Statutes, section 120.040, requires that the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky certify to the President of the United States Senate under the great seal of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and countersigned by the secretary of state, the name of the United States Senator-elect. Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Somerset, Ky., is the United States Senator elected in the general election held November 4, 1952.

Given under my hand and official seal this the 11th day of December 1952.

LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY,
Governor of Kentucky.

[SEAL] CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For those elected to fill terms which ended on the day of the election, no oath is necessary.

Those who have been elected to fill unexpired terms beginning on the day of the election will take the oath with Senators elected for full terms.

The Chair now lays before the Senate certificates of election for the 32 Senators elected for 6-year terms commencing today. All the certificates have been filed. Some certificates are in accordance with the form of the Senate, and some are in accordance with the forms of the States from which they come. That is a technical difference which will not interfere with the ordinary procedure.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, FRANK A. BARRETT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, FRANK A. BARRETT, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, the State capital, this 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] C. J. "Doc" ROGERS,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 J. GLENN BEALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, and our seal hereto affixed at Annapolis, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor.

[SEAL] JOHN R. REEVES,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF OHIO.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION OF JOHN W. BRICKER TO THE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR

This is to certify that at the general election held in the State of Ohio on the 4th day of November, A. D. 1952, JOHN W. BRICKER was duly elected United States Senator and that he is entitled to all the rights and privileges of such office.

Given under my hand and seal at Columbus, Ohio, this 1st day of December, A. D. 1952.

[SEAL] FRED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, November 25, 1952.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, HUGH BUTLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Val Peterson, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol in the city of Lincoln, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

VAL PETERSON.

[SEAL] JAMES S. PITTENGER,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, HARRY FLOOD BYRD was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Given under my hand and under the lesser seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952, and in the one hundred seventy-seventh year of the Commonwealth.

JOHN S. BATTLE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] MARTHA BELL CONWAY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of Noveber 1952 DENNIS CHAVEZ was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Edwin L. Mechem, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

EDWIN L. MECHEM,
Governor.

By the Governor:

EUGENE D. LUJAN,
Chief Justice of New Mexico.

[SEAL] BEATRICE B. ROACH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF TEXAS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 PRICE DANIEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Allan Shivers, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this the 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor.

[SEAL] JACK ROSS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 RALPH E. FLANDERS was duly

chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, LEE E. EMERSON, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier, this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

LEE E. EMERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HOWARD E. ARMSTRONG,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., November 25, 1952.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 BARRY M. GOLDWATER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Howard Pyle, and our seal affixed at Phoenix, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

HOWARD PYLE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
THE CAPITOL,
Tallahassee.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 SPESSARD L. HOLLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Fuller Warren, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee, this 12th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

FULLER WARREN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, ALBERT GORE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Gordon Browning, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, this the 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

GORDON BROWNING,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JAMES H. CUMMINGS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

Whereas the board of canvassers of the State of New York has completed the canvass of the votes cast at the general election on the 4th day of November 1952, and pursuant to law has caused to be filed and recorded in the department of state of the State of New York a statement of the number of votes cast for all candidates for the office of United States Senator, together with its determination that IRVING M. IVES was elected to that office:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, IRVING M. IVES, of Norwich, was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of New York to the office of United States Senator from the State of New York for a term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 18th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Attest:
[SEAL] RUTH M. MINER,
Executive Deputy Secretary of State.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 HENRY M. JACKSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Washington a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Washington to be affixed at Olympia this 4th day of December, A. D. 1952.

ARTHUR B. LANGLIE,
Governor of Washington.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EARL COE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, Ind.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 WILLIAM E. JENNER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Henry F. Schricker, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] LELAND SMITH,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 JOHN F. KENNEDY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Paul A. Dever, and our seal hereunto affixed at Boston, this 5th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

PAUL A. DEVER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

UNITED STATES SENATOR—A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas it appears by the certificates returned by the commissioners of the county courts (who are ex officio the boards of canvassers) of the several counties composing the State of West Virginia, that at the general election held on the 4th day of November 1952, HARLEY M. KILGORE received 470,019 votes; and Chapman Revercomb received 406,554 votes, therefore, I, Okey L. Patteson, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do by this my proclamation declare that HARLEY M. KILGORE, of Beckley, in the county of Raleigh, having received the largest number of votes cast at the said election, is duly elected United States Senator for the 6-year term beginning January 3, 1953.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in the city of Charleston, State of West Virginia, this the 15th day of December in the year of our Lord 1952 and in the ninetieth year of the State.

OKEY L. PATTESON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Earl Warren, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 11th day of December in the year of our Lord 1952.

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By CHARLES J. HAGERTY,
Assistant Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, WILLIAM LANGER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Dakota a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Norman Brunsdale, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 28th day of November 1952.

NORMAN BRUNSDALE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 4th day of November 1952, GEORGE W. (MOLLY) MALONE was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1953, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the secretary of state at Carson City, Nev.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of State

to be affixed at Carson City, this 4th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, MIKE MANSFIELD was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, John W. Bonner, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 3d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

JOHN W. BONNER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, EDWARD MARTIN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, John S. Fine, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Harrisburg, Pa., this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

JOHN S. FINE.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, commencing on the 3d day of January 1953.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

WALTER H. KOHLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Providence, December 3, 1952.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, JOHN O. PASTORE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Dennis J. Roberts, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 3d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1952.

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MAINE.

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

Know ye that FREDERICK G. PAYNE, of Waldoboro, in the county of Lincoln, on the 8th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1952, was chosen by the electors of this State, a United States Senator to represent the State of Maine in the United States Senate, for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of State to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at Augusta, the 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952, and in the one hundred and seventy-seventh year of the independence of the United States of America.

FREDERICK G. PAYNE.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 CHARLES E. POTTER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

WM. C. VANDENBERG,
Lieutenant and Acting Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. M. ALGER, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 WILLIAM A. PURTELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, John Lodge, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

JOHN LODGE,
Governor.

[SEAL] ALICE K. LEOPOLD,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on November 4, 1952, H. ALEXANDER SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator from the said State, to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

In testimony whereof the great seal of the State is hereunto affixed.

Witness the hand of His Excellency, our Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, at Trenton, this 2d day of December A. D. 1952.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 JOHN C. STENNIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Hugh White, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson, this the 14th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

HUGH WHITE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HEDER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, STUART SYMINGTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Missouri a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Forrest Smith, and our seal hereto affixed at Jefferson City, Mo., this 15th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1952.

FORREST SMITH,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] WALTER H. TOHERMAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 EDWARD J. THYE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed by the State capitol in St. Paul this 24th day of November 1952.

ELMER ANDERSON,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] MRS. VIRGINIA HOLM,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 1952 JOHN J. WILLIAMS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Elbert N. Carvel, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 14th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

ELBERT N. CARVEL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I, Heber Bennion, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that on the 4th day of November 1952, ARTHUR V. WATKINS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1953.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, J. Bracken Lee, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1952.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor.

As appears of record in my office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah at Salt Lake City, this 25th day of November 1952.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] HEBER BENNION, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

By WAYNE CHRISTOFFERSON,
Deputy.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will now call, alphabetically, and in groups of four, the names of the Senators-elect who as their names are called will advance to the desk and the oath of office will be administered to them.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BUSH.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HUNT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. COOPER.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with reference to the seating of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], there has been filed with the Secretary of the Senate a contest, or a letter proposing a contest, which letter I have not seen. It relates to the election in New Mexico. Other protests may be filed. I understand that a protest has been filed with respect to the seating of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

My own view is that these Senators should be permitted to take the oath and be seated. It is my further view that the oath is taken without prejudice to the right of anyone contesting the seat to proceed with the contest, and without prejudice to the right of anyone protesting or asking for expulsion from the Senate to proceed. I believe that the various protests which have been filed should be referred to the appropriate committee and dealt with in due course.

Therefore, I ask that these Senators be allowed to take the oath, as I have said, without prejudice. I understand that such would be the case anyway, regardless of any statement which I might make. I should object to any effort to prevent their taking the oath today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will it be understood that after they take the oath they will not be denied in any way whatsoever their prerogatives in the Senate, including the right to assignment to committees, and all other rights and prerogatives as Senators?

Mr. TAFT. That is my understanding. They will have every right to vote, and every other right as Senators unless some action is taken by the Senate itself to change their status.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No statement on the part of any Senator is necessary. If a Senator-elect takes the oath, he becomes a Senator and remains a Senator unless he is relieved of his duties by some action of the Senate.

The Chair will take advantage of the situation to state that there is a great deal of confusion with respect to the question of seating Senators against whom some objection may be registered. When there is a contest over the election of a Senator, the Senate may determine that question by majority vote. If the Senate finds that he has not been duly elected, the Senate may, by majority vote, so declare. If the Senate finds that he is not qualified as a Senator, the Senate may, by majority vote, declare the seat vacant. All the rights of the Senate are preserved.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Chair——

The VICE PRESIDENT. When an effort is made to expel a Senator who has taken the oath, because of some misconduct on his part, some malfeasance or misfeasance in office, involving his conduct as a Senator, a two-thirds vote is required to expel him. That has nothing to do with the validity of his election. It has to do with his conduct as a Senator after he is sworn in.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with due respect to the distinguished President of the Senate, I wish to register an objection to his second statement as to the vote required to oust a Senator with respect to whom objection is made because of lack of qualifications—say with respect to character—and also as to the distinction between a majority vote and a two-thirds vote which the distinguished Presiding Officer suggests, depending upon whether the misconduct occurs before or after a person becomes a Senator. I think that question is open to debate. I do not wish to debate it at the present time. I merely wish to reserve the right to have that question raised later and determined by the Senate itself.

In the first Langer case, as I remember, it was decided by the Senate itself that a two-thirds vote was required. The Senate decided, by a majority vote, that a two-thirds vote was required in that case, which related to action taken largely before Mr. LANGER became a Senator. I think that question ought to be left open. I do not wish to argue with the Chair. I simply wish to reserve the right to present a different argument at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair should state that his second statement relates to the possible disqualification of a Senator at the time of taking the oath of office.

Mr. TAFT. By reason of insufficient age, or failure to meet the residence requirement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Or for other reasons of disqualification. However, that has nothing to do with his conduct as a Senator after he takes the oath.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to know the significance of the term "without prejudice." I should like to know the difference between a full oath and an oath which is taken without prejudice.

Mr. TAFT. My own opinion is that there is no difference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. May I finish my question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been told that when the stipulation "without prejudice" is injected into the taking of the oath, at a later time, when a vote is taken upon the qualifications of the particular Senator, he may be ousted by a majority vote, whereas if that stipulation is not entered at the time he takes the oath, a two-thirds vote is required to oust him, in a case involving any question of character or other qualifications. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. My own opinion, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, is that nothing which I or any other Senator may say today in using the words "without prejudice" makes the slightest difference, unless the Senate takes some action. When a man takes the oath he becomes a Senator. I express my opinion that the taking of the oath in no way prejudices anyone who may have filed a contest. The taking of the oath in no way changes the status of the contest. That is my opinion at the present time. So far as I know, it is wholly unnecessary to make such a statement. The law is the same anyway. If a Senator takes the oath, I do not believe that that fact changes the basis of the vote, or the percentage of the vote required, which is determined by the character of the case, rather than by anything done at the time the oath is administered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senators who are waiting at the door please approach the desk and take the oath?

The Senators whose names had previously been called, namely, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. COOPER, escorted, respectively, by Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CLEMENTS, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. GORE.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. KEFAUVER, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. IVES, and Mr. JACKSON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MAGNUSON, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. KNOWLAND.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that a protest has been filed against the seating of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Everything that was said with reference to the Chavez case applies also to the Langer case.

The Senators whose names had previously been called, namely, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MANSFIELD, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. MURRAY, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PAYNE.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. DUFF, Mr. WILEY, Mr. GREEN, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. STENNIS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. EASTLAND, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. FREAR, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

LIST OF SENATORS, BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry M. Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and William A. Purtell.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Herman Welker.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—Earl C. Clements and John Sherman Cooper.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne.

Maryland.—John M. Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Homer Ferguson and Charles E. Potter.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Thomas C. Hennings and Stuart Symington.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Dwight Griswold.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and Willis Smith.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Edward Martin and James H. Duff.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Lyndon B. Johnson and Price Daniel.

Utah.—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Lester C. Hunt and Frank A. Barrett.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarran
Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	Welker
George	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

GENERAL MEETING IN CANADA OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Under the authority of the order of July 7, 1952, the Vice President appointed during the adjournment of the Senate the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] members on the part of the Senate to attend the general meeting in Canada of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 7, 1952, the Vice President, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Eighty-second Congress, second session, appointed, during the adjournment of the Senate, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] as a member of the Joint Committee To Arrange for the Inauguration of the President-Elect of the United States on January 20, 1953, vice the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], resigned.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] being unable to accept the appointment, the Vice President subsequently appointed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] to fill the vacancy.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to elect a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio want to nominate somebody? [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 4), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890, on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move that the name of Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, the senior Senator from Georgia, be substituted for the name of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.] In the judgment of the Chair, the "noes" have it, by a narrow margin. [Laughter.] The question recurs on the resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is elected President pro tempore. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as a committee of one to escort the newly elected President pro tempore to the rostrum to take the oath of office.

Mr. BRIDGES, escorted by Mr. GEORGE, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to him by the Vice President.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. TAFT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 5), which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move that the name of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, be substituted for the name of J. Mark Trice, of Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.] In the judgment of the Chair, the "noes" have it by the same margin as in the case of the previous motion of the Senator from Texas. The question recurs on the resolution of the Senator from Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle, to escort Mr. Trice to the rostrum to take the oath.

Mr. Trice, escorted by Mr. Biffle, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the Vice President.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. JENNER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6) which was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That Forest A. Harness, of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I move that the name of Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona, be substituted for the name of Forest A. Harness.

The motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TAFT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TAFT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 8), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator of the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, as Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY TO THE MINORITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the conference of the minority, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read. I also ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection the resolution (S. Res. 9) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary for the minority of the Senate.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I send forward a concurrent resolution and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 6th day of January 1953, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate time to state the order of procedure which I shall propose to the Senate.

The Constitution requires that the joint session be held on Tuesday. When we have finished with the regular

business today, I propose that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock on Tuesday, at which time we shall have a morning hour. It has not been customary in the Senate to introduce bills and take up the general order of business during the first day of the session, but on Tuesday next we shall have a regular morning hour, beginning at 12 o'clock, and then, at a quarter of 1 o'clock, the Senate will recess and go to the House Chamber.

I understand a resolution will be offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with regard to the rules of the Senate, raising the question whether the Senate is a continuing body with continuing rules, or otherwise. That motion is open to debate. Debate could be cut off by motion to lay on the table, but I do not propose to offer such a motion. I suggest that we carry that matter over until Tuesday afternoon and lay it open to debate at that time. Whether I shall later make a point of order or move to lay the motion on the table can be determined after sufficient time has been given for adequate presentation of the issue. I think that is agreeable to those who are proposing the question. Therefore, after that motion is offered, it is planned to adjourn until Tuesday.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to say that the program suggested by the distinguished majority leader is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Ohio, with reference to the morning hour on Tuesday and the custom of the Senate with respect to introducing bills and resolutions, that the Chair has no intimation of the present intention in that regard. The Chair would suggest that the Senate keep in mind the discussion with reference to the morning hour.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had that in mind. I suppose we may receive a message from the present President. I do not want to wait, however, until President-elect Eisenhower assumes office and delivers his message. In the House the procedure has been different from that in the Senate; Members of the House always introduce bills on the first day of the session. I hesitate to ask Senators to postpone the introduction of bills beyond next Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to request information with regard to the morning hour suggested by the Senator from Ohio. Will that in any way prejudice the right of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to offer his motion that the Senate proceed to take up the question of the Senate rules?

In other words, Mr. President, will the morning hour be under the rules of the Eighty-second Congress, or will it be by unanimous consent; or what will the situation be?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if there is any doubt whatever, and the Senator from Minnesota is not satisfied, we shall defer proceedings under the morning hour until the debate on the rules is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire under what rules we are now operating. We are ordering quorum calls and taking other parliamentary proceedings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Are we not operating under the Constitution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope we are, and I trust that we shall continue to do so.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is fair to say that none of the matters that have been acted on today have been taken up under the provisions of any particular rules, as I understand; at least, I have been so advised by the Parliamentarian of the Senate. Some of the matters are provided for in the Constitution of the United States, and others seem to be merely formal in nature.

So far as I am concerned, I have no intention whatever to prejudge in any way the question of rules, although I have very definite opinions on the question.

The question of the rules under which the Senate operates while it is deciding what the rules should be is a very complicated procedural question, which probably will be argued in the course of the debate on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked the Senator the question because I had read the committee hearings when the idea was first suggested by Mr. Walter Reuther that the Senate has been proceeding unconstitutionally for 160 years. Mr. Reuther, who proposed this scheme for the first time to the Committee on Rules, stated or suggested that the Senate should operate under Robert's Rules of Order until such time as the rules he proposed could be adopted.

If we are to operate under Robert's Rules of Order, I wish to refresh my recollection of those rules. I have not studied them since the time I presided over a literary society in high school. I hope to be prepared so that I will be qualified to participate in the proposed new legislative procedure of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The organization of the Senate is an inherent right of the Senate, as it is of any sovereign body, and all that has taken place up to date has been under that inherent right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say to my distinguished friend, the very able Senator from Georgia, that while the problem of rules is one that we will soon come to, the first Senate and the first Congress of the United States of America did not have the valuable words of wisdom which are printed as the rules of the Senate to guide its destinies.

I am willing to rest my case with the innate, beautiful judgment of the great men, the pioneers of this Republic, the Founding Fathers, who were able, in that first session, to find their way through the difficult process of parliamentary organization. I think they proceeded well, Mr. President, and I now suggest that we proceed along the paths followed by those who have preceded us and who evidenced their knowledge, their wisdom, and their great genius in the first session of 1789.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to observe, in answer to what has been said by the Senator from Minnesota, that the rules of the Senate of the United States have grown over a period of 163 years. They represent the wisdom and patriotic effort of many great Senators. I shall await with interest any precedents which the Senator from Minnesota and others may cite, that will undertake to show that any person prior to this time has ever seriously suggested to the Senate, or to a committee of the Senate, that the Senate, under the Constitution, is not a continuing body. The Constitution, decisions of the Supreme Court and every precedent of the Senate clearly demonstrate that it is a continuing body.

Mr. Walter Reuther is a man of parts. His views in many fields are worthy of consideration. If I were forming a labor union which I wanted to have tightly held and disciplined, he would be one of the first whose advice I would seek. His views on labor relations would be helpful. If I were seeking someone to advise me how to bring pressure to bear upon candidates for public office and those who hold public office, I would go to Mr. Reuther, because he is without a peer in that field. But I prefer to draw my own conclusions as to the constitutionality of the proposal that the Senate of the United States is not a continuing body, even if it finds its genesis with Mr. Reuther. I think it is in the interest of orderly procedure for the Senate to follow the precedents of 160 years rather than to adopt the views of Mr. Reuther as our rules.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I hope we can proceed with the business of the Senate, and not get into a debate indirectly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana relating to the counting of the electoral vote, in which all Senators are interested—some more than others. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will not appoint the tellers on the part of the Senate until the House has agreed to the resolution.

ASCERTAINMENTS OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two communications from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, official copies of ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President from the States of Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi,

Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, which were ordered to lie on the table.

RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, jointly with Senators IVES, LEHMAN, TOBEY, GREEN, HUMPHREY, HENDRICKSON, NEELY, DUFF, PASTORE, KILGORE, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, MORSE, and HUNT, and in accordance with article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," I now move that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has read the motion, but if he will send it to the desk, it will be stated by the clerk.

Mr. ANDERSON. I send the motion to the desk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON, jointly with Messrs. IVES, LEHMAN, TOBEY, GREEN, HUMPHREY, HENDRICKSON, NEELY, DUFF, PASTORE, KILGORE, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, MORSE, and HUNT, makes the following motion:

"In accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution which declares that '* * * Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * *,' I now move that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress."

DEATH OF SENATOR McMAHON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is involved a question as to whether the motion just submitted by the Senator from New Mexico is in order. I suggest that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is prepared to offer a motion to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is not making such a motion now, is he?

Mr. TAFT. No. Is there any further business to be transacted before adjournment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a resolution which will be offered in regard to the late Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TAFT. The senior Senator from Connecticut will offer the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was read, and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Senator MCMAHON was Connecticut's outstanding statesman of modern times. He was respected not only in his State, but elsewhere, by members of both parties. In fact, in 1950 it was the Republicans in Connecticut who sent Senator MCMAHON back to the United States Senate for his second term.

No son of Connecticut has attained such recognition, both nationally and internationally, as did Senator MCMAHON while he was a Member of the Senate. This was probably because certain measures which he sponsored in this body had tremendous appeal to the minds and hearts of millions of people, both at home and abroad.

For these reasons, I join with my colleagues, on my first day as a Member of the Senate, in paying tribute to the memory of my highly distinguished predecessor, the late Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to raise the point of order that no debate is in order. A time will be set aside in the near future for memorials to the late Senator MCMAHON. However, I certainly would not wish to interfere with the desire of the other Senator from Connecticut to make a brief statement, with unanimous consent of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that I join with my colleague from Connecticut in an expression of profound sorrow at the death of the late Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut. It is most fitting that at the opening of this important session of Congress we recognize the great loss suffered by Connecticut, by our Nation, and by the world because of the death of Senator MCMAHON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1953

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, in this first meeting of the Eighty-third Congress, we are humbly beseeching Thee that daily we may be guided and sustained by Thy divine spirit in our high vocation as the chosen representatives of our great Republic.

Grant that in all our deliberations and decisions we may bear clear and unmistakable testimony that we are seeking to do that which is well pleasing unto Thee and imperative and beneficent for the welfare of our beloved country and all mankind.

During this new year may it become increasingly evident to men and nations everywhere that the old world of self-interest and self-aggrandizement, of prejudice and hatred, of isolation and greed, is too small for the growing and magnanimous soul of democracy with its spirit of brotherhood and good will, of mutual understanding and service.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to cultivate and achieve a social order which incarnates and exemplifies those spiritual ideals and principles that were enunciated by our blessed Lord in His Sermon on the Mount.

Hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of the Prince of Peace, our Saviour:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.

Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The CLERK. Representatives-elect to the Eighty-third Congress, this is the day fixed by the Constitution of the United States for the meeting of the Eighty-third Congress, and as directed by law the Clerk of the House of Representatives has prepared the official roll of Members-elect. Certificates of election covering 435 seats in the Eighty-third Congress have been received and are now on file with the Clerk of the Eighty-second Congress. The names of those persons whose credentials show they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, and beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin	Roberts	Elliott
Grant	Rains	Jones
Andrews	Selden	Battle

ARIZONA

Rhodes Patten

ARKANSAS

Gathings	Trimble	Hays
Mills	Harris	Norrell

CALIFORNIA

Scudder	Hunter	Doyle
Engle	Bramblett	Poulson
Moss	Hagen	Hillings
Mailliard	McDonough	Yorty
Shelley	Jackson	Sheppard
Condon	King	Utt
Allen	Hosmer	Phillips
Younger	Hinshaw	Wilson
Gubser	Hiestand	
Johnson	Holt	

COLORADO

Rogers	Chenoweth	Aspinall
Hill		

CONNECTICUT

Dodd	Cretella	Patterson
Seely-Brown	Morano	Sadlak

DELAWARE

Warburton

FLORIDA

Campbell	Lantaff	Matthews
Bennett	Herlong	
Sikes	Haley	

GEORGIA

Preston	Davis	Wheeler
Forrester	Vinson	Landrum
Camp	Lanham	Brown

IDAHO

Pfost Budge

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Hoffman	Velde
O'Hara	Sheehan	Chiperfield
Busbey	Jonas	Simpson
McVey	Church	Mack
Kluczynski	Reed	Springer
O'Brien	Mason	Vursell
Gordon	Allen	Price
Yates	Arends	Bishop

INDIANA

Madden	Beamer	Wilson
Halleck	Harden	Harvey
Crumpacker	Bray	Brownson
Adair	Merrill	

IOWA

Martin	LeCompte	Jensen
Talle	Cunningham	Hoeven
Gross	Dolliver	

KANSAS

Miller	George	Hope
Scrivner	Rees	Smith

KENTUCKY

Gregory	Chelf	Perkins
Withers	Spence	Golden
Robsion	Watts	

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Brooks	Thompson
Boggs	Passman	Long
Willis	Morrison	

MAINE

Hale	Nelson	McIntire

MARYLAND

Miller	Fallon	Friedel
Devereux	Small	
Garmatz	Hyde	

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton	Bates	O'Neill
Boland	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Goodwin	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Nicholson	Martin
Rogers	Curtis	

MICHIGAN

Machrowicz	Wolcott	O'Brien
Meader	Bentley	Rabaut
Shafer	Thompson	Dingell
Hoffman	Cederberg	Lesinski
Ford	Knox	Oakman
Clardy	Bennett	Dondero

MINNESOTA

Andresen	McCarthy	Andersen
O'Hara	Judd	Hagen
Wier	Marshall	

MISSISSIPPI

Abernethy	Smith	Winstead
Whitten	Williams	

MISSOURI

Karsten	Bolling	Cannon
Curtis	Cole	Jones
Sullivan	Short	Moulder
Hillelson	Carnahan	

MONTANA

Metcalf D'Ewart

NEBRASKA

Curtis	Harrison	Miller
Hruska		

NEVADA

Young

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow Cotton

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton	Case	Addonizio
Hand	Widnall	Kean
Auchincloss	Canfield	Sieminski
Howell	Osmers	Hart
Frelinghuysen	Rodino	

NEW MEXICO

Dempsey

NEW YORK

Wainwright	Powell	Taylor
Derounian	Coudert	Kearney
Becker	Donovan	Kilburn
Latham	Klein	Williams
Bosch	Roosevelt	Riehlman
Holtzman	Javits	Taber
Delaney	Fino	Cole
Heller	Dollinger	Keating
Keogh	Buckley	Ostertag
Kelly	Fino	Miller
Celler	Gamble	Radwan
Dorn	Gwinn	Pillion
Multer	St. George	Reed
Rooney	Wharton	
Ray	O'Brien	

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Chatham	Alexander
Fountain	Durham	Jonas
Barden	Carlyle	Jones
Cooley	Deane	Shuford

NORTH DAKOTA

Burdick Krueger

OHIO

Scherer	Jenkins	Hays
Hess	Bolton, Oliver P.	Kirwan
Schenck		Feighan
McCulloch	Vorys	Crosser
Clevenger	Weichel	Bolton, Frances P.
Polk	Ayres	
Brown	Secrest	Bender
Betts	Bow	
Reams	McGregor	

OKLAHOMA

Belcher	Albert	Jarman
Edmondson	Steed	Wickersham

OREGON

Norblad	Angell	Ellsworth
Coon		

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Bonin	Kelley
Granahan	Fenton	Saylor
Byrne	McConnell	Gavin
Chudoff	Rhodes	Kearns
Green	Walter	Graham
Scott	Mumma	Morgan
James	Bush	Fulton
King	Simpson	Eberharter
Dague	Stauffer	Corbett
Carrigg	Van Zandt	Buchanan

RHODE ISLAND

Forand Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Dorn	Richards
Riley	Bryson	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lovre Berry

TENNESSEE

Reece	Evins	Murray
Baker	Priest	Cooper
Frazier	Sutton	Davis

TEXAS

Patman	Thomas	Regan
Brooks	Thompson	Burleson
Gentry	Thornberry	Rogers
Rayburn	Poage	Mahon
Wilson	Lucas	Kilday
Teague	Ikard	Fisher
Dowdy	Lyle	Dies

UTAH

Stringfellow Dawson

VERMONT

Prouty

VIRGINIA

Robeson	Stanley	Wampler
Hardy	Poff	Broyhill
Gary	Harrison	
Abbitt	Smith	

WASHINGTON

Pelly	Holmes	Magnuson
Westland	Horan	
Mack	Tollefson	

WEST VIRGINIA

Mollohan	Bailey	Kee
Staggers	Neal	Byrd

WISCONSIN

Smith	Kersten	Byrnes
Davis	Van Pelt	Hull
Withrow	Laird	O'Konski

WYOMING

Harrison

The CLERK. The roll call discloses the presence of 424 Members-elect. A quorum is present.

STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been received showing the election of the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska and of the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii, and of the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Clerk will state that since the last regular election of Representatives to the Eighty-third Congress, two changes have occurred, and as a result of which vacancies now exist in the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois occasioned by the death of the late Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, and in the Second Congressional District of the State of Georgia occasioned by the death of the late Honorable EUGENE E. COX.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. By authority and by direction and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, I have the honor to nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives

of the Eighty-third Congress, the name of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

The CLERK. The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] Are there further nominations? If there are no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint tellers: The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], and the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice. The Clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

MARTIN—220

Adair	Dolliver	Lovre
Allen, Calif.	Dondero	McConnell
Allen, Ill.	Dorn, N. Y.	McCulloch
Andersen, H. Carl	Ellsworth	McDonough
	Fenton	McGregor
Andresen, August H.	Fino	McIntire
	Ford	McVey
Angell	Frelinghuysen	Mack, Wash.
Arends	Fulton	Mailliard
Auchincloss	Gamble	Martin, Iowa
Ayres	Gavin	Mason
Baker	George	Meader
Bates	Golden	Merrill
Beamer	Goodwin	Merrow
Becker	Graham	Miller, Md.
Belcher	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Bender	Gubser	Miller, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Morano
Bentley	Hagen, Minn.	Mumma
Berry	Hale	Neal
Betts	Halleck	Nelson
Bishop	Hand	Nicholson
Bolton, Frances P.	Harden	Norblad
	Harrison, Nebr.	Oakman
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Hara, Minn.
	Harvey	O'Konski
Bonin	Heselton	Osmers
Bosch	Hess	Ostertag
Bow	Hiestand	Patterson
Bramblett	Hill	Pelly
Bray	Hillelson	Phillips
Brown, Ohio	Hillings	Pillion
Brownson	Hinshaw	Poff
Broyhill	Hoeven	Poulson
Budge	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Burdick	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Busbey	Holmes	Ray
Bush	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Carrigg	Hosmer	Rees, Kans.
Case	Hruska	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cederberg	Hull	Riehlman
Chenoweth	Hunter	Robsion, Ky.
Chiperfield	Hyde	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Jackson	Sadlak
Clardy	James	St. George
Clevenger	Javits	Saylor
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins	Schenck
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Scherer
Coon	Johnson	Scott
Corbett	Jonas, Ill.	Scrivner
Cotton	Jonas, N. C.	Scudder
Coudert	Judd	Seely-Brown
Cretella	Kean	Shafer
Crumpacker	Kearney	Sheehan
Cunningham	Kearns	Short
Curtis, Mass.	Keating	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kilburn	Small
Dague	King, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Knox	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Utah	Krueger	Springer
Derounian	Laird	Stauffer
Devereux	Latham	Stringfellow
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Taber
Talle	Vorys	Wigglesworth
Taylor	Vursell	Williams, N. Y.
Thompson, Mich.	Wainwright	Wilson, Calif.
	Wampler	Wilson, Ind.
Tollefson	Warburton	Withrow
Utt	Weichel	Wolcott
Van Pelt	Westland	Wolverton
Van Zandt	Wharton	Young
Velde	Widnall	Younger

RAYBURN—201

Abbitt	Fountain	Norrell
Abernethy	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Addonizio	Friedel	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alexander	Gary	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Gathings	O'Neill
Aspinall	Gentry	Passman
Bailey	Gordon	Patman
Barden	Granahan	Patten
Barrett	Grant	Perkins
Battle	Green	Pfost
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Philbin
Boggs	Hagen, Calif.	Poage
Boland	Haley	Polk
Bolling	Hardy	Powell
Bonner	Harris	Preston
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Price
Brooks, La.	Hart	Priest
Brooks, Tex.	Hays, Ark.	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Bryson	Hébert	Regan
Buchanan	Heller	Rhodes, Pa.
Buckley	Herlong	Richards
Burleson	Holtzman	Riley
Byrd	Howell	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Ikard	Roberts
Camp	Jarman	Robeson, Va.
Campbell	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Celler	Kee	Roosevelt
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Selden
Chudoff	Keogh	Shelley
Condon	Kilday	Sheppard
Cooley	King, Calif.	Shuford
Cooper	Kirwan	Sieminski
Crosser	Klein	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Spence
Deane	Lantaff	Staggers
Delaney	Lesinski	Stanley
Dempsey	Long	Steed
Dies	Lucas	Sullivan
Dingell	Lyle	Sutton
Dodd	McCarthy	Teague
Dollinger	McCormack	Thomas
Donohue	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Donovan	Machrowicz	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Dowdy	Madden	Trimble
Doyle	Magnuson	Vinson
Durham	Mahon	Walter
Eberharter	Marshall	Watts
Edmondson	Matthews	Wheeler
Elliott	Metcalf	Whitten
Engle	Miller, Kans.	Wickersham
Evins	Mills	Wier
Fallon	Mollohan	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Morgan	Willis
Fine	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Moss	Winstead
Fogarty	Moulder	Withers
Forand	Multer	Yates
Forrester	Murray	Yorty

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Martin, Mass.	Rayburn	Reams

NOT VOTING—9

Bentsen	Fernandez	Miller, Calif.
Blatnik	Holifield	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Lanham	Zablocki

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 424, of which Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has received 220 and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN 201; present 3. Therefore, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK.

(The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Members of the House of Representatives, the result of this ballot was not entirely disappointing to me; I had a slight suspicion it was going like it did.

In January 1947, it was my high privilege and my great pleasure to present to you a great man who made a great Speaker of the Eightieth Congress. Today I come back to present that same great legislator and great American to be Speaker of the House again, temporarily. But in turning over this gavel, I could not turn it over to a man for whom I have a greater respect or more admiration.

He is going to be fair. I have often remarked that it would be pretty hard for a Speaker not to be fair because there are 434 besides him, and it might be a little dangerous, especially politically, and it might develop it would be dangerous physically. So today it is a pleasurable privilege that I have in presenting my successor in this high and honorable position. The speakership of the House of Representatives should be and is the second office in power in the Government of the United States. One thing I have tried never to forget, and I know that my successor will never forget it, is the dignity of this high office in protecting, defending, and perpetuating the rights, the prerogatives, and the privileges of the House of Representatives.

This is a great body that comes each 2 years fresh from the people. We know their wishes. We try to carry them out when they are wise and in the interest of the country.

I am going to stand by this Speaker in procedure because I know he is going to make proper and fair rulings. I am glad to present him to you because for many, many years we have been close personal friends. He is a man of the type and character who will carry on the high traditions of this office. And, Joe, in the arduous and onerous task that you undertake I wish you well. I bid you Godspeed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank you, Sam, for your splendid introduction.

For the second time in my life it becomes my great honor to ascend the rostrum of this House as its Speaker. To you, my colleagues, may I express a deepfelt sense of gratitude and my realization that you have conferred more than an honor upon me; you have imposed an inspiring duty.

I love this House. I love it for the high character of the men and women who occupy its seats, for the glory of its tradition, and above all else, for its role as the voice of the American people. Therefore, I again accept the duties of the speakership in the knowledge that in this forum is worked the will of the people, a forum that we must ever strengthen, never weaken. Here lies the true citadel of the Republic.

And when I speak of love and affection for this House, I must say to you that none among us can pay it greater devotion than the man who has so generously presented me to the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. Forty years of his life have been spent in serving his country unselfishly, faithfully, and honorably. He has served as Speaker longer than any other man in history. The gavel of this House has never passed from the hand of a nobler man than the gentleman from Texas.

This Eighty-third Congress convenes under a new order. For the first time in 20 years a Republican President is about to take office. The Republican Party is again the majority party in both the Senate and this House. To my Democrat colleagues I must say we assume the duties of the majority mindful that only a few months ago we ourselves were the minority party, yet you treated us with the respect and dignity that befits the great two-party system. We shall do as well. To you now falls the mantle of constructive criticism. At times, you will experience, as we all have, a choice between the welfare of your party and the welfare of your country. I entertain no doubt about your decisions, for we all seek the answer to the same question—what is best for America?

The power of decision is a wondrous but awful thing. We who have taken our oath of office here today have been privileged to do so because our Revolutionary fathers were determined that no one single individual, nor one single branch of government should be solely vested with the power of decision.

They went further than mere representative government; they devised the great instrumentality of tripartite government, with its checks and balances for the protection not only of the majority, but the minority as well. The world hailed these great accomplishments as a new way to political freedom, a milestone in man's eternal search for liberty. That was a short 177 years ago as time is counted in the history of mankind.

And where are we today?

For the past half century, the world has been caught up in a political tidal wave that already has drowned out the lamps of liberty in two-score countries and has dimmed them in every other nation on the face of the globe, including our own United States. We call this political malady Marxism, a doctrine which has spawned those twin evils, socialism and communism. By either name it has only one goal: To deliver the people once more into the hands of the state; to deliver the power of decision once more to the few instead of the many.

Were it not for the advent of Marxism, Europe today might be peaceful and happy. China might be free. Certainly our sons would not be fighting in Korea.

Here in the United States the drift toward socialism has been steady. Our English-speaking cousins in Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand actually established Socialist governments, only to reject them in the past 3 years. No nation has escaped; no nation has been untouched.

We in this Congress would make a tragic error if we did not fully comprehend that Marxism is the greatest enemy of representative government that the world has ever known.

In the Marxian state, there is no authority equal to the executive. It is the authority. It makes the decisions.

The legislative branch becomes a mere body servant, if, indeed, it exists at all. The courts are mere instruments for meting out punishment to those who fail to observe the edicts of the executive.

The pattern for the destruction of representative government has become increasingly apparent in recent years. The Congress is derided as an outmoded and archaic instrument. The Members are depicted as incompetent, easily corrupted, and without a grasp of the people's needs. Articles and books magically have appeared overnight unleashing vicious attacks on Congress under the guise of reforming it. Not a single aspect of the congressional function has escaped the abuse which these disciples of Marxism have heaped upon it.

Now, the Congress is never above criticism. It should always welcome change for the better, but let me say this to the House:

The fundamental machinery of the Congress is as sound today as it was at its inception. Tamper with this fundamental machinery and you are tampering with human liberty.

We can dedicate ourselves to no higher goal than to restore the Congress of the United States to its full share of participation in our tripartite form of government. Let us join hands in this task, knowing that the burden is on our shoulders.

But I would be less than candid if I did not say the burden is partially shared by another branch of this Government—the executive branch. Too often the executive department, in the press of world affairs, tends to forget that our constitutional process purposely reserves unto the Congress certain specific functions that are the backbone of our liberty.

I am proud to tell the House that in the new atmosphere of changing administrations, I think we will find not only a willingness but a will by the new Chief Executive to reestablish the proper working relationship between the executive and legislative branches. I base my conclusion on personal talks that I have had with the President-elect in the weeks since the November election. In this age of malignant political doctrines, police states, and assaults on liberty everywhere, America can thank God that the next President of the United States is going to be Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In performing our part in safeguarding and reaffirming the checks and balances of our great American form of government, all of us on both sides of the aisle must never forget that this wondrous mechanism has worked best under a strong two-party system. If it were in my power to bring about the destruction of the Democratic Party, I would not exercise that power.

You who have been in control for 20 years have basic differences among yourselves. That is as it should be in a society of free men. But I trust that those differences will never be so deep-seated as to lessen the stature of your party or to corrupt its principles. One-party government would destroy America.

Among us today are 81 new Members. May I extend to you the hand of welcome into this historic body. The trials and tribulations are many, but as your ability to render service grows and your knowledge of the great machinery of government becomes more profound, you will begin to know an enduring sense of satisfaction that can be found in no other endeavor.

We are all here to serve. The problems faced by the new administration are enormous and world-wide in scope, but they must be solved if we are to remain a free people and if liberty is once again to be the watchword in the world.

Every one of us, whether Democrat or Republican, shares with the new administration the task ahead. Let us join in a monumental effort to make this Eighty-third Congress the Congress which will go down in history as having best served America and the oppressed people of the world everywhere.

With God's help and His guidance, we can do it.

The Chair is ready to take the oath of office, and invites the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to administer the oath.

Mr. REED of New York then administered the oath of office to Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the custom, which was established a number of years ago, the Chair will now ask all Members to rise and take the oath of office.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, has been selected as majority leader of the House.

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority leader the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

ELECTION OF CLERK, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1), which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, of the State of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Tom J. Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Beecher Hess, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have a substitute to the resolution, but before offering the substitute I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

The question was taken; and that portion of the resolution referring to the election of the Chaplain was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph H. Callahan, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled that JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; and Lyle O. Snader, a citizen of the State of Illinois, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3), which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the following gentlemen: Mr. HALLECK, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAYBURN.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on January 6, 1953, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and to inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 8

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator of the State of New Hampshire, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, as Secretary of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 10

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 4).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, Speaker, and Lyle O. Snader, a citizen of the State of Illinois, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR THE EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 5).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the Eighty-third Congress:

RULE I

DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER

1. The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the Members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum, cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

2. He shall preserve order and decorum, and, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries, or in the lobby, may cause the same to be cleared.

3. He shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages and the disposal of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House, until further order.

4. He shall sign all acts, addresses, joint resolutions, writs, warrants, and subpenas of, or issued by order of, the House, and decide all questions of order, subject to an appeal by any Member, on which appeal no Member shall speak more than once, unless by permission of the House.

5. He shall rise to put a question, but may state it sitting; and shall put questions in this form, to wit: "As many as are in favor (as the question may be), say Aye"; and after the affirmative voice is expressed, "As many as are opposed, say "No"; if he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or a count is required by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one from each side of the question to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision.

6. He shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings, except where his vote would be decisive, or where the House is engaged in voting by ballot; and in cases of a tie vote the question shall be lost.

7. He shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond three legislative days: *Provided, however*, That in case of his illness, he may make such appointment for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment, the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore to act during his absence.

RULE II

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

There shall be elected by a viva voce vote, at the commencement of each Congress, to continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified, a Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and Chaplain, each of whom shall take an oath to support

the Constitution of the United States, and for the true and faithful discharge of the duties of his office to the best of his knowledge and ability, and to keep the secrets of the House; and each shall appoint all of the employees of his department provided for by law.

RULE III

DUTIES OF THE CLERK

1. The Clerk shall, at the commencement of the first session of each Congress, call the Members to order, proceed to call the roll of Members by States in alphabetical order, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, preserve order and decorum, and decide all questions of order subject to appeal by any Member.

2. He shall make and cause to be printed and delivered to each Member, or mailed to his address, at the commencement of every regular session of Congress, a list of the reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, referring to the act or resolution and page of the volume of the laws or Journal in which it may be contained, and placing under the name of each officer the list of reports required of him to be made.

3. He shall note all questions of order, with the decisions thereon, the record of which shall be printed as an appendix to the Journal of each session and complete, as soon after the close of the session as possible, the printing and distribution to Members and Delegates of the Journal of the House, together with an accurate and complete index; retain in the library at his office, for the use of the Members and officers of the House, and not to be withdrawn therefrom, two copies of all the books and printed documents deposited there; send, at the end of each session, a printed copy of the Journal thereof to the executive and to each branch of the legislature of every State and Territory; preserve for and deliver or mail to each Member and Delegate an extra copy, in good binding, of all documents printed by order of either House of the Congress to which he belonged; attest and affix the seal of the House to all writs, warrants, and subpenas issued by order of the House, certify to the passage of all bills and joint resolutions, make or approve all contracts, bargains, or agreements relative to furnishing any matter or thing, or for the performance of any labor for the House of Representatives, in pursuance of law or order of the House, keep full and accurate accounts of the disbursements out of the contingent fund of the House, keep the stationery account of Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law. He shall pay to the officers and employees of the House of Representatives the amount of their salaries that shall be due them.

4. He shall, in case of temporary absence or disability, designate an official in his office to sign all papers that may require the official signature of the Clerk of the House, and to do all other acts, except such as are provided for by statute, that may be required under the rules and practice of the House to be done by the Clerk. Such official acts, when so done by the designated official, shall be under the name of the Clerk of the House. The said designation shall be in writing, and shall be laid before the House and entered on the Journal.

RULE IV

DUTIES OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

1. It shall be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to attend the House during its sittings, to maintain order under the direction of the Speaker or Chairman, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, under the direction of the Clerk, execute the commands of the House, and all processes issued by authority thereof, directed to him by the Speaker; keep the accounts for the pay and mileage of Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law.

2. The symbol of his office shall be the mace, which shall be borne by him while enforcing order on the floor.

RULE V

DUTIES OF THE DOORKEEPER

1. The Doorkeeper shall enforce strictly the rules relating to the privileges of the Hall and be responsible to the House for the official conduct of his employees.

2. At the commencement and close of each session of Congress he shall take an inventory of all the furniture, books, and other public property in the several committee and other rooms under his charge, and report the same to the House, which report shall be referred to the Committee on House Administration to ascertain and determine the amount for which he shall be held liable for missing articles.

3. He shall allow no person to enter the room over the Hall of the House during its sittings; and 15 minutes before the hour of the meeting of the House each day he shall see that the floor is cleared of all persons except those privileged to remain, and kept so until 10 minutes after adjournment.

RULE VI

DUTIES OF THE POSTMASTER

The Postmaster shall superintend the post office kept in the Capitol and House Office Building for the accommodation of Representatives, Delegates, and officers of the House, and be held responsible for the prompt and safe delivery of their mail.

RULE VII

DUTIES OF THE CHAPLAIN

The Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of each day's sitting of the House and open the same with prayer.

RULE VIII

OF THE MEMBERS

1. Every Member shall be present within the Hall of the House during its sittings, unless excused or necessarily prevented; and shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question.

2. Pairs shall be announced by the Clerk, after the completion of the second roll call, from a written list furnished him, and signed by the Member making the statement to the Clerk, which list shall be published in the RECORD as a part of the proceedings, immediately following the names of those not voting: *Provided*, pairs shall be announced but once during the same legislative day.

RULE IX

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to adjourn.

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

(a) Committee on Agriculture, to consist of 27 members.

(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 43 members.

(c) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 33 members.

(d) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 27 members.

(e) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 25 members.

(f) Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 25 members.

(g) Committee on Foreign Affairs, to consist of 25 members.

(h) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of 25 members.

(i) Committee on House Administration, to consist of 25 members.

(j) Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to consist of 27 members.

(k) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 27 members.

(l) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 27 members.

(m) Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of 25 members.

(n) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of 25 members.

(o) Committee on Public Works, to consist of 27 members.

(p) Committee on Rules, to consist of 12 members.

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

(r) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 27 members.

(s) Committee on Ways and Means, to consist of 25 members.

2. The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

3. At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman the member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

4. All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Government Operations, Committee on Un-American Activities, or the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively:

1. Committee on Agriculture.

(a) Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

(b) Agriculture generally.

(c) Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

(d) Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

(e) Agricultural economics and research.

(f) Agricultural education extension services.

(g) Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

(h) Animal industry and diseases of animals.

(i) Crop insurance and soil conservation.

(j) Dairy industry.

(k) Entomology and plant quarantine.

(l) Extension of farm credit and farm security.

(m) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

(n) Human nutrition and home economics.

(o) Inspection of livestock and meat products.

(p) Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

(q) Rural electrification.

2. Committee on Appropriations.

(a) Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

(b) The committee is authorized, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with procedures authorized by the committee by a majority vote, to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive department or other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as it may deem necessary to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; and for this purpose the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

3. Committee on Armed Services.

(a) Common defense generally.

(b) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force generally.

(c) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(d) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(e) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

(f) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(g) Selective service.

(h) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

(i) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(j) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

4. Committee on Banking and Currency.

(a) Banking and currency generally.

(b) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.

(c) Deposit insurance.

(d) Federal Reserve System.

(e) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

(f) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

(g) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

(h) Public and private housing.

(i) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

5. Committee on the District of Columbia.

(a) All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

(b) Adulteration of foods and drugs.

(c) Incorporation and organization of societies.

(d) Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

(e) Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

(f) Municipal and juvenile courts.

(g) Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

(h) Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

(i) Taxes and tax sales.

6. Committee on Education and Labor.

(a) Measures relating to education or labor generally.

(b) Child labor.

(c) Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

(d) Convict labor and entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

(e) Labor standards.

(f) Labor statistics.

(g) Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

(h) Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

(i) School-lunch program.

(j) United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

(k) Vocational rehabilitation.

(l) Wages and hours of labor.

(m) Welfare of miners.

7. Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(a) Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

(b) Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

(c) Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

(d) Foreign loans.

(e) International conferences and congresses.

(f) Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

(g) Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

(h) Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

(i) Neutrality.

(j) Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

(k) The American National Red Cross.

(l) United Nations organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

8. Committee on Government Operations.

(a) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

(b) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

(c) Such committee shall have the duty of—

(1) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

(2) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

(3) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

(4) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

(d) For the purpose of performing such duties the committee, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee, is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

9. Committee on House Administration.

(a) Appropriations from the contingent fund.

(b) Auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged to the contingent fund.

(c) Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.

(d) Except as provided in clause 15 (d), matters relating to the Library of Congress and the House Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

(e) Except as provided in clause 15 (d), matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

(f) Expenditure of contingent fund of the House.

(g) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(h) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.

(i) Measures relating to assignment of office space for Members and committees.

(j) Measures relating to the disposition of useless executive papers.

(k) Measures relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; and Federal elections generally.

(l) Measures relating to services to the House, including the House Restaurant and administration of the House Office Buildings and of the House wing of the Capitol.

(m) Measures relating to the travel of Members of the House.

(n) Such committee shall also have the duty of—

(1) arranging a suitable program for each day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding period, and to arrange for the publication of the proceedings thereof;

(2) examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; and in cooperation with the Senate, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that they are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the House, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the House;

(3) reporting to the Sergeant at Arms of the House the travel of Members of the House.

10. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(a) Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

(b) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(c) Geological Survey.

(d) Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

(e) Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

(f) Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(g) Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.

(h) Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

(i) Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

(j) Mineral resources of the public lands.

(k) Mining interests generally.

(l) Mining schools and experimental stations.

(m) Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

(n) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

(o) Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

(p) Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

11. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(a) Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

(b) Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.

(c) Civil aeronautics.

(d) Inland waterways.

(e) Interstate oil compacts and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

(f) Public health and quarantine.

(g) Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

(h) Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.

(i) Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(j) Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.

(k) Securities and exchanges.

(l) Weather Bureau.

12. Committee on the Judiciary.

(a) Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal generally.

(b) Apportionment of Representatives.

(c) Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

(d) Civil liberties.

(e) Constitutional amendments.

(f) Federal courts and judges.

(g) Holidays and celebrations.

(h) Immigration and naturalization.

(i) Interstate compacts generally.

(j) Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

(k) Measures relating to claims against the United States.

(l) Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

(m) National penitentiaries.

(n) Patent Office.

(o) Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

(p) Presidential succession.

(q) Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

(r) Revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States.

(s) State and Territorial boundary lines.

13. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

(a) Merchant marine generally.

(b) Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(c) Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

(d) Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

(e) Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water (except matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission) and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

(f) Merchant marine officers and seamen.

(g) Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

(h) Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone; and interoceanic canals generally.

(i) Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

(j) Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.

(k) United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

14. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(a) Census and the collection of statistics generally.

(b) Federal civil service generally.

(c) National Archives.

(d) Postal-savings banks.

(e) Postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

(f) Status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

15. Committee on Public Works.

(a) Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

(b) Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

(c) Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads, other than appropriations therefor; but it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads to contain any provision for any specific road, nor for any bill in relation to a specific road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific road.

(d) Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

(e) Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

(f) Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

(g) Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

(h) Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

(i) Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

(j) Water power.

16. Committee on Rules.

(a) The rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House.

(b) Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.

(c) The Committee on Rules is authorized to sit and act whether or not the House is in session.

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

18. Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

(a) Veterans' measures generally.

(b) Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.

(c) Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

(d) Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

(e) Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

(f) Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

(g) Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

19. Committee on Ways and Means.

(a) Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

(b) National social security.

(c) Reciprocal trade agreements.

(d) Revenue measures generally.

(e) Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

(f) The bonded debt of the United States.

(g) The deposit of public moneys.

(h) Transportation of dutiable goods.

20. The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Appropriations—on the general appropriation bills; the Committee on House Administration—on the right of a Member to his seat, enrolled bills, on all matters referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—on bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers, and bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Public Works—on bills authorizing the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—on general pension bills; the Committee on Ways and Means—on bills raising revenue.

21. It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last 3 days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

22. The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pend-

ing before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

23. The Committee on House Administration shall make final report to the House in all contested-election cases not later than 6 months from the first day of the first regular session of the Congress to which the contestee is elected except in a contest from the Territory of Alaska, in which case the time shall not exceed 9 months.

24. Each standing committee of the House (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary and each such committee shall meet to consider any bill or resolution pending before it (a) on all regular meeting days selected by the committee; (b) upon the call of the chairman of the committee; (c) if the chairman of the committee, after 3 days' consideration refuses or fails, upon the request of at least three members of the committee, to call a special meeting of the committee within seven calendar days from the date of said request, then upon the filing with the clerk of the committee of the written and signed request of a majority of the committee for a called special meeting of the committee, the committee shall meet on the day and hour specified in said written request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee to notify all members of the committee in the usual way of such called special meeting.

25. (a) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees.

(b) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

(d) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(e) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

(f) Each committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

(g) All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

27. (a) Each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Services of professional staff members may be terminated by majority vote of the committee. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(b) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work.

(c) The professional staff members of the standing committees shall receive annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, ranging from $5,000 to $8,000 and the clerical staff shall receive annual compensation up to $6,000.

(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations may appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as it by majority vote determines to be necessary, such personnel, other than minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe.

(e) No committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on House Administration.

28. Each committee shall report to the Clerk of the House within 15 days after December 31 and June 30 of each year the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by such committee or any subcommittee thereof during the period covered by such report, and shall make an accounting of funds made available to and expended by such committee or subcommittee during such period, and such information when reported shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

29. No committee of the House, except the Committees on Government Operations, Rules, and Un-American Activities, shall sit, without special leave, while the House is in session.

RULE XII

DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The Delegate from Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico shall be elected to serve as additional members on the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, and Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Delegate from Alaska shall be elected to serve as an additional member on the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Interior and Insular Affairs; and they shall possess in such committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider.

RULE XIII

CALENDARS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. There shall be three calendars to which all business reported from committees shall be referred, viz:

First. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to which shall be referred bills raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills of a public character directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Second. A House Calendar, to which shall be referred all bills of a public character not raising revenue nor directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Third. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House, to which shall be referred all bills of a private character.

2. All reports of committees, except as provided in clause 20 of rule XI, together with the views of the minority, shall be delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar under the direction of the Speaker, in accordance with the foregoing clause, and the titles or subject thereof shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD: *Provided*, That bills reported adversely shall be laid on the table, unless the committee reporting a bill, at the time, or any Member within 3 days thereafter, shall request its reference to the calendar, when it shall be referred, as provided in clause 1 of this rule.

3. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

4. After a bill has been favorably reported and shall be upon either the House or Union Calendar any Member may file with the Clerk a notice that he desires such bill placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Consent Calendar." On the first and third Mondays of each month immediately after the reading of the Journal, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order, which have been for three legislative days upon the "Consent Calendar." Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called it shall be carried over on the calendar without prejudice to the next day when the "Consent Calendar" is again called, and if objected to by three or more Members it shall immediately be stricken from the calendar, and shall not thereafter during the same session of that Congress be placed again thereon: *Provided*, That no bill shall be called twice on the same legislative day.

5. There shall also be a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, as provided in clause 4 of rule XXVII.

6. Calendars shall be printed daily.

RULE XIV

ORDER AND DECORUM AND DEBATE

1. When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personality.

2. When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak; and no Member shall occupy more than 1 hour in debate on any question in the House or in committee, except as further provided in this rule.

3. The Member reporting the measure under consideration from a committee may open and close, where general debate has

been had thereon; and if it shall extend beyond 1 day, he shall be entitled to 1 hour to close, notwithstanding he may have used an hour in opening.

4. If any Member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call him to order; in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate; if the decision is in favor of the Member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and, if the case require it, he shall be liable to censure or such punishment as the House may deem proper.

5. If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

6. No Member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the House, unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending, in which case he shall be permitted to speak in reply, but not until every Member choosing to speak shall have spoken.

7. While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

8. It shall not be in order for any Member to introduce to or to bring to the attention of the House during its sessions any occupant in the galleries of the House; nor may the Speaker entertain a request for the suspension of this rule by unanimous consent or otherwise.

RULE XV

ON CALLS OF THE ROLL AND HOUSE

1. Upon every roll call the names of the Members shall be called alphabetically by surname, except when two or more have the same surname, in which case the name of the State shall be added; and if there be two such Members from the same State, the whole name shall be called, and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

2. In the absence of a quorum, 15 Members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, and in all calls of the House the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted; and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found, by officers to be appointed by the Sergeant-at-Arms for that purpose, and their attendance secured and retained; and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged. Members who voluntarily appear shall, unless the House otherwise direct, be immediately admitted to the Hall of the House, and they shall report their names to the Clerk to be entered upon the Journal as present.

3. On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with. At any time after the roll call has been completed, the Speaker may entertain a motion to adjourn if seconded by a majority of those present, to be ascertained by actual count by the Speaker; and if the House adjourns, all proceedings under this section shall be vacated.

RULE XVI

ON MOTIONS, THEIR PRECEDENCE, ETC.

1. Every motion made to the House and entertained by the Speaker shall be reduced to writing on the demand of any Member, and shall be entered on the Journal with the name of the Member making it, unless it is withdrawn the same day.

2. When a motion has been made, the Speaker shall state it or (if it be in writing) cause it to be read aloud by the Clerk before being debated, and it shall then be in possession of the House, but may be withdrawn at any time before a decision or amendment.

3. When any motion or proposition is made, the question, Will the House now consider it? shall not be put unless demanded by a Member.

4. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order; and no motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, shall be again allowed on the same day at the same stage of the question. After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order, and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution.

5. The hour at which the House adjourns shall be entered on the Journal.

6. On the demand of any Member, before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it include propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain: *Provided*, That any motion or resolution to elect the members or any portion of the members of the standing committees of the House and the joint standing committees shall not be divisible, nor shall any resolution or order reported by the Committee on Rules, providing a special order of business be divisible.

7. A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible, but a motion to strike out being lost shall neither preclude amendment nor motion to strike out and insert; and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

8. Pending a motion to suspend the rules, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result thereon is announced he shall not entertain any other motion till the vote is taken on suspension.

9. At any time after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue, or general appropriation bills.

10. No dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker.

RULE XVII

PREVIOUS QUESTION

1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

2. A call of the House shall not be in order after the previous question is ordered, unless it shall appear upon an actual count by the Speaker that a quorum is not present.

3. All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

RULE XVIII

RECONSIDERATION

1. When a motion has been made and carried or lost, it shall be in order for any member of the majority, on the same or succeeding day, to move for the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence of all other questions except the consideration of a conference report or a motion to adjourn, and shall not be withdrawn after the said succeeding day without the consent of the House, and thereafter any Member may call it up for consideration: *Provided*, That such motion, if made during the last 6 days of a session, shall be disposed of when made.

2. No bill, petition, memorial, or resolution referred to a committee, or reported therefrom for printing and recommitment, shall be brought back into the House on a motion to reconsider; and all bills, petitions, memorials, or resolutions reported from a committee shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed.

RULE XIX

OF AMENDMENTS

When a motion or proposition is under consideration a motion to amend and a motion to amend that amendment shall be in order, and it shall also be in order to offer a further amendment by way of substitute, to which one amendment may be offered, but which shall not be voted on until the original matter is perfected, but either may be withdrawn before amendment or decision is had thereon. Amendments to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage, and shall be decided without debate.

RULE XX

OF AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE

1. Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

2. No amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI, if said amendment had originated in the House, nor any amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than a general appropriation bill, shall be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House unless specific authority to agree to such amendment shall be first given by the House by a separate vote on every such amendment.

RULE XXI

ON BILLS

1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member, and the question shall then be put upon its passage.

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs or to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

5. No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations; except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

6. No general appropriation bill shall be considered in the House until printed committee hearings and a committee report thereon have been available for the Members of the House for at least three calendar days.

RULE XXII

OF PETITIONS, MEMORIALS, BILLS, AND RESOLUTIONS

1. Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, indorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof; and said petitions and memorials and bills of a private nature, except such as, in the judgment of the Speaker, are of an obscene or insulting character, shall be entered on the Journal, with the names of the Members presenting them, and the Clerk shall furnish a transcript of such entry to the official reporters of debates for publication in the RECORD.

2. No private bill or resolution (including so-called omnibus claims or pension bills), and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing (1) the payment of money for property damages, for personal injuries or death for which suit may be instituted under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code, or for a pension (other than to carry out a provision of law or treaty stipulation); (2) the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in the House.

3. Any petition or memorial or private bill excluded under this rule shall be returned to the Member from whom it was received; and petitions and private bills which have been inappropriately referred may, by the direction of the committee having possession of the same, be properly referred in the manner originally presented; and an erroneous reference of a petition or private bill under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee to consider or report the same.

4. All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, endorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with Rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

5. All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of executive departments shall be reported to the House within 1 week after presentation.

6. When a bill, resolution, or memorial is introduced "by request," these words shall be entered upon the Journal and printed in the RECORD.

RULE XXIII

OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

1. In all cases, in forming a Committee of the Whole House, the Speaker shall leave his chair after appointing a Chairman to preside, who shall, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries or lobby, have power to cause the same to be cleared.

2. Whenever a Committee of the Whole House or of the Whole House on the State of the Union finds itself without a quorum, which shall consist of 100 Members, the Chairman shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the Committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the Committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House.

3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people, all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriation to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring any claim to the Court of Claims, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

4. In Committees of the Whole House business on their calendars may be taken up in regular order, or in such order as the Committee may determine, unless the bill to be considered was determined by the House at the time of going into Committee, but bills for raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors shall have precedence.

5. When general debate is closed by order of the House, any Member shall be allowed 5 minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the Member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak 5 minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon, but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the Committee.

6. The Committee may, by the vote of a majority of the members present, at any time after the 5 minutes' debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such section or paragraph or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only (which motion shall be decided without debate); but this shall not preclude further amendment, to be decided without debate.

7. A motion to strike out the enacting words of a bill shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to its rejection. Whenever a bill is reported from a Committee of the Whole with an adverse recommendation and such recommendation is disagreed to by the House, the bill shall stand recommitted to the said Committee without further action by the House, but before the question of concurrence is submitted it is in order to entertain a motion to refer the bill to any committee, with or without instructions, and when the same is again reported to the House it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole without debate.

8. The rules of proceeding in the House shall be observed in Committees of the Whole House so far as they may be applicable.

RULE XXIV

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. The daily order of business shall be as follows:

First. Prayer by the Chaplain.

Second. Reading and approval of the Journal.

Third. Correction of reference of public bills.

Fourth. Disposal of business on the Speaker's table.

Fifth. Unfinished business.

Sixth. The morning hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees.

Seventh. Motions to go into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Eighth. Orders of the day.

2. Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows:

Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by Members; but House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole may be at once

disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House bills already favorably reported by a committee of the House, and not required to be considered in Committee of the Whole, be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee.

3. The consideration of the unfinished business in which the House may be engaged at an adjournment, except business in the morning hour, shall be resumed as soon as the business on the Speaker's table is finished, and at the same time each day thereafter until disposed of, and the consideration of all other unfinished business shall be resumed whenever the class of business to which it belongs shall be in order under the rules.

4. After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order, and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consideration: *Provided*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on 2 days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn.

5. After 1 hour shall have been devoted to the consideration of bills called up by committees, it shall be in order, pending consideration or discussion thereof, to entertain a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, or, when authorized by a committee, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider a particular bill, to which motion one amendment only, designating another bill, may be made; and if either motion be determined in the negative, it shall not be in order to make either motion again until the disposal of the matter under consideration or discussion.

6. On the first Tuesday of each month after disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution so called, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution, and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker. Such bills and resolutions, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. No other business shall be in order on this day unless the House, by two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine. On such motion debate shall be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against said motion.

On the third Tuesday of each month after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar, preference to be given to omnibus bills containing bills or resolutions which have previously been objected to on a call of the Private Calendar. All bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar so called, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution other than an omnibus bill, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker.

Omnibus bills shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. Any item or matter stricken from an omnibus bill shall not thereafter during the same session of Congress be included in any omnibus bill.

Upon passage of any such omnibus bill, said bill shall be resolved into the several bills and resolutions of which it is composed, and such original bills and resolutions, with any amendments adopted by the House, shall be engrossed, where necessary, and proceedings thereon had as if said bills and resolutions had been passed in the House severally.

In the consideration of any omnibus bill the proceedings as set forth above shall have the same force and effect as if each Senate and House bill or resolution therein contained or referred to were considered by the House as a separate and distinct bill or resolution.

7. On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed 5 minutes for and against. On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This rule shall not apply during the last 2 weeks of the session. It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion for a recess on any Wednesday except during the last 2 weeks of the session: *Provided*, That not more than 2 hours of general debate shall be permitted on any measure called up on Calendar Wednesday, and all debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill, the time to be equally divided between those for and against the bill: *Provided further*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied one Wednesday it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any unfinished business previously called up by such committee, unless the previous question had been ordered thereon, upon any succeeding Wednesday until the other committees have been called in their turn under this rule: *Provided*, That when, during any one session of Congress, all of the committees of the House are not called under the Calendar Wednesday rule, at the next session of Congress the call shall commence where it left off at the end of the preceding session.

8. The second and fourth Mondays in each month, after the disposition of motions to discharge committees and after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, shall, when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

Rule XXV

Priority of Business

All questions relating to the priority of business shall be decided by a majority without debate.

Rule XXVI

Unfinished Business of the Session

All business before committees of the House at the end of one session shall be resumed at the commencement of the next session of the same Congress in the same manner as if no adjournment had taken place.

Rule XXVII

Change or Suspension of Rules

1. No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on the first and third Mondays of each month, preference being given on the first Monday to individuals and on the third Monday to committees, and during the last 6 days of a session.

2. All motions to suspend the rules shall, before being submitted to the House, be seconded by a majority by tellers, if demanded.

3. When a motion to suspend the rules has been seconded, it shall be in order, before the final vote is taken thereon, to debate the proposition to be voted upon for 40 minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate in favor of, and one-half to debate in opposition to, such proposition; and the same right of debate shall be allowed whenever the previous question has been ordered on any proposition on which there has been no debate.

4. A Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has been referred to it 30 days prior thereto (but only one motion may be presented for each bill or resolution). Under this rule it shall also be in order for a Member to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of any resolution providing either a special order of business or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action: *Provided*, That said resolution from which it is moved to discharge the Committee on Rules has been referred to that committee at least 7 days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. The motion shall be placed in the custody of the Clerk, who shall arrange some convenient place for the signature of Members. A signature may be withdrawn by a Member in writing at any time before the motion is entered on the Journal. When a majority of the total membership of the House shall have signed the motion, it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the signatures thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees.

On the second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling up the motion, and the House shall proceed to its consideration in the manner herein provided without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn. Recognition for the motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered on the Journal.

When any motion under this rule shall be called up, the bill or resolution shall be read by title only. After 20 minutes' debate, one-half in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto, the House shall proceed to vote on the motion to discharge. If the motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from any resolution pending before the committee, the House shall immediately vote on the adoption of said resolution, the Speaker not entertaining any dilatory or other intervening motion except one motion to adjourn, and, if said resolution is adopted, then the House shall immediately proceed to its execution. If the motion prevails to discharge one of the standing committees of the House from any public bill or resolution pending before the committee, it shall then be in order for any Member who signed the motion to move that the House proceed to the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution (such motion not being debatable), and such motion is hereby made of high privilege; and if it shall be decided in the affirmative, the bill shall be immediately considered under the general rules of the House, and if unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up it shall remain the unfinished business until it is fully disposed of. Should the House by vote decide against the

immediate consideration of such bill or resolution, it shall be referred to its proper calendar and be entitled to the same rights and privileges that it would have had had the committee to which it was referred duly reported same to the House for its consideration: *Provided*, That when any perfected motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of any public bill or resolution has once been acted upon by the House it shall not be in order to entertain during the same session of Congress any other motion for the discharge from that committee of said measure, or from any other committee of any other bill or resolution substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, or from the Committee on Rules of a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of any other such bill or resolution, in order that such action by the House on a motion to discharge shall be res adjudicata for the remainder of that session: *Provided further*, That if before any one motion to discharge a committee has been acted upon by the House there are on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees other motions to discharge committees from the consideration of bills or resolutions substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, after the House shall have acted on one motion to discharge, the remaining said motions shall be stricken from the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees and not acted on during the remainder of that session of Congress.

RULE XXVIII

CONFERENCE REPORTS

1. (a) The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read, while the roll is being called, or the House is dividing on any proposition.

(b) After House conferees on any bill or resolution in conference between the House and Senate shall have been appointed for 20 calendar days and shall have failed to make a report, it is hereby declared to be a motion of the highest privilege to move to discharge said House conferees and to appoint new conferees, or to instruct said House conferees; and, further, during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, it shall be a privileged motion to move to discharge, appoint, or instruct, House conferees after House conferees shall have been appointed 36 hours without having made a report.

(c) And there shall accompany every such report a detailed statement sufficiently explicit to inform the House what effect such amendments or propositions will have upon the measures to which they relate.

2. It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the 6 days preceding the end of a session.

3. Whenever a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been committed to a conference committee it shall be in order for the managers on the part of the House to propose a substitute which is a germane modification of the matter in disagreement, but their report shall not include matter not committed to the conference committee by either House.

RULE XXIX

SECRET SESSION

Whenever confidential communications are received from the President of the United States, or whenever the Speaker or any Member shall inform the House that he has communications which he believes ought to be kept secret for the present, the House shall be cleared of all persons except the Members and officers thereof, and so continue during the reading of such communications, the debates and proceedings thereon, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

RULE XXX

READING OF PAPERS

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

RULE XXXI

HALL OF THE HOUSE

The Hall of the House shall be used only for the legislative business of the House and for the caucus meetings of its Members, except upon occasions where the House by resolution agrees to take part in any ceremonies to be observed therein; and the Speaker shall not entertain a motion for the suspension of this rule.

RULE XXXII

OF ADMISSION TO THE FLOOR

1. The persons hereinafter named, and none other, shall be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto, viz: The President and Vice President of the United States and their private secretaries, judges of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress and Members-elect, contestants in election cases during the pendency of their cases in the House, the Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, heads of departments, foreign ministers, governors of States, the Architect of the Capitol, the Librarian of Congress and his assistant in charge of the Law Library, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, such persons as have, by name, received the thanks of Congress, ex-Members of the House of Representatives who are not interested in any claim or directly in any bill pending before Congress, and clerks of committees when business from their committee is under consideration; and it shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a request for the suspension of this rule or to present from the chair the request of any Member for unanimous consent.

2. There shall be excluded at all times from the Hall of the House of Representatives and the cloak rooms all persons not entitled to the privilege of the floor during the session, except that until 15 minutes of the hour of the meeting of the House persons employed in its service, accredited members of the press entitled to admission to the press gallery, and other persons on request of Members, by card or in writing, may be admitted.

RULE XXXIII

OF ADMISSION TO THE GALLERIES

The Speaker shall set aside a portion of the west gallery for the use of the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, justices of the Supreme Court, foreign ministers and suites, and the members of their respective families, and shall also set aside another portion of the same gallery for the accommodation of persons to be admitted on the card of Members. The southerly half of the east gallery shall be assigned exclusively for the use of the families of Members of Congress, in which the Speaker shall control one bench, and on request of a Member the Speaker shall issue a card of admission to his family, which shall include their visitors, and no other person shall be admitted to this section.

RULE XXXIV

OFFICIAL AND OTHER REPORTERS

1. The appointment and removal, for cause, of the official reporters of the House, including stenographers of committees, and the manner of the execution of their duties shall be vested in the Speaker.

2. Such portion of the gallery over the Speaker's chair as may be necessary to accommodate representatives of the press wishing to report debates and proceedings shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters and correspondents shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the standing committee of correspondents, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may assign one seat on the floor to Associated Press reporters, one to the International News Service, and one to the United Press Associations, and regulate the occupation of the same. And the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association.

3. Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by radio, wireless, and similar means of transmission, wishing to report debates and proceedings, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the standing Committee of Radio Reporters, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one representative of the National Broadcasting Co., one of the Columbia Broadcasting System, one of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and one of the Transradio Press Service.

RULE XXXV

PAY OF WITNESSES

The rule for paying witnesses subpenaed to appear before the House or either of its committees shall be as follows: For each day a witness shall attend, the sum of $8; for each mile he shall travel in coming to or going from the place of examination, the sum of 7 cents each way; but nothing shall be paid for traveling when the witness has been summoned at the place of trial.

RULE XXXVI

PAPERS

1. The clerks of the several committees of the House shall, within 3 days after the final adjournment of a Congress, deliver to the Clerk of the House all bills, joint resolutions, petitions, and other papers referred to the committee, together with all evidence taken by such committee under the order of the House during the said Congress and not reported to the House; and in the event of the failure or neglect of any clerk of a committee to comply with this rule the Clerk of the House shall, within 3 days thereafter, take into his keeping all such papers and testimony.

2. At the close of each Congress the Clerk of the House shall obtain all noncurrent records of the House and each committee thereof and transfer them to the National Archives for preservation subject to the order of the House, and in so transferring he may act jointly with the Secretary of the Senate.

RULE XXXVII

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

No memorial or other paper presented to the House shall be withdrawn from its files without its leave, and if withdrawn therefrom certified copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Clerk; but when an act may pass for the settlement of a claim, the Clerk is authorized to transmit to the officer in charge with the settlement thereof the papers on file in his office relating to such claim, or may loan temporarily to an officer or bureau of the executive departments any papers on file in his office relating to any matter pending before such officer or bureau, taking proper receipt therefor.

RULE XXXVIII

BALLOT

In all cases of ballot a majority of the votes given shall be necessary to an election, and where there shall not be such a majority

on the first ballot the ballots shall be repeated until a majority be obtained; and in all balloting blanks shall be rejected and not taken into the count in enumeration of votes or reported by the tellers.

RULE XXXIX

MESSAGES

Messages received from the Senate and the President of the United States, giving notice of bills passed or approved, shall be entered in the Journal and published in the RECORD of that day's proceedings.

RULE XL

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Estimates of appropriations and all other communications from the executive departments, intended for the consideration of any committees of the House, shall be addressed to the Speaker, and by him referred as provided by clause 2 of rule XXIV.

RULE XLI

QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

No person shall be an officer of the House, or continue in its employment, who shall be an agent for the prosecution of any claim against the Government, or be interested in such claim otherwise than as an original claimant; and it shall be the duty of the Committee on House Administration to inquire into and report to the House any violation of this rule.

RULE XLII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Jefferson's Manual and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House and joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. EBERHARTER (interrupting reading of resolution). Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Clerk to read in full paragraph 2 (c) of rule 11.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, would an amendment to rule 11 be in order after the rule is read?

The SPEAKER. No amendments will be in order until the resolution is read in its entirety. Then I presume if the gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question none will be in order unless the previous question is voted down.

The Clerk continued the reading of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, before stating my point of order I wonder if the Chair would indulge me to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois whether or not he will yield for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will not yield for the purpose.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order then that it is not in order for the gentleman from Illinois to offer a resolution unless he explains the resolution or permits debate on it before moving the previous question. In other words, in presenting a resolution there must be debate on it before the previous question is put.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would invite the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that what we are trying to establish is the rules of the House, and the question now is on the previous question offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order then that this House not having adopted any rules governing the Eighty-third Congress, the gentleman has no right to offer the previous question, so that debate can be had on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under the practice established over the years, the motion for the previous question is in order. The Chair so holds and overrules the point of order.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, are we proceeding now under the rules we are going to adopt later, and which have not yet been adopted? Under what rules is the House proceeding, or is it proceeding under any rules?

The SPEAKER. The House is proceeding under the general parliamentary rules we have had for many years.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the rules are not adopted today and the question goes over until next week, would we still proceed under some other rules that have not yet been adopted by the Eighty-third Congress?

The SPEAKER. If the rules were not adopted today, we would proceed as we are at this very moment, under general parliamentary law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that the parliamentary situation is that if the motion for the previous question is not voted down, no opportunity will be given to offer an amendment by way of liberalizing the rules?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states the situation accurately.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, does the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois, the further reading of which was dispensed with, contain the rules as they were during the Eighty-second Congress or as they were during the Eighty-first Congress?

The SPEAKER. As they were during the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. YATES. So that the rules which were in effect during the Eighty-first Congress are not contained in the gentleman's resolution? Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. These are the rules of the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, this matter is very, very important.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am not trying to delay the proceedings.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, and the regular order is the question on the motion for the previous question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chair can recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania to submit a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair is now doing that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the House as a body will have any opportunity again during the sessions of the Eighty-third Congress to amend these rules?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair is neither a clairvoyant nor a prophet, but the rules of the House are always subject to change at the will of the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask as a further parliamentary inquiry if a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of an amendment proposed to the rules would have the effect of bringing it to the floor of the House, provided enough signatures were obtained to the petition?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot foresee that because we have not yet adopted any rules. If the gentleman will submit his inquiry after the rules have been adopted, the Chair will be very glad to answer it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Chair means that he will wait to make his ruling under the rules we are going to adopt?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion for the previous question.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion for the previous question was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority

employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 3, 1953, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Ralph R. Roberts and Joseph H. Callahan, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum, respectively; William M. Miller and Finis E. Scott, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum, respectively; D. Thomas Iorio (minority pair clerk) to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum; and Landon Mitchell to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,300 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATIONS OF MEMBERS OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications, which were read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1952.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Massachusetts my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of Massachusetts, effective midnight September 30, 1952.

A copy of my letter to the Governor is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully yours,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Eleventh District of Michigan as of the close of business November 4, 1952.

With great respect, your obedient servant,
CHARLES E. POTTER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1952.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of New York to be effective as of midnight this day.

Respectfully,
LEONARD W. HALL.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 20, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable GARRETT L. WITHERS as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-second Congress from the Second Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable John A. Whitaker, has been received and is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF ESCAPE CLAUSES IN TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Office of the Clerk on July 10, 1952, said to contain a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

Since my last report on this matter, dated January 10, 1952 (H. Doc. 328, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), progress has been made with respect to the inclusion of escape clauses in trade agreements which do not include such clauses. In the case of a few trade agreements it has been determined that it would not be practicable to attempt to include escape clauses in the agreements at this time. Steps have been taken toward termination of another trade agreement.

There is attached a more detailed report on this subject prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 10, 1952.*

(Enclosure: Report on trade agreement escape clauses.)

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES (PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6 (B) OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951)

Section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 reads as follows:

"(a) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

"(b) The President, as soon as practicable, shall take such action as may be necessary to bring trade agreements heretofore entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, into conformity with the policy established in subsection (a) of this section.

"On or before January 10, 1952, and every 6 months thereafter, the President shall report to the Congress on the action taken by him under this subsection."[1]

Since the report on escape clauses, dated January 10, 1952, no new trade agreements have been concluded. That report lists, in addition to the trade agreements therein found to be in conformity with the policy of section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, six other bilateral trade agreements which need further examination, namely, those with Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Turkey, and Venezuela.

The previous report stated that steps were being taken to terminate the existing bilateral trade agreement with Turkey following the accession of Turkey to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. An agreement was signed on July 5, 1952, terminating the bilateral trade agreement on August 4, 1952.

The negotiations for a supplementary trade agreement with Venezuela, referred to in the report of January 10, 1952, have been in progress for several months. The United States has requested inclusion in the supplementary agreement, in such a manner that it would become applicable to concessions remaining in the original agreement of November 6, 1939, as well as to concessions in the supplementary agreement, of an escape clause generally comparable to that made applicable to the trade agreement with Switzerland by the agreement of October 13, 1950 (H. Doc. 328, 82d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 10 and 11). The inclusion of such an escape clause in the Venezuelan agreement would bring it into conformity with section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

Discussions are presently underway between the Government of the United States and the Government of Ecuador with regard to the existing trade agreements with that country, including the possibility of inserting an escape clause in the agreement.

After detailed study of the problems involved in adding escape clauses to the agreements with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, the Trade Agreements Committee found for the reasons set forth below that it would not be practicable at this time to approach these countries for the purpose of bringing about the inclusion of escape clauses in the agreements with them.

This decision was taken on the basis of the following considerations. Many of the products on which the United States granted concessions in these agreements are on the free list, and none of them is likely to be produced in the United States in commercial quantities. The dutiable products on which concessions were granted by the United

---

[1] The report of the Senate Committee on Finance, which proposed section 6 in its present form, explained that "the principle of including an escape clause in existing agreements is not mandatory unless such action would be practicable" (S. Rept. 299, April 27, 1951, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 5). In opening the debate on this provision in the Senate, Senator GEORGE, chairman of the committee, stated that, "In general, this amendment is designed to allow the greatest possible freedom in the operation of existing and future trade agreements without resultant serious injury to domestic producers" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 4, p. 5491). He continued: "Recognizing, however, the varying situations which exist in our trade relations with different countries at different times, the committee places no time limit upon the President, and makes the principle of including the escape clause in existing agreements mandatory only if such action would be practicable. This is to make sure that no important interest in this country will be jeopardized by action which might be unwise or precipitate under the circumstances" (ibid. 5490, 5491).

States are largely tropical products, imports of most of which result in no, or negligible, competition with United States producers, whereas a relatively high proportion of the concessions granted by the other countries are on products which compete with their domestic production. Furthermore, the Trade Agreements Committee was convinced that an attempt to secure the escape clause at this time would probably lead to the renegotiation of the agreements with these countries and result in a less satisfactory situation than now exists.

Finally, it should be pointed out that all of these three agreements are already subject to unilateral termination, by the United States, on 6 months' notice, pursuant to the requirements of the Trade Agreements Act.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

JULY 19, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk on July 19, 1952, said to contain the midyear economic report of the President.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers referred to the Joint Committee on Economic Reports and ordered printed with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1952.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a Midyear Economic Report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 16, 1952, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Midyear 1952 Economic Review, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

SUPPLEMENTARY TRADE AGREEMENT WITH VENEZUELA (H. DOC. NO. 43)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

AUGUST 29, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Office of the Clerk on August 29, 1952, said to contain a message to the Congress of the United States relating to a supplementary trade agreement with Venezuela.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On August 28, 1952, the United States signed an agreement with Venezuela which amends and supplements the trade agreement of 1939 between the two countries. In view of a special situation which arose in connection with this agreement, I am submitting the following statement to the Congress:

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 provides that before entering into negotiations for a trade agreement the President shall submit to the Tariff Commission a list of the articles to be considered for specific concessions and that upon receipt of such list "the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such articles as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign-trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period." The findings of the Tariff Commission under this subsection are popularly known as the peril-point findings.

Under subsection (a) of section 4, in case the President enters into a trade agreement which exceeds the so-called peril-point findings of the Tariff Commission, he shall within the 30 days "transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement, together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be."

Subsection (b) of section 4 requires the Tariff Commission promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign-trade agreement to Congress to "deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a copy of the portions of its report to the President dealing with the articles with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with."

In preparation for the negotiations with the Government of Venezuela looking toward an agreement supplementary to the existing reciprocal trade agreement with that country of November 6, 1939, I submitted to the Tariff Commission a list of articles to be considered for specific concessions by the United States. In accordance with section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, hereinabove set forth, the Tariff Commission reported to me on December 27, 1951, its findings with respect to each such article as to the limit below which concessions could not be granted without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. For a certain group of petroleum products [1] three of the Commissioners found that the peril point was the existing tariff quota arrangement—10½ cents per barrel or one-fourth cent per gallon on a quantity equal to 5 percent of the total quantity of crude petroleum processed in refineries in continental United States during the preceding calendar year and 21 cents per barrel, or one-half cent per gallon, in excess of this quantity). The other three Commissioners found a rate of 10½ cents per barrel on all imports would constitute the peril point.

Although there are a number of legal issues involved on the question of whether there is or is not any peril point found within the requirements of section 3 of the statute by reason of the evenly divided Commission, I nevertheless desire to inform the Congress of the action I have taken with respect to these petroleum products in the agreement.

The text of the supplementary trade agreement which I have concluded with the Government of Venezuela is attached. This agreement contains the following concession on paragraph 1733 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code:

Tariff Act of 1930 paragraph	Description of article	Rate of duty
1733	Petroleum, crude, fuel, or refined and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzine, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil, not specially provided for (except petroleum jelly or petrolatum, and except mineral oil of medicinal grade).	Free.

[1] Crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum, and fuel oil derived from petroleum (including fuel oil known as gas oil), par. 1733, Tariff Act of 1930, and sec. 3422, Internal Revenue Code.

Internal Revenue Code section	Description of article	Rate of import tax
3422	Crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum, and fuel oil derived from petroleum (including fuel oil known as gas oil):	
	Testing under 25° API	¼ cent per gallon.
	Testing 25° API or more	¼ cent per gallon.

Thus, when the agreement enters into force, a rate of 5¼ cents per barrel will apply to imports into the United States of crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum and fuel oil derived from petroleum (including fuel oil known as gas oil) which is testing under 25° API (American Petroleum Institute Rating); the rate on these same products testing 25° API or more will be 10½ cents per barrel.

The supplementary agreement with Venezuela will provide for increased trade between the two countries. It will contribute to the security of both countries and will stimulate the development of proven oil reserves in the Western Hemisphere.

As compared to the 1939 agreement, Venezuela grants new or improved concessions on $154 million of imports from the United States in 1950; on $12 million of imports they are withdrawing the 1939 concessions; and on $6 million of imports the new agreement provides for higher Venezuelan rates than in the 1939 agreement. The trade coverage of the 1939 agreement as supplemented by the new agreement is $240 million or about 60 percent of total United States exports to Venezuela. Under the 1939 agreement, only 35 percent of our exports were covered. Among the important items receiving new or improved duty concessions are apples, pears, certain dried vegetables, rolled oats, wheat flour, barley malt, baby and dietetic foods, wrapping paper, laboratory and refractory glass products, galvanized iron sheets, enameled iron and steel manufactures, builders' hardware, table flatware, unassembled trucks and passenger cars, motorcycles, aircraft and parts, trailers, radio and television receivers including parts, phonographs including combinations and parts, phonograph records, automatic refrigerators, scientific apparatus, hand tools, photographic products, office machinery, electric motors, pumps, numerous types of industrial machinery and apparatus and parts, generators and transformers. Among the products on which new bindings of duty-free treatments were granted by Venezuela are road building, textile and printing machinery; stoves, heaters and ovens, and parts for agricultural machinery. The agreement, as revised, covers 179 Venezuelan tariff items as compared with 88 in the 1939 agreement. It includes products of interest to practically every important group of United States exporters. Concessions by Venezuela have particular significance since that country has no balance of payment difficulties in purchasing from the dollar area.

In 1950 United States imports from Venezuela of crude petroleum and residual fuel oil amounted to $288 million, or about 90 percent of our total imports from Venezuela. It is estimated that the 1950 value of trade on which the United States granted improved customs treatment is about $175 million, of which practically all was crude petroleum and residual fuel oil. New concessions of potential value to Venezuela consisted of the binding of existing duty-free entry for iron ore, deposits of which are now being developed.

The new agreement also amends and supplements some of the general provisions of the 1939 agreement. The principal changes are a substantial strengthening of the quota provision so as to safeguard more adequately the value of the reciprocal tariff concessions, an additional reciprocal undertaking with regard to customs formalities, and the inclusion of the standard escape clause in event serious injury should be caused or threatened to domestic industry as a result of the agreement.

With regard to the concession on crude petroleum, topped crude and fuel oil derived from petroleum, it would have been possible under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act to reduce the excise tax provided for in section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code to 5¼ cents per barrel. The majority of the representatives of private business urged during the hearings held both by the Tariff Commission and by the Committee for Reciprocity Information that such a concession be made to Venezuela. I have agreed to a concession of 5¼ cents per barrel on imports of some of these kinds of petroleum products, namely, those which test under 25° API. A rate of 10½ cents per barrel, a treatment which was in effect from 1943 through 1950 under the Mexican Trade Agreement, is provided for under the new agreement for petroleum products testing 25° or more API, which constitute the greater part of United States imports of crude oil. Experience during 1943–50 indicates that imports at 10½ cents will undoubtedly prove no deterrent to drilling and development programs now under way in the United States.

Most of the crude oil produced in the United States has a specific gravity of 25° API or higher. The national average is about 35° API. For example, less than 1 percent of the crude oil produced in West Texas is below 25° API. Most of the heavier crude oils in the United States are produced in the Rocky Mountain area, in California, and in some of the Gulf coast area.

About one-third of the Venezuelan crude oil production has a gravity of less than 25° API. Nearly all of the low-gravity oil is shipped to the refineries on the islands of Aruba and Curacao.

Only the asphalt crudes, some of the topped crude, and the residual fuel oil will pay the lower excise tax. Generally, imports of these heavier crude oils sell in markets different from those in which domestic low-gravity oils sell. Furthermore, the lower gravity oils have a lower value in the market than the higher gravity petroleum products. It is believed appropriate, therefor, that these commodities of less worth should be dutiable at a lower specific rate and that the more valuable oils should pay a higher rate.

The imported oils which would pay the lower tax are among those which are in relatively short supply in the United States and generally throughout the world. It is not expected that the lower tax applicable to such oils will cause an undue increase in imports above the quantity which otherwise might be imported. It would appear, accordingly, that the lower tax on residual fuel oil would not serve to disturb the relationship which now exists in the United States between this fuel and other sources of heat and energy.

One major use of residual fuel oil is for ship bunkering; oil for this purpose traditionally has been imported free into the United States. The residual fuel oil subject to import tax is utilized mainly in gas and electric power plants, in smelters, mines, and manufacturing industries, and to a lesser degree, as heating oil in industrial plants. Most of these users are located along the east coast.

For the most part, these fuel-burning installations, particularly the power plants, are convertible, using either coal or residual fuel oil depending upon which is cheaper at a given time. In recent years coal has been cheaper. Coal is also more available, because residual fuel oil is in tight world supply, and because the percentage of residual fuel oil to total output of United States refineries is constantly decreasing as emphasis shifts to distilling larger amounts of the higher and more valuable fractions, such as gasoline. Therefore, the percentage of convertible plants using coal has increased steadily since 1949, until now most of the east coast power plants are using coal rather than residual fuel oil. The reduction in excise tax on residual fuel oil in the present agreement is not expected to be sufficient to change this long-term trend. In reviewing this situation in its peril point findings, the various Tariff Commission members, too, concluded that it offered no valid deterrent to a reduction in the import tax on petroleum.

The conclusion of the supplementary trade agreement is recognized by both the United States and Venezuela of a common interest in the expansion of trade. Venezuela is one of the largest markets for a wide range of United States export products. The United States provides an important and established market for Venezuelan oil, this representing, in turn, an essential supplement to domestic United States production. The United States will also provide a market for other Venezuelan natural resources, such as iron ore, which are needed in this country. The agreement, therefore, will be of economic benefit to both countries. It is, moreover, of vital security importance in view of the strategic nature of some of the products included within its terms.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 29, 1952.*

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 18, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk on November 18, 1952, said to contain a report to the Congress of the Mutual Security Program.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Second Report on the Mutual Security Program, covering operations during the first 6 months of 1952 in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.). The report reviews the steps that we have taken with other nations to work for peace and security.

The Mutual Security Program is a positive program for peace. It is absolutely essential to the security of the United States. At a time when one nation is bent upon world conquest—as the Soviet Union is today—other nations, large or small, have but two real choices: To pay the ransom of appeasement or to pay the price of building together sufficient strength—military, economic, political, and moral strength—to keep the peace. The United States and other free nations have chosen to build up their strength. That is what the Mutual Security Program is all about.

During the 6-month period reviewed in this report, real progress was made in strengthening the free world. Although much remains to be done, we are heading in the right direction. If we keep on, if each of the partners in this joint effort makes every effort to meet problems in a sensible manner, we shall eventually reach our goal of a secure, peaceful, and confident world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 18, 1952.*

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent when the roll call No. 1 was called, due to the fact that the train on which I was traveling was an hour and a half late. I was here when the oath of office was administered.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be noted in the RECORD as being present here today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President of the United States requested that the committee state that he would communicate to the Congress a message in writing on Wednesday next.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE RECESS ON JANUARY 6

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, January 6, 1953, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING JOINT SESSION TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, the 6th day of January, 1953, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral vote: The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1).

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1953, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, of the Eighty-second Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1953, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, of the Eighty-second Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 1, Eighty-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee To Make the Necessary Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect of the United States on the 20th Day of January 1953, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. RAYBURN.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS INTRODUCED TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several hundred bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

PRIVILEGE OF INTRODUCING BILLS TODAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] is unavoidably absent today due to the death of his mother. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding his absence, he may be permitted to introduce bills today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, may I ask the majority leader what will be the program for next week? Of course, the resolution carried providing for the counting of the electoral votes on Tuesday, but does the gentleman contemplate anything else happening on that day or during the remainder of the week?

Mr. HALLECK. I have not consulted with the Speaker as to whether or not he may recognize Members for extensions of remarks or other requests. That may be determined later. It is our understanding that a message will come up here from the President on Wednesday. I did hear some talk of another message for Friday. But beyond that there is no program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Tuesday next the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask unanimous consent for extensions in the RECORD now?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that it is his desire not to have requests for extensions of remarks made now. There are four resolutions relative to deceased Members that will be offered and the Chair feels that the introduction of those resolutions should not be delayed. Therefore the Chair will not receive unanimous-consent requests today.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE LATE ADOLPH J. SABATH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a heavy burden on my heart that I announce to the Members of the House the passing of ADOLPH J. SABATH who died on November 6, 1952, at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md., just 2 days after he was elected for his twenty-fourth consecutive time to this body. Congressman SABATH was born in Czechoslovakia April 4, 1866, and came to the United States in 1381. He made his permanent home in Chicago, Ill., where he attended school. He was graduated from the Chicago College of Law in 1891, and was admitted to practice law the same year. He also received the degree of bachelor of laws from Lake Forest University.

Congressman SABATH, after being admitted to practice law, was selected for judge of the municipal court of Chicago, and served as judge until 1906 when he was elected a Member of Congress. He has served in this body ever since, establishing for himself a record for continuous service that has never been equaled by any Member of either body in the history of our country. He served under eight Presidents and nine Speakers, and on many of the important committees of this House. With the exception of the Eightieth Congress, he served continuously as chairman of the Rules Committee for the past 14 years.

Congressman SABATH was a Democrat—a good Democrat. He was a member of the county central committee of his party for nearly 50 years, 36 years as a member of the executive committee and 10 years as chairman. He also was a delegate to national conventions of his party for many years. He represented the people of his district all the years he was in Congress with great ability. He was an honest man and a devoted public servant. We have lost a loyal friend, the country a great legislator. His death is a loss not only to the people of Illinois, but to the people of America. To his good wife and friends, from the depth of my heart, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I want to join with my good friend from Illinois in paying honor to the late Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH, who was a great American, a great patriot. I believe he had one of the most unusual lives I know of. He came over here as an immigrant boy, and in his life he personified the virtues of perseverance and integrity. He was honored not only by his own people of Chicago but those of the State of Illinois and the Nation.

It was my honor to serve for many years with Mr. SABATH on the Committee on Rules. He was impartial, he was fair, and he was a fighter—a strong fighter, I may say—for the things he thought to be right.

I know every Member of this body will long remember and cherish the close friendship each and every one of us had with our good friend, Judge SABATH.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] and with my other colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to our dear departed friend, A. J. SABATH.

Congressman SABATH was a unique and wonderful person. He was one of the most conscientious and militant men I ever saw, fighting for the little people, not only of his district but of the Nation as a whole. He was outstanding for his long and distinguished record of service, unparalleled in the history of this House. He was outstanding, too, for the friendliness of his nature, for his good humor, and for his helpfulness to the many young men he saw come into the House. No one who asked Congressman SABATH for help was ever turned away.

In more than these qualities, however, Congressman SABATH was unique. He was a symbol, personifying the dream of those in foreign countries who see America as a land of hope and glory, of opportunity for even the humblest person—for Congressman SABATH started as a poor, immigrant boy and by his own efforts became one of the leaders of this country. He became, and will continue to be, a symbol of the universality of American citizenship, living proof to all the world that foreign-born Americans can and do enjoy the benefits and rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to the same high degree and extent as those fortunate enough to be born in this country. His life proved that there is a oneness in American citizenship—that the Constitution draws no distinction between American citizens regardless of their race, religion, or place of national origin.

Congressman SABATH was a great friend to me. Since I first came here 4 years ago, his advice has been invaluable and his help tremendous. I will miss him very much.

To his bereaved family, I want to extend my deepest sympathy, with the hope that time will heal the grief they now feel.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman form Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I announce the death of our beloved dean, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, which occurred at the United States Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., November 6, 1952. The story of our departed colleague is the story of America. He was a champion of the people, a supporter of all progressive legislation, an ardent Democrat, and at 86 years was one of

the really important men in the Congress and the United States.

As dean of Congress, he served longer continuously in Congress than any other man in history. He was serving his forty-sixth year or the last year of his twenty-third term in the House at the time of his death. His faith in progress was unruffled, his courage undismayed, and he remained an administration spokesman.

Mr. SABATH was born April 4, 1866, in a poverty-stricken village in Bohemia, now a part of Czechoslovakia. He was 1 of 11 children and his boyhood education was at a parochial school in the small town in which he lived. At the age of 13 he became an apprentice clerk in a dry-goods store and while there heard stories of opportunity and freedom in America which set his imagination afire. He saved his money and by the time he was 15, he had enough funds for his passage to America. He arrived in Baltimore in 1881 with $2.35 in his pocket and made his way to Chicago.

Our departed colleague studied at night at a business college and later established a real estate business. Continuing his studies, he graduated from the Chicago College of Law, was admitted to the bar, and in 1893 commenced active practice.

Mr. SABATH brought to America his mother, his father, and five sisters and five brothers. He became active in politics and helped organize, or joined, many social clubs. He was cofounder of the Czech Old Peoples and Orphans Home for which he contributed several building lots and cash. He also built an old peoples home in his birthplate, Zabori, Czechoslovakia.

He became a justice of the peace in Chicago in 1895. In 1897 he was elected police magistrate, where he served until 1907, and acquired his title of judge. He was a member of the central and executive committee of the Democratic Party and since 1902 was a delegate to all Democratic national conventions with the exception of 1948 and 1952. He was elected to the Congress in 1906 and served continuously to the time of his death.

He served for many years on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, on Foreign Affairs Committee and on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and for 23 years as a member of the Committee on Rules, 12 years as its chairman.

Well do I recall his helpfulness in my early days of service in this body. Many of his colleagues and friends knew him as a man with a golden heart.

The intensity of his convictions and the spirit with which he gave his best to every cause that he championed will long be remembered in this body. He was respected by his neighbors and deeply loved by his many friends.

ADOLPH SABATH labored for the welfare of all races and in the Seventh District of Illinois which he represented, one could find inhabitants of many racial strains. He gave his services to humanity irrespective of race, and it did not make any difference to him what a man was as long as he was decent and devoted to our American institutions.

We have lost an able and conscientious legislator, and a fine gentleman. He shall, however, remain in our loving memory as one who enriched our association and experience in this House. We mourn his memory; we must strive to emulate his example.

In the years to come I shall remember his ability, his accomplishments, his constructiveness, his noble character, and all that he stood for, and in my memory I shall always cherish his friendship.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife upon her great loss. May he rest in eternal peace.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. I join my distinguished colleagues from the State of Illinois and other Members of this body in paying tribute to the memory of our deceased friend and fellow legislator, the late Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH. It was my privilege to follow Mr. SABATH'S career closely in my years here as a secretary from 1933 to 1943; and later more closely as a fellow Member of the House.

He was an inspiration to me, as he was to all Members of the House. He was an able leader, a great legislator, a champion of the underprivileged, a champion of the workingman. He devoted his time and energy to many good causes. This House and the Nation will greatly miss him.

A short time before his death I visited Mr. SABATH in his office in the great city he loved so much, Chicago. Only a short time before my visit he had undergone a serious operation. While I had the feeling then he was failing rapidly, the Judge, as I always like to call him, showed his same aggressive spirit and talked enthusiastically of what the future held in store. He never looked back, except to profit by experience, and to point to errors which he hoped would not be repeated. He was not only the dean of the Congress who had accumulated vast wisdom as a legislator because of long service but in my opinion he was the most forward-looking Member of the Congress. At the age of 86, ADOLPH SABATH was still looking ahead in his desire to best serve his people.

I extend my most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Sabath.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feeling that I pay tribute to the memory of our beloved colleague and friend ADOLPH J. SABATH. His death occurred just 2 days after his election to serve his twenty-fourth successive term in this body, but He above beckoned and our friend has gone from us today. He was a man for whom I had the deepest affection.

As an immigrant boy of 15 he came to America from his native Bohemia, now Czechoslovakia, and settled in Chicago. Imbued with the freedom and opportunity of our great country, he diligently worked as a young man to gain a better education. This he accomplished by attending night school which enabled him to enter business and a further night course at the Chicago Law School led to a law degree. Admitted to the practice of law, he continued on a successful career which eventually brought about his entering the political field. Successively, he was elected police magistrate and judge, and then was elected to Congress in 1906 where he served continuously for nearly 46 years.

He served during the most crucial years in the history of our country and at all times had the best interest of our country and people at heart. He was a peace-loving man and frequently expressed the hope that notwithstanding the general world disturbances, universal peace will be forthcoming to the people of our country as well as to the people of the world.

Beginning with the Sixtieth Congress Judge SABATH has served his country and his congressional district faithfully under eight Presidents—Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman.

We knew him as a kindly man and especially so to me. During our friendship, we talked much together, and his wisdom derived from experience, made a deep impression with me. He was fatherly. In talking with ADOLPH SABATH, you knew that uppermost in his mind and heart was the welfare of the United States. Everything in his life was subordinate to his country.

Death has stilled ADOLPH SABATH'S heart and voice in the service of his Nation. All of us who knew him have had our lives enriched by his friendship. His contribution to our country and mankind will live on forever.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to me this is a sad homecoming. The living vibrations of a close and warm friendship of half a century have been stilled. The voice radiating from a heart that loved all mankind has been silenced. One of the great Americans of our times has passed, and the Congress of the United States, in which he served continuously longer than any other Member, has lost a statesman of the highest caliber whose devotion to the cause of the poor and the misunderstood has never been surpassed. America will never forget this immigrant boy who rose in the brilliancy of his mind and the purity of his heart to dazzling heights of achievement untouched by affectation, untainted and unchanged, ending as he had started, the friend of all mankind.

With my distinguished colleagues from Illinois I join in expression of the deepest sympathy to that fine good woman whose care over him and solicitude for his welfare contributed so much to ADOLPH SABATH'S ability to continue so long past the usual span of human existence and so virilely his service in this Chamber. My deep and sincere sympathy also is with his brother, Judge Joseph Sabath, no longer young and recently retired from the bench of Cook County with a record as a jurist which is the pride of Chicago and of Illinois. ADOLPH SABATH and Joseph Sabath were my friends, whom I loved, and around whom are entwined the memories of four or five decades, and when the news reached me of the passing of Adolph

I thought of that morning in the Eighty-first Congress which was Adolph's birthday. Twice he came to me on the floor and said, "Joe telephoned me; Joe, my brother." The heart of ADOLPH SABATH was as tender as his mind was vibrant. He has written a chapter in the book of Americana the like of which possibly never will be written again. That chapter in his own words, and covering the administration of eight Presidents of the United States, he has related in transcribed records, made in the radio room of the Old House Office Building, and which I hope may be made available to those of his colleagues who may wish to preserve as an inspiration and in fond companionship the voice of our beloved colleague and the dean of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us deeply mourn the passing of the beloved dean of the House, ADOLPH SABATH. Forty-six years of continuous service in itself bespeaks the high regard in which he was held by the people he represented. It also bespeaks the great contribution he has made over the years to his party and to the country.

ADOLPH SABATH has been the outstanding example of what we really mean when we refer to this being the land of freedom and opportunity. He came here as an immigrant from Czechoslovakia. He studied law and his legal talents were quickly recognized. He became a judge and did much for improving legal procedures to insure the preservation of individual rights.

In 1907 he came to the Congress. It would take more than time could possibly permit even to begin to recite a small part of his legislative contribution. While he was an ardent advocate of certain political policies with which I personally did not always agree, he was indeed a good friend of mine and certainly always just and fair in all his dealings with his fellow man.

With the passing of ADOLPH SABATH we have suffered a great loss. I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of ADOLPH SABATH is felt as keenly by me as by anyone in the House of Representatives. When I came here 4 years ago, ADOLPH SABATH was my guiding light. He assisted me when I was a new Member in this body. He was more than a half century older than I and had over half a century of experience—rich experience—behind him. I thank God for the privilege of serving with him and for his advice and counsel during the past 4 years. I think the life of ADOLPH SABATH will be another chapter in the history of this great democracy telling the story of an immigrant who came to this country to participate in the development of this great land. A man who was truly a representative of the people, fighting at all times for the betterment of our society. He was a champion of the rights of the individual and one of the greatest protectors of our liberties and our way of life. I will miss ADOLPH SABATH but I will always have a feeling of appreciation for the contribution he has made to our society and our Nation. Along with the entire membership of this distinguished body, I extend my sympathy to his relatives and loved ones. The loss of ADOLPH SABATH will be great, but history will always reveal what he has contributed to his country.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the passing on of our colleague, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, brings to a close a unique and spectacular career of a man who, had he lived to fulfill his term in the Eighty-third Congress, would have served 48 years in the House.

I knew and was personally acquainted with Congressman SABATH for many years prior to my election to Congress. His political career always intrigued me because I was aware of his early struggles after he came to Chicago as a poor and unknown immigrant boy from Bohemia. His ultimate rise to prominence and political power in Chicago is an achievement that illustrates and emphasizes again that the United States is the land of opportunity. After his arrival in the United States, Congressman SABATH decided to make Chicago his home. It was in that city where he made the most of his opportunity, and where he demonstrated that a lowly and humble beginning in life was no handicap to a boy who possessed the courage, will power, and vision to seize the opportunities that his adopted country made available to him.

A summary of his outstanding political and Congressional performances reveal that he never lost sight of his humble origin. Throughout his public career he manifested a deep and sincere interest in the welfare of those who are frequently referred to as the poor people. I entertained more than a passive interest in his activities in Congress because of my close acquaintance and friendship with his brother, Judge Joseph Sabath, who served with distinction as a jurist in the courts of Chicago and Cook County for more than 40 years, and who recently retired as a judge of the Superior Court of Cook County.

Congressman SABATH had many honors conferred upon him during his lifetime—a number of the specific honors have already been mentioned by my distinguished colleagues while paying tribute to his memory on the floor of the House. Congressman SABATH is well remembered by the bench and bar of Chicago as the senior member of a prominent and active law firm with which he was affiliated for many years, and from which firm he severed his connections during the past 10 years.

I had occasion to frequently confer with him because of the position he occupied as chairman of the Rules Committee. In that capacity he served for many years. My experiences and personal contacts with him were of a most cordial and friendly nature. He was a devoted and militant member of his party, but regardless of his extreme partisan leanings, he proved himself on all occasions to be eminently fair and open-minded in matters pertaining to his official duties, and courteous and cooperative to anyone who sought his counsel in expediting legislative measures, regardless of party affiliation or policy.

Congressman SABATH was a man possessed of strong convictions, an aggressive, vigorous, and militant Member of the House, who long will be remembered for his strong determination and demonstrated leadership, and his diligent service to his constituency that he represented so faithfully in Congress for nearly 50 years.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with you in sending condolences to the family of our lost Member. He was my friend. I remember him as slightly different from most people. A catastrophe occurred in my district where many poor people were left homeless. I received a check from ADOLPH SABATH to use in any way I saw fit, to help them.

To my mind he exemplified what the poet meant when he said:

He giveth but little who gives but tears;
He does his best who aids and cheers;
But he does better and merits more
Who drives the wolf from the poor man's door.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1906, when ADOLPH J. SABATH was elected to this body until his passing in the late days of the year 1952, many hundreds of eminent citizens have served as his colleagues. I think I am safe in saying that of all of this number there is not one still living today who does not have regret at his passing; but more than that, Mr. Speaker—all who have been fortunate enough to have had the privilege of being a colleague of his have, without doubt, received inspiration from him, because of his outstanding devotion to the public interest; his indefatigable energy in discharging his duties as a Member of this body; in his courage and patience in ever pressing for those ideas and principles in which he believed; and in his unfailing sympathy and friendship for, shall we say—those people—persons—whether as a group or individuals, who yearned for understanding and assistance in their aim of a better life; the aim that is inherent in every human soul. Upon ADOLPH J. SABATH, these could always rely; and those who knew him best were those who loved him most. I pride myself upon being numbered as one of his many thousands of friends.

To his widow and the loved ones he leaves behind, I extend my heartfelt sympathy; and pray the Almighty to comfort them in the knowledge that he has gone to that reward prepared for those who love their neighbor as themselves.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the life work of ADOLPH SABATH demonstrates, as well as anything, America and what it stands for, where everybody who

deserves an opportunity gets it; where their reward is what they deserve.

Coming to this country as a small boy, an immigrant, ADOLPH SABATH went to work for himself, for his family, and for his country. The fact that he served in Congress longer than any other man in the history of the Congress of the United States, even adding together the services of men in the House and in the Senate, demonstrates that his people had great faith and confidence in him, and he was one in whom you could put faith and confidence. I was personally deeply devoted to ADOLPH SABATH.

I, along with his loved ones and dear ones, will miss him always.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of ADOLPH SABATH leaves in the hearts and minds of all who knew him a void that must be hard to fill. ADOLPH SABATH was a remarkable man of outstanding character, intense in his love of God and of his fellow man. His whole life was symbolic of progressive, constructive effort, and in particular trying to help those less fortunate than himself, as was so eloquently expressed by our friend from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Adolph and I were very close to one another not only in our official life but also in our social life. I find it difficult to express my thoughts because of the nobility of his character and the profound impression he made upon me through his simplicity. Every time I met him he was an inspiration to me and an example to follow in trying in my own way to be a better man and to lead a better life.

As our distinguished minority leader, Mr. RAYBURN, so well said, all who knew ADOLPH SABATH and served with him will miss him very much. I think I can truthfully say there was only one ADOLPH SABATH, that when Adolph was born the mold was broken. As long as any who knew Adolph lives, the light from the candle of his life will always be in existence and shine on, for his life was one of goodness, of kindness, of charity, and love: Love of God, in whom he had great faith, and love of his neighbor. All of us who knew ADOLPH SABATH are a little better because of the fact that we knew him.

The whole Nation is the poorer by the death of my most valued late friend ADOLPH J. SABATH.

This venerable Representative, whose tenure in the House spanned nearly half a century, devoted himself unstintingly over the years to the betterment of the lot of the average man, and toward the integration of the immigrant into the fabric of American life.

His record-breaking term of consecutive service of more than 46 years in the House of Representatives bespoke the esteem in which he was held by the people of his district in Chicago. But more than that, his career will always stand as an exemplary and shining symbol of the opportunities for all under our democratic system in this land of free men. ADOLPH SABATH, in fact, epitomized in the political and legislative fields the contribution which the foreign-born have made, and the descendants are making today, in the building of the greatness of the United States, and in its achievement of world leadership.

He was a fighter for the causes in which he deeply believed and vigorously espoused. Yet, I venture to say, that even among those with whom he differed strongly, there is none who does not mourn his passing. His friendships knew no party or factional limitations.

Mr. SABATH's wise counsel and stanch liberalism will be sadly missed in this Congress.

He was a man. Take him for all and all, we shall not look upon his like again.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend our deep sympathy to Mrs. Sabath.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], Mr. RAYBURN, and Mr. MCCORMACK, and with the Illinois delegation in paying tribute to our departed friend and colleague ADOLPH SABATH.

I was acquainted with ADOLPH SABATH before I came to Congress 10 years ago. When I became a Member of this House, Congressman SABATH was one of the first to extend advice and aid, and I will always remember our departed colleague for those offers of assistance that he extended to me. During his public life he has always fought for the rights of the common man and woman. He was a great liberal statesman and humanitarian.

As our minority leader stated, Congressman SABATH came to America as a poor immigrant boy back in the latter part of the last century and rose to the heights of business and political life in America. He has been a living example of what a free democracy can do for any person regardless of station in life, who wants to take advantage of the opportunities this country has to offer.

I shall never forget an incident of his life that he told me one day when we were having lunch. He stated that the first great impression he had of America was as a young man in the year 1896. During the Democratic national convention in Chicago that year he boarded a street car to go down Wabash Avenue to the Coliseum to attend the last day of the convention. The man sitting across from him in the street car was a young Congressman from Nebraska. He had heard a great deal about William Jennings Bryan but had never met him. So he moved over introduced himself and sat beside Mr. Bryan. Mr. SABATH said that as a young American he thought one of the greatest honors that could come to a young immigrant in America was to be able to sit beside and talk to a Member of Congress.

He asked the Congressman who he thought would be nominated that day at the convention. Congressman William Jennings Bryan stated that if he was able to get the floor at the convention on that day he thought he had an excellent opportunity of being nominated.

Of course, the rest of the story is history. That evening William Jennings Bryan got the floor and through the power of his oratory and his voice he made his famous Cross of Gold and Crown of Thorns Speech. Bryan became the nominee in 1896 after one of the greatest demonstrations following his great speech in convention history.

The young immigrant, ADOLPH SABATH, thought that was one of the greatest demonstrations of free democracy in action that could come to any nation in the world. At that time, he said, he decided to make public life his career. He came to Congress in 1907 during Theodore Roosevelt's administration and has served continuously until his death a few weeks ago. No Member of Congress in the history of the Nation has equaled his tenure in the House of Representatives.

I extend my sympathy to the wife and family of our departed colleague, Congressman ADOLPH SABATH.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this moment to express my very deep personal affection for the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ADOLPH SABATH, who recently passed away. Death is a very complicated matter to speak about. During the last 2 months two chairmen of great committees on which I have served have passed away. Both were big men who contributed greatly to our way of life.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] stated a moment ago, when a young man who could not speak English, born in a far away land, comes to America and has the opportunity, the privilege, the courage and faith to spend 46 continuous years in public life, that should be an inspiring thought to all of the people of the world, particularly to those who sometimes feel that they are members of minority groups in this great country of ours.

I knew Judge SABATH well and had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and on committees with him for some time. I shall never forget my pleasant experiences growing from this long friendship.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and the privilege of serving nearly 10 years as a member of the great Committee on Rules with ADOLPH SABATH.

Last spring when he left Washington and the House here for the last time, I traveled on the same train with ADOLPH SABATH to Chicago. He was a very sick man at that time. He was unable to sleep. We sat and talked for a long time that night in his bedroom. I carried with me since that day a different impression of ADOLPH SABATH than I ever had before, because I believed that he had a premonition of death. He told me things that happened in his lifetime, the history of his life, that I had never heard before. Certainly we can all take encouragement from the story of ADOLPH SABATH and in the great progress he made in our America, because ADOLPH SABATH was a success in life. He proved again that to the boy who goes out on his own

and works and strives, success will come. I did not always agree with our great chairman, ADOLPH SABATH, in all of the positions he took on legislative matters or upon political questions. We jousted with each other often on this floor of the House, as you all know, and yet it was a friendly jousting, but throughout the years we did have a very warm affection for each other. I had the pleasure of spending many delightful hours with our genial friend. As was said a moment ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the mold was broken when ADOLPH SABATH was given to the world. There will never be another like him. He will live in our memories for a long, long time. Some day, of course, we, all of us, will look forward to seeing ADOLPH SABATH again with that genial smile, that willingness to forget and to forgive and to do the million and one little friendly things that he did for all of us. We all miss him now, and I am sure that we all join in extending our sincerest sympathies to his family.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I count it a great honor and a privilege to have become, during the last term of Congress, rather closely acquainted with the late Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois. I went on the committee of which he was chairman as a new minority member, and never at any time was I accorded anything but the finest courtesy and fairness which I felt so keenly, even though I had not known him intimately before as a Member of the House. I just want to take this brief time to say I admired and respected ADOLPH SABATH; that I shall miss him; that I count it as a personal loss to me, and I want to extend my very deep sympathy to the members of his family and to his loved ones.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I was not as close to ADOLPH SABATH as were our names on the roll. However, during my time in Congress and prior to that time, while I served as a secretary, I had the opportunity on many occasions to talk with Judge SABATH. I found him to be a true gentleman, a real, genuine and genial character, who will remain a legend of the House of Representatives. I concur in the sentiments already expressed and join in the condolences to his loved ones.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the life and character and services of our late colleague, ADOLPH J. SABATH, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, those of us who worked with ADOLPH J. SABATH for so many years can well understand why his constituents returned him to the Congress of the United States for 23 consecutive terms.

Knowing the ruggedness of his character we can appreciate his great ability to weather the sometimes heavy storms and complex vicissitudes of political life.

The history of ADOLPH SABATH's life is, in itself, an eloquent testimony to the great opportunities for service which America offers those who accord this Nation their faith and devotion.

The people of Illinois who put their continued trust and confidence in ADOLPH SABATH as their elected Representative in the Congress have lost a great public servant. My friends on the other side of the aisle have lost a pillar of strength in their party councils and we on this side mourn the passing of an admired and highly respected colleague.

But there must be a great measure of consolation to all of his friends in the realization that a divine providence gave to our late colleague a long and useful life rich in service to the Nation.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the death of the late Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH was a tragic loss to the entire Nation and a great shock to his many loyal friends. ADOLPH SABATH won great honor and distinction for having served in Congress longer than any other American. But to me his right to a place in the hall of fame of America rests on his leadership and sponsorship of liberal causes and in his championing of the rights of the common man. "The rich and the strong can take care of themselves," he often told me, "it is the poor and helpless who rely on us and need our help. It is to them that we owe our loyalty."

I am proud to consider myself as one of his close friends. Though I was only a new Member of Congress, he always found time for words of fatherly advice and encouragement for me. I shall forever be deeply indebted to him for his kindness and sincere friendship.

Perhaps that was because there was another bond which held us together. He, just as I, was an immigrant to this country in his youth. He was not born in America, but America was born in him. He was not an American by birth, but by choice, and he was always proud of that fact and grateful to this country for the opportunities it gave him.

We shall miss him and his leadership in the Halls of Congress, but I am sure his friends will carry on the fight for the principles to which he was so devoted. I extend to his widow and family my deepest sympathy. May he rest in eternal peace.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, ADOLPH SABATH was a kindly man who showed anew each day that he lived his great faith in and his appreciation for his country. America was good to ADOLPH SABATH and he sought constantly to repay her and to leave her richer by his service.

In his career every lad in every land may find inspiration. Few things that are finer than that can be said for any person.

He was able. He was a worker. He was a great American.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the old legislative warrior and champion of democracy, ADOLPH SABATH, was a sad day not only for his thousands of friends but for his district and country as well. As dean of the House of Representatives, chairman of the Rules Committee, successful businessman, and one of the great elder statesmen of our country, he was a constant exhibit of the opportunities this great country has to offer to even an immigrant boy who comes here without money, position, or friends.

Although born in a foreign country, he fitted well in the American scheme of democracy and, through honesty and rugged individualism, he carved a niche high on the walls of the hall of fame here. He became one of the most loyal Americans I have ever known.

ADOLPH SABATH was a loyal friend, an indefatigable worker, sympathetic and understanding of the problems of all who sought his advice and aid.

May the Great Comforter sustain his loved ones who are left behind. Peace and glory be to his ashes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the life of ADOLPH J. SABATH holds a wealth of lessons for all those who would study America to discover what makes her great.

He symbolized the great idea of this Nation: that America is truly the world's land of opportunity for all those of courage and faith, whatever might be their origins.

He was a fighter on the side of progress for all of the 46 years he served so ably as a Member of this distinguished body. His great contributions to the well-being of the people of this Nation cannot, by any token, possibly be measured in mere material terms.

Never did I or any of my colleagues fail to be deeply impressed with his unfailing courtesy to those of us who appeared with legislation before the Rules Committee.

I extend my deep sympathies to the family of our sadly missed Member.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House who have had the privilege of knowing our late colleague, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, will miss him during this new session. We shall miss his familiar face, his kind words, and most of all his sound advice. We shall miss his inspiring leadership and his wisdom, his experience and knowledge of men and affairs, his great devotion and ardent patriotism to the United States, which received him as an immigrant boy back in 1881 and afforded him the opportunity to rise to great heights of national distinction.

Few mortal men are privileged to reach the venerable age of four score and six, and fewer still attain such an incomparable record of achievement and service to our Nation as did our late colleague. He has given the American people long and distinguished service which is recorded in the annals of Congress. He was a man of deep convictions and a great believer in human rights and humanitarian principles. Throughout his long service in this House extending over a period of 46 years consecutively—more than any other man in the history of the United States Congress—he has constantly championed and fought hard for liberal and constructive legislation.

ADOLPH SABATH was almost an institution in himself. Deeply beloved by the people and revered by his colleagues in

Congress, including those who disagreed with him violently, he deserves to be remembered more than by words. I should like to see this House take steps to memorialize his name in suitable fashion, either through a statue or monument in the vicinity of the Capitol, so that future generations may know of this outstanding American of immigrant stock and his achievements as a legislator.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his bereaved family. May they be consoled by the thought that he leaves behind a great and honorable name that will long be remembered by the American people.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE EDWARD EUGENE COX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and profound sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EUGENE COX, of the Second District of Georgia. He passed away on Christmas Eve at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda. He succumbed to a heart attack, and has been laid to rest among his friends and neighbors in the warm and friendly soil at his old home, Camilla, in his beloved State, to which he gave his fullest devotion.

For 28 years he served with distinction in the House and had been elected for his fifteenth consecutive term. During the time he had been a Member of this body, he witnessed a whole breath-taking chain of events in the history of our country and of the world.

For many, many years he was ranking Democrat on the Rules Committee, and no Member of this House for the past 20 years exerted more influence in what measures came to the floor of the House than did the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. COX.

At the time of his death he was chairman of a special committee investigating subversive influence in American foundations. He was among the very first in the House to warn the Nation of the danger of the communistic infiltration in Government.

He was independent in thought and acts, and always had the courage of his convictions. A brilliant debater, a gifted speaker, his sentences were always logical and gems of thought, and whenever he addressed the House he meant every word he said. He spoke from the heart, and if perchance the words uttered in the heat of debate offended, he was most apologetic, for he was indeed gentle and kind.

He had a heart of gold. He could not bear malice against anyone. He possessed a most lovable character and a charming personality. He was endowed with a keen and analytical mind.

I know of no greater compliment that I can pay his memory than to say that the respect and affection of this House for GENE COX grew greater and greater as the years rolled by.

In him was reflected the unusual attributes of selflessness. His dominant thought was always the welfare of the country.

I know that every member of this body admired and respected him. All of you have lost a friend, an able colleague. But I have lost more than that—I have lost a friend of 50 years, and a classmate. His passing saddens me more than I can say. I shall miss him for his genuine affection, his wise counsel, and his sincerity. But beyond that, the Nation will miss him, for GENE COX loved America as few men ever have. His whole life was devoted to his country and the records of this great body will bear witness to the fact that he never failed to wholeheartedly support what he thought best for the Nation.

Every piece of legislation dealing with our national security for the past 28 years bore the stamp of his approval.

His opinions on domestic and foreign affairs were firm and given without reservation. When he espoused a cause he did so deliberately, after long, careful, and searching thought.

He considered only what was best for his country. He never chose a course because it was easy or might be popular.

When he had reached a decision he brought to his task all of his skill and all of his talents, all the energy and the resources with which he was so generously endowed. Whatever he did, he did with conviction, with zest, with enthusiasm, and without wavering.

He was the sort of man who became more beloved as time went on. He was the sort of man who wore well. No one will replace him, for he was one of those rare men who is made from a secret mold.

Nor will he be forgotten—because men like him are not forgotten in the hearts of those who loved and respected them.

Georgia will always count him as one of her most illustrious sons, and the Nation is greater because GENE COX lived.

We in the Georgia delegation and the Members who were so intimately associated with him in his years in Congress will miss his wise counsel. We will miss his sturdy and unwavering support of the causes in which he came to believe.

Right was his only criterion. Compromise was not in his nature. His was the stout heart of the worthy adversary.

Now the stillness of the dark night is upon us. Another of our colleagues joins the long line of silent figures whose voices echoed through these halls. The rugged warrior has laid down his armor and sleeps in the earned peace of a task well done—of a life well spent in service.

To his widow and children, to his constituents, to his State, and to his Nation, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate for me to pay just and deserving tribute to GENE COX. He fearlessly fought for what he thought was right. No one had more courage or exemplified a greater fighting spirit than he. His long service in public life rendered throughout the years was to make the Nation, his State, his community, and the home a better place in which to live.

He was a champion of States rights, and stood for the sound constitutional principles that have made this country great. He believed in democratic processes. He believed that the people should rule and that they had the capacity to rule.

He was known in every State of the Union for his sound thinking on foreign relations and policies. He respected the views of others, whether he agreed with them or not.

His effective work against communism in this country and abroad will be remembered by all.

He loved people and always extended sympathy to the little fellow and those in trouble. As a lawyer he was true to his clients, never taking advantage of opposing counsel, and was held in high esteem by the jury. As a judge he was just and fair. As a Member of this House he was diligent and energetic, loved and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. He was a kind and devoted husband and father.

I extend to the family my deepest personal sympathy in his passing.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when the time comes to speak of a dear friend who has gone from us to the Great Beyond, so many precious memories come to recollection that it is hard to talk at all.

I think at this moment of countless times when my life has been richer and fuller because I was blessed with the friendship of Judge COX.

His personality was an extraordinary personality. It was a joy always to come into his presence. His cheery greeting never failed to kindle anew that warm, responsive feeling of friendship which had lived in my heart throughout the years in which I knew him.

As we think and talk of Judge COX today, it is fitting to recall that he was a lawyer of recognized ability; that as a member of the bar he added distinction and luster to our great legal profession of which lawyers are justly proud.

As a judge of the superior courts of Georgia, he demonstrated that he possessed that quality so necessary and essential to all judges, namely, judicial temperament. He enforced the laws with firmness and a determination to protect the law-abiding citizens of his circuit from the lawless element. It was not possible in his court for the strong to oppress the weak, or for the rich to impose upon the poor. His presence upon the bench was a guaranty that every party to a case in his court would receive that to which the law entitled him.

Judge COX first established his reputation as a lawyer, a jurist, and a statesman in his native State and in his home

surroundings. When he came upon the national arena, those same qualities of intellect, fearlessness, and zeal in fighting for the causes he supported established for him on a Nation-wide basis the same reputation which he enjoyed at home.

He loved America and American institutions. He believed they were worth fighting for, and he devoted his finest talents and his utmost energy to their preservation. He did not dodge issues. He did not hesitate to take an open, frank, and unequivocal position on any question where he felt it was his duty to take a stand. He would not stoop to hypocrisy or deception. On most questions one who knew Judge Cox would generally know without asking him where he stood on current issues, because he was forthright and consistent in his philosophy and his personal code.

He was a power to be reckoned with in all the great battles which came to the floor of the House. He was not always victorious, but he was always courageous. He possessed those qualities which made him generous in victory and magnificent in defeat.

It happened to be my privilege to last see Judge Cox on the afternoon in November when he went to the hospital before his death. I had come to Washington for a visit of only one day. When my business had been transacted, I dropped into his office for a visit, and we discussed the coming session of Congress. I was looking forward with anticipation to serving again with him as a member of the Georgia delegation. The news which I received on Christmas Eve day of his passing saddened me beyond the power of words to describe. I extend sincere sympathy to the members of his family. His passing is not only a great loss to them. It is a great loss to his friends and colleagues and to our Nation. Our Nation is richer because of his life, poorer because of his death.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Georgia has lost one of her most distinguished sons in the passing of our beloved and lamented EUGENE COX.

Possessed of a golden heart, a brilliant mind, and the courage of his convictions, he was respected and loved by all who knew him. One never failed to know where Mr. Cox stood on any question of the day. His brilliant mind was quick to understand and to see the dangers to our American way of life and to our Republic. One of the first who gave battle to communism, one of the quickest to see its danger, he made a record here which we respect and honor him for.

I will miss him, and I know that all of our colleagues who served with him will miss the cheerful voice, the golden heart, and friendship of lovable EUGENE COX.

I extend to Mrs. Cox and the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, the strong and silent hand of sadness gripped my heart when first I heard that my good and great friend, GENE COX, had succumbed to the Grim Reaper. Finite mind cannot forge the words with which human tongue can tell of the tremendous sense of personal loss that has been mine since news came to me of his untimely death. Those of you who knew GENE need no reminder of the tragic loss his passing brings to his district, State, and Nation. You know that he had few, if any, equals in this legislative forum. As a personal friend and wise counselor to the young and inexperienced such as I, there was no man who was kinder, more understanding and loyal than he.

When I first came to this body I only knew GENE COX by reputation although he represented a district that adjoins mine. I, along with the other people of Georgia and the Nation, knew GENE COX to be a fighter for that which honest conviction led him to believe was right. We knew him to be the toughest of foes to those with whom he disagreed and knew him to be unrelenting in his fight against those who would, by subversion or otherwise, seek to do harm to this country he so dearly loved.

Within a very short time after I came to this body, I found GENE COX to be as kind and generous to his friends as he was critical of his foes. In fact, I came soon to be persuaded to believe that GENE COX had no personal foes. The composition of his fine spirit would not tolerate the harboring of personal malice within a heart that was as big as the human body can encompass. It is true that in the flaming and consuming fire of his incomparable spirit, there were times when his tongue, directed by one of the keenest minds I have known, would become devastatingly sharp and bitter as only those who have felt its keen lash can know. But those who have felt its keenest lash for a fleeting moment can also best testify to the speed with which he would always hasten to make amends for any personal harm that might have come to them.

There are those here who have known my great departed friend longer than I, but there cannot be one who feels more deeply the sense of personal loss that his passing has brought to me. Time will not permit detailed accounting of the number of times that GENE COX has befriended me in ways that only his kindly nature could devise. No man can assume the special place he has within my heart and memory, just as his district cannot replace him for his State and Nation.

No man could know GENE COX without loving and respecting him as an incomparable champion of the America he loved so dearly and as a personal friend who was always willing to give of himself to others. There are those of us who feel that his willingness to give of himself to his friends and to the performance of his duty as he saw it so unstintingly hastened his death. If he had been a little more selfish of his time and service, he would probably be here with us today.

Those who knew GENE best loved him most and it is to those that I offer my inadequate words of consolation and regret in their hours of deepest sorrow. The man called GENE COX is gone, but his great spirit will haunt these halls for countless years to come. He was a great Georgian, a great American in the very finest tradition of this Republic. In short, he was a great man.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as a friend and colleague, and as a member of the Georgia delegation in the House of Representatives, I attended the funeral of our departed brother at his home town of Camilla. It was there that I came to fully appreciate how his people loved him. We have, of course, ample opportunity here in the House to know each other and to learn and evaluate the virtue of others, but really to find out how great a person is, one must go among the people with whom he was raised.

On that Sunday morning when I arrived at Camilla there was every evidence of the sorrow that those people felt. There was a hushed reverence everywhere and people in all walks of life were streaming through his magnificent home out of respect and love for him. I was impressed by the large number of his colored friends who came to pay their respect to him, many of whom the Judge had defended in court, many of whom he had befriended. On every turn there the people were telling of some of the fine things that the Judge had done during his lifetime.

The first place I stopped down there was at a service station operated by a paralytic. This man was broken in grief. He stated that only a few weeks ago the Judge had come down from Washington and, as he always did, he came by to see this man and to inquire of his feelings. He told me that as he shook hands and left he placed a sizable bill in the palm of his hand.

That was typical of his many acts of kindness. Everywhere he went he touched people with kindness and with optimism and joy. I think GENE COX could properly be called a great public defender. Anyone in difficulty found him at their side. I have seen him many times rise on the floor of this House in defense of some brother who might have been in momentary difficulty. He was of excellent counsel to all of us. We all respected his views and judgment.

Georgia has produced a great many individualists, men like Alex Stephens and Bob Toombs. Georgia will place GENE COX in memory and reverence beside those two great patriots. He was one of the few remaining of the old school of statesmanship, men who did not rely upon things political and diplomacy in dealing with issues but who approached issues with the view of what is best for my land.

That was GENE COX's approach to every question. He was brilliant in debate and never yielded to an adversary in discussion. For courtesy's sake he would sometimes compromise a conviction. I did not always agree with him in the positions he took in the Congress, but I never questioned his motive or his sincerity. He did not make decisions for expediency's sake but out of a heart full of sincerity and great love of his country.

Yes; during his life he touched the lives of many people. He set a pattern for many to follow. He influenced the

lives of a great many individuals. He had the courage of personal convictions that was an inspiration to me. I stated at one time about him that if someone challenged GENE COX to a duel with rapiers, although he never had one in his hand before, he would quickly seize one and accept the challenge. That great trait, coupled with his intellectual courage, goes to make a strong, brave man. That is what he was. They need only put in his epitaph on the headstone of his grave: This is GENE COX, a truly great statesman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday afternoon at Camilla, Ga., I, with thousands of other sorrowing friends, saw the mortal remains of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Hon. EUGENE COX, return to the soil from whence it came. I wish every Member of this body could have been there to see the genuine love and devotion the people of his district, State, and Nation held for him as a servant, neighbor, and friend. And, it was only as it could be for no real American had reason not to love him and every loyal and informed American did love him.

I saw the American flag draped over his casket-enclosed body. It belonged there. I saw gentle hands tenderly remove that flag, fold it, and present it to his widow as a testimony of his fidelity evermore. Through my soul surged the thought, if there was ever a time etiquette would permit our flag to remain with a body, that was the time for only death could separate the two. I thought of his friendship to me over the years, his outstanding and unsurpassed service in this great body and that no longer would that outstanding American be physically present in the Hall of the House. Then, I realized that his spirit would always be present and that we all would be better Americans because of that spirit.

I have seen many lovers of this country, and God bless them all, but I have never seen one greater than Judge Cox. Never have I seen such devotion and zeal for the American way of life at all times and under all conditions, and sometimes under misunderstanding. It pained that gentle soul to be misunderstood, but never did he swerve in his courageous stand for his country and his principles. No man will ever enter this Congress with more genuine love for his country than Judge Cox, or who would more gladly defend it.

Years ago Judge Cox saw the great dangers of communism and he declared war on those dangers. The going was rough and many times he was almost alone. Thank God this Christian soldier lived long enough to see his critics eat their words. The people are awakening to this terrible menace. I am confident, supremely so, that as future history unfolds every event will be proof of the foresight, courage, loyalty, and love unsurpassed and that history's proudest pages will do justice to this great American.

As certain as we are to triumph over godless communism is the fact that his name will grow brighter through history. The Second District of Georgia and our State of Georgia were immensely proud of him. They and we will continue to have his spirit as the days go by and Americans will take his name forever in their hearts. To his widow and children we extend our abiding love and affection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the bright joys of the holiday season were dimmed for me, as I am certain they were dimmed for so many others in this Chamber, by the shocking news that we had lost one of our most beloved colleagues, EDWARD EUGENE COX, of Georgia.

GENE COX was one of my great friends in the House of Representatives. I shall miss him more than I can tell.

His was an outstanding career of service to the people of his district and to the people of the Nation.

Some men are clever; others we characterize as brilliant; many are diligent and resourceful. Yet so often they lack that divine spark of warmth and sincerity which distinguishes the truly noble personality.

GENE COX was a wise man. But beyond that he was blessed with a great spirit of warmth coupled with complete sincerity of purpose. He was a man of principle, a hard-fighting and vigorous champion of what he fervently believed to be the right.

It is perhaps only human that I shall remember GENE COX primarily as a generous-hearted friend.

But I will never forget his stanch Americanism, his able talents as a legislator, and his stalwart sense of obligation to serve the Nation he loved with complete loyalty and devotion.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when GENE COX passed on on Christmas Eve he left his heart in this House, because he loved the House of Representatives, which he had served 28 years.

I went to the hospital 2 days before GENE'S death to visit with him. He looked much better than when I had last seen him before he became ill. He was cheerful, but his whole thought and mind was upon the organization of this new House which took place here today and of the 2 years ahead and of the work that was to be done.

I served with GENE COX on the Rules Committee. I never knew any individual that had a better or a greater grasp of legislation or who had a more sincere desire to do only that which was best for his country. He placed his country and its welfare beyond all other considerations. I have seen him time after time do that which might not be popular for him at the moment, but which his own conscience and his judgment told him was in the best interest of the America that he loved so deeply and served so well.

We shall all miss GENE COX here. It will not be the same House of Representatives as we have known it for so many years with GENE away; yet I believe that somehow or other the very fact that he served here will inspire all of us to carry on in the tradition that he established of service to country, of willingness and readiness to do that which he believed right regardless of the cost.

To Mrs. Cox and to his children I join in extending sincere sympathy and the hope that divine providence will give them the strength to bear up under the great bereavement which has been theirs.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume much time in a eulogy of GENE COX except to express my concurrence in everything that has been said here today, particularly by his colleagues from Georgia, who knew him so well. GENE COX was a man of many parts. I think probably the outstanding features of his life were his great courage, politically and physically, his generosity to a degree greater than most any man I ever knew, and above all his unfailing loyalty to those who could claim his friendship. I served with him for 20 years on the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, and during that time I followed his leadership. I would do so again. I have never regretted it. I think GENE COX is one of the great men of our generation, and those many qualities which he possessed are going to live long in the hearts of the Members who knew him. While he has gone, his influence in this body, I think, will live on for years to come. He was a man who was quick of temper at times, and yet I do not think GENE COX ever had enmity toward any man. I have seen him in the warmest of debates when immediately afterward he was ready to shake the hand of his adversary and seek his friendship and forgiveness. That is not true of many people.

I happen to know something about his home life. I know of his deep and most generous and unselfish devotion to his fine wife, children, and his grandchildren. I know of their very deep affection for him. No person who is not a fine, great man would ever inspire the affection which was felt for him by his family and by those of his friends in the House of Representatives who were the closest to him and knew him best.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can do better than to adopt the wonderful words and marvelous tribute just paid to GENE COX by our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who was so long associated with Mr. Cox on the important Committee on Rules. During all the years that GENE COX was a Member of the House of Representatives, he gave me a confidence and he gave me a love and a loyalty unsurpassed by any friendship that anyone could know. My affection for him is deep and abiding. I never associated death with GENE COX somehow. I did not know he was ill, when the word came to me down on the farm that GENE COX had passed away. I knew of his love and loyalty to friends, and of his devotion to his wife and his children. He gave friendships and love without alloy. He was capable. He was

just built that way. He was a strong man in every sense of the word; strong in his convictions as he was in his love and his loyalty. Hot of temper, but when he lost his temper, he always came back and made everything all right with the man that he had lost his temper with. His was a noble soul. He had a grand and useful life. I do not think I will ever see such a life as his again exactly for he was built in a mold which was not at all common. He was a gentleman. He was an aristocrat of character and devotion. With his darling wife, who is my great and good friend, and his children, I shall miss him as long as I can remember friendship and good people.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when EUGENE COX first came to the House he picked out an office right next to mine in the Old House Office Building. I got to know him very well. That acquaintanceship has continued right down to the end. I have always found him true and straight, having in his heart and in his words the best interests of the United States.

At this time we are sorry that he has gone. We are glad that such a fine character lived with us.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when I first came here as a new Member 8 years ago, I very shortly became aware of the presence and the force in this House of Representatives of our late colleague, EUGENE COX. I knew him for the first several years only as a forceful, dynamic speaker. I classified him, as we all do, as a great American. But it was not until I had the pleasure and the honor of serving with him on the Rules Committee that I realized that this legislator, this powerful debater, this man of force, character, and strength was also a human being, a likable man, a man who thoroughly enjoyed doing things for people, doing favors for folks. I, too, have a great friendship and liking for our late colleague, EUGENE COX. I shall miss him greatly, just as we all will. I feel that in his passing this country has lost one of its greatest Americans.

I extend my sympathy to the members of his family and his loved ones and the people of his State who have lost a great representative.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse everything that has been stated on this floor today about our deceased friend and colleague, EUGENE COX. When I heard of the passing of this great friend of mine I was deeply grieved. It is rather difficult to know that EUGENE COX will not walk with us again in this Chamber. I had such a high regard for him that I can hardly visualize that he has gone to the Great Beyond.

EUGENE COX and I met when I first came to this House 14 years ago, and from that very moment my admiration and respect for him has grown up to this time. I saw that great, strong, patriotic American stand on the floor of this House and defend with every ounce of strength he had the things which he believed to be fine and big and best for this great America which he loved so dearly.

GENE COX to me was a symbol of everything that is fine in man. I have not the words to express my true feeling of this great patriot who has gone to his reward. I shall miss him as will every Member of this House who knew him, and as will everyone in his State and in this Nation who knew GENE COX as we did. But GENE is gone, and we must carry on as GENE COX would want us to. To fill his shoes and to take his place in this House is possibly beyond the ability of any of us, but we shall attempt to carry on where GENE COX left off.

My heart goes out to his good wife and family whom he loved so much.

God rest his soul.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, others have spoken ably of the fiery eloquence of GENE COX, of his unswerving courage, of his great ability as a fighter for the causes in which he believed. In my tribute I merely want to give one instance that will reveal a part of GENE COX that has been referred to but that many perhaps on this floor have not witnessed.

I looked today at the picture of GENE COX, our departed friend, and his photograph showed that stern, fiery courage and proud, indomitable will; I feel it did not show the great heart of the man, his infinite capacity for friendship, and his utterly winsome generosity.

It was my honor and privilege to serve with GENE COX on a subcommittee that traveled in Europe in the fall of 1947. Our train got to Essen, Germany, and the sleepers laid over there for us to board again. After we had been through the devastated city, we went back to the train to change our clothes and rest ourselves, and we found a lot of German children had assembled around the train. We had all supplied ourselves with chocolate and soap for an extended stay in that devastated country, and many of us had taken a supply of cigarettes. GENE COX went to his suitcase and soon emptied it of those things. He gave the children the chocolate that we had brought along for our own use, and he gave away all the soap that we had been supposed to take with us. Then, although it was possibly forbidden, he gave out the cigarettes to those children because he knew they could trade them for food in that community. Finally—and this was in the fall and it was beginning to get cool—he was outside the train with a sweater on and saw one little kid standing there who was particularly threadbare. GENE COX stripped off his sweater and handed it to that child. We finally coaxed him to come back into the car, to stop his generosity before he stripped himself further. He traveled contentedly the rest of the month in cold weather in Germany and Austria without the sweater that he really needed. That was GENE COX pouring out with his great heart things that he could have used himself.

That is the spirit of the man that does not show in his pictures but that should live in the hearts of all of us. That is the spirit of the man that will be of great comfort in memory to his beloved family and to his friends who now mourn him.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the fine things that have been said about GENE COX and his friendship came to me almost every day. He did me the very high honor and courtesy of patting me on the back and saying: "God bless you, young man."

Of course, GENE COX was a great American, a fine statesman, and I am sure he will be remembered for those great qualities. But I can remember him because he was a good, warm-hearted man who appreciated the miracle of humanity, a man who loved beautiful things, a man who enjoyed the things he might do for others.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, very pleased, that GENE COX did me the honor of giving me his friendship and I shall always cherish the memory of this splendid, lovely American.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks of Mr. COX's life we were associated together in a special assignment in the House of Representatives in connection with a study of American foundations. In that investigation and in my intimate association with him there were accentuated many of these virtues and fine qualities that have been brought out so eloquently by his colleagues from Georgia and by others who knew him longer than I.

I am not surprised that two things stand out that were also in my mind, first, the warm, human sympathy that was so characteristic of him, and, second, his innate patriotism, his intense patriotism. Those are the two things I will remember longest about him.

Supplementing what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said about his generosity, I think it may have been on that same trip or conceivably another, that one of our colleagues reported that in the presence of hunger and suffering he saws tears of sympathy in the eyes of GENE COX. It was not a display, because the gentleman from Georgia was not capable of that. Compassion is a larger word than friendship. The gentleman from Georgia had an incredible capacity for friendship, and those of us who were privileged to be in that circle appreciated it and shall always cherish it. But his was a wide circle. It took in the suffering of the world. This is something that I think belongs in the record.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] made reference to two other Georgians—Alexander Stephens and Robert Toombs. I am interested in Georgia's history, though not a close student of it. But because I spent time among its people before I was elected to Congress, Georgia has a special place in my affections. It is appropriately referred to as the Empire State of the

South, truly one of the greatest States in the Union. But there was another Georgian who contributed to its finest traditions, the unforgettable Benjamin Hill. He died just about the time that GENE COX was born. He said something that exemplifies the love of our united country which flowered so beautifully in the heart of GENE COX:

> Who lets his country die lets all things die and all things dying curse him; who lets his country live lets all things live and all things living bless him.

In the powerful tradition of Robert Toombs and Alexander Stephens and Benjamin Hill, and other great Georgians who preceded him in these Halls our colleague did his work worthily. The Nation will always be in debt to the State of Georgia for that contribution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague, E. EUGENE Cox, this body loses one of its its outstanding figures of the past three decades. GENE, as we who knew him well addressed him, possessed all the fine instincts of a true gentleman. His was one of the keenest intellects I have ever met. His general all-around capacity made him one of the most powerful advocates in any cause in which his interest could be aroused. His influence was a powerful factor in helping to shape the destiny of this body and, therefore, the history of these United States.

I have always been deeply thankful that he was at all times foursquare and vigorously a supporter of the foreign policies of his country, and, I believe this: that this course on his part was the result of his fierce and intense patriotism.

I was the last Member of this body to speak to him personally, when I visited him in the Naval Medical Hospital at Bethesda on the Eve of Christmas. I received the same genial and friendly greeting with which most of us have many times been greeted by him, and this in spite of the fact that just a few minutes before I arrived he began to suffer an attack. GENE, Mrs. Cox, and I chatted just a few minutes, but his attack became more severe and he requested another pill and the summoning of his nurse. While the nurse was ministering to him, I slipped from the room and with Mrs. Cox waited in the hall.

The last words I heard from the lips of my friend—spoken to his doctor and indicative of his genial and friendly character—were: "Ask Mr. EBERHARTER to come in." We decided it would probably be better for him if he did not attempt further conversation. I left, and within the hour our colleague passed on to his reward.

He was a gentle soul, and I shall always treasure the many pleasant hours spent with him.

To his widow and all the loved ones he leaves, I extend my deep and lasting sympathy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee has been struck twice by the grim reaper since the election 2 months ago. The death of our colleague GENE COX, of Georgia, who was ranking Democratic member of our committee, followed the death of our chairman, ADOLPH SABATH, by only a few weeks.

I served two terms as a member of the Rules Committee with GENE COX. I have observed his abilities as an outstanding statesman during my 10 years service in this House.

Though I did not agree with him on all legislation, I found him very human and considerate for those who held opposite views. He possessed a sympathetic heart and was always considerate of the feelings of his fellow man. He will be greatly missed by me as well as all the Members of this House. His wife and family have my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was with a very heavy heart that Mrs. McCormack and I heard over the radio of the death of our dear and beloved friend, GENE COX. It is with a very heavy heart that I today join my colleagues and participate in these tributes to his memory.

Each and every one of us are elected by the people of our districts, located in different sections of the country. We come as new Members to this body at some time or another. As Speaker MARTIN said today, 81 new Members were sworn in today.

When I came here as a new Member, one of the first men I met was the man to whose memory we pay our tribute today. I came from Boston. He came from Georgia. When we first come here we are products of our environment, each and every one of us, and we come with certain impressions, those of us of the West about the East and the South, of the South about the West and the East, and of the East about the South and the West. Then we come here and mix and meet our colleagues from different sections of the country, and we revise our views considerably. We find that human nature is pretty much the same everywhere. There are men and women of fine character everywhere, trying to make their contributions to those things which are nice and noble and uplifting; and in the case of those of us who are serving in this body, we try to make our contributions to the best interest of our country.

When I came here a little over 24 years ago, as I have said, one of the first Members I met as a new Member was my dear and valued friend, GENE COX. From that time to the time of his death there developed between us a friendship that to me will always be a most treasured memory of my service in this body and my personal contact with my colleagues.

We differed considerably, as those who served with both of us know, but there was a deep respect for the intellectual honesty of each other's views, and there was a deep respect on the part of Gene for my views and on my part for the sincerity of his views. There was an abiding friendship between us.

I can remember in 1940 when I was a candidate for majority leader in the Democratic caucus, the man who led my fight was GENE COX, of Georgia. I did not know at that time what effort would be made by other candidates to be elected. As a matter of fact, an effort was made to postpone the election from September 1940 until January 1941, until after the general election. Without saying anything in regard to the motives of those who wanted to postpone that election, I knew that was not for my best interests. I could not plan my fight because I did not know what was going to come, so to speak. I had to wait until we got into the caucus. I could not even designate anyone to lead my fight, it was so uncertain as to what I would encounter in the caucus. When the motion was made to postpone the election, I did not have to ask anyone, for GENE COX jumped up to lead the fight for me. I shall never forget that. I never forgot it during his life, and as long as I live I will never forget it.

GENE COX was very close to me. I numbered him among my most valued friends. As he was close to me in life, so will his memory always remain close to me as long as I live. And to Mrs. Cox, whom Mrs. McCormack and I deeply respect, and his loved ones, I extend the profound sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself in her bereavement.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point on the life, character, and services of the late Honorable EUGENE COX, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of EUGENE COX, of Georgia came to all of us as a severe shock. That was true especially of the older Members of the House.

EUGENE COX and I came to the House together. We both were Members of the Sixty-ninth Congress. From that time until the hour of his death he was a true and treasured friend.

During these years I have come to admire his great talents and his rugged Americanism. He was a man of strong convictions, and he was steadfast in support of those convictions.

Where he gave his friendship he never wavered in his loyalty to that friend. He was ever ready to demonstrate that friendship even when it was against his own interests.

He loved the House. He loved his country, and with great fervor he ever battled to keep the country strong and true to personal freedom.

He was an orator of great skill and a frequent participant in the historic debates of the last 25 years. He made a powerful impress upon Government policies.

We shall miss EUGENE COX as a great friend and a great American. To his fine wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the many tributes being paid to the memory of our late distinguished colleague, Judge Cox, of Georgia. I can speak with special reference to the unfailing kindness which he exhibited to new Members of the House, for I was a beneficiary.

Judge Cox was one of the elder statesmen of the House of Representatives, and one of its most influential Members, but he always had time for a considerate thought or word with any Member. As a Member who served only briefly with him, I want to express my deep appreciation for his courtesy and kindness to me. We have lost an able legislator and leader, but also a kind personal friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the Honorable EUGENE COX, one of the true pillars of this House is gone.

He ably represented his State and fought for those principles which have made this Nation great. He hated subterfuge and hypocrisy. He opposed them with a fierceness that was awesome and inspiring. We will miss him greatly.

I visited Judge Cox while he was in the hospital. As always he was cheerful and courteous. It was a pleasure just to chat with him and to wish him a speedy recovery.

However, the Almighty had decreed otherwise, and GENE COX lives now only in the memories of those who knew and loved him and to those countless millions whom his life has benefited.

No finer memorial could be.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a tribute to our great, departed friend, colleague, and comrade, EDWARD EUGENE COX.

When I received the sad news of Gene's death, it was a great blow to me and very hard to realize that he was gone. It is true I knew that his health was none too good in recent months and that the years and hard work had exacted their toll, but it simply had not occurred to me that GENE COX would ever pass away. He was one of those strong, virile types that we only associate with life and living—never whining, never complaining, never seeming to realize that there is a limit to human energies.

EUGENE COX was a great statesman, patriot and debater, an ardent lover of his country and defender of the faith of his native State and the South. Eager for the fray where issues of principle in which he believed were involved, sometimes fierce and impulsive in battle when it came, but always willing to meet any foe more than halfway in effort to heal the scars of what he may have said or done.

It has been said of our departed friend on this floor that the Omnipotent Potter, who shapes molds of human clay, broke the one that encased the body and soul of GENE COX. That may be a rash statement to make about things we know not of, but certainly few who knew, admired and loved him will deny that he was a unique character on and off the floor of Congress, whose like has not been seen here and probably never will.

GENE COX was able, courageous, loyal, and a foeman worthy of any man's steel, but withal as gentle and forgiving as an infant in his inner soul. His friends and admirers are legion. I am proud that we were warm personal friends. He has proved it on more than one occasion.

May the all-wise and omnipotent Ruler of the Universe place the hand of comfort upon his loved ones left behind and dry away their tears.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a great Georgian and a great American has left us. In GENE COX we were privileged to know a truly big man. His long and impressive record of service was marked alike with distinguished achievements and simple kindnesses. Therefore, as we mourn his passing we share a grief that bears on many shoulders throughout the Nation.

I knew a common bond with GENE COX for he represented the district in which I was born and where I grew to manhood. His friends were my friends. They saw in GENE COX a man of sturdy stock, a man who placed Americanism first, a man devoted to his ideals, and a man unafraid to fight for the things in which he believed. Wisely they turned to him for leadership and he gave them a leadership which never faltered.

I have lost a valued friend and a wise counselor. Congress and the Nation have lost a great statesman whose strong voice still is sorely needed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the well-earned tributes being paid to the late E. EUGENE COX.

We remember Judge Cox as a man possessed of the greatest kindness and sincerity. His profound ability in the field of government led him to become one of the most valued servants of this Nation he loved so dearly. With wisdom, he foresaw that these United States are not able to live alone, but rather that they must assert their leadership among the free nations of the world if we are to attain universal peace.

He will be greatly missed by all of us. My sincerest and most heartfelt sympathies are extended to Mrs. Cox and to his children.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we return from our respective districts to take up the duties of the Eighty-third Congress we find that there is a vacancy because of the death of E. EUGENE COX, of Georgia, who was one of the outstanding and capable leaders of the Congress.

I feel a distinct personal loss in the passing of Gene. I knew of him when he was judge of the superior court in Georgia, prior to the time he entered the halls of Congress, and he was known over the State of Georgia as a distinguished and able jurist. His district joined the county in which I resided and practiced law until 1925, at which time I went to Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

When I came to the Congress in 1945, I found GENE COX in the Congress as one of its leaders. Being native fellow Georgians we formed a friendship that grew through our association. His family and my family, for the past 6 years, lived at the Wardman Park Hotel, and we spent many happy evenings together.

Gene was a man of many virtues; he was especially loyal to his friends and devoted to his wife, Grace; he was a beloved father and regarded his children as his "jewels"; he was a St. Peter with his impulsive and impetuous nature, yet a St. John with belovedness, calmness, kindness, and compassion toward his fellow man. He possessed a noble soul that was filled with the milk of human kindness.

GENE COX was a man of courage and conviction and stood by his courage and conviction. He was generous, considerate, and tolerant.

We will all miss the excellent courage and leadership of GENE COX in the Eighty-third Congress. Not only the State of Georgia but the entire Nation can ill afford the loss of this man. To have known him is enrichment. To have lost him is desolation. To have memory of him is sturdy equipment.

To his beloved wife and family our expressions of sympathy are the deeper as we measure knowingly the incalculable loss they endure.

May God bless and sustain them in this, their sad hour of sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. EDWARD EUGENE COX, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. STIGLER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, and that I may insert with my remarks a tribute to our late colleague, Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, a eulogy by our former colleague, Hon. Toby Morris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and services of our late colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM G. STIGLER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I advise the House of the death during the recent congressional adjournment of one of the finest friends I have ever had, the late Honorable WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

Mr. STIGLER was elected to this House in a special election held March 7, 1944. He served continually until his death.

BILL STIGLER was born July 7, 1891, at Stigler, Okla., a little city in the eastern part of our State, named in honor of his father. He died in the same community on August 21, 1952.

He was born, lived, and died among the hills of eastern Oklahoma, which were dearer to him than all the places of the earth. Mrs. Stigler and their two lovely daughters survive him.

WILLIAM G. STIGLER was truly one of Oklahoma's finest citizens and public servants. He has left behind him a long and noble record of service to his State and Nation.

Of Choctaw Indian descent, he was once attorney for the Choctaw Tribe. He knew more about Indian problems and accomplished more in this body in the field of Indian legislation, affecting the Five Civilized Tribes, than any other Member of Congress in the history of our State.

BILL STIGLER was a soldier and a leader among the veterans of Oklahoma. He was a combat veteran of World War I. In 1934 he was department commander of the American Legion. He was the best informed man on veterans' affairs that I have ever known.

Congressman STIGLER came to this House with broad experience as a lawyer and legislator. He served in our State senate and was president pro tempore of that body.

Bill loved his friends, who indeed were legion. He was loyal. He was generous. He possessed the noblest traits of generosity so characteristic of his race.

BILL STIGLER was a great patriot. A proud first American, he always put America first. He gave every ounce of energy he had to the service of his country and to the performance of the duties of the high office to which his people entrusted him.

I have never had a finer friend. As long as I live, BILL STIGLER will live in my memory. I have lost a friend. Our country has lost a statesman. I extend to Mrs. Stigler and their lovely daughters my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I now include as a part of my remarks a eulogy prepared by our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Toby Morris, of Lawton, Okla.:

EULOGY OF HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER BY TOBY MORRIS

It was my honor and pleasure to serve, as his colleague, in the United States House of Representatives, for about 5½ of the 8 years that the late Honorable WILLIAM G. STIGLER served. During that time I came to know him as a true and valued friend. I had known him for many years before my service began in Congress, in January 1947, but only slightly. It was by association as Members of Congress that I was honored by his warm friendship. This I shall remember as long as my life shall last.

I have never known a man more devoted to the highest ideals of public service than BILL STIGLER. His constant thought was that of the welfare of the good people whom he had the honor to represent, in the Second District in Oklahoma, and also of his beloved State and Nation.

And, not only did he sincerely have the welfare of the people in mind, at all times, but he labored continuously to promote such welfare. Whether in his office answering mail of constituents and attending to other official details, or in committee, carefully examining witnesses and documents, and studying proposed legislation, or engaging in debates on the floor of the House, he exhibited always a keen interest in and a profound knowledge of what was transpiring. In other words, he worked extremely hard concentrating on the work at hand and knew it all as an expert. His service was invaluable to his district, State, and Nation. We, his Oklahoma colleagues, often affectionately referred to him as a good Indian. He was one, in fact and in truth. No nobler epitaph could, in my judgment, be used. He was one-fourth Choctaw Indian in blood. He was devoted indeed to his Indian constituents and was recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in the United States on Indian legislation and problems generally. But what we meant by this expression was that he was a good man, good husband and father, good legislator and citizen. He was truly one of the best in each category.

For some time before his death, BILL STIGLER was the dean of the Oklahoma congressional delegation in the House. We sought and relied upon his advice concerning many matters. He was always ready, willing, and able to unselfishly assist us in any way possible.

BILL STIGLER, who was a distinguished Oklahoma lawyer, served in many prominent stations in life, among which were Oklahoma State senator; member of the State soldiers' relief commission; departmental commander of the American Legion for the State of Oklahoma; executive vice president of the Choctaw Area Council of the Boy Scouts of Oklahoma, and national attorney for the Choctaw Indian Nation for 7 years.

These accomplishments are proof enough of his outstanding ability. However, in conclusion, I wish to say that he had not only a big mind, but also a big heart. He loved his friends, his State, his Nation. He loved justice and right. He loved humanity. He knew that—

"The night has a thousand eyes and the day but one,
Yet the light of a whole world dies with the setting sun—
The mind has a thousand eyes and the heart but one,
Yet the light of a whole life dies when its love is done."

May God bless his good wife and family who mourn the passing of this noble man.

The great Second District of Oklahoma, which Congressman STIGLER represented at the time of his death, is now represented by a new Member who took his oath of office today, a distinguished young Oklahoman. It is my pleasure at this time to recognize Congressman STIGLER's successor, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address this House on one's first day as a Member, but that honor is multiplied many times by the fact that the occasion is an opportunity to say a few words in behalf of a man who was not only a dear friend but also a great Oklahoman and a great American, a man who held the office of Congressman from the Second District of Oklahoma for many years, and a man who, had he chosen to run again in the primaries last spring, would still be holding that office by virtue of the fact that no one in the district would have elected to run against him.

BILL STIGLER was a man, as Congressman ALBERT has said, who was a great leader, and representative of the Choctaw Indian people. He was a man of vision, a man of complete, absolute, and unquestioned integrity; a man of the very highest principles; a man whose watchword and daily byword at all times was service—service and complete unselfishness. He was a man of unquestioned courage; a man who had the strength of his convictions, and a man who did not hesitate to act in accordance with those convictions.

The example which he has set for all of us in the Oklahoma delegation, through his service in Congress, is a fine one. Certainly the State and the Nation as well have lost a fine leader in the halls of Congress.

Of all the men that I knew in my brief period in public life, BILL STIGLER was one about whom I never heard the breath of scandal or a single suggestion or insinuation regarding his complete integrity. His honesty was beyond any question. Whatever criticism may have been directed against him by the very few who did question his votes on occasion, his sincerity of purpose and his honesty and his integrity were never questioned by any man within my hearing.

When the final summary is made of a man's achievements in life, if that man has set a model for his fellow man in his personal conduct and by the example of his integrity, he has left a monument greater than anything carved in granite or marble or stone for his fellow man.

It is with humility and with a sense of my own shortcomings that I undertake the task of following in W. G. STIGLER's footsteps as Representative from the Second District of Oklahoma.

I have had so many people of the district tell me in the past few months that if I make half the Congressman Bill was they would be well satisfied, that I have no question of the fact that he won an untiring place in the hearts of the people of my district. The farmer, the veteran, the school teacher, the businessman, the working people, the men and women of the Second District in Oklahoma have all lost a true friend. To Mrs. Stigler and to Bill's lovely daughters I am proud on this occasion to join in a message of sympathy, and I now wish that BILL STIGLER's memory may live on in the hearts of all his fellow citizens, as it will in mine.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress nearly 12 years ago. At that time, and ever since, there has been no one in Oklahoma who was esteemed more highly than our late friend, the Honorable BILL STIGLER. He could have been easily elected governor, or to any high position to which he might have aspired in our great State of Oklahoma; he was head of our legislature for several years. He has piloted through Congress many most worthwhile measures pertaining to benefits to Indians.

BILL STIGLER was capable, honest, efficient, courteous, and cooperative; I would say he was a "good Indian." He was a "good soldier" and was a "good scout." Bill was very active as American Legion department commander of our great State for many years. Bill worked diligently on the Committee on Appropriations. BILL STIGLER died with his boots on.

I am sure he would want us to remember Tennyson's great words:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

BILL STIGLER will be remembered many, many years.

Let me say to the Members here that all of us are working too hard. I think BILL STIGLER worked too hard. He was so conscientious. During the 10 years I have served in Congress 16 members of the Oklahoma delegation or former Members of the House or Senate from Oklahoma have passed away. Let us slow down a little and be able to render a greater service for a longer period.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in the few brief years I have had the honor and privilege of serving in this House I have been impressed many times by the frequency with which our colleagues are stricken down by death in the performance of their daily duties. Each time as we pause in our labors to pay our respects to these hard-working colleagues it has been impressed even more deeply on me how heavy and arduous has been the task these men have been called upon to perform, and how literally it can be said that they have given their lives in the service of their country. I know of no case in which it could be more truly stated that overwork had hastened the day of death of any of our colleagues than in the case of the late WILLIAM STIGLER, of Oklahoma.

In the last few years that Mr. STIGLER served here he was not in good health and for many months he had to make the decision whether or not to shirk his duty here or to risk his life. For too long a time he made the decision in favor of the job he came here to do although he finally heeded the advice of his doctor and decided to retire from these halls. Unfortunately he waited too long, and the days of rest and pleasure he had envisioned back at his home in Stigler, Okla., were to be denied him because he had stayed too long in performance of his work and had drained his vitality to the point where he could not survive.

Whatever else may be said of him, I think the most impressive thing in his life was that his supreme devotion to duty and his great love for public service carried him to the point where he literally did give his life in the service of his country. He had offered himself in the service of his country as a soldier, then as a public servant.

He occupied a unique position in this House during the time he served here because he was a member of that great race known as the American Indians. In our lifetime no man who traced his racial heritage to these great people gave a better example of the many contributions in service and tradition that the American Indians have given to this country than did Mr. STIGLER.

He was of a gentle character. When I first came here, one of the impressions made upon me, and which I shall always remember, was that in making the acquaintance of other Members of the House I found no man who had anything but the finest and warmest feeling for Mr. STIGLER. If it can honestly be said that a Member served over a period of years in this House and made no man his enemy, that can be said of BILL STIGLER. It seemed that everyone who knew him applauded his fine character and his generosity and fairness and loved him for those qualities.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in extending my deep sympathy to the family and friends of this great Oklahoman, this great American, BILL STIGLER.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Oklahoma and other Members of the House of Representatives in paying a sincere tribute and eulogy to a great Oklahoman and a great American, WILLIAM G. STIGLER. Our State and our Nation have profited by his life and by his service and will be poorer because of his loss.

Mr. STIGLER was an outstanding lawyer in Oklahoma. He served in the State senate before coming to the House of Representatives. When I served in the State senate I was very conscious of the record and the work that Senator STIGLER had left behind him before he came to this Congress.

When I came here I found a man who, though very busy on the Committee on Appropriations, busy in representing his own district and State and Nation, still had time to help a freshman Congressman get started to begin service in this House, a man of heart, a man of character, a man who believed sincerely in the finest ideals of this Nation. He worked to that end both in the State of Oklahoma and in his service here in this House of Representatives. I join in the fine tribute paid to him today by the members of our delegation, and I join in the sincere sympathy that we extend to Mrs. Stigler and to his two daughters.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, BILL STIGLER, as I knew him, was one of the finest men I have ever known. He was good and great. He was a good legislator, a real statesman.

His type of man we can ill afford to lose. My deepest sympathy goes out to all of his loved ones.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it came as a distinct shock to me when I received a telegram advising me of the death of my good friend and colleague the late Honorable WILLIAM G. STIGLER of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma. I had known that Bill was not in good health, but I had no idea that he was so seriously ill.

BILL STIGLER and I had been personal friends for many, many years. I first met him through his activities in the Oklahoma Department of the American Legion. I was active in helping him be elected as department commander for the State of Oklahoma. I had worked with, and associated with, him in Legion activities from that time to the time of his death.

Bill was a man who had many friends because he was a friendly man. He was a great humanitarian, and spent many years of his life helping the disabled veterans, widows, and orphans. Bill was a hard, aggressive worker, a man who took his duties seriously. Perhaps that characteristic hastened his death. Regardless of his physical condition, Bill so loved his friends and his buddies that he was willing to make any personal sacrifice for them.

I have lost a great friend and the country has lost a great statesman. I extend to Mrs. Stigler and his lovely daughters and the rest of his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to know and to love BILL STIGLER. For several years we worked together on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. That association was always harmonious and constructive.

Bill believed in himself because he believed, with all his heart, in what was sound, fair, and which added to the sum total of our progress.

With such faith is a great Nation builded. Such faith is the very raw materials of a great body such as ours.

Such men as BILL STIGLER leave their mark upon the hearts and memories of other men. In a way they never leave us for their good works live on and color our conduct forever.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a good friend and a capable legislator with the departure of WILLIAM STIGLER. His record of service to the Nation and to his native State of Oklahoma was a highly distinguished one.

I wish to join with my many colleagues who extend their deep and sincere sympathy to Mrs. Stigler and his two daughters.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the passing of WILLIAM G. STIGLER was a grievous loss to the public service. Like Carroll of Carrollton, he honored the city and State with which his family was historically identified. BILL STIGLER of Stigler was known for his devotion to the highest standards of legislative service first in the Oklahoma General Assembly and in later years in the Congress of the United States.

It was a privilege to work with him in these Halls and to have the inspiration of his friendship. "Being faithful unto death he has received his crown of life."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE BRIEN McMAHON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this is my first day as a Member of the House of Representatives. It should be, of course, as you Members who have served here before will well understand, a completely happy occasion for me, one that I shall remember all the days of my life. However, it is not completely happy because I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend who passed away last July while in the prime of life, the great senior Senator from the State of Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON. I was privileged to know him intimately

and well. I served at his side in the Department of Justice when he was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division. In earlier days I had known him in young manhood. He was at all times a devoted and warm friend of mine. It occurred to me today as I entered this chamber that on two or three occasions in my lifetime he had suggested to me that I seek public office. I was never able to do so until this past year. But it seems a strange, hard fate that he could not be living to share with me the joy of having won election to this distinguished body, the House of Representatives. BRIEN MCMAHON was a very great man; he was a great American; he served his State and he served his Nation well, and I think it is not an exaggeration to say that he served as well the peoples of this world. He was born and raised in Connecticut. He was a product of our public schools. He was a graduate of Fordham University in 1924 and of the Yale Law School in 1927. From his earliest days he was marked for great things. He was an industrious and a brilliant student. After he left law school he entered the practice of law and he became judge of the city court of Norwalk, and then the great Attorney General of the United States, Homer Cummings, called him to Washington as his assistant, and in a little while he was raised to be Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice. Those who served with him say, and the record of time will bear them out, that he was one of the best Assistant Attorneys General that the Nation has ever had. After he had concluded a brilliant service in the Department of Justice and with an interlude of only a little while in the general practice of law, he sought a Senate seat from the State of Connecticut and won it in 1944. He was reelected in 1950. I suppose he is best known and will be long remembered by many people because of his great work as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Those who have served in the Congress know of his wonderful work with that committee, and what great leadership he gave to it.

I am one of those who earnestly believe that one of the real reasons we have been able to preserve some semblance of peace in the world is the fact that we possess the power of atomic energy. BRIEN MCMAHON and those who served with him preserved and developed that power for this Nation. But he was more than a great legislator, he was more than a great lawyer, he was, believe me, a good man. He was industrious; I never knew a man who worked harder at any task he ever undertook, and he had great ability. When you put those talents together you get great results.

He was stricken down in the prime of his life, only in his forty-ninth year, and in the early days of his second term in the United States Senate. It is a great pity and a great tragedy that the Congress has lost him, and it is a greater pity and a greater tragedy that his State and his Nation have lost him, because he had so much to give in the difficult years that lie ahead.

Just a year ago, I remember very well, I visited with him in his home. He was planning and looking ahead to his term in the Senate, not knowing that already, hidden away in his body, was a dread cancer which was to take his life in a few short months.

I sat in the great Democratic National Convention in Chicago and heard his name offered to that great convention as a possibility for the highest office in this land. His name did not go in nomination because we knew then that he was on his deathbed. His family tell us that he heard and saw the generous tribute paid to him by the men and women who attended that convention. In a few days he went beyond to his Maker.

Mr. Speaker, as one who knew him well for many years, I want the RECORD to show that I am paying this tribute as an old friend. I extend my very deep sympathy to his lovely wife, his daughter, his mother, and his brothers and sisters.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always an occasion of sadness when a great and good man dies, and this is especially true when he had reached such a high goal in life and American achievements as Senator BRIEN MCMAHON had.

Brien will always be remembered by the people of Connecticut as a great statesman, Senator, and outstanding American.

To Mrs. McMahon and their young and lovely daughter Patricia I extend my most sincere condolences.

As time passes all Americans will realize that a great Senator has passed on and taken his rightful place in the choir of angels.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by our two colleagues, TOM DODD and JIM PATTERSON, in regard to BRIEN MCMAHON. I had known him for a long time, and had the privilege of serving in the same Congresses with him for three terms. We had differed politically but we had great respect and affection for each other.

As has been mentioned, he was under 50 years of age when he was called to his Maker in the prime of life, when his star was in the ascendancy, because he made his mark early in the Senate soon after he commenced his first term in 1945.

I think and am convinced that the great love and esteem and affection that the people of Connecticut had for BRIEN MCMAHON was truly manifested in the overwhelming majority which was tendered to him when he was reelected to his second term, and it was also indicated at the very largely attended funeral, which I also had the honor to attend and to pay my respects to his memory.

BRIEN MCMAHON was taken in early manhood. He prided himself, and rightly so, on being the father and author of the McMahon Act on Atomic Energy. As has been mentioned, only time can record the great contributions that BRIEN MCMAHON has made to this country and to his State by his initiative in bringing forth that great bill.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending my condolences to his family.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the close relationship and friendship that existed between our late friend, BRIEN MCMAHON, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I know that Brien in the Great Beyond is happy as he looks down on us today in the knowledge that his close and valued friend, TOM DODD, as a Member of this body on the first day of the session when he was sworn in, is the one who announced officially to the membership of the House of Representatives of his death.

I first met BRIEN MCMAHON some years ago when he was Assistant Attorney General, serving under another great American, an outstanding son of Connecticut, and in my opinion a man who is one of the greatest of our Attorneys General of all times, the Honorable Homer S. Cummings. From the time I first met BRIEN MCMAHON a close friendship developed between us which continued throughout the years until his death. I was proud of him as Assistant Attorney General because of the outstanding services he rendered to our country in that position. I was proud of him as a Senator of the United States, and particularly proud of the great contributions that he made toward peace and the determined efforts that he constantly made to bring about and achieve that goal which constitutes the hopes and aspirations and desires not only of millions of Americans but of countless of millions of persons living in all lands throughout the world.

BRIEN MCMAHON died at a young age, but he crowded into his life many things that few persons have been able to crowd into a much longer life. He was not only outstanding in his ability but he was an indefatigable worker, a man of charming personality and of fixed determination in accomplishing those things which he considered to be for the best interests of our country. He was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Two of the members of that committee representing the House are on the floor today. We all know of his leadership on that important joint committee, and of the contributions of that joint committee under his leadership. Dying at a comparatively young age, BRIEN MCMAHON has left his imprint on the pages of our history.

To Mrs. McMahon, to his daughter, and to his loved ones, to the Connecticut delegation in both branches of the Congress, and to the people of Connecticut, I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow. I have lost a personal friend.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I take the floor this afternoon to participate in the eulogies in behalf of one of the great Americans of this time and this age.

Just about 1 year ago at this time Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, acting as chairman of the joint committee, and I as vice chairman, began reviewing the budget and the requests by the Commis-

sion for the work for 1953. I so well remember one item when we came to it. The request was for $5,000,000 for research on cancer. He raised the question immediately, being a well man at that time, if that was enough. Was that enough? There was some question, and we finally arrived at a figure of around $6,000,000, which the Appropriations Committee so kindly gave the American people to fight this dreadful disease. With those funds there have been established in this country at the present time over 100 research projects in medical institutions. That, in itself, is worth a man's lifetime for humanity, in my opinion.

I could point out many, many things that have not been said about BRIEN MCMAHON's work in this particular project. It has been so broad, it has been so big that this body has so kindly and graciously permitted the joint committee to a large extent to run what we believe is a sound program. There is no man in American history, to my mind, who has contributed as much up to the present as BRIEN MCMAHON on this one project alone. You can go through what was said about him in the medical journals and the scientific journals. I know what we have to handle. When we took over this project in 1945 there was nothing that held it together except just loose appropriations, and it went to pieces. There was no man who did more to bring that together than BRIEN MCMAHON. It was no easy job, because the scientists at that time were not entirely satisfied. You can read the scientific journals, where they each pay tribute to this great American for what he has done for science.

When he died last summer, he was only 48. Great as his contributions to his State and his country were, the best was yet to come. Distinguished leaders of both parties saw him as a future Secretary of State. Countless wise Americans considered him worthy presidential timber. Indeed, BRIEN MCMAHON was actively supported for the presidency before the Democratic convention.

BRIEN MCMAHON seemed destined for greatness from the very outset. His rise in public office was meteoric, and his record was one of holding progressively more important jobs with progressively greater distinction.

At the age of 31, he was made an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice—the youngest person ever to hold such a high post. Under his direction, the Criminal Division established a unique record of protecting the innocent and punishing the guilty.

In 1944, when he had scarcely turned 40, Connecticut sent him to the Senate, and 6 years later returned him once more. Following his death, the New York Times said that he had helped make the word "politician" a term of honor. I think that was very well put. With BRIEN MCMAHON it was a deep article of faith that there is no calling higher than the vocation of politics—and he acted in accordance with this belief.

I know that he loved the lusty give-and-take of hard-hitting and honorable political debate; and he loved his colleagues. While he fought with all his heart for what he considered right, he fought fairly and cleanly. He respected honestly held differences of opinion, and his friendships were never formed along the lines of political parties.

America knew BRIEN MCMAHON as "Mr. Atom"—and for very good reason. Immediately after Hiroshima, he grasped the tremendous dilemma of the atomic age. He saw that we had entered into a new era of history. He anticipated the enormous potentialities of the atom for good and for evil—and he resolved to do his best to help make sure that the atom would be used for the enrichment, and not the destruction, of mankind.

While still a freshman Senator, he assisted in writing the law governing our atomic program. He fought harder and more effectively than any other American to establish the principle of civilian control. He served with wisdom and distinction as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. America's atomic enterprise stands as a monument to his work.

BRIEN MCMAHON hated the atomic weapons which our Nation has been forced to build—he longed for the day when these dreadful instruments of destruction could be abolished from the earth. But so long as self-defense left us no alternative, he resolved that we must maintain and increase our atomic lead.

Yet he never supposed that armaments, standing by themselves, could furnish us real and lasting security. He saw that peace was not simply a matter of building more guns and bombs—he saw that real peace was at bottom a matter of the spirit, a matter of creating the kind of world in which men would live in decency and brotherhood. And so he never ceased working for such a world. Three years ago, when he took the floor of the Senate to argue on behalf of the hydrogen-bomb program, he proposed also that this Nation dedicate itself to a great moral crusade with peace with justice. He summoned us to wage peace and launch a mighty effort to take the everyday peoples of the Communist world away from their tyrannical rulers and win them over to the side of freedom.

No man in public life had greater respect for the realities of statecraft than BRIEN MCMAHON—and no man had a deeper, or more unquenchable sense of idealism.

This blend of practicality and vision was reflected in his work as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

He was able to look beyond this present grim era of international strife—beyond to a world in which the wondrous power of the atom would be used to heal the sick, and to bring new dignity to the wretched and hungry of the earth.

The hearts of Connecticut, of this Chamber, and of this Nation are filled with sympathy for Senator MCMAHON's beloved wife and daughter.

He will be remembered.

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST OF ELMER DAVIS, JULY 28, 1952

We have lost one of the ablest of our younger statesmen—Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who died this morning at the age of 48. He had been an effective and energetic Assistant Attorney General; but his outstanding achievements were as a Senator, and particularly in handling the matter of atomic energy. Though he was a new Senator at the time of the Hiroshima bomb, he was one of the first who realized the tremendous potential importance of atomic energy in both war and peace. He knew that for the time being its military application was of great significance, but he was convinced that it should be kept under civilian control.

He learned all he could about atomic energy; he wrote a bill to provide for its control, headed a committee that held hearings on his bill and others, and finally got his own measure through the Senate. It was chopped to pieces in the House of Representatives, where many men used patriotism and talk of the need for military control as a cloak for what was really an attempt to give private monopoly a hold on the atomic program. But the two versions of the bill went to conference; and there MCMAHON's firmness combined with political adroitness succeeded in bringing out a bill which preserved the essential principle of civilian government control, with contractual relations with private industry and a satisfactory liaison with the military forces.

He then became chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and held that post ever since, except for the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress. But he didn't confine himself to overseeing atomic development; he was an active and very useful member of the Foreign Relations Committee; and while he got considerable publicity for some fruitless proposals for disarmament—proposals springing from his realization of the frightful character of atomic war, and a conviction that he ought to make every effort to avert it—his real value was in the day-to-day work of the committee, as an upholder of the principle of collective security and the military and economic measures needed to fortify it. Last week, the Connecticut delegation to the Democratic National Convention gave him a complimentary vote for the Presidency, though he had sent word that he was not well enough to be considered. That was a mere gesture of courtesy and affection; but if he had lived a dozen years longer he might well have become the first Catholic President of the United States. For his character and his record of public service were such as to commend him to honest men, whatever their religious views.

[From Federation of American Scientists Newsletter, Washington, D. C., of September 16, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

The untimely death of Senator BRIEN MCMAHON on July 28 was a grievous blow to the Nation as a whole, and a particularly tragic loss to American science. As early as the first atomic bomb explosions in 1945, Senator MCMAHON grasped with prescience the political significance of atomic energy both nationally and internationally. Applying his great gifts to the study of atomic science and its social implications, he successfully championed the struggle for civilian control of atomic energy, a struggle which culminated in the 1946 Atomic Energy Act bearing his name. In his capacity as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he did much to stimulate the enlightenment of the American public in atomic matters, as well as to shepherd the Atomic Energy Commission through its initial trying years.

He early established a cordial relationship with the Nation's scientists, acting as friend and adviser, giving and taking with earnestness, simplicity, and charm. His unique genius lay in a happy blend of an almost romantic idealism with a shrewd sense of practical realities. He was concerned and made proposals to deal with the international problems of human want and misery.

At the same time, he was acutely aware of the needs for national defense, down to the last step of securing adequate congressional appropriations for his projects.

Of particular interest to Federation of American Scientists is a proposal made in his last address delivered by wire from a Washington hospital on June 14 to the Democratic State Convention in Hartford. He said, 'We need, I think, a little group of dedicated men * * * to take a fresh look at the control problem * * * [of atomic energy on an international scale]." A similar proposal, initiated by Federation of American Scientists last fall was transmitted to the White House on behalf of Federation of American Scientists by Senator McMAHON. At the end, as at the beginning, he stood shoulder to shoulder with American scientists.

Within the short perspective of 6 years since the Atomic Energy Act became law, this monument to BRIEN McMAHON'S efforts has gained general acceptance as part of our way of life. BRIEN McMAHON, it has been said, wrote atomic history, the first chapter of which is atomic organization on a national scale. In that chapter and in the traditions of American citizen-scientists, his name will remain enshrined.

I wish I had time to tell this House about many more projects. It so happened that BRIEN McMAHON had no idea a year ago that he had this disease, and I had no idea that I had it in my family. My wife is just alive today.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, no one could be more deserving of the fine tribute paid to his memory than the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable BRIEN McMAHON.

I concur fully in the statement which has been made by the present chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Hon. CARL DURHAM, of North Carolina, to the effect that no one in the country has contributed more to our Nation's atomic energy program than the late Senator McMAHON.

I have been a member of the joint committee since its creation under law in 1946, when the first chairmanship went to the great Senator from Connecticut. I am thoroughly acquainted with the work he did in this field. I know how he put the force of his personality behind the recent expansion program in the field of atomic energy, how he put force into the hydrogen program; I know how he carried on his great work to keep America ahead in this field.

I am of the opinion that there was no one in the United States, aside from the great scientists themselves, who was more versed in this field than BRIEN McMAHON. He obtained his knowledge of it in a comparatively short time by his devotion to his work and by the great effort he put into his assignment as a member of the joint committee.

I join my colleagues from the State of Connecticut and from all the other States of the country in expressing profound sympathy to the family of Senator BRIEN McMAHON.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of Senator McMAHON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 11).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BRIEN McMAHON, a Senator of the United States from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that as a further mark of respect to our deceased colleagues the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress, second session:

1637. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 12, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Sheboygan Harbor, Wis., requested by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on October 15, 1949. (H. Doc. No. 554.) September 30, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1638. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 16, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Weymouth Fore River, Mass., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 22, 1947. (H. Doc. No. 555.) September 30, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1639. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and on Piscataqua River, Maine, and New Hampshire, with a view to determining the advisability of further improvement in the interest of navigation at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on February 17, 1949. (H. Doc. No. 556.) September 30, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1640. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 16, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Apalachicola Bay, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 29, 1937. (H. Doc. No. 557.) September 30, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1641. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Bellingham Harbor, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 30, 1944. (H. Doc. No. 558.) September 30, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1642. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Illinois shore of Lake Michigan, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 28.) October 13, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 5 exhibits and 21 illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1643. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 6, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Pacific coast line of the State of California, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties from Carpinteria to Point Mugu, appendix I, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 29.) October 24, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1644. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 29, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore line of the State of Connecticut, area 5, Pawcatuck River to Thames River, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 31.) December 5, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 11 illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

1645. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 29, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Lake Erie, Sandusky to Vermilion, Ohio, appendix VI, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 32.) December 5, 1952, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 504, 82d Cong.).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports of committees on public bills and resolutions were submitted subsequent to the adjournment

of the Eighty-second Congress, second session:

Mr. DELANEY: Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 74, Eighty-second Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. July 10, 1952.

Mr. TEAGUE: Select Committee To Investigate Educational, Training, and Loan Guaranty Programs Under GI Bill. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 93, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. September 11, 1952.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Nineteenth intermediate report, pursuant to House Resolution 736, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 11, 1952.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 698, Eighty-second Congress, resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Rept. No. 2503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 15, 1952.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twentieth intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, pursuant to House Resolution 736, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 18, 1952.

Mr. MADDEN: Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre. Final report pursuant to House Resolution 390 and House Resolution 539, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 19, 1952.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-first intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments entitled "Military Construction at 15 Continental Bases." Report pursuant to House Resolution 736, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 23, 1952.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-second intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments entitled "Military Housing Construction in Alaska." Report pursuant to House Resolution 736, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 30, 1952.

Mr. HELLER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on study of the Securities and Exchange Commission, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and House Resolution 51, House Resolution 323, and House Resolution 653, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 30, 1952.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on investigation of radio and television programs, pursuant to House Resolution 278, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 30, 1952.

Mr. GATHINGS: Select Committee on Pornographic Materials. Report on pornographic materials, pursuant to House Resolution 596, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 31, 1952.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report of Special Subcommittee on Revision of the Public Land Laws, pursuant to House Resolution 80, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 31, 1952.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report of a study of problems in connection with insular affairs, irrigation and reclamation, Territories, public lands, mines and mining, and Indian affairs pursuant to House Resolution 80, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. December 31, 1952.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report of the Select Committee on Small Business, pursuant to House Resolution 33, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, December 31, 1952.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Select Committee To Investigate Foundations. Final report of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and Other Organizations, pursuant to House Resolution 561, Eighty-second Congress (Rept. No. 2514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 1, 1953.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 676, Eighty-second Congress, Second session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 2, 1953.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report for the year 1952, pursuant to House Resolution 7, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 3, 1953.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 558, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 3, 1953.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 3, 1953.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 414, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. January 3, 1953.

[Submitted January 3, 1953]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting additional letters of comment on the Department of Agriculture's supplemental report to the Missouri River Basin agricultural program for inclusion in House Document 530, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of May 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been compromised during the fiscal year 1952, the addresses of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amounts of the settlements, and the reasons therefor, prepared as of June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 41 (g) 4 of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of obligations incurred in excess of the quarterly limitation of an allotment, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act of 1951 and administrative regulations issued thereunder by the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of violations of subsection (h) (B) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., Supp. V, 665), which occurred in the United States Coast Guard during the period from September 1950 through April 1952, pursuant to provisions of subsection (l) of this section; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Bartley diversion dam, canal, and laterals, Red Willow unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Madera irrigation district, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Columbia Basin project, Washington, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Cachuma project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

13. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, north side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

14. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Kirwin unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, pursuant to the Department of Interior Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

15. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Vermejo project, New Mexico, pursuant to the Department of Interior Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

16. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

17. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Weber Basin project, Utah, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

18. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Eden project, Wyoming, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

19. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of a further reapportionment of funds made available to the Federal Security Agency under the limitation entitled "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," which indicates a necessity for a supplemental or deficiency estimate in a larger amount than was contemplated earlier; to the Committee on Appropriations.

20. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Crow Creek Pump Unit, Three Forks Division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

21. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Wellton-Mohawk Division, Gila project, Arizona, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Lower Marias Unit, Marias Division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

23. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Plain View water district, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

24. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Delano Earlimart irrigation district, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

25. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Collbran project, Colorado, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

26. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Sly Park Unit, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong); to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Grants Pass project, Oregon, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

28. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Rapid Valley Unit, Cheyenne Division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

29. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report with respect to construction of transmission lines, Southeastern Power Administration, pursuant to provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

30. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an overobligation of the approved apportionment as a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of a revision of the apportionment of the appropriation "Retired pay, Department of Defense," fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

32. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for support of United States prisoners for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

33. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation "Military personnel, Navy," for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

34. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation "Military personnel, Army," for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

35. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Operating expenses, Coast Guard," for the fiscal year 1953, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

36. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps" for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

37. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation "Retired pay, Department of Defense" for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

38. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation, "Military personnel requirements, Air Force," for the fiscal year 1953 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

39. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Webster unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

40. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Solano project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

41. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Missouri diversion unit, Missouri-Souris division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

42. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting reports of expenditures in excess of allotments of funds made under apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1952 for the Federal Housing Administration, and of administrative action taken in connection therewith, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

43. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Heart Butte unit, Heart division, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

44. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, Bureau of Employment Secu-

rity," for the fiscal year 1953, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report on apportionment of the appropriation to the Department of Justice for support of United States prisoners for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

46. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of obligations incurred in excess of the quarterly limitation in an allotment, pursuant to requirements of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, and administrative regulations promulgated thereunder by the Department of Agriculture and procedures of the Production and Marketing Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

47. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering cases where payment of claims has been made for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section (e) of Public Law 220, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

48. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report covering the period July 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952, of transportation furnished for certain Government and other personnel, pursuant to provisions of section 2 of Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

49. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated for experimental, development, or research work executed during the period January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

50. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report as of the end of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1952 of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (Public Law 150, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

52. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each employed by the United States Naval Postgraduate School, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 303, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

53. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the sixth quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

54. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the fifth quarterly report of financial contributions made to the States for civil-defense purposes, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

55. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the fourth quarterly report for the quarter ending June 30, 1952, on contributions to States made pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

56. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, no contracts were negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

57. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report as of the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year 1953 of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (Public Law 150, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report with respect to furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, pursuant to Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

59. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pertaining to transportation furnished by the Air Force for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

60. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1951, together with a copy of the Report of Annual Inspection, 1951, of the Home by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

61. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the twelfth semiannual report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the twentieth quarterly report pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

63. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the fourteenth semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period January–June 1952, in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

64. A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Corporation, transmitting a special report on the future activities of the Small Defense Plants Administration, and on the major problems which it will continue to face; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

65. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the thirty-eighth annual report, prepared by direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the calendar year 1951, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

66. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1951, pursuant to section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

67. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to section 301 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

68. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, transmitting the quarterly report for the quarter ending June 30, 1952, on borrowing authority, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

69. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the nineteenth quarterly report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

70. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting a report of activities and expenditures for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 592, Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

71. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, covering the fiscal year from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to provisions of section 47 of an act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia, approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

72. A letter from the Acting Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Board, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

73. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the provision in the Coal Mine Inspection Act of May 7, 1941 (Public Law 49, 55 Stat. 177, 30 U. S. C., secs. 4–P to 4–O); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

74. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the Eighth Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange which covers the Commission's activities from January 1 to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 603 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong., H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

75. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the sixth report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, as required by section 6 of Public Law 897 (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950) covering the period from March 16, 1952, through June 15, 1952 (H. Doc. No. 36); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

76. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report reviewing the expenditures made and the activities carried on under the authority of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, for the period July 1–December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 1008 of that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

77. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the financial report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," as amended by the acts approved June 23, 1910 (36 Stat. 604), December 10, 1912 (37 Stat. 647), February 27, 1917 (39 Stat. 946), March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1354), and May 8, 1947 (61

Stat. 80); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

78. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the financial report of the retirement system of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the act approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," as amended by the acts approved June 23, 1910 (36 Stat. 604), December 10, 1912 (37 Stat. 647), February 27, 1917 (39 Stat. 946), March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1354), and May 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 80); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

79. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the Fourth Semiannual Report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, from December 31, 1951, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, Public Law 455, Eighty-first Congress, approved March 10, 1950; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

80. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, with compensation payable from the allotment contained in section 202, General Provisions, Department of Justice, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952, approved October 22, 1951; to the Committee on Government Operations.

81. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated under section 302 (c) (10) during the 6 months ending June 30, 1952, covering contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, and for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, pursuant to Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

82. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Farmers Home Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950; to the Committee on Government Operations.

83. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928, as amended July 1, 1948 (22 U. S. C. 278, 278a, and 278b), and in the manner contemplated in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841); to the Committee on Government Operations.

84. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the comprehensive audit of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950; to the Committee on Government Operations.

85. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the accounts and financial statements of the Agricultural Marketing Revolving Fund for the 4-year period ended June 30, 1951, as authorized by section 14 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929 (12 U. S. C. 1141l); to the Committee on Government Operations.

86. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting the annual report of the receipts and expenditures of the Navy Club of the U. S. A., together with the proceedings of the various meetings conducted by this organization, for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1952, pursuant to the law governing these reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

87. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting the report of proceedings and activities, including complete statement of reports and expenditures during the preceding calendar year, pursuant to section IV of the act of Congress which incorporated the Marine Corps League, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

88. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting the report on the financial operations of the United States Olympic Association and the United States Olympic Committee for the calendar year 1951, pursuant to Public Law 805, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Marangos, Nicholaos, or Nicholaos Maragos or Nick Maranjos or Nicus Marajos or Mikolao Maragus or Nikolaos Miragus, No. A-6921225; McKenzie, Dudley Sylvester, No. A-9717285; Meng-Hsiu, Chang, No. A-7685267; and Williams, Lauriston O'Connor, or Laureston O'Connor Williams or Lauriston Williams or L. O. Williams, No. A-7140540; requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a supplement to part II of the original report of claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, pursuant to the act approved June 14, 1948 (Public Law 637, 80th Cong. (62 Stat. 389), and Public Law 423, 78th Cong. (58 Stat. 731)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the period January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

93. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1951, pursuant to section 11 of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

94. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

98. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Humberto Jacobo Hernandez Mendicondo, A-7736444 CR 39638; Roman Ramirez, A-6043315 CR 37940; and Mohandas Gunamal Vaswani, alias G. Mohan, A-7752438 CR 37584; and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Manuel Barrio, A-7962169; Angela S. Barrio, A-7962173; Eliseo Zermeno Garcia, A-6746756; Eleazar Rottenberg Perle, A-7070297; Ida Radl Perle, A-6652695; and Clarence Norman Willery, A-7903390; and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Aitcheson, Gabriel Octaviu or Gabriel Aitcheson, CR 36537 A-7962652; Albini, Pasquale, CR 37420 V-1451206; Barrientos, Cirilo, CR 35097 A-6855849T; and Porter, Donald Wayne, CR 38914 A-7395398; and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Lidorikis, Alexander Milton or Alexander Lidor, A-6164951; Cecil Pack, Jr., A-7821835; Santiago Domingo Cordova y or Santiago Cordova or Julio Neis, A-7983397T; Cordova, Carmen nee Carmen Virginia Linares Perea or Carmen Perez, T-1299396; and Spadaveochia, Antonio, A-3539106, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

102. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1952 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 4 of Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), pursuant to section 404 of said act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of claims for damage caused by naval vessels settled under the act of July 3, 1944 (46 U. S. C. 797) during the fiscal year of 1951-52, pursuant to section 8 of the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726; 46 U. S. C. 797); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

104. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of recoveries collected by the United States for damage caused to naval vessels settled by the Navy Department pursuant to the act of December 5, 1945 (34 U. S. C. 600a), pursuant to section 2 of said act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

105. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended and codified (28 U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act by the Department of Agriculture

for the period July 1, 1951, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1952, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as reenacted (28 U. S. C. 2671–2680); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

107. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the annual report of claims paid under the provisions of section 2672 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, as amended, for the fiscal year ending 1952, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

108. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

109. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended and codified (28 U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1951, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673, the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report including the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim against the Central Intelligence Agency under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

112. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the settlement of the claim of the American Dock Co., 17 State Street, New York City, as owner of pier No. 1, Staten Island, N. Y., pursuant to title 14, United States Code 646 (b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

113. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

114. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of the approvals of individual claims which include the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of each claim paid under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code, for the fiscal year 1952, beginning July 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

116. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Tri-State Transfer Company, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 93), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *John W. Healzer, an Individual d/b/a Healzer Cartage Company, and Healzer Cartage Company, a Corporation*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 99), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

118. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Toedebusch Transfer, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 100), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

119. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the claim of *Wichita Forwarding Company, a Corporation*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 88), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

120. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Sioux Transportation Company, a Corporation* v. *The United States* (docket No. 77), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

121. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *S. L. Goldish, d/b/a Lake Superior Motor Freight* v. *The United States* (docket No. 101), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

122. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Bernard L. White, d/b/a White's Motor Transport* v. *The United States* (docket No. 87), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

123. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *William A. Schien, d/b/a Schien Truck Lines* v. *The United States* (docket No. 74), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *W. G. Burgess, d/b/a Reliable Motor Freight Line* v. *The United States* (docket No. 70), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

125. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Matt W. Hanten and Roy Wheaton, a Partnership, d/b/a Western Transportation Company* v. *The United States* (docket No. 86), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Mercury Motor Freight Lines, Inc.* v. *The United States* (docket No. 91), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

127. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *North Shore Fish and Freight Company, a Corporation* v. *The United States* (docket No. 63), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Fern R. Wilber, d/b/a Wilber Transfer Company* v. *The United States* (docket No. 89), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

129. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Jack Bradley, d/b/a Film Pickup Service* v. *The United States* (docket No. 25), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

130. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Peter C. Peterson, Earl K. Peterson, and Clarence D. Peterson, a Partnership, d/b/a Peterson & Sons Transfer* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 67), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Ralph D. Holt, d/b/a Smith Transmit Co.* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 92), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Ralph D. Holt, d/b/a Certified Motor Transport* v. *The United States*, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Olson Transfer Co.* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 65), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Merrill M. Pregler and Louise G. Fosse, d/b/a Dairy Dispatch Co.* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 20), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Heuer Truck Lines, Inc.* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 38), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of

Glenn Breeding and Irene Breeding, a Partnership, Successors in Interest to: E. W. Lyman, Opal Bowlin Lyman, Lucill Lyman Porter, and Mrs. Frances Ring, Heirs at Law and Ralph W. Porter, Trustee, d/b/a Lyman Truck Lines v. *The United States* (Docket No. 49), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

137. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Victor McKeown, d/b/a McKeown Trucks* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 54), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Adolph Muehring and Herman H. Muehring, a Partnership, d/b/a Schmidt Truck Lines* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 75), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

139. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills for Cities of 2,500 Population and More, January 1, 1952"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

140. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies in the United States, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

141. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States, pursuant to provisions of Public Law 390, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

142. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled, "Typical Electric Bills for Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1952"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

143. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled, "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

144. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

145. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of the Deer Creek power plant and appurtenant facilities as supplemental works to the Deer Creek division, Provo River project, Utah, pursuant to section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Doc. No. 37); ordered to be printed, with illustrations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

146. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

147. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a proposed domestic water system for the north unit of the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, Oregon, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

148. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior on Synthetic Liquid Fuels, pursuant to provisions of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325), as amended, for the calendar year 1951; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

149. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

150. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

151. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

152. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplementary report of the survey to determine the feasibility of developing a Mississippi River Parkway entitled "Parkway for the Mississippi, Part II (Technical Data)," pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 626); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

153. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of bill No. 41 enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

154. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of the acts of the thirteenth to nineteenth special sessions of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, enacted prior to the repeal of section 23, of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, on July 25, 1952, the date on which the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico came into effect, pursuant to section 23 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of Public Laws 47 and 53 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of Public Laws 51, 52, and 57 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19, Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature, Public Laws 54, 60, 63, 64, and 70, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, to the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

158. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

159. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

160. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

161. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of Public Laws 65 and 75 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

162. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: *Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Indian Tribes, Plaintiffs,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 265). This report is submitted pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

163. A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70), with respect to the following claim: *Seneca Nation of Indians, on the relation of John L. Snyder and Arline R. Friday, Petitioner,* v. *The United States, Defendant* (Docket No. 77); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. A letter from the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the Senate, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1951, pursuant to section 69 of an act of Congress, entitled "An act to provide a Government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

165. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report No. 22, pursuant to provisions of section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

166. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relative to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, for the quarter ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

167. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from April 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952, in accordance with section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

168. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the annual report of the United States Civil Service Commission covering the number and types of additional step increases as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 702 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

169. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a statement of penalty

mail for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 302, title 111, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

170. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the thirty-first annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil-service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

171. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the twelfth quarterly report on the administration of the advance-planning program, pursuant to Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated March 1951, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Youghiogheny River watershed, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

173. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated March 1951, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Savannah River watershed in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

174. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report on the flood situation in the Osage River Basin, Mo., in which is located Union Electric Co. of Missouri's Bagnell hydroelectric development, designated as project No. 459, pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

175. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting the final report of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, pursuant to Public Law 40, section 2 (h), Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Public Works.

176. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the eleventh quarterly report on the administration of the advance-planning program authorized under Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

177. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 17, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Jenkins Creek, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on July 8, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

178. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 19, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, with a view to determining whether any modification of the recommendation contained therein is advisable at the present time, particularly with respect to a harbor of refuge for light-draft vessels at the mouth of Big Iron River, Ontonagon County, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 26, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

179. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 7, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis., with a view to determining the advisability of providing a channel 5 feet deep at mean low water between Stillwater and Taylors Falls, with suitable widths, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

180. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., with a view to determining if any further improvements in this project should be made at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 2, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

181. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 5, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Kaunakaki (Kaunakakai) Gulch, island of Molokai, T. H., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

182. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 19, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Arkansas River, Ark., Okla., and Kans., with special reference to the control of caving banks above Little Rock in the vicinity of Palarm Creek, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 25, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

183. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 19, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Buffalo Creek and tributaries, West Virginia and Pennsylvania, for flood-control and allied purposes, authorized by the Flood Control Act adopted on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

184. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 18, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Boothbay Harbor, Maine, particularly the Mill Cove area, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

185. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

186. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, U. S. C., title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the month of September 1952; to the Committee on Agriculture.

188. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, relative to making certain adjustments between appropriations to improve the administration of appropriated funds available to the Department of the Army, pursuant to section 403 of the National Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

189. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a statement regarding apportionment of the appropriation for servicemen's indemnities, for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

190. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force Annual Flying Pay Report, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

191. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 630, Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

192. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report required by section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, for the period ending September 30, 1952; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

193. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 548, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

194. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the seventh report concerning the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program for the period June 16, 1952, through September 15, 1952, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 897 (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950) (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

195. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report by the Division of Audits of the General Accounting Office on the Bureau of Customs relating to importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Government Operations.

196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

197. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

198. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an order canceling $1,113,362.66 of reimbursable irrigation charges against Pueblo Indian lands in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, pursuant to an act of Congress approved July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C. 386a); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

199. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of

Omar Mahammed Hindiyeh, file No. A-6830459 T., CR 37383, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *H. M. Barnes, d/b/a Arrow Motor Freight, Successor in Interest to Fred A. Benz and Howard M. Barnes, d/b/a Weighley Transfer Company* v. *The United States* (docket No. 85), pursuant to provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

201. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Oscar R. Thiel, d/b/a Thiel Truck Service* v. *The United States* (docket No. 79), pursuant to provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Byers Transportation Company, Inc., a Corporation* v. *The United States* (docket No. 96), pursuant to provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the supplemental report on the claim of *Brady Transfer & Storage Co., Inc.* v. *The United States* (docket No. 8); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Knaus Truck Lines, Inc., and Mary Jane Knaus and Ezra Knaus, a Partnership, d/b/a Knaus Truck Lines* v. *The United States* (docket No. 97), pursuant to provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Wheelock Bros., Inc., a Corporation* v. *The United States* (Docket No. 98), pursuant to provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of activities authorized by Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended September 30, 1952; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

207. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from July 1, 1952, through September 30, 1952, pursuant to section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

208. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report covering activities under the Federal-aid-in-fish-restoration program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 11 of the act approved August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 16 U. S. C. 777); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

209. A letter from the Director, the American Legion, National Legislative Commission, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion for the period including October 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 47, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

210. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, relative to a budget allotment for personal services issued to Mr. John F. Golden, Jr., manager of the Corporation's Boston loan agency, for the period July 1–September 30, 1952, was exceeded by the amount of $304.58, this report filed in compliance with the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

211. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to Executive Order 10082; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

212. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of Activities of the War Claims Commission as of March 13, 1952, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong.), approved July 3, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

213. A letter from the Attorney General relative to the cases of Dominick Cardo, case No. A–4087857, Antonio Huante-Ceja, case No. A–7356675, Catalina Franco Tauler Serrano, case No. A–7910953, and Marshall Joseph Yacks, case No. A–6268601, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264); to the Committee on Government Operations.

215. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the Semiannual Stockpile Report, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

216. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting the semiannual report prepared by the National Munitions Control Board, pursuant to subsection (h), section 12 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (Public Res. No. 54, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

217. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 7 of the Agricultural Extension Work Act of May 8, 1914; to the Committee on Agriculture.

218. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting separate reports on contracts and cooperative agreements entered into during fiscal year 1952 pursuant to authorities contained in title I, sections 9 (b) 3 and 10 (a), and title II of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946, Public Law 733, Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to title I, section 11 and title II, section 205 (b) of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

220. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification, Coachella Division, All-American Canal project, California, pursuant to the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Public Law 470, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

221. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report regarding reapportionment of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Secret Service Division, 1953," Treasury Department, pursuant to provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

222. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

223. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report for the calendar year 1952 of agreements entered into pursuant to the act of June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280); to the Committee on Armed Services.

224. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of 20,000 pounds of contaminated ground talc now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

226. A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting the fourth quarterly report, October 15, 1952, of the Small Defense Plants Administration, pursuant to section 714 (g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

227. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members, the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on House Administration.

228. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or Department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

229. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "For the relief of Floyd E. Dotson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

230. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1952 under the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. App. §§ 1981–1987), amended by Public Law 116, Eighty-second Congress, pursuant to section 4 (c) of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended October 3, 1952, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, pursuant to section 791 (c) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the claim of *Pacific Intermountain Express Company, a Corpora-*

tion, v. *The United States* (docket No. 2), pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the claim of *Hi-Way Freight Terminal, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 40), pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

234. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the claim of *Triangle Terminal Company* v. *The United States* (docket No. 80), pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the claim of *K. M. & C. Truck Lines, a Corporation*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 60), pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Powell Bros. Truck Lines, Inc.*, v. *The United States* (docket No. 28), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of *Irving R. Anderson, d/b/a Lee Cartage Company* v. *The United States* (docket No. 47), pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

239. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of an order of May 16, 1952, canceling certain irrigation charges against Indian lands in the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Okanogan County, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of revolving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

241. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

242. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled "Electric Utility Depreciation Practices, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

243. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

244. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1. A bill to reduce the individual income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer certain counties from the eastern district of Michigan to the western district of Michigan, to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the judicial districts of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7. A bill to provide for a system of cross-country superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9. A bill to repeal section 3 (g) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952, thereby giving permanent effect to those provisions of such amendments which relate to the preservation of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance rights of individuals while they are permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS (by request):

H. R. 10. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 11. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 12. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 13. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 14. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 16. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 17. A bill to provide reduced postage on air-mail parcel post sent to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in certain areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 18. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 19. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 20. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 21. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 22. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 23. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 24. A bill to amend the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, to mature United States Government life insurance when the insured becomes 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 25. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 26. A bill to regulate the membership of sections of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 27. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 28. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 29. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 30. A bill to amend subparagraph (K) of paragraph II, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize increased compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 31. A bill to authorize restoration of a remarried widow to the rolls upon termination of her remarried status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 32. A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 33. A bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis, the psychoses, and multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 34. A bill to provide an identical basis for award of death pension to widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 35. A bill to provide hospital care and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 36. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 37. A bill to revise the basis for certain disability compensation awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 38. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of deceased veterans of World War II, or of service on and after June 27, 1950, on the same basis as pension as provided for widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 39. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by extending the benefits of titles II and III to certain persons who have continued on active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 40. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 41. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the United States Army during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 42. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 43. A bill to make uniform the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 44. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to make uniform the rates of service-connected disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 45. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that malignant tumors developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 46. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for tuberculosis other than pulmonary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 47. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 48. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 50. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 51. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 52. A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 53. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 54. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 55. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 56. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 57. A bill to amend the fifth paragraph of section 311 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 58. A bill to amend section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to special taxes on the sale of liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 59. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 60. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 61. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 62. A bill to amend section 3178 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 63. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for petroleum products to be temporarily imported, under certain circumstances, without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 64. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 65. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 66. A bill to amend section 3469 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 67. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 68. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 69. A bill to exempt persons who served as cadets in the United States Merchant Marine Academy in excess of 90 days at sea beyond the continental limits of the United States between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 70. A bill to make the United States Merchant Marine Academy library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 71. A bill to provide that United States commissioners shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 72. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 73. A bill to extend the benefits provided by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain persons who served as technical advisers to the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 74. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 75. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the Congressional Record to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 76. A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 77. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 78. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General to finance the construction or acquisition of post offices, in certain cases, by borrowing from local lending institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 79. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 80. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to resignation and retirement of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 81. A bill to increase the opportunities of blind persons for employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 82. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 83. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 84. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 85. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 86. A bill to increase the salary of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 87. A bill to establish the seniority status of employees in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 88. A bill to change the designations of certain positions in the postal field service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 89. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 90. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 91. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 92. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 93. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 94. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the armory board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 95. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 96. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 97. A bill to amend section 4 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to extend to certain medical personnel credit for military service rendered in the armed forces of cobelligerent nations during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 98. A bill providing for distribution of certain funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 99. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 100. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 102. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 103. A bill making it unlawful for any person for himself or for any corporation, firm, partnership, or association, to accept any fee, service charge, or any other thing of value for the purpose of securing a position for any person in the Government of the United States, or the Armed Forces, or position in any construction work, civil or military, which is financed in whole or in part by the Government of the United States, or a position on any construction work upon which the United States Government has extended any loan, or who for a fee, service charge, or any other thing of value undertakes to use his influence with Government agents in securing a loan from any agency of the Government, providing a penalty for the violation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 104. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of the Standing Rock Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 105. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 106. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 107. A bill to provide for the transfer of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 108. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 109. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 110. A bill to authorize the cancellation, adjustment, and collection of certain obligations due the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 112. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 113. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas, to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 114. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 115. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 116. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale of such fireworks is prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 117. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 118. A bill to assist individuals to provide financial security upon retirement and to make provisions for surviving members of their families by allowing an income-tax deduction for premiums paid on annuity and life-insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 119. A bill to provide that certain amounts expended by individuals for the purchase of non-interest-bearing United States bonds may be deducted in computing net income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 120. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 121. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 122. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuities, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to one-half the average monthly compensation on the basis of the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 123. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River development, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 124. A bill to abolish the Lakeview Federal sustained-yield unit, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 125. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 126. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 127. A bill to quitclaim interest of the United States to certain land in Placer County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the 5-year limitation on the time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 129. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 130. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 131. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 132. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 133. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to the duty of the Federal Power Commission to report to Congress regarding the effect and operation of State compacts dealing with the conservation, production, transportation, or distribution of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 134. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 135. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 136. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 137. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to industrial dispersion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 138. A bill for the relief of the Greenwood Township School District, Crawford County, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 139. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 140. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold $10 pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 141. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of emergency works for the protection of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie Harbor, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 142. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 143. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the San Antonio River, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 144. A bill to extend the expiration date of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 for 2 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 145. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Cass Lake, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 146. A bill to amend section 24 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the disallowance of certain deductions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 147. A bill to provide aid in stabilizing agriculture prices by providing an equalizing fee on imported fats and oils, an offset on exports of fats and oils, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 148. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 149. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 150. A bill to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the district courts to determine income-tax deficiencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 151. A bill to reduce from 12 to 8 months the time for which livestock must be held in order to qualify for the benefits of section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 152. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 153. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income-tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 154. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 155. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 156. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 157. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 158. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 159. A bill to provide for the sale of certain submarginal lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 160. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the Armed Forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 161. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfork Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 162. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam in Baxter and Marion Counties, Ark., as Lake Tom Shiras; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 163. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Monroe County, Ark., to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 164. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 165. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 166. A bill to establish a Tax Settlement Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 167. A bill relating to compensation for veterans of World War II who have a service-connected or a service-aggravated tuberculous condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 168. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 169. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 170. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 171. A bill to exempt certain functions of the Post Office Department from the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 172. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 173. A bill to provide hospitalization and medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 174. A bill to authorize the long-term chartering of tankers for the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 175. A bill to amend the Army Organization Act of 1950 to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 176. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 177. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 178. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 179. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 180. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 181. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 182. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large for former Presidents and former Vice Presidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 183. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 184. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the United States Government (in Windsor Locks, Conn.) to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 185. A bill to provide certain additional benefits for members of the National Guard of the United States who suffer disability or death while engaged in active-training duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 186. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 187. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 188. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 189. A bill to terminate all ceilings and controls on meats and livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 190. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 191. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 192. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 193. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 194. A bill to authorize research work in weed control, grass culture, and soil-fertility maintenance at Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Goodwell, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 195. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 196. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 197. A bill to provide for a minimum price support for the 1953 crop of peanuts at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 198. A bill to increase the minimum level of price support for the 1953 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 199. A bill to increase the special pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services for sea and foreign duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 200. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 201. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 202. A bill making an appropriation for the Washita Valley flood-prevention program in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 203. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that a railroad employee who has completed 30 years of service may retire on a full annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 204. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 205. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 206. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 207. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 208. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 209. A bill to authorize the remodeling and extension of the existing main post-office building and to construct a new post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 210. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 211. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Piedmont district in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 212. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Montavilla district in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 213. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Rose City Park district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 214. A bill to provide for a study and survey as the basis for the establishment of publicly owned natural grassland areas, to assure the preservation of typical areas of each of the major grasslands types, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 215. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 216. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with certain organizations to carry out the functions of the Poundmaster of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 217. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 218. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health-service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 219. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 220. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.) and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 221. A bill to require the Attorney General to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 222. A bill to amend paragraph 207 and schedule 16 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 223. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 224. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 225. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 226. A bill to provide for the detention and prosecution of Communists and former Communists, to provide that peacetime espionage may be punished by death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 227. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversay of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 228. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France by President Jefferson in 1803; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 229. A bill to incorporate the Board for Fundamental Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 230. A bill to incorporate the United Mexican Border Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 231. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 to provide for the termination of assistance to any nation which does not make a full contribution to the development and maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 233. A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 234. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 235. A bill to amend section 22 (d) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 236. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 237. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt home workers in rural areas from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 238. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for

other purposes," approved May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 239. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 240. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation or half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 241. A bill to provide for representation of independent labor organizations on the Wage Stabilization Board, Economic Stabilization Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 242. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 243. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 244. A bill to provide for a standing army of 1,000,000 men and for furnishing basic military training to the youth of America through membership in the National Guard and Organized Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 245. A bill providing for the collection of internal-revenue taxes and customs duties and the administration of the internal-revenue and customs laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 246. A bill to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the district courts to determine income-tax deficiencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 247. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to people in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 248. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to cover reductions, occurring as a result of the 1950 United States census, in Federal funds apportioned for expenditure in the States and Territories; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 249. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary- and secondary-school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 250. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in extending and improving their program of health instruction, safety instruction, and physical education, for children of school age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 251. A bill to provide that permanently disabled individuals (including the blind) who are under 65 shall be entitled to the same tax treatment of their medical expenses as they would be entitled if they were 65, to grant permanently disabled individuals an additional tax exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 252. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 253. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 254. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration hospital being constructed at Birmingham, Ala., shall be named in honor of Gen. William Crawford Gorgas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 255. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 256. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 257. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 258. A bill to provide for research in child life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 259. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 260. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 261. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 262. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 263. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 264. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces a statutory award for the total loss of hearing in one ear; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 265. A bill to provide an allowance for uniforms for certain officers recalled to active service with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 266. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 267. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 268. A bill to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 269. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 270. A bill to provide for the control and extinguishment of out-crop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 271. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barbourville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 272. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 273. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Middlesboro (Yellow Creek), Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 274. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 275. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 276. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 277. A bill to authorize promotions from apprentice to journeyman in the Government service to be made on a permanent basis, to provide credit for promotion and retention purposes for graduate apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 278. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 279. A bill to grant pensions to certain veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 280. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 281. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, to provide for the making of payments in lieu of State and local taxation of certain property transferred to service departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 282. A bill to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions when admission is free of charge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 283. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to employees of Federal home-loan banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 284. A bill to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 286. A bill to authorize emergency appropriation for the purpose of erecting a post-office building in Waynesboro, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 287. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 288. A bill to provide for the creation of a Board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 289. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 290. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 291. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 292. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 293. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 294. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 295. A bill to place in the Administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 296. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 297. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 298. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 299. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 300. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 301. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public-health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 302. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 303. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 304. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 305. A bill to allow a widow or widower to deduct, for income-tax purposes, amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 306. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 307. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 308. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which relate to price and wage controls and the settlement of labor disputes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 309. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 310. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to establish a presumption of service connection in all cases of active tuberculosis which develop a 10-percent degree of disability within 3 years after separation from the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 311. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the (southern district of the) State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 312. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 313. A bill to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination and priority of combat connection of disabilities, injuries, or diseases alleged to have been incurred in, or aggravated by combat service in a war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 314. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America from a staff in a church or public auditorium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 315. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 316. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, title IV of the National Housing Act, and the judicial code in order to define the limitations of Government control of savings and loan associations, to provide judicial and administrative remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 317. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce to provide for larger allocations of sulfur to increase production of newsprint; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 318. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 319. A bill to place on the retired list certain commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 320. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 322. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 323. A bill to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be abridged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 324. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 325. A bill to promote the development of minerals in lands under the jurisdiction of a department or agency of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 326. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 327. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 328. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 329. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 330. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American school teacher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 331. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 332. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 333. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 334. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 336. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 337. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the

Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 338. A bill to provide out-patient treatment for non-service-connected disabilities for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 339. A bill to extend for a period of 2 years the education and training benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 340. A bill to increase certain disability pension awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 341. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to certain dependents of deceased veterans of World War I, World War II, and of service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 342. A bill to extend pension benefits payable under the veterans regulations to persons who served with the United States military occupation forces in Germany during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 343. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 345. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 346. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 347. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 348. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the sale at certain post offices of tobacco, cigar, and cigarette tax stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 350. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to determine the need for improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., via Destin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 351. A bill to authorize the dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 352. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 353. A bill to provide a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 354. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey to determine the need for a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 355. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay via East Pass; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 356. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 357. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 358. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State or municipal tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 359. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 360. A bill to amend section 1341 of title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 361. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 362. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 363. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 364. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 365. A bill to grant certain former officers of the Army who enlisted for aviation cadet training certain lump-sum payments of which they were deprived by the enactment of the Flight Officer Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 366. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 367. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 368. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the States and their political subdivisions for the loss of tax revenue with respect to certain real property, and improvements thereon, acquired by the United States and used by the Armed Forces for recreational and welfare purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 369. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 370. A bill to amend section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 371. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 372. A bill to provide for the display of the flag of the United States outside premises wherein deceased members or former members of the Armed Forces are lying in state, and at funerals of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 373. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 374. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil-service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 376. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, long-range budget estimates, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 377. A bill to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 378. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Boston, Mass., as the Dr. Harvey Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 379. A bill granting a limited exemption from income tax in the case of pensions and annuities received by widows and orphans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 380. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 381. A bill to confirm and establish in the State of Texas the title to certain submerged coastal lands of such State and to the natural resources within such lands and the waters above such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 382. A bill to permit certain students to receive Reserve Officers Training Corps military training at institutions other than the ones they are attending; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 383. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 384. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 385. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 386. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 387. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 388. A bill to provide for expeditious naturalization of persons serving in the present hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 389. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 390. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to provide insured aged persons and their dependents, and survivors of deceased insured persons, with insurance against the cost of hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 391. A bill to amend the Clayton Act so as to provide that domestic corporations may be required by subpena to produce the records of their foreign affiliates and subsidiaries, to require that foreign corporations doing business in the United States register with the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 392. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 393. A bill to amend section 1102 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 394. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 395. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 396. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 397. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," with respect to the provisions relating to manufacture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 398. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 399. A bill to fix the term of the judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands at 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 400. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 401. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 402. A bill to assure the provision of all necessary services to prepare disabled persons for and establish them in remunerative employment, to make special provision for the blind and other severely disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 403. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 404. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 405. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 406. A bill to provide protection of persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 407. A bill to amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit attempts to commit the offenses therein proscribed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 408. A bill to regulate the interception of communications in the interest of national security and the safety of human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 409. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 410. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 411. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 412. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 413. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit the rendering of free telephone service to certain hospitalized members, and former members, of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 414. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 415. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 416. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 417. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces in the Philippine Islands during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 418. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 419. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 420. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 421. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 422. A bill relating to the manufacturers' excise tax on trailers used in connection with passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 423. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 424. A bill to provide that students away from home while attending college shall be enumerated for census purposes as residents of the enumeration district in which their home is located; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 425. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party with respect to candidacy for Federal or State elective offices; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 426. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the amortization deduction for emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 427. A bill to amend the Census Act of June 18, 1929, so as to prohibit inquiries as to income of individuals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 428. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the amount of active service which certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies may be required to serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 429. A bill to terminate the retailers' excise tax on luggage and handbags, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 430. A bill to provide for insurance of shareholdings in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 431. A bill to enact the provisions preserving the social-security insurance rights of disabled individuals which were contained in H. R. 7800 of the Eighty-second Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 432. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 433. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on certain claims of individual Navajo Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 434. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 435. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, and to reenact all acts repealed or amended by the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 436. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 437. A bill to prevent the application or exercise of monopoly power by employers and labor organizations in their dealings with employees, to amend the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 438. A bill to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 439. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of Public Law 393 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 440. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 441. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 442. A bill to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; to restore the right of American citizens to own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to open up foreign trade through the channels of private enterprise; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 443. A bill to grant certain interests in mineral rights, including oil and gas rights, to persons who have acquired or hereafter acquire land pursuant to homestead entry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 445. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 447. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 448. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 449. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 450. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 451. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 452. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 454. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of selective immigrants possessing skills beneficial to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 455. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Council Bluffs, Iowa, a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 457. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American service man or woman who lost his or her life while serving in one of the various theaters of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 458. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 460. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrified their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester;* to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 461. A bill to provide increases in the rates of death compensation payable to certain widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or of service on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 462. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 463. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 464. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 465. A bill to establish a Board of Education in the Federal Government and to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 466. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 467. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 468. A bill to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 469. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 470. A bill to provide books and sound-reproduction records for certain physically incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 471. A bill to pay certain substitute postal employees time and one-half overtime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 473. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 474. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 475. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 476. A bill to permit Civil War veterans to receive hospital treatment in hospitals of their choice if Veterans' Administration facilities are not available in their locality; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 477. A bill to authorize acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 478. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 479. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 480. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 481. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure), so as to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity in the case of Government officers and employees convicted of a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 482. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 483. A bill to require persons who obtain commissions for rendering assistance in the obtaining of Government contracts to register with the Congress, and to establish in the General Services Administration an Office of Contract Information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 484. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1842 (U. S. C., title 1, ch. 2, sec. 25), relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 485. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 486. A bill to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the Armed Forces buried outside the United States, lost at sea, or reported missing in the performance of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 488. A bill to provide a correctional system for juvenile delinquents proceeded against in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 489. A bill to prohibit justices and judges of the United States from testifying as to the character or reputation of any person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 490. A bill to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war and peacetime veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 491. A bill to provide permanent civil-service status for certain partially disabled Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 492. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 493. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 494. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 495. A bill to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 496. A bill to amend section 200, title II, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, as amended by Public Law 316, Eightieth Congress, approved August 1, 1947; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 497. A bill to include certain additional veterans' organizations whose accredited representatives and claim agents may assist veterans and their dependents under section 616, National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and section 500, World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 498. A bill to amend section 200, chapter II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 3, Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 499. A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 500. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 501. A bill to provide for the storage in New England of at least 150,000 bales of cotton owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 502. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility at Boston, Mass., the William P. Connery, Junior, Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

H. R. 503. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 504. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 505. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 506. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 507. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of worsted fabric in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the worsted-fabric industry, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 508. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and local governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 509. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 510. A bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 511. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 512. A bill providing for the examination and survey of Lynn and Nahant Beaches, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 513. A bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 514. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1941, to include Public Health Service officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 515. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 516. A bill to repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to a prohibition upon the denial of Social Security Act funds); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 517. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 518. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1918, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 519. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 520. A bill to restrict the application of section 1154 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the dispensing of intoxicants to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 521. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 522. A bill to amend section 25 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that, under certain circumstances, the taxpayer shall be allowed a credit for a child whom he is in the course of adopting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 523. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 524. A bill to authorize promotions from apprentice to journeyman in the Government service to be made on a permanent basis, to provide credit for promotion and retention purposes for graduate apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 525. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the employment of administrative assistants by Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 526. A bill to increase the compensation of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 527. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 528. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity

for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 529. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to certain suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 530. A bill relating to the performance by Federal judges of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 531. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 532. A bill to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 533. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to exemption from the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 534. A bill to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 535. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 536. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, Minn., from mile 14.2 to its mouth; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 537. A bill relating to the approval, as treaties, of certain agreements negotiated by and under authority of the United States with foreign states; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 538. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alleviate shortages in railroad freight cars and other vehicles during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 539. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 540. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 541. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 542. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 543. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 544. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities urgently and immediately needed for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 545. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Veterinary School of Middlesex University, Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 546. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Reserve officers, formerly in the Regular Army and Navy and who were appointed prior to August 24, 1912, and March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 547. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for a refund of premiums in certain cases where the insured failed to apply for a waiver of such premiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 548. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary center at Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 549. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles to amputees whose injury was incurred while on active service before World War II and who were not discharged until after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 550. A bill to provide for certain tax-exempt purchases for hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 551. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 552. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 553. A bill to require that one member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be from the New England States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 554. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 555. A bill authorizing construction of works to restore to Palo Verde irrigation district, California, a means of gravity diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River and providing certain benefits to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 556. A bill to authorize the President to accept enlistments of nationals of other countries into the armed services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 557. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 558. A bill to establish the requirement that political statements concerning certain candidates for public office shall contain information relating to sponsorship and cost of publication or transmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 559. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 560. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 561. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 562. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 563. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 564. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 565. A bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under 17 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 566. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 567. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 568. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 569. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 570. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 571. A bill to prohibit the sending of blasphemous matter through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 572. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 573. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 574. A bill to rehabilitate and stabilize labor conditions in the textile industry of the United States; to prevent unemployment; to remove obstructions to interstate commerce; to regulate wages and hours in said industry; to protect and foster the defense effort; to safeguard and promote the general welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 575. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 576. A bill to repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 577. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 578. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 579. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination

or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 580. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 581. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 582. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 583. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 584. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 585. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 586. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 587. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 588. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 589. A bill to provide for a preliminary survey of the mouth of the Sparkill Creek and the immediate area of the Hudson River thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 590. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 591. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 592. A bill to restore directory service for letters and parcels sent through the mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 593. A bill to authorize the renewal at increased rates of existing contracts for mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 594. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years, to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 595. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water-supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 596. A bill to provide that the compensation the United States shall pay the Borough of Blairsville, Pa., for certain land and improvements thereon, shall include the replacement costs of such improvements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 597. A bill to conform provisions relating to payments in lieu of taxes in Lanham Act (act of October 14, 1940, as amended) to provisions in Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 598. A bill granting an exemption from income tax in the case of certain pensions and annuities of policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 599. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the Armed Forces dying in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 600. A bill to authorize additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 601. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service may be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 602. A bill to provide double pay for certain infantrymen in combat, and to credit such infantrymen with double time for days spent in combat; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 603. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 604. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to iron-ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 605. A bill allowing a credit against the additional estate tax for inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes paid to any State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 606. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 607. A bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Interal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 608. A bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the time for filing individual income-tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 610. A bill to provide for the correction of inequities under the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax treatment of income derived by domestic corporations from sources within foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 612. A bill to allow taxpayers, in computing adjusted gross income, to deduct expenses paid or incurred by them in connection with their employment on a commission basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 613. A bill to repeal the Buy American Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 614. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 615. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide additional requirements for State plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 616. A bill to extend the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to World War II veterans to certain citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 617. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 618. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 619. A bill to authorize certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 620. A bill to require that a more adequate statement of the ingredients in certain insecticides and other economic poisons be contained on the labels thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 621. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 with reference to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the operation of a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital at the Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility, Clinton, Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 623. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 624. A bill to exempt certain nonprofit religious and charitable organizations from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 625. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 626. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 627. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Trudeau Sanatorium, Saranac Lake, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 628. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 629. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries

and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 630. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 631. A bill to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability rated 20 percent or less disabling shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 632. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 633. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 634. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 635. A bill to clarify the right of sellers to engage in competition by in good faith meeting the equally low price of a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 636. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 637. A bill to extend the watershed programs authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 638. A bill to repeal certain restrictions on cotton acreage reports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 639. A bill to repeal provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill to make it unlawful for any officer in the executive branch of the Government to take or maintain possession and control of any private property except pursuant to statutory authority for such action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 641. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill to require that cases in which the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction be decided by the affirmative vote of at least five members of the Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 643. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 644. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 645. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 646. A bill to prescribe the minimum number of personnel of the Army to be assigned as instructors of junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 647. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 4. Joint Resolution authorizing a compact or agreement between the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and certain other States, and the Dominion of Canada, with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution providing for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase from France by President Thomas Jefferson in 1803 and for public celebrations, historical exhibits, and pageants in the 17 Louisiana Purchase States in 1953 and 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing the power of subpena and to grant immunity in certain investigations relating to improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution providing for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress to impose income taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress, in admitting any new State, to limit its representation in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for filling the office of President after a vote of no confidence by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college system and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of Federal funds to pay the salaries and expenses of Federal officers and employees performing functions in connection with the unauthorized seizure of steel mills or other private property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution safeguarding the economic stability of the United States by imposing limitations on expenditures during the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national

emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution limiting the spending powers of the Congress and to provide for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution acknowledging, confirming, and establishing the title of the States to the navigable waters and lands beneath such navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution designating November 19 the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1953, as a day for Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution amending sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting free postage to members of the Armed Forces, while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution providing for the American Joint Commission To Assist in the Unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution appointing a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, relating to the display and use of the flag, so as to establish a rule that no foreign national or supranational flag shall be publicly displayed unless it is accompanied by the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil and property rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution providing for a study and investigation of the grade classification and salary scale of certain employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution providing for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the

Louisiana Purchase from France by President Thomas Jefferson in 1803 and for public celebrations, historical exhibits, and pageants in the 17 Louisiana Purchase States in 1953 and 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution authorizing a sum, not to exceed $80,000,000, to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Minnesota River in the Minnesota River Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution designating payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed, and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution providing for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for the conveyance of the Muir Wood Toll Road by Marin County, State of California, to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to nominations of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim January 30 of each year Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thirty-first President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution establishing a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the apportionment of Representatives among the several States on the basis of the number of citizens of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution providing for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution setting aside the Charter of the United Nations as approved by the Senate under alleged treaty powers, which approval was unconstitutional and void; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing chapel facilities for Members of Congress and their immediate families; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of State to submit a plan for amalgamation of personnel of the State Department establishment of Washington and personnel of the Foreign Service into a single Foreign Affairs Career Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution congratulating Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra on occasion of Golden Jubilee season; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of a Manual of Veterans' Rights; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution providing a Code of Ethics for Government Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the meetings of the United Nations Assembly, and similar world organizations of which the United States is a member, should be opened with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to refer to the International Joint Commission a study and investigation of the fluctuating water levels of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam should be forthwith repudiated by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing and directing an inquiry by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, into the commercial and proprietary activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 13. Resolution providing for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 14. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 15. Resolution creating a select committee to inquire into the commercial and proprietary activities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 16. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives, so as to make in order, provision in and amendments to general appropriation bills which reduce, or impose limitations upon the expenditure of, appropriations previously made; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 17. Resolution providing for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 18. Resolution amending the Rules of the House to allow Members serving on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and members of the majority party serving on the Committee on Rules, to serve on two standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 19. Resolution providing for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 20. Resolution providing for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 21. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relative to broadcasts of committee hearings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 23. Resolution establishing a new dining room or cafeteria in the House wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 24. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 25. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives favoring the revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 26. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the distribution of pornographic materials; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 27. Resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserve at Fort Knox and other places; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 28. Resolution authorizing inquiry into manner of selecting candidates for the United States Military and Naval Academies; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 29. Resolution amending rule XI (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 30. Resolution creating a select committee to study the Government's farm price-support program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 31. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the more frequent display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 32. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 33. Resolution providing for the printing of a compilation of veterans' laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 34. Resolution conducting an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 35. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study security conditions in and around the port of New York, in order to determine the effect of inadequate port security upon shipments to Europe under the mutual security programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 36. Resolution providing funds and expenses to investigate and study security conditions around the port of New York as authorized by House Resolution 35; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 37. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 38. Resolution providing funds and expenses to conduct studies and investigations as authorized by House Resolution 37; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. Res. 39. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to impose certain limitations with respect to action on appropriation bills other than those which provide appropriations for support of the Government pursuant to the budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 40. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study the participation of the United States in the International Materials Conference; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 41. Resolution opposing all plans, programs, and proposals tending toward the development of any form of world government which would limit the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to vote against the passage of the so-called Thomas leave rider attached to the independent offices appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to S. 2863, Eighty-second Congress, relative to construction of the Solano County project, and with reference to H. R. 4574, Eighty-second Congress, relative to the selection of Beale Air Force Base as the site for the Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, transmitting an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact as entered into and ratified by this State, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico transmitting a copy of the ratification on the part of the State of New Mexico of an interstate civil defense and disaster compact with the State of New York, pursuant to the provisions of section 6 (b) of chapter 189 of the Laws of New Mexico, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York transmitting a letter concerning the existence and ratification of an interstate civil defense compact between the State of New York and the States of Arizona, Florida, Maine, and Oregon, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, Public Law 920, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York transmitting a photostatic copy of the interstate civil defense and disaster compact as ratified by the State of New York and transmitted to the Governor of the State of Colorado and approved by him on July 14, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma transmitting a certified copy of the Oklahoma interstate civil defense and disaster compact, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, section 201 (g) and section 206; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia transmitting an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact as entered into and ratified by this State, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming transmitting an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact as entered into and ratified by this State, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 648. A bill for the relief of Israel Kampel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 649. A bill for the relief of Margarete Vavrovec and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of Richard Brenneis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Gallazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of Angelina Lanza Buldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 653. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Knasin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 654. A bill to recognize the public service of, and extend certain benefits to, Oscar Bitchman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 655. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 656. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 657. A bill for the relief of William J. Popaca; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Blumenfeld Fielding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 659. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Lucente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Pindle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Yip Soy Naum and Yip Kug Yow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 664. A bill for the relief of Jan de Bakker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 665. A bill for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Karyenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 666. A bill for the relief of Michele Paccione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Albano Batoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Emma White Hibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of George D. Kyminas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 670. A bill for the relief of David Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 671. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 672. A bill for the relief of Albert Beraha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 674. A bill for the relief of Irene F. M. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 676. A bill for the relief of Paul Bohus-Vilagosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 678. A bill for the relief of Pfc Nicholas Francis Erjavec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 679. A bill to provide additional time for presenting certain tort claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON (by request):

H. R. 680. A bill to provide for the extension of design patent No. 133,870 issued September 22, 1942, to Mrs. Beulah Hill, relating to a bootiette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of John G. Rohrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 682. A bill for the relief of Kinu (Kenuko) Shiina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of George P. Symrniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 684. A bill to effect entry of Kim Jung Soo to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Walter Carl Sander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 686. A bill for the relief of Emma Gronowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of two missionary sisters Servants of the Holy Ghost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of Akiko Niina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Keiko Inouye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 690. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas F. Morrissey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 692. A bill for the relief of Nina Makeef, also known as Nina Berberova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 693. A bill for the relief of Lydia Sarrka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 694. A bill for the relief of Uttal Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 695. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 696. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Christos Mataraggiotis, and Zoi Demetre Mataraggiotis, his wife, and Christos Mataraggiotis and Constantinos Mataraggiotis, their minor sons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 698. A bill for the relief of Janis Lamberts and Pauline Leontine Lamberts, his wife, and Harold Lamberts and Arnis Lamberts, their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Isaac H. Shohet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Peter G. Coutavas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Shikany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 702. A bill for the relief of Hans R. Zimmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 703. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Corp. Silvano Giuricin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 705. A bill for the relief of George R. Badley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 706. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Hamaoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 707. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignacy Adam, Mrs. Amalya Alexander Adam, and George Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 708. A bill for the relief of Darwin Deen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 709. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Freda Seltzer Siegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 712. A bill for the relief of Milton C. Towner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 713. A bill for the relief of Marziano Rita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. A. Isaac Burnstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Angelo Staffani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of William Engelbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of Henriette Matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Constantine Stameson (formerly Spyridon Constantine Stamatopoulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of Rosa Huch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Luise Pempfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fumiko Sawai Skovran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 724. A bill for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 725. A bill for the relief of Dezio Blascovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 726. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 727. A bill for the relief of Lilli Deininger Steinbrunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Helga G. Jordan and her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 729. A bill for the relief of Maria Battista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 730. A bill for the relief of William Foster Denney, administrator of the estate of William Myre Denney, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Rennick Moffett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Chaim and Inna Grade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 733. A bill for the relief of Hildegard H. Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 734. A bill for the relief of Mihai Handrabura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Joseph Criss Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 736. A bill for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 737. A bill for the relief of Harold Donaghy Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 738. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L. LeCours; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 741. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 742. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Spyridon Karavitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 743. A bill for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of Chin Kuan Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of Chi Ye Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsovicsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 747. A bill for the relief of Nannie Augusta Layne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of Nick Giannioudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 751. A bill for the relief of John E. Franklin and Martha Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 752. A bill for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill for the relief of Antonio Andrea Chitato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 754. A bill for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of Jerome M. Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of John Yanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Ida Bifolchini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 758. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Hisami Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of Wilbert F. Kerns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Chieko Sakai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Gerzon Gruszka, Stella Gruszka, and Tamara Gruszka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of Michael Woon Sam, Neal Woon Sam, and Jackqueline Woon Sam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Robert Wellington McClintock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 768. A bill for the relief of Bozica Begonja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 769. A bill for the relief of Arthur Winkler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Giuseppe) Gasparini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 771. A bill for the relief of Ayako Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of Wieslaw Kiniczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Niamonitakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 774. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitski, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 775. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen B. Lambropoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 776. A bill for the relief of George Henry Mahoney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 777. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Backus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 778. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 779. A bill for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Berjouhie Andreassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 781. A bill for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 782. A bill for the relief of Kurt J. Hain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 784. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John H. Wagenblass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 785. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 786. A bill for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 787. A bill for the relief of Israel Ratsprecher and Maryse Ratsprecher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of Beryl Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 789. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Catapano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 790. A bill for the relief of William Henry Lyster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 791. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Topol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 792. A bill for the relief of Faiga Kunda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 793. A bill for the relief of Manolis N. Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 794. A bill for the relief of Domenico Landolfa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Jean Hollis Vock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 796. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Glowacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 797. A bill for the relief of Harry Constandoloulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 798. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Catapano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 799. A bill for the relief of Antonio D'Alterio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 800. A bill for the relief of Anna Mucha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 801. A bill for the relief of Sarah Young and Melvin Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 802. A bill for the relief of Wesley Amell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 803. A bill for the relief of Christakis Modinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Enrichetta F. C. Meda-Novara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 805. A bill for the relief of Gustaf Henrik Walfrid Walden and his wife, Anja Leila Seijes Walden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 806. A bill for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of Sister Isabel (Purificacion Montemayor Maceo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 808. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 809. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Denny and Dorothy Mae Denny, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 810. A bill for the relief of Connie Marie Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of Alonzo Carrejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of Jane Loraine Hindman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 815. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lydia Fahlbusch Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Alamo Motor Lines, Inc., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of Karl Beker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 818. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Martha Staack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of Monika Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pia Bondi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 822. A bill for the relief of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Antranik Hovsepian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 826. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 829. A bill for the relief of Yi Fu Chen and his wife, Betty Yi Fu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 830. A bill for the relief of Gerald Augustine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of Poulikis S. Loukakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 832. A bill for the relief of Katharine Balsamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George L. Goulet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 834. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 835. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 836. A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Charles Edmund Dumaresq Clavell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 839. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Stretch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 841. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Commander Nicholas T. Gansa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 842. A bill for the relief of Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Aiko Kinjo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of Roman Boguslaw Massalski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 845. A bill for the relief of Kang Duk Yee or Mrs. John J. Hassett (married name); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of Primitivo A. Cuenca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards and Walter John Rickards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Katem, Theodosia Katem, Basil Katem, and Josephine Katem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stella Rebner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Wefel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Hugh L. Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 853. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Central Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Edward F. Zap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 854. A bill to restore United States citizenship to Saburo Akune, a former citizen who has expatriated himself; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 855. A bill for the relief of Albert Weeks Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 856. A bill for the relief of James Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 857. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 858. A bill for the relief of Kim Mi Hae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 859. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 860. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sommer Jacobsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 861. A bill for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 862. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of First Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 863. A bill for the relief of Josephine Reigl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 864. A bill for the relief of Sisters Elvira Stornelli and Augusta Sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 865. A bill for the relief of Emilio Federico Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 866. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 867. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joseph Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 868. A bill for the relief of Ciriaco Catino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of Masuko Oshima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Harry Block; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 871. A bill for the relief of Orsola Jacopelli Leggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of John Vasilatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Nabiha Elias Audi, also known as N. E. Audi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of Nabiha Elias Audi, also known as N. E. Audi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 878. A bill for the relief of Mikhail N. S. Skarlatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 879. A bill for the relief of Pertti A. Muttilainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Aaron, Shifra, and Ahud Sternburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 882. A bill for the relief of Tokie Hashiguchi and her son, Koichi Hashiguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of Leila Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 884. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of George Shukri Koudsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Francesca Servello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Scarlett Scroggin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of the estate of George Jacobus, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Betty and Irene Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of Panaiotis Nicurezos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of Naim Solomon Bahary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 895. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Friedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Fajwel Goldblat (also known as Felix Bibich) and Judith Goldblat (also known as Judith Berg Fibich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Abdul K. Barik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 899. A bill for the relief of Stanley Trela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 900. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of Edward Henry Erbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 902. A bill for the relief of Jose Correia Dos Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Edward Lis Michonski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 904. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw (John) Waz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Wolczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Majewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Danuta Resizke 'Birke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 910. A bill for the relief of Anna Leonard, an American citizen, covering damages by American troops to her property located in Salzburg, Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Adelchi Colecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Epaninondos Zhoustis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 914. A bill for the relief of Jerry Pagoulatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Luigi Di Massa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mary Youn (Byung Soo Youn); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lotito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of Alfred Herbert Vondran, midshipman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Eva Enevoldsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 920. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Inger Werner Pattersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of Magdalena Rose Denes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Hiroko Doki and Takako Doki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of Marion Urbanek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Wing Chong Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 927. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Albert Sidney Freedman, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to the grade of rear admiral on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Kunibert Franciszek Grabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Eugene Albert Bailly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of Stefan Jankielewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 931. A bill for the relief of Stanley Dankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Joseph Cieplinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of William and Helen Kobielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 934. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Stanley Brodzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Melnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of the estate of Frank DeNuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of the estate of Henry F. Aniszewski, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of Maurice Ghnassia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Karastamatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 941. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 942. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildergarde Wycisk McKaig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 943. A bill for the relief of Milthadis Skordos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lyguim Sowinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of Dr. Claude Buonaiuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 947. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Tom Gwin a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 948. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Nourita Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 950. A bill for the relief of Panoula Panagopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Sander and her minor daughter, Irene Sander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Jekabs Lenbergs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Edith Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of Paula Akiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 956. A bill for the relief of Francis Budovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Alex Harfenist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Viktor Palango, Agnes Palango, and Toivo Palango; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of James Moustakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 960. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Aurora Theresa Blasich and her daugher, Marisa Anna Ghersinich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Aitcheson Lock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Nettie E. Whitfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of Robert George Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Rosa Egner and her son Gerald Egner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 969. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of George Economos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Brahos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of John C. K. Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dudley A. Reekie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Max Franz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Dutour Rovzar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Harue Fukushi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Board of Supervisors, Honolulu, T. H., relative to transmitting a copy of Resolution No. 751, requesting the Congress to enact legislation to authorize the board of supervisors to issue bonds for the purpose of acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes in the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2. Also, petition of Dr. Henry L. Peckham, Jr., Washington, D. C., relative to impeachment of Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3. Also, petition of William Henry Roberts, Represa, Calif., relative to a review of a certain decision of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Also, petition of William H. Roberts, Represa, Calif., relative to a letter sent to the Attorney General, dated September 5, 1952, relating to certain portions of the petition regarding certain violations of Federal criminal laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5. Also, petition of Mario L. Bove, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to his case before the Supreme Court of the United States, relating to an open answer to the denial of petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6. Also, petition of Datu Domato D. Panondiongan, care of Attorney C. C. Dimayuga, Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines, relative to requesting settlement of claim No. H-10-03029 CC 110, in the amount of $133,951.10; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. Also, petition of Maj. V. R. Barros, Commander, Regular Veterans' Association, Inc., Manila, Philippines, relative to an increase of pension of former retired Philippine Scout soldiers, United States Army; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8. Also, petition of Jose A. Buenafior, secretary, Provincial Board, Province of Negros Occidental, Philippines, relative to its Resolution No. 44, dated June 30, 1952, supporting the Havenner bill proposing the abolition of the 3-cent processing tax imposed on coconut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration), with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered items is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.
E. (4) $1; (5) $1; (6) $0.70; (7) $1; (9) $3.70; (10) $387.48; (11) $391.18.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry. (3) The aircraft year book of 1951.
D. (6) $6,416.33.
E. (1) $4,999.98; (2) $1,250; (4) $79.75; (7) $86.60; (9) $6,416.33; (10) $11,672.45; (11) $18,288.78; (15) $4,999.98; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations; $79.75, The Judges, Inc., Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., letters; $1,336.60, Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., services.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which will or may affect members of employing labor organization.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $50.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal aid to education, ECA and point 4 program, qualified equal rights amendment, strengthening the United Nations, school construction and teachers' pay, independent status to the United States Office of Education, reciprocal trade agreements without peril points.
E. (4) $5.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,374.99; (7) $1,461.84; (9) $5,836.83; (10) $10,295.89; (11) $16,132.72.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East Seventeenth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bills pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries; for such statutes and bills.
D. (6) $65.
E. (4) $7.13; (6) $41.79; (9) $48.92; (10) $3,160.78; (11) $3,209.70.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $802.
E. (2) $750; (5) $397.92; (6) $119.60; (9) $1,267.52; (10) $3,778.43; (11) $5,045.95; (15).[1]

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D. (6) $1,589.57.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $1,472.45; (5) $68.45; (6) $8.54; (7) $40.13; (9) $1,589.57; (10) $8,038.84; (11) $9,628.41; $365.13, Robert C. Jackson, 9 Hunting Cove Place, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; $760.20, C. G. Caffrey, 215 South Royal Street, Alexandria, Va., salary; $250, C. T. Murchison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. American Council of Style and Design, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to protect original commercial styles and designs on textile fabrics and other commodities.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To disseminate information which will assist the constituent and component societies in their problems involving the enactment and enforcement of legislation involving the dental health of the public or the practice of dentistry.
D. (6) $6,609.
E. (2) $6,609; (9) $6,609; (10) $15,498.25; (11) $22,107.25; (15) $3,000, Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $1,588, B. J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $1,138, O. O. Norberg, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $808, H. Hofener, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $75, E. Harold Gale, 142 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y., reimbursement for expenditures for secretarial services.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, general office, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Washington office, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture and News Letter.
D. (6) $9,936.
E. (2) $13,766; (4) $3,390; (5) $1,747; (6) $1,748; (7) $165; (9) $20,816; (10) $43,172; (11) $63,988.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,081.92; (2) $14,769.28; (4) $3,910.58; (5) $964.50; (9) $26,726.28; (10) $51,845.35; (11) $78,571.63; (15) $7,081.92, Furman Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; $3,910.58, Ransdell, Inc., 805 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing; etc.[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1202, S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2652, H. R. 4051, and S. 1874.
D. (6) $4,080.81.
E. (10) $3,435.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $122,756.56.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans and their dependents, general welfare of the country, child welfare, etc. (3) American Legion magazine and Merchant Marine Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,036.21.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $11,596.86; (4) $3,033.48; (5) $2,249.42; (6) $720.52; (7) $4,505.21; (9) $22,105.49; (10) $67,063.88; (11) $89,169.37.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $5,280.73.
E. (2) $3,778.05; (5) $512.72; (6) $199.62; (7) $790.34; (9) $5,280.73; (10) $7,740.15; (11) $13,020.88.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to advance the science and art of medicine.[1]
E. (1) $50,000; (2) $32,845.95; (5) $3,749.34; (6) $2,150.67; (7) $529.22; (8) $5,570.89; (9) $94,846.07; (10) $134,560.92; (11) $229,406.99; (15) $50,000, Whitaker & Baxter, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., public relations; etc.[1]

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting nurses, nursing, and health.
D. (6) $43,877.54.
E. (2) $1,153.80; (5) $178.77; (6) $68.51; (7) $316.11; (9) $1,717.19; (10) $3,599.62; (11) $5,316.81.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $551.10.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $7.10; (9) $551.10; (10) $1,587.87; (11) $2,138.97.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.
D. (6) $295.
E. (2) $250; (6) $25; (7) $20; (9) $295; (10) $590; (11) $885.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, support of legislation providing national school health services, appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers, bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers, appropriations for the Children's Bureau, appropriations for the national school lunch program, emergency maternal and infant care.
D. (6) $295.98.
E. (2) $1,004.36; (4) $123.10; (5) $167.65; (6) $50.50; (8) $466.47; (9) $1,812.08; (10) $4,517.84; (11) $6,329.92.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $13,003.
E. (2) $5,625; (5) $3,400; (6) $265; (8) $1,071; (9) $10,361; (10) $21,117; (11) $32,478; (15).[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices and properties.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.
D. (6) $24,167.59.
E. (2) $8,750; (5) $785.83; (6) $729.30; (7) $390.65; (9) $10,655.76; (10) $20,993.74; (11) $31,649.52.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $976.74.
E. (2) $250; (4) $230.11; (5) $312.16; (6) $32.20; (7) $152.27; (9) $976.74 (10) $3,535.98; (11) $4,512.72; (15).[1]

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,275.
E. (2) $8,842.18; (4) $2,019.16; (5) $1,125.26; (6) $184.04; (7) $299.47; (8) $243.24; (9) $12,713.35; (10) $26,619.36; (11) $39,332.71; (15) $1,500, John Lee Coulter, Investment Building, Washington, D. C., retainer; $1,983.13, Sande Rocke & Co., 44 West Fourth Street, New York, N. Y., printing; etc.[1]

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote legislation that will enhance and protect employment in domestic industry by preventing unfair wage competition from abroad.
D. (6) $4,080.
E. (2) $4,050.55; (6) $39.29; (7) $1; (8) $34.53; (9) $4,125.37; (10) $8,429.11; (11) $12,554.48.

A. Angelina and Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads.
E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $1,258.74; (9) $5,633.73; (10) $12,403.56; (11) $18,037.29.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $29.35; (8) $163.70; (9) $193.05.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $1,782.77.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) The following rider to the Air Forces appropriation for research and development, defense appropriations bill, H. R. 7391: "Provided that no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center."
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $50.69; (9) $50.69; (10) $389.12; (11) $439.81.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $263.13; (9) $1,163.13; (10) $1,994.04; (11) $3,157.17.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Taxation, appropriations, labor legislation, etc.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation which members believe to be in the interest of sound national transportation policy and oppose legislation contrary to such interest.
D. (6) $53,067.02.
E. (2) $23,124.80; (3) $20,000; (4) $1,460; (5) $1,910.90; (6) $216.05; (7) $2,544.78; (8) $3,810.49; (9) $53,067.02; (10) $129,843.76; (11) $182,910.78; (15) $20,000, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 815 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; $1,460, Eastern Printing Corp., New York, N. Y., printing.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.
D. (6) $1,661.78.
E. (2) $1,302.25; (4) $30.67; (5) $94.53; (6) $30.69; (7) $72.99; (8) $120.85; (9) $1,661.78; (10) $3,497.20; (11) $5,158.98.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue acts.
E. (2) $125; (11) $125.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that affects member electric-utility companies, etc.
D. (6) $6249.99.
E. (6) $3; (7) $31.82; (9) $34.82; (10) $141.84; (11) $176.66.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia Pa.
C. (2) Restriction of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism; any other legislation we consider of benefit to Americans.
D. (6) $249.99.
E. (5) $69; (6) $3.20; (7) $16.50; (8) $1.25; (9) $83.70; (10) $238.98; (11) $322.68.

A. John A. Baker, 700 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver 3, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).

A. H. M. Baldridge, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30 Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or import quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris 8e, France.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on all legislation affecting imports into the United States, tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 6007.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (9) $24.67.

A. J. H. Ballew, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,156.30.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 105 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,860.45.
E. (6) $172.13; (7) $123.96; (8) $107.75; (9) $403.84; (10) $1,706.94; (11) $2,110.78.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (6) $18.30; (7) $389.09; (8) $47.86; (9) $455.25; (10) $662.89; (11) $1,118.14.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (10) $200; (11) $300.

A. Earl C. Bassett, 304 North Lafayette Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. National St. Lawrence Seaway Project Conference, Room 843, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposition to all proposals to construct St. Lawrence seaway.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington D. C.
B. The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests will be those required by this organization in its broad national agricultural policy as defined each year in its annual convention. (3) National Grange Monthly.
D. (6) $2,083.33.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Continuing interest in library services bills and legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,451.25; (4) $51.38; (5) $5; (9) $1,507.63; (10) $3,204.47; (11) $4,712.10.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Preston B. Borgin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $9.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) In accordance with resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation affecting agriculture was opposed or favored.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $303.75.
E. (7) $10.92; (9) $10.92; (10) $135.85; (11) $146.77.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones and Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters; the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange; American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.
E. (5) $75.60; (9) $75.60; (10) $243.69; (11) $319.29.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $169.79.
E. (2) $1.50; (4) $20.33; (9) $170.33; (10) $318.46; (11) $480.79.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting employer.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $263.68.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $2,749.76.
E. (2) $1,666.65; (6) $2.45; (7) $468.56; (8) $612.10; (9) $2,749.76; (10) $5,646.65; (11) $8,396.41.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives; H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
E. (2) $200; (8) $32.95; (15) $232.95, Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich., legal fee.

A. D. A. Bodary, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,275.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.
D. (6) $625.
E. (10) $133.14.

A. Maywood Boggs, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., Kansas City, Kans.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (5) $450; (6) $181.95; (7) $528.50; (9) $1,160.45; (10) $3,994.11; (11) $5,154.56.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $125.
E. (10) $21.86.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including proposals involving appropriations and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, Government controls over industry, etc.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (9) $424.07.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) General legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) Legislation to require responsibility of city policemen and other petty arresting officers by bonding them or prohibiting them from carrying lethal weapons.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.
E. (10) $167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including proposals involving national labor and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, industrial mobilization, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (9) $970.90.

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (7) $19.25; (9) $19.25; (10) $102.93; (11) $122.18.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.
D. (6) $300.
E. (10) $1,568.03.

A. William P. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C .
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) We support or oppose legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor. (3) Locomotive Engineers' Journal.
D.[1]
E. (2) $5,931.55; (5) $351.27; (8) $750.98; (9) $7,033.80.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth S reet NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (2) $6,825; (5) $375; (6) $19.74; (7) $325; (8) $32; (9) $7,576.74; (10) $14,662.81; (11) $22,239.55; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $267.35.
E. (6) $2.35; (7) $211.82; (9) $214.17; (10) $1,008.20; (11) $1,222.37.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, local, State or Federal, which relates to the television broadcasting industry.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion picture industry when introduced in Congress.
D. (6) $6,280.79.
E. (7) $497.49; (8) $250; (9) $747.49; (10) $3,598.41; (11) $4,345.90.

A. Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes.
E. (2) $65,000; (6) $107.65; (7) $199.27; (9) $65,306.92; (11) $65,306.92.

A. Harold J. Buoy, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., Kansas City, Kans.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in rubber-tires bill, basing-point legislation, antitrust-law legislation, all legislation affecting independent small business; opposing spare-tire monopoly; supporting FTC maximum-quantity discount rule.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $1,833.34.
E. (7) $371.85; (3) $33.30; (9) $405.15; (10) $760.53; (11) $1,165.69.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $703.50.
E. (2) $2,891.32; (5) $255; (6) $74.69; (7) $390.87; (3) $337.63; (9) $3,949.51; (10) $7,190.03; (11) $11,139.54.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and in support of unemployment insurance and severance pay and other liberal benefits for the workers.
D. (6) $2,067.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (9) $11; (10) $113.05; (11) $124.05.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (11) $88.47.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $75.
E. (10) $75.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Work on legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,286.05.
E. (1) $10; (2) $20; (3) $2.50; (4) $149.43; (5) $4.62; (6) $10.70; (7) $77.20; (8) $11.60; (9) $286.05; (10) $623.96; (11) $910.01.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $634.86; (6) $32.50; (7) $331.50; (8) $15.90; (9) $1,014.76; (10) $2,215.28; (11) $3,230.04.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings.
E. (6) $13.97; (7) $79.37; (8) $93.34; (9) $127.09; (10) $220.42.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $1,064.75.
E. (9) $2.25; (10) $49.05; (11) $51.30.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills which affect the interests of milk dealers.

A. Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayon, president, Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation and Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $1,902.52.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) S. 75, H. R. 1500, and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act, known more frequently as Central Arizona Project Bill.
D. (6) $1,941.84.
E. (1) $96.40; (2) $6,135.41; (3) $7; (4) $447.86; (5) $911.92; (6) 188.61; (7) 673.85; (8) $82.99; (9) $8,544.04; (10) $21,458.56; (11) $30,002.60; (15).[1]

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to business.
D. (6) $694,538.06.
E. (9) $15,763.10; (10) $69,018.76; (11) $84,781.95; (15).[1]

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative programs affecting industry, which includes proposals involving labor and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, remobilization of industry, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $8,000.
E. (9) $1,153.04.

A. Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $2,753.77.
E. (1) $150; (2) $1,650.85; (4) $746.73; (5) $231.65; (6) $28.83; (7) $196.69; (8) $500.23; (9) $3,504.90; (10) $7,023.56; (11) $10,528.54; (15).[1]

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,400.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.), calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcasting stations; opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
E. (7) $42.33; (9) $42.83; (10) $1,202.63; (11) $1,244.96; (15).[1]

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, % Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Sorbie, Paris 8e, France.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on all legislation affecting imports into the United States, tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service (Keepers) Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) Aiding in securing legislation for members of the association.
E. (10) $38.55; (11) $62.24.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.
B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Lewisville, Ark.
E. (10) $1,372.85.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $100.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
E. (6) $25.87; (8) $1,022.62; (9) $1,048.49; (10) $70.77; (11) $1,119.26.

A. Howard O. Colgan, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $5.84; (9) $5.84; (11) $5.84.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,110.
E. (2) $250; (4) $40.40; (5) $30.50; (7) $45.86; (8) $244.18; (9) $610.94; (10) $580.62; (11) $1,191.56; (15) $244.18, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., subscriptions; $30.50, Edna H. Peet, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; $40.40, Laman for Letters, Denver, Colo., mailing notice of annual meeting; $45.86, Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Colo., luncheon; $250, Bart W. O'Hara, 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo., services.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500; favoring passage of Senate Joint Resolution 26 and House Joint Resolution 21.
E. (1) $10,180.75; (2) $10,196.28; (4) $2,049.82; (5) $2,096.77; (6) $890.41; (7) $6,275.89; (9) $31,689.42; (10) $50,470.52; (11) $82,159.94; (15) $1,176.76, Wilma H. Flynn, 7311 Matilija Avenue, Van Nuys, Calif., salary and expenses; $7,400.13, Al Greene and Associates, 346 Clay Street, Los Angeles, display material and service; $1,738.45, Robert B. Griffin, 1061 Rivoli Drive, Los Angeles, salary and expense accounts, etc.[1]

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $312.
E. (5) $62.63; (9) $62.03; (10) $529.34; (11) $592.17; (15) $62.83. Abco Press, Inc., 121 East Twenty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., printing.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington. D. C.
C. (2) To promote through education and legislative activities passage of national health insurance—basic features of the Pres-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

ident's national health plan. The committee opposes socialized medicine, restrictive laws preventing consumers, farmers, workers, and others from organizing health-insurance plans.
D. (6) $1,900.25.
E. (2) $5,900.53; (4) $864.65; (5) $1,441.66; (6) $204.55; (7) $179.67; (8) $197.50; (9) $8,788.78; (10) $25,592.06; (11) $34,380.86; (15) $791.66, John M. Brumm, 4532 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $600, John W. Edelman, 2200 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va., salary; $975, Richard H. Lohman, 1225 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $975, Frances C. Pasmanick, 2500 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) S. 1689 and H. R. 5032.
D. (6) $100.
E. (2) $9,285.98; (4) $482.73; (5) $437.52; (6) $158.11; (7) $1,136.91; (8) $2,060.82; (9) $13,562.07; (10) $26,436.67; (11) $39,998.74; (15) $3,309.48, Gordon C. Locke, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $157.08, Flavia Ann Lee, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $819.42, Millicent Williams, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $5,000, Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., legal services; etc.[1]

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Mutual security and military manpower.
D. (6) $5,121.29.
E. (2) $1,712.52; (4) $64.22; (5) $957.53; (6) $294.51; (8) $366.86; (9) $3,395.64; (10) $9,380.97; (11) $12,776.61.

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (6) $3,800.
E. (1) $1,250; (5) $10.72; (9) $1,260.72; (10) $12,500; (11) $13,760.72.

A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News and CWA Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,010,148.65.
E. (1) $15; (2) $3,125; (4) $330.92; (5) $47.43; (6) $4.37; (7) $634.25; (8) $749.93; (9) $4,906.90; (10) $10,161.78; (11) $15,063.68.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.
E. (9) $474.70.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,770.
E. (1) $2,647.40; (2) $5,560.02; (4) $240.50; (5) $1,418.90; (6) $148.21; (7) $150; (9) $9,865.03; (10) $35,373.49; (11) $45,238.52.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, property, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $7,719.51.
E. (2) $1,875; (3) $3,500; (4) $525; (5) $685; (6) $850; (8) $284.51; (9) $7,719.51; (10) $20,680.01; (11) $28,399.52; (15).[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3168.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $4,469.
E. (5) $351.27; (6) $29.27; (7) $50.14; (8) $4.60; (9) $435.28; (10) $831.64; (11) $1,266.92.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $210.
E. (10) $1,260.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capitol offices.
E. (7) $18; (9) $18; (10) $146.50; (11) $164.50.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the chemical industry.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $45,852.67.
E. (2) $425; (9) $425; (10) $854.88; (11) $1,279.88.

A. Leo J. Crowley, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Legislative Committee.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. (2) H. R. 7755, a bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.), to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same.
E. (10) $17.58.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 7754, a bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases.
E. (10) $70.82.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (10) $5.95; (11) $7.95.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8159, for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.
E. (10) $31.73.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, Townsend plan bills in Congress.
D. (6) $3,696.38.
E. (4) $1,141.15; (5) $600.15; (6) $116.65; (7) $29.31; (8) $114.30; (9) $2,001.56; (10) $2,730.21; (11) $4,731.77; (15).[1]

A. Ralph E. Curtis, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $4.38; (7) $152; (8) $1.98; (9) $158.36; (10) $103.62; (11) $261.98.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277, a bill dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail; study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 277, a bill dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail. Study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
E. (10) $222.36.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $2,509.22.
E. (6) $9.22; (9) $9.22; (10) $460.84; (11) $470.06.

A. William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Activities limited to advising association in connection with postal-rate matters.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (10) $82.12.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (9) $374.95.

A. C. B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3408.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $2,600; (11) $3,900.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $168.25; (9) $5,234.85; (10) $10,599.43; (11) $15,834.28.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,500; (9) $2,500; (10) $5,152.46; (11) $7,652.46.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement, Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,143.42.
E. (7) $200.75; (9) $200.75; (10) $167.25; (11) $368.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $77.28.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. W. H. Loomis Talc Co., Gouvernor, N. Y.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $500.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Specific legislation employed for was percentage depletion.
D. (6) $333.36.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $8,845.32.
E. (2) $4,736.62; (4) $175.90; (5) $744.93; (6) $486.42; (7) $1,661.83; (8) $4,314.71; (9) $12,120.41; (10) $16,351.94; (11) $28,472.35; (15) $21.16, M. E. Griffin, 14 Rodgers Place, Portsmouth, Va., board meeting; $193.66, L. L. Hatter, 417–18 Alexander Building, care of United States Department of Labor, Abilene, Tex., board meeting; $52.10, Frank G. Quinn, 925 Nineteenth Street, Watervliet, N. Y., board meeting; $30.19, Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $57.71, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; etc.[1]

A. Doctors for Freedom, 511 Medical Arts Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) General legislative interests in the medical field.
D. (6) $735.94.
E. (4) $236.73; (5) $13.90; (6) $59.33; (8) $688; (9) $997.96; (10) $798.52; (11) $1,796.48; (15).[1]

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D. (6) $870.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
D. (6) $125.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Revied.
E. (10) $697.51.

A. Robert P. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including, without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $90.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,043.23.
E. (7) $79.30; (9) $79.30; (10) $76.50; (11) $155.80.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $147.55; (9) $147.55; (10) $331.74; (11) $479.29.

A. Mrs. P. P. Douglas, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $458.35.
E. (7) $7; (9) $7; (10) $15; (11) $22.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (9) $482.78.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Any legislation which if enacted would divorce pipelines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
E. (10) $1,311.17.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; etc. (3) VFW magazine and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $4; (9) $4; (10) $65.90; (11) $69.90.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes.
D. (6) $32,500.
E. (6) $83.03; (7) $83.74; (9) $166.77; (11) $166.77.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 519 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR Notes.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (9) $225; (10) $450; (11) $675.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $175; (5) $385.99; (6) $127.13; (7) $150.16; (9) $838.28; (10) $1,772.59; (11) $2,610.87.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $63.52.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Seafarers International Union of North America, A. F. of L., 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Bills of interest to unions affiliated with the international union.
D. (6) $568.75.
E. (5) $41.25; (6) $0; (7) $150; (8) $25; (9) $225.25; (10) $1,093.05; (11) $1,318.30.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Petroleum legislation.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $366.42.

A. George S. Eaton, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small business.
D. (6) $100.

A. John W. Edelman, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27 and H. R. 54; also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146.
D. (6) $600.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any American.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to matters affecting the engineering profession. (3) Civil Engineering.
E. (5) $2; (9) $2; (10) $32.75; (11) $34.75.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, Thirteenth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Public Law 550.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $38.15; (7) $250.88; (8) $116.35; (9) $405.38; (10) $416.02; (11) $821.40.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $5,107.93.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 430 Syndicate Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the retail lumber dealer.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $213.50; (9) $213.50; (10) $695.45; (11) $908.95.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.
E. (10) $313.60.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Public Law 470, Eighty-second Congress, Interior Department Appropriations Act, 1953, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,277.81.
E. (4) $119.68; (6) $18.72; (7) $6.30; (8) $33.11; (9) $177.81; (10) $232.64; (11) $410.45.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation district, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,154.82.
E. (4) $43.04; (8) $11.78; (9) $54.82; (10) $103.53; (11) $158.35.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $4,740.40.
E. (6) $42.47; (7) $90.65; (8) $29.58; (9) $162.70; (10) $695.38; (11) $858.08.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to client on legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interests; tuna tariff legislation (H. R. 5693), and related Federal Tariff Commission hearings.
D. (6) $3,378.42.
E. (6) $108.02; (8) $20.40; (9) $128.42; (10) $101.44; (11) $229.86.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans' educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
E. (4) $80.21; (6) $801.44; (8) $78.20; (9) $959.85; (11) $959.85.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public power policies and projects generally.
D. (6) $2,268.80.
E. (7) $16.60; (9) $16.80.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Public Law No. 504, Eighty-second Congress, Army civil functions appropriations, 1953, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal-rate legislation.
D. (6) $1,427.40.
E. (2) $750; (4) $91.04; (6) $28.19; (9) $859.23; (10) $2,617.88; (11) $3,487.11; (15) $778.19, Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $79.53, Fred Keck Co., 305 East Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., printing.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $2,325.
E. (7) $352.51; (9) $352.51; (10) $819.61; (11) $1,172.12.

A. Leon J. Engel, chairman, Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the taxation of organizations under section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States.
D. (6) $900.
E. (5) $450; (6) $23.86; (7) $125.08; (8) $73; (9) $671.94; (10) $1,669.94; (11) $2,541.88.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (10) $92.87.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers on matters which from time to time may be regarded by the Board of Directors as affecting the program of the National Farmers Union as set forth in the program adopted by the Convention of the National Farmers Union.
D. (6) $116,742.82.
E. (15) $24, National Citizens Committee for UN Day, Washington, D. C., literature; $40, Electric Consumers Information Committee, Washington, D. C., contribution; $487.50, John A. Baker, Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association.
C. (2) All bills affecting retail automobile dealers; Federal aid to highways; tax bills.
D. (6) $5,777.63.
E. (7) $2,359.80; (9) $2,359.80; (10) $2,593.56; (11) $4,953.36.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1130 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (6) $4.95; (7) $4.75; (9) $9.70; (10) $18; (11) $27.70.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. John E. Fields, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans' educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
D. (6) $136.80.
E. (6) $21.20; (7) $425.42; (9) $445.62; (10) $2,054.79.

A. James Finucane, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace such as foreign economic assistance programs, military appropriations, universal training and other manpower programs, peace treaties, disarmament, immigration, and educational exchange.
E. (7) $113.61; (9) $113.61.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $675.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Our function is a general one; the assignment is to assist the NAEC in articulating and expressing its point of view with respect to general legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D. (6) $18,000.
E. (4) $823.29; (6) $431.35; (7) $2,841.43; (8) $209.36; (9) $4,365.43; (10) $6,023.02; (11) $11,291.45.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to American Farm Bureau Federation; agricultural, etc.[1]
D. (6) $1,166.63.
E. (7) $11.90; (9) $11.90; (10) $108.62; (11) $120.52.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (2) $28; (4) $17.50; (5) $98.06; (6) $66.30; (7) $111.35; (9) $391.21; (10) $3,589.12; (11) $3,980.33.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, Suite 1002-3, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, Suite 1002-3, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry.
D. (6) $5,000.04.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2752, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $366.42.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interest.
D. (6) $5,119.56.
E. (7) $384.44; (9) $384.44; (10) $257.37; (11) $641.81.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. Dr. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation.
D. (6) $3,490.
E. (7) $1,540.98; (11) $1,717.23.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognition of civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience.
D. (6) $9,676.43.
E. (2) $5,346.03; (4) $621.50; (5) $1,299.72; (6) $254.16; (7) $294.17; (8) $1,851.91; (9) $9,661.49; (10) $35,738.75; (11) $45,406.24; (15) $71.66, Addressograph Multigraph Corp., Washington, D. C., printing supplies; $92.82, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $16.32, Congressional Quarterly News, Washington, D. C., subscription; $113.63, Drake Press, 916 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $26.02, E. Morrison Paper Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; etc.[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,174.98.
E. (7) $669.89; (9) $669.89; (10) $2,649.92; (11) $3,319.81.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Amendment to title V of Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952.
D. (6) $625.

A. Fyffe & Clarke, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry.
E. (10) $50.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.[1]
C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employers Liability Act and proposed amendments.
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $523.94.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including House Resolution 520.
E. (7) $90; (9) $90; (10) $259.50; (11) $349.50.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y., agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 4702, and H. R. 5802, Eighty-second Congress.
E. (6) $43.55; (7) $35; (8) $10.20; (9) $88.75; (10) $101.60; (11) $190.35.

A. Gwynn Garnett, Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Immigration legislation, mutual security program, Customs Simplification Act, establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities, United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations, farm credit legislation.
D. (6) $1,062.50.
E. (7) $15.85; (9) $15.85; (10) $96.43; (11) $112.33.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.
D. (6) $2,362.50.
E. (10) $181.96.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Examination and analysis of bills, rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy, etc. (3) Journal of the American Dental Association.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $583.03.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.
E. (10) $252.59.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (1) $4,775.72; (4) $43,449.75; (8) $103; (9) $48,320.47; (10) $3,315.90; (11) $51,644.37.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John S. Gibson, Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.
B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.
C. (2) An appropriation for dredging at St. Marys Harbor and up St. Marys River.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (10) $401.15.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal relations division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $175.
E. (10) $179.70.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, and National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
E. (10) $1,168.08.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $5,535.74.
E. (2) $3,108.22; (4) $169.83; (5) $400.83; (6) $125.17; (8) $497.47; (9) $4,301.52; (10) $8,880.23; (11) $13,181.75.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relative to interests of grain and feed trade.
E. (11) $80.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $5.50.
E. (2) $3,816.55; (5) $484.26; (6) $129.60; (7) $1,286.54; (8) $36.60; (9) $5,753.55; (10) $10,830.71; (11) $16,584.26; (15) $2,499.99, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,186.56, Glenn C. Russell, 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. David G. Gray, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $35; (7) $1,835; (9) $1,870; (10) $6,156.45; (11) $8,026.45.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (7) $1,200.
E. (10) $74.81.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; tax legislation; etc.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (10) $4.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
E. (10) $85.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any and all Federal legislation proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Supported or opposed legislation in accordance with the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $950.06.
E. (7) $13.70; (9) $13.70; (10) $109.55; (11) $123.25.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,600.
E. (10) $770.98.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,874.96.
E. (7) $220.90; (9) $220.90; (10) $793.98; (11) $1,014.88.

A. Lloyd C. Halverson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) My legislative work, if any, will be in farm programs, health, social security, and possibly housing, taxation, farm credit and inflation control; antimonopoly, transportation, and alcoholic beverage advertising.
D. (6) $1,686.
E. (7) $14.90; (9) $14.90; (10) $27.25; (11) $42.15.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,320.69.
E. (6) $5.95; (7) $189.74; (9) $195.69; (10) $1,723.29; (11) $1,918.98.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., also 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (4) $384.57; (5) $168.74; (6) $34.01; (7) $162.30; (9) $847.12; (10) $1,785.90; (11) $2,633.02.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $176.90.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $4,375.02.
E. (9) $660.59.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation.
D. (6) $2,464.50.
E. (7) $61.90; (9) $61.90; (10) $82.85; (11) $144.75.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $370.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime legislation.
E. (9) $169.69.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise, and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $300.43.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters, including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock, and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures; and livestock accounting methods.
D. (6) $2,664.49.
E. (9) $798.49.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412–414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation authorizing the sale to private industry of facilities for the production of man-made rubber in the United States, also repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure, which would relieve burdens upon business and industry, and generally in all legislative proposals in Congress relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products.

D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.

D. (6) $3,375.

E. (7) $3; (9) $3; (10) $150.40; (11) $153.40.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) This registrant is interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 5505, S. 2164, S. 1267, S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, H. R. 7852, H. R. 8124, H. R. 7447, H. R. 7554, and appropriations legislation. (3) Stores.

E. (6) $12.79; (7) $44.52; (8) $1.25; (9) $58.56; (10) $459.56; (11) $518.12.

A. Thomas P. Healy, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

D. (6) $1,634.91.

E. (1) $15; (2) $1,458.35; (6) $1.92; (7) $145.69; (8) $13.95; (9) $1,634.91; (10) $3,779.91; (11) $5,414.82.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.

B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.

C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.

E. (10) $851.49.

A. K. W. Heberton, Room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.

E. (7) $7; (9) $7; (10) $241.10; (11) $248.10.

A. George J. Hecht, 13[illegible] Third Street, Washington D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, support of legislation providing national school health services, appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers, bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers, appropriations for the Children's Bureau, appropriations for the national school-lunch program, emergency maternal and infant care.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trade.

D. (6) $500.

E. (10) $200.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D. (6) $2,312.49.

E. (7) $488.66; (9) $488.66; (10) $101.77; (11) $590.43.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property agents, etc. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.

D. (6) $88.90.

E. (7) $88.90; (9) $88.90; (10) $342.98; (11) $431.88.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Office of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry and the wool industry, etc.[1]

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (10) $364.60.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,666.65.

E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200; (10) $7,900; (11) $11,100.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (7) $790.34; (9) $790.34; (10) $987.98; (11) $1,778.32.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.

D. (6) $4,125.

E. (10) $26.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.

B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors' International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.

D. (6) $648.49.

E. (7) $183.49; (9) $183.49; (10) $1,087.40; (11) $1,270.89.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, 100 Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) $2,400.

E. (7) $112.37; (9) $112.37; (10) $230.32; (11) $342.69.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Economic legislation affecting family life.

D. (6) $14.

E. (4) $9.09; (9) $9.09 (10) $112.04; (11) $121.23.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Harold K. Howe, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $1,087; (7) $140.40; (9) $1,227.40; (10) $2,953.20; (11) $4,180.60.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
E. (6) $4.38; (8) $0.50; (9) $4.88; (10) $124.48; (11) $129.36.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.
E. (6) $7.31; (7) $1,392.47; (9) $1,399.78; (10) $2,589.12; (11) $3,988.90.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,834.
E. (6) $23.30; (8) $204.70; (9) $228; (10) $524; (11) $752.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $750; (7) $400; (9) $1,150; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,650; (15) $1,150, J. D. Snyder, La Salle, Chicago, Ill., salary and expenses.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects any or all phases of the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $21,401.34.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (10) $12,100; (11) $18,150; (15) $3,750, John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,250, W. E. Disney, 918 Sixteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C., salary; $750, Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $300, Herbert Harvey Real Estate, Inc., 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (2) $630; (4) $33.75; (7) $880.06; (8) $75; (9) $1,618.81; (10) $3,811.48; (11) $5,430.29.

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation.
D. (6) $25.
E. (2) $300; (3) $1,031.75; (5) $53.24; (9) $1,384.99; (10) $343.15; (11) $1,728.14.

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $3,025.
E. (2) 460; (4) $44.20; (5) $569.87; (6) $123.10; (8) $360; (9) $1,557.17; (10) $4,417.99; (11) $5,975.16.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative matters concerning agriculture.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (1) $1,250; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $2,150; (10) $3,300; (11) $5,450.

A. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, AFL, Kansas City, Kans.
E. (10) $3,628.24.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, room 311, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (10) $7,500; (11) $11,250.

A. Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $7.92.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.
B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Tidelands legislation.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (2) $705; (5) $535.50; (6) $89.71; (9) $1,430.21; (10) $2,913.79; (11) $4,344.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $325.
E. (7) $40.13; (9) $40.13; (10) $472.70; (11) $512.83.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) A nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $300.
E. (5) $125; (9) $125; (10) $375; (11) $375.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., of Mayfield, Ky., and Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.
C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage-depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $2,645.81.
E. (10) $649.77.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945, Millwood Dam; legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (2) $1,250; (9) $1,250; (10) $4,282.77; (11) $5,532.77.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $2,916.
E. (10) $122.82.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $3,510.
E. (7) $1,080; (9) $1,080; (10); $1,731.31; (11) $2,811.31.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $949.86; (8) $64; (9) $1,013.86; (10) $1,408.80; (11) $2,422.66.

A. Lillian Cohen for Willard Johnson, general secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y.
C. (2) Senate ratification of genocide convention.
E. (10) $438.13.

A. Bascom F. Jones, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads operating in Tennessee.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the industry.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (10) $2,609.21.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (7) $387.65; (9) $387.65; (10) $507.49; (11) $895.14.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.

A. Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.

C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.

D. (6) $697.

E. (5) $478.94; (7) $150; (9) $628.94; (10) $432.17; (11) $1,061.11.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, ship construction, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, taxation and Government controls, and veterans' educational benefits.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (5) $985; (6) $439.02; (7) $31.25; (8) $38; (9) $1,493.27; (10) $3,705.12; (11) $5,198.39.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $1,125.

E. (7) $973.22; (9) $973.22; (10) $912.03; (11) $1,885.25.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.

D. (6) $500.

E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (8) $25; (9) $100; (10) $650; (11) $750.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; etc. (3) American Legion magazine.

D. (6) $9,100.

E. (7) $232.99; (9) $232.99; (10) $181.89; (11) $414.88.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy. (3) VFW magazine.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (7) $127; (9) $127; (10) $244; (11) $371.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $2,730.

E. (2) $2,730; (9) $2,730; (10) $5,280; (11) $8,010.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Corporate income- and excess-profits taxes.

D. (6) $32,500.

E. (6) $24.62; (7) $115.53; (9) $140.15; (11) $140.15.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.

C. (1) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Act of 1950, which appear in section 4 of Public Law 594, Eighty-second Congress, second session, approved July 21, 1952.

A. Williford I. King, room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.

D. (6) $3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $165.

E. (7) $13.26; (9) $13.26; (10) $247.34; (11) $260.60.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

E. (10) $50.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The legislative interests cover only such legislative matters in which the American Farm Bureau Federation is interested, primarily those matters affecting directly American agriculture.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Appearing before congressional committees relative to private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy.

E. (10) $63.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative developments of interest to association members.

A. Robert A. Koch, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30 Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Robert A. Koch, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris, France.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariff, quotas, etc.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

E. (10) $63.50.

A. John Kolanda, room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. John A. Kratz, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) For the enactment of S. 1000 and H. R. 3793, identical bills, to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 5796, S. 991, S. 241, H. J. Res. 480, S. J. Res. 166, H. R. 6245, and H. R. 8271.

D. (6) $500.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing;

oppose legislation inimicable interests of savings and loan industry.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Income, estate, and gift tax legislation.[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1508 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) Legislative proposals and governmental programs pertinent to objectives of Trinity Improvement Association.
D. (6) $900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $1,616; (9) $1,616; (10) $3,256; (11) $4,872.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,499.98.
E. (7) $9.70; (9) $9.70; (10) $19.15; (11) $28.85.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce.
D. (6) $6,250.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D. (6) $1,654.65.
E. (7) $154.65; (10) $244.90; (11) $399.55.

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $926.66.
E. (2) $458.35; (4) $823.27; (6) $13.57; (9) $1,295.19; (10) $4,204.08; (11) $5,499.27.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba.
D. (6) $3,405.10.
E. (4) $1,381; (6) $46.87; (8) $177.23; (9) $1,605.10; (10) $2,012.97; (11) $3,618.07.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before Congress relating to public education.
E. (2) $400.63; (4) $1,001.51; (5) $76.51; (6) $27.01; (9) $1,505.66; (10) $7,839.12; (11) $9,344.78.

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills and statutes relating to mining, smelting and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Operators Wage Agreement Committee, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (6) $5; (7) $45; (9) $50; (11) $50.

A. Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidders procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls and subcontracting policies and procedures.
D. (6) $3,955.09.
E. (2) $3,668.48; (4) $214.57; (7) $72.04; (9) $3,955.09; (10) $7,871.73; (11) $11,826.82.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual-assistance program; appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation, including universal military training and service; proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany; economic assistance; disarmament; expellees and displaced persons; educational exchange; and immigration legislation.
D. (6) $1,350.38.
E. (7) $125.39; (9) $125.39; (10) $222.22; (11) $347.61.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madiron Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $3,284.06.
E. (2) $2,364.21; (5) $791.40; (6) $90.64; (7) $37.81; (9) $3,284.06; (10) $12,043.42; (11) $15,327.48.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C (2) Legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry.
D. (6) $2,500.02.
E. (4) $18; (7) $14.82; (9) $32.82; (10) $235.59; (11) $268.41.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Amendment to title V of Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, H. R. 6346.
D. (7) $375.

A. Leon S. Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Leon S. Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris 8e, France.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $3,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (6) $4.55; (7) $196.25; (8) $56.50; (9) $257.30; (10) $1,375.10; (11) $1,632.40.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major Steam Railroads of California.[1]
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project.
E. (6) $17.60; (7) $122.69; (9) $140.29; (10) $1,019.03; (11) $1,159.32.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipeline Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the pipeline industry.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives; H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $200.
E. (6) $65.43; (9) $65.43; (10) $268.57; (11) $334.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom; all bills concerning world government, such as S. 56, S. 57, and S. 66; and all bills relating to socialized medicine. (3) Press Digest and DAR Magazine.
D. (6) $100.
E. (6) $6.30; (8) $7.50; (9) $13.80; (10) $26.60; (11) $40.60.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Passage of fair trade legislation; specifically H R. 5767.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coaches as mobile homes.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2679, the Townsend Plan.
D. (6) $117.72.
E. (6) $110; (8) $110; (10) $110.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
E. (10) $959.94.

A. A. L. Lynn, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Island Creek Coal Co., and Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc.
D. (6) $5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation in accordance with resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation.[1]
D. (6) $2,156.24.
E. (7) $38.52; (9) $38.52; (10) $204.89; (11) $243.41.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $600.

A. Kenneth J. McAuliffe, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Institute of Makers of Explosives, 348 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To support enactment of H. R. 6521, a bill to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel; and the identical bill, S. 2702.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (6) $69.20; (7) $245.63; (9) $314.83; (11) $314.83.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular, and railroad employees in general.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $625.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $175.02; (9) $175.02; (10) $534.59; (11) $709.61.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,615.39.
E. (7) $7.80; (9) $7.80; (10) $23.40; (11) $34.20.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1700 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $225.63.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., public-relations counsel to the Aircraft Industries Association.
C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, etc.

A. Warren C. McClure, box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislative matters relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D. (6) $900.
E. (10) $100.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Glen McDaniel, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry.

A. Angus McDonald, 700 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Christian Amendment bills, House Joint Resolution 156 and Senate Joint Resolution 29. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $190; (9) $190; (10) $550; (11) $740.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation touching on taxpayers' welfare, national welfare, world peace, etc.
D. (5) $18.04.
E. (2) $18.04; (9) $18.04; (10) $36.04; (11) $54.04.

A. William F. McKenna, 315 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Conference of Savings and Loan Associations, Box 850, San Jose, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation that promotes thrift and home ownership particularly legislation relating to community thrift and home-financing institutions.
E. (6) $2.20; (7) $95.20; (9) $97.40; (10) $309.88; (11) $407.28.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, ORT Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Parcel-post legislation.
E. (10) $1,439.10.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D. (6) $94.88.
E. (7) $2.36; (9) $2.36; (10) $20.83; (11) $23.19.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. and C. (2) S. 106, H. R. 4528, S. 2738, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720, S. 2714, on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln 8, Nebr.; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Pranton Court, Greens Farms, Conn., bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by United States Government, H. R. 4507.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (4) $146.39; (5) $48.67; (7) $13.75; (8) $1.25; (9) $210; (10) $222.51; (11) $432.51.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, trustees operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation giving former owners of land sold to the United States the right to repurchase or reacquire minerals in lands sold to the Government.
E. (6) $49.52; (9) $49.52; (10) $4,707.01; (11) $4,756.53.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislative matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $139.13; (9) $139.13; (10) $1,558.82; (11) $1,697.95.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5796, S. 991, S. 241, S. J. Res. 150, H. R. 8370, H. R. 7072, H. R. 6245; S. 2364.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $38.68; (9) $38.68; (10) $62.86; (11) $101.54.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $12.50; (7) $109.35; (9) $121.85; (10) $304.17; (11) $426.02.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $12.50; (4) $109.35; (9) $121.85; (10) $304.17; (11) $426.02.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The association has a general interest on behalf of its members in any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
E. (1) $15,000; (9) $15,000; (10) $32,750; (11) $47,750.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.
D. (6) $1,545.
E. (8) $7.25; (9) $7.25; (11) $131.90.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $21.
E. (10) $1.

A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $112.50.
E. (10) $30.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,068.
E. (6) $21.45; (8) $114.55; (9) $136; (10) $429; (11) $565.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to support legislation which the railroads believe to be in the interest of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interest.
D. (6) $4,399.98.
E. (7) $1,814.18; (9) $1,814.18; (10) $1,205.40; (11) $3,019.58.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $2,766.08.
E. (7) $16.10; (9) $16.10; (10) $288.06; (11) $304.16.

A. Medical Association of State of Alabama, 519 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR Notes.
E. (2) $1,650; (4) $225; (9) $1,875; (10) $3,750; (11) $5,625.

A. E. A. Meeks, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ross A. Messer, Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and General Services Administration. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $17.65; (8) $18.30; (9) $35.95; (10) $241.14; (11) $277.09.

A. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For long-range shipping bill, with revisions.
D. (6) $100.92.
E. (10) $161.46.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the interests of milk dealers.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (3) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (10) $8,846.78; (11) $10,346.78.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $380; (5) $27.35; (6) $56.18; (7) $628.54; (8) $39.80; (9) $1,131.87; (10) $1,800; (11) $2,931.87.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
D. $3,000.
E. (5) $19.82; (6) $14.07; (7) $348.97; (8) $4.50; (9) $387.36; (10) $859.85; (11) $1,247.21.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $945.50; (6) $59.06; (7) $219.57; (8) $18.70; (9) $1,242.83; (10) $2,645.75; (11) $3,888.58.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $9,017.95.
E. (9) $1,517.95.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (10) $717.87.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $2,861.
E. (3) $282.50; (4) $154.49; (5) $174.69; (7) $19.15; (9) $630.83; (10) $2,016.58; (11) $2,647.41.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 605–607 Plaza Building, Post Office Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business and taxation.
D. (6) $245.
E. (2) $332.46; (4) $17.90; (5) $80; (6) $69.33; (7) $50; (8) $14.63; (9) $564.32; (10) $3,017.49; (11) $3,581.81; (15).[1]

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
D. (7) $660.
E. (4) $384.94; (5) $2.31; (6) $2; (7) $255.19; (8) $45; (9) $689.44; (10) $965.56; (11) $1,655.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (10) $1,924.08.

A. William W. Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) The Townsend Plan bills in Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
D. (6) $994.
E. (3) $10; (7) $385.74; (9) $395.74; (10) $481.73; (11) $877.47.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $26.13; (6) $5.25; (7) $29.87; (9) $61.25; (10) $122.75; (11) $184.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (9) $86.60.

A. Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $59.05; (7) $218.35; (8) $15; (9) $292.40; (10) $420.58; (11) $712.98.

A. Moss and Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $139.60; (7) $506.01; (9) $645.81; (10) $358.03; (11) $1,001.84.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $600; (11) $900.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc.
C. (2) Regulation W, Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.
D. (6) $937.50.
E. (7) $60.56; (9) $60.56; (10) $442.34; (11) $502.90.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527.
E. (10) $246.42.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (10) $1,534.77.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security and tax-privileged corporations in business.
E. (2) $2,602.12; (4) $5; (5) $572.73; (6) $78.19; (8) $159.66; (9) $3,417.70; (10) $11,618.65; (11) $15,036.35; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

D. (6) $7,000.

E. (2) $4,646.88; (5) $407.64; (6) $149.49; (7) $1,013.86; (8) $948.11; (9) $7,165.98; (10) $13,920.05; (11) $21,086.03; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $14,112.50.

E. (6) $10.38; (9) $10.38; (10) $151.41; (11) $161.79.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]

D. (6) $19,166.33.

E. (1) $14,943.93; (2) $71,488.22; (3) $3; (4) $12,944.05; (5) $4,543.36; (6) $1,976.95; (7) $7,263.09; (8) $3,327.45; (9) $116,490.05; (10) $232,877.04; (11) $349,367.09; (15) $14,943.93, The Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations services; $6,261.81, Awalt, Clark, and Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., fees and expenses; $6,250, Brenner, Butler, and McVeigh, 60 Wall Tower, New York, N. Y., legal services; $4,615.50, Herman and Conway Associates, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., fee and expenses; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that affects the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.

D. (6) $213.52.

E. (2) $21; (4) $192.52; (9) $213.52; (10) $73.49; (11) $287.01; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) American Agency Bulletin.

D. (6) $2,688.80.

E. (2) $3,756.88; (5) $456.83; (6) $235.48; (7) $88.90; (9) $4,538.09; (10) $8,631.83; (11) $13,169.92; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 3207, H. R. 5012, and S. 2083, all designed to amend the Navy Ration Statute; interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.

E. (10) $187.80; (15) $175, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

E. (10) $164.50.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting Postal and General Services employees, and Post Office custodial employees and GSA in PBS employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.

D. (6) $10,032.76.

E. (2) $637.64; (4) $192.57; (5) $110; (6) $38.57; (7) $17.65; (9) $996.43; (10) $2,674.79; (11) $3,671.22.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) $7,521.29.

E. (2) $2,400; (4) $2,349.43; (5) $300; (6) $10; (7) $112.37; (9) $5,172.80; (10) $9,604.40; (11) $14,777.20.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.

E. (10) $600.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States Storekeepers-Gaugers.

D. (6) $649.20.

E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500; $500, Robert E. McLaughlin, care of Roberts & McInnis, 400 DeSales Building, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street, Washington, D. C., legal services.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (10) $370.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D. (6) $375,951.23.

E. (2) $3,812.49; (4) $232.30; (6) $41.34; (7) $1,243.23; (8) $1.48; (9) $5,330.84; (10) $10,963.38; (11) $16,294.22; (15) $2,312.49, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; $1,500, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; $600, J. M. Steele, Springdale, Ark., travel expenses; $13.12, Columbia Reporting Co., Washington, D. C., transcript; $488.66, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., travel expense; etc.[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

D. (6) $352,050.85.

E. (9) $18,444.60.

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt.

D. (6) $183.

E. (4) $260.43; (9) $405.43; (10) $947.36; (11) $1,352.79; (15) $182.49, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., postage, mail-room service; $145, Geraldine Hawkins Candido, Tower Building, Washington, D. C., professional services; $62.13, Columbia Business Service, 1028 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., auto-typed letters; $15.81, the American Publishing Co., 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., reprint of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.

E. (10) $557.07.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton-compress and cotton-warehouse industry.

E. (10) $561.76.

A. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $9,769.33.

E. (2) $5,890.45; (4) $126.80; (5) $199.80; (6) $59.98; (7) $3,492.30; (9) $9,769.33; (10) $13,907.15; (11) $23,676.48; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.

D. (6) $992.22.

E. (1) $900; (3) $26; (5) $2.93; (6) $3.90; (8) $60.39; (9) $992.22; (10) $3,889.31; (11) $4,881.53; (15) $967.22, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., public relations; $25, National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation.

D. (6) $2,925.

E. (2) $1,600; (4) $50; (5) $185; (6) $88; (7) $172; (8) $143.50; (9) $2,238.50; (10) $4,850; (11) $7,088.50; (15).[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) H. R. 7376 and House Joint Resolution 411. (3) Junior American.

E. (2) $249.99; (6) $58.31.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual-assistance program; appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation, including universal military training and service; proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany; economic assistance (point 4); disarmament; expellees and displaced persons; educational exchange; and immigration legislation. (3) Peace Action.

D. (6) $6,970.25.

E. (2) $4,424.41; (4) $600.60; (5) $1,441.89; (6) $150.74; (7) $258.30; (8) $1,113.10; (9) $7,989.04; (10) $20,539.66; (11) $28,528.70.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise, maintain American inde-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

pendence, and in opposition to any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $23,360.56.
E. (2) $12,005.84; (4) $4,131.41; (5) $4,969.30; (6) $562.83; (7) $1,291.17; (8) $616.40; (9) $23,576.95; (10) $64,072.88; (11) $37,649.83; (15) $433.85, Brooklyn Eagle Press, Inc., 24 Johnson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., printing.

A. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.
D. (6) $4,574.30.
E. (1) $5,204.79; (4) $630.49; (9) $4,574.30; (10) $34,766.37; (11) $39,340.67; (15).[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) All legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Qualified Contractor.
E. (9) $2,854.40.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $274,145.
E. (2) $900; (5) $409.16; (6) $51; (8) $4; (9) $1,364.16; (10) $2,615.79; (11) $3,979.95.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $132,563.05.
E. (2) $6,908.64; (4) $4,299.58; (5) $380; (6) $7,084.74; (8) $5,757.16; (9) $24,430.12; (10) $53,239.57; (11) $77,669.69. (15).[1]

A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.
E. (6) $686.09; (7) $19.50; (9) $705.59.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Robinson-Patman Act; opposed to S. 719.
D. (6) $1,326.76.
E. (2) $500; (4) $784.02; (5) $30; (6) $12.74; (9) $1,326.76; (10) $766.55; (11) $2,093.31; (15).[1]

A. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,660.22.
E. (7) $44.48; (9) $44.48; (10) $180.80; (11) $234.28.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,245.84.
E. (2) $5,846.82; (3) $20; (4) $57.24; (5) $1,459.64; (6) $568.34; (7) $1,393.10; (8) $4,019.28; (9) $13,364.41; (10) $34,833.13; (11) $48,197.54; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,250.
E. (1) $1,049.70; (2) $1,630.28; (4) $172.85; (5) $586.70; (6) $109.71; (7) $461.95; (8) $113.30; (9) $4,124.49; (10) $6,979.12; (11) $11,103.61; (15).[1]

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Livestock taxation.
D. (6) $1,192.
E. (9) $2,664.49; (10) $5,626.68; (11) $8,291.17.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.
D. (6) $10,653.20.
E. (1) $3,360.99; (2) $3,640.77; (4) $2,608.55; (5) $200.01; (6) $9.38; (7) $817.44; (8) $1,043.20; (9) $11,680.34; (10) $25,861.12; (11) $37,541.46.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director and News for Dairy Co-ops.
D. (6) $48,414.84.
E. (2) $25,135.05; (3) $7,000; (4) $3,699.86; (6) $905.83; (7) $2,813.49; (8) $1,661.96; (9) $41,215.78; (10) $86,018.96; (11) $127,234.74; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $177.43; (9) $777.43; (10) $1,329.35; (11) $2,106.78.

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485) and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $8,040.65.
E. (2) $4,536.11; (4) $2,480.86; (5) $1,138.78; (6) $172.96; (7) $1,210.60; (8) $100.34; (9) $9,639.65; (10) $21,813.24; (11) $31,452.89.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act as amended, Customs Simplification Act, cotton labeling, fiber labeling, flammable fabrics, consumer interest proposals, Internal Revenue Code (LIFO), excise taxes, proposals relating to parcel post size and weight limitations, Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Act, Internal Revenue Code (wagering tax), all appropriations legislation.
E. (2) $3,375; (4) $2,307.09; (5) $517.60; (6) $12.79; (7) $44.52; (8) $2.50; (9) $6,259.50; (10) $13,336.04; (11) $19,595.54; (15) $358.56, John C. Hazen, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., fees and expenses; $376.25, Erskine Stewart, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., fees and expenses.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.
E. (2) $500; (5) $400; (6) $50; (9) $950; (10) $3,700; (11) $4,650; (15) $500, Leo H. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects. (3) No publications in this quarter.
D. (6) $2,034.99.
E. (2) $2,218.42; (4) $68.34; (5) $72.77; (6) $49.49; (7) $676.18; (8) $1,055.99; (9) $4,141.19; (10) $9,145.87; (11) $13,287.06; (15).[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural-electrification program, resulting from the REA Act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams, funds for the transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydro power to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $6,790.62.
E. (1) $1,575.95; (2) $2,553.97; (3) $1,500; (4) $216.10; (5) $425; (6) $290.72; (7) $1,889.73; (8) $329.48; (9) $8,780.95; (10) $14,866.91; (11) $23,647.86; (15) $61.34, Columbia Processing and Distributing Co., Inc., 1814 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., public relations; $26.52, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1156 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office overhead; $471.94, T. E. Craddock, Seymour, Tex., travel, food and lodging; $69.88, the W. D. Campbell Co., 1014 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office overhead; $500, Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., contribution; etc.[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.
D. (6) $20,000.
E. (2) $12,701.29; (4) $1,196.01; (5) $786.65; (6) $1,014; (7) $3,089.95; (8) $272.22; (9) $19,060.12; (10) $34,615.98; (11) $53,676.10; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimicable to interest of savings and loan industry.
D. (6) $4,171.03.
E. (2) $2,000; (4) $319.10; (9) $2,319.10; (10) $5,627.10; (11) $7,946.20; (15) $2,000, Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $319.10; Batt, Bates and Co., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (2) $4,372.92; (5) $1,124.41; (6) $99.72; (8) $31.94; (9) $5,610.99; (10) $12,278.54; (11) $17,889.53.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $34,216.76.
E. (2) $1,183; (4) $1,274.30; (9) $2,457.30; (10) $2,337.90; (11) $4,795.20.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation.
D. (6) $10,565.72.
E. (1) $2,327.29; (2) $3,149.52; (4) $2,385.41; (5) $432.37; (6) $1,281.28; (7) $1,334.46; (9) $10,910.33; (10) $27,639.98; (11) $38,750.31; (15).[1]

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Favors tax limitation.
D. (6) $480.
E. (2) $375; (7) $110; (9) $485; (10) $2,425; (11) $2,910.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,210.01.
E. (2) $1,250; (4) $33.60; (5) $266.46; (6) $192.32; (7) $75; (8) $11.29; (9) $1,828.67; (10) $3,580.44; (11) $5,409.11.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $13,709.50.
E. (2) $2,499.99; (8) $825; (9) $3,324.99; (10) $11,607.37; (11) $14,932.36; (15) $2,499.99, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, salary; $825, Wyoming Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., services.

A. William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reduction of Federal expenditures, revision of tax laws, limitation of economic controls, maintenance of patent system and maintenance of labor regulatory laws.
D. (6) $4,367.30.
E. (9) $367.30.

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
C. (2) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.
D. (6) $2,154.50.
E. (5) $15.03; (8) $127.60; (9) $142.63 (10) $254.35; (11) $396.98.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $5,770.20.
E. (2) $278.41; (5) $1,206.93; (6) $546.18; (7) $113.72; (9) $2,145.24; (10) $4,316.72; (11) $6,461.96.

A. C. Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E. (8) $4.88; (9) $4.88; (10) $10.80; (11) $15.68.

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,553.39.
E. (6) $4.18; (7) $849.29; (9) $853.47; (10) $3,438.53; (11) $4,292.

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $516.28.
E. (7) $121.28; (9) $141.28; (11) $141.28.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange. (3) National Grange Monthly.
D. (6) $2,138.89.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
E. (2) $375; (7) $82.12; (9) $457.12; (11) $457.12.

A. W. R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel De Sota Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Keeping associations informed as to pending legislation and interpretations of legislation; special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (6) $159.77; (7) $822.18; (8) $236.33; (9) $1,218.28; (10) $1,446.04; (11) $2,664.32.

A. J. S. Hoffsinger, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Private School Associations, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect member electric-utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $4,375.02.
E. (7) $330.26; (8) $71.10; (9) $401.36; (10) $463.25; (11) $864.61.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, minerals, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All matters concerning the practice of medicine and surgery for the self-improvement and protection of dues-paying members.

A. A. E. Notarianni, employed by Cummings, Stanley, Truitt and Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., acting in the interest of T. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8159, for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $912.50.
E. (6) $40; (7) $57.62; (9) $97.62; (10) $829.94; (11) $927.56.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1206 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Public Law 590 (H. R. 7800).
D. (6) $6,727.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (10) $381.48.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Company, Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (10) $755.75.

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislative interest pertained to Federal coal-mine safety legislation in 82d Congress; this interest terminated with the passage and the signing by the President of Public Law 552.
D. (6) $15,000.
E. (9) $15,000; (15) $15,000, Ed. D. Schorr, Columbus, Ohio, fee.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (10) $600.37.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare; foreign relations; civil aviation, etc. (3) American Legion Magazine.
D. (6) $1,929.24.
E. (7) $381.76; (9) $381.76; (10) $34; (11) $415.76.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160; (10) $320; (11) $480.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $856.58; (6) $53.91; (9) $3,035.49; (10) $6,481.85; (11) $9,517.34.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the classified employees of the Federal Government.
E. (10) $140.32.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $30.
E. (7) $30; (9) $30; (10) $40; (11) $70.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to Titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $900; (9) $900; (10) $1,800; (11) $2,700.

A. George F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, post-office box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,249.99.

A. James G. Patton, 700 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $115.56; (8) $0.80; (9) $116.36; (10) $671.09; (11) $787.45.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, P. O. Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Alaska Statehood Commission, Juneau, Alaska.
C. (2) Statehood for Alaska.
D. (6) $356.12.
E. (9) $0.18; (10) $357.29; (11) $357.47.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, P. O. Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States, Agana, Guam, M. I.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $19.40; (7) $171.10; (8) $1.20; (9) $191.70; (10) $698.71; (11) $890.41; (12) $3,125; (14) $625.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Vegetable Products, Inc., Vacaville, Calif.; Gentry, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Puccinelli Packing Co., Turlock, Calif.; and J. R. Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho.
C. (2) Tariff and customs legislation; appropriations for Tariff Commission.
E. (10) $1.80.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, foreign trade, and appropriations for Agriculture Department and Tariff Commission.
D. (6) $500.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association and Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, both of Kennett Square, Pa.
C. (2) Tariff and customs legislation; Tariff Commission and Department of Agriculture appropriations.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa, and Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers Association, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff Commission appropriation; tariff and tax legislation.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pin Clip and Fastener Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, foreign trade, and defense production legislation; Tariff Commission appropriations.
D. (6) $2,082.
E. (4) $83.18; (9) $83.18; (10) $96.27; (11) $179.45; (15) $83.18, Batt Bates, 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing.

A. Pope, Ballard, and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg., and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters.
D. (6) $3,265.42.
E. (4) $48.33; (6) $2.44; (7) $10.15; (9) $60.92; (10) $358.30; (11) $419.22; (15) $48.33, Batt Bates, 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.
C. (2) Proposals affecting Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $3,924.99.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., for the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $10.25.

A. Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (4) $136.80; (7) $100; (9) $236.80; (10) $473.60; (11) $710.40.

A. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Post Office Drawer 594, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $3,750; (7) $424.32; (9) $4,174.32; (10) $7,011.03; (11) $11,185.35; (15) $4,174.32, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio, professional services.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E. (9) $4.88; (10) $10.80; (11) $15.68.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $2.69; (8) $1.09; (9) $3.78; (10) $38.73; (11) $42.51.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.
D. (6) $200.

A. C J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interests in matters affecting railroads.
E. (10) $267.40.

A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), Suite 532, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $42.33; (9) $42.33; (10) $1,061.63; (11) $1,103.96.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue; National Multiple Sclerosis, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) To present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal Legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $7,274.98.
E. (2) $940.39; (5) $273.03; (6) $216.88; (7) $1,763; (9) $3,193.30; (10) $8,586.52; (11) $11,779.82.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (10) $87.60.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry.
E. (2) $2,867.50; (8) $169.45; (9) $3,036.95; (10) $5,754.69; (11) $8,791.64; (15) $3,036.95, Pierson and Ball, Ring Building, Washington, D. C., services and expenses.

A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings.
D. (6) $201.
E. (4) $61.11; (5) $63.12; (6) $13.97; (7) $79.37; (8) $9.21; (9) $226.78; (10) $475.45; (11) $702.23.

A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Raina, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.
E. (10) $50.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 619 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
D. (6) $4,249.98.
E. (7) $969.23; (9) $969.23; (10) $1,920.53; (11) $2,889.76.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the record industry.
E. (6) $328.45; (10) $7.50; (11) $335.95.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 617 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $1,500; (5) $150; (9) $1,650; (10) $3,476.76; (11) $5,126.76.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated moter common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $1,642.81.
E. (2) $1,050; (4) $263.69; (5) $25; (8) $304.12; (9) $1,642.81; (10) $10,706.37; (11) $12,349.18; (15) $263.69, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., biweekly news letter; $295.47, Marion F. Jones, Denver, Colo., legal fee, $825; R. J. McBride, salary; $225, A. B. Rosenbaum, salary.

A. Gerard D. Rielly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Foremanship Foundation, 512–20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $20,417.25.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $12,735.57.
E. (2) $2,737.90; (4) $433.50; (5) $568.01; (6) $94.53; (7) $280.05; (8) $3,021.22; (9) $7,135.21; (10) $9,961.72; (11) $17,096.93; (15).[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $425.
E. (10) $21.55.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interests to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $115.01; (9) $115.01; (10) $327; (11) $442.01.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in the passage of H. R. 3207, H. R. 5012, and S. 2083, all designed to amend the Navy Ration Statute; interested

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.
E. (10) $12.80.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,444.
E. (6) $18.35; (8) $145.65; (9) $164; (10) $496; (11) $660.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $8.50; (9) $8.50; (10) $22.95; (11) $31.45.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Robinson-Patman Act and reappointment of John Carson as Federal Trade Commissioner.
D. (6) $500.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of Federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
E. (10) $9.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers.
D. (6) $54.45.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries.
E. (2) $1,000; (8) $287.20; (9) $1,287.20.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
D. (6) $450.
E. (7) $15.15; (9) $15.15; (10) $617.55; (11) $632.70.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Upholding the principles of private enterprise and constitutional government.
D. (6) $3,800.

A. Charles J. Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $845.34; (9) $845.34; (10) $1,361.65; (11) $2,206.99.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or affiliated companies.
E. (7) $160; (9) $160; (10) $461.55; (11) $621.55.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (10) $104.29.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $238.50; (9) $238.50; (10) $667.75; (11) $906.25.

A. William Henry Ryan, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,499.94.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates; particularly Public Law No. 233.
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $25.94; (9) $25.94; (10) $211.12; (11) $237.06.

A. J. T. Sanders, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) I am employed to support any legislation on which the National Grange has expressed policy statement.
D. (6) $1,752.
E. (7) $29.58; (9) $29.58; (10) $162.55; (11) $192.13.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (5) $102; (6) $36; (7) $48; (9) $186; (10) $252; (11) $438.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, which appear in section 4 of Public Law 594, Eighty-second Congress, second session, approved July 21, 1952.
E. (10) $9,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $30.75.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Studies of Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement.
E. (6) $25.12; (7) $1.77; (9) $26.89; (10) $11.54; (11) $38.43.

A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety; interest terminated with passage of Public Law 552.
E. (2) $424.39; (4) $566.88; (5) $519.47; (6) $189.56; (7) $210.81; (8) $9.61; (9) $1,920.72; (10) $21,567.53; (11) $23,506.25.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Against S. 1202, for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2652, H. R. 4051, S. 1874.

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $14.50; (9) $14.50; (10) $108.85; (11) $123.35.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (7) $2.25; (9) $2.25; (10) $34.85; (11) $37.10.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund, and Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $4,449.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, universal disarmament, full cooperation with UN in economic and social welfare; oppose UMT, UMS, military aid program, rearming Germany and Japan, and other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
E. (7) $19.30; (9) $19.30; (10) $114; (11) $133.30.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For S. 2722, S. 2815, H. R. 4484; against Senate Joint Resolution 20.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $52.67; (9) $52.67; (10) $327.85; (11) $380.52.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $110.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (10) $600.37.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
E. (2) $6,867.98; (5) $945.61; (6) $547.42; (7) $969.23; (8) $366.20; (9) $9,696.44; (10) $19,190.66; (11) $28,887.10.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions, and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $3,715; (8) $162.70; (3) $3,877.70; (10) $10,402.13; (11) $14,279.83; (15) $3,877.70, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., fee and expenses.

A. Stephen G. Slipher, Room 512, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting savings and loan associations, housing, home financing, thrift and financial institutions.
D. (6) $1,150.
E. (7) $4.60; (9) $4.60; (10) $42.15; (11) $46.75.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women, and children.
D. (6) $612.
E. (5) $151.29; (6) $39.65; (9) $190.94; (10) $1,068.66; (11) $1,259.60.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Forestry, regional development, resource conservation, labor relations.
D. (6) $42.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Specific interests include appropriations bills, bills to enact recommendations of the Hoover Commission, other reorganization proposals, and substantive legislation involving Government expenditures.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $12.12; (7) $762.87; (9) $774.99; (10) $881.24; (11) $1,656.23.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, 1500 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.
D. (6) $2,085.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $16,250.01.
E. (6) $18.75; (7) $2,151.40; (8) $35; (9) $2,205.15; (10) $948.93; (11) $3,154.08.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $125.95; (7) $1,348.30; (9) $1,474.25; (10) $1,294.82; (11) $2,769.07.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago 3, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $750.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.
D. (6) $15,443.38.
E. (2) $13,901.97; (4) $4,342.83; (5) $1,519.76; (6) $374.38; (7) $113.34; (8) $317.59; (9) $20,569.87; (10) $41,008.28; (11) $61,578.15.

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker and Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Better laws for maternal care, child health, and welfare.
D. (6) $5.
E. (5) $15.45; (6) $20; (7) $30; (9) $65.45; (10) $416.09; (11) $481.54.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolutions 51 and 56, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act and to secure for railroad employees covered by this act additional benefits. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $46; (9) $2,980.50; (10) $5,257.05; (11) $8,237.55.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.
E. (10) $15.25.

A. Charles I. Stengle, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $1,615.32.
E. (7) $6.40; (9) $6.40; (10) $93.50; (11) $99.90.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,553.36.
E. (2) $5,772.30; (4) $504.24; (5) $2,059.25; (6) $306.17; (7) $233.96; (9) $8,875.92; (10) $21,260.81; (11) $30,136.73.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $3,431.21.
E. (7) $114.96; (8) $16.25; (9) $131.21; (10) $555.90; (11) $687.11.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 5505, S. 2164, cotton labeling; H. R. 1267, fiber labeling; S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, all appropriation legislation; H. R. 7852, H. R. 8124, H. R. 7447, H. R. 7554.
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $1.25; (10) $38.30; (11) $39.55.

A. Wilson E. Still, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $711.27; (9) $711.27.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,460.40.
E. (7) $2.60; (8) $32.80; (9) $35.40; (10) $97.56; (11) $132.96.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $12.51; (9) $12.51; (10) $42.06; (11) $54.57.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction and legislation providing national school-health services. Appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers, bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers, appropriations for the Children's Bureau, and national school-lunch programs, emergency maternal and infant care.
D. (6) $1,149.85.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1310, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2652, H. R. 4051, S. 1874.
E. (11) $2,560.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Labor-Management Council.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, employees, and customers.[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (10) $18.50.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $43; (5) $26.06; (6) $5.40; (7) $667.92; (8) $86.56; (9) $828.94; (10) $2,141.86; (11) $2,970.80.

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Louis Cary, successor trustee of Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 6913.
E. (6) $1.55; (9) $1.55; (10) $57.45; (11) $59.

A. Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont.
C. (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in sections 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $3.61; (11) $128.61.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,587.50.
E. (2) $521.23; (4) $89.07; (5) $210; (6) $7.66; (7) $141.28; (8) $7.84; (9) $977.10; (10) $1,617.29; (11) $2,594.39; (15) $375, Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Mutual Security Agency and Department of Agriculture appropriations.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $215.17; (8) $13.05; (9) $228.22; (10) $433.33; (11) $561.55.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,369.65.
E. (9) $7.15; (10) $9.50; (11) $16.45.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.
D. (6) $2,156.28.
E. (5) $503.82; (6) $121.77; (9) $625.59.

A. Donald Teel, 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $274,145.
E. (2) $900; (5) $409.16; (6) $51; (8) $4; (9) $1,364.16; (10) $2,615.79; (11) $3,979.95.

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) S. 75 and H. R. 1500.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, (P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $11,405.
E. (2) $1,781.46; (3) $25; (4) $1,508.97; (5) $351.24; (6) $152.04; (7) $485.07; (8) $1,133.83; (9) $5,437.61; (10) $10,226.28; (11) $12,663.89; (15) $1,218.60, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary; $562.86, Mildred B. Vaught, Austin, Tex., salary; $25, National Rivers

and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., contribution; $185.35, The Steck Co., Austin, Tex., printing and stationery; etc.[1]

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev., The Union Pacific Railroad Co., The Western Pacific Railroad Co., and Southern Pacific Co.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) $675.
E. (10) $423.64.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing-vessel industry and water transportation.
D. (6) $6,166.66.
E. (7) $69; (9) $69; (10) $370.75; (11) $439.75.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Suite 805, Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting nurses, nursing, and health.
D. (6) $1,153.80.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (10) $33.75.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest.[1]
E. (10) $98.75.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,193.12.
E. (9) $14.40; (10) $109.28; (11) $123.68.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
E. (10) $15.56.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To enact the Townsend Plan into law. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
E. (2) $1,950.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control; Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contribution to State unemployment insurance payments; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; control and eradication of brucellosis; selective service; flood control.
D. (6) $1,687.50.
E. (7) $38.20; (9) $38.20; (10) $106.18; (11) $144.38.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $999.99; (7) $858.71; (9) $1,358.70; (10) $2,215.58; (11) $3,574.28.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are all statutes and bills affecting the importation by the United States of sugar from Cuba, and the tariff rates on such sugar, and those statutes and bills affecting trade between the United States and Cuba, particularly trade in sugar.
D. (6) $31,962.44.
E. (1) $3,378.42; (4) $501.61; (9) $3,880.03; (10) $11,336.05; (11) $15,216.08; (15) $3,378.42, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., public relations.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.
E. (12) $4,546.17; $3,127.27; (5) $774.32; (6) $114.07; (7) $11.60; (8) $278.64; (9) $8,852.07; (10) $23,534.67; (11) $32,386.74; (15).[1]

A. Western Vernon, Jr., partner of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. (6) $225.
E. (7) $12.20; (9) $12.20; (11) $12.20.

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the tax exemptions allowed under section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States.
D. (6) $645.
E. (2) $1,001.50; (4) $477.71; (5) $450; (6) $23.86; (7) $125.08; (8) $240.02; (9) $2,318.17; (10) $5,646.61; (11) $7,964.78; (15).[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Tracy S. Voorhies, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on the Present Danger.
C. (2) Mutual security and military manpower.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $7,000.02.
E. (7) $461.15; (8) $114.85; (9) $576; (10) $1,066.62; (11) $1,642.62.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,277.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (10) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $424.32; (9) $424.32; (10) $761.03; (11) $1,185.35.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.
E. (10) $146.71.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $50; (11) $75.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley 2d, doing business as Weaver & Glassie, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $2,265.27.
E. (5) $190.05; (7) $225.09; (8) $399.81; (9) $814.95; (10) $1,285.44; (11) $2,100.39.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills dealing with ROTC as they apply to colleges in last session; also airmen's training legislation; supported Korean veteran-training bills in general except on matters related to qualifications of schools for participation in training programs.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (2) $0.50; (7) $1; (9) $1.50; (10) $117.46; (11) $118.96.

A. W. S. Weismann, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $70; (9) $70; (10) $325; (11) $395.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support such legislation as will carry out the purpose of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution and to oppose legislation which would tend to frustrate the purpose therein expressed. (3) The Jewish Veteran.
D. (7) $2,499.96.
E. (5) $21.39; (6) $11.95; (7) $418.96; (8) $21.33; (9) $473.63; (10) $818.08; (11) $1,291.71.

A. William E. Welsh, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (7) $843.16; (9) $843.16; (10) $1,149.98; (11) $1,986.14.

A. Charles F. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $500.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Madison Street, Suite 1002–3, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry, supporting or opposing such legislation as it affects the interests of the industry.
D. (6) $11,224.47.
E. (4) $18.00; (7) $14.82; (9) $32.82; (10) $235.59; (11) $268.41.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev., and Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question.
E. (9) $12.38; (10) $7.50; (11) $19.88.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (9) $40; (10) $43.50; (11) $83.50.

A. Wheeler and Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (9) $1.25; (10) $24.45; (11) $25.70.

A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (7) $190.58; (9) $190.58; (10) $392.74; (11) $583.32.

A. Leone Baxter Whitaker, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (7) $190.58; (9) $190.58; (10) $392.74; (11) $583.32.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,124.98.
E. (2) $31.25; (4) $7.98; (5) $14.98; (6) $2.17; (7) $11.04; (9) $67.42; (10) $130.11; (11) $197.53.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
D. $750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.
D. (6) $827.76.
E. (2) $400; (5) $203.55; (6) $11.46; (7) $112.75; (8) $100; (9) $827.76; (10) $1,372.07; (11) $2,199.83.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) H. R. 7376 and House Joint Resolution 411. (3) Junior American.
D. (6) $58.31.
E. (6) $58.31; (9) $58.31; (10) $521.90; (11) $580.21.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control of and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience.
D. (6) $1,812.50.
E. (6) $0.10; (7) $48.18; (9) $48.28; (10) $299.58; (11) $347.86.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1623 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins and legislative notes published in Journal of American Medical Association.

D. (6) $3,750.

E. (7) $296.38; (9) $296.38; (10) $899.13; (11) $1,195.51.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.

E. (10) $100.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American Merchant Marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (7) $171.48; (9) $171.48; (10) $1,327.95; (11) $1,449.43.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Kaltys, Tex., et al.

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]

D. (6) $5,633.73.

E. (6) $91.58; (7) $362.96; (9) $454.49; (10) $4,483.29; (11) $4,937.78.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative proposals in accordance with resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation.[1]

D. (6) $2,109.38.

E. (7) $28.95; (9) $28.95; (10) $69.14; (11) $98.09.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.[1]

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, associate of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, associate in Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris, France.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 241, long-range shipping bill, for, with revisions.

D. (6) $134.62.

E. (7) $10.13; (9) $10.13; (10) $396.65; (11) $406.78.

A. J. Banks Young, 1632 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $178.55; (9) $178.55; (10) $94.34; (11) $272.89.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. J. H. Ballew, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

A. Robert C. Barnard, partner of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Robert C. Barnard, partner of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris, France.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States, tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information, individually, to other interested persons in the United States.

A. John M. Brumm, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.

A. Wilmer Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general interest is with legislation pertaining to world peace, civil liberties, and any other legislative concerns of Friends prescribed by the FCNL Executive Committee. (3) Will contribute to the Washington Newsletter from time to time. (4) Salary will be $5,000 annually; expenses will probably be about $2,000 annually.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 5415 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interests of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity; for House Joint Resolution 291, declaring right of sovereignty of United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent. (4) Between $100 and $1,000 for postage, telephone, reprints, etc.

A. Robert A. Koch, associate of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Robert A. Koch, associate in Cleary Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris, France.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information, individually, to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Anthracite Operators' Wage Agreement Committee, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry. (4) There is a general retainer covering legal services at the rate of $1,500 per month, plus reimbursement monthly for transportation, long distance telephone calls and other out of pocket expenses.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry in general. (4) $15,000 per annum, plus expenses not to exceed $300 per month.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer. (4) Anticipated expenses should ordinarily be not in excess of $100 per quarter; compensation will represent prorating of salary in accordance with time spent.

A. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture of company products and television broadcasting.

A. William H. Rodd, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 125 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) House Concurrent Resolution 64 and other measures to strengthen the U. N.; aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas by the United States and the United Nations.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, doing business as Weaver and Glassie, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture of company products, television broadcasting, and taxation.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, associate of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Alton, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, here at this noontide altar of devotion which our fathers builded and on which, with their founding faith, they cut deep the devout confession, "In God we trust," we humbly bow with the deathless assurance that turns tragedy to triumph: "The eternal God is our refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." We pray Thy blessing on these servants of the people's will, whose judgments must weigh vast issues and whose minds must face tangled problems. In Thy light may they see light and in Thy straight path may they not stumble. In all the deliberations begun this day, we pray that their motives may be kept clean, their vision clear, their patriotism undefiled, their speech guarded, their appraisals fair, and their integrity unbetrayed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 3, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House was present; that JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker; and Lyle O. Snader, a citizen of the State of Illinois, had been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives, of the Eighty-third Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session of the two Houses on January 6, 1953, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa, and Mr. RAINS, of Alabama, were appointed as tellers on the part of the House to ascertain and count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) making the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Adolph J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Edward Eugene Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. William G. Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. TAFT and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas advanced in the center aisle, and Mr. TAFT said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed by the President of the Senate to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Congress had assembled and was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make to it, report that they have performed that duty; and the President of the United States has requested the committee to state that he will communicate to the Congress a message in writing on Wednesday next, tomorrow.

I may say that I am also informed that two other messages, one on the budget and one on the Economic Report, will be submitted by the President on Friday, January 9, and Wednesday, January 14, respectively.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR STATE OF MONTANA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the certificate of ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President for the State of Montana; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE SENATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is the intention to have the Senate meet today and tomorrow in order to dispose of the motion relating to the rules, then to meet on Friday, and from Friday go over until next week and meet on Tuesday and Friday. It is further the intention to have the Senate recess on Friday of next week until Inauguration Day, Tuesday, January 20. I do not believe there will be sufficient business of the Senate to justify any further meetings than those I have suggested.

In view of the question arising as to possible prejudice in connection with the motion affecting the rules, I shall suggest that the Senate recess until 20 minutes to 1, and when it reassembles proceed to the House to participate in the joint session at 1 o'clock.

It is hoped that when Senators return from the joint session, debate may be begun on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the concurrent resolution providing for the joint session of the two Houses to count the electoral vote, the Chair is required to appoint two tellers on the part of the Senate. Heretofore it has been customary to appoint the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That committee has now been merged with the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Chair understands that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] will be chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and therefore, in the role of prophet, and in anticipation of that fact, the Chair appoints the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral vote in the joint session.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 20 minutes to 1 this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:40 o'clock p. m.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Symington
Eastland	Kuchel	Taft
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Tobey
Flanders	Long	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Mansfield	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Goldwater	Maybank	
Gore	McCarran	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) previously agreed to, I move that the Senate proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives. I may say there will be no introduction of bills today, or general business, but I hope that Senators will return to the Senate Chamber immediately following the conclusion of the joint session in the House, so that we may begin debate on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Bills may be introduced and other morning business transacted tomorrow, as soon as we shall have finished with the rules questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (J. Mark Trice), its Sergeant at Arms (Forest A. Harness), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The joint session of the two Houses having been concluded, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), returned to its Chamber and was called to order by the Vice President.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, at the joint session of the two Houses in the Hall of the House of Representatives the electoral votes for President of the United States and for Vice President of the United States were counted. I send to the desk the official result as shown by the count of the electoral votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report of the state of the votes will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 442 votes.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 89 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Richard M. Nixon, of the State of California, has received for Vice President of the United States 442 votes.

JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of the State of Alabama, has received 89 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 1953, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be spread upon the Journal of the Senate.

(For tabulation of electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States, see House proceedings of this day, p. 130.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Symington
Eastland	Kuchel	Taft
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Tobey
Flanders	Long	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Mansfield	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Goldwater	Maybank	
Gore	McCarran	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

RULES OF THE SENATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) that the Senate immediately consider the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I stated on Saturday, my intention is, after adequate time for debate shall have been had, to move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is extremely important that the Senate shall get started. It is necessary that the Senate be promptly organized. We have to go ahead with the organization of committees, including the report of the Committee on Committees, and consider some questions which can be considered only when this question is disposed of. Therefore, there is every reason for expedition. I hope, therefore, that I may be able to make my motion tomorrow at some time during the latter part of the afternoon. Until that time we shall not take up the regular order, the morning business. I hope we shall be able to transact such business, including the introduction of bills, tomorrow afternoon.

On the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit the Chair to state the question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The clerk will state the motion.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. ANDERSON, for himself and other Senators, moves that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I was instructed by the Republican caucus, which took place on last Friday, to present the viewpoint that the Senate is a continuing body, with continuing rules. I was so instructed by a very large majority.

The motion which has been made implies that there are no rules of the Senate; that today we are operating without rules until we choose to adopt a body of rules.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I should prefer to make my statement.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. I should ask the distinguished Senator if he is not aware that there was a minority of the members on the Republican side of the aisle who were present at the caucus and who were opposed to the view which the Senator from Ohio has just expressed?

Mr. TAFT. I did not assert that it was a unanimous vote. I heard a negative vote. I heard only one negative vote and only one argument against the proposition, which was the vote and argument of the distinguished Senator from New York. There may have been other negative votes, but I did not hear them.

Mr. President, it seems to me that every precedent of the Senate is to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body. I have failed to find a single precedent holding the other way. From the very first the practice has been not to adopt rules at the beginning of a new Congress. No Senate has undertaken at the beginning of a Congress to adopt its rules. It has been assumed that the Senate is a continuing body and that it has continuing rules. The proposition has been questioned only on one or two occasions.

I do not intend to speak at great length. I merely wish to state the proposition and the reasons why we have come to the conclusions which we have reached. This is a constitutional question; it is not a question of civil rights; it is a question of whether the Senate is a continuing body. There is absolutely nothing in the Constitution which indicates in any way that there are separate Congresses. The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States simply provides that—

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Wherever Congress is referred to it is always as "the Congress."

Section 2 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

> The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

There certainly is nothing in the Constitution which can in any way justify the theory that the Senate is not a continuing body. I think the decision of precedent arose out of the fact that the Senate always has at least 64 Members, or substantially that number. They can meet and can act. We could have acted before the new Senators were sworn in last Saturday. Those Senators who had already become Members of this body could have voted, and it would have been a continuous Senate without 96 Senators being qualified.

I shall not read to any great extent, but I may say that the question was stated in 1841—and it has been discussed often—by one of my predecessors from Ohio, Senator Allen:

> And to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. * * * There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate.

The Supreme Court, when filled by new appointments, is still the same Supreme Court, and it is just as perpetual as the Senate, and its rules are just as perpetual as are the rules of the Senate of the United States until changed by a majority of the Senate.

The rules are not sacrosanct. Of course, they have been changed steadily for 165 years, but they have never been changed by an effort to adopt new rules at the beginning of a session. They have been rewritten several times. Substantially new rules were adopted in 1884, not at the beginning, but in the middle of the particular Congress in session then.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the majority leader, would have included in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the photostatic document which he holds in his hand. The reason for my request is that there is available only a limited number of copies of the document. I do not think it will occupy too much space in the RECORD, and there is a great deal of discussion about the matter throughout the country. It seems to me that it is a very well-documented paper which might well be included in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a Senate print of the Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "The Senate as a Continuing Body."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

1. CONTROVERSY OVER THE SENATE PRINTERS IN 1841

A joint resolution of March 3, 1819, had provided that "as soon as this resolution shall have been approved by the President of the United States, each House shall proceed to ballot for a printer, to execute its work during the next Congress." (The reso-

lution is reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 26th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 9, p. 238.)

An amendatory joint resolution adopted in 1839 provided that "within 30 days before the adjournment of every Congress, each House shall proceed to vote for a printer to execute its work for and during the succeeding Congress." (Reprinted, ibid., p. 189.) Accordingly, on February 20, 1841, during the second session of the Twenty-sixth Congress, the Senate elected Blair and Rives as its printers for the Twenty-seventh Congress. (Ibid., p. 197.)

On March 4, 1841, the political complexion of the Senate changed. (Ibid., p. 186.) The Senate organized by reelecting its President pro tempore (ibid., p. 231), and sat in special session until March 14. The House of Representatives duly adjourned sine die, and was not in session after March 4.

On March 4, 1841, a resolution was introduced "That Blair and Rives be dismissed as printers of the Senate for the twenty-seventh Congress." (Ibid., p. 236). On March 5 a motion to take up this resolution for consideration was debated at length. In February at the time of the election of the printers it had been urged that the "next Senate" should be allowed to elect its own printers. (Ibid., p. 186.)

Mr. Allen, of Ohio:

"And as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. The argument so much relied on in this discussion and on which so much logic and reasoning had been wasted in opposition to the election of these printers was untrue. There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate. There was a new House of Representatives because the entire House expired at the expiration of the second year and because the 4th of March terminated the life of that body. But not so the Senate. The Constitution replenishes that body every 2 years by the election of a class of Senators, and thereby gives eternity to the duration of the body. There was no new, nor was there any old Senate. The same Senate, therefore, which elected Blair and Rives now without charge or allegation proposes to rescind the act, but he would not go into that." (Ibid., p. 236.)

Mr. Wright, of New York (as the Senate was in special session and the House of Representatives was not sitting, the Senate could properly consider no other business than nominations and treaties):

"He had never heard it pretended that the rules of the Senate are not perpetual from Congress to Congress, unless they were changed by the body. The rules were not now changed; and what, then, were they doing? Why, they were debating this matter in violation of their rules, and by their action were assuming to exercise legislative powers." (Ibid., p. 236.)

Mr. Henry Clay, of Kentucky:

"It was contended on one side that the Senate was a continuous, never-dying body, and on the other side it was said there was no House of Representatives. But in the true contemplation of the Constitution, the Senate and the House, too, were supposed to be in existence; for if the States had discharged their duties by the election of Members, they were ready to form a House. The Senate and the House were in the contemplation of the Constitution, continuous bodies; they were not identical in the Members that composed them, but he hoped that, though theoretically always in existence, the acts and measures of the Senate would depend on the component Members that constitute the body. By the Constitution the Senate had power, exclusively of the House, of the President, or any other authority, to elect its own officers. They said that their Printer was an officer; but he should not go over the arguments which had been urged with so much ability by his friend from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] and which stood unanswered to that day, that these Printers were officers." (Ibid., p. 237.)

"Mr. WRIGHT. He had before referred to the rules of the Senate, and he had stated what he supposed would not be controverted, that those rules were as perfectly binding on that body as they were on the body which occupied those seats a week ago. Now, one of those rules was, that 'when acting on confidential or Executive business the Senate shall be cleared of all persons, except the Secretary, the principal or executive Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, and the Assistant Doorkeeper.' Well, then, under their rules they must assume to be acting legislatively, a position which he undertook to show they did not occupy after their organization for executive purposes." (Ibid., p. 237.)

The Senate voted to take up for consideration the resolution to dismiss the printers (ibid., p. 238). On March 8, the debate proceeded. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, contended that the printers were not officers of the Senate, but were entitled under a binding contract to do the Senate printing. But what if they were officers?

"Senators had contended that one Senate or one Congress had no right to elect officers for their successors; and that, therefore, the joint resolution violated the Constitution, because it gave the election of a Printer for the next Senate to that which had expired on the 3d of March. This was as strange a position as any which had been assumed throughout the argument. An old Senate and a new Senate.

"There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting in 1789. It has existed without any intermission from that day until the present moment, and would continue to exist as long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body. Its rules were permanent and were not adopted from Congress to Congress like those of the House of Representatives. For many years after the commencement of the Government its Secretary was a permanent officer, though our rules now require that he should be elected at stated intervals. The Senate always had a President, and there were always two-thirds of its actual members in existence, and generally a much greater number. It would be useless to labor this question. Every writer, without exception, who had treated on the subject had declared the Senate to be a permanent body. It never dies; and it was the sheet anchor of the Constitution on account of its permanency. Senators were thus deprived of the poor apology that one Senate had no right to bind its successors." (Ibid., p. 240.)

On March 9 the discussion was continued. A resolution that it was not competent for the Senate to annul the election and divest the printers of their rights was voted down. (Ibid., p. 246.) On March 10 the resolution to dismiss was again taken up. Mr. Sevier, of Arkansas:

"It had been very properly said that this was a permanent body, and that the election, whether before the 4th of March or after, was good and valid. It had been acquiesced in before, as he found on looking at the ayes and noes." (Ibid, p. 250.)

Mr. Woodbury, of New Hampshire:

"He was summoned here to a session of the Senate without the House of Representatives; and, of course, a session for the transaction of executive business merely. This body was a permanent one; and hence it was supposed that no new officers were to be elected if no vacancies already existed." (Ibid., p. 251.)

The resolution to dismiss Blair and Rives as printers of the Senate to the Twenty-seventh Congress was adopted by a vote of 26 to 18, on March 11, 1841. (Ibid., p. 256.) This action tended to support the view that the Senate was a discontinuous body.

But a vote to dismiss its printers was not necessarily a vote that the Senate was discontinuous. One of the Senators who advocated and voted for the dismissal, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, agreed with the opposition that the Senate was everlasting. (See above.) And if the proponents of the discontinuity view were, in fact, more numerous than its opponents, the reports in the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE (of which Blair and Rives were editors and publishers) wholly fail to indicate it.

3. OFFICE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Senator Collamer introduced in the Senate, August 5, 1861 (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 37th Cong., 1st sess., p. 436), the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the President pro tempore of the Senate, elected in the absence of the Vice President, holds his office, while a Member of the Senate, until another is elected, and executes the duties thereof whenever the Vice President is absent."

He declared:

"The object of this resolution is to declare what I have understood to be really the law. * * * It seems to me that, if an election be made to last only while the Vice President is at that time absent, the election to the office must cease with the session. It is an absurdity to talk about the absence of the Vice President when the Senate is not sitting. * * *

"The law which provides, in accordance with the Constitution, who shall perform the duties of President of the United States, in case of the death or resignation of both the President and Vice President, declares that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall officiate, or, if there be no President pro tempore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is very observable that that law necessarily implies that the Congress which passed it understood the place of President pro tempore to be a continuing office; that when elected, he remained in until another was elected. True, it might fall out that he might die; and so provision was made for the Speaker of the House of Representatives; but the necessary implication from the law is that the office of President pro tempore of the Senate is a continuing office."

Senator Bayard opposed the resolution, saying (ibid., p. 437):

"If the Vice President does not return, the occupant of the chair remains President pro tempore of the Senate, session or no session; because that is the natural inference from the duration of the office. He is not elected President pro tempore during the session of the Senate; he is elected President pro tempore during the absence of the Vice President, and you cannot assume the Vice President will return until he again appears in the chair as President of the Senate."

No vote was taken on Senator Collamer's resolution, and there was no discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore could continue over into a new Congress.

On December 17, 1875, after the death of the Vice President, Senator Edmunds introduced a resolution to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore on the 7th of January (Misc. Doc. No. 21, 44th Cong., 1st sess.).

January 10, 1876, Senator Morton, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, introduced four resolutions relating to the office of President pro tempore (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD vol. 4, p. 311). In the report of the committee (S. Rept. 3, 44th Cong., 1st sess.) it is stated (p. 2):

"The custom of the Vice President to vacate the chair before the close of a session to enable the Senate to choose a President pro tempore, did not begin until after the passage of the act of March 1, 1792, and was

obviously instituted to meet the contingency contemplated in the act, by providing a President pro tempore of the Senate during the vacations of that body. The Senate in contemplation of law, is a perpetual body, and the officers of the Senate are as much its officers during its vacations as during its sessions."

The report also cites 4 cases where the office of President pro tempore ceased "at the meeting of the Senate after the first recess," and 49 where it did not.

The first resolution proposed was (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 311):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of office of President pro tempore of the Senate elected at one session does not expire at the meeting of Congress after the first recess, the Vice President not having appeared to take the chair."

Senator Merrimon, discussing this resolution, said:

"I entertain the opinion that when the Senate elects a President pro tempore the the Senator so elected may rightfully continue to hold his office, unless his term as Senator shall sooner terminate or he shall be removed for cause, until the Vice President shall return to preside over the Senate, and in case he shall fail to so return because of death or other cause, then until a new Vice President shall be elected and qualified. * * * The Senate is a perpetual body; it is created, its powers are conferred, defined, and limited, by the Constitution."

The resolution was unanimously adopted (ibid., p. 316). Senator Sherman then remarked:

"I want to emphasize the matter. This resolution is adopted unanimously. It is a resolution that affects the organization of the body for all time to come and establishes a precedent."

January 12, 1876 (ibid., pp. 360–373), the Senate adopted this resolution:

"That the office of President pro tempore is held at the pleasure of the Senate."

October 10, 1881, Senator Garland, objecting to the admission of new Senators until a President pro tempore should be selected (the Vice President having become President of the United States during the recess of the Senate), said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, v. 12, p. 507):

"The Senate is a continuing body. It has Members enough whenever it may meet, in legal contemplation, to transact its business."

June 23, 1862, while Senator Morgan was addressing the Senate on the powers of the presiding officer, Senator Maxey interjected the remark (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, v. 13, p. 5263): "The Senate is a perpetual body." Thereupon Senator Morgan continued:

"The Senate being a perpetual body, if the Journals show that we have a presiding officer selected under the Constitution, the Journals cannot show that any other person can convene the Senate and call it to order and organize it as a legislative body except that person, until we supply another man under the Constitution and furnish him with the constitutional and record authority also to preside in this body * * *. Whenever the Senate of the United States is not together in pursuance, if you please, of an adjournment from yesterday or an adjournment from the last term and we do not find the gentleman present who fills the office which the Journals of this body show that he is entitled to fill, our duty then, and it is our first constitutional and unavoidable duty, is to supply that record and supply the man to fill the place."

March 20, 1889, Senator Butler introduced the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 37):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of the President pro tempore does not expire at the meeting of Congress after a recess, the Vice President having appeared to take the chair."

In discussing this resolution, Senator Reagan said (ibid., p. 46):

"A great many of the precedents show that the President pro tempore at the expiration of a Congress takes his seat at the commencement of a new Congress. It is convenient for the Senate to allow him to do so for the purpose of organization; but it seems to me as a rule to be unjust and improper for the reason I shall state. I know it is done upon the supposition that the Senate is a continuing body. So it is a continuing body with installments added every 2 years, if I may use such an expression. At the end of each Congress it is presumed that one-third of the Senate are new to their position. It ought not to be that that one-third of the Senate shall have no choice in the selection of a President pro tempore."

The resolution was not acted upon.

February 10, 1890, Senator Evarts, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 1154):

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore, who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof when the Vice President is absent."

In discussing this resolution Senator Evarts (ibid., p. 1717) referred to Senator Collamer's resolution of 1861, and also to the Morton report of 1876, which he said raised the question "whether a President pro tempore chosen at one session of the Senate should vacate that place, that post, that office, at the opening of the next session or after the first recess of the Senate. This committee were entirely of opinion, and there is now, I suppose, no difference in the Senate on that point, that that did not terminate the office of President pro tempore. * * * It appears now that there is left for consideration only this: Whether as a matter of constitutional obligation it is essential that the Senate should confine the existence and authority of a President pro tempore to the immediate occasion of the particular absence of the Vice President on which he is elected. * * * No Senator can see more clearly than I do the very great inconvenience of being dependent, entirely without a Presiding Officer, when a merely casual, unexpected, and unannounced, and yet necessary absence of the Vice President may require that there should be someone to take the chair."

Senator Hoar supported the resolution but Senator George maintained that it was contrary to "the uniform, unbroken practice of the Senate of the United States for a hundred years, and the uniform and unbroken practice of the House of Commons in England for 500 years."

March 12, 1890, Senator George (ibid., p. 2144) stated:

"At all times, and in every conceivable way in which the question could be raised, it was uniformly decided until 1861, without dissent on the part of anyone, that the President pro tempore of the Senate held his office, as the words themselves mean, during that particular absence of the Vice President for which he was elected. * * * Down to the present time the practice of the Senate has conformed to the original interpretation placed upon the Constitution, as I have stated it to be."

Senator George then reviewed the various elections of a President pro tempore from 1789 to 1869, and concluded (p. 2145):

"At the expense of frequent elections, at the expense of changing the occupant of the chair as frequently as 10 or 12 days apart, with one uniform consensus of opinion, with a uniformity of practice which is without a single break for a hundred years, the judgement of the Senate has been that the President pro tempore elected in the absence of the Vice President vacates his office upon the return of that officer."

Senator Turpie (ibid., p. 2150) introduced an amendment to change the resolution to the following form:

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof during all future absences of the Vice President until the Senate shall otherwise order."

In reply to Senator George he said:

"I think the unbroken practice or custom which he speaks of is owing to the fact that the question has not been discussed, and there has been no determinative or affirmative decision on the construction of the National Constitution herein."

The resolution was adopted as amended by Senator Turpie without division March 12, 1870 (ibid., p. 2153). Nothing was said in the discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore under the resolution would expire with the Congress during which he was elected.

March 2, 1891, Senator Charles F. Manderson was elected President pro tempore to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of March 12, 1890 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 22, p. 3637), with the intention, apparently, that his office would continue over into the following Congress. Subsequent Presidents pro tempore have regularly been elected with reference to this same resolution.

In Gilfry's compilation, "President of the Senate Pro Tempore," numerous instances are cited of Presidents pro tempore holding over from one Congress to the next:

John Gaillard, Thirteenth to Fourteenth Congress (p. 14).

William P. Mangum, Twenty-seventh to Twenty-eighth Congress (p. 22).

William R. King, Thirty-first to Thirty-second Congress (p. 36).

Jesse D. Bright, Thirty-third to Thirty-fourth Congress (p. 39).

Benjamin F. Wade, Thirty-ninth to Fortieth Congress (p. 49).

John J. Ingalls, Forty-ninth to Fiftieth Congress (p. 175).

Charles F. Manderson, Fifty-first to Fifty-third Congress (p. 213).

William P. Frye, Fifty-fourth to Fifty-sixty Congress (pp. 215–217).

William P. Frye, Fifty-seventh to Fifty-ninth Congress (pp. 218–220).

William P. Frye, Sixtieth to Sixty-second Congress (pp. 221–223).

On the other hand, the same compilation cites cases of reelection of Presidents pro tempore at a special March 4 session of the Senate, as follows:

William R. King, March 4, 1841 (p. 21).
David R. Atchison, March 4, 1853 (p. 37).
James M. Mason, March 4, 1857 (p. 42).
Solomon Fort, March 4, 1863 (p. 47).
William P. Frye, March 7, 1901 (p. 217).
William P. Frye, December 5, 1907 (p. 220).

3. DEBATE CONCERNING JOINT RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

January 10, 1876, Senator Hamlin, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 309):

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives in force at the close of the last session of Congress be, and the same are hereby, adopted as the joint rules of the two Houses for the present session."

Senator Hamlin, in supporting the resolution, said:

"The Senate has its rules. The Senate is an existing body, and its rules exist with the body. The House of Representatives is a body which expires once in 2 years, and its rules expire, of course, with each expiring Congress."

Senator Bayard, speaking on the same resolution January 17, 1876, said (ibid., p. 431):

"The question comes at once whether a joint rule adopted by the two Houses falls and becomes void by the expiration of the Congress in which that rule was adopted. So

far as the Senate is concerned, it will not, I think, be suggested, because this is a continuing body; there is always and at all times a quorum continuing from one Congress to another. It is not so with the House of Representatives the termination of whose legal existence is at the end of every 2 years. * * * So far as the Senate is concerned, we all know that the Senate's rules continue, but the question is what effect the different constitution of the other House of Congress has upon a joint rule."

Senator Merrimon stated:

"The long experience of our Chief Clerk, embracing about 38 years, knows of no exception; and, as far as he has been able to learn on examination, there has been no exception to the practice that the joint rules continue from Congress to Congress on the part of the Senate. But when the matter was brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules, we could not see how any rule, whether joint or otherwise, of one Congress could be binding upon a subsequent Congress, for the Congress as a Congress lasts but 2 years. As a legal proposition, if a joint rule is not binding upon the House, how could it be binding upon the Senate?"

Senator Thurman said (ibid., p. 432):

"The resolution now before the Senate rests upon the assumption that the joint rules of the two Houses fall at the end of what is called every Congress, and that they must necessarily do so upon the theory that the House of Representatives expires at the end of every Congress, while it is said that the Senate is a perpetual body. Why is it said that the Senate is a perpetual body? I know of no reason except one, and that is that only one-third of its Members go out every 2 years, so that there is always a sufficient number of Senators in office to constitute a quorum of the Senate. * * * The Senate is said to be a perpetual body, because it can be convened at any instant.

"I say, in reply to the Senator from Maine, that the Congress of the United States can be convened at any moment. In the contemplation of our Constitution there is never one moment of time when there is not a Congress of the United States which can be convened upon the call of the President, and in point of fact it is so. * * * The theory of our Government is that all the departments of the Government—executive, judicial, legislative—are in existence at every moment of time. * * * The Senate is said to be a continuing body. Cannot we change our rules whenever we please? The House can change its rules, no matter whether the rules of the last House continue in force until altered or not. * * * I think this idea that there is a dead House of Representatives every 2 years is all a mistake. I think the House of Representatives is as permanent a body as the Senate. The fact that we hold our office for 6 years and they for only 2 makes no manner of difference between the two Houses as to the permanent nature of the body."

Senator Sherman said (ibid., p. 433):

"The rules of the House of Representatives, I believe it is conceded on all hands, expire with the Congress. There can be no doubt about that, because that has been the universal practice of the Government, I believe, from the beginning. While I was a Member of the House there were two or three important occasions when, before the House was organized, it was held that there were no rules. By the established practice of the Government from the beginning to this hour it has been held that the rules of the House of Representatives expire with the Congress, and that no law can operate to extend the rules from one Congress to another, because that would be to violate the Constitution itself. In this respect the rules of each House are precisely alike.

"The rules of the Senate are no more operative than the rules of the House of Representatives. We have the power to change them at any moment. It is said that this body is a continuous body; but these rules need not be written out in the form of rules prescribed in set phrases. I have come, therefore, to the conclusion that it is not necessary, so far as the joint rules or the rules of the Senate are concerned, to take any action at the beginning of each Congress, simply because the joint rules expire by the expiration of Congress. It is not necessary for us, to continue any of our rules, to adopt the usual resolution of the House at the beginning of every Congress. I believe the joint rules will be continued without any such action. The Senate itself is a permanent body, and all the rules which affect the Senate continue until changed by the action of the Senate."

Senator Kelly said (ibid., p. 434):

"The Senate has never considered it necessary to adopt the rules of a previous Congress, probably for the reason which has been stated, that it is always an organized body; that is, it always has a quorum to do business. Being an organized body it has never since 1789 adopted the rules of a previous Congress."

Senator Morton said (ibid., p. 435):

"I have always understood the theory of the two Houses to be this: First, that the Senate is a continuing body. That results from the nature of its organization and also because it is a part of the executive department of the Government. * * * When the Senate adjourns from one session to another it is nothing more than a recess of the Senate. I believe I have never before heard it said that the House of Representatives was a continuing body. * * * We have a President pro tempore, a Sergeant at Arms, and a Secretary, and they continue until the Senate itself makes a change. Therefore, the organization of the body is not lost, and every adjournment of the Senate is simply in the nature of a recess."

Senator Maxey said (ibid., p. 438):

"It is said that the House of Representatives is a continuous body; and that reason is assigned by a Senator for whose legal judgment I have great respect; but I do not concur in it; I do not think it is true. I believe that there is a cessation of the organization of the House of Representatives every 2 years. The very fact that this body requires the President of the Senate (whoever that may be) to call the Senate together, that it is a perpetual body, that it never ceases to exist, that while one-third goes out every second year one-third comes in at the same time, makes it a perpetual body. * * *

"There never has been a time since the organization of this Government that two-thirds of the Senate were not in existence. It is, therefore, a perpetual body, so laid down in all the works on the subject. The House is not so. It is true of the House of Lords; it is not true of the House of Commons. Precisely what is true of the House of Lords is true of the Senate; precisely what is true of the House of Commons is true of the House of Representatives." (Edgerton, April 30, 1915; McClenon, November 22, 1915.)

Mr. TAFT. I continue to read from Senator Allen's remarks:

They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate. There was a new House of Representatives because the entire House expired at the expiration of the second year and because the 4th of March terminated the life of that body. But not so the Senate. The Constitution replenishes that body every 2 years by the election of a class of Senators, and thereby gives eternity to the duration of the body. There was no new, nor was there any old, Senate.

Senator Wright, of New York:

He had never heard it pretended that the rules of the Senate are not perpetual, from Congress to Congress, unless they were changed by the body. The rules were not now changed, and what, then, were they doing?

Senator James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, who became President of the United States, said:

There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting in 1789. It has existed without any intermission from that day until the present moment and would continue to exist as long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body. Its rules were permanent and were not adopted from Congress to Congress like those of the House of Representatives.

These are only quotations; their exact relevancy may be questioned. I merely wish to show the idea that has been accepted universally since the beginning of Congress.

Senator Merrimon said:

I entertain the opinion that when the Senate elects a President pro tempore the Senator so elected may rightfully continue to hold his office, unless his term as Senator shall sooner terminate or he shall be removed for cause, until the Vice President shall return to preside over the Senate. * * * The Senate is a perpetual body; it is created, its powers are conferred, defined, and limited, by the Constitution.

Senator Sherman, of Ohio, said:

I want to emphasize the matter. This resolution is adopted unanimously. It is a resolution that affects the organization of the body for all time to come, and establishes a precedent.

The resolution unanimously adopted was that the tenure of office of the President pro tempore of the Senate, elected at one session, does not expire at a meeting of Congress after a recess, the Vice President not having appeared to take the chair.

Mr. President, parliamentary authorities are very much the same. I wish to quote from the book, The Senate of the United States, by Haynes, one of the leading authorities on parliamentary law. He says:

Since in each Congress the House is newly elected, it has been held that the rules of the House in the preceding Congress cannot without specific adoption be held binding on the new House.

The Senate, on the other hand, is a continuing body. It first effected its organization April 6, 1789, and there never since has been a time when the Senate as an organized body has not been available, at the President's summons or in accordance with the terms of its own adjournment, for the transaction of public business. The first rules, adopted only 10 days after the Senate came into being, have continued in force without reaffirmation until amended or abolished by the Senate.

I believe every parliamentary authority follows the same principle. In the introduction to his manual, President Jefferson discusses the proceedings of the Senate, and refers to the question of the rules under which the Senate would be acting if it did not have any rules of its own to cover a case. I do not see how the Senate could be a continuing body unless it had continuing rules. I do not quite see how the Senate could operate if it were a body without rules.

It is said that the Senate must now operate under Robert's Rules of Order, or some other rules of parliamentary law.

But surely there must be rules of some kind. It seems obvious to me that those rules should be the rules of the Senate. Why should we go to the Parliament of Great Britain, why should we go to Robert's Rules of Order, why should we go to anybody else's rules, when we have rules of our own that have been in force for 165 years? The practices of the Senate are good evidence of what the rules of parliamentary law ought to be. It seems to me that if we had no rules, we still would be operating under Senate rules while we determined whether we had any rules. I cannot see any basis for saying there are some other rules which should govern.

Jefferson says:

The Senate have accordingly formed some rules for their own government; but those going only to few cases, they have referred to the decision of their President, without debate and without appeal, all questions of order arising either under their own rules, or, where they have provided none. This places under the discretion of the President a very extensive field of decision, and one which, irregularly exercised, would have a powerful effect on the proceedings and determinations of the House. The President must feel, weightily and seriously, this confidence in his discretion; and the necessity of recurring, for their government, to some known system of rules, that he may neither leave himself free to indulge caprice or passion, nor open to the imputation of them. But to what system of rules is he to recur, as supplementary to those of the Senate? To this there can be but one answer: to the system of regulations adopted for the government of some one of the parliamentary bodies within these States, or of that which has served as a prototype to most of them. This last is the model which we have all studied; while we are little acquainted with the modifications of it in our several States.

Jefferson there is referring to the rules of Parliament.

It is deposited, too, in publications possessed by many, and open to all. Its rules are probably as widely constructed for governing the debates of a considerative body, and obtaining its true sense, as any which can become known to us; and the acquiescence of the Senate, hitherto, under the references to them, has given them the sanction of their approbation.

Considering, therefore, the law of proceedings in the Senate as composed of the precepts of the Constitution, the regulations of the Senate, and where these are silent, of the rules of Parliament, I have here endeavored to collect and digest so much of these as is called for in ordinary practice, collating the parliamentary with the senatorial rules, both where they agree and where they vary.

The entire book, however, is set up on the theory that at the time Jefferson wrote the manual the Senate rules apparently had governed a good many different Congresses. There is no suggestion in his preface that the rules must be adopted by every Senate. He concedes that the Senate is governed by a set of rules, the Constitution of the United States, the rules that the Senate has been formerly operating under, and other precedents that may develop.

As far as the question of the unlimited debate is concerned, the British Parliament had unlimited debate, as I understand, until 1882. So if we have inherited anything from the British Parliament in the way of unlimited debate, we inherited it at the time when they had no such limitation.

An article in the Congressional Digest of November, 1926, states that the practice of the "previous question" was adopted in 1604 in Parliament, but it was used to avoid a vote, not to limit debate. It was in effect a motion to lay on the table. The article says:

At the establishment of our Government debate was practically unlimited in the Senate. * * * The "previous question" was provided for in the first Senate Rules found in the Annals of the First Congress from 1789 to 1791. Rules VIII, IX, and XI, related to the "previous question" but were rarely used. Like the precedents for the rule in the British Parliament and the Continental Congress when it was used in the early days of the Senate it did not limit debate but avoided a vote on a given subject. The "previous question" was debatable * * * but not on amendments.

The limitation of debate in the House of Commons was not introduced until 1882, according to Sir Erskine May (Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament, 12th Ed. London, 1917, p. 313).

* * * * *

The reason was apparently a great increase in the number of members.

So, if we are looking for a historical precedent so far as the practice of unlimited debate is concerned, it has been the approved legislative practice in the bodies from which we derive our customs. It was nothing strange in the Senate that no limitation was made, and that the rule of unlimited debate was generally adopted.

In 1917, Senator Walsh raised this question. He made a motion substantially like that of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. The motion never came to a vote. There was an agreement on a change in the rule—this same rule XXII—imposing some limitation on debate. But when the Senate came to act upon the question, it did not go back and adopt new rules. It did not adopt Senator Walsh's motion. It amended rule XXII, thereby affirming the fact that rule XXII had been in effect since the first day of that particular session.

So far as concerns the method which was adopted, and so far as the disposition of the question was concerned, the Walsh incident is authority for the fact that the Senate then insisted that it had rules, and proposed to make a change in the rules according to the terms of the rules, and not by throwing the rules out and adopting new rules at the beginning of a session.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the present rule XXII had been adopted only in 1949?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

With respect to rule XXII, to clear up the general situation, let me say that it seems to me that there are many respects in which there is a tremendous advantage arising from the fact that the Senate is a continuing body. I think it gives us an advantage in permanence which we ought to seek. I do not believe that Senators ought to be sworn in every 2 years. I think we ought to insist on the fact that the Senate has a perpetual status. I believe that the fact that the Senate is a continuing body adds to its prestige and power. I believe that it adds to the influence we have with the people in performing the duties which we have to perform. I do not believe that we should depart from the established practice, which has been supported by all the precedents and by the statements of practically everyone who has ever dealt with the subject since the Constitution of the United States first went into effect.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Coming back to rule XXII, as I understand it, the contention is that we must now abandon the practice which we have followed because we have a rule which certain Senators do not like. I refer to rule XXII in its present form.

In the first place, I do not believe that rule XXII is a rule authorizing unlimited debate. Unlimited debate has existed from the beginning. It was the practice long before the present rule XXII was adopted at all. It has always been the practice of the Senate. Rule XXII is a limitation on the power of unlimited debate. There was no limitation until 1917, when a limitation was adopted.

Certain Senators say that this rule is outrageous, that it does not go far enough, that it does not sufficiently modify the old rule with respect to the practice of unlimited debate. Therefore, we must take the radical step of declaring that the Senate is not a continuing body, that we have no rules, and that at the first of every session we are to debate all the practices and rules of the Senate. I do not believe that that contention would be justified even by a very great abuse; and I do not admit that rule XXII is a great abuse. I should like to see it changed and liberalized somewhat.

What happened in 1917 was that the cloture rule with which we are familiar was adopted. It provided that two-thirds of the Senators voting could enforce cloture with respect to any measure. When that rule was adopted, I believe it was thought that it provided for cloture in every case. The word used, however, was unfortunate. The rule provided for cloture on every "measure." Then a question arose. Someone invented the idea that a motion to take up a measure could be debated in an unlimited way. That question was before us for a long time. The question was whether a motion to take up a "measure" was "a measure," or whether it would be subject to the cloture rule.

The distinguished late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, ruled that a motion was not a measure. The ruling was supported by a number of precedents which had arisen in the meantime. As a matter of fact, I voted against the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I voted to overrule his ruling, because I thought the intent was to cover all motions as well as measures. Nevertheless, the Senate voted against me, and the precedent was set, and was definitely determined. Later the present Vice President ruled contrary to the ruling of Senator Vandenberg, and he was over-

ruled by a majority vote of the Senate, although I supported him. So it was found that there was no rule XXII effective against a motion to take up a measure. So in 1949 we did our best to try to modify that rule. Having found that it prevented us from taking up a bill in the Eightieth Congress, we announced that the first thing we would do in the Eighty-first Congress would be to change the rule in order to provide cloture with respect to motions as well as measures. Unfortunately the Republicans were no longer in charge when the Eighty-first Congress assembled. The question came up a little late, when we were under heavy pressure, and the motion to change the rule was debated for a long time, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator Lucas of Illinois. The fight which ensued in connection with that rule resulted in his being incapacitated for several months.

The result was finally that a compromise was reached, which applies cloture to every motion to take up a measure as well as to every measure, with the exception of the motion to take up changes in the rules. So we now have a cloture rule which applies to motions. For the first time in the history of the Senate we have such a rule. On one occasion in 1950 an attempt was made to get 64 votes, but it failed to secure even two-thirds of those present.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that under the terms of the so-called Wherry rule, rule XXII as it now stands, there is a complete prohibition against limiting debate on any change in the rule? Is not that a backward step?

Mr. TAFT. No; there is no such prohibition. There is a provision that there shall be no cloture on a motion to take up a change in the rules. In other words, the situation with regard to the rules was left exactly as it was under the amendment of 1917. There can be cloture on a motion to change the rules, but the motion to take up the question for consideration is not subject to cloture under this rule. Consequently, the Wherry amendment was not a backward step in that regard.

However, it was a compromise. Cloture was obtained with respect to every motion to take up any measure, but there was one reservation, reserving the right of unlimited debate on a motion to take up the rules, which situation had existed before the Wherry amendment was adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It had existed since the Congress was organized.

Mr. TAFT. It had existed since the Congress was organized. There has always been unlimited debate on motions to take up the rules. Of course, the rules could be changed by majority vote, if the question could be brought to a vote. The rules have been changed many times. At nearly every session there are rule changes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that debate on a change in the rule cannot be limited? If one or two or three Senators wish to carry on a filibuster, there is no human way, so far as I can see, to bring about a limitation on debate. The question may involve the taking up of a motion, or it may involve the rule itself.

Mr. TAFT. There is no prohibition of cloture with regard to the rule itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. There cannot be any change if there is substantial opposition.

Mr. TAFT. The matter of unlimited debate refers to a motion to take up the rules.

The question whether or not a filibuster can be broken is certainly a question which remains to be determined. I have always felt that if a majority were sufficiently determined and the minority were not too large, a filibuster could be broken. However, I do not maintain that there is any great ease in changing the rules.

The Martin resolution of 1917 was the first effective limitation on debate. I may say that that was the first time we adopted cloture as a practical matter. I felt at the time, and I feel now, that if a measure is of sufficient importance and its proponents are sufficiently in earnest, particularly if it is an administration measure, it is possible to get 64 votes in favor of breaking a filibuster. I suggest that 96 Senators were in their seats on Saturday. In the Eightieth Congress when the Senate had before it the question of overriding the President's veto on the tax bill, and when the Senate overrode the Presidential veto of the Taft-Hartley law, I believe only one Senator was absent. It is my honest opinion that action can be taken on any bill if an organized effort is made to insist upon a vote on it.

So far as civil-rights legislation is concerned, or so far as other legislation is concerned, such legislation can be passed under the present rules. The question has never been tested.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Ohio has referred to a number of parliamentary authorities supporting his position. May I ask the Senator from Ohio whether in the history of Congress since 1789 the Senate has ever by its vote supported the contention which the Senator from Ohio has made? Has a vote ever been taken in the Senate on that point? In other words, has a vote ever been taken in the Senate on the question of whether the Senate has the right to adopt its own rules? I know that there was acquiescence in 1789, but it was merely acquiescence. There was no forfeiture so far as I can find.

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe the question was ever raised until former Senator Walsh raised it. Then the Senate bypassed the question. The Senate's action at that time seems to me to have been a reaffirmation of the fact that there were such rules in existence; that they were continuing rules.

Mr. President, I believe that the precedents are clear, and I do not believe that under the present circumstances we would be justified in setting aside all the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with respect to the array of evidence which the Senator from Ohio has brought forth this afternoon in connection with his contention that the Senate is a continuing body, and the application of rule XXII, I should like to ask him a question. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether or not the Senate of the United States, under article I, section 5 of the Constitution, shall exercise the right therein prescribed to adopt rules for the governing of its proceedings? Is that not the issue before the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not believe that is the issue. The issue is whether the Senate's rules should continue in effect, and whether the way to amend them is not in accordance with the rules already prescribed. It seems to me that if today we are to debate the question under any rules, a decision must be made as to what rules we operate under; and those temporary rules, I believe, would still be the rules and precedents of the Senate. As Emerson has said, "When me they fly, I am the wings."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to finish the quotation? "I am the doubter and the doubt."

Mr. TAFT. It has always been assumed that the Senate's rules carry over. The question is, Shall the Senate change its rules? It takes a majority vote to do it, and the Senate certainly has the right to change its rules. If the Senate wishes to do so, it could protect itself against a filibuster. The Senate has other rules beside the cloture rule. If the votes are available, and if the Presiding Officer is favorable it is always possible for the Senate to protect itself against a filibuster.

Some Senators say it is difficult to do so, and therefore we must change the rule. I submit that the rules of the Senate permit a change by a majority vote at any time the Senate wishes to make a change. I notice in the lengthy brief which has been submitted on the question—and I did not intend to embark on a full discussion of the question, but wished merely to bring on the subject for debate—it is stated that the rule provides against continuity because it ends the consideration of bills and treaties at the end of a Congress.

If the Senate expired at the end of a Congress, there would be no need for such a rule. The fact that there is such a rule is evidence that the Senate is a continuing body. I maintain that everything goes back to the general proposition that the Senate is a continuing body with continuing rules. It would be unfortunate to hold otherwise, because in that event it would be possible to tie up the operation of the Senate and the Senate could not get started. At one time

the House got into dispute with respect to its rules, which blocked the progress of legislation for a period of a month or more.

Mr. President, it is vitally important to the Nation that the Senate be a continuing body. Let us consider the situation which will arise on the 20th of January, when new Cabinet officers are to take office. We must have Cabinet officers appointed as quickly as possible. We must have officials to operate the Government.

If we should become involved in a rules fight, the discussion could go on forever. In fact, I would venture to say that if there were a majority in the Senate who wished to adopt the procedure suggested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the discussion would proceed almost indefinitely; we would continue the debate for a month in order to break the filibuster that might develop under such circumstances. Therefore, I believe it is exceedingly unfortunate to raise a controversy regarding the rules at this time and contend that the Senate must begin all over again at the beginning of the session and confront all the uncertain and difficult questions that could arise under such circumstances.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe I know the attitude of the Senator from Ohio with respect to civil-rights legislation, and I believe that basically it is about the same as mine. I should like respectfully to suggest to the Senator that the language he used about 5 minutes ago may leave an impression in the RECORD which I am sure he does not really intend; namely, that he is of the opinion that it would be proper to require a two-thirds vote to pass civil-rights legislation in contrast to the majority-vote requirement with respect to other legislation.

The only point I wish to make is that I assume that his statement with reference to a two-thirds vote goes only to the procedure which brings up a bill for consideration, and not to the vote which is required to pass legislation.

Mr. TAFT. I agree entirely. Not only that, but I think it should be two-thirds of those present, not two-thirds of the constitutional number of Senators.

Mr. President, although it is claimed that rule XXII is an abuse in regard to civil-rights legislation, I say it is not an abuse. I say it is a reasonable rule, that it can be changed if necessary, but that in any event so far as civil-rights legislation is concerned, if two-thirds of the Senate wish to bring up such a measure for consideration and wish to force a vote on it, they have the power to do so under the present rules, and I think it can be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator from Minnesota was first on his feet, so I yield now to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just one more question. In his remarks the Senator from Ohio has made it quite clear that the issue before us is not that of civil-rights legislation, but is that of the Constitution itself.

Mr. TAFT. The only point I wish to make is that, as I understand the matter, we must disregard the question of civil-rights issues as affected by the rules, predicated on the ground that here is an abuse which justifies the setting aside of the precedents of the Senate. I say there is no abuse. I say we have rules and we can operate under them.

Even then it seems to me that unlimited debate is no abuse, because it has been the practice of Parliament and it has been the practice of the Senate for 165 years, and I do not think such debate could be considered an abuse sufficient to justify setting aside the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that his argument is convincing to me, and he makes the argument very well.

The only point I should like to bring to his attention is that regardless of whether rule XXII is sound or is unsound, regardless of whether we like the precedent or dislike it; I think the question before the Senate is simply whether we have the right and the privilege of exercising the right to adopt rules, be they good, bad, or indifferent. Do we, as Members of this body, lose our right to have anything to say about its rules, by reason of the fact that we are elected to a Senate which adopted rules years and years ago?

I am not going to argue the merits of rule XXII; we shall do that later.

Mr. TAFT. We have the power to change the rules. I tried to explain why I think we have that power, if we wish to change the rules. They provide very definitely that by majority vote we can change them at any time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Ohio assumes that we have the power to change the rules, on the one hand, by saying that we could break a filibuster, which I believe we could. Let me suggest to my colleagues that some day we should.

Secondly, the Senator from Ohio defeats his own argument by saying that at the opening of a session, such as this, debate about the rules is likely to go on for a month or 2 months, thereby delaying the operation of the Senate. On the one hand, that impasse can be broken; on the other hand, if it were not broken, the Senate itself could be broken.

Would not it be desirable simply to bring up the rules and lay them before the good Members of this body, and let them decide? What is so different about the rules, as compared to other matters about which the Senate decides? We handle legislation by means of majority vote, and cloture can be applied by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. TAFT. The rules can be amended by majority vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So why is it that in a particular situation in this body the rules, which are so precious—not to the public, but to an inside group of the Senate—are not subject to having cloture applied to them, but are left in the lap of the gods or in the lap of the filibuster?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have made the argument that I think it is clear that the precedents support the position that the Senate is a continuing body and has rules which continue. There is absolutely no reason why we should have to adopt the rules over again at the beginning of every session, and thereby tie up the business of the Senate and the country. I think it is important that we proceed under the rules of the Senate. I think those rules are in effect at this moment, and I see no reason why we should not determine this question in a reasonably quick period.

I cannot conceive that the Senate would surrender the position it is given under the Constitution and the position it has always assumed, namely, that it has the power to determine its own affairs and to limit itself by means of its own rules in any way that it becomes apparent to a majority of the Senate that the Senate ought to be limited. We have that power, and that power extends throughout the entire proceedings of the Senate, from one Congress to another Congress. There is no new Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia, who was first on his feet.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Ohio. I intend to speak briefly on the subject in my own time.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I did not intend to give any comprehensive view of the precedents; I merely cited examples to show what men who have considered the subject have thought about it. I think we shall submit later a much more complete presentation, at least for the purpose of the record, regarding the precedents in this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not like to have the distinguished majority leader take his seat without having included in the record what to me is the most significant constitutional basis for the continuing body argument. I refer to the original Constitution of the United States, as found in part on page 455 of our Manual. The Senator from Ohio read the amendment to that portion of the Constitution, but he did not read the significant language which clearly writes into the Constitution the principle that the Senate is a continuing body, for after the provision:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

At that point the Founding Fathers wrote this provision into the Constitution:

> Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election—

The first election—

> they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second

class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year—

Mr. President, I am unable to see how the Constitution could more specifically spell out the fact that the Senate is a continuing body, when the Constitution provides for three classes of Senators, with the body to be a continuing body, replenished by the election of one-third of the total number of Senators every 2 years, and when, under the Constitution, the Presiding Officer of the Senate is not one chosen by the Senate itself, but is the Vice President of the United States, elected for a period of 4 years. Those two facts are to my mind a conclusive argument that the Founding Fathers intended that the Senate be a continuing body, just as has been accepted by every Senate that has convened since 1789.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I am sorry I did not read the original constitutional provision, as well as the amendment. However, I agree particularly that the words "so that one-third may be chosen every second year" are most significant. One-third of what, Mr. President? One-third of the Senate, a continuing body. So I agree entirely with the Senator from Georgia; I think the words there are very significant.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate is not a continuing body, where is the interregnum in the service of the 64 Senators who are carried over every second year? When do they cease to serve as Senators? They are specifically carried over, under the Constitution. They constitute a quorum of this body carried over every election year, as members of a continuing body. The Founding Fathers could have had no other purpose in mind in phrasing the provision in that fashion.

If the Senator from Ohio will indulge me for another question, I shall subside. I am interested in the argument that the Senate is not a continuing body and should adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress. Of course, that is interesting. It is true that no man can bind his successor, but that is not an argument to the effect that at each session we can say, "We are new here, and we refuse to be bound by the acts of our predecessors, and therefore we intend to change the former rules, and now offer amendments to them."

It still has to be done by the method prescribed by law, and it in nowise affects the fact that the issue before this Senate is a simple one, as to whether or not the Senate is a continuing body. I shall await with interest any precedent that can be cited, other than mere words and oratory, to demonstrate that that principle has ever been challenged seriously in the Senate. The idea that the Senate is not a continuing body has only found its birth during the past year, in an effort to find a shortcut to amend the rules. If the theory can apply to the rules, it can apply to any law, it can apply to amendments to the Constitution, and our entire Government, without any orderly processes, can be driven into chaos.

Mr. TAFT. The fact that previous Congresses have sought to bind future Congresses in some way seems to me to be no particular argument. The Constitution itself says it cannot be amended at all with respect to the representation of any State in the Senate of the United States. That is a perpetual provision which, under no circumstances, can be changed. And in other respects it cannot be amended without a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

The process by which we have adopted rules and enacted laws somewhat binding those who may succeed us is not an untried or original idea. It seems perfectly clear to me that the Senate rules simply continue in effect, although they are subject to change by the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the proposal for a change in the rules is motivated by civil-rights legislation, I think the Senate ought to be refreshed on the fact that in March of last year the Rules Committee met, and reported a liberalization of section 2 of rule XXII, so that instead of requiring a single intervening day, 5 days would be allowed so as to make it possible for every Senator who might be abroad in the land to get back in case a cloture petition were before the Senate.

Secondly, it recommended a change in the provision advanced by the late Senator Wherry, so that instead of requiring the votes of two-thirds of the Senators sworn to bring about cloture, the votes of only two-thirds of the Senators present would be required. Under a liberalization of that kind every Senator would be on notice, and the number of votes Senators required might be somewhat diminished.

I might amplify by saying that, insofar as I can tell from the report which came from the Rules Committee at that time, in the 32 years from 1917 to 1949 on the occasions when cloture petitions came up, there were in attendance an average of 84 Senators. Two-thirds of 84 is 56. If there is any quarrel about a constitutional two-thirds majority being required, this provision, which was reported by the Rules Committee in March 1952, would be a forward step. If I recall correctly from conversations with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], if he assumes the chairmanship of the Rules Committee, I am confident one of his first acts will be to try to bring such modification to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois and to other Members of this body that I have already prepared a resolution to amend the cloture rule with respect to the number of votes required for the adoption of a cloture motion. When the order of business calling for the introduction of bills and resolutions is reached, I shall offer the resolution, which is based upon a report—Report No. 1256—which came from the Rules Committee at the last session. I think its adoption will take care of a great deal of the controversy which has arisen over the cloture rule.

The resolution embodies two new features which I think will make it acceptable to the Members of this body. One of the features is that under the proposed resolution the votes of only two-thirds of the Members present and voting would be required to adopt a cloture motion. The other feature is that after a cloture petition is filed a 5-day period would have to elapse before it could be voted upon; which means that a Member of this body who might be at the far ends of the earth, would still have ample time to return to the Senate to vote, if he were interested enough to do so.

Mr. President, under my resolution, if 90 Senators were present at the end of the 5-day period after a cloture petition had been filed, 60 Members could force cloture. If 84 Members were present when the 5-day period expired, then 56 Members could bring about cloture, whereas the present rule requires a minimum of 64, or two-thirds of all the Members elected to this body. In other words, the resolution proposes to modify the present rule. It is reasonable. It is practical.

We had long discussion and hearings before our committee at the last session of Congress. I think that if each Member of this body were sufficiently interested to read the report which I submitted at the last session, and which was on the calendar at that time, Calendar No. 1187, he would find the proposal agreeable and that it would obviate much of the discussion on this question. It proposes a rule that is practical, and one which can be adopted, whereas I am positive that some of the proposals now being discussed will never be adopted by the Senate. I propose to offer the resolution to which I have referred at the first opportunity during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to yield the floor, in order that the Senator from New Mexico may proceed with the presentation of his motion. I desire only to add that I oppose the pending motion for the reason that, since we have continuing rules, its adoption would lead only to confusion. I feel that the rules are adequate to deal with the present situation. I shall ask the Senate to vote to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, when debate has been had on this question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator from Ohio I was greatly impressed by his argument and by the colloquy between him and the Senator from Georgia with reference to the fact that the Constitution itself shows so clearly the intent that the Senate be a continuing body without interruption of its existence. Particularly was I impressed with the reading of that part of the text of original section 3 of article I of the Constitution, which was read into the RECORD.

It seems to me, however, that that small portion of that original section

which was not read into the RECORD likewise tends to show that it was the intention of the Founding Fathers that the Senate should be a continuing body, and that under no circumstances would a condition have been allowed under which the Senate would fail to have a quorum to transact business before the swearing in of new Senators who had been elected.

I call attention, therefore, to the last portion of that section—which is the original section of the Constitution designated as section 3, article I—now omitted, of course, through the adoption of the seventeenth amendment. The omitted portion reads as follows: "and if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies."

Does not the distinguished Senator feel that that is but an additional and supplemental showing of the fact that the Founding Fathers wanted it to be quite clear not only that the Senate would be a continuing body but that the Senate would never be left in such a position that the two-thirds who were not subject to election at any general election would not supply a quorum to transact business?

Mr. TAFT. I think that certainly is a clear implication of what the framers of the Constitution intended to establish.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a second question, I may ask the Senator whether it is not true that that same provision does not apply with reference to the Members of the House, which, to the contrary, were required to be elected after the issuance of special writs of election in the event there were vacancies?

Mr. TAFT. That is true also.

Mr. HOLLAND. And is it not also true that in the adoption of the amendment to this particular provision of the Constitution which has already been referred to, the same idea was carried forward in permitting the naming of persons to fill vacancies in the Senate by the governors until a special election could be called or a general election held?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So that in each case it was shown that it was the intention of the original framing fathers and of the Congress at the time of the submission of amendments, and of the people and the States at the time of the adoption of the amendments, that the Senate could never fail in its ability to function by reason of the fact that it might not have a quorum, but would always have such machinery; that the States which were most concerned could be sure that vacancies were promptly filled, and that there could not be a failure to function resulting from the failure of a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has added a very powerful argument to the one which I presented.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the statement made by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is to be chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He has stated that the proposal which he advances would do a great deal to cure the difficulties which exist in this situation. I not only agree with him, but I say that there are Members of the Senate who recognize that his proposal would do a great deal to accomplish the desired result. But if the resolution should come out of the Committee on Rules and Administration to the floor of the Senate, there is no possibility whatever that it can be adopted, because, under subsection 3 of rule XXII, any Senator can filibuster it to death. If the Senator from Indiana wants to make his proposal effective and filibuster-proof, all he has to do is to vote for the motion tomorrow allowing the Senate to adopt its own rules. We can then act on all the rules, including his slight modification of rule XXII, following exactly the pattern of 1917. In that way his purpose can be accomplished, and the country will be eternally grateful to him. He has laid the basis upon which action can be taken; and I hope that the Republican Members of the Senate will stay with him.

Mr. President, I have always been conscious that light is good in whatever lamp it is burning. I hold in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body," prepared by David Kammerman, professional staff member of the Senate Republican policy committee, published in January 1953. I do not know how widely it has been circulated, but it should have had a wide circulation.

When the distinguished majority leader began reading from this pamphlet, he began reading halfway down on page 18. I wish he had started at the top of that page, because that is the part which would give aid and comfort to the Senator from Indiana, who is to be chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The brief prepared by the Republican policy committee states:

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. * * *"

Thus, the Senate is the sole judge of its own rules, and a majority at any time can change its rules or adopt new ones, whether at the beginning of a session of Congress or at any other time when it is sitting.

Then it goes on to say:

But what about the minority's power to block a vote on this issue?

This is the part which the distinguished majority leader read. But I am not interested in trying to block a vote; I want to know how we can make the rules of the Senate workable and how we can adopt the very wise proposal which the Senator from Indiana has made. The Senate, at the very beginning of the new Congress, can adopt rules, and those rules can include the modification proposed by the Senator from Indiana, without the possibility of filibuster, it will be realized how important it is that we act now and not try to act a month from now.

What happened in 1917? We have heard a great deal about it. I defy any Senator to read the RECORD and reach an understanding about that situation different from that which is actually disclosed. Senator Walsh, ably supported by many other Senators, stood on the floor of the Senate and said that the filibuster against the ship bill was unconscionable. I am not using his exact words. He got pretty rough in the course of his remarks. He made a very powerful argument, a great deal of which might well be put into the RECORD today. When he finished, someone surrendered. Senator Walsh won without firing another shot. A cloture rule was brought forth, but not by Senators who had been talking against the bill, and, with the exception of three, every one of them, including a Senator from Ohio, Mr. Harding, who subsequently became President of the United States, fell into line.

Mr. President, all we have to do tomorrow is to agree to the simple motion which is before the Senate, and then adopt a modification of rule XXII, and we shall have accomplished our purpose. Anything else will smack of hypocrisy, because it will be known that there was not a genuine effort to bring about the desired result.

I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator from Indiana took the floor and stated clearly that he intends to push the matter, because it means that a sincere effort will be made to modify the rule.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I tried to permit the Senator from Ohio to proceed without interruption. However, I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Has the Senator, in his study of the question, found any instance of the Senate at the opening of a session of the Congress reaffirming the whole body of its rules or adopting an entire set of rules, other than at the very first session?

Mr. ANDERSON. The language at the first session was, "The following rules shall be observed." There was no adoption of rules as such.

Mr. CASE. That was in 1789?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I have the Journal here.

Mr. CASE. At any time since then, at the opening of a new Congress, has the precedent been established for adoption of a total body of rules?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. When?

Mr. ANDERSON. In 1917.

Senator Walsh presented his motion and it was followed by a motion by Senator Warren for a modification of rule XXII to provide cloture. I say that today we could adopt all the old rules, plus a modification of rule XXII, and get along very well.

Mr. CASE. I am assuming that it would be within the power of the Senate, if the Senate adopted a total set of rules at the beginning of a session. On the Senator's own statement, that has happened only once in the entire life of the Republic. It seems to me that clearly the practice is that it is not necessary to adopt rules at the beginning of a Congress, and it has been the established precedent of the Senate that the rules continue in force from one Congress to another.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall eventually deal with the subject of how many times there has been a complete revision of the rules. There have been complete revisions though not on the first day of a new Congress. The question has been referred to a committee which would report new rules. We have a peculiar situation here. If we adopt no rules, we could be confronted with a filibuster which could last until Washington's birthday anniversary.

Mr. President, we are not confronted with theories, but with facts. There is not a Senator who does not know that if we let the pending motion go by the board there will perhaps never be another opportunity to amend the rules of the Senate. They will be here for another 50 years before there is any effort to modify them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In 1917 was the action taken by unanimous consent?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was taken by a yea-and-nay vote. Senators Gronna, La Follette, and Sherman voted "nay." Warren Harding voted "yea," as did other Senators.

This was not done by Senators who felt that the Senate was a continuing body——

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would be willing to argue that the Senate is a continuing body.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I would not care to admit it is a continuing body, because having read what Senator Walsh and many others said about it not being a continuing body, I think we should consider both sides of the question. I am willing to be exposed to the light on that point. But the question whether it is or is not a continuing body does not in the slightest change the possibility that the Senate in the first few days of a new Congress can adopt rules for its guidance.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the Senator from New Mexico has really answered my question.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I was trying to get at, that we can adopt rules now without getting into the question of the Senate's being a continuing body.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I understood the Senator to say that a total body of rules was adopted in 1917 on the motion of Senator Walsh, but in looking into the matter a bit I understand that what actually happened was that Senator Walsh offered a resolution dealing with the total body of rules, but that it was referred to a committee, and that all that was adopted at that time was a rule then under discussion. There was no reaffirmation of the total body of rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will read all the debate carefully, he will find that Senator Walsh said he was not striking at any portion of the rules except rule XXII. Why should he come before the Senate and fight when victory was handed him on a silver platter?

Consider what the House of Representatives does, as it did the other day. It met in a few minutes and adopted new rules for the Eighty-third Congress, which appear from pages 15 to 24, inclusive, of the RECORD of January 3. After perhaps a minute and a half of colloquy the rules were adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Surely the Senator must admit he is wrong in saying that a whole set of rules was adopted in 1917. What happened is perfectly clear. Senator Walsh presented a resolution, somewhat like that of the Senator from New Mexico. It was referred to a committee, and never reported. On March 8, 1917, Senator Martin, of Virginia, submitted a resolution and asked for its immediate consideration. It was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 76 to 3, and became rule XXII. In other words, what Senator Martin did was to submit a resolution amending the rules in accordance with the rules of the Senate, and by adopting that method of amendment, the Senate reaffirmed its belief that those rules, existed. How could the Senate amend rule XXII if rule XXII was not in existence?

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator Walsh insisted that there must be a cloture rule, and he intended to submit new rules embracing a cloture rule, but a cloture rule was brought forward voluntarily, and he naturally did not present what he had in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Naturally. He persuaded the Senate to act under the rules. That is no precedent for saying there were no rules. He abandoned his claim that the Senate did not have any rules.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with reference to the House of Representatives, both the Senator from New Mexico and myself had the privilege of serving in the House a number of terms, and what he says is true, that the House does adopt a new set of rules at the opening of each Congress. But there is this distinction, and he will find it in the very RECORD before him, that when the House of Representatives meets at the beginning of a new Congress, it is called to order by the Clerk of the House, who calls the roll of the States. There is no House of Representatives in being until after the Clerk has called the names, and the certificates of election have been presented. Then the House proceeds to organize by the election of a Speaker. But when the Senate met on Saturday for the first session of the Eighty-third Congress, the Senate was called to order by the Vice President as the continuing officer of a continuing body. The rules of the House provide for quite different action. The House does adopt a new set of rules. They do start from scratch, and elect a Speaker.

Mr. ANDERSON. My point is that adopting rules at the beginning of a session is no great task. The House does it each time it meets at the beginning of a new Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that what the Senate did on the 7th and 8th of March 1917, was to make the change in rule XXII which Senator Walsh urged? Is it not also true that this change would not have been made had not Senator Walsh presented his original resolution for the adoption of Senate rules as a whole, except rule XXII, and for a committee to draft a substitute for that rule, and that this resolution was based upon the theory clearly set forth by Senator Walsh that the Senate had the power to adopt new rules under general parliamentary law at the very beginning of the new Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe there is any question in the world about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not further true that the provision of general parliamentary law was that the previous question could be moved, and that debate could thereby be cut off?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that after Senator Walsh spoke on the 7th of March the opposition collapsed, and then a substitute was presented providing what Senator Walsh was trying to accomplish, namely, that there should be a rule for cloture?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that while there was no formal rule or decision dealing with the Walsh motion, it was not overruled, and the result he was seeking to accomplish was attained, because the objectors had hanging over their heads general parliamentary law, under which the previous question could be moved to shut off debate. Was not that the situation?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. To carry that point one step further, is it not a fact that the action taken at that time was in effect the adoption and approval of rules for the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question with me is whether or not the rule book itself does not indicate that the rules were not readopted in 1917. If the Senator will look on page 11, and almost all the other pages, in the footnotes he will find dates much earlier, respecting rules and amendments to rules, indicating that they were not adopted in 1917.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct. I have said they would have been adopted if the objectors had not surrendered on the question of cloture.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that what was adopted on March 8, 1917, was an amendment to an existing rule?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. So the Senate did have rules when it adopted the amendment, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Some have regarded the effort now being made as one solely dealing with the question of civil rights, while there are many Senators who have questions to present different from those affecting civil rights.

I recall distinctly the effort we made to have hearings and discussions regarding Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. I could not help noticing in the press the statement that yesterday four Senators, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], went to New York to meet with the President-elect and to discuss with him the possibility of statehood for Hawaii. They conferred with General Eisenhower, I presume in the hope that they could work out a program to bring about statehood for Hawaii. The best way to bring about statehood for Hawaii is to make possible a rule which will make possible a vote on statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator mean to say that we did not debate statehood for Alaska on the Senate floor last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not mean to say that.

Mr. SMATHERS. And is it not true that it was finally decided, by a majority of one, to recommit the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true. We considered the cases of both Alaska and Hawaii. We debated the questions inside the committee at great length in the Eighty-first Congress, and we tried very hard to bring the Alaskan and the Hawaiian statehood bills to the floor of the Senate at the end of the session in 1950. Everybody was assured that those bills would have a chance to get to the floor of the Senate. They were brought to the floor of the Senate on November 27, but they had to be laid aside when a filibuster was undertaken against them.

On November 28, 1950, Senator O'Mahoney said:

> What I am emphasizing now, Mr. President, is one simple statement, namely, that the Senate will presently have to decide, either openly or indirectly, whether it is going to meet the question of statehood by a direct vote or whether Members of the Senate desire to exercise their right—which is their right under the rule—to defeat statehood by irrelevant talk about other measures.

After the filibuster was over we laid aside the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. We tried to bring it up in the next Congress.

I have heard a great deal to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body. On February 27, 1952, we brought up the Alaska statehood bill, which we hoped would be followed by the Hawaii statehood bill. At that time the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] rose and said:

> Would not the Senator from New York agree that new members of a committee who have been appointed to the committee for the first time and know nothing about the bill should have the privilege of attending public hearings if they ask that public hearings be held on the subject? Should not they be recognized as Senators and entitled to a hearing on these questions?

What about the new Members who have so recently come into the Congress? We are trying to present rules to them. Should not they be considered as Senators and should not they have the right to a voice in determining what those rules should be? Should there not be a hearing on all aspects of the rules, and should not the Senate decide, by majority vote, what its rules for this Congress shall be?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am trying to get clear in my mind what the Senator and his associates are trying to do. I read from page 11 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday last. The Senator from New Mexico said:

> I now move that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

Is it the contention of the Senator from New Mexico that we are taking up the question of amending existing rules; or is he contending that we are operating without rules at the present time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am contending that we are operating without rules at the present time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then I should like to ask one additional question of the distinguished Senator. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday:

> The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.
>
> ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

Is it the contention of the Senator and his associates that on Saturday the Senate proceeded without rules and that up to the present time it has been proceeding without rules?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been proceeding under general parliamentary rules. The things which happened on Saturday happened under the Constitution.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under what rule did the Senator obtain recognition from the present occupant of the chair?

Mr. ANDERSON. Under general parliamentary procedure.

Mr. GILLETTE. When did this unorganized group, whether it has been operating under Robert's Rules of Order or any other rules of order, proceed, under such rules of order to the selection of a temporary chairman and temporary officers, and then the selection of permanent officers? If it is the contention of the Senator and his group that we are operating without rules at the present time, the Senator occupying the Chair in such a distinguished manner has no right there. The Senator who is now speaking has no right to recognition until there has been effected an organization of an unorganized group.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator should realize that there are certain obligations placed on this assemblage by the Constitution of the United States. It shall meet. It shall elect a presiding officer. It shall elect a clerk. It shall do various other things. Then the Constitution says that it may adopt rules. Under the provision that it may adopt rules, we have been trying to get the Senate to adopt rules. Every parliamentary authority I have consulted agrees that that is the proper way to proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order that we may be of some help in clarifying the point, the Vice President ruled on the very issue which the Senator from Iowa is now bringing to our attention. On page 10 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Saturday last, the Vice President, in response to a question by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], had this to say:

> The organization of the Senate is an inherent right of the Senate, as it is of any sovereign body, and all that has taken place up to date has been under that inherent right.

In other words, the Vice President was pointing out that under the provisions of the Constitution, the Senate of the United States is entitled to organize itself, and entitled to proceed with those responsibilities which are outlined in the Constitution, until it reaches the point of transaction of business under rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I am not going to try to refine or improve upon the rulings of the Vice President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not ask the Senator to refine or improve upon them. I merely wish to make an observation with respect to them. I did not do so yesterday, although I once thought I would. However, the ruling of the Vice President has been pointed out to the Senate as a precedent. Therefore I feel that I am bound by my duty to mention it.

There are two schools of thought in this country. There are those who believe in inherent rights and inherent powers, and there are those who believe in the written law. I am one of those who believe in the written law. I do not challenge the right of the distinguished Vice President to believe in inherent powers. I remember that he publicly stated that he believed in the inherent power of the President of the United States to seize property without due process of law. I did not agree with that view.

I believe in the Constitution. The Constitution provides that property shall not be seized without due process. When anyone talks to me about inherent rights and inherent powers, I am frightened for the future of this Republic. If the Republic ever falls, it will be because we are seduced and enticed by the argument of inherent rights and inherent powers. This is a government of law, and not a government of men.

Much as I respect the Vice President of the United States, I am not willing to submit to him the question of the inherent rights of the Senate when we have written rules of the Senate which have been adopted by this body over a long period of time.

I make this observation merely because the Senator from Minnesota, who is an ardent champion of inherent powers in the Senate, is relying on the inherent rights of the Senate, when we have rules for our guidance which have enabled the Senate of the United States to serve well the people of the Republic over a period of 163 years.

I could not sit quietly here and have it stated that we were relying on inherent rights or inherent powers, because I am one of those who subscribe to the doctrine that in this Republic we have a government of law, a government of rules, not a government of inherent powers or inherent rights.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is talking about the written law, and his opposition to the doctrine of inherent rights. It seems to me, as I have listened to this debate this afternoon up to this point, that the whole thesis of those who are opposing our motion is that for 168 years we have acquiesced—supinely, if you will—in the continuation of rules adopted back in 1789.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Constitution is 2 years older than that; and I still believe in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. So do I, just as does the Senator from Georgia. The Constitution of the United States distinctly states that each House shall have authority to adopt its own rules.

It is claimed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and others that merely because the Senate of the United States has acquiesced in the acceptance, year after year, term after term, session after session, and Congress after Congress, in rules adopted in 1789, we are bound today by such acquiescence. If that is not the operation of inherent authority, I do not know what it is. That is not the written law. The written law definitely states that each House is the judge of the qualifications of its own Members, and shall adopt its own rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. But each House adopts its rules in the manner prescribed by law, not under any inherent rights. I shall continue to maintain that our Government is a government of rules, of law, and of order, and not a government of men.

Mr. ANDERSON. On the question of changing a rule of the Senate by law, I should like to ask Senators to point to the section in the rules which permits the Senate to suspend a rule by a two-thirds vote. There is nothing in the rules to the effect that it shall be done in that way. However, we do it all the time. We do it not by any written law, but by certain traditions which have been established in the Senate. We have not always based our proceedings on written law, and no one knows that fact better than Senators who have served only a short time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not interrupt the Senator from New Mexico again. However, in view of the remarks made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I believe some reply should be made to what he has said. He stated that I believe in the doctrine of inherent powers and inherent rights. That is not a correct statement. The Senator from Minnesota is a believer in the doctrine of powers under the Constitution of the United States. Although I recognize the knowledge and wisdom of the Senator from Georgia, I venture to say that he, too, is a believer in the powers that are derived from the Constitution of the United States, and that he would be the last man on the floor of the Senate who would for a moment state that every detail of legislative authority and executive authority is to be found in the Constitution.

The Senator from Georgia served as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and as such he supported the hand of the President of the United States in sending troops overseas without a declaration of war. I, too, voted in favor of such action. I did so because the action flowed from executive power, without regard to precise language in the Constitution.

Mr. President, let me say that there is not one article in the Constitution which is any more specific than article I, section 5, which pertains to the rules of the two Houses. There is no double talk contained in it. The article says that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

That is exactly what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] contends, namely, that the Senate may adopt rules to govern its proceedings. Whether the Senate will do so is now the question before us. The Senator from New Mexico moves that we proceed to consider the adoption of Senate rules. What the Vice President may say about inherent powers is his responsibility.

I may say that the Senator from Minnesota did not talk about inherent powers. He said to the Senator from Iowa and said on this floor that the powers which we exercised as of Saturday last were powers which are prescribed by the Constitution. They are all contained in the Constitution. As of this hour we have adopted no rules. We are proceeding in the same manner in which the First Congress of the United States proceeded, namely, under the Constitution, which prescribes that the Senate shall engage in transacting legislative business. That is where Congress started in 1789. We are proceeding in the same tradition, within the same framework, and under the same article and section of the Constitution. I suggest that no Senator in this body knows that better than does my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who knows the Constitution, and knows particularly the procedural rules which have been adopted under the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know the Constitution, but I do not know of any constitution which authorizes the taking of any such action as is proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. I did not bring up the question of inherent powers. It did not originate with me.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia must recognize the fact that when the Constitution states that each House shall determine the rules of its procedure, it is not unconstitutional to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not if we do it under proper rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. In accordance with law, I would suggest to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the law? It is the Constitution. The Senator from New Mexico takes the position that the Senate has no rule or law, and should proceed according to his own view.

The question was presented once before to the Senate. Former Senator Walsh made a speech on it in 1917. I have read his speech. It is a great speech. Former Senator Thomas of Colorado supported the stand taken by former Senator Walsh. However, if the Senator will read the RECORD, he will note that former Senator Thomas recanted his previous position and stated that the precedents showed the Senate to be a continuing body. If it is a continuing body, we do not need to proceed to adopt rules, because we already have rules.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to address my question to the Senator from Georgia. He asked, "What is the law of the Senate?"

I suggest that the law of the Senate is the same as the law of the Medes and Persians. We cannot change them.

Mr. RUSSELL. The rules have been changed hundreds of times. If the Senator from New Hampshire will read the RECORD he will note that the rules have been changed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course the situation in which we find ourselves is that expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. The rules are established; they have been laid down, and they cannot be changed except by unanimous consent. If there were a method of getting the question before a court of the land, it could be determined. The question to be determined by the court would then be whether each Congress has the right to establish its own rules, unfettered by previous Congresses.

I suggest that the situation confronting us should receive the sympathetic consideration of Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

In an article appearing in the New York Times of August 13, 1952, there appeared an interview with Gen. Dwight D.

Eisenhower, then the Republican candidate for President. It reads:

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Republican candidate for President, was quoted yesterday by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., chairman of his campaign advisory committee, as favoring a curb on Senate filibusters, which have been used in the past to block congressional action on civil-rights legislation.

Senator Lodge said the General had told him at their conference that he felt "very strongly in favor of curbing the filibuster and of taking every measure practicable to support a program for civil rights—one that will not defeat itself."

That article, Mr. President, indicates to the Republicans what they can do now. If they are serious they had better do it now. Once the rules have been laid down the Senate will go ahead under the rules and we will be told that we cannot change them except by unanimous consent, because they are the law.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that if at any time the Vice President should hold that the rules mean something different than what some of us think they mean, and a majority of the Senators should uphold the view of the Vice President, we would in that way effect a change in the rules.

Therefore it seems to me that there are many ways in which it could be accomplished. For example, it could be done by means of a ruling by the Chair. Any time a majority wants to undertake to change the rules other than by the normal process or by the recognized process, they can accomplish their purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that no Senator would be able to get a ruling from the Chair during the course of the debate. While debate is in progress it is impossible to appeal from the decision of the Chair. The debate could go on forever and run into an endless filibuster. There would be no possibility of getting a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator know that any appeal from a ruling of the Chair is subject to a motion to table, and that any Senator may obtain recognition to make such a motion, which motion is not debatable?

Mr. ANDERSON. But it is impossible to get a ruling from the Chair during the course of a filibuster.

I refer now to the Republican brief, which states that there is no judicial precedent invalidating a rule of either the Senate or of the House. The Supreme Court has pointed out that fact. I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court is significant, for in it we are told that neither House may "by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there must be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of the proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained."

The result which is sought to be attained is the making of an amendment to the rule. Under the present rule that cannot possibly be done. That is why I say that if rule XXII ever got before the Supreme Court of the United States, in view of the position on which it is predicated the Court would throw it out very quickly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield? I did not quite understand him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say that if rule XXII ever got to the Supreme Court of the United States, it would throw out the rule, under the Republican brief.

Mr. TAFT. First, let me say that the brief is not a Republican brief; it is a brief which was prepared for the use of both sides, and it was prepared before Congress returned to Washington.

However, do I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that rule XXII contains something which the Supreme Court would say is not possible?

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that a person who is not a lawyer should not discuss the law, but it seems to me that a rule which seeks to provide for amendment of the rules and then provides a formula to the effect that no one can amend them defeats its own purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest that the Constitution of the United States does exactly the same thing; it says that it cannot be amended in certain respects. So the precedent is there, and thus it is not unconstitutional to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Constitution provides a method for its own amendment.

Mr. TAFT. But not in all respects, for in the Constitution it is provided that no amendment can be made with respect to the number of Senators to serve from each State. In other words, there must be two Senators from each State, under the Constitution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Constitution provides that never, under any circumstances, can that provision be changed. So does the Senator from New Mexico think that is an unconstitutional provision of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator from New Mexico read, in the cited Supreme Court decision, the reference to the Senate, as it appeared in the opinion in the case of McGrain against Daugherty?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I did not.

Mr. TAFT. It read as follows:

The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives whose Members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it cannot well be the same with the Senate, which is a continuing body whose Members are elected for a term of 6 years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation.

In other words, the Supreme Court accepts the general theory that the Senate is a continuing body.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the very point I was trying to make earlier. I was afraid that this debate would be confined to the question of whether the Senate is or is not a continuing body. I should like to have the debate confined to the question of whether the Senate can or cannot make its own rules and whether new Senators entering this body have a right to participate in the making of those rules, or whether they must have shoved down their throats everything that has been decided before their service here.

At the present time there are 14 new Members of this body. I should like it to be possible for them to have a voice in deciding this question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from New Mexico know of anything whatsoever in the rules that would prevent any of the new Senators who have just been sworn in from offering an amendment to any of the rules?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; they can offer amendments until they are blue in the face, but they will never succeed in having the Senate adopt an amendment which touches the question of cloture. An amendment to any other rule will be all right, no doubt; but if any one of the new Members should offer an amendment touching the question of cloture, he would be in a hopeless position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that the last time a Member of the Senate attempted to have the Senate amend rule XXII, the proposed amendment did come to the floor of the Senate, and it was debated at some length, and a new rule was adopted. So when the Senator from New Mexico throws up his hands and says, "This is the only way to do it," he is not supported by the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the new rule was stronger than the one which preceded it, and the new rule tied the Senate's hands tighter than they had been tied before.

Mr. RUSSELL. But is not the Senator from New Mexico claiming that the Senate did not have a chance to adopt a change in the rule at that time? Nevertheless, the Senate did adopt a change.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the point is that the new rule included paragraph 3 which really requires unanimous consent to change the rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in paragraph 3 that has not obtained in the Senate since the first day the Senate assembled.

Mr. ANDERSON. Paragraph 3 says, in effect, that there may be unlimited debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON. But in 1917 many Senators thought they had plugged that loophole by the adoption of a cloture rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I challenge that statement, for the original rule referred to "any issue," but when the new rule finally came to the floor it referred to "any measure," thereby limiting the application of the rule to measures.

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator Walsh had gotten out of town.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think he had left here.

Mr. ANDERSON. He was not in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not charge him with any dereliction of duty if he had left town, for he was a great American.

Mr. ANDERSON. And he brought the first cloture rule to the Senate.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from New Mexico was a Member of this body when the present cloture rule was adopted. One night about 11 o'clock, after 4 or 6 weeks of filibuster, the present cloture rule was adopted simply in order to proceed with the business of the Senate. Senators who did not favor the new cloture rule were simply beaten by a filibuster, which is what the present Senator from New Mexico is attempting to prevent in the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; and I say to the Senator from Wyoming, who was loyally trying to help out, that he voted one way and I voted the other way on the question of the adoption of that new rule, but I still rejoice that I voted against the adoption of that rule.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to refer to the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who very happily, so far as I am concerned, said that he will submit a resolution with reference to the cloture rule.

Without attempting to pass any judgment on the merits of that resolution, let me say that the Senator from Indiana has suggested that such a resolution will be forthcoming.

If the Senate is in all circumstances the continuing body which the Senator from Georgia has argued it is, I am interested in finding out why we have to have a new resolution on these matters. Furthermore, why is it necessary to have new bills with each new session? Many of the bills at a new session were on the calendar at the preceding session. Of course, I know that the answer is that at the conclusion of a Congress the calendar is extinguished.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not my answer. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota can give his.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The answer is that the Congress of the United States completes its business when it adjourns sine die. However, there is nothing in the Constitution that so provides. As a matter of fact, in the early days of this Republic there was continuing legislation; but by rule of the Senate and by rule of the House of Representatives continuing legislation was stopped.

What I am driving at is that the "continuing body" issue is but one of the many facets of this argument. The Senate may be a continuing body, in terms of an institution, in terms of its membership; but the question is, what does it continue, when is it continuing, in terms of its actions; when is it continuing, in terms of its legislative program; when is it continuing, in terms of its procedures? In some aspects it may continue; in other aspects it is not continuing.

I say to the Senator from New Mexico that he has clearly defined the issue before this body, rather than to be drawn into debate in the unknown field of the theory of a "continuing body," on which there is no rule, on which there is no Supreme Court decision, notwithstanding the decision in the case of McGrain against Daugherty as the Senator from New Mexico has said most pertinently, within the framework of the Constitution and the legislation of every legislative body in the history of this Republic. In short, the Senator from New Mexico has clearly stated the issue before us when he has said that it is whether the Senate shall adopt its rules before it proceeds with its business.

I submit that is the only issue. To those who take issue with me I submit that there are dozens of Supreme Court decisions and a multitude of State court decisions which hold that a legislative body is an entity unto itself at each legislative session. I submit with equal candor and vigor that there is not, and never has been, a Member of the Senate who can produce evidence to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body in terms of the actions of the body on the rules which govern its proceedings.

Obiter dicta in court decisions are not sufficient to prove the point, which is exactly what were presented in the Republican brief, namely, dicta in a court opinion, where the court posed a question for its own edification, although the question was not relevant to the case before it. Such obiter dicta are not probative or binding; they are simply so much verbiage. They take on substance only when later they become parts of a court case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not take issue with many of the points raised by the Senator from New Mexico, except in the case of the challenge he issued to any Senator to point out one instance under the rules where the Senate is a continuing body. I wish to meet that challenge by reading paragraph (2) of rule XXV, on page 40 of the Senate Manual:

> (2) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

We are now in a new Congress, but under that Senate rule we have the same committee set-up that we had before until the Senate, by affirmative action, changes that arrangement. Section II of rule XXV continues it. That is certainly one instance the Senator has challenged anyone to produce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my distinguished friend from Georgia that I hope I did not state what he said I stated, and if I did, I shall correct the RECORD. What I was saying was that without express deliberation and decision on the part of the Congress the Senator can produce not one scintilla of court decision or evidence to prove that the Senate is a continuing body. He has relied upon the doctrine of inherent right. He has relied upon the doctrine of a political Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. RUSSELL. Who has?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator calls the rules of the Senate an Alice in Wonderland. That is what the Senator has said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are available, in bound volumes for our guidance. There is no Alice in Wonderland about them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am amazed at the argument made by the Senator from Georgia. At the end of the session, of course, all bills become dead.

Reference has been made to treaties, and even as to treaties, while they are placed in the custody of the clerk of the Senate, all work on them, their consideration must start de novo.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may interrupt the Senator to say that appointments also come in that category.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate the correction. It is very helpful, because those are very important things. So far as I can see, there is nothing which connects one Congress, so far as the Senate is concerned, with another Congress, except that the Presiding Officer continues the same, if he happens to be the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Constitution says that the Senators are elected by classes, one-third of the membership constituting a new class at the beginning of a new Congress. Every Senator is a member of one of those classes. This is clearly designed to carry over at all times 64 Senators, so as to provide a quorum for the purpose of transacting business, and that is the provision of the Constitution of the United States. The expiration of treaties and the lapse of executive appointments and of all measures on the calendar, result from affirmative action of the Senate. Why was that action taken? It was taken in order that those who come into the Senate, representing an infusion of new blood every 2 years, when one-third of the Members of the Senate are elected, may have an opportunity to attend the committee hearings, to familiarize themselves with measures proposed, and to enable the Senate, in its consideration de novo of those measures, to hold new hearings, in order to get the benefit of changes which may have occurred in the lapse of time. It is done to protect the Senate. It is done under the power of the Senate as a continuing body under its rules, and it is done in the same manner in which we require rules of the Senate to be changed by resolution duly referred to a committee, to protect the integrity of the committee system, on which all our legislation is built. It comes as a result of the Senate's action, not in the way of rebuttal to any idea of the Senate's being a continuing body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from New York, but I was about to say that, for personal reasons, I am going to have to proceed, then for a while, without yielding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from New Mexico does not leave me at a disadvantage in this controversy. He cut me off a few minutes ago, when the Senator from Minnesota had been speaking. He said he was going to yield no further, and I took my seat. If the Senator from New Mexico intends to yield to one Senator, it seems to me that, even under Robert's Rules of Order, he should, in justice, yield to all Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry the Senator puts this debate on the basis of Robert's Rules of Order. I think the Senator might rely upon my conscience to prompt me to be fair to all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that is so, and I appeal to the Senator from New Mexico on that ground.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Georgia has referred to the fact that the reason the Senate has provided in its rules for a discontinuance of the work of committees, the lapse of appointments, and the lapse of bills on the calendar is so that new facts may be brought forth, and the new Senators may be brought up to date. I agree with that. I believe it is sound. But why should he refuse to recognize the same principal in considering the rules? Sixteen new Senators have been sworn in this year, none of whom had any voice in the writing of the rules. Why should I, as a matter of fact, who have been in the Senate since 1949, and who am now in my fourth year, not have a voice in the drafting of the rules of the Senate, merely because those great men, the founding fathers, in 1789 adopted certain rules, according to their wisdom? They were very wise. They did it as a matter of patriotism. But certainly I do not think we are going to be willing to acknowledge—I do not think any man should be willing to acknowledge—that rules adopted in 1789 should be binding on the Senate of the United States in 1953, 163 years later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to permit me to reply to the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The point made by the Senator from New York indicates where he and I disagree. I submit the rules are binding until they are changed in the manner provided therein for their change, just as any law is binding until it is changed by a succeeding Congress.

Mr. President, no new Member of the Senate is put at a disadvantage in this matter. Every new Member of the Senate has exactly the same right possessed by our distinguished colleague, who is a senior member of this body, in dealing with changes in the rules. He cannot change the rules, he would not undertake to do so, in this bizarre and fantastic fashion; but he has a right as a Senator of the United States, as does every other one of the 95 Members of this body, to offer a resolution in the manner prescribed by the rules for their change; and the rules have been frequently changed. This is merely an attempt to short cut the rules of the Senate, and I submit that it falls in the face of the argument that the Senate is a continuing body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me that the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, while highly interesting and diverting, would be rather academic unless it were tied to some specific thing; and, judging from what the Senator has said, I suppose the burden of the argument will be that there ought to be an opportunity to amend the rules—and we are thinking only of rule XXII—because of some inaction of the Senate in other days. The Senator from New Mexico has mentioned Alaska and statehood for Hawaii. I make the suggestion that this is the first time in 20 years that the Republican Party has been in charge of both the executive branch and both Houses of the legislative branch. I am sure that I, for one, appreciate the solicitude of the minority, because I was a minority Member for nearly 20 years on Capitol Hill, and I exercised a most encompassing solicitude for the majority, by reason of their mistakes and their excesses. Now, why not let us make a few mistakes for a little while, to see what we can do to express and articulate the pledges we have made in the Republican platform? If we fail on statehood for Hawaii, if we fail on statehood for Alaska, if we fail to do something in the field of civil rights, then we can readily understand why the Senator would want a change in rules. But let us make the first failure. This is our first chance in 20 years.

There is no great, overwhelming sentiment on this side of the aisle for a change in the rules. In our Republican conference recently there were very few dissenting votes that I could hear to the course there proposed. We are quite content to operate under the existing rules of the Senate. We appreciate the Senator's almost boundless solicitude for our political welfare in the days ahead, but we much prefer to have a chance under the existing rules of the Senate, and if we fail we shall be the first to confess our sins of omission and commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to remind the Senator from New Mexico that he can yield only for questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is aware of the fact that the Republican slogan was not "We want a chance," but "We want a change."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Democrats had 20 years, and they failed. Give us a chance now. That is only a sporting proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we were told a moment ago that the effort to change the rule was bizarre and fantastic. I picked up a newspaper a few days ago and found in it an item which stated that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had denounced the proposed rule change as "goon squad" tactics. It is very difficult to come up with a proposition of this nature in good faith and then be accused of "goon squad" tactics.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not refer to the Senator from New Mexico as practicing any "goon squad" tactics. I was interviewed in Atlanta on this question, and I stated that I had read the testimony of Mr. Walter Reuther in which he suggested his method of changing the rules, and I said that merely walking in and demanding that the rules be changed to suit his fancy partook of "goon squad" tactics. That is what I said. Mr. Reuther said that he would just put the rule through. That would suggest "goon squad" tactics.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the Senator's explanation.

Why are we concerned when some persons say to us that we cannot succeed in this effort? I have read three or four newspaper stories as to what the possibility of the adoption of this motion may be, and it is said that it will be defeated 3 to 1 or 4 to 1 or whatever figures happen to come to mind. I have no way of knowing. I do not intend to poll the Senate to find out how any Senator will vote. We cannot always tell the ultimate fate of issues by the number of votes they receive or whether there will even be a yea-and-nay vote on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, as school children and as young people we have all read, I think, the Webster-Hayne debate which began over a simple resolution regarding the sale of public lands. Hayne and Webster got into a great discussion that involved State versus Federal rights, and when it was all over the original resolution was entirely forgotten. This original motion may be entirely forgotten; I am not sure about that. But if new Members of the Senate do not have the right to participate in the formulation of Senate rules or are not able to bring about changes in them by action on the floor of the Senate, the effort to change the Senate rules will go on expanding and become more intensified as the years go by.

A great many changes have taken place in the past 163 years. Let us consider some of the traditions of the Senate. I have been reading the first Journal of the Senate, and I found that back in the period when the rules which we now have were adopted, there was a discussion about Indian treaties, and General Washington himself came to the Senate and took his seat beside the Vice President. He brought with him General Knox, his Secretary of State, and presented the treaties to the Senate. The Senate wanted to refer them to a committee, but General Washington objected and said he came there to get advice and consent and insisted that he have it at once. It happened that those Indian treaties dealt with situations which concerned the State of Georgia.

Can anyone imagine what would happen if the President of the United States should come today to the Senate, accompanied by his Secretary of State, and submit treaties relating to the State of Georgia and tell the Senate that he wanted immediate action? I know of

two Senators who would be on their feet very promptly and very properly.

We have changed our conception of things as we have gone along. A great deal of time was spent in deciding whether the President of the United States had a right to see anyone who came to see him. The Senate decided how many parties the President could attend, and whether he should be seen in public, or be like a Lama and appear once a year, because Senators were his counselors and advisers. We have changed and altered things as we have gone along.

I do not think the idea of adopting rules at the beginning of a new Congress, Mr. President, originated with Mr. Walter Reuther, because Senator Thomas, of Colorado, on March 6, 1917, expressed it as his opinion that the Senate did not have rules. I do not think he knew Walter Reuther at that time. Walter Reuther was a boy 9 years of age, and I doubt that he communicated with Senator Thomas.

Mr. Vardaman, of Mississippi, got into the discussion in 1917, as did John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. Senator Williams said:

If the President is dissatisfied with Congress, the President has never said so. The President, on the contrary, said he was very highly satisfied with the action of the House of Representatives, which is one branch of Congress, and that he was very highly satisfied with the demonstration of the purpose of seventy-odd Senators, constituting seven-eighths of the other branch of Congress. He merely expressed dissatisfaction with the conduct of 11 or 12 men who refused to permit the Senate of the United States to vote.

Eleven or twelve men? One or two men can prevent the Senate of the United States from voting on a change in its rules.

I shall not go on with endless illustrations of how Senators in those days felt.

Senator Kenyon said:

I am not disagreeing with the Senator as to the desirability of a change in the rules. I have been in favor of that ever since I have been in the Senate. It is a question of leaving reasonable debate for the Senate, and not going too far in restricting the same.

Senator Walsh finally stated:

I assert, Mr. President, that the question as to whether the rules live from one Congress to another, has never been directly considered by this body, although many times incidentally it has been asserted that the Senate is a continuing body.

I find nothing to indicate that there has ever been a decision to that effect.

When he opened that great discussion on March 7, 1917, Senator Walsh had done a great job of research and study. He raised this question:

Are the rules under which the Senate operated during the last session of Congress now effective, or is the Senate governed by the general parliamentary law until rules are adopted, and is it in order to move to fix a time when the Senate shall take a vote on a pending question or to move the previous question with a view to closing debate even on a motion to amend the rules?

Senator Walsh proceeded with a discussion which might profitably be read by Members of the Senate. He pointed out that a rule of the House had come in, reading:

These rules shall be the rules of the Senate and succeeding Congresses until otherwise ordered.

That could not last, because it was a continuing declaration. Some persons may recall that there were joint rules of the Senate and the House. They stood for 80 years and no one questioned that they were continuing. Then someone raised the question one day as to whether the joint rules were continuing, and they fell like a house of paper because they were not continuing at all.

I believe, Mr. President, that the whole matter of the consideration of the rules of the Senate deserves to be brought to the attention of the Senate on the first few days of every Congress. I believe that only in that way is there a possibility that new Members shall have a right to participate in the formulation of the rules.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point some comments which Charles Dawes made with reference to the principal objections to the Senate rules as they stood. He could not accomplish his purpose, but he tried very hard to do so.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Charles G. Dawes, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post of November 28, 1925, said:

"I will state the principal objections to the Senate rules as they stand:

"1. Under these rules individuals or minorities can at times block the majority in its constitutional duty and right of legislation. They are therefore enabled to demand from the majority modifications in legislation as the price which the majority must pay in order to proceed to the fulfillment of its constitutional duty. The right of filibuster does not affect simply legislation defeated but, in much greater degree, legislation passed, continually weaving into our laws, which should be framed in the public interest alone, modifications dictated by personal and sectional interest as distinguished from the public interest.

"2. The Senate is not and cannot be a properly deliberative body, giving due consideration to the passage of all laws, unless it allots its time for work according to the relative importance of its duties, as do all other great parliamentary bodies. It has, however, through the right of unlimited debate, surrendered to the whim and personal purposes of individuals and minorities its right to allot its own time. Only the establishment of majority cloture will enable the Senate to make itself a properly deliberative body. This is impossible when it must sit idly by and see time needed for deliberation frittered away in frivolous and irrelevant talk, indulged in by individuals and minorities for ulterior purposes.

"3. The rules subject the people of the United States to a governmental power in the hands of individuals and minorities never intended by the Constitution and subversive of majority rule under constitutional limitation. In the words of Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania:

"'The Senate, by sanctioning unlimited debate and by requiring a two-thirds vote to limit it, has in effect so amended the Constitution as to make it possible for a 33-percent minority to block legislation.'

"4. The present rules put into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President of the United States, and enabled them to compel the President to call an extra session of Congress in order to keep the machinery of Government itself in functioning activity. The reserved power of the States in the Constitution does not include the power of one of the States to elect a Senator who shall at times control a majority or even all the other States.

"5. Multiplicity of laws is one of the admitted evils from which this country is suffering today. The present rules create multiplicity of laws.

"6. The present rules are not only a departure from the principles of our constitutional Government but from the rules of conduct consistent therewith which governed the United States Senate for the first 17 years of its existence and which provided for majority cloture."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement by Charles S. Thomas, a former Senator from Colorado, concerning the fundamental vice of the right of unlimited debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fundamental vice of the right of unlimited debate is the power with which it clothes every Member of the Senate, a power that will inevitably be exercised and generally on critical occasions. The Member who can prevent ultimate action in matters of legislation may dictate the terms if he pleases whereby he will abstain from doing so. And if that Member's constituency is aware—as all of them are—that he has such power, he will be required to assert it for local benefits and private legislation which never could command favorable action on their merits. The practice necessarily grows by what it feeds on. Hence the countless amendments providing for special appropriations for persons and communities which disfigure practically all the general appropriation bills and which swell into the millions at every session. Hence the subordination of matters of national and even of international importance to those of domestic and sometimes of local or regional concern. It is by no means intended to convey the inference that all Senators do this, but a considerable number of them do so largely because they do not care to offend powerful influences by refusing to emphasize the outstanding fact. This evil more than counterbalances all the virtues that can be imagined of such a code, and fully explains why it is retained with such tenacity and defended with such vigor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, a former Republican leader of the House, writing in July, 1923, gave some instances in which he thought the Senate had acted improperly because of its rules. I should like to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The entire appropriation and legislative program of the recent session of Congress was considered in the Senate under a flag of truce in the intervals in which the managers of the Senate filibuster were pleased to make way for measures other than the shipping bill.

During this period the Senate passed on one occasion more than 100 bills in about the same number of minutes. There was not time to read even the titles in full. Quite a

number of these measures treated of matters of moment and involved heavy expenditures. Appropriation bills containing thousands of items were passed with the reading of only a few Senate amendments. Under the circumstances, this procedure could not be avoided; otherwise appropriation bills would have failed, and an extra session would have been inevitable. But the flag of truce was never utilized for the consideration of any measure to which there was serious objection on the part of the minority; and thus the filibuster directed against one measure operated to render impossible the proper consideration of all; and eventually prevented any action on a number of measures of importance in addition to the shipping bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Finally, because this struggle is nonpartisan, I should like to refer to a statement made by the late Senator Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, of whom a Massachusetts governor once said:

In breadth and clearness of mind, and in the statesmanlike quality, Senator Underwood would have been conspicuous in any Senate in our history.

I think the Senate might well have printed in the RECORD what the late Senator Underwood said about the Senate rules.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had served with your permission for 20 years in the House of Representatives. I had been the leader of that body; I was responsible for the legislative conduct of a great party; and I have gone to the conference table with Senate amendments on my bill, and convinced a conference—the representatives of the Senate in conference—that their amendments were wrong, and then they would calmly tell me they would not yield because a Senator So-and-So would talk the bill to death if I did not accept his amendment; and with great governmental issues at stake, I have been compelled to accept minor amendments to great bills that I will not say were graft, but they were put there for the purpose of magnifying the importance of one man with his own constituency, at the point of jeopardizing good legislation in America.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that many Senators desire to speak on the subject I have been discussing, and I do not intend to take their time longer, except to point out that Speaker Reed, in his manual, speaking of amendments to the rules of parliamentary bodies, said:

Such modifications the assembly is always competent to make. Such changes can be made by a majority. This is true even if the rules already adopted provide that two-thirds or any larger number alone shall make changes. The assembly cannot deprive itself of power to direct its method of doing business. It is like a man promising himself that he will not change his own mind.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not deprive itself of the right to determine how it shall conduct its own business. The adoption of a motion such as the one now pending, followed by submission of rules, would achieve that result.

I express the hope at this time that the Senate may adopt its rules for this Congress. It will aid its legislative program throughout the whole Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the proposition that the majority of the Senate—of this Senate—and the Senate of each new Congress has the right to adopt its own rules, at the beginning of the session. I hold this to be a constitutional right, clearly expressed in our basic law. Moreover, it is the inherent right of any democratic representative body.

The issue at this moment is not what type of cloture rule should govern the proceedings of the new Senate. I have supported a particular type of majority cloture rule with reasonable safeguards for debate; many of my colleagues have supported other modifications of rule 22. I will certainly accept any formula worked out by majority vote on this question, as long as the formula does not, by its own terms, seek to fix those terms on the United States Senate in perpetuity.

If it were not for the right of the Senate to adopt new rules at the beginning of a new Senate, rule 22, adopted in the Eighty-first Congress, would paralyze the right of the majority to modify the rules of the Senate to meet the needs of changing times and conditions. But this phase of the issue is not before us yet.

The issue at this moment—and it is a fundamental and profound one—is whether the Senate, at the beginning of the new Congress, has the right to adopt its own rules of proceedings, reflecting the will and wish of the clear majority of the Members of that body, as newly constituted.

It seems to me that the essence of the present question is very simple. There is no doubt, that up to now, the rules of the Senate have continued from one Congress to another without readoption. But who can deny the clear constitutional right to adopt new rules if a majority so desires? Perhaps that right was not exercised in the past; but that right was never surrendered. It could not be surrendered. That right is inalienable. The previous rules were agreed to by acquiescence; but this cannot constitute an obstacle to our assertion today of our right to adopt new rules, by majority vote.

The Supreme Court of the United States has made itself very clear on the right of the majority of the Senate to adopt rules. In the case of *U. S.* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 1, 5) the Court said:

The Constitution empowers each House to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights.

Again, the Court made itself perfectly clear on this point when it said in the case of *Newton* v. *Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning* (11 U. S. 548, 535):

Every succeeding Legislature possesses the same jurisdiction and power * * * as its predecessors. The latter have the same power of repeal and modification which the former had of enactment, neither more nor less. All occupy, in this respect, a footing of perfect equality. This must necessarily be so in the nature of things. It is vital to the public welfare that each one should be able at all times to do whatever the varying circumstances and present exigencies touching the subject involved may require. A different result would be fraught with evil.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I assume the Senator undoubtedly has most profound respect for the late President Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have very great respect for him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. On page 121 of his book, Constitutional Government in the United States, he says:

The fact that the Senate has kept its original rules of debate and procedure substantially unchanged, is very significant.

I ask the Senator from New York to note the statement, "has kept its original rules of debate."

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the volume, and I do not recall the entire book, although in all probability I have read it, because I have read most of the writings of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The statement seems to me to be very significant of the fact that the Senate has a body of rules.

Mr. LEHMAN. My recollection is that the statement just read by the Senator from Maryland is one sentence taken from a long chapter with regard to procedure in the Senate. I am not able to discuss that, because I am not familiar with the details of the book or the chapter.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The House of Representatives has kept its rules almost the same throughout the years. It readopts them at each new session, but they are pretty largely the same rules.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from New Mexico is pitching his argument on what the House has done and is in effect saying that the Senate, in turn, should do what the House has done. But the Senate is a body entirely different from the House. Its function is entirely different. The Senate acts more as counselors to the Government. The House is an efficient workshop. In the House legislation is enacted rapidly. Why? Because there is stern organization. I think the Senator will find that the House is so constituted that at times its Members are swallowed up in the organization and do not have freedom of speech. They do not have the right to bring before the people of the country the views of their great States they represent in the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall take up that question a little later in my discussion, but I wish to make it very clear to the Senator from Maryland that we are not advocating any particular formula under which cloture could be invoked. As I said a few moments ago, I have my own ideas; but others have different ideas.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not at the moment; later I shall be glad to yield.

The position of the proponents of the motion is that the Senate has the right

to adopt its own rules, which would make it possible to bring before the Senate as a whole, including the newly elected Senators, new proposals for rules which should be considered.

If a proposal made by me or by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Minnesota, the senior Senator from New York, the Senator from Oregon, or the Senator from Illinois, were not agreeable to the Senate when it was submitted to them, the Senate could reject it by majority vote, and we would have no complaint, of course. That could be done after a proposal had been made de novo to the Senate in connection with the adoption of rules, which the Senate as it exists today, not as it existed in 1789, could consider, and on which it could act.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have been carefully following the argument of the Senator. I may say to the Senator that I have not by any means made up my mind. I think I would probably vote for a liberalization of this rule. However, as I see the problem, we would not be a body today if we had not had rules under which new Senators could have been sworn in and the Senate could have been organized. We would have been a body of Senators less 32.

The membership of Members in this body is continuous. They remain Members of the Senate from one Congress to the next, with the exception of the new Senators who are elected every second year.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize very well that 64 Members continue in office by virtue of their election; but the 32 who must stand for election do not.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Those 64 Members can conduct the business of the Senate. If the Senate had no rule providing who should be sworn in and who should not be sworn in, we would not be able to act.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that there is, of course, no question that the Senate could function with only 64 Members if it had to. I agree that the Senate has the right to judge the qualifications of its Members. That right is provided for in the Constitution along with the right to adopt rules. But the swearing in of new Members is a procedure called for by the Constitution. We could not disregard that requirement. No rule is required to authorize it. The Constitution directs it. But when it comes to binding, under preexisting rules, not only those 32 Members who have just been elected, but also a very much larger number of Members who already occupy seats in this body who have never had a chance to vote on those rules, we come to a different question.

No present Member of the Senate had the opportunity to vote upon the adoption of all our present rules which were basically adopted in 1789. While I am not a young man, I do not go back to 1789.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As was pointed out earlier in the debate, there are many things in connection with our Government upon which none of us had the opportunity to pass. They are set by the Constitution, and certain of those things cannot be changed. I think it was pointed out that the composition of this very body is governed by the Constitution. We cannot change the composition of this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am encouraged to discuss this question at some length with the Senator from Maryland because he says that he has an open mind. I am still hopeful of convincing him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am asking these questions in order to develop the debate.

Mr. LEHMAN. The question of amendments to the Constitution is covered by the Constitution itself. The United States Senate cannot change that provision.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me conclude my observation.

The Constitution further provides that each House shall have the right to adopt its own rules. In advancing the present proposal we are acting definitely and distinctly under the authority given to us by the Constitution, and under the terms of the Constitution.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I will withhold further questions until later.

Mr. LEHMAN. To say that each new Senate does not have the right to adopt its own rules, de novo, is not only to fly in the face of the dictum of the Supreme Court, but it is also to violate basic principles of representative government. It is to give the past an unearned veto power over the actions of the present.

Perhaps the argument most frequently used to prove that the Senate is a continuing body with continuing rules is that two-thirds of its membership remains unchanged from one Congress to the next. Obviously, the continuance in office of 64 Senators does not mean that the Senate, as an organized body, continues beyond the expiration of the Congress of which the Senate is an integral part. That would be an impossible contradiction. When the Congress dies, the Senate, as an organized body, dies, too. It is revived, as the House is, on the 3d day of January, when the new Congress begins its term. The fact that 64 Senators remain in office provides a bridge of personal continuity. But that continuity has no relationship to the fact that at the end of the term of the whole Congress the whole Congress is finished, and that includes the rules of the Senate. In the interim the people have spoken at the congressional elections; and the popular decisions would be frustrated if both Houses of Congress did not have the right to carry out the people's will unfettered by rules from a previous Senate. The only restraint on the Houses of Congress in this regard is the Constitution.

A popular election may completely change the political complexion of the Senate, although only one-third of the seats are at stake. I need not remind my friend from Maryland that such a thing happened only last November. Now everything has changed in this body, or is about to change. Is this the same Senate which adjourned here last July?

We have a new majority leader, a new minority leader, and new officers. We shall have new committee chairmen. All these will have been elected by majority vote, in the process of organizing this body. All the bills considered in the last session are dead. All committee work must begin over again from the start, regardless of what progress was made in the previous Congress. Then why should the rules be exempt from this otherwise complete new beginning of a legislative life? To say that a popular mandate at election time is to be made ineffectual under the theory that the new Senate does not have the right to determine its own rules of procedure is to deny democracy and defy the will of the people. It is to threaten our national safety in a world which demands flexible and responsible government, ever sensitive to changing times and conditions.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not think the quotation which I shall read is out of context. President Woodrow Wilson wrote the following, on page 113 of his Treatise on Constitutional Government:

> For the Senate is as various as the country it represents. It represents the country, not the people; the country in its many diverse sections, not the population of the country, which tends to become uniform where it is concentrated.

The thought behind that statement is that the Senate is not to be swayed by elections, as masses of people would be swayed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I hesitate to debate what Woodrow Wilson has written. I do not know what else is in his book.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me finish my thought, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I cannot distinguish between the country and its people. I look upon a country as the people of the country. I cannot conceive that any country can be anything but the composite will, the composite thinking, and the composite philosophy of its people. I do not wish to undertake to analyze the quotation which the Senator has read, because I am sure there must be something else, which the Senator has not read.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is something else. I think President Wilson was talking about the composition of the Senate under the Constitution. The Senate represents the country. We do not represent or express in this body the views of the masses of population. We represent, rather, the idea of the individual State and the various sectional and diversified interests of the country. I believe that if the Senator will refer to this treatise, he will find that that is what President Wilson said. He stated that the principle to which I have referred is basic in the make-up of the country, and that it must be jealously preserved if the basic idea underlying the composition of the Senate is to remain.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have the highest respect, of course, for what the Senator from Maryland suggests. So far as I am concerned—and I speak only for myself—I cannot distinguish between a country and its people. I cannot distinguish between the duty which the Senate of the United States owes to the country and the duty which it owes to the people of the country. It seems to me that the only reason for any legislative body, and the only reason for government is to represent the people of the country.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thought I made that clear. I tried to make it clear that the Senate represents the sectional interests and the many diversified interests of the various States in this great Nation. They do not represent a district or a mass of population. That is the distinction which I should like to make.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am not at all willing to agree with the statement of the Senator from Maryland, or that it represents the thinking of Woodrow Wilson. I should like to make one further point, and I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland has it in mind. When Woodrow Wilson wrote his book Senators represented the legislatures of their States. They were elected by the legislature. They were really political appointees.

For example, if the Legislature of New York State, or the Legislature of Maryland, were a Republican legislature, they, a handful of people, would elect the Senator. On the other hand, if the legislature were predominantly Democratic, a similar handful of men would elect a Democratic Senator. Today, of course, Senators are elected by the people. They represent the people. They are chosen by popular vote. I would be rejecting and repudiating everything that has been in my political and social philosophy if I did not affirm that Senators of the United States represent the people. They do not represent groups; they do not represent legislatures.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I thought I had made myself clear. Of course, I am cognizant of the fact that in 1916 Senators were elected by the direct vote of the people. However, I still say that a United States Senator represents his State. He represents a sectional part of the country. He represents the part of the country from which he is elected.

A Member of the House of Representatives is more directly the spokesman of the people whom he represents in his district. He has at heart the interests of the people of his district. On the other hand a Senator has at heart the over-all interest of the people of his State. Certainly he has at heart also the over-all interest of his country. His chief duty in the Senate is to represent that over-all interest.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it is interesting to recall that the present rule XXII was amended in 1949 during the Eighty-first Congress by the affirmative vote of 63 Senators. I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland realizes that today in the Eighty-third Congress there are only 46 Members who supported the Wherry proposal.

That is less than a majority of the present Senate. I am referring to a rule which was amended fairly recently, in 1949. Some sections of rule XXII were enacted in 1917. There is not a Member in the Senate today who voted for the other parts of rule XXII. Some portions of rule XXII, as well as of other rules, go back to Civil War days, and earlier. No present Member has had an opportunity to vote on them, to either approve or disapprove them. But we have the right. We who are supporting the Anderson motion wish to exercise that right here and now, and I hope and believe that we will have strong support in our efforts.

I submit to my colleagues, both those who prefer rule XXII as it was amended in the Eighty-second Congress of the Senate and those who would prefer that it be further modified, that before we proceed with legislative business in this session, that we should have an opportunity to vote on this and other rules.

I have determined that they come from States representing 58,000,000 people, 40 percent of the population of our country. Are we going to deny them the opportunity to vote upon the rules of the body to which they have been elected, and in which they are expected to legislate in accordance with the mandates they received from the voters of their States in the last election? Are we going to say to them, "We are sorry, but you have no right to vote upon the rules under which the Senate operates"? Can they honestly be expected to take responsibility for legislation adopted under rules over which they have no control? I say this is an intolerable imposition upon any new Member elected to this body.

Sixteen new Senators have joined our ranks since the Senate was last in session. Although they have just been sworn in, I would like to refresh your memory by calling their names and their States: Senator GOLDWATER, Arizona; Senator PURTELL, Connecticut; Senator BUSH, Connecticut; Senator COOPER, Kentucky; Senator PAYNE, Maine; Senator GRISWOLD, Nebraska; Senator DANIEL, Texas; Senator BARRETT, Wyoming; Senator BEALL, Maryland; Senator POTTER, Michigan; Senator KENNEDY, Massachusetts; Senator SYMINGTON, Missouri; Senator MANSFIELD, Montana; Senator GORE, Tennessee; Senator JACKSON, Washington; and Senator KUCHEL, California.

In order to cast this issue in some historical perspective, I would like to quote from an article that appeared in the Washington Post 56 years ago, written by that eminent Senator from Texas, Roger Q. Mills.

Senator Mills was born in Kentucky in 1832, was admitted to the bar in Texas in 1852, served as an enlisted man in the Confederate Army and attained the rank of colonel by the end of the war, and served nine terms in the House, and for 7 years in the Senate.

Senator Mills of Texas wrote on April 11, 1897, in a signed article appearing in the Washington Post:

It is a fact not to be disguised that the Senate of the United States has been for some years losing its hold on the confidence and support of the American people. There are many reasons that might be given for this unhappy condition, but it is only necessary now to speak of that upon which the attention of the country is so earnestly fixed. The complaint is universal that public business is not dispatched as it should be. The difficulty arises from the fact that the Senate has no rule by which a majority of its Members can bring the body to a vote on a pending proposition. Every Member can speak when he pleases and as long as he pleases when any measure is before it for consideration except unobjected bills. Under the existing code one Senator, if so disposed, can prevent the passage of any measure as long as he can talk.

Mr. President, that is an excerpt from Senator Mills' article. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SENATE IN PRESSING NEED OF REFORM—SHOULD LOSE NO TIME IN PUTTING ITSELF IN HARMONY WITH THE SENTIMENT OF THE COUNTRY

(By Roger Q. Mills)

It is a fact not to be disguised that the Senate of the United States has been for some years losing its hold on the confidence and support of the American people. There are many reasons that might be given for this unhappy condition, but it is only necessary now to speak of that upon which the attention of the country is so earnestly fixed. The complaint is universal that public business is not dispatched as it should be. The difficulty arises from the fact that the Senate has no rule by which a majority of its Members can bring the body to a vote on a pending proposition. Every Member can speak when he pleases and as long as he pleases when any measure is before it for consideration except unobjected bills. Under the existing code one Senator, if so disposed, can prevent the passage of any measure as long as he can talk.

The Senate meets at 12 o'clock. From that hour till 2 o'clock p. m. the time is given to reading the Journal, introducing and referring petitions, bills, and resolutions, and making reports of committees. After this routine is gone through a bill may be called up, which, if it could be put to vote, would command the support of nine-tenths of the body. But if one Senator is opposed to its passage and is willing to talk it to death he may take the floor and speak till 2 o'clock, when, under the rule, the bill goes over and the unfinished business of the former day is taken up. When the bill comes up again the same tactics may be repeated from day to day and the bill may never be permitted to come to a vote.

During the recent session the Senate was made to witness its inability to pass measures that would have commanded majority votes. This practice of talking bills to death may be indulged in on the unfinished business after, as well as before, 2 o'clock. It has been employed often, in all stages of parliamentary progress. This humiliating spectacle has aroused the indignation of the country. The press and people have arraigned the Senate before the bar of public opinion and called upon it to change its rules so that it may transact the business imposed upon it by the Constitution. So far that demand has not been heeded, but there is a growing spirit of discontent among its Members, and it is hoped that the necessary reforms will be adopted and the vividness of verbal exercise may give place to legitimate methods of legislation.

The great statesman who gave the Senate its first code of rules says "every man, and every body of men on earth possess the right of self-government. They receive it with their being from the hand of nature. Individuals exercise it by their single will; col-

lections of men by that of their majority, for the law of the majority is the natural law of every society of men. * * * The first principle of republicanism is that the lex majoris partis is the fundamental law of every society of individuals of equal rights. To consider the will of the society enounced by the majority of a single vote as sacred as if unanimous is the first of all lessons of importance, yet the last which is thoroughly learned."

The Senate is over 100 years old, but that first of all lessons of importance has not yet been thoroughly learned. It reaches its vote on all questions like the historic Diet of Poland, by the unanimous agreement of the whole, and not by the act of the majority. The refusal to exercise this natural right of the majority is the principal cause of the troubles which have aroused the displeasure of the country. If a small minority determine that a bill shall not be passed there is no rule by which it can be put to vote. The only course left to the majority is one outside the rules, and in most cases where it has been tried it has been found utterly futile. If a majority, however large, determine that a vote shall be had, and the minority determine that it shall not, in Senatorial parlance they proceed to "sit it out." The Senate refuses to adjourn. The sessions continue day and night. The minority talks. The majority may try to sleep, because if the majority can sleep and eat while the minority talks and watches, the minority must soon subside.

To prevent this advantage one of the minority suggests the absence of a quorum. The roll is then called and both sides must appear in the chamber. The sitting-out business soon wears out both sides. The majority will find that it cannot keep a quorum, and therefore cannot have a vote, and abandons its measure to its fate, or the minority will find that it cannot continue the "vividness of the verbal exercise," and some settlement of the controversy will be reached by unanimous consent. But this is not the proper way to do the business confided to the Senate. The majority should take upon themselves the obligations imposed upon them by the Constitution and make the necessary rules to carry their will into execution. By refusing to make a rule to close debate and force a vote, the majority abdicates its rightful power and shirks its constitutional duty. It makes it difficult and often impossible for the will of the people to become the law of the land. It prolongs the sessions of Congress, increases the expenses of the Government, and makes the law sometimes the result of diplomacy and not legislation.

It is contended by those who are opposed to cloture that it cuts off amendments and stifles debate. That does not necessarily follow. The power to close debate and stop amendments does not imply that it will be so employed. It means that all legitimate debate shall be had and proper consideration of all amendments that may be appropriately offered, and when that is done that abuse of the right shall be shut off and the legislative body be permitted to exercise its constitutional functions. Every legislative body has the inherent right of self-government, but not one would be capable of self-government which would refuse to any of its members the right to offer amendments and discuss the effects of measures pending before it. There may be, and doubtless are, instances where majorities have been wanton and wicked in their conduct, but that is not the rule, certainly not in the Senate of the United States.

The argument based upon such an assumption is absurd. Majorities in times of great excitement may become lawless and trample under foot all rights, and it is to prevent this, as well as to facilitate the dispatch of business, that parliamentary rules are made. But when the minority attempts to usurp the power that belongs of natural right to the majority it becomes equally culpable. Such extremes are rare in our legislative history. They have only occurred in periods of great political disturbance. Scenes like this occurred just preceding our Civil War and just after its close, and in both cases they were the product of the revolutionary spirit which preceded and followed the war. But there is nothing in our present situation to call into existence such methods of parliamentary warfare.

The Senate should begin at once to reform existing conditions. It should lose no time in putting itself in harmony with the sentiment of the country. Speaking against time is not debate. Neither is speaking to empty benches. One is time improperly consumed, the other is time thrown away. Holding the floor and speaking to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not always for the purpose of preventing a vote. That is exceptional. It is habitually done in sincere advocacy of or opposition to the pending measure. When one becomes interested in a subject and knows there is no limit to debate he glides easily along without measuring the moments as they fly. One abuse begets another. When long speeches are being delivered the Chamber is almost emptied. Senators go to the departments to attend to the business of their constituents or to their rooms to keep up their correspondence. They will not remain to hear, nor will they read the speech in the RECORD, and, however strong and luminous, it is lost.

All this can be remedied by the adoption of the previous question in the Senate rules. If the Senate would amend the twenty-second rule and provide for the previous question, which cuts off debate and amendments, and provides that when it is moved there shall be entertained by the chair but two motions—one to fix the day to which the Senate shall adjourn and one to adjourn before the previous question shall be put—it will solve the problem that has long been vexing it, and which has brought upon it so much criticism. The conservatism of the Senate may always be safely relied upon to prevent the arbitrary use of the rule. The main question would never be moved until reasonable debate were had. The courtesy of its Members and the dignity of the body make that impossible.

Relieved of the abuse of too much speaking, the demand upon its time could never be so exacting as to require the improper enforcement of the rule. If anyone should move it merely to gag the minority, a majority would always be found to vote it down, and if the majority should sanction its improper use, ninety-nine times in a hundred the minority could protect themselves by breaking the quorum. In a Senate of 90 Members the business is ordinarily done by less than 60. It requires 46 Members to make a quorum. Twenty Members could easily compel an arbitrary majority to permit reasonable debate and amendments.

The power to refuse to vote should never be taken from the minority. They are representatives, and as such they must account to their constituents for casting or withholding their votes. No presiding officer should ever be permitted by any rule to count any Senator or Representative except by his own consent. He may determine that he can best protect the interests committed to him by refusing to vote. If he does, and the Chair counts him against his will, his representative character is suppressed, and the authority committed to him is usurped by another.

It is often asked in reply to this, "What is the use of compelling the attendance of Members?" It is to bring the majority to the Senate that they may discharge the duties incumbent on them. It is not for the minority to change sides and for the time join the ranks of the majority and help them do the work committed to them and to oppose which the minority were sent to the Senate.

In a great civil-rights contest, when Mr. Blaine was Speaker of the House, his party demanded of him to count as present to make a quorum those who were present and refused to answer to their names. His reply was: "A majority can do business." There was a very large Republican majority. That majority earnestly favored the civil-rights bill. There was a minority of Democrats who as earnestly opposed it. The Republicans left their seats, remained at home or elsewhere, and the majority side of the question had no majority present. So, by an arbitrary method, they sought to make the minority help them to a quorum and thus pass the bill to which that minority were opposed.

Such power ought never to be conferred on a presiding officer. It has been conferred by the House on its Speaker, and it has been charged that under that rule Members have been counted present who were not even in the Capitol. Be that as it may, it is a long step toward giving the Chair control over the legislation of the body. To hold supreme control over legislation is a duty which the Constitution has devolved upon the Members, and it is one which they cannot rightfully abdicate or transfer. This proposition to authorize the Chair to count as present those who do not answer to their names when the roll is called is intended to prevent a Senator from suggesting the absence of a quorum and compelling the roll to be called. This feature of obstructive tactics is only employed when the minority are trying to prevent a vote and the majority are trying to enforce it by the sitting-out process.

This, as I have shown, will be cured by the adoption of the previous question, which sweeps away all obstructions and brings the Senate to a direct vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this advocacy of the majority's right to vote with reasonable provisions for debate, is as applicable to the situation today as it was 56 years ago.

The call for action to end the filibuster has come from all parts of the country for many years. We must not ignore this call, and we must not ignore the necessity of permitting the majority to legislate in the name of the people. It is intolerable to have legislation killed by the mere threat of a filibuster. We must release the legislative arm of our Government from this paralyzing threat which is the very negation of Democracy.

It is said that the right of so-called unlimited debate is necessary to protect the rights of the minority in the Senate. I say that in practice, the filibuster has been used by the minority to oppress the majority, to frustrate it and to deny it the right to act.

The time has come to protect the majority in its right to act, and thus to protect the country.

To do this, the majority must exercise its right to adopt rules to safeguard majority rule in the Senate and in the Nation.

I should like to turn for a moment to a discussion of the history of the Senate rules as it applies to this question. The Senate of the First Congress, pursuant to the Constitution, adopted rules of procedure when it met in 1789.

The Senate of the Second Congress organized itself without formally adopting another set of rules; the oath of office was administered to the new Senators and the Senate proceeded to consider its regular business. A similar practice has been followed at the commencement of each new Congress.

The Senate has never decided by specific vote that the standing rules carry over from one Congress to the succeeding Congress.

On several occasions in the past the Senate, after acquiescing for many years in certain practices has suddenly asserted its right to act and has submitted the practice acquiesced in to the will of the majority.

One of the outstanding examples of this is found in the history of the joint rules of the House and the Senate. In the First Congress, the Senate and the House adopted joint rules to govern the relationship and any necessary business between them. Until 1869 these joint rules were treated as being in force, without the formal necessity of readoption at the beginning of a new Congress. In 1869 a violent dispute broke out over the effect of rule XXII of the joint rules, a rule governing the counting of electoral votes. The Senate desired to eliminate joint rule XXII, and, in a dispute with the House on this point, readopted anew the joint rules, with a modified version of joint rule XXII. The Senate claimed that the old joint rules had been in force only because of acquiescence. After 87 years of acquiescing in the joint rules the Senate decided it wished to exercise its right to readopt them, and that is precisely what the Senate did.

On that occasion, the Senate voted to accept a revised set of rules, on the theory that no joint rules existed at the opening of that new Congress. Thus, the Senate adopted a concurrent resolution adopting joint rules anew for the Forty-fourth Congress.

The decision, by vote of the Senate, that the joint rules were not in effect demonstrated that the joint rules had existed only by acquiescence, and that the acquiescence of even 87 years was in no way binding when a majority wished to manifest its will to the contrary. It also showed conclusively that the method by which the majority in such a situation manifests its will is by the adoption of new rules, not by amendment of the old ones.

Mr. President, I emphasize that point because, as I have already stated, as I listened to the debate earlier this afternoon I could not help but be impressed by the fact that the only argument of the opponents of the so-called Anderson motion, which has 19 cosponsors, is that for 187 years the Senate operated under old rules. No claim which would stand up was made to the effect that under article I, section 5 of the Constitution, the Senate does not have a right to adopt its own rules of procedure. That point was not brought up. The old story was repeated time and time again, namely, "What was good enough for the Senate in 1789 should be good enough for the Senate in 1953."

Mr. President, I do not wish for a moment to attempt to take from the great men who constituted the Senate in 1789 a full measure of honor and respect for their wisdom and their patriotism; but I am not willing to agree that any body of men, no matter who they may be, no matter how wise they may be, no matter how patriotic they may be, should have the power to proceed by means of tradition—and it is only tradition—to bind those of us who serve in the Senate of the United States in the Eighty-third Congress, and to require us to accept their views. I do not believe the people of the United States would agree to such a point of view. I believe the Senate should repudiate such a point of view. The Senate should take steps at least to consider new rules, or a new rule in place of rule XXII, which would meet the wishes and views and philosophy of the Members of the present Senate in the Eighty-third Congress.

To some persons who are following this debate it may not be clear why the procedural question of what rules are in force in the Senate is so important. I only wish to remind my colleagues of the difficulties which have arisen in the proceedings of the Security Council of the United Nations in regard to which questions are ones of procedure and which are ones of substance.

In many cases, matters of procedure are far more important than matters of substance in determining the effectiveness of a legislative body. This is true in the United States Senate today. I, for one, do not wish to see the Senate frustrated, as the Security Council has so often been, because rules of procedure permit the will of the majority to be blocked.

A small minority of the Senate should not be able to set up procedural roadblocks, as the Soviet Union has so successfully done in the Security Council of the United Nations.

There is much more to be said on this fundamental question; I hope other Senators will cover these points. For the moment I should like to put aside all the technical issues and all the theories regarding whether the Senate is a continuous or a noncontinuous body.

The first characteristic of the Senate is its identity as a representative, democratic House of Congress, operating in accordance only with the basic law of the land, which is the Constitution of the United States.

I should like to direct the attention of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Georgia, to my remarks, and I should like to repeat the last sentence, for I know that there is no Member of the Senate who is more concerned with adherence to the Constitution or who is more patriotic than is my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Like him, Mr. President, I wish to see the provisions of the Constitution carried out carefully, strictly, vigorously; but I also wish to see them carried out in such a way that they will help make possible an expression of the will of the people of the United States.

Of course, I must apologize for having interrupted the private conversation of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from New York is so laudatory, he need not apologize. [Laughter.] I thank him for his statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Georgia may always be assured that although he and I may differ in regard to many problems, I always respect his complete integrity, his complete patriotism, and, not the least, his great wisdom.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can fully reciprocate the compliment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to say this of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, the first characteristic of the Senate is its identity as a representative, democratic House of Congress, operating in accordance only with the basic law of the land, which is the Constitution of the United States. Rules of the Senate have neither the sanction nor the force of the Constitution. Under the basic precepts of democracy set forth in the Constitution, each House has the right to determine its rules of procedure and to adopt them by majority vote.

I am willing to submit this simple case to the Senate and to the American people: Are we a democratic body or are we a self-perpetuating body? Do the people of New York State, whom I have the honor to represent, have an equal voice in this body, or are they to be bound by some vague tradition unsanctioned by law or the Constitution? On that issue I am confident of a satisfactory decision, now or at a later time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator is ready to speak at this time. I am very anxious to have this debate finished tomorrow afternoon if possible. If any other Senator is ready to speak at this time, I hope he will do so.

We are faced with the necessity of getting the committees organized. We are very anxious to submit to the Senate a change in the number of members on some committees in order to meet the peculiar situation we have this year. That would require an amendment of a rule, and, of course, it is a little hard to know how we can amend a rule until we have decided that we have the rule.

So it is extremely important to finish this matter. I have a list of five or six Senators who would like to speak. If any of them is ready to speak today, I should like to have him proceed at this time.

If no other Senator is ready to speak, Mr. President, I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio withhold the motion?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion?

Mr. TAFT. I withhold it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a

brief prepared under the auspices of the 1952 Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, in support of the proposition that the majority of the Senate of each new Congress has the constitutional right to make rules of the proceedings of that Congress unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress, and I also wish to have a list of the organizations supporting the leadership conference printed with this brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared in answer to a brief issued by the Senate Republican Policy Committee, entitled "Rules of the Senate, as a Continuing Body." This memorandum was prepared by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before giving unanimous consent to the request, I suggest that there be incorporated in the RECORD the document to which it referred, to which this purports to be an answer. It seems to me that should the answer go into the RECORD, the document itself should likewise be printed. I have a little hesitation as to whether all these long briefs should be printed in the RECORD. The first brief submitted by the Senator from New York is very long. Does the Senator think it necessary to print these briefs in the RECORD?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it would be useful in the consideration of the question. I am perfectly willing, so that there will be no confusion in the debate, to have them printed in the Appendix, but I am only suggesting this in the interest of a thorough and careful consideration of this very important question. I shall not insist, if the Senator feels it is unwise.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD material entitled "Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body," prepared by the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that material to be inserted in the Appendix must be limited in length, and the documents in question exceed that length.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Incorporated in the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not object in this instance, but I abhor the custom of printing in the body of the RECORD great lengthy statements, and I care not whence they come. The RECORD should be confined more to debate of Senators. While I shall not object in this instance, I serve notice now that in the future I reserve the right to object to encumbering the RECORD with great, lengthy briefs.

Mr. TAFT. I thoroughly agree with the Senator as to the practice. I think it is a very expensive proposition. It is one that is very difficult for the printer to handle. I wonder whether the Senator from New York would withdraw his request, and let us discuss this matter tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. TAFT. That applies not only to the answer, but also to the withdrawal of the requests as to the two briefs—the long brief and the answer; and I will withdraw my request as to the one offered by me, and let us see whether we cannot decide whether it is necessary to put all this material in the RECORD, or whether we could not have a part of it put in.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to follow the suggestion of the Senator, though I think it would be useful to have the documents in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the requests for printing in the RECORD be withdrawn for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE COX, OF GEORGIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. EDWARD EUGENE COX, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK read the resolution (S. Res. 11), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EDWARD EUGENE COX, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SABATH, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with the understanding that we are not proceeding under the old rules of the Senate but rather under the general rules of parliamentary procedure, I should like to offer a resolution. The resolution contains a clause which I think will be covered by the motion the Senator from Ohio indicates he will make, and therefore the clause can be eliminated, if the Senator from Ohio wishes to make the motion. The clause reads:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 12), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE STIGLER, OF OKLAHOMA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. laid before the Senate the following resolution coming over from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 13), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days, by Thy grace we have entered upon a new year.

May we accept each day as a priceless gift and a glorious opportunity for heroic endeavor to do all the good we can, in all the ways we can, and to all the people we can.

Grant that we may not walk in the new year with face turned backward or with fear and foreboding, but with a resolute and daring faith, assured that the future will be as bright as the promises of God.

We pray that Thou wilt be present and favorable unto our beloved Speaker and all the Members of Congress as they seek the right solution to the many difficult problems which challenge the consecration of their noblest manhood and womanhood.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 3, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Vice President of the United States has appointed the Senator from Indiana, Mr. JENNER, and the Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN, as members on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States today.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that there are several Members who have not yet taken the oath of office and that they are present. If they will present themselves in the well of the House, the Chair will be glad to administer the oath.

Messrs. BENTSEN, LANHAM, ROGERS of Florida, and ZABLOCKI appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a statement. The Chair desires deferment of unanimous-consent requests and also 1-minute speeches until after the formal ceremony of the day, which is the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President. Therefore, pursuant to the order adopted on Saturday, the Chair declares the House in recess until 12:50 o'clock p. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 12:50 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES

At 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. T. J. Kennamer, announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. JENNER and Mr. HAYDEN on the part of the Senate, and Mr. LECOMPTE and Mr. RAINS on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Mr. RAINS (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, received 11 votes for President, and JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of the State of Alabama, received 11 votes for Vice President.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, WILLIAM E. JENNER and CARL HAYDEN, tellers on the part of the Senate, KARL M. LECOMPTE and ALBERT RAINS, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1953:

Electoral votes of each State	States	For President		For Vice President	
		Dwight D. Eisenhower, of New York	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois	Richard M. Nixon, of California	John J. Sparkman, of Alabama
11	Alabama		11		11
4	Arizona	4		4	
8	Arkansas		8		8
32	California	32		32	
6	Colorado	6		6	
8	Connecticut	8		8	
3	Delaware	3		3	
10	Florida	10		10	
12	Georgia		12		12
4	Idaho	4		4	
27	Illinois	27		27	
13	Indiana	13		13	
10	Iowa	10		10	
8	Kansas	8		8	
10	Kentucky		10		10
10	Louisiana		10		10
5	Maine	5		5	
9	Maryland	9		9	
16	Massachusetts	16		16	
20	Michigan	20		20	
11	Minnesota	11		11	
8	Mississippi		8		8
13	Missouri	13		13	
4	Montana	4		4	
6	Nebraska	6		6	
3	Nevada	3		3	
4	New Hampshire	4		4	
16	New Jersey	16		16	
4	New Mexico	4		4	
45	New York	45		45	
14	North Carolina		14		14
4	North Dakota	4		4	
25	Ohio	25		25	
8	Oklahoma	8		8	
6	Oregon	6		6	
32	Pennsylvania	32		32	
4	Rhode Island	4		4	
8	South Carolina		8		8
4	South Dakota	4		4	
11	Tennessee	11		11	
24	Texas	24		24	
4	Utah	4		4	
3	Vermont	3		3	
12	Virginia	12		12	
9	Washington	9		9	
8	West Virginia		8		8
12	Wisconsin	12		12	
3	Wyoming	3		3	
531	Total	442	89	442	89

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
CARL HAYDEN,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.
KARL M. LECOMPTE,
ALBERT RAINS,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 442 votes;

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 89 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of the State of California, has received for Vice President of the United States 442 votes;

JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of the State of Alabama, has received 89 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1953, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair directs that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the friendships we make here are not determined by the middle aisle which separates the two political parties. We come here elected as members of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, and we serve our country as our judgment and our conscience dictate. But separate and apart from that there is another important aspect of our life and associations together as members of this body, and that is on what might be termed the personal level, our personal contacts with each other, our little chats, our exchange of views which develops the spirit of each one of us, the type of person we are; and out of it develops respect and friendship. That respect and friendship is not, as I said, determined by the middle aisle which separates this Chamber as far as the seating of the great majority parties is concerned.

Today is the birthday anniversary of one of our most distinguished Members, a man whom I have termed, when I had occasion to refer to him or make remarks about him personally, as "the man with the heart of gold." Underneath his exterior is a heart of gold. His friendships are based upon loyalty. He is a man who fights for his friends no matter who they are, no matter from what section of the country they come, or what their political affiliation may be; a man whose nobility of character has impressed itself upon everyone who ever served with him during his long, honorable, and trustworthy service in this body; a man who loves the Congress of the United States and who loves in particular the National House of Representatives of which he has been a Member for so many years and of which we are Members today.

On occasions of this kind it is nice for us to show our respect and friendship for our colleagues on their birthday anniversary, particularly such an outstanding one as he whose anniversary takes place today. I have served with him for 24 years, the last 12 under the most intimate relationship of the leadership of my party. Our friendship is just as deep underneath the surface as it appears to be upon the surface. My friendships are not superficial; his friendships are not superficial. Superficial friendship to me carries with it a mark of hypocrisy.

My association with him, no matter how long I live, will be always one of my treasured memories, as I know it will be the treasured memory of all who served with him, particularly those who have had the opportunity during their service to meet him under those conditions where they could see the real inner mind of the man.

To summarize, today is the birthday of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, our former Speaker, who has served longer than anyone in the history of our country in the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of the greatest Americans of this time and era. I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues in congratulating SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, on his birthday anniversary and I hope that God will bless him for many, many years to come.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend, and I say that in all sincerity, the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this really is quite a day, SAM RAYBURN'S birthday, and we Republicans just having elected a President and a Vice President. I am sure all of us can rejoice about both of those great occasions in some measure at least.

You know, it has been well said that a man is as young as he feels. I am sure happy to observe that my very esteemed friend, Mr. RAYBURN, is carrying his years as lightly today as always. For some of us, of course, birthdays become milestones, but for our wise and vigorous colleague they are but honored milestones in a distinguished career.

I am happy to add my congratulations and felicitations to the minority leader. I have worked with him when he was in the minority before and I have worked with him when he was in the majority. May I say I want to see him continue to be minority leader for a long, long time. But certainly no man in this Chamber more richly deserves the veneration of this body than does the gentleman from Texas, who has served the House so capably, so faithfully, and so long as our former Speaker. The manner in which he has acquitted himself with the responsibilities of that high office through these many years as striking testimony not only to the esteem in which he is held but to the strength of his character and, may I add also, of his constitution.

Not the least of the lessons he has taught us is that we can meet the trials and tribulations of our work here head-on and yet remain young in heart and in spirit. So I wish for him the happiest returns of the day and express the hope that we shall be privileged to enjoy for a long time to come his wit, his wisdom, his great companionship, and his valued counsel.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my equally and valued good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 30 years since I came here. At that time SAM RAYBURN was a veteran Member of the House. During that time I have learned to love and to respect him as one of the finest Americans in the House of Representatives.

During the time he was majority leader and when he was Speaker, it was always possible for an ordinary minority Member like myself to have an audience with him and be treated courteously in his office and on the floor. It is that sort of thing which to my mind builds up strength among the membership here in the House and it means for the man, who has the capacity to approach his problems that way, the love and respect and esteem of his colleagues. I wish to add at this time my congratulations to Sam upon his anniversary and to wish him many more fine birthdays in the fine fettle he is in today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the felicitations for our beloved former Speaker under whom we served for so long. When I came here some 34 years ago, as was said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], Hon. SAM RAYBURN was a senior, and I know how I admired his long black hair in those days. He had flowing locks then. I got to know him intimately. We lived in a hotel known as Congress Hall Hotel. It stood where the New House Office Building now stands, and there were 90 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who lived in that hotel. In those early days the Members all dressed for dinner, black tie, went down to the dining room under the American plan, and may I say that if we could have the rates that we had on the menus in those days we would be living handsomely on our present salaries.

I am very proud to have known for so long our fine ex-Speaker, and I want to say that he has been perfectly wonderful to me. I have gone to him when I wanted recognition on the floor and he has always been most charitable to me as a Republican. He has always been very cooperative in every way. I cannot think of a thing that he has done of

which I could complain. I congratulate him upon his seventy-first birthday, and I can say, measuring his span of life by mine, that he is just a youngster.

Mr. McCORMACK. Before yielding to my friend from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, members of both parties have saluted Speaker RAYBURN on this anniversary occasion, as a native Tennessean, a veteran Texan, and a great American.

I hope it is not presumptuous for a freshman Congressman to speak for the State of Oklahoma, in likewise saluting Mr. RAYBURN on this date, since we of Oklahoma have long regarded him as a close neighbor, a close friend, and an adopted son of the Sooner State. His strong and helping hand has always been ready to help a neighboring Oklahoman or a cause close to Oklahoma's heart and interest, and the Oklahoma delegation is deeply grateful for this neighborly spirit on the part of Mr. RAYBURN.

All of us join, with enthusiasm and best wishes for the future, in wishing SAM RAYBURN a happy birthday, and many more in years to come.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my felicitations to those of my colleagues who have already congratulated our beloved SAM RAYBURN upon his seventy-first birthday.

From the time that I first became a Member of the House of Representatives and down through the years since, I have found no greater friend and no truer American than the gentleman from Texas, who has just vacated the Speaker's chair of the House of Representatives. His many courtesies to me and his friendship, I prize greatly. He has served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any individual occupying that high office.

For him, I can only wish many, many years of health and happiness, and the continuance of rendering in the future the great service he has rendered our country in the past.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American whom we are honoring first saw the light of day in Roane County, Tenn., in the great congressional district which I have the honor to represent. East Tennessee is proud of SAM RAYBURN. I join my colleagues in wishing him many more years of service to our country and of good health and happiness.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard uttered such tributes to the character and service of that great American, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, by such long-time distinguished colleagues of his as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and others, that my limited vocabulary makes it difficult for me to add in deservedly glowing terms any appropriate words. However, as there is no teacher like experience itself, and as there is no life which lives higher than its actual daily experience, I pay tribute to my friend and leader, SAM RAYBURN, by saying that all these 6 years I have now served in this House of Representatives, he has been a great inspiration personally to me. His fairness of consideration, his fineness of understanding, and his righteous thinking of all matters with which I had to deal with him, have been of lasting strength to me. He has made me a better Representative, I am sure.

Surely no Member of this House, on either side of the political aisle, can help but have specifically noticed, beginning this January 3, how graciously and how sweetly and decently SAM RAYBURN has made the transition from Speaker of this great House down the ladder one peg to become the able, dignified, vigorous minority leader in this great legislative body. The way he has done it; the spirit in which he has done it; the high level of political attitude which he has expressed toward both the majority and minority parties' responsibilities as Speaker JOE MARTIN took his chair, cannot help but have made an indelible imprint upon the minds and decisions of all of us. It is truly said that the fortunes of politics makes strange bedfellows. It can, likewise, be said that the fortunes of politics make or break the spirit, the character, and fortunes of men. Therefore, we who have the honor and privilege of serving in this House of Representatives these next 2 years have seen the fortune of politics defeat our great American for Speaker of the House of Representatives in favor of another. But, my colleagues, the fortunes of politics have again contributed to the greatness of character and patriotic attitude of SAM RAYBURN in the minds and hearts of all Americans. I felicitate him upon this, his birthday, and wish him many such birthdays of good health and also of satisfaction in personal awareness for long-lived opportunity to serve our great Nation as one of the really great American legislators in the history of our United States.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be privileged to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to SAM RAYBURN, who has served as our Speaker longer than any other person in the history of our country. He has served in some of the most difficult and trying times in our history and has proved himself to be one of the most outstanding men in our time. SAM RAYBURN has made a courageous record in the House of Representatives in carrying out the destinies of this democratic form of government. He has been fair to all, and today maintains the respect and admiration of every Member of the House. Certainly, the citizens of Texas have a feeling of satisfaction to know that they have given us this great leader and outstanding American.

Today, on his birthday anniversary, I congratulate SAM RAYBURN and pray that God will grant him continued good health that he may carry on his courageous work for many more years to come.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my excuse for joining in this tribute to SAM RAYBURN with my colleagues of so much longer and vastly more distinguished service in this Chamber lies in the circumstance that the man who was destined to wield the gavel in the greatest deliberative body in the world longer than any other man in our history was born in the year 1882. As far as I know, John Rankin having retired, I am the sole Member left of the natal class of 1882 to salute on the floor of the House on this occasion the distinguished gentleman from Texas whose outstanding and unprecedented achievements have made all the rest of us feel, by a sort of reflective glory, that being born in 1882 was really big stuff. And may I add, in all seriousness, that the index of SAM RAYBURN'S character, which has stamped itself indelibly and imperishably upon the world, is in the fact that as the years advanced he never ran away from, nor sought to hide, the year of his birth. In 1953 on this happy anniversary occasion he is as proud of 1882 as he was in 1911 when it marked him, then at 28, as the youngest speaker of the Texas House of Representatives. And the natal class of 1882 is proud beyond expression of its greatest living member.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the birthday of a delightful man, of a great statesman, and of a great American, the former Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

I remember his courteous helpfulness to me. At times I felt he dropped the gavel rather quickly, but I remember many times when he was most helpful. I remember an occasion when I asked unanimous consent to speak for so long a time as I desired. The Speaker in his generosity granted me 3 hours.

Happy birthday to you, Mr. RAYBURN, and many of them. And many thanks for your helpfulness and your cooperation with the Republicans. I never felt there was a party line with you, when you could be helpful or when you thought a measure was right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on many public occasions and on many platforms during the last 16 years in a Republican district, my own, I have stated that, in my opinion, SAM RAYBURN was one of the greatest men in the country; one of the most able men in the country. I formed that opinion from 16 years experience in the House, and because of that I want to say that I wish SAM RAYBURN many, many happy returns of the day, and many more years of active service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to Hon. SAM RAYBURN of Texas on this his birthday. As we all know Mr. RAYBURN is not only a great Texan and great American, but he is also a great Tennessean. We of Tennessee share a large claim on SAM RAYBURN. He was born in Roane County, in east Tennessee, which county adjoins the district which I am honored to represent in the Congress. And I wanted to say these words in behalf of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. RAYBURN has not only served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man in the history of our Nation but he has achieved for himself many other honors. He, by length of his service, has recently become the dean of this House and dean of the Congress. I congratulate him and wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the State of Texas is, of course, a great State. There is tremendous wealth there of a material nature. But the State of Texas possesses unlimited wealth of a moral nature in having as one of its distinguished sons, and in my opinion its most distinguished son of today, our friend, SAM RAYBURN.

RESOLUTION FOR INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT AND INSURANCE RATES, SAFETY, AND BARRIERS TO INTERSTATE MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a revised resolution calling upon the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the whole question of safety in motor vehicle operation, barriers to interstate motor vehicle operation, automobile accident rates and fatalities, materially increased automobile insurance rates, and the measures which the Federal Government can take in this situation. Almost unwittingly the American automobile has become the principal means of interstate transportation and a major problem in interstate commerce, the regulation of which is exclusively the Federal Government's province under the Constitution. Yet except for Interstate Commerce Commission regulation of heavy trucking, the Federal Government is taking practically no part in dealing with the new situation presented by interstate automobile traffic. The public is feeling the impact severely.

Thirty-eight thousand deaths from motor vehicle accidents and 1,330,000 injuries estimated for 1952 are a new high—a far greater casualty rate than is facing us in the actual Korean war. Automobile liability and property damage insurance rates increased 20 percent in 1952, an added insurance bill of $300,000,000 for the 42,500,000 passenger car owners, nearly two-thirds of all households in the United States.

The Federal Government already has a large interest in the situation through the annual appropriation of $500,000,000 for Federal aid to road construction. Such aid can certainly and fairly be coupled with Federal interest in the safety of operation over such roads, including maximum safety factors in their design and construction. Motor vehicle laws and regulations are properly a matter of State law, but where automobile traffic from one State injures the citizens of another State because of mechanical defects in motor vehicles which could be corrected by State inspection laws or because the operator of the out-of-State motor vehicle is not covered by liability insurance and is not responsible financially, the Federal Government should certainly look into the situation. I am not advocating compulsory automobile insurance or any other specific law, but I am advocating an investigation which will disclose the action which the Federal Government may take to standardize and make more unified the efforts of the individual States for safety in connection with motor vehicle traffic.

Nearly one-third of the States now demand regular inspection of motor vehicles as a highway safety measure and one State—Massachusetts—has a compulsory automobile insurance law. Governor Dewey is recommending both laws to the New York State Legislature this year. Forty-five States have safety responsibility laws. These call for compulsory liability insurance to be carried by any owner after an accident involving personal injuries. Thirty-five of the 45 States include the security provision—requiring participants in accidents to deposit security or otherwise indicate their ability to pay judgments arizing out of such accidents which might be later entered against them—in their statutes. Three States require only future proof of financial responsibility following accidents. The uniform laws generally in force were developed by the American Automobile Association and the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances.

A previous bill introduced last year had an encouraging response from the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the public generally. The Hearst newspaper, Parade magazine, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and many others have featured campaigns, serials, editorials, and articles on the subject. This is a field in which the Federal Government can render a real service to the people and keep pace with modern developments in transportation.

My bill provides that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee make a study and investigation of:

First. State and local laws and regulations respecting motor vehicle inspection, safety responsibility, and compulsory liability insurance;

Second. Effect of such laws on automobile accident rates and liability insurance rates;

Third. Measures which may be practicably undertaken in cooperation with the States to reduce such accident rates;

Fourth. Existing and any desirable regulation of the operation of motor vehicles in or affecting interstate and foreign commerce and any barriers to such operation; and

Fifth. The effect of highway improvements on safety in the operation of motor vehicles.

A report is to be made not later than January 1, 1954, and I am introducing a separate bill to provide an appropriation of $50,000 for the purposes of the resolution.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, for 20 minutes, on the subject of our outmoded ox-cart system of electing Presidents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore granted.

OVERSTAFFING OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND WASTE OF GOVERNMENT MANPOWER AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the allotted time, it is my purpose to direct the attention of this House to the excessive waste of Government manpower and expenditures—resulting from overstaffing of civilian employees and useless expenditures in Government departments and agencies—in the past two decades.

I urge the Members to study the report and recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Hoover Commission report, the report of the Committee headed by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer in his recent tour of Western Europe, and the recent press statement by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, regarding the luxurious living and high salaries paid a quarter million Federal employees overseas. These reports substantiate the facts I have presented to this House at various times during the past several Congresses when the Jensen amendment was attached to the sundry appropriations bills.

It is my intention to offer my amendment to the various appropriations bills in this Congress, as that is the only means I know of to reduce the number of Federal civilian employees in an orderly manner by attrition—retirement, resignation, transfer, death, and so forth, and not discharge or lay-off of capable and experienced employees.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION SERVICES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE OPERATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1951, I introduced House Resolution 36, providing for the establishment of a select committee of the House of Representatives to study our international information services in time of peace and our psychological

warfare operations in time of war. This bill did not pass.

House Resolution 36 would, if it had been approved, have given our country a well of vital information on which to draw to bolster a powerful parapet of our national defense. Its findings would have materially assisted the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations. Its findings would have bulwarked the operations of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Psychological Strategy Board, and other interested agencies of the Federal Government.

This bill would have accomplished its purpose by recording the testimony of individuals, groups, and committees, official and unofficial, who have been intimately connected with all significant phases of international information and psychological warfare. Its studies and reports would have been made available to the executive branch for the formation of consistent and effective policies in this highly specialized field.

Scarcely a week has gone by in 1952 without some public statement or speech by President-elect Eisenhower pinpointing the pressing need for concentrated psychological warfare effort.

This day I am reintroducing the same bill in the Eighty-third Congress.

In the name of national necessity, I urge every Member of the House to carefully consider this urgent legislation, to study it, to support it, and to vote for it when given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I introduced in 1951 is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the means by which the national interest may best be protected and served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war or threat of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necesary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

In the last session of Congress, in fact throughout the last 4 years, committee after committee has protested the inadequacy of the present Voice of America in sending information abroad regarding this country. Criticism has been made by the Appropriations Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and other committees. Yet nothing was actually done that would remove the evil of having improper propaganda sent abroad, and the proper method giving out of information which is coming back to this country.

A watchdog committee of this sort would be invaluable to call before it and seek the advice of the National Defense Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, or any other committee of the House that had anything to do with our national welfare. It would be a watchdog committee to advise and recommend legislation to the House, advise and recommend to the different departments. The Department of Justice should be called before it. It could call before it the head of Central Intelligence, the able Gen. Walter Bedell Smith.

The cost would be very small. I am sure if we had such a committee, it would be the duty of these Members to conduct the meetings, assemble all the material, and it would be a day-by-day watchdog on what is going on.

They are spending billions of dollars upon arms and munitions; we are wasting—I do not like to use the word "wasting," but it seems that we are wasting very precious lives, and a lot could be done instead of sending our boys to fight. If the propaganda development material, voice, or whatever you may call it, could be sent out all over the world I believe wars could be prevented; other countries could know, and know accurately, how fine this country is and they could know what it means in a really free world, to live in a world where the people are not afraid to speak their minds. Those living behind the iron curtain would try to have their countries made free. It is terribly important, it seems, Mr. Speaker; and I believe in time it will bring about peace in the whole world.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced H. R. 12, a bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes.

The bank holding company has been used as a device to place in the same hand the control of money and credit and of industries. This constitutes a basic and impregnable monopoly destructive of competitive enterprise and of sound economy.

The bill has for its objective to prevent conditions that have frequently existed in the past by reason of the power exercised by bank holding companies. The bill in no way lessens the influence or circumscribes the powers of legitimate banking. It does not penalize in any way the large banks which are necessary to meet the business needs of our industries if they confine their activities to banking. It will encourage competitive banking everywhere. Its passage will result in putting banking on a higher plane and give to it an added confidence and respect by the people.

I hope and trust that the banking interests generally will urge the passage of the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

MINORITY WHIP

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that I have appointed as minority whip of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I feel sure that will be pleasing to both the minority and majority.

TIDELANDS LEGISLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the hope that when the committees are organized, early consideration will be given to what is known as the tidelands bill.

We have had extensive hearings at different times in different Congresses. The record is complete. The facts are well known. Hearings are unnecessary. I believe it is in the public interest that this question be gotten out of the way as early as possible, and I wish to express the hope that early consideration be given to this subject when the committees are properly organized.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, I hereby wish to announce the selection of Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, as majority whip.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for my remarks to be inserted following my former remarks?

The SPEAKER. It would be by unanimous consent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FRANK PACE, JR.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order that I might refresh in the minds of the Members of the House the magnificent work which has been done by the Army of the United States in Korea and elsewhere in the world. Its members do the dirty, hard, and often thankless tasks of war. Theirs is a 24-hour-a-day, 7 day-a-week job from which danger is seldom absent. I also want to recall to your minds the long, difficult, and very important work that was required to rebuild the Army to its present strength from the post-war low which followed demobilization.

When I speak of these it is natural that I include the magnificent contributions rendered toward making the present-day Army possible by the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace. I trust that the Members of the House will think carefully on the things I say today in connection with that wonderful story.

For nearly 3 years, Frank Pace, Jr., has given the Nation distinguished service as Secretary of the Army. He has been the civilian leader of the Army during an unprecedented time in America's military history—a period in which the Army, virtually overnight, moved from the comparative ease of occupation and peacetime duties to the brutal battle of Korea. Not only has the Army borne the chief burden of the fighting in Korea, but it also is manning the ramparts of freedom in many other parts of the globe and is building a realistic security for the United States and the rest of the free world, in America's partial mobilization.

I would like to sketch for you some of the major recent developments of the Army, particularly since Secretary Pace took office April 12, 1950. A most knowledgeable Secretary, he personally has been responsible for the initiation of a number of these developments; in others he has seen that they received top direction. In my judgment, this comparatively young man will leave a definite mark on today's Army, and his ideas will be a part of the Army of the future.

The mobilization which Secretary Pace has directed has increased the Army by a million men and has added even more proportionately to its combat efficiency.

When the decision was made to send Army units to Korea, we had an army of about 590,000 men in 10 divisions, 12 regimental combat teams, and 48 anti-aircraft battalions, plus supporting overhead and men and women in other jobs connected with the Army ancillary operations. Even these remnants of the mightiest army of all times were at greatly reduced strength, lacked integral fighting and supporting components and were equipped with World War II weapons. Today the picture is different. The Army now has about 1,600,000 men with a hard core of 20 full-strength divisions, 18 combat teams, and 110 antiaircraft battalions. This force is organized to meet a new and grave situation.

The combat effectiveness of the Army has increased in even greater proportion than numbers indicate because of more rigorous and realistic training, the development of new and better weapons and equipment, improvement of older models, and an increased mobility, chiefly through greater use of the airplane and helicopter. For example, our present infantry division, with 30 percent more men than a World War II division, has increased its firepower by 75 percent. In other words our present 16 infantry divisions would equal, in firepower alone, 28 of the divisions we committed to action late in World War II. Because of recent experiences in Korea, the Army has reduced its infantry divisions by some 700 men but at the same time increased division firepower by 6 percent. Today one of these divisions can plaster the enemy with over 11,000 pounds of steel a minute—more than a similar unit of any other army in the world.

I wonder if people generally realize just how big our Army is? Here we have a million and a half men and women in uniform plus some half million civilians working for the Army. Besides the people involved, the Army together with its sister services constitute the biggest business in America, with fiscal requirements this year for about 60 percent of the Federal budget. The implications of the military on the Nation's over-all economy outstrip four or five of our largest corporations. The Army is a huge operation. And one, in my judgment, which the Secretary has directed in a most admirable manner.

The magnitude and the diversity of its operations result in personnel problems for the Army unmatched by any civilian organization in the world. In the first place only about 600,000 soldiers are Regulars; most men are in the Army involuntarily and although the great majority of them take their military obligations and duties seriously, they just don't want to be in service. Under the circumstances, it is surprising that the Army has been able to maintain a generally high morale.

Two over-all factors, I believe, are responsible. One is that, perhaps unconsciously, soldiers become imbued with the sense of belonging to an organization that is doing a job important to national security. Americans want to do things right.

The other over-all factor leading to high morale is that the Army realizes the importance of the individual and looks after its people. Secretary Pace has said time and again that the Army has a responsibility to see that whether a man or woman remains in the Army or returns to civilian life he should, because of his military experience, be better able mentally, morally, physically, and spiritually to take a place in our society.

The Army takes definite steps to promote the intangibles leading to better citizenship. Examples are found in the work of the chaplains, character-guidance program, troop information and education, and morale and welfare activities. These measures, coupled with superior medical treatment and better administrative and supply operations, make the United States soldier today the best cared for fighting man in the world. Secretary Pace has said that as much as he would like to see these personnel welfare functions maintained if only to make the soldiers' lot more pleasant, he realizes that these activities and many others must pay off in a more efficient Army; otherwise they would be luxuries too expensive for an economy-minded Army to tolerate.

One of the Army's biggest manpower problems is imposed on it by the limited length of service for selectees. Not only would the Army be able to operate more efficiently if it had the bulk of its people for longer than 2 years, but it could save billions of dollars simply by a substantial increase in the length of time that a man serves. To do the best it can under these conditions, the Army has improved its classification, assignment, and training procedures and has assigned good men to these activities.

Perhaps the most important element in maintaining soldiers' morale in Korea is the Army's rotation program. This spreading of the combat burden in the largest systematic rotation program in history has involved returning some 400,000 soldiers from the Far East command since the first shipload of returnees docked at Seattle on May 5, 1951. Under this great, humanitarian program, instituted by Secretary Pace, the combat soldier does not serve more than 9 or 10 months in the actual front lines.

The Army has moved forward in the treatment of battlefield casualties—another important morale boost to the fighting man. In World War II, 955 out of every 1,000 soldiers who reached battalion aid stations lived—34 more than in World War I. In Korea, in spite of the terrible conditions of climate and terrain there, this survival rate has been increased to a remarkable 978. Furthermore 85 percent of those wounded have been returned to duty. And nothing is spared to bring about the final recovery and complete rehabilitation of those more seriously stricken.

Morale was also strengthened by two items of legislation passed by the Congress in 1952. These were the Career Compensation Act Amendments of 1952, which gave higher pay and allowances to service men and women and the Combat Pay Act, which primarily benefited soldiers in Korea who, more than any other servicemen, are carrying the greatest share of the fighting there. Secretary Pace has been a strong advocate of both measures.

Any organization must keep looking for new and better methods. The Army particularly cannot rest on past achievements.

Secretary Pace has been greatly concerned that the Army hold its own in the battle of ideas. Repeatedly he has stated that the ultimate strength of America's defenses lies in the fields of ideas—ingenious approaches to the problem of defending ourselves and the free world. When he became Secretary, the Army was receiving only about 20 cents

of the service research and development dollar. Feeling that in time this would mean an Army which would take a definite backseat to its sister services—with a resultant weakening of America's defensive strength—Secretary Pace battled for an even share of research and development money for the Army. And the Army now receives approximately one-third of the Armed Forces appropriations for this vital activity.

Recognizing the need for giving top-level impetus to Army research and development, Secretary Pace took the direction of this function out of logistics and assigned it to a Deputy Chief of Staff. Serving on his immediate staff are a general officer and a civilian scientist who are experts in this field.

At the Secretary's request, 12 outstanding scientists and industrialists agreed to serve on an Army scientific advisory panel to help give to this country a fighting force as effective, economical, and progressive as our scientific, technological, and industrial resources will permit. Members of this panel have been working on projects since January 1952 and have already made significant contributions to the Army's research and development program.

The continuing goal of Army research and development is an army with added firepower, increased mobility, and lower casualties. Progress has been substantial.

Advances in firepower include guided missiles, artillery capable of firing atomic projectiles, new and improved rockets and bazookas, a new family of tanks, the Skysweeper antiaircraft gun, new and better mines, and continuing improvements in small arms and ammunition.

The Army has increased its mobility by broadening its air-transport capabilities and by the ever-growing use of helicopters. In Korea, the helicopter has been as commonplace as the jeep and has greatly increased the effectiveness of our forces there. In future operations, the Army plans to employ organic helicopters on an even larger scale.

In the reduction of casualties, the Army has done a truly superb job. In addition to the fine record in saving the lives of wounded, which already has been mentioned, the Army is trying to devise methods of protecting soldiers from becoming casualties and still help them to carry out their aggressive missions on the battlefield. Body armor is a dramatic illustration of what is being done in this regard. Another is the method of Army fighting—making maximum use of terrain, firepower, and maneuver, which helps to reduce casualties.

Secretary Pace has stressed that the battle of ideas must be directed also at the less spectacular field of Army administration and other routine business so that the Army can produce more defense at lower cost.

The best known Army supply-economy effort is the cost-consciousness indoctrination program which Secretary Pace started in August 1951 when he called on everyone in the Army to conduct a one-man campaign against waste. Although results cannot be measured in dollars and cents, the importance of the cost-consciousness program lies in the cumulative effect against waste that arises when some two million soldiers and civilians who carry out Army business realize that the Government's dollars are their dollars, and it is to their personal advantage as well as the national interest to economize.

Commenting on this program, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, headed by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, said this in December 1951:

> The Army, we are pleased to note, has taken under Secretary Pace's direction some potentially valuable steps to instill cost consciousness into the attitudes of its personnel. Officers, for example, are being graded upon their ability and interest in economizing. That is good, and we commend the Secretary and the Army.

Another program which Secretary Pace started early in 1951 is "operation red tape," designed to cut down on the paper work that plagues Army administration. As with the cost-consciousness indoctrination program, this war on Army paper work is continuous. Results to date range from simplification of reenlistments procedures, with a savings of 680,000 man-hours and $780,000 dollars since adoption, to streamlined administration at Army installations. For instance, operations at the Army's Utah General Depot in Ogden are under a new system of simplified requisition and accounting procedures. After visiting this installation, in September 1952, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House watchdog committee, made these comments:

> This looks like the real thing, and it looks as if it will go a long way to eliminate waste and cut down cost of activities. If it works out as it seems to be doing here, it will no doubt become the procedure of all military services in requisition and supply of material.

A major postwar economy move is the world-wide Army rebuild program. Inaugurated to rehabilitate the countless tons of equipment and supplies left scattered about the earth after World War II, this program has borne full fruit with the requirements of the Korean conflict and the return of United States troops to Europe. Since fighting started in Korea to October 31, 1952, about $8,800,000,000 of equipment has been returned to the supply line at a cost of $1,200,000,000.

The variety of equipment repaired and restored is great indeed, ranging from clothing and tentage, to tanks, trucks, and artillery, to radar, radio, and telephone, to dental and X-ray equipment, to boats and bridging. It does not include ammunition renovation, however.

At the vast Ordnance automotive-rebuild shops in Japan, sometimes called the Big Five, mountains of matériel reclaimed from islands of the Pacific and transported by LST's have been hammered back into shape at minimum cost. For example, 2½-ton trucks, costing about $7,000 new, have been taken from the junk heap and rebuilt from the ground up for as little as $1,000. These shops now form a huge reclamation center for Korean equipment casualties. Soldiers passing through Japan on their way to the front are given a tour through the center to impress them with the importance of salvaging even junk for this vital process.

From these shops have come a great deal of the equipment U. N. forces have used in Korea; for example, 85 percent of the general-purpose vehicles, 38 percent of the tanks, 68 percent of the artillery, and 70 percent of the infantry weapons.

These savings have been translated into a reduction of the cost of the Korean conflict and a consequent reduction in the price the taxpayer has had to pay. In fact, we have been able to fight in Korea because of the large reserve of World War II weapons and ammunition we had on hand. Had we not possessed these reserves and depended solely upon the nonexistent production lines of 1950, it is doubtful if Korea could have been held.

Conservation of equipment is only part of the story. In September of 1950, the Army initiated a program to save scarce raw materials through substitution and simplification of design. An important part of this substitution process includes replacing some 41,400 tactical vehicles in the Army with commercial ones. Generally, the plan is to substitute commercial vehicles for tactical vehicles in all units not subject to combat conditions.

The Army is trying to restrict the use of the jeep to tactical purposes and combat training—the reason the Army got it in the first place. Many people think the jeep is inexpensive, cheaper than the ordinary commercial car. Nothing could be further from the facts. A jeep is built to combat specifications. It must take every sort of stress and shock, requires a four-wheel drive, and must not cause radio interference. It costs $2,147 as compared with $1,256 for a simple light commercial-type vehicle.

So far this vehicle substitution program has saved the army $230,000,000 when one compares the purchase price of tactical vehicles with the cost of the commercial substitutes. Commercial vehicles also afford considerable savings in gas consumption and maintenance and supply of spare parts.

As a result of Army policy throughout all areas of research and development and procurement, critical materials have been replaced by less critical materials in hundreds of items of equipment. Specifications and bills of materials have been revised and extensive testing of materials has been carried out.

It is estimated that during calendar year 1952 the following significant amounts of some of the critical materials were saved:

	Pounds
Copper	9,769,891
Nickel	3,516,081
Zinc	5,468,134
Molybdenum	61,677
Aluminum	4,961,736
Lead	117,269
Manganese	1,609,279
Seamless steel tubing	342,733

These materials were saved in such items as gun barrels; mounts for the 105-millimeter gun; railway tank cars; clothing and equipage hardware; medical and food-handling equipment; ammunition, cast and rolled armor; and electronic components.

The Army is also conducting a huge scrap hunt which has paid off in the past year and a half to the tune of $37,000,000. More important, the Army has been able to supply more than three-quarters of its needs for brass and other nonferrous metals needed to make ammunition. Much of this scrap has been recovered from the breakdown of obsolete and deteriorated ammunition, fired cartridge cases, and other metal recovered from the Korean battlefield, and from the firing ranges and training camps in this country.

Secretary Pace has brought a greater degree of orderliness to an operation as large and varied as the Army by streamlining Army activities under 14 primary programs. Additionally he has developed a performance-type budget for the Army to facilitate cross-analysis with the Army's 14 primary programs. In this new budget structure the Army has embodied some of the features recommended by the Hoover Commission and retained some of its old system. The new structure is made possible by regrouping the various similar projects relating to the same operating functions.

The real criterion of an army is its performance in battle. The splendid record of our troops in Korea speaks for itself. Veteran observers have termed the Eighth Army there one of the greatest fighting units of all times. Behind an army's proficiency, however, is rigorous, realistic training.

In addition to insisting that the American Army maintain its supremacy in training its own troops, Secretary Pace has vigorously pushed the great effort the Army is making today in training the armies of other nations. At the present time the instruction which the Army has provided, or to which it contributed, is highly varied in character, ranging in level from that of the NATO Defense College—headed by a United States Army general—to the teaching of simple maintenance for the thousands of items of United States military equipment in the hands of foreign armies.

A miracle of training has been accomplished with the Republic of Korea Army. In the darkest days of the battle there, the ROK Army had been reduced to some 25,000 to 30,000 men. It has now developed into a well-trained, well-equipped, and well-led force of about 400,000. This army of major proportions has been created literally on the field of battle and is proving itself more than the equal man for man of the Communist enemy. The Army's training accomplishments with the Turkish and Greek Armies also indicate what a reasonable expenditure in material and training manpower can do to help America's friends develop first-class fighting forces.

It is easier and cheaper to stop a war while it is small and can be contained than after it has grown into widespread conflict. It is easier yet to stop a war before it is started. The presence of strong and properly disposed ground forces which could be employed promptly to counter the early moves of an aggressor constitutes the best insurance against the small aggression that might lead to a big war. By helping to build the defensive strength of the free world, the Army is returning an extra dividend and is thus most capable of all our fighting forces to work within the national potential. As we help our allies to rebuild their armies, and as we are participating actively in joint defense arrangements, we are strengthening the free world and in effect providing the means to reduce our own Army.

Although I believe the Army under Secretary Pace has moved ahead vigorously in carrying out its vital and varied missions. I know the Secretary would be the last to say that in all cases the Army has arrived at perfect or even the best solutions to its problems. I know however, that the Army is attempting to do the best possible job. It is not afraid to try something new. Today our Army is an army on the move.

I have indicated to you some of the reasons which, in my judgment, earn the departing Secretary of the Army a resounding "well done" for the contribution he has made in this post since April 1950. I for one shall be sorry to see him retire from the duties of this most important office.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am extremely glad the gentleman has brought the thanks, his own, and I believe the thanks of the entire House, to the men who are fighting and dying for us in Korea. I had a message in reply to a cable of Christmas greetings I sent to Gen. Mark Clark. In that he thanked me for my support in behalf of himself and his men. I thought it was very tragic that he could possibly feel that there might be anyone in the entire country who would not support him and support his men and give them undying affection, undying gratitude.

Mr. SIKES. I believe the gentlewoman's remarks are most appropriate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that there are those in civilian life who sometimes forget because their lives are not touched by the war?

Mr. SIKES. I am afraid that is true, and that, of course, in part is the reason for my statement today. We all should be fully aware of the job that is being done and the sacrifices that are being made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman for the remarks he has made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We notice also when we pick up the paper this morning, for example, and read of the build-up in the South Korean forces. That has been going on all the time, yet in the national interest of our country it could not be made public until it actually took place.

Mr. SIKES. It has been going on for a long time and it has now reached a stage of great importance to our Nation and the rest of the world. The South Koreans are making a splendid contribution to the war effort and accepting greater responsibilities in the common effort every day.

THE McCARRAN ACT

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD not violative of the 1-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, on the opening of the Congress I introduced a bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act—Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress—and to reenact all laws or parts of laws amended or repealed by said act.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 414, commonly known as the McCarran Act, the immigration law was based on statutes originally enacted in 1920 and 1924. The organic law has, of course, been amended many times, but the law itself has never been entirely overhauled. American immigration policy is an important issue, and there is a vital need to review and revise our immigration laws.

During the recent election campaign both parties and their leaders came out against the McCarran Act. This is good, since American immigration policy is not, and should not be, a partisan political issue. President Truman originally vetoed this bill and then joined Gov. Adlai Stevenson in condemning it. President-elect Eisenhower stated during the campaign "that the McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed."

The President's special commission, appointed last June to study the McCarran bill, has just reported, and it, too, denounces its inequities and recommends that the law must be completely rewritten from beginning to end.

I myself voted against the McCarran bill, and I voted to sustain President Truman's veto of that bill. During my campaign for reelection I stated that I favored its repeal and that I would introduce a bill for that purpose when the Congress meets again in January of 1953. I have fulfilled that pledge today on the occasion of the opening of the Eighty-third Congress.

Prior to December 24, 1952, the law barred members of all totalitarian organizations from entering the United States. The new McCarran Act bars Communists and former Communists from entering this country. It apparently does not expressly bar Nazis and Fascists or former members of Nazi or Fascist organizations. I am sure that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to nazism and fascism as well as communism. For a generation now our country has happily been free of the Nazi virus. We should not import the seed of future dissension by permitting indiscriminate emigration of former Nazis to this country. Since the McCarran law permits them to come in it should be repealed for that reason, as well as for its discriminatory provisions

against other peoples who do believe in our ideals and traditions of freedom.

A new bill should be written with a central theme of welcoming those people who have in the past aided in the building of a greater and better America and at the same time excluding Communists, Nazis, and all those who, by their acts or convictions, seek to destroy our great democracy.

My bill is designed to restore our immigration legislation to its status before December 24, 1952, until such time as our Judiciary Committees report, and the Congress enacts, a new and equitable immigration bill.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and that they may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include a speech entitled "The Duties of a Congressman."

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER) and to include an article by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. KILBURN and to include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BENDER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include quotations.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an article.

Mr. LANE in four instances, in some to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in three instances.

Mr. KLEIN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and also, Mr. Speaker, that I may insert on my own behalf a speech of the corporation counsel of the city of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. LUCAS and to include an address by the Honorable R. B. Anderson, of Vernon, Tex.

Mr. POULSON in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

245. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the Fifty-fourth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Louisville, Ky., August 24, to 28, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 249, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts, pursuant to provisions of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952, approved August 31, 1951, the Purnell Act, approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 972), and the Adams Act, approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 64); to the Committee on Agriculture.

247. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, transmitting the twenty-fifth annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved May 7, 1928 (Public Law 350, 70th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

248. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1952, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

249. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting copies of certificates of ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in each of the States on November 4, 1952, pursuant to the final clause of section 6 of title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

250. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting additional copies of certificates of ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in each of the States on November 4, 1952, pursuant to the final clause of section 6, title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

251. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting additional certificates of ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in each of the States on November 4, 1952, pursuant to the final clause of section 6 of title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

252. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the final report of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, pursuant to Public Law 880, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C., sec. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled a bill "To amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

255. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Report pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 979. A bill to provide for the construction of post-office buildings in local communities where the residents purchase bonds in an amount sufficient to finance the construction cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 980. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and range-land management in the Rocky Mountain area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 981. A bill to continue the improvement and protection of the natural resources of the United States by providing for the transfer to the States of certain lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and held by such States under lease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 982. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 with reference to claims arising out of the death of members of the Armed Forces of the United States as the result of enemy action after cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 983. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 984. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the time of filing income-tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 986. A bill to provide that presidential electors shall meet on the third Tuesday after the first Monday in November; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 987. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy substandard quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 988. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 989. A bill to provide for the detention and prosecution of Communists and former Communists, to provide that peacetime espionage may be punished by death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 990. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to prohibit, under certain conditions, the employment of a former employee of the Federal Government by any person, concern, or government other than the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 991. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 992. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 993. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "Agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 994. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $100 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of old-age or survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 995. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to suspend price and wage controls until the President or the Congress finds that such controls are needed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 996. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 997. A bill to require Federal officers, agencies, and employees to act in accordance with and submit to the laws of the several States relative to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water and providing that the United States shall sue and be sued in the courts of such States in litigation arising therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 998. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the State of Idaho for certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 999. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 1000. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Person County, N. C., in the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1001. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (p), any contribution made by an employer to a profit-sharing employees' trust within 90 days after the close of the taxable year with respect to which such contribution is made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 1002. A bill to provide for State and local taxation of real property which is owned by the United States and leased to private persons, and to prevent the leasing of real property owned by the United States for uses which violate State and/or local law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1003. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 1004. A bill to authorize the appointment of district judges for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 1005. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1006. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1007. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1008. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1009. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1010. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1011. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1012. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1013. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1014. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1015. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1016. A bill to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1017. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1018. A bill to provide a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of losses and certain other expenses caused by abnormally high water levels in the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 1019. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1020. A bill to amend the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, so as to emphasize that pictures and representations of the flag, as well as the flag itself, should never be used for advertising purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1021. A bill to amend section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code and other statutes relating to the deduction of war losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1022. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of certain members of the Armed Forces who died as a direct result of active service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 1023. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1024. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions to moving-picture theaters shall be cut in half on July 1, 1953, and shall be eliminated on July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1025. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1026. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1027. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1028. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that espionage and advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence shall be

capital offenses at all times; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1029. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1030. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of devices for protection of property from storms, floods, or erosion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1031. A bill authorizing the prosecution of the work of improvement for purposes of beach erosion control at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1032. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1033. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America by requiring the display of the flag of the United States of America whenever any other flag or pennant is displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1034. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 1036. A bill to provide that local boards of the Selective Service System shall make available for publication certain information about persons inducted, deferred, or exempted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1037. A bill to establish the Green River Canyons National Park, in the States of Colorado and Utah, from a portion of the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1038. A bill to prohibit the construction, operation, or maintenance of any project for the storage or delivery of water within or affecting any national park or monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1039. A bill to provide for the installation and utilization of electrical equipment in the House of Representatives for recording and counting votes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1040. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, so as to require that motor vehicles operated for pleasure purposes in the District of Columbia by minors, licensed to drive in the District of Columbia shall carry emblems or devices calling attention to the fact that such motor vehicles are being operated by minors; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1041. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens who have been citizens 10 years or over, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1042. A bill to provide biweekly pay periods for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1043. A bill to restore to civilian officers and employees of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia the right to accumulate annual leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1044. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1045. A bill to protect the civil-service retirement rights of hospitalized veterans in service-connected cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1046. A bill relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 1047. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1048. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1049. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the Armed Forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 1050. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1051. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1052. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit persons engaged in national defense activities to occupy dwellings in housing projects developed under that act in critical defense housing areas without regard to the income limitations contained in that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1053. A bill to erect a suitable shrine on the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor in memory of the crew killed in the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1054. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1055. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1056. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Davis-Monthan Field, Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1057. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1058. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1059. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemption of a taxpayer from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1060. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1061. A bill to establish the name of Kiser Glacier on Mount Baker, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1062. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1063. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of California with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1064. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1065. A bill to recognize naval service performed in sweeping the North Sea of mines in 1919 as service in World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1066. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1067. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1069. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1070. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1071. A bill to consolidate and revise the laws governing mutual defense assistance and related foreign-aid programs, and to authorize appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1072. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to athletic and certain other events, where the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of a community chest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1073. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the acts of September 23, 1950, and September 30, 1950, providing financial assistance to local educational agencies, so as to remove discrimination against larger school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1074. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1075. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain volunteer firemen injured while performing duty as firemen on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1076. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by providing for the improvement of the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1077. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1078. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, under certain conditions, shall be deemed to have been in the active military service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1079. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Kellogg Airport and Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1080. A bill granting cost-of-living increases to certain members and former members of the Armed Forces who are now or hereafter receiving or entitled to receive retired, retirement, or equivalent pay by reason of physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1081. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1082. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1083. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1084. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require State agencies in determining need to disregard the value of land held in trust for Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1085. A bill to amend section 23 of the act of April 26, 1906, in order to remove permanently the limitation in such section permitting full-blooded Indians to devise real property without regard to the laws of the State of Oklahoma with respect to wills; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1086. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1087. A bill to permit the enlistment of persons convicted under the Youthful Offender Act of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1088. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation, as a part of the National Park Service, of the building formerly owned by "Uncle Sam" Wilson, which is located at 144 Ferry Street, Troy, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 1089. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to increase the maximum benefits provided by such act and to extend its provisions to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1090. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 1091. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide a per diem allowance for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System in certain cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1092. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1093. A bill to terminate the tax on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1094. A bill to terminate the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1095. A bill to appropriate $2,400,000 for the study of the causes of the vesicular exanthema and assistance in its eradication; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1096. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1097. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution providing that certain mineral leases issued by the States covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall remain in force and effect, and that others shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior, and that the royalties from all such leases shall be used for grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans for, erect, and maintain a suitable monument commemorating the battle between the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis;* to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans for, erect, and maintain a suitable memorial to Commodore Stephen Decatur; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans for, erect, and maintain a suitable monument commemorating the great sea battle between the *Alabama* and the *Kearsage;* to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Motor Vehicle Commission for the purpose of making uniform laws pertaining to operation, ownership, and control of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the celebration of holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the holding of a plebiscite in the Free Territory of Trieste; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy to observe the provisions and intent of the act of Congress, section 208 (d), Department of Justice Appropriation Act 1953, and suspend the further prosecuting of the action pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, entitled *"United States of America* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District and others"*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Ways and Means to make a study of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in all fields, with special reference to the field of taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 43. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of a national retirement system; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 44. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 43; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to study and investigate interstate motor-vehicle accident and insurance rates, safety, and barriers to interstate motor-vehicle operation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 46. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 45; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 47. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study the administration of the Buy American Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives to investigate and report upon the policies and practices of the Department of the Interior in the leasing or other disposition of Alaskan coal lands; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing a biennial audit by the Office of the Comptroller General, of the Offices of the Chief Clerk, the Doorkeeper, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Postmaster of the House of Representatives,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 51. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives, so as to permit two or more Members to introduce jointly any public bill, memorial, or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution amending the Rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 53. Resolution providing for a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to mutual-aid and defense compacts made and entered into by the State of South Dakota and the States of Oklahoma, Oregon, New Jersey, California, Delaware, Montana, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Massachusetts, Florida, Texas, Nevada, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Echelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 1099. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Leon Lawrence Hamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Maria Buffoni and Emma Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Evoggelos Mpompotsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of Vacellios Koniditsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Mayerl Fulbright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 1107. A bill for the relief of J. A. Vance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Yoshi Yamaguchi and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 1109. A bill for the relief of Pu Lun Chien and Helen S. Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Matilde Monos Tamayo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Sister Augusta Sala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1112. A bill for the relief of Sister Elvira Stornelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 1113. A bill for the relief of George N. Giannacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suhula Adata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1117. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Beatrice Merzer, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE (by request):

H. R. 1118. A bill for the relief of Eugen Berde, Rosalia Berde, and Olga Berde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Aroussian Agopian and Tacor Agopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of Lester Eliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 1121. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. James C. Kimbrough; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 1122. A bill for the relief of Paul Dimitriu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1123. A bill for the lawful admission of August Soo and Hilda Vaikjarv Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Gerda Goerauch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of Mitsu Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1126. A bill to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1127. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 1128. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1129. A bill for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiffis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiffis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vaccaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Alessandro DeSanto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Equitable Infants Wear, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Fritz Schneeweiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Katarzyna Pienkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Meilich and Eta Goldstein and daughter, Yochewed Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of Samu Meisels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Icchok Fajncajg and Chaja Fajncajg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1140. A bill for the relief of Isak and Osias Gutwein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Martha Farah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Wali Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1146. A bill for the relief of Nawazish Ali Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of Ahmad Darwish Abdallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski, his wife, and their three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Albert Satoshi Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Eugene Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of William F. Friedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Luis Eduardo Equizabal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shui-fong Lee Kwong, Kai-pond Kwong, and Kai-Lai Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of William H. Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Fissore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Mihai Patrichi and Victoria Viorica Patrichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of Wong Gook Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Irving Polonoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Betty Jean York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of Leopold Danihel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Beatrice De Pra Iannantouono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of Magdalena P. Bristol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill for the relief of W. A. Sampsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1168. A bill for the relief of Abdel-Jawad Mohamad Salameh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Edwin M. Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Alexander Chebotniagin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wai-Jan Low Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of Basil Jamil Harb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1173. A bill for the relief of Helena Lubke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Yoko Todoroki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1175. A bill for the relief of Milorad Otasevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Kayed Musa Salem Farhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1177. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Mario Bernardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1178. A bill for the relief of Aurina Garcia Balle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1179. A bill for the relief of Victor Michael Ivanov and Mrs. Zinaida Alexsandrovna Ivanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1180. A bill for the relief of Virgil N. Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1181. A bill for the relief of Agnes Alberta R. Nixon Francis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1182. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Krueger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1183. A bill for the relief of Karol Herse and his wife, Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1184. A bill for the relief of the Denver Live Stock Exchange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1185. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valerie M. Schmiedeke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1186. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1187. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna DiGiorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1188. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 1189. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1190. A bill for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1191. A bill for the relief of Franciska Gruber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1192. A bill for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1193. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1194. A bill for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill for the relief of Gunther Johannes (John) Rathnow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1196. A bill for the relief of Hans V. Diernisse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill for the relief of Michel J. Constantindis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1198. A bill for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1199. A bill for the relief of Mie Kuniyoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1200. A bill for the relief of Ronald J. Palmer and Ronda Kay Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAUFFER:

H. R. 1201. A bill for the relief of Victoria Cilta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1202. A bill for the relief of Alan Keith Stanfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla., by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1204. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Papavasiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 1205. A bill for the relief of Joseph Yukio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1206. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Kaneko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill for the relief of Margarete Bauer and her infant son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill for the relief of Paolo Danesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Hariambidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 1210. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mollicone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1211. A bill for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1212. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1213. A bill for the relief of Arthur DeWitt Janes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1214. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schaitel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1953

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose years have no beginning or ending, replenish us, we beseech Thee, with Thy sustaining and restraining grace, as our feet tread the uncertain ways of the new year. As we go forward into the unknown future, the past inspires us. We are grateful for the great traditions of which we are heirs. We are conscious of the cloud of witnesses out of heroic yesterdays, who look down upon us from the sacred spaces of this white dome of each patriot's devotion. We are conscious, too, of a listening world, hoping in its agony as in these halls of state is being designed the global shape of things to come. We would be the true servants of Thy will in this troubled time, and in Thy will alone can we find our own peace and peace for the world; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message of the President will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have conferred with the majority leader, and it meets with his approval for me to ask unanimous consent at this time to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that that was the agreement which the majority leader had with the Senator from Oregon. It was then the purpose of the majority leader to ask for a quorum call and request unanimous consent for the transaction of certain routine business such as the introduction of bills, resolutions, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will come later. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he will yield in order that I may introduce a resolution. It will take only a few moments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I would say that immediately after the Senator from Oregon completes his speech, there will be a unanimous-consent request made to permit the introduction of bills, resolutions, and so forth.

Mr. BRICKER. Will that be before the quorum call?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will be immediately after the quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not rise to comment on the President's message to the Congress; I merely rose to a question of personal privilege. However, I am so deeply moved by the message of the President that I should like to say a few words about it. I think we have listened to a great historic statement, which is, in my opinion, the greatest message President Truman has sent to the Congress; indeed, I regard it as one of the greatest messages ever sent to the Congress by any President in our history. It is dramatic in its ideals, reassuring in its goals, inspiring in its appeals to patriotic duty, and convincing in its citizenship challenge.

In my judgment, it is a fitting valedictory of a President who I am convinced, in the judgment of history, will be a much greater President than his critics now realize or appreciate.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

ASSIGNMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to the subject to which I wish to address myself for the remainder of the 10 minutes, I think it is only fair and courteous for me to announce to my colleagues in the Senate of the United States today, before plans for reorganization of the Senate have been completed, that I ask for my assignments to committees in the Eighty-third Congress as a Member of a minority party. I ask for my assignments to committees in the Eighty-third Congress in keeping with what I think my rights as a member of a minority party are, under the Reorganization Act of 1947. I am neither a Republican nor a Democrat. I stand in American politics today as an Independent.

I have a great many warm personal friends among Senators on this side of the aisle, Mr. President, as I have also on the Democratic side of the aisle, and I have no wish or desire because of my position in American politics today to embarrass any of my friends. Some Members on the Republican side of the aisle have talked to me in confidence and intimacy in regard to the position in which they find themselves as members of the Republican Party concerning my committee assignments. In fairness to them, as to every other Member of the Senate, I wish to say that I do not want to be assigned to committees by the Republican caucus. I have great respect for Republicans in the Senate, as well as for Democrats, but I think I have the right, Mr. President, to be assigned to committees in keeping with the Reorganization Act as a member of a minority party. I happen to stand alone in the Senate today as an Independent, but there are thousands like me across the Nation. In my judgment, in the years immediately ahead, their number is going to increase. I also venture the prediction that their number will increase in the Congress of the United States.

So, most respectfully, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. President, rule XXIV, which is found on page 28 of the Senate Manual and which reads as follows:

1. In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

2. When a chairman of a committee shall resign or cease to serve on a committee, and the Presiding Officer be authorized by the Senate to fill the vacancy in such committee, unless specially otherwise ordered, it shall be only to fill up the number on the committee.

Then I call the attention of my colleagues to the last paragraph on page 40 of the Manual, which reads as follows:

4. Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

Mr. President, I wish also to say that, in checking the precedents of the Senate, I find no precedent for the request that I now make, and I think the reason is that no such request has heretofore been made. Most of the so-called insurgent or independent Senators in the history of the Senate served in the Senate prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The last third-party Member of the Senate was the distinguished Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of the State of Wisconsin, who served as a Progressive Republican and who, I was reliably advised this morning by parliamentary authority, accepted, as a matter of courtesy, appointments to committees, when he was last elected to the Senate, from the Republican side of the aisle. By indication and implication in the early part of my remarks, I have made clear that I do not wish to place that responsibility upon the Republican side of the aisle. Most respectfully, let me say that I have no desire or wish at all to be under the least obligation to the Republican side of the aisle. During the next 4 years, as I have done for the past 8 years, I intend to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as I find them, irrespective of party affiliation or partisan considerations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully request all of my colleagues in the Senate of the United States today to grant to me, under the Reorganization Act, in accordance with the sections of the rules I have read, what I consider to be my right to assignment to committees. That of course, opens up the question: Assignment to which two committees?

I am not at all interested in or concerned with any question of discipline, which has been discussed with me privately. I shall continue to assume, Mr. President, that each Member of the Senate will recognize that we stand on a common level, so far as our rights on the floor of the Senate are concerned. I have 8 years of seniority in the Senate, so when the question arises as to which two committees I shall be assigned as a member of a minority party, I only respectfully suggest to my colleagues that the privileges of seniority are as precious to them as they are to me. The question of seniority is as precious to Senators now, in this session of Congress, as it has been to Senators in past sessions of Congress, and as it will be to Senators in future Congresses.

Therefore, it seems to me that I have the right to express my preference, at least, as to which committees, as a Member of an independent minority party, I prefer and wish to be assigned. Thus, in keeping with what I think are my seniority rights and privileges, Mr. President, I think it is fair and equitable on my part to say that I request to retain my present committee assignments.

I now serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services. I respectfully serve notice now that when the vote is taken on the organization of the Senate in respect to the assignment of Senators to committees, I shall make a motion, if it becomes necessary for me to do so, asking to be allowed, as an Independent, to keep my present assignments on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services. I think that is a fair request, because I have had 8 years of service in the Senate, most of that period on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services.

I was first on the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service, and shortly thereafter was transferred to the old Committee on Naval Affairs. Later I was transferred to the new Committee on Armed Services. Since coming to the Senate I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I have made this announcement today because I believe Republicans in the Senate are entitled to know officially what my attitude or position is with respect to committee assignments. With this notice of intention and desire on my part I am perfectly willing, on the basis of the language of the Reorganization Act itself, to abide by the will of the majority of the entire Senate. As a member of a minority party, I respectfully submit that, under the Reorganization Act, I am entitled to action by the entire Senate on the question of my committee assignments rather than by members of a caucus of the majority party alone.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarran
Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	Welker
George	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF CERTAIN ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials and introduce bills, joint resolutions, concurrent and other resolutions and make insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD, without changing in any way the parliamentary situation relating to the Anderson motion or prejudicing the rights of the proponents of that motion.

I call attention to the fact that, strictly speaking, this is not a morning hour. I do not refer to it as such, in order not to prejudice the rules question. However, the unanimous-consent request is confined to certain specific things.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if his unanimous-consent request calls for any particular order in which these matters are to be submitted.

Mr. TAFT. The Chair can determine that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that if the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, the usual and regular order will be followed. Otherwise, bills, resolutions, and petitions would be submitted indiscriminately. The usual routine will be followed.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

If there is no objection, the Chair will first take the liberty of laying before the Senate several messages from the President received by the Secretary during the adjournment of Congress and certain other routine matters. The Chair hears no objection.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate during adjournment, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1952.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a Midyear Economic Report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 16, 1952, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Midyear 1952 Economic Review, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF ESCAPE CLAUSES IN EXISTING TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

Since my last report on this matter, dated January 10, 1952 (H. Doc. 328, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), progress has been made with respect to the inclusion of escape clauses in trade agreements which do not include such clauses. In the case of a few trade agreements it has been determined that it would not be practicable to attempt to include escape clauses in the agreements at this time. Steps have been taken toward termination of another trade agreement.

There is attached a more detailed report on this subject prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 10, 1952.*

(Enclosure: Report on trade agreement escape clauses.)

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH VENEZUELA — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 43)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

On August 28, 1952, the United States signed an agreement with Venezuela which amends and supplements the Trade Agreement of 1939 between the two countries. In view of a special situation which arose in connection with this agreement, I am submitting the following statement to the Congress:

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 provides that before entering into negotiations for a trade agreement the President shall submit to the Tariff Commission a list of the articles to be considered for specific concessions and that upon receipt of such lists "the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period." The findings of the Tariff Commission under this subsection are popularly known as the peril point findings.

Under subsection (a) of section 4, in case the President enters into a trade agreement which exceeds the so-called peril point findings of the Tariff Commission he shall within the 30 days "transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reason for the action taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of

the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be."

Subsection (b) of section 4 requires the Tariff Commission promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign trade agreement to Congress to "deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a copy of the portions of its report to the President dealing with the articles with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with."

In preparation for the negotiations with the Government of Venezuela looking toward an agreement supplementary to the existing reciprocal trade agreement with that country of November 6, 1939, I submitted to the Tariff Commission a list of articles to be considered for specific concessions by the United States In accordance with section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, hereinabove set forth, the Tariff Commission reported to me on December 27, 1951, its findings with respect to each such article as to the limit below which concessions could not be granted without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. For a certain group of petroleum products—crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum, and fuel oil derived from petroleum, including fuel oil known as gas oil; paragraph 1733 Tariff Act of 1930 and section 3422, Internal Revenue Code—three of the Commissioners found that the peril point was the existing tariff quota arrangement—10½ cents per barrel or one-fourth cent per gallon on a quantity equal to 5 percent of the total quantity of crude petroleum processed in refineries in continental United States during the preceding calendar year and 21 cents per barrel, or one-half cent per gallon, in excess of this quantity. The other three Commissioners found that a rate of 10½ cents per barrel on all imports would constitute the peril point.

Although there are a number of legal issues involved on the question of whether there is or is not any peril point found within the requirements of section 3 of the statute by reason of the evenly divided Commission, I nevertheless desire to inform the Congress of the action I have taken with respect to these petroleum products in the agreement.

The text of the supplementary trade agreement which I have concluded with the Government of Venezuela is attached. This agreement contains the following concession on paragraph 1733 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of article	Rate of duty
733.....	Petroleum, crude, fuel, or refined and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzine, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil, not specially provided for (except petroleum jelly or petrolatum, and except mineral oil of medicinal grade).	Free.

Internal Revenue Code, section	Description of article	Rate of import tax
3422	Crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum, and fuel oil derived from petroleum (including fuel oil known as gas oil):	
	Testing under 25° API.....	¼ cent per gallon.
	Testing 25° API or more.....	¼ cent per gallon.

Thus, when the agreement enters into force, a rate of 5¼ cents per barrel will apply to imports into the United States of crude petroleum, topped crude petroleum, and fuel oil derived from petroleum—including fuel oil known as gas oil—which is testing under 25° API—American Petroleum Institute rating—the rate on these same products testing 25° API or more will be 10½ cents per barrel.

The supplementary agreement with Venezuela will provide for increased trade between the two countries. It will contribute to the security of both countries and will stimulate the development of proven oil reserves in the Western Hemisphere.

As compared to the 1939 agreement, Venezuela grants new or improved concessions on $154,000,000 of imports from the United States in 1950; on $12,000,000 of imports they are withdrawing the 1939 concessions; and on $6,000,000 of imports the new agreement provides for higher Venezuelan rates than in the 1939 agreement. The trade coverage of the 1939 agreement as supplemented by the new agreement is $240,000,000 or about 60 percent of total United States exports to Venezuela. Under the 1939 agreement, only 35 percent of our exports were covered. Among the important items receiving new or improved duty concessions are apples, pears, certain dried vegetables, rolled oats, wheat flour, barley malt, baby and dietetic foods, wrapping paper, laboratory and refractory glass products, galvanized iron sheets, enameled iron and steel manufactures, builders' hardware, table flatware, unassembled trucks and passenger cars, motorcycles, aircraft and parts, trailers, radio and television receivers including parts, phonographs including combinations and parts, phonograph records, automatic refrigerators, scientific apparatus, hand tools, photographic products, office machinery, electric motors, pumps, numerous types of industrial machinery and apparatus and parts, generators and transformers. Among the products on which new bindings of duty-free treatment were granted by Venezuela are road building, textile and printing machinery; stoves, heaters, and ovens, and parts for agricultural machinery. The agreement, as revised, covers 179 Venezuelan tariff items as compared with 88 in the 1939 agreement. It includes products of interest to practically every important group of United States exporters. Concessions by Venezuela have particular significance since that country has no balance of payment difficulties in purchasing from the dollar area.

In 1950 United States imports from Venezuela of crude pertoleum and residual fuel oil amounted to $288,000,000 or about 90 percent of our total imports from Venezuela. It is estimated that the 1950 value of trade on which the United States granted improved customs treatment is about $175,000,000, of which practically all was crude petroleum and residual fuel oil. New concessions of potential value to Venezuela consisted of the binding of existing duty-free entry for iron ore, deposits of which are now being developed.

The new agreement also amends and supplements some of the general provisions of the 1939 agreement. The principal changes are a substantial strengthening of the quota provision so as to safeguard more adequately the value of the reciprocal tariff concessions, an additional reciprocal undertaking with regard to customs formalities, and the inclusion of the standard escape clause in event serious injury should be caused or threatened to domestic industry as a result of the agreement.

With regard to the concession on crude petroleum, topped crude and fuel oil derived from petroleum, it would have been possible under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act to reduce the excise tax provided for in section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code to 5¼ cents per barrel. The majority of the representatives of private business urged during the hearings held both by the Tariff Commission and by the Committee for Reciprocity Information that such a concession be made to Venezuela. I have agreed to a concession of 5¼ cents per barrel on imports of some of these kinds of petroleum products, namely, those which test under 25° API. A rate of 10½ cents per barrel, a treatment which was in effect from 1943 through 1950 under the Mexican Trade Agreement, is provided for under the new agreement for petroleum products tested 25° or more API, which constitute the greater part of United States imports of crude oil. Experience during 1943–50 indicates that imports at 10½ cents will undoubtedly prove no deterrent to drilling and development programs now under way in the United States.

Most of the crude oil produced in the United States has a specific gravity of 25° API or higher. The national average is about 35° API. For example, less than 1 percent of the crude oil produced in west Texas is below 25° API. Most of the heavier crude oils in the United States are produced in the Rocky Mountain area, in California, and in some of the Gulf coast area.

About one-third of the Venezuelan crude oil production has a gravity of less than 25° API. Nearly all of the low-gravity oil is shipped to the refineries on the islands of Aruba and Curacao.

Only the asphalt crudes, some of the topped crude, and the residual fuel oil will pay the lower excise tax. Generally, imports of these heavier crude oils sell in markets different from those in which domestic low-gravity oils sell. Furthermore, the lower gravity oils have a lower value in the market than the higher gravity petroleum products. It is be-

lieved appropriate, therefore, that these commodities of less worth should be dutiable at a lower specific rate and that the more valuable oils should pay a higher rate.

The imported oils which would pay the lower tax are among those which are in relatively short supply in the United States and generally throughout the world. It is not expected that the lower tax applicable to such oils will cause an undue increase in imports above the quantity which otherwise might be imported. It would appear, accordingly, that the lower tax on residual fuel oil would not serve to disturb the relationship which now exists in the United States between this fuel and other sources of heat and energy.

One major use of residual fuel oil is for ship bunkering; oil for this purpose traditionally has been imported free into the United States. The residual fuel oil subject to import tax is utilized mainly in gas and electric power plants, in smelters, mines, and manufacturing industries, and, to a lesser degree, as heating oil in industrial plants. Most of these users are located along the east coast.

For the most part, these fuel-burning installations, particularly the power plants, are convertible, using either coal or residual fuel oil depending upon which is cheaper at a given time. In recent years coal has been cheaper. Coal is also more available, because residual fuel oil is in tight world supply, and because the percentage of residual fuel oil to total output of United States refineries is constantly decreasing as emphasis shifts to distilling larger amounts of the higher and more valuable fractions, such as gasoline. Therefore, the percentage of convertible plants using coal has increased steadily since 1949, until now most of the east coast power plants are using coal rather than residual fuel oil. The reduction in excise tax on residual fuel oil in the present agreement is not expected to be sufficient to change this long-term trend. In reviewing this situation in its peril point findings, the various Tariff Commission members, too, concluded that it offered no valid deterrent to a reduction in the import tax on petroleum.

The conclusion of the supplementary trade agreement is recognition by both the United States and Venezuela of a common interest in the expansion of trade. Venezuela is one of the largest markets for a wide range of United States export products. The United States provides an important and established market for Venezuelan oil, this representing, in turn, an essential supplement to domestic United States production. The United States will also provide a market for other Venezuelan natural resources, such as iron ore, which are needed in this country. The agreement, therefore, will be of economic benefit to both countries. It is, moreover, of vital security importance in view of the strategic nature of some of the products included within its terms.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 29, 1952.*

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Patrick J. Hurley, of Sante Fe, N. Mex., contesting the right of DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, to a seat in the Senate of the United States, for the term beginning January 3, 1953, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the international information and educational exchange program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period June 16, 1952, through September 15, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period March 16 through June 15, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the International Claims Commission, for the period December 31, 1951, to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting two letters relating to Pan-American Day—one from the Secretary of the Brazilian Senate, addressed to the United States Minister Counselor of the Embassy of the United States of North America, and the other from the President of the Senate of Colombia (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CLAIM SETTLED BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the settlement of the American Dock Co. claim in the sum of $4,185; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS SETTLED BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all claims paid under section (e) of Public Law 220, Eighty-second Congress, first session, by the Treasury Department, for the 6 months ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE RELATING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on violations of the Code relating to excessive allotments of appropriations for the Coast Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE, ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TITLE CHANGES AND FUND ADJUSTMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title changes and fund adjustments in the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year 1951–52 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the United States Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1951, together with a photostatic copy of the Report of Annual Inspection, 1951, of the Home by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 5)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished certain Government and other personnel, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED TO GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretry of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation facilities provided Government and other personnel by the Department of the Navy, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON CLAIMS ARISING FROM EXPLOSION AT PORT CHICAGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report (pt. II) on the settlement of claims arising from the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damages occasioned by naval vessels, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on settlement of claims for damages to naval vessels, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOLS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of professors and instructors and the compensation for each at the United States naval postgraduate schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on contracts entered into by the Navy Department relating to naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLYING PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flying pay paid to officers above the grade of major in the Air Force, for the period March 1 to August 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished by the Air Force, for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS OF AIR FORCE ASSIGNED TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government, for the quarter ended September 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICERS OF AIR FORCE ASSIGNED TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Acting Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of officers of the Air Force assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON GRANTING OF TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Five letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the granting of temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Seven letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of certain aliens whose deportation has been suspended by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF ADJUDICATIONS RENDERED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the adjudications rendered by the Department of Justice during the year 1952, together with a statement of the compromise settlements effected during that year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through the Post Office Department, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, by the executive departments, independent establishments, organizations, and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CANCELLATION OF REIMBURSABLE IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS, NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling reimbursable irrigation charges against Pueblo Indian lands in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST INDIAN LANDS, OROVILLE-TONASKET IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain irrigation charges against Indian lands in the Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District, Okanogan County, Wash. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law reports on synthetic liquid fuels, part I being a report on oil from coal, and part II being a report on oil from oil shale, for the calendar year 1951 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TRINITY RIVER DIVISION OF CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON SOIL SURVEYS AND LAND CLASSIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES

Two letters from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on soil surveys and land classifications of the lands to be benefited by the Rapid Valley Unit, Cheyenne Division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and the Madera Irrigation district, Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Twenty letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on soil surveys and land classifications of the lands to be benefited by the Missouri diversion unit, Missouri-Souris division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana; the Lower Marias unit, Marias division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana; the Webster unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas; the Solano project, California; the Sly Park unit, Central Valley project, California; the Collbran project, Colorado; the Plain View water district, Central Valley project; California; the Delano-Earlimart irrigation district, Central Valley project, California; the Grants Pass project, Oregon; the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington; the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho; the Kirwin unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas; the Vermejo project, New Mexico; the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, Arizona; the Crow Creek pump unit, Three Forks division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana; the Weber Basin project, Utah; the Eden project, Wyoming; the Cachuma project, California; the Columbia Basin project, Washington; and the Heart Butte Unit, Heart division, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSMISSION LINES, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the restrictions on the availability of appropriations for the construction of transmission lines in the Southeastern Power Administration are no longer applicable (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Five letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of bill No. 41, ordinance to amend section 7, chapter 4, title III, of the Code of Laws of the Municipality of St. Croix, enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DEER CREEK POWER PLANT, PROVO RIVER PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of the Deer Creek power plant and appurtenant facilities as supplemental works to the Deer Creek Division, Provo River project, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the survey to determine the feasibility of developing a Mississippi River Parkway (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROPOSED DOMESTIC WATER SYSTEM, NORTH UNIT OF DESCHUTES FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the proposed Domestic Water System for the North Unit of the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited by the Bartley diversion dam, canal, and laterals, Red Willow unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted and resolutions adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Thirteenth to the Nineteenth Special Sessions of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted and resolutions adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON INDIAN REVOLVING CREDIT FUND TRANSACTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Indian revolving credit fund transactions, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON INSPECTION OF COAL MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmititng, pursuant to law, a report by the Bureau of Mines on inspection of coal mines, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON OVER-OBLIGATION OF FUNDS, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the over-obligation of funds by the Bureau of Reclamation, for the period ended December 31, 1951 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, copies of additional letters of comment on the Department of Agriculture's supplemental report on the Missouri River Basin agricultural program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of July 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Five letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the months of May, June, August, September, and October 1952 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OBLIGATIONS INCURRED IN EXCESS OF QUARTERLY LIMITATION OF ALLOTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on obligations incurred in excess of quarterly limitation of allotment by the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Agricultural Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS IN EXCESS OF $1,000

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims in excess of $1,000, together with a statement showing the addresses of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amounts of the settlements, and the reasons therefor, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATIVE RESEARCH, SERVICE, AND EDUCATIONAL WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperative research, service, and educational work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXCESS OBLIGATIONS OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the obligations incurred in excess of the quarterly limitation in an allotment, by the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA, MARYLAND, AND WEST VIRGINIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Youghiogheny River watershed, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF SAVANNAH RIVER WATERSHED, NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Savannah River watershed, North Carolina (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Agriculture, for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nineteenth quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on its activities under the Merchant Ship Sales Act, for the period April 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the period July 1 through

September 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended June 30, 1952, with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK AND CERTAIN OTHER INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended September 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twentieth quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on commissary activities outside the continental United States by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNITED STATES MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations by the United States Maritime Administration for the period January 1 through August 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Defense Mobilization, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority under the Defense Production Act, as amended, for the period ended September 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Twenty letters from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on reapportionment of appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Treasury Department for Salaries and Expenses, Secret Service Division;

Treasury Department for Operating Expenses, Coast Guard;

Veterans' Administration for Readjustment Benefits;

Veterans' Administration for Compensation and Pensions;

Veterans' Administration for Veterans' Miscellaneous Benefits;

Veterans' Administration for Administration, Medical, Hospital, and Domiciliary Services;

Veterans' Administration for Servicemen's Indemnities;

Veterans' Administration for Grants to the Republic of the Philippines;

Department of Justice for Support of United States Prisoners;

Department of Justice for Support of United States Prisoners;

Department of Labor for Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, Bureau of Employment Security;

Military Personnel, Marine Corps;

Military Personnel Requirements, Air Force;

Military Personnel, Army;

Military Personnel, Navy;

Retired Pay, Department of Defense;

Federal Security Agency for Grants to States for Public Assistance;

Federal Security Agency for Salaries and Expenses, Office of Education;

Federal Security Agency for Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; and

Federal Security Agency, under the limitation Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman, U. S. Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the Trade Agreements Program, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REWARDS FOR SUPERIOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional step increases as rewards for superior accomplishment, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON FLOOD SITUATION IN OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MO.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on the flood situation in the Osage River Basin, Mo. (project No. 459) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STEAM-ELECTRIC PLANT CONSTRUCTION COST AND ANNUAL PRODUCTION EXPENSES, 1951"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publication entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1951" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF NATURAL GAS COMPANIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1951"

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly-issued publication entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies in the United States, 1951" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "TYPICAL ELECTRIC BILLS FOR CITIES OF 50,000 POPULATION AND MORE, JANUARY 1, 1952"

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate a copy of that Commission's publication entitled "Typical Electric Bills for Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1952" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC BILLS FOR CITIES OF 2,500 POPULATION AND MORE, JANUARY 1, 1952"

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly-issued publication entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills for Cities of 2,500 Population and More, January 1, 1952" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1951"

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "ELECTRIC UTILITY DEPRECIATION PRACTICES, 1951"

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publication entitled "Electric Utility Depreciation Practices, 1951" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COOS (OR KOWES) BAY, LOWER UMPQUA (OR KALAWATSET), AND SIUSLAW INDIAN TRIBES VERSUS UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order sustaining motion for summary judgment in the case of Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Indian Tribes versus the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENECA NATION OF INDIANS, ON THE RELATION OF JOHN L. SNYDER AND ARLINE R. FRIDAY, PETITIONER VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the order sustaining the motion to dismiss and the opinion of the United States Court of Claims affirming the order to dismiss in the case of Seneca Nation of Indians, on the relation of John L. Snyder and Arline R. Friday, petitioner versus the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON CLAIMS OF VICTOR MCKEOWN AND BYERS TRANSPORTATION CO., INC., VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

Two letters from the chairman of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the claims of Victor McKeown, doing business as McKeown Trucks versus the United States, and the Byers Transportation Co., Inc., versus

the United States (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON CERTAIN CLAIMS BY MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Thirty-five letters from the Chairman of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on claims against the United States (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Olson Transfer Co.; Lyman Truck Lines; Dairy Dispatch Co.; Heuer Truck Lines, Inc.; Certified Motor Transport; Peterson & Sons Transfer; Film Pickup Service; North Shore Fish & Freight Co., a corporation; Wilber Transfer Co.; Smith Transit Co.; McKeown Trucks; Schmidt Truck Lines; Sioux Transportation Co., a corporation; Schien Truck Lines; Reliable Motor Freight Line; Lake Superior Motor Freight; White's Motor Transport; Mercury Motor Freight Lines, Inc.; Western Transportation Co.; Byers Transportation Co., Inc.; Brady Transfer & Storage Co., Inc.; Wheelock Bros., Inc.; Knaus Truck Lines; Tri-State Transfer Co., Inc.; Wichita Forwarding Co., a corporation; Toedebusch Transfer, Inc.; Healzer Cartage Co., a corporation; Arrow Motor Freight, successor to Weighley Transfer Co.; Thiel Truck Service; M. K. & C. Truck Lines, a corporation; Hi-Way Freight Terminal, Inc.; Triangle Terminal Co.; Lee Cartage Co.; Powell Bros. Truck Lines, Inc.; and Pacific Intermountain Express, a corporation.

FINAL REPORT OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's activities from January 1 to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter signed by the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth semiannual report of that Commission, dated July 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT ON GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT, PIKE COUNTY, OHIO

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report relating to the selection of a site for the new gaseous diffusion plant to be constructed by that Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, for the calendar year 1951 and the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF CUSTOMS RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN WHEAT

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Bureau of Customs, relating to importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT OF JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE RECORDING FACILITY

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, at the request of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, an audit report of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, for the period January 5, 1951, to June 4, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AUDIT REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL MARKETING REVOLVING FUND (FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION)

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Agricultural Marketing Revolving Fund (Farm Credit Administration), for the 4-year period ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank for the period January–June 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON PROJECT EAST RIVER

A letter signed by the Chairman, National Security Resources Board, and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report on Project East River, relating to the civil defense problem (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that agency, for the calendar year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXCESS OBLIGATIONS OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on the excess allotments of funds for the Federal Housing Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh quarterly report on the advance planning program, dated June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated September 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the executive secretary of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the tort claims paid by that agency during the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all judgments rendered by that court for the year ended October 3, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

J. D. MOTLOW AND THOMAS MOTLOW, ADMINISTRATORS OF ESTATE OF LEM MOTLOW, DECEASED, AND OPHELIA MOTLOW VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 252, Eightieth Congress, a copy of the judgment in the case of Mr. and Mrs. Lem Motlow versus the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

V. A. VERHEI VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, reporting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 344, that the case of V. A. Verhei versus the United States, had been dismissed for lack of prosecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESENTMENT OF HUDSON COUNTY (N. J.) GRAND JURY

A letter from the Clerk to Grand Juries, Hudson County, Jersey City, N. J., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the presentment of the Hudson County (N. J.) grand jury, 1950 term, relating to criminal conditions existing on the waterfront throughout that county (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON STOCKPILE

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential statistical report on the stockpile for the 6 months ended June 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON OVER-EXPENDED ALLOTMENT OF APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reporting, pursuant to law, the over-expended allotment for personal services to the Corporation's Boston Loan Agency, in the amount of $304.58 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Corporation for the calendar year ended December 31, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts were negotiated by that committee during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts executed, by negotiation, for experimental, developmental or research work by the Coast Guard, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report) to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report of that Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON FUTURE ACTIVITIES OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the President, a special report on the future activities of that Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUBSTITUTE SHEETS FOR REPORT OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting errata sheets to be substituted for pages 2 and 11 of the Fourth Quarterly Report of that Administration, transmitted to the Senate on October 15, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for research and development purposes, for the period ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE RELATING TO DISPOSITION OF CONTAMINATED GROUND TALC

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of 20,000 pounds of contaminated ground talc now held in the National stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the Director, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of the American Legion, dated October 31, 1952 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the executive secretary of the National Munitions Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Board's activities in the control of the traffic in arms and implements of war for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the President of the National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Agency for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquired by that administration, for the quarter ended September 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, contributions to the States, the District of Columbia, and five Territories and Possessions, for civil defense purposes, for the quarter ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Administator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no financial contributions were made to the States for civil defense purposes during the quarter ended September 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOURNAL OF HAWAIIAN LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Senate Journal of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1951 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INFORMATION CONCERNING PROPOSALS OF CANDIDATES FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

A letter from the Secretary of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, transmitting information concerning proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize, to be distributed December 10, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent order, entered on motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the first order of business is the submission of petitions and memorials.

If there be no petitions or memorials, the next order of business is reports of committees. It is assumed that there are no reports of committees.

The next order of business is the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I submit at this time a concurrent resolution relating to the presidential succession, and I ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution is not in order at this time. It will be in order at a later time. Concurrent resolutions are not now in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this is a report of a committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but reports of committees are not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote obervance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3. A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4. A bill to deny income-tax exemption to certain organizations which make donations to subversive organizations or individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 5. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 6. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 7. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the merger and the consolidation of international air carriers for the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 8. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; and

S. 9. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; and

S. 11. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 12. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 13. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 14. A bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States;

S. 15. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes;

S. 16. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees;

S. 17. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies;

S. 18. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom; and

S. 19. A bill to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 20. A bill to provide for the use of 25 percent of grazing receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 21. A bill to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 22. A bill to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 23. A bill to make it unlawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold an office or employment with any labor organization, and to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States;

S. 24. A bill to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged;

S. 25. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

S. 26. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions;

S. 27. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Award Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes;

S. 28. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 29. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II; and

S. 30. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 32. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 33. A bill to provide for the care of members of the Coast Guard and their dependents in naval hospitals in certain cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 34. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 35. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 36. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 37. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 38. A bill to assist in the provision of facilities for free public education required in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 39. A bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 40. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish recreational facilities in reservoir areas of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 41. A bill to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended;

S. 42. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States;

S. 43. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit officers or employees of the United States from accepting payments for appointment or retention of a person in office or employment under the United States;

S. 44. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations;

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Cappelier Weyel;

S. 46. A bill for the relief of E. S. Berney;

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Joseph Andrew Wright; and

S. 48. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CORDON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; and

S. 51. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Anny Del Curto;

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards;

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra;

S. 55. A bill for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht;

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert;

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra;

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Jacquet;

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Felix Kortschak;

S. 60. A bill for the relief of Fawn S. Louie;

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marek and Emma Elizabeth Marek;

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Martinez y Garcia;

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Vaclav Mostecky;

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri;

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy; and

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk; and

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 70. A bill to amend section 4 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to extend to certain medical personnel credit for military service rendered in the armed forces of cobelligerent nations during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Bernard W. Olson; and

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 73. A bill providing for the payment by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of medical and hospital expenses incurred by Daniel E. Robertson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 74. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interest in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 75. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 76. A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 77. A bill to prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing on public lands in violation of State or Territorial laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 78. A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be security risks or disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 79. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 81. A bill to require certain members of the legislative and executive branches of the Government to file additional copies of their annual Federal income-tax return; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 82. A bill to permit exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the mineral-land laws of the United States of certain lands acquired by the United States; and

S. 83. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Joseph Amin Kehdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 85. A bill to prevent Federal dam and reservoir projects from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations;

S. 86. A bill to authorize payment, on a fair and equitable basis, to the States and their political subdivisions for the replacement, relocation, rebuilding, or improvement of public highway facilities inundated, abandoned, damaged, or destroyed by the construction or operation of certain public works of the United States; and

S. 87. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 88. A bill to provide for the addition to the Willamette National Cemetery of the Veterans Burial Plot of Lincoln Memorial Park, Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; and

S. 89. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 90. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 91. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Thomas Post; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 93. A bill to authorize grants to enable the States to survey, coordinate, supplement, and strengthen their existing health resources so that hospital and medical care may be obtained by all persons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 94. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donka Kourteva Dikova (Dikoff) and her son Nicola Marin Dikoff;

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Vicent;

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Gunhard Oravas and Virve Oravas;

S. 98. A bill for the relief of (Mrs.) Betty Thornton or Jozsefne Toth;

S. 99. A bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes;

S. 100. A bill for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Phed Vosniacos;

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo; and

S. 103. A bill for the relief of Silverio Salvatore Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 104. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Food and Drug district office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 105. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 106. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 107. A bill to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes; and

S. 108. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on certain claims of individual Navajo Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 109. A bill for the relief of Crisanto Castillo Underwood;

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Christopher F. Jako;

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida McCabe; and

S. 112. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to establish a minimum payment of compensation for the survivors of prisoners of war who died during imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 113. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 114. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 115. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 116. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 117. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; and

S. 119. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 120. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Giannatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 121. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 122. A bill directing the conveyance of certain property to the city of Rupert, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Wolf-Rudiger Johannes Urban;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Nikolas Walleri;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Eusebio Asis; and

S. 128. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 129. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 130. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled Crimes and Criminal Procedure, with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Minnesota civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State; and

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Schafhausen and Gertrude Julie Schafhausen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska):

S. 132. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 133. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans;

S. 134. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; and

S. 135. A bill to amend section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the maximum amounts and terms for which loans may be made under such section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 136. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 137. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so that persons receiving insurance benefits under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System can earn as much as $100 a month, in lieu of $50 a month, without forfeiting insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 138. A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 139. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 140. A bill for the relief of John W. McBride;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke;

S. 144. A bill for the relief of the Cavalier County Fair Association;

S. 145. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

S. 146. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired while a bona fide resident of the United States;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato;

S. 148. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890;

S. 149. A bill conferring authority on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to regulate admission to the bar of the District of Columbia;

S. 150. A bill for the relief of Vladimir and Jaroslava Wolf;

S. 151. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired by gift, trust, annuity, devise, bequest, inheritance, or as beneficiary of any insurance policy from an American citizen or national and to provide that in any present or future conflict similar property be held in trust for such enemy alien by courts of competent jurisdiction or by an agency of the Government appointed by the President, subject to the use of the United States Government for the successful conclusion of hostilities, to be returned to such alien after the end of hostilities under certain conditions as set out herein;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas; and

S. 155. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 156. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation as to the cause, prevention, treatment, and possible cure of epilepsy; and

S. 157. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 158. A bill to provide for the installation of improvements and facilities needed for the protection, development, and utilization of Federal resources affected by dam and water reservoir projects constructed by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 159. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Montana control over their tribal funds;

S. 160. A bill authorizing investigation, research, and development work by the Secretary of the Interior and the construction and operation of facilities, including not more than one demonstration plant, to determine and demonstrate the economic feasibility of producing electric power and energy by means of a wind-driven generator operated in conjunction with an electric-power system, and for other purposes;

S. 161. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent in fee to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

S. 162. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Montana for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

S. 163. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent in fee to Olive Old Bull Comes in a Day;

S. 164. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; and

S. 165. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent in fee to Amy Old Bull; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 168. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Jessie Connelly;

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Benjamin;

S. 172. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Sengoku;

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro;

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Musa Eid M. Abdes Salam; and

S. 175. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 176. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 177. A bill to prohibit the donation to or acceptance by Members of Congress of contributions for services rendered or to be rendered as such Members or for reimbursement of expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as such Members and for other purposes;

S. 178. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; and

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Insun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 180. A bill to limit the cases in which persons charged with offenses cognizable by the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia may forfeit collateral in lieu of appearing for trial;

S. 181. A bill to amend the Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 182. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention and punishment of all gambling, except casual social gambling, in the District of Columbia;

S. 183. A bill to provide for the better control of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia;

S. 184. A bill to make uniform the procedure on interstate extradition in the District of Columbia;

S. 185. A bill to make certain transactions involving the making of gifts to, or the receiving of gifts by, officials of the District of Columbia prima facie evidence of a violation of certain statutes relating to bribery;

S. 186. A bill to prescribe certain penalties applicable to present and former officers and employees of the District of Columbia who refuse to testify concerning matters relating to their public office; and

S. 187. A bill to provide criminal penalties for unlawful possession of narcotic drugs with intent to barter, exchange, sell, or give the same to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 188. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 189. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government;

S. 190. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes;

S. 191. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 192. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki); and

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Theodore G. Passalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 195. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in naval shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Alejandro de la Cruz Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 197. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the joint construction and operation of public welfare institutions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 198. A bill to authorize the improvement of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River, N. H., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 199. A bill to provide for the exchange of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 200. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations;

S. 201. A bill making the day designated for appointment of electors of President and Vice President a legal holiday;

S. 202 (by request). A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Gail Mackiernan, a minor;

S. 203 (by request). A bill for the relief of Yvonne Linnea Colcord;

S. 204 (by request). A bill for the relief of Yoko Okuno; and

S. 205 (by request). A bill for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Ursula Kirkpatrick;

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Jimy Okuda;

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi);

S. 209. A bill for the relief of Irene C. Karl;

S. 210. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy;

S. 211. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schwartz;

S. 212. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Papantoniou (formerly Georgia Zazas);

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Katina and Theodoros Fiflis; and

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Geraldine B. Mathews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 216. A bill to set aside the proceeds of the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles, tires and tubes, gasoline, and lubricating oil for the purposes of the Federal-Aid Road Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 217. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 218. A bill to amend section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline);

S. 219. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers in building roads; and

S. 220. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 221. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to include claims of certain American citizens who served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II and who were taken prisoners of war;

S. 222. A bill for the relief of Martha H. Braun; and

S. 223. A bill to amend section 284 of the United States Code relating to disqualifications of former officers and employees in matters connected with their former duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 224. A bill to provide that the Governor and Secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 225. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its Territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Keiko Tashiro;

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo;

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Irene Exitis;

S. 229. A bill for the relief of Michael David Montgomery;

S. 230. A bill for the relief of Jenny Evely Elsie Duncan;

S. 231. A bill for the relief of Otmar Sprah; and

S. 232. A bill for the relief of Hugo Kern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 233. A bill for the relief of Jeno Csepio;

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Thomas Szabo;

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco;

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 237. A bill for the relief of Augusta Barrois;

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahn and Suzanne Hahn;

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Goto; and

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Isabel Eileen Burn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 241. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 242. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 243. A bill to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111) to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration); the to Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 244. A bill to provide for recognition of the Cathedral-of-the-Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 245. A bill to authorize promotions from apprentice to journeymen in the Government service to be made on a permanent basis, to provide credit for promotion and retention purposes for graduate apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Gerrit Been; and

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Frans Gunnick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb; and

S. 249. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of amounts payable to aliens under trust funds created by American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 250. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GRISWOLD, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to impose limitations with regard to executive agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property; and

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the same rights to the Indian tribes which are enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution designating the period beginning on the Sunday before Thanksgiving Day and ending on the Sunday after Thanksgiving Day of each year as Homemakers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and a State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, introduced by Mr. CORDON (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference bills providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union and to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators) were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; and

S. 51. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

The bills are identical with those which were reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the Eighty-second Congress. The purpose of the Alaska bill is to enable the strategically situated and richly endowed Territory of Alaska to enter the Union as a State on a free and equal basis with the present 48 States. The Alaska bill provides the legal and political means of achieving this purpose by authorizing the people of the Territory to elect delegates on the basis of the 1950 census to a nonpartisan constitutional convention which would draft a proposed constitution and submit it to the people of the Territory for ratification. It sets forth specific provisions which must be part of the State constitution. The new State and its people must provide in the State constitution for a republican form of government with no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color and that no subversive persons shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the proposed constitution. Congress must approve the proposed constitution.

Under the bill, Alaska can select some 23,000,000 acres of public land there best fitted for the community and other requirements of Alaska.

There is a disclaimer provision in the proposed Alaska legislation similar to those in the enabling acts of the public land States and found in the Federal statutes of admittance to the Union for the last 13 States admitted. Thus, the new State of Alaska in its constitution must disclaim all right and title not only to any lands or other property of the United States not conveyed or conferred to it or its political subdivisions, but also to any lands or property of natives of Alaska or held by the United States in trust for these natives.

Alaska would have control over the highly important Alaskan fisheries and wildlife except certain activities subject to international agreement or included within the reserved native rights. There is another provision which requires a specific clause in the constitution to protect native rights, thus extending the chance to the people of Alaska to make clear that the natives are and shall continue to be full citizens of the United States. The new constitution to be drafted by delegates elected publicly to the constitutional convention must be approved by the people of the Alaska Territory and they can disapprove Alaska statehood by disapproving this constitution. Thus, the bill I am introducing provides for its own referendum on the central issue.

The purpose of the Hawaii bill is to enable this fortress of Americanism in the greater Pacific area to become a State of the United States. The passage of this bill will be evidence to the world that America practices what it preaches, that it enforces the principles of democracy and equality and opportunity which is the foundation of our Nation.

The Hawaii bill provides for the recognition of the constitutional convention held under territorial law from April 4 to July 22, 1950, as the body which would be authorized to draw up the proposed State constitution. This would simply make it unnecessary to elect, for a second time, delegates to a constitutional convention and the holding of a convention at a second plebiscite on the proposed constitution—thus saving a substantial outlay of public funds as well as the time of men in public life. The Hawaii constitution must contain specific requirements such as a guaranty of freedom of speech and of religious worship and a provision that no subversive person shall be qualified to hold any office of trust or profit under the State constitution. Like the Alaska proposal, the bill would require a disclaimer of title to the people of Hawaii as to lands in that Territory set aside for the use of the Federal Government and make provision for the disposal of the remaining public land. Lastly, it would require approval of the State constitution by the Congress.

The strategic importance of Alaska and Hawaii to our system of national defense is undisputable. Pearl Harbor made us aware that its western frontier was that group of islands called Hawaii, some 2,000 miles southward in the Pacific. By granting statehood to Hawaii America would bind itself for evermore to an impregnable wall of defense which is so vital to its own security.

A mere 54 miles of the Bering Straits separate Alaska from Soviet territory. The shortest and most direct air route between Soviet centers and inland centers of the United States is across the narrow Arctic waters of Alaska's northern shores.

Statehood for Alaska would be an act in further fulfillment of obligations assumed by the United States under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter which is a declaration regarding non-self-governing territories. Alaskan statehood would strengthen American foreign policy and the position of the United States in international affairs. It would be a clear indication of American declarations against colonization.

With respect to Hawaii, the moral and psychological position of the United States with the people of Asia on this Pacific front should not be weakened by the paradoxical status of Hawaii. The American sector of the Pacific arena should be an unbroken line of equal States. The racial background of Hawaiian people gives the Nation a unique medium of communication and understanding with Asiatic people—thus Hawaii, through statehood, could send representatives to Congress who have intimate knowledge of trans-Pacific affairs and could well become the center of administration of our interests in the Pacific and in Asia.

The industrial and economic potentialities of Alaska and Hawaii would contribute greatly to promote our national prosperity. Alaska has tremendous resources of untapped raw materials including iron ore, coal, copper, lead, zinc, tin, antimony, mercury, and chromite. Its forest products make it possible for the lumber industry to compete successfully with other areas despite higher transportation costs to markets. Alaska has splendid sites and facilities for the development of hydroelectric power as well as coal reserves. Its fishing industry which produces almost $100,000,000 a year is susceptible of further expansion.

Agriculture and recreational facilities are Hawaii's major assets. In 1950 internal-revenue collections from Hawaii totaled over $81,000,000, exceeding that for 10 States.

Alaska and Hawaii are the two remaining incorporated Territories under the American flag which have not yet achieved statehood. Approval by Congress of these two bills would complete the historical pattern for our Nation. Both of these Territories are ready for statehood. The inhabitants of the proposed States are imbued with the fundamental principles of democracy as we know it in the United States. They have proved that they have reached democratic political maturity, having undergone a period of tutorage as incorporated Territorial governments.

The vast majority of the citizens of these two Territories want statehood. Each of them has sufficient population and resources to provide revenues in support of their own State governments and at the same time contribute toward their fair share of the cost of operating our Federal Government.

Mr. President, the history of the political platforms of the Democratic Party on these bills is very clear. The Democratic Party in its platforms of 1900–20, 1940, and 1948 strongly supported eventual statehood for the Territories. In 1952 we urged immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

We have promised the people of Alaska and Hawaii eventual statehood by the original act of annexation in the case of Hawaii; by the original treaty of purchase in the case of Alaska and by the events showing the course of American history.

The United States saw fit to make Alaska and Hawaii incorporated Territories. Our past history shows that the granting of Territorial status has meant only one further step—ultimate statehood. The Democratic Party has been endeavoring for many years to give to the people of Hawaii and Alaska the same right and recognition we have given to other Territories in our past history. The Democratic Party has always envisioned an America which would grow both spiritually and economically, which would foster the ideals of self-government and freedom. We have always tenaciously supported the concept that the frontiers of democracy are unlimited, that its growth goes far beyond our own natural geographical boundaries.

We are no longer a Nation of Thirteen Colonies. We are no longer a country which has limitless, untapped, and unexplored areas which we had in the West during the nineteenth century. Times have changed; conditions are different; the world we live in is more closely knit.

Today the United Nations organization is the foundation and symbol for world peace and brotherhood. A strong United Nations, operating in a democratic tradition which we know so well and revere, would mean the end of war and strife for many generations to come.

A strong unified American Government composed of our individual States is the bastion of the U. N., the stronghold of world democracy. The granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would be a symbol and a signal to the rest of the world that we are trying with all our might to promote and propagate the principles of self-determination and self-government among the people of the earth. The inclusion of these two Territories as States within our own Union would be a spark to the United Nations to eliminate the degradations of colonialism and economical and political imperialism which dominates many parts of the world. It would show to the people of other nations that we mean to maintain our position as moral, spiritual, and material leaders of the world for the benefit of mankind today and in the future.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced bills to enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter the Union. I have prepared a statement on the subject and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, following the statement of the distinguished Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I am joining with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, in introducing bills to enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter the Union as States.

At the same time I have gladly consented to cosponsor, with Senator GUY CORDON, Republican, Oregon, and others, legislation to enable the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State.

For many years I have supported statehood for both of these great Territories. As a member of the platform committee at the last Democratic National Convention I assisted in drafting, and presented, the following plank, which was adopted:

"Alaska and Hawaii: By virtue of their strategic geographical locations, Alaska and Hawaii are vital bastions in the Pacific.

"These two Territories have contributed greatly to the welfare and economic development of our country and have become integrated into our economic and social life. We therefore urge immediate statehood for these two Territories."

I think it has been a grave injustice to deny the loyal, progressive citizens of Alaska, and the loyal, progressive citizens of Hawaii, the rights and privileges of statehood.

Alaska has been an organized Territory of the United States for the past 40 years. It was a civil and judicial district for many years before that, and its first Governor, the Honorable John H. Kinkead, of Nevada, took office July 4, 1884.

Alaska is the only area in the Western Hemisphere formerly under Russian sovereignty, and was acquired by purchase from Russia 85 years ago.

Under all the principles of self-government asserted throughout our national history, and which we reaffirmed in the Charter of the United Nations, the peoples of Alaska are equally deserving with the peoples of Hawaii the glorious opportunity of full sovereignty under statehood.

News dispatches report a conference held Monday in New York City between four of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate, all Republicans, and President-elect Eisenhower.

The accounts indicated they had discussed statehood for Hawaii, but added: "Statehood for Alaska was not discussed."

I am happy that Hawaiian statehood was discussed and pleased that the eminent senior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, forecast following the conference that an Hawaiian statehood bill would be approved.

But I am grieved and disappointed that no such assurances were forthcoming with respect to the Territory of Alaska, and that, from all news accounts, the matter of statehood for Alaska was not considered at all.

In previous Congresses when Alaska statehood bills were brought up, a possible reason for the opposition of some Republicans was that Alaska, then at least, was predominantly Democratic. A majority of the Territorial legislators were Democrats, and there was an assumption, at least in some circles, that admission of Alaska as a State would mean an increase in the number of Democratic Senators.

The new legislature of Alaska, however, has Republican majorities in both the House and Senate, and it may astonish some of these Members, as it has me, that Alaska statehood was ignored in yesterday's conference between four Republican Senators and the President-elect.

I hope that this omission was not deliberate but merely an oversight. Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is not a partisan issue. Several of the Members at Monday's conference have supported Alaska statehood in the past as they have statehood for Hawaii. I trust they will continue to do so.

I join them in urging Hawaiian statehood. Statehood for Alaska must go hand in hand. It would be shocking, I feel, to the entire free world, if the only former Russian territory under the American flag—and under our flag for more than 85 years—would remain the last organized Territory denied statehood.

May the Eighty-third Congress add two stars to the flag, completing the field of blue.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN RESERVATIONS OF MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them. I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 75) to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. YOUNG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

The bill which I have today introduced, in my opinion, makes the early passage of this measure imperative.

The Federal land banks, of which there are 12 in number in the United States, are chartered under the Federal law. They are under the broad jurisdiction of the Land Bank Commissioner, although the banks themselves are owned entirely by their users. The members of the system, for the most part, are the membership of the farm loan associations. The farm loan associations, in turn, own stock of the Federal land banks.

During the course of their operations these various Federal land banks have acquired thousands and thousands of acres of land because of forfeiture, foreclosure, and other proceedings in lieu of foreclosure. It is their policy to resell such properties, returning them to private ownership, thus releasing their capital for other lending. In conveying interests in land to the purchaser, the Federal land banks may or may not reserve all or a portion of the mineral interests at the time of the sale. It is quite a common practice for any given Federal land bank to retain at least a portion of the minerals, for future sale perhaps to another purchaser thousands of miles away from the new surface owner. Obviously, this leads to a most confusing situation and perpetuates the continual division of the mineral interests from the surface itself.

During the drought and depression days of the thirties, when wheat was selling for less than 30 cents a bushel, and other farm commodities were a drug on the market even at give-away prices, many ambitious and capable farmers were just unable to continue in agriculture. Those with heavy encumbrances on their property were under an especially severe handicap since many

couldn't even realize enough annual income to make the interest payments on their loan. Consequently, any number of good farmers lost their lands through no fault of their own, and the title became vested in the Federal land banks. In subsequent years of better crops and prices, many of these same farmers had recovered sufficiently so as to be in a position to repurchase their land from the land banks for cash consideration. Thousands of them did just that. When they received the deed, after paying all of the principal amount of the loan, interest, and countless other charges, they found, much to their disappointment, that the Federal land bank had reserved all or a portion of the minerals, in some instances on the very land they once had owned free and clear.

Here is a case which comes as close to a violation of the doctrine of unjust enrichment as any I know. There is no earthly reason why any bank or institution whose operations are sanctioned, and in effect regulated, by the Federal Government should be permitted to engage in such a nefarious and inequitable practice. The bill which I have introduced today will take care of the situation and require that Federal land banks dispose of their mineral holdings as soon as possible and also prevent their reservation in years to come. The Federal land banks are not constituted to be in the mineral business, and never should be.

Let me hasten to add that Congress has recognized the principle of this measure upon several occasions in the past. Public Law 760 of the Eighty-first Congress authorized the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to dispose of mineral interests which they acquired in exactly the same way as the Federal land banks. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, which likewise loaned money to farmers on their land, is no longer engaged in this activity, however. I hope that by the passage of the legislation to which I have referred we can extend this same principle to the activities of the Federal land banks themselves. There is no reason at all for a differentiation as between the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and the Federal land banks. This bill has obvious merit when viewed in the light of justice and fair play.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 106) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

The legislation which was introduced in the House and Senate today will add another important weapon to the battle for preservation of our American way of life. It will provide for a new and wider study of the methods for bringing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of public business.

In brief, the bill provides for the establishment of a new commission to survey the Federal Government, but with important and major differences from the original 1947 Hoover Commission. The Commission, composed of 12 members, 4 each appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate, will conduct a thorough and intensive study of the Federal Government and report its findings to the Congress next year.

The most important aspect of this Commission lies in the purposes of its investigations, which differ considerably from the aims which guided the original Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

This Commission will explore and investigate the services, activities, and functions of the Federal Government with a view to "abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; eliminating services, functions, and activities more properly within the jurisdiction of State and local government, and eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise."

The Commission will conduct a long-range study of the fundamental activities of our Federal Government and its relationships with State and local governments. It will open new ground in surveying the relationships between the levels of American government—a field not covered by the Hoover Commission or any other government reorganization effort.

It should be pointed out that the Commission will make recommendations, based on the results of its investigations, to the Congress and the Congress has complete authority to accept or reject those recommendations. The Commission will be widely representative and the sponsors contemplate that its members shall be men (or women) of outstanding ability and wide experience who would be chosen solely for their ability and qualifications for the job.

Ours is a government of limited powers and the Founding Fathers were definite and explicit in separating our total government into proper spheres of action based on matters of Federal, State, or local concern. The Founding Fathers were also concerned lest the Government enter fields reserved to the individual. Recent years have seen the development of a widespread shift away from this division of powers. The Federal Government has poached on the activities of the States, the local governments, and the private citizen to an ever-increasing extent. This Commission would study that field of relationship and the sponsors feel that such a study would be of tremendous value in straightening out the tangles of intergovernmental relations, and that the work of this Commission can produce results which will strengthen and fortify our free heritage.

The Commission we propose will in no way conflict with the immediate, short-range study of Government reorganization which President-elect Eisenhower has set in motion. The Commission would observe the activities of the President's committee, aid and strengthen their recommendations, and carry on beyond the scope of that group. This Commission would use the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as a starting point, but would enlarge on them and go beyond them, since that group limited its studies to the efficient operation of the Government without considering the nature and purposes of the activities of the Government.

The need for an over-all evaluation of Federal activities is compelling, and we believe the Commission provided in this legislation to be a loud and clear answer to the growing riddle of how to maintain individual liberty and at the same time maintain a strong nation.

We feel certain that the members of the Commission will be men of the same high caliber as those who served on the Hoover Commission and under their leadership great benefits can arise from the work of the Commission. The Nation will derive much greater economy and efficiency in its Government.

BRIDGE ACROSS CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL AT SUMMIT, DEL.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 121) authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del., introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

On behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I have introduced a bill which was introduced in both the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses, and which is of the utmost importance not only to the State of Delaware, but to the whole system of automotive transportation along the eastern seaboard.

The proposed legislation would authorize the construction, at Government expense, of a new high-level, fixed bridge of four lanes across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

I will not take the time now to cite the many, many reasons for the necessity of this new crossing. But, I am sure that many Senators will realize the importance of this project when I tell them that the new bridge, proposed in this legislation, will serve as a major link between the newly completed Chesapeake Bay Bridge between the eastern and western shores of Maryland, and the Delaware River Memorial Bridge which connects the great States of Delaware and New Jersey. This new bridge, which would be constructed at Summit, Delaware, is intended to help speed the flow of traffic between such points as New York and Washington, and the south as well.

Anticipated traffic loads over existing bridges and highways already exceeds all previous estimates.

I might add that the Board of Rivers and Harbors of the Corps of Engineers has approved this project, and the reason why Senator WILLIAMS and I are offering the bill at this time is to endeavor to obtain special consideration of the project by Congress.

It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will be able to give early and favorable consideration to this legislation.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES TO AID FEDERAL-AID ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to set aside the proceeds of the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles, tires and

tubes, gasoline, and lubricating oil for the purposes of the Federal-Aid Road Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 216) to set aside the proceeds of the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles, tires and tubes, gasoline, and lubricating oil for the purposes of the Federal-Aid Road Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KILGORE), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Federal-Aid Highway Trust Fund created by section 2 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1954, a sum equal to the amount collected during the preceding calendar year as receipts from taxes imposed by sections 3400, 3403, 3412, and 3413 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

(b) Of the sum appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (a) for any fiscal year—

(1) Forty-five percent shall be available for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(2) Thirty percent shall be available for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(3) Twenty-five percent shall be available for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

(c) The sum authorized to be appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. Any sum apportioned to a State under this subsection shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sum was appropriated, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, $20,000,000 of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, shall be apportioned among the several States in the same manner as funds apportioned under subsection (c). The amount apportioned to any State under this subsection shall be available for expenditure by such State for study and research for the purpose of ascertaining methods of increasing the safety of users of the highways.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Federal-Aid Highway Trust Fund. There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) collected under sections 3400, 3403, 3412, and 3413 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended. No amounts shall be paid out of the trust fund except in pursuance of appropriations authorized by the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. The first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (Public Law 413, 82d Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

"The sum herein authorized shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(a) $247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(b) $165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

"(c) $137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

"The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

"Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State until June 30, 1956, and any amount remaining unexpended on the close of business on such date shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act."

The statement by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

The American Association of State Highway Officials at its thirty-eighth annual meeting in Kansas City, Mo., December 12, adopted a resolution urging that Federal-aid for highway authorizations be increased to the full amount of the Federal revenues from gasoline taxes. I am today introducing a bill embodying this plan and designed to carry out that objective. Senator JACKSON and Senator KILGORE have joined me in sponsoring this proposal.

The association is made up of the 48 State highway departments, the Territorial departments of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, the District of Columbia Highway Department and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MCCARRAN, AIKEN, BARRETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER of Nebraska, BUTLER of Maryland, BYRD, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE, CHAVEZ, CORDON, DANIEL, DIRKSEN, DUFF, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, FERGUSON, FLANDERS, FREAR, GILLETTE, GOLDWATER, HENDRICKSON, HICKENLOOPER, HOEY, IVES, JENNER, JOHNSON of Colorado, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KERR, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, MCCLELLAN, MALONE, MARTIN, MAYBANK, MUNDT, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMITH of New Jersey, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of North Carolina, STENNIS, TAFT, THYE, TOBEY, WATKINS, WELKER, WILLIAMS, YOUNG, GRISWOLD, and MAGNUSON, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements. It is the same joint resolution I introduced last year when I was joined by 58 other Senators. I am anxious to introduce it now, in order that we may obtain early hearings. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared, together with the joint resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, introduced by Mr. BRICKER (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof, shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriation legislation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

The statement presented by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The joint resolution expresses the basic objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 130, which I introduced in the last Congress for myself and 58 other Senators. At this time, I should like to express my deep appreciation to the Senators who joined with me in that proposal to amend the Constitution. The bipartisan sponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 130 stimulated discussion of the treaty-making power and helped in creating widespread support for placing appropriate limitations on that power. I regret that I

have not had time to consult with the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 130 concerning the revised resolution just introduced. Although overwhelming public support for amending the treaty power makes multiple sponsorship no longer necessary, I hope that the revised joint resolution will be endorsed by the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 130 and by other Senators.

In particular, I should like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCARRAN, who, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Eighty-second Congress, appointed a subcommittee to hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 130. The resolution just introduced is intended to meet all the legitimate criticisms advanced at those hearings to the language of Senate Joint Resolution 130. I urge the Senate Judiciary Committee to continue its work on this subject so that the Eighty-third Congress may submit to the States a constitutional amendment to prevent any treaty or executive agreement from undermining the rights and freedoms of the American people.

I shall discuss at a later date the necessity for amending the Constitution as proposed in the resolution. At this time, I shall discuss very briefly three arguments used to discredit any restriction on the treaty-making power.

First, the argument has been made that this is an anti-United Nations measure. That is not true. Nothing threatens the existence of the United Nations more than its desire to interfere in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of its members. The American people are not alone in their determination to prevent the U. N. from acting as the supreme arbiter of all economic and political activity. My amendment would make effective, insofar as the United States is concerned, the prohibition of article 2, paragraph 7, of the U. N. Charter forbidding U. N. intervention in purely domestic matters. By making such intervention impossible, we will encourage the United Nations to concentrate its energies in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The second argument advanced against any treaty clause amendment is that the President and the Senate should be trusted not to make any treaty which weakens constitutional freedoms. A similar argument was made and rejected at the time the Constitution itself was submitted for ratification. The people decided not to trust the President and the Congress with power to abridge their unalienable rights. The Bill of Rights was then added as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Failure to place comparable limitations on the President and the Senate in the exercise of the treaty-making power was due to the fact no one anticipated that treaties would ever be used to regulate matters of purely domestic concern.

The third argument advanced against proposals to restrict the treaty power is that the alleged dangers are remote. This is somewhat like saying that the barn should not be locked until after the horse has been stolen. The State Department, for example, has maintained that the U. N. draft Covenants on Human Rights are entirely consistent with American law and tradition. That argument has been exploded by none other than the present chairman of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon. Dr. Malik, writing in the September 1, 1952, issue of the United Nations Bulletin about the Human Rights Covenants, said:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to Western promptings."

Dr. Malik attributed this shocking fact to a "materialistic revolution" within the Human Rights Commission brought about, he said, by "the increasing impact of Marx" and "the apparent unimaginative helplessness of the Western World." Referring to the refusal of the U. N. Human Rights Commission to recognize the right to own property as a basic human right, Dr. Malik said:

"A study of this particular debate will reveal the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened. It seems incredible that in these economic matters * * * the Western World is so divided in itself as to be incapable of presenting a common front against communism."

Since Dr. Malik wrote his article, we have learned, thanks to the work of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, that American Communists employed by the U. N. have had a hand in advancing Communist doctrines. My proposed amendment and the investigation of subversives in the U. N. are related parts of a larger problem. That problem concerns the relationship which should exist between the United States and the United Nations and the quality of American representation at the U. N. The incoming administration and Eighty-third Congress must work together to insure that participation in the U. N. does not threaten the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States. They must make certain that American representatives to the U. N. are dedicated to preserving the immutable principles of freedom embodied in the American Constitution. If the incoming administration and the Eighty-third Congress fail in this task, public opinion will compel some future Congress to sever our relationship with the U. N.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Today I am once again introducing a series of proposals aimed at modernizing the national election procedures of the United States of America.

It seems to me that this Congress is especially charged with the responsibility for giving most earnest consideration to this subject.

The fact that we have a newly elected leadership in the Congress and a new National Government bespeaks, I believe, a desire of the people for a "different deal." Indeed, we can assume that the results of the national election last November reflect a desire on the part of the people for a change from things as they have been.

Efforts to revise and reform the election machinery of this Nation should be nonpartisan, or bipartisan. Both our major political parties should be interested in achieving changes in the direction to which my proposals point, and no particular significance should be attached to the failure of both conventions last summer to endorse the national primary plan because much of the dissatisfaction with the present method of selecting nominees for President and Vice President is based upon the first-hand knowledge of the operations of conventions—a knowledge general throughout the country for which television is to be thanked.

This is the fifth year in which I have urged the Congress to move toward election reforms. Those of us—and there are many in this body—who fervently believe in such reforms feel no discouragement over previous failures. Heretofore we did not have television on our side to show the American people the complete inadequacy and downright evil of the present convention system of nominating Presidents. We have not heretofore had such widespread interest in the changing of many of our election procedures. But the American people by the aid of television and spurred on by recent elections have awakened, and are now urgently requesting that we, the Congress—the only ones who can do anything about this situation—get busy and act. If there is any doubt on the part of Senators of the attitude of the American people toward these proposals, I direct Senators' attention to the most recent Gallup poll which appeared in various papers on Sunday, January 4. The poll shows that over 73 percent of the people are anxious to have the archaic practice of selecting a Presidential candidate at a smoke-shrouded, politically controlled national convention put in the coffin and under the ground forever. The poll shows that the public favors a Nation-wide nominating primary by overwhelming majority and by an ever-increasing percentage.

The American public is also anxious to change the present electoral college procedure, recognizing it as ancient, undemocratic, and dangerous. According to Mr. Gallup's figures, every two out of three people in the United States would like to see the Congress of the United States get busy and change the electoral college system.

On November 22, 1952, the able Senator from Arkansas, Senator FULBRIGHT, and myself, without previous consultation and without knowledge of the other's thinking, issued statements on that day expressing our belief that the present law is unsatisfactory which permits a Vice President to succeed to the Presidency upon the death of the President of the United States, and to hold that Presidency for the balance of the 4-year term. This tenure of the Vice President has, on more than one occasion, been almost the full 4-year term. These statements were made by Senator FULBRIGHT and myself, without thought of any personality or individual in mind. However, it is clear that the Founding Fathers of our governmental system intended that the Vice President should be only the caretaker of the office of the President until such time as the people could expeditiously go about the business of electing a new President. The average citizen approves of that conclusion if this most recent Gallup poll is anywhere near correct, for it reflects that 61percent of the citizens of the United States favor a change in the present system. Therefore, today, I am again introducing a resolution calling for constitutional amendments to effect changes in our election procedures.

The first constitutional change would establish a Nation-wide primary for the

nominating of party candidates for President. This is not a new proposal. As a matter of fact, Woodrow Wilson recommended Nation-wide primaries in his message to the Congress in 1913. Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, one of this body's all-time, all-American great Senators advocated a somewhat similar proposal when he honored the United States Senate by his presence. More recently the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, subscribed to the general idea. Last year he introduced a proposal which recognized the need for nominating primaries, although his resolution urged nominating primaries by the States on a permissive basis, rather than effecting a constitutional amendment making Nation-wide primaries mandatory.

The second part of this resolution would abolish the electoral-college sysetem of electing the President and Vice President. It would establish a system under which the electoral votes of each of the States would be divided among candidates on the basis of the percentage of popular votes received by each candidate in the States. This proposal was most recently identified with the former able Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, and the former distinguished Congressman from Texas, Mr. Ed Gossett. This proposed change in the electoral-college procedure passed the Senate in 1950 but failed to pass in the House of Representatives.

The third proposal in this resolution which I am today introducing provides that when a President dies, or otherwise becomes incapacitated to serve as President, that the Vice President succeed to the Presidency but hold that office only until the next general election, providing the next general election is more than 90 days away.

I have not gone into detail on these proposals. Obviously there are many technical aspects regarding each one of them, but I do not feel that this is the time nor the place to go into a long discussion of the ramifications of each of these proposals. I am offering this resolution today, however, to get it into the machinery of the Congress with the hope that we can have action on this legislation soon and with the hope that we will somehow be able to modernize and strengthen our system of democracy. We cannot continue to limp along in this year of 1953—with all its marvelous means of communication and education and with an alert and an aroused citizenry—on the same old election procedures which have on several occasions in the past permitted a man to become President even though he did not receive the largest popular vote, and has permitted political leaders and back-room barons to nominate and select Presidential candidates.

I do not claim authorship or proprietorship of any of these proposals. Most of them have been discussed on forums, in debate classes, and even in the Congress in the past years. They belong to all of us. The recent Gallup poll proves that the citizens of your State and mine know of these ideas and are anxious that we cease debating them academically and make of them a reality. These proposals should be treated in bipartisan manner for they do not concern just Republicans or just Democrats. They are a matter of vital concern to the strength and well-being of our entire democracy, and we in the Congress, as the only ones who can do anything about effecting these changes, must busy ourselves now toward serving and strengthening our democracy.

ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN HONOR OF EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

I submit for the consideration of Congress a resolution authorizing the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor the noble woman from the State of Delaware who founded and promoted the sale of the famed antituberculosis Christmas seal in the United States.

The name of this great lady is perhaps not so well known as her Christmas seals. She was Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, and her whole life was devoted to the welfare of others.

It was through her untiring efforts that the sale of Christmas seals, which she initiated, has continued to grow through the years, with the result that millions of sufferers of the dread malady of tuberculosis have been cured or materially helped through the money obtained from their purchase.

I know of no contemporary American more worthy of recognition than Emily Bissell and her Christmas seals.

NATIONAL HOMEMAKERS WEEK

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing the establishment by Congress of National Homemakers Week, which would honor the women who are the homemakers of the Nation.

Under this joint resolution, the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week beginning on the Sunday before Thanksgiving Day and ending on the Sunday after Thanksgiving Day of each year as Homemakers Week.

The occasion would pay tribute to the homemakers of the Nation, who have contributed so much to the happiness and stability of their homes and to the improvement of their communities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) designating the period beginning on Sunday before Thanksgiving Day and ending on the Sunday after Thanksgiving Day of each year as Homemakers Week, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE QUESTION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND SUCCESSION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not candidates for President and Vice President should be nominated by national political conventions, as at present, and, if so, recommendations which should be made to the parties for improving the convention process, and, if not, a method which would be preferable.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it.

(5) Whether or not a constitutional amendment should be proposed under which failure of candidates for President and Vice President to receive a majority of the electoral votes shall be resolved by popular vote rather than by the House of Representatives.

(6) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(7) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, where by reason of removal, death, resignation, or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(8) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual executing the office of President.

(9) Whether or not the term of the Vice President or other individual succeeding to the Presidency should be limited to a duration of approximately 2 years, a new presidential election to coincide with election of Members of the House of Representatives where such individual succeeds to the Presi-

dency during the first or second year of the term for which the President was elected.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of any legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1953, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation and effect, to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-third Congress to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROCEDURES BY SERGEANT AT ARMS IN TAKING CUSTODY OF BOOKS, PAPERS, OR RECORDS AND PERSONS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That upon certification by the chairman or the acting chairman of a standing committee of the Senate that two-thirds of the members of the committee have voted to require the production of specified or identified books, papers, or records in the custody of an officer of the Government of the United States, the President of the Senate shall issue his warrant, returnable at a time when the Senate is meeting, commanding the Sergeant at Arms to obtain the books, papers, or records specified by the chairman or the acting chairman, and in the event of the refusal of the officer of the Government of the United States having custody thereof, to deliver the required books, papers, or records, to take the said officer into bodily custody forthwith, and bring him before the bar of the Senate, then and there to answer questions as to his refusal.

LOYALTY CHECKS ON SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, or any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to the Central Intelligence Agency, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to the Central Intelligence Agency a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty of such employee.

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-third Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. CASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (a) (relating to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(2) by striking out "twenty-one" in subsection (b) (relating to the Committee on Appropriations) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three";

(3) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (c) (relating to the Committee on Armed Services) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(4) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (d) (relating to the Committee on Banking and Currency) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(5) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(6) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (f) (relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(7) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (g) (1) (relating to the Committee on Government Operations) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(8) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (h) (relating to the Committee on Finance) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(9) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (i) (relating to the Committee on Foreign Relations) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(10) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (j) (relating to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(11) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (k) (relating to the Committee on the Judiciary) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(12) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (l) (relating to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(13) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (m) (relating to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(14) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven"; and

(15) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (o) (relating to the Committee on Rules and Administration) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

SEC. 2. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed eighteen Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed three Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on three standing committees and no more."

FURNISHING BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF A LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a full and complete list of all offices, positions, places, and employments, listing the same by departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, and independent establishments, including the government of the District of Columbia, unofficial observers, special attorneys or special agents, and Federal employments of all kinds, with the amount of salaries of each attached, under the Government of the United States and not under civil-service rules and regulations.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is amended by inserting before the word "following" the word "fifth", and by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO MINORITY MEMBERS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the minority Members of the Senate are authorized to appoint a special assistant to the minority who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by such minority Members and who shall receive compensation to be fixed by them at a basic rate of not less than $7,320 or more than $8,000 per annum to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. TOBEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 332, agreed to June 26, 1952, hereby is extended to June 30, 1953.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS

Mr. TOBEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, Senate Resolution 55, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951, Senate Resolution 154, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, and Senate Resolution 258, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952, hereby is extended to June 30, 1953.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That commencing with the Eighty-fourth Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraph 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.";

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that 18 Senators of the majority party, and 6 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, shall serve on 3 standing committees and no more. During any period in which the minority party has a total membership of 15 Senators or less, such 6 Senators of such party who shall be members of 3 committees may be members of any 3 standing committees."

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF EXPANDING FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to make a thorough study of means and methods for increasing and expanding our international trade, through the operation of the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, and such other agencies and devices as will promote and facilitate increased investments abroad and expand our international trade.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the very able chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee during the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses is joining me in submitting the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in connection with the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), submitted by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK), was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study of means and methods for increasing and expanding our international trade, through the operations of the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and such other agencies and devices as would facilitate increasing American investment abroad and expanding international trade. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The statement presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

For a long time it has been my view that the most efficient, least expensive, soundest, and most durable method by which we can help our friends and our allies around the world to improve their own economic conditions and get them back to a more normal state of affairs is to do it by making the maximum use of the capitalistic tools that have worked so well in the past. Of recent date, I am happy to observe that an increasing number of people are reaching the same conclusion—"Trade, not aid" is the way they refer to it.

I am very anxious, as are Members of the Senate, to do everything I can to encourage better world economic conditions and international economic stability by whatever sound means I can. I also am anxious to provide the opportunity for American capital and American capitalistic know-how to contribute in a more direct way in carrying out the job.

It is only logical that the Banking and Currency Committee should take an active interest and part in facilitating through the credit machinery and institutions which it helped to formulate and develop, and over which it has had jurisdiction the program of increasing our foreign investments and expanding our international trade. Only last Congress we increased the authorization of the Export-Import Bank by $1,000,000,000, and at that time I and several other members of the committee stated that we thought the solution to our international assistance program lay in the capitalistic method of making sound loans rather than in loose give-away programs.

It is also my view that the Banking and Currency Committee because of its intimate knowledge and work in connection with our own economic machinery is particularly well equipped to make sound decisions on the most efficient and businesslike methods by which such a program of foreign investment and international trade can be facilitated and promoted.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee during this Congress I first propose to hold hearings on the broad subject of how we can best get such a program of trade and foreign investment under way. Depending on what we learn at the initial hearings we shall proceed with all the expeditiousness possible on recommending to the Senate and such other committees that may have jurisdiction, a program of action.

PRINTING OF MEMORANDUM RELATING TO SENATE RULES AND THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY (S. DOC. NO. 4)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and as a Senate document the memorandum prepared by the Republican Policy Committee relative to Senate rules and that the Senate is a continuing body, together with three appendixes.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed as a Senate document, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RULES AND THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

I

The right or privilege of extended debate in the United States has been a subject of recurring controversy. Almost from the Senate's beginnings the numerous efforts to impose limitations have not been too effective.[a] The most recent positive action to curb debate, which was taken in 1949, permitted, for the first time,[b] the invocation of cloture in all cases except that of a motion to take up a change in the Senate rules.[c]

Critics of this 1949 amendment attack it on the grounds that: (1) it may be invoked only by affirmative vote of not less than 64 Senators; and (2) that the rules themselves remain subject to amendment by simple majority vote of those present and voting, while a motion to take up an amendment to the rules can be filibustered indefinitely.[d]

Many supporters of civil-rights measures, such as FEPC, antilynch bills, anti-poll-tax bills, claim that such measures never can be passed in the Senate so long as rule XXII remains in its present form, because of the opportunities the rule still affords for filibuster by a minority.[e] There have also been many other measures which have been successfully blocked by extended debate of a minority, during the course of the Senate's history.[f]

During the hearings in October 1951 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, various proposals were considered relative to limitation of debate in the Senate beyond that now provided in Senate rule XXII. These included proposals to achieve cloture by vote of a constitutional majority of the Senate (S. Res. 52, by IVES and Lodge); by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting (S. Res. 203, by Wherry); by majority vote of those present and voting (S. Res. 41, by MORSE and HUMPHREY); by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to limit debate to 48 hours in case of "grave national emergency," and in 15 days "on any question whatsoever," by vote of a majority of the Senators present and voting (S. Res. 105, by Lehman, Murray, Magnuson, Neely, Douglas, Humphrey, Green, Benton, Pastore, McMahon, and Kilgore).[g]

A novel angle on changing Senate rules

At these hearings where many witnesses, including a number of Senators, testified, an interesting and somewhat different approach was suggested by Walter Reuther.

"It is our contention," he told the committee, "that the Senate is not a continuing body and therefore the Eighty-second, the Senate that sits as part of the Eighty-second Congress cannot adopt a set of rules which binds future Senate bodies, because if the Eighty-second session of the Senate can adopt a set of rules that go on in perpetuity, it means that they are exercising an authority which they deny to a future Senate, and they can't do that."[h] He further stated: "Now, when the Senate meets in January, 1953, a Senator can stand up and say, 'Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the following set of rules for adoption to govern the work and the proceedings of this body'."[i]

In a supplemental written statement[j] Mr. Reuther spelled out his suggestion in detail, as follows:

"Proposal No. 1: When the new Senate of the Eighty-third Congress convenes January 3, 1953, the following procedure can be adopted:

"1. After the credentials have been submitted and accepted, a Senator can rise and move the adoption of the Rules of the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress which he will then submit to the body. These rules may include a new rule XXII providing for limitation of debate by majority vote. He may state, in making his submission, that there are no existing rules of the Senate because the rules of one Senate cannot bind a succeeding Senate. Also, he may point out that, until adoption of rules, there is no committee to which his motion can be referred.

"2. It can be expected that a point of order will be made that the motion is out of order since, it will be contended, there are existing rules which can only be amended as provided through the present rules.

"3. The President of the Senate must rule on this point of order.

"4. His ruling, if he rejects the point of order,[k] is subject to an appeal. Under general parliamentary rules, which would be in effect during the period prior to the adoption of specific rules, the appeal can be debated, although most parliamentary authorities limit the debate to one speech by each person.

"Should the minority group attempt to turn the debate on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair into a filibuster, the debate can be cut off either by a motion to lay on the table or by moving the previous question. A majority vote in favor of the motion to table would operate to affirm the Chair's ruling. A majority vote in favor of the call for the previous question would permit an immediate vote on the appeal.

"5. If the ruling of the Chair is sustained by a majority vote, the Senate will be able to adopt rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress by regular parliamentary procedure of majority vote. If a filibuster should be attempted at this point, it can again be dealt with by the parliamentary device of moving the previous question outlined in step 4, above. It is significant that the Speaker of the House, at the time of an attempt to prevent the adoption of rules by repeated dilatory motions, ruled that he would refuse to recognize Members attempting these delaying tactics as they were interfering with the constitutional right of the House to determine its rules (Cannon, Precedents, vol. 5, secs. 5705, 5707)."

Mr. Reuther also submitted a brief in support of his claims that the Senate is not a continuing body, that its rules are not continuing and, therefore, new rules may be adopted (or old rules amended, rule XXII to the contrary notwithstanding) by a simple majority vote of the Senate.[l]

Statements made by Senators Benton, Lehman, and Humphrey during the course of the hearings appear to be in agreement with these claims.[m] In the Senate report to Senate Resolution 203[n] are found the views of Senator Benton and Senator Green, as follows:

"Subsection 3 of rule XXII should not be allowed to bind this Senate and all future Senates by perpetuating the right to filibuster against any motion to change any rule of the Senate. Such a right, written into the rules only in 1949 and in spite of the warning and protest of Vice President BARKLEY, violates the great tradition which the Senate has always followed. We deny the right of any past Senate so to tie the hands of this or any future Senate. The Senate by acquiescence accepts the rules of each previous Senate as the rules of the current Senate, but nowhere in such a procedure can there be found any excuse for the gag rule which subsection 3 imposes.

"Many compelling arguments were presented to the committee in support of majority cloture at any and all times. The hearings have been printed and we recommend their study to our colleagues in the Senate."

Various newspaper stories and articles have appeared in recent weeks stating the possibility that when the Eighty-third Congress assembles in January 1953, some Senator will rise on the Senate floor "almost as soon as the Chamber is convened and move adoption of all the rules that governed the Senate of the preceding Congress except rule XXII."[o]

---

[a] For a detailed study of the subject, see "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate," by Dr. George B. Galloway, Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64, Library of Congress. This was incorporated in the Hearings on Limitation of Debate in the Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration, October 1951, pp. 46–54; see also, Haynes, The Senate of the United States, pp. 394 et seq.

[b] The 1917 amendment to rule XXII provided for cloture in the case of "any pending measure." There has been much support for the claim that this was intended to be unlimited in scope and to include, for example, a motion to take up a matter. But this contention has not had majority support in the Senate since it first was challenged in the Senate in 1919. See debates in the Senate, March 1949, preceding the overruling by the Senate of Vice President Barkley on this issue; also Haynes, The Senate of the United States, pp. 409–15.

[c] This amendment has been referred to as the Wherry-Hayden amendment. For the complete text of rule XXII in its present form see appendix I, annexed hereto.

[d] See section 3, rule XXII.

[e] Webster defines one who filibusters as follows: "A member of a legislative or deliberative body who, in opposition to the proposed action of the majority, obstructs or prevents action by the extreme use of dilatory tactics, such as speaking merely to consume time."

[f] For an incomplete list of these measures, see hearings, op. cit. supra, note 1, p. 60.

[g] Both the Morse and the Lehman proposals provided also for repeal of the present sec. 3, rule XXII, which would thereby make the rule itself subject to cloture.

[h] Hearings, p. 130.

[i] Hearings, p. 138.

[j] Hearings, pp. 282–285. This was entitled, "Supplemental Written Statement Setting Forth Two Proposals for Breaking Filibusters by a Simple Majority Vote."

[k] If the Vice President should support the point of order, thereby declaring rule XXII adopted by the 81st Senate binding upon the 83d Senate, there would be the possibility of unlimited debate on the appeal, as Senator MONRONEY pointed out in the hearings October 3. Such a ruling, together with a filibuster, could prevent the majority from expressing its will. For practical purposes, the 83d Senate would be deprived of the rule-making power assigned to it by art. I, sec. 5 of the Constitution. (See pp. 19–20 of our brief.)

[l] Hearings, pp. 147–160.

[m] Hearings, pp. 15, 19, 29, 264, 269.

[n] S. Rept. No. 1256, Eighty-second Congress, p. 13. The Wherry resolution, S. Res. 203, providing for cloture by vote of two-thirds of the Senate Members present and voting, was reported from committee on March 5, 1952, but died on the Senate Calendar.

[o] Quoted from an article entitled "Battle of Filibuster: New Round Opens," New York Times magazine, September 14, 1952; see also New York Times news stories and articles, dated July 16, August 12, 14, September 3, 1952, on the same subject matter.

This discussion deals with a consideration of the possibilities suggested from the foregoing that may thus be presented shortly after the Senate convenes in January. Could it mean, for example, an end to filibustering in the Senate by a simple majority vote, by vote of 25 Senators present and voting?[32]

The issue of whether the Senate is a continuing body, or whether its rules are continuing, obviously is subject to being strongly colored by the issues involved in any consideration of the pros and cons of extended debate and efforts to curb it; the civil-rights issue; the individual prerogative of Senators, and the like. So far as practicable, however, this discussion will be limited to the constitutional and policy questions directed to the continuity of the Senate and of its rules, from Congress to Congress. These questions will be considered within the framework of the following issues:

I. Was the Senate established as or intended to be a continuing body? What does the Constitution provide? What did the Founding Fathers say?

II. Even if issue I is answered in the affirmative can the Senate, notwithstanding, determine it is not to have continuing rules?

III. Should the Senate so determine?

Preliminarily, this much can be stated: That precedent overwhelmingly is against the propositions (a) that the Senate is not a continuing body, and (b) that its rules are not continuing.[33]

II

Was the Senate established as or intended to be a continuing body?

(a) Constitutional Provisions

Article I, section 3, provides for rotation of one-third of the Senate every 2 years.[34] This provision has been compared with the requirement in the Constitution for biennial election of all House Members. Unlike the case of the House of Representatives, the plan of rotation every 2 years has resulted, ever since the Senate organized for the first time in 1789, in there always being more than a majority of sitting Senators. The Senate has thus always been able to do business, since it always has had a quorum as required by the Constitution.[35]

Other provisions of the Constitution cited to establish that the Senate is an always organized body include (a) those dealing with the office of the Vice President and the President pro tempore;[36] (b) those establishing the Senate's executive functions, as distinguished from its legislative functions;[37] (c) the power of the President "on extraordinary occasions [to] convene both Houses, or either of them";[38] (d) the limiting proviso in article V (which deals with amending the Constitution), as follows: "No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."[39]

(b) The Intent of the Founding Fathers

The Constitutional Convention of 1787 had before it various alternatives with respect to the powers, duties and composition of the Senate, as well as the manner of selection and tenure of office of its Members. The agreements which were finally reached on these alternatives appear in varying degrees to have a general bearing on the subject of this discussion. These details were expanded upon at length by the authors of The Federalist, Messrs. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. Typical of their comments are the following:

In The Federalist, No. 62, James Madison or Alexander Hamilton wrote:

"The necessity of a Senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies, to yield to the impulses of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions. Examples on this subject might be cited without number; and from proceedings within the United States, as well as from the history of other nations. But a position that will not be contradicted, need not be proved. All that need be remarked, is, that a body which is to correct this infirmity, ought itself to be free from it, and consequently ought to be less numerous. It ought, moreover, to possess great firmness, and consequently ought to hold its authority by a tenure of considerable duration. * * *

"The mutability in the public councils, arising from a rapid succession of new members, however qualified they may be, points out, in the strongest manner, the necessity of some stable institution in the Government. Every new election in the States is found to change one-half of the Representatives. From this change of men must proceed a change of opinions; and from a change of opinions, a change of measures. But a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence, and every prospect of success. The remark is verified in private life, and becomes more just, as well as more important in national transactions. * * *

"To trace the mischievous effects of a mutable government would fill a volume. I will hint a few only, each of which will be perceived to be a source of innumerable others.

"In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. * * * The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessing of liberty itself."

Also, in The Federalist, No. 63, Madison or Hamilton wrote as follows:

"Yet however requisite a sense of national character may be, it is evident that it can never be sufficiently possessed by a numerous and changeable body. It can only be found in a number so small that a sensible degree of the praise and blame of public measures may be the portion of each individual; or in an assembly so durably invested with public trust, that the pride and consequence of its Members may be sensibly incorporated with the reputation and prosperity of the community. The half-yearly representatives of Rhode Island would probably have been little affected in their deliberations on the iniquitous measures of that State by arguments drawn from the light in which such measures would be viewed by foreign nations, or even by the sister States; whilst it can scarcely be doubted that if the concurrence of a select and stable body had been necessary, a regard to national character alone would have prevented the calamities under which that misguided people is now laboring.

"I add, as a sixth defect, the want in some important cases of a due responsibility in the government to the people, arising from that frequency of elections, which in other cases produces this responsibility. The remark will, perhaps, appear not only new, but paradoxical. It must nevertheless be acknowledged, when explained, to be as undeniable as it is important.

"Responsibility, in order to be reasonable, must be limited to objects within the power of the responsible party; and in order to be effectual, must relate to operations of that power, of which a ready and proper judgment can be formed by the constituents. The objects of government may be divided into two general classes: the one depending on measures which have singly an immediate and sensible operation; the other depending on a succession of well-chosen and well-connected measures, which have a gradual and perhaps unobserved operation. The importance of the latter description to the collective and permanent welfare of every

---

[32] Under article I, section 5 of the Constitution, a majority of the Senate constitutes a quorum to do business.

[33] Mr. Reuther expressly conceded the precedent, which is more fully discussed hereinafter, when he stated in the hearings, op. cit. supra, p. 1, note 1, at p. 131: "Now you may choose to follow precedent, but there is a fundamental difference between your willingness to follow precedent and the constitutional compulsion. We are not raising your right to choose to follow precedent. We are raising the question of constitutionality. Are you compelled? According to our research, you are not."

[34] The pertinent language is as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State [chosen by the legislature] thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

(The part included in brackets was changed by clause 1 of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, providing for popular election of Senators.)

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year [and if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies]."

(The part included in brackets was changed by clause 2 of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution.)

[35] Art. I, sec. 5, provides "a majority of each [House] shall constitute a quorum to do business." See Cushing, Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies, p. 272.

[36] The fourth and fifth clauses of art. I, sec. 3, are as follows:

"The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate * * *.

"The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of the President of the United States." (See appendix III, attached hereto, pp. 5–10).

[37] These provisions are to be found in art. II, sec. 2, clause 2, which reads as follows: "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

[38] Art. II, sec. 3, the Congressional Directory for January 1952, p. 270, lists 46 special sessions of the Senate, between 1791 and 1933. See Haynes, II, 1021–1022, op. cit. supra, note 1, for his comments, "What the Senate Can Do Alone."

[39] "The most conspicuous, and what was at one time deemed the most important feature of the Senate, is that it represents the several States of the Union as separate commonwealths, and is thus an essential part of the Federal scheme. Every State, be it as great as New York or as small as Delaware, sends two Senators, no more and no less. This arrangement was long resisted by the delegates of the larger States in the Convention of 1787, and ultimately adopted because nothing less would reassure the smaller States, who feared to be overborne by the larger. It is now the provision of the Constitution most difficult to change, for no State 'can be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent,' a consent most unlikely to be given." Bryce, the American Commonwealth, 2d ed. (1891), pp. 93–94.

country, needs no explanation. And yet it is evident, that an assembly elected for so short a term as to be unable to provide more than one or two links in a chain of measures, on which the general welfare may essentially depend, ought not to be answerable for the final result any more than a steward or tenant, engaged for 1 year, could be justly made to answer for plans or improvements which could not be accomplished in less than half a dozen years. Nor is it possible for the people to estimate the share of influence which their annual assemblies may respectively have on events resulting from the mixed transactions of several years. It is sufficiently difficult, to preserve a personal responsibility in the members of a numerous body, for such acts of the body as have an immediate, detached, and palpable operation on its constituents.

"The proper remedy for this defect must be an additional body in the legislative department, which having sufficient permanency to provide for such objects as require a continued attention, and a train of measures, may be justly and effectually answerable for the attainment of those objects."

The Federalist No. 64, by John Jay, concerns itself with the Senate and treaty making. The following, on the permanency of the Senate, is quoted from that paper:

"Although the absolute necessity of system, in the conduct of any business, is universally known and acknowledged, yet the high importance of it in national affairs, has not yet become sufficiently impressed on the public mind. They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly, composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession, seem not to recollect, that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects, which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances and which can only be approached and achieved by measures, which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise therefore, in convention to provide, not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political information, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence, in providing for the frequent elections of Senators in such a way, as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men: for by leaving a considerable residue of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved."

In The Federalist, No. 59, Alexander Hamilton commented on the regulation of elections of both Senators and Representatives. He stated:

"It may be easily discerned also, that the National Government would run a much greater risk, from a power in the State legislatures over the elections of its House of Representatives, than from their power of appointing the Members of its Senate. The Senators are to be chosen for the period of 6 years; there is to be a rotation, by which the seats of a third part of them are to be vacated, and replenished every 2 years; and no State is to be entitled to more than two Senators; a quorum of the body, is to consist of 16 Members. The joint result of these circumstances would be, that a temporary combination of a few States, to intermit the appointment of Senators, could neither annul the existence, nor impair the activity of the body; and it is not from a general and permanent combination of the States, that we can have anything to fear. The first might proceed from sinister designs in the leading members of a few of the State legislatures; the last would suppose a fixed and rooted disaffection in the great body of the people; which will either never exist at all or will, in all probability, proceed from an experience of the inaptitude of the General Government to the advancement of their happiness, in which event no good citizen could desire its continuance.

"But with regard to the Federal House of Representatives, there is intended to be a general election of Members once in 2 years. If the State legislatures were to be invested with an exclusive power of regulating these elections, every period of making them would be a delicate crisis in the national situation, which might issue in a dissolution of the Union, if the leaders of a few of the most important States should have entered into a previous conspiracy to prevent an election."

Attention is also directed to a compilation of early source material related to the division of Senators into classes. This compilation, which is annexed hereto as appendix II, was prepared by the Library of Congress and contains extracts from Elliott's Debates and other contemporaneous sources.

III

Can the Senate determine it is not to have continuing rules?

(a) The Rules of the Senate

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * *" Thus, the Senate is the sole judge of its own rules,[20] and a majority at any time can change its rules or adopt new ones, whether at the beginning of a session of Congress or at any other time when it is sitting. But what about the minority's power to block a vote on this issue?

In his book, The Senate of the United States, Haynes commented on the rules of the House and the Senate, as follows:

"Since in each Congress the House is newly elected, it has been held that the rules of the House in the preceding Congress cannot without specific adoption be held binding on the new House, inasmuch as such restraint would impair the constitutional right of this House to 'determine the rules of its proceedings.' Hence at the opening of each Congress the House faces the task of adopting the rules by which it is to be governed. This may be disposed of—as it usually is—by the perfunctory adoption of the rules effective during the preceding Congress. On the other hand, this biennially recurring task may start a long and bitter struggle. Thus, at the opening of the Sixty-eighth Congress (December 1923), a group of 'insurgents' blocked the organization of the House until they had extorted a pledge that the question of radical change of certain rules should promptly be brought to open debate and decisive vote; and several changes of moment were their temporary gain from this contest.

"The Senate, on the other hand, is a continuing body.[21] It first effected its organization April 6, 1789, and there never since has been a time when the Senate as an organized body has not been available, at the President's summons or in accordance with the terms of its own adjournment, for the transaction of public business. The first rules, adopted only 10 days after the Senate came into being, have continued in force without reaffirmation until amended or abolished by the Senate. In contrast with notable revisions of the House rules,[22] the few Senate revisions have been significant of no urgent spirit of revolt or reform; they have been authorized when the accumulation of changes through a long series of years made a new codification desirable.[23]

Thus, by the revision of March 26, 1806, the list grew from the 20 of 1789 to 40, the more important additions dealing with the regulation of Senate action upon nominations and treaties. The 1820 revision brought the number up to 45, but most of the new rules were of trifling importance, the changes being mostly for the purpose of more systematic arrangement and combination of the substance of the old rules. The most significant addition was rule XXX, formally bringing into the code of rules the provisions as to the choice of standing committees which had been adopted 4 years earlier. In 1868, the revision not only gathered up the modifications in the rules that had been accumulating for nearly half a century, but it embodied some provisions that evidenced the strain of the war and of the reconstruction problems. The number of rules increased to 53, the maximum reached in any general revision. Among the more important changes were those intended to prevent general legislation under the guise of amendments to general appropriation bills (XXX); to regulate special orders (XXXI); and to provide for more careful handling of nominations (XLIII). There is an echo of the passions of the day in the elaborate provisions for calling to order any Senator who in speaking or otherwise should transgress the rules of the Senate. The last of the rules set forth the formalities attending the suspension, modification, or amendment of the rules. The revision of 1884 has met the Senate's wishes so well that in more than two score years no general revision of the rules has been found necessary (pp. 340–342).[24]

[20] There is no known judicial precedent invalidating a rule of either Senate or House. In at least one case which reached the Supreme Court the validity of a House rule (concerning quorums) was challenged, but the rule was upheld. *United States* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 1 (1892)). The following dictum in that case, by Mr. Justice Brewer may be of some interest, however: "[Neither House may] by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights and there must be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained."

[21] Walsh (Montana) has argued that the Senate rules are equally evanescent with those of the House. See resolution and speech of March 7, 1917. Root strongly set forth the Senate "as a continuing body." February 15, 1915, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3793.

[22] De Alva S. Alexander, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives, chs. IX, X, and XI.

[23] See the following:

CODIFICATION OF SENATE RULES

Date	Reference	Number of rules	Senate membership
Apr. 16–18, 1789..	Senate Journal.....	20	20
Mar. 26, 1806.....	Ibid., pp. 65–66....	40	34
Jan. 3, 1820.....	Ibid., pp. 61–69....	45	46
Mar. 25, 1868.....	Ibid., pp. 340–347..	53	68
Jan. 11, 1884.....	Ibid., pp. 145–160..	40	76

To the original list of April 16, 1789, 2 days later by vote there was "subjoined to the standing orders of the Senate" a twentieth rule. Senate Journal, 16.

[24] The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made no change in parliamentary, as distinguished from organizational, rules of either the House or the Senate, due to lack of authority of the joint committee which considered the general subject to make recommendations for such rule changes. Although

(b) The Proposal To "Adopt" Senate Rules for the Eighty-third Congress

The Reuther proposal contemplates that after acceptance of credentials of new Senators on January 3, 1953, a motion will be made to adopt Senate rules for the Eighty-third Congress, such rules to "include a new rule XXII providing for limitation of debate by majority vote."

A point of order could be anticipated, on the ground that the motion is out of order, since there are existing rules governing procedure in the Senate. The Vice President must then rule on the point of order.

If he overrules the point of order, an appeal from that ruling, it is contended, would be under general parliamentary rules. These would be in effect during the period prior to the adoption of specific rules. Moreover, while the appeal can be debated * * * most parliamentary authorities limit the debate to one speech by each person. The parliamentary authorities are not cited, however.[25]

If the Vice President sustains the point of order, an appeal could be taken by proponents of the Reuther proposal. Whether under present Senate rules or under general parliamentary rules, such an appeal would be debatable.

It is possible that a secondary issue might be raised at this point, viz, the issue over whether the appeal itself is debatable under general parliamentary rules or under the Senate rules. If the Vice President sustains the point of order on the main question, he can be expected to rule on the secondary issue that the Senate rules apply while the main question is being debated. Under both Senate rule XX[26] and general parliamentary rules,[27] his ruling on the secondary issue would not be debatable and an appeal therefrom could be voted upon and decided immediately by majority vote.

If the Vice President is sustained by the Senate as to the secondary issue, the main question would be subject to limitation of debate under Senate rule XXII only. If the Senate does not sustain the Vice President's ruling on the secondary issue, debate on the main question would proceed under general parliamentary rules.

It should be pointed out that the same secondary issue could be raised, if the Vice President overrules a point of order directed to the main question. This is true, notwithstanding the claim that parliamentary rules would automatically govern in such an event. It is doubtful that the secondary issue would be raised by opponents of the Reuther proposal for they may be expected to avoid such a showdown vote, especially since that vote would be reached without debate.

With respect to the main question, it is claimed that if debate thereon is under general parliamentary rules a filibuster "can be cut off either by a motion to lay on the table or by moving the previous question. A majority in favor of the motion to table would operate to affirm the Chair's ruling. A majority in favor of the call for the previous question would permit an immediate vote on the appeal."[28] The conclusion is then reached that the adoption of rules "for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress" would then be in order, under "regular parliamentary procedure by majority vote."

Under the rules of the Senate a motion to lay on the table has the effect of shutting off debate and reaching a vote by a simple majority,[29] but under general parliamentary rules this motion does not have the same effect. On the contrary, such a motion will, if adopted, result only in postponing a matter temporarily.[30] Obviously, an appeal from a ruling of the Chair that is adverse to the Reuther proposal would not be made the subject of a motion to lay on the table, since the effect of that ruling would be to make the Senate rules (including rule XXII) continuing rules.

If, as a result of the ruling of the Chair that is favorable to the Reuther proposal, the Senate rules are held not to apply, a motion to lay on the table an appeal from that ruling would not have the effect of killing debate, since it would be made under general parliamentary rules. It would result not only in postponing the appeal, but the main question as well.[31] It is not likely, therefore, that such a motion would be resorted to, despite the suggestion in the supplemental written statement of Mr. Reuther, above referred to, of its possible use.

On the question of limitation of debate under general parliamentary rules, authorities seem to agree that a two-thirds, rather than a majority, vote is required. Thus, Sturgis, in Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), pages 47–48, says: "It is unwise to make a practice of cutting off or preventing debate and deliberation on debatable questions. This is true whether debate is cut off by recognized motions or by arbitrarily bringing questions to vote without adequate opportunity for discussion. * * * Since full discussion of all proposals is a fundamental right of members, a motion which restricts or sets aside this right by closing or limiting debate requires a two-thirds vote."

Additional parliamentary authorities stating that a two-thirds vote is needed in order to limit debate are the following:

1. Palmer, A New Parliamentary Manual (1904), section 941:

"The general principles of parliamentary law require that the assembly should reach its decisions on matters that come before it (1) in the order prescribed for their introduction, (2) after full debate, (3) in accordance with its established rules. And these requirements are of such importance that a bare majority should not be permitted to disregard or alter them. They should be observed unless the reasons for proceeding contrary to them are so obvious that a two-thirds majority desire to so proceed."

The author then cites six instances, including limitation or closing debate, as requiring "a two-thirds vote because they are in opposition to one or another of these three requirements."

2. Rice's Rules of Order (1921), section 41, footnote 17, page 146.

"The two-thirds vote * * * is the rule for ordinary societies, while in the United States House of Representatives it requires only a majority vote, and in the Senate the motion is not allowed at all. But there is a growing sentiment throughout the country that the Senate should adopt a cloture rule."

3. Plummer, Practical Lessons in Parliamentary Procedure (1931), page 50.

4. Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), section 29, page 112.

With respect to the previous-question rule, there are some who refer to rule VIII of the original Senate rules, adopted in 1789. That rule was invoked some four times between 1789 and 1806, when the Senate rules were revised and mention of "the previous question" was dropped from rule VIII. It has never since been in the Senate rules. There is some question whether this rule provided for cloture, however, in the way the previous-question rule now operates in the House of Representatives.[32] Indeed, the House rule "was not turned into an instrument for closing debate until 1811, although it, also, adopted a rule for the previous question in 1789."[33]

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in an article appearing in the North American Review of November 1899, entitled "Obstruction in the Senate," wrote: "The rules of the Senate are practically unchanged from what they were at the beginning. They are the same now to all intents and purposes as when they were first adopted more than 100 years ago. There never has been in the Senate any rule which enabled the majority to close debate or compel a vote. The previous question, which existed in the earliest years, and was abandoned in 1806, was the previous question of England and not that with which everyone is familiar today in our House of Representatives. It was not in practice a form of cloture and it is therefore correct to say that the power of closing debate in the modern sense has never existed in the Senate."[34]

---

there have been six impeachment trials (for a complete list see Congressional Directory) since that of President Andrew Johnson in 1868, the Senate rules on impeachment have undergone no change since that trial. See Haynes II 847, op. cit. supra, note 1. With respect to joint Senate-House rules, see Appendix III, document entitled, "The Senate as a Continuing Body" (pp. 10–12).

[25] See hearings, op. cit, supra, note 1, p. 283.

[26] Senate rule XX reads as follows: "1. A question of order may be raised at any stage of the procedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer. 2. The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate."

[27] Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), sec. 21, p. 78.

[28] Attention is directed to the Manual of Rules of the House of Representatives, in which is found the following statement: "The power of each House of Representatives to make its own rules may not be impaired or controlled by the rules of a preceding House * * *. Before the adoption of rules the House is governed by general parliamentary law, but the Speakers have been inclined to give weight to the precedents of the House in modifying the usual constructions of that law." (H. Doc. 739, 81st Cong., pp. 22–23.) If similar weight were to be given to precedents of the Senate, it would by no means be certain, therefore, even if general parliamentary rules were held controlling, that the Senate rules, especially Senate rule XXII, would be disregarded in the circumstances under discussion.

[29] See Senate rule XXII, sec. 1 (appendix I, attached hereto).

[30] See Sturgis, Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), pp. 202–204; Robert's Rules of Order, Revised (1951), sec. 28, pp. 106–111.

[31] See Sturgis, Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (1950), p. 204; Robert's Rules of Order, p. 110.

[32] Rule XVII of the House provides: "There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered."

[33] See Manual of Rules of House of Representatives, footnote concerning House rule XVII.

[34] Quotation as cited in 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. IV, p. 3736 (Feb. 13, 1915). The conclusion that the early Senate rule concerning the "previous question" did not provide cloture was repeatedly asserted without challenge on the Senate floor during the 1949 debates which preceded adoption of the Wherry-Hayden amendment to Senate rule XXII. See, e. g., statement of Senator HOLLAND, 95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part II, pages 1784–5; also, colloquy between Senator GEORGE and Senator MORSE, p. 2144.

IV

Should the Senate determine its rules are not continuing from one Congress to another?

(a) Arguments Pro

Any decision the Senate might make on this question will also contemplate its effect on rule XXII and a possible end to unlimited debate in the Senate by a majority cloture rule. This would follow from the fact that if the Senate in each new Congress could determine its own rules by majority vote, rule XXII would no longer be a bar, either in its requirement of a minimum of 64 affirmative votes to end debate on all matters save a change in the rules themselves, or in its application to prevent cloture of any kind on an attempted rule change.

Another collateral but equally important consideration in the thinking of many will be the effect of the Senate's decision upon the civil-rights issue.

The pros and cons of these two issues will not be detailed here, except as they are related directly to the main question.[32]

Whether or not the Senate rejects all precedent in this instance, an examination of that precedent is indicated.

Of equal or even greater significance are the remoter consequences, either assured or conjectural, of a determination that its rules are not continuing.

The brief in support of Walter Reuther's claim asserts that majority rule is the basic principle of our Constitution; and that rule XXII is violative of that principle not only in that it fastens a requirement of a constitutional two-thirds vote to invoke cloture but also in that "in its efforts to bind future Congresses to its own standards of inaction, the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress compounded the unconstitutionality of the rule it was adopting." [33]

The result has been "a constitutional crisis of senatorial inaction in time of national emergency. * * * Talk has been substituted for action; the duty to legislate has been frustrated. * * * It was just such a crisis of inaction that the founding fathers had seen in the Articles of Confederation and had sought to prevent in the Constitution of the United States."[34]

"But rule XXII has a second fatal flaw which would demonstrate its unconstitutionality even if one were to close his eyes to the clearly expressed intent of the Constitutional Convention in favor of majority rule and the other constitutional history set forth in this brief.

"Clause 3 of rule XXII provides that cloture cannot apply to any motion to consider a change in any of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The Senate of the Eighty-first Congress has attempted to fasten its will on all future Senates; it has attempted to perpetuate the present rule XXII for all time.

"By clause 3, a future Senate no longer can 'determine the rules of its proceedings.' The rule adopted by the 1949 Senate sought to determine them once and for all. A virtually unanimous vote is now required for any succeeding Senate to adopt its own rules, for clause 3 makes it possible for any one or two stubborn Senators to prevent a change in the rules. Rule XXII thus clearly deprives each succeeding Senate of the constitutional right to make its own procedural rules.

"The principle is well established that one Congress cannot bind future Congresses. This principle finds expression, for example, in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, sixth edition, 1890, pages 146–147:

" 'To say that the Legislature may pass irrepealable laws is to say that it may alter the very Constitution from which it derives its authority; since, insofar as one Legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two Houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual.'

"This quotation almost seems to have been addressed to rule XXII. That rule, by allowing a small minority to prevent changes in the rule and to prevent action by the Senate under the rule, actually operates to exclude subjects of legislation from the control of the Senate. Civil-rights legislation, desired by the overwhelming majority of the Senate, cannot be acted upon by the present Senate, not because of anything the present Senate did or can do, but because of rule XXII passed by the Senate of an earlier Congress. The dead hand of the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress excludes vital subjects of legislation from the control of all future Senates.

"Strangely enough, although the principle that one Congress cannot bind a subsequent Congress is generally accepted, the statement that the Senate is a continuing body is used to defend the perpetuation of its rules. This continuing-body theory seems to be predicated upon the fact that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate continue their terms at the expiration of each Congress; it certainly has no other or constitutional basis.

"Yet the Senate itself recognizes that it is not truly continuing. Bills must be reintroduced and repassed in the Senate of each new Congress. The Senate, even when acting in executive capacity, does not treat itself as continuing; consideration of the ratification of treaties begins de novo in each new Congress (rule XXXVII, clause 3). The Senate adjourns sine die at the end of each Congress.

"The reintroduction of bills into the Senate of each new Congress is made necessary, of course, because a majority in favor or against a given bill may be changed by the election of new Senators to some or all of the one-third of the seats whose terms expire. A bill passed by an earlier Senate could not, therefore, be considered the will of the later Senate unless a new vote were taken. But certainly the new Senate must be able to express its will on the rules of the Senate as well as concerning legislation proposed for adoption. And this is particularly true of rule XXII, which, because it determines the course of all legislation in the Senate, is far more important than any single piece of substantive legislation that the Senate might consider.

"It will be urged that the uniform practice from the time of the organization of the second Senate until the present time has been to treat the rules of the Senate as continuing in force from Congress to Congress. But this practice would be more persuasive if it had been challenged and voted upon. Until Senator Walsh, of Montana, on March 7, 1917, argued that the rules were not in force as the Senate was not and could not legally be a continuing body, the question does not seem ever to have been directly raised (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9). Senator Walsh urged that, since there were no Senate rules in effect at the beginning of the session of Congress which was then starting, it should be possible to adopt a cloture rule directly rather than by the process of amending the rules. The Senate did not vote on Senator Walsh's proposal.[35] Certainly, general acquiescence in the practice of continuing rules from Congress to Congress is no binding precedent upon a Senate no longer prepared to acquiesce in that practice.

"The generally admitted principle that one Congress cannot bind its successors is especially applicable to rule XXII. The suggestion that the Senate is a continuing body has neither the logical nor historical force to prevent a new Senate from exercising its constitutional right to determine the rules of its proceedings." [36]

(b) Precedents on the Continuity Question

1. Senate precedents

No direct precedent has been found in the form of a Senate ruling either on the question (1) whether the Senate is a continuing body, or (2) whether its rules are continuing. It is evident, however, that the overwhelming body of opinion and comment, both in the Senate and elsewhere, negatives the Reuther thesis. In the portion of the brief which he submitted and which is quoted above, the challenge to Senate continuity is shown not to be a new one.

The continuity of the Senate as a body was questioned on the Senate floor by Senator James of Kentucky on February 15, 1915, during a filibuster on a shipping bill. He stated: "These rules have not been adopted by the Senate. These (sic) are merely the inheritance of 100 years behind us, with the gathered cobwebs and dust that have come down through the centuries. It is to say that it must be done by some new change and that we cannot by ourselves submit to the majority the right to transact business."

This was challenged by Senator Root of New York, who asked: "Does anybody dispute that the Senate is a continuous body?" To which the following reply was made by Senator Thomas, of Colorado:

"I dispute it, and [that it will be tested out at the beginning of the next Congress]." [36] The Senate is a continuous body in the sense that two-thirds of it hold over with every Congress. We appoint new committees and assign the new Members; but there is no more reason why the rules of the Senate should continue from Congress to Congress than that our committees should continue from Congress. I do not know what others may think, but one of the efforts I shall make will be to secure a change of the rules when the new Senate shall organize." [41]

On Tuesday, March 6, 1917—the day after the convening of the Sixty-fifth Congress in special session—Senator Owen obtained recognition on the Senate floor and the following colloquy ensued:

"Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish, before any action is taken that will recognize the Senate as being bound by the rules of the preceding Congress, to make the observation that while the Senate is a continuing body as an executive body it is not a continuing body as a legislative body. All the bills on the calendar died with the Sixty-fourth Congress. We have no calendar. We have

---

[32] Many of these pros and cons are comprehensively set forth, generally, in the Hearings, op. cit. supra, note 1. Some of the arguments favoring such a determination have already been stated in part I, supra.

[33] Hearings, op. cit. supra, pp. 147–157. Note that Mr. Reuther testified: "Unfortunately you can't get this kind of thing to the Supreme Court. Otherwise, there would have been a test" (p. 146).

[34] While the quoted language refers both to the Constitution and to the founding fathers, it is believed that the arguments here used have a more direct bearing on the issue whether the Senate should alter the precedent of the continuity of its rules than on whether the Constitution and the founding fathers intended to provide for such continuity. Hence the inclusion of the material at this point rather than in an earlier part of this discussion.

[35] However, the cloture resolution which was adopted was phrased in terms of an amendment of rule XXII. Recently the Senate has recognized that it could not bind future Congresses. In sec. 101 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) it was provided that certain rules set out were to be the Standing Rules of the Senate and House, respectively, with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules.

[36] Hearings, pp. 156–157.

[36] Bracketed matter added.

[41] 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, p. 3792.

no legislative committees. I wish to make the point that those rules are not binding on the new Members who come into this body, who have had no opportunity to participate in the making of the rules by which they are to be bound, and that they are not bound in the legislative functions of the Senate by the rules of any preceding Congress.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a point of order?

"Mr. OWEN. I make that observation for the RECORD so that any proceedings we take here shall be by unanimous consent.

"Mr. LODGE. I wish to call attention to the fact that the committees of the Senate were continued by resolution, as usual, and those committees can only exist under the rules. The question whether the rules continue or not is a rather large one, which I have no desire to discuss at this time. I call attention to the action of the last session of Congress." [42]

On Wednesday, March 7, 1917, Senator Walsh, Montana, submitted Senate Resolution 5, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the close of the Sixty-fourth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

"*Resolved*, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII." [43]

On Thursday, March 8, 1917, Senator Martin, Virginia, submitted a resolution (thereafter identified as S. Res. 5) and asked for its immediate consideration. It passed the Senate, 76–3, and became rule XXII in the form in which it remained until the Wherry-Hayden amendment thereto was adopted.[44]

During the following year Senator Thomas stated to the Senate: "I recall that in one instance I was referred * * * for information regarding the continuous character of the Senate. I availed myself of that suggestion to investigate the subject, and found the references were correct." [45]

It is altogether probable that the source material to which Senator Thomas thus referred was contained in a 1917 document "printed for the use of the Secretary of the Senate," which was entitled, "The Senate as a Continuing Body," containing extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE and other information.[46] A copy is annexed hereto as appendix III.

2. Judicial precedents

The question whether the Senate is a continuing body and, in that respect, is unlike the House of Representatives, which cannot continue beyond the period of a single Congress, was considered by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135 (1926)).

The question before the Court in that case was whether the Attorney General was within his legal rights when he refused to appear, although subpenaed as a witness before a Senate investigating committee.

The following is quoted from the unanimouse decision of the Court in that case (pp. 180–182):

"We conclude that the investigation was ordered for a legitimate object; that the witness wrongfully refused to appear and testify before the committee and was lawfully attached; that the Senate is entitled to have him give testimony pertinent to the inquiry, either at its bar or before the committee; and that the district court erred in discharging him from custody under the attachment.

"Another question has arisen which should be noticed. It is whether the case has become moot. The investigation was ordered and the committee appointed during the Sixty-eighth Congress. That Congress expired March 4, 1925. The resolution ordering the investigation in terms limited the committee's authority to the period of the Sixty-eighth Congress; but this apparently changed by a later and amendatory resolution authorizing the committee to sit at such times and places as it might deem advisable or necessary.[47] It is said in Jefferson's Manual: [48] 'Neither House can continue any portion of itself in any parliamentary function beyond the end of the session without the consent of the other two branches. When done, it is by a bill constituting them commissioners for the particular purpose.' But the context shows that the reference is to the two houses of Parliament when adjoined by prorogation or dissolution by the King. The rule may be the same with the House of Representatives whose Members are all elected for the period of a single Congress; but it cannot well be the same with the Senate, which is a continuing body whose Members are elected for a term of 6 years and so divided into classes that the seats of one-third only become vacant at the end of each Congress, two-thirds always continuing into the next Congress, save as vacancies may occur through death or resignation.

"Mr. Hinds in his collection of precedents says: 'The Senate, as a continuing body, may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of a Congress';[49] and, after quoting the above statement from Jefferson's Manual, he says: 'The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of a Congress.' [50] So far as we are advised the select committee having this investigation in charge has neither made a final report nor been discharged; nor has it been continued by an affirmative order. Apparently its activities have been suspended pending the decision of this case. But, be this as it may, it is certain that the committee may be continued or revived now by motion to that effect, and, if continued or revived, will have all its original powers.[51] This being so, and the Senate being a continuing body, the case cannot be said to have become moot in the ordinary sense." [52]

The following is quoted from *Robertson* v. *State* (109 Indiana 79, 10 N. E. 582 (1887)):

"In response to much that has been said upon the subject in argument, I feel quite assured that the senate of this State is not, like the Senate of the United States, a continuous body. In the Senate of the United States a majority constitutes a quorum and as there is always more than a quorum of qualified Senators holding seats in that body, its organized existence is necessarily continuous. But in the senate of this State, two-thirds of its members are necessary to make a quorum. As one-half of its members go out of office at the end of each legislative term of 2 years—that is to say, on the day after each general and biennial election—it becomes, at the end of each such legislative term a disorganized body; and, as the officers of the Senate comprise an essential part of its organization, it necessarily results that the terms of such officers expire when the body becomes disorganized for want of a quorum." [53]

(c) Senate Officers and Continuity [54]

Because the Senate has been held to be a continuing body, its officers have no stated term of office, but serve until their successors are selected. On March 24, 1879, while the Senate was in process of replacing some of its officers with others, along purely political lines, Senator Anthony observed: "Unlike the House of Representatives, which expires every 2 years and is renewable fresh from the people, the Senate never dies. The same which it was when it met, in 1789, it is now, and has held continuous and unbroken existence ever since. Its officers have naturally partaken of its permanent character. Its elective officers are chosen, not for a definite period, but during the pleasure of the Senate." [55]

(d) Senate Committees and Continuity

Hitherto the House of Representatives has been at a distinct disadvantage over the Senate because its committees end with each Congress. The Senate can and does order investigations, interim reports, final report and recommendations by its committees, without reference to the ending of one Congress or the beginning of another. This procedure is not affected even where there is some change in the composition of the committee membership.

Under Senate rule XXV, all standing committees continue until their successors are appointed.[56] The duration of select committees in the Senate depends on the terms of the resolutions under which their power is derived.

"In the first 40 years after the adoption of the Constitution, the House conducted seven or eight times as many investigations as did the Senate. In fact, down to the last quarter of the nineteenth century most of the investigations of large consequence were instituted by the House. But increasingly, beginning with the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the House has seemed to be relinquishing such activities, while the Senate has been greatly expanding its exercise of the investigative function, in the number, variety, and importance of its inquiries. The explanation of this remarkable shift is to be found in the contrast between the rules and procedure of the House and of the Senate * * * For the future, the decision in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* has materially broadened the scope of congressional inquiries and the grand jury investigative function is likely to be increasingly used by the Senate, particularly as to the Executive and the 'independent agencies.'" [57]

Obviously, what Haynes wrote in 1938 is equally applicable today. To destroy Senate continuity would, in effect, reverse the precedent in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, of continuity as it applies to Senate committees.

---

[42] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 3.

[43] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 9.

[44] Senator Walsh did not vote, being "necessarily absent from the city," when the Martin resolution was passed on the same day that it was submitted. Moreover, there is no record of any subsequent action on Senate Resolution 5 by Senator Walsh.

[45] 57 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 437, December 14, 1918.

[46] This document was prepared by the Legislative Reference Division, Library of Congress, and printed as a Senate print, 65th Cong., special session.

[47] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4126.

[48] Senate Rules and Manual, 1925, p. 303.

[49] Vol. 4, sec. 4544.

[50] Vol. 4, sec. 4545.

[51] Hinds' Precedents, vol. 4, secs. 4396, 4400, 4404, 4405.

[52] See also, discussion of the Senate as a permanent body, in a leading article entitled, The Smith-Vare Case and Its Relation to Senate Procedure, by Charles C. Tansill, Nat'l. Univ. L. Rev., May 1928, pp. 29–38.

[53] See also *State* v. *Rogers* (56 N. J. Law 480, 622 (1894)).

[54] For discussion of applicable Constitutional provisions, see supra, pt. II (a).

[55] 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 147. See, to the same effect, This Country of Ours, p. 51, by Benjamin Harrison, former U. S. President and U. S. Senator; Haynes, op. cit. supra, note 1, p. 261; appendix III, attached hereto.

[56] Compare House rule X on standing committees. It has no comparable provision, and all committees expire with each Congress.

[57] Haynes, op. cit. supra, note 1, pp. 551–3.

(e) The Senate as an Executive Body

The constitutional prerogatives of the Senate in treaty-making and in giving or withholding "advice and consent" to certain presidential appointments have already been referred to. Indeed, the many special sessions of the Senate, as distinguished from special sessions of the Congress heretofore convened, were for executive, rather than legislative purposes.[59]

The Senate "does not change all at once, as do bodies created by a single popular election, but undergoes an increasing process of gradual change and renewal, like a lake into which streams bring fresh water to replace that which the issuing river carries out. This provision was designed to give the Senate that permanency of composition which might qualify it to conduct or control the foreign policy of the Nation."[60]

Woodrow Wilson wrote: "The continuity of the Government lies in the keeping of the Senate more than in the keeping of the Executive, even in respect of matters which are the especial prerogative of the Presidential office."[61]

Attention is directed to Senate rule XXXVII, section 2, as follows:

"Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon."

Note that even under this rule, unless it is withdrawn by the President or fails from lapse of time, a treaty continues to be live matter and, as such, pending in the Senate. It need not be resubmitted with commencement of a new Congress.[62] On the other hand, nominations not disposed of in the Senate die with the Congress in which they are submitted.[63]

APPENDIX I

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE XXII. PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS

1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

To take a recess.

To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

To lay on the table.

To postpone indefinitely.

To postpone to a day certain.

To commit.

To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XXXII.)

2.[63] Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the presiding officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

APPENDIX II

SOURCE MATERIAL RELATED TO THE DIVISION OF SENATORS INTO CLASSES[64]

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION (1777)

ART. 5. For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State, to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

No State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than 3 years in any term of 6 years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit, receives any salary, fees, or emolument of any kind. (Elliot, Debates on the Federal Constitution, 2d ed., Philadelphia 1907. Vol. 1, p. 80. Hereafter cited as Elliot.)

Mr. Charles Pinckney's Draft of a Federal Government.

"Art. IV. The Senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates," which house, immediately after their meeting, shall choose by ballot — senators from among the citizens and residents of New Hampshire; — from among those of Massachusetts; — from among those of Rhode Island; — from among those of Connecticut; — from among those of New York; — from among those of New Jersey; — from among those of Pennsylvania; — from among those of Delaware; — from among those of Maryland; — from among those of Virginia; — from among those of North Carolina; — from among those of South Carolina; and — from among those of Georgia. The senators chosen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, shall form one class, those from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, one class; and those from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, one class. The House of Delegates shall number these classes one, two, and three, and fix the times of their service by lot. The first class shall serve for — years, the second for — years, and the third for — years. As their times of service expire, the House of Delegates shall fill them up by elections for — years, and they shall fill all vacancies that arise from death, or resignation, for the time of service remaining of the members so dying or resigning. Each senator shall be — years of age, at least; shall have been a citizen of the United States four years before his election; and shall be a resident of the State he is chosen from. The Senate shall choose its own officers." (1 Elliot 145–6.)

Monday, June 25, 1787: It was moved and seconded to add, after the words "seven years," in the 4th resolution, the words "to go out in fixed proportions."

It was moved and seconded to insert the word "six," instead of "seven."

It was moved and seconded to amend the clause so as to read, "for four years, one fourth to go out annually."

No determination being taken on the three last motions, it was moved and seconded to erase the word "seven" from the third clause of the fourth resolution; which passed in the affirmative (1 Elliot 188).

Tuesday, June 26, 1787: It was moved and seconded to amend the third clause of the fourth resolution, reported from the committee, so as to read as follows, namely, "for nine years, one third to go out triennially;" which passed in the negative. Yeas: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, 3. Nays: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, 8.

It was then moved and seconded to amend the third clause of the fourth resolution so as to read, "for six years, one third to go out biennially."

On the question to agree to the amendment, it passed in the affirmative. Yeas: Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, 7. Nays: New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, 4 (1 Elliot 189).

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVENTION

Referred, on the twenty-third and twenty-sixth of July 1787, to a committee of detail, (Messrs. Rutlege, Randolph, Gorham, Ellsworth, and Wilson,) for the purpose of reporting a constitution.

Journals, June 25:

"IV. *Resolved*, That the members of the second branch of the legislature of the United States ought to be chosen by the individual legislators; to be of the age of thirty years at least; to hold their offices for six years, one third to go out biennially; to receive a compensation for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to, and incapable of holding, any office under the authority of the United States, (except those peculiarly belonging to

---

[59] See footnote 1, p. 11 of this discussion. These special Senate sessions were all held prior to enactment in 1933 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution which, among other things, abolished the so-called "lame-duck" sessions of the Congress and which advanced the commencement of the Presidential term of office from March 4 to January 20.

[60] The American Commonwealth, by James Bryce (1891 ed., p. 101). At this point Bryce cited the Federalist, No. 61, and Alexander Hamilton's argument in the New York State Convention (Elliott's Debates, vol. II, p. 307).

[61] Constitutional Government in the United States, p. 127.

[62] For an extreme illustration, consider the Isle of Pines Treaty. It was continuously before the Senate from March 3, 1904, until its ratification on March 13, 1925. See Haynes, op. cit. supra, note 1, p. 626.

[63] Senate rule XXXVIII, sec. 6.

[63] As amended, Senate Journal 173, 81–1, March 17, 1949.

[64] Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, November 17, 1952.

the functions of the second branch), during the term for which they are elected, and for one year thereafter" (1 Elliot 221).

DRAFT OF A CONSTITUTION

Reported by the committee of five, August 6, 1787.

(One copy of this printed draft is among the papers deposited by President Washington in the Department of State; another copy is among the papers of Mr. Brearly, furnished by General Bloomfield.)

"ART. V. SEC. 2. The Senators shall be chosen for 6 years; but immediately after the first election, they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be, numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the Members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that a third part of the Members may be chosen every second year" (1 Elliot 225).

REVISED DRAFT OF THE CONSTITUTION

Reported September 12, 1787, by the Committee of Revision.

"ART. I. SEC. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for 6 years and each Senator shall have one vote.

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided, as equally as may be, into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that one-third may be chosen every second year. And if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature" (1 Elliot 298).

THE NOTES OF THE SECRET DEBATES OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787 TAKEN BY THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT YATES, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AND ONE OF THE DELEGATES FROM THAT STATE TO THE SAID CONVENTION

(Copied from the original manuscript of Chief Justice Yates, by John Lansing, Jr., and certified to be a true copy.)

Saturday, June 2, 1787. The Convention went into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Wilson moved that the States should be divided into districts, consisting of one or more States, and each district to elect a number of Senators to form the second branch of the National Legislature—the Senators be elected, and a certain proportion to be annually dismissed—avowedly on the plan of the New York Senate. Question put—rejected (1 Elliot 393).

Monday, June 25, 1787: Mr. Gorham proposed that the Senators be classed, and to remain 4 years in office; otherwise great inconveniences may arise if a dissolution should take place at once.

"Governor RANDOLPH. This body must act with firmness. They may possibly always sit—perhaps to aid the executive. The State governments will always attempt to counteract the general government. They ought to go out in classes. Therefore I move that they go out of office in fixed proportions of time, instead of the words '7 years.'"

Question on Governor Randolph's motion—7 ayes, 3 noes, 1 divided.

Ditto for 5 years—5 ayes, 5 noes, 1 divided.

The question for 4 years was not put; and the Convention adjourned till tomorrow morning.

Tuesday, June 26, 1787: Met pursuant to adjournment. Present, 11 States.

"Mr. GORHAM. My motion for 4 years' continuance was not put yesterday. I am still of opinion that classes will be necessary, but I would alter the time. I therefore move that the senators be elected for 6 years, and that the rotation be triennial."

* * * * *

Mr. Read moved that the term of "nine years" be inserted, in triennial rotation.

* * * * *

"Mr. SHERMAN. The two objects of this body are permanency, and safety to those who are to be governed. A bad government is the worse for being long. Frequent elections give security, and even permanency. In Connecticut we have existed 132 years under an annual government; and as long as a man behaves himself well, he is never turned out of office. Four years to the Senate is quite sufficient, when you add to it the rotation proposed."

* * * * *

"Mr. WILSON. The motion is now for 9 years, and a triennial rotation. Every nation attends to its foreign intercourse; to support its commerce; to prevent foreign contempt; and to make war and peace. Our Senate will be possessed of these powers, and therefore ought to be dignified and permanent. What is the reason that Great Britain does not enter into a commercial treaty with us? Because Congress has not the power to enforce its observance. But give them those powers, and give them the stability proposed by the motion, and they will have more permanency than a monarchial government. The great objection of many is that this duration would give birth to views inconsistent with the interests of the Union. This can have no weight, if the triennial rotation is adopted; and this plan may possibly tend to conciliate the minds of the members of the Convention on this subject, which have varied more than on any other question."

The question was then put on Mr. Read's motion, and lost—8 noes, 3 ayes.

The question on 5 years and a biennial rotation was carried—7 ayes, 4 noes. New York in the minority (1 Elliot 447-451).

DEBATES IN THE FEDERAL CONVENTION

Tuesday, May 29, 1787: Mr. Charles Pinckney laid before the House the draft of a federal government which he had prepared, to be agreed upon between the free and independent States of America:

"PLAN OF A FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

"Art. IV. The Senate shall be elected and chosen by the House of Delegates; which House, immediately after their meeting, shall choose by ballot — Senators from among the citizens and residents of New Hampshire, — from among those of Massachusetts, — from among those of Rhode Island, — from among those of Connecticut, — from among those of New York, — from among those of New Jersey, — from among those of Pennsylvania, — from among those of Delaware, — from among those of Maryland, — from among those of Virginia, — from among those of North Carolina, — from among those of South Carolina, and — from among those of Georgia. The Senators chosen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, shall form one class; those from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware one class; and those from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia one class. The House of Delegates shall number these classes, one, two, and three, and fix the times of their service by lot. The first class shall serve for — years, the second for — years, and the third for — years. As their times of service expire, the House of Delegates shall fill them up by elections for — years; and they shall fill all vacancies that arise from death or resignation, for the time of service remaining of the Members so dying or resigning. Each Senator shall be — years of age at least; and shall have been a citizen of the United States for 4 years before his election, and shall be a resident of the State he is chosen from. The Senate shall choose its own officers." (5 Elliot 129.)

Monday, June 25, 1787: The clause, that the second branch hold their offices for a term of "7 years," being considered,

Mr. Gorham suggests a term of "4 years," one-fourth to be elected every year.

Mr. Randolph supported the idea of rotation, as favorable to the wisdom and stability of the corps; which might possibly be always sitting, and aiding the executive, and moves, after "7 years," to add, "to go out in fixed proportion"; which was agreed to.

Mr. Williamson suggests "six years," as more convenient for rotation than seven years.

Mr. Sherman seconds him.

Mr. Read proposed that they should hold their offices "during good behavior." Mr. R. Morris seconds him.

General Pinckney proposed "four years." A longer term would fix them at the seat of government. They would acquire an interest there, perhaps transfer their property, and lose sight of the States they represent. Under these circumstances, the distant States would labor under great disadvantages.

Mr. Sherman moved to strike out "seven years," in order to take questions on the several propositions.

On the question to strike out "seven," Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, ay, 7; Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, no, 3; Maryland, divided.

On the question to insert "six years," which failed, five States being, ay; five, no; and one, divided, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, ay, 5; Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

On a motion to adjourn, the votes were, five for, five against it; and one divided, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, ay, 5; Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

On the question for "five years," it was lost, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, ay, 5; Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 5; Maryland, divided.

Adjourned (5 Elliot 241).

Tuesday, June 26, 1787: In convention. The duration of the second branch being under consideration.

Mr. Gorham moved to fill the blank with "6 years," one-third of the Members to go out every second year.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

General Pinckney opposed 6 years, in favor of 4 years. The States, he said, had different interests. Those of the southern, and of South Carolina in particular, were different from the northern. If the Senators should be appointed for a long term, they would settle in the State where they exercised their functions, and would in a little time be rather the representatives of that, than of the State appointing them.

Mr. Read moved that the term be 9 years. This would admit of a very convenient rotation, one-third going out triennially. He would still prefer "during good behavior"; but being little supported in that idea, he was willing to take the longest term that could be obtained.

Mr. Broom seconded the motion.

"Mr. MADISON. In order to judge of the form to be given to this institution, it will be proper to take a view of the ends to be served by it. These were, first, to protect the people against their rulers; secondly, to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led. A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plan of government most likely to secure their happiness, would first be aware, that those charged with the public happiness might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this

danger would be, to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. In this they would be governed by the same prudence which has prevailed in organizing the subordinate departments of government, where all business liable to abuses is made to pass through separate hands, the one being a check on the other. It would next occur to such a people, that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want of information as to their true interest; and that men chosen for a short term, and employed but a small portion of that in public affairs, might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest, that the government be so constituted as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests" (5 Elliot 242).

"Mr. WILSON. The true reason why Great Britain has not yet listened to a commercial treaty with us has been, because she had no confidence in the stability or efficacy of our Government. Nine years, with a rotation, will provide these desirable qualities; and give our Government an advantage in this respect over monarchy itself. In a monarchy, much must always depend on the temper of the man. In such a body, the personal character will be lost in the political. He would add another observation. The popular objection against appointing any public body for a long term, was, that it might, by gradual encroachments, prolong itself, first into a body for life, and finally become a hereditary one. It would be a satisfactory answer to this objection, that, as one third would go out triennially, there would be always three divisions holding their places from unequal times, and consequently acting under the influence of different views and different impulses."

On the question for 9 years, one third to go out triennially, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virgina, ay, 3; Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 8.

On the question for 6 years, one third to go out biennially, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, aye, 7; New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, Georgia, no, 4 (5 Elliot 245).

Monday, July 2, 1787: Mr. Pinckney thought an equality of votes in the second branch inadmissible * * * Congress have failed in almost every effort for an amendment of the Federal system. Nothing has prevented a dissolution of it but the appointment of this Convention; and he could not express his alarms for the consequence of such an event. He read his motion to form the States into classes, with an apportionment of Senator among them. (See article 4 of his plan—ante, p. 129.)

Mr. Gouverneur Morris thought a committee advisable, as the convention had been equally divided. He had a stronger reason also. The mode of appointing the second branch tended, he was sure, to defeat the object of it. What is this object? To check the precipitation, changeableness, and excesses, of the first branch. Every man of observation had seen in the democratic branches of the State legislatures, precipitation—in Congress, changeableness—in every department, excesses against personal liberty, private property, and personal safety. What qualities are necessary to constitute a check in this case? Abilities and virtue are equally necessary in both branches. Something more, then, is now wanted. In the first place the checking branch must have a personal interest in checking the other branch. One interest must be opposed to another interest. Vices, as they exist, must be turned against each other. * * * In the fourth place, an independence for life involves the necessary permanency. If we change our measures, nobody will trust us; and how avoid a change of measures, but by avoiding a change of men? (5 Elliot 270–271).

Thursday, July 26, 1787: The proceedings since Monday last were unanimously referred to the committee of detail; and the Convention then unanimously adjourned till Monday, August 6th, that the committee of detail might have time to prepare and report the Constitution. The whole resolutions, as referred, are as follows:

* * * * *

"4. *Resolved*, That the members of the second branch of the legislature of the United States ought to be chosen by the individual legislatures; to be of the age of 30 years at least; to hold their offices for 6 years, one third to go out biennially; to receive a compensation for the devotion of their time to the public service; to be ineligible to, and incapable of holding, any office under the authority of the United States (except those peculiarly belonging to the functions of the second branch) during the term for which they are elected, and for 1 year thereafter" (5 Elliot 374–375).

Monday, August 6, 1787: Mr. Rutledge delivered in the report of the committee of detail as follows—a printed copy being at the same time furnished to each member:

Article V, section 1:

"The Senate of the United States shall be chosen by legislatures of the several States. Each legislature shall choose two members. Vacancies may be supplied by the executive until the next meeting of the legislature. Each member shall have one vote."

Article V, section 2:

"The senators shall be chosen for six years; but immediately after the first election, they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year; so that a third part of the members may be chosen every second year" (5 Elliot 376–377).

DEBATES OF THE CONVENTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Tuesday, June 24, 1788: Convention assembled; and being resolved into a committee, the first paragraph of the third section of the first article was read; when Mr. G. Livingston rose, and addressed the chair.

"I therefore move that the committee adopt the following resolution, as an amendment to this clause:

"'*Resolved*, That no person shall be eligible as a senator for more than six years in any term of twelve years, and that it shall be in the power of the legislatures of the several states to recall their senators, or either of them, and to elect others in their stead, to serve for the remainder of the time for which such senator or senators, so recalled, were appointed."

"Hon. Mr. LANSING. Now, if it was the design of the plan to make the Senate a kind of bulwark to the independence of the States, and a check to the encroachment of the general government, certainly the members of this body ought to be peculiarly under the control, and in strict subordination to the state who delegated them. In proportion to their want of dependence, they will lose their respect for the power from whom they receive their existence, and, consequently, will disregard the great object for which they are instituted. The idea of rotation has been taken from the articles of the old Confederation. It has thus far, in my opinion, operated with great advantage. The power of recall, too, has been an excellent check, though it has, in fact, never been exercised. The thing is of so delicate a nature, that few men will step forward to move a recall, unless there is some strong ground for it" (2 Elliot 286, 289).

"Mr. R. R. LIVINGSTON. The amendment appears to have in view two objects—that a rotation shall be established in the Senate, and that its members shall be subject to recall by the State legislatures. It is not contended that 6 years are too long a time for the Senators to remain in office. Indeed, this cannot be objected to, when the purposes for which this body is instituted are considered. They are to form treaties with foreign nations. This requires a comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics, and an extensive acquaintance with characters, whom, in this capacity, they have to negotiate with, together with such an intimate conception of our best interests, relative to foreign powers, as can only be derived from much experience in this business. What singular policy, to cut off the hand which has just qualified itself for action. But, says the gentleman, as they are the representatives of the States, those States have a control. Will this principle hold good? The Members of the lower House are the representatives of the people. Have the people any power to recall them? What would be the tendency of the power contended for? Clearly this: The State legislatures, being frequently subject to factious and irregular passions, may be unjustly disaffected and discontented with their delegates; and a Senator may be appointed one day and recalled the next. This would be a source of endless confusion. The Senate are indeed designed to represent the State governments; but they are also the representatives of the United States, and are not to consult the interest of any one State alone, but that of the Union.

* * * * *

"But to return: The people are the best judges who ought to represent them. To dictate and control them, to tell them whom they shall not elect, is to abridge their natural rights. This rotation is an absurd species of ostracism—a mode of proscribing eminent merit, and banishing from stations of trust those who have filled them with the greatest faithfulness. Besides, it takes away the strongest stimulus to public virtue—the hope of honors and rewards. The acquisition of abilities is hardly worth the trouble, unless one is to enjoy the satisfaction of employing them for the good of one's country. We all know that experience is indispensably necessary to good government. Shall we, then, drive experience into obscurity? I repeat that this is an absolute abridgment of the people's rights.

"As to the Senate's rendering themselves perpetual, or establishing such a power as to prevent their being removed, it appears to me chimerical. Can they make interest with their legislatures, who are themselves varying every year, sufficient for such a purpose? Can we suppose two Senators will be able to corrupt the whole legislature of this State? The idea, I say, is chimerical. The thing is impossible.

"Hon. Mr. LANSING. The objects of this amendment are, first, to place the Senators in such a situation of dependence on their several State legislatures, as will induce them to pay a constant regard to the good of their constituents; secondly, to oblige them to return, at certain periods, to their fellow citizens, that, by mingling with the people, they may recover that knowledge of their interests, and revive that sympathy with their feelings, which power and an exalted station are too apt to efface from the minds of rulers.

"It has been urged that the Senators should be acquainted with the interests of the States in relation to each other, and to foreign powers, and that they should remain in office in order to acquire extensive political information. If these were the only objects, the argument would extend to rendering their dignity perpetual—an idea which probably none of the gentlemen will consent to; but, if one-third of the Senators go out every

2 years, cannot those who succeed them acquire information from the remaining Members with respect to the relative interests of the States? It is to be presumed that the Senate will be composed of the best-informed men, and that no such men will be incapable of comprehending the interests of the States, either singly or collectively. If it be the design of representation that the sense and spirit of the people's interests and feelings should be carried into the Government, it is obvious that this design can be accomplished in no way so perfectly as by obliging our rulers, at certain periods, to relinquish their offices and rank. The people cannot be represented by men who are perpetually separated from them" (2 Elliot 291–294).

"Hon. Mr. HAMILTON. The zeal for liberty became predominant and excessive. In forming our confederation, this passion alone seemed to actuate us, and we appear to have had no other view than to secure ourselves from despotism. The object certainly was a valuable one, and deserved our utmost attention, but, sir, there is another object, equally important, and which our enthusiasm rendered us little capable of regarding; I mean a principle of strength and stability in the organization of our Government, and vigor in its operations. This purpose could never be accomplished but by the establishment of some select body, formed particularly upon this principle. There are few positions more demonstrable than that there should be, in every republic, some permanent body to correct the prejudices, check the intemperate passions, and regulate the fluctuations, of a popular assembly. It is evident that a body instituted for these purposes must be so formed as to exclude, as much as possible, from its own character, those infirmities, and that mutability, which it is designed to remedy. It is, therefore, necessary that it should be small, that it should hold its authority during a considerable period, and that it should have such an independence in the exercise of its powers, as will divest it, as much as possible, of local prejudices. It should be so formed as to be the center of political knowledge, to pursue always a steady line of conduct, and to reduce every irregular propensity to system. Without this establishment, we may make experiments without end, but shall never have an efficient Government.

* * * * *

"Sir, the main design of the Convention, in forming the Senate, was to prevent fluctuations and cabals. With this view, they made that body small, and to exist for a considerable period. Have they executed this design too far? The senators are to serve six years. This is only two years longer than the senators of this state hold their places. One third of the members are to go out every two years; and in six, the whole body will be changed. Prior to the revolution, the representatives in the several colonies were elected for different periods—for three years, for seven years, etc. Were those bodies ever considered as incapable of representing the people, or as too independent of them? There is one circumstance which will have a tendency to increase the dependence of the senators on the states, in proportion to the duration of their appointments. As the state legislatures are in continual fluctuation, the senator will have more attachments to form, and consequently a greater difficulty of maintaining his place, than one of shorter duration. He will, therefore, be more cautious and industrious to suit his conduct to the wishes of his constituents" (2 Elliot 300–306).

"The Honorable Mr. HAMILTON. If the members of Congress are too dependent on the state legislatures, they will be eternally forming secret combinations from local views. This is reasoning from the plainest principles. Their interest is interwoven with their dependence, and they will necessarily yield to the impression of their situation. Those who have been in Congress have seen these operations. The first question has been, How will such a measure affect my constituents, and consequently, how will the part I take affect my reelection? This consideration may be in some degree proper; but to be dependent from day to day, and to have the idea perpetually present, would be the source of numerous evils. Six years, sir, is a period short enough for a proper degree of dependence. Let us consider the peculiar state of this body, and see under what impressions they will act. One third of them are to go out at the end of two years, two thirds at four years, and the whole at six years. When one year is elapsed, there is a number who are to hold their places for one year, others for three, and others for five years. Thus there will not only be a constant and frequent change of members, but there will be some whose office is near the point of expiration, and who, from this circumstance, will have a lively sense of their dependence. The biennial change of members is an excellent invention for increasing the difficulty of combination. Any scheme of usurpation will lose, every two years a number of its oldest advocates, and their places will be supplied by an equal number of new, unaccommodating, and virtuous men. When two principles are equally important, we ought, if possible, to reconcile them, and sacrifice neither. We think that safety and permanency in this government are completely reconcilable. The state governments will have, from the causes I have described, a sufficient influence over the Senate, without the check for which the gentlemen contend" (2 Elliot 318–319).

LUTHER MARTIN'S LETTER ON THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787

"The Senate, sir, is so constituted that they are not only to compose one branch of the legislature, but, by the second section of the second article, they are to compose a privy council for the President. Hence it will be necessary that they should be, in a great measure, a permanent body, constantly residing at the seat of government. Seventy years are esteemed for the life of a man; it can hardly be supposed that a Senator, especially from the States remote from the seat of empire, will accept of an appointment which must estrange him for 6 years from his State, without giving up, to a great degree, his prospects in his own State. If he has a family, he will take his family with him to the place where the government shall be fixed; that will become his home; and there is every reason to expect that his future views and prospects will center in the favors and emoluments of the General Government, or of the government of that State where the seat of empire is established. In either case, he is lost to his own State" (2 Elliot 361).

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXII

"Thirdly. Another defect to be supplied by a Senate lies in a want of due acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation. It is not possible that an assembly of men called for the most part from pursuits of a private nature, continued in appointment for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs, and the comprehensive interests of their country, should, if left wholly to themselves, escape a variety of important errors in the exercise of their legislative trust. It may be affirmed, on the best grounds, that no small share of the present embarrassments of America is to be charged on the blunders of our governments; and that these have proceeded from the heads rather than the hearts of most of the authors of them. What indeed are all the repealing, explaining, and amending laws, which fill and disgrace our voluminous codes, but so many monuments of deficient wisdom; so many impeachments exhibited by each succeeding against each preceding session; so many admonitions to the people, of the value of those aids which may be expected from a well-constituted Senate?

"A good government implies two things; first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be best attained. Some governments are deficient in both these qualities; most governments are deficient in the first. I scruple not to assert, that in American governments too little attention has been paid to the last. The Federal Constitution avoids this error; and what merits particular notice, it provides for the last in a mode which increases the security for the first.

"Fourthly. The mutability in the public councils arising from a rapid succession of new Members, however qualified they may be, points out, in the strongest manner, the necessity of some stable institution in the Government. Every new election in the States is found to change one-half of the Representatives. From this change of men must proceed a change of opinion; and from a change of opinions, a change of measures. But a continual change even of good measures is inconsistent with every rule of prudence and every prospect of success. The remark is verified in private life, and becomes more just, as well as more important, in national transactions.

"To trace the mischievous effects of a mutable government would fill a volume. I will hint a few only, each of which will be perceived to be a source of innumerable others.

"In the first place, it forfeits the respect and confidence of other nations, and all the advantages connected with national character. An individual who is observed to be inconstant to his plans, or perhaps to carry on his affairs without any plan at all, is marked at once, by all prudent people, as a speedy victim to his own unsteadiness and folly. His more friendly neighbors may pity him, but all will decline to connect their fortunes with his; and not a few will seize the opportunity of making their fortunes out of his. One nation is to another what one individual is to another; with this melancholy distinction perhaps, that the former, with fewer of the benevolent emotions than the latter, are under fewer restraints also from taking undue advantage from the indiscretions of each other. Every nation, consequently, whose affairs betray a want of wisdom and stability, may calculate on every loss which can be sustained from the more systematic policy of their wiser neighbors. But the best instruction on this subject is unhappily conveyed to America by the example of her own situation. She finds that she is held in no respect by her friends; that she is the derision of her enemies; and that she is a prey to every nation which has an interest in speculating on her fluctuating councils and embarrassed affairs.

"The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. It poisons the blessing of liberty itself. It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed?" (The Federalist, Lodge edition, New York, 1908, pp. 388–391.)

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXIII

"I add, as a sixth defect, the want, in some important cases, of a due responsibility in the Government to the people, arising from that frequency of elections which in other cases produces this responsibility. This remark will, perhaps, appear not only new,

but paradoxical. It must, nevertheless, be acknowledged, when explained, to be as undeniable as it is important.

"Responsibility, in order to be reasonable, must be limited to objects within the power of the responsible party, and in order to be effectual, must relate to operations of that power, of which a ready and proper judgment can be formed by the constituents. The objects of government may be divided into two general classes: The one depending on measures which have singly an immediate and sensible operation; the other depending on a succession of well-chosen and well-connected measures, which have a gradual and perhaps unobserved operation. The importance of the latter description to the collective and permanent welfare of every country, needs no explanation. And yet it is evident that an assembly elected for so short a term as to be unable to provide more than one or two links in a chain of measures, on which the general welfare may essentially depend, ought not to be answerable for the final result, any more than a steward or tenant, engaged for 1 year, could be justly made to answer for places or improvements which could not be accomplished in less than half a dozen years. Nor is it possible for the people to estimate the share of influence which their annual assemblies may respectively have on event resulting from the mixed transactions of several years. It is sufficiently difficult to preserve a personal responsibility in the members of a numerous body, for such acts of the body as have an immediate, detached, and palpable operation on its constituents.

"The proper remedy for this defect must be an additional body in the legislative department, which, having sufficient permanency to provide for such objects as require a continued attention, and a train of measures, may be justly and effectually answerable for the attainment of those objects." (The Federalist, pp. 392–393.)

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXIV

"They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly, composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession, seem not to recollect that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects, which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances, and which can only be approached and achieved by measures which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise, therefore, in the convention to provide, not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political information, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence in providing for the frequent elections of senators in such a way as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men; for by leaving a considerble residue of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved." (The Federalist, p. 402.)

THE FEDERALIST, NO. LXXVII

"It has been mentioned as one of the advantages to be expected from the cooperation of the Senate, in the business of appointments, that it would contribute to the stability of the administration. The consent of that body would be necessary to displace as well as to appoint. A change of the Chief Magistrate, therefore, would not occasion so violent or so general a revolution in the officers of the government as might be expected, if he were the sole disposer of offices. Where a man in any station has given satisfactory evidence of his fitness for it, a new President would be restrained from attempting a change in favor of a person more agreeable to him, by the apprehension that a discountenance of the Senate might frustrate the attempt, and bring some degree of discredit upon himself. Those who can best estimate the value of a steady administration, will be most disposed to prize a provision which connects the official existence of public men with the approbation or disapprobation of that body which, from the greater permanency of its own composition, will in all probability be less subject to inconstancy than any other member of the government." (The Federalist, pp. 476–477.)

APPENDIX III

THE SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

(Extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE relating to debates in the Congress of the United States on the question of the Senate as a continuing body)

1. CONTROVERSY OVER THE SENATE PRINTERS IN 1841

A joint resolution of March 3, 1819, had provided that "as soon as this resolution shall have been approved by the President of the United States, each House shall proceed to ballot for a printer, to execute its work during the next Congress." (The resolution is reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 26th Cong., 2d sess., v. 9, p. 238.)

An amendatory joint resolution adopted in 1829 provided that "within thirty days before the adjournment of every Congress, each House shall proceed to vote for a printer to execute its work for and during the succeeding Congress." (Reprinted ibid, p. 169.) Accordingly, on February 20, 1841, during the second session of the Twenty-sixth Congress, the Senate elected Blair & Rives as its printers for the Twenty-seventh Congress (ibid., p. 197).

On March 4, 1841, the political complexion of the Senate changed (ibid., p. 186). The Senate organized by reelecting its President pro tempore (ibid., p. 231), and sat in special session until March 14. The House of Representatives duly adjourned sine die, and was not in session after March 4.

On March 4, 1841, a resolution was introduced "That Blair & Rives be dismissed as printers for the Senate for the Twenty-seventh Congress" (ibid., p. 236). On March 5 a motion to take up this resolution for consideration was debated at length. In February at the time of the election of the printers it had been urged that the "next Senate" should be allowed to elect its own printers (ibid., p. 186).

Mr. Allen, of Ohio:

"And as to the assertion that this was a new Senate, he denied the fact. The argument so much relied on in this discussion and on which so much logic and reasoning had been wasted in opposition to the election of these printers was untrue. There was no such thing as a new Senate known to the Constitution of this Republic. They might as well speak of a new Supreme Court as of a new Senate. There was a new House of Representatives because the entire House expired at the expiration of the second year and because the 4th of March terminated the life of that body. But not so the Senate. The Constitution replenishes that body every 2 years by the election of a class of Senators, and thereby gives eternity to the duration of the body. There was no new, nor was there any old, Senate. The same Senate, therefore, which elected Blair and Rives now without charge or allegation proposes to rescind the act, but he would not go into that" (ibid., p. 236).

Mr. Wright, of New York (as the Senate was in special session and the House of Representatives was not sitting, the Senate could properly consider no other business than nominations and treaties):

"He had never heard it pretended that the rules of the Senate are not perpetual from Congress to Congress, unless they were changed by the body. The rules were not now changed; and what, then, were they doing? Why, they were debating this matter in violation of their rules, and by their action were assuming to exercise legislative powers" (ibid., p. 236).

Mr. Henry Clay, of Kentucky:

"It was contended on one side that the Senate was a continuous, never-dying body, and on the other side it was said there was no House of Representatives. But in the true contemplation of the Constitution, the Senate, and the House, too, were supposed to be in existence; for if the States had discharged their duties by the election of Members, they were ready to form a House. The Senate and the House were, in the contemplation of the Constitution, continuous bodies; they were not identical in the Members that composed them, but he hoped that, though theoretically always in existence, the acts and measures of the Senate would depend on the component Members that constitute the body. By the Constitution the Senate had power, exclusively of the House, of the President, or any other authority, to elect its own officers. They said that their printer was an officer; but he should not go over the arguments which had been urged with so much ability by his friend from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] and which stood unanswered to that day, that these printers were officers" (ibid., p. 237).

Mr. Wright:

"He had before referred to the rules of the Senate, and he had stated what he supposed would not be controverted, that those rules were as perfectly binding on that body as they were on the body which occupied those seats a week ago. Now, one of those rules was, that 'When acting on confidential or executive business the Senate shall be cleared of all persons, except the Secretary, the Principal or the Executive Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, and the Assistant Doorkeeper.' Well, then, under their rules they must assume to be acting legislatively, a position which he undertook to show they did not occupy after their organization for executive purposes" (ibid., p. 237).

The Senate voted to take up for consideration the resolution to dismiss the printers (ibid., p. 238). On March 8, the debate proceeded. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, contended that the printers were not officers of the Senate, but were entitled under a binding contract to do the Senate printing. But what if they were officers?

Senators had contended that one Senate or one Congress had no right to elect officers for their successors; and that, therefore, the joint resolution violated the Constitution, because it gave the election of a printer for the next Senate to that which had expired on the 3d of March. This was as strange a position as any which had been assumed throughout the argument. An old Senate and a new Senate.

There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting in 1789. It has existed without any intermission from that day until the present moment, and would continue to exist as long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body. Its rules were permanent and were not adopted from Congress to Congress like those of the House of Representatives. For many years after the commencement of the Government its Secretary was a permanent officer, though our rules now require that he should be elected at stated intervals. The Senate always had a President, and there were always two-thirds of its actual Members in existence, and generally a much greater number. It would be useless to labor this question. Every writer, without exception, who had treated on the subject

had declared the Senate to be a permanent body. It never dies; and it was the sheet anchor of the Constitution on account of its permanency. Senators were thus deprived of the poor apology that one Senate had no right to bind its successors (ibid., p. 240).

On March 9 the discussion was continued. A resolution that it was not competent for the Senate to annul the election and divest the printers of their rights was voted down (ibid., p. 246). On March 10 the resolution to dismiss was again taken up.

Mr. Sevier, of Arkansas:

"It had been very properly said that this was a permanent body, and that the election, whether before the 4th of March or after, was good and valid. It had been acquiesced in before, as he found on looking at the ayes and noes" (ibid., p. 250).

Mr. Woodbury, of New Hampshire:

"He was summoned here to a session of the Senate without the House of Representatives; and, of course, a session for the transaction of executive business merely. This body was a permanent one; and hence it was supposed that no new officers were to be elected if no vacancies already existed" (ibid., p. 251).

The resolution to dismiss Blair & Rives as printers of the Senate to the Twenty-seventh Congress was adopted by a vote of 26 to 18, on March 11, 1841 (ibid., p. 256). This action tended to support the view that the Senate was a discontinuous body.

But a vote to dismiss its printers was not necessarily a vote that the Senate was discontinuous. One of the Senators who advocated and voted for the dismissal, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, agreed with the opposition that the Senate was everlasting. (See above.) And if the proponents of the discontinuity view were, in fact, more numerous than its opponents, the reports in the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE (of which Blair & Rives were editors and publishers) wholly fail to indicate it.

2. OFFICE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Senator Collamer introduced in the Senate, August 5, 1861 (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 37th Cong., 1st sess., p. 436), the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the President pro tempore of the Senate, elected in the absence of the Vice President, holds his office, while a Member of the Senate, until another is elected, and executes the duties thereof whenever the Vice President is absent."

He declared:

"The object of this resolution is to declare what I have understood to be really the law. * * * It seems to me that, if an election be made to last only while the Vice President is at that time absent, the election to the office must cease with the session. It is an absurdity to talk about the absence of the Vice President when the Senate is not sitting. * * *

"The law which provides, in accordance with the Constitution, who shall perform the duties of President of the United States, in case of the death or resignation of both the President and Vice President, declares that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall officiate, or, if there be no President pro tempore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is very observable that that law necessarily implies that the Congress which passed it understood the place of President pro tempore to be a continuing office; that when elected, he remained in until another was elected. True, it might fall out that he might die; and so provision was made for the Speaker of the House of Representatives; but the necessary implication from the law is that the office of President pro tempore of the Senate is a continuing office."

Senator Bayard opposed the resolution, saying (ibid., p. 437):

"If the Vice President does not return, the occupant of the chair remains President pro tempore of the Senate, session or no session; because that is the natural inference from the duration of the office. He is not elected President pro tempore during the session of the Senate; he is elected President pro tempore during the absence of the Vice President, and you cannot assume the Vice President will return until he again appears in the chair as President of the Senate."

No vote was taken on Senator Collamer's resolution, and there was no discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore could continue over into a new Congress.

On December 17, 1875, after the death of the Vice President, Senator Edmunds introduced a resolution to proceed to the election of a President pro tempore on the 7th of January. (Misc. Doc. No. 21, 44th Cong., 1st sess.)

January 10, 1876, Senator Morton, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, introduced four resolutions relating to the office of President pro tempore (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, v. 4, p. 311). In the report of the committee (S. Rept. 3, 44th Cong., 1st sess.) it is stated (p. 2):

"The custom of the Vice President to vacate the chair before the close of a session to enable the Senate to choose a President pro tempore, did not begin until after the passage of the act of March 1, 1792, and was obviously instituted to meet the contingency contemplated in the act, by providing a President pro tempore of the Senate during the vacations of that body. The Senate in contemplation of law, is a perpetual body, and the officers of the Senate are as much its officers during its vacations as during its sessions."

The report also cites 4 cases where the office of President pro tempore ceased "at the meeting of the Senate after the first recess," and 49 where it did not.

The first resolution proposed was (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 311):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of office of President pro tempore of the Senate elected at one session does not expire at the meeting of Congress after the first recess, the Vice President not having appeared to take the chair."

Senator Merrimon, discussing this resolution, said:

"I entertain the opinion that when the Senate elects a President pro tempore the Senator so elected may rightfully continue to hold his office, unless his term as Senator shall sooner terminate or he shall be removed for cause, until the Vice President shall return to preside over the Senate, and in case he shall fail to so return because of death or other cause, then until a new Vice President shall be elected and qualified. * * * The Senate is a perpetual body; it is created, its powers are conferred, defined, and limited, by the Constitution."

The resolution was unanimously adopted (ibid., p. 316). Senator Sherman then remarked:

"I want to emphasize the matter. This resolution is adopted unanimously. It is a resolution that affects the organization of the body for all time to come and establishes a precedent."

January 12, 1876 (ibid., pp. 360–373), the Senate adopted this resolution:

"That the office of President pro tempore is held at the pleasure of the Senate."

October 10, 1881, Senator Garland, objecting to the admission of new Senators until a President pro tempore should be elected (the Vice President having become President of the United States during the recess of the Senate), said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 12, p. 507):

"The Senate is a continuing body. It has members enough whenever it may meet, in legal contemplation, to transact its business."

June 23, 1882, while Senator Morgan was addressing the Senate on the powers of the Presiding Officer, Senator Maxey interjected the remark (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 13, p. 5263): "The Senate is a perpetual body." Thereupon Senator Morgan continued:

"The Senate being a perpetual body, if the Journals show that we have a Presiding Officer selected under the Constitution, the Journals cannot show that any other person can convene the Senate and call it to order and organize it as a legislative body except that person, until we supply another man under the Constitution and furnish him with the constitutional and record authority also to preside in this body * * *. Whenever the Senate of the United States is not together in pursuance, if you please, of an adjournment from yesterday or an adjournment from the last term and we do not find the gentleman present who fills the office which the Journals of this body show that he is entitled to fill, our duty then, and it is our first constitutional and unavoidable duty, is to supply that record and supply the man to fill the place."

March 20, 1888, Senator Butler introduced the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 37):

"*Resolved*, That the tenure of the President pro tempore does not expire at the meeting of Congress after a recess, the Vice President having appeared to take the chair."

In discussing this resolution, Senator Reagan said (ibid., p. 46):

"A great many of the precedents show that the President pro tempore at the expiration of a Congress takes his seat at the commencement of a new Congress. It is convenient for the Senate to allow him to do so for the purpose of organization; but it seems to me as a rule to be unjust and improper for the reason I shall state. I know it is done upon the supposition that the Senate is a continuing body. So it is a continuing body with installments added every two years, if I may use such an expression. At the end of each Congress it is presumed that one-third of the Senate are new to their position. It ought not to be that that one-third of the Senate shall have no choice in the selection of a President pro tempore."

The resolution was not acted upon.

February 10, 1890, Senator Evarts, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 1154):

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore, who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof when the Vice President is absent."

In discussing this resolution Senator Evarts (ibid., p. 1717) referred to Senator Collamer's resolution of 1861, and also to the Morton report of 1876, which he said raised the question "whether a President pro tempore chosen at one session of the Senate should vacate that place, that post, that office, at the opening of the next session or after the first recess of the Senate. This committee were entirely of opinion, and there is now, I suppose, no difference in the Senate on that point, that that did not terminate the office of President pro tempore. * * * It appears now that there is left for consideration only this: Whether as a matter of constitutional obligation it is essential that the Senate should confine the existence and authority of a President pro tempore to the immediate occasion of the particular absence of the Vice President on which he is elected. * * * No Senator can see more clearly than I do the very great inconvenience of being dependent, entirely without a presiding officer, when a merely casual, unexpected, and unannounced, and yet necessary absence of the Vice President may require that there should be some one to take the chair."

Senator Hoar supported the resolution, but Senator George maintained that it was contrary to "the uniform, unbroken practice of the Senate of the United States for a hundred

years, and the uniform and unbroken practice of the House of Commons in England for 500 years."

March 12, 1860, Senator George (ibid., p. 2144) stated:

"At all times, and in every conceivable way in which the question could be raised, it was uniformly decided until 1861, without dissent on the part of anyone, that the President pro tempore of the Senate held his office, as the words themselves mean, during that particular absence of the Vice President for which he was elected. * * * Down to the present time the practice of the Senate has conformed to the original interpretation placed upon the Constitution, as I have stated it to be."

Senator George then reviewed the various elections of a President pro tempore from 1789 to 1860, and concluded (p. 2145):

"At the expense of frequent elections, at the expense of changing the occupant of the chair as frequently as 10 or 12 days apart, with one uniform consensus of opinion, with a uniformity of practice which is without a single break for a hundred years, the judgment of the Senate has been that the President pro tempore elected in the absence of the Vice President vacates his office upon the return of that officer."

Senator Turpie (ibid., p. 2150) introduced an amendment to change the resolution to the following form:

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall executive the duties thereof during all future absences of the Vice President until the Senate shall otherwise order."

In reply to Senator George he said:

"I think the unbroken practice or custom which he speaks of is owing to the fact that the question has not been discussed, and there has been no determinative or affirmative decision on the construction of the National Constitution herein."

The resolution was adopted as amended by Senator Turpie without division March 12, 1870 (ibid., p. 2153). Nothing was said in the discussion as to whether or not the office of President pro tempore under the resolution would expire with the Congress during which he was elected.

March 2, 1891, Senator Charles F. Manderson was elected President pro tempore to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of March 12, 1890 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 22, p. 3637), with the intention, apparently, that his office would continue over into the following Congress. Subsequent Presidents pro tempore have regularly been elected with reference to this same resolution.

In Gilfry's compilation, President of the Senate Pro Tempore, numerous instances are cited of Presidents pro tempore holding over from one Congress to the next:

John Gaillard, Thirteenth to Fourteenth Congress (p. 14).

William P. Mangum, Twenty-seventh to Twenty-eighth Congress (p. 23).

William R. King, Thirty-first to Thirty-second Congress (p. 36).

Jesse D. Bright, Thirty-third to Thirty-fourth Congress (p. 39).

Benjamin F. Wade, Thirty-ninth to Fortieth Congress (p. 49).

John J. Ingalls, Forty-ninth to Fiftieth Congress (p. 175).

Charles F. Manderson, Fifty-first to Fifty-third Congress (p. 213).

William P. Frye, Fifty-fourth to Fifty-sixth Congress (pp. 215–217).

William P. Frye, Fifty-seventh to Fifty-ninth Congress (pp. 218–220).

William P. Frye, Sixtieth to Sixty-second Congress (pp. 221–223).

On the other hand, the same compilation cites cases of reelection of Presidents pro tempore at a special March 4 session of the Senate, as follows:

William R. King, March 4, 1841 (p. 21).
David R. Atchison, March 4, 1853 (p. 37).
James M. Mason, March 4, 1857 (p. 42).
Solomon Fort, March 4, 1863 (p. 47).
William P. Frye, March 7, 1901 (p. 217).
William P. Frye, December 5, 1907 (p. 220).

3. DEBATE CONCERNING JOINT RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

January 10, 1876, Senator Hamlin, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 4, p. 300):

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives in force at the close of the last session of Congress be, and the same are hereby, adopted as the joint rules of the two Houses for the present session."

Senator Hamlin, in supporting the resolution, said:

"The Senate has its rules. The Senate is an existing body, and its rules exist with the body. The House of Representatives is a body which expires once in 2 years, and its rules expire, of course, with each expiring Congress."

Senator Bayard, speaking on the same resolution January 17, 1876, said (ibid., p. 431):

"The question comes at once whether a joint rule adopted by the two Houses falls and becomes void by the expiration of the Congress in which that rule was adopted. So far as the Senate is concerned, it will not, I think, be suggested, because this is a continuing body; there is always and at all times a quorum continuing from one Congress to another. It is not so with the House of Representatives, the termination of whose legal existence is at the end of every 2 years. * * * So far as the Senate is concerned, we all know that the Senate's rules continue, but the question is what effect the different constitution of the other House of Congress has upon a joint rule."

Senator Merrimon stated:

"The long experience of our Chief Clerk, embracing about 38 years, knows of no exception; and, as far as he has been able to learn on examination, there has been no exception to the practice that the joint rules continue from Congress to Congress on the part of the Senate. But when the matter was brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules we could not see how any rule, whether joint or otherwise, of one Congress could be binding upon a subsequent Congress, for the Congress as a Congress lasts but two years. As a legal proposition, if a joint rule is not binding upon the House, how could it be binding upon the Senate?"

Senator Thurman said (ibid., p. 432):

"The resolution now before the Senate rests upon the assumption that the joint rules of the two Houses fall at the end of what is called every Congress, and that they must necessarily do so upon the theory that the House of Representatives expires at the end of every Congress, while it is said that the Senate is a perpetual body. Why is it said that the Senate is a perpetual body? I know of no reason except one, and that is that only one-third of its Members go out every 2 years, so that there is always a sufficient number of Senators in office to constitute a quorum of the Senate. * * * The Senate is said to be a perpetual body, because it can be convened at any instant.

"I say, in reply to the Senator from Maine, that the Congress of the United States can be convened at any moment. In the contemplation of our Constitution there is never one moment of time when there is not a Congress of the United States which can be convened upon the call of the President, and in point of fact it is so. * * * The theory of our Government is that all the departments of the Government—executive, judicial, legislative—are in existence at every moment of time. * * * The Senate is said to be a continuing body. Cannot we change our rules whenever we please? The House can change its rules, no matter whether the rules of the last House continue in force until altered or not. * * * I think this idea that there is a dead House of Representatives every two years is all a mistake. I think the House of Representatives is as permanent a body as the Senate. The fact that we hold our office for 6 years and they for only 2 makes no manner of difference between the two Houses as to the permanent nature of the body."

Senator Sherman said (ibid., p. 433):

"The rules of the House of Representatives, I believe it is conceded on all hands, expire with the Congress. There can be no doubt about that, because that has been the universal practice of the Government, I believe, from the beginning. While I was a Member of the House there were two or three important occasions when, before the House was organized, it was held that there were no rules. By the established practice of the Government from the beginning to this hour it has been held that the rules of the House of Representatives expire with the Congress, and that no law can operate to extend the rules from one Congress to another, because that would be to violate the Constitution itself. In this respect the rules of each House are precisely alike.

"The rules of the Senate are no more operative than the rules of the House of Representatives. We have the power to change them at any moment. It is said that this body is a continuous body; but these rules need not be written out in the form of rules prescribed in set phrases. I have come, therefore, to the conclusion that it is not necessary, so far as the joint rules or the rules of the Senate are concerned, to take any action at the beginning of each Congress, simply because the joint rules expire by the expiration of Congress. It is not necessary for us, to continue any of our rules, to adopt the usual resolution of the House at the beginning of every Congress. I believe the joint rules will be continued without any such action. The Senate itself is a permanent body, and all the rules which affect the Senate continue until changed by the action of the Senate."

Senator Kelly said (ibid., p. 434):

"The Senate has never considered it necessary to adopt the rules of a previous Congress, probably for the reason which has been stated, that it is always an organized body; that is, it always has a quorum to do business Being an organized body it has never since 1789 adopted the rules of a previous Congress."

Senator Morton said (ibid., p. 435):

"I have always understood the theory of the two Houses to be this: First, that the Senate is a continuing body. That results from the nature of its organization and also because it is a part of the executive department of the Government. * * * When the Senate adjourns from one session to another it is nothing more than a recess of the Senate. I believe I have never before heard it said that the House of Representatives was a continuing body. * * * We have a President pro tempore, a Sergeant at Arms, and a Secretary, and they continue until the Senate itself makes a change. Therefore the organization of the body is not lost, and every adjournment of the Senate is simply in the nature of a recess."

Senator Maxey said (ibid., p. 438):

"It is said that the House of Representatives is a continuous body; and that reason is assigned by a Senator for whose legal judgment I have great respect; but I do not concur in it; I do not think it is true. I believe that there is a cessation of the organization of the House of Representatives every two years. The very fact that this

body requires the President of the Senate (whoever that may be) to call the Senate together, that it is a perpetual body, that it never ceases to exist, that while one-third goes out every second year one-third comes in at the same time, makes it a perpetual body. * * *

"There never has been a time since the organization of this Government that two-thirds of the Senate were not in existence. It is, therefore, a perpetual body, so laid down in all the works on the subject. The House is not so. It is true of the House of Lords; it is not true of the House of Commons. Precisely what is true of the House of Lords is true of the Senate; precisely what is true of the House of Commons is true of the House of Representatives." (Edgerton, Apr. 30, 1915; McClenon, Nov. 22, 1915.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago on November 18, 1952.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address entitled "Freedom and Its Purpose," delivered by John Foster Dulles at the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, at Denver, Colo., on December 11, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him and material relating to the crimes of international communism, and the necessity for stricter anti-espionage laws.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

Address delivered by the Honorable Peter Campbell Brown, Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, before the sixty-fourth annual dinner of the Brooklyn Bar Association, at Brooklyn, N. Y., on Thursday, December 4, 1952.

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by the Honorable Walter M. Bastian, United States District Court, at the welcome to Washington dinner given by the Washington Board of Trade in honor of the new Members of Congress.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, on November 14, 1952.

A poem entitled "A Nation Prayed," written by Vincent Godfrey Burns, and published in Redwood and Other Poems.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Letter addressed to her by Miss Hilda E. Sawtelle, Maine State secretary, National League of District Postmasters, under date of November 7, 1952.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Unlimited Senate Debate Vital to United States Minorities," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 4, 1953.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article entitled "West Virginia Brings Useful Books to the People," published in the Pathfinder magazine of August 20, 1952.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement entitled "Why I Would Be in Favor of the High Dam at Hells Canyon," prepared by Harold Dawson, a sophomore in the Marsing (Idaho) High School.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Flaw in a Boom," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of January 4, 1953.

STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT BUDGET BY JOSEPH M. DODGE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement on the Government budget by Joseph M. Dodge, Director-designate of the Bureau of the Budget. I think it should be available to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE GOVERNMENT BUDGET

(By Joseph M. Dodge, Director-designate of the Bureau of the Budget)

1. It should be emphasized again that the Government budget for the fiscal year 1954 (July 1, 1953–June 30, 1954), about to be presented to the Congress, will be a Budget completely developed and prepared by the outgoing administration.

Designees for official positions in the incoming administration have not participated in the determination of the programs or policies on which the Budget is based and have not attempted to influence the dollar figures appearing in it.

2. The incoming administration will inherit the Budget for the fiscal year 1954 and will inherit the supplemental budgets which are additions to the regular fiscal year 1953 budget (July 1, 1952–June 30, 1953), and also will be submitted to the new Congress.

It will inherit the accumulated and unfulfilled fiscal obligations arising from appropriation legislation enacted for the new budgets and for the budgets of prior years.

3. The first budget completely prepared by the incoming administration will be for the fiscal year 1955, taking effect July 1, 1954, and submitted to the Congress in January 1954. The preparation of that Budget, in many areas, will have to begin before the fiscal year 1954 budget goes into effect, July 1, 1953.

4. It is significant that for the first time in 20 years there will be a change of administration which will involve a reconsideration of the prevailing policies and programs that are implemented through budgetary action.

Also, for the first time in 20 years, a complete change of administration takes place early in the year. Prior to the adoption of the twentieth amendment, congressional review of the budget usually was well under way before inauguration and organization of the new Government.

5. Every Government budget is the result of 6 or more months of work in the multiple and diverse departments and agencies by many persons at all levels of responsibility.

It contains large dollar amounts that are relatively inflexible and uncontrollable and the automatically expanding costs which result from the nature of the workload required by statutory enactments and from economic changes producing higher costs.

6. It should be remembered that Government cash expenditures in any one year may differ from the appropriated amounts in the budget itself as it is finally approved and will vary according to the rate of cash expenditure on programs authorized under present or prior year appropriations. This is principally because appropriations for defense, foreign aid, construction, and other activities are authorized some time before the actual cash is paid out to complete them.

Therefore, all adjustments in fiscal year 1954 appropriations automatically will not have an equal effect on Government cash expenditures in the fiscal year 1954.

7. Any proposed revisions recommended by the new administration in the budgets that the present administration shortly will present to the Congress will require reconsideration of the policies, programs, and operations on which they have been based; the details of their present and probable future costs; the effect of any proposed changes; and any changes in the budget will need the concurrence of the Congress.

In making recommendations for budgetary revisions it is imperative that the President-elect have the advice of his newly appointed department and agency heads and of his own and their staffs before stating his views to the Congress about expenditures and taxes with respect to the fiscal year 1954 budget and the fiscal year 1953 supplemental budgets.

8. The heads of departments and agencies appointed by the new administration will have only a limited opportunity to make a thorough examination and review of all the details of the budgets which were prepared and submitted before they took office. The committees of the Congress necessarily will begin to review and act on appropriations which should be available at the start of the new fiscal year, July 1, 1953, before the new appointees can have final views on all budgetary matters.

9. To meet this problem it is intended to establish a budgetary review procedure immediately after January 20, 1953, which will concentrate on selected items in each department. Detailed arrangements and methods for these reviews will be announced to the department and agency heads. The recommendations resulting from these reviews will be presented to the President and then to the Congress as rapidly as possible.

10. There is no qualification by the Eisenhower Administration in its objective or its determination to proceed, with the cooperation of the Congress, to the achievement of a balanced budget.

THE McCARRAN-WALTER ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Plot Against the McCarran-Walter Act" written by Herbert G. Moore and published in the National Republic of December 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLOT AGAINST THE McCARRAN-WALTER ACT

(By Herbert G. Moore)

"A people's coalition can rout racist McCarranism." So reads a headline in a recent issue of the Daily Worker (Communist organ). The article under this heading is written by Pettis Perry, Negro member of the national committee of the American Communist Party, who is now under indictment. It estimates that "more than 40,000,000 Americans are directly affected by the brutally undemocratic provisions of the McCarran 'immigration' law," and it calls upon all progressive forces to meet this ominous political threat to their liberties by uniting to defeat these new alien and sedition laws.

This Daily Worker tirade is typical of the concerted attack being waged by Communists and left-wingers against this new act which becomes effective on December 24, 1952. In the leftist press and from the speaker's rostrum, the McCarran-Walter immigration and naturalization bill has been termed a pernicious piece of legislation which runs counter to American principles and traditions. It was a major target for attack by demagogic orators during the recent political campaign, and it continues to be blasted in certain quarters as a wicked and discriminatory measure. As a result, many loyal Americans are understandably confused. Is

this really good or bad legislation? Is it a pro-American or an anti-American bill? What is the truth?

There is one very quick way to answer questions such as these. By analyzing the opponents and proponents of this issue, we can arrive at a fairly accurate conclusion. The nature of the opposition in particular should immediately determine our position. If we find that Communists and left-wingers are against such a bill, then it is safe to say that loyal Americans should be for it. Let's first take a look at the characters who are now attacking it with all their energy.

The most vicious attacks in the press were—and are—to be found in the pages of the Daily Worker and the People's Daily World, the two leading newspapers of the Communists which always take their orders direct from Moscow. Outside the press the main opposition has been spearheaded by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, which was described by a Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Another group—and a most articulate one—opposing the bill is the National Lawyers Guild, also cited by both the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front. In fact, the Lawyers Guild has been named as the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, which since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

In Congress, when the McCarran-Walter Act was up for consideration, the opposition was led by the left-wing coterie, most prominent of whom were Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York. Indeed, these two Fair Deal Senators offered a substitute bill which would have opened the gates to a virtually unrestricted flood of aliens, including, of course, many subversives from Europe and Asia. Fortunately this measure was voted down by a large margin. But the important thing to keep in mind is that this substitute bill was written, not by the two Senators who espoused it, but by one Felix Cohen, who has identified himself as a collectivist dedicated to the elimination of our capitalist system. Cohen also happens to be a brother-in-law of Harry N. Rosenfield, who in turn happens to have been a director in the Washington chapter of the aforementioned Lawyers Guild.

From the above it is not difficult to discern the color of the opposition, joined by President Truman and the whole New Deal-Fair Deal crowd. In other words, the plot unfolds. The Communists and those who travel with Communists did not want the McCarran-Walter Act on the books because it would bar their overseas comrades from entering our country—and it would deport those who had already succeeded in entering by fraud. So they got one of their friends to write a substitute bill, persuaded two Senators to sponsor it, and then induced President Truman to support them. It is inconceivable that the President of the United States would lend his name and office to a program designed to destroy the America we love. We prefer to believe that once again the man in the White House has been duped into siding with our pro-Soviet enemies, just as two gentlemen in the United States Senate were likewise gullible enough to become accessories in the plot.

So much for the opposition. What about those who favor the bill? What manner of men are they? The McCarran-Walter Act was endorsed by the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Visa and Passport Divisions of the Department of State. In other words, it was unqualifiedly approved by men who through experience know the problems and the dangers of unrestricted immigration and naturalization. The bill was also actively and vigorously supported by the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and more than 100 other patriotic, civic, and religious organizations which enthusiastically termed it sound and urgently needed legislation. Does that help to dissipate the smoke-screen? Can there be any reasonable doubt as to where loyal Americans should take their stand?

But this is by no means the end of the story. There is much more to this plot to repeal the McCarran-Walter Act and to open the gates to a flood of undesirable aliens from all over the world. Let us first take a brief glance at the history of this legislation.

The McCarran-Walter Act represents a complete codification of the immigration, passport, and naturalization laws, the first complete revision in more than a century. Designed to remove the inequities and plug the loopholes in our outmoded regulations, this statute was not hastily framed, but was the product of 4 years of research and many months of public hearings. Opponents, to be sure, call it discriminatory legislation, and admittedly it does discriminate against undesirable and subversive aliens who do not, and cannot, fit into our American life. But is it wrong for Americans to set high standards for citizenship and to protect their national interests? Is it wrong to bar the doors against persons who do not understand and cannot appreciate our free way of life? Is it wrong to blacklist those who cannot measure up to our moral code? Men like President Truman and Senator LEHMAN pose as great friends of labor. But is it in the interests of labor to open the floodgates to cheap workers from all over the world, who would most certainly break down our standards of living?

We do not have to answer those questions because the loyal Members of Congress answered them for us. This omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, the finest instrument ever devised to tighten the provisions for dealing with aliens and naturalized citizens suspected of subversive activities, was passed by the House on April 25, 1952, by an overwhelming majority, 206 to 68. It was then that President Truman, egged on by the Communists and left-wingers, vetoed the bill. On June 27, 1952, it was passed over the veto by another large majority. Since the Republicans were in the minority, it goes without saying that the victory was due in large measure to Democrats who loyally placed their country ahead of the party in repudiating the President. Only the left-wingers, spearheaded by Senators LEHMAN and HUMPHREY, voted to sustain the ill-advised veto.

But Mr. Truman, high-pressured by the pro-Red clique, was not to abide by the will of the people as made manifest through their representatives. The President has missed no opportunity to sound off against this act. And on last September 4, just 2 months before the election, he went so far as to appoint a special commission to hold hearings and to study the whole matter of immigration and naturalization, with the view of repealing the McCarran-Walter Act and to replace it with another bill which would destroy our protective immigration system, weaken the procedures designed to exclude and deport Communists and other subversives, and overrun the United States with a flood of undesirable aliens. Mr. Truman is apparently determined to do what he can to "liberalize" our immigration policies, whether or not he is aware that in so doing he is aiding and abetting the Communist plot to let the enemy within our gates.

Furthermore, please note this very significant fact. The McCarran-Walter Act does not go into effect until December 24. And the special commission, appointed by the President to study the act, goes out of existence on January 1. In other words, the commission will have only five working days in which to examine this new law in operation.

If you still think that this commission may be able to make a complete and impartial report on our immigration policies after only 5 days of the new law's operation, it might be enlightening to glance at some of the men appointed by the President for the job. Harry N. Rosenfield, mentioned earlier, is the executive director of the commission. In 1949, when he was a member of the Displaced Persons Commission, a Senate committee investigated his administration. In the course of the probe it was disclosed that Mr. Rosenfield had devised a calculated risk plan whereby displaced persons were allowed to enter our country in violation of the law and without receiving security clearances from intelligence agencies. The report showed that the whole program was reeking with fraud and false practice and expressed "deep concern over the evidences of laxity in the administration of the law." On the basis of testimony, approximately one-third of the displaced persons, who were then coming into the United States by the tens of thousands, were in fact ineligible. As a sequel to Mr. Rosenfield's calculated risk plan, immigration authorities announced a year ago that approximately 1,200 displaced persons admitted to the country had warrants of arrest for deportation outstanding against them—for fraud or criminal or subversive activities. And yet this is the man whom Mr. Truman now thinks is qualified to hold the post of executive director of a commission to study immigration and naturalization policies.

Earl G. Harrison is another appointee to the commission. He served as Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service during a period when there was virtually no enforcement of the immigration laws. On April 17, 1943, he received the annual award from the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, cited as subversive. The presentation was actually made by Vito Marcantonio, former left-wing Congressman with a notorious affinity for Communist causes. Mr. Harrison may be acceptable to Commie-coddling leftists, he may be flattered to be honored by Communist-front organizations, but by what possible yardstick can he be considered qualified to frame immigration policies to protect the American way?

Clarence Pickett is best known as executive secretary of the American Friends Committee and as a fanatical pacifist. But he has been listed as a director of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, and on June 3, 1948, according to the Daily Worker (Communist), he addressed a meeting of the American-Russian Institute, cited as Communist by the Attorney General. Mr. Pickett also protested the Supreme Court decision upholding the conviction of the 11 top Communist Party leaders in America. Is this man, who apparently thinks we should stand idly by while Communists advocate the violent overthrow of our Government, fitted to decide who should come to the United States? Mr. Truman thinks so.

And yet this loaded commission, appointed by Mr. Truman, has been holding hearings from one end of the country to the other, and may soon be expected to hand down its opinion. There can hardly be any doubt as to what that opinion will be, as the whole issue is cut and dried. Senator LEHMAN has already testified to the effect that we should take in 350,000 aliens a year, instead of the 154,657 allowed under the McCarran-Walter Act, with the elimination of country-of-origin quotas. Senator LEHMAN has also called intolerable the penalty of loss of citizenship imposed on naturalized persons

who refuse to testify before a congressional committee concerning their membership in subversive organizations. In other words, according to the plot, we would open wide the doors to races that cannot be readily assimilated, and we would encourage such immigrants to defy our duly constituted authorities and to join the Communist conspiracy without penalty. If the plot succeeds, we will simply be inviting the Kremlin to march in and take over.

In the main, the attack has been concentrated against just two of the law's provisions. The first is against the antisubversive clauses which have been called too strict—as if it is possible to make such regulations too strict in these critical times. And the second is against the preservation of the national origins formula, the very meat of the act if we would maintain the America we love.

There have been some strange developments among the opposition, too. Despite the fact that, prior to its passage, the bill was endorsed by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, some Catholics are attacking the bill. The truth is that Senator McCARRAN himself is a Catholic, has a daughter who is a nun, and it is hardly likely that he would sponsor anti-Catholic legislation. And many Protestant churches have joined the opposition chorus. When will church leaders learn to keep out of politics and especially learn to avoid supporting Communist causes?

Actually the McCarran-Walter Act removes the ban on orientals, which was a big factor in building up hate against America in prewar Asia; it liberalizes the bringing in of families of American citizens; it includes the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 to make it more difficult for known subversives to enter the United States and to simplify deportation of those already here; it preserves the "national origins" quotas which would maintain the racial percentages as they existed in 1920; and it offers special inducements to teachers, artists, scientists, professional men and other specialists who would tend to raise, rather than lower, our standard of living. Can any loyal American possibly object to such provisions?

There is one other point that should be called to our attention. The expenses of this study by the commission are being met out of President Truman's $1,000,000 emergency fund, provided by Congress to be used by the President "in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home and abroad during the current fiscal year."

Is it not obvious that the President is spending this money in direct violation of the law? Is it not clear that the President has been goaded by left-wing organizations to let down the bars? Is there any doubt that all this is part of an evil plot to destroy the best immigration act which we have ever possessed, and to replace it with legislation that will play into the hands of the Commies? These are serious charges. But this is a serious issue, and there is not much time if we would nip the plot in the bud. What can you do about it?

Perhaps the question can best be answered by referring again to the Daily Worker. Quoting from Pettis Perry's article:

"The progressive movement should organize broad conferences of all sections of labor and people's organizations in every community to put heat on their congressional delegation in Congress. All possible pressure should be brought on city, county, and State governments demanding that Congress and the administration be memorialized against these Fascist bills." (The McCarran-Wood Act, the Smith Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act are grouped with the McCarran-Walter Act as Communist targets.)

The Daily Worker article continues:

"Nor should the progressive forces take the position that they refuse to work with or approach this or that grouping, because they red-bait, or because they have red-baited in the past, or are Social-Democrats, etc. While ways and means should be found to fight these ideologies, one of the best ways to oppose them is to find a bridge to the millions who are following Social-Democratic leaders, and to find that which is common between us and the Social-Democratic leaders themselves. In other words, the most flexible united front tactic is required to begin an all-out people's struggle on this front."

To counter this strategy on the part of the Communists and to keep the McCarran-Walter Act intact, all patriotic Americans—individuals and groups—must unite. Don't write Senator McCARRAN or Congressman WALTER. As cosponsors of this legislation they are already on our side. But write your own Senators and Congressmen, and persuade your friends to do likewise. It might also be pointed out that it is an old Communist practice to send delegations to Washington to discuss such matters with their congressional representatives in person. Patriotic organizations might adopt this plan and present their pleas in person.

There is plenty which you can do—and must do—if this act is to be saved. But there isn't much time. For once let's hope that loyal Americans will wage as active a campaign as our Communist opposition. Today is the day; tomorrow may be too late.

RULES OF THE SENATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) that the Senate immediately consider the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared in answer to the brief issued by the Senate Republican Policy Committee entitled "Senate Rules and the Senate as a Continuing Body." This memorandum was prepared by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and I believe it asks some very searching questions concerning the conclusions reached in the Republican Policy Committee document.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE BRIEF

The brief of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, dated January 1953, meets only the first of the two basic contentions documented in the brief of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and meets this contention only half-heartedly. The brief of the leadership conference demonstrates, first, that the Senate is not a continuing body and, secondly, that, even if it is a continuing body in certain respects, the Senate of each new Congress has the right to adopt its own rules of proceedings under article I, section 5, of the Constitution and the basic principles of legislative organization in a democracy. The Republican brief only weakly meets the first contention and fails to meet the second one at all. Indeed, as we shall show, the Republican brief (p. 18) seems to concede the second of these contentions.

A quick run-down of the contents of the Republican brief might be useful at this point:

Subject:	Page
Existing rules and proposals for amendment	1–2
Quotations from "Reuther" proposal	3–6
The questions to be considered in Republican brief	7–8
Constitutional provisions (2-year rotation, etc.)	9–10
Quotations from Federalist re size and tenure of Senate	11–17
Quotation from Haynes giving history of rules	18–20
Parliamentary questions raised by Reuther proposal	21–27
Quotations from Reuther's arguments against continuity of Senate	28–32
Senate precedents—quotations from Walsh episode	33–36
Judicial precedents — quotations from *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*	37–39
Senate officers and continuity	40
Senate committees and continuity	41
The Senate as an executive body	42–44
Quotation from Senate Rules	45–46
References to unattached appendices	47

Even this cursory run-down demonstrates that the Senate Republican brief is more a compilation of statements by Walter Reuther and of quotations from sources fully analyzed in the leadership conference brief than it is an argument in favor of the proposition that the Senate is a continuing body or the proposition that the Senate does not have the right to adopt its own rules at the beginning of a new Congress. Indeed, any suggestion that may have been made that the Republican brief answers the arguments in the leadership conference brief could only have been made by one who had neglected to read either or both of the briefs.

We list below, in the order of their presentation in the Republican brief, a number of the errors, concessions, and rebuttable arguments contained in the Republican brief:

(1) The brief admits that not only civil rights legislation, but other legislation has been defeated by the failure to enact a workable cloture rule. Thus, on page 2, the brief states: "There have also been many other (than civil rights) measures which have been successfully blocked by extended debate of a minority, during the course of the Senate's history."

(2) The Republican brief (pp. 11–17) quotes at length from the Federalist, but nowhere explains the relevance of the quoted passages to the issue at hand. Certainly there is no reference in these quotations to continuity. The quoted statements from the Federalist relate solely to the well-known fact that the Senate was made a smaller body with longer terms than the House in the interests of governmental stability, a far cry from saying that the founding fathers intended the Senate which met on January 3, 1953, to be bound by actions of the Senate of 1789 and the Senate of 1884 (the last general revision of the rules). Indeed, Federalist author Hamilton's proposal for tenure of Senators during life or good behavior was dropped by the Constitutional Convention without even the necessity of a formal vote, and a 9-year term was voted down on the ground it was too long. The Convention adopted a 6-year term with rotation in office so that the will of the people would at all times be reflected in the Senate. It is ironic that this very rotation provision should now be asserted as the basis for the theory that Senators long since dead can bind their successors (see pp. 4–5, leadership conference brief).

(3) The Republican brief seems to concede that the Senate can determine that it is not to have continuing rules regardless of whether or not it is a continuing body. The brief states (p. 18):

"Article I, section 5 of the Constitution provides: 'Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings * * *.' Thus, the Senate is the sole judge of its own rules, and a majority at any time can change its rules or adopt new ones, whether at the beginning of a session of Congress or at any other time when it is sitting."

Following this unequivocal statement appears the question: "But what about the minority's power to block a vote on this issue?" The brief then quotes extensively from Haynes who fails to answer this question, but simply relates the well-known history of the Senate Rules. We are prepared, however, to answer the question thus posed in the Republican brief. If, as is apparently conceded in that brief, a majority of the Senate of a new Congress can proceed to the adoption of new rules for the Senate of that Congress, it would quite clearly do so under general parliamentary procedure. This admitted right of the majority to adopt its own rules cannot be nullified by applying the old Senate Rules which contain a provision expressly designed to prevent any change. Once under general parliamentary rules, a minority could not long block the adoption of new rules because dilatory tactics are not permitted under general parliamentary procedure[1] and, if necessary, the previous question could always be called. Although the Vice President might rule that such a motion requires a two-thirds vote, this number would soon be obtainable, since the filibuster bloc would have few allies in their efforts to prevent the adoption of rules, efforts which would, in turn, be blocking all Senate action.

(4) The Republican brief admits the existence of a body of general parliamentary rules (see pp. 22, 24, 25) which can readily be followed by the Senate while adopting its new rules. General parliamentary rules or procedure quite clearly means that body of parliamentary law which governs the procedures of deliberative bodies in the United States prior to the adoption of particular rules for the particular body. The Vice President would determine any particular parliamentary question that might be raised by reference to such authorities as Jefferson's Manual, Robert's Rules of Order, and other recognized reference works. The Vice President would use these precedents in the same way that a judge uses precedents in the fields of civil or criminal law. The significant thing about the Republican brief is that it admits the existence of a readily ascertainable body of general parliamentary rules which could be followed during debate on new rules.

(5) The Republican brief makes two points about parliamentary procedure which might be noted:

(a) The brief (p. 24) points out that, under general paraliamentary procedure, if the Vice President on a point of order ruled in order the motion to consider the rules of the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress and if an appeal were taken from that ruling, a successful motion to table the appeal would only postpone the appeal temporarily. This seems of little significance, however, since as long as there is a majority in favor of the motion to table the appeal, the body could proceed to adopt new rules under the Vice President's ruling that the motion to consider the rules was in order. The theoretical possibility that the tabled appeal might at some later date be taken from the table would be foreclosed by a majority action in adopting new rules.

(b) The Republican brief (pp. 25–27) contends that limitation of debate by calling the previous question under general parliamentary rules requires a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, although the brief concedes that the Senate itself originally adopted a majority "previous question" rule and Jefferson's Manual (sec. XXXIV) take the same position.

(6) The Republican brief (p. 33) states categorically that, "No direct precedent has been found in the form of a Senate ruling on the question (1) whether the Senate is a continuing body, or (2) whether its rules are continuing." This is quite an admission by those who are suggesting that this is an open and shut question and, indeed, there is considerable doubt whether even this admission goes far enough. In two instances where the continuing-body theory was raised on the floor of the Senate, those who raised this argument against the pending action were defeated. See leadership brief on Abrogation of Joint Rules in 1876 (pp. 28–31) and Dismissal of the Senate Printer in 1841 (pp. 31–34).

(7) After conceding the absence of any direct precedents, the brief continues (p. 33) with the statement that the overwhelming body of opinion and comment in the Senate favors continuity. But all that is referred to in this connection is the Walsh episode. (See Leadership Brief, pp. 22–26 and appendix A.) What the Republican brief fails to recognize is the fact that Senator Walsh's argument against continuity had such force that the Senate gave him exactly what he wanted in the way of a cloture rule and he then ceased to press his point on the adoption of new rules.

(8) For judicial precedents on continuity, the Republican brief (pp. 37–39), of course, relies upon *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*. The brief misstates the facts and the quotation, which is fully explained in the Leadership Conference brief (pp. 13–14), was the rankest kind of irrelevant dictum. It is worth noting here, as has already been pointed out, that it would hardly seem appropriate for those who are contemplating legislation in opposition to a number of recent Supreme Court decisions on the offshore oil lands to place great weight on the irrelevant dictum of an earlier generation of judges.

(9) The Republican brief continues (p. 40): "Because the Senate has been held to be a continuing body, its officers have no stated term of office, but serve until their successors are selected." The reasoning is obviously circular and the point unpersuasive. The Clerk of the House also carries over to the next Congress—which would seem to end this point, as far as it being any precedent on the issue before the Senate. One might wonder, too, how long a rule would have lasted on January 3, 1953, which said that officers of the Senate should continue until their successors were elected by a two-thirds vote. The new majority which acted Saturday would not have allowed such a rule to continue a single day.

(10) The Republican brief (pp. 41–42) relies upon the fact that Senate investigations can go beyond the period of a particular Congress. But, what is really significant, the committees are all appointed anew at the beginning of each Congress. See rule XXV. There seems to be no reason why the House of Representatives could not also order investigations to be carried over to the next Congress (subject to recission by the will of the majority of the next House) and there is no legal precedent to the contrary.

(11) The Republican brief (pp. 42–44) refers to the executive functions as continuing, but the only example cited is its treaty function, which, in fact, is a precedent against the position taken in the Republican brief. As Senate rule XXXVII, section 2, specifically states, "all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress." Of what significance is the fact that the treaty formally lays in the files of the Clerk of the Senate, when substantively all action starts anew at the beginning of each new Congress?

CONCLUSION

Possibly the most significant thing about the entire Republican brief is the omission of a single reference to the legislative functions of the Senate. How can this be explained since the Senate is a part of the legislative branch of the Government and created for the prime purpose of legislating? Why no mention of this prime function of the Senate? The answer is simple: the drafters of the Republican brief recognize that everything in the legislative process begins anew at the opening of each Senate and that this is an unanswerable precedent against the continuing-body theory.

As stated at the outset of this memorandum, there is no demonstration whatever in the Republican brief that the Senate is a continuing body. The precedents cited in the leadership conference brief are left wholly unanswered. But possibly even more significant is the failure of the Republican brief to answer the proposition, and its apparent readiness to concede, that, even if the Senate is a continuing body, the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress has the right to adopt its own rules of proceedings under article I, section 5, of the Constitution and the basic principles of legislative organization in a democracy.

JANUARY 5, 1953.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a brief prepared under the auspices of the 1952 Leadership Conference on Civil Rights in support of the proposition that the majority of the Senate of each new Congress has the constitutional right to adopt rules of proceedings for the Senate of that Congress unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. I also wish to have the list of the organizations supporting the leadership conference printed with this brief. While I do not necessarily agree with every point presented in this brief, or have personal knowledge of all the facts set forth, I believe this is an outstandingly convincing document and should be available to the country at large as well as to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York offer the long brief to be printed in the body of the RECORD or in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. LEHMAN. In the body of the RECORD itself, because it is too long to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSITION THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE OF EACH NEW CONGRESS HAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ADOPT RULES OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE SENATE OF THAT CONGRESS UNFETTERED BY THE ACTIONS OR RULES OF THE SENATE OF ANY PRECEDING CONGRESS

The following are the supporting organizations of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights: A. M. E. Zion Church; Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity; American Civil Liberties Union; American Council on Human Rights; American Federation of Labor; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Veterans' Committee; Americans for Democratic Action; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. F. of L.

Catholic Interracial Council; Colored Methodist Episcopal Church; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Congress of Racial Equality.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartenders International Union of America, A. F. of L.

[1] The Speaker of the House, at the time of an attempt to prevent the adoption of rules by repeated dilatory motions, ruled that he would refuse to recognize Members attempting delaying tactics as they were interfering with the constitutional right of the House to determine its rules (Cannon, Precedents, vol. 5, secs. 5706, 5707). See also Robert's Rules of Order Revised, sec. 40.

Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World; International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO.

Japanese-American Citizens League, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans.

National Alliance of Postal Employees; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Colored Women, Inc.; National Baptist Convention, U. S. A.; National Bar Association; National Catholic Committee on Race Relations; National Community Relations Advisory Council; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National Frontiers Club; National Negro Business League; National Newspaper Publishers Association; National Religion and Labor Foundation; National Supreme Council Scottish Rite Masons.

Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Phi Delta Kappa Sorority.

Textile Workers Union, CIO; the American Ethical Union; the Workmen's Circle; Transport Workers Union of America, CIO.

Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice; United Automobile Workers of America, CIO; United Hebrew Trades; United Rubber Workers, CIO; United Steelworkers of America, CIO; United Transport Service Employees of America, CIO.

Workers Defense League.

Young Women's Christian Association.

FOREWORD

The establishment of majority rule in the Senate of the United States is one of the most important issues facing the country today. The significance of this issue and the need for action in the Senate are well understood by the American people.

Unfortunately, some staunch adherents of majority rule, saddened by the defeats of recent years, have concluded that there is no way of accomplishing the desired result. This brief is intended to point the way for action. It is directed to one single proposition: That the majority of the Senate of each new Congress has the constitutional right to adopt rules of proceedings for the Senate of that Congress unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. In other words, applying this principle to the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress which meets on January 3, 1953, a majority of the Members of the Senate of this new Congress may express their own will by the adoption of new rules for this Senate.

Until the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress adopts new rules, it will, of course, be guided by general rules of parliamentary procedure just as in the House of Representatives until it adopts new rules in each Congress. This brief does not cover the general parliamentary problems prior to the adoption of rules by the new Senate, although it does contain historical examples where such questions have arisen and been resolved in the House of Representatives. Suffice it to say on this point that countless new bodies of legislatures and of other organizations meet day after day and adopt their rules under general parliamentary practices without experiencing undue delays in so doing.

Neither does this brief deal with the need for majority cloture in the public interest nor with the proposition that the present Senate rules, including rule XXII, violate the Constitution of the United States in that they fail to provide for the expression of the will of the majority of the Senate. As already indicated, this brief seeks to demonstrate only one principle: That the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress is a new body and can act as such in the adoption of its own rules by majority vote. Once that principle is established, the road to majority rule is open.

I. THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE IN EACH CONGRESS HAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ADOPT RULES OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE SENATE OF THAT CONGRESS. THE SENATE OF ONE CONGRESS CANNOT BIND THE SENATE OF SUCCEEDING CONGRESSES

The Constitution empowers each house to "determine the Rules of its Proceedings" (art. I, sec. 5). Each House means not only the separate branches of the Congress but each branch of each succeeding Congress. This result is fundamental to and inherent in the nature of representative government through legislative assemblies.

Legislative assemblies are periodically renewed for the primary purpose of permitting the people to express their will with respect to governmental policies (Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration, p. 239). In line with this purpose each legislative assembly is a separate entity and has the constitutional right to make its own decisions in pursuance of its mandate from the electorate. It is and must be independent of any action by any preceding legislature which purports to restrain it (Willoughby, op. cit. supra, p. 309; Chamberlain, Legislative Processes, National and State, p. 62). Indeed, if a legislature could in any degree bind its successors, the result would be an erosion of power which over the years would render later legislatures helpless in the face of the past.

This fundamental principle of the independence and full authority of each new legislature, recognized by all authorities, has been well stated by Judge Cooley (Constitutional Limitations, 6th ed., 1890, pp. 146–147):

"To say that the legislature may pass irrepealable laws, is to say that it may alter the very constitution from which it derives its authority; since, insofar as one legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provision that the legislative power shall be vested in two houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual."

Senator Walsh, of Montana, in discussing this very issue in 1917, emphasized the plain fact which cannot be gainsaid, that Congress dies and Congress is born, that each Congress is an entity:

"This practice, persisted in since the Constitution went into effect, under which each new Congress in both branches proceeds untrammeled by any action which may have been taken by its predecessor on any measures that may have come before it, plainly speaks of a prevalent and accepted theory that each Congress is an entity, possessing the same degree of independence as was enjoyed by the first when it assembled in 1789."[1]

* * * * *

"The idea of a 'continuing' Senate is at war with the theory of parliamentary government the world over. It is an essential conception in such a system that at intervals representatives assemble in one or more houses, transact such business as demands their attention, and then as a legislative body pass out of existence, a new assembly coming into being in conformity with organic law, or at the call of the sovereign authority. The British Parliament is dissolved at the end of 7 years by operation of law, unless by the royal fiat its dissolution is accomplished earlier."[2]

The inherent right of legislative bodies to be unfettered by previous assemblies has been forcefully recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in cases dating back over a long period. This right, as analyzed by the Supreme Court, does not arise from any particular phraseology in Federal and State constitutions; it arises from the very nature of successive legislatures in a democratic society.

In one of the leading cases dealing with this problem, the Court said:

"Every succeeding legislature possesses the same jurisdiction and power with respect to them as its predecessors. The latter have the same power of repeal and modification which the former had of enactment, neither more nor less. All occupy, in this respect, a footing of perfect equality. This must necessarily be so in the nature of things. It is vital to the public welfare that each one should be able at all times to do whatever the varying circumstances and present exigencies touching the subject involved may require. A different result would be fraught with evil."[3]

Again, in response to the argument that Congress could not change the use of certain public lands, Justice (later Chief Justice) Stone said:

"By dedicating the lands thus acquired to a particular public use, Congress declared a public policy, but did not purport to deprive itself of the power to change that policy by devoting the lands to other uses. The dedication expressed no more than the will of a particular Congress which does not impose itself upon those to follow in succeeding years. See *Newton* v. *Mahoning County Commissioners* (100 U. S. 548, 559, 25 L. Ed. 710); *Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.* v. *Spratley* (172 U. S. 602, 621, 19 S. Ct. 308, 43 L. Ed. 569.)"[4]

This principle, that no legislature can act so as to fetter its successors in expressing public policy and public will, has been repeatedly expressed. See *Town of East Hartford* v. *Hartford Bridge Co.* (10 How. 511, 533); *Ohio Life Insurance and Trust Co.* v. *Debolt* (16 How. 416, 431); *Connecticut Mutual Life Ins. Co.* v. *Spratley* (172 U. S. 602, 621); *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 393 (n. 19)).

The members of the Constitutional Convention, in creating the Senate of the United States, were highly aware of the principles later stated by the authorities and the Supreme Court and of the necessity for any legislative body to respond to the "impulses" and "views" of a changing popular will. They voted against a 9-year term for Senators on the ground that it was too long, and dropped Hamilton's proposal for tenure during life or good behavior without even the necessity of a formal vote. Six years was chosen as a fair compromise between the competing principles of stability in office and of reaction to the will of the people. Then, to further weight the scales on the side of the latter principle and to insure that the Senate would not become a body unresponsive to the electorate, the system of biennial expiration of the terms of one-third of the Senators was established.[5]

Mr. Wilson, in the debates at the Constitutional Convention relating to the creation of the Senate, stated the caution against a prolonged body as follows:[6]

[1] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10.

[2] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11.

[3] *Newton* v. *Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio* (100 U. S. 548, 525, L. Ed. 710, at 711).

[4] *Reichelderfer* v. *Quinn* (287 U. S. 315, at 318).

[5] See Schuls, Creation of the Senate, pp. 4–18.

[6] Prescott, Drafting the Federal Constitution, p. 264. Mr. Wilson was speaking in support of his proposal for a 9-year term, which he considered would allow sufficiently for the new impulses which were required.

"The popular objection against appointing any public body for a long term was that it might, by gradual encroachments, prolong itself, first into a body for life, and finally become a hereditary one. It would be a satisfactory answer to this objection that as one-third would go out triennially [there would be always three divisions holding their places for unequal times, and consequently acting under the influence of different views, and different impulses]." (Matter in brackets supplied.)

Throughout the debates at the Constitutional Convention, the fear was expressed that the Senate would become a body akin to the upper house in England. The adoption of the 6-year term, biennially expiring for one-third of the Senators, was intended as the answer to those fears and as the means of keeping the Senate continually responsive to the will of the people. It is ironic that this very provision should now be asserted as the basis for the theory that Senators long since dead can bind their successors.[7] There is not one word in the debates by those whose proposals succeeded at the Convention which expresses any intention of permanency or continuity for the Senate.

A famous exponent of parliamentary law, when faced with the problem of rules created by past bodies stultifying the will of the majority, expressed the principle of legislative responsiveness to popular will in the historic debate on the adoption of the 1890 rules by the House of Representatives:

"The consequence was that there came to us, from right-thinking Members of the last Congress and of this, in their cooler moments, and from conservative public sentiment throughout the country, a demand that we should reverse the engine and should so construct a code of rules as to enable a majority of the representatives of the people, in the shortest possible time consistent with fair debate and consideration, to register the will of the people in the shape of law.

"The Committee on Rules have attempted to do this in the code which they have reported here."[8]

Thus, it seems abundantly clear that the Senate in each Congress was intended by the drafters of the Constitution, in accordance with the basic principles of legislative organization in a democracy, to have power to determine its rules of proceedings. Its will cannot be fettered or limited by the action of the Senate in preceding Congresses. Its will need not necessarily be manifested by affirmative action. Unless and until it manifests a contrary will, it may, in appropriate cases without violence to constitutional and democratic principles, be presumed to acquiesce in the continuance of procedures authorized by its predecessors. Examples of Senate practices illustrating both such acquiescence and the manifestation of a later contrary will are discussed in later portions of this brief. But the right of the Senate in each Congress to determine its rules of proceedings derives from the Constitution and the nature of legislative power in a democracy. And the exercise of that power by the Senate in one Congress cannot restrict the exercise of that power by the Senate in a succeeding Congress.

II. THE SENATE ACTS AS A NEW BODY IN EACH CONGRESS FOR ESSENTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES

The Senate of each Congress acts as a new legislative body in nearly all respects. Despite the fact that only one-third of its membership (barring elections to fill vacancies) is elected, the composition of the Senate is considered so changed that in both its legislative and executive functions, it begins its business anew.

A. The present Senate rules provide for the treating of all legislative matters anew in each Congress

All bills, no matter what the state of their consideration, die at the end of each Congress. Business may, however, be carried over to the next session of the same Congress, under the authority of Rule XXXII which provides that legislative business shall be continued from session to session. It is clear from the rule [9] that legislative business lapses at the end of each Congress so that committee hearings, committee reports, Senate debate and even progress through the Senate calendar are all for naught if the legislative business has not been completed by that time.

Is this rule the procedure of a continuing body? Obviously not. If the Senate truly considered itself a continuing body and dared to behave as such in legislative matters, it could save thousands of man-hours of time and probably millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds by taking up legislation in each new Congress at the point at which it was left in the preceding Congress. This action would be consistent with the generally expressed theory of the Senate's continuity. Nevertheless, this practice has never, to our knowledge, even been proposed and it certainly has never been acted upon.[10]

We submit that the Senate procedure with respect to legislation is an open admission on the part of each Senate that, when the Senate of a new Congress convenes with one-third of its membership newly elected, it is a new body and that it is the constitutional right of the new body to consider any proposed legislation from the beginning. The Senate has never carried over legislative business beyond the life of a Congress.

B. Treaties

It has been suggested that the explanation for the Senate's unbroken practice of legislating anew in each Congress is the fact that both Houses are required to pass a bill before it can be presented to the President for signature, and that some constitutional doubt might arise if the bill passed one House in one Congress and the other in a subsequent Congress. Whatever the merits of that explanation, it does not take into account the full facts, because the Senate has equally consistently regarded itself as a new body with respect to those functions which are called its executive functions. The applicable Senate rule [11] provides, like the rule on legislative business, that treaties must be considered at the beginning of each Congress as if they had never been presented to the Senate before. While there might be some basis for the Senate distinguishing between its legislative and executive functions, it has never done so. We submit that the only possible explanation for this is that the Senate has in practice acknowledged that, in its function of ratification of treaties, it would be constitutionally and legally improper to fail to recognize that the influx of new Members at the beginning of each Congress creates a new entity which has its own right to consider a treaty in all its aspects.

C. Nominations

With respect to its second executive function, that of advising on and consenting to nominations by the President, the Senate again acts as a new body. Rule XXXVIII, like the Senate practice preceding it,[12] provides that all nominations shall die at the end of each session of each Congress. This arises, apparently, from the constitutional provision for recess appointments (art. II, sec. 2, clause 3). The historical basis for this practice is unclear, though it may be that if

---

[7] In *State* v. *Rogers* (50 N. J. L. 480) the Supreme Court of New Jersey rejected the argument that the irregular expiration of senatorial terms was intended to create a continuous Senate (p. 622). See appendix B.

[8] Mr. Cannon, 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1172, 51st Cong., 1st sess. For detailed discussion of these debates, see part IV, B, infra.

[9] Rule XXXII reads as follows:

"At the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place; and all papers referred to committees and not reported upon at the close of a session of Congress shall be returned to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and be retained by him until the next succeeding session of the Congress, when they shall be returned to the several committees to which they had previously been referred."

[10] The present rule XXXII first became part of the Standing Rules in the revision of March 25, 1868. Until that time the practice of the Senate with respect to the carry-over of legislative business had been varied. In early years, all legislative business had died at the end of the session. A number of times the Senate provided by special resolution that the legislative business should carry over to the next session of the same Congress, as is done under the present rule (see, e. g., resolutions of August 2, 1854, and August 14, 1856).

The House has had a similar interesting historical development with respect to the carry-over of business. In the second session of the First Congress, it was decided that unfinished business, whether before committees or between the two Houses, must be taken up as new business at the beginning of the next session, even of the same Congress. In March of 1818 the House adopted a rule permitting business which had originated in the House in the preceding session of the same Congress to be acted on as if adjournment had not taken place. It was another 30 years before this practice was applied to bills which had been sent to the Senate but not acted upon there. Prior to 1848 the procedure was for the House to act on these bills again at the next session and again send them to the Senate. The current practice in both Houses is in accord with the 1848 rule (Hinds, Precedents of the House of Representatives, sec. 6727).

[11] Rule XXXVII.2. "Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or any subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon." This paragraph became part of the rules on January 6, 1877; the earlier rules dealing with the ratification of treaties did not specifically cover this point. It is understood that prior to the written rule, treaties were handled like other legislative business; the consideration of their ratification began anew in each Congress.

[12] Rule XXXVIII.6. "Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than 30 days, all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned by the Secretary to the President, and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President." This provision was first adopted, in substance, on February 18, 1843, and became rule XXXVII in the Revision of 1868. Prior to that time, the Senate had infrequently passed resolutions keeping the nominations alive until the next session of the same Congress, when there was only a short interval between the two.

nominations were reported pending during recesses there would be doubt as to the power of the President to make recess appointments. This much is evident, however, in its function which comes closest to being purely executive and on which it might well have treated itself as a different kind of body, the Senate has never acted as a continuing body.

D. Impeachments

The Constitution established the Senate as the court to try impeachments after vote of the House (art. I, sec. 3, clause 6). The procedure of the Senate, acting in its judicial capacity in the trial of impeachments, is governed by a separate group of rules distinct from the Standing Rules of the Senate. They are known as the Rules for Impeachment Trials.

They do not cover the situation which would arise if an impeachment trial should last beyond the expiration of a Congress and no impeachment trial has so lasted.[13] Undoubtedly, impeachment trials have been confined to the period of no more than one Congress for sound reasons, the same fundamental reasons which underlie the doctrine that each legislature is a new entity. If one-third of the Senate entered upon duty during the course of an impeachment trial, they would not know the evidence, they would not have heard the witnesses, yet they would be able to participate in the verdict. A result so lacking in the elements of due process had to be avoided, and has been avoided, in Senate practice, a practice which supports the view that each Senate is a new body.

E. Committees

In its treatment of the appointment of committees, the Senate acts in accordance with the view that the Senate of each Congress is a new entity. The present rules and practice (rule XXV) [14] provide for the appointment of committees at the commencement of each Congress. This has been the regular historical practice.

Newspaper reports and discussions in the press illustrate that the reconstitution of committees, and of committee chairmanships, is of the utmost practical importance. The change in the political make-up of the Senate brought about by the biennial election is immediately reflected in the organization of the Senate by new committees and new chairmanships. A minority party, which became the majority party, as in the recent elections, through changes in the occupancy of Senate seats, would be aghast at the suggestion that, when the Senate of the next Congress met, the committee chairmanships should remain unchanged because the Senate was a continuing body to which some new Members had merely been added. The reaction to this proposal, which is the only view really consistent with the idea of continuity to which so much lip service is paid,[15] is the acid test for that theory.

It is hard to conceive that any person conversant with our Federal two-party system would not see the necessity for a change in committee chairmanships and committee members in line with the popular will demonstrated in the election. Yet, if the Senate is a continuing body that result is not reached. Where lies the difference between committee organization and other organization, such as procedural rules of the Senate? If one must reflect the electoral mandate, so should the other.

This argument is not affected by the provision in clause 2 of rule XXV by which committee members may continue to act until their successors are appointed. This carryover of personnel is often adverted to as the real proof of the continuity of the Senate. But it is only another example of a minor and little-noticed procedure which has continued by acquiescence of the majority of the Senate. It does not indicate continuity, for the House of Representatives which is, without question, regarded as discontinuous, carries over its clerk and certain other functions where the realities of the situation enforce acquiescence in this procedure on the part of the new House.[16]

The Supreme Court case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135) is in accord with the current practice of the Senate. That case involved the Senate investigation by a select committee into the malfeasance of Attorney General Daugherty. The authorizing resolution was passed during the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress. The select committee subpenaed a brother of the Attorney General who failed to obey the subpena. The Senate then authorized the issuance of a warrant and arrested the witness. The Federal District Court granted a writ of habeas corpus and a direct appeal to the Supreme Court was permitted.

All these events occurred during the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress. The case was argued on December 5, 1924, soon after the beginning of the second session of that Congress. The Solicitor General prayed the Court for a swift determination of the issues, but the decision was not handed down until January 17, 1927. In the intervening time, the life of the Sixty-eighth Congress had expired. After considering at length the numerous questions presented as to the extent of the investigatory power of Congress, the Court itself raised the question as to whether the case had become moot, since the Congress during which the investigation was ordered had expired. While discussing this issue, the Court referred to the Senate as a continuing body. The Court then stated (pp. 181–182):

"So far as we are advised the select committee having this investigation in charge has neither made a final report nor been discharged; nor has it been continued by an affirmative order. Apparently its activities have been suspended pending the decision of this case. But, be this as it may, it is certain that the committee may be continued or revived now by motion to that effect, and, if continued or revived, will have all its original powers. This being so, and the Senate being a continuing body, the case cannot be said to have become moot in the ordinary sense. The situation is measurably like that in *Southern Pacific Terminal Co.* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission* (219 U. S. 498, 514–516, 31 S. Ct. 279, 55 L. Ed. 310), where it was held that a suit to enjoin the enforcement of an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission did not become moot through the expiration of the order, where it was capable of repetition by the Commission and was a matter of public interest. Our judgment may yet be carried into effect, and the investigation proceeded with from the point at which it apparently was interrupted by reason of the habeas corpus proceedings. In these circumstances we think a judgment should be rendered as was done in the case cited."

This language makes it evident that the Court did not decide (although it admittedly stated) that the Senate was a continuing body. It based its conclusion on the fact that the committee may be continued or revived by the new Senate and likened the case to one involving an expired administrative order which was capable of repetition. It was not because of any theoretical decision as to the nature of the Senate but because, as a practical matter, the issue in the case was one which could become alive by a motion of the new Senate, that the Court held that the case was not moot.

The Supreme Court adverted, in its discussion of the Senate to two statements by Mr. Hinds in his famous collection of precedents. These statements are a vivid example of the kind of circular reasoning in which the adherents of the idea that the Senate is a continuing body for all purposes necessarily find themselves. The Court noted that Mr. Hinds said:

"The Senate, as a continuing body, may continue its committees through the recess following the expiration of a Congress.

* * * * *

"The Senate, however, being a continuing body, gives authority to its committees during the recess after the expiration of a Congress."

The statements by Mr. Hinds start with the idea that the Senate is a continuing body, though he does not there, or elsewhere in his manual, explain the basis for that theory other than the fact that all the terms do not expire at once. Then, proceeding from his assumption, he decides that, because the Senate is a continuing body, it may continue its committees through a recess. He then turns around and illustrates the fact that the Senate is a continuing body by the fact that it gives authority to its committees during the recess. Obviously, the mere giving of authority to committees during recess is no evidence of continuity. The newspapers give daily accounts of House committees acting after the expiration of the last session of the Eighty-second Congress.

But when we are faced, as we are faced here, with the initial question of whether the Senate is a continuing body, there is no legal or constitutional basis for an affirmative answer. The Daugherty case, which is often offered as that basis, does not decide that a committee may continue beyond the life of the expired Senate. It decides only

---

[13] See list of occasions on which the Senate has sat as a Court of Impeachment, Congressional Directory, 82d Cong., 2d Sess.; p. 271. The period noted there for the trial of Judge Pickering is incorrect. On March 3, 1803, the last day of the Seventh Congress, two Members of the House appeared in the Senate to make verbal impeachment charges against Judge Pickering. In the first session of the Eighth Congress, the Senate sat as a Court of Impeachment beginning January 4, 1804, and on January 12, 1804 issued a writ summoning Judge Pickering on the basis of the written impeachment charges presented by the House on January 4, 1804. The trial ended March 12, 1804. Thirteen Annals of Congress, p. 315, et seq.

[14] Rule XXV, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"(1) The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"(2) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed."

[15] Appendix C contains a list of statements referring to the Senate as a continuing body. While the origin of this theory is not clear, most of the statements result either from the blind acceptance of earlier statements to this effect or from the circular reasoning that the rules continue and, therefore, the Senate is a continuing body which may continue its rules.

[16] See discussion of Clerk carryover, part IV, A, infra.

The present Senate rule for carrying over of standing committees is a fairly recent innovation. For nearly a hundred years after its organization, the Senate practice in this regard was inconsistent. Beginning with the expiration of the 51st Congress, each Senate, for more than 20 years, passed a resolution at the end of each Congress continuing its standing and select committees. In March of 1915, the resolution referred only to standing committees. The latter practice is now embodied in clause 2 of rule XXV.

This history discussed in Haynes, The Senate of the United States, vol. I, p. 309. See also sec. 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which provides that standing committees of the Senate may sit and act in such times and places during sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate as may be necessary.

that, whether or not the committee can so continue, the case was not moot, because the committee could be revived.

F. Adjournment

The Senate has one additional practice which illustrates that it does not treat itself as a body which has existed since it was first organized in 1789. When the Senate had been in session on the last day of an expiring Congress and it had been called into special session to begin at the moment of the commencement of a new Congress, it went through the ritual, at the last moment as the clock approached 12 noon of the last day of the expiring Congress, of declaring itself adjourned sine die. At the stroke of 12 noon, the presiding officer then called the Senate to order for the business of the special session. Senator Walsh referred to this practice in his speech on the nature of the Senate.[17] He argued there, as the facts argue for themselves, that no body which seriously considered itself continuous need carry out that procedure. It is inconsistent with any idea except the idea that the Senate expires, as does the House, at the end of a Congress, and that it is a new body which meets a moment later at the commencement of a new Congress.

G. The Senate practice on rules can and must be reconciled with its actions as a new entity in each Congress

At the moment that the Senate adjourns sine die, its legislative activities cease, its pending nominations expire, its consideration prior to ratification of a treaty dies, and 1 moment later the bills must be reintroduced, the treaty must again be referred to committee, and the President must once again present the nominations. To state those facts and then to urge that, as has been said, the Senate is the same body which met for the first time on April 6, 1789, is to state an obvious non sequitur.

Those who urge, in the face of those facts, that the Senate is a continuing body for the purpose of continuing its rules, are saying in effect that the rules are somehow different in nature from nearly everything else the Senate does, from its consideration of bills, of treaties, of nominations, from its handling of committees. This difference, if it is to be sustained, must lie in some difference between things substantial and procedural. That difference does not, and cannot exist. Procedure and substance in a legislative body cannot be divorced.

The history of recent years is vivid evidence of this intermixture. One aspect of legislative action, the obstruction of many important pieces of legislation which had majority support,[18] has been the result solely of procedural obstacles, particularly the lack of effective means of bringing debate to a close and the impossibility of changing this procedural roadblock. It is procedure which has determined legislative action and nonaction and not the will of the Members of the Senate.

Indeed, the transcending importance of procedure in dealing with substance was recognized in the passage of clause 3 of the present rule XXII, as the price of ending the famous 1949 cloture filibuster. Rule XXII now allows 64 Senators to permit the majority to express its will on anything other than a change in the procedure of the Senate. For that, in view of the possibility of filibuster, unanimous consent is necessary.

Let us test once again the theory that the Senate is the same body which met in 1789, that the rules continue and that these rules can be changed only by amendment according to their terms. If the Senate of the First Congress, feeling themselves, perhaps, men closer to the drafters of the Constitution and the people who ratified it than anyone who would come after them, had included within their rules one which said, "these rules may be amended hereafter only by unanimous consent," would such a rule have continued to the present day through our allegedly continuous Senate? Obviously not.

"The Constitution empowers each House to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained." *U. S.* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 1, 5).

Such a rule would both violate the constitutional injunction that each House should determine its rules of proceedings and the fundamental right of each legislative assembly to express the will of the electorate.

The example we have proposed is shocking. It is no more shocking, however, than the result to which the continuity idea takes us, that whatever the complexion of the Senate, whatever the changes brought about by popular election, it cannot change the rules if the rules do not themselves permit the change to be accomplished. The remark of Senator Thomas, in February of 1915, during the debates on the ship purchase bill, is equally pertinent here. He said, in 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3736:

"Mr. President, I might digress to say that for more than a hundred years Members of the Senate were chosen by legislatures and not by the people. This was a constitutional requirement. Nevertheless, an important reform has been made, and made successfully, in that direction. The argument of antiquity was for years a potent weapon of defense against that great reform, but the system went down, as it should have done, before the stern logic of the present demand, the necessities of modern conditions, and the supreme importance of restoring this body to its constitutional functions, and keeping it in touch with and responsible to its constituency."

The Senate acts as a new body in each Congress for essential constitutional purposes. It starts its legislative activities anew; it begins over on its executive functions of considering nominations and ratifying treaties; its committees are chosen again; and when it completes its work it adjourns sine die. It acts as a new body in every important way except for the readoption of rules. This brings the proponents of the continuing body theory to the circular reasoning that the Senate is continuous because the rules continue and that the rules continue because the Senate is continuous. As we shall show in the next section, there is a simple way out of this dilemma of circular reasoning—by recognizing that the rules have continued through the acquiescence of a majority of each new Senate, acquiescence tantamount to readoption of the rules. Whenever a majority of a new Senate refuses further acquiescence and desires to act for itself, it has the constitutional power to do so free of any erosion of power by the action of its predecessors.

III. ACQUIESCENCE HAS BEEN A METHOD OF ADOPTING RULES FOR THE SENATE; WHEN A MAJORITY OF THE SENATE OF A NEW CONGRESS DOES NOT ACQUIESCE IN THE EXISTING RULES, RULES MUST BE ADOPTED BY MAJORITY VOTE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEW CONGRESS

A. The history of the Senate rules

The Senate of the First Congress, in pursuance of the constitutional provision, adopted rules of procedure for its own governance (April 16–18, 1789, Senate Journal). The Senate of the Second Congress organized itself without formally adopting another set of rules; the oath of office was administered to the new Senators and the Senate proceeded to consider its regular business (2 Annals of Congress, p. 1782). A similar practice has been followed at the commencement of each new Congress. Changes in the rules have occurred either through periodic major revision or through motions to add or change a particular rule. The revisions, listed below,[19] have been infrequent and the last general revision was in 1884, 68 years ago.

The present Rule XL is the only standing rule which governs changes in the rules (with the exception of the third clause in Rule XXII). It provides in substance that motions to suspend, modify, or amend any rule must be preceded by 1 day's written notice, specifying the rule and purpose of the change, except that suspension of any rule other than that which governs voting on a roll call (Cl. 1, rule XII) can be had by unanimous consent. This last provision has led to the observation that action is had in the Senate only by unanimous consent.[20] Rule XL, and its predecessors, did not appear in the Senate rules until 1868; [21] prior to that time there was no written provision for changing the rules.

Amendment of the rules can be had by a vote of a majority of those present and voting.[22] This has been established by usage and precedent. This theoretical majority power, however, is modified by clause 3 of the present rule XXII, which prohibits the use of cloture on a motion to proceed to consider a proposal to change the standing rules. This provision permits one Member of the Senate to filibuster any proposed change in the rules, so that essentially the requirement for change is one of unanimity.

B. The Senate has never decided by vote that the standing rules carry over from one Congress to the succeeding Congress

The Senate has met, since its first organization as a Senate of a new Congress, 81 times. In that period of more than 160 years, the Senate has never had occasion to determine directly by vote whether its rules carry over by their own operation to the Senate of a new Congress. From this circumstance has arisen the theory that the Senate necessarily retains its rules and that they can be changed only by an amendment under the terms of the existing rules of the Senate.

We submit that this theory is incorrect; that the historical facts are equally consistent with the theory that the Senate of each Congress, for the purpose of exercising its constitutional power to make its own rules, is a new body and that the majority of it may either acquiesce by silence, tantamount to readoption, in the rules of the preceding Senate or may adopt new ones. This explanation accords just as much with the facts of Senate usage and practice, and has the additional advantage that it recognizes the constitutional and inherent right of each new legislature to respond to the will of the people as expressed through their elected representatives. When in doubt, an interpretation which avoids grave constitutional questions should be adopted.[23] Moreover, the theory that the Senate has acquiesced as a new Senate in the rules of the preceding Senate is the only one consistent with the other usages of the Senate with respect to bills, committees, treaties, nominations, etc., which are all based on the Senate of each Congress acting as a separate entity. (See point II, supra.)

---

[17] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10.

[18] See, e. g., Limitation of Debate in the U. S. Senate, by George B. Galloway, Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service.

[19] March 26, 1806, Senate Journal 65–66; January 3, 1820, Senate Journal 61–69; March 26, 1868, Senate Journal 340–347; January 11, 1884, Senate Journal 145–160.

[20] Willoughby, op. cit. supra, p. 487.

[21] March 26, 1868. At that time it appeared as rule LIII.

[22] It is otherwise with suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote. See Haynes, op. cit. supra, p. 378.

[23] *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629). See also the additional authorities collected in the concurring opinion of Brandeis, J. in *Ashwander* v. *TVA* (297 U. S. 288; 346–348).

As stated above, the necessity for readoption of the Senate rules has never before been tested. Examination of congressional debates and of authorities on the history of the Senate and the House of Representatives will reveal many statements that the Senate is a continuous body. It will also reveal that never has the Senate voted that it was a continuous body with respect to the acceptance of the rules from the Senate of the preceding Congress.

The question has been raised, although without resolution, in fairly recent history. At the opening of the special session of the Sixty-fifth Congress on Tuesday, March 6, 1917,[24] Senators Owen of Oklahoma and Walsh of Montana raised the question as to whether the rules of the preceding Senate were binding (55 Cong. Rec. 3, et seq.). Senator Owen refused to permit a bill to be referred to committee on the ground that the committees were not in existence at the beginning of this new Congress. The Senator also pointed out that, in the absence of rules, general parliamentary law governed and that, under such law, proceedings could be had by unanimous consent. But he cautioned that any such proceedings must not be considered as being under the rules of any preceding Congress.[25]

Senator Walsh said: [26]

"So likewise, Mr. President, you are proceeding upon the assumption that the rules should have been continued in force. That question has never been debated in this body. It has never been determined in this body. I make that statement, likewise, advisedly."

* * * * *

"Mr. President, let me add, because a certain practice has been followed for many years is no reason at all, although its persuasive force may be open to question, why it is the right procedure. For instance, for 76 years—yea, for 87 years—it was regarded that the joint rules of the two Houses lived from one Congress to another, and yet when that question was directly presented to the Senate in 1876 and debated in this body the conclusion was arrived at that they did not."

The Vice President remarked that the question whether there were or were not rules was for the Senate. The Senate thereupon adjourned that day.

It reconvened on March 7, and Senator Walsh presented the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the close of the Sixty-fourth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

"*Resolved*, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII."

The Senator spoke at length in support of his resolution, pointing out that there was no basis for the acceptance of the idea that the Senate was a continuous body; that references to the Senate as such a body had been made in passing debate and not in connection with adoption of the rules, and that every consideration of constitutional intent, of the principle of majority rule, and of moral right supported the view that the Senate should not be bound by the dead hand of the past. He emphasized that the theory of the rules as having continuing validity denied to future majorities the right to change them.

"Why should such members be bound by the so-called rule of 'unlimited debate' which the Senate that assembled in the year 1806 deemed wise to adopt to regulate its deliberations? Is it consistent with the idea of representative government that they should be restrained by such a rule or by any rule to which their assent was never given and never asked? What is the theory upon which you decline to hold them bound by any action which the Senate, as constituted before they entered it, may have taken with reference to any bill? Why is it insisted that everything proceed de novo? What is the basis of reason underlying the want of power to proceed with all bills at the stage at which they had arrived at the death of one Congress upon the assembling of another? Clearly, because the people, whose representatives we are, have a right to have all measures that engage the attention of this body considered without prejudice on account of any action that may have been taken by a Senate whose course and record had made it odious, or which, for some other reason, had been regenerated so far as it was possible to make a change. It is because the new Members, coming fresh from the people, ought to have the right to be heard and be accorded the opportunity to vote in the light of information gleaned at every stage of the passage of a bill or resolution.

* * * * *

"A majority may adopt the rules, in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them." [27]

Senator Walsh concluded his remarks and the Senate adjourned.

Meanwhile, after Senators Owen and Walsh had announced their position, the parties in the Senate had each assembled in caucus on the evening of March 6 prior to Senator Walsh's speech and had each appointed a committee to formulate a cloture rule. Senators Walsh and Owen were members of the Democratic committee. On the evening of March 7 after Senator Walsh's speech, both party caucuses voted to approve a rule providing for cloture by two-thirds vote.[28] It cannot be doubted that the full approval of both political parties for the proposed innovation was in recognition of and response to the force of the arguments made by Senator Walsh.

When the Senate convened on the day after Walsh's speech, Senator Martin, of Virginia, Democratic floor leader, offered the formal resolution to amend the rules of the Senate so as to permit cloture upon a vote of two-thirds. This resolution was debated at once by unanimous consent without ever being referred to committee and was adopted that same day, March 8, 1917 (76 yeas, 3 nays), as an amendment to rule XXII. Senator Walsh's resolution was not discussed further, nor was it acted upon. Since Senator Walsh was one of the most active proponents of cloture and a member of the committee formulating the rule, he acquiesced in the alternative method of procuring cloture, which achieved the end he then sought.

The proposal by Senators Owen and Walsh did not come without warning. In 1915, at the time of the consideration of the ship-purchase bill, an amendment to rule XXII, providing that the Senate should proceed to vote upon the bill on a particular date, was introduced by Senator Reed, of Missouri. In the course of the debate on the resolution, its proponents adverted to the fact that the rules under which they were operating were merely the result of long-time acquiescence, had never been adopted by the Senate, did not represent the view of the majority and could not, because of the inability to control filibustering, represent the will of the majority. Senator James said:

"These rules have not been adopted by the Senate. They are merely the inheritance of a hundred years behind us, with the gathered cobwebs and dust which have come down through the century. It is to say [the theory that the Senate rules continue] that it must be done by some change and that we cannot ourselves submit to the majority the right to transact business." [29]

Senator Root asked whether anyone disputed that the rules of the Senate "once adopted continue until they are changed." Senator Thomas said:

"I dispute it; and that will be tested out at the beginning of the next Congress. The Senate is a continuous body, in the sense that two-thirds of it hold over with every Congress. We appoint our new committees and assign the new Members; but there is no more reason why the rules of the Senate should continue from Congress to Congress than that our committees should continue from Congress to Congress. I do not know what others may think about it, but one of the efforts I shall make will be to secure a change of the rules and test that question when the new Senate shall organize.

* * * * *

"I do not pretend to be able to make any Herculean efforts or to exercise the same power and ability as the Senator from New York. I am merely stating an opinion which is drawn from the Senator's inquiry and which I thought should be answered. I do not know whether we shall succeed or not, but the fact that the Senate is under rules of construction which have tied its hands and feet for a hundred years has no terror for me. I believe the rules are made for the Senate. I do not think the Senate was made for the rules." [30]

To summarise, the history of Senate rules is one of readoption by the acquiescence of the majority of the Senate of each new Congress in the rules of the preceding Senate. Some Members of the Senate have recognized that such acquiescence must be subject to the will of the majority, but the question has never been voted upon. The Senate itself has no affirmative precedent to lend support to the theory of the continuing vitality of the rules; it has only silence which, if taken as acquiescence, is more consistent with constitutional requirements and other Senate procedures.

C. The Senate, when brought to the question, has always demonstrated that even a long-standing practice of acquiescence must respond to the will of the majority of a new Senate

It will no doubt be argued that this long-standing usage of the Senate to omit the formal adoption of new rules at the opening of a new Congress, of which there is no doubt, constitutes an implicit decision on the question in issue here and that the Senate rules therefore necessarily continue. While we do not dispute that usage and precedent may be of value in deciding an issue such as that here considered, it is significant that, as will be shown in detail, the Senate has twice overruled long-standing practice which was assumed to be continuous, when it was necessary to do so to effectuate the will of the majority. The past usage in these two cases was held to represent a silent acquiescence by the majority in the decision of the preceding Senates. When those decisions of the earlier Senates no longer represented majority will, the Senate did not hesitate to display its nonacquiescence by vote and abrogated the historical practice.

---

[24] The Senate had met on Monday, March 5, 1917, but the sole business had been the administration of the oath and the address of Vice President Marshall. This had been followed by the second inauguration of President Wilson on the inauguration platform at the East Front of the Capitol (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1–3).

[25] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4–5.

[26] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8–9. The full statement of Senator Walsh is attached hereto as appendix A.

[27] 55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 14, 18.

[28] New York Times, March 7, 8, 1917.

[29] 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3792, 63d Cong., 3d sess.

[30] 52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3792.

(1) Abrogation of the Joint Rules

In the first Congress the Senate and House adopted joint rules to govern the relationship and necessary business between them.[31] Thereafter, these joint rules of the two Houses were treated as in force and revised and amended, although the Senate and House did not adopt them at the beginning of each Congress.

In 1865, rule XXII of the joint rules was adopted in an attempt to settle the long-standing controversy on the method of counting electoral votes. In 1869, there was a violent quarrel between the two Houses of Congress over the effect of this particular joint rule. This led to a determination by a portion of the Senate to rescind that rule, in anticipation of any problems over the counting of electoral votes which might arise from the 1876 presidential election.[32] The desire of the Senate to eliminate joint rule XXII led to the end of acquiescence of each new Senate in the continuation of the joint rules and the Senate in the first session of the Forty-first Congress, after 87 years of unbroken historical usage, demonstrated its right to adopt new joint rules at the beginning of each new Congress.

On December 15, Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, introduced a resolution to adopt the joint rules in force at the close of the last session of Congress. Senator Bayard, of Delaware, asked whether this was necessary, and Senator Edmunds answered:

"That, as a celebrated Englishman said, is past finding out. The object of this resolution is to ascertain from the proper Committee on Rules (which had jurisdiction over the joint rules as well as the Standing Rules of the Senate) whether the joint rules that were in force at the last session of Congress are in force now without any vote; and, if so, upon what principle of law or joint proceeding; and, if not, of course to take some steps to have some joint rules between the two Houses." [33]

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules, which reported it back favorably with a technical amendment making it a concurrent resolution. Senator Hamlin argued that the joint rules operated only by acquiescence (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 309). Considerable heated discussion ensued, in which widely different theories as to the effect and validity of the joint rules were stated. The one point receiving constant reiteration was that the joint rules had operated by acquiescence, and must be subject to change. Senator Hamlin, as he gave the committee report, stated it as follows:

"It is only by acquiescence in long years that they have been treated and regarded as rules, and not by an affirmative vote either of the House or of the Senate." [34]

Recognition that common consent or acquiescence could give validity to that which was otherwise doubtful only so long as the acquiescence continued was voiced by Senator Merrimon, who said in the course of this debate:[35]

"It seems, as the venerable Senator from Maine (Mr. Hamlin) stated on a former occasion, that this matter has passed uniformly from the beginning of the Government down to this time without question. The question is now raised, and if today some action of Congress should be required under the joint rules, and a Senator should rise and say 'I object,' there would be the end of it. It is only by common consent that the practice to which I have referred has prevailed." [36]

Despite the appeals to history, long-standing practice, and the venerability of the joint rules, the Senate voted to reject a substitute resolution which would have treated the rules as in force and provided for an amendment of those rules, and accepted the initial resolution which was framed on the theory that no joint rules existed at the opening of the new Congress.[37]

Thus, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution adopting the joint rules anew for the Forty-fourth Congress. The House never passed this resolution. The Senate, at various times since then has made an effort to have joint rules passed but they never have succeeded. (Gilfrey, Precedents, 1914, p. P-441; Hinds, sections 6782–6787.) In most respects the House and Senate now operate in the same manner as they did under the joint rules on some theory of usage.

The decision, by vote of the Senate, that the joint rules were not in effect demonstrated that the joint rules had existed only by acquiescence and that the acquiescence of even 87 years was in no way binding when a majority manifested its will to the contrary. It also showed conclusively that the method by which the majority in such a situation manifests its will is by the adoption of new rules and not by amendment of the old ones.

(2) Dismissal of the Senate Printer

The abrogation of the joint rules is clear evidence that the Senate has not hesitated to abrogate a long-standing historical usage when put to the test. In another famous incident, the Senate of the Forty-seventh Congress dismissed Blair & Rives as printers for the Senate, despite the fact that they had been elected pursuant to an established practice under a joint resolution of 1819, which authorized each House of Congress to choose the printer for the next succeeding House and provided the method, rates of pay, and other matters of detail.

The cause for the dismissal of Blair & Rives was a political one. The Twenty-seventh Congress was a Whig Congress—the first in power after many years of rule by the Jacksonian Democrats. Mr. Blair, one of the partners who had been chosen by the dying Democratic Senate as printer for the next Senate, was editor of the Washington Globe, an intensely partisan newspaper which supported the Democratic administration. The Whigs had given notice during the last days of the second session of the Twenty-sixth Congress that they did not consider that the Democrats had any right, constitutional or moral, to choose a printer for the next Congress, and that they would not be bound by such a choice but would consider it a nullity despite the apparent authority of the joint resolution of 1819 (9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 180, 188–195). The Whigs warned that the election of a printer by the expiring Senate would not and could not prevent the next Senate from executing its "constitutional right" [38] which was "inherent in both bodies." [39] No laws of Congress could change the character of the Constitution, nor could Congress qualify its constitutional power by law. Despite these warnings, the Democratic Senate awarded a printing contract for the printing for the next Senate to Blair & Rives.

Immediately upon the opening of the special session of the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Congress, Senator Mangum, of North Carolina, introduced a resolution that Blair & Rives be dismissed as printers to the Senate (9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, p. 236).

The resolution was heatedly opposed, largely on the authority of the established usage under the joint resolution of 1819.[40] The opponents argued that a printer had been elected ten times under the authority of the resolution and that now, on the occasion of the eleventh election, the unconstitutionality of the authorizing resolution was claimed. Those in favor of the dismissal designated the resolution of 1319 as a nullity because it attempted to bind the actions of future Houses of Congress. They pointed out that the House had disregarded the resolution a number of times. Senator Clayton stated the theory of the Whigs as follows:

"Now they found it necessary to go into the election of a printer, but they were told the office was filled. With that he did not agree. He believed the act performed was a nullity, and not consistent with the powers given them by the Constitution to appoint their own officers; and therefore they could remove these printers, and go into the election of other printers." [41]

Senator Clay's views were somewhat different. He argued that both the Senate and the House were continuous bodies, but that succeeding Houses, of course, were not identical in the Members that composed them. He hoped that the acts and measures of the Senate "while theoretically always in existence, would depend on the component Members that constitute the body." [42] Senator Clay thus emphasized the view taken here that, whatever the theoretical nature of the Senate, it must be able to act on the basis of the views of its present members and not on the basis of a majority long since out of office or dead.

Senator Buchanan, among the leaders of the opposition to the resolution of dismissal, defined the Senate as a continuous body in remarks which have often been quoted.[43]

The appeals to usage, the definitions of the Senate as a continuing body, the cries of chaos which were voiced by the Democrats were in vain. The resolution was adopted 26 to 18.[44]

---

[31] Annals of Congress, 87–88, 987.

[32] Haynes, op. cit. supra, p. 245 et seq.

[33] 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 220.

[34] 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 309.

[35] 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 431–432. See also the remarks of Senator Conklin at p. 437 of the debates.

[36] Senator Thurman advanced the unusual theory that both the House and the Senate were continuous bodies, since a quorum of the House of Representatives is always elected (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 432). A number of the Senators opposing the change relied on the continuity of the Senate (Senator Bayard, 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 431) and stated in passing that the Senate's rules continue. Even some of the Senators who supported the theory that the joint rules were not in force referred to the Senate as "existing" (Hamlin, 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 309) although, of course, these references were irrelevant to the point at issue.

[37] 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 519.

[38] Senator Mangum, 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE 191.

[39] Senator Henderson, 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE 190.

[40] The history of the joint resolution of 1819 is set forth in Senator Hubbard's speech at 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, p. 189. It can be summarized as follows: In 1819, a joint resolution was passed which set the rates of pay and method for contracting for a printer for each House of Congress by that House of the preceding Congress. This was amended by a joint resolution of 1829, which was also signed by the President, which set the time for the election of the printer as within 30 days before the expiration of the Congress, and provided that a majority of votes was necessary for election.

[41] 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 236.

[42] 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 237.

[43] 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 240.

[44] For discussion of this episode, see Burdett, Filibustering in the Senate, p. 21. The Senate not only declined to follow an established usage in this instance, it had tacitly, both in 1833 and 1835, approved the usage and carried out the joint resolution governing the choice of a printer despite protests similar to those made in this successful instance. (See Senator Benton's remarks, 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 255–256.)

Thus, the Senate's vote in favor of the necessity of adopting the joint rules anew at the opening of each Congress and its vote to dismiss the printer chosen by the previous Senate, despite the apparently binding authority of a joint resolution, confirm the view that the Senate is a body in which the majority can consent by silent acquiescence to an action of a preceding Senate or can and will, when necessary, make its own views known through affirmative action at the beginning of a new Congress.

IV. THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HAS, BY ACQUIESCENCE, ACTED CONTINUOUSLY IN SOME RESPECTS; SUCH ACQUIESCENCE DOES NOT CREATE A CONTINUOUS BODY

Even the House of Representatives, admittedly a new body in each Congress, has by acquiescence, acted on a continuous basis in some respects. These examples of House action are further demonstration that continuity by acquiescence does not operate to change the essential nature of a legislative body and that the acquiescence can be terminated by majority actions.[46]

A. The carry-over of the Clerk of the House from one Congress to another

One of the most interesting anomalies of the American legislative system is the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the preceding Congress to organize the House in a new Congress. The Clerk of the preceding House has the all-important responsibility and power of preparing a roll of Members of the new House. He has used any source he wishes for this purpose—newspaper reports, formal election returns, etc. Upon the meeting of the House he calls the House to order, calls the roll prepared by himself, and the effect of that roll call is to determine whether there is a quorum. The composition of this roll of Members, especially at a doubtful time, could determine the election of the Speaker of the House, as it has in contests in the past. The Clerk can completely dominate the organization of the House, and he holds his office until his successor qualifies.

For many years this procedure continued only by custom and House rule, and in 1865 the custom was formulated into a statute (14 Stat. L. 397). This practice, in one famous instance, permitted the Clerk to insure the election of the Speaker from the party of his choice,[47] and in another equally famous instance the Clerk of the preceding House, chosen by an expired body, guided the House of Representatives from its meeting in December 1855 until February 3, 1856, when the House was finally able to agree on the election of the Speaker.[47]

Authorities who have commented on both the statute and the usage which preceded it have remarked that, of course, neither the usage nor the statute is binding since it obviously conflicts with the constitutional power of each House to choose its own officers and make its own rules.[48] Speaker Reed gave the complete explanation of the practice when he said:

"It is clear that the inherent right of the House under the Constitution to make its rules and elect its officers cannot be limited by the act of 1863, 'but the law has thus far been acquiesced in because of the fear that any other course might lead to chaos.'"[49]

Acquiescence by the majority of the new body in the procedure by which the Clerk of one House performs very important duties with respect to the new House, has been the equivalent of a biannual readoption of that system, but it has not and could not thereby transform the House into a continuous body for other purposes.

B. House rules considered as continuing for 30-year period

The history of congressional procedure affords another example of the powerful effect of acquiescence upon an otherwise doubtful procedure. On March 19, 1860, the House adopted a rule providing that the then Rules of the House should be the Rules of the House "of the present and subsequent Congresses unless otherwise ordered," which rule was continued until 1890.

This provision, although it continued for 30 years, had a somewhat checkered history. On December 7, 1875, a resolution providing for adoption of the rules of the preceding House with certain changes was offered. A point of order was raised against this resolution based on the provision of the general rule quoted above, providing that the rules should apply to the House of subsequent Congresses.[50] The Speaker overruled this point of order and no appeal was taken from his decision, but the resolution was adopted. Despite this apparent rejection of the carry-over provision of the House rules, the House refused, at a subsequent time when it was considering a major revision of the rules, to vote for a motion changing that provision of the rules.[51]

This apparently inconsistent series of events, is fully understandable if one accepts the explanation proposed here that acquiescence of a majority is an action equivalent to readoption. In 1875, when an attempt to obstruct proposed changes in the rules, the majority, by its acceptance of the Speaker's decision and its adoption of the changes, demonstrated its lack of acquiescence in the old rules and its affirmative intent that the rules be changed. The majority of the House in 1880, when it voted to retain the "carry-over" rule in question, demonstrated its conviction that the rules could, unless the majority expressed a contrary intention, carry over by acquiescence. Indeed they did so carry over at least three times at the beginning of the Congress—in 1869, in 1871, and in 1873.[52]

Thereafter, in 1890, there occurred Speaker Reed's revolution, another and perhaps the most famous example of the majority changing basic procedures when necessary for manifestation of the right of each House to make its own rules and to legislate. At the opening of the Fifty-first Congress, despite the provision discussed above which would have automatically carried over the rules of the preceding Congress, the rules were treated as not being in force and were referred to a committee for consideration and revision.[53]

The committee did not report out any new rules for a long period. During the interim, Speaker Reed had ruled that the House was acting under general parliamentary law because there were no rules in existence until the House adopted them. Then, using the principles of general parliamentary law, Speaker Reed made a startling change in the historical method of determining a quorum in the House. One of the favorite methods of minority obstruction in the House of Representatives had been for Members to refuse to answer a quorum call, although the Congressman might have been actually present within the view of the Speaker and the Clerk in the Chamber.[54] This ruling of Speaker Reed's was contrary to the more than 100-year-old precedent on counting a quorum in the House of Representatives.

In the debate subsequent to this revolutionary decision and in the long debates on the adoption of the new rules,[55] the Members of the House expressed forcefully the basic reasons why it was necessary and proper for the House to reject the binding effect of the preceding rules and the long-standing precedent on counting a quorum.

"Mr. CUTCHEON. Secondly, it is said, and we have heard it iterated and reiterated until it has become stale in our ears, that the proposed rules are revolutionary. Well, if it is meant by that simply that we are about to make a radical change, let us admit that in that sense the proposed change is revolutionary, because it proposes to substitute the rule of the majority for the rule of the minority. It proposes to substitute action for inaction. It proposes to substitute legislation for obstruction, and in that sense and to that extent, and that extent only, they are revolutionary.

"Mr. Speaker, we may say further, in reply to the charge that these rules are revolutionary, that no long-continued and deep-rooted evil can be removed except by radical measures, and we have realized, and the realization has been growing on us for years, that there is in the system of procedure of this House a deep wrong perpetrated whereby it is possible for one Member to take this House by the throat and throttle it in its entirety and to prevent its proceeding with its legitimate and constitutional functions. That is the evil, that is the wrong we proposed to uproot by radical changes in our code of rules."[56]

The conditions which necessitated these radical changes were vividly described.

"I am dealing with conditions in the last Congress under the rules and with conditions now. What was the result of that exercise of the Speaker's power? The result was that the business of 60,000,000 people piled up on the calendars, and not more than 5 percent of it could receive consideration, and, in fact, under former codes of rules, almost as much time was given to obstruction by the minority as was given to the consideration of the business of 60,000,000 people.[57]

* * * * *

"Notwithstanding that the majority of the House was nearly two-thirds in favor of that proposition, this filibustering was kept up successfully, and all of that majority believed that the appropriation from the Treasury of the United States should be made, believed it to be a just and constitutional appropriation, and showed by their votes and action that they were following the demands of the people of the loyal States; but they were met by the opposition of some 30 men, so that, day and night, continuously, we were compelled to sit here doing nothing but answer roll calls until the minority forced the postponement of the considera-

[46] There are respects in which the Senate has treated itself as an organized body from Congress to Congress, notably, the election since 1890 of the President pro tempore to hold office indefinitely at the will and pleasure of the Senate. See Senate Manual, footnote at p. 575. Moreover, by unwritten usage, other officers are elected only when the majority composition of the Senate is changed. These instances are not persuasive for a number of reasons: (a) They can be explained by acquiescence, (b) because they refer to minor organizational matters rather than to the substance of the Senate functions; (c) because they are not historically unbroken precedents but on the contrary have been settled only within about the past 65 years; and (d) lastly, because we find that in even more important respects the House also carries forward from one Congress to another.

[47] Riddick, Congressional Procedure, 1941, p. 100; Alexander, History of the House of Representatives, p. 12, et seq.

[47] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 222.

[48] Cushing, op. cit. supra, p. 106; Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 67.

[49] Alexander, op. cit. supra, p. 24.

[50] Hinds, op. cit. supra, s. 6744.

[51] Feb. 27, 1880, Hinds, op. cit. supra, s. 6746.

[52] See remarks of Senator Kelly during the discussion on the necessity for adoption of the Joint Rules in 1876, 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 434, 44th Cong., 1st sess.

[53] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 84.

[54] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 740–749.

[55] Reported by the committee, 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1005.

[56] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1236.

[57] Mr. Cannon, 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1172.

tion of that measure until the next session of Congress. Can gentlemen tell me that the minority has a right by mere obstructive dilatory filibustering, which is but another name for a piratical system of obstruction, to prevent the will of a majority of the Representatives of the American people from being enacted into law? I deny it.

"I have listened with some curiosity to observations made by gentlemen on the other side, but I failed to hear from one yet wherein the rights of the minority, for which they are clamoring, are taken away by this measure. What rights do the minority claim, collectively, as a factor of this parliamentary body, which they fear are going to be infringed upon? Will any gentleman dispute this proposition: That the only rights a minority in this or any other legislative assembly have is, first, the right to a fair, full, and free discussion of the measure and, second, the right to offer such amendments as may be germane, under either the rules of the body or the general parliamentary law, to the proposition being considered? When the minority have accorded to them these two rights they are at the end of their tether, and if I am wrong in this I shall be glad to be corrected, but I assert it believing in its truth." [59]

The rules which permitted the majority of the House to perform its legislative functions were finally adopted by a vote of 161 to 144 on February 14, 1890 (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1347).

Speaker Reed's declaration that general parliamentary law governed the House in the absence of adopted rules and the confirmation of this declaration by a majority of the House through their adopting the new rules demonstrated the power of the majority, inherent in the legislature of a constitutional democracy, to determine its own procedures even at the rejection of long-standing precedents and purportedly binding rules. Moreover, the decision by a majority of the House that the old rules did not carry over, and that, in their absence, the rules of general parliamentary law prevailed, did not lead to chaos, as the opponents of change then and now argue. The House expedited its business, expressed the majority will, and generally readopted the rules of the preceding Congress, with minor changes, except when a major revision (as in 1911) was necessary. It is significant for the question considered here that Speaker Reed's "revolution" was not followed by biannual controversies over the Rules of the House, nor is it to be expected that the necessity for adopting rules at the opening of each Congress would have any different result in the Senate.

C. Other incidents of House action continuing beyond the expiration of a Congress

Many precedents of the House of Representatives in addition to the episodes already described confirm the proposition that acquiescence will permit the carry-over of certain functions of the House from one Congress to the succeeding Congress.

1. The first House on December 30, 1791, voted to require a report to the House by the Secretary of the Treasury as to the state of the public moneys. It was agreed to as a rule of the House. In the debates on this resolution the objection was made that this House could not bind future Congresses. "Mr. Wilson supported the resolution. He said the present Congress had a right to make such rules and regulations respecting the Treasury as they thought proper; and to say that those rules shall be perpetual; still a future Congress may repeal them and establish others which they may say shall be standing rules." In the same debate one Member referred to another report by the Secretary of the Treasury on manufactures which had been ordered by the previous House and made to this one.[59]

2. On February 1, 1830, the House ordered the Secretary of War to send printed copies of the Army list annually. Subsequent legislative records show that this was at least intermittently complied with.[60]

3. The House has passed a rule prohibiting the use of its Hall during its recess. It is clear from the date of this resolution that it was referring to the recess after the expiration of a Congress.[61]

4. By specific authorization, a select committee of the House filed its report after the expiration of a session.[62]

5. A statute provided for an appointment of a committee on accounts by the Speaker of the expiring House from Representatives-elect, to act as a committee from the time the old Congress expires until the new Congress meets and appoints a regular committee on accounts.[63]

6. (a) Joint committees have been appointed, by joint resolutions, which have represented Congress after the expiration of the authorizing Congress.[64]

(b) Likewise, a resolution authorizing the creation of a joint committee on civil service in the next Congress was passed on March 2, 1869. This was treated as effective, although as a matter of fact the committee was not appointed, since both Houses in effect rescinded the action.[65]

V. SUMMARY

At the moment when a new Congress opens, the fact that a new body is in existence is indicated by a new number for that Congress. The whole body then—the Congress—treats itself as a separate assembly from that which preceded it. The House, too, despite the minor procedural instances outlined in point 4 of this brief, treats itself as a new body and adopts new rules. In what respect is the Senate of this new Congress so different from the House as to make it continuous? Although a proportion of its Members are the same as those who were Members in the previous Congress, the Senate, as a Senate and as a part of the Congress established by the Constitution, is a new entity.

Since 1789 the Senate of each Congress has had the right, both under the Constitution and by the necessary effect of the establishment of a democratic representative assembly, to legislate without being bound by the action of preceding Senates, and to adopt rules of procedure for such legislation without being bound by the rules of procedure of preceding Senates.

The Senate has demonstrated by its treatment of its legislative business, its executive business, and its committees, as new in each Congress, that the majority of the Senate in such a new Congress has a right to declare its own will.

The Senate of the United States has, over a long period, acquiesced in the rules of preceding Senates. It has never by vote determined that such rules were in effect at the beginning of a succeeding Congress; the question of whether the rules need to be readopted when a majority wishes them changed has never been tested. Since the assertion that the rules of a preceding Senate are binding upon a later Senate raises grave constitutional questions, the action of the Senate must be construed as acquiescence in the rules rather than as proving a continuity of the Senate for this purpose.

Whenever a majority of the Senate has found it necessary to reject the purportedly binding effect of the action of previous Senates, as in the case of the joint rules and the election of the Senate printer, it has done so at the beginning of the opening session of a new Senate by majority vote.

The lengthy period of acquiescence does not by itself establish the continuity of the Senate. Even the House in a number of instances, notably in the carryover of its Clerk to a new Congress and in the 1860 to 1890 period, when the rules were carried over to the succeeding House, has acquiesced in the action of prior Houses without establishing itself as a continuing body.

Every constitutional and legislative principle, and every action of the Senate in other matters, leads inescapably to the conclusion that new Senate rules can be adopted at the beginning of a new Congress by a majority vote unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congresses.

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Text of Senator Walsh's 1917 speech and debate thereon.

Appendix B: Discussion of *State* v. *Rogers*.

Appendix C: List of well-known statements to the effect that the Senate is a continuous body which may be cited.

Appendix D: List of current State practice with respect to this issue.

APPENDIX A

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do the officers of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms and the officers, hold now by virtue of their election during a preceding session of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was trying to ascertain whether the Senator from Oklahoma wanted the ruling of the Chair upon the question as to whether the Senate as a continuing body has rules and whether it has officers. The Senator from Oklahoma simply desired to place on the record a protest.

Mr. OWEN. A caveat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; he served notice that there is a patent applied for. The Chair is not inclined to answer parliamentary inquires for the reason that everyone knows or should know what is coming up. If it is taken up now the Chair will formally rule on the question and an appeal can be taken. There is no way the Chair could rule on a parliamentary inquiry without immediately precipitating a debate on this question.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Montana pardon a suggestion?

Mr. WALSH. I really would like to present to the Presiding Officer that question in connection with this matter, not involving the question of the continuity of the rules at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes that the various officials of the Senate hold until their successors have been by the Senate appointed.

Mr. WALSH. I was of the impression that it had been definitely determined by the Senate. That is the rule in respect to the President pro tempore, who holds his office by virtue of the Constitution. I am not so certain that there is a statute to the effect that when once elected he holds until his successor is elected and qualified. I am not certain whether that question has been determined so far as the other officers of the Senate are concerned.

I merely desire to say, Mr. President, that if the terms of those officers expired with the last Congress and they do not continue beyond the life of the last Congress, then the resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia would scarcely be in order until the organization of the Senate is completed by the election of a Secretary and a Sergeant at Arms. Accordingly, for the purpose of determining whether the resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia is in order at

---

[59] Mr. Payson, 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1217.

[59] 3 Annals of Congress 300–302; Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 6752.

[60] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 6754.

[61] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 6751.

[62] Cannon, Precedents of the House of Representatives, s. 381.

[63] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 4335.

[64] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 7053, Jamestown Exposition; Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 7054, Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

[65] Hinds, op. cit. supra, sec. 4445.

this time, it occurs to me that we must first determine whether we have a Secretary.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to say that the Senator from Virginia asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution and that would make it in order, even though the point of order made by the Senator from Montana should be well taken upon a full consideration of the question.

Mr. WALSH. I was not unmindful of the suggestion now made by the Senator from Kentucky, but the resolution recites that there is a quorum of the Senate present and ready to receive any communication that the President of the United States may care to make. Of course, if he makes any communication to the Senate we ought to have a Secretary to report the communication that he makes. We ought to have a Sergeant at Arms to preserve order before——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LODGE. It has not yet been determined that there is a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll and Mr. Ashhurst answered "present."

Mr. HARDING. May I make a parliamentary inquiry at this stage?

Mr. JAMES. The regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing can be done in the way of a parliamentary inquiry until we determine whether a quorum is present.

Mr. HARDING. I want to raise this point, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

* * * * *

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I have no desire to annoy the Presiding Officer, but I should like to ask how we establish the validity of the roll call until the Chair has ruled concerning the continuing services of the officers of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are at least de facto officers of the Senate, whether they be de jure or not.

Mr. HARDING. That is very manifest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And the action of de facto officers is always valid anywhere at any time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Chair remarked a few moments ago that the purpose of these queries and of the protest or notice by the Senator from Oklahoma is very obvious, and that is true. The purpose on the part of some of us—not from a partisan standpoint at all, but in the interest of transacting the public business—is to amend the rules of the Senate, if we can. It has been demonstrated many times that, whatever else we may be able to do, we cannot vote upon a pending measure in the absence of unanimous consent. Some of us think that now we should stay here until December, if necessary, in order that the country may learn whether, in addition to that inability, we are too imbecile to amend our own rules.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. OWEN. There is no regular order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has asked unanimous consent for the passage of a resolution.

Mr. OWEN. The regular order is under general parliamentary law, and in that sense only could there be unanimous consent to there being any regular order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What is the business before the Senate, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has been read. Nobody seems to have objected to it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is there objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no objection of which the Chair has heard.

Mr. WALSH. I do not desire to embarrass the proceedings at all, but I suggest that probably we can go on and allow a record of the proceedings to be made by some de facto officer or by anybody whom the Chair should designate to take down what transpires. I see no reason why this course should not be taken, even though we have not officers; but it is quite obvious that we must soon determine that question.

Mr. REED. Do I understand that the resolution proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has been adopted by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not yet.

Mr. REED. I hope that no one in the Senate will object to the consideration of the motion for the appointment of a committee to wait on the President. Whatever else we ought to do hereafter, we certainly ought not to neglect to do this necessary thing. No right will be lost by it. We are not in a court where we shall waive our right by laches.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Debate is not in order on a request for unanimous consent. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, there is no regular order in the Senate, because the Senate has not adopted any rules for its procedure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like a ruling of the Chair. I take the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma at its face value, but I prefer a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Oklahoma will in this parliamentary body express his opinion without regard to the permission of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I demand the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. OWEN. There is no regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. We are getting nowhere, and we are doing absolutely no good. The Senator from Oklahoma refuses to make a point of order, and nobody else makes one.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I make the point of order that debate is not in order on this request for unanimous consent, and I will ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent has been granted for the consideration of the resolution, but whether the resolution shall be passed is debatable, the Chair thinks.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is the resolution before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is before the Senate and has been read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, I think it is perfectly obvious that the continuation of the services of the stenographers and all the officers of the Senate is granted by unanimous consent, because there is no single Senator who desires to make any objection to that, and that certainly may be considered as of unanimous consent, whether we are under the general parliamentary law or whether we are under the law of a continuing body. Therefore that much is eliminated, and the only thing that I wish to preserve is that we shall not be put in the attitude of proceeding under the rules of any preceding Congress. To that I will not consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. Reed and Mr. Vardaman addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I presume it will take something like an hour for the committee appointed to wait on the President to report, and I move, therefore, that immediately upon the appointment of the committee the Senate shall stand in recess until the hour of half past 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to rise to a question of personal privilege, if the Senator from Missouri will be kind enough to withhold his motion.

Mr. REED. Certainly; but my motion would not interfere with the Senator from Mississippi, because my motion was that the Senate take a recess after the committee has been appointed. However, I will withhold the motion.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will pause a moment, the Chair appoints as the committee to wait on the President the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Martin], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Warren].

* * * * *

Mr. WALSH. Before making that motion will the Senator indulge me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I feel that the question presented to the Senate by the bill tendered by the Senator from Massachusetts ought not to be considered as disposed of at the present time. It has been determined by the Senate of the United States that the Senate convened in extraordinary session, without the House acting in conjunction with it, can transact only executive business, as has been suggested by the Chair.

I have very carefully considered all the debates on that subject. In none of them, marvelous as it may seem, is any reference whatever made to that provision of the Constitution to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just called the attention of the Senate. I find it difficult to believe that that subject could have been canvassed by the able men who discussed it before this body without reference to it. But after an exhaustive examination of the question I am obliged to say that that is the situation. Yet, for myself, I can see no possible escape from the conclusion which is announced by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I had intended to make a motion to adjourn for the very purpose of leaving this question open, not for the purpose of foreclosing it.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I wanted to suggest to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Of course, if we are going to discuss it, we might be here all day. It is an important question and it ought to be fully discussed.

Mr. WALSH. I trust the Senator will permit me to make a statement of my attitude with respect to the matter. I will discuss it later on.

The Constitution gives to the President of the United States exactly the same power to convene the House in extraordinary session that it gives him to convene the Senate in extraordinary session. The language is that "he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them."

So, Mr. President, he may convene the House in extra session without the Senate. If he can, of course, the House can only transact legislative business, because it has no power but legislative power. So if the House may be convened in extra session for the purpose of transacting legislative business, it strikes me as indisputable that the Senate can transact legislative business when so convened.

Yet, Mr. President, you are quite right in the view that the other has been accepted for many years and even has been determined by this body. But we shall have to reexamine that question, and we shall have to reexamine it at this session.

So likewise, Mr. President, you are proceeding upon the assumption that the rules should have been continued in force. That question has never been debated in this body. It has never been determined in this body. I make that statement, likewise, Mr. President, advisedly.

I trust that we shall not consider that question either as determined until I have had an opportunity to advance some consideration which forces me strongly to the conclusion at which I have arrived in that regard as I am convinced on the other question to which reference has been made.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the question of the continuing existence of the Senate has been discussed. I have the references here. I have not had time to get them together in a form to present.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Massachusetts misunderstood me. Repeatedly you will find the declaration made that the Senate is a continuing body. The question is then presented as to what is meant by a continuing body; whether that means that the rules continue from one Congress to another Congress or not.

I assert, Mr. President, that the question as to whether the rules live from one Congress to another Congress has never been directly considered by this body, although many times incidentally it has been asserted that the Senate is a continuing body.

Mr. President, let me add, because a certain practice has been followed for many years is no reason at all, although its persuasive force may be open to question, why it is the right procedure. For instance, for 76 years—yea, for 87 years—it was regarded that the joint rules of the two Houses lived from one Congress to another, and yet when that question was directly presented to the Senate in 1876 and debated in this body the conclusion was arrived at that they did not.

So, Mr. President, I trust Senators will hold their minds in suspension on both these questions, because the question now presented by the Senator from Massachusetts is one of very grave moment, and, as I have indicated, I have been unable to escape the conclusion which I have arrived at that we can transact legislative business.

* * * * *

THE RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to present the following resolution, upon which I shall not ask immediate action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH. I shall not ask for immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I could not hear what the Senator said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 5), as follows:

"Resolved, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the close of the Sixty-fourth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

"Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I am obliged to leave the city tonight I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate while I express briefly my views concerning the subject matter of the resolution. It presents this question:

Are the rules under which the Senate operated during the last session of Congress now effective, or is the Senate governed by the general parliamentary law until rules are adopted, and is it in order to move to fix a time when the Senate shall take a vote on a pending question or to move the previous question with a view to closing debate even on a motion to amend the rules?

Before response is made to this inquiry I desire, with the indulgence of the Senate, to submit some observations.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The Vice President rapped with his gavel.

Mr. HARDWICK. A parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment. I take it the Senator from Montana is addressing the Senate by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have no objection. I merely wanted to understand the situation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is undeniable that since the present Government of the United States assumed the direction of their destiny the rules in force at the close of any session of the Senate have governed its deliberations upon reassembling without any formal action readopting them, even though the last adjournment marked the demise of a Congress. Were the rules theretofore in force adopted by the acquiescence of the Senate on reassembling, or was their vigor perpetual from Congress to Congress by virtue of the peculiar constitution of the Senate and the power vested in it by the Constitution? That the view has generally prevailed, so far as any thought has been given to the subject at all, that the rules have the quality of perpetuity, except as they may be altered or abrogated by affirmative action of the Senate, is altogether probable. It is a matter of common knowledge that the rules of the House do not survive the Congress during which they were adopted. At the first session of each new Congress that body entertains a motion that the rules of the last preceding Congress, with or without changes or exceptions, shall govern its deliberations until further ordered. Until such a resolution or some other of like import is passed the House operates under general parliamentary law, unless, as has occurred, it is assumed that the rules of the last House are in force until by acquiescence they are deemed to have been reinvigorated and in effect reenacted. The House of Representatives holds that by virtue of the provision of the Constitution that "each House may determine its rules of proceedings" the representatives of the people assemble, after a general election, untrammeled by any rules any of their predecessors may have adopted; that no House can take any proceedings in derogation of the powers of its successor; that it is powerless to bind its successor in any way touching the constitutional privilege of that body, and that the language of the Constitution—"each House"—differentiates one House from the House of a succeeding Congress, as well as from the coordinate branch of the Congress. This view of the powers of the House and the limitation of its powers, now universally acceded to, was not always dominant. Though it had been its practice since its history began formally to reenact in whole or in part the rules of the House in force at the expiration of the preceding Congress at the first session of a new Congress, the code of rules adopted in 1860 embraced the following:

"These rules shall be the rules of the present and succeeding Congresses unless otherwise ordered."

Notwithstanding it was continued nominally in force until 1890, it was repeatedly held during the intervening period to be nugatory though from time to time some feeble effort was made to justify it. On December 7, 1875, Samuel J. Randall offered a resolution providing that the rules of the Forty-third Congress, which had expired on the 4th day of March preceding, be the rules of the House then organizing. James A. Garfield raised the point of order that the rules of the last House were by their terms in force without such a resolution—to which the Speaker, Mr. Kerr, replied:

"The Chair overrules it on the ground that the Constitution clearly gives to each House the right to adopt its own rules. Whatever may have been the rules or orders of a preceding House in reference to this matter, they cannot supersede the constitutional right of this House to adopt its own rules."

Any doubt that may have arisen from time to time was set at rest in the memorable controversy that attended the elevation of Thomas B. Reed to the Speakership in 1889. He held that the rules did not continue in force beyond the life of the Congress which recognized their authority, and it was while the House was operating under general parliamentary law that he counted a quorum. In his vigorous style he declared:

"The Chair has always been unable to see how it was possible for a House which had passed out of existence to bind by rules and regulations a House which was to come into existence in the future."

Mr. Carlisle, the leader of the militant opposition, in the course of debate, said:

"I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] a member of the Committee on Rules, in the statement that it has been almost universally, perhaps universally, held in this House that it was not within the power of the House to bind its successors by any rules it might adopt, and that therefore each House, when it assembled, had in it the inherent right as a legislative body to prescribe for itself its own rules; that until it did so prescribe rules for the government of its own proceedings it was governed simply by what may be called the general parliamentary law."

He had himself ruled in accordance with these views when Speaker.

With much diffidence I submit that the Senate rules are equally evanescent in character. I do so in recognition of the weight that attaches to the uniform practice of the Senate down to this time and to the opinions of many eminent Members of this and the other House, expressed in a casual way in the course of debate on other more or less remotely related questions. I am reassured, however, so far as the usage of the Senate is concerned, by the fact—and to that, Mr. President, I direct your thoughtful consideration—by the fact that for 87 years, until 1876, the joint rules were treated as continuing in character just as the Senate rules have been to this day, and yet when that view was challenged, the Senate, with some dissent, it is true, in response to the sentiments of an overwhelming number of its Members, reached the conclusion that they were not. Statutes have been enacted by Congress and enforced for years without a suggestion having been made during the course of their passage or a suspicion having been aroused in the minds of those charged with the execution of them touching their constitutionality, only to be held void when eventually attacked before the judicial branch of the Government. The Missouri Compromise will readily occur to all as an instance of how the minds even of the most acute lawyers and students of the Constitution may fail to appreciate what in time is revealed as a fatal weakness in a statute.

Touching the other consideration adverted to, namely, the views advanced from time to time by Senators whose memories are revered and whose opinions upon the powers of this body under the Constitution are justly held in the highest respect, it is to be borne in mind in connection therewith that the question now before us, the continuing character of the Senate rules, has never been debated in or presented for determination by the Senate. It is absolutely new *res nova*, to use the language of the law.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will it bother the Senator if I ask him a question or two?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. By what authority, then, did the Senator from Delaware, Mr. Saulsbury, the President pro tempore of the Senate, call the Senate to order on the 5th day of March, if there is no usage that the officers of the Senate hold over?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. President, I shall canvass that a little later, and I am going to show to the Senate in the course of my remarks that any Senator could have performed that function.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator, then, contends that it is practically by unanimous consent, in the absence of objection?

Mr. WALSH. Pretty much so. The Senate was confronted with that situation exactly upon its first convening. The oldest Senator went to the desk and called the meeting to order, just the same as is done in a political convention.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think I can understand the Senator's view on that point. Just one more question, then. I am sorry to bother the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator contends—I have heard his contention before, as he has made it repeatedly in this body and with force, too—that the Senate is not a continuing body as a part of the Congress of the United States; but I have not yet heard the Senator contend that the Senate, as the executive council of the Nation, is not a continuing and unending body. If that is true, all of the Senator's argument has no application to the present situation, because this session is limited by the proclamation to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WALSH. If I do not canvass those considerations in the course of my remarks I will be very glad if the Senator from Georgia will challenge the attention of the Senate particularly to them by appropriate questions when I get through.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Montana, then, intends to cover these questions?

Mr. WALSH. I do; but if I do not deal with them so explicitly as to elucidate my views, I shall be very thankful to the Senator if he will address another question to me.

The debates in which the idea was expressed by Senators of great learning that the Senate is a "continuous body," or that its rules once adopted remain in force until amended or abrogated by affirmative action, afford intrinsic evidence that none of them gave the subject serious reflection or canvassed the consideration which impel the mind to a contrary conclusion. The most profound lawyers warn their clients against the acceptance of any views they may express without investigation, touching any debatable question of law, usually characterizing such contemptuously as a "curbstone opinion." May I ask you to disabuse your minds of any preconceived notion, to escape from the thraldom, which deference to usage long continued naturally imposes, to consider with me how far and in what sense the Senate is a continuing body?

As used in this connection the expression is intended to signify that the Senate as a constituent part of the Congress did not cease to exist as such when the Sixty-fourth Congress expired, to reassemble as an integral part of a quite distinct entity, the Sixty-fifth Congress. It embodies the idea of perpetual and continued existence on the part of the Senate, in character essentially different from the ephemeral life of the House.

But has not the entire history of this body, save in respect to the rules by which its proceedings have been guided, if any exception at all is to be made, been at war with any such theory? On the 4th day of March last, but 2 days ago, when the hands of the clock signified that the hour of 12 meridian had arrived, the Senator occupying the chair at the request of the Vice President, and in accordance, without doubt, with an understanding with that officer, without any direction from it, announced that the Senate stood adjourned sine die. By the mere lapse of time the body, as an organized assembly, had become functus officio. If it is, indeed, a "continuing body," why should the arrival of any particular time terminate its power to act? A majority of its Members were, on the occasion referred to, present on the floor. The successors of not a few of those whose terms were expiring, moved by curiosity or a desire to inform themselves concerning the procedure of the body of which they were about to become Members, were in the Chamber ready to take the oath.

The procedure on the occasion referred to was in conformity with that observed on the 3d day of March 1791, when the First Congress came to its end. The Constitution provides that—

"Neither House during the session of Congress shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days."

Congress having once convened, neither House can, except in defiance of the Constitution, quit, so long as the other insists upon continuing in session, until the 4th of March, in the odd-numbered year, arrives. Nominally a break will occur on the first Monday in December when, by another provision of the organic law, Congress is required to "assemble"; but, in fact, no interruption in the work of either Senate or House ensues in such a case. At the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the first Monday in December 1913, the Vice President announced the termination of the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and forthwith declared the second session convened. The work of the Senate proceeded as it had on the day previous. The first session of the First Congress came to a close on the 29th day of September 1789, agreeably to a joint resolution passed 3 days earlier. (1 Annals of Congress, 96.) But on the approach of the 4th day of March 1791, the Congress being in session, each House notified the other that it was about to adjourn sine die, and did so adjourn without either asking or receiving any consent from the other, each recognizing its inability longer to preserve its existence as a body vested with any authority under the Constitution. (2 Annals of Congress, 826.)

So complete is the revolution on the arrival of the 4th day of March, in the odd year, that under the uniform practice of the Senate, since its career began, all bills die. Though a measure had proceeded until it had reached the final stage of its consideration by this body, even though a vote had been ordered when the fateful hour of 12 of the 4th day of March of the odd-numbered year arrives, it falls, and the tedious course through which it has passed must be traversed again when Congress reconvenes. It is of no consequence when that time arrives what views may have been voiced in the Senate as it was constituted at the preceding session—how protracted or how exhaustive may have been the debate, what statesmanship may have characterized it. The Senate as a constituent part of the new Congress utterly ignores the action taken by its predecessor and proceeds as it did upon the assembling of the First Congress. Not so in the case of an adjournment and a reassembling of Congress within the 2-year period between the 4th day of March of any odd-numbered year and the same day 2 years later. In such a case every bill retains its status over the adjournment. The work of the session proceeds as if no interruption whatever had ensued. This practice, persisted in since the Constitution went into effect, under which each new Congress in both branches proceeds untrammeled by any action which may have been taken by its predecessor on any measures that may have come before it, plainly speaks of a prevalent and accepted theory that each Congress is an entity, possessing the same degree of independence as was enjoyed by the First when it assembled in 1789.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the procedure to which reference has been made is sanctioned by rule XXXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate as they have been observed in past Congresses. But that rule is but an expression of the practice which had been observed long before it first came into existence in 1868. It is merely declaratory in character, like the first clause of rule I, which directs that "in the absence of the Vice President the Senate shall choose a President pro tempore," a duty enjoined by the Constitution.

The idea of a "continuing" Senate is at war with the theory of parliamentary government the world over. It is an essential conception in such a system that at intervals representatives assemble in one or more houses, transact such business as demands their attention, and then as a legislative body pass out of existence, a new assembly coming into being in conformity with organic law, or at the call of the sovereign authority. The British Parliament is "dissolved" at the end of 7 years by operation of law, unless by the royal fiat its "dissolution" is accomplished earlier.

The Century Dictionary defines "dissolved" as "to disunite, break up; destroy, as any connected system or body; put an end to; as to dissolve a government; to dissolve Parliament."

On reassembling after a dissolution the House of Lords goes through all the formalities attendant upon reorganization. Every member takes the oath. The representative peers from Scotland and Ireland are admitted. The members are, for the greater part, the same. The Lord Chancellor is ready to exercise the duties of presiding officer reposed in him by the constitution, the subordinate officers, even, are all at hand, for even in the House of Commons these functionaries hold practically for life, their tenure being indeterminate, but there is a new Parliament. The House of Lords cannot be said to be a "continuing body." No one ever attempted to characterize it as such. It comes together at the call of the Crown. Writs are issued to every hereditary peer commanding his presence. At its pleasure the Crown dissolves the Parliament and dismisses the members of both houses. As a judicial body the House of Lords has permanency. As a part of the machinery of legislation it undergoes exactly the same dissolving process from time to time as does the House of Commons.

When the Senate is spoken of as a "continuing body" nothing more is meant or can be meant than that two-thirds of its Members remain in office at the expiration of each 2-year period; that is, that there is not a complete change in membership as is the case in the House every second 4th of March, treating Members reelected as new Members.

Reference has been made to the fact that the session of the Senate comes to an end on the arrival of the 4th day of March of each alternate year just as does the session of the House. The Senate cannot continue its existence, try as it may. It cannot reassemble except at the call of the President or upon the arrival of the succeeding first Monday in December. It can neither convene nor can it adjourn beyond 3 days of its own volition.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the Fortieth Congress assembled under a resolution.

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Fortieth Congress was assembled in exactly the way the Senator says cannot be done; that is, by resolution of the two Houses of the Thirty-ninth Congress.

Mr. WALSH. If by a resolution of the preceding Congress they assembled at a certain time it would be simply tantamount to adjournment over to that day.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know about that.

Mr. WALSH. And if they did adjourn for more than 3 days they did it in defiance of

the Constitution and not in accordance with it.

Mr. HARDWICK. That was after March 4.

Mr. WALSH. I cannot help that.

Mr. HARDWICK. But it makes a very vital difference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator will admit, I presume, that every Senator has the same capacity as a Member of this body and the same powers during his entire term. The status of a Member of the Senate does not change at any time during his term of 6 years.

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Whatever may be said in regard to the Senate, a Senator in an official capacity is a continuing official; the office of Senator is a continuous office. I should like to hear the Senator discuss the proposition: If the office of Senator is a continuing office and does not change in any respect during the 6 years of his term, how the body of which he is a Member can be said to be changed in that period of time. The two things, it seems to me, are indissoluble—membership in the body and the body itself. If the Members of the body have exactly the same nonvarying capacity and functions during the entire period of their term, which covers several Congresses, the body which gives them that capacity and authority must also continue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator briefly. I think that is not the correct view at all. There is a vast difference between the Members of the Senate and the Senate. Although a bill should be signed at the home of each of the Members of the Senate by every Member of the Senate it would not be a law. It must be enacted while the Senate is actually assembled in its customary place for the transaction of business. I am talking about the continuity of the Senate as an organized legislative body.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I ask one other question of the Senator? How can there be a member of a body unless there is that body in existence? How can there be membership in the Senate unless there is a Senate?

Mr. WALSH. The answer to that is that the same question may with equal propriety be directed to the House. How can there be a Member of the House of Representatives without a House of Representatives?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There cannot be, Mr. President. The House of Representatives is a continuing body during the term of office of its Members, and is not a continuing body when their term of office expires, but the difference between the House and the Senate is that there are always Members of the Senate covering the entire period of time, without ending or beginning.

Mr. WALSH. The plain answer to that is that the very moment the term of office of the sitting Members of the House of Representatives expires, that moment the term of office of their successors begins, and there never is any interval.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion at this time, that the instance which was cited by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Hardwick] is one which proves too much. If it be true that the Congress has the power, by resolution, to assemble itself without a call from the President, and that fact is of importance here, would it not also establish a continuing element in the House of Representatives as well as in the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Unquestionably.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me that it proves too much if it is at all applicable to the discussion.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I was not suggesting my entire approval of that proceeding, but the fact is that it has been done in the history of this Government just in that way.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not questioning the accuracy of the Senator's statement. I am merely saying that it proves too much if it is applicable, because it would convert the House as well as the Senate into a continuing body.

Mr. WALSH. It may occur to some that this paralysis which biennially overcomes the Senate is due to the fact that it cannot function in the absence of an organized House of Representatives. The Senate has on various occasions adjourned from day to day until the House solved some troubles attendant on the selection of a Speaker, the notion prevailing to some extent, that it could not proceed with the work of legislation until the other branch of Congress was duly organized, though courtesy alone might have prompted that course.

In the debate on the choice of a Public Printer at the first session of the Twenty-sixth Congress, in the year 1841, to which reference will be made more fully hereafter, and in the course of which the remark was frequently made that the Senate is a "continuing body," while the House is not, it was advanced, and with what appears to have been general acquiescence, that when the Senate alone is called in extra session it can exercise no legislative powers. The question has been discussed here on more than one occasion since. But the Constitution itself settles the question, for it provides, as was stated by the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday, that the President "may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them." He may, accordingly, convene the House of Representatives, which has no powers except those which are legislative in character. It certainly may act in a legislative capacity should it alone be called in extra session, and if it may, how can it be maintained that the Senate cannot?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to address myself to the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Thomas], and ask them this question: In their judgment, even though the President did not summon the Senate or the House, and even though there were not a constitutional provision providing a date for assembly, is it not the opinion of both the learned Senators that the representatives of the people could come in, take possession of their Chamber, organize, and proceed with the business of legislation in response to the commission of the people without regard to the fact that they were not called?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that if they all assembled and proceeded to the enactment of legislation which received the approval of the President of the United States, I am not prepared to say that they could not. Indeed, I apprehend that the action of the President would be regarded as tantamount to a proclamation assembling them. But, Mr. President, I have no doubt at all that if they did assemble under those circumstances, the President of the United States would be entirely justified in refusing to recognize them as authorized to transact any business.

Mr. LEWIS. Then may I ask my able friend to give me his view upon this question: Upon that theory, would we not be forced to the conclusion that until the President called them together they would have no right to come, and if we had a President who had purposes of his own in not calling the Congress, the people then would never have a Congress assemble to express their will?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all, Mr. President. The wise framers of the Constitution carefully guarded against that, because they provided that they should assemble at least once a year, on the first Monday in the month of December, unless the date of assembling should otherwise be fixed by law.

Mr. LEWIS. I thought I understood the able Senator from Montana to contend—and for that reason I rose—I must have misunderstood him—that this body ended unless called together by the President.

Mr. WALSH. Except on the first Monday in December. I so stated.

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HARDWICK, and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the Senator, for whose opinion I have the very highest esteem, whether he is strictly correct in his conclusion that if the House of Representatives should be assembled in special session it could legislate, in view of the constitutional provision which came upon Congress—not upon the House, not upon the Senate, but upon Congress—the power of legislating? How is it conceivable that one-half of Congress, however assembled, can legislate? It would certainly seem to me to be exceeding its constitutional authority. For that reason, I made the point of order yesterday against the bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge.

Mr. WALSH. And quite properly so, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. If the House is in session, one-half of Congress is in session; and the same is true of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. That is the argument that always has been advanced in favor of the contention that the Senate, convened in extra session, can exercise no legislative functions at all, because the legislative power is vested in Congress; but that provision must be considered in connection with the other, authorizing the President to convene the House of Representatives alone. Now, of course, the other House—the Senate—must give its concurrence either before or after the House of Representatives is assembled in extra session. There is not any question about that.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator is logical; but it does seem to me that the exact and literal conferring of power by the Constitution upon the Congress is not of a character that would justify the attempt to legislate by one half of that body when the other half is not in session.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not think that is a difficulty at all, because it is the Congress. When a bill receives the assent of the House of Representatives and receives the assent of the Senate, it has the assent of the Congress; and it does not by any means follow—at least, that is my view—that they must be actually in session concurrently.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. In connection with the Senator's statement that the Constitution provides that the President can call either House in extra session, and that the House of Representatives has no function except a legislative one, and therefore that the Senate can legislate, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the constitutional provision and ask his opinion as to whether that might have an important bearing on this particular question, which provides that the House of Representatives shall have the sole right to originate legislation providing for the raising of revenue. Now, it occurred to me that possibly our forefathers had that in mind when they put in the provision that the President could call the House in special session as well as the Senate—that the House might be called for the purpose of originating and passing, or at least getting ready for passage, laws relating to the raising of revenue; but if that was the only thing that was going to be done in the special session, if the Senate

were called at the same time, they could do nothing but wait until the House finished.

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that it had occurred to me that it is not at all improbable that they thought it would be in the interest of dispatch of the public business to assemble the House, when revenue legislation was necessary, a month or 2 months or 3 months before the general assembling of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wanted to suggest to the Senator a rather more important consideration than that, I think. The power to originate impeachment—a matter totally disconnected with legislation—resides in the House of Representatives. That is one character of business that the House may transact, with which the Senate, in the beginning at least, has nothing whatever to do.

Mr. WALSH. That consideration had also addressed itself to me; but I reached the conclusion that impeachment, like the passage of a bill, is absolutely a futile thing unless there is concurrent action by the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not see how the Senator could arrive at that conclusion, because the right to try out the question whether or not articles of impeachment shall be preferred must exist; and if the House decides negatively, the Senate has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. WALSH. Why, certainly. I assume that they are going to find the articles, however.

Mr. HARDWICK. But very often they do not.

Mr. WALSH. Very often they reject a bill, too.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand; but the power to consider the question is absolutely disconnected with any function of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I do not quite agree with that; but even if that were true I could scarcely believe that one could construe the provision granting power to the President to convene the House in extra session as being limited in its scope to the preferment of impeachment charges against an officer. I scarcely believe that that could have been in the minds of the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. That might be, if the Senator will pardon me, one of the most important things that could ever be brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that you might just as well claim that a grand jury could not find an indictment unless there was at the same time a petit jury impaneled to try the case, to try the case, to try the indictment.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think so. I do not think the analogy is perfect at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it may not be perfect, but still there is an analogy. The function of the House in finding an impeachment and the function of the Senate in trying it are analogous in some respects to the indictment by a grand jury and the trial of the indictment by a petit jury; and it seems to me that one can sit separate from the other in each case.

Mr. WALSH. This discussion has been in the nature of a diversion, Mr. President. I proceed.

The Senate was accordingly shorn of none of its legislative powers by reason of the fact that the House organization fell with the arrival of March 4 if the Senate is and remained a continuing body. But even if it were thus limited in its powers, why should it not remain in session and proceed with the executive business before it? Two treaties were pending at the time the Sixty-fourth Congress came to an end, one at least imperatively demanding the attention of the Senate. So imperative were its claims that in the estimation of many, the good faith of our Government toward a sister nation was compromised by further delay. Senators may differ as to the action that should be taken upon it; none can question the propriety of a speedy reply as to whether it is approved or not.

Owing to conditions on which it is not necessary to dwell, 1,134 nominations theretofore sent to the Senate by the President, many of them for offices of the highest importance, in view of the grave crisis confronting the country, were before it for consideration. Of these more than 1,100 had been reported upon by the committees to which they were referred and were on the calendar of the Senate awaiting its final action.

The President obviously did not think the Senate a "continuous" or "continuing" body, in any sense in which the House is not likewise continuing or continuous in character. It is quite apparent that he did not believe that the Senate might quite properly at noon on March 4 admit the new Members who should present themselves with no more interruption of the business of the Senate than attends the admission of a new Member elected or appointed in the midst of a session to fill a vacancy occasioned by death or resignation, and thereupon proceed with the executive business before it or with such as he might transmit. Anticipating that the session would terminate and that the Senate would become powerless to act at noon on March 4, he issued his proclamation on the 23d day of February last, requiring this body to reconvene in extra session on March 5. This he did in accordance with the understanding and the practice that has prevailed even from the days of the fathers. The Senate realized its impotency when the fateful hour arrived and dissolved without a protest, upon the affirmation by the occupant of the Chair, a profound lawyer, that under the Constitution the body stood adjourned sine die.

When it reassembled next day the acting President pro tempore, who called the assembly to order, caused the proclamation of the President to be read in evidence of its authority to be and to act. No Senator, however, emphatically he may today assert that the Senate is a continuing body, had sufficient confidence in the opinion he now expresses to suggest, on Sunday last, that the Senate remain in session after noon of that day to dispatch any business that might be before it, either executive or legislative.

Though the Vice President yesterday expressed somewhat hurriedly, though probably not without reflection, not only that the Senate is a continuous body but that the rules perpetuate themselves because it is such, he did not have the temerity to arrest the automatic dissolution of the session on Sunday. Some practical difficulties arising from the acceptance of the theory that the Senate is now without rules were suggested in the course of the comments by the Vice President, alluded to, among others, that he is, if that theory is sound, not the Vice President, apparently his view being that it would follow that his induction into office had not been legally accomplished. His right to preside depends to no extent on what transpired here on Monday. He was legally elected Vice President. He might qualify by taking the oath anywhere. The Senate has no power either to admit or to reject him as its Presiding Officer. The Senator who during the last session was elected President pro tempore called the Senate to order and administered the oath. Any Senator might have done either act without imperiling the validity of the proceedings. It has happened that there was neither Vice President nor President pro tempore, but that difficulty was easily solved. The majority Senator longest in service usually calls the Senate to order when it proceeds to organize. At the first session there could have been no President pro tempore to administer the oath, and even on assembling no Secretary to record the proceedings, no Sergeant at Arms to preserve order.

Here I might state a rather interesting historical fact, that the Senate on assembling for the first time was in session at least 3 or 4 days before it elected a Secretary.

The House of Representatives finds itself in that predicament as to the minor officers every 2 years. The embarrassments imagined by the Vice President are never appreciated by the House of Representatives, and such as they are they are met by every State legislative assembly—indeed, by both branches of every legislative assembly, on every occasion of their assembling except when they are convened in extra session.

Henry Clay insisted that the House of Representatives is as much a continuous body as is the Senate. He maintained that the same House that first convened in 1789 sat in 1841—its membership changed, changing, possibly, every 2 years, but remaining the same governmental agency. He likened the case to a court whose existence continues indefinitely, though the judges change from time to time. A court comprised of three judges would not cease to exist though the terms of all three expired at the same time instead of at intervals so that but one returned at a time. Their successors, should others be elected or appointed, would take the bench and the business of the court proceed without interruption. Senator Thurman took the same view. In the debate on the joint rules in 1876 he said:

"Why is it said that the Senate is a perpetual body? I know of no reason except one, and that is that only one-third of its Members go out every 2 years, so that there is always a sufficient number of Senators in office to constitute a quorum of the Senate. If the judges of the Supreme Court were all to die today, and their successors should be appointed tomorrow, it would still be the same Supreme Court, although the individuals would be changed. The Members of the House of Representatives are in a great measure different from those of the last House of Representatives, but still it is the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Its character does not depend on its personnel; its character does not depend on the individuality of its Members; it is the House, which, according to the true idea of the Constitution, is a perpetual House, whoever may constitute the individual Members of that House."

It has been seen that the idea of perpetuity as an inherent quality in the House, thus advanced by one of the most brilliant and by one of the most profound statesmen that has ever held membership in the Senate, has been definitely repudiated by the other branch of Congress. But the contention which they both put forth that, with respect to perpetuity or continuity, no distinction can properly be raised between the Senate and the House has never been answered.

The logical result of acceptance of that doctrine was pointed out by Senator Morton in the debate on the joint rules. Referring to the views expressed by Senator Thurman, he remarked:

"The argument of my friend from Ohio, I submit to him, defeats itself. He says the House of Representatives is a perpetual body just like the Senate. Well, the House of Representatives has always assumed that it made its own rules. It has adopted rules at the beginning of each Congress, showing that in its judgment the rules of the former House are not binding upon it. The two Houses stand upon the same footing, and that would be the law also in the Senate; the rules of the Senate at a former session are not binding at the next session, and the Senate consequently must adopt its rules at the beginning of every session."

The Senator must have meant to convey the idea that, conceding the soundness of Thurman's position, at the first session of each new Congress the Senate would be required to adopt rules. The analogy to

which Thurman had recourse is not perfect, as the House ultimately decided, because under the system in vogue at stated intervals corresponding with the times when the terms of all the Members of the House and one-third of those of the Senate expire, the authority of Congress automatically ceases, and its action must be invoked on reconvening by proceedings entirely new. It is not necessary to start anew all lawsuits that were pending at the time the judge's term expired. The work of the court is continuous, however the personnel of the bench may change. A court never undergoes any fatality either equivalent or analogous to a dissolution. In legislation it has been deemed wise to fix periods, corresponding usually with the terms of the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, after the lapse of which its authority ceases, the assembly when it reconvenes being bound in no way in respect to its proceedings by any action taken theretofore, and specifically by no rules deriving their force from such action, even though some of the members may be hold-overs. A "legislative period" as distinguished from a "session" is a common conception in parliamentary government.

In a late report of a committee of the House of Commons to inquire into procedure with a view to reforming the system in vogue in that body occurs the following:

"In continental parliament it is the common rule that at the beginning of a legislative period the chair should be occupied by the oldest member."

A table is given of the duration of standing committees in the legislatures of the leading countries in which parliamentary government prevails, in which the "legislative period" is contrasted with the "session."

The idea of a complete break in the life of legislative assemblies at stated intervals is implied in the very terminology applicable to their sittings.

This will be known as the Sixty-fifth Congress, and so designated in all the official records. I am sending to the desk a list, to which reference will be made hereafter, of official publications from which it will appear that in Iowa they refer to the "thirty-fifth general assembly," in Missouri to the "forty-seventh general assembly," in Utah to the "seventeenth legislature," and in Texas to the "thirty-third legislature." I hold in my hand an official publication of what purports to be the laws of the "Thirteenth General Assembly of Montana."

In harmony with the idea embodied in this form of expression, the custom of formally adopting rules on reassembling after a general election seems to be universal among the constituent bodies of American legislatures and is observed even by those, one-half of whose members or even two-thirds are hold-overs.

In New Jersey the members of the lower house are elected annually. As to the senate, the constitution provides that:

"The senate shall be composed of one senator from each county in the State, elected by the legal voters of the counties, respectively, for three years. As soon as the senate shall meet after the first election to be held in pursuance of this constitution, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the first year; of the second class at the expiration of the second year; and of the third class at the expiration of the third year, so that one class may be elected every year, and if vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, the persons elected to supply such vacancies shall be elected for the unexpired terms only."

Obviously the New Jersey Senate is constituted on identically the same principle that is said to give continuity to the United States Senate. Yet the former regularly observes the custom referred to, adopting rules at the beginning of each regular session. It was follow[illegible] in the sixty-eighth senate, 1912 (Journal, pp. 18, 19), in the sixty-ninth senate, 1913 (Journal, pp. 19, 20, 21), and in the seventieth senate, 1914 (Journal, pp. 10 to 13). The supreme court of that State has held, after the most elaborate argument and upon the fullest consideration, that notwithstanding the fact that two-thirds of the members of the Senate of New Jersey are hold overs, it is not a continuous body, but assembles annually, as does the lower house, as a body quite distinct from the senate of the preceding year. More will be said of this case hereafter.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does not that authority draw a distinction between that case and the Senate of the United States?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I am going to refer to that. I am going to show just what the distinction is that the judges seek to draw.

The resolution customarily, as in the National House of Representatives, proposes that the rules in force at the last preceding session be adopted until otherwise ordered, evidencing the view that such rules would not be operative without affirmative action on the part of the body thus adopting them. In nearly half the States of the Union members of the upper branch of the legislature are elected for terms double the length of those of the lower house, and are so classified as that one-half of them go out of office with each general change in the more numerous branch. Usually the lieutenant governor is made ex officio presiding officer of the upper house. Yet they all, apparently, adopt rules on assembling after a general election; in none is any countenance given to the idea that the rules adopted at some remote time, under conditions that might be characterized as primitive, are efficacious to prevent the representatives, coming fresh from the people, from carrying out their will with all due speed.

The memorandum sent to the desk a few moments ago contains a list of 21 States—half of the members of whose senates, respectively, are hold overs—in all of which the custom prevails, to which reference has been made. For convenience of verification, the page of the Senate Journal is given in each instance. I ask that the memorandum be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, what has been thus far offered may be said to be more or less technical in character. I should despair of securing acceptance of the views which have been advanced, however sound they might appear to those who have followed the discussion, as a matter of strict legal right, unless the conviction is aroused that elemental justice and sound policy demand their adoption.

Why should the Senate, as it is constituted during any particular Congress, have power to impose its views concerning the procedure in this body upon the Senate of some succeeding Congress, one-third of the Members of which, possibly, never heard of the rules to which they become subject? I appeal particularly to the new Members appearing upon this floor for the first time 2 days ago, and to you, Mr. President, and to my fellow Members in their behalf.

Why should such Members be bound by the so-called rule of unlimited debate which the Senate that assembled in the year 1806 deemed wise to adopt to regulate its deliberations? Is it consistent with the idea of representative government that they should be restrained by such a rule or by any rule to which their assent was never given and never asked? What is the theory upon which you decline to hold them bound by any action which the Senate, as constituted before they entered it, may have taken with reference to any bill? Why is it insisted that everything proceed de novo? What is the basis of reason underlying the want of power to proceed with all bills at the stage at which they had arrived at the death of one Congress upon the assembling of another? Clearly, because the people, whose representatives we are, have a right to have all measures that engage the attention of this body considered without prejudice on account of any action that may have been taken by a Senate whose course and record had made it odious, or which, for some other reason, had been regenerated so far as it was possible to make a change. It is because the new Members, coming fresh from the people, ought to have the right to be heard and be accorded the opportunity to vote in the light of information gleaned at every stage of the passage of a bill or resolution.

The formalities observed are enjoined by the rules and by general parliamentary law, so that through deliberation a wiser conclusion may more certainly be assured. Moreover the elections which bring an entirely new membership to the House and new Members to the number of one-third to the Senate are quite the equivalent of those which ensue in most countries upon a dissolution of the parliament. The sense of the people is taken concerning measures passed as well as those proposed. The result should not be without its lessons to those Senators who are to continue their service. All ought to act and be required to act in the light of the latest expression of the people. It is quite generally understood that the mere matter of the reference of a bill to one committee rather than to another occasionally signifies whether it is again to see the light of day or not. Neither the new Member nor the old Member whose views have changed to conform to the popular will ought to be required to acquiesce in the reference of a bill to an adverse committee. For like reasons the action of the Senate in the appointment of its committees goes for naught when it gets the regular infusion of new blood.

"Vacancies in the committees occasioned by the regular retirement of one-third of the Members are not filled up as they are in the event of the occurrence of such during the life of the Congress. They are constituted anew at the commencement of each Congress," to use the language of rule XXXIII. Treaties fall that are not acted upon at the adjournment of any final session of a Congress, though they preserve their status from one interim session to another (rule XXXVII). Can anyone assign any good reason why the Senate, as it begins the work of a new Congress, should be unrestrained by any action theretofore taken upon any bill or resolution or treaty or in the appointment of committees and yet be subject to the fiat of this assembly at some earlier day as to the method it is to pursue in dealing with bills or resolutions or treaties identical in every respect with those theretofore considered? The theory of the perpetuity of the rules subserves no good purpose and is a convenient one for the promotion of the ends of factional reactionaries.

It is well known that adroit parliamentarians in the service of corrupt masters of some of our legislative assemblies contrive speciously to have the rules so framed as to be useful in obstructing the enactment of remedial legislation and then tie the hands of later legislatures by procuring the hurried adoption, on organization, of the rules of the last assembly.

The idea I am combating is a refinement on this hoary but unhonored practice. It is fraught with a danger even more grave, illustrated by an incident in the history of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, whose senate is constituted, as will be remembered, upon the model of the National Senate. As a result of the elections held in the fall of 1893 the political complexion of the Senate of that State changed, though contests were instituted which, if successful, would preserve the status of the preceding year. A majority of the hold overs were Democrats.

These assembled in the customary meeting place and proclaimed themselves the duly organized senate. They set up the claim that the senate is a continuous body; that on assembling after the election the old members alone constituted the senate; that they alone could admit new members; that they alone were invested with the right to pass upon the credentials of the new members and to say which, if any, of two contesting for the same seat should be recognized pending the contest.

The conditions excited what appeared to be a well-grounded suspicion on the part of the Republican members of a plot to seat enough Democratic claimants to maintain the supremacy in the chamber of the party to which they adhered. The Republican hold overs organized, with their brethern newly elected, a separate assemblage which sat in the antechamber and claimed to be the only true senate. The rivalries of the two bodies became the subject of inquiry by the supreme court of that State which utterly exploded the claim of continuity, and with it the pretension of the majority hold overs that none might participate in the deliberations of the new senate, if so it may be called until admitted in due course by an assemblage of those whose terms had not expired and at such time as suited their convenience or their whim. The details will be learned from the report of the case *State* v. *Rogers*, 56 N. J. L., 480.

Will it be contended that on assembling after the 4th day of March in the odd-numbered years, two-thirds of the Members of the Senate of the preceding Congress may proclaim themselves the United States Senate, appoint from among their number a committee on credentials, charge it with the duty of examining into the credentials of all new claimants to seats in this body, and that meanwhile and pending a report from that committee it may proceed with the transaction of business? Such a procedure would not be an abuse of power but a usurpation.

Members presenting themselves Monday morning were sworn upon exhibiting their credentials, and immediately acquired the right to participate in all the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is the Senator from Montana referring to the present Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Montana himself during the session of the Senate of the last Congress rose in his seat and presented the credentials of his colleague [Mr. MYERS], who had been elected last November, and asked that they be received and entered upon the records of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. I did.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And was that not done.

Mr. WALSH. It was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Did not receiving the credentials of a Senator newly elected constitute an act of the old Senate and constitute a continuing membership?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. The credentials were turned over to the Secretary of the Senate here in open Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, why did he not wait until the convening and oganization of the Senate to which his colleague had been elected, and present the credentials to the Secretary of that body?

Mr. WALSH. I simply proceeded in accordance with the usage.

Mr. HARDWICK. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. It does not signify anything one way or the other, so far as I can see.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if he sees no advantage or convenience in the permanency and continuity of a set of rules for the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have never discovered that any disaster has come to the Republic by reason of the adoption of that idea in the House of Representatives. As I have tried to indicate to the Senate, the matter has been debated and debated, and the practice in the House has been both ways. Finally the House has come to the conclusion that the procedure now followed is the course that ought to be adopted.

Mr. STERLING. Are not the rules apt to be better known and better understood if we have continuous rules?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes. The Senator from South Dakota, however, need have no apprehension about that, because, of course, the rules as a complete body would remain practically unchanged. It is exactly the same with the rules of a court.

Mr. THOMAS. And of the House.

Mr. WALSH. The rules of a court change from time to time, but the bar generally understands that in any revision, as a whole, they would be continued in force, and that changes would be made only in specific cases in which a necessity for the change had been demonstrated by experience.

Mr. STERLING. Take it in general parliamentary practice or general parliamentary laws, is it not a great advantage and convenience that we recognize certain fixed rules as governing deliberative bodies?

Mr. WALSH. Undoubtedly. It is not to be assumed that the Senate, in modifying its rules, would disregard those fairly well-fixed principles.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I understand the Senator to say that no new Member of this body ought to be bound by the rules which had been enacted by a previous Senate. Then, a new Member may move to change the rules, may he not?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. And if, in the judgment of a majority of this body, the rules should be changed, they may be changed at any time?

Mr. WALSH. A new Member may move to change the rules; but just so long as the Senator from South Dakota has physical endurance to stand on the floor the change could not be made.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know as to that. It may appeal to the wisdom and the good judgment of the Senate that the one particular rule to which the Senator from Montana refers should be changed. It is a matter that may be brought before the Senate at any time. It, after all, rests in the judgment of the Senate, to be determined by a majority vote, whether that rule should be changed, whether or not it is a hindrance to legislation, or whether it is in the interest or not in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator resumes I should like to ask, if it would be agreeable to him, to have put into the RECORD the joint resolution adopted by Congress on January 22, 1867, which called a session of the new Congress to follow it on March 4, 1867.

Mr. WALSH. That would be agreeable to me, Mr. President, but I trust it will be put in at the conclusion rather than in the body of my address.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, I now ask consent that the joint resolution to which I have refered be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator, because it shows that heretofore Congress has used its power to call a session of Congress, and that it is not necessary for the President to do so.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is true that in the New Jersey case the court accepted without inquiry the oft-repeated assertion that the United States Senate is a continuous body, but pointed to some provisions of the local constitution which it said served to differentiate it from the senate of that State. But the whole argument of the court against the pretensions of continuity in the life of the New Jersey Senate is equally applicable to its counterpart in the Federal Congress.

The claim rests, in the case of both bodies, upon the fact that two-thirds of the Members, more than a quorum, are always in office, and that a presiding officer is designated by the law.

Mr. President, because I am obliged to leave, I want to submit a few observations now upon matters that will be under consideration, assuming that the view for which I am contending is rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair interrupt the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to remain in the position he has taken—that it is not any of his business what rules the Senate adopts and that he has no function except to carry out the will of the Senate—but take the old rules. The rule provides that no motion to suspend, modify, or amend the rules "shall be in order except on one day's notice," and so forth. The Senator is conversant with it. Is there any inconsistency in the fact that there are now rules of the Senate which, if they are to be amended in any particular, must be amended in accordance with the rules, and the broad proposition that a set of new rules may be presented as an entirety to take the place of the existing rules?

Mr. WALSH. I should say, quite so; the two are utterly inconsistent. If the old rules are in force——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not get the point the Chair would like to have the Senator enlighten the Senate upon.

Mr. WALSH. I shall attend very carefully.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What have the old rules of the Senate to do with the desire of the Senate to adopt new rules at once, if they want to, if they are presented as a whole, instead of as amendments?

Mr. WALSH. If new rules, as a whole, an entire body of new rules are presented—and that is what I have done; I have presented an entire body of new rules, which are identical with the old rules, with the exception of rule XXII—I have no doubt that some Senator will make a point of order that the motion is out of order; that my resolution contemplates an amendment of the rules; and that the rules can be amended only in accordance with their provisions. They must go——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has any Presiding Officer ever ruled in that way?

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Chair to say yesterday that in his view——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are rules here?

Mr. WALSH. That the old rules were in force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. My contention is that the body is now governed by general parliamentary law and not by the old rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are no old rules.

Mr. WALSH. That is to say, there are no old rules of the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not desire to break off the continuity of thought of the Senator from Montana or to interfere in this matter, but the Chair perceives a very great distinction between attempting to amend the rules or a part of the rules, and the presentation of a new set of rules to be adopted by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the parliamentary situation of a certain resolution introduced by the Senator from Montana. I will ask the Senator from Montana if he requested the reference of the resolution to a committee?

Mr. WALSH. If my view is correct, there is no committee to which it can be referred; indeed, I think that is the state of affairs

anyway—that, under the rules, there is no committee to which it can be referred.

Mr. STERLING. Would the Senator from Montana say that it should lie over until another day?

Mr. WALSH. Why, no. According to my view, I say it can be disposed of just as resolutions in a political convention are disposed of, governed by general parliamentary law. There is no rule that requires it to lie over anytime. That is the argument I have been making, that there is no rule, and the Senate now can proceed just as it directs with respect to the matter; and there is no rule except general parliamentary law governing its action.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Ohio will pardon me, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is exactly the situation that would obtain in the House of Representatives, if, upon the assembling of that body, some Member introduced a resolution.

Mr. STERLING. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana must admit that political conventions, to which he makes allusion, first adopt the rules governing the House of Representatives until they adopt their own rules of procedure; but in this case the Senator from Montana is assuming a status of legislative chaos. We have nothing practically——

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. I recognize that sometimes political conventions do adopt a resolution of that kind; but more often they do not. They simply proceed, and Roberts' Rules of Order or Reed's Rules of Order are referred to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. WALSH. And Jefferson's Manual is referred to; so that no resolution on the subject of rules is adopted at all.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I want to ask the Senator from Montana another question.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will pardon me, of course assemblages of all kinds gather in this country, farmers' meetings, teachers' institutes, and all that kind of thing, and they proceed quite successfully without the adoption of any rules.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, all bodies start out with a temporary organization, and adopt some recognized rules of procedure. I want to ask the Senator from Montana if he holds that there is anything to impede a change of the rule which he has in mind if the Senate accepts its recognized rules and proceeds in regular order to make the change?

Mr. WALSH. If I am sound in my opinion, it is simply impossible to change the rules so long as one man has the physical endurance requisite to prevent the change. I offered a resolution this morning which contemplates a change of the rules. Under the rules, if they do exist, any Senator may debate that motion without end and without limit; one may raise a point of order that debate upon the matter is out of order, and if the Chair should sustain that point, and assuming that the old rules are in force and that we are proceeding in accordance with them to secure an amendment, an appeal is taken, the appeal may be debated without end, and thus the amendment of the rules is frustrated.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana and I are agreed as to the object aimed at. I am quite content to say that I favor some modified form of cloture rule; but the point I want to make is, that where the sentiment of this body is favorable to a change of the rules no dilatory tactics can long obtain in opposing that change of the rules.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has not been here as long as some of us.

Mr. HARDING. That is quite true; I admit that; but I am not ready to accept the soundness of the Senator's argument, that this is not a continuing body; and I cannot accept the contention that we must first enter into a state of chaos in order to bring about the reform which the Senator seeks.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Montana stated, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterling], that, in his opinion, there were no committees now. I will remind the Senator that Senator Kern introduced a resolution, which passed this body, continuing in force the committees of the Senate as they then existed. So that there are committees now in existence.

Mr. HARDING. If the Senator from Montana will not be annoyed at another interruption——

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. HARDING. If there are no committees continued, I should like to know by what process the Committee on Rules authoritatively designates what apartments the several Senators shall occupy?

Mr. OVERMAN. I say that the committees have been continued in force by the action of this body.

Mr. HARDING. I think that very wise——

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand the statement of the Senator from Ohio as to the activities of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARDING. I asked if there were no committees now, by what authority could the Committee on Rules designate to the new Senators their apartments in the Senate Office Building?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will excuse me just a moment, I will read the resolution which was adopted by the Senate on motion of Senator Kern, of Indiana. It is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress, or until their successors are duly elected."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, that resolution indicates that the committees are in existence by virtue of a special act of the last Senate, and not because they continued under the rules, the existence of which is now being challenged by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I thought some Senator might rise and say that I was exceeding my authority in assigning rooms to the new Senators, and, inasmuch as the Senator from Montana said there were no committees, I desired to direct his attention to the resolution which has been adopted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think every one will acquiesce in the course of the Senator from North Carolina in the matter to which reference has been made. Likewise, Mr. President, the adoption of the resolution immediately suggests that it was the opinion of the Senate that the committees would die unless some action were taken continuing them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is another obstruction to a change in the rules. Under the old rules, as they have been interpreted by this body several times within the last few years, the Senate has decided under rule XL that it requires a two-thirds vote, even when we get the question up to a vote, to suspend or to modify any rule of the Senate. The Senate, by its interpretation, has written that into the rules, although from the language of the rule itself it would seem that a majority should control. The rule is as follows:

"RULE XL. SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

"No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII."

As will be observed, there is absolutely nothing in the rule that can possibly be construed as fairly implying the requirement of a two-thirds vote, but the Senate has unfortunately decreed otherwise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has not so decided. The requirement as to a two-thirds vote relates to a suspension of the rules, and not to a modification of the rules.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me for a moment, as I am obliged to leave the Chamber shortly, I desire to say that earlier in the day I presented a number of memorials from the Montana Legislature. I overlooked the fact that by resolution of the preceding Congress, the committees of this body had been continued. I asked that the memorials lie on the table. I now ask unanimous consent that they be referred to the appropriate committees to which they pertain.

Mr. WALSH. I shall object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There seems to be objection.

Mr. WALSH. I think they can very well remain where they are until we actually get to work.

But let it be assumed that the argument thus far made cannot be accepted, that the Senate is indeed a continuous body in the widest sense; that the rules are endowed with a vitality, upon which age makes no inroads. I trust I am not wanting in reverence for the political sages of a century ago whose wisdom in all things that appertain to government has commanded the admiration of a grateful posterity.

It may be that we are obliged generally to accept for our guidance the rules they prescribed in 1806 to govern the deliberations of the Senate; that we are required, in a double sense, to salute them as—

"The dead but sceptered sovereigns, who still rule
Our spirits from their urns."

I venture to assert, notwithstanding, that their power to make rules was not without limitation. The Supreme Court defined the limitation in *United States* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 5, 6), saying in the opinion in that case:

"The Constitution empowers each House to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result sought to be attained."

The Senate, on the 13th day of January 1915, recorded its judgment that under the rules then recognized, a two-thirds vote was necessary to the suspension of the rule. A majority determined that two-thirds must assent to accomplish a suspension. It is not so expressed in the rule—rule XL. But it was believed to be implied therein. If so, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that it is equally implied that a two-thirds vote is necessary to amend the rules. Let it be assumed that the wise men, whose work these rules are expressly so declared in what is now rule XL. Had they the right to make such a rule? Would it have any efficacy? Would it be entitled to any respect at any time or place? If they had such right, they might, with equal power, whatever might be said

as to the justice or propriety of their action, have prescribed that the rules should not be amended except with the concurrence of three-fourths of the Members or nine-tenths or 99 percent, or that like the laws of the Medes and Persians they should remain immutable forever. Any such regulation would be void because it would transgress the vital principle of majority rule. When the Constitution says that "Each House may determine its rules of proceeding," it means that each House may, by a majority vote, a quorum being present, determine its rules.

It is elementary that unless otherwise prescribed by the Constitution the Senate can, by a majority vote, do anything it can do at all. Speaker Reed says in his manual, speaking of amendment to the rules of parliamentary bodies:

"Such modifications the assembly is always competent to make. Such changes can be made by a majority. This is true even if the rules already adopted provide that two-thirds or any larger number alone shall make changes. The assembly cannot deprive itself of power to direct its method of doing business. It is like a man promising himself that he will not change his own mind."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. As I understand, the gravamen of the Senator's contention is that he wishes some cloture for the ending of debate; and I judge from what he has said that he presumes that the proposal to amend a rule would cause contention which would finally result in a test of physical endurance. Now, if the Senator proposes new rules, does he propose to muzzle the Senate so that they shall not debate them? And if they are new rules, is there anything to prevent debate on every one of those rules by the Senate and by every Member of it? Does he think he would gain any time in the long run by declaring that we are in chaos and without rules, and undertaking to build up an entirely new set of rules rather than by taking up the offensive rule and amending it?

That is the practical question. I am not entering into the elementaries of the matter.

Mr. WALSH. I want to answer the question in a perfectly practical way. I shall assume, as I said a while ago, that the rules will be in substance the same; that there will be no great change in the general body of the rules.

Mr. WARREN. I am putting it right down upon the basis of the Senator's argument that we are totally and wholly without rules; that we will start in to adopt new rules. If that is true, no matter if every rule but one is the same as the Senator presents it, yet every one of them is open to debate, if it is offered as a new matter.

Mr. WALSH. Why, undoubtedly—undoubtedly.

Mr. WARREN. Then does the Senator think, practically, that he would gain any time in that way rather than simply to recognize the old rules and seek to amend the particular one in question?

Mr. WALSH. But the Senator from Wyoming will recognize that if a resolution were presented here to amend only one rule, under the existing system every man who cares to do so may get up and talk about each rule from beginning to end; so they all are before us anyway.

Mr. WARREN. I will admit that under the rules there is practically unlimited debate, but what I am getting at is this: The Senator has evidently given this matter great attention, and has proceeded with great ability, as he always does with all matters that challenge his attention; but I cannot practically see where we are going to eliminate ourselves any sooner from the condition in which the Senators and the Senate find themselves if we adopt his theory that we are meeting here each time, every 2 years, without rules; because as the Senator from Ohio has said, every body, when it meets, assumes the rules of some other body until it makes its own; and with two-thirds of the older body sitting as present Members, is it not better to assume the rules of the body wherein the two-thirds have helped to make those rules than to undertake to say we have none, or to assume the rules of some other body?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Wyoming will note that the resolution to which I am addressing myself provides that all of the rules of the Senate during the last Congress be adopted as the rules of the present one, save and except rule XXII.

Mr. WARREN. Then to what effect is the Senator's argument leading, that we have no rules, and that we are building up new ones?

Mr. WALSH. It is to the effect that as we have no rules we proceed under general parliamentary law which permits to put an end to debate at some time.

Mr. WARREN. Well, we will do that, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I think I see what the Senator from Wyoming is driving at. It is within the power of this or any other body, unless the rules forbid, to fix a time when a vote can be had upon any question. It is within the power of this body now to vote to fix a time for voting upon this very proposition at 2 o'clock, so there is no practical difficulty in the way.

Mr. WALSH. That is the line of argument which I am now going to make—that a legislative body cannot deprive itself of the power to fix a time when a vote shall be taken.

Mr. WARREN. I understand from the Senator, then, that he proposes to accept entire and en bloc the Senate rules, with one exception?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; and that in the expectation that when that exception is reserved, and an appropriate rule is made, we can then proceed with reasonable dispatch to correct any defect that there may be in other features of the rules.

Mr. WARREN. I wish the Senator to understand that I do not object to some manner of procedure that may terminate what sometimes becomes intolerable; but I am not willing yet to take the ground that every 2 years we are at sea without rudder or compass regarding rules.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I am thankful to the Senator for the attention he has given to my presentation of the other view of the matter.

Mr. HARDING and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio, who first rose.

Mr. HARDING. I want to ask the Senator from Montana a question. I do not want him to misconstrue my motive, or to think that the proposition is founded on the fortunes of political majorities in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator need have no fear on that score.

Mr. HARDING. The Senator spoke a moment ago of the framers of the Constitution having the purpose that the Senate should be directed by the will of the majority. I assume that the Senator will agree that it was also designed that the Senate should be a deliberative body. I want to ask him, in perfect good faith, if he believes the framers of the Constitution had in mind at any time the domination of the majority through a majority in political conference or caucus, whereby a minority of this body could determine the proceedings of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I cannot doubt that the framers of the Constitution had in mind the fact that they were framing a system under which party government would be operative, and in that view they must have recognized that party members would confer and endeavor to agree upon a concerted line of action. I cannot doubt that. Their model was the English Constitution; experience had taught them that there were two parties in the Parliament and that the two parties were composed of members who conferred together and usually agreed upon a certain line of action which they desired to pursue.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I am in perfect accord with the Senator from Montana in his statement that we are a Government through political parties. I think that ever must be so, and I hope it will be so. I want to ask the Senator, however, if he is contending for a rule of the majority which will allow a majority in caucus to direct the majority in the Senate to come in here with a previous-question proposition which will deny the minority of the Senate the right of debate?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana would not think for a moment of advocating any course the tendency of which would be to shut off legitimate debate; but I am sure the Senator from Ohio will have recognized in very recent events and in the proceedings of recent Congresses the necessity for shutting off something that is a mere pretense of debate.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, if I may reply to that, I am again in accord with the Senator from Montana; and I have the abiding faith that a conservative cloture rule can be made a rule of this body along the lines of regular procedure for the amendment of the rules, without adopting a chaotic condition here wherein a majority of the Senate can fix the rules.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio that any chaotic condition would ensue, but I join with him in the hope that a reasonable cloture rule may be adopted; and it is in view of the likelihood of the submission of such that I am now addressing the Senate upon the question as to whether, when it is before us, it will be possible under the rules as they exist—assuming that they continue—for a Senator to stand here and simply pretend to debate, and hold up the proceedings of the Senate until he drops in his tracks from physical exhaustion. I want to address myself to that question for a few minutes.

A majority may adopt the rules, in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them. A court would make itself the subject of ridicule that should attempt to adopt rules one of which should provide that they could be changed only by a vote of two-thirds of the judges. It would not be tyrannical to make such a rule; it would be futile. The court, when wiser men graced the bench, would contemptuously, by a majority, set it aside. It is scarcely less preposterous that a legislative body should by rule deny itself the right to bring debate to an end and to proceed to a vote; nay, that it should by rule provide that so long as any Member should hold the floor and pretend to debate there should be no vote; that though such pretense should be persisted in until it became a hollow mockery, a transparent sham, a subject of open raillery and jocularity, there should be no vote; that so long as there remains one Member with physical strength to keep the floor there should be no vote.

In the course of debates in this body in which the remark has been unreflectingly made, frequently, that the Senate is a continuous body and that the rules continue in force from Congress to Congress, they have been likened to the rules of a court that remain in force whatever changes ensue in the personnel of the judges.

The inaptness of the illustration has been adverted to. But continue the comparison. Suppose a rule of court expressly authorized counsel to be heard ad libitum, what reverence would be paid to it in the face of an abuse of the right by council who undertook

to talk against time? Would not any court make itself contemptible by recognizing any force in such a rule? To make the parallel more perfect, let it be assumed that the rule forbade any decision so long as any member of the bench desired to talk. Would not the court be declining to discharge the functions reposed in it by the Constitution by refusing to decide, after a reasonable time for investigation had elapsed and a reasonable opportunity had been given to every justice to make known his views and to convert his brethren to his way of thinking? To delay justice is to deny justice. The judge who heeded such a rule, after becoming satisfied that the due proceeding of the court was being arrested to await adjournment or a change in its composition, or some other fortuitous circumstance that might avert the impending judgment, would be guilty of a violation of his oath to administer justice without delay.

I assert unhesitatingly that the Senate has no power to make a rule which will prevent it from bringing debate to a close or setting a time for a vote. That there are limitations upon the exercise of the right to bring on a vote may be conceded, but to maintain that a rule has any virtue under which one man may, by his physical prowess alone, defeat a vote is to invite calamity unspeakable and expose the Senate to the well-deserved contempt of mankind.

Reflecting upon this queston being discussed, I wrote 2 years ago as follows:

"Much has been said recently of preparedness and the subject promises to engage the earnest thought of Congress.

"The people whom, in our feeble way, we are trying here to represent are evidently resolved to take upon themselves burdens for providing and maintaining a Naval and Military Establishment greater than ever heretofore borne in time of peace, and rivaling those rendered necessary by the exigencies of the Civil War. A genuine alarm pervades the country lest some enemy may, in the very near future, attack us. Imagine the time at hand and the foe bearing down upon us. The crisis involves the very life of the Nation. The occasion brooks no delay. Action—immediate action—by Congress is imperative. Congress is empowered by the Constitution to declare war. Congress it is, that is to raise and support armies. Congress is to provide and maintain a Navy. Congress is to provide for calling forth the militia to repel invasions and to organize armies and discipline them to that end. Congress it is that must lay and collect taxes to meet the expenditures of war and that must borrow money on the credit of the United States for the vigorous prosecution of war. It is scarcely conceivable that war should be precipitated or be impending without an appeal from the President, both in his civil capacity and as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces of the Nation, for some hurried action by Congress. Such an appeal comes to this body. It finds a ready response except from a small coterie of Senators, who spell each other on the floor until the enemy thunders at the gates of our cities, and the Republic has had its death blow. They may be honest but misguided peace-at-any-price men, who refuse to believe that war is inevitable, and continue to hope that the awful horror of armed conflict may be averted by further peaceful overtures.

"Multitudes of sagacious men believed in 1861 that the South would not fight and others that the North would never resort to arms to preserve the Union. It is not inconceivable that the obstructionists—filibusterers—may be actuated by traitorous sentiments. The Revolution had its Arnold. I trust I offend no sensibilities in referring to the fact that in 1861 10 or more Members of this body were expelled for treason. A Vice President of the United States who, for 4 years presided over the Senate, was indicted and tried for treason, and a Senator, charged with him for this capital offense, escaped expulsion by but one vote. The Senate had already at that early day expelled one of its Members for perfidious negotiations with the enemies of his country. We are all sworn to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States—a needless oath unless it be that some of us may, conceivably, require the aid of Heaven to keep us true.

"What say you? Can the Senate make a rule under which it may be held at bay by treachery until a foreign foe shall have prevailed over a supine nation?"

I repeat, a rule of the Senate, the effect of which is or may be to deprive it of the power, under any circumstances, of bringing debate to a close, is void. Mr. President, I am not one of those who, being balked by some law, organic or otherwise, would ruthlessly, having the power, sweep it aside to attain his end. Reverence for law is the sure foundation upon which government and society alike rest. If in our conduct it is not inculcated, where shall we look to find it exhibited? I shall vote with a clear conscience that we violate no law, even assuming the old rules remain in force, so far as they are valid, in fixing a time at which debate on any subject before this body shall close.

"APPENDIX A

"DISCONTINUOUSNESS OF STATE SENATES IN THE LIGHT OF THEIR ACTION ON RULES

"Rules of the previous senate were adopted temporarily, with or without amendment, by 27 State senates, namely:

"Arkansas, thirty-eighth session, 1911. Journal, p. 6. (In the thirty-ninth session, 1913, 'suspension of the rules' took place shortly before the adoption of the rules. Journal, pp. 7, 8.)

"California, fortieth session, 1913. Journal, p. 5.

"Colorado, eighteenth session, 1911. Journal, p. 19.

"Delaware, regular session, 1911. Journal, p. 46.

"Florida, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 3.

"Georgia, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 10.

"Iowa, thirty-fifth general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 8.

"Louisiana, third general assembly under constitution of 1898, 1908. Journal, p. 6.

"Maine, seventy-sixth legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 13.

"Massachusetts, regular session, 1915. Journal, p. 5.

"Minnesota, thirty-eighth session, 1913. Journal, p. 8.

"Missouri, forty-seventh general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 4.

"Montana, thirteenth general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 5.

"New Hampshire, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 12. (A particular inquiry respecting New Hampshire warrants the additional statement that the practice was the same in 1911 and 1909. Journals, pp. 6, 6.)

"North Carolina, regular session, 1911. Journal, p. 8.

"North Dakota, thirteenth general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 31.

"Ohio, eightieth general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 9.

"Oregon, twenty-seventh legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 13. (These rules had been 'recommended' to the previous senate.)

"Pennsylvania, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 11.

"South Dakota, fourteenth session, 1915. Journal, p. 6.

"Tennessee, fifty-eighth general assembly, 1913. Journal, p. 9.

"Texas, thirty-third legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 9.

"Utah, tenth legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 4.

"Vermont, regular session, 1912. Journal, p. 6.

"Washington, thirteenth legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 6.

"West Virginia, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 160. (There had been a deadlock over the presidency of the senate.)

"Wyoming, thirteenth legislature, 1913. Journal, p. 7.

"In 17 senates the rules of the previous senate were adopted at or near the time of organization without being characterized as temporary:

"Arizona, first special session, 1912. Journal, p. 32.

"Connecticut, regular session, 1911. Journal, p. 9.

"Indiana, sixty-eighth session, 1913. Journal, p. 6. (However, no action upon the resolution concerned is shown. The same is true of a similar resolution at the sixty-seventh session, except that its passage receives mention in the index. Journal, p. 7.)

"Kansas, eighteenth session, 1913. Journal, p. 26.

"Maryland, January session, 1914. Journal, p. 15.

"Michigan, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 11.

"Mississippi, extra session, 1914. Journal, p. 5.

"Nebraska, thirty-third session, 1913. Journal, p. 57.

"Nevada, special session, 1912. Journal, p. 3.

"New Jersey, seventy-first senate and one hundred and thirty-ninth session of the legislature, 1915. Journal, pp. 17–20.

"New Mexico first State legislature, second session, 1913. Journal, p. 9.

"New York, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 15. (The regular session of 1911 provided that pending adoption of rules the order of business prescribed in rule 1 of the 1910 rules be adopted. Journal, p. 9.)

"Oklahoma, extra session, fourth legislature, 1912–1913. Journal, p. 5.

"Rhode Island, regular session, 1914. Journal, v. 8, No. 1, p. 2. (Proposed amendments to 'the rules of the senate' had been defeated just before.)

"South Carolina, regular session, 1913. Journal, p. 18.

"Virginia, extra session, 1915. Journal, p. 11.

"Wisconsin, fiftieth session, 1911. Journal, pp. 62–63. (Some minor business not related to organization had been transacted before. At the fifty-first session, 1913, the resolution was introduced, but its passage appears only by implication.)

"In three senates rules were duly adopted, but without being characterized (at any stage), either as temporary or as taken from a previous senate:

"Alabama, regular session, 1911. Journal, p. 97. (Rules were adopted on the fourth day as then reported from a standing committee appointed on the first. The resolution for the appointment of this committee was passed under 'suspension of the rules.' Journal, pp. 7, 13.)

"Idaho, twelfth session, 1913. Journal, p. 4.

"Illinois, forty-seventh general assembly, 1911. Journal, p. 7.

"One senate adopted rules which it characterized as temporary but not as taken from a previous senate:

"Kentucky, regular session, 1912. Journal, p. 13. (These were Roberts' Rules of Order. At the session of 1914 the same resolution was introduced, and a week later a set of rules was adopted. Journal, pp. 17, 141.)

"While the adoption of rules stands recorded in the journals of certain sessions only by implication, if at all, there is no State senate whose journals do not furnish valid evidence that such action forms part of the recognized program. In the case of every State senate, definitely recorded adoption of rules can be found without looking far.

"APPENDIX B

"Ch. X. An act to fix the times for the regular meetings of Congress.

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in addition to the present regular times of meeting of Congress there shall be a meeting of the Fortieth Congress of the United States, and of each succeeding Congress thereafter, at 12 o'clock meridian on the 4th day of March, the day on which the term begins for which the Congress is elected, except that when the 4th of March occurs on Sunday, then the meeting shall take place at the same hour on the next succeeding day.

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That no person who was a Member of the previous Congress shall receive any compensation as mileage for going to or returning from the additional session provided for by the foregoing section.

"Approved January 22, 1867."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the Senator from Montana whether he put in the RECORD the New Jersey case?

Mr. WALSH. No; I did not.

Mr. OVERMAN. Would the Senator object to putting it in, and also the dissenting opinion?

Mr. WALSH. I will be very glad if that order will be made.

APPENDIX B

1. STATE V. ROGERS (56 N. J. L. 480 (1894))

This case is discussed in Senator Walsh's speech. He was apparently concerned that the case would be cited as authority for the proposition that the Senate of the United States is a continuing body, and he attempted to dispose of it by pointing out that all the arguments against continuity made by the court were equally applicable to the Senate of the United States.

The case arose because, after an election in which many Republicans were elected, the Democratic hold-over Senators alone attempted to pass on the credentials of the new Senators, on the ground that the holdovers were a body in existence. The Republicans organized a rival Senate, and the case was brought to determine the validity of the proceedings.

Senator Walsh was under the impression that the New Jersey court had said flatly that the Senate of the United States was a continuous body. We do not so read the case. The court said that even if the United States Senate were a continuing body, the New Jersey Constitution did not have the same meaning. The latter provided that each county was entitled to one senator, and the court argued that unless each senate could organize anew, the counties would not be equally represented.

The relevant portion of the court's opinion is quoted below:

"The first and most elaborate argument pressed with such force and earnestness upon the attention of the court by the learned Attorney General and his able associate, Mr. McDermott, was grounded almost entirely upon the fact that the clause in the constitution of the State, that gives to the membership of the Senate a continuity of life by a succession of members in such a way that provides for the continued presence of a quorum of the body, was a transcript of a similar provision in the Federal Constitution, and it was thereupon further insisted that the language of the regulation so adopted had, before its adoption, a settled meaning, denoting the permanent existence of the body regulated by it.

"If we were to assume the truth of the foregoing statement in all its parts, no one could doubt that the reasoning founded upon it would be entitled to great weight. It cannot be denied that the section is, in substance, a copy of a clause of the same import in the Constitution of the United States, and if the clause so imported had antecedently received an authoritative interpretation, it would be but reasonable to infer that the framers of our organic law, many of whom were jurists of great learning and experience, understood the provision in the sense thus impressed upon it. Under such circumstances, no other conclusion would be at all rational. The "rule is well settled," says this court in the case of *Fritts* v. *Kuhl* (22 Vroom 191), "that where a statute or a constitutional provision of a doubtful import has been adopted in one State from the statutes or constitution of another State, after a practical construction has been given to the language by judicial decision, it will be presumed that the interpretation adopted in the State from which it is taken has been adopted as well as its words."

"If, therefore, counsel on this occasion are justified in predicating that the clause under criticism had acquired, in the manner indicated, a settled signification at the time in question, it must be admitted that this would be the sense in which it should be now read and understood.

"But upon careful examination of the subject, I am satisfied that the assumption in question is wholly without basis. So far as I have ascertained, no person, whether text writer, jurist, or statesman, has ever asserted that the clause under discussion bears the force and meaning now for the first time imputed to it. And it would have been singular indeed if any critic had ventured to express such an opinion, for the constitutional provision obviously would refuse to bear such treatment. The expressions employed do not in any degree import the continuance of the Senate itself, but simply provide for the succession and length of the terms of the Members of that body. It is true that, by providing an always-existent membership, the clause imparts to the body the potentiality of a permanent existence, but it does not impart to the body such continuous vitality. I think it is safe to say that never, on any occasion, has it been suggested that the clause has any further reach than this. The Senate of the United States has been declared to be a permanent body, and when the subject was under discussion it was on all sides assumed that the section in a Federal Constitution from which, as has been stated, our own has been copied, gave to the Senate an aptitude for a continuous existence, but it was never alleged that it was possessed of any further effect. The vivifying force that was infused into the body thus made capable of receiving it was looked for and discovered in other constitutional adjustments, and especially in the provision that gave to the Senate an always-existing presiding officer. This is a factor mentioned and relied on by everyone who has written upon the subject, and, similarly, it has been the principal argument in all debates relating to the longevity of the Senate. It was deemed that permanency of the Presiding Officer constituted the permanency of the body itself, as, by such a constitution, there was no necessity for periodical reorganizations.

"It is obvious, therefore, that the construction put upon the National Constitution can have but little effect in an effort to construe our own. The problems are differently conditioned, so that the solution of one of them will afford but slender assistance in the solution of the other. We must construe our own constitution exclusively by its own lights."

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES TO SENATE AS A CONTINUING BODY

There are numerous references to the Senate as a continuing body. Usually, these references have been made in passing in connection with a brief description of the typical organizational meeting of the Senate in a new Congress.

The following is a list of some of the most important of such references:

Bryce, American Government and Politics: "The Senate * * * a permanent body" (p. 103).

Beard, American Government and Politics: "The Senate * * * in being a continuous body" (p. 109).

H. C. Lodge, Senate of the United States: "The Senate has never required reorganization since the beginning of the Government" (p. 11).

Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration: "It (the upper House) meets fully organized and provided with rules determining its methods of procedure" (p. 243).

Cushing, Legislative Assemblies: "Senate is a continuous and permanent body" (p. 104).

Wilson, Congressional Government: "In order that its life may be perpetual, one-third of its membership is renewed or changed every 2 years, each third taking its turn at change or renewal in regular succession; and this device has, of course, an appreciably weakening effect on the legislative sinews of the Senate" (p. 22).

Senator Buchanan, in 9 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE 340, during debate on dismissal of printers:

"An old Senate and a new Senate. There could be no new Senate. This was the very same body, constitutionally, and in point of law, which had assembled on the first day of its meeting, in 1789. It had existed without any intermission, from that day until the present moment, and would continue to exist so long as the Government should endure. It was emphatically a permanent body, its rules were permanent, and were not adopted from Congress to Congress, like those of the House of Representatives. For many years after the commencement of the Government, its Secretary was a permanent officer, though our rules now require that he should be elected at stated intervals. The Senate always had a President, and there were always two-thirds of its actual Members in existence and generally a much greater number. It would be useless to labor this question. Every writer, without exception, who had treated on the sub,ect, had declared the Senate to be a permanent body. It never dies; and it was the sheet-anchor of the Constitution on account of its permanency."

Hayes, Senate of the United States: "* * * is a continuing body" (p. 341).

APPENDIX D

Subject: State senates as continuing bodies.

1. Which State senates are continuing bodies? None.

In *Robertson* v. *Smith* (1886) (109 Ind. 79, 123; 10 N. E. 582, 603), one judge, in a concurring opinion, asserted that: "The Indiana Senate is not, like the Senate of the United States, a continuing body * * * In the senate of this State, two-thirds of its members go out of office at the end of each legislative term of 2 years * * *, it becomes at the end of each legislative term a disorganized body. * * *"

The Supreme Court of California has asserted that *McGrain* v. *Daugherty,* op. cit., is the only case upholding the principle that the upper house of a bicameral legislature, the members of which are elected on a staggered basis, is a continuing body. The California Senate, it maintains, cannot be held to be a continuing body "under the theory of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty.* An interim committee created by the California Senate, if instructed to function after adjournment of the California Legislature, "would not be reporting back to a senate which is a continuous body," inasmuch as "50 percent of the senators are elected anew each 2 years" and there would not be "present a 'majority'

of the membership of the body appointing that committee."—*Petition of Special Assembly Interim Committee, etc.* (1938) (13 Cal. (2d) 932, 935; 90 P. (2d) 304, 308); *Swing* v. *Riley* (1939) (13 Cal. (2d) 513; 83 P. (2d) 938, 940–941; 90 P. (2d) 313, 315).

In *State ex rel. Werts* v. *Rogers* (1894) (56 N. J. L. 480; 29 A. 726; 29 A. 173; 23 L. R. A. 354), a majority of the New Jersey Appellate Court ruled that the Senate of New Jersey, as then organized, was not a permanent, continuous body, such that the old or holdover members are entitled to pass upon the title of the newly elected members; but the latter are entitled to enter the body, since the Constitution appoints a day on which the two houses shall meet separately, imposing the duty of yearly organization and also provides that the senate shall be composed of one senator from each county, thus entitling each senator to a voice in all proceedings (49 Am. Jur. 248). In accord (*Ex parte Hague* (1929), 105 N. J. E. 134; 147 A. 220; aff., 9 N. J. Misc. 80; 150 A. 322.)

Except for these cases, no other judicial decisions embodying a similar line of reasoning and referring directly to this issue of the continuing character of State senates have been found (Century Digest, States, key Nos. 38, 42; Decennial Digest, States, key Nos. 29, 34; 1658 to August 1952).

Additional evidence supporting these judicial pronouncements that a State senate, the membership of which is elected on a staggered basis, is not a continuing body is obtainable from the following sources:

(a) The constitutions of the following States, which grant 4-year terms to their senators and elect half of them biennially, expressly provide that the senate shall elect officers, including its president pro tempore, at each regular biennial session:

Colorado, article 5, section 10, Amended Laws 1951, chapter 223; Delaware, article 2, section 7; Illinois, article 4, section 9; Kentucky, section 34; Montana, article V, section 10; North Dakota, article II, section 31; Oklahoma, article V, section 28; Pennsylvania, article II, section 9; Texas, article III, section 9; Wyoming, article II, section 13; New Jersey, article IV, section 3, shall organize annually.

The journals of the senate in the following States contain ample evidence of an established practice of choosing a president pro tempore at the beginning of each regular session: California, Iowa, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina (meets annually; selection at beginning of session in odd-numbered year), Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

2. Which States adopt their rules each session?

In the following States the senate adopts its rules of procedure at the beginning of each regular session: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina (meets annually; rules adopted in odd-numbered years), Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have ascertained the number of Senators who wish to speak on the pending motion and the length of time they desire to occupy. Even allowing for the possibility that some of the Senators may have underestimated their time, I expect that the debate will be concluded in approximately 3 hours. Therefore at half past 4 I expect to move to lay the motion on the table. I hope Senators will confine their remarks to reasonable limits in order that the motion may be disposed of and we may proceed with the organization of the Senate, provide for a Committee on Committees, and determine the size of certain committees. Therefore I hope Senators will make their remarks as brief as possible.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the question which we have been discussing is one of the most vital questions we shall consider at this session, but it is essentially a simple one. Stated briefly, the question is whether we in this body shall have the right, in accordance with the Constitution, to determine our own rules of proceedings or whether we shall be bound by the rules first adopted in 1789 and revised for the last time in 1884. Its outcome will determine whether the rule of the majority shall prevail or whether a minority shall continue to have the power to keep a majority from voting after full and free debate.

The Constitution, article I, section 5, provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Under this provision, each House of each Congress is empowered to adopt its own rules of proceedings, unrestricted by the actions of preceding Congresses. That is what the Senate did in the First Congress in 1789. That is what we can do now by virtue of the very same clause of the Constitution under which the First Congress acted.

The opponents of the pending motion, however, argue that the rules adopted by the first Senate in April 1789, continue in force until amended. What they are really contending is that article I, section 5, should read "the Senate of the First Congress may determine the rules of its own proceedings and of all subsequent Senates." They would deny to subsequent Senates the authority enjoyed by the Senate which first met in 1789. They would give to the Senate rules a permanent status not enjoyed by bills, treaties, and nominations which die with the end of each Congress. There is no justification for any such differential treatment to be accorded to the rules.

It is no answer to say that the existing rules of the Senate provide for their amendment and that the procedure for amending those rules should be followed. This power to change the existing rules is largely theoretical, because section 3 of rule XXII, by allowing filibusters on, motions to change the rules, makes any rules change subject to the arbitrary whims and caprices of a small minority. The pending motion would give to this body the same fundamental right which our sister House, ironically described as the lower House, has always enjoyed, but which has been denied to the Senate, namely, the right at the beginning of each Congress to adopt rules for its own proceedings in accordance with the will of a majority of the Members.

Enough has already been said about how the filibuster negates the very process of democracy. It makes a majority subservient to the will of a minority. Parliamentary rules which allow a minority to dictate to the majority enable the minority to defeat the will of the people and their representatives. To invoke the Senate rules to deny to the majority of the Senate the power which the Constitution has granted to it to change its rules is to make the rules the master of the Senate, instead of the Senate the master of its rules.

The late Senator Thomas said in the Sixty-third Congress:

> I believe the rules are made for the Senate. I do not think the Senate was made for the rules.

The issue at stake here is more than a mere change in the rules. It goes to the very heart of the mechanics of our Government. The filibuster, which gives a handful of men a veto power over legislation, frustrates the will of the people and their elected representatives. Congressional practices like the filibuster, which prevent the expression of the majority, will threaten the basic integrity of our democracy.

It is time that we in this body undertook to modernize the rules of the Senate. If we are to change the rules of the Senate, we must do it now. We are merely fooling ourselves if we talk about a change later in the session, because section 3 of the existing cloture rule makes impossible any change in the rules once the Senate begins to operate.

In the face of the world-wide Communist aggression, we must take steps to prevent a minority of the Senate from talking us to death at a time when swift action is required. We must also show the world that there is no gulf between our democratic principles and practices. We know only too well how our enemies exploit our shortcomings. It is time, therefore, that we in this Senate proclaim to the world that this is not only the greatest deliberative body but also the most democratic body—that there is not only the right of full and free debate, but the right to vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Eighty-third Congress.

We who are supporting the motion take our ground upon the Constitution, article I, section 5, which states:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

We hold that this right was intended to be real and effective, and not merely nominal, and that it applies to the Senate as well as to the House of Representatives.

SENATE MAY ADOPT RULES AT OUTSET OF NEW CONGRESS, UNDER GENERAL PARLIAMENTARY LAW

We of the Senate are now meeting as one branch of the Eighty-third Congress as it meets and organizes for the business of legislating. In our body all bills introduced in the Eighty-second Congress but not passed have died, and if they are to be considered by us in the Eighty-third Congress they will have to be reintroduced. All appointments made by the President during the Eighty-second Congress which were not then confirmed by the Senate have lapsed, and either the same names will have to be resubmitted or new names substituted. All treaties submitted to the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress which were not ratified will now have to be resubmitted to committees and dealt with anew. The new Senate has had to elect

new officers for the Eighty-third Congress. It will have to re-form its committees; and, with the shift of power, many committee changes will be made.

The old Senate therefore has died with the Eighty-second Congress. It is a new Senate which now convenes as one branch of the Eighty-third Congress. I believe this is as true in the matter of rules and procedure as it is in the case of legislation, appointments, treaties, officers, and committees.

There are those, however, who contend that this is not so—as we saw from the debate yesterday—and that the rules of the Senate are in effect immortal and exist at the very start of proceedings. They further contend that the Senate does not have the right to adopt new rules at the inception of a new Congress under general parliamentary procedure.

MAJORITY RULE IS THE REAL ISSUE

The issue thus stated may seem at first thought to be a barren and arid matter of parliamentary procedure, but it involves, in the first place, the whole question as to whether Congress will ever be able to pass civil-rights legislation. The issue is, in fact, far broader even than that. It is basically whether the Senate can ever free itself for decision by breaking filibusters conducted by a small minority. The principle of majority rule is the real issue.

DEVELOPMENT OF SENATE CLOTURE RULES TO STOP FILIBUSTERS

In order to understand just what is at stake, a brief discussion of the history of this subject may be desirable. A filibuster, it should be needless to say, is prolonged discussion of a measure which is designed to prevent it from ever coming to a vote. It is not discussion for the purpose of making voting more intelligent. Its purpose is to tie up business so completely that a vote will never occur. It is, therefore, a method of preventing the majority from making its decisions effective. Hence it is a form of minority rule.

We all know how, in recent years, filibusters have been used to prevent civil-rights legislation from being passed. Historically, they have also been used against many other proposed measures, as well. This is well shown by Dr. Franklin L. Burdette in his classic book on the subject. I think I should admit, in the interest of fairness, that prior to 1940 the filibuster was frequently used by so-called liberal Senators, as well as by so-called conservatives.

There was absolutely no check upon filibustering in the Senate until after the "willful eleven" in March 1917 and in the closing days of the Sixty-fourth Congress had talked to death President Wilson's proposal to arm merchantmen to resist German submarine attack. Then, in order to get ready for German aggression and to prevent the Senate in so doing from being hamstrung by later filibusters, President Wilson immediately called the Senate of the new Sixty-fifth Congress into special session. At that time, after Senators Walsh and Owen had asserted the right of the new Senate of the Sixty-fifth Congress to adopt new rules and to curb filibusters, a partial beginning was made. Rule XXII was altered by the addition of a second paragraph, so that a vote to limit debate, or what we call a vote for cloture, could be passed by two-thirds of those present and voting and after such a cloture motion was passed each Senator could speak for an hour. After this later right had been exercised the substantive measure under consideration would then be voted upon.

CLOTURE RULE OF 1917 INEFFECTIVE

In practice this provision proved ineffective. This was shown on numerous bills, particularly the antilynching bills of the 1920's and 1930's, but most notably in the filibuster against the Federal fair employment practices bill of 1946. The opponents of that measure were in the minority; but with covert allies, or crypto-opponents of civil rights, they did number more than a third, and hence were able to talk the measure to death. Once again these groups were able to prevent it from even coming to a vote. This led in 1949 to the attempt of the so-called liberal bloc to make it easier to terminate or limit debate.

WHERRY RULES OF 1949 GAVE ADDED PROTECTION TO FILIBUSTERS

The dramatic adoption of the civil rights plank of the Democratic Convention in July of 1948, followed by the striking Democratic victory in November of that year, filled us all with the hope that something could be done to remove the road block of the filibuster. We therefore introduced an amendment to rule XXII providing that, after a decent initial interval for debate, further debate could be limited by vote of a majority of the Senate. But our friends from south of the Mason and Dixon's line, plus most of the Republicans brought their coalition out into the open and then passed an amendment to rule XXII which gave far greater protection to filibusters than did the 1917 rule. We wound up therefore in a worse position than when we started. In trying to take one step forward, we had really been forced to take two steps backward.

This was done in two ways:

First. The new rule provided that debate could only be limited upon vote of two-thirds of the Senators "duly chosen and sworn," or by a so-called constitutional two-thirds, or 64 affirmative votes. Thirty-three Senators voting in the negative or absenting themselves from the vote could therefore prevent debate from being limited and permit a filibuster to go on. We all know how easy it is to believe that one is ill and needs medical and hospital attention when a particularly difficult vote is coming up, and it should be remembered that a failure to vote counts as a vote against limiting debate.

I prophesied at the time that if this provision were put in the rules of the Senate, during votes on future civil rights measures a number of Senators would stay away, finding that they were ill, and, because they were ill, they would not vote, and would in effect therefore vote to continue the filibuster.

Since the average vote on cloture proposals had been approximately 84 during the years from 1917 to 1949, this in itself greatly raised the barrier by requiring 64 affirmative votes as against a probable average under the old rule of around 56. In practical effect, this raised the requirement for cloture by 8 votes.

Second. Even more important, although at the time relative little noticed except by close students, was the addition of a third paragraph to rule XXII, namely, that there could be absolutely no limitation of debate upon any motion to bring up a change in the rules. This meant that debate could never be legally ended or limited on any proposal to liberalize the cloture provisions, except by unanimous consent. For, if any proposal to limit debate by majority vote or by some such ratio were introduced and if a motion were made to bring it to the floor of the Senate, then a small group could talk it to death and not even the requirement of a constitutional two-thirds could stop them. The debate could be terminated only by unanimous consent which in vital matters would be impossible to obtain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say to my good friend from Tennessee that I am trying to develop a compact argument, and that if I yield to him, in all decency I shall have to yield to other Senators. I should like to finish the argument, after which I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

WHERRY RULE BLOCKS ALL CLOTURE RULE CHANGES

Mr. DOUGLAS. The rule to which I have just referred was the celebrated so-called Wherry rule, which ties our hands once the Senate is fully organized and is considered to have adopted or carried over its previous rules of procedure. For under it any later proposal to alter the rules can be filibustered and never be permitted to come to a vote.

I listened yesterday to the contention of the able and very eminent senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the majority leader, and our learned colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that this paragraph did not change the former Senate procedure, since they hold that the Vandenberg ruling that debate could not be limited or terminated under rule XXII on motions to take up a measure had been upheld by the Senate of the Eightieth Congress; and they further contend that a contrary ruling by Vice President BARKLEY had been overruled, by a 1-vote majority, in 1949.

This contention, however, completely misses the point. The framers of paragraph 3 realized that, with the margin so close in the Senate, it was quite possible that a future Senate would reverse itself, and a future Senate could vote that debate on a motion to take up an amendment to the rules could be stopped. They therefore sought to fasten the Vandenberg ruling into the rules of the Senate for eternity by specifically providing that cloture could never be proposed to a motion to take up a change in the rules, thus making cloture impossible on any change in the second paragraph of

rule XXII. There was now virtually no chance to change rule XXII, once the Senate had organized. The filibuster seemed safe, civil rights had been cast into the deepest dungeon, put into an iron vest or a strait-jacket, loaded down with the heaviest chains, and the door locked; and now, by the third paragraph, the key had been thrown away in an ocean of words.

The framers of the new rule thought it would be impossible for the friends of civil rights ever again to find the keys to the dungeon.

Therefore, if it be permanently decided that the rules of the preceding Senate apply automatically as the new Senate organizes, we may as well say farewell to any chance either for civil rights legislation or needed changes in Senate procedure. In slang parlance, we may kiss such a possibility good bye.

ADOPTION OF NEW RULES AT START OF NEW CONGRESS IS SENATE'S ONLY CHANCE TO CHANGE CLOTURE RULE

If, on the other hand, the Senate of a given Congress such as we of the Eighty-third first proclaims its existing right to adopt rules of procedure as it organizes, if this motion is upheld, the way is then opened before organization is completed for the immediate revision of rule XXII, which would permit debate to be limited after a decent and full interval by some variant of a majority vote and which would also allow us to strike from the books the final and third paragraph of rule XXII.

As I shall later develop, this is the only way by which we can recover the key which my comment on the Wherry resolution indicated was irretrievably lost, for if we proceed under general parliamentary rules instead of under the old Senate procedure, we can terminate debate as debate is terminated in every legislative body of the world. We can terminate debate either by a motion, by moving the previous question, or by a motion under certain circumstances to lay on the table, and we can proceed at once to the vote. This is the only chance we have. In so doing we would free ourselves from the strait-jacket which the rules have now imposed upon us and, like Houdini, the Senate would break its bonds and would at last be free.

FATE OF OTHER LEGISLATION THAN CIVIL RIGHTS IS ALSO INVOLVED

I should like to emphasize the fact which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stressed in his opening remarks yesterday, that while civil rights is probably the most notable field which would thus be opened up for legislation, it is by no means the only one. For example, the procedure of the Senate seems to cry aloud for the adoption of the rule of relevance in debate, so that discussion on a bill may not be totally disassociated from the measure under consideration. This has been advocated by the junior Senator from New Jersey and by others. But such a reform can probably never be put into effect as long as paragraph 3 of the rule XXII remains. The St. Lawrence seaway, as the Senator from New Mexico pointed out yesterday, and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii are also examples of measures which may be stopped by filibusters.

ANALYSIS OF OBJECTIONS TO SENATOR ANDERSON'S MOTION

What, then, are the objections which are advanced against our proposal that the Senate should, as a matter of explicit right, under the Constitution, adopt the proposed motion?

One which was made by our able colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] at one point in his opening remarks last Saturday, intimated that the real origin of the motion came from Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Yesterday, in a glancing fashion, the Senator from Georgia returned to that charge.

May I say that even if this were true, I would not regard it as essential to the issue. I had always thought we should debate issues on their merits, and not according to the virtues or lack of virtues of their sponsors.

In the first place, Mr. President, I would say that while I have sometimes disagreed with Mr. Reuther, I regard him as a man of honor and ability who, amongst his many other achievements, has probably done more effectively to fight communism in this country than has anyone else, and he can go into any assemblage in this land and hold his head up with pride.

Secondly, Mr. President, the issue is not who proposes the measure, but whether the measure has merit in itself.

I must admit that the Senator from Georgia somewhat troubled me on one point. He is an expert on the procedures and rules of the Senate. I must admit that when he said the proposal was first advanced by Mr. Walter Reuther, my own memory was shaken very badly. I thought I remembered that this proposal had been made by no less eminent a Senator of the United States than Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana; and when our good friend from Georgia said Mr. Reuther was the author, since I knew that his knowledge in this respect was much greater than mine, I must admit that my own confidence in my historical knowledge was badly shaken. So I went back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 1917, to see whether I was mistaken.

I found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, on page 9 of the proceedings of the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, that Senator Walsh of Montana sent a resolution to the desk which read as follows:

Resolved, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the conclusion of the Sixty-fourth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII.

On first thought it occurred to me that the Senator from Georgia had been mistaken in his historical reference. Then I felt that possibly he might have thought that Mr. Reuther had in some strange way influenced Senator Walsh in 1917. So I turned to Who's Who to find out when Mr. Reuther was born and how old he was at that time. I found that he was born on September 1, 1907 and hence would have been 9½ years old when Senator Walsh submitted his resolution. Therefore, even if he had had all the merits and virtues which the sculptors and painters of the Renaissance period applied to the infant St. John the Baptist, it would have been very difficult to think he had any definitive effect upon Senator Walsh.

But I checked up further to ascertain if Mr. Reuther had made any journey from Wheeling, W. Va., to Washington, D. C., to influence Senator Walsh, and I found that no such trip had been made.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the very able Senator from Georgia for once in his life—and this does not occur very often—was wrong in his historical precedents and that the first proposal did not come from Mr. Reuther, but from Thomas J. Walsh in 1917.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been asked to yield to my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and I did not yield. But if the Senator feels I have attacked him improperly I should be very glad to yield with the understanding that it shall not constitute a precedent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not feel that the Senator has attacked me. I can always enjoy the wit and sparkling humor of the Senator from Illinois, even though it is applied to me. I stated that Mr. Reuther brought the plan here in 1951. That is the first time I had heard it seriously urged on the Senate or on the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Georgia now say that the Walsh proposal antedates Mr. Reuther's proposal?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. But it is an entirely different proposal. I am sure the Senator from Illinois has read the testimony of Mr. Walter Reuther appearing on pages 125 to 165 of the Senate hearings of 1951 in regard to this question, in which Mr. Reuther laid down in great detail his plan to short-circuit the rules of the Senate, holding that the Senate was not a continuing body and saying that precedents should not obtain; that they did not obtain even in the Supreme Court; that we should use Robert's Rules of Order until the Senate had organized, and that he hoped someone would raise the issue of that the Senate was not a continuing body.

If I have attacked Mr. Reuther I am wholly unaware of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not say the Senator attacked him, but that he ascribed the parentage of this motion to him. The Senator said that the idea was first suggested by him.

Mr. RUSSELL. This identical motion. I did not know Senator Walsh had offered such a resolution when I made my statement. There is nothing unusual in ascribing plans to individuals. The Senate debated the Ruml plan on the floor. Personally, I though we made a mistake in adopting the proposal, but we did adopt it. Time and again bills have been introduced, designated by the name of the author. If the Senator is disturbed about my attributing the procedure to Mr. Reuther, which I did in the very best of faith, it would probably be because

Mr. Reuther has now become ashamed of his suggestion——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely trying to get the historic precedents stated correctly, and I was startled by the statement of the Senator that the idea originated with Mr. Reuther.

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit it to any fair man that reads Mr. Reuther's proposal that someone should walk in on the opening day and challenge the rules and then override the Chair, stating that when he was chairman of conventions of his organization no debate was permitted on appeals from decisions of the Chair, a proceeding which is slightly contrary to that which has heretofore obtained in the Senate. I think he overlooked the fact that Robert's Rules of Order require a two-thirds vote on the previous question——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall take that point up in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that salient passages from the speech of Senator Walsh be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, after noting that many others are also urging approval of Senator ANDERSON'S motion, let me proceed to some of the points which were so ably argued yesterday. Let us turn to the substantive objections to the motion offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

METHOD OF ELECTION DOES NOT REQUIRE RULING THAT SENATE CANNOT ADOPT NEW RULES AT START OF EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

It is contended that the Senate is a continuing body because only one-third of its Members are elected every 2 years, and two-thirds of the Members carry over from one Congress to another. It is argued, and was argued by the Senators from Ohio and Georgia, that this is what differentiates the Senate from the House.

But this argument, as Senator Thomas J. Walsh pointed out in 1917, confuses the Senate as a body with its Members as individuals. Individual Senators serve for three successive Congresses in the senatorial branch of Congress. But even though a bill may be signed in their offices or homes by each and every one of the 96 Senators, it does not thereby become a law. For this to be done, a measure must be passed by the Senate meeting as a body and operating under agreed rules and procedures. This is almost in the language used by Senator Walsh himself in 1917.

The contention that the Senate as a body is continuous and immortal and cannot in effect change its rules is indeed, upon close examination, seen to be ridiculous. It seeks to confer upon a secular body that which is indeed only an attribute of the divine. It can be justified only if we regard ourselves as God, which we are sometimes accused of doing; but I am afraid that our credentials in this respect could not pass proper scrutiny. If one holds to the objection that the Senate is a continuous body, he must be forced to argue that the Senate which convenes today is the very same body that first met in 1789, or 164 years ago, and that we must be bound by their rules; or that the so-called Wherry provisions, which were riveted into the rules in 1949, must, as a practical matter, be continued to the end of time, and that even a Senate meeting for organization in the year 2100 would be the same body as the Senate of today, and hence would be bound by the work of the Senate of 1949.

Surely the only sensible conclusion is that each Congress is separate and distinct from its predecessors; that the Senate is only one branch of Congress—a fact that its Members sometimes forget—and that, hence, this separate character is true of each Senate as it is of the House of Representatives. Despite the hold-over of two-thirds of its Members in each new Congress, it is conceded by everyone that the Senate is not a continuing body for the consideration of legislation, executive appointments, treaties, officers, or committees. There is no basis for a different conclusion on the matter of rules. Just as the House can, in each Congress, adopt its rules prior to the completion of organization, as it adopted them last Saturday, or modify them, as Representative John E. Rankin abundantly demonstrated in 1945, so can the Senate.

NONAPPLICATION OF OLD RULES WILL NOT PRODUCE PARLIAMENTARY CHAOS

The second contention is that if the rules of the Senate do not apply prior to its organization, there will be no rules to govern our procedures during this transitional period, and hence there will be parliamentary chaos.

With all due respect to the eminent and able Senators who have advanced this argument, this is sheer nonsense. In the absence of rules to govern the Senate, the generally established rules of parliamentary procedure will govern. These are well stated in the classic American handbook, Robert's Rules of Order, with Jefferson's Manual serving as a supplement. Under these rules, the Chair can rule initially—and I hope the Chair in this instance will be permitted to rule—that a motion proclaiming the right of each Senate to adopt its own rules can be made and, if upheld by the Senate, will prevail. Then, before organization is finally completed, another motion will follow that will call for the adoption of all present rules except rule XXII, for which an adequate substitute can be submitted as a part of the same motion. After the Chair has made its rulings, appeals can be, and doubtless will be, taken to the body of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had to refuse to yield to other Senators, with the exception of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I would prefer to have the Senator from Louisiana allow me to continue to the end of my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield for any question he may wish to ask.

DEBATE ON SENATOR ANDERSON'S MOTION TO PROCEED TO RULE CHANGES CAN BE TERMINATED UNDER GENERAL PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

This is the point: After a decent interval of debate, and for the very purpose of preventing filibustering, a Member under approved parliamentary procedure may move the previous question, or move to table an appeal. Neither of these motions is debatable, and a vote upon them must be taken immediately. Upon request of one-fifth of those present, under the Constitution, article I, section 5 (3), the vote must be by yeas and nays. A motion to table requires only a majority; for the previous question to be put, a two-thirds vote is required under Robert's Rules of Order, although Jefferson's Manual is silent upon this point, and does not specifically prescribe the precise ratio of the vote necessary to approve the motion.

So, far from creating chaos, the substitution of general parliamentary law for the specific rules of the Senate actually frees the Senate to act in good order and without any risk of causing chaos or of thwarting the Nation's will, a condition which the filibuster, as protected by rule XXII, creates. It enables the Senate to do what the House can do, and what every other parliamentary or any private body in the world can do.

Is the Senate more chaotic than the House, which has almost five times the number of Members? Is the Senate more unruly than the House? Is the House plunged into chaos because it has to adopt new rules at the beginning of each Congress? The answer is "No." Why should the Senate then be plunged into chaos? What the adoption of the motion would do would be to permit the Senate to change rule XXII, and eliminate the third paragraph of rule XXII, which now permits unlimited filibustering on any motion to take up a modification of the second paragraph of rule XXII.

The application of general parliamentary procedure would permit the Senate to recover the key which the framers of the Wherry resolution threw away, and which they thought had been lost for all time. It is the one Achilles' heel in the strong armor of the defenders of the filibuster. Now is the time when we can get at rule XXII.

FAILURE TO ACT NOW WILL MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO STOP FILIBUSTER ON MOTION TO TAKE UP CLOTURE RULE CHANGE LATER

Once we act under the general rules of the Senate, as laid down in the printed document, we are in the strait-jacket of the third paragraph of rule XXII. Now we are, for the moment, free. When a ruling is made, one side or the other can appeal to the membership of the Senate, and debate can be closed either by moving the previous question or by a motion to lay on the table, neither of which is debatable. We will not be excessively severe in these motions. We will permit adequate debate. But at some time or other the Senate should have the opportunity to vote, and now, as the Senate organizes, is the only time it will have the right to vote on rule XXII. This, general parliamentary procedure permits, but the rules of the Senate forbid.

SENATOR WALSH'S 1917 PROPOSAL WAS THE SAME AS THIS 1953 MOTION

I have studied rather carefully the debates in 1917. This action is precisely what Senator Walsh was trying to accomplish. The willful 11 had filibus-

tered to death the armed merchantman bill. Germany was launching upon a program of unrestricted submarine warfare. President Wilson wanted to arm merchantmen in order to resist submarine attack, but he thought his powers were limited under the act of 1819. He therefore wanted specific legislation from the Congress which would permit him to arm merchantmen and to fire at sight upon submarines; but so long as the previous rules of the Senate applied, the opponents could filibuster this proposal to death.

What did Senator Walsh do then? Senator Walsh, at the outset of the new Congress, made a very able argument that the Senate was not a continuing body, that it was not then operating under its previous rules, but that it was operating under general parliamentary procedure, and should, therefore, proceed to adopt new rules, with a change in rule XXII.

What he was telling the Willful Eleven was simply this: "If you filibuster against the change in rule XXII, we will make the change under general parliamentary procedure, and we will move the previous question." So far from its being a different situation, as the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, it was an identical situation.

In 1917 Senator Walsh was doing precisely what we are doing in 1953, namely, laying down the thesis that the Senate is not a continuing body, that we have the right to adopt our own rules at the inception of the Congress, and that the consideration of such measures should proceed not under the previous rules, which are void, but under general parliamentary law, which permits the previous question to be put without further debate.

Again I wish to emphasize that general parliamentary law, since it is framed to reach decisions and not to prevent the will of the people from being heard, permits a deliberative body to vote at one time or another, and does not forever encase it in an iron vest.

PRECEDENT OF 1952 REPUBLICAN CONVENTION SUPPORTS SENATOR ANDERSON'S MOTION

Incidentally, the course of action which we propose would enable the Senate to do what our Republican friends did at their national convention last July. Without wishing to stress the conflict of wills which there occurred and without wishing to fan the flame of party bitterness across the aisle, but with pure friendship in my heart, nevertheless, I wish to point out what happened there.

It will be remembered that one faction of the Republican Party, I will not say which one, contended that the 1952 convention as it opened was bound by the rules established in 1912, to the effect that in the vote on the seating of delegates approved by the credentials committee, those whose votes were challenged were privileged to vote on the seating of at least others who were challenged. The contention was that they should be seated as delegates de facto and allowed to pass either upon their own cases or at least on the case of their political allies whose votes were also being challenged. This was on the mutual basis of "You scratch my back, and I will scratch yours."

This view was successfully opposed by the other faction of the Republican Party, which believed that the 1952 convention could initially frame its own rules. It was the second faction which won. This decision largely determined the final choice of their presidential candidate.

Without going into the substantive merits of the two candidates, because we all admire both of them, nevertheless I wish to congratulate our Republican brethren on their good sense in enabling their own convention to act and to frame its own rules. I look forward across the aisle with the hope that they will be equally farsighted and consistent in enabling this body to do what they did, and will allow the Senate to be free to act, as the Republican Convention was free to act. If such doctrine is good for the august Republican Convention, why should it not also be good for the United States Senate?

SUPREME COURT HAS NOT RULED, AS CLAIMED, ON QUESTION BEFORE SENATE

Let us see what the third argument is. It is contended that the Supreme Court has ruled, in the case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135), that the Senate is a continuing body and that we should therefore abide by the rulings of the Court.

I have studied this case with great interest. I hold it in my hand. It is quite a commentary on American political history in the 1920's. A committee of the United States Senate, of which I believe both Messrs. Walsh and Wheeler were Members, tried to subpena the bank accounts of Harry S. Daugherty, who had formerly been Attorney General, in the bank at Washington Courthouse, Ohio, the head of which was his brother, Mal Daugherty.

Mr. Mal Daugherty did not want to give up the documents, and resisted to the end. Subject to later correction, it is my recollection that while this subject was in litigation the bank burned down and the records were destroyed. I make no comment upon that circumstance. The issue arose, however, as to whether a later Congress could order those records produced and whether the case had become moot because the Congress during which the investigation was ordered had expired.

It is true that in rendering its opinion the Court stated that the United States Senate is a continuing body. I wish to make two comments in that connection.

First, I comment that it is truly extraordinary how the very men who object so violently to decisions of the Supreme Court when they go against their beliefs and interests, and who then demand that Congress pass acts to reverse the Court's decisions, will predominantly insist that those decisions of which they approve shall be accepted by Congress as final and shall not even be questioned. Thus, the vast majority of those who want the Congress to reverse three successive opinions of the Supreme Court which gave "paramount rights" in offshore oil to the Federal Government, and who want us to give this rich treasure to the States, form the hard core of the group which is now insisting that the Daugherty case shall be accepted as final.

Upon analysis, however, in the second place it will be seen that the Daugherty case did not really involve the question of whether the Senate is in fact a continuing body. It did not decide that a committee may continue beyond the life of an expired Senate. It merely ruled that such a committee could be revived by a succeeding Congress; but if so revived it would be by action of a different body, and hence the issue in the Daugherty case was very different from the issue which is here raised. Any statements by the court in that case to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body were therefore obiter dicta and in no sense legally binding.

CONSTITUTION EXPLICITLY AUTHORIZES SENATOR ANDERSON'S MOTION

We need go back to the Constitution itself to get a clearer idea of the powers of the Senate to form its rules. Article I, section 5 (2) states that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." The House can do so with each new Congress. There is no reason for differentiation in the case of the Senate.

FAILURE TO ACT IN PREVIOUS CONGRESSES IS NO BAR TO PROPOSED ACTION

In the fourth objection, it is argued that even if the Senate once had the right to adopt new rules at the beginning of a new Congress, it has lost that right by failing to exercise it over its historical past. This, I believe is what the lawyers, with their penchant for putting thoughts in obscure language which no one can understand, call the doctrine of laches.

As I have previously pointed out, however, Senators Walsh and Owen both asserted at the opening of the Sixty-fifth Congress in March 1917 that the Senate had the right to adopt rules for its procedure prior to organization.

This issue was not finally pushed to a test because, as I have stated, those Senators were later able to change rule XXII to permit a limited power of cloture. In effect, what they did was to hold the club—to move the "previous question"—over the heads of the potential filibusterers and the defenders of the filibuster, and to force a cloture rule thereby into the rules of the Senate. Later that cloture rule was eaten away, both by the Vandenberg interpretation and by the very unwise Wherry amendment of 1949. But no ruling was made against the contention of Senators Walsh and Owen, and a preliminary ruling by the Vice President refusing to allow bills to be submitted to committees until the Senate was organized slanted in their direction.

In the Republican brief it is stated that Senator Thomas later recanted. I have read the debate, and I find that while the Republican brief has quoted from one page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, namely, page 437, from the remarks of Senator Thomas, apparently the authors of the brief did not take the trouble—and I am sure it was inadvertent—to quote the statement of Senator Thomas on page 438, where he said:

> My own opinion is that the Senate is not a continuing body, except in a very peculiar sense.

As a matter of fact, while the present Vice President has not ruled on the subject, certain statements which he made last Saturday caused hope to rise in our hearts, when he said that the Senate had the inherent right to organize itself. Last night I began to wonder whether possibly the statement of the Vice President might not have stimulated my good friend from Ohio to say that he would move to table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. If his intention should be carried through, the Vice President would not have an opportunity to rule on the question.

Mr. President, I am not a suspicious man, and certainly I do not suspect the Senator from Ohio, but the thought has occurred to me that possibly the Senator from Ohio had noticed that phrase of the Vice President and that it had occurred to him that if he could table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico the Vice President could be estopped and prevented from ever ruling on the question.

As a matter of fact, the same argument, namely, that the failure of a branch of Congress to adopt rules constitutes an abandonment of that right, was made in the House of Representatives in 1890, when the Republican majority sought to change the rules of that body.

Mr. President, there had been filibusters in the House before that time, but such filibusters proceeded on quorum calls. The minority would incessantly call quorums, and when their names were called they would refuse to answer and would rush out of the room, so that they would not be present; therefore, no quorum could be obtained. On many occasions the House of Representatives was thus prevented from acting merely because it was impossible to obtain a legal quorum.

Then in 1890 two men set themselves to break filibusters in the House. One was Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, the State in which I grew up, and the other Joseph G. Cannon, from my home State of Illinois. Speaker Reed ruled that if a Member was physically present he, the Speaker, would count him as present and direct that his name be entered as being present.

One Democratic Member in the House objected to this procedure and inquired:

> How can you count me as present? I did not answer my name.

Speaker Reed replied in substance:

> Does the gentleman deny that he is present? From whence did I hear his voice proceed?

So the Reed rule was adopted by the House of Representatives, and the precedent established for over 30 years was broken.

We also contend that the acquiescence by the Senate in the past in carrying over its old rules constituted in effect a tacit act of passing upon them and was in no sense an abandonment of the right to do so.

In any case, under the Constitution we can always point to the existence of the right. On the desert island we see the footprints of Senator Thomas J. Walsh, Robert L. Owen, Charles S. Thomas, and many others. They served to save us from any doctrine to the effect that we have abandoned our right.

ONE SENATE SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO BIND THE HANDS OF ALL FUTURE SENATES IN PERPETUITY

It is, moreover, a bad principle to hold that one generation or one Congress can by a failure to act or by any other means abandon the rights of future generations or future Congresses. The fact was very well stated by a man who is now regarded by all sections of our country as a great sage, one who is appealed to by the most diverse groups, namely, Thomas Jefferson. Men from the North, South, East, and West all join in paying homage to the patriotism and foresight of Thomas Jefferson.

Over the weekend I consulted the writings of Thomas Jefferson, and I found some very interesting quotations on the question which now engages our attention.

I found the argument well stated by Thomas Jefferson in a letter he wrote to John Cartwright in 1824. I believe he also stated it in a letter which he wrote to James Madison on about September 1789, as Jefferson was leaving the Embassy in France to return home to become the first Secretary of State, but I quote the statement from the letter which Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Cartwright in 1824. This was in the year before Jefferson died:

> Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. * * * A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing, then, is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man (The Jeffersonian Cyclopedia, vii, pp. 377, 378).

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me repeat, the issue at stake is not merely procedural. The decision upon it is likely to determine much of the political course of the next few years. The fate of many important measures is bound up in what we do. The freedom of the Senate to act, after reasonable debate, on legislation and on its own rules is in the balance here. And the confidence of the people in the ability of their Government to move ahead free from the obstruction of filibusters can be strengthened by our action on this motion.

I shall therefore support the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico, and a succeeding motion to adopt new rules with a fair and workable cloture rule, and I hope it will have the approval of the Senate.

I hope the Chair will be permitted to rule on the question. If there are any questions, I shall be glad to yield for questions.

EXHIBIT 1

[Senate proceedings of Wednesday, March 7, 1917]

* * * * *

THE RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to present the following resolution, upon which I shall not ask immediate action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH. I shall not ask for immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I could not hear what the Senator said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 5), as follows:

"*Resolved*, That until further ordered the rules of the Senate in force at the close of the Sixty-fourth Congress be adopted as the rules of the Senate, with the exception of rule XXII thereof.

"*Resolved*, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Vice President, four of whom shall be members of the majority and three members of the minority, to draft a substitute for rule XXII."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I am obliged to leave the city tonight I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate while I express briefly my views concerning the subject matter of the resolution. It presents this question:

Are the rules under which the Senate operated during the last session of Congress now effective, or is the Senate governed by the general parliamentary law until rules are adopted, and is it in order to move to fix a time when the Senate shall take a vote on a pending question or to move the previous question with a view to closing debate even on a motion to amend the rules?

Before response is made to this inquiry I desire, with the indulgence of the Senate, to submit some observations.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. HARDWICK. A parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment. I take it the Senator from Montana is addressing the Senate by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have no objection. I merely wanted to understand the situation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is undeniable that since the present Government of the United States assumed the direction of their destiny the rules in force at the close of any session of the Senate have governed its deliberations upon reassembling without any formal action readopting them, even though the last adjournment marked the demise of a Congress. Were the rules theretofore in force adopted by the acquiescence of the Senate on reassembling, or was their vigor perpetual from Congress to Congress by virtue of the peculiar constitution of the Senate and the power vested in it by the Constitution? That the view has generally prevailed, so far as any thought has been given to the subject at all, that the rules have the quality of perpetuity, except as they may be altered or abrogated by affirmative action of the Senate, is altogether probable. It is a matter of common knowledge that the rules of the House do not survive the Congress during which they were adopted. At the first session of each new Congress that body entertains a motion that the rules of the last preceding Congress, with or without changes or exceptions, shall govern its deliberations until further ordered. Until such a resolution or some other of like import is passed the House operates under general parliamentary law, unless, as has occurred, it is assumed that the rules of the last House are in force until by acquiescence they are deemed to have been invigorated and in effect reenacted. The House of Representatives holds that by virtue of the provision of the Constitution that "each House may determine its rules of proceedings" the representatives of the people assemble, after a general election, untrammeled by any rules any of their predecessors may have adopted; that no House can take any proceedings in derogation of the powers of its successor; that it is powerless to bind its successor in any way touching the constitutional privilege of that body, and that the language of the Constitution—"each House"—differen-

tiates one House from the House of a succeeding Congress, as well as from the coordinate branch of the Congress. This view of the powers of the House and the limitation of its power, now universally acceded to, was not always dominant. Though it had been its practice since its history began formally to reenact in whole or in part the rules of the House in force at the expiration of the preceding Congress at the first session of a new Congress, the code of rules adopted in 1860 embraced the following:

"These rules shall be the rules of the present and succeeding Congresses unless otherwise ordered."

Notwithstanding it was continued nominally in force until 1890, it was repeatedly held during the intervening period to be nugatory though from time to time some feeble effort was made to justify it. On December 7, 1875, Samuel J. Randall offered a resolution providing that the rules of the Forty-third Congress, which had expired on the 4th day of March preceding, be the rules of the House then organizing. James A. Garfield raised the point of order that the rules of the last House were by their terms in force without such a resolution—to which the Speaker, Mr. Kerr, replied:

"The Chair overrules it on the ground that the Constitution clearly gives to each House the right to adopt its own rules. Whatever may have been the rules or orders of a preceding House in reference to this matter, they cannot supersede the constitutional right of this House to adopt its own rules."

Any doubt that may have arisen from time to time was set at rest in the memorable controversy that attended the elevation of Thomas B. Reed to the Speakership in 1889. He held that the rules did not continue in force beyond the life of the Congress which recognized their authority, and it was while the House was operating under general parliamentary law that he counted a quorum. In his vigorous style he declared:

"The Chair has always been unable to see how it was possible for a House which had passed out of existence to bind by rules and regulations a House which was to come into existence in the future."

Mr. Carlisle, the leader of the militant opposition, in the course of debate, said:

"I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon], a member of the Committee on Rules, in the statement that it has been almost universally, perhaps universally, held in this House that it was not within the power of the House to bind its successors by any rules it might adopt, and that therefore each House, when it assembled, had in it the inherent right as a legislative body to prescribe for itself its own rules; that until it did so prescribe rules for the government of its own proceedings it was governed simply by what may be called the general parliamentary law."

He had himself ruled in accordance with these views when Speaker.

With much diffidence I submit that the Senate rules are equally evanescent in character. I do so in recognition of the weight that attaches to the uniform practice of the Senate down to this time and to the opinions of many eminent Members of this and the other House, expressed in a casual way in the course of debate on other more or less remotely related questions. I am reassured, however, so far as the usage of the Senate is concerned, by the fact—and to that, Mr. President, I direct your thoughtful consideration—by the fact that for 87 years, until 1876, the joint rules were treated as continuing in character just as the Senate rules have been to this day, and yet when that view was challenged, the Senate, with some dissent, it is true, in response to the sentiments of an overwhelming number of its Members, reached the conclusion that they were not. Statutes have been enacted by Congress and enforced for years without a suggestion having been made during the course of their passage or a suspicion having been aroused in the minds of those charged with the execution of them touching their constitutionality, only to be held void when eventually attacked before the judicial branch of the Government. The Missouri Compromise will readily occur to all as an instance of how the minds even of the most acute lawyers and students of the Constitution may fail to appreciate what in time is revealed as a fatal weakness in a statute.

Touching the other consideration adverted to, namely, the views advanced from time to time by Senators whose memories are revered and whose opinions upon the powers of this body under the Constitution are justly held in the highest respect, it is to be borne in mind in connection therewith that the question now before us, the continuing character of the Senate rules, has never been debated in or presented for determination by the Senate. It is absolutely new—res nova, to use the language of the law.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will it bother the Senator if I ask him a question or two?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. By what authority, then, did the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], the President pro tempore of the Senate, call the Senate to order on the 5th day of March, if there is no usage that the officers of the Senate hold over?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. President, I shall canvass that a little later, and I am going to show to the Senate in the course of my remarks that any Senator could have performed that function.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator, then, contends that it is practically by unanimous consent, in the absence of objection?

Mr. WALSH. Pretty much so. The Senate was confronted with that situation exactly upon its first convening. The oldest Senator went to the desk and called the meeting to order, just the same as is done in a political convention.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think I can understand the Senator's view on that point. Just one more question, then. I am sorry to bother the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator contends—I have heard his contention before, as he has made it repeatedly in this body and with force, too—that the Senate is not a continuing body as a part of the Congress of the United States; but I have not yet heard the Senator contend that the Senate, as the executive council of the Nation, is not a continuing and unending body. If that is true, all of the Senator's argument has no application to the present situation, because this session is limited by the proclamation to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WALSH. If I do not canvass those considerations in the course of my remarks I will be very glad if the Senator from Georgia will challenge the attention of the Senate particularly to them by appropriate questions when I get through.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Montana, then, intends to cover these questions?

Mr. WALSH. I do; but if I do not deal with them so explicitly as to elucidate my views, I shall be very thankful to the Senator if he will address another question to me.

The debates in which the idea was expressed by Senators of great learning that the Senate is a continuous body, or that its rules once adopted remain in force until amended or abrogated by affirmative action, afford intrinsic evidence that none of them gave the subject serious reflection or canvassed the considerations which impel the mind to a contrary conclusion. The most profound lawyers warn their clients against the acceptance of any views they may express without investigation, touching any debatable question of law, usually characterizing such contemptuously as a curbstone opinion. May I ask you to disabuse your minds of any preconceived notion, to escape from the thraldom, which deference to usage long continued naturally imposes, to consider with me how far and in what sense the Senate is a continuing body?

As used in this connection the expression is intended to signify that the Senate as a constituent part of the Congress did not cease to exist as such when the Sixty-fourth Congress expired, to reassemble as an integral part of a quite distinct entity, the Sixty-fifth Congress. It embodies the idea of perpetual and continued existence on the part of the Senate, in character essentially different from the ephemeral life of the House.

But has not the entire history of this body, save in respect to the rules by which its proceedings have been guided, if any exception at all is to be made, been at war with any such theory? On the 4th day of March last, but 2 days ago, when the hands of the clock signified that the hour of 12 m. had arrived, the Senator occupying the chair at the request of the Vice President, and in accordance, without doubt, with an understanding with that officer, without any direction from it, announced that the Senate stood adjourned sine die. By the mere lapse of time the body, as an organized assembly, had become functus officio. If it is, indeed, a continuing body, why should the arrival of any particular time terminate its power to act? A majority of its Members were, on the occasion referred to, present on the floor. The successors of not a few of those whose terms were expiring, moved by curiosity or a desire to inform themselves concerning the procedure of the body of which they were about to become Members, were in the Chamber ready to take the oath.

The procedure on the occasion referred to was in conformity with that observed on the 3d day of March 1791, when the First Congress came to its end. The Constitution provides that—

"Neither House during the session of Congress shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days."

Congress having once convened, neither House can, except in defiance of the Constitution, quit, so long as the other insists upon continuing in session, until the 4th of March, in the odd-numbered year, arrives. Nominally a break will occur on the first Monday in December when, by another provision of the organic law, Congress is required to assemble, but, in fact, no interruption in the work of either Senate or House ensues in such a case. At the hour of 12 o'clock m. on the first Monday in December 1913, the Vice President announced the termination of the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and forthwith declared the second session convened. The work of the Senate proceeded as it had on the day previous. The first session of the First Congress came to a close on the 29th day of September 1789, agreeably to a joint resolution passed 3 days earlier. (1 Annals of Congress, 96.) But on the approach of the 4th day of March 1791, the Congress being in session, each House notified the other that it was about to adjourn sine die, and did so adjourn without either asking or receiving any consent from the other, each recognizing its inability longer to preserve its existence as a body vested with any authority under the Constitution (2 Annals of Congress, 826).

So complete is the revolution on the arrival of the 4th day of March, in the odd year, that under the uniform practice of the Senate, since its career began, all bills die. Though a measure had proceeded until it had reached the final stage of its consideration by this body, even though a vote had been ordered when the fateful hour of 12 of the 4th day of March of the odd-numbered year arrives, it falls, and the tedious course through which it has passed must be traversed again when Congress reconvenes.

It is of no consequence when that time arrives what views may have been voiced in the Senate as it was constituted at the preceding session—how protracted or how exhaustive may have been the debate, what statesmanship may have characterised it. The Senate as a constituent part of the new Congress utterly ignores the action taken by its predecessor and proceeds as it did upon the assembling of the First Congress. Not so in the case of an adjournment and a reassembling of Congress within the 2-year period between the 4th day of March of any odd-numbered year and the same day 2 years later. In such a case every bill retains its status over the adjournment. The work of the session proceeds as if no interruption whatever had ensued. This practice, persisted in since the Constitution went into effect, under which each new Congress in both branches proceeds untrammeled by any action which may have been taken by its predecessor on any measures that may have come before it, plainly speaks of a prevalent and accepted theory that each Congress is an entity, possessing the same degree of independence as was enjoyed by the First when it assembled in 1789.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the procedure to which reference has been made is sanctioned by rule XXXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate as they have been observed in past Congresses. But that rule is but an expression of the practice which had been observed long before it first came into existence in 1868. It is merely declaratory in character, like the first clause of Rule I, which directs that "in the absence of the Vice President the Senate shall choose a President pro tempore," a duty enjoined by the Constitution.

The idea of a "continuing" Senate is at war with the theory of parliamentary government the world over. It is an essential conception in such a system that at intervals representatives assemble in one or more houses, transact such business as demands their attention, and then as a legislative body pass out of existence, a new assembly coming into being in conformity with organic law, or at the call of the sovereign authority. The British Parliament is "dissolved" at the end of 7 years by operation of law, unless by the royal fiat its "dissolution" is accomplished earlier.

The Century Dictionary defines "dissolve" as "to disunite, break up; destroy, as any connected system or body; put an end to: as to dissolve a government; to dissolve Parliament."

On reassembling after a dissolution the House of Lords goes through all the formalities attendant upon reorganization. Every member takes the oath. The representative peers from Scotland and Ireland are admitted. The members are, for the greater part, the same. The Lord Chancellor is ready to exercise the duties of presiding officer reposed in him by the constitution, the subordinate officers, even, are all at hand, for even in the House of Commons these functionaries hold practically for life, their tenure being indeterminate, but there is a new Parliament. The House of Lords cannot be said to be a "continuing body." No one ever attempted to characterize it as such. It comes together at the call of the Crown. Writs are issued to every hereditary peer commanding his presence. At its pleasure the Crown dissolves the Parliament and dismisses the members of both houses. As a judicial body the House of Lords has permanency. As a part of the machinery of legislation it undergoes exactly the same dissolving process from time to time as does the House of Commons.

When the Senate is spoken of as a "continuing body" nothing more is meant or can be meant than that two-thirds of its Members remain in office at the expiration of each 2-year period; that is, that there is not a complete change in membership as is the case in the House every second 4th of March, treating Members reelected as new Members.

Reference has been made to the fact that the session of the Senate comes to an end on the arrival of the 4th day of March of each alternate year just as does the session of the House. The Senate cannot continue its existence, try as it may. It cannot reassemble except at the call of the President or upon the arrival of the succeeding first Monday in December. It can neither convene nor can it adjourn beyond 3 days of its own volition.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the Fortieth Congress assembled under a resolution.

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Fortieth Congress was assembled in exactly the way the Senator says cannot be done; that is, by resolution of the two Houses of the Thirty-ninth Congress.

Mr. WALSH. If by a resolution of the preceding Congress they assembled at a certain time it would be simply tantamount to adjournment over to that day.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know about that.

Mr. WALSH. And if they did adjourn for more than three days they did it in defiance of the Constitution and not in accordance with it.

Mr. HARDWICK. That was after March 4.

Mr. WALSH. I cannot help that.

Mr. HARDWICK. But it makes a very vital difference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator will admit, I presume, that every Senator has the same capacity as a Member of this body and the same powers during his entire term. The status of a Member of the Senate does not change at any time during his term of 6 years.

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Whatever may be said in regard to the Senate, a Senator in an official capacity is a continuing official; the office of Senator is a continuous office. I should like to hear the Senator discuss the proposition: If the office of Senator is a continuing office and does not change in any respect during the 6 years of his term, how the body of which he is a Member can be said to be changed in that period of time. The two things, it seems to me, are indissoluble—membership in the body and the body itself. If the Members of the body have exactly the same nonvarying capacity and functions during the entire period of their term, which covers several Congresses, the body which gives them that capacity and authority must also continue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator briefly. I think that is not the correct view at all. There is a vast difference between the Members of the Senate and the Senate. Although a bill should be signed at the home of each of the Members of the Senate by every Member of the Senate it would not be a law. It must be enacted while the Senate is actually assembled in its customary place for the transaction of business. I am talking about the continuity of the Senate as an organized legislative body.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I ask one other question of the Senator? How can there be a member of a body unless there is that body in existence? How can there be membership in the Senate unless there is a Senate?

Mr. WALSH. The answer to that is that the same question may with equal propriety be directed to the House. How can there be a Member of the House of Representatives without a House of Representatives?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There cannot be, Mr. President. The House of Representatives is a continuing body during the term of office of its Members, and is not a continuing body when their term of office expires, but the difference between the House and the Senate is that there are always Members of the Senate covering the entire period of time, without ending or beginning.

Mr. WALSH. The plain answer to that is that the very moment the term of office of the sitting Members of the House of Representatives expires, that moment the term of office of their successors begins, and there never is any interval.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion at this time, that the instance which was cited by the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Hardwick, is one which proves too much. If it be true that the Congress has the power, by resolution, to assemble itself without a call from the President, and that fact is of importance here, would it not also establish a continuing element in the House of Representatives as well as in the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Unquestionably.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me that it proves too much if it is at all applicable to the discussion.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I was not suggesting my entire approval of that proceeding, but the fact is that it has been done in the history of this Government just in that way.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not questioning the accuracy of the Senator's statement. I am merely saying that it proves too much if it is applicable, because it would convert the House, as well as the Senate, into a continuing body.

Mr. WALSH. It may occur to some that this paralysis which biennially overcomes the Senate is due to the fact that it cannot function in the absence of an organized House of Representatives. The Senate has on various occasions adjourned from day to day until the House solved some troubles attendant on the selection of a Speaker, the notion prevailing, to some extent, that it could not proceed with the work of legislation until the other branch of Congress was duly organized, though courtesy alone might have prompted that course.

In the debate on the choice of a Public Printer at the first session of the Twenty-sixth Congress, in the year 1841, to which reference will be made more fully hereafter, and in the course of which the remark was frequently made that the Senate is a "continuing body," while the House is not, it was advanced, and with what appears to have been general acquiescence, that when the Senate alone is called in extra session it can exercise no legislative powers. The question has been discussed here on more than one occasion since. But the Constitution itself settles the question, for it provides, as was stated by the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday, that the President "may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them." He may, accordingly, convene the House of Representatives, which has no powers except those which are legislative in character. It certainly may act in a legislative capacity should it alone be called in extra session, and if it may, how can it be maintained that the Senate cannot?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to address myself to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and ask them this question: In their judgment, even though the President did not summon the Senate or the House, and even though there were not a constitutional provision providing a date for assembly, is it not the opinion of both the learned Senators that the Representatives of the people could come in, take possession of their Chamber, organ-

ize, and proceed with the business of legislation in response to the commission of the people, without regard to the fact that they were not called?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that if they all assembled and proceeded to the enactment of legislation which received the approval of the President of the United States, I am not prepared to say that they could not. Indeed, I apprehend that the action of the President would be regarded as tantamount to a proclamation of assembling them. But, Mr. President, I have no doubt at all that if they did assemble under those circumstances the President of the United States would be entirely justified in refusing to recognise them as authorized to transact any business.

Mr. LEWIS. Then may I ask my able friend to give me his view upon this question: Upon that theory, would we not be forced to the conclusion that until the President called them together they would have no right to come, and if we had a President who had purposes of his own in not calling the Congress, the people then would never have a Congress assemble to express their will?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all, Mr. President. The wise framers of the Constitution carefully guarded against that, because they provided that they should assemble at least once a year, on the first Monday in the month of December, unless the date of assembling should otherwise be fixed by law.

Mr. LEWIS. I thought I understood the able Senator from Montana to contend—and for that reason I rose—I must have misunderstood him—that this body ended unless called together by the President.

Mr. WALSH. Except on the first Monday in December. I so stated.

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HARDWICK, and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the Senator, for whose opinion I have the very highest esteem, whether he is strictly correct in his conclusion that if the House of Representatives should be assembled in special session it could legislate, in view of the constitutional provision which confers upon Congress—not upon the House, not upon the Senate, but upon Congress—the power of legislating? How is it conceivable that one-half of Congress, however assembled, can legislate? It would certainly seem to me to be exceeding its constitutional authority. For that reason I made the point of order yesterday against the bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge].

Mr. WALSH. And quite properly so, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. If the House is in session, one-half of Congress is in session; and the same is true of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. That is the argument that always has been advanced in favor of the contention that the Senate, convened in extra session, can exercise no legislative functions at all, because the legislative power is vested in Congress; but that provision must be considered in connection with the other, authorizing the President to convene the House of Representatives alone. Now, of course, the other House—the Senate—must give its concurrence either before or after the House of Representatives is assembled in extra session. There is not any question about that.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator is logical; but it does seem to me that the exact and literal conferring of power by the Constitution upon the Congress is not of a character that would justify the attempt to legislate by one half of that body when the other half is not in session.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not think that is a difficulty at all, because it is the Congress. When a bill receives the assent of the House of Representatives and receives the assent of the Senate, it has the assent of the Congress; and it does not by any means follow—at least, that is my view—that they must be actually in session concurrently.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. In connection with the Senator's statement that the Constitution provides that the President can call either House in extra session, and that the House of Representatives has no function except a legislative one, and therefore that the Senate can legislate, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the constitutional provision and ask his opinion as to whether that might have an important bearing on this particular question, which provides that the House of Representatives shall have the sole right to originate legislation providing for the raising of revenue. Now, it occurred to me that possibly our forefathers had that in mind when they put in the provision that the President could call the House in special session as well as the Senate—that the House might be called for the purpose of originating and passing, or at least getting ready for passage, laws relating to the raising of revenue; but if that was the only thing that was going to be done in the special session, if the Senate were called at the same time, they could do nothing but wait until the House finished.

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that it had occurred to me that it is not at all improbable that they thought it would be in the interest of dispatch of the public business to assemble the House, when revenue legislation was necessary, a month or 2 months or 3 months before the general assembling of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wanted to suggest to the Senator a rather more important consideration than that, I think. The power to originate impeachment—a matter totally disconnected with legislation—resides in the House of Representatives. That is one character of business that the House may transact, with which the Senate, in the beginning at least, has nothing whatever to do.

Mr. WALSH. That consideration had also addressed itself to me; but I reached the conclusion that impeachment, like the passage of a bill, is absolutely a futile thing unless there is concurrent action by the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not see how the Senator could arrive at that conclusion, because the right to try out the question whether or not articles of impeachment shall be preferred must exist; and if the House decides negatively, the Senate has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. WALSH. Why, certainly. I assume that they are going to find the articles, however.

Mr. HARDWICK. But very often they do not.

Mr. WALSH. Very often they reject a bill, too.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand; but the power to consider the question is absolutely disconnected with any function of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I do not quite agree with that; but even if that were true, I could scarcely believe that one could construe the provision granting power to the President to convene the House in extra session as being limited in its scope to the preferment of impeachment charges against an officer. I scarcely believe that that could have been in the minds of the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. That might be, if the Senator will pardon me, one of the most important things that could ever be brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that you might just as well claim that a grand jury could not find an indictment unless there was at the same time a petit jury impaneled to try the case, to try the indictment.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think so. I do not think the analogy is perfect at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it may not be perfect, but still there is an analogy. The function of the House in finding an impeachment and the function of the Senate in trying it are analogous in some respects to the indictment by a grand jury and the trial of the indictment by a petit jury; and it seems to me that one can sit separate from the other in each case.

Mr. WALSH. This discussion has been in the nature of a diversion, Mr. President. I proceed.

The Senate was accordingly shorn of none of its legislative powers by reason of the fact that the House organization fell with the arrival of March 4 if the Senate is and remained a continuing body. But even if it were thus limited in its powers, why should it not remain in session and proceed with the executive business before it? Two treaties were pending at the time the Sixty-fourth Congress came to an end, one at least imperatively demanding the attention of the Senate. So imperative were its claims that in the estimation of many the good faith of our Government toward a sister nation was compromised by further delay. Senators may differ as to the action that should be taken upon it; none can question the propriety of a speedy reply as to whether it is approved or not.

Owing to conditions on which it is not necessary to dwell, 1,134 nominations theretofore sent to the Senate by the President, many of them for offices of the highest importance, in view of the grave crisis confronting the country, were before it for consideration. Of these more than 1,100 had been reported upon by the committees to which they were referred and were on the calendar of the Senate awaiting its final action.

The President obviously did not think the Senate a continuous or continuing body, in any sense in which the House is not likewise continuing or continuous in character. It is quite apparent that he did not believe that the Senate might quite properly at noon on March 4 admit the new Members who should present themselves with no more interruption of the business of the Senate than attends the admission of a new Member elected or appointed in the midst of a session to fill a vacancy occasioned by death or resignation, and thereupon proceed with the executive business before it or with such as he might transmit. Anticipating that the session would terminate and that the Senate would become powerless to act at noon on March 4, he issued his proclamation on the 23d day of February last, requiring this body to reconvene in extra session on March 5. This he did in accordance with the understanding and the practice that has prevailed even from the days of the fathers. The Senate realized its impotency when the fateful hour arrived and dissolved without a protest, upon the affirmation by the occupant of the chair, a profound lawyer, that "under the Constitution" the body stood adjourned sine die.

When it reassembled next day the Acting President pro tempore, who called the assembly to order, caused the proclamation of the President to be read in evidence of its authority to be and to act. No Senator, however emphatically he may today assert that the Senate is a continuing body, had sufficient confidence in the opinion he now expresses, to suggest on Sunday last, that the Senate remain in session after noon of that day to dispatch any business that might be before it, either executive or legislative.

Though the Vice President yesterday expressed somewhat hurriedly, though probably not without reflection, not only that the Senate is a continuous body but that the rules perpetuate themselves because it is such, he did not have the temerity to arrest the automatic dissolution of the session on Sunday. Some practical difficulties arising from the acceptance of the theory that the Senate is now without rules were suggested in the course of the comments by the Vice President, alluded to, among others, that he is, if that theory is sound, not the Vice President, apparently his view being that it would follow that his induction into office had not been legally accomplished. His right to preside depends to no extent on what transpired here on Monday. He was legally elected Vice President. He might qualify by taking the oath anywhere. The Senate has no power either to admit or to reject him as its Presiding Officer. The Senator who during the last session was elected President pro tempore called the Senate to order and administered the oath. Any Senator might have done either act without imperiling the validity of the proceedings. It has happened that there was neither Vice President nor President pro tempore, but that difficulty was easily solved. The majority Senator longest in service usually calls the Senate to order, when it proceeds to organize. At the first session there could have been no President pro tempore to administer the oath, and even on assembling no Secretary to record the proceedings, no Sergeant at Arms to preserve order.

Here I might state a rather interesting historical fact, that the Senate on assembling for the first time was in session at least 3 or 4 days before it elected a Secretary.

The House of Representatives finds itself in that predicament as to the minor officers every 2 years. The embarrassments imagined by the Vice President are never apprehended by the House of Representatives, and such as they are they are met by every State legislative assembly—indeed, by both branches of every legislative assembly, on every occasion of their assembling except when they are convened in extra session.

Henry Clay insisted that the House of Representatives is as much a continuous body as is the Senate. He maintained that the same House that first convened in 1789 sat in 1841—its membership changed, changing possibly every 2 years, but remaining the same governmental agency. He likened the case to a court whose existence continues indefinitely, though the judges change from time to time. A court comprised of three judges would not cease to exist though the terms of all three expired at the same time instead of at intervals so that but one returned at a time. Their successors, should others be elected or appointed, would take the bench and the business of the court proceed without interruption. Senator Thurman took the same view. In the debate on the joint rules in 1876 he said:

"Why is it said that the Senate is a perpetual body? I know of no reason except one, and that is that only one-third of the Members go out every 2 years, so that there is always a sufficient number of Senators in office to constitute a quorum of the Senate. If the judges of the Supreme Court were all to die today, and their successors should be appointed tomorrow, it would still be the same Supreme Court, although the individuals would be changed. The Members of the House of Representatives are in a great measure different from those of the last House of Representatives, but still it is the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Its character does not depend on its personnel; its character does not depend on the individuality of its Members; it is the House, which, according to the true idea of the Constitution, is a perpetual House, whoever may constitute the individual Members of that House."

It has been seen that the idea of perpetuity as an inherent quality in the House, thus advanced by one of the most brilliant and by one of the most profound statesmen that has ever held membership in the Senate, has been definitely repudiated by the other branch of Congress. But the contention which they both put forth that, with respect to perpetuity or continuity, no distinction can properly be raised between the Senate and the House has never been answered.

The logical result of the acceptance of that doctrine was pointed out by Senator Morton in the debate on the joint rules. Referring to the views expressed by Senator Thurman, he remarked:

"The argument of my friend from Ohio, I submit to him, defeats itself. He says the House of Representatives is a perpetual body just like the Senate. Well, the House of Representatives has always assumed that it made its own rules. It has adopted rules at the beginning of each Congress, showing that in its judgment the rules of the former House are not binding upon it. The two Houses stand upon the same footing, and that would be the law also in the Senate; the rules of the Senate at a former session are not binding at the next session, and the Senate consequently must adopt its rules at the beginning of every session."

The Senator must have meant to convey the idea that, conceding the soundness of Thurman's position, at the first session of each new Congress the Senate would be required to adopt rules. The analogy to which Thurman had recourse is not perfect, as the House ultimately decided, because under the system in vogue at stated intervals corresponding with the times when the terms of all the Members of the House and one-third of those of the Senate expire, the authority of Congress automatically ceases, and its action must be invoked on reconvening by proceedings entirely new. It is not necessary to start anew all lawsuits that were pending at the time the judge's term expired. The work of the court is continuous, however the personnel of the bench may change. A court never undergoes any fatality either equivalent or analogous to a dissolution. In legislation it has been deemed wise to fix periods, corresponding usually with the terms of the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, after the lapse of which its authority ceases, the assembly when it reconvenes being bound in no way in respect to its proceedings by any action taken theretofore, and specifically by no rules deriving their force from such action, even though some of the Members may be hold-overs. A legislative period as distinguished from a session is a common conception in parliamentary government.

In a late report of a committee of the House of Commons to inquire into procedure with a view to reforming the system in vogue in that body occurs the following:

"In continental parliament it is the common rule that at the beginning of a legislative period the chair should be occupied by the oldest member."

A table is given of the duration of standing committees in the legislatures of the leading countries in which parliamentary government prevails, in which the legislative period is contrasted with the session.

The idea of a complete break in the life of legislative assemblies at stated intervals is implied in the very terminology applicable to their sittings.

This will be known as the Sixty-fifth Congress, and so designated in all the official records. I am sending to the desk a list, to which reference will be made hereafter, of official publications from which it will appear that in Iowa they refer to the "thirty-fifth general assembly," in Missouri to the "forty-seventh general assembly," in Utah to the "seventeenth legislature," and in Texas to the "thirty-third legislature." I hold in my hand an official publication of what purports to be the laws of the "Thirteenth General Assembly of Montana."

In harmony with the idea embodied in this form of expression, the custom of formally adopting rules on reassembling after a general election seems to be universal among the constituent bodies of American legislatures and is observed even by those, one-half of whose members or even two-thirds are hold-overs.

In New Jersey the members of the lower house are elected annually. As to the senate, the constitution provides that:

"The senate shall be composed of one senator from each county in the State, elected by the legal voters of the counties, respectively, for 3 years. As soon as the senate shall meet after the first election to be held in pursuance of this constitution, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the first year; of the second class at the expiration of the second year; and of the third class at the expiration of the third year, so that one class may be elected every year, and if vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, the persons elected to supply such vacancies shall be elected for the unexpired terms only."

Obviously the New Jersey Senate is constituted on identically the same principle that is said to give continuity to the United States Senate. Yet the former regularly observes the custom referred to, adopting rules at the beginning of each regular session. It was followed in the sixty-eighth senate, 1912 (Journal, pp. 18, 19), in the sixty-ninth senate, 1913 (Journal, pp. 19, 20, 21), and in the seventieth senate, 1914 (Journal, pp. 10 to 13). The supreme court of that State has held, after the most elaborate argument and upon the fullest consideration, that notwithstanding the fact that two-thirds of the members of the Senate of New Jersey are hold-overs, it is not a continuous body, but assembles annually, as does the lower house, as a body quite distinct from the senate of the preceding year. More will be said of this case hereafter.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does not that authority draw a distinction between that case and the Senate of the United States?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I am going to refer to that. I am going to show just what the distinction is that the judges seek to draw.

The resolution customarily, as in the National House of Representatives, proposes that the rules in force at the last preceding session be adopted until otherwise ordered, evidencing the view that such rules would not be operative without affirmative action of the part of the body thus adopting them. In nearly half the States of the Union members of the upper branch of the legislature are elected for terms double the length of those of the lower house, and are so classified as that one-half of them go out of office with each general change in the more numerous branch. Usually the lieutenant governor is made ex officio presiding officer of the upper house. Yet they all, apparently, adopt rules on assembling after a general election; in none is any countenance given to the idea that the rules adopted at some remote time, under conditions that might be characterized as primitive, are efficacious to prevent the representatives, coming fresh from the people, from carrying out their will with all due speed.

The memorandum sent to the desk a few moments ago contains a list of 21 States—half of the members of whose senates, respectively, are hold-overs—in all of which the custom prevails, to which reference has been made. For convenience of verification the page of the Senate Journal is given in each instance. I ask that the memorandum be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, what has been thus far offered may be said to be more or less

technical in character. I should despair of securing acceptance of the views which have been advanced, however sound they might appear to those who have followed the discussion, as a matter of strict legal right, unless the conviction is aroused that elemental justice and sound policy demand their adoption.

Why should the Senate, as it is constituted during any particular Congress, have power to impose its views concerning the procedure in this body upon the Senate of some succeeding Congress, one-third of the Members of which possibly, never heard of the rules to which they become subject? I appeal particularly to the new Members appearing upon this floor for the first time 2 days ago, and to you, Mr. President, and to my fellow Members in their behalf.

Why should such Members be bound by the so-called rule of "unlimited debate" which the Senate that assembled in the year 1806 deemed wise to adopt to regulate its deliberations? Is it consistent with the idea of representative government that they should be restrained by such a rule or by any rule to which their assent was never given and never asked? What is the theory upon which you decline to hold them bound by any action which the Senate, as constituted before they entered it, may have taken with reference to any bill? Why is it insisted that everything proceed de novo? What is the basis of reason underlying the want of power to proceed with all bills at the stage at which they had arrived at the death of one Congress upon the assembling of another? Clearly, because the people, whose representatives we are, have a right to have all measures that engage the attention of this body considered without prejudice on account of any action that may have been taken by a Senate whose course and record had made it odious, or which, for some other reason, had been regenerated so far as it was possible to make a change. It is because the new Members, coming fresh from the people, ought to have the right to be heard and be accorded the opportunity to vote in the light of information gleaned at every stage of the passage of a bill or resolution.

The formalities observed are enjoined by the rules and by general parliamentary law, so that through deliberation a wiser conclusion may more certainly be assured. Moreover the elections which bring an entirely new membership to the House and new Members to the number of one-third to the Senate are quite the equivalent of those which ensue in most countries upon a dissolution of the parliament. The sense of the people is taken concerning measures passed as well as those proposed. The result should not be without its lessons to those Senators who are to continue their service. All ought to act and be required to act in the light of the latest expression of the people. It is quite generally understood that the mere matter of the reference of a bill to one committee rather than to another occasionally signifies whether it is again to see the light of day or not. Neither the new Member nor the old Member whose views have changed to conform to the popular will ought to be required to acquiesce in the reference of a bill to an adverse committee. For like reasons the action of the Senate in the appointment of its committee goes for naught when it gets the regular infusion of new blood.

"Vacancies in the committees occasioned by the regular retirement of one-third of the Members are not filled up as they are in the event of the occurrence of such during the life of the Congress. They are constituted anew at the commencement of each Congress," to use the language of rule XXXIII. Treaties fall that are not acted upon at the adjournment of any final session of a Congress, though they preserve their status from one interim session to another (rule XXXVII). Can anyone assign any good reason why the Senate, as it begins the work of a new Congress, should be unrestrained by any action theretofore taken upon any bill or resolution or treaty or in the appointment of committees and yet be subject to the fiat of this assembly at some earlier day as to the method it is to pursue in dealing with bills or resolutions or treaties identical in every respect with those theretofore considered? The theory of the perpetuity of the rules subserves no good purpose and is a convenient one for the promotion of the ends of factional reactionaries.

It is well known that adroit parliamentarians in the service of corrupt masters of some of our legislative assemblies contrive speciously to have the rules so framed as to be useful in obstructing the enactment of remedial legislation and then tie the hands of later legislatures by procuring the hurried adoption, on organization, of the rules of the last assembly.

The idea I am combating is a refinement on this hoary but unhonored practice. It is fraught with a danger even more grave, illustrated by an incident in the history of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, whose senate is constituted, as will be remembered, upon the model of the National Senate. As a result of the elections held in the fall of 1893 the political complexion of the Senate of that State changed, though contests were instituted which, if successful, would preserve the status of the preceding year. A majority of the hold-overs were Democrats. These assembled in the customary meeting place and proclaimed themselves the duly organized senate. They set up the claim that the senate is a continuous body; that on assembling after the election the old members alone constituted the senate; that they alone could admit new members; that they alone were invested with the right to pass upon the credentials of the new members and to say which, if any, of two contesting for the same seat should be recognized pending the contest.

The conditions excited what appeared to be a well-grounded suspicion on the part of the Republican members of a plot to seat enough Democratic claimants to maintain the supremacy in the chamber of the party to which they adhered. The Republican hold-overs organized, with their brethren newly elected, a separate assemblage which sat in the antechamber and claimed to be the only true senate. The rivalries of the two bodies became the subject of inquiry by the supreme court of that State which utterly exploded the claim of continuity, and with it the pretension of the majority hold-overs that none might participate in the deliberations of the new senate, if so it may be called until admitted in due course by an assemblage of those whose terms had not expired and at such time as suited their convenience or their whim. The details will be learned from the report of the case *State* v. *Rogers* (55 N. J. L., 480).

Will it be contended that on assembling after the 4th day of March in the odd-numbered years, two-thirds of the Members of the Senate of the preceding Congress may proclaim themselves the United States Senate, appoint from among their number a committee on credentials, charge it with the duty of examining into the credentials of all new claimants to seats in this body, and that meanwhile and pending a report from that committee it may proceed with the transaction of business? Such a procedure would not be an abuse of power but a usurpation.

Members presenting themselves Monday morning were sworn upon exhibiting their credentials, and immediately acquired the right to participate in all the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is the Senator from Montana referring to the present Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Montana himself during the session of the Senate of the last Congress rose in his seat and presented the credentials of his colleague [Mr. Myers], who had been elected last November, and asked that they be received and entered upon the records of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. I did.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And was that not done?

Mr. WALSH. It was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Did not receiving the credentials of a Senator newly elected constitute an act of the old Senate and constitute a continuing membership?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. The credentials were turned over to the Secretary of the Senate here in open Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, why did he not wait until the convening and organization of the Senate to which his colleague had been elected, and present the credentials to the Secretary of that body?

Mr. WALSH. I simply proceeded in accordance with the usage.

Mr. HARDWICK. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. It does not signify anything one way or the other, so far as I can see.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if he sees no advantage or convenience in the permanency and continuity of a set of rules for the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have never discovered that any disaster has come to the Republic by reason of the adoption of that idea in the House of Representatives. As I have tried to indicate to the Senate, the matter has been debated and debated, and the practice in the House has been both ways. Finally the House has come to the conclusion that the procedure now followed is the course that ought to be adopted.

Mr. STERLING. Are not the rules apt to be better known and better understood if we have continuous rules?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes. The Senator from South Dakota, however, need have no apprehension about that, because, of course, the rules as a complete body would remain practically unchanged. It is exactly the same with the rules of a court.

Mr. THOMAS. And of the House.

Mr. WALSH. The rules of a court change from time to time, but the bar generally understands that in any revision, as a whole, they would be continued in force, and that changes would be made only in specific cases in which a necessity for the change had been demonstrated by experience.

Mr. STERLING. Take it in general parliamentary practice or general parliamentary law, is it not a great advantage and convenience that we recognize certain fixed rules as governing deliberative bodies?

Mr. WALSH. Undoubtedly. It is not to be assumed that the Senate, in modifying its rules, would disregard those fairly well-fixed principles.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I understand the Senator to say that no new Member of this body ought to be bound by the rules which had been enacted by a previous Senate. Then, a new Member may move to change the rules, may he not?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. And if, in the judgment of a majority of this body, the rules should be changed, they may be changed at any time?

Mr. WALSH. A new Member may move to change the rules; but just so long as the Senator from South Dakota has physical endurance to stand on the floor the change could not be made.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know as to that. It may appeal to the wisdom and the good judgment of the Senate that the one particular rule to which the Senator from Montana refers should be changed. It is a matter that may be brought before the Senate

at any time. It, after all, rests in the judgment of the Senate, to be determined by a majority vote, whether that rule should be changed, whether or not it is a hindrance to legislation, or whether it is in the interest or not in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator resumes I should like to ask, if it would be agreeable to him, to have put into the RECORD the joint resolution adopted by Congress on January 22, 1867, which called a session of the new Congress to follow it on March 4, 1867.

Mr. WALSH. That would be agreeable to me, Mr. President, but I trust it will be put in at the conclusion rather than in the body of my address.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, I now ask consent that the joint resolution to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator, because it shows that heretofore Congress has used its power to call a session of Congress, and that it is not necessary for the President to do so.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is true that in the New Jersey case the court accepted without inquiry the oft-repeated assertion that the United States Senate is a continuous body, but pointed to some provisions of the local constitution which it said served to differentiate it from the senate of that State. But the whole argument of the court against the pretensions of continuity in the life of the New Jersey Senate is equally applicable to its counterpart in the Federal Congress.

The claim rests, in the case of both bodies, upon the fact that two-thirds of the Members, more than a quorum, are always in office, and that a presiding officer is designated by the law.

Mr. President, because I am obliged to leave, I want to submit a few observations now upon matters that will be under consideration, assuming that the view for which I am contending is rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair interrupt the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to remain in the position he has taken—that it is not any of his business what rules the Senate adopts, and that he has no function except to carry out the will of the Senate—but take the old rules. The rule provides that no motion to suspend, modify, or amend the rules "shall be in order, except on one day's notice," and so forth. The Senator is conversant with it. Is there any inconsistency in the fact that there are now rules of the Senate which, if they are to be amended in any particular, must be amended in accordance with the rules, and the broad proposition that a set of new rules may be presented as an entirety to take the place of the existing rules?

Mr. WALSH. I should say, quite so; the two are utterly inconsistent. If the old rules are in force——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not get the point the Chair would like to have the Senator enlighten the Senate upon.

Mr. WALSH. I shall attend very carefully.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What have the old rules of the Senate to do with the desire of the Senate to adopt new rules at once, if they want to, if they are presented as a whole, instead of as amendments?

Mr. WALSH. If new rules, as a whole, an entire body of new rules are presented—and that is what I have done; I have presented an entire body of new rules, which are identical with the old rules, with the exception of rule XXII—I have no doubt that some Senator will make a point of order that the motion is out of order; that my resolution contemplates an amendment of the rules; and that the rules can be amended only in accordance with their provisions. They must go——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has any Presiding Officer ever ruled in that way?

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Chair to say yesterday that in his view——

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are rules here?

Mr. WALSH. That the old rules were in force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. My contention is that the body is now governed by general parliamentary law and not by the old rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are no old rules.

Mr. WALSH. That is to say, there are no old rules of the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not desire to break off the continuity of thought of the Senator from Montana or to interfere in this matter, but the Chair perceives a very great distinction between attempting to amend the rules or a part of the rules, and the presentation of a new set of rules to be adopted by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the parliamentary situation of a certain resolution introduced by the Senator from Montana. I will ask the Senator from Montana if he requested the reference of the resolution to a committee?

Mr. WALSH. If my view is correct, there is no committee to which it can be referred; indeed I think that is the state of affairs anyway—that, under the rules, there is no committee to which it can be referred.

Mr. STERLING. Would the Senator from Montana say that it should lie over until another day?

Mr. WALSH. Why, no. According to my view, I say it can be disposed of just as resolutions in a political convention are disposed of, governed by general parliamentary law. There is no rule that requires it to lie over any time. That is the argument I have been making, that there is no rule, and the Senate now can proceed just as it directs with respect to the matter; and there is no rule except general parliamentary law governing its action.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Ohio will pardon me, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is exactly the situation that would obtain in the House of Representatives, if, upon the assembling of that body, some Member introduced a resolution.

Mr. STERLING. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana must admit that political conventions, to which he makes allusion, first adopt the rules governing the House of Representatives until they adopt their own rules of procedure; but in this case the Senator from Montana is assuming a status of legislative chaos. We have nothing practically——

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. I recognize that sometimes political conventions do adopt a resolution of that kind; but more often they do not. They simply proceed, and Robert's Rules of Order or Reed's Rules of Order are referred to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. WALSH. And Jefferson's Manual is referred to; so that no resolution on the subject of rules is adopted at all.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I want to ask the Senator from Montana another question.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will pardon me, of course assemblages of all kinds gather in this country, farmers' meetings, teachers' institutes, and all that kind of thing, and they proceed quite successfully without the adoption of any rules.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, all bodies start out with a temporary organization, and adopt some recognized rules of procedure. I want to ask the Senator from Montana if he holds that there is anything to impede a change of the rule which he has in mind if the Senate accepts its recognized rules and proceeds in regular order to make the change?

Mr. WALSH. If I am sound in my opinion, it is simply impossible to change the rules so long as one man has the physical endurance requisite to prevent the change. I offered a resolution this morning which contemplates a change of the rules. Under the rules, if they do exist, any Senator may debate that motion without end and without limit; one may raise a point of order that debate upon the matter is out of order, and if the Chair should sustain that point, and assuming that the old rules are in force and that we are proceeding in accordance with them to secure an amendment, an appeal is taken, the appeal may be debated without end, and thus the amendment of the rules is frustrated.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana and I are agreed as to the object aimed at. I am quite content to say that I favor some modified form of cloture rule; but the point I want to make is, that where the sentiment of this body is favorable to a change of the rules no dilatory tactics can long obtain in opposing that change of the rules.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has not been here as long as some of us.

Mr. HARDING. That is quite true; I admit that; but I am not ready to accept the soundness of the Senator's argument, that this is not a continuing body; and I cannot accept the contention that we must first enter into a state of chaos in order to bring about the reform which the Senator seeks.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Montana stated, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterling], that, in his opinion, there were no committees now. I will remind the Senator that Senator Kern introduced a resolution, which passed this body, continuing in force the committees of the Senate as they then existed. So that there are committees now in existence.

Mr. HARDING. If the Senator from Montana will not be annoyed at another interruption——

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

Mr. HARDING. If there are no committees continued, I should like to know by what process the Committee on Rules authoritatively designates what apartments the several Senators shall occupy?

Mr. OVERMAN. I say that the committees have been continued in force by the action of this body.

Mr. HARDING. I think that very wise——

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand the statement of the Senator from Ohio as to the activities of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARDING. I asked if there were no committees now, by what authority could the Committee on Rules designate to the new Senators their apartments in the Senate Office Building?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will excuse me just a moment, I will read the resolution which was adopted by the Senate on motion of Senator Kern, of Indiana. It is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress, or until their successors are duly elected."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, that resolution indicates that the committees are in existence by virtue of a special act of the last Senate, and not because they continued under the rules, the existence of which is now being challenged by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I thought some Senator might rise and say that I was exceeding my authority in assigning rooms

to the new Senators, and inasmuch as the Senator from Montana said there were no committees, I desired to direct his attention to the resolution which has been adopted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think every one will acquiesce in the course of the Senator from North Carolina in the matter to which reference has been made. Likewise, Mr. President, the adoption of the resolution immediately suggests that it was the opinion of the Senate that the committees would die unless some action were taken continuing them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is another obstruction to a change in the rules. Under the old rules, as they have been interpreted by this body several times within the last few years, the Senate has decided under rule XI that it requires a two-thirds vote, even when we get the question up to a vote, to suspend or to modify any rule of the Senate. The Senate, by its interpretation, has written that into the rules, although from the language of the rule itself it would seem that a majority should control. The rule is as follows:

RULE XL. SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII.

As will be observed, there is absolutely nothing in the rule that can possibly be construed as fairly implying the requirement of a two-thirds vote, but the Senate has unfortunately decreed otherwise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has not so decided. The requirement as to a two-thirds vote relates to a suspension of the rules, and not to a modification of the rules.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me for a moment, as I am obliged to leave the Chamber shortly, I desire to say that earlier in the day I presented a number of memorials from the Montana Legislature. I overlooked the fact that by resolution of the preceding Congress, the committees of this body had been continued. I asked that the memorials lie on the table. I now ask unanimous consent that they be referred to the appropriate committees to which they pertain.

Mr. WALSH. I shall object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There seems to be objection.

Mr. WALSH. I think they can very well remain where they are until we actually get to work.

But let it be assumed that the argument thus far made cannot be accepted, that the Senate is indeed a continuous body in the widest sense; that the rules are endowed with a vitality, upon which age makes no inroads. I trust I am not wanting in reverence for the political sages of a century ago whose wisdom in all things that appertain to government has commanded the admiration of a grateful posterity.

It may be that we are obliged generally to accept for our guidance the rules they prescribed in 1806 to govern the deliberations of the Senate; that we are required, in a double sense, to salute them as—

"The dead but sceptered sovereigns, who still rule
Our spirits from their urns."

I venture to assert, notwithstanding, that their power to make rules was not without limitation. The Supreme Court defined that limitation in *United States* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 5, 6), saying in the opinion in that case:

"The Constitution empowers each House to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result sought to be attained."

The Senate, on the 13th day of January, 1915, recorded its judgment that, under the rules then recognized, a two-thirds vote was necessary to the suspension of the rule. A majority determined that two-thirds must assent to accomplish a suspension. It is not so expressed in the rule—rule XL. But it was believed to be implied therein. If so, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that it is equally implied that a two-thirds vote is necessary to amend the rules. Let it be assumed that the wise men, whose work these rules are, expressly so declared in what is now rule XL. Had they the right to make such a rule? Would it have any efficacy? Would it be entitled to any respect at any time or place? If they had such right, they might, with equal power, whatever might be said as to the justice or propriety of their action, have prescribed that the rules should not be amended except with the concurrence of three-fourths of the Members or nine-tenths, or 99 percent, or that like the laws of the Medes and Persians they should remain immutable forever. Any such regulation would be void because it would transgress the vital principle of majority rule. When the Constitution says that each House may determine its rules of proceeding, it means that each House may, by a majority vote, a quorum being present, determine its rules.

It is elementary that unless otherwise prescribed by the Constitution the Senate can, by a majority vote, do anything it can do at all. Speaker Reed says in his manual, speaking of amendment to the rules of parliamentary bodies:

"Such modifications the assembly is always competent to make. Such changes can be made by a majority. This is true even if the rules already adopted provide that two-thirds or any larger number alone shall make changes. The assembly cannot deprive itself of power to direct its method of doing business. It is like a man promising himself that he will not change his own mind.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. As I understand, the gravamen of the Senator's contention is that he wishes some cloture for the ending of the debate; and I judge from what he has said that he presumes that the proposal to amend a rule would cause contention which would finally result in a test of physical endurance. Now, if the Senator proposes new rules, does he propose to muzzle the Senate so that they shall not debate them? And if they are new rules, is there anything to prevent debate on every one of those rules by the Senate and by every Member of it? Does he think he would gain any time in the long run by declaring that we are in chaos and without rules, and undertaking to build up an entirely new set of rules rather than by taking up the offensive rule and amending it?

That is the practical question. I am not entering into the elementaries of the matter.

Mr. WALSH. I want to answer the question in a perfectly practical way. I shall assume, as I said a while ago, that the rules will be in substance the same; that there will be no great change in the general body of the rules.

Mr. WARREN. I am putting it right down upon the basis of the Senator's argument that we are totally and wholly without rules; that we will start in to adopt new rules. If that is true, no matter if every rule but one is the same as the Senator presents it, yet every one of them is open to debate, if it is offered as a new matter.

Mr. WALSH. Why, undoubtedly—undoubtedly.

Mr. WARREN. Then does the Senator think, practically, that he would gain any time in that way rather than simply to recognize the old rules and seek to amend the particular one in question?

Mr. WALSH. But the Senator from Wyoming will recognize that if a resolution were presented here to amend only one rule, under the existing system every man who cares to do so may get up and talk about each rule from beginning to end; so they are all before us anyway.

Mr. WARREN. I will admit that under the rules there is practically unlimited debate, but what I am getting at is this: The Senator has evidently given this matter great attention, and has proceeded with great ability, as he always does with all matters that challenge his attention; but I cannot practically see where we are going to eliminate ourselves any sooner from the condition in which the Senators and the Senate find themselves if we adopt his theory that we are meeting here each time, every 2 years, without rules; because, as the Senator from Ohio has said, every body, when it meets, assumes the rules of some other body until it makes its own; and with two-thirds of the older body sitting as present Members, is it not better to assume the rules of the body wherein the two-thirds have helped to make those rules than to undertake to say we have none, or to assume the rules of some other body?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Wyoming will note that the resolution to which I am addressing myself provides that all of the rules of the Senate during the last Congress be adopted as the rules of the present one, save and except rule XXII.

Mr. WARREN. Then to what effect is the Senator's argument leading, that we have no rules, and that we are building up new ones?

Mr. WALSH. It is to the effect that as we have no rules we proceed under general parliamentary law which permits us to put an end to debate at some time.

Mr. WARREN. Well, we will do that, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I think I see what the Senator from Wyoming is driving at. It is within the power of this or any other body, unless the rules forbid, to fix a time when a vote can be had upon any question. It is within the power of this body now to vote to fix a time for voting upon this very proposition at 2 o'clock, so there is no practical difficulty in the way.

Mr. WALSH. That is the line of argument which I am now going to make—that a legislative body cannot deprive itself of the power to fix a time when a vote shall be taken.

Mr. WARREN. I understand from the Senator, then, that he proposes to accept entire and en bloc the Senate rules, with one exception?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; and that in the expectation that when that exception is reserved, and an appropriate rule is made, we can then proceed with reasonable dispatch to correct any defect that there may be in other features of the rules.

Mr. WARREN. I wish the Senator to understand that I do not object to some manner of procedure that may terminate what sometimes becomes intolerable; but I am not willing yet to take the ground that every 2 years we are at sea without rudder or compass regarding rules.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I am thankful to the Senator for the attention he has given to my presentation of the other view of the matter.

Mr. HARDING and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio, who first rose.

Mr. HARDING. I want to ask the Senator from Montana a question. I do not want him to misconstrue my motive, or to think that the proposition is founded on the fortunes of political majorities in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator need have no fear on that score.

Mr. HARDING. The Senator spoke a moment ago of the framers of the Constitution having the purpose that the Senate should be directed by the will of the majority. I assume that the Senator will agree that it was also designed that the Senate should be a deliberative body. I want to ask him, in perfect good faith, if he believes the framers of the Constitution had in mind at any time the domination of the majority through a majority in political conference or caucus, whereby a minority of this body could determine the proceedings of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I cannot doubt that the framers of the Constitution had in mind the fact that they were framing a system under which party government would be operative, and in that view they must have recognized that party members would confer and endeavor to agree upon a concerted line of action. I cannot doubt that. Their model was the English constitution; experience had taught them that there were two parties in the Parliament, and that the two parties were composed of members who conferred together and usually agreed upon a certain line of action which they desired to pursue.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I am in perfect accord with the Senator from Montana in his statement that we are a Government through political parties. I think that it ever must be so, and I hope it will be so. I want to ask the Senator, however, if he is contending for a rule of the majority which will allow a majority in caucus to direct the majority in the Senate to come in here with a previous-question proposition which will deny the minority of the Senate the right of debate?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana would not think for a moment of advocating any course the tendency of which would be to shut off legitimate debate; but I am sure the Senator from Ohio will have recognized in very recent events and in the proceedings of recent Congresses the necessity for shutting off something that is a mere pretense of debate.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, if I may reply to that, I am again in accord with the Senator from Montana; and I have the abiding faith that a conservative cloture rule can be made a rule of this body along the lines of regular procedure for the amendment of the rules, without adopting a chaotic condition here wherein a majority of the Senate can fix the rules.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio that any chaotic condition would ensue, but I join with him in the hope that a reasonable cloture rule may be adopted; and it is in view of the likelihood of the submission of such that I am now addressing the Senate upon the question as to whether, when it is before us, it will be possible under the rules as they exist—assuming that they continue—for a Senator to stand here and simply pretend to debate, and hold up the proceedings of the Senate until he drops in his tracks from physical exhaustion. I want to address myself to that question for a few minutes.

A majority may adopt the rules, in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them. A court would make itself the subject of ridicule that should attempt to adopt rules one of which should provide that they could be changed only by a vote of two-thirds of the judges. It would not be tyrannical to make such a rule; it would be futile. The court, when wiser men graced the bench, would contemptuously, by a majority, set it aside. It is scarcely less preposterous that a legislative body should by rule deny itself the right to bring debate to an end and to proceed to a vote; nay, that it should by rule provide that so long as any Member should hold the floor and pretend to debate, there should be no vote; that though such pretense should be persisted in until it became a hollow mockery, a transparent sham, a subject of open raillery and jocularity, there should be no vote; that so long as there remains one Member with physical strength to keep the floor there should be no vote.

In the course of debates in this body in which the remark has been unreflectingly made, frequently, that the Senate is a continuous body and that the rules continue in force from Congress to Congress, they have been likened to the rules of a court that remain in force whatever changes ensue in the personnel of the judges.

The inaptness of the illustration has been adverted to. But continue the comparison. Suppose a rule of court expressly authorized counsel to be heard ad libitum, what reverence would be paid to it in the face of an abuse of the right by counsel who undertook to talk against time? Would not any court make itself contemptible by recognizing any force in such a rule? To make the parallel more perfect, let it be assumed that the rule forbade any decision so long as any member of the bench desired to talk. Would not the court be declining to discharge the functions reposed in it by the Constitution by refusing to decide, after a reasonable time for investigation had elapsed and a reasonable opportunity had been given to every justice to make known his views and to convert his brethren to his way of thinking? To delay justice is to deny justice. The judge who heeded such a rule, after becoming satisfied that the due proceeding of the court was being arrested to await adjournment or a change in its composition, or some other fortuitous circumstance that might avert the impending judgment, would be guilty of a violation of his oath to administer justice without delay.

I assert unhesitatingly that the Senate has no power to make a rule which will prevent it from bringing debate to a close or setting a time for a vote. That there are limitations upon the exercise of the right to bring on a vote may be conceded, but to maintain that a rule has any virtue under which one man may, by his physical prowess alone, defeat a vote is to invite calamity unspeakable and expose the Senate to the well-deserved contempt of mankind.

Reflecting upon this question being discussed, I wrote 2 years ago as follows:

"Much has been said recently of preparedness and the subject promises to engage the earnest thought of Congress.

"The people whom, in our feeble way, we are trying here to represent are evidently resolved to take upon themselves burdens for providing and maintaining a Naval and Military Establishment greater than ever heretofore borne in time of peace, and rivaling those rendered necessary by the exigencies of the Civil War. A genuine alarm pervades the country lest some enemy may, in the very near future, attack us. Imagine the time at hand and the foe bearing down upon us. The crisis involves the very life of the Nation. The occasion brooks no delay. Action—immediate action—by Congress is imperative. Congress is empowered by the Constitution to declare war. Congress it is that is to raise and support armies. Congress is to provide and maintain a Navy. Congress is to provide for calling forth the militia to repel invasions and to organize armies and discipline them to that end. Congress it is that must lay and collect taxes to meet the expenditures of war and that must borrow money on the credit of the United States for the vigorous prosecution of war. It is scarcely conceivable that war should be precipitated or be impending without an appeal from the President, both in his civil capacity and as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces of the Nation, for some hurried action by Congress. Such an appeal comes to this body. It finds a ready response except from a small coterie of Senators, who spell each other on the floor until the enemy thunders at the gates of our cities, and the Republic has had its death blow. They may be honest but misguided peace-at-any-price men, who refuse to believe that war is inevitable, and continue to hope that the awful horror of armed conflict may be averted by further peaceful overtures.

"Multitudes of sagacious men believed in 1861 that the South would not fight and others that the North would never resort to arms to preserve the Union. It is not inconceivable that the obstructionists—filibusterers—may be actuated by traitorous sentiments. The Revolution had its Arnold. I trust I offend no sensibilities in referring to the fact that in 1861 10 or more Members of this body were expelled for treason. A Vice President of the United States who for 4 years presided over the Senate, was indicted and tried for treason, and a Senator, charged with him for this capital offense, escaped expulsion by but one vote. The Senate had already at that early day expelled one of its Members for perfidious negotiations with the enemies of his country. We are all sworn to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States—a needless oath unless it be that some of us may, conceivably, require the aid of Heaven to keep us true.

"What say you? Can the Senate make a rule under which it may be held at bay by treachery until a foreign foe shall have prevailed over a supine nation?"

I repeat, a rule of the Senate, the effect of which is or may be to deprive it of the power, under any circumstances, of bringing debate to a close, is void. Mr. President, I am not one of those who, being balked by some law, organic or otherwise, would ruthlessly, having the power, sweep it aside to attain his end. Reverence for law is the sure foundation upon which government and society alike rest. If in our conduct it is not inculcated, where shall we look to find it exhibited? I shall vote with a clear conscience that we violate no law, even assuming the old rules remain in force, so far as they are valid, in fixing a time at which debate on any subject before this body shall close.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it had been my hope that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] would be present to continue the argument in behalf of the Anderson motion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from New Jersey had to attend a meeting of the New Jersey delegation. He will return to the Chamber in approximately an hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall proceed with the argument in behalf of the proponents of the motion and shall look forward to the presentation of the argument by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and other Senators, and then to the arguments in opposition to the motion.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made a very exhaustive and comprehensive analysis of the points which have been expressed thus far in the debate by those who are in opposition to the Anderson motion. He has

also expressed, with considerable vigor and with great insight into the constitutional and congressional history of Senate rules, the position which has been advanced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and Senators who are associated with him.

I should like, in the time that I shall take, to consider again some of the points which have been raised, particularly by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who are indeed worthy opponents in this debate. I do not claim that there is a closed door or a yes-or-no answer to some of the problems confronting us. Frankly, Mr. President, we are searching for the truth. We are searching for the logic of argument that will substantiate the point of view we have taken or the proposition we have made. I say with equal candor that those who argue against us are similarly engaged in that pursuit.

So let me make a brief statement of our case, so that we may separate what is extraneous and what may be considered on the fringe of the issue from what is the heart of the issue. The issue is simply that those of us who are supporting the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] believe that the Senate has a right, under the Constitution of the United States, to adopt its own rules for every Congress.

We recognize that it is true that the Senate has not exercised that right since 1789, when the first Senate of the United States met. But the fact that we have not exercised that right does not in any way deny its validity or its strength. Frequently, after a President of the United States has taken action under the terms of the Constitution as Commander in Chief, the Supreme Court has ruled that the President of the United States does not have any new rights in an emergency, even an emergency such as a war, but that the President can exercise every right which the Constitution places in the executive branch of the Government, even if they were not previously exercised.

A similar situation exists in the case of the legislative branch. I say this, Mr. President, because one of the compelling arguments made by those who are in opposition to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico is that since 1789 the rules of the Senate have continued, and that the Senates of the past have never taken action to adopt new rules. Therefore, the total of the argument or the deduction from it is that because the Senate has not done so, it cannot adopt its own rules anew.

Mr. President, that is not true. As a matter of fact, until the time of Andrew Jackson's administration, no President of the United States had dismissed a Cabinet officer who had been confirmed by the Senate. However, when Andrew Jackson got ready to dismiss Cabinet officers, he did so. His power was tested in the courts. The courts said that the President of the United States, the Chief Executive, possesses certain rights; and even though he has not exercised those rights, they remain.

So I am saying, in terms of constitutional history and constitutional theory, that once a right is prescribed in the Constitution, the fact that it may not have been exercised does not in any way remove it from the constitutional powers therein provided.

Therefore, Mr. President, what we are doing is simply returning to article I, section 5, of the Constitution, with which all Members of this body are fully familiar, which outlines the right—and I emphasize the word "right"—of both Houses of Congress to adopt or determine their rules of procedure.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that from 1789 to approximately 1869 there were joint rules for the House of Representatives and the Senate, and those rules remained in force Congress after Congress because of the acquiescence of the two Houses? However, after those joint rules had been in force for 80 years, the Senate of the United States decided to adopt, for its part, new joint rules, with certain changes included in them. The Senate did precisely that. This is virtually an analogous case. Those joint rules existed for 80 years, but that circumstance did not prevent the Senate from acting to adopt new rules where the Senate decided it was the necessary thing to do. At that time it was clearly demonstrated that the Senate had not surrendered any of its constitutional rights by 80 years of acquiescence, but still had the power and authority and right to adopt new rules when it saw fit to do so. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York is absolutely correct. The history he cites to us is a part of the public record. I believe it was a part of the famous debate between Senator Walsh and his colleagues in 1917.

Mr. President, let me ask this question: Why are the Senate rules important? I want the opposition in this argument to know that we who are the proponents and the supporters of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico know and believe that the Senate rules are important. In fact, Mr. President, the rules of any public body or any public institution are of vital importance. The fourteenth amendment was originally proposed as a guarantee of due process of law, due procedure of law—in other words, as a provision that proper rules of evidence and fair trial and impartial proceedings, as rules of procedure in court, must be fulfilled.

It has been some time since I studied in detail the constitutional history in regard to the fourteenth amendment, but I recall full well that the doctrine of due process of law was essentially a matter of guaranteeing due procedure. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has on many occasions reminded this body of the importance of procedure as it relates to administration and to legislation. The more I have listened to his splendid addresses and remarks on the subject of procedure and its importance, the more I have realized how very important procedure is to any public body or public institution.

Mr. President, 20 Senators, including Senators on both sides of the aisle, are taking the time of the Senate this early in the new Congress to debate this technical question. We do so because we believe procedure is important. In fact, the procedure of the Senate is so important that it may very well determine the life of the Nation. Had Senator Walsh not contested the procedure of the Senate in 1917, our country would have been left defenseless. Let me say now, although later I shall review the record of filibusters, that the civil-rights issue is not the only issue; but the civil right with which I am concerned this afternoon is the right of the duly elected Senators of the United States in the Eighty-third Congress to vote.

Mr. President, there is a kind of senatorial rules poll tax here that I do not like. The Senate of the United States has an obligation to vote. A legislative body has a duty to make decisions, not simply to deliberate or to take exercises in dilatory tactics.

Mr. President, in the months or years ahead there may come days when there will even be Members of the Senate—if not at this session of Congress, possibly at other sessions of Congress—who will be determined to oppose or put to an end a policy which may be of vital importance to the very life of our Nation. That could be. I say to you, Mr. President, that it is the responsibility of a legislative body such as this to protect itself from the kind of gag rule or minority rule to which a filibuster, engaged in for purposes other than those we have known up to now, could be directed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I may continue a moment, I shall then yield to the Senator. Rules of procedure are basic to the legislative process. Jefferson knew that. That is why we have Jefferson's Manual. Every parliamentary body in the world knows that, and we know that in the United States Senate. That is exactly what we are debating about here today. It is not merely rule XXII, Mr. President. There may be other rules that need to be changed, as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out. We cannot afford to have our sights set upon a particular rule. What we are talking about is a principle. We are talking about whether the Government of the United States is to be permitted to be immobilized because of rules, or whether it is to be permitted to be energized because of rules. Rules of procedure should not be designed to inhibit but to facilitate; they should not be made to impair but to expedite. The purpose of rules of procedure is for the purpose of processing legislation, and expediting the activities of a legislative branch; and, Mr. President, the more numerous the issues that come to this body, and the more complex those issues are, the greater the responsibility of the United States Senate, the greater the importance of the rules of procedure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will first yield to the Senator from New York, then surely I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Minnesota know of a single great legislative body anywhere in the world in

which the majority is blocked from taking action by minorities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from New York I wrote to the Library of Congress, asking that the Legislative Reference Service make a study for me of rules of procedure of legislative bodies, such as the State legislatures, and the parliamentary bodies of the governments of the free world. I believe I am correct in saying that there is no parliamentary or legislative body in the free world—and certainly I do not want to go any further than the free world—in the democratic world, that does not adopt rules of procedure at the beginning of its legislative sessions. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, in Great Britain, I believe after 7 years, the Parliament is automatically dissolved and it must start all over. Even the House of Lords, where they hold their titles for life, adopts rules of procedure each time there is a new Parliament.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may add one word, I want to point out that the Senator's point of view and mine has had the concurrence of a very great man, a very great President of this country. I want to quote from a statement made by President Woodrow Wilson, issued at the time of the famous fight over the arming of merchant vessels, to which the Senator from Illinois has already referred. This is taken from the New York Times of March 5, 1917. I read:

> The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action. A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible.

That is pretty strong language, but I think was justified at that time, and I think the machinery against which we are now struggling, which ties the hands of the majority beyond any question, on many issues, under many contingencies, problems, and dangers, is equally serious to the life and welfare of our country, with the subject discussed by President Wilson in 1917.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to thank the Senator. I shall yield in just a moment to my friend from Louisiana.

For the purpose of a more complete record, Mr. President, I should merely like to cite the outstanding Senate filibusters from 1841 to 1951. I should like to ask, that at this point in my remarks, listing of the outstanding filibusters from 1841 to 1951, as prepared by Dr. George B. Galloway, of the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, be included. I ask unanimous consent for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDING SENATE FILIBUSTERS FROM 1841 TO 1951

1841

A bill to remove the Senate printers was filibustered against for 10 days.

A bill relating to the Bank of the United States was filibustered for several weeks and caused Clay to introduce his cloture resolution.

1846

The Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

1863

A bill to suspend the writ of habeas corpus was filibustered.

1876

An Army appropriation bill was filibustered against for 12 days, forcing the abandonment of a rider which would have suspended existing election laws.

1880

A measure to reorganize the Senate was filibustered from March 24 to May 16 by an evenly divided Senate, until two Senators resigned, giving the Democrats a majority.

1890

The Blair education bill was filibustered.

The Force bill, providing for Federal supervision of elections, was successfully filibustered for 29 days. This resulted in the cloture resolution introduced by Senator Aldrich which was also filibustered and the resolution failed.

1893

An unsuccessful filibuster lasting 42 days was organized against a bill for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

1901

Senator Carter successfully filibustered a river and harbor bill because it failed to include certain additional appropriations.

1902

There was a successful filibuster against the tri-State bill proposing to admit Oklahome, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood, because the measure did not include all of Indian territory according to the original boundaries.

1903

Senator Tillman (South Carolina) filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item paying his State a war claim. The item was finally replaced in the bill.

1907

Senator Stone filibustered against a ship-subsidy bill.

1908

Senator LaFollette led a filibuster lasting 28 days against the Vreeland-Aldrich emergency currency law. The filibuster finally failed.

1911

Senator Owen filibustered a bill proposing to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood. The House had accepted New Mexico, but refused Arizona because of her proposed constitution. Senator Owen filibustered against the admission of New Mexico until Arizona was replaced in the measure.

The Canadian reciprocity bill passed the House and failed through a filibuster in the Senate. It passed Congress in an extraordinary session but Canada refused to accept the proposition.

1913

A filibuster was made against the omnibus public building bill by Senator Stone of Missouri until certain appropriations for his State were included.

1914

Senator Burton (Ohio) filibustered against a river and harbor bill for 12 hours.

Senator Gronna filibustered against acceptance of a conference report on an Indian appropriation bill.

In this year also the following bills were debated at great length, but finally passed: Panama Canal tolls bill, 30 days; Federal Trade Commission bill, 30 days; Clayton amendments to the Sherman Act, 21 days; conference report on the Clayton bill, 9 days.

1915

A filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship-purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

1917

The armed ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administration measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

1919

A filibuster was successful against an oil- and mineral-leasing bill, causing the failure of several important appropriation bills and necessitating an extraordinary session of Congress.

1921

The emergency tariff bill was filibustered against in January 1921, which led Senator Penrose to present a cloture petition. The cloture petition failed, but the tariff bill finally passed.

1922

The Dyer antilynching bill was successfully filibustered against by a group of southern Senators.

1923

President Harding's ship subsidy bill was defeated by a filibuster.

1925

Senator Copeland, of New York, talked at length against ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty with Cuba, but the treaty was finally ratified.

1926

A 10-day filibuster against the World Court Protocol was ended by a cloture vote of 68 to 26, the second time cloture was adopted by the Senate.

A bill for migratory bird refuges was talked to death by States' rights advocates in the spring of 1926, a motion for cloture failing by a vote of 46 to 33.

1927

Cloture again failed of adoption in 1927 when it was rejected by 32 yeas against 59 nays as a device to end obstruction against the Swing-Johnson bill for development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

One of the fiercest filibusters in recent decades succeeded in March 1927 in preventing an extension of the life of a special campaign investigating committee headed by James A. Reed, of Missouri. The committee's exposé of corruption in the 1926 senatorial election victories of Frank L. Smith, in Illinois, and of William S. Vare, in Pennsylvania, had aroused the ire of a few Senators who refused to permit the continuance of the investigation despite the wishes of a clear majority of the Senate.

1933

Early in 1933 a 2-week filibuster was staged against the Glass branch banking bill in which Huey Long first participated as a leading figure. Senators found him impervious to sarcasm and no man could silence him. Cloture was defeated by the margin of a single vote. Finally, the filibuster was abandoned, and the bill passed.

1935

The most celebrated of the Long filibusters was staged on June 12–13, 1935. Senator Long spoke for fifteen and one-half hours, a feat of physical endurance never excelled in the Senate, in favor of the Gore amendment to the proposed extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act. But the amendment was finally tabled.

1938

A 29-day "feather duster" filibuster in January-February, 1938, defeated passage of

a Federal antilynching bill, although an overwhelming majority of the Senate clearly favored the bill.

1939

An extended filibuster against adoption of a monetary bill, extending presidential authority to alter the value of the dollar, continued from June 20 to July 5, 1939, but finally failed by a narrow margin.

1942, 1944, 1946, 1948

Four organized filibusters upon the perennial question of Federal anti-poll-tax legislation were successful in these years. An attempt to pass fair employment practice legislation in 1946 was also killed by a filibuster. The Senate cloture rule proved ineffective in these cases as a device for breaking filibusters.

1949

A motion to take up a resolution (S. Res. 15) to amend the cloture rule was debated at intervals in the Senate from February 28 to March 17 when it was amended and agreed to.

1950

A motion to take up the FEPC bill (S. 1728) was debated in the Senate, May 8–19, 1950, a total of 9 days. Ten Senators spoke in favor of the motion to take up (really in support of the bill) and 8 Senators spoke against the motion. According to a rough calculation, the proponents of the motion and bill used 35 percent, and the opponents used 65 percent, of the space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD devoted to the subject. During the 9-day period 3,414 inches of the RECORD were consumed with discussion of FEPC and 2,635 inches with other matters. Mr. MALONE filibustered for 11 hours against the conference report on the slot machine bill (S. 3357) in December 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read from Public Affairs Bulletin 64, of the Library of Congress:

A filibuster was organized against President Wilson's ship purchase bill by which German ships in American ports would have been purchased. The filibuster was successful, and as a result three important appropriation bills failed.

That is the price of a filibuster, Mr. President, merely one price that we paid. Reading further from Public Affairs Bulletin 64:

The armed ship bill of President Wilson was successfully filibustered, and caused the defeat of many administrative measures. This caused the adoption of the Martin resolution embodying the President's recommendation for a change in the Senate rules, on limitation of debate.

That has been capably, ably, and fully described by the Senator from Illinois. I shall not go into that in any more detail, but I want to remind the Senate that before Senator Walsh was able to get his change in the rules, President Wilson's program to defend America had been stopped dead in the Senate of the United States. The fact of the matter is that the security of this country was jeopardized. It was jeopardized by the rules of the United States Senate.

I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator, after quoting the rules, spoke of the rules being used to expedite and facilitate and hasten action, rather than to delay action. Does the Senator mean that Thomas Jefferson entertained that idea in writing Jefferson's Manual, or his other writings?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not recall my direct reference to Thomas Jefferson, except to say that Thomas Jefferson's Manual was a set of procedures made to facilitate the work of the Congress and of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I believe, if the Senator would kindly refer to Jefferson's Manual, at the very opening page, it sets out that the purpose of the rules is for the protection of a minority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Correct.

Mr. LONG. Quoting from him:

So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense; that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which a minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary.

That is the first page of Jefferson's Manual, from which I was reading. Thomas Jefferson seemed always to feel that the rules were necessary for the protection of a minority when they were defending what they believed to be the right of the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. We are deeply indebted to Thomas Jefferson, who recognized that the responsibility of government is not only to fulfill the will of the majority, but also to respect the rights of the minority. What the Senator from Louisiana fails to interpret from that which he has read is that at the time of Jefferson's Manual the previous question could be moved. It always stood as a means of cutting off debate in order to secure action on the particular proposition before the legislative body. It prevented the majority from riding roughshod over any minority group in the Congress. I want to say that that is one thing that is held sacred by all of us. None of us wants to ride roughshod over anyone, either by actions of commission or omission. The sins of legislative commission are no worse than the sins of legislative omission. What Thomas Jefferson sought to do was to draw up a manual from experience as the Presiding Officer of the Senate which would give guidance to the membership of that body so that the majority might legislate without ruthlessly or in any other way violating the rights of the minority.

I would further note to my friend from Louisiana——

Mr. LONG. The Senator sees, however, that the very theory set forth in the purpose of the rule is to impede the majority and protect the minority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would put it in a different way.

Mr. LONG. I am simply quoting Thomas Jefferson's language, not the language of the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator said it was to expedite or hasten——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say "hasten"; I said "expedite." That process does not necessarily mean to hasten. It means that we shall not be having unnecessary roadblocks in the way of legislative progress. There is nothing in the Manual that says we should stop dead. Jefferson was the creator of the philosophy of the living Constitution of a forward-moving Government.

As the Senator from Illinois pointed out so well a little while ago, Jefferson believed that no generation should be governed by the action of a previous generation. He thought that every 20 years or so——

Mr. LONG. Not every 20 years.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG.] Does the Senator gather from anything Jefferson said that he wanted to give the minority the right to oppress the majority? That is exactly what is happening today when a small minority can completely block action by the majority. It can be done by a minority as small as one person. I do not believe Jefferson ever wanted to do that, although he was sincere in his desire to protect the minority, as every other decent man was and is today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that to stay here today and try to interpret the will of Jefferson and his purposes as disclosed in his many writings would be a task to which the Senator from Minnesota is not capable of addressing himself. Jefferson was known as one of the greatest exponents of democratic representative government, and we are indebted to him for his philosophy and his faith; but I think he would suggest that we take care of our own work and not leave it on his shoulders. Even Jefferson did not foresee what we are faced with in 1953.

Therefore, I think we should carry on the business of the Senate, not resting upon traditions alone, because some of them did not serve us well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In my own case I feel, as the Senator does, that while in the Senate there should be full and ample debate, there should be some more adequate means to bring debate to an end and to decide subjects on their merits. I should be willing to have a two-thirds majority of the Senators present or a simple majority to determine the length of the debate on measures. On the other hand, I have always had the conviction, and I think the weight of the argument is to that effect, that the Senate is a continuing body, and it at least places one in a difficult position to vote for an idea that negatives the proposition of a continuing body.

I wanted to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he feels that there is some other way in the regular procedure whereby debate can be limited.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been perplexed by the same problem as to whether the Senate is a continuing body or is not a continuing body. The motion made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is not predicated upon the assumption that the Senate is a continuing body. It is predicated upon the constitutional right to be exercised by the Senate to adopt its own rules.

There are honest differences of opinion amongst Members of this body as to whether we should be able to stop debate

by a constitutional two-thirds vote, that is, 64 of the 96 Senators, or 49 of the 96 Senators, or a simple majority.

Resolutions have been offered on all sides of the proposition. None of us wants to end debate until there has been a full and complete discussion. I would go so far to say that if 14 days is not sufficient, we can add to the number of days. I think there should be some time at which the issue can be joined. The problem is not how to get more talk, but to get a little bit less talk.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says, we can change the rules by a majority vote. What beautiful words those are. At times they even mislead some of our splendid constituents, because frequently the people do not understand that before we can get an opportunity to vote there must be a motion to bring up the question.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so well stated, the problem arises because the key to the question of rules has been dropped into a deep well. It has been lost—at least, temporarily. Why? Because section 3 of rule XXII makes it literally impossible to stop debate upon a motion to bring about a change in the rules.

I was very much interested in the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I commended him yesterday, and I wish to do so again today. The Senator from Indiana told the Senate yesterday how he felt as a result of the hearings in last year's Congress. Of course, hearings will be held all over again, except that nobody will say anything new. Hearings will be held all over again, and a new resolution will be introduced. This, incidentally, is another indication of a way in which the Senate is not a continuing body.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At the last session of Congress careful consideration was given to this matter, and I thought a resolution was submitted to provide cloture by two-thirds up to a certain number of days, and then, after that time, by a majority vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I believe that is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. After 14 or 21 days. That was a proposal which I felt inclined to support at that time. That resolution was not voted upon by the Senate. I do not believe it was brought to the floor. Was that because the Senate was preparing to adjourn, and committee action had not been taken, or was it because of something that happened on the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe a fair statement is that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported the resolution to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The full committee made a report, and I know the resolution was on the calendar about a week before adjournment, but it was not taken up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Ohio has given us information that the full committee did report the resolution and that it was placed on the calendar before the Senate adjourned. Again, we might just as well be frank in saying that everybody wanted Congress to adjourn. Two rather spectacular conventions were about to be held.

Strange to say, the Congress of the United States can declare war, can vote billions of dollars in budgets, can draft millions of men for the armed services, can take over a banking structure in terms of regulation, can do anything with the American economy, in less than the time it will take to amend a rule of the Senate. One hundred and fifty-eight million Americans can be handled in the Senate with almost a flick of the eyelash on the floor of the Senate. We have appropriated billions of dollars with little or no debate. I remember in the last session that the Senate authorized more than $2,000,000,000 for military installations after less than a half-hour of debate. We have literally upturned the homes and lives of millions of people with only a few days of debate.

But if an attempt is made to touch that sacred cow, the debate rules of the Senate, we will be here from now until eternity.

The fact of the matter is that whether one believes the Senate is a continuing body or a noncontinuing body, if one desires to have the rules of the Senate changed, he had better act now, because the roll will be called; and when the roll is called, it may be the last time Senators will have a chance to speak up for a change in the rules. From this time forward, the talking will be done to see that the rules are not changed.

This is despite the good wishes of our friends on the other side of the aisle, who have momentarily said they are going to propose changes in the rules. Changes in the rules have been proposed ever since I became a Member of the Senate. There have been only two times that the debate rules of the Senate have been changed, once when the very safety of the country was at stake.

When was the second time? In 1949, when the Senate had seen fit to turn down a ruling of the Vice President of the United States, a decision which we will live to regret, Senators, more than we have regretted up until now. Then we got what is known as the Wherry compromise. What a compromise. We gave up all of our horses and got one rabbit. The Wherry compromise merely provided that if the proponents of a measure were able to muster two-thirds of the total membership, debate could be closed upon any motion, measure, or legislative proposal before the Senate. But the rule included section, or paragraph, 3, which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has characterized so well as the key that was thrown down a deep well.

The Founding Fathers were great constitutional experts and practical men. They provided in the Constitution for two-thirds votes. For example, in the Constitution of the United States they provided that everything should be done by majority vote except with respect to certain items. There were specific exceptions. What were some of them? It took two-thirds of the membership present—not two-thirds of the Senate, but two-thirds of those present—to impeach a President of the United States.

But when we come to the Senate rules, it takes 64 of the 96 to bring an end to debate.

I remember that in 1949, when this issue was debated, I placed in the RECORD a list of some of the great decisions the Senate had made affecting the most crucial items in the legislative history of the United States, and in very many of them—in the overwhelming majority of them—there were never 64 votes.

The leaders of the two political parties, both the President-elect and the man who was defeated, have made statements to the American people expressing a desire to see the Senate revise its rules. It is one thing to be against sin. It is another thing really to do something about it. It is one thing for the Senate to say, "We ought to change the rules," but it is another thing to meet the real issue of how the rules are to be changed. The Senate is like many a taxpayers' association. The taxpayers' association is always for law enforcement, but it never wants to hire a police force. It likes to see good streets, but it does not want to pay taxes for them. The Senate wants to change the rules, but in order to change the rules, the majority leader must first move that the next item of business shall be a Senate resolution to change rule XXII. When that day comes, I suggest that I shall pass out literature as to the wonders of northern Minnesota, so that Senators who do not want to remain here and listen may go fishing. The weather will be quite warm when that day arrives, even though it is now 10 degrees below zero back home.

Yesterday the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], stated that the provision of rule XXII requiring 64 votes to end a filibuster has not really been tested. I hesitate to make this statement, because of my great respect for the majority leader and his accuracy in such matters, but I do not believe that is quite the fact. In the short period of its operation since 1949 we have already had two tests of its effectiveness. On May 19, 1950, as appears from volume 96, part 6, page 7300 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a motion was made by the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, to bring up fair-employment-practices legislation. The vote in favor of the motion to end the filibuster was 52 to 32, or 12 short of the 64 votes required to end the filibuster, and the motion failed.

I should not like to see a provision in the Constitution or in the laws of any of the States requiring that those of us who are elected to the Senate shall receive a 2 to 1 majority before we can come to the Senate. That would be rough. However, we have a rule in this body requiring 64 votes to end debate.

The second time this provision was tested was on July 12, 1950. I refer to volume 96, part 8, page 9982 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The then majority leader, Senator Lucas, made an effort to bring up civil-rights legislation. The motion to end debate received an overwhelming majority, 55 to 33, or 9 votes short of the required 64. The Wherry amendment to rule XXII has indeed been tried, and it has been found wanting.

The other provision of rule XXII which violates every democratic procedure and interferes with the legislative process is paragraph 3 of the rule, which makes it impossible, without unanimous consent, to end a filibuster against a motion to bring up a change in the rules. In my judgment this provision cannot be properly defended. It would make of the rules of the Senate a dead weight, an iron hand on democratic procedure in the Senate. It means that a minority of 3 or 4 can stand in the way of 91, 92, or 93 Senators who desire to change the rules.

For these reasons our effort to change the rules in the first days of the session is crucial to the future of democratic procedure in the Senate.

The Senate has met 81 times since it was first organized, more than 160 years ago. Never during that period has the Senate determined by vote whether its rules carry over from one Congress to the next without its acquiescence. That question has never been passed upon by an actual vote. We submit that each Senate in each Congress has the constitutional power to make its own rules. It may or may not exercise that right. But when it chooses not to exercise that right, and to acquiesce by silence, it thereby readopts the rules of its preceding body. The Senate has in the past acquiesced, and thereby automatically readopted the rules of the preceding Senate. By doing so, however, the Senate has not renounced its constitutional right to make its own rules. It cannot, in fact, renounce this constitutional power. I am prepared to defend that proposition for a long time. I am prepared to defend the principle that whether a magistrate, an executive, or a legislature ever does use the rights which belong to that agency, the fact that the rights are not exercised in no way constitutes a denial of such rights. The fact that a legislature may not have exercised its rights in no way invalidates such rights. The fact that an executive may not have exercised his right to execute a policy or to take a particular action in no way denies the fact that the right still exists as a reservoir of power for him to use.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If the Senate had not actually exercised its right to make rules, the Senator would not be arguing this question today. The Senate has in the past exercised, and continues to exercise, its right to make rules. The Senator is arguing that if the Senate should not act under the rules it has made for itself, it may still attempt to act for itself in making additional rules.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the efforts of the Senator to clarify the point. However, I must say that he has not helped me very much. What I am saying is that each new Congress is an entity unto itself. The Senator from Louisiana knows that there is decision after decision, which I could quote to him from the brief which we have prepared, to the effect that a legislative body is an entity unto itself, and therefore has the right to adopt its own rules.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator taken the oath prescribed by the Constitution in this new Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did so with great pride and honor.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator one of those who was reelected?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I took the oath for my term of office. Under the Constitution I am elected for a 6-year term.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Minnesota taken the oath of office in the Eighty-third Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has not.

Mr. LONG. Neither has the junior Senator from Louisiana. If this were a completely new body and not a continuing body, it seems to me that we would have no right to speak until we had taken the oath.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is too wise a man to maintain such a contention. On the one hand, there is an organic body, the legal entity of the Senate. On the other hand, there is its membership. I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the Constitution speaks about the Congress. The Congress is an entity unto itself. The Constitution provides that the Congress shall consist of two branches.

Mr. President, Congress consists of two branches: one is the Senate and the other is the House. The Senator from Louisiana can argue with me about the question until doomsday. He can argue until doomsday the question of whether the Senate is a continuing body or not a continuing body, and he can have either side of the argument. The fact is that the Senate is not always a continuing body. The fact is that we have the right, and we ought to exercise the right, of adopting our own rules. If we do nothing more than readopt the old rules, we ought to do at least that much, just to flex our legislative muscles and prove that the body still has in it a spark of life.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota has been making the argument that when the present session of the Senate began it met de novo, without any rules made for it by a previous Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. And that the Senate must organize completely from the beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota has compared the Senate with the House of Representatives, and he argues that the Senate should organize in the same fashion. In the House of Representatives the other day the junior Senator from Louisiana was privileged, because a relative of his was fortunate enough to be sworn in as a Member of the House, to take note of the way in which the Members take the oath of office.

All of the Members of the House are sworn in. First the House elects a Speaker. The Speaker takes the oath. After the Speaker has taken the oath he swears in all Members of the House. In the Senate only the new Members are sworn in; whereas over in the House all Members are sworn in. In the Senate the old Members remain Members of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is only my love for my good friend from Louisiana that leads me to say that he should not say anything like that. In the House all Members are elected at the same time. Of course, every Member of the House must take an oath of office, because he has been elected. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he noticed that the House had a Clerk. The Clerk carried over from the previous session of Congress, although the House is not a continuing body.

Let me refresh the memory of the Senator from Louisiana, by reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 3, 1953. It will show that when the House of Representatives met, the man who was in the chair was the Clerk of the House. The man who was in charge of calling the roll—and I may say that the calling of the roll is very significant and important, because if the roll were not called the House could not assemble—the man who called the roll was the Clerk of the House.

When was the Clerk appointed or given the position? He was given the position in the Eighty-second Congress. The House is not a continuing body, yet the Clerk continues in office.

I shall read from the proceedings of the House of Representatives of January 3, 1953:

> This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana is one of the finest Members of this body, and possesses a keen legal mind. I do not care to engage further in legal argument with him. I merely wish to say that he should not argue that the Senate is a continuing body. What he ought to do, as one of the vigorous and brilliant young men of present-day American history, is to insist that this generation has the right to be heard and the right to have something to say about the rules of this body, so that we may be able to do our part in protecting this bulwark of our Republic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that precisely the same point which the Senator from Louisiana has raised was raised by Senator Poindexter during the debate in 1917. Senator Walsh, of Montana, answered as follows:

> I think that is not a correct statement at all. There is a vast difference between Members of the Senate and the Senate. Although a bill should be signed at the home of each of the Members of the Senate, by every Member of the Senate, it would not be a law. It must be enacted while the Senate is actually assembled in its customary place for the transaction of business.

In other words, a Senator is elected for three successive terms of Congress, but

each Senate, as it assembles, is a different body from the Senate of the preceding Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator from Minnesota in a position to tell me how much longer he intends to speak? He had told me that he would take approximately 40 minutes, and he has spoken for nearly an hour. There are a number of other Senators who would like to be heard on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sorry. I started to yield to my colleagues; and that is always a bad thing to do, because it tempts one to yield to his natural desires to speak on and on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of remarks prepared by me be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

THE SENATE RULES

1. A statement of our case

This is a historic debate. I am honored to join with 19 of my colleagues in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, in urging that the Senate immediately proceed to the adoption of rules for its operation during the Eighty-third Congress. We believe that the Senate has a right under the Constitution of the United States to adopt its own rules for every Congress. It is true that the Senate has not exercised that right since 1789, when the first Senate of the United States met.

Article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." There is no requirement that the Senate exercise its right each Congress to adopt its rules anew, but that right is clearly established in the Constitution. We join the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in his motion, because we believe that the Senate during these opening days of the Eighty-third Congress should act this year to carry out its constitutional prerogatives.

2. Why are the Senate rules important?

Why is it, Mr. President, that more than 20 United States Senators on both sides of the aisle take the time of the Senate this early in the session to debate a question so technical as the question of rules? Why is it that the newspapers in this Nation are paying so much attention to this debate? Why is it that millions of Americans follow our proceedings today and urge us to adopt the Anderson motion? It is because there is a growing understanding that rules of procedure are basic to the legislative process.

The poet has said, "I care not who makes the laws of this nation, as long as I can write its songs." The poet's words may well be paraphrased today, "I care not who makes the laws of this nation, as long as I can write its rules."

The rules of the Senate determine the extent to which the Senate may legislate. The present rules of the Senate include a provision, rule 22, which makes it virtually impossible for us to legislate in the face of a determined, though small minority, in spite of the fact that an overwhelming majority may want to enact a bill and in spite of the fact that the bill may reveal the overwhelming wishes of the American people.

There are two ways in which rule 22 of the Senate obstructs the legislative process and interferences with the democratic operation of the Congress. First is the requirement that 64 votes are necessary to end a filibuster or bring debate to an end. For no other business of the Senate is there such a rigid requirement. We can adopt treaties, impeach a President, expel a member and declare war easier than we can end a filibuster under the rules of the Senate, because for none of these crucial exercises of power by the Senate is as many as 64 votes required. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], stated yesterday that this provision of rule 22, the so-called Wherry resolution, has not really been tested. That is not so, Mr. President. In this short period of its operation since 1949, we have already had two tests of its effectiveness.

On May 19, 1950 (vol. 96, pt. 6, p. 7300 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), a motion by Mr. Lucas to bring up fair employment legislation received the vote of 52 to 32 in favor of the motion, but it was 12 short of the 64 votes to end a filibuster and the motion failed. On July 12, 1950 (vol. 96, pt. 8, p. 9962 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), Senator Lucas again made an effort to bring up civil rights legislation. He received an overwhelming majority vote of 55 to 33, but again we were 8 votes short of the required 64 votes. The Wherry resolution, rule 22, has indeed been tried, Mr. President. It has been tried and found wanting.

The other provision of rule 22 which violates every democratic procedure and interferes with the legislative process is section 3 of the rule, which makes it impossible, without a unanimous vote, to end a filibuster against a motion to bring up a change in the rules. This section, Mr. President, is unconscionable. It would establish the rules of the Senate as a deadweight, an iron hand of democratic procedure in the Senate. It means that a minority of one or two can stand in the way of 94 or 95 Senators who desire to change the rules.

For these reasons, Mr. President, our effort to change the rules during these first days of the session is crucial to the future democratic operation of the Congress.

3. Precedent is consistent without motion

(a) The Senate has met 81 times since it was first organized more than 160 years ago. Never during that period has the Senate determined by vote whether its rules carry over from one session of the Congress to the next without its acquiescence. We submit that each Senate in each Congress has the constitutional power to make its own rules; that it may or may not exercise that right; that when it chooses not to exercise that right it acquiesces by silence and thereby readopts the rules of its preceding body. The Senate has in the past acquiesced and thereby automatically readopted the rules of its preceding Senate. By doing so, however, the Senate has not renounced its constitutional right to make its own rules. It cannot, in fact, renounce this constitutional power.

(b) This argument which we present today has been presented to the Senate before and has never been repudiated by the Senate. In the opening of the special session of the Sixty-fifth Congress on March 6, 1917, Senators Owen, of Oklahoma, and Walsh, of Montana, argued that in the absence of the Senate adopting its rules and in the absence of acquiescence in adopting its old rules, general parliamentary law governed in the Senate. Senator Walsh said (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 18):

"A majority may adopt the rules in the first place. It is preposterous to assert that they may deny to future majorities the right to change them."

Senator Thomas said (52 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3792):

"There is no reason why the rules of the Senate should continue from Congress to Congress than that our committees should continue from Congress to Congress."

The Senate did not vote on the issue raised by Senator Walsh and his colleagues in 1917. The Senate rather submitted to Senator Walsh and agreed to adopt a new rule designed to tighten Senate procedure against filibuster. With their mission accomplished, Senator Walsh and his colleagues did not press for a vote on their resolution.

(c) Our motion would not be the first time that the Senate has demonstrated that it may upset a long-standing practice of acquiescence.

(1) One session of the Senate can never give up a constitutional power and prevent future Senates from exercising that power.

(2) Once before, the Senate, by majority vote, overruled a long-standing practice with regard to its rules. In the First Congress, the Senate and House adopted joint rules, to govern the relationship of any necessary business between them. (Annals of Congress, pp. 57–58, 987.) These rules were in operation until 1869 and were not questioned, even though they were revised and amended. Neither the Senate nor the House readopted them formally at the beginning of each Congress. Nevertheless, in 1869, the Senate decided it wanted to rescind those rules. It, therefore, refused again to acquiesce in their adoption. In the first session of the Forty-first Congress, after 87 years of acquiescence, it did so by adopting new joint rules. The Senate thus demonstrated that it could, by majority will, decide not to acquiesce in any previous precedent with regard to its rules.

Senator Hamlin (4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD p. 309), reporting for the Senate Committee on Rules, said:

"It is only by acquiescence in long years that they have been treated and regarded as rules, and not by an affirmative vote either of the House or of the Senate."

This decision of the Senate that the joint rules were not in effect demonstrated that those rules existed only by acquiescence. The fact that this acquiescence lasted for 87 years was not binding upon future Senates to change those rules when it met, I am sure.

4. The Senate has a right to adopt its own rules

(a) I have already referred to article I, section 5 of the Constitution, which empowers each House to "determine the rules of its proceedings."

(b) It is a well-established constitutional principle that each new legislature is independent with full authority and equal power with that of any previous session of the legislature. No one Congress may bind a subsequent Congress. No law that is passed cannot be repealed by a future Congress. Senator Walsh, of Montana, in discussing this issue in 1917 (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10) stated the issue clearly as follows:

"This practice, persisted in since the Constitution went into effect, under which each new Congress in both branches proceeds untrammeled by any action which may have been taken by its predecessor on any measure that may have come before it, plainly speaks of a prevalent and accepted theory that each Congress is an entity, possessing the same degree of independence as was enjoyed by the First when it assembled in 1789."

This fundamental constitutional understanding was, likewise, stated clearly by the outstanding constitutional jurist, Judge Cooley. (Constitutional Limitations, 6th ed., 1890, pp. 146–147.)

"To say that the legislature may pass irrepealable laws is to say that it may alter the very constitution from which it derives its authority; since, in so far as one legislature could bind a subsequent one by its enactments, it could in the same degree reduce the legislative power of its successors; and the process might be repeated until, one by one, the subjects of legislation would be excluded altogether from their control, and the constitutional provisions that the legislative

power shall be vested in two houses would be to a greater or less degree rendered ineffectual."

The Supreme Court (*Newton* v. *Board of County Commissioners* (100 U. S. 548)) in one of the leading cases dealing with this issue had the following to say in support of the proposition which I have just stated:

"Every succeeding legislature possesses the same jurisdiction and power with respect to them as its predecessors. The latter have the same power of repeal and modification which the former had of enactment, neither more nor less. All occupy, in this respect, a footing of perfect equality. This must necessarily be so in the nature of things."

(c) It is clear—by virtue of the Constitution in accordance with democratic procedure and consistent with constitutional principles—that the Senate in each Congress has the power to determine its rules of proceedings and that this power cannot be limited by the action of the Senate in any preceding Congress.

5. Is the Senate a continuing body?

(a) Opponents of our motion argue that the Senate is a continuing body and that the rules of the Senate, therefore, automatically continue from one Congress to the next. I have already demonstrated how such an application of this principle to the Senate rules violates the Constitution, and historical precedent as to powers of the Senate. I now wish to demonstrate that this principle of our opponents is not consistent with other procedures in the Senate.

Argument as to whether the Senate is or is not a continuing body is an interesting academic question. It is not vital to the decision we are about to make. Senator Walsh and his colleagues argued that the Senate is not a continuing body. Senator TAFT and Senator RUSSELL yesterday and today insist that the Senate is a continuing body. The fact of the matter, Mr. President, as I see it, is that in some respects the Senate is in fact a continuing body and in other respects is not a continuing body. Whether it is a continuing body or not does not affect constitutional power of the Senate "to determine its own rules of proceedings."

(b) The Senate of each Congress acts as a new legislative body with regard to its legislative and executive functions, despite the fact that two-thirds of the membership of the Senate continue in office every 2 years. If the Senate were to consider itself a continuing body in all respects—and particularly were this concept of a continuing body established by the Constitution—the Senate would not and could not provide that old bills in the Senate die with the end of each Congress.

In fact, therefore, we must all be agreed that the Senate is not a continuing body insofar as legislation is concerned, since it is necessary for bills to be reintroduced with each new Congress. The Senate has never carried over legislative business beyond the life of a Congress.

(c) Furthermore, it is clear that the Senate is not a continuing body insofar as its treaty functions are concerned, for treaties must be considered at the beginning of each new Congress as if they had never been presented to the Senate during an earlier Congress.

(d) The same is true with regard to nominations. The Senate is not a continuing body insofar as nominations are concerned, in that we provide that all nominations die at the end of each session of each Congress.

(e) The same is true with regard to the committees in the Congress. We act in the Senate on the assumption that each new Senate of each new Congress is a new entity. We appoint new committees at the beginning of each Congress. We change committee chairmen when the majorities change in the Senate. We do not argue that committees should remain the same or that committee chairmanships should remain unchanged, because the Senate is a continuing body.

It is true that under practices in the Senate and under the Rules Committee, Members may continue to act until their successors are appointed, but this does not prove that the Senate is a continuing body insofar as either legislations or rules are concerned, since we know that the House of Representatives, which is without question regarded as a discontinuous body, carries over its Clerk from one Congress to the next.

(f) When a Senate adjourns sine die, its legislative activities cease, its nominations expire, its consideration of treaty ratification dies. With each new Congress bills must be reintroduced, treaties must be again referred to committee, and the President must again present nominations to the Senate. It is thus clear that, insofar as these functions are concerned, the Senate of each new Congress is indeed a new Senate. There is no reason to believe that any other principle or procedure exists insofar as the rules of the Senate are concerned.

The Senate is a continuing body insofar as two-thirds of its membership is concerned, but it is not a continuing body for its legislative activities, its nominations, its treaty functions, and it is not a continuing body insofar as its rules are concerned. It is this understanding which gives meaning to article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which states that the Senate "may determine the rules of its proceedings."

(g) The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] argue that the rules of the Senate continue because two-thirds of the membership of the Senate continues. There are no Supreme Court decisions supporting this position. No other legislative body in the United States acts in this manner. Every State legislature, even where the senate of the State legislates, has different classes of membership and rotating terms of office, acts on the basis that each new term is indeed a new senate.

The only appointed judiciary decision on this subject which has come to my attention is *State* v. *Rogers* (56 N. J. L. 480) in 1894. The case related to the statutes of the New Jersey Senate. The constitution of New Jersey followed the Constitution of the United States very closely insofar as the formulation of the senate was concerned, with staggering terms of office and rotating membership. The Supreme Court of New Jersey in discussing this question said:

"The expressions employed do not in any degree import the continuance of the Senate itself, but simply provide for the succession and length of the terms of the Members of that body. It is true that, by providing an always existent membership, the clause imparts to the body the potentiality of a permanent existence, but it does not impart to the body such continuous vitality. I think it is safe to say that never, on any occasion, has it been suggested that the clause has any further reach than this. The Senate of the United States has been declared to be a permanent body, and when the subject was under discussion it was on all sides assumed that the section in a Federal Constitution from which, as has been stated, our own has been copied gave to the Senate an aptitude for a continuous existence, but it was never alleged that it was possessed of any further effect."

(h) The logic of those who differ with us appears to be quite strange. They argue that the Senate is a continuing body because the rules continue and that the rules continue because the Senate is continuing. This is indeed circular reasoning. Our position that the rules have continued from 1789 until the present by virtue of majority acquiescence under each new Senate, amounting to the readopting of those rules, is much more consistent with the Constitution and Senate precedent.

6. How does the Senate differ from the House?

Further evidence that it is a gross oversimplification to say that the Senate is a continuing body and the House is not is a fact that even the House of Representatives, admittedly a new body in each Congress, has in some respects acted as a continuing body.

(a) The Clerk of the House of Representatives of a preceding Congress has the duty to organize the House in a new Congress. He has the responsibility and power of preparing a roll of Members of the new House. This has been interpreted as a procedure based on custom and later provided with a statutory base. It is another indication of a new body acquiescing in a practice. Yet this practice does not thereby transform the House into a continuing body for other purposes.

(b) Our history demonstrates that the House of Representatives on May 19, 1860, adopted a rule providing that the rules of the House "of the present and subsequent Congresses unless otherwise ordered" would be continued. This established continuing rules for the House for more than 30 years until 1890. Attempts were made to change this rule, but it is clear, from a reading of the record, that again the House acquiesced, in fact, readopted its rules every new Congress for 30 years. When the House decided not to acquiesce on the old rules, new rules were adopted every new Congress. The fact that the House for about 30 years provided for continuing rules did not in any way transform the House into a continuing body.

The so-called Speaker Reed's resolution in 1890 ended the practice whereby the House automatically acquiesced in its old rules with the beginning of each new Congress. The old rules were treated as not being in force (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 84) during the period between the decision that the House would not acquiesce in its old rules and the adoption of new rules. Speaker Reed held that the House was acting under general parliamentary law. The House was, therefore, in 1890 exercising its constitutional right of article I, section 5, to "determine its own rules of proceedings."

7. Conclusion

Mr. President, Members of the Senate have not voted on the adoption of their rules since 1789. Fourteen Members of the new Senate are beginning their term of office as elected representatives of their people. Unless our motion is adopted they will operate under rules of procedure which will affect their legislative activities and their ability to represent their people without having voted upon those rules. I have been a Member of this body for more than 4 years. My legislative activities and those of my colleague from Minnesota have been impeded by rules under which I have had no voice and no control. This, therefore, gives me, as a United States Senator, less power and influence, and gives the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress less power and influence than our predecessors had in 1789. Such a condition violates the basic premise of our Constitution and is not democratic.

The Senate may, in its judgment, when it votes today, decide not to adopt the resolution introduced by the Senator from New Mexico and cosponsored by myself and 19 other Senators. It may decide rather to acquiesce in the old rules. If it does so, it will be restricting its legislative activities in the 2 years to come.

I am convinced that whether the Senate acts today in support of our motion or not, that the time will soon come when a future Senate will exercise its right under article I, section 5, and establish its own rules of procedure at the beginning of its operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in concluding my argument today, I should

like to point up the issue once more so that every Senator may understand the point of view of those of us who are sponsors of the motion offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. President, an overwhelming majority of the Senate would like to see the rules of the Senate amended. I am convinced of it. I have heard from several Members of this body. I have had letters and I have had conversations with them. They have stated to me in all sincerity: "Senator HUMPHREY, we want to change the rules, and we think the rules ought to be changed; but we cannot go along with you on the idea that the Senate is not a continuing body."

I respect their judgment. I have already stated that it is not an open and shut case with me. I have stated my case as vigorously as I possibly could. However, I do not think it is necessary to be too dogmatic about it. After all, Mr. President, we are in the competitive atmosphere of a market place of ideas.

Mr. President, I do not wish to spend any more time by merely arguing the question of the continuity of the Senate. I do not believe anyone can improve on the argument presented by the late Senator Walsh. I believe he covered the field in its totality. The issue is: Shall we follow article I, section 5 of the Constitution? That is the issue. Is a new Senator willing to say that from now on he shall not have anything to say about the rules of the Senate? Is a new Senator willing to say that he shall have no rights? That is exactly what the Senate would be saying if it rejected the Anderson motion.

I wish my words to be carefully measured and considered when I say that the only opportunity that any Senator may ever have to vote on a change of debate rules is now. We who sponsor the motion are not asking Senators to vote in favor of a two-thirds vote or a vote by a constitutional majority on cloture. That question should be discussed on its own merits. We are merely trying to establish the principle that the Senate of the United States at the opening of the Eighty-third Congress shall adopt its own rules of procedure for this Congress.

It may be that if we are successful we will merely readopt the old rules of the last Congress. I would not like it, and I would protest such action to the best of my ability, but at least we would have taken some action. But if we wish to change the rules of the Senate, if we would like to adopt the proposal submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], for example, if we would like to have a chance to vote for the amendment to the cloture rule submitted last year by the Senator from New York, if we would like to have a rule under which two-thirds of the Senators present would be able to bring an end to debate, whatever may be our personal desires in terms of limiting debate, with due opportunity for full debate, if we ever want to prove that chance, the only way we shall ever get it—and let no one attempt to argue to the contrary—is to support the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico, on which a vote will soon be taken on the floor of this body.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York asked me to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, or I am willing to yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to postpone my question, so as to permit the Senator from New Jersey to proceed at this time. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators, namely, that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

I believe that the majority of the Senate of each new Congress has the constitutional right to adopt rules of procedure for the transaction of its business, unfettered by the actions or rules of the Senate of any preceding Congress. After a careful study of the history of the Senate, I am convinced that when the Constitution says that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," it means that each House may, by a majority vote, a quorum being present, determine its rules.

If our rules were adopted by a majority in the first place, it is absurd to say that future majorities may not change them.

In each new Congress one-third of the Senate come to this body with a fresh mandate from the people.

Unless these newly elected Senators have a voice in determining the rules of our proceedings, which go far to control legislative action in this body, then the past is fastened upon the new membership of the future, and the new Members begin their service in this body under a competitive disadvantage.

The United States Senate, Mr. President, has long been regarded as a continuing body because two-thirds of its members continue in office from one Congress to another. It is argued, therefore, that the first rules, adopted by this body, in 1789, have continued in force without reaffirmation down to the present time.

I construe the past practice of the Senate as acquiescence in its former rules, rather than as proof of its own continuity.

The fact is that on four occasions in the history of the Senate it "adopted" a new or revised code of rules for the transaction of its business.

This happened in connection with the general revision of our rules which took place in 1806, in 1820, in 1868, and in 1884.

The official records of the Senate show that, on these occasions, the new codifications of the Senate rules were "adopted."

In other words, the historic fact is that four times in the history of this body a majority of the Senate has approved of a revision of our code of rules and has adopted a revised code.

This might well happen again.

Mr. President, if we look objectively at the past practice of the Senate, we see that there is more evidence of discontinuity than there is of continuity. The Senate of each Congress acts as a new legislative body in nearly all respects.

As has already been said many times in this debate, all bills die at the end of each Congress. All legislative business lapses when the Senate adjourns sine die.

Likewise, under rule XXXVII, all proceedings on treaties terminate with the Congress, and are resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon.

Likewise, under rule XXXVIII, all nominations die at the end of each session of each Congress.

Moreover, Mr. President, in the appointment of standing committees, the Senate of each new Congress acts as if it were a new body. Rule XXV provides for the appointment of standing committees at the commencement of each Congress. This has been the regular historical practice.

It has long been the custom of the Senate to elect its officers at the beginning of each new Congress, as we did last Saturday.

In short, the past practice of the Senate in handling its legislative and executive business and in its internal organization has been predominantly that of a discontinuous body.

The practice of many of our State legislatures which stagger the election of their State senators, much as is done in the case of United States Senators, supports the concept of discontinuity.

There are 22 States in the Union whose senates adopt their rules of procedure at the beginning of each regular session. There are 24 States which stagger the election of their State senators. The constitutions of 11 States expressly provide that their State senates, which are elected on a staggered basis, shall elect their officers at each regular biennial session.

State supreme court decisions in New Jersey, my own State, Indiana, and California have held that their State senates, whose members are chosen for overlapping terms—or in classes, if you please—are not continuing bodies.

The senate of New Jersey is constituted on the same principle that is said to give continuity to the United States Senate. Yet the senate of my State regularly observes the custom of adopting rules at the beginning of each regular session.

In the case of *State* v. *Rogers* (56 N. J. L. 480, 28 Atl. 726; Sup. Ct. 1894), the Supreme Court of New Jersey held, after the most elaborate argument and upon the fullest consideration, that not-

withstanding the fact that two-thirds of the members of the Senate of New Jersey were hold-overs, it was not a continuous body, but assembles annually, as does the lower house, as a body quite distinct from the senate of the preceding year.

The New Jersey State Constitution of 1947, Mr. President, still provides that the New Jersey Senate shall be divided into classes with overlapping terms. The term of office for a senator, however, has been increased from 3 to 4 years and accordingly, the number of classes has been reduced from three to two.

Mr. President, I am one of the sponsors of the pending motion. I submit that history and logic are preponderantly on the side of the sponsors.

But it is said that the outcome of this debate is a foregone conclusion, that our motion is doomed to defeat.

Observers are saying that debate in the Senate is "after the fact," so to speak, designed more to air opinions than to decide a course of action; that no conversions are made here after the first 15 minutes; that this question will not be decided on its intrinsic merits or by the weight of logic or by the lessons of history.

Critics of the Senate say that such considerations have little weight with us; that in this body we reach decisions on the basis of logrolling, of group alliances, of bipartisan deals, and on the basis of shrewd calculations of party and sectional advantage. I am only repeating, Mr. President, what our fellow citizens say of us frequently.

We have little hope, they say, of converting our colleagues whose minds perhaps are already made up on this matter.

There are 16 new Members of this body whose minds are not yet indoctrinated in some of our ancient and archaic ways.

Six of our new colleagues are Democrats whose 1952 national platform pledges them to take action at the beginning of the Eighty-third Congress "to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House."

Mr. President, I appeal to my new colleagues, all of them, on both sides of the aisle, to consider carefully the arguments I have made, to repudiate the allegations that the Senate is impervious to logic and reason, to consider the long-run implications of Senate action in this matter for majority rule and the right of the Senate to exercise its legislative power under the Constitution, and to assert their right to participate in the making and revision of the Senate rules.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was a year that witnessed widespread popular revulsion against the activities of some professional politicians in our public life.

General Eisenhower's great victory was widely interpreted as a personal triumph and as a popular reaction against politicians as a class.

In his campaign the General gave repeated assurances that he would, if elected, use his high office to extend the frontiers of democracy at home and abroad.

If, in the event these assurances are nullified by means of manipulation and maneuver in Congress, by processes of filibuster and pigeonhole, then I predict that the Eighty-third Congress will go down in history as a Congress of double talk. I shudder to think of such an eventuality, because I have the highest hope for the Eighty-third Congress. Mr. President, if what I have intimated should happen, the patience of the people with the devious ways of politicians will be exhausted.

Today, Mr. President, all eyes are upon the Congress of the United States.

The Senate stands at the bar of public opinion. For the quality of our membership the voters in the several States are responsible.

But we alone are responsible for our internal methods and procedures.

If it was time for a change in the political control of the Federal Government, I suggest that it is also time for a change in the rules of the Senate, which have not been revised since 1884.

The American people are looking to the Senate to improve its efficiency and to modernize its ways.

Only by amending our rules can we effectively limit debate in this body and make it relevant to the pending business.

In this way we can go far to restore the Senate in public esteem.

The future of the Senate itself may well depend upon our action here.

I appeal, Mr. President, for a favorable vote on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, at the outset I want to commend my colleague from New Jersey for the excellent presentation he has just made.

I have no intention of consuming the time of the Senate in repetitious argument or presentation. In the debate of yesterday and today almost every aspect of the question before us has been covered in one way or another.

I rise, however, to express my personal feeling concerning this vital matter.

I favor the pending motion as indicated by the fact that I am one of its cosponsors.

I favor the pending motion because I believe deeply that every public legislative body periodically should adopt rules of procedure.

In this discussion much has been said for and against the idea that the Senate is a continuing body with continuing rules. I shall not enter into this controversy where it concerns the nature of the Senate itself. To me it seems immaterial whether or not the Senate is a continuing body. For the sake of argument I am willing to agree that it is a continuing body.

On the other hand, the assumption that because the Senate is a continuing body its rules also must be continuing, seems to me to be without foundation. Such an assumption is part and parcel of the fallacious theory that any course of human conduct having been, it must always continue to be. Just as no Congress can commit a future Congress, so no Senate can commit a future Senate.

Nothing in the Constitution requires that the rules of the first or any subsequent Senate must remain unchanged in perpetuity. The record of the Senate since 1789 furnishes resounding denial to such a ridiculous notion. Neither does the Constitution deny to the Senate the authority to adopt former or new rules on the first, the last, or any other day of any Congress.

Whether or not one accepts it, the fact remains that by acquiescence or default, or however one wants to term it, the Senate in the first instance in each new Congress has approved the rules by which it operates. In the few cases where this course of action has been challenged directly, subsequent Senate action in effect has approved the Senate rules. This approval has taken the form of their acceptance for want of something else and for want of sufficient opposition to them.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the question of civil rights has become entangled in the immediate debate. Civil rights is a vitally important question in this country. But there are also other vitally important questions. To pick out any one particular subject and to assume by emphasis that the importance of that subject is transcendent where the question of Senate rules is concerned, must detract inevitably from the basic and overshadowing question here at issue.

This question is a simple one: Shall Senators exercise the right which nearly every Senator seems to think he possesses as a Member of the Senate, the right to vote in fact and not in theory on its rules?

It is claimed by those opposed to the pending motion that the rules of the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress provided a guaranty of the exercise of this right. But all of us know that such guaranty was no more than an empty gesture.

All of us know—none of us is deceived—that the rules of the Senate in the last Congress, while theoretically permitting their own amendment by a majority vote of the Senate, in reality denied the use of that vote by allowing unlimited and unrestricted debate on any motion "to take up" a proposed amendment to the rules. In other words, all of us know that there is at least one type of amendment to the Senate rules of the Eighty-second Congress which, under those rules, can never be brought to a final vote. As a matter of fact, far fewer than 20 opposing Senators would be able to prevent a final vote on any amendment to the rules.

It has been stated that the establishment of a precedent, as would be done by the adoption of the pending motion, would constitute dangerous action on the part of the Senate. The theory seems to be that the sense and wisdom of a majority must be continually inferior to the sense and wisdom of a minority and that the will of a majority should be subordinated constantly to the will of a minority. This is to say that the preponderance of error lies consistently with commission and never with omission. It is to say that, by the law of averages, more is always to be lost by affirmative action than by negative action. It is to feign advance by backing forward. I do not subscribe to this kind of doctrine.

I do not believe that rules adopted by the Senate at the outset of a new Congress must be worse than are former rules accepted by default. I do not believe that former Senate rules, revised

and adopted at the beginning of a new Congress, must be less desirable than would be such rules where revised and adopted later in the life of that Congress.

It seems to me that the pending motion by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] which I am very glad to cosponsor, offers a practical, forthright means by which to obtain an expression of majority sentiment in the Senate.

With all due respect to the obviously sincere intentions of those who propose to amend rule XXII by means of later Senate action, I must point out that the chance of success of such an effort is most remote.

I well remember the debate on the so-called Hayden-Wherry resolution in 1949, which, to prevent a filibuster at the time, was finally resolved by the adoption—over the vigorous opposition of some of us—of the cloture provisions contained in Senate rule XXII of the Eighty-second Congress. The surest way to bring about the change in rule XXII, which has been proposed and which many Senators support, is through the adoption of the pending motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me make it clear at the outset that I believe my record of many years standing on the subject of civil rights—as an elected State official and as a United States Senator—speaks clearly for itself.

But I have never been in favor nor am I now of any move in behalf of this or any other cause which I believe might weaken or undermine our legislative system and institutions under the Constitution.

The purpose of this motion is to have the Senate adopt rules at the opening of the first session of this new Congress. This, if carried out, will establish a new precedent. The Senate for 164 years has always continued its rules from session to session because, while a session may adjourn sine die, the Senate continues. It does not die. There never is a new Senate—there is just a change in one-third of its membership.

If this is not so and there is a new Senate, like the new House of Representatives, then every Member should take a new oath—but only the new Members comprising the new one-third now take the oath of office.

But the proponents of this motion argue that while the Senate continues, its rules do not. Why, they argue, does the Senate elect new officers, require bills to be filed, and yet continue its rules. The answer to that argument is clear and simple. A continuing legislative body cannot exist without rules under which to proceed. If it has no rules under which to function, it cannot legislate and will cease to exist. So the rules continue as the Senate itself continues.

The purpose of the continuing Senate under the Constitution is to make sure that our system of government does not stop when a session of Congress closes. In the days before the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, the Senate sat after the House recessed to fulfill its duties of confirming executive appointments. There is always a Senate just as there is always a Supreme Court.

I have in three Congresses offered amendments to rule XXII, which is the rule by which debate can be closed. The present language to make cloture possible on a motion to take up a bill is language worked out by the Parliamentarian and myself. It was filed first by me in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was adopted in a compromise form in the Eightieth Congress. There have been several amendments to the rules adopted during my membership in this body. There can be more.

I personally want to see rule XXII further amended to make it more simple to foreclose debate and yet not deprive the minority of all safeguards and rights. There can well be amendments to other sections of the rules that will be helpful.

But, in our eagerness to get those changes, we must not destroy one of the fundamental strengths of our system of government—a continuing Senate. This body repelled an attack on the packing of the Supreme Court in an effort to get the Court to change its views. It repelled that attack because it went to the heart—the core—of our system of government under the Constitution.

Here today we have a question that goes to the root of our system. Members are elected to this body for 6 years instead of 2 years as in the House in order that there may always be a group of legislators with experience and background to carry on the functions delegated to the Senate by the Constitution. To carry on those functions the Senate established its rules. It amended them to meet new situations, but it never, never terminated those rules. If it should do so, then it could not function; it would end itself; it would cease to be a continuing body.

If the precedent is established which the proponents of the pending motion wish to establish today of adopting a complete set of new rules at the start of each new session, then the Senate may not be able to function for some days or weeks. Its rules too might well be constantly changing. A majority at the start of each session could establish its own set of rules. This certainly would end the continuity of the Senate and its operating effectiveness.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has said he favored a change in the rules, and I wonder whether he will advise me in regard to this question: If we should decide to function under the old rules and should fail to adopt new rules, how could the Senator possibly explain to his colleagues in the Senate the manner in which a new rule XXII could be proposed and adopted requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senators present or a simple majority vote? How could he possibly break the filibuster that would inevitably ensue as a result of such a motion? We know that under paragraph 3 of the existing rule XXII it would require substantially a unanimous vote even to bring before the Senate such a proposed change in the rule.

Mr. TAFT. May I answer that?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like an answer from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that when a sufficient number of Senators in this body, as I believe there are, are willing to try to work out a change in the rule, a change will be brought about. It may not be worked out in a day or a night. I was one of those who tried to work out a compromise in the case of the existing rule. The present language in rule XXII which includes a motion to take up was the language the present majority leader and I worked out with the Parliamentarian. Perhaps it would be more fair to say the Parliamentarian and I worked it out and submitted it to the majority leader, and it became the language of the rule.

I agree that when a proposal to amend rule XXII or when any proposed amendment of the rules is taken up, there is no limitation of debate. In my opinion, that is not an overwhelming difficulty. But I would rather try to accomplish what is desired in the hard way than to take action which might come back to plague us in the days to come, in a way the Senator and I cannot foresee today. If the Senate is going to debate new rules at each session, and if only a majority is to be necessary to amend the rules, we cannot tell how much continuity of the rules there will be.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further brief observation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. After all, new rules are adopted the world over by legislative bodies. They are adopted by our House of Representatives, which has a right to adopt them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yet I do not recall a single instance in which the organization of the House of Representatives has been held up for any substantial time because of the adoption of new rules. I see no more reason to suppose that such delay would happen in the Senate than occurs in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would go a little further than the distinguished Senator from New York has gone. As I see it, a continuing Senate is one of the basic necessities if we are to be able to safeguard the Constitution in these difficult times.

I believe a fundamental point for Senators to remember, no matter how much they may wish to change the rules, is that we must preserve the foundations, customs, and precedents that have made this country great, as we want it to continue. That is the basis of my argument.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to hear the Senator make that statement, because now the situation is a little clearer to me. In other words, the Senator from Massachusetts is taking the same position that a number of other Senators have taken, namely, that the only reason for declaring that the opposition to the Anderson resolution is sound is that since 1789 the Senate, through inertia, lethargy, or indifference, has acquiesced in, or has been willing to go along with,

the rules that were drafted by the very wise, patriotic, and great men who founded this country in 1789. But I doubt whether the Senator from Massachusetts would claim that conditions always remain static; that conditions today are basically as they were 163 years ago. With all the great regard I have for tradition, with the regard I have for the great men of those days, I do not think any of us would claim that conditions should remain static. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I most respectfully disagree with the statement of the Senator from New York that the rules have not been amended or have not been kept up to date. Of course, they are not up to date in every respect, in my mind, in the Senator's mind, or in the mind of anyone else. But the rules are up to date in the sense that they enable the Senate to function, and have enabled it to function for a great many years. Perhaps under the present rules the Senate cannot function in some respects as quickly as some of us would wish. In such cases it is up to the Senate to try to improve its ways. But, as I see it it is not up to the Senate, in order to make one change which some of us may desire, to change the whole basic principle upon which the Senate was founded. On that point I disagree fundamentally with the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has not yet told me or other Members of the Senate how under the sun we can break a filibuster against a proposed change in the rules.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to the Senator from New York that the Senate can amend its rules in a logical, sensible way, a way that will safeguard the rights of the minority, but yet give the majority or two-thirds of the Senate a greater flexibility to act, if we grit our teeth and really work toward that end, as I am willing to do.

In these days of stress and insecurity and uncertainty in the world, it becomes mighty important to hang on to the precedents, the customs, and the foundations of government upon which our Nation has been built. Not only all of our 150 million people, but also many more millions of people throughout the world, look to the government here in Washington for strength and confidence and hope for the future. Let us, therefore, build thoughtfully and progressively upon our customs and precedents in the orderly way provided. We want ever to go forward, but as I have said, we do not, to achieve an end which many, including myself, desire, want to break down, or even take the chance of breaking down, the foundations upon which our Nation has been built. The continuity of the Senate as a functioning legislative body with its continuity of rules to enable it to function, is one of those foundations.

I have always tried to do my part to advance civil rights in my State and in our country. I shall continue to do so, but I cannot vote, in order possibly to advance civil rights, to break down any portion of the continuity of our Government which may make it difficult, in some way unforeseen by us today, to advance those rights in the future. The customs and precedents upon which our civil rights have advanced to the point they have now reached have been established because of the rock-ribbed strength, the firm foundations of our system of government, founded by our fathers in 1789. They set forth that all men are created equal. Let us strive to make these words a living reality. But let us strive within the framework of the Constitution as they gave it to us.

A part of the rock-ribbed strength of our Nation, a part of its firm foundation, was the continuity of our Senate as a functioning legislative body. Let us never destroy that. Let us advance our civil rights on the foundation of a continuing government in accordance with the orderly methods provided, even though at the moment those methods seem tough and hard.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was very much impressed by what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said about not destroying the continuity of the Senate. May I ask the Senator whether the amendment of the cloture rule in 1917 in any way destroyed the continuity of the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would state to the Senator, who has studied this question very carefully, that, as I understand, in 1917 the present cloture rule was established. Before that time there was no restriction on debate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did that change in the rules destroy the character of the Senate as a continuing body?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was done by amendment of the rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. But did it destroy the continuity of the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; but the change was made in an orderly way, by amendment of the rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. There have been four complete general revisions of the rules. Did they destroy the continuity of the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I may say to the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why would a change in the cloture rule destroy the continuity of the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have a great deal of respect, that we should always remember that the rules must continue if the Senate is to be a continuing legislative body. That is the basis of my argument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, an editorial entitled "Price of Limited Debate," published in the Washington Post of January 7, 1953, with which I agree almost entirely, and which very succinctly presents the argument I have tried to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE OF LIMITED DEBATE

If the question before the Senate were simply one of limiting debate, the Anderson resolution would have powerful support from public opinion. By and large, the people have no patience with talkathons for the sole purpose of frustrating legislative action by majority vote. For many years this newspaper has been especially active in the fight against filibusters, and we continue to believe that a simple majority in the Senate should be sufficient to cut off debate on any issue after a reasonable time for discussion has elapsed. But Senator ANDERSON and his supporters are offering too high a price for this reform, and the Senate ought to turn them down.

In the first place, a filibuster dragging out through the period of the inauguration and perhaps for weeks longer would have disastrous psychological repercussions. The Eisenhower administration is coming to office with a new program and a heavy schedule of legislation, some of which needs prompt attention, for it is in the nature of renewal of existing law. It would be inexcusably shortsighted for the Senate to work itself into a frenzy of futile debate before the vital business of the new session can get under way. Yet that will be the unavoidable result unless the Senate votes to table the Anderson motion.

In the second place, it seems to us that the Anderson proposal rests on fiction. By asking the Senate to give immediate consideration to the adoption of "rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress," it presupposes that the Senate's 163-year-old rules are no longer in effect. One practical advantage of thus starting afresh is obvious. By this means the Senate could adopt an antifilibuster rule by a simple majority vote instead of waiting for a two-thirds majority of the Senate membership, as is required by the present rules. The only difficulty is that the Senate has always regarded itself and is regarded as a continuing body, automatically carrying over its rules from one Congress to another.

The fact that only one-third of the Senate is elected at any one time seems to us to clinch the argument that the Senate is a continuing body, properly governable, that is to say, by continuing rules. This arrangement gives the Senate a stability that it could not otherwise attain, and we cannot help thinking that it would be foolish to give up this asset in pursuit of a temporary rule for limitation of debate. If the Anderson thesis should prevail, the Senate would have to adopt a new set of rules every 2 years. What would then prevent the foes of civil rights, or of any other potential legislation, from filibustering indefinitely against the adoption of proposed new rules at the opening of every Congress? Such a "cure" might prove far worse than the filibuster evil itself.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the interest of obtaining a quick vote on the pending motion, I shall not take as much time as I had planned to take. However, I believe the debate should not close without including in the RECORD a statement made by the late Senator James A. Reed, who represented the State of Missouri in the Senate. I shall offer that statement at the conclusion of my remarks.

I know it is popular in certain circles throughout the country to hold the Senate up to ridicule because of its rules. I know that is popular within a small group in the Senate, and in some small segments of our population. I believe

this debate is a matter of vital concern to the people of the United States who do not wish to see the rules hastily swept aside.

One of the major political parties in its platform adopted last summer advocates material changes in the Senate rules. I am a member of that party, and the action was taken over my objection, of course. That party went down to one of its most ignoble defeats. In fact, the only States it carried were a few States which some of the group who are trying to abolish the Senate rules tried to kick out of that political convention.

I think this is one of the most serious matters we shall have before us at any time during this session or at any session soon to come. I trust that by an overwhelming vote the Senate will send forth word to the people of the Nation who are concerned that this is a serious matter, and will be considered only in such a light and, furthermore, that whatever changes are desirable will be made only after the normal processes of consideration, reconsideration, and the most grave and serious thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement made by the late Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri. He was a Member of the Senate from 1911 to 1929. This statement is taken from the hearings before the Senate Rules Committee on October 2, 3, 9, and 23, 1951, with a few paragraphs deleted which pertain to matters which were purely current as of that time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cloture means the granting of a power. Whenever you grant a power you must assume that the power will be exercised. So, when we discuss this proposed rule, we must do so in the light, not of how it may be exercised so as to do no harm, but we must consider how it may be exercised to do harm.

* * * * *

The truth is that this measure, if adopted, will empower a majority to throttle freedom of speech upon this floor and enable sinister and wicked measures to be carried to consummation without the country being advised of the iniquities they bear.

Gag rule is the last resort of the legislative scoundrel. Gag rule is the surest device of the rascal who presides over a political convention and proposes to accomplish something which will not bear discussion. Gag rule is the thing that men inexperienced in legislative proceedings always advocate at first, and if they have any sense, nearly always retire from as gracefully as possible after they have seen it in operation.

There is justification for unlimited debate in this body. I am getting a little tired of hearing about the sacred rights of the majority; that this is a country ruled by the majority; and that the majority has the right to have its way. This is not a country ruled by the majority. This is not a country of majority rule. The Constitution of the United States was written, in large part, to prevent majority rule. The Declaration of Independence was an announcement that there are limitations upon majority rule.

The rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were declared in the Declaration to be inalienable rights. They could not be given away by the citizen himself. Much less could they be taken away by temporary agents, sitting in legislative bodies, holding a limited authority of brief duration.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution itself is a direct limitation upon the majority rule. "You shall not take property without due process of law," says the Constitution, and before we can take that safeguard away what must we do? We must obtain not a majority by this body, not a majority of the House of Representatives, but a two-thirds majority in each House concurring in a resolution, and that resolution must be approved by three-fourths of the States. What about majority rule in connection with that proposition?

* * * * *

Majority rule. Where is the logic or the reason to be found back of majority rule except in the mere necessity to dispatch business? The fact that a majority of 1 or 10 vote for a bill in the Senate is not a certification that the action is right. The majority has been wrong oftener than it has been right in all the course of time. The majority crucified Jesus Christ. The majority burned the Christians at the stake. The majority drove the Jews into exile and the ghetto. The majority established slavery. The majority set up innumerable gibbets. The majority chained to stakes and surrounded with circles of flame martyrs through all the ages of the world's history.

Majority rule without any limitation or curb upon the particular set of fools who happen to be placed for the moment in charge of the machinery of a government. The majority grinned and jeered when Columbus said the world was round. The majority threw him into a dungeon for having discovered a new world. The majority said that Galileo must recant or that Galileo must go to prison. The majority cut off the ears of John Pym because he dared advocate the liberty of the press. The majority to the south of the Mason and Dixon's line established the horrible thing called slavery, and the majority north of it did likewise and only turned reformer when slavery ceased to be profitable to them.

THE PUBLIC BUSINESS

Oh, but somebody says—and we have heard it ad nauseam, indeed, until the gorge would rise in the gizzard of an ostrich at the sheer idiocy of the statement—"we must speed up the public business. We must enact more laws." We must not consider them. We must not analyze them. We must not talk about them. Of course, if we cannot talk about them we ought not to think about them. There are a good many men who do a good deal of talking in favor of stopping talking who never stop long enough talking themselves to do any thinking themselves.

What we need to do is to stop passing laws. We have enough laws now to govern the world for the next 10,000 years. Every crank who has a foolish notion that he would like to impose upon everybody else hastens to some legislative body and demands that it be graven upon the statutes. Every fanatic who wants to control his neighbor's conduct is here or at some other legislative body demanding that a law be passed to regulate that neighbor's conduct.

FREEDOM

What is it that has made this race great? It has not been the proud blood of any illustrious ancestry; it has not been because we could trace our lineage back to kings and a royal household; it has not been because of the peculiar graces or abilities of those immigrants who came to our shores and from whose loins we are sprung. It is simply because for once in the history of the world the chains were taken from the arms, the shackles from the brain, the shadows of fear were dissipated by the sunlight of liberty and freedom, and every brain of every human being, great or small, was at liberty to function, every arm and every limb was at liberty to move. So we unleashed the latent powers of a race of people; and from the cottage of poverty there came forth the genius, and from the house of the man of humble estate there emerged the child who could turn the dull and inexpressive canvas into pictured harmony of color, light, and shade, and paint the rainbow's mingling hues and marvelous tints.

From the cottages of the impoverished, from the homes of ancestors who had been enslaved and enthralled, there came forth children who in the full liberty of our civilization were able to attack every problem and to undertake every great vocation of life; so that within one generation of time we produced here orators whose words of flame could fire the hearts of all the people of this land; poets whose words will be read so long as men shall love the music of our tongue, and a citizenry who have defended our soil and our flag with unexampled valor in every contest of this Republic. All these triumphs of intellect, all these great advances in the arts and in the sciences, all our wondrous advance in wealth are due to one great fact: That we have allowed the individual in this land the opportunity to develop, the opportunity to express himself.

FREE DEBATE

Mr. President, what has this to do with the question I am discussing? Everything, sir. Before any law to bind 110,000,000 people could be passed it should somewhere be subjected to free debate; somewhere it should encounter opposition; somewhere the fires of keen intellects should burn their heat about it and test it for its metal; somewhere and somehow it should be determined by all that the intellect can do and all that the tongue can express whether the particular law which is proposed is fit to be fastened upon 110,000,000 people who think they are free and who once were free. That one forum reserved of all the places in the world is the Senate of the United States. Here a man can stand and express his views until exhaustion comes. And what of it? Some rules of common sense and decency and gentlemanly conduct have their effect. Not in all the nearly 16 years I have sat in this body have I ever seen but two or three instances of what might be really called a filibuster.

Time and time again I have seen the opportunity under the rules for the minority to have stood and obstructed legislation, but as soon as debate was fairly over they have invariably given way and the vote has come. In the two or three instances which I remember a very simple expedient was adopted. Freedom of speech was not denied, but continuance of speech was demanded. It was insisted that the bill was before the Senate and that the opponents or advocates of the bill should speak for or against it and that no other business should intervene.

We have been told here of two or three bills—one of them the force bill. The force bill, if it had been enacted, would have kept alive the fires of hatred between the North and the South almost as bright and as keen and as hot as they were at the close of the great civil strife.

NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

Another example: It was sought here to admit New Mexico to statehood as a partisan measure and under a constitution that had been written by the corporations of New Mexico. It was insisted upon the other hand that New Mexico should not come into the Union except under a fairly adopted constitution, and that at the same time Arizona should be received. What happened? One or two men stood here and held their ground; and a short space of time, a few months, rolling by, both States were received into the Union with proper constitutions.

Sir, I know it is popular to attack the Senate. So many an ass has stood and brayed at the lions. He who would claim for this body perfection would prove himself a fool. But the more imperfect we are, the more we need to counsel and to take advice. The

less we knew, the more we ought to strive to know. There may be some men of such supernatural power of intellect that they can gain nothing by the discussions their fellows may produce; but I have never seen an important bill upon the floor of the Senate, unless there was some political organization in control determined to pass it without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," that has not been amended and amended to its benefit.

A FREE FORUM

As long as we can keep this forum free, as long as a vigorous and determined minority can prevent the passage of a statute, so long this country will be safe, reasonably safe, at least, for no great act of treachery can ever be consummated where there are not some brave souls to stand in its resistance and to stand to the end.

But strike down this safeguard of public discussion, apply the gag, and imagine, if you please, that it is to be applied only to pass good measures, only to accomplish the virtuous and the wise and the holy, only to bring the thing of rectitude; imagine that, if you please. He is a fool, he is every kind of a fool, that has ever cursed this earth or cursed himself, who thinks that any power will always be used wisely and justly. Power is almost invariably abused.

Has there ever been one of those important measures discussed on the floor of the Senate when it was not found that many changes were necessary, when the proponents of the measure have not been willing to accept amendment after amendment? Why should there not be some place in this country where the virtues or the iniquities of proposed legislation could be exposed without gag, without rule, without limit; some place where every public act must come under the surveillance of men who have complete freedom of speech, so that the good that is in it may be properly exemplified and the evil that exists may be properly exposed?

Mr. STENNIS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks section I from Jefferson's Manual, which is found on pages 305 and part of 306 of the current Senate Manual.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON'S MANUAL OF PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE

IMPORTANCE OF RULES

Section 1. Importance of adhering to rules

Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say it was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power. So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense; that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

And whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not, is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by, than what that rule is; that there may be a uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or captiousness of the members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, like Senators who have preceded me, I shall make my remarks quite brief.

First, there are two corrections which I wish to offer to the statements which were made—I am sure mistakenly—by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the course of his argument.

The first such statement was to the effect that the "previous question" had been a part of the rules of the Senate in the early days, and that under the "previous question" rule the Senate had the right to bring the debate to a close and come to a vote on the question which was pending. My distinguished friend was trying to state correctly the situation as of those remote days, but he inadvertently failed to do so. The reason for his failure is quite easy to understand.

There have been two meanings attached to the expression "the previous question" in the course of our parliamentary history. If the Senator from Minnesota will take the trouble to read the texts on the subject, he will find that they show quite clearly and conclusively that at the time the "previous question" was a part of the rules of the United States Senate, in the first few years of its existence, the meaning of that rule was not at all what we ascribe to it now. It would not permit cloture or bringing the debate to a close so that the main question could be voted upon.

On the contrary, the meaning of the "previous question" at that time was completely different—and I refer Senators to page 356 of the Senate Manual, in which, as a part of Jefferson's Manual, they will find a paragraph which gives the meaning of the "previous question" rule as it existed at that time. I quote:

> The proper occasion for the previous question is when a subject is brought forward of a delicate nature as to high personages, etc., or the discussion of which may call forth observations which might be of injurious consequences.
>
> Then the previous question is proposed; and in the modern usage—

That is, the usage prevailing at that time—

> the discussion of the main question is suspended, and the debate confined to the previous question. The use of it has been extended abusively to other cases; but in these it has been an embarrassing procedure; its uses would be as well answered by other more simple parliamentary forms, and therefore it should not be favored, but restricted within as narrow limits as possible.

That language, as quoted from Jefferson's Manual, will, if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will address his inquiry to the texts which prevailed at that time and which still state the rule accurately, be found by him and other Senators to be the precise meaning of the previous question rule as contained in the rules of the Senate in the early days. There has never been a time in which the previous question was a part of the rules of the United States Senate, if the familiar present meaning of the previous question rule as it is generally understood now and as it is now applied in the House of Representatives, is given to that rule.

The second point I wish to make relates to the statement of the Senator from Minnesota that there had been no departure from the principle of unlimited debate in the history of the Senate since those early days. I am sure my distinguished friend wants his remarks to be strictly in accord with the facts, and the events of history. I do not question his motives, which I am sure are the highest. As I understood his remarks, he thought that in those early days there was a limitation under the previous question rule, which I have already discussed.

The Senator from Minnesota is almost correct, but not entirely so in his statement just quoted, because the Senate, during the course of the War Between the States, when it was highly necessary, with a divided Senate, that it be made possible to take quick action upon military matters affecting the defense of the Union, adopted a special rule then applicable only during those war years, under which there were very close limitations upon debate. Debate upon that type of measure could proceed for only a very short time before a final vote was taken.

With those two suggestions, which I believe to be correct and in accordance with the facts and with the situation confronting the Senate, let me very briefly discuss the question of stability in the Senate. I believe all Senators know that the Senate was created as the body which, in the opinion of the Founding Fathers, would give the essential quality of stability to our legislative structure, and, indeed, in a larger sense, to our Government as a whole.

I took occasion within the past few days to review the discussions in the Federalist by the three men best in a position to discuss just what was intended by the Founding Fathers in setting up the Senate. Senators will find those discussions embraced in five papers in the Federalist, two by Mr. James Madison, one by Mr. John Jay, and two by Mr. Alexander Hamilton, with which I am sure most Senators are already familiar.

The thing which stands out upon a reading of those papers is that those founders of the faith, those who participated in the building of the Constitution and in its adoption by our people in those early days, set forth their views as to what was fundamental in concept in the creation of the Senate. Senators will be impressed with the fact that stability or relative permanence is set forth as the outstanding contribution to be made by the Senate, which was established under the Constitution. The Senator from Florida was impressed by the fact that the word "stability," "stable," or "instability," depending upon the exact wording used, appears nine times in the two very brief articles by Mr. Madison, in which he made it completely apparent that stability was what the Founding

Fathers were seeking to accomplish in setting up the Senate.

On one occasion they speak of the fact that it was necessary to set up something which could give "continuing" attention to important problems which could not be readily solved. In two other places they made the statement that it was necessary to set up a body which could establish a "system" which would have permanence. In particular they discussed the problems of dealing with international affairs. They spoke of the treaty-approving power of the Senate.

It is quite apparent from the wording of the Constitution in many places that in many of its references to the Senate it was built around the idea of stability, around the idea of relative permanence. Some of the matters have already been mentioned. I will simply mention them for the RECORD, without elaborating upon them.

First was the proposal that there should be two Senators from each State, large or small. That provision is found in section 3 of article I.

Next is the limitation in the Constitution itself, in article V, that no State shall be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate against its own consent.

The third provision is that the Vice President, after his election, which was very carefully provided for, should be the presiding officer of the Senate, as its continuing presiding officer. Assuming the existence of a Vice President there would be no time when the Senate would be without a presiding officer. This is to be found in section 3, article I, of the Constitution.

Fourth, there is the division into three classes of the Senators, which was directed to be accomplished at the first opportunity, so that the terms of Senators elected for 6 years would overlap each other, only a third of them being elected each 2 years. That provision assured the existence of a quorum at all times for the transaction of business.

The next point was that, realizing that there may be vacancies, through death, resignation, or other reasons, a provision was inserted in the original Constitution in the form of section 3, article I, for the appointment of individuals to fill vacancies if such vacancies were created, in order that the States, which were primarily concerned with the Senate and its functioning, would be very certain to have representation at all times. It was provided that if the legislatures were not in session, they being the body by which the election of Senators took place, the governors could appoint a Senator until the next session of the legislature.

The sixth point is that the provision was continued in the seventeenth amendment, by which governors are empowered to appoint Senators to fill vacancies. That is a similar provision to the one previously in effect. In that way there can never be a failure of a quorum in the Senate.

Mr. President, these provisions appear in the Constitution itself. However, there are ample evidences of action by the Senate itself of its appreciation of the fact of stability and of permanence and continuity.

We need not look to the decision of the Supreme Court which has already been referred to by my very learned friend from Minnesota and other Senators, which refers, as a matter of obiter dictum, it is true, nevertheless refers very strongly to the existence of the Senate as a continuing body.

Action by the Senate itself, in the early days, in later days, and in recent days, all show that it knew that it was a continuing body.

First, there are the 163 years of Senate history and tradition under which the rules have been continued, most often without positive readoption of rules, and most often by continuing to function under rules adopted by earlier Senates.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who hold that such a fact cuts the Senate off from any right to do anything it has a right to do. It can certainly amend its rules. I merely invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that certainly the Senate's repeated action in that regard shows that it has regarded itself as a continuing body and has so acted in its traditional handling of itself on the question of rules.

Then I invite attention to the fact it is also shown by the various rules itself which the Senate has adopted that it knew itself to be a continuing body and has set up provisions in its rules so as to limit itself from being a too-long continuing body in certain fields.

The first is as to the provision with reference to treaties. It knew that without such provision, by which succeeding Senates and succeeding Senators would have the right to hear evidence with reference to treaties only until the end of the pending Congress, there would be question as to whether treaties would continue as pending from one Congress to another Congress until they were acted on. Therefore rule XXXVII was adopted. Under rule XXXVII a Senate retains jurisdiction of a treaty only up to the time of adjournment sine die of the last session of the pending Congress during which the treaty is submitted.

On the question of nominations, since that was not such a formal matter, the rule is more limited in time in its application. It provides that the nominations last only up to the end of the pending session, provided 30 days elapse between the present session and the next one, and that if the names are not resubmitted the Senate ceases to have jurisdiction and authority to again consider the nominations.

There is likewise the matter of the appointment of standing committees under rule XXV.

I invite attention to the fact that not only the Senate but the House concurred in this action, because it was adopted by the passage of a law, namely, in the passage of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Then provision was made that committees would continue to function right on into the next Senate until other members had qualified and been sworn in.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senators present to the fact that no such provision appears with reference to the committees of the House, because not only this body but the House, and Congress as a whole, knew full well that the committees of the House could have no such continuing jurisdiction, whereas the continuing nature and the continuing personnel of the Senate was recognized in the way that I have indicated in the passage of the law known as the Reorganization Act.

Likewise there are provisions in that act requiring the appointment of standing committees over again with each Congress, so as to clarify the question as to whether they should remain in existence after the earlier Congress.

Mr. President, there are many other evidences of the same kind. On page 388 of Jefferson's Manual we find that impeachments which are pending will remain in the Senate into the succeeding session until they are acted upon. There are repeated evidences, therefore, of the fact that the Senate itself—and sometimes the Senate and the House acting in conjunction in the passage of legislation—recognized the Senate as a continuing body.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks I wish to quote very briefly from an insertion which was previously made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It is from an editorial entitled "Price of Limited Debate," which was published in the Washington Post of this morning. I should like to quote a portion of the editorial which refers to the stability of the Senate, which would be undermined by the adoption of the motion sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and his distinguished associates.

I may say that the writer of the editorial had already indicated that he favors the enactment of civil-rights legislation. The portion of the editorial which I should like to read is as follows:

> The fact that only one-third of the Senate is elected at any one time seems to us to clinch the argument that the Senate is a continuing body, properly governable, that is to say, by continuing rules. This arrangement gives the Senate a stability that it could not otherwise attain, and we cannot help thinking that it would be foolish to give up this asset in pursuit of a temporary rule for limitation of debate.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has made this point so crystal clear that it is unnecessary for me to pursue the argument further. It is obvious that very much more is at stake than any temporary value that might be gained by the adoption of the motion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and his associates.

Mr. President, I continue to quote from the editorial:

> If the Anderson thesis should prevail, the Senate would have to adopt a new set of rules every 2 years. What would then prevent the foes of civil rights, or of any other potential legislation, from filibustering indefinitely against the adoption of proposed new rules at the opening of every Congress? Such a "cure" might prove far worse than the filibuster evil itself.

Mr. President, I hope and I believe that the Senate, realizing the stability that was written into our form of government through the creation of the Senate as a continuing body, whose light

never goes out but continues to burn through all time—through the time during which the Senate is in recess and during election time and, in fact, always—will conclude that that permanent value must not be destroyed by action, although no doubt well motivated, which seeks to cure an ill which the authors of the motion believe should be corrected.

Mr. President, I hope that the motion of the Senator from New Mexico and his associates will be very strongly defeated by the Senate. I would regret to see any sizable number of Senators put themselves on record as not believing in the preservation of the stability of the Senate. It is the stability of the Senate that means most to our country and it is such stability which has given to the Senate the greatest meaning in our Nation throughout the 163 years of its existence.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on this subject. In a way it is difficult for me to do so, because I find myself in disagreement with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], whom I wish to compliment for having made a very able speech on the other side of the present controversy. He spoke in support of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. At this time I wish to state briefly why I cannot support that position and my reasons for opposing the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, which, as I see it, is based upon a single question, namely, whether the Senate is a continuing body.

I consider it unfortunate that the issue at hand, namely, that of whether the Senate is a continuing body, is being confused with issues which are of an entirely different character. The issue now before the Senate is not one of civil rights; neither is it a question of what is the best cloture rule for the Senate to adopt. The issue before us is whether the Senate is a continuing body, and that question is a constitutional one. As I view the question, under the Constitution the Senate either is or is not a continuing body. If the Senate is a continuing body under the Constitution, then no vote taken either at this time or at any other time can change the status of the Senate under the Constitution of the United States. I shall not go further into that question, but I shall simply confine myself to stating that I find myself in disagreement with Senators who hold that the Senate is not a continuing body and that it therefore has a different relationship to its rules than would otherwise be the case.

Of course, Mr. President, the Senate has a right to change its rules. The question is whether the rules we have today continue until we change them.

Reasonable men may disagree as to what the Constitution means in any particular case. I am one of those who believe that the staggered arrangement for the service of Senators, under the Constitution, was intended to show and is evidence that the Senate is, and was intended to be, a continuing body. There is much other evidence to support that position.

However, the important point to be emphasized here is that the issue is one regarding the nature and character of the Senate as a legislative body. My views on this issue, which support the concept that the Senate is a continuing body, have nothing whatever to do with my views on civil-rights legislation or on the question of instituting a stronger cloture rule. I think those issues have become confused with the present issue. I have frequently registered my views on these other issues. I favor a stronger cloture rule than the one we have today, and I shall support action for that purpose at this session. I favor civil-rights legislation. As the new chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at this new session, I propose to move right ahead with my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and other Senators, in endeavoring to bring about a fuller civil-rights program which I believe we can get our colleagues to support. However, I shall not now go into that situation.

Mr. President, we must not accept a philosophy that the end justifies the means, simply because we are trying to achieve a valuable goal.

As has been urged here by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and other Senators, including my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who spoke only a moment ago, let us maintain a sense of stability of our Constitution, and let us not try to proceed by a method different from that under which the Senate has proceeded from the very inception of its life.

As I have said, Mr. President, I believe in and favor civil-rights legislation, and I believe in and favor a change in the cloture rule. However, let us work along proper lines toward those goals. Let us not simply throw up our hands, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] did recently in the course of the debate, and say that we shall never get another chance at this session or in this Congress. With all due respect to the Senator from Minnesota, I take issue with that view.

I simply wish to make this brief statement of my position in setting forth the reasons why I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I gave notice to the Senate at the opening of today's session, I am about to move to lay on the table the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico, on behalf of himself and other Senators. I do not wish to shut off any statements for the RECORD or any insertions which Senators may wish to make; but in that case, I shall request unanimous consent that such Senators be permitted to speak for not more than a definite length of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Under that understanding, will the Senator from Ohio yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to speak for not more than 2 minutes on the pending motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the 2 minutes I have I can make clear my position on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Of course I respectfully disagree with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] when he argues, as he has just done, that the motion of the Senator from New Mexico is based on the theory that the Senate is not a continuing body.

In my judgment the Senator from New Mexico has tried time and time again to make clear that his motion has no relationship whatsoever to the theory and argument, advanced by some Senators, to the effect that the Senate is not a continuing body. Many of us can support the motion of the Senator from New Mexico—and I do support it—on an entirely different theory, namely, that in my judgment, as a matter of sound public policy, the Senate of the United States at the beginning of this Congress should proceed as a committee of the whole to amend rule XXII. I take that position, Mr. President, because I believe this is the best time during the entire course of the Congress which has just begun to amend rule XXII. We do not have pending before us at the present time any committee action on proposed legislation that requires consideration by the Senate. We have the time to consider this matter now. I dare say that, by and large, all Senators know how they stand, as individual Members of the Senate, regarding the merits of the question of whether the cloture rule of the Senate should be changed.

Mr. President, I close by saying that we need to remember again that the substantive legislative rights of the people of the United States, insofar as the Congress of the United States is concerned, can be no better than their procedural rights in the Senate of the United States. In my opinion—and I stress this as my personal judgment—the substantive legislative rights of the American people will never be given the careful, adequate attention they deserve as long as the Senate has a rule which denies to the American people what I believe is one of the basic premises of a democratic representative government, namely, the passing of proposed legislation by majority vote. So long as rule XXII remains one of the rules of the Senate, as that rule now stands, I submit that majority rule in the Senate of the United States is denied to the voters of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] be allowed to speak for not more than 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the pending question because I realize its importance. I believe I have signed every cloture petition which has been presented since I came to

the Senate. And on every occasion when I believed that the purpose of debate was only delay, I voted to close debate.

However, Mr. President, some very fundamental principles are involved at this time, and the vote each of us casts must take those principles into consideration. If I were to vote for the pending motion, I would be compelled to say in my own conscience and to the public that I believe that the Senate of the United States has not been and is not a continuing body or a continuing institution in somewhat the same way that our courts are continuing bodies. In that connection, let me say that I have not heard anyone contend that when a judge dies or when any number of judges are reelected to serve in a court all the rules of that court are nullified and an entirely new set of rules must be drawn up.

I believe that the Senate of the United States is a continuing body.

There are those who contend, as has just been contended by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that there cannot be democracy unless there is control by a majority. I wish to say that, in my opinion, one of the things that saves our country and cements it together as the United States of America is the fact that minorities are protected under our system.

At this time I should like to read a portion of a recent article by Walter Lippmann, as follows:

As I see it, the filibuster is a great and irreplaceable protection of the civil rights of the American people, and it would be a paradox with tragic consequences if it were swept away in the name of civil rights. What is the filibuster? It is a device, developed by long usage, which enables a minority, when it feels that its interests are threatened, to compel the majority to be at least a two-thirds majority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE FILIBUSTER

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Senate is about to deal with a motion designed to lead to the amendment of the rules in order that it may be easier to cut off a filibuster. The motion is by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and it has the support of 4 northern Republican Senators, 18 northern Democrats, and Senator MORSE, an independent. The purpose of these Senators is to clear the way for civil rights laws, particularly for a compulsory Federal fair employment law. They wish to enact this law by a majority vote in the Senate over the objection of the minority of southern Senators.

It is all but certain that they will fail to amend the rules, and that the right of filibuster will be preserved. Yet it would be, I believe, an error to interpret the defeat of their effort to amend the rules as a defeat for the cause of civil rights. The fundamental fact in the situation today is that an agreed settlement of the deepest issue is now clearly in sight. If this settlement is negotiated with perseverance and good faith, it should readily command the necessary 64 votes, the so-called constitutional two-thirds. As a matter of fact, an agreed settlement is more likely to be reached if the rules are not amended than if they are.

The basis of an agreed settlement exists in a bill (S. 3368) sponsored by two of the Senators now engaged in trying to amend the rules. It is the Humphrey-Ives bill. It was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare about the first of July last year—just as the Republican Convention was assembling. At the time nobody paid much attention to it. It was swamped by the other news. Yet it contains a new principle, which is acceptable to the northern sponsors of this whole body of legislation, a principle which, however, removes virtually all the practical objections of the modern South to Federal compulsion in the field of employment. The essential principle of the Humphrey-Ives bill is, as I read it, that it places the administration and enforcement of the Federal law in the hands of local, State, and regional officials.

Thus the bill acknowledges the principle that fair employment is a national interest. But it recognizes also that the application of the principles can best be done with local consent. This means that actual progress in the practice of fair employment will come not by compulsion from officials in Washington but by conciliation and education in each community.

With this bill available for negotiation and discussion, there is no need, then, to amend the rules of the Senate in order to coerce the South. It would be a strange thing to coerce the South for the sake of a law of which the fundamental principle is that it is not coercive. If a bill, like the Humphrey-Ives, can operate by consent in the modern South, as surely it can if it is well handled, then such a bill can be enacted with the consent of the modern southerners in the Senate.

As I see it, the filibuster is a great and irreplaceable protection of the civil rights of the American people, and it would be a paradox with tragic consequences if it were swept away in the name of civil rights. What is the filibuster? It is a device, developed by long usage, which enables a minority, when it feels that its interests are threatened, to compel the majority to be at least two-thirds majority.

It is often said that the filibuster is a denial of the American principle of majority rule. This is an inaccurate generalization. What is an American majority? Is it 51 percent of those voting? Is it 51 percent of those entitled to vote? Is the two-thirds vote required to ratify a treaty a denial of the American principle of majority rule? Why is it a denial of American principles to permit the minority to insist where it feels vitally affected that the majority must be as big as for a treaty?

The answer, of course, is that the American principle of the right of the majority to rule takes many different forms under our constitutional system. It is of the very essence of the system that there should be easier and harder majorities to organize, depending on the gravity and the impact of the decision that the majority is being called upon to make. Nothing, therefore, is less American than the idea that a 51-percent majority should always prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in Robert's Rules of Order it is provided that if an assembly wishes to close debate without allowing all the time desired by speakers, it may do so by ordering either the previous question or the closing of the debate at a certain time, or the body may limit the length of speeches and allow each member to speak only once on a question, as fully explained in rules XXIX and XXX.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just 1 minute. I have but 5 minutes, after which I shall yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Parliament of Great Britain today is supreme, and it was said of Great Britain in 1946 by the Attorney General that if the Parliament itself should declare that all blue-eyed babies must be destroyed at a breath, that would be the law of the land. But that could not happen in this country. The inalienable rights granted by the Constitution are based upon protection of minorities, and I can foresee many possible occasions when those who today are proposing a change in the Senate rules and are contending that this is not a continuing body may want to rise upon this floor to protect minorities in their respective States, and then, certainly, they would want the Senate to follow the rule laid down requiring a two-thirds vote to end debate. For example, that would certainly be the case if legislation abolishing or prohibiting labor unions ever reached the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have always voted for civil rights legislation, and shall continue to do so, and I voted against the present cloture rule, because I believed that a vote of two-thirds of those present should be sufficient to end debate, instead of requiring a constitutional two-thirds, as the present rule provides. I hope the time will come when I shall be able to join in an effort to vote to modify and strengthen the cloture rule. But we are now considering something much broader than cloture or civil rights, and in conscience I cannot today vote to say that the United States Senate is not a continuing body, with all the tremendous and widespread implications of such a concept.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I had mentioned to the distinguished minority leader that I desired to speak on the subject now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to file a brief statement regarding the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. In view of the fact that there are obviously sufficient votes to defeat the motion, I do not wish to delay the proceedings of the Senate any longer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

It is not necessary for me to trespass upon the time of the Senate during this particular debate by making any lengthy statement. I was on the floor during the discussion yesterday afternoon, and I have been here listening with interest to today's remarks.

It seems absurd that the first order of business in the First Session of the Eighty-third Congress should be a question of whether or not the Congress has operated legally during its previous 164 sessions. Let me make it plain that I do not pose now, or have not at any other time, as a constitutional authority. I am, however, somewhat familiar with certain passages in the

Constitution, as well as the precedents which have been established and referred to through the years. I also claim substantial knowledge of the rules of the Senate which are being questioned.

If the principal purpose of this confusion is to secure consideration of a civil rights bill, then I say to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota, "Bring a civil rights bill to the floor."

If the primary desire is to strike rule XXII from the rules of the Senate, then I say to them, "Bring in an amendment to accomplish that purpose."

Rule XXII, as all well know, does not prohibit unlimited debate. It simply offers a device by which, after a period of time, providing 64 Members of the Senate agree, further debate may be finally terminated following still another lapse of time and discussion.

It was not until 1917, after a good many years of unlimited debate, that any restrictions were accepted in the Senate.

In an effort to stymie the operations of this body, we are told now by the proponents and supporters of the Anderson motion that the Senate, after all these many years, is no longer a continuing body. They say that, under a misapprehension, we are still using the Senate rules adopted by the first session of the Senate. They do not even acknowledge the many amendments which have been agreed to in the passing years. Even as the rules have been changed, the basic set has been retained.

The rules of the Senate, just as the laws of the land, have been changed from time to time as necessity has dictated.

The junior Senator from Georgia and the senior Senator from Ohio performed an admirable service yesterday in pointing out the fallacies of the arguments presented by the proponents of this motion. The absurdities of the argument against the continuing authority of the Senate are obvious.

I think it is well to repeat the sense of the constitutional provision that the Senate replenish one-third of its membership every 2 years. I know of no terminating date for the services of the other 64 Members of this body. There is no directive that they shall cease to serve at any given time.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the very substantial arguments that have been made against the Anderson motion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] are the only Senators who, during the afternoon, have requested an opportunity to speak. We had hoped they would be able to speak before 4:30 p. m. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be allowed to speak for not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader generously increase my allotted time to 10 minutes?

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to speak not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator at first requested 7 minutes. Would the Senator compromise on 7 minutes?

Mr. NEELY. Not if he thought he could get more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio modifies his request.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from West Virginia, earlier in the afternoon, agreed to 7 minutes. I yield to him 7 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the vital matter before us as a result of the motion of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has, during the past 2 days, been relentlessly bemuddled with parliamentary technicalities and ruthlessly bedeviled with constitutional confusion. Simply stated, this is the pending question: Shall the Senate prudently amend its senseless Rule XXII so that important business can be transacted and the general welfare promoted by a vote of a majority of its members, or shall it imprudently perpetuate its present outrageous restrictions, by means of which as few as four or five willful Senators can, at their pleasure, filibuster to death the most meritorious measure that man's mind can conceive and his statesmanship propose for senatorial approval?

Judging from recent, relevant newspaper comments, 80 percent of the people of the United States favor the substance of the Anderson motion.

As long as a majority of one electoral vote can determine who will be President of the United States; as long as a majority of one vote can determine who will be the governor of any State in the Union; as long as the Congress can, by a majority of one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate, declare a war that might cost the lives of millions of American boys, the despotic demand for a two-thirds majority vote in order to amend the Senate's rules of procedure, or transact any other legitimate senatorial business should be unhesitatingly and decisively defeated now and forever.

Bleak House, one of Charles Dickens' most engaging novels, contains a description of a character known as little Miss Flite, who was a litigant in an interminable suit in chancery. For many weary years she faithfully attended all the sittings of the court. She finally went crazy waiting for justice which she never received. To inquiries concerning her persistent attendance, she habitually replied, "I expect to get judgment on Judgment Day." If we fail to improve the present opportunity to amend the rules of the Senate, we, like poor Miss Flite, should resign ourselves to the dubious expectation of achieving the desired result on Judgment Day, and not a moment before that fateful time of weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth.

If the pending motion is laid on the table or otherwise defeated, it will be useless to hope for any adequate amendment of the Senate's rules during any session of the Eighty-third Congress. Without such amendment the promises of legislative benefits for the people made by both great political parties during the recent campaign will perish from irreparable repudiation.

According to ancient legend, Gordius, a Phrygian king, dedicated his wagon to Jupiter and with a rope of bark so ingeniously fastened it to a beam that no one could untie it. General Alexander the Great was informed that anyone who would undo the knot would reign over the entire eastern world. Thereupon the conqueror cut the knot in twain with his sword.

A knot infinitely more important than the one that Gordius tied and Alexander severed has, for many decades, afflicted the Senate as the plagues afflicted the ancient Egyptians. Ours is the parliamentary knot tied by the most accomplished artificers of reaction and the most efficient obstructors of progress that ever lived in the tide of times. There was only one general on earth who could loose the celebrated Gordian knot of long ago. Coincidentally there is but one general on earth today who can untie or sever the knot that scourges the Senate and distresses the Nation—that general is the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President-elect of the United States.

According to a quotation from the New York Times of the thirteenth day of last August, which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] inserted in the RECORD yesterday, General Eisenhower "was quoted as favoring a curb on Senate filibusters, which have been used in the past to block congressional action on civil-rights legislation."

"Senator Lodge said that the General had told him that he felt 'very strongly in favor of curbing the filibuster and of taking every measure practicable to support a program for civil rights.' "

Mr. President, General Eisenhower can in the twinkling of an eye translate this encouraging statement into reality, by simply telephoning to "Mr. Republican," the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a sincere request that he and the other Republican Members of the Senate vote for the Anderson motion. There is not a shadow of doubt that practically every Republican Senator would promptly and favorably respond to such a request from the great general who has provided the Republican Party its first presidential election in 20 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NEELY. My very dear Republican friends in the Senate, you have a wonderful opportunity today to make names for yourselves that will forever shine like the bright and morning star. But, to my unspeakable regret, you are apparently determined to throw that opportunity away. And if you do, in your campaign for reelection, you will, with Maud Muller, sorrowfully say:

Of all sad words of tongue or pen,
The saddest are these: "It might have been!"

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, if the Senator will obtain the necessary time for his interruption without subtracting it from mine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator from Ohio will grant me additional time, I will gladly yield, otherwise I will not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator yields, the Senator from California cannot make that request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for that purpose?

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia may yield to me for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from West Virginia will expire in a minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have asked unanimous consent.

Mr. NEELY. I do not yield. [Laughter.]

General Eisenhower, the Senate liberals implore you to rise to unsurpassed heights of statesmanship, and inscribe your name in the golden book of immortality by immediately and earnestly urging the Republican membership of the Senate to support the Anderson motion, to the end that the American people may, without further delay, receive the abundant benefits which Senate rule XXII has long rendered it impossible for them to enjoy.

General, your failure to act in this matter will be the first significant demonstration that Republican control of the Congress will be for the brief period of only 2 years. For this failure, you and your party will deserve and receive all the blame. On the other hand, if you perform the suggested, priceless service, the people everywhere will enthusiastically applaud you and love you, and as the angels of the Apocalypse sang the song of Moses upon the sea of glass so will the people sing your praise around the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] made on behalf of himself and other Senators, that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be laid on the table. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. The Senator from Ohio has suggested the absence of a quorum; so the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Green
Anderson	Daniel	Hayden
Barrett	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Beall	Douglas	Hennings
Bennett	Duff	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Dworshak	Hill
Bridges	Eastland	Hoey
Bush	Ellender	Holland
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Humphrey
Butler, Nebr.	Flanders	Hunt
Byrd	Frear	Ives
Capehart	Fulbright	Jackson
Carlson	George	Jenner
Case	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Clements	Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.
Cooper	Gore	Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Kilgore	Monroney	Smith, N. C.
Knowland	Morse	Sparkman
Kuchel	Mundt	Stennis
Langer	Murray	Symington
Lehman	Neely	Taft
Long	Pastore	Thye
Magnuson	Payne	Tobey
Malone	Potter	Watkins
Mansfield	Purtell	Welker
Martin	Robertson	Wiley
Maybank	Russell	Williams
McCarran	Saltonstall	Young
McCarthy	Smathers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. IVES. To ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], for himself and other Senators, that the Senate immediately consider the adoption of rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress. On this question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent, and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—70

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Barrett	George	Monroney
Beall	Gillette	Mundt
Bennett	Goldwater	Payne
Bricker	Gore	Potter
Bridges	Hayden	Purtell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hill	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Saltonstall
Byrd	Holland	Smathers
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cooper	Kerr	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Daniel	Langer	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Martin	Wiley
Ellender	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	McCarran	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

NAYS—21

Anderson	Hendrickson	Ives
Douglas	Hennings	Jackson
Duff	Humphrey	Kennedy
Green	Hunt	Kilgore
Kuchel	Morse	Pastore
Lehman	Murray	Symington
Mansfield	Neely	Tobey

NOT VOTING—5

Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Griswold	Magnuson	

So Mr. TAFT's motion to lay Mr. ANDERSON's motion on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe with all my heart in majority rule. It is therefore that I, accept the decision of the Senate in tabling the Anderson motion. I wish it to be clearly understood that the question of majority rule and lessening the power of the filibuster is so dear to my heart that I shall continue the fight.

The adoption of the motion to table the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico is implicit recognition of the fact that our main contention that each Senate has the constitutional right to adopt its own rules is sound. No point of order was raised against the Anderson motion. A majority of the Senate has laid that motion on the table. I believe the opposition did not dare to raise a point of order because of the fear that such a point against the Anderson motion would have been overruled.

I am sure that the will of the American people will some day be asserted in the United States Senate. The voice of the people will bring a majority vote on this issue at some future time. We have lost the first round, but this is only the beginning of a long and historic fight to establish majority rule in the United States Senate. I believe it to be an incontrovertible fact that the Senate has the constitutional right—even the obligation—to adopt its own rules at the beginning of a new Congress. It is incontrovertible because the right to do so is expressly set forth in the Constitution. It is, moreover, basically inherent in the nature of a democratic parliamentary body. That right can never be set aside, whatever the technical grounds. No precedent can be permitted to lie against this basic right, this fundamental characteristic of a democratic body. The dead hand of the past cannot be permitted indefinitely to choke the life out of democracy and to thwart not only the will of the majority, but what is fundamentally right and needful. The filibuster must go. The majority must reassert its right to act. In the end, we will win. I am confident of that.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may report a resolution from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the resolution as proposed to be amended be taken up for consideration immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not clearly hear the request of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I asked unanimous consent that I might make a report from

the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the resolution as reported be taken up immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the report being submitted.

Mr. JENNER. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 18) proposing changes in the number of members of certain committees, and I submit a report (No. 1) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, and that the report be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the report be read for the information of the Senate:

The report (No. 1) was read as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 18) proposing changes in the number of certain standing committees, having considered same, report thereon favorably with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

This resolution would accomplish the following changes in the Senate rules affecting certain standing committees as follows:

1. To increase 10 standing committees by 2 members each (1 majority, 1 minority), and to reduce 5 similarly.

2. To permit 18 Senators of the majority and 3 of the minority to serve on 4 standing committees—Civil Service, District of Columbia, Public Works, or Government Operations. (Present rules do not include Civil Service or Public Works and do not recognize the minority.)

This will present the following committee picture:

15 MEMBERS INSTEAD OF 13 (9)

Agriculture.
Armed Services.
Banking and Currency.
Finance.
Foreign Relations.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Judiciary.
Labor and Public Welfare.
Interior and Insular Affairs.

11 MEMBERS INSTEAD OF 13 (5)

Civil Service.
District of Columbia.
Government Operations.
Public Works.
Rules and Administration.

23 MEMBERS INSTEAD OF 21 (1)

Appropriations.

The proposal—

1. Creates 20 new positions in the more desired committees (10 each for majority and minority) without increasing total number of committees.

2. Makes committee size more nearly reflect committee workload and thereby adjusts burdens and responsibilities more equally to all Senators and all committees.

3. Establishes a minimum margin of 1 for the majority party in each of the Senate's 15 committees, which present rules do not, in an evenly divided Senate. This can be seen from the following:

PRESENT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1 committee of 21	21
14 committees of 13	182
Total committee positions	203
Two assignments for each of 96 Senators requires	192
Leaving for members serving on 4 committees	11

which does not provide the necessary minimum of 15 for control of 15 committees in an evenly divided Senate.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1 committee of 23	23
9 committees of 15	135
5 committees of 11	55
Total committee positions	213
Two assignments for each of 96 Senators requires	192
Leaving for members serving on 3 committees	21

which divided 18 to the majority and 3 to the minority gives the margin of 15 for the majority to have the minimum one on each of 15 committees.

4. Permits continuity and experience for both parties on the committees which, in the past, have tended to be loaded with new Senators.

5. Insures better use of senatorial talent, industry and ability, for both majority and minority.

IN SUMMARY

1. The plan meets the necessary mechanics of an evenly divided Senate.

2. It opens the door for new Senators on major committees.

3. It retains the values of long Senate service.

4. It dispossesses no one, has distinct advantages for majority and minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am hopeful that we shall be able to study this report and proposal, perhaps agree upon some amendments, and obtain a unanimous vote on the proposal to amend the rules.

The Committee on Rules and Administration met very briefly this afternoon. The minority has not had an opportunity to examine the amendments reported, and I shall have to object to consideration of the resolution this afternoon. I am hopeful that after conferences with the majority leader, in which we propose to point out certain things which the report does not point out, some agreement can be reached with respect to the proposal. If that is done, we can all get together and agree on the amendments. I hope it will not be insisted that the resolution, which was reported only at 4 o'clock this afternoon, be considered at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am quite willing to have the matter go over until Friday. Let me say that I had understood that the minority leader had accepted the principle. We have been discussing it for 2 or 3 days. I would not have suggested that the resolution be brought up at once if I had understood that there was still some doubt in the mind of the minority leader. So I am quite willing to have the resolution go over until Friday. However, the proposed amendments must be acted upon quickly if they are to be effective. Otherwise we had better throw them away, because we must organize the committees, and we cannot organize the committees until the numbers are agreed upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have had several conversations with the majority leader on this subject. I agreed with him that it was necessary that the membership of certain committees be increased so that the majority might have control of such committees. I agreed to the principle; but before the resolution was reported, and before a request was made for immediate consideration of it, I notified the majority leader that there were certain features of the proposed amendments which were entirely unsatisfactory to the minority. I asked him if we could have a meeting immediately after the recess, and he agreed to it. So he was on notice before the request was made for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not understand the minority leader to make such a request. I understood that his request was to confer with me as to how the proposed plan would work with respect to the assignment of certain Senators, but I had understood, up until just a moment ago, when the Senator from Indiana reported the resolution, that the resolution itself was agreeable to him. Certainly I am not insisting upon the present consideration of the resolution. I would have no right to do so in any event. I intend to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday, unless there is some further business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Ohio whether he desires that the resolution lie on the table or go to the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the report lie on the table. Does that require unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will lie on the table.

Mr. TOBEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. The report on the resolution which has been under discussion contains certain words which constitute a reflection on the Senate of the United States. Those words are to the effect that Senators are "loaded." I do not know that there is such an animal in the Senate. I do not like the expression "loaded Senators." I object to the language and to its implication. No Senator is "loaded."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is not now before the Senate. The Senator may move to strike out that language when it is taken up.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to take a moment or two of the time of the Senate in reply to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who raised a question as to why General Eisenhower would not telephone to the majority leader to instruct Members on this side of the aisle how to vote on a change in the rules of the Senate.

I think the answer is very apparent. President-elect Eisenhower clearly understands the Constitution of the United States. He clearly understands the divisions between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government of this Nation. He clearly understands that the subject of the rules of

the Senate is for the Senate of the United States alone. Although the Senator from West Virginia and some of his colleagues may have become accustomed to being rubber stamps for the executive branch of the Government of the United States, President-elect Eisenhower does not expect either the Republicans or the Democrats of the Senate or of the House of Representatives to be rubber stamps for the new administration.

THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not see present in the Chamber at this time the Senator who will succeed me as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. However, having served on that committee since I have been a Member of this body, and particularly having served as chairman of the committee during the past 4 years and subsequent to its creation by the Reorganization Act of 1946, I wish to say to the majority leader and to the Senators who are sponsoring the resolution that in my humble judgment they are making a very serious mistake in reducing the number of members of that committee.

With its new powers and responsibilities under the Reorganization Act of 1946 the workload of the committee has become tremendous. Not only does it have jurisdiction over all reorganization plans which the President may send to the Congress, but it also has jurisdiction over much technical and important legislation. It also has the duty to study Government operations at all levels with reference to efficiency and economy. I may say, Mr. President, that the subcommittee of the committee known as the investigating subcommittee also serves to make the committee one of the major committees of the Senate.

I believe that, instead of reducing the number of members of the committee, the membership should be increased. I can well anticipate that in this new session of Congress, under a new administration, the workload will not diminish but will continue to increase.

I make this statement not for any personal reason, but because I believe the majority will find, as will other Members of this body, that to reduce the membership of the committee will place a hardship on the 11 Members of this body who will serve on it, and cause the important work of the committee in many instances to be retarded and delayed.

I hope some consideration will be given to the subject before the resolution is finally acted upon.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of greatness and goodness, in this moment of prayer wilt Thou give us a clearer vision of those nobler heights of joy and splendor to which our lives may ascend.

Help us to hasten dawning of a new day when the spirit of our blessed Lord shall prevail everywhere, and grant that we may always have an eye single to Thy glory.

May it be the supreme ambition of our lives to do those things that are well pleasing unto Thee, and may the time come when the spirit of brotherhood and good will shall be regnant in the lives of men and of nations.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 11

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EUGENE E. COX, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 12

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 13

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to report to the Congress on the state of the Union.

This is the eighth such report that, as President, I have been privileged to present to you and to the country. On previous occasions, it has been my custom to set forth proposals for legislative action in the coming year. But that is not my purpose today. The presentation of a legislative program falls properly to my successor, not to me, and I would not infringe upon his responsibility to chart the forward course. Instead, I wish to speak of the course we have been following the past 8 years and the position at which we have arrived.

In just 2 weeks, General Eisenhower will be inaugurated as President of the United States and I will resume—most gladly—my place as a private citizen of this Republic. The Presidency last changed hands 8 years ago this coming April. That was a tragic time: a time of grieving for President Roosevelt—the great and gallant human being who had been taken from us; a time of unrelieved anxiety to his successor, thrust so suddenly into the complexities and burdens of the Presidential office.

Not so this time. This time we see the normal transition under our democratic system. One President, at the conclusion of his term, steps back to private life; his successor, chosen by the people, begins his tenure of the office. And the Presidency of the United States continues to function without a moment's break.

Since the election, I have done my best to assure that the transfer from one administration to another shall be smooth and orderly. From General Eisenhower and his associates, I have had friendly and understanding collaboration in this endeavor. I have not sought to thrust upon him—nor has he sought to take—the responsibility which must be mine until 12 o'clock noon on January twentieth. But together, I hope and believe we have found means whereby the incoming President can obtain the full and detailed information he will need to assume the responsibility the moment he takes the oath of office.

The President-elect is about to take up the greatest burdens, the most compelling responsibilities, given to any man. And I, with you and all Americans, wish for him all possible success in undertaking the tasks that will so soon be his.

What are these tasks? The President is Chief of State, elected representative of all the people, national spokesman for them and to them. He is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. He is Chief Executive of the Nation's largest civilian organization. He must select and nominate all top officials of the executive branch and all Federal judges. And on the legislative side, he has the obligation and the opportunity to recommend, and to approve or veto legislation. Besides all this, it is to him that a great political party turns naturally for leadership, and that, too, he must provide as President.

This bundle of burdens is unique; there is nothing else like it on the face of the earth. Each task could be a full-time job. Together, they would be a tremendous undertaking in the easiest of times.

But our times are not easy; they are hard—as hard and complex, perhaps, as any in our history. Now, the President not only has to carry on these tasks in such a way that our democracy may grow and flourish and our people prosper, but he also has to lead the whole free world in overcoming the Communist menace—and all this under the shadow of the atomic bomb.

This is a huge challenge to the human being who occupies the Presidential office. But it is not a challenge to him alone, for in reality he cannot meet it alone. The challenge runs not just to him but to his whole administration, to the Congress, to the country.

Ultimately, no President can master his responsibilities, save as his fellow citizens—indeed, the whole people—comprehend the challenge of our times and move, with him, to meet it.

It has been my privilege to hold the Presidential office for nearly 8 years now, and much has been done in which I take great pride. But this is not personal pride. It is pride in the people, in the Nation. It is pride in our political system and our form of government—balky sometimes, mechanically deficient perhaps, in many ways—but enormously alive and vigorous; able through these years to keep the Republic on the right course, rising to the great occasions, accomplishing the essentials, meeting the basic challenge of our times.

There have been misunderstandings and controversies these past 8 years, but through it all the President of the United States has had that measure of support and understanding without which no man could sustain the burdens of the Presidential office, or hope to discharge its responsibilities.

For this I am profoundly grateful—grateful to my associates in the executive branch—most of them nonpartisan civil servants; grateful—despite our disagreements—to the Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle; grateful especially to the American people, the citizens of this Republic, governors of us all.

We are still so close to recent controversies that some of us may find it hard to understand the accomplishments of these past 8 years. But the accomplishments are real and very great, not as the President's, not as the Congress', but as the achievements of our country and all the people in it.

Let me remind you of some of the things we have done since I first assumed my duties as President of the United States.

I took the oath of office on April 12, 1945. In May of that same year, the Nazis surrendered. Then, in July, that great white flash of light, man-made at Alamogordo, heralded swift and final victory in World War II—and opened the doorway to the atomic age.

Consider some of the great questions that were posed for us by sudden, total victory in World War II. Consider also, how well we as a Nation have responded.

Would the American economy collapse after the war? That was one question. Would there be another depression here—a repetition of 1921 or 1929? The free world feared and dreaded it. The Communists hoped for it and built their policies upon that hope.

We answered that question—answered it with a resounding "No."

Our economy has grown tremendously. Free enterprise has flourished as never before. Sixty-two million people are now gainfully employed, compared with fifty-one million seven years ago. Private businessmen and farmers have invested more than 200 billion dollars in new plant and equipment since the end of World War II. Prices have risen further than they should have done—but incomes, by and large, have risen even more, so that real living standards are now considerably higher than seven years ago. Aided by sound government policies, our expanding economy has shown the strength and flexibility for swift and almost painless reconversion from war to peace, in 1945 and 1946; for quick reaction and recovery—well before Korea—from the beginnings of recession in 1949. Above all, this live and vital economy of ours has now shown the remarkable capacity to sustain a great mobilization program for defense, a vast outpouring of aid to friends and allies all around the world—and still to produce more goods and services for peaceful use at home than we have ever known before.

This has been our answer, up to now, to those who feared or hoped for a depression in this country.

How have we handled our national finances? That was another question arising at war's end. In the administration of the Government, no problem takes more of the President's time, year in and year out, than fashioning the budget, and the related problem of managing the public debt.

Financing World War II left us with a tremendous public debt, which reached 279 billion dollars at its peak in February 1946.

Beginning in July 1946, when war and reconversion financing had ended, we have held quite closely to the sound standard that in time of high employment and high national income, the Federal budget should be balanced and the debt reduced.

For the four fiscal years from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950, we had a net surplus of 4.3 billion dollars. Using this surplus, and the Treasury's excess cash reserves, the debt was reduced substantially, reaching a low point of 251 billion dollars in June 1949, and ending up at 257 billion dollars on June 30, 1950.

In July of 1950, we began our rapid rearmament, and for two years held very close to a pay-as-we-go policy. But in the current fiscal year and the next, rising expenditures for defense will substantially outrun receipts. This will pose an immediate and serious problem for the new Congress.

Now let me turn to another question we faced at the war's end. Would we take up again, and carry forward, the great projects of social welfare—so badly needed, so long overdue—that the New Deal had introduced into our national life? Would our Government continue to have a heart for the people, or was the progress of the New Deal to be halted in the aftermath of war as decisively as the progress of Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom had been halted after the First World War?

This question, too, we have answered. We have answered it by doubling old-age insurance benefits and extending coverage to ten million more people. We have answered it by increasing our minimum wage. We have answered by the three million privately constructed homes that the Federal Government has helped finance since the war, and the 155 thousand units of low-rent public housing placed under construction since 1949.

We have answered with the 42 thousand new hospital beds provided since 1946 through the joint efforts of the Federal Government and local communities.

We have answered by helping eight million veterans of World War II to obtain advanced education, 196 thousand to start in business, and 64 thousand to buy farms.

We have answered by continuing to help farmers obtain electric power, until today nearly 90 percent of our farms have power line electric service.

In these and other ways, we have demonstrated, up to now, that our democracy has not forgotten how to use the powers of the Government to promote the people's welfare and security.

Another of the big postwar questions was this: What we would do with the Nation's natural resources, its soils and water, forests and grasslands. Would we continue the strong conservation movement of the 1930's, or would we, as we did after the First World War, slip back into the practices of monopoly, exploitation, and waste?

The answer is plain. All across our country, the soil conservation movement has spread, aided by Government programs, enriching private and public lands, preserving them from destruction, improving them for future use. In our river basins, we have invested nearly $5,000,000,000 of public funds in the last 8 years, invested them in projects to control floods, irrigate farm lands, produce low-cost power, and get it to the housewives and farmers and businessmen who need it. We have been vigilant in protecting the people's property, lands and forests and oil and minerals.

We have had to fight hard against those who would use our resources for

private greed; we have met setbacks; we have had to delay work because of defense priorities, but on the whole we can be proud of our record in protecting our natural heritage, and in using our resources for the public good.

Here is another question we had to face at the war's close: Would we continue, in peace as well as war, to promote equality of opportunity for all our citizens, seeking ways and means to guarantee for all of them the full enjoyment of their civil rights?

During the war we achieved great economic and social gains for millions of our fellow citizens who had been held back by prejudice. Were we prepared, in peacetime, to keep on moving toward full realization of the democratic promise? Or would we let it be submerged, wiped out, in postwar riots and reaction, as after World War I?

We answered these questions in a series of forward steps at every level of government and in many spheres of private life. In our Armed Forces, our civil service, our universities, our railway trains, the residential districts of our cities—in stores and factories all across the Nation—in the polling booths as well—the barriers are coming down. This is happening, in part, at the mandate of the courts; in part, at the insistence of Federal, State, and local governments; in part, through the enlightened action of private groups and persons in every region and every walk of life.

There has been a great awakening of the American conscience on the issues of civil rights. And all this progress—still far from complete but still continuing—has been our answer, up to now, to those who questioned our intention to live up to the promises of equal freedom for us all.

There was another question posed for us at the war's end, which equally concerned the future course of our democracy: Could the machinery of government and politics in the Republic be changed, improved, adapted rapidly enough to carry through, responsibly and well, the vast, new complicated undertakings called for in our time?

We have answered this question, too, answered it by tackling the most urgent, most specific problems which the war experience itself had brought into sharp focus. The reorganization of the Congress in 1946; the unification of our armed services, beginning in 1947; the closer integration of foreign and military policy through the National Security Council created that same year; and the Executive reorganizations, before and after the Hoover-Acheson Commission Report in 1949—these are landmarks in our continuing endeavor to make government an effective instrument of service to the people.

I come now to the most vital question of all, the greatest of our concerns: Could there be built in the world a durable structure of security, a lasting peace for all the nations, or would we drift, as after World War I, toward another terrible disaster—a disaster which this time might be the holocaust of atomic war?

That is still the overriding question of our time. We cannot know the answer yet; perhaps we will not know it finally for a long time to come. But day and night, these past 8 years, we have been building for peace, searching out the way that leads most surely to security and freedom and justice in the world for us and all mankind.

This, above all else, has been the task of our Republic since the end of World War II, and our accomplishment so far should give real pride to all Americans. At the very least, a total war has been averted each day up to this hour. And at the most, we may already have succeeded in establishing conditions which can keep that kind of war from happening for as far ahead as man can see.

The Second World War radically changed the power relationships of the world. Nations once great were left shattered and weak, channels of communication, routes of trade, political and economic ties of many kinds were ripped apart.

And in this changed, disrupted, chaotic situation, the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as the two strongest powers of the world. Each had tremendous human and natural resources, actual or potential, on a scale unmatched by any other nation.

Nothing could make plainer why the world is in its present state—and how that came to pass—than an understanding of the diametrically opposite principles and policies of these two great powers in a war-ruined world.

For our part, we in this Republic were—and are—free men, heirs of the American Revolution, dedicated to the truths of our Declaration of Independence:

> That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights * * * That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Our postwar objective has been in keeping with this great idea. The United States has sought to use its preeminent position of power to help other nations recover from the damage and dislocation of the war. We held out a helping hand to enable them to restore their national lives and to regain their positions as independent, self-supporting members of the great family of nations. This help was given without any attempt on our part to dominate or control any nation. We did not want satellites but partners.

The Soviet Union, however, took exactly the opposite course.

Its rulers saw in the weakened condition of the world not an obligation to assist in the great work of reconstruction, but an opportunity to exploit misery and suffering for the extension of their power. Instead of help, they brought subjugation. They extinguished, blotted out, the national independence of the countries that the military operations of World War II had left within their grasp.

The difference stares at us from the map of Europe today. To the west of the line that tragically divides Europe we see nations continuing to act and live in the light of their own traditions and principles. On the other side, we see the dead uniformity of a tyrannical system imposed by the rulers of the Soviet Union. Nothing could point up more clearly what the global struggle between the free world and the Communists is all about.

It is a struggle as old as recorded history; it is freedom versus tyranny.

For the dominant idea of the Soviet regime is the terrible conception that men do not have rights but live at the mercy of the state.

Inevitably this idea of theirs—and all the consequences flowing from it—collided with the efforts of free nations to build a just and peaceful world. The cold war between the Communists and the free world is nothing more or less than the Soviet attempt to checkmate and defeat our peaceful purposes, in furtherance of their own dread objective.

We did not seek this struggle—God forbid. We did our utmost to avoid it. In World War II, we and the Russians had fought side by side, each in our turn attacked and forced to combat by the aggressors. After the war, we hoped that our wartime collaboration could be maintained, that the frightful experience of Nazi invasion, of devastation in the heart of Russia, had turned the Soviet rulers away from their old proclaimed allegiance to world revolution and Communist dominion. But instead, they violated, one by one, the solemn agreements they had made with us in wartime. They sought to use the rights and privileges they had obtained in the United Nations to frustrate its purposes and cut down its powers as an effective agent of world progress and the keeper of the world's peace.

Despite this outcome, the efforts we made toward peaceful collaboration are a source of our present strength. They demonstrated that we believed what we proclaimed, that we actually sought honest agreements as the way to peace. Our whole moral position, our leadership in the free world today, is fortified by that fact.

The world is divided, not through our fault or failure, but by Soviet design. They, not we, began the cold war. And because the free world saw this happen—because men know we made the effort and the Soviet rulers spurned it—the free nations have accepted leadership from our Republic, in meeting and mastering the Soviet offensive.

It seems to me especially important that all of us be clear, in our own thinking, about the nature of the threat we have faced—and will face for a long time to come. The measures we have devised to meet it take shape and pattern only as we understand what we were—and are—up against.

The Soviet Union occupies a territory of 8 million square miles. Beyond its borders, east and west, are the nearly 5 million square miles of the satellite states—virtually incorporated into the Soviet Union—and of China, now its close partner. This vast land mass contains an enormous store of natural resources sufficient to support an economic development comparable to our own.

That is the Stalinist world. It is a world of great natural diversity in geography and climate, in distribution of resources, in population, language, and living standards, in economic and cultural development. It is a world whose people are not all convinced Commu-

nists by any means. It is a world where history and national traditions, particularly in its borderlands, tend more toward separation than unification, and run counter to the enforced combination that has been made of these areas today.

But it is also a world of great man-made uniformities, a world that bleeds its population white to build huge military forces; a world in which the police are everywhere and their authority unlimited; a world where terror and slavery are deliberately administered both as instruments of government and as means of production; a world where all effective social power is the state's monopoly—yet the state itself is the creature of the Communist tyrants.

The Soviet Union, with its satellites, and China are held in the tight grip of Communist Party chieftains. The party dominates all social and political institutions. The party regulates and centrally directs the whole economy. In Moscow's sphere, and in Peiping's, all history, philosophy, morality, and law are centrally established by rigid dogmas, incessantly drummed into the whole population and subject to interpretation—or to change—by none except the party's own inner circle.

And lest their people learn too much of other ways of life, the Communists have walled off their world, deliberately and uniformly, from the rest of human society.

That is the Communist base of operation in their cold war. In addition, they have at their command hundreds and thousands of dedicated foreign Communists, people in nearly every free country who will serve Moscow's ends. Thus the masters of the Kremlin are provided with deluded followers all through the free world whom they can manipulate, cynically and quite ruthlessly, to serve the purposes of the Soviet State.

Given their vast internal base of operations, and their agents in foreign lands, what are the Communist rulers trying to do?

Inside their homeland, the Communists are trying to maintain and modernize huge military forces. And simultaneously, they are endeavoring to weld their whole vast area and population into a completely self-contained, advanced industrial society. They aim, some day, to equal or better the production levels of Western Europe and North America combined, thus shifting the balance of world economic power, and war potential, to their side.

They have a long way to go, and they know it. But they are prepared to levy upon living generations any sacrifice that helps strengthen their armed power, or speed industrial develpoment.

Externally, the Communist rulers are trying to expand the boundaries of their world, whenever and wherever they can. This expansion they have pursued steadfastly since the close of World War II, using any means available to them.

Where the Soviet Army was present, as in the countries of Eastern Europe, they have gradually squeezed free institutions to death.

Where postwar chaos existed in industrialized nations, as in Western Europe, the local Stalinists tried to gain power through political processes, politically inspired strikes, and every available means for subverting free institutions to their evil ends.

Where conditions permitted, the Soviet rulers have stimulated and aided armed insurrection by Communist-led revolutionary forces, as in Greece, Indochina, the Philippines, and China, or outright aggression by one of their satellites, as in Korea.

Where the forces of nationalism, independence, and economic change were at work throughout the great sweep of Asia and Africa, the Communists tried to identify themselves with the cause of progress, tried to picture themselves as the friends of freedom and advancement—surely one of the most cynical efforts of which history offers record.

Thus, everywhere in the free world, the Communists seek to fish in troubled waters, to seize more countries, to enslave more millions of human souls. They were, and are, ready to ally themselves with any group, from the extreme left to the extreme right, that offers them an opportunity to advance their ends.

Geography gives them a central position. They are both a European and an Asian power, with borders touching many of the most sensitive and vital areas in the free world around them. So situated, they can use their armies and their economic power to set up simultaneously a whole series of threats—or inducements—to such widely dispersed places as Western Germany, Iran, and Japan. These pressures and attractions can be sustained at will, or quickly shifted from place to place.

Thus the Communist rulers are moving, with implacable will, to create greater strength in their vast empire, and to create weakness and division in the free world, preparing for the time their false creed teaches them must come: The time when the whole world outside their sway will be so torn by strife and contradictions that it will be ripe for the Communist plucking.

This is the heart of the distorted Marxist interpretation of history. This is the glass through which Moscow and Peiping look out upon the world, the glass through which they see the rest of us. They seem really to believe that history is on their side. And they are trying to boost "history" along, at every opportunity, in every way they can.

I have set forth here the nature of the Communist menace confronting our Republic and the whole free world. This is the measure of the challenge we have faced since World War II—a challenge partly military and partly economic, partly moral and partly intellectual, confronting us at every level of human endeavor and all around the world.

It has been and must be the free world's purpose not only to organize defenses against aggression and subversion, not only to build a structure of resistance and salvation for the community of nations outside the iron curtain, but in addition to give expression and opportunity to the forces of growth and progress in the free world, to so organize and unify the cooperative community of free men that we will not crumble but grow stronger over the years, and the Soviet empire, not the free world, will eventually have to change its ways or fall.

Our whole program of action to carry out this purpose has been directed to meet two requirements.

The first of these had to do with security. Like the pioneers who settled this great continent of ours, we have had to carry a musket while we went about our peaceful business. We realized that if we and our allies did not have military strength to meet the growing Soviet military threat, we would never have the opportunity to carry forward our efforts to build a peaceful world of law and order—the only environment in which our free institutions could survive and flourish.

Did this mean we had to drop everything else and concentrate on armies and weapons? Of course it did not; side by side with this urgent military requirement, we had to continue to help create conditions of economic and social progress in the world. This work had to be carried forward alongside the first, not only in order to meet the nonmilitary aspects of the Communist drive for power, but also because this creative effort toward human progress is essential to bring about the kind of world we as free men want to live in.

These two requirements—military security and human progress—are more closely related in action than we sometimes recognize. Military security depends upon a strong economic underpinning and a stable and hopeful political order; conversely, the confidence that makes for economic and political progress does not thrive in areas that are vulnerable to military conquest.

These requirements are related in another way. Both of them depend upon unity of action among the free nations of the world. This, indeed, has been the foundation of our whole effort, for the drawing together of the free people of the world has become a condition essential not only to their progress, but to their survival as free people.

This is the conviction that underlies all the steps we have been taking to strengthen and unify the free nations during the past 7 years.

What have these steps been? First of all, how have we gone about meeting the requirement of providing for our security against this world-wide challenge?

Our starting point, as I have said on many occasions, has been and remains the United Nations.

We were prepared, and so were the other nations of the free world, to place our reliance on the machinery of the United Nations to safeguard peace. But before the United Nations could give full expression to the concept of international security embodied in the Charter, it was essential that the five permanent members of the Security Council honor their solemn pledge to cooperate to that end. This the Soviet Union has not done.

I do not need to outline here the dreary record of Soviet obstruction and veto and the unceasing efforts of the Soviet representatives to sabotage the United Nations. It is important, however, to distinguish clearly between the principle of collective security embodied in the Charter and the mechanisms of

the United Nations to give that principle effect. We must frankly recognize that the Soviet Union has been able, in certain instances, to stall the machinery of collective security. Yet it has not been able to impair the principle of collective security. The free nations of the world have retained their allegiance to that idea. They have found the means to act despite the Soviet veto, both through the United Nations itself and through the application of this principle in regional and other security arrangements that are fully in harmony with the Charter and give expression to its purposes.

The free world refused to resign itself to collective suicide merely because of the technicality of a Soviet veto.

The principle of collective measures to forestall aggression has found expression in the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, the North Atlantic Treaty, now extended to include Greece and Turkey, and the several treaties we have concluded to reinforce security in the Pacific area.

But the free nations have not this time fallen prey to the dangerous illusion that treaties alone will stop an aggressor. By a series of vigorous actions, as varied as the nature of the threat, the free nations have successfully thwarted aggression or the threat of aggression in many different parts of the world.

Our country has led or supported these collective measures. The aid we have given to people determined to act in defense of their freedom has often spelled the difference between success and failure.

We all know what we have done, and I shall not review in detail the steps we have taken. Each major step was a milepost in the developing unity, strength, and resolute will of the free nations.

The first was the determined and successful effort made through the United Nations to safeguard the integrity and independence of Iran in 1945 and 1946.

Next was our aid and support to embattled Greece, which enabled her to defeat the forces threatening her national independence.

In Turkey, cooperative action resulted in building up a bulwark of military strength for an area vital to the defenses of the entire free world.

In 1949 we began furnishing military aid to our partners in the North Atlantic Community and to a number of other free countries.

The Soviet Union's threats against Germany and Japan, its neighbors to the west and to the east, have been successfully withstood. Free Germany is on its way to becoming a member of the peaceful community of nations, and a partner in the common defense. The Soviet effort to capture Berlin by blockade was thwarted by the courageous Allied airlift. An independent and democratic Japan has been brought back into the community of free nations.

In the Far East, the tactics of Communist imperialism have reached heights of violence unmatched elsewhere—and the problem of concerted action by the free nations has been at once more acute and more difficult.

Here, in spite of outside aid and support, the free government of China succumbed to the Communist assault. Our aid has enabled the free Chinese to rebuild and strengthen their forces on the island of Formosa. In other areas of the Far East—in Indochina, Malaya, and the Philippines—our assistance has helped sustain a stanch resistance against Communist insurrectionary attacks.

The supreme test, up to this point, of the will and determination of the free nations came in Korea, when Communist forces invaded the Republic of Korea, a state that was in a special sense under the protection of the United Nations. The response was immediate and resolute. Under our military leadership, the free nations for the first time took up arms, collectively, to repel aggression.

Aggression was repelled, driven back, punished. Since that time, Communist strategy has seen fit to prolong the conflict, in spite of honest efforts by the United Nations to reach an honorable truce. The months of deadlock have demonstrated that the Communists cannot achieve by persistence, or by diplomatic trickery, what they failed to achieve by sneak attack. Korea has demonstrated that the free world has the will and the endurance to match the Communist effort to overthrow international order through local aggression.

It has been a bitter struggle and it has cost us much in brave lives and human suffering, but it has made it plain that the free nations will fight side by side, that they will not succumb to aggression or intimidation, one by one. This, in the final analysis, is the only way to halt the Communist drive to world power.

At the heart of the free world's defense is the military strength of the United States.

From 1945 to 1949, the United States was sole possessor of the atomic bomb. That was a great deterrent and protection in itself.

But when the Soviets produced an atomic explosion—as they were bound to do in time—we had to broaden the whole basis of our strength. We had to endeavor to keep our lead in atomic weapons. We had to strengthen our Armed Forces generally and to enlarge our productive capacity—our mobilization base. Historically, it was the Soviet atomic explosion in the fall of 1949, 9 months before the aggression in Korea, which stimulated the planning for our program of defense mobilization.

What we needed was not just a central force that could strike back against aggression. We also needed strength along the outer edges of the free world, defenses for our allies as well as for ourselves, strength to hold the line against attack as well as to retaliate.

We have made great progress on this task of building strong defenses. In the last 2½ years, we have more than doubled our own defenses, and we have helped to increase the protection of nearly all the other free nations.

All the measures of collective security, resistance to aggression, and the building of defenses, constitute the first requirement for the survival and progress of the free world. But, as I have pointed out, they are interwoven with the necessity of taking steps to create and maintain economic and social progress in the free nations. There can be no military strength except where there is economic capacity to back it. There can be no freedom where there is economic chaos or social collapse. For these reasons, our national policy has included a wide range of economic measures.

In Europe, the grand design of the Marshall plan permitted the people of Britain and France and Italy and a half dozen other countries, with help from the United States, to lift themselves from stagnation and find again the path of rising production, rising incomes, rising standards of living. The situation was changed almost overnight by the Marshall plan; the people of Europe have a renewed hope and vitality, and they are able to carry a share of the military defense of the free world that would have been impossible a few years ago.

Now the countries of Europe are moving rapidly toward political and economic unity, changing the map of Europe in more hopeful ways than it has been changed for 500 years. Customs unions, European economic institutions like the Schuman plan, the movement toward European political integration, the European Defense Community—all are signs of practical and effective growth toward greater common strength and unity. The countries of Western Europe, including the free Republic of Germany are working together, and the whole free world is the gainer.

It sometimes happens, in the course of history, that steps taken to meet an immediate necessity serve an ultimate purpose greater than may be apparent at the time. This, I believe, is the meaning of what has been going on in Europe under the threat of aggression. The free nations there, with our help, have been drawing together in defense of their free institutions. In so doing, they have laid the foundations of a unity that will endure as a major creative force beyond the exigencies of this period of history. We may, at this close range, be but dimly aware of the creative surge this movement represents, but I believe it to be of historic importance. I believe its benefits will survive long after Communist tyranny is nothing but an unhappy memory.

In Asia and Africa, the economic and social problems are different but no less urgent. There hundreds of millions of people are in ferment, exploding into the twentieth century, thrusting toward equality and independence and improvement in the hard conditions of their lives.

Politically, economically, socially, things cannot and will not stay in their prewar mold in Africa and Asia. Change must come—is coming—fast. Just in the years I have been President, 12 free nations, with more than 600,000,000 people, have become independent; Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Korea, Israel, Libya, India, Pakistan and Ceylon, and the three Associated States of Indochina, now members of the French Union. These names alone are testimony to the sweep of the great force which is changing the face of half the world.

Working out new relationships among the peoples of the free world would not be easy in the best of times. Even if

there were no Communist drive for expansion, there would be hard and complex problems of transition from old social forms, old political arrangements, old economic institutions to the new ones our century demands—problems of guiding change into constructive channels, of helping new nations grow strong and stable. But now, with the Soviet rulers striving to exploit this ferment for their own purposes, the task has become harder and more urgent—terribly urgent.

In this situation, we see the meaning and the importance of the point 4 program, through which we can share our store of know-how and of capital to help those people develop their economies and reshape their societies. As we help Iranians to raise more grain, Indians to reduce the incidence of malaria, Liberians to educate their children better, we are at once helping to answer the desires of the people for advancement, and demonstrating the superiority of freedom over communism. There will be no quick solution for any of the difficulties of the new nations of Asia and Africa—but there may be no solution at all if we do not press forward with full energy to help these countries grow and flourish in freedom and in cooperation with the rest of the free world.

Our measures of economic policy have already had a tremendous effect on the course of events. Eight years ago, the Kremlin thought postwar collapse in Western Europe and Japan—with economic dislocation in America—might give them the signal to advance. We demonstrated they were wrong. Now they wait with hope that the economic recovery of the free world has set the stage for violent and disastrous rivalry among the economically developed nations, struggling for each other's markets and a greater share of trade. Here is another test that we shall have to meet and master in the years immediately ahead. And it will take great ingenuity and effort—and much time—before we prove the Kremlin wrong again. But we can do it. It is true that economic recovery presents its problems, as does economic decline, but they are problems of another order. They are the problems of distributing abundance fairly, and they can be solved by the process of international cooperation that has already brought us so far.

These are the measures we must continue. This is the path we must follow. We must go on, working with our free associates, building an international structure for military defense, and for economic, social, and political progress. We must be prepared for war, because war may be thrust upon us. But the stakes in our search for peace are immensely higher than they have ever been before.

For now we have entered the atomic age, and war has undergone a technological change which makes it a very different thing from what it used to be. War today between the Soviet empire and the free nations might dig the grave not only of our Stalinist opponents, but of our own society, our world as well as theirs.

This transformation has been brought to pass in the 7 years from Alamogordo to Eniwetok. It is only 7 years, but the new force of atomic energy has turned the world into a very different kind of place.

Science and technology have worked so fast that war's new meaning may not yet be grasped by all the peoples who would be its victims; nor, perhaps, by the rulers in the Kremlin. But I have been President of the United States, these 7 years, responsible for the decisions which have brought our science and our engineering to their present place. I know what this development means now. I know something of what it will come to mean in the future.

We in this Government realized, even before the first successful atomic explosion, that this new force spelled terrible danger for all mankind unless it were brought under international control. We promptly advanced proposals in the United Nations to take this new source of energy out of the arena of national rivalries, to make it impossible to use as a weapon of war. These proposals, so pregnant with benefit for all humanity, were rebuffed by the rulers of the Soviet Union.

The language of science is universal; the movement of science is always forward into the unknown. We could not assume that the Soviet Union would not develop the same weapon, regardless of all our precautions, nor that there were not other and even more terrible means of destruction lying in the unexplored field of atomic energy.

We had no alternative, then, but to press on, to probe the secrets of atomic power to the uttermost of our capacity, to maintain, if we could, our initial superiority in the atomic field. At the same time, we sought persistently for some avenue, some formula, for reaching an agreement with the Soviet rulers that would place this new form of power under effective restraints—that would guarantee no nation would use it in war. I do not have to recount here the proposals we made, the steps taken in the United Nations, striving at least to open a way to ultimate agreement. I hope and believe that we will continue to make these efforts so long as there is the slightest possibility of progress. All civilized nations are agreed on the urgency of the problem, and have shown their willingness to agree on effective measures of control—all save the Soviet Union and its satellites. But they have rejected every reasonable proposal.

Meanwhile, the progress of scientific experiment has outrun our expectations. Atomic science is in the full tide of development; the unfolding of the innermost secrets of matter is uninterrupted and irresistible. Since Alamogordo we have developed atomic weapons with many times the explosive force of the early models, and we have produced them in substantial quantities. And recently, in the thermonuclear tests at Eniwetok, we have entered another stage in the world-shaking development of atomic energy. From now on, man moves into a new era of destructive power, capable of creating explosions of a new order of magnitude, dwarfing the mushroom clouds of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We have no reason to think that the stage we have now reached in the release of atomic energy will be the last. Indeed, the speed of our scientific and technical progress over the last 7 years shows no signs of floating. We are being hurried forward, in our mastery of the atom, from one discovery to another, toward yet unforeseeable peaks of destructive power.

Inevitably, until we can reach international agreement, this is the path we must follow. And we must realize that no advance we make is unattainable by others, that no advantage in this race can be more than temporary.

The war of the future would be one in which man could extinguish millions of lives at one blow, demolish the great cities of the world, wipe out the cultural achievements of the past, and destroy the very structure of a civilization that has been slowly and painfully built up through hundreds of generations.

Such a war is not a possible policy for rational men. We know this, but we dare not assume that others would not yield to the temptation science is now placing in their hands.

With that in mind, there is something I would say to Stalin: You claim belief in Lenin's prophecy that one stage in the development of Communist society would be war between your world and ours. But Lenin was a preatomic man, who viewed society and history with preatomic eyes. Something profound has happened since he wrote. War has changed its shape and its dimension. It cannot now be a "stage" in the development of anything save ruin for your regime and your homeland.

I do not know how much time may elapse before the Communist rulers bring themselves to recognize this truth. But when they do, they will find us eager to reach understandings that will protect the world from the danger it faces today.

It is no wonder that some people wish that we had never succeeded in splitting the atom. But atomic power, like any other force of nature, is not evil in itself. Properly used, it is an instrumentality for human betterment. As a source of power, as a tool of scientific inquiry, it has untold possibilities. We are already making good progress in the constructive use of atomic power. We could do much more if we were free to concentrate on its peaceful uses exclusively.

Atomic power will be with us all the days of our lives. We cannot legislate it out of existence. We cannot ignore the dangers or the benefits it offers.

I believe that man can harness the forces of the atom to work for the improvement of the lot of human beings everywhere. That is our goal. As a nation, as a people, we must understand this problem, we must handle this new force wisely through our democratic processes. Above all, we must strive, in all earnestness and good faith, to bring it under effective international control. To do this will require much wisdom and patience and firmness. The awe-inspiring responsibility in this field now falls on a new administration and a new Congress. I will give them my support, as I am sure all our citizens will, in whatever constructive steps they may take to make this newest of man's discoveries a source of good and not of ultimate destruction.

We cannot tell when or whether the attitude of the Soviet rulers may change. We do not know how long it may be before they show a willingness to negotiate effective control of atomic energy and honorable settlements of other world problems. We cannot measure how deep-rooted are the Kremlin's illusions about us. We can be sure, however, that the rulers of the Communist world will not change their basic objectives lightly or soon.

The Communist rulers have a sense of time about these things wholly unlike our own. We tend to divide our future into short spans, like the 2-year life of this Congress, or the 4 years of the next Presidential term. They seem to think and plan in terms of generations. And there is, therefore, no easy, short-run way to make them see that their plans cannot prevail.

This means there is ahead of us a long, hard test of strength and stamina, between the free world and the Communist domain; our politics and our economy, our science and technology against the best they can do; our liberty against their slavery; our voluntary concert of free nations against their forced amalgam of "people's republics"; our strategy against their strategy; our nerve against their nerve.

Above all, this is a test of the will and the steadiness of the people of the United States.

There has been no challenge like this in the history of our Republic. We are called upon to rise to the occasion, as no people before us.

What is required of us is not easy. The way we must learn to live, the world we have to live in, cannot be so pleasant, safe, or simple as most of us have known before, or confidently hoped to know.

Already we have had to sacrifice a number of accustomed ways of working and of living, much nervous energy, material resources, even human life. Yet if one thing is certain in our future, it is that more sacrifice still lies ahead.

Were we to grow discouraged now, were we to weaken and slack off, the whole structure we have built, these past 8 years, would come apart and fall away. Never then, no matter by what stringent means, could our free world regain the ground, the time, the sheer momentum, lost by such a move. There can and should be changes and improvements in our programs, to meet new situations, serve new needs. But to desert the spirit of our basic policies, to step back from them now, would surely start the free world's slide toward the darkness that the Communists have prophesied, toward the moment for which they watch and wait.

If we value our freedom and our way of life and want to see them safe, we must meet the challenge and accept its implications, stick to our guns and carry out our policies.

I have set out the basic conditions, as I see them, under which we have been working in the world, and the nature of our basic policies. What, then, of the future? The answer, I believe, is this: As we continue to confound Soviet expectations, as our world grows stronger, more united, more attractive to men on both sides of the iron curtain, then inevitably there will come a time of change within the Communist world. We do not know how that change will come about, whether by deliberate decision in the Kremlin, by coup d'etat, by revolution, by defection of satellites, or perhaps by some unforeseen combination of factors such as these.

But if the Communist rulers understand they cannot win by war, and if we frustrate their attempts to win by subversion, it is not too much to expect their world to change its character, moderate is aims, become more realistic and less implacable, and recede from the cold war they began.

Do not be deceived by the strong face, the look of monolithic power that the Communist dictators wear before the outside world. Remember their power has no basis in consent. Remember they are so afraid of the free world's ideas and ways of life, they do not dare to let their people know about them. Think of the massive effort they put forth to try to stop our campaign of truth from reaching their people with its message of freedom.

The masters of the Kremlin live in fear their power and position would collapse were their own people to acquire knowledge, information, comprehension about our free society. Their world has many elements of strength, but this one fatal flaw: the weakness represented by their iron curtain and their police state. Surely, a social order at once so insecure and so fearful, must ultimately lose its competition with our free society.

Provided just one thing—and this I urge you to consider carefully—provided that the free world retains the confidence and the determination to outmatch the best our adversary can accomplish and to demonstrate for uncertain millions on both sides of the iron curtain the superiority of the free way of life.

That is the test upon all the free nations; upon none more than our own Republic.

Our resources are equal to the task. We have the industry, the skills, the basic economic strength. Above all, we have the vigor of free men in a free society. We have our liberties. And while we keep them, while we retain our democratic faith, the ultimate advantage in this hard competition lies with us, not with the Communists.

But there are some things that could shift the advantage to their side. One of the things that could defeat us is fear—fear of the task we face, fear of adjusting to it, fear that breeds more fear, sapping our faith, corroding our liberties, turning citizen against citizen, ally against ally. Fear could snatch away the very values we are striving to defend.

Already the danger signals have gone up. Already the corrosive process has begun. And every diminution of our tolerance, each new act of enforced conformity, each idle accusation, each demonstration of hysteria—each new restrictive law—is one more sign that we can lose the battle against fear.

The Communists cannot deprive us of our liberties—fear can. The Communists cannot stamp out our faith in human dignity—fear can. Fear is an enemy within ourselves, and if we do not root it out, it may destroy the very way of life we are so anxious to protect.

To beat back fear, we must hold fast to our heritage as free men. We must renew our confidence in one another, our tolerance, our sense of being neighbors, fellow citizens. We must take our stand on the Bill of Rights. The inquisition, the star chamber, have no place in a free society.

Our ultimate strength lies, not alone in arms, but in the sense of moral values and moral truths that give meaning and vitality to the purposes of free people. These values are our faith, our inspiration, the source of our strength, and our indomitable determination.

We face hard tasks, great dangers. But we are Americans and we have faced hardships and uncertainty before, we have adjusted before to changing circumstances. Our whole history has been a steady training for the work it is now ours to do.

No one can lose heart for the task, none can lose faith in our free ways, who stops to remember where we began, what we have sought, and what accomplished, all together as Americans.

I have lived a long time and seen much happen in our country. And I know out of my own experience, that we can do what must be done.

When I think back to the country I grew up in—and then look at what our country has become—I am quite certain that having done so much, we can do more.

After all, it has been scarcely 15 years since most Americans rejected out of hand the wise counsel that aggressors must be "quarantined." The very concept of collective security, the foundation stone of all our actions now, was then strange doctrine, shunned and set aside. Talk about adapting; talk about adjusting; talk about responding as a people to the challenge of changed times and circumstances—there has never been a more spectacular example than this great change in America's outlook on the world.

Let all of us pause now, think back, consider carefully the meaning of our national experience. Let us draw comfort from it and faith and confidence in our future as Americans.

The Nation's business is never finished The basic questions we have been dealing with, these 8 years past, present themselves anew. That is the way of our society. Circumstances change and current questions take on different forms, new complications, year by year. But underneath, the great issues remain the same—prosperity, welfare, human rights, effective democracy, and above all, peace.

Now we turn to the inaugural of our new President. And in the great work he is called upon to do he will have need for the support of a united people, a confident people, with firm faith in one another and in our common cause. I pledge him my support as a citizen of

our Republic, and I ask you to give him yours.

To him, to you, to all my fellow citizens, I say, Godspeed.

May God bless our country and our cause.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 7, 1953.*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

IT COULD ONLY HAPPEN IN AMERICA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to include a letter and an address, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place this letter from Mr. Joseph H. Cohen, of Woburn, Mass., and an address he delivered at Family Day celebration, October 25, 1952, into the RECORD. Mr. Cohen is the general manager of Atlantic Gelatin, division of General Foods Corp., the largest in the United States. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD because it is an American story; it is a story of a poor boy, an immigrant coming to this country, and what he has accomplished. I ask to have it put in because this life could only happen in America. He was a Russian boy.

ATLANTIC GELATIN,
DIVISION GENERAL FOODS CORP.,
Woburn, Mass., January 5, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: When you visited us on October 25 to participate in our Family Day program you very graciously asked me to send you a copy of my remarks for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Enclosed is a copy of my talk.

I appreciated very much the privilege of entertaining you and the interest which you displayed in our organization. I sincerely hope that you will find time to visit us again.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. COHEN.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH H. COHEN, GENERAL MANAGER OF ATLANTIC GELATIN, DIVISION OF GENERAL FOODS CORP., WOBURN, MASS., AT FAMILY DAY CELEBRATION, OCTOBER 25, 1952

I am happy to have this opportunity to welcome you today. As founder of Atlantic Gelatin, the history of this company represents to a great extent my own personal history and experience. Accordingly my remarks today will of necessity be of a personal nature.

Many of us don't appreciate how fortunate we are to be living in America. I was born in Russia—it was Lithuania at that time but has since been absorbed by the Soviet Union. I came to this country with my parents at the age of 4. Our boat docked at Boston, so quite naturally we settled in the city in what is known as the West End. I went to grade school there and took my secondary education at the English High School in Boston.

As many of you know, I came of very humble surroundings and the early years of my life were filled with the struggle of wresting a living for myself and those dear ones who were, in part, dependent upon me. It was also filled with the struggle of obtaining an education which would serve as a satisfactory preparation for the later years of life. My story has been repeated millions of times in this beloved land of ours, where poor boys who had the grit and the determination could also find the opportunity to rise from poverty to positions of responsibility and respect.

Like so many young American boys, I sold newspapers in my spare time after school in the area of North Station in Boston. After completing high school I was fortunate enough to receive a scholarship to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and each year thereafter until graduation. During summer vacations I worked to help pay additional expenses at college and to help support members of my family. One summer I worked in a tannery, and another summer as a streetcar conductor for the Boston Elevated. I also worked at the Revere Beach Bath House for the metropolitan district commission.

One year during the course of my college career, it was necessary for me to take a leave of absence from school in order to earn enough money to continue my education. During this year from November 7, 1910, to October 1911, I worked for the Mosser Tanning Co. in Peabody. I worked hard, learned quite a bit about the business and met a number of prominent businessmen in the industry. Also during this period I taught English to newly arrived immigrants at night school in Boston, and when I returned to M. I. T. in October 1911, I continued instructing in the evenings. It was there that I met the girl I was to marry, who was also an instructor at the school.

In the spring of 1913, I was graduated from M. I. T. with a degree in chemical engineering. As I had had some experience in the leather industry, it was quite natural that I should seek employment at one of the tanneries. I obtained a job with Albert Bernard & Sons in Whitefield, N. H., at a salary of $13 a week. While there I established a laboratory for the company, but the work was not challenging enough. I resigned and returned to Boston where I obtained a job with the American Glue Co. at the salary of $17 a week. This company was then one of the largest manufacturers of gelatin and glue in the United States and operated about 20 plants, which were located all over the country. The First World War broke out at this time and the supply of ossein, derived from Europe, on which this company was dependent in part for the manufacture of gelatin, was suddenly cut off. Accordingly, I was requested to design and construct a plant to manufacture ossein. This plant was constructed in Everett, Mass., and up until a few years ago was in operation. Later, the American Glue Co. asked me to design and construct a fish-glue plant for them on Spectacle Island in Boston Harbor. This plant was completed in 1917.

I worked for American Glue for 6 years at the conclusion of which I was earning $5,200 a year. This was a handsome salary in 1919, but I was anxious to strike out for myself. I had heard that the tanners in this area were dissatisfied with the price they were getting for their byproducts and the idea of building a gelatin plant which would use these byproducts for processing into gelatin seemed to me to be a good one. Accordingly, I approached several friends in the tanning business, principally Mr. Skilton, whom I had met while working for the Mosser Tanning Co. in Peabody, and had come to know most cordially in the intervening years. At this time Mr. Skilton operated one of the large tanneries in this section and thought my plan was a good one, but lacked adequate funds to back such a project. However, he suggested that I see his financial backer, Mr. Bullivant. I went to see Mr. Bullivant and outlined at length my plan for the new enterprise. He was impressed and not only was willing to help support the project financially, but also recommended me to other prominent tanners. On August 11, 1919, I resigned my job with the American Glue Co. and between that date and September 21, I was able to enlist the support of a limited number of important tanners and we received our charter. Naturally, I wanted to have a controlling interest in the new company, but did not have sufficient personal funds to buy 51 percent of the stock.

As the seat of the leather industry was in Peabody and Woburn, I wanted to locate the plant as close as possible to the source of raw material. Mr. Thayer, one of the backers, and I drove over many roads in this area but could not find a suitable site for the plant. Then my good friend, Mr. Daniel O'Brien, of Woburn, located the site where we are now gathered which had the advantage of adequate water and acreage. At a board meeting, Mr. Mosher, of the Northwestern Leather Co., stated that the property was owned by the Baeder-Adamson Co., in Philadelphia. We went to see Mr. Adamson and within a few hours we had negotiated a deal for the property. On October 14, 1919, ground was broken for the present factory and the first gelatin was produced in 1920.

During the first year of operation we managed to break even, but, unfortunately, we had a serious depression in 1921 and the price of gelatin dropped sharply. However, by dint of hard work, we were able to weather the storm and during the ensuing years business improved. But, on the other hand, the leather industry began to decline with the result that the backers of Atlantic Gelatin were constantly after me for the money they had invested in order to maintain their leather interests.

One of the important reasons for the rapid growth of the Atlantic Gelatin Co. was the happy business and friendly relations that developed between it and the Genessee Pure Food Co., of LeRoy, N. Y., which later became the Jell-O division of General Foods Corp. In 1922 the Genessee Pure Food Co. was pursuing a policy which necessitated having on hand constantly a large inventory of gelatin. In order to meet the expanding needs of Jell-O at that time, the company loaned Atlantic Gelatin $100,000 to expand its plant and to enlarge its productive capacity. At the same time, the Genessee Pure Food Co. agreed to purchase from Atlantic Gelatin 1,000,000 pounds of gelatin a year for 5 years at the prevailing market price. The agreement proved to be mutually advantageous, and within 3 years the Atlantic Gelatin Co. had liquidated its indebtedness. At the time of the loan in 1922 our production was 1,000,000 pounds a year, which increased in 1924 to 2,000,000 pounds.

After the Genesee Pure Food Co. became a subsidiary of General Foods Corp., it was natural that an effort should have been made to absorb the Atlantic Gelatin Co. as well. This was essential in order to eliminate the necessity of maintaining an inventory of gelatin in excess of 1 year's supply and to have a producing unit of adequate capacity to serve as a substitute. I was also encouraged to sell the company to General Foods by the original investors. Finally, in December 1930, the Atlantic Gelatin Co. was absorbed by General Foods Corp. and since then we have been a profitable and progressive member of the General Foods family. It is important to mention that no individual lost money by investing in Atlantic Gelatin.

Atlantic Gelatin today is the largest gelatin manufacturing company in the world. We like to think it is also the best gelatin company in the world. Time has brought a tremendous increase in the demand for gelatin just as we had visualized, and we have been able to keep abreast with the increased needs for our product. In 1913, there were 10,000,000 pounds of gelatin produced in the United States. In 1921, Atlantic Gelatin produced 1,000,000 pounds. Today, approximately 55,000,000 pounds of gelatin are produced in this country of which Atlantic Gelatin produces 20,000,000 pounds. You can see, therefore, that our growth has been twentyfold in an industry that has increased fivefold.

Gelatin is produced from three principal raw materials—porkskins, calfskins and splits, and ossein. You will see how gelatin is extracted from these raw materials as you go through the plant on your tour and the process will be explained to you.

Gelatin is used in many different ways and in many products. Of course, the largest use of gelatin is in the food industry for gelatin desserts and the largest part of our production is sold to the Jell-O division of General Foods Corp. Gelatin is also used by the food industry in the production of jellied meats and soups. It is used in the production of ice cream, candy, marshmallow, and a variety of other confectionery products. It is used in the preparation of salads and in the feeding of the sick and convalescents. It has even been used as a substitute for blood plasma in the treatment of patients suffering from loss of blood and shock.

As you doubtless know, gelatin is used extensively in photography for it is a basic element in the preparation of photographic film. Amateur and professional photography and the vast motion-picture industry could not have been developed were it not for gelatin, since it plays a critical part in the production of photographic films. During the last war when aerial photography became so highly developed and more recently in the Korean conflict, gelatin through its application to the photographic industry and X-ray film has been tremendously important. No doubt it was an essential element to Allied victory and continues to play a vital role in saving American lives in modern warfare.

Gelatin is also used extensively in many other ways. It is used in the manufacture of vitamin pills, of capsules, and of numerous other pharmaceutical compounds. It is used in the chemical and plastic industry in making printed strings, straw hats, and sizing for textiles. We can say in all sincerity with those who have said it many times before, "What a world this would be without gelatin." Certainly it would not be as interesting or as healthy or as happy a world without gelatin.

The gelatin industry has succeeded because it has met numerous human needs. These needs have expanded with the passage of time, so that we have had to employ more men and more women to keep abreast of the demands being made upon us for our product. This has been a source of great personal joy to me, for it has given work to many people; it has supported homes and families; it has paid taxes to the city, the State, and the Nation; and it has helped other industries to flourish in order to supply our needs. That is a worthy monument to anybody, one of which we are very proud and happy.

Our product is sold throughout the United States and in many foreign countries, including Canada, Mexico, Germany, Japan, Italy, Israel, Spain, Belgium, France, Switzerland, the Philippine Islands, and Puerto Rico. In turn we draw on the raw materials not only of the United States of America but likewise of Europe, Asia, and South America. From small beginnings we have achieved international significance. We are a part of the greatest food organization in the world—the General Foods Corp.—and the future looks bright and assured. Our objective here at Atlantic Gelatin is to make this company a good place to work, a safe place to work, and a secure place to work.

Thank you.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

STRUGGLE OVER THE 21-DAY RULE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 3, 1953, at the opening session of this Eighty-third Congress at which the organization of the House of Representatives was consummated, I attempted to present an amendment to the resolution proposing the rules which would govern the conduct of the business of the Eighty-third Congress. This attempt on my part stems from an honest and sincere conviction that the will of a majority of the membership could be obstructed and denied by the desires and actions of a small group of only seven colleagues. The attempt to present an amendment to the proposed rules even before any rules whatsoever were adopted by the new House membership was completely frustrated when a motion offered by one of the leaders of the Republican majority for the previous question was ruled by the newly elected Speaker of the House to effectively preclude the offering of my amendment, or even the slightest discussion or debate on the entire subject of rules to govern the newly elected and incoming House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in 1937 the New Deal lost control of the House Rules Committee when three of its Democratic members joined with the four Republican members to block floor consideration of controversial administration bills. The coalition succeeded in preventing a score or more of New Deal-Fair Deal measures from reaching the House floor, except by the laborious discharge route. After the Second World War a rising demand developed for reform of the powers of the Committee on Rules. Rebellion against the "undemocratic and abitrary dictatorship" of the committee found expression in a letter which I wrote to my House colleagues in December 1948:

In theory—

I said—

the Rules Committee is a traffic director on the legislative highway, determining the order of business on the floor of the House. In practice this committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. The committee often allows bills to come before the House only on its own terms. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committee of the House by holding hearings and reviewing the merits of bills that have already been carefully studied by the proper legislative committees. A reform of this undemocratic system is long overdue. Congress is constantly engaged in a struggle for the respect of the people. The people never have and never will be able to understand how the will of a majority of the House of Representatives can be set aside by the judgment of a few men on a powerful committee.

The fight against the obstructive tactics of the Rules Committee finally came to a head on January 3, 1949, when the House adopted the so-called 21-day rule by a vote of 275 to 142. Under this rule, the chairman of a legislative committee which had favorably reported a bill could call it up for House consideration if the Rules Committee reported adversely on it or failed to give it a green light to the House floor within 21 days. The 21-day rule remained in effect throughout the Eighty-first Congress—1949–50—despite a determined effort to repeal it early in the second session. A coalition led by Congressman Cox, of Georgia, was defeated on January 20, 1950, by a vote of 236 to 183. Eighty-five southern Democrats voted for the Cox repeal resolution, while 64 Republicans sided with the administration against their own leadership. The 21-day rule proved effective in preventing a permanent blockade of vital legislation by the Rules Committee. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, it brought the anti-poll-tax bill to the House floor for a successful vote, and forced action on the housing and minimum-wage bills. During the second session it enabled the House to vote for the National Science Foundation, Alaska and Hawaii statehood legislation, and other important measures. Altogether during the Eighty-first Congress, eight measures were brought to the floor of the House and passed by resort to the 21-day rule, and its existence caused the Rules Committee to act in other cases.

On January 3, 1951, a hostile coalition regained control of the situation and obtained repeal of the 21-day rule by a vote of 247 to 179 after a bitter fight. As a result, the power of the Rules Committee to block bills was restored and exercised during the Eighty-second Congress. For example, a bill authorizing the shipment of wheat to India was held up by the committee for many weeks until it had been amended to conform to its views.

Until the 21-day rule is restored—

Said Representative HOLIFIELD, of California—

we can expect further situations in which a few men, strategically situated in the Rules Committee, can impose their will on the Congress and prevent the enactment of legislation deemed by the House majority to be essential to the security and welfare of this Nation.[1]

Two opposing principles are involved in the struggle over the powers of the House Committee on Rules: whether legislative action should be controlled by a majority of the entire House, or whether the majority party should control through its nominal agent. Those who believe in the principle of majority rule by the whole House favor reducing the Rules Committee to a traffic director on the legislative highway and a more lib-

[1] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the organization and operation of Congress, June 1951, p. 52.

eral discharge rule. Their fundamental objection to the existing set-up is that it vests power in a small group of Rules Committee men to prevent the House from considering and taking action upon measures not favored by the Rules Committee or the House leaders. Under the present system many cases arise where a bill or resolution that would receive favorable action by the House, if it had a chance to consider it, is killed in the Rules Committee. Such a system denies the House its constitutional right to legislate and violates the principle of representative government.

Only a reform of the powers of the Rules Committee will, in crucial cases, enable the true desires of the majority to prevail.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that, under the rules of the House, at any time a majority of the Members of the House can sign a petition on the Speaker's desk and bring out any legislation?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is true. It is a fact that a bill can be brought to the floor of the House by the method of the discharge petition, which requires the signatures of 218 Members, but we have had that in effect for many years and it has been absolutely proven to be impracticable and never has worked except in one or two instances within the last 15 years. It has been proven impracticable and I think any Member, such as the gentleman from Ohio himself, who has had a great deal of experience, knows there are many reasons why Members will not sign that petition, even though they may think favorably of a measure.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that both he and I on a number of occasions have signed petitions to relieve committees of consideration of antipoll-tax bills, and so on?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct. The gentleman knows that if we had had the 21-day rule in effect we could have considered bills that by no stretch of the imagination could be considered under the present rules of the House. I am sure the gentleman voted for the change in the rules 4 years ago. The gentleman voted for the 21-day rule.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman on occasion changes his mind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was extended 2 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. With respect to the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], of course what the gentleman says is absolutely correct. Under the rules, a discharge petition signed by 218 Members would discharge the Rules Committee. But on the other hand, what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said is absolutely correct, that from a practical angle the chances of getting 218 signatures is very, very difficult and very remote.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield for me to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman is right in theory but wrong in practice.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely proven to be wrong, because many Members who favor a bill hesitate to discharge a committee because there is an implied reflection upon the committee membership.

Mr. McCORMACK. To obtain 218 signatures is a very difficult job.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding so that I may ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] a question.

The gentleman served on our committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have served on the gentleman's committee.

Mr. BENDER. I would love for you to serve on the committee again, and I trust the gentleman will ask to be placed on that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. If you will take my advice, you will not have too many investigating committees.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the advice, but while the gentleman was majority leader, he was aware of the fact that we had Calendar Wednesday, as well as this other device, this petition device, that was used on numerous occasions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but again the gentleman is well aware of the many difficulties in connection with Calendar Wednesday. The gentleman is theoretically correct, but again, without in any way attacking, the gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement from a theoretical angle, but from a practical angle there is a departure between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has again expired.

THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President, yesterday, with only 14 days of his term remaining, issued a last-minute Executive order that adds 47,916 acres to the already overly large Olympic National Park in Washington State. This brings the size of this park to approximately 897,000 acres, which is an area substantially larger than that of the entire State of Rhode Island.

We want a large Olympic Park in the State of Washington, but one of 897,000 acres is too large, much too large. Furthermore, in this colossal park is being locked up large areas of agricultural land, that almost everyone is agreed should not be within the park, and also locked up against use are sizable stands of timber and sizable quantities of diseased and overripe timber which will go to waste unless harvested. If these diseased stands of timber die and rot they will add greatly to the forest-fire menace of adjacent green timber, most of which belongs to the Federal Government.

Obviously, the question of the size of the Olympic National Park is one of great importance not only to the State of Washington but also to the Nation. Certainly no enlargement of the present area of the park, about 841,000 acres, should have been made without the more careful study and the weighing by the President of all facts involved. Before any enlargement was made hearings certainly should have been held in the area to provide an opportunity to State officials and private citizens to be heard.

The President, obviously, used snap judgment, without weighing the facts, when he hastily signed an Executive order yesterday enlarging the park.

Proof that his decision was made with snap judgment is indicated by these facts. On November 5, the day after Eisenhower's election, the President signed a letter on White House stationery, addressed to Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of the State of Washington, asking the Governor's opinion on his, the President's, proposal to enlarge the Olympic Park by 47,916 acres. Governor Langlie replied he was opposed to such an enlargement.

Several days later, at a White House press conference, a reporter asked the President about the proposed Olympic Park enlargement. The President replied he knew nothing about any such proposal or a letter to Governor Langlie on the subject. Had he given any weighty or deep consideration to the proposal for enlarging the Olympic National Park, the President certainly should have remembered it—but the park enlargement matter, apparently, made such a small impression on him that a few days after his letter to Governor Langlie he had completely forgotten all about it.

The President had almost 8 years during his term of office to issue an Executive order enlarging the park if he wished to do so. He never did issue such an order, however, until within just a few days of his impending retirement from office.

Apparently, there is nothing that can be done, immediately, about this unwise and unjust hasty decision. President Truman had the authority, in law, to make it if he elected to do so. Now that he has issued his Executive order increasing the size of the park, President-elect Eisenhower, when he takes office, cannot undo that Truman order by issuing an order rescinding the Truman action. It will require an Act of Congress to do that and obtaining passage of such an act by Congress is a long, laborious, and expensive procedure.

With President Truman just about to retire, it would seem to me that the proper course would have been for him to have left this park matter for the new administration to decide.

The Truman administration had been repudiated by the people at the polls. The voters of Washington State had given their approval and electoral votes to General Eisenhower. It, therefore, would seem to me to have been best that President Eisenhower, the people's choice, decide an issue as to the size of the park. This is particularly true since Governor Langlie, who had just been reelected by the people of Washington State, had recommended against the proposed enlargement, and, having been Governor of the State for 8 years, was much better qualified than the President to pass judgment on the issue of whether or not the park should be enlarged.

The main purpose behind the President's decision to enlarge the Olympic National Park, apparently, is that of launching a grandiose experiment in socializing the tourist resort industry of the coastal region of the State of Washington, at the taxpayers' expense.

Some years ago, the Federal Government, for park purposes, acquired large areas of land along the coastal areas of Washington State and along the shores of Lake Crescent. The New Deal spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, probably millions, in acquiring land and in purchasing tourist resorts there. The tourist resorts were condemned and taken away from their private owners. Then, these resorts were leased, on 1 year leases, to operators favored by the park service.

These operators, having only short leases, have not maintained these properties. In 10 years most of these properties have deteriorated almost to the point of ruin. Some of them are unsanitary and in such a bad state of repair that they are not habitable or usable.

Despite the apparent utter failure of the costly previous efforts to socialize these tourist resorts, the President now, apparently without much investigation, blithely signs an order adding additional tourist lands to the park. The taxpayers will have to foot the bill.

Not many years ago, the Park Service, itself, took the position that the Olympic Park was too large and recommended the deletion of 56,000 acres from it. The Park Service, itself, admitted the deletion of this 56,000 acres would make the administration of this park more efficient and feasible without any damage to park and recreational values. Yet, now in a snap judgement, President Truman enlarges the park.

Included in this colossal Olympic National Park are large areas of agricultural lands, which most persons familiar with the area say and which the Park Service agrees, never should have been included within the park. Now, under the President's order, more agricultural lands will be locked up in the park and farmers prohibited from cultivating this land, for, under park rules, there must be no commercial activities of any kind within a national park, other than tourist resorts operated by the Park Service or on unprofitable leaseholds administered by Federal officials.

At the very time the President is withdrawing this agricultural land from use by locking it up in a park, he is recommending that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' money be expended elsewhere, for bringing barren lands under irrigation at a cost of more than $400 an acre, in order to maintain the Nation's food supply. Most inconsistent, is it not?

The Olympic National Park, as now constituted, contains approximately 17,500,000,000 feet of merchantable timber. This timber, according to estimates of the United States Forest Service, has a value, on the stump, of $423,000,000.

The 47,916-acre addition to the Olympic Park, which President Truman ordered yesterday will add another 880,000,000 feet of timber.

The park, as enlarged by the President's order, will contain almost 18,500,000,000 feet of timber valued at about half a billion dollars.

Everyone is agreed that there should be a large Olympic National Park and that substantial quantities of virgin timber should be preserved within its borders as museum specimens for future generations to behold. But half a billion dollars of timber is entirely too much to lock up against use in a park.

Certain areas within the park should be turned back to the United States Forest Service, particularly those areas where the timber is overripe or diseased. The Forest Service, then, can arrange to have it logged on the sustained-yield principle, now universally practiced by the Forest Service.

Under sustained yield only one-eightieth or one one-hundredth of the trees in a given area are logged in any one year. New trees, immediately, are planted to take the place of those which are cut. In 80 to 100 years these new trees are old enough to log. Under this practice the Nation is assured a permanent, perpetual growing forest.

Wise forestry and wise conservation can provide the Nation with timber for her industries and at the same time preserve vast areas in parks for recreation purposes.

A park of the colossal size created by President Truman's executive order of yesterday is not conservation. It is waste because areas not of park caliber are being locked up against use and the way to get the most out of a forest is to harvest areas of overripe, diseased timber and not to let it rot and decay, thereby causing economic waste and increasing the forest-fire hazard.

Certainly, I do hope that the present Congress will act during the present session to rectify the mistake which President Truman, on snap judgment and without sufficient study, made yesterday when, by Executive order, he enlarged the Olympic National Park.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. What effect will it have on the local government for the Federal Central Government to take that much land off the tax base?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The land is primarily in Federal ownership now. Part of it is in the Forest Service and we would like to have it remain in the Forest Service of the United States. Part of it was purchased by a ruse employed by the now defunct Public Works Administration. The PWA was going to use these lands as a wood lot, yet the land was 50 to 60 miles from the nearest community.

We think that especially the diseased and overripe timber should be logged to provide jobs in industry. Putting this additional land in the park will adversely affect industrial payrolls.

Mr. GOLDEN. For many years there has been a tendency on the part of the Federal Government to reach out and take in vast amounts of land. Now I think in my State they have taken over a million acres away from the tax base. I agree with the gentleman from Washington; I think it is time we should stop this process and rather than increasing the great holdings of the Federal Government we should begin to reduce them, and I think the gentleman has cited one instance where it should apply.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct. Of all the landed area of the United States, about 27 percent is now in Federal ownership. States and local communities suffer a loss in tax income.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I happen to know that our great legislative Committee on Agriculture is interested in this matter. I do trust that after we move into the legislative work after the inaugural that items of this nature will be taken care of because there is a principle involved. The management of our national forests is one of our most troublesome national resources.

Mr. MACK of Washington. This whole question of whether land holdings of the Federal Government should be larger or smaller is something which should be studied carefully and not determined by snap judgment such as the President used in this instance. The President wrote a letter to the Governor of the State of Washington on November 5 asking the Governor's opinion about this proposed park enlargement. Several days later at his press conference he was asked if he proposed to enlarge the Olympic National Park. He said he had no recollection of ever having written or sent any such letter to the Governor of the State of Washington. Apparently, he made snap judgment in deciding to enlarge this part, for he did not recall having sent this letter to the Governor.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield gladly.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not a fact that in the West the Government ownership of lands is too great already?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes, 47 percent of the land of the 11 Western States is in Federal ownership.

Mr. ANGELL. I know in my own State of Oregon it is over 50 percent.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct, in the State of Washington it is 46 percent and in the State of Nevada, 87 percent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. POFF, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include a resolution.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include an address he delivered at the dedication of the Fort Dodge Municipal Airport.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter, including in one an article by Leonard Carmichael, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS and to include an editorial.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK at Milwaukee, Wis., at the time he was awarded the medal of the Third Order of St. Francis.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER).

Mr. EBERHARTER and to include a letter he received from the director of the CIO legislative department.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address delivered by Attorney General McGranery.

Mr. DINGELL and to include a tribute to the late Benjamin C. Marsh and a press dispatch.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Friday, January 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

256. A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting the Third Quarterly Report of the Small Defense Plants Administration, pursuant to section 714 (g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

257. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

259. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

260. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

261. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

262. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, to remove the limitation upon the rank of the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

263. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

264. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communication System"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

265. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

266. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

267. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952," and a draft of a proposed resolution entitled "Resolution to postpone the effective date of section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 relating to the maximum strength of the Ready Reserve"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

268. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled 'An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

269. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

270. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

271. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Army Medical Service Graduate School to award master of science and doctor of science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint Rear Adm. Morton Loomis Ring, United States Navy, retired, to a civilian position with the Munitions Board without affecting his military status and perquisites"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

274. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

275. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

276. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

277. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

278. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

279. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

280. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to repeal Public Law 820, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 1098), an act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

281. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

282. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

283. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

284. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

285. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime-compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

286. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements and accounts of the Home Loan Bank Board and the organizations under its supervision, consisting of the 11 Federal home loan banks, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

287. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property in the State of New Mexico to the Department of the Army, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

288. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands for other lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

289. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the seventh annual report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

290. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their official duties, suffered losses for personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of a Treasury Claim Board"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, an act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled, 'An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service' by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

296. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

297. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

298. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461), as amended, to make permanent the exemptions from duty of personal and household effects"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1952 (56 Stat. 1041), as amended, so as to make permanent certain temporary provisions thereof"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

300. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 1215. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 1216. A bill to authorize payment of the servicemen's indemnity to survivors of members of the National Guard who die while engaged in any training duty under competent orders; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1217. A bill to govern the hospitalization of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1218. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1219. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1220. A bill relating to the fulfillment by the United States of its obligations with respect to certain Indians under an agreement ratified by an act of Congress approved February 28, 1877; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1221. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1222. A bill to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1223. A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1224. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1225. A bill to amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1226. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1227. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 1228. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1229. A bill to amend section 1073, title 18, United States Code, with respect to indecent molestation or sexual abuse of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1230. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1231. A bill to prevent the taking of bail which originates with subversive individuals or organizations in criminal cases, and to prohibit bail, pending appeal or certiorari, after conviction of certain offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1232. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that individuals may elect not to receive old-age and survivors' insurance coverage with respect to self-employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1233. A bill to provide for an appropriate medal to be awarded to individuals for the performance of certain acts in behalf of the United States requiring valor and great personal sacrifice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1235. A bill to provide for increased penalties for the sale or distribution of narcotics to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1236. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that ministers may elect to receive old-age and survivors' insurance coverage by treating service performed in the exercise of their ministry as self-employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1237. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to annuities of former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1238. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1239. A bill to deny benefits, under the civil service and other Federal retirement systems, to persons convicted of felonies involving improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as officers or employees of the United States or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1240. A bill to provide for the training of candidates for appointment as nurses in the military services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1241. A bill relating to the detail of certain officers of the Armed Forces retired with full pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1242. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1244. A bill to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes," approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1245. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Dane County, Wis., to the Wisconsin State Armory Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1246. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1247. A bill to provide that the absence of any individual for 20 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1248. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1249. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1250. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1251. A bill to declare the public policy of the District of Columbia to be opposed to the segregation of persons of different race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry; to provide for the operation of the public schools of the District of Columbia on a nonsegregated basis; and to provide for the denial of business licenses to persons who fail to conform to the aforesaid policy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1252. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1253. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 1254. A bill to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 1255. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1256. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1257. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1258. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the earning of $900 in wages in a year without loss of insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1259. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 and the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 to provide for lump-sum payments to certain beneficiaries under those acts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1260. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1261. A bill to provide that policies of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance shall be incontestable for fraud after 2 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1262. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 to provide for the termination of assistance to any nation which does not make a full contribution to the development and maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1263. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1264. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1265. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1266. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1267. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1268. A bill to provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as the Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1269. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1270. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1271. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1272. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E United States savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1273. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1274. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1275. A bill to equalize income-tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1276. A bill to exempt from income-tax compensation and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1277. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1278. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1279. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1280. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1281. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1282. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1283. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1284. A bill to eliminate any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1285. A bill to amend section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act so as to broaden judicial relief under that section pending review of administrative action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1286. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1287. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require United States obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1288. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1289. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export-trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1290. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1291. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from consolidating any offices under his jurisdiction, or directing reductions in force of Veterans' Administration personnel, without notifying the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1292. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1293. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1294. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

H. R. 1295. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1296. A bill to extend the time for initiating recommendations for certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1297. A bill to provide that pension, compensation, and retirement pay shall be paid during periods of active service and the amount thereof deducted from the amount payable for such active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1298. A bill to increase the expense allowance of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1299. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1300. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1301. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1302. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1303. A bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1304. A bill to remove the time limitations on a period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to certain seriously disabled veterans of World War II and of service on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1305. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for the payment of an additional amount to cover the cost of a burial lot in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1306. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1307. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control inmprovements on the Mississippi River in the Sny Island levee and drainage district; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1308. A bill to amend the Color of Title Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1309. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1310. A bill to extend pension benefits to certain persons who served 90 days or more in the Armed Forces of the United States during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1311. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1312. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, so as to repeal the $75 limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received in any month by a person receiving benefits under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1313. A bill to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1314. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of the city of Hazelhurst, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1316. A bill to provide for competitive bidding on oil and gas leases issued on acquired lands where a competitive interest in leasing is evident; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1317. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government required by law or regulation to wear them; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1318. A bill to include the fees for issuing money orders as a part of the gross postal receipts of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1319. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1320. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1321. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1322. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1323. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college system and to provide for the election of the

President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint congressional committee to study the nomination, election and succession to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution recommending use of atomic weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate and study the continued high prices of beef products to the consumer in view of the current tremendous decrease in the prices of live-beef cattle; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 55. Resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserve at Fort Knox; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 56. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation of the Department of Agriculture activities relating to sugar; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr MULTER:

H. Res. 57. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the operation of accident, health, and hospitalization insurance companies, associations, societies, and funds; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 58. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 57; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 59. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 60. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Georgina Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of George L. F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1326. A bill for the relief of Beulah I. Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Dustean Alexander Youngs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1333. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Stanley J. Nietupski and Sarah Jane Nietupski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1335. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Ludovica Nagel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franca Gatti Ohta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Araxi Nazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 1340. A bill for the relief of Peter Lukac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1341. A bill for the relief of Vytautas Stanislau Bacevicius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Sanders Knanishu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 1343. A bill for the relief of Ikuro Yajima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Stanislao Marazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of John Lampropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Zoheir Daud Abu Rsheid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Alwine Reichenbauch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Francisco da Luz Conceicao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1350. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paule David, Claire David, and Ariane David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Rachel Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Nissim Salim Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Ann Yellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Trencher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of Pedro R. Jalandoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1357. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Henning Von Royk-Lewinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1361. A bill for the relief of Kiyoshi Nabeshima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Peter James O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1364. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Kurth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Patricia Fletcher Cain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Rea D. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1367. A bill for the relief of Nadeem Tannous and Mrs. Jamile Tannous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1368. A bill for the relief of William McCraw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1369. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eunice Weaver Bula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1371. A bill for the relief of Klaus Dieter Ploetzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9. By Mr. CEDERBERG: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Arenac County, Mich., requesting legislation for the return of no less than 50 percent of the Federal gasoline tax to the respective States wherein it is collected; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Midland County, Mich., requesting legislation for the return of no less than 50 percent of the Federal gasoline tax to the respective States wherein it is collected; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1953

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, endue with Thy wisdom our fallible minds in the midst of decision with the background of fearful forces of nature which, if not harnessed by mutual good will,

may destroy us utterly. Give us greatness of soul that the keys of new power may be used to open doors, not of peril but of plenty for the whole earth. In disturbing days strengthen us with the assurance that in the supreme tests only the soul is decisive and that only the spirit can save the flesh.

So, distill upon us the dews of quietness and confidence that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast and abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in Him and for Him and with Him our labor is not in vain. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 7, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the message of the President is read, there is some routine business which Senators would like to transact.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills, joint resolutions, and transact other routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HEALTH NEEDS OF THE NATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1951 and 1952, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), Seventy-ninth Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF ESCAPE CLAUSES IN EXISTING TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 54)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This detailed report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PAN-AMERICAN DAY—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF SENATE OF DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a letter from the president of the Senate of the Dominican Republic, relating to Senate Resolution 303 of the United States Senate, in connection with Pan-American Day (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions for the account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION OF LAND BENEFITED BY COACHELLA DIVISION, ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on soil survey and land classifications of the lands to be benefited by the Coachella Division, All-American Canal project, California (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FLOYD E. DOTSON

A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Floyd E. Dotson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Commerce on the operations under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATION NO. 2 (A), RELATING TO PAYMENT OF CERTAIN UNNEGOTIATED CHECKS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSPORTATION IN GOVERNMENT-OWNED AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the national shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Rockford, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of that Administration, dated July 15, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the executive, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association for the period ended May 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD, HOME LOAN BANKS, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION, AND HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal home loan bank, Federal home-loan banks, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of that Commission for the period ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF CERTAIN CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTIONS FROM DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461), as amended, to make permanent the exemptions from duty of personal and household effects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS BY MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVIL EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY FOR LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, to further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service" by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AFFECTING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITH PUERTO RICO

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FURNISHING OF CERTAIN SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN NEW MEXICO FROM DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR TO DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property in the State of New Mexico to the Department of the Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTERSERVICE TRANSFER OF COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DESIGNATION OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD AS POSTAL CLERKS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal Public Law 820, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 1098), an act to provide a revolving fund for the purpose of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPRODUCTION AND SALE OF CERTAIN OFFICIAL RECORDS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE DISCHARGE FROM MILITARY SERVICES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FREE POSTAGE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specific areas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT RELATING TO TIME LIMITATION FOR FILING CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAY OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY ARMED FORCES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CORRECTION OF BOUNDARIES OF QUINCY NATIONAL CEMETERY AND EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands for other lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RETROCESSION TO STATE OF VIRGINIA JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN HIGHWAYS WITHIN FORT BELVOIR, VA.

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within

Fort Belvoir, Va. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MAXIMUM STRENGTH OF THE READY RESERVE

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and a draft of proposed legislation to postpone the effective date of section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, relating to the maximum strength of the Ready Reserve (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED FACILITIES BETWEEN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN DUTY-FREE ARTICLES BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 1041), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 846, 847), so as to make permanent certain temporary provisions thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO TARRANT COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 IN EXCHANGE FOR OTHER LANDS AT EAGLE MOUNTAIN LAKE, TEX.

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 302, SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STANDARD DESIGN FOR SERVICE FLAG AND LAPEL BUTTON

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTRUCTION AT STATIONS OF ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communication System (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF BOARDS OF REVIEW

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS ACT, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF A CHIEF OF MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION UPON RANK OF DIRECTOR OF MUSIC, LEADER OF MILITARY ACADEMY BAND

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, to remove the limitation upon the rank of the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROMOTION AND MAINTENANCE OF CIVILIAN RECREATION PROGRAMS

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AWARDING OF CERTAIN DEGREES BY ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE GRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Army Medical Service Graduate School to award Master of Science and Doctor of Science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 26, 1948, RELATING TO CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPOINTMENT OF REAR ADMIRAL MORTON LOOMIS RING, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, TO A CIVILIAN POSITION WITH MUNITIONS BOARD

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint Rear Adm. Morton Loomis Ring, United States Navy, retired, to a civilian position with the Munitions Board without affecting his military status and perquisites (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF OFFICIAL REGISTERS BY SECRETARIES OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN NEW MEXICO BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO DEPARTMENT OF ARMY

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property in the State of New Mexico to the Department of the Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF APRIL 23, 1930, RELATING TO UNIFORM RETIREMENT DATE FOR CERTAIN RETIREMENTS OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate resolution by the Senate of the State of New Jersey, of protest to the United States Department of Agriculture, objecting to the proposed enlargement of the milk marketing area so as to include therein an area of northern New Jersey

"Whereas, the Department of Agriculture of the United States is proposing to enlarge the milk marketing area, as set forth in the petition of the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., so as to include therein an area of northern New Jersey; and

"Whereas hearings have been held and are being conducted in such manner as to exclude certain proper and relevant statements by citizens of this State who have valid reasons for objecting to the said proposed enlargement of the milk marketing area in question; and

"Whereas the subject of milk control has received careful attention by the legislature of this State and the office of milk industry in the State department of agriculture is effectively functioning in promoting the general welfare of the citizens of this State in this important field of government; and

"Whereas the said proposed enlargement of a milk marketing area so as to include therein an area in northern New Jersey conflicts with the public policy of this State as evidenced by the legislation heretofore enacted in respect to milk control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey—

"1. That the Senate of the State of New Jersey does hereby protest to the Department of Agriculture of the United States against any enlargement of the milk marketing area referred to in the petition of the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to amend a certain order heretofore promulgated by the United States Department of Agriculture, relating to milk marketing, to enlarge the marketing area therein set forth so as to include therein the metropolitan area of northern New Jersey and against any such enlargement of the area unless specifically consented to by the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture.

"2. That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States.

"3. This resolution shall take effect immediately."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolutions memoralizing Congress to vote against the passage of the so-called Thomas leave rider attached to the independent offices appropriation bill

"Whereas the so-called Thomas leave rider attached to the independent offices appropriation bill is now being considered by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas Federal employees are at present allowed to carry over their accumulated annual leave; and

"Whereas this bill provides that employees' annual leave must be taken and used before the thirtieth day of June in the year following the accumulation of said annual leave; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill would seriously imperil the defense effort and would necessitate payment of large sums of money for overtime wages; and

"Whereas the adoption of this rider would affect the efficient functioning of governmental agencies in that employees would be required to take their annual leaves at a time when they might be urgently needed: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to vote against the passage of the so-called Thomas leave rider; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relating to memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 4574 and to select Beale Air Force as the site for the Air Force Academy

"Whereas there has been pending before the Congress of the United States H. R. 4574, referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and

"Whereas it is possible that a special session of Congress may be called at which this measure could be considered; and

"Whereas H. R. 4574 is entitled, "A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes"; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to the security of the United States to establish an Air Force Academy; and

"Whereas the Department of the Air Force has promulgated a list of requirements befitting a suitable site for an Air Force Academy, and Beale Air Force Base, Calif., eminently fulfills all of these requirements; and

"Whereas the Academy Site Selection Committee of that Department, after intensive study, has recommended to the Committee on Armed Services a number of sites, of which Beale Air Force Base is the only one located in California; and

"Whereas Beale Air Force Base, containing 86,000 acres of land, is owned by the Federal Government, and contains millions of dollars invested by the Nation in installations at this ideal location, facilities including an inexhaustible water and fire-fighting system, sewerage and drainage systems, power installations, streets, access highways, railroad extensions, and numerous other improvements; and

"Whereas Beale Air Force Base is visited with a climate most desirable for an Air Force Academy, situated near an abundant supply of water power, adjacent to widespread agricultural and industrial centers, supplied by all various forms of modern transportation, near multiple metropolitan areas, and possessing unlimited recreational facilities; and

"Whereas communities surrounding Beale Air Force Base have warmly received and generously aided in the past many large military installations, contributing greatly to the success of military operations in this area; and

"Whereas in the interest of the most advantageous location to the Air Force and to the economy of the Nation, this vast and desirable aviation installation should be selected as the location for the Air Force Academy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 4574, and to select Beale Air Force Base, Calif., as the site of the United States Air Force Academy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Air Force, to the Chief of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Academy Site Selection Board, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to construction of the Solano County project

"Whereas Senate bill 2863, introduced in the Eighty-second Congress, second session, if enacted, would integrate the Solano County project into the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas the Congress thereafter appropriated $3,000,000 for the Solano County project (the Monticello Dam) with the understanding that the money shall not be used to initiate construction of the project until the local interests have an opportunity to be heard by appropriate congressional committees and to make known their views as to whether or not the project should be integrated into the Central Valley project, and until a determination has been made thereon; and

"Whereas it has been reported that preliminary investigations and studies indicate that approximately 80,000 acre-feet of water annually is now being pumped from the Putah Creek Cone, which is recharged almost entirely by Putah Creek water, to fulfill the existing water requirements therefrom; and

"Whereas the Commissioner of Reclamation has stated in House Document 65, Eighty-first Congress, first session, that contemplated operation of the Solano County project calls for the allocation of 15,000 acre-feet of water annually to downstream use along Putah Creek, which is far less than the estimated water requirements for such purposes; and

"Whereas the College of Agriculture of the University of California at Davis, one of the leading agricultural colleges in the world, representing a capital investment of over $25,000,000, is dependent upon an adequate water supply from the Putah Creek Cone; and it appears that the releases of water proposed by the Secretary of the Interior are inadequate to meet the water requirements of the college of agriculture and other water requirements on the Putah Creek Cone; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California in the 1951 regular session enacted chapter 1478 authorizing and directing the State engineer to make an investigation of and report on the water supplies of an area which includes the Putah Creek Cone, and appropriated $50,000 for that purpose; and

"Whereas said investigation by the department of public works, acting through the State engineer, is in progress but will not be completed until early in 1953; and

"Whereas the public interest requires the utilization of California's water resources to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that existing water rights must be protected in accordance with the laws of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress is respectfully memorialized not to appropriate or permit the use of funds for the construction of the Solano County project nor to take any further action regarding the reauthorization of that project until the investigation of the water supplies of the Putah Creek Cone has been completed by the State engineer, and a report thereon is made available to the public; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislature respectfully urges that every congressional committee conducting a public hearing in connection with the reauthorization of the Solano County project consider, as one of the primary questions, the availability of water to meet the existing requirements of persons within Putah Creek Cone area, including the University of California at Davis; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully memorialized to include in any legislation authorizing the construction of the Solano County project, provisions which will protect the existing requirements of persons within the Putah Creek Cone area, including the University of California at Davis; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker

of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A statement from the Director of Civil Defense, State of Colorado, certifying that that State had entered into a civil defense and disaster compact with the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the State director of civil defense, State of New Jersey, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of that State's ratification of civil-defense compacts with all States which have ratified similar compacts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the State director of civilian defense, State of New Mexico, transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Governor of New Mexico, notifying the Senate that that State had ratified an interstate civil defense and disaster compact with the State of New York (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the general counsel, New York State Civil Defense Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a civil defense and disaster compact entered into by the States of New York and Colorado (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the general counsel, New York State Civil Defense Commission, New York, N. Y., relating to correspondence between that State and the States of Arizona, Florida, Maine, and Oregon, relating to the ratification of civil-defense compacts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Oklahoma Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Company (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the State director, Office of Civil Defense, Pierre, S. Dak., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a civil-defense compact entered into between that State and the States of Oklahoma, Oregon, New Jersey, California, Delaware, Montana, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Massachusetts, Florida, Texas, Nevada, and Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Governor of the State of West Virginia, notifying the Senate, pursuant to law, of the ratification by that State of an interstate civil-defense compact (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Governor of the State of Wyoming, notifying the Senate that that State had ratified an interstate civil-defense compact (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the California State Convention of the Democratic Party, favoring Federal financial assistance for damages caused by earthquakes in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York, N. Y., favoring a reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Western New England Region of Hadassah, at Blantyre, Mass., favoring the appropriation of the entire sum allocated for the Middle East as recommended by the President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Eulalia G. Vda. De Jureidini, of Cebu City, the Philippines, relating to her claim for damages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Civil Defense Police Services of the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, at Portland, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation providing compensation for injury and death to civil defense workers in the States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Regular Veterans' Association, Inc., Manila, Philippine Islands, signed by Maj. V. R. Barros, United States Army, retired, relating to increased pay for retired soldiers of the Philippine Scouts, United States Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., protesting against the latest price increase for newsprint; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Iowa Townsend Council, protesting against the continued payment of old-age and survivors insurance funds to persons behind the iron curtain; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Holy Name Society, St. Patrick Church, Maysville, Ky., signed by Richard T. Snopp, president, remonstrating against the death sentence imposed upon certain church dignitaries in Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Queens County Committee, Inc., the American Legion, Department of New York, Little Neck, Long Island, favoring repudiation of Georgi Zarubin, Ambassador from Russia to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Grand Lodge of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, signed by Nicholas Sarro, M. D., grand recording secretary, reaffirming their faith in the principles and ideals of democracy and their determination to stand behind the leadership of our Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the General Society, Sons of the Revolution, New York, N. Y., favoring the ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the Senate; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Military Order of the World Wars, at New Orleans, La., favoring the withdrawal of our Ambassador to Russia and of the Russian Ambassador to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Jewish Youth Conference, Narrowsburg, N. Y., favoring the prompt ratification by the Senate of the genocide treaty (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association, of Boston, Mass., favoring the prompt ratification of the genocide treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., favoring the appointment of Samuel W. King as Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize that Board to issue bonds for public school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Koolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, favoring the appointment of Samuel Wilder King as Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of the Federated Indians of California, Sacramento, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petitions of the Active Club, Lions Club, Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Kiwanis Club and the Rotary Club, all of the city of Aberdeen, Wash., praying for the appointment of Frank R. Landsburg as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Marina Business and Professional Women's Club of San Francisco, Calif., relating to the radio and television industry in their portrayal of the national conventions of the two major political parties, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called McCarran immigration bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions of the General Society of the War of 1812, at New York, N. Y., relating to communism, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass., favoring the repeal of the so-called McCarran immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Raymond S. Wood, of Eastport, Md., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New York Women's Bar Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of Public Law 414, the so-called McCarran immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the General Society of the Sons of the Revolution, New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposal that the United Nations flag be displayed over American school buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Western New England Region of Hadassah, at Blantyre, Mass., favoring the repeal of the so-called McCarran immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the grand lodge of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, Sons of Italy in America, praying for the enactment of House bill 7376, of the Eighty-second Congress, to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota-immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and establishing a Special Migration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Local Union 266, International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, at Russellville, Ala., relating to the McCarran committee investigating subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Carson Bounds Post 4396, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Philadelphia, Miss., relating to methods employed by the United States Civil Service Commission in establishing rosters of eligibles for postmaster appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Resolutions adopted by the Western Association of State Highway Officials, in Seattle, Wash., relating to the protection of watersheds from fire, overcutting, overgrazing, and other forms of abuse and to work toward restoring damaged areas, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Resolutions adopted by the American Jewish Congress, South Shore Women's Division, Arverne, Long Island, and the South Shore Women's Division, Far Rockaway, both in the State of New York, favoring a revision of the Senate rules to limit debate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The memorial of J. B. Bridston, and sundry other citizens of the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the seating of Senator LANGER as a Member of the Senate for the term beginning January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN BUILDERS ASSOCIATION ON FHA, TITLE I, FUNDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the building trades constitute a cornerstone of American prosperity.

The private builders of this Nation have written some of the finest chapters in the story of the American free-enterprise system. I have in my hand a resolution which has been adopted by the home-finance committee of the Milwaukee Builders Association and which has been forwarded to me here in Washington and to the National Association of Home Builders.

In a message to me accompanying the resolution, Mr. Roy F. Healy, executive vice president, supplemented the appeal of his associates for extension of appropriations under FHA, title I. I feel sure that my colleagues in the Congress will give their early and sympathetic attention to this and similar messages.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 23, 1952.

Re FHA, title I.
MORTGAGE FINANCE COMMITTEE,
National Association of Home Builders,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The following resolution was presented by the home finance committee of the Milwaukee Builders' Association and approved by the board of directors for forwarding to your committee, with the request that you give it your serious consideration:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas FHA, title I, section 2A, of the National Housing Act, stipulates in part that the aggregate amount of the principal obligations of all loans under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $1,250,000,000; and

"Whereas, about September 1952, the amount of outstanding loans reached the maximum allowable under the act; and

"Whereas, all loans reported in for insurance after the maximum was reached had to wait their turn as the payoffs of loans reduced the maximum total; and

"Whereas the liquidation of outstanding loans is approximately $75,000,000 per month; and

"Whereas any loan reported in excess of this amount monthly would have to wait their turn and be insured under future months' payoffs, thus building up large volume of uninsured loans; and

"Whereas because of the war years, shortages of materials and labor, much work scheduled for improvement of American homes has been needlessly delayed; and

"Whereas within the last year there has been a tremendous increase in the use of FHA, title I, loans: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the immediate extension of additional funds would provide for the continued employment of American building trades workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the movement under way to improve the American home can continue without further undue interruption; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the home finance committee of the Milwaukee Builders' Association respectfully requests the board of directors of said association to petition our national association, through its officers, to appeal to Congress that additional FHA, title I funds be appropriated at the earliest possible date in the next session; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of the above resolution be forwarded to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, the Honorable JOSEPH MCCARTHY, the Honorable CHARLES KERSTEN, and the Honorable ANDREW ZABLOCKI."

Adopted and approved by the Milwaukee Builders' Association board of directors on October 30, 1952.

ROY F. HEALY,
Executive Vice President.

REPORT ON ALUMINUM EXPANSION PROGRAM AND COMPETITION (H. REPT. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, a report on the aluminum expansion program and competition.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION (S. REPT. NO. 6)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, I submit, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, a report of that joint committee relating to social insurance policies and the railroad retirement system, and I request that it be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and, without objection, will be printed as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

REPORT OF STUDY OF CONSUMER COMMODITY PRICES AND MARGIN SPREADS (S. REPT. NO. 2)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, a report of a study of consumer commodity prices and margin spreads.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report just laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore be printed with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (S. REPT. NO. 3)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, a report of that committee, together with a report from each agency performing functions under authority of that act.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report just laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore be printed with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS RELATING TO SENATE ACTION ON HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS (S. REPT. NO. 4)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report relating to the Senate action on the Hoover Commission reports, and request that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 5)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report relating to the activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and request that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT OF DELEGATION ATTENDING COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION MEETING IN OTTAWA, CANADA (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, last summer, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, the Vice President appointed a delegation of four Senators to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Ottawa, Canada, on September 12 and 13. I was appointed as chairman of the delegation. I now submit our report to the Senate, and ask unanimous consent to have the report printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was one of the members of the Senate delegation to the Ottawa meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, on which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who was chairman of our group, has just submitted a report to the Senate.

I should like to take just a moment at this time to add a word expressing my personal appreciation of the opportunity which was given me to serve on our delegation and to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the splendid way in which he discharged his duties as our chairman.

We did not go to Ottawa, by right, as members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We went by invitation, as guests, and we were present for only 2 days of discussions which lasted a full week. On those 2 days, the subject was International Affairs and Defense.

The delegates who were assembled there from all over the world—representing 48 parliaments of the British Commonwealth—were an exceptionally able group of men and women. They included members not only from the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, but also from India and Pakistan, and from Malaya, the Gold Coast, Jamaica, and others, as well.

It was as diverse a group as one could imagine, Mr. President, with different backgrounds and different problems, but held together by a common interest in the success of representative government. The discussions were frank and vigorous; and there were, of course, differing viewpoints which were presented forcefully and honestly.

The whole experience was intensely interesting and stimulating, and I think I gained an insight into some of the problems of the world which I did not have previously, and which will be extremely helpful to me in discharging my duties as a Senator.

I commend the meetings of this and like associations to all other Members of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 251. A bill to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 252. A bill to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 253. A bill for the relief of O/Y Concrete A/B;

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Kristine Lea Kimball;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus C. Karde and Ingeborg Karde;

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan;

S. 258. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Wasiel;

S. 259. A bill for the relief of Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich; and

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 261. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 262. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Green River watershed in Kentucky and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 263. A bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide price support for 1953 and 1954 crops of oats, rye, and barley at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 264. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the State of Maryland to the Disney-Bell Post, No. 66, of the American Legion, Bowie, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 265. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant;

S. 266. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant;

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis;

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn;

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Raoul Rigler; and

S. 270. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 271. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late George Herman (Babe) Ruth; and

S. 272. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 273. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands on the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 274. A bill to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 275. A bill to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 277. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing more equitable schedules of salaries for teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools, and to promote the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Sayga (Saul) Morgenstern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. CLEMENTS):

S. 279. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 280. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 281. A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 283. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Dario Del Basso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 285. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 286. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 287. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Miho Koshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 289. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to provide further relief for persons in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 290. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 291. A bill to amend the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 292. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 293. A bill to extend the period within which courses of instruction may be initiated pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by certain veterans unable to avail themselves of such educational benefits because of illness or physical disability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 294. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within original State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for jurisdiction, use, and control of

the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying outside of the original State boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 295. A bill for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 296. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 298. A bill to afford the taxpayer the right to determine the period of useful life of property in computing deductions for depreciation under the income-tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 299. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States;

S. 300. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, serving outside continental United States or in Alaska; and

S. 301. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Emery and Keanor Nussbaum;

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Winternitz and Jonta Winternitz;

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 306. A bill for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe;

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Amy Beverley Wong;

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Pilolaos Tsolakis and his wife, Vassiliki Tsolakis;

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Betty Kiyoko Saito;

S. 310. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Romano;

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Francesco Palumbo;

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orsi;

S. 313. A bill for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori;

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowery;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Vera Lazaros and Cristo Lazaros;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Hans Horn;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Guenter Hoffman;

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Carlo di Luigi e di Beltrami Adalgisa Gola;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Robert David Franklin (Shunichi Tanimura);

S. 321. A bill for the relief of John Aristidis Dragazis;

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Anna Aiello;

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Rose Cohen; and

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Cary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 326. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor; and

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 329. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 330. A bill to provide for segregation of the interests of individual members of the various Indian tribes in funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of such tribes;

S. 331. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees;

S. 332. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; and

S. 333. A bill to repeal the act of August 9, 1946, providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 334. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 335. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 336. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service;

S. 337. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit the retirement of postal employees who have rendered at least 30 years of service;

S. 338. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit redeposit by reemployed annuitants of refunds of contributions and to allow credit for service covered by such redeposits;

S. 339. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees;

S. 340. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees;

S. 341. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948;

S. 342. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; and

S. 343. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Anna Josephine Vigo;

S. 345. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut;

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark;

S. 347. A bill for the relief of George Taipale;

S. 348. A bill for the relief of Antonios Lygizos;

S. 349. A bill for the relief of May Ling Ng;

S. 350. A bill for the relief of John Mroczek; and

S. 351. A bill for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation of functions relating to irrigation projects on Indian reservations; and

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to reopen certain lands in the State of Washington to entry under the mining laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORT FOR OATS, RYE, AND BARLEY AT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY DURING 1953 AND 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The bill proposes to place oats, barley, and rye crops in the same category as the six basic crops, namely, under the 90 percent of parity price support for 1953 and 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 263) to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide price support for 1953 and 1954 crops of oats, rye, and barley at 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

KEEPING OF DETAILED RECORDS AND FURNISHING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION BY CERTAIN PERSONS FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income-tax purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 274) to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. HUNT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HUNT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUNT

This bill requires that every person liable to a tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code on operators of wagering houses file an annual return listing daily records of gains and losses from wagering transactions, and keep records and make other returns as the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time prescribe. These records and returns will be subject to the penalties of perjury for any falsehoods contained therein.

The bill also contains a requirement that every person operating a wagering house illegally shall maintain records prescribed in accordance with the provisions of the bill. In addition, it is provided that all books and records of wagering houses shall be open to inspection by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This bill would have the effect of imposing a greater duty upon keepers of wagering establishments in the maintenance of records than on persons in other forms of business. An even greater duty is imposed upon persons engaged in illegal wagering transactions.

The basic problem raised by the bill is one of enforcement. But in any event, if the records required by the bill were kept, the BIR would have a convenient method of determining tax liability. If the records are not kept, a basis for prosecution would exist.

The Department of Justice was generally in accord with the bill, suggesting only minor and technical changes. There is no record of the Treasury Department's position on this bill. It would be charged with the enforcement.

FURTHER DEFINING THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to further define the national transportation policy. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 275) to further define the national transportation policy, introduced by Mr. HUNT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. HUNT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUNT

This bill amends the Transportation Act of 1940. It is known as the antiracketeering amendment. Its purpose is to establish as a matter of policy the intention of Congress that the transportation industry shall be kept free of terrorism, extortion, racketeering, or similar unlawful or unethical business tactics.

This bill adds a statement to the national transportation policy but contains no specific implementing authority. Since the declaration of policy sets the scope and purpose of the entire act, within which the Interstate Commerce Commission is required to administer and enforce its provisions, the bill should have the effect of strengthening the position of the ICC in dealing with the above-mentioned practices. The bill would have little practical application to the railroads but would broaden the ICC's authority with respect to motor carriers, water carriers, and freight forwarders.

The Department of Justice, with limited suggestions, favored the enactment of this legislation.

The committee's comments are contained in Report No. 721 (82d Cong., 1st sess.); the comments of the Justice Department in a letter dated March 13, 1952 (not reprinted in the report).

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES OR LOSSES INCURRED IN ILLEGAL WAGERING

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 276) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering, introduced by Mr. HUNT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HUNT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUNT

This bill would amend section 23 (a) and 23 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code. It would provide for the disallowance of expenses or disbursements incurred by a taxpayer as a result of illegal wagering, and also require taxation on gains from illegal wagering transactions without regard to losses similarly incurred. It would apply to amateurs as well as professionals, but its primary impact would be on professionals.

It would have the effect of taxing persons engaged in the business of illegal gambling upon their gross receipts. Salaries, rents, and other expenses incident to the operation of the illegal gambling business could not be deducted in arriving at the amount on which the tax is to be computed. The net result, in general, would be that the tax due would exceed the amount of net income earned. Professional gamblers operating illegally would be forced to discontinue operations or to violate the law.

Denying a deduction for losses or—in the terminology of the professional gambler—"paid-outs," the effect would be a tax on all money received whether or not it is retained. Some question may be raised as to whether such money so received is income within the meaning of the sixteenth amendment. Furthermore, it is unlikely that persons having gambling losses in excess of gambling gains would pay a tax on the gains when they are forbidden to take their losses into account.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing more equitable schedules of salaries for teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools, to promote the general welfare, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 277) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing more equitable schedules of salaries for teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools, and to promote the general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I have today introduced a bill which would give Federal aid for a specific purpose—to help raise public-school teachers' salaries.

For over 30 years Congress has been considering general Federal-aid-to-education bills. I, myself, have sponsored several comprehensive Federal-aid bills, but no comprehensive Federal-aid-to-education legislation has passed Congress. Yet, the need for Federal aid to education continues to demand the Nation's attention.

There are many fields in which Federal aid is needed, but I am convinced that there are five fields in which the need is most pressing. These fields are:

1. Aid for public-school teachers' salaries.
2. Aid for public-school construction.
3. Aid to provide funds for scholarships and loans for worthy, needy students.
4. Aid to help eradicate adult illiteracy in United States.
5. Aid to provide essential service for all children in America to protect and promote their health and welfare.

It is essential that each need to be met be expressly provided in a Federal-aid bill, lest any State decide to use all of the funds granted for one of these purposes, or for general maintenance. Actually, the Federal-aid bill which the Senate passed in the Eighty-first Congress does not assure a single teacher one cent from the total fund as an increase in his or her pay. It does not assure a single service to any child in the United States.

Now I voted for the bill because it was the only Federal-aid bill which I had a chance to vote on, and I hoped the House would write more specific provisions into it. Let me emphasize that unless the law expressly provides for the use of the money appropriated for teachers' salaries, we cannot be sure that one cent will be used for that purpose. I base this statement on the decision of the United States Supreme Court in a case arising in Washington State.

The Case of Kings County, Washington v. *Seattle School District* (263 U. S. 361) establishes the need for stating specifically what the Federal money is to be used for. This case grew from a special Federal appropriation to the State of Washington, "for education, roads, and bridges." All three purposes were named in the bill, and, at first, all three purposes were equally served from the Federal funds. However, soon thereafter, the practice was started of cutting down on the sum allowed for education, and later for bridges. Finally, not one cent of the money allocated in the total fund was given for education. The board of education decided to take the case to court, and carried the case to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled that if the State uses all of the funds for any one authorized item it does not have to use any of the sum for the other two authorized purposes. By similar reasoning, it follows that if the bill authorizes funds for school maintenance and teachers' salaries, that the State may use all of the sum for school maintenance so as not to increase the State's appropriation for maintenance and deny the teachers one cent of increase.

It is not the intent, I believe, of the Members of the United States Senate, to support Federal aid for education to make it possible for any State to deny to the public-school teachers of any State any increase in their salaries through a Federal aid bill. Yet, the only way to assure to the teachers that they will receive an increase in pay through a Federal aid appropriation is to have the law expressly require such payments. This requirement is the basis of my bill.

Yet, judging from the action of our Congress, I now realize that while some Members may accept a general bill with specific purposes for the use of authorized funds precisely set forth, and many others would take a chance on letting the several States each allocate the funds as may be desired, that more and more Members are eager to have a chance to vote on each provision for which Federal aid is needed in a separate bill.

There is a growing feeling that each provision should be voted up or down on its own merits. I have, therefore, introduced the bill which appears to me to provide aid where it is sorely needed, to raise the salaries of public-school teachers. I cannot see how the principle in such a bill can be controversial.

I had, in this bill, introduced another basic principle in relation to the distribution of funds.

I believe the funds given to each State should not only recognize the relative need of the State among the several States, but we should also serve as a means of help and requiring a State to more nearly equalize salaries within the State.

In some of our richest States today, teachers are paid less than $150, some even less than $100, a month. I am most concerned with helping raise the salaries of the lowest paid classroom teacher. This, the bill I am now introducing, will provide aid for just this group. As for the other four needs which I have mentioned, and I feel must be met, I believe they will be taken care of in other legislation. Today, however, I plead for American public-school teachers and the children they teach. The teachers in the elementary and secondary schools of our country must be paid a more nearly adequate salary if we are to retain thousands of qualified teachers now serving our people and if we are to attract capable men and women to the teaching profession. I believe that aid for public elementary and high-school teachers' salaries is most essential today and I shall press for early consideration of my bill.

COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 295) for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service considered a bill which I introduced providing for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes. In brief, it proposed to set up a Commission well diffused geographically, and also as to occupation and profession, to consider the matter in all its aspects and then to make a report and a finding. That bill was favorably reported, and it was on the calendar throughout the second session of the Eighty-second Congress. Quite a number of Senators made an endeavor, of course, to obtain favorable action, but for reasons that do not have to be enumerated now, no action was had. So I have now introduced that same bill, as amended by the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that if I become chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I can assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the committee will give early consideration to the matter, and hold hearings, if necessary. The subject will be given immediate consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce.

This proposal is a major item in the legislative program of the railroads. It is controversial legislation. I introduce it by request so that it may receive the consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce; introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

USEFUL LIFE OF PROPERTY IN COMPUTING DEDUCTIONS FOR DEPRECIATION UNDER INCOME-TAX LAWS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to afford the taxpayer the right to determine the period of useful life of property in computing deductions for depreciation under the income-tax laws. I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 298) to afford the taxpayer the right to determine the period of useful life of property in computing deductions for depreciation under the income-tax laws, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR ON BILL TO AMEND SECTION 23 (l), INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The effect of the bill, if enacted into law, would be to give to the taxpayer the right to determine the period of useful life of his property for which he is allowed to take a deduction for depreciation under section 23 (l) of the code. However, the bill imposes certain limitations. In the case of real property, the taxpayer would have to select a period of useful life of not less than 5 years nor more than 50 years. In the case of personal property, the taxpayer would have to select a period of useful life of not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years. The taxpayer's determination of the useful life of any particular piece of property, if within the permissible periods described above, would be binding upon all tax-collection officers. It would also be binding upon the taxpayer, in that once having selected the period of useful life of a particular piece of property he could not later select a different period of useful life for that piece of property, unless he secured the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury to do so.

This change in the present law would, under the bill, be effective for all taxable years which begin after December 31, 1952. However, the change would apply only to property which, in the hands of the taxpayer, first becomes the subject of the depreciation deduction in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1952. That is, the change would not apply to property of the taxpayer with respect to which he took a deduction for depreciation in a taxable year which began before January 1, 1953. The change in law would apply to property which the taxpayer acquires in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1952, and to property which he acquired in a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1953, but which

first becomes the subject of a depreciation deduction in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1952.

DISCLOSURE OF SOURCES OF INCOME BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would require Members of Congress and other top Government officials to file reports disclosing their sources of income, receipt of gifts, assets held individually or with another person, transactions in securities and commodities, and all funds, in whatever form, subject to their use.

I believe that the American people would feel very much more assured that there was not corruption in Government if high Government officials, including Members of Congress, were required to make public the sources and amounts of their incomes. I believe further that no man should run for public office unless he is willing to disclose to the American people the source of his income.

Since 1947 I have introduced measures to accomplish this purpose. Congress has taken no action on any of them. But the time has come for decisive action to be taken. The American people demand and deserve it.

This bill is an amplification of S. 2284 which I introduced for myself, and Senators DOUGLAS and HUMPHREY in October 1951. This new bill extends the proposed reporting requirements to gifts, all jointly held property, and funds available for the use of officials whether or not such funds constitute income for tax purposes. In addition, it is provided that the Comptroller General, who would be the custodian of such reports, issue regulations to insure that the reports would be available for public consumption, but not for private use.

The bill (S. 334) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN CAPITAL TRANSIT CO. LINES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is requested to (1) determine the extent of its power to make an investigation and study of, and its power to issue orders or take other action with respect to, the proposed cancellations of service by the Capital Transit Co. on lines N-8, O-2, Y-3, T-4, F-8, H-3, G-8, and X-8 in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, Md., and the District of Columbia; (2) make such investigation and study with respect to such proposed cancellations, and issue such orders or take such action pending the making of such investigation and study and upon the completion thereof, as it may determine to be within its powers and in the public interest; and (3) report to the Congress as soon as practicable the results of such investigation and study (including an account of any orders issued or action taken pending or upon completion thereof), together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE IN REGARD TO REPORTS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That paragraph 3 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate as shown on page 42 of the 1951 edition of the Senate Manual be and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House; nor may they strike out matter passed in identical form by both Houses, nor modify any such matter. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subparagraph (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order."

APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVERS AND TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining the feasibility of (1) appointing on a permanent basis, in each judicial district, one or more receivers who would serve in equity receivership cases, or as trustees in proceedings under chapter X of the Bankruptcy Act, in the United States district court for such district, and who would be paid a salary by the United States for such services, and (2) of utilizing the services of the United States attorneys to represent and protect the interests of investors in enterprises involved in such cases.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1953, the joint committee created by Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, of the Eighty-second Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the twentieth day of January 1953, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, of the Eighty-second Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF EXPANDING FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, last Wednesday the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 25). I shall not take the time to read the statement which I have prepared relative thereto. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

On last Wednesday the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] introduced for himself and me a resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to make a thorough study of means and methods for increasing and expanding our international trade, through the operations of the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and such other agencies and devices as will promote and facilitate increased investments abroad and expand our international trade.

For a long time I have been convinced that the only way to establish a sound and enduring economic base for international peace, is to make possible in the economies of our allies what we have demonstrated works so well in our own economy—free and sufficient capital to utilize more fully the most efficient and modern industrial techniques. And by free capital I mean capital that is free to move to those areas and those industries where the chances appear best for an adequate return on the money invested.

I agree, and I have so voted on the foreign aid bills before this body, that our Nation, in the name of Christianity and simply in terms of being good neighbors and allies, had to provide a reasonable amount of charitable assistance to our friends across the sea. But, it seems to me, that the time is already overdue when, if we are to save our civilization, the countries of the world ought to get back to more normal trade conditions. It is incredible to expect self-respecting and sovereign nations to become stronger and soundly prosperous on programs of charity. There is no doubt in my mind that if we want to lick the world's economic problems we must use the tested economic tools that this Nation's economy has demonstrated and proven.

In 1951 when I reported my bill to increase the authorization of the Export-Import Bank and again in a discussion on the conference report on the mutual security bill, I emphasized the importance of promoting better economic conditions among our allies by encouraging the flow of private capital and

facilitating sound loans to industries. I am happy to see that others have come around to this same view and "trade not aid" is the accepted slogan of a progressive approach to our international economic problem.

The Export-Import Bank, can in my opinion, facilitate greatly the job of increasing our foreign-capital investment. Let me repeat and reiterate what I said on October 2, 1951, in my discussion on the mutual-security bill. I quote, "In the long years ahead I envision the Export-Import Bank as the most important single instrument for constructive international economic policy, if we help develop it to do its proper job. Good and sound international loans will develop good and sound businesses in every country throughout the world, and it can lead to most stable and sound international trade and international prosperity. We have to develop a sound-loan program as an alternative to a program of grants and a relatively unsound international-loan program, and I think the Export-Import Bank is the medium through which it can be developed."

Through our hearings and our study of the whole problem of foreign investment opportunities and ways of increasing international trade I am confident that we shall discover and develop ways of improving the climate for increased foreign investment, ways and means by which the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank can increase its activities and possibly develop and recommend to the Senate and to those committees involved some form of investment guaranty system or tax measures for the stimulation of private investment abroad.

There is much talk about doing something along these lines. I have recommended and supported programs to implement these aims in the past. It is my hope now, with the end of charitable devices in sight, that these goals may be achieved. The resolution the Senator from Indiana and I introduced means the time for action is at hand.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR McCARRAN AND EXPLANATIONS THEREOF

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 7, I introduced certain bills and resolutions, and I have introduced another bill today. I have prepared brief statements explanatory thereof, and I ask unanimous consent that in each case the full text of the measures together with the explanations may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bills, resolutions, and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3

A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) no citizen of the United States hereafter shall accept any office or employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof unless he has applied in writing to the Attorney General of the United States for, and has received from such officer, the security clearance required by this section.

(b) Under such regulations as the Attorney General shall prescribe, each application for security clearance filed pursuant to subsection (a) shall bear the fingerprints of the applicant, and shall contain a true and complete statement, executed by the applicant under oath, of the following information concerning such applicant:

(1) Each arrest, indictment, or conviction of the applicant for the violation or alleged violation of any law of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States other than a violation or alleged violation of any law or ordinance for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic punishable as a misdemeanor.

(2) Each membership held by the applicant at any time in any organization (A) teaching or advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, (B) registered as a Communist-action or Communist-front organization pursuant to section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, or (C) required by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to register pursuant to such section.

(3) Each name, other than the name subscribed upon such application, by which such applicant has been known.

(4) Each occasion on which the applicant has applied to the Government of the United States for a passport and has been denied such passport.

(5) The circumstances under which the applicant has been discharged or has resigned from any office or employment in or under the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

(6) Such other information as the Attorney General shall determine to be necessary for the purpose of ascertaining whether the occupancy by the applicant of any office or employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof would involve reasonable probability of danger to the security of the United States.

(c) Upon the filing of any application pursuant to this section, the Attorney General shall conduct as expeditiously as may be practicable such investigation as he shall deem necessary to ascertain whether in his opinion the occupancy by the applicant of any office or employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof would involve reasonable probability of danger to the security of the United States. If no such probability is determined to exist, the Attorney General shall furnish to the applicant a written statement of security clearance. If such probability is determined to exist, the Attorney General shall furnish to the applicant a written denial of his application together with a statement of his reason for such denial.

SEC. 2. Each citizen of the United States who, on the date of enactment of this act, occupies any office or is engaged in any employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof shall, within 60 days after such date, file with the Attorney General of the United States a registration statement in such form as the Attorney General shall prescribe. Each registration statement shall bear the fingerprints of the person filing such statement, and shall contain a true and complete statement, executed by such person under oath, of the following information concerning such person:

(a) The nature of the office or employment held by such person in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof.

(b) The period during which such office or employment has been held by such person.

(c) Each element of information specified in paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive, of subsection 1 (b) with respect to applicants for security clearance under section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) Whoever, being a citizen of the United States, shall accept any office or employment in or under the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof in violation of subsection 1 (a) of this act shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being a citizen of the United States and an officer or employee of the United Nations or any organ or agency thereof, shall willfully fail to comply with the requirements of section 2 of this act, or who shall aid, abet, or counsel any other such person to refrain from compliance with such requirements, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Whoever shall willfully make any false statement in any application or registration statement filed under this act, or willfully omit to state in any such application or registration statement any fact required by law or regulation to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements made or information given therein not misleading, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 3) to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes.

This bill is designed to implement the recommendations of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee with respect to this matter.

The terms of the bill are, I think, so clear as to be fully self-explanatory. It could do no harm, however, to point out that the bill proposes somewhat different treatment for two groups of persons, namely, those already employed by the United Nations, and those who may be or become applicants for employment with the United Nations. With respect to both groups, of course, the bill concerns itself only with United States employees.

I should like to say that after careful research of the question, I am satisfied this bill as introduced is entirely constitutional and does not exceed the bounds of proper legislation in the national interest.

In connection with this bill, reference is made to the text of the Internal Security Subcommittee's recommendations, which were as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee, considering it necessary to emphasize what it believes to have been a lack of alertness and a proper sense of responsibility on the part of the Department of State, recommends—

(1) That procedures be devised for giving the greatest possible degree of assurance that any and all information respecting the loyalty of any American citizen employee of an international organization be communicated to the proper authorities of the organization.

(2) That legislative safeguards be established to prevent future employment by international organizations, located in this country, of American nationals of questionable loyalty to the United States; and that a definite arrangement be entered into between the United States Government and international organizations, under which information concerning the records of all American applicants for employment should be submitted to responsible officials of the international organizations so that the security of the United States may be protected.

(3) That the inquiry and investigation thus far conducted by this subcommittee be continued in order to fix responsibility for any failure on the part of United States officials to prevent employment or continued service of American nationals of questionable loyalty with any international organization. Further, the continuing inquiry and investigation should relate to past policies and practices of departments and officials of the United States Government to determine whether they have been lacking in effectiveness insofar as American interests are concerned, and to ascertain in what respects such policies and practices should be changed.

(4) That the Senate reassert and take effective steps to implement its inherent power to compel the production of documents and information which it needs in the proper performance of its functions, and to punish for contempt.

It may also be desirable to include in this statement the specific recommendations on this subject made by a Federal grand jury of the southern district of New York in a presentment handed up December 2, 1952. These recommendations were:

(a) No citizen of the United States shall hereafter be permitted to accept employment with the United Nations or any of its various divisions and departments or specialized agencies without prior clearance by a designated body of our own United States Government.

(b) That before a United States citizen may accept employment with the United Nations, he should be required to fill out an applicaiton form containing the questions designated to elicit the following information:

(1) Does the applicant have a criminal record? (And there should be the customary fingerprinting test as a supplement to this question.)

(2) Is or was the applicant a member of any organization teaching and advocating the overthrow of the United States by force and violence?

(3) Was applicant ever known by any other name?

(4) Was applicant ever denied a passport by the United States Government?

(5) Has applicant ever been discharged or resigned from any United States Government employment, and if so, under what circumstances?

(c) The recommendations made in (b) as to future applicants shall be applied at earliest opportunity to all present United States citizens employed in the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

S. 4

A bill to deny income-tax exemption to certain organizations which make donations to subversive organizations or individuals

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3815. Denial of exemption under section 101 (6) in the case of organizations making donations to subversive organizations or individuals.

"(a) Definitions: For the purposes of this section.—

"(1) Subversive organization: The term 'subversive organization' means any organization which (A) advocates, abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force or violence, or (B) is on the list of organizations furnished by the Attorney General pursuant to part III, section 3 of Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, or (C) is registered (or required by a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to register) with the Attorney General under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

"(2) Subversive individual: The term 'subversive individual' means any individual who (A) advocates, abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force or violence, or (B) is a member of any subversive organization as defined in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or (C) is registered or required to be registered with the Attorney General under section 8 of the Subversive Activties Control Act of 1950.

"(3) Donation: The term 'donation' includes (A) any gift, contribution, or grant of money, property, services, or any other thing of value, and (B) any loan of money, property, services, or any other thing of value, other than a loan in the course of a bona fide business transaction.

"(b) Denial of exemption:

"(1) General rule: No organization which makes a donation to any subversive organization or to any subversive individual shall be exempt from taxation under section 101 (6).

"(2) Exceptions: The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any donation made by an organization to—

"(A) an individual solely for charitable purposes to supply food, clothing, shelter, or other necessities for such individual or for members of his family or household; or

"(B) an individual solely for the purpose of providing medical or hospital services for such individual or for members of his family or household; or

"(C) an organization which furnishes to the donor organization in advance of such donation a sworn statement that it is not a subversive organization as defined in subsection (a) (1) of this section, unless the donor organization knows or has reasonable opportunity to know that such organization is a subversive organization; or

"(D) an individual who furnishes to the donor organization in advance of such donation a sworn statement that he is not a subversive individual as defined in subsection (a) (2) of this section, unless the donor organization knows or has reasonable opportunity to know that such individual is a subversive individual.

For the purposes of this subsection, an organization shall, with respect to the making of any donation, be charged with the knowledge or opportunity to know of any officer, agent, or employee of such organization who actively participates in the making of such donation.

"(3) Taxable years affected: A denial of exemption under section 101 (6) by reason of this section shall be effective for taxable years commencing with the taxable year during which the Secretary, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, determines that an organization has made a donation to which the provisions of this subsection are applicable.

"(c) Future status of organization denied exemption: Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any organization denied exemption under section 101 (6) by reason of this section may, during any taxable year following the taxable year in which exemption is denied, file claim for exemption, and if the Secretary, pursuant to such regulations, is satisfied that there is no reason for believing that such organization will again make a donation which would be grounds for denial of exemption by reason of this section, such organization shall be exempt under section 101 (6) with respect to taxable years subsequent to the taxable year in which such claim is filed.

"(d) Disallowance of certain charitable, etc., deductions: No gift or bequest for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes (including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals), otherwise allowable as a deduction under section 23 (o) (2), 23 (q) (2), 162 (a), 505 (a) (2), 812 (d), 831 (a) (3), 1004 (a) (2) (B), or 1004 (b) (2) or (3), shall be allowed as a deduction if made to an organization during a taxable year of such organization in which it is not exempt under section 101 (6) by reason of this section, unless such gift or bequest is made prior to the date of the Secretary's determination under subsection (b) (3) that such organization has made a donation to which the provisions of subsection (b) are applicable."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 23 (o) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(b) Section 23 (q) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "section 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(c) Section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "sections 3813 and 3814" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 3813, 3814, and 3815".

(d) Section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "section 23 (ee);" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "section 23 (ee). For disallowance of certain charitable, etc., deductions otherwise allowable under this subsection, see section 3815;".

(e) Section 505 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(f) Section 812 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(g) Section 861 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(h) Section 1004 (a) (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

(i) Section 1004 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "sections 3813" the following: ", 3815,".

SEC. 3. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this act. The provisions of section 3815 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by this act, shall be applicable only with respect to donations (as defined in section 3815 (a) (3)) made after the date of enactment of this act.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 4) to deny income-tax exemption to certain organizations for making donations to subversive organizations or individuals.

Let me say at the outset that I am fully cognizant of the fact that since this legislation is, in terms, an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, though it has a purpose basically concerned with internal security, it must originate in the House of Representatives. That does not mean there is anything improper in the introduction of the bill in the Senate, but only that I recognize that the bill as such cannot be reported out of the Senate committee under its Senate number. It could be reported by the Senate committee as an amendment to any revenue bill which had passed the other body and come here for consideration. I do not anticipate that any such expedient will become necessary. I am hopeful that the bill may be introduced in the other body under the sponsorship of a Member or Members of that body and that it may have early and favorable consideration by the proper committee of the other body.

This bill deals with a subject which was originally opened up by hearings of the Senate Committee on Internal Security of which I have had the honor to be chairman. This same question has been the subject of further inquiry by a committee of the other body. In my opinion, the record as it stands amply justifies the enactment of the proposed legislation.

With regard to certain questions which may be raised in connection with this proposed legislation, I want to quote from a memorandum prepared for me by Mr. Harry B. Littell, assistant legislation counsel of the Senate. Mr. Littell's memorandum states:

"It has long been established that the Congress can validly grant exemptions to the income taxes and excise taxes which are otherwise generally imposed. *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy Co.* ((1911) 220 U. S. 107, 173); *Brushaber* v. *Union Pacific R. R.* ((1916) 240 U. S. 1, 21). The granting of tax exemptions is a matter of legislative grace, and the

burden is upon the taxpayer to show that he qualifies under the law for an exemption. *United States* v. *Community Services Inc.* ((1951) 189 F. 2d 421, 425).

While we have been unable to find any cases specifically on the question of the power of the Congress to remove an exemption already granted, there are numerous recent instances of the exercise of this power by the Congress. Thus, the Revenue Act of 1951 removed, or limited, the tax exemption of certain cooperatives, mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperative banks. The Revenue Act of 1950 provided for loss of exemption by certain organizations if they engaged in specified prohibited transactions, such as lending any part of their income or corpus to the creators of the organizations without exacting adequate security. The same act subjected to tax that portion of the income of certain exempt organizations derived from specified classes of business transactions unrelated to the functions forming the basis of exemption of such organizations.

The granting of tax exemptions being a matter of legislative discretion, it follows that the Congress can validly impose conditions which must be met by an organization seeking to establish its qualification for an exempt status or which must be met by a tax-exempt organization in order to maintain its exempt status. It may be argued that it is not within the scope of the proper exercise of the taxing power for the Congress to enact legislation which bases the denial or withdrawal of a tax-exempt status upon the making of donations to a subversive organization or individual. However, it must be remembered that the granting of tax exemptions as a corollary of the exercise of the taxing power has been based largely upon the premise of giving support to persons and organizations performing functions considered to be in the general public good. When the Congress concludes that an organization enjoying a tax-exempt status is engaged in activities which do not benefit the general public good, it is our opinion that the Congress can, by general legislation, terminate the organizations' tax-exempt status.

The due process clause of the fifth amendment of the Constitution is not a limitation upon the taxing power, also granted by the Constitution, except where the exercise of the taxing power is so arbitrary as to amount to a confiscation of property or where there is such a lack in basis of classification as to produce a gross and patent inequality having the same result. *Brushaber* v. *Union Pacific R. R.* (1916) 240 U. S. 1, 24. We think that an act which denies or removes tax exemption in the case of certain organizations otherwise entitled to exemption because of donations made by such organization to subversive organizations or individuals constitutes a permissible classification for tax purposes and is not a denial of due process.

S. 5

A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$25,500" and substituting therefor the figures "$35,000", and by striking out therefrom the figures "$25,000" and substituting therefor the figure "$30,000".

SEC. 2. Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$17,500" and substituting therefor the figures "$22,500".

SEC. 3. Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$15,000" and substituting therefor the figures "$20,000", and by striking out therefrom the figures "$15,500" and substituting therefor the figures "$20,500".

SEC. 4. Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$17,500" and substituting therefor the figures "$22,500".

SEC. 5. Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$17,500" and substituting therefor the figures "$22,500".

SEC. 6. Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$15,000" and substituting therefor the figures "$20,000".

SEC. 7. The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$15,000" and substituting therefor the figures "$20,000".

SEC. 8. Section 3 of the act approved May 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 220), as amended, relating to the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands, is amended by striking out therefrom the figures "$15,000" and substituting therefor the figures "$20,000".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 1102 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Salary: Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum".

(b) The act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 716), is hereby repealed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 5) to provide for an increase in the salaries of judges of the United States.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for a $5,000 increase in the annual salary of each member of the Federal judiciary and for an increase of $9,500 in the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States. The increase for the Chief Justice of the United States is because of the additional burdens attendant to that office. For example, the Chief Justice is Chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The important factor in favor of increase in judicial salaries is that fixed salaries for a long period of years have been diminished salaries so far as purchasing power is concerned. Figures made available by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the Consumers' Price Index for moderate-income families in large cities as of December 15, 1937, stood at 103, and as of November 15, 1948, the index stood at 172.2.

The last raise granted to the judiciary was by the act of July 3, 1946, and since that time the cost of living has increased.

Although a number of comparisons could be made, the following indicates that the increase in salary provided for by this legislation is a proper increase.

The presiding judge of the Supreme Court of New York, appellate division, first and second departments, receives an annual salary of $31,500; the associate judges receive salaries of $30,000. The chief judge of the Court of Appeals of New York receives $25,000 plus $3,000 expenses, and the associate judges receive $25,000 plus $3,000 expenses. The justices of the Supreme Court of New York, the trial court of general civil jurisdiction, in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County, receive salaries of $28,000 a year in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey receives $25,000 a year and the associate justices of that court receive $24,000 a year. The judges of the superior court, the trial court of general jurisdiction, receive $20,000 a year. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania receives $23,500 a year, while the associate justices receive $23,000. The judges of the Court of Common Pleas of the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties, a trial court of general civil jurisdiction, receive salaries of $16,500 a year.

In addition to the foregoing, there is recommended and provided for in this legislation, an increase of $5,000 in the salaries of the following judicial positions: The judges of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Customs Court, the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court for the Virgin Islands, and The Tax Court of the United States.

S. 15

A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit and two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

"Circuits	Number of judges
• • • • •	
Fifth	Seven
• • • • •	
Ninth	Nine
• • • • •	

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, one additional district judge for the district of Delaware, one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, one district judge (who shall reside at Norfolk) for the eastern and western districts of Virginia, one additional district judge for the western district of Washington, and one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

(2) The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the western district of Virginia shall not be filled.

(3) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), and the existing judgeship for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall be permanent judgeships.

(4) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States

Code will reflect the changes made by this subsection in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
California:	
* * * * *	
Southern	11
* * * * *	
Colorado	2
* * * * *	
Delaware	3
* * * * *	
Florida:	
* * * * *	
Southern	4
* * * * *	
Indiana:	
Northern	2
Southern	2
* * * * *	
Missouri:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and Western	2
* * * * *	
Nevada	2
* * * * *	
New Jersey	7
* * * * *	
Ohio:	
Northern	5
* * * * *	
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	9
* * * * *	
Western	5
* * * * *	
Texas:	
* * * * *	
Eastern	2
Southern	4
* * * * *	
Virginia:	
* * * * *	
Western	1
Eastern and Western	1
Washington:	
* * * * *	
Western	3
* * * * *	
West Virginia:	
* * * * *	
Northern and Southern	1
Wisconsin:	
Eastern	2
* * * * *"	

(b) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of New Mexico. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(2) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the southern district of New York. The first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(3) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(4) The second sentence of section 102 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: "Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Bay City, Port Huron, and Flint."

(5) The last sentence of section 128 (b) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Tacoma and at one other place in such division to be designated by the district judges for the western district of Washington."

(6) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

(7) The present incumbent of the judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

(8) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; title 48, U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"There is established a district court for the District of Alaska with the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States and with general jurisdiction in civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty causes; and five district judges shall be appointed for the district, each at an annual salary of $15,000. The court shall consist of four divisions, which shall also be recording divisions. Two of the judges of the court shall be assigned by the President to the third division and one each shall be assigned by the President to the first, second, and fourth divisions. During the terms of office these judges shall reside in the divisions of their district to which they may be respectively assigned."

SEC. 4. The act entitled "An act to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and to provide for the appointment of an additional United States district judge for the eastern, middle, and western district of Pennsylvania," approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 654), is amended by adding at the end of section 2 a new sentence to read as follows: "If a vacancy arises in the office of district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania while the judge appointed pursuant to this section is holding the office created by this section, such judge shall thereafter be a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania."

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 26 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1405y), is amended to read as follows:

"The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall hold office for the term of 8 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause, and a district attorney who shall hold office for the term of 4 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

(b) This section shall take effect upon its approval but shall not affect the term of any incumbent whose term has not yet expired.

SEC. 6. (a) Sections 371 and 372 of title 28, United States Code, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned.

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"§ 372. Retirement for disability; substitute judge on failure to retire

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who becomes permanently disabled from performing his duties may retire from regular active service, and the President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a successor.

"Any justice or judge of the United States desiring to retire under this section shall certify to the President his disability in writing.

"Whenever an associate justice of the Supreme Court, a chief judge of a circuit or the chief judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or Customs Court, desires to retire under this section, he shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

"A circuit or district judge, desiring to retire under this section, shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of his circuit.

"A judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court desiring to retire under this section, shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of his court.

"Each justice or judge retiring under this section after serving 10 years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, receive the salary of the office. A justice or judge retiring under this section who has served less than 10 years in all shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, receive one-half the salary of the office.

"(b) Whenever any judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who is eligible to retire under this section does not do so and a certificate of his disability signed by a majority of the members of the Judicial Council of his circuit in the case of a circuit or district judge, or by the Chief Justice of the United States in the case of the chief judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or Customs Court, or by the chief judge of his court in the case of a judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or Customs Court, is presented to the President and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Whenever any such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled. Any judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit, district, or court."

(b) The analysis of Chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding

§ 371 of such title, is amended by striking out the items "371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire." and "372. Retirement for disability.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"371. Resignation or retirement for age.

"372. Retirement for disability; substitute judge on failure to retire."

SEC. 7. Section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 373. Judges in Territories and possessions.

"Any judge of the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam or the District Court of the Virgin Islands and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years, continuously or otherwise, shall continue during the remainder of his life to receive the salary he received when he relinquished office.

"Any judge of any of such courts who is removed by the President of the United States upon the sole ground of mental or physical disability, or who fails of reappointment, shall be entitled, upon attainment of age 65 or upon relinquishing office if beyond age 65, (a) if his judicial service aggregated 16 years or more, to receive during the remainder of his life the salary he received when he relinquished office, or (b) if his judicial service aggregated less than 16 years but not less than 10 years, to receive during the remainder of his life that proportion of such salary which the aggregate number of years of his judicial service bears to 16.

"Service at any time in any of the courts referred to in the first paragraph, or in any other court under appointment by the President, shall be included in the computation of aggregate years of judicial service for the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 2. (a) The United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall henceforth be courts of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the terms of office of the district judges for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico in office at the time of approval of this act shall then terminate and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the District of Hawaii and one district judge for the District of Puerto Rico, all of whom shall hold office during good behavior.

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall not affect the right of any judge who resigned, retired, or failed of reappointment prior to the enactment of this act or who fails of reappointment under this section to continue to receive salary under the provisions of section 373 as originally enacted. Service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii or of the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico or of the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico shall be included in computing under sections 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a judge of one of said courts on the date of enactment of this act or who may thereafter be appointed as a circuit judge under section 44 or a district judge under section 133 of title 28, United States Code.

"(c) The second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico'."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have sent to the desk for appropriate reference a bill (S. 15) which provides for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges.

A similar bill, S. 1203, was introduced by me, and passed the Senate, in the Eighty-second Congress; but it did not pass the House. That legislation passed the Senate on October 9, 1951.

Practically all of the provisions of this legislation are in accord with the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. The legislation I am now introducing is the same as the legislation which was heretofore approved and passed by the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress, with the exception that there has been added to it the additional recommendations of the Judicial Conference, which were approved by that body in September 1952.

It would appear that the need for the circuit and district judges proposed in this bill is clear. It will be recalled that in Public Law 205 of the Eighty-first Congress certain additional circuit and district judges were provided, but as stated in the report on that legislation, it was intended only to take care of the very minimum needs for an efficient Federal judiciary. At that time Public Law 205 accomplished its purpose, and now a further survey of the situation, as time has progressed, calls for the additional legislation herein proposed in order to take care of numerous situations which are becoming acute and which were not specifically or adequately dealt with in the previous legislation.

Even with the relief given in past legislation, it is evident from the facts assembled that in a number of districts there are more cases than the judges can possibly handle and dispose of with the efficiency and dispatch desired. There is every evidence, both from the statistical standpoint and from the standpoint of human experience, that the past tendency toward a steady increase in the case load of our Federal courts will continue and grow more burdensome in the future. Failure to recognize the trend and provide for it might mean that in many cases justice might be so long delayed that the ends of justice might be largely defeated.

The Judicial Conference of the United States and the Office of the Director of the Administrative Office of United States Courts have each made a very careful study of the condition of the dockets of all the Federal courts going back over a period of the past several years. This study has been most comprehensive and has related to each and every district and each and every circuit. Of necessity, the most that this study can reveal is the cold data as to the number of cases filed, the number of cases disposed of, the number of cases pending, and related factual data. These studies cannot possibly take into account the various intangible factors which enter into any complete understanding of the over-all problem of the load being carried by each Federal judge. It is a known fact that in certain of the districts wherein wealth is concentrated or large corporations are located a great many tremendously large, important, and involved suits are filed primarily because of the location in the district of either the plaintiff or the defendant. In certain other districts there is an extremely heavy case load of criminal cases by reason of immigration-law violations. Other intangible factors, such as illness of judges, judges being assigned to other judicial duties, age, physical incapacity, and numerous other factors enter into the forming of the full and complete picture and a full and complete understanding of the problem.

This legislation also provides for changes in some of the provisions of title 28, United States Code, which have been recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and which should be brought to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary in considering the problem as a whole.

The need for this legislation has not depreciated since the Senate approved a bill in the last Congress, and in fact it is my opinion that the statistics will show that the condition has worsened. I am convinced that the need for additional judges is of paramount importance at this time and should be given early consideration.

S. 16

A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 3486, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3486. Testimony before Congress; immunity.

"No witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers and other records and documents before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground, or for the reason, that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows—

"(1) in the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that House, or

"(2) in the case of proceedings before a committee, that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least one member of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee.

shall by affirmative vote have authorized that such person be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which, after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, he is nevertheless compelled by direction of the presiding officer or the chair to testify. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination he is nevertheless so compelled to testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"No official paper or record required to be produced hereunder is within the said privilege.

"No person shall be exempt from prosecution or punishment for perjury or contempt committed in so testifying."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before congressional committees.

I am hopeful the Judiciary Committee may see fit to report this proposed new statute to the Senate in the near future. It is needed to correct a deficiency in existing law.

Without citing cases, and stating the matter simply, there is no question about the fact that the present immunity statute does not give a witness before a congressional committee a degree of protection which is as broad as his constitutional privilege; and therefore, the present statute does not accomplish its purpose of putting a congressional committee in a position to require a witness to testify, even with respect to matters which might incriminate him.

This proposed legislation would cure that situation by giving such a witness immunity as broad as his constitutional privilege.

The important difference between this proposal and the existing congressional immunity statute is that the existing law provides, in effect, only that no testimony which the witness gives may be used against him in any subsequent criminal prosecution; whereas the proposed new law adopts the language which has been approved by the Supreme Court in several instances and provides that the witness shall not be prosecuted on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify under the circumstances set forth in the bill.

The proposed new law is carefully worded so that the witness would not get an immunity bath by the mere fact of testifying. He would have to raise specially his claim to privilege. That would put the committee on notice that it was faced with a decision as to whether, for the greater good, the witness should be required to testify, and thereby be given an immunity bath with respect to the matters concerning which he testified; or whether it was better to excuse the witness from testifying, and seek the information elsewhere, in order to preserve possible rights of criminal action against the witness.

This will be, of course, a serious decision in any case; but at the present time, under the existing congressional immunity statute, a committee has no choice at all. Even though a committee should decide that it is necessary to let a particular witness get immunity from possible wrongdoing, in order to elicit testimony of importance to the committee, there is actually no way in which the committee can compel such testimony if, in fact, it touches upon some previous wrongdoing of the witness in such a way as to incriminate him within the meaning of the constitutional provision.

Congress must have a way to meet this situation. My bill will provide it.

S. 17

A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies

Be it enacted, etc., That the definitions in the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to the same terms used in this act.

SEC. 2. Rules of practice and procedure for agencies: The Commission established by section 3 of this act shall formulate, and transmit to the Attorney General for report to Congress, general rules of practice and procedure for agencies, including forms and such rules as it may deem appropriate in agencies respecting judicial proceedings for the enforcement or review of agency action. Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify substantive powers or limitations respecting any agency nor may they provide or withdraw authority to hold hearings or to issue compulsory process. Unless previously disapproved by concurrent resolution of Congress, the rules so formulated shall take effect 10 days after the adjournment sine die of any regular session of Congress at which, within 30 days of the beginning of such session, they shall have been reported to Congress by the Attorney General. After rules so become effective all laws and agency rules or practices in conflict therewith shall, to the extent of such conflict, be of no further force or effect except in the case of an agency proceeding initiated prior to such effective date. Additions, repeals, or amendments shall be formulated and shall become effective in the same manner. So far as any administrative function is exempt from such general rules by statutory definition or by a provision of the rules, they shall nevertheless be treated as models for adoption to the extent that the policy of this act and the ends of justice would be served.

SEC. 3. Administrative Rules Commission: For the purposes of section 2 of this act there is hereby established a commission composed of (1) the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives or, in case one or more of them declines to serve, the next ranking member of the committee on the majority or minority side, as the case may be, until four shall accept; (2) one of the Assistant Attorneys General who has served as such not less than 2 years, designated by the Attorney General; (3) the head of an independent agency who has served more than one term of office as such, designated by the President; (4) the senior chief judge of the judicial circuits or, in case he declines to serve, the next in seniority until one agrees to serve; (5) a dean of a law school, designated by the President; and (6) a practicing lawyer versed in Federal administrative law and representative of the legal profession, designated by the President, who shall not be subject to title 18, United States Code, section 283, or any similar prohibition. Members of the Commission shall receive no compensation other than reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission except that members not drawing compensation from the United States for personal services shall be paid $50 per diem in lieu of subsistence. The Commission shall elect a chairman and secretary from among their number and, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act, shall appoint, and fix the compensation of, such professional and clerical assistants as may be necessary for the performance of its duties. The Commission shall also provide for, and collaborate with, voluntary and uncompensated advisory committees representative of Government agencies and private or professional interests. The Attorney General shall be responsible for the Commission's quarters, facilities, and budget. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000, as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 17) which would provide for general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies. An identical bill was introduced in the Eighty-second Congress and was passed by the Senate on June 21, 1951, but no action was taken thereon in the House.

Over the years in the field of law there has been and there is continuing a desire on the part of the bar for uniformity and simplicity in the rules of practice and procedure in our courts. So that practice and procedure could be readily understood and readily followed, Congress, by the Rules Act of 1934, provided for the formulation and operation of one set of uniform and simplified rules of civil procedure for all of the Federal trial courts. Not only was that act successful in its purpose; it also succeeded in finally closing the breach between law and equity which had prevailed for some 200 years. Because of the success of that 1934 Rules Act, in 1938 a similar project was proposed for the field of Federal criminal law. We have now a uniformity of practice and procedure in such widely different fields of law as equity, admiralty and criminal law, and variations and complexities have been reduced to an understandable system. Also during the years there has been a growth in the law dealing with administrative agencies. But our process of simplifying and unifying the rules of practice and procedure has stopped short of administrative agencies. With essential differentiation this bill is modeled after the statutes of 1934 and 1938, which implemented the similar purpose in the fields of criminal and civil procedure in Federal courts.

As indicated above, we have now in this country a new segment of the law, known as administrative law; and in this rapidly growing field these old questions and conflicts in the development of the legal system are being reenacted. In the field of administrative law we are just reaching the question as to how far the legislature should go in prescribing the rules to be followed. This, of course, is not because the legislatures have been hesitant but because administrative law is relatively new in its significance, scope and impact.

This readjustment which I propose will not smother the growing field of administrative law; it will, rather, strengthen it by giving it better recognition in our legal system, and the tools to perform its task. In some corners there has been apprehension that such a commission as here proposed should not be set up for the reason that no study has yet been made demonstrating the advisability and the practicability of adopting uniform rules of practice and procedure for Federal administrative agencies. Even these sources are in favor of procedural reform which will substitute order and certainty for needless differences and confusion. As an example, where the method of proceeding before administrative agencies is made uniform, it will save untold work and research on the part of the people who in their everyday business must appear before various different agencies which in themselves have adopted their own special rules.

Since the field of administrative law is the only remaining field that does not have uniform rules of practice and procedure, it is my opinion that a bill of this nature is extremely meritorious and should receive the full and favorable consideration of the Senate.

S. 25

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is hereby amended and incorporated as chapter XVI of such act, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER XVI—FARMER-DEBTOR RELIEF

"ARTICLE I—CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 901. The provisions of this chapter shall apply exclusively to proceedings under this chapter.

"SEC. 902. The provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, apply in proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, provisions relating to 'bankrupts' shall be deemed to relate also to 'debtors,' and 'bankruptcy proceedings' or 'proceedings in bankruptcy' shall be deemed to include proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, the date of the filing of the petition in bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the filing of an original petition under section 922 of this act, and the date of adjudication shall be taken to be the date of approval of a petition filed under section 921 or 922 of this act, except where an adjudication had previously been entered.

"ARTICLE II—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 906. For the purposes of this chapter, unless inconsistent with the context—

"(1) 'claims' shall include all claims of whatever character against the debtor or his property, whether or not such claims are provable as debts under section 63 of this act, and whether secured or unsecured, liquidated or unliquidated, fixed, or contingent;

"(2) 'unsecured creditor' shall mean the holder of any unsecured claim;

"(3) 'secured creditor' shall include the holder of any secured claim, and any purchaser at a judicial or official sale to whom the deed was not delivered at the time the

petition was filed to the extent of the money paid or credit received by such purchaser;

"(4) 'debtor' shall mean a farmer who files a petition under this chapter;

"(5) 'debts' shall include all claims;

"(6) 'executory contracts' shall include unexpired leases of real property;

"(7) 'farmer' shall mean an individual, or a partnership, or a corporation where actual farmers own at least 75 percent of its capital stock, and which farmer is primarily bona fide engaged in producing products of the soil, or in dairy farming, or in the production of poultry or livestock, or in the production of poultry or livestock products in their unmanufactured state, and the principal part of whose gross income is derived from any one or more of such operations, whether so engaged personally or as a tenant or by tenants, and shall include the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of any such deceased person so engaged at the time of his death in one or more of the foregoing operations: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this chapter shall not be available to a farmer whose sole interest in property, as hereinafter defined, is that of tenant;

"(8) 'individual' shall include common, joint, community, and entirety owners, provided that as to encumbered property all of such owners join in the petition so that the court will acquire jurisdiction over all interests in any affected encumbered property;

"(9) 'petition' shall mean a petition filed in a court of bankruptcy or with its clerk, by a debtor praying for the benefits of this chapter;

"(10) 'period of redemption' shall include any State moratorium, whether established by legislative enactment or executive proclamation, or where the period of redemption has been extended by judicial decree or as provided elsewhere in this chapter;

"(11) 'property' of a debtor shall include all his property, real or personal, wherever located, of every kind and nature, including but not limited to his interests in contracts for purchase, contracts for deed, conditional sales contracts, rights or equities of redemption, rights under trust deeds given as security, rights within a period of redemption which has not expired, rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, rights existing in case of sale which has not been confirmed or where a deed pursuant to sale has not been delivered; and

"(12) 'integral part or parcel' of a debtor's property shall not include only a portion of any contract lienholder's security.

"ARTICLE III—JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COURT

"SEC. 911. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the court in which the petition is filed shall, for the purposes of this chapter, have exclusive jurisdiction of the debtor and his property, wherever located.

"SEC. 912. Prior to the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers, where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication.

"SEC. 913. Upon the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 914. Upon the approval of a petition under this chapter, the court may, in addition to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties hereinabove and elsewhere in this chapter conferred and imposed upon it, permit the rejection of executory contracts of the debtor, upon notice to the parties to such contracts and to such other parties in interest as the court may designate.

"SEC. 915. Whenever notice is to be given under this chapter, if not otherwise specified hereunder, the court shall designate the time within which, the persons to whom, the form and manner in which the notice shall be given, and the contents of the notice. Any notice to be given under this chapter may be combined, whenever feasible, with any other notice or notices to be given under this chapter.

"SEC. 916. The judge may transfer a proceeding under this chapter to a court of bankruptcy in any other district, regardless of the residence of the debtor, if the interests of the parties will be best served by such transfer.

"SEC. 917. Where a petition is filed by the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, the consent of the court in which such estate is pending shall not be required.

"SEC. 918. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the jurisdiction of appellate courts shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding.

"ARTICLE IV—PETITION, APPROVAL, AND STAY

"SEC. 921. A debtor may file a petition under this chapter in a pending bankruptcy proceeding either before or after his adjudication.

"SEC. 922. If no bankruptcy proceeding is pending, a debtor may file an original petition under this chapter with the court in whose territorial jurisdiction he has resided or the principal part of his farming operations have occurred for the preceding 6 months or for a longer portion of the preceding 6 months than in any other jurisdiction. The filing of such petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $45, to be distributed by him as in the case of a bankruptcy proceeding.

"SEC. 923. A petition filed under this chapter shall state—

"(1) that the debtor is insolvent or unable to pay his debts as they mature and that he desires to avail himself of the benefits of this chapter; and

"(2) the nature and status of all pending proceedings affecting the property of the debtor known to him and the courts in which they are pending.

"SEC. 924. The petition shall be filed in triplicate and at the time it is filed, or within 10 days thereafter, the debtor shall file in triplicate—

"(1) a statement of the executory contracts of the debtor;

"(2) the schedules and statement of affairs, if not previously filed, including a statement of rights of redemption which have not expired and rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, and of deeds which have not been confirmed or delivered, and the property affected thereby;

"(3) where a petition is filed by the legal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, copies of his appointment by the probate court, of which the original shall be certified;

"(4) his claim of exemption;

"(5) if he does not desire to retain possession of all of his property, a statement of the unexempt property, or such integral part or parcel thereof, and of the encumbered exempt property, possession of which he desires to retain for the purposes of the proceeding under this chapter; and

"(6) the offer, including the terms of payment, of a fair and reasonable rental to be made by him for each separately encumbered portion of his property, and for his unencumbered unexempt property, of which he desires to retain possession. All rental shall be payable from the date of the filing of the debtor's petition.

"SEC. 925. In determining the rental to be offered, the debtor shall give due consideration to the market value of the debtor's property, the customary rental value of property of the same general character located in the community in which the debtor's property is located, the actual net income and earning capacity of the debtor's property, its depreciation or deterioration by reason of use or age, and such other factors which may be essential in arriving at a fair and reasonable rental value, and shall give due consideration, in fixing the periodic payments quarterly, semiannually, or annually, in advance or at the end of such period, to the availability of farm income.

"SEC. 926. Upon the filing of the petition by a debtor and upon compliance by the debtor with section 924 of this act the judge shall enter an order approving the petition if satisfied that the requirements of this chapter have been complied with or, if not so satisfied, dismissing it for want of jurisdiction.

"SEC. 927. A petition shall not be dismissed under section 926 of this act because of the distressed financial condition of the debtor, or because there is no reasonable expectation of his financial rehabilitation, or because he may have no equity in his property above the encumbrances and other liens against it, or because of any other ground of like nature.

"SEC. 928. In addition to the applicable relief of section 11 of this act and the relief elsewhere provided under this chapter, the filing of a petition by a debtor shall, for the purposes of a proceeding under this chapter, operate as a stay of a prior pending bankruptcy, mortgage foreclosure, or equity receivership proceeding and of any act or other proceeding to enforce a lien against any of the debtor's property, including the sale of any of the debtor's property under the terms of any mortgage, pledge, or deed of trust, and of the commencement or continuation of any act, suit, or proceeding against the debtor or his property until dismissal of the petition under section 926 of this act, or, if not so dismissed, then until further order of the court or until final decree dismissing or closing the proceeding under this chapter: *Provided, however*, That any exempt property of a debtor, whether or not encumbered, which he does not desire to retain in his possession, shall be wholly excluded from the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court without any order of the court other than the order setting aside the exemptions.

"SEC. 929. As to any property of the debtor, where, at the time of the filing of the debtor's petition, any legal or equitable action is pending, or steps toward selling under a power of sale in a mortgage or deed of trust have been taken but the sale has not become absolute, or a sale had not been confirmed, or a sale has been confirmed as provided in section 930 of this act, or the deed has not been delivered, or an executory contract has not been terminated, or the period of redemption has not expired, the plaintiff may dismiss such pending action without prejudice, or such pending action, such right to exercise the power of sale, such confirmation of sale, all proceedings and acts following confirmation of such sale as provided in section 930 of this act, the delivery of such deed, or the termination of such contract, shall be stayed or the period of redemption shall be extended for the period necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter, and until the termination of such stay the rights of any affected creditors and purchasers shall remain in the status which existed immediately prior to the filing of the petition, except as otherwise provided in this chapter. Any action taken in any of the matters mentioned in section 928 or in this section of this act after the filing of the petition and without prior approval of the court shall be of no legal force or effect, and the affected parties shall be restored to the status and to all legal and equitable rights they had immediately before the petition was filed.

"SEC. 930. Where any of his property, possession of which the debtor desires to retain, has been sold under a sale that requires

confirmation, but which has not been confirmed, the court shall make an order authorizing the interested parties to proceed with the confirmation of the sale by the proper court for the sole purpose of determining whether such sale should be confirmed and thereby fixing the rights of the purchaser and secured creditor for the purposes of this section. If the proper court refuses to confirm the sale, all further proceedings pertaining to said sale shall be stayed as provided in sections 928 and 929 of this act. Where any sale has been made prior to the time of filing the petition, but such sale had not been confirmed until after the filing of the petition or the deed had not been delivered, the purchaser at such sale, to the extent of the amount paid on the purchase price, shall be considered a secured creditor, and payments to be made by the debtor under an extension proposal in payment of claims against the property so sold shall be paid in redemption from such sale. Any redemption under this chapter shall be subject to any prior liens. The amount necessary to redeem shall be the amount bid at such sale, whether or not the purchaser has paid the full amount of his bid. If the purchaser has not paid the full amount of his bid, such purchaser shall be the claimant as to the amount paid by him, and the affected secured creditor shall be the claimant as to the difference between the amount so paid and the amount bid. The secured creditor who has caused such sale to be made shall be deemed an unsecured creditor as to any excess of the debt over the amount of the bid and such excess shall be deemed to be allowed as an unsecured claim.

"SEC. 931. Any sale that would have foreclosed junior lienholders had the debtor's petition not been filed shall nevertheless foreclose such junior lienholders, and no such junior liens shall reattach after the debtor reacquires title.

"ARTICLE V—PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO APPROVAL OF PETITION

"SEC. 932. Upon approval of a petition, the judge may refer the proceeding to a referee appointed, qualified, and acting under chapter V of this act.

"SEC. 933. Upon the approval of the petition, the court shall promptly call a meeting of creditors upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors.

"SEC. 934. The notice of such meeting shall specify the purposes of the meeting, which shall include a determination of the cause of the debtor's distress, the setting apart of the debtor's exemptions, and the approval or fixing of the rental to be paid by the debtor upon the property to be retained by him.

"SEC. 935. The notice of such meeting shall also be accompanied by—

"(1) a summary of the scheduled liabilities;

"(2) a list of the names of the 10 largest general unsecured creditors and the 10 largest secured creditors, their addresses, and the scheduled amount owing to each of them, and, in the case of the secured creditors, the nature of the security held by each of them;

"(3) a list of the names of the unsecured creditors, entitled to priority, their addresses and the nature and amount of the priority owing to each of them, as scheduled;

"(4) a brief summary of the debtor's claim of exemptions; and

"(5) a brief summary of the property, possession of which is requested to be retained by the debtor, and the rental and terms of payment thereof offered by the debtor for each separately encumbered parcel of his property, and his unencumbered, unexempt property.

"SEC. 936. At such meeting of creditors and at all adjournments thereof, and at all hearings under this chapter, the judge or referee shall preside.

"SEC. 937. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, the court shall examine the debtor or cause him to be examined, and hear witnesses on any matters relevant to the proceedings.

"SEC. 938. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, the court shall determine whether the debtor's distress is due to causes beyond his control, such as a national emergency, as the result of which farmers in general cannot operate with normal profits, or local emergencies, such as drought, freeze, flood, and hail, or is due to causes within his control, such as bad personal habits, failure to attend to business, diverting farm income to nonagricultural expenditures, extravagant operations, and lack of farming ability. If the cause is determined by the court to be beyond the debtor's control, the court shall enter an order granting the debtor a moratorium for the duration of the emergency, without expressly limiting the moratorium to a term of years. If the cause is determined by the court to be within the debtor's control, the court shall proceed as provided in section 1016 of this act.

"SEC. 939. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, if a moratorium is ordered, the court shall enter an order approving the rental offered by the debtor for each separately encumbered portion of his property and for the unencumbered, unexempt portion, if any, unless a written objection to any portion of the rental offered for encumbered property has been filed by a secured creditor as to any separately encumbered portion, or unless a written objection to the rental offered for unencumbered property has been filed by an unsecured creditor, in which event the court shall hear and determine such objections and shall enter an order approving or disapproving the portion of the offered rental as to which objections have been filed. In case of disapproval, the court shall determine the fair and reasonable rental value of the specific portion of the debtor's property and the terms of payment based upon the factors provided in section 925 of this act. Such rental shall be paid into court and shall be used as follows: The first 10 percent thereof shall be deposited by the court with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided by section 72 of this act to be deposited equally in the referee's salary fund and referee's expense fund. The remainder shall be used, first, for the payment of any compensation or reimbursement for such costs and expenses, if any, as may be allowed by the court under the provisions of section 1023 and 1038 of this act; second, for the payment of taxes, insurance, and repairs on the property for which the rental was paid; third, shall be paid to and applied on the claims of the secured creditors who have claims against the property for which the rental was paid, as their interests may appear; and, fourth, any excess rental from encumbered property and all rental from unencumbered property shall be paid to the unsecured creditors as their interests may appear. A person aggrieved by the rental order may, within 10 days after the entry of the order, file a petition to review the same in the manner provided in this act.

"SEC. 940. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, if jurisdiction is retained under this chapter, the court shall set apart the exemptions of the debtor: *Provided, however,* That the court shall supervise and control the encumbered exempt property to be retained by the debtor for the purposes of the proceedings under this chapter.

"SEC. 941. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, in the event the debtor has not elected to retain possession of all of his unexempt property, the court may appoint a trustee to administer such property not retained by the debtor. No individual shall be eligible to appointment as a trustee unless he is (a) a resident of the county where the principal part of the debtor's property is located; (b) familiar with agricultural conditions therein; (c) not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farmers or transactions in agricultural commodities, or of furnishing agricultural supplies; and (d) not a relative of, or associated in business with, any creditor.

"SEC. 942. When a moratorium has been ordered, the creditors shall have the right not more often than at 2-year intervals from the date of the order granting the moratorium to a hearing on the question as to whether the emergency has ceased. Such hearing shall be had upon petition of any creditor after 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors. The order granting the moratorium shall remain in full force and effect if the court makes an order determining that the emergency still exists. If a determination is made by the court that would result in a moratorium of more than 4 years from the date of the order granting the moratorium, any creditor may appeal from such order if made by a judge, or, if made by a referee, may within 10 days after the entry of such order, file a petition for review as to the existence of the emergency. The determination by a judge on review shall be subject to appeal. If a judge, after a review, or an appellate court, on appeal, determines that the emergency still exists, such determination shall continue the moratorium in full force and effect: *Provided, however,* That thereafter at 1-year intervals from the date of any determination by a judge after a review or by an appellate court on appeal, until it is finally determined that the emergency has ceased, any creditor may present the same question to the court on petition and notice as in this section provided, and shall have the right to a review or an appeal from any order thereafter made by a referee or judge determining that the emergency still exists. Upon a final determination that the emergency has ceased, the moratorium shall terminate.

"SEC. 943. After the entry of any order by a referee, any person aggrieved may file a petition to review the same in the manner provided in section 39c of this act.

"SEC. 944. During the moratorium the debtor shall have authority to manage and operate the property of which he has elected to retain possession, subject, however, at all times to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. The court may require the debtor to file reports of the farming operations at such intervals as it may designate and in such form and containing such information as it may prescribe.

"SEC. 945. Upon its own motion or upon application of any creditor, the court may, after hearing upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors, require the debtor to make payments into court in addition to the fixed rental as provided in section 939 of this act and, in fixing the amount and periods of such payments, the court shall give due consideration to the interests of creditors and to the debtor's ability to pay, with a view to his financial rehabilitation.

"SEC. 946. The court may at any time during the proceedings, either upon its own motion or upon application of the debtor or any creditor, at a hearing upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors, order the debtor to sell any unexempt perishable products of the farm if it appears necessary to protect the estate from loss, and any unexempt personal or real property not reasonably necessary to the farming operations of the debtor, except heirlooms and personal gifts in the discretion of the court, despite any order of the

court retaining the debtor in possession thereof: *Provided, however*, That in the case of perishable property, the court may, upon cause shown, shorten the period of notice or order the sale without notice. Any such sale shall be for cash and the debtor shall immediately turn such cash over to the court to be held as an asset of the estate, subject, however, to such liens as may have existed against the property so sold.

"ARTICLE VI—TITLE, RIGHTS, DUTIES, AND POWERS OF DEBTOR

"SEC. 956. Except as provided in this chapter, and for the purposes of this chapter, a debtor shall, with respect to the property retained by him under section 924 of this act, and during the period of its retention by him, have all the title and exercise all the powers of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act, subject, however, at all times, to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe for the protection of the property or the conservation of the security. A debtor may manage and operate such property in the manner and subject to the conditions as provided in this chapter.

"SEC. 957. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the rights, privileges, and duties of the debtor shall be the same, before the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication and, upon the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 958. Except as provided in this chapter, a debtor shall not be adjudged a bankrupt under this chapter without his consent in writing filed with the court.

"ARTICLE VII—TITLE, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF TRUSTEE

"SEC. 966. A trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, shall administer all of the unexempt property of the debtor, or unexempt property belonging to his estate, other than the property possession of which the debtor elects to retain under section 924 of this act.

"SEC. 967. A trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, shall, as to all property administered by him as provided in section 966 of this act, be vested with the title of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act.

"SEC. 968. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, a trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, with respect to the property administered under section 966 of this act, shall be vested with the rights, be subject to the duties, and exercise the powers of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act.

"ARTICLE VIII—CREDITORS AND CLAIMS

"SEC. 978. Proofs of claim of secured and unsecured creditors may be filed in the court of bankruptcy where the proceedings are pending, or with the referee if the case has been referred, at any time within 6 months after the date of the first meeting of creditors. The proof shall be sufficient in form if made under oath, setting forth the nature and amount of the indebtedness, and, when based upon a written instrument, if the instrument or a certified or photostat copy is included or attached showing what securities are held, if secured. Section 57d of this act shall apply to claims so proved.

"SEC. 979. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the rights, duties, and liabilities of creditors and of all other persons with respect to the property of the debtor shall be the same, before the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication and, upon the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 980. In case an executory contract shall be rejected pursuant to the permission of the court given in a proceeding under this chapter, or shall have been rejected in a prior pending proceeding, any person injured by such rejection shall, for the purpose of this chapter, be deemed a creditor. The claim of a landlord for damages for injury resulting from the rejection of an unexpired lease of real estate or for damages or indemnity under a covenant contained in such lease shall be governed by the provisions of clause (9) of subdivision a of section 63 of this act.

"SEC. 981. If the time for filing claims in a pending bankruptcy proceeding has expired prior to the filing of a petition under this chapter, unsecured claims provable under section 63 of this act, and not filed within the time prescribed by subdivision n of section 57 of this act, shall not be allowed in the bankruptcy proceeding when reinstated as provided in this chapter.

"SEC. 982. Upon the entry of an order under the provisions of this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed and claims not already filed, including claims of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof, may be filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors, held pursuant to section 55 of this act, or, if such date has previously been set, then within 6 months after the mailing of notice to creditors of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with.

"ARTICLE IX—EXTENSION

"SEC. 986. Within 60 days after a final determination under section 942 of this act that the emergency has ceased, the debtor may file with the court a notice of election wherein he may elect an extension.

"SEC. 987. If the debtor elects an extension, he shall file with his notice of election an extension proposal, together with a copy thereof for each affected creditor, which proposal shall provide for full payment of his secured claims amortized over a term of years, which term of years shall be based upon the earning power of the property that is security for the debt as determined by the court, but not exceeding the greater of 10 years or the original term of years, payable in equal quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments, plus interest at the contract rate, or 5 percent per annum, whichever is the lesser, and such extension proposal shall provide for payment of unsecured debts, for which claims have been filed and allowed or are allowed under section 930 of this act, to the extent and on the terms which the debtor believes he will have the ability to pay from his future income. The extension proposal shall identify the related lien or liens, shall describe the property which the debtor wishes to redeem, which description may be incorporated by reference to the recording data of the related lien instrument, and shall set forth the amount to be paid in redemption of the property, the interest rate and terms of payment, as well as the persons to whom payment is to be made.

"SEC. 988. Upon the filing of such extension proposal, the court shall give a 10-day notice by mail to the debtor and all affected creditors of a hearing on such extension proposal and shall include a copy thereof with each notice. If no written objections to such extension proposal are filed at or before the hearing, the court shall confirm the proposal. If written objections are filed, the court shall consider the written objections or hear the objecting party and shall enter an order in accordance with the proof, approving the proposal as submitted, or modifying it as to the objecting party and approving it as modified. The extension proposal, when approved by the court, shall have the full force and effect of a binding contract for redemption between the affected parties. After the approval of an extension proposal, the debtor shall make all required payments directly to the persons entitled thereto. The debtor shall be discharged as to all unsecured debts or parts of debts not provided for in the approved extension proposal. Upon the recordation of a certified copy of such order in the proper office in the county or parish in which the land is located, it shall constitute constructive notice of the debtor's right to redeem the affected property, and any unconfirmed sale may be confirmed and any deed to which a purchaser is entitled may be delivered and recorded. Any such deeds executed after the approval of the extension proposal shall expressly state that the conveyance is subject to the right of the debtor, naming him, to redeem the property. Any deed executed but not delivered before the time the petition was filed shall vest title in the grantee subject to the debtor's right of redemption regardless of the failure of the deed to so provide.

"ARTICLE X—DISMISSAL, TRANSFER, AND ADJUDICATION

"SEC. 1015. The court shall, during the moratorium, upon the written application of a debtor, without a hearing and based solely upon such application, transfer the proceeding to a proceeding under chapters I to VII, inclusive, in this act.

"SEC. 1016. If (a) under the provisions section 938 of this act, the court finds that the debtor's distress is due to causes within his control, or if (b) the debtor defaults in the payment of rental or defaults under any other order made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, the court shall promptly give him written notice to cure the default within 60 days after the date of such notice, and if such default is not cured within said 60 days, or if (c) within 60 days after a final determination under section 942 of this act that the emergency has ceased the debtor had not filed an extension proposal, the court shall—

"(1) where the petition was filed under section 921 of this act, enter an order dismissing the proceeding under this chapter and directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with pursuant to the provisions of this act; or

"(2) where the petition was filed under section 922 of this act, enter an order, upon hearing after notice to the debtor, the creditors, and such other persons in interest as the court may direct, either adjudging the debtor a bankrupt and directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with pursuant to the provisions of this act, which adjudication shall be mandatory if a trustee has been appointed and has not completed the administration of the property, title to which had vested in him, or, if adjudication is not mandatory, dismissing the proceeding under this chapter, whichever in the opinion of the court may be in the interest of creditors: *Provided, however*, That where a petition was filed under this chapter during a redemption period, or prior to confirmation of a sale, or prior to delivery of a deed, the affected property shall be dismissed from the proceedings although jurisdiction is otherwise retained, and the purchasers of such property shall be reinstated to the rights they had when the petition was filed, and the debtor shall have the right to redeem during the time thereafter that had not expired under any redemption right when the petition was filed.

"SEC. 1017. Upon the entry of an order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with—

"(1) in the case of a petition filed under section 921 of this act, the bankruptcy proceeding shall be deemed reinstated and thereafter shall be conducted, so far as possible, as if such petition under this chapter had not been filed;

"(2) in the case of a petition filed under section 922 of this act, the proceeding shall be conducted, so far as possible, in the same manner and with like effect as if a voluntary

petition in bankruptcy had been filed and a decree of adjudication had been entered on the day when the petition under this chapter had been filed; and

"(3) (a) the trustee theretofore appointed and qualified, if any, shall be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor remaining under the jurisdiction of the court, title to which had not previously been vested in him, as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with; and

"(b) the trustee, if not theretofore appointed and qualified, shall, upon his appointment and qualification, be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor remaining under the jurisdiction of the court as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with; and

"(c) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor after filing under this chapter and before the date of the entry of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall, unless and except as otherwise provided by the court, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced by any payment made thereon; and

"(d) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts incurred by the debtor after the filing of the petition and before the date of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, and of all persons with respect to the property of the debtor, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall control.

"SEC. 1018. Concurrently with the approval of an extension proposal the court shall enter a final decree discharging the debtor as to all debts dischargeable under this chapter, discharging the trustee, if one has been appointed and qualified, and closing the estate: *Provided, however*, That if a trustee has been appointed and qualified as provided in this chapter, and his administration of the property, title to which had vested in him, has not been completed, including payment of his fees and expenses, the final decree herein required shall be entered after such property has been fully administered by the trustee and his fees and expenses have been paid.

"ARTICLE XI—COMPENSATION AND ALLOWANCES; PRIORITIES AND DISTRIBUTION AMONG CREDITORS

"SEC. 1022. A trustee appointed under this chapter shall receive out of that portion of the estate administered by him—

"(1) as full compensation for his services after they are rendered, such reasonable sum as the court may allow, not to exceed 2 percent upon the moneys disbursed or turned over by him to any persons, including the lienholders;

"(2) such reimbursement for the actual and necessary costs and expenses incurred by him in a proceeding under this chapter, as the court may allow.

"SEC. 1023. Where a petition is filed under section 921 of this act, the court may allow, if not already allowed, reasonable compensation for services rendered and reimbursement for proper costs and expenses incurred in such superseded bankruptcy proceeding, as authorized and prescribed in this act.

"SEC. 1024. Upon the dismissal of a proceeding under this chapter after a moratorium has been ordered and prior to the payment of any rental or by reason of the failure to pay a rental installment, the court may, as a condition to such dismissal, require payment by the secured creditor or secured creditors, as their interests may appear, of an amount equal to 10 percent of the installment of rental then in default, which payment shall be deposited with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided in section 72 of this act to be deposited equally in the referee's salary fund and referee's expense fund.

"SEC. 1025. The filing fee of $45, the fee to be paid out of rental, and such fees as may be paid under section 1024 of this act, shall be the only payments required of the debtor or the creditors toward the referee's fees, costs, and expenses under this chapter, except that the court may require as a condition precedent that the debtor or any creditor who may petition for any hearing other than the hearings expressly provided for in this chapter shall pay into court the sum of $10, plus 20 cents for each copy of the notice of hearing mailed to the debtor and the creditors if the court prepares such copy, or 10 cents for each copy if prepared by the petitioner, the petitioner to have the option as to preparation of the notices, and such payments shall be deposited with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided in section 72 of this act to be deposited in the referee's expense fund.

"SEC. 1026. The debtor and each creditor shall pay all of his own costs and expenses, including attorney fees, none of which shall be allowed or paid out of rental money or the estate.

"SEC. 1027. The net funds of the estate administered by a trustee after payment of the trustee's fees and expenses, if any, as provided in section 1022 of this act, and any funds paid into court under the provisions of sections 945 and 946 of this act shall be distributed, from time to time, as may be ordered by the court, among the secured and unsecured creditors, as their interests may appear. Where partial distributions occur, proper adjustment shall be made in the final distribution, or sooner when practicable.

"SEC. 1028. Upon the entry of an order in a proceeding under this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, the actual and necessary fees, costs, and expenses thereafter incurred and allowed in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding shall be determined in the manner provided in chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act and shall be given priority over any unpaid fees, costs, and expenses incurred prior to the entry of such order.

"ARTICLE XII—PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 1036. A petition may be filed under this chapter notwithstanding the pendency of a prior mortgage foreclosure, equity, or other proceeding in a court of the United States or of any State in which a receiver or trustee of all or any part of the property of a debtor has been appointed or for whose appointment an application theretofore has been made.

"SEC. 1037. As to any such property, possession of which the debtor elects to retain, the debtor, upon approval of his petition, shall become vested with the rights, if any, of such prior receiver or trustee in such property retained by the debtor, and with the right to immediate possession thereof, and shall also have the right to immediate possession of such property in the possession of a trustee under a deed of trust, a mortgagee under a mortgage, or a pledgee under a pledge of personal property, the possession of which is essential to the debtor's operations, possession of which he elects to retain, subject, however, at all times to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe, and subject to existing liens regardless of the lienholder's surrender of possession: *Provided*, That the trustee, appointed and qualified under this chapter, shall become vested with all such rights as to any such property which is unexempt and of which the debtor has not elected to retain possession as provided in section 924 of this act.

"SEC. 1038. The court shall make such provision as may be equitable for the protection of the obligations theretofore incurred by a receiver or trustee in such prior proceeding and for the payment of the reasonable costs and expenses incurred therein as may be allowed by the court.

"ARTICLE XIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1041. All statutes of limitations affecting claims provable under this chapter and the running of all periods of time prescribed by this act in respect to the commission of acts of bankruptcy, the recovery of preferences and the avoidance of liens and transfers shall be suspended while a proceeding under this chapter is pending and until it is finally dismissed.

"SEC. 1042. Unless otherwise directed by the court, all notices required by this chapter may be given by mail to the parties entitled thereto to their addresses ascertained in the manner prescribed for other notices in section 58 of this act.

"SEC. 1043. A previous discharge of a debtor or confirmation of an arrangement under other provisions of this act shall not be ground for denying him the benefits of this chapter.

"SEC. 1044. No income or profit, taxable under any law of the United States or of any State now in force or which may hereafter be enacted, shall, in respect to the adjustment of the indebtedness of a debtor in a proceeding under this chapter, be deemed to have accrued to or to have been realized by a debtor by reason of a modification in or cancellation in whole or in part of any such indebtedness in a proceeding under this chapter: *Provided, however*, That if it shall be made to appear that the proceeding had for one of its principal purposes the evasion of any income tax, the exemption provided by this section shall be disallowed.

"SEC. 1045. Until the Supreme Court of the United States has promulgated general orders and official forms governing this chapter, General Order 50, and the official forms heretofore made shall, insofar as not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, be applicable to procedure under this chapter.

"ARTICLE XIV—EFFECT OF CHAPTER

"SEC. 1051. A petition may be filed under this chapter in a proceeding in bankruptcy which is pending on the effective date of this amendatory act, and a petition may be filed under this chapter notwithstanding the pendency on such date of a proceeding in which a receiver or trustee of all or any part of the property of a debtor has been appointed or for whose appointment application has been made in a court of the United States or of any State.

"SEC. 1052. As of the day preceding the date on which the provisions of this amendatory act become effective, an allocation shall be made by the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy of all filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and of all expense funds, due the then existing conciliation commissioners for services rendered and expenses incurred in the cases pending before them, whether as referee or conciliation commissioner under this act. The balances of such filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and the expense surpluses shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States by the conciliation commissioners and the clerks, to be deposited to the credit of the respective salary and expense funds as provided in paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act. All cases then pending before conciliation commissioners shall be referred, and no additional filing fees shall be required, but additional salary and expense charges may be assessed in such cases in such amounts as the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy may deem equitable, taking into consideration the provisions of this chapter.

"SEC. 1053. The provisions of section 75, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, shall continue in full force and effect with respect to proceedings pending under that section upon the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this amendatory act shall govern in such proceedings so far as practicable."

SEC. 2. Clause (2) of section 35 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof other than special master under this act: *Provided, however,* That part-time referees may be commissioners of deeds, United States commissioners, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or retired officers and retired enlisted personnel of the Regular and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, except the National Guard disbursing officers who are on a full-time salary basis;".

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) A referees' salary fund and a referees' expense fund shall be established in the Treasury of the United States, and the amounts of the various fees and allowances collected by the clerks for the services of referees and for their expenses, including the fees, allowances, and charges for their services and expenses as special masters under this act, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for the account of such salary fund and expense fund. The salaries of the referees in active service shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such salary fund, and the expenses of referees, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such expense fund, by the United States. Any deficiencies of such salary fund or expense fund shall be paid out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and appropriations to pay such deficiencies are hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That there shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States in any subsequent year so much of the surplus, if any, arising in the salary fund or expense fund, respectively, as may be necessary to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for payments made on account of such respective funds in any prior year."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subdivision d of section 40 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any referee who has retired or been retired under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subdivision d may, if called upon by a judge of a court of bankruptcy, perform, without compensation, such duties of a referee or special master under this act, within the jurisdiction of such court, as such referee may be able and willing to undertake: *Provided, however,* That when so acting, compensation for his services shall be allowed and paid or deposited and his expenses shall be allowed and paid, as in the case of an active referee."

SEC. 4. Clause (2) of section 51 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) collect the fees of the clerk and trustee and the fees for the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act in each case instituted before filing the petition, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this act, and collect the various other fees, allowances, and charges for the services of referees and for their expenses, including their services and expenses as special masters under this act;".

SEC. 5. Section 72 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 72. Limitation of compensation of officers of court: No receiver, marshal, or trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow him, any other or further compensation for his services as required by this act, than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act.

"No referee shall receive any compensation for his services under this act other than his salary; and allowances made to a referee for compensation or expense while acting as a referee or special master under any chapter or section of this act, shall be paid to the clerk, and by him transmitted to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund, respectively."

SEC. 6. (a) If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such individuality shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

(b) Article and section headings shall not be taken to govern or limit the scope of the articles or sections to which they relate.

(c) Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 25) having the purpose to provide relief for farmer debtors, as is provided for many other categories of industry under our bankruptcy statutes. A similar bill, having the same number, was introduced by me in the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress, on January 8, 1951. It passed the Senate on April 4, 1952, but no action was taken in the House on this proposed legislation.

Legislation dealing with farmer-debtor relief was originally enacted in the year 1933, as section 75, of the Bankruptcy Act. It carried a limitation as to the time within which petitions could be filed to obtain the benefits of its provisions. The time within which such petitions could be filed has been extended from time to time, the last extension being to March 1, 1949, as provided in Public Law 495, Eightieth Congress, approved April 21, 1948. Presently existing section 75 has always been considered as emergency legislation, and the various extensions of time within which petitions might be filed have always been on a temporary and emergency basis. Something like the farmer-debtor relief provisions of the Bankruptcy Act should be made permanent, and the subject no longer dealt with on such temporary or emergency bases.

A full, factual justification for this position would require a detailed recital of the financial plight in which farmers found themselves, beginning in the early 1930's and continuing to date. Suffice it to say that about the year 1930, and following, the farming industry found itself practically bankrupt. Farmers were losing their farms and being forced to move. They had no place to go, because there was no employment except such as was furnished by the Government under made-work projects such as WPA and PWA. The general condition of the farming industry was not such as might have been explained merely on the theory that some of the less-efficient farmers were being normally pushed out of an industry in which they were not suited. Regardless of the ability and efficiency of the farmer, he could not, with the then current prices of his products, make a living farming. He was being forced to operate his farm at a loss, and the more farm products he produced the more he lost. True, many farmers did not owe on their farms but, in fact, had reserves of savings on which they could draw to tide themselves over. But the farmer who had no such reserve of savings was forced to borrow money on his farm, and the farmer who owed on his farm was forced to increase his borrowings.

In both instances, after a lien was placed on the farm, there was no possible way (except from sources outside the farming operation) that a farmer could hope or expect to pay off the loan, or, in fact, even meet the interest payments on it. The net result was that had the farming industry, as a whole, been pushed for repayment of the debts of the industry, it would have been wiped out. The problem was not local in scope. Since farming is probably the basic industry of the Nation, it assumed proportions of a national calamity. Farm lands worth as much as $50 per acre were selling for fantastically low prices, as low as $2.50 to $5 per acre, and this was not just in one locality, but was county-wide and State-wide.

The banks, insurance companies, and other financial interests that owned the loans on the farms did not wish to push the debtors; but when the interest payments and principal payments were not met, they had no alternative. If they failed to collect, they could not themselves remain solvent.

The situation of farmers today is entirely different. They are generally in a prosperous condition, have built up substantial reserves in the form of savings, and are, to a great extent, protected in the foreseeable future against any large impairment of income by the price-support programs of Government.

However, even during the times when farmers are generally prosperous in this country, there are some who are faced with so-called local emergencies and subjected to ruin through no fault of their own. It can be said that this bill is designed so as to provide relief as needed and deserved by such individual farmers. The bill recognizes that there may be emergencies wherein a farmer finds himself in dire circumstances due to causes beyond his control. In such a case a farmer who would be entitled to the benefits of this bill would be granted a moratorium. The American farmer is the backbone of this Nation. It is for the good of the whole country to give the farmer a reasonable measure of financial protection.

The legal and economic principles embodied in foreclosure moratoria have been tested in mass emergencies; this bill would apply these tested principles in individual or localized emergencies of the same nature.

S. 27

A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Inventions Awards Act of 1952."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to foster invention for national defense through the establishment within the Department of Defense of an Inventions Awards Board which shall be authorized to recommend to the Secretary the making of such awards, to be known as National Defense Awards, as it shall consider just for meritorious inventions contributing to the national defense.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "invention" means any art, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof which is useful, or susceptible of use, for application in the national defense

of the United States, and which is not subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, whether or not such invention is patented, unpatented, or patentable.

(b) The term "inventor" means any person who has made an invention.

(c) The term "person" shall include any natural person, and his heirs.

(d) The term "the Department" shall mean the Department of Defense, and the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Defense.

(e) The term "defense agency" means the Department, or any other department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government (except the Atomic Energy Commission), and any wholly owned Government corporation, designated by the President as a defense agency for the purposes of this act.

(f) The term "Board" means the Inventions Awards Board established pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(g) The term "award" means a national defense award authorized by section 4 of this act.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AWARDS

SEC. 4. Whenever any inventor has disclosed to any defense agency any invention which contributes or has contributed substantially to the national defense, and any such agency in consequence of such disclosure has used such invention, the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Board, may make a national defense award to such inventor in such amount, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Board shall determine in conformity with the provisions of this act to be just compensation for such invention or the use thereof.

INVENTIONS AWARDS BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish within the department an Inventions Awards Board which shall be composed of not more than 15 members appointed by the Secretary, for such term or terms as he may specify, from persons in civil life who are eminent in one or more of the following fields of activity: invention, science, research, development, and patent law. The Board shall meet at such times as the Secretary may specify to consider applications made pursuant to section 6 of this act for awards. Five members shall constitute a quorum of the Board.

(b) Each member shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day of his attendance at meetings of the Board, and shall be reimbursed for all travel expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board.

(c) The Board shall perform the duties required of it by section 6 of this act. The Secretary shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as he may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

(d) The Board may promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this act, as may be required for the performance of its duties hereunder.

APPLICATIONS FOR AWARDS AND PROCEEDINGS THEREON

SEC. 6. (a) Any inventor may file with the Secretary an application for an award under section 4 of this act. Such application may be filed upon information and belief, and shall contain a statement concerning—

(1) the nature of such invention;

(2) the ownership thereof;

(3) the time and manner of its disclosure to any defense agency;

(4) the nature and extent of its use by any defense agency;

(5) the utility of such invention to the United States in the interest of national defense;

(6) the nature and extent of the compensation received by such inventor from the United States under any other provision of law for or on account of the development or use of such invention;

(7) the nature and extent of the compensation for which application is made pursuant to this act; and

(8) such other facts as the Board shall deem pertinent.

(b) Each application so filed shall be transmitted to the Board which, subject to the provisions of this act and of the Administrative Procedure Act, shall hear and determine the questions presented by such application, and shall make and transmit to the Secretary a report thereon in which the Board shall set forth—

(1) its findings of fact and conclusions of law;

(2) its recommendation on the question whether the applicant is entitled to an award under this act; and

(3) the terms and conditions upon which any such award should be made.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS AND QUANTUM THEREOF

SEC. 7. (a) In any proceeding under this act, the applicant shall bear the burden of establishing by probative proof the disclosure of the invention in question by the inventor directly or indirectly to a defense agency and the use of such invention by a defense agency in consequence of such disclosure, except that—

(1) in the case of a patented invention, proof of the issuance of a patent thereon shall constitute proof of disclosure of such invention to a defense agency; and

(2) in the case of an invention described in a patent application which has been duly filed and has been placed under secrecy pursuant to any provision of law, proof of access to such application by any officer or employee of any defense agency shall constitute proof of disclosure of such invention to such agency.

(b) In any proceeding under this act, the respondent defense agency or agencies shall be entitled to assert any legal or equitable defense which could be asserted by the United States in any suit brought by the applicant against the United States for judicial relief on account of the use of the invention in question by the United States, except that—

(1) the worth of such invention shall be measured by its contribution to the needs of the national defense, and not by the advance it makes in the field to which it pertains;

(2) the validity of any patent issued to the inventor for such invention shall be presumed in the absence of competent proof of the invalidity of such patent; and

(3) proof that the disclosure made by the inventor to any defense agency was sufficiently specific to permit the making or practicing of such invention shall constitute proof of the actual reduction of such invention to practice.

(c) Payment by the United States of the cost, in whole or in part, of developing an invention shall not bar the making of an award under this act to the inventor thereof, but in determining the amount of any such award consideration shall be given to—

(1) the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the inventor, and the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the United States;

(2) the extent to which the inventor has benefited and will benefit through the commercial exploitation of such invention in consequence of development made at the expense of the United States; and

(3) the extent to which the inventor has been denied the benefits of commercial exploitation of such invention in consequence of any secrecy restrictions imposed by the United States.

(d) If, in any proceeding under this act, it shall appear to the Board that more than one inventor is entitled to compensation with respect to the same invention, the Board shall ascertain and determine the interests of each such inventor, and shall recommend the division of the award, in such proportions as it shall deem equitable, among all persons whom it shall find to be entitled to share therein.

PAYMENT OF AWARDS

SEC. 8. (a) Any award made pursuant to this act may be paid in a single payment or by such periodic payments as the Board may recommend.

(b) Awards so made shall be paid from funds appropriated to the defense agency principally interested in the invention for which such award is made, as determined by the Board, and may be paid from any funds appropriated to such agency which are available for the procurement of equipment or supplies incorporating such invention or resulting from the practice of such invention. If the head of the defense agency concerned certifies that funds are not available to such agency for the payment of any such award, the Secretary shall include in his budget estimate for the Department for the next fiscal year an appropriate item for the payment of such award.

(c) No award made under this act shall be paid until each person entitled to share therein has executed a release, in such form as the Secretary shall approve, by which such person surrenders, for himself and all others holding rights from him, all further claims against the United States for compensation with respect to the invention for which such award is made.

(d) No award shall be paid under this act to any inventor or with respect to any invention in any amount exceeding $75,000 until such award has been transmitted to and approved by the Congress. The approval of the Congress to any such award shall be deemed to have been granted upon the expiration of the first period of 120 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such award is transmitted to it for approval, but only if prior to the expiration of such period there has not been passed a concurrent resolution disapproving such award or approving such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions. If within such period any such resolution is passed authorizing payment of such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions, payment of such award may be made in conformity with the terms of such resolution.

PROCEEDINGS UNDER OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 9. (a) Nothing contained in this act shall—

(1) prevent any department or agency of the United States from making any payment to any inventor pursuant to any other provision of law; or

(2) bar any inventor from prosecuting any suit in the Court of Claims pursuant to section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to any invention, or from recovering judgment in any such suit.

(b) No inventor shall be entitled to receive any award pursuant to this act with respect to any invention—

(1) for which he has received any compensation (other than salary received for services rendered as an officer or employee of the Government) under any other provision of law; or

(2) with respect to which he has instituted any suit in the Court of Claims for compensation pursuant to section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 27) to provide for the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

This legislation would establish an Inventions Awards Board of qualified civilians un-

der the Department of Defense. The Board would make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense for the payment of money to any person whose invention has contributed substantially to the national defense. The limit as to the amount to be awarded is $75,000. If the award should be determined to be higher than that, such award would have to be submitted to Congress, and if no adverse action is taken thereon in 120 days of continuous meetings of the Congress, the award would be considered approved.

This legislation has undergone much study and revision and has the unanimous approval of the National Inventors Council.

In the case of Government employees whose duties require them to develop new inventions and processes, title to their products would remain in the United States Government. For others, the only requirement is that the Government shall be entitled to an irrevocable, nonexclusive, world-wide and royalty-free license for the use of the inventor's product.

The Nation owes much more than a debt of gratitude to the many able persons who have strengthened our defense and aided our economic development by the product of their specialized knowledge and skill.

My information is that a great many of the important inventions and developments of various kinds that have been found invaluable to the defense activities of our Nation have originated with minor civil-service employees and enlisted personnel of the armed services who were not engaged in that type of activity. It is my belief that this legislation will serve to properly compensate these people for their services in our behalf and their patriotic assignment of their accomplishments to the United States Government. In addition, this legislation will serve to spur the initiative of qualified people to give to the Government the benefit of their knowledge in these matters.

S. 29

A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) (1) In the case of the death on or after December 7, 1941, of any person described in section 101 (a), if (A) there is no beneficiary entitled to receive monthly death benefits under the provisions of this title on account of the death of such person, or if (B) the amount of benefits paid to the beneficiary or beneficiaries under the provisions of this title on account of the death of such person is less than $7,500 and there is no beneficiary entitled to receive any further benefits, then there shall be paid, in the manner provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to the following persons, in the order named, (i) the sum of $7,500, or (ii) the difference between $7,500 and the amount of death benefits previously paid, whichever is the smaller—

"first, to the parent of such person, or, if there are two surviving parents, to both parents, in equal shares; or if there be none

"then to the child of such person, or, if there is more than one surviving child, to all such children, in equal shares; or if there be none

"then to the brother or the sister of such person, or, if there is more than one surviving brother or sister, to all such brothers and sisters, in equal shares.

"(2) The Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts payable under this section and the persons to whom such amounts are payable. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay all such amounts out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 29) to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II.

This legislation will provide that in the case of death, on or after December 7, 1941, of employees of contractors, due to enemy action, there will be paid to the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such employee the maximum sum of $7,500. The award will be predicated on the fact of whether or not there has been any other insurance paid on such persons. If there has been, the amount paid will be the sum by which $7,500 exceeds the amount already paid.

As you know, certain civilian employees of Government contractors went through all of the hardships that confronted the men in uniform, and at that time their dependents were not as adequately taken care of as those of men in uniform, due to the fact that legislation had not been passed anticipating the situation in which we found ourselves immediately after December 7, 1941.

The war claims act of 1948 aided the employees of contractors to the extent of the money that they would have earned under their contract but the introduction of this bill gives thought and consideration to the beneficiaries of these people as it would relate to loss of life suffered at the hands of the enemy.

It is my studied opinion that the Congress should provide for this feature of hardship to the beneficiaries of the employees of contractors who died during World War II as the result of enemy detention.

S. 30

A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1875. Condemnation proceedings.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (h) of rule 71A of the Rules of Civil Procedure, any party to an action in a district court involving the exercise of the power of eminent domain under the law of the United States may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation, except where a tribunal has been specially constituted by an act of Congress governing the case for the determination of that issue, by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed by such rule for answer or within such further time as the court may fix."

(b) The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1875. Condemnation proceedings."

SEC. 2. Section 1875 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to (a) actions commenced after the date of enactment of this act, (b) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act in which the time for requesting a jury trial under the applicable provisions of law in effect immediately prior to August 1, 1951, had not expired prior to August 1, 1951, and (c) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act which were commenced subsequent to July 31, 1951; but the time within which a jury trial may be demanded under such section in any case referred to in clause (b) or clause (c) above shall be 30 days after the date of enactment of this act in lieu of the time prescribed in such section.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 30) to restore to litigants in condemnation proceedings by the United States Government the right to a trial by jury if either of the parties thereto desire a jury to pass on the question of adequate compensation. This legislation rises out of rule 71 (A) promulgated by the Supreme Court.

On July 9, 1951, the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate unanimously rejected rule 71 (A) and unanimously reported a Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82), which in effect gave the right of a trial by jury on the demand therefor of any interested party. Senate Joint Resolution 82 unanimously passed the Senate on July 11, 1951, and was thereafter amended in the House. Due to the fact that agreement could not be reached by the Senate and House and the resolution acted on by the President prior to August 1, 1951, rule 71 (A) by operation of law became effective on that date.

The proposed legislation provides that, except where a tribunal has been specially constituted by an act of Congress governing the case for a determination of the issue of just compensation, that notwithstanding provisions of subdivision (h) of rule 71 (A) any party may by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed by the rule have a trial by jury. The bill further provides that, as to actions pending on the date of enactment of this act and which were commenced prior to July 31, 1951, if a jury trial has been requested or the time within which a jury trial may have been requested under the law applicable had not expired, such jury trial may be had. A jury trial is also authorized for actions commenced subsequent to August 1, 1951, and the date of enactment of this act.

The right of trial by jury, particularly where the property of an individual is being taken from him, is one of paramount importance, and if an individual desires he should be entitled to have a jury decide as to what is just compensation for his loss. It would seem that to deny jury trial when requested in this type of case is not in the best interests of the public. This is particularly true when it is noted that some 41 States provide for jury trial. I see no reason why these provisions should be abrogated.

S. 39

A bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution

Be it enacted, etc., That, where a State has exercised through its courts jurisdiction to dissolve the marriage of spouses, the decree of divorce thus rendered must be given full faith and credit in every other State as a dissolution of such marriage, provided (1) the decree is final as to the issue of divorce; (2) the decree is valid in the State where rendered; (3) the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites of such State to the granting of the divorce have been met; and (4) the State wherein the decree was rendered was the last State wherein the spouses were domiciled together as husband and wife, or the defendant in the proceeding for divorce was personally subject to the jurisdiction of the State wherein the decree was rendered or appeared generally in the proceedings therefor. In all such cases except cases involving fraudulent conduct of the successful party which was practiced during the course of an actual adversary trial of the issues joined and the effect of which was directly and affirmatively to mislead the defeated party to his injury after he announced that he was ready to proceed with the trial, the

recitals of the decree of divorce shall constitute a conclusive determination of the jurisdictional facts necessary to the decree.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 39) to implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution, with respect to divorce. An identical bill passed the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress, on June 21, 1952, but no action was taken thereon in the House.

It is neither good morals nor good law to have a divorce legal in one State and illegal in another, so that a married man or woman may become a criminal by stepping over an imaginary line. Such a situation demands congressional action to the extent that such action may provide a remedy. But all proposals for a uniform Federal divorce law contemplate an invasion of State sovereignty inimical to the basic principles of our Federal Union. What we need is not a uniform Federal divorce law, but a uniform and reasonable interpretation and application of the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

One approach to the problem of interstate recognition of divorces has been through the so-called Uniform Divorce Recognition Act. As of November 1, 1950, this act had been adopted by seven States. Without attempting a discussion of the merits and shortcomings of this act, it may be pointed out that it does not meet the important requirement of certainty, which is an essential characteristic for a divorce law which is to be satisfactory from a national viewpoint. The Uniform Divorce Recognition Act fails in this regard because it is necessarily subject to the constitutional requirement with respect to full faith and credit. Thus, without thorough litigation in the Federal courts, it cannot be said precisely how the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act may be construed; and it appears that the act may be unconstitutional under some existing decisions of the United States Supreme Court. It seems clear that in the light of the constitutional provision with respect to full faith and credit, the only satisfactory method of giving uniformity of recognition to divorces granted in the different States is through a Federal law, rather than by means of the separate adoption by the States of the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act, even assuming that all 48 of the States, instead of only 7, could be persuaded to enact the uniform statute.

Briefly stated, the purpose of this bill is to guarantee the divorce decree of any State full faith and credit in every other State, providing that (1) the decree is final as to divorce in the State where rendered; (2) the decree is valid in the State where rendered; (3) the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites have been met; and (4) the State in which the decree was granted was the last State in which the couple lived together as man and wife, or the defendant was personally subject to the State's jurisdiction or appeared generally in the proceedings.

This proposed statute, if enacted, would not derogate from the right of any State to question a decree based on fraud, where such a decree would not be valid in the rendering State. It would, however, in the absence of fraud, give full recognition to decrees based on constructive service where the rendering State was the last place of domicile with respect to the marriage relationship; and would also permit a State wherein only one spouse is domiciled to determine its jurisdiction to grant the divorce, and to render a decree conclusive against everyone, where the defendant appears or is validly personally served with process. A default judgment, entered without such appearance or service, against a spouse not domiciled in the State, and where the State was the last State of marital domicile, would be open to attack and refusal of recognition to the same degree as under the present State of the law.

This legislation had the very full consideration of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress and was carefully considered from all angles. The able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] wrote an exceptionally fine report. As I have stated before, the legislation has already been approved by the Senate; and it is my firm belief that this legislation is needed and should receive the approval of the Congress in this present session.

For the sake of the legislative history of this measure, I call attention to the questions submitted by the then minority calendar committee, and answered by me, at the time this legislation, then embodied in the bill S. 1331, passed the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress.

S. 41

A bill to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title VI of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 233), as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 22, sec. 401), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain such arms or munitions of war or other articles and may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles. All arms or munitions of war and other articles, vessels, vehicles, and aircraft seized pursuant to this subsection shall be forfeited.

"(b) All provisions of law relating to seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture and condemnation for violation of the customs laws; the disposition of the property forfeited or condemned or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Awards of compensation to informers under this section may be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated therefor.

"(c) Arms and munitions of war forfeited under subsection (b) of this section shall be delivered to the Secretary of Defense for such use or disposition as he may deem in the public interest, or, in the event that the Secretary of Defense refuses to accept such arms and munitions of war, they shall be sold or otherwise disposed of as prescribed under existing law in the case of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, title VI, 40 Stat. 224–225; U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 22, secs. 402, 403, 405, 407), and section 4 of such act, as amended by the act of March 1, 1929 (ch. 420, 45 Stat. 1423; U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 22, sec. 404), are repealed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 41) to amend title VI of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended. The bill originally was introduced at the request of the Treasury, in the form proposed by said Department. Subsequently the Department of Justice, in collaboration with the Treasury Department, submitted a recommendation for revision of the form of the bill. This was adopted in its entirety, and a confidential print of the bill in revised form was prepared. Lack of time precluded action upon the bill prior to the adjournment of Congress.

In preparing the revised form of this bill in the Treasury Department, section 2 of the bill as originally prepared was inadvertently deleted. Section 2 was a provision providing for repeal of those sections of the existing law which would be suspended by section 1 of this bill. For that reason section 2 is obviously desirable, and this section has been added to the form of the bill as now introduced.

S. 42

A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 125, title 28, United States Code is hereby amended by adding immediately after section 1963 of such title a new section as follows:

"§ 1964. Attorney's charging lien in an action or other proceeding.

"That from the commencement of an action, or other proceeding, in any court of the United States or before any department or agency of the United States, or the service of an answer containing counterclaim, an attorney-at-law whose appearance has been entered for a party shall have a lien upon his client's cause of action, claim, or counterclaim, which shall attach to any verdict, report, determination, decision, judgment, or final order in his client's favor, and the proceeds thereof in whatever hands they may come. Such lien shall not be affected by any settlement between the parties before or after judgment, final order, or determination. The court in which the action or proceeding is brought, or the court in which a proceeding for judicial review may be brought if the proceeding be brought before any department or agency of the United States, or if no judicial review of such department or agency action is provided by law, any district court of the United States, shall, upon petition of the client or attorney, determine and enforce such lien.

"SEC. 2. No statute forbidding or limiting the assignment of a claim against the United States or the creating or enforcement of a lien against property seized or vested by the United States shall be deemed to apply to the lien established as aforesaid.

"SEC. 3. The lien created under this section shall attach to any verdict, report, determination, decision, judgment, or final order which arises as a result of any action or other proceeding presently pending or hereafter commenced in any court of the United States or before any department or agency of the United States.

"SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 125 of title 28, United States Code, immediately following section 1963 of such title, is amended so as to read:

" 'Sec. 1964. Attorney's charging lien in an action or other proceeding'."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I have introduced a bill (S. 42) to provide for an attorney's charging lien in any court of the United States or before any department or agency of the United States.

An identical bill passed the Senate on May 1, 1952, and was favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee on July 2, 1952. Due to the closing rush of business, this bill was not considered by the House of Representatives.

In my opinion, such a statute is greatly needed to protect attorneys at law in the Federal courts. Of course, an attorney at law has the benefit of a charging lien in the vast majority of the State courts, but it is highly

desirable to have a uniform statute applicable in the Federal courts. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

S. 43

A bill to amend section 215 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit officers or employees of the United States from accepting payments for appointment or retention of a person in office or employment under the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 215 of title 18, United States Code, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 215. Whoever solicits or receives, either as a political contribution, or for personal emolument, any money or thing of value, in consideration of the promise of support or use of influence in obtaining for any person any appointive office or place under the United States, or

"Whoever, being a Member of or a Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, either before or after he is qualified, or the head of a department, or other officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, solicits, receives, or accepts, or exacts, or attempts to exact, either directly or indirectly on behalf of himself or another, any money or thing of value from any person for the appointment, retention, or promotion of such person in any employment, office, or place under the authority of the United States,

"Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by making the caption of section 215 read as follows:

"ACCEPTANCE, SOLICITATION OR EXACTION OF PAYMENT FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, OR RETENTION IN PUBLIC OFFICE"

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced a bill, S. 43, to amend section 215 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit not only the soliciting or receiving of a consideration but also the exacting or accepting of a consideration from a Federal employee to obtain or retain his position or to obtain a promotion therein. A similar bill, S. 459, the wording of which was originally that of the Department of Justice, was introduced by me in the Eighty-second Congress, first session, but no action was taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The present wording of the bill is the result of the study made during the preceding Congress. It is my intention to ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to appoint a subcommittee to consider this bill further, as the original study begun in the Eighty-second Congress was not completed.

An amendment in the nature of the one herein proposed would seem to be highly desirable.

Senate Resolution 15

Resolved, That upon certification by the chairman or the acting chairman of a standing committee of the Senate that two-thirds of the members of the committee have voted to require the production of specified or identified books, papers, or records in the custody of an officer of the Government of the United States, the President of the Senate shall issue his warrant, returnable at a time when the Senate is meeting, commanding the Sergeant at Arms to obtain the books, papers, or records specified by the chairman or the acting chairman, and in the event of the refusal of the officer of the Government of the United States having custody thereof to deliver the required books, papers, or records, to take the said officer into bodily custody forthwith and bring him before the bar of the Senate, then and there to answer questions as to his refusal.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have introduced Senate Resolution 15, with respect to procedures whereby the Sergeant at Arms shall take specified books, papers, or records and persons, into custody.

This resolution reflects my feeling, which I have stated before, that the Senate should reassert and implement its traditional power to compel the production of books, papers, and documents and the testimony of witnesses, and to punish contempt.

This resolution is based on the proposition that the Senate should be willing to invoke its constitutional powers, insist on its constitutional prerogatives, and enforce its own process. A whole series of landmark cases, culminating in the decision of the Supreme Court in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* ((1927) 273 U. S. 135) have sustained the power of either House of Congress to obtain information for a legislative purpose. Further, the Supreme Court on at least one occasion has pointedly suggested that the Senate, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, should enforce its own process. That decision is *Reed* v. *County Commissioners* ((1928) 277 U. S. 376). Further, in enforcing its own process, the Senate is not bound by what may be considered to be desirable judicial practice. This principle is brought out in *Barry* v. *U. S. ex rel. Cunningham* ((1929) 279 U. S. 597). In that case Mr. George W. Wickersham, with whom Attorney General Mitchell was on the brief, argued, in behalf of the Sergeant at Arms Barry, that the court of appeals had "erred in holding that a subpena served on a witness followed by his neglect to appear constituted necessary preliminaries to the issue of the attachment" (p. 601); that since the Senate had jurisdiction to bring Cunningham before it by process of attachment, no inquiry should be made by the Court on habeas corpus into the reasons which induced it to do so, and he should, therefore, be remanded to custody (p. 602). The Court sustained this argument, stating:

"It is not necessary to determine whether the information sought was pertinent to the inquiry before the committee, the scope of which was fixed by the provisions of the Senate resolution. But it might well have been pertinent in an inquiry conducted by the Senate itself, exercising the full, original, and unqualified power conferred by the Constitution. If the Senate thought so, and, from the facts before it reasonably believing that this or other important evidence otherwise might be lost, issued its warrant of arrest, it is not for the court to say that in doing so the Senate abused its discretion. The presumption in favor of regularity, which applies to the proceedings of courts, cannot be denied to the proceedings of the Houses of Congress, when acting upon matters within their constitutional authority. It fairly may be assumed that the Senate will deal with the witness in accordance with well-settled rules and discharge him from custody upon proper assurance, by recognizance or otherwise, that he will appear for interrogation when required. This is all he could properly demand of a court under similar circumstances."

Now, the Reed decision and the Barry decision involved election cases arising under article I, section 5, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States which makes each House the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members. The fact that they are election cases does not detract from the principles heretofore stated for, as Mr. Justice Sutherland said in the Barry opinion:

"In exercising the power to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members, the Senate acts as a judicial tribunal, and the authority to require the attendance of witnesses is a necessary incident of the power to adjudge, in no wise inferior under like circumstances to that exercised by a court of justice. That this includes the power in some cases to issue a warrant of arrest to compel such attendance, as was done here, does not admit of doubt. *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 160, 180). That case dealt with the power of the Senate thus to compel a witness to appear, to give testimony necessary to enable that body efficiently to exercise a legislative function; but the principle is equally, if not a fortiori, applicable where the Senate is exercising a judicial function."

Note carefully the reliance on *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, supra. The power invoked in that decision and principle found by Mr. Justice Sutherland to be equally applicable, stems from the exercise of another grant to the Congress, and that is the grant of "all legislative powers" by article I, section 1, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States. The Senate exercising its constitutional rule making power (art. I, sec. 5, cl. 2) in the implementation of this grant, has conferred upon its standing committees, and thereby its subcommittees, a general investigatory power with respect to the subject matter assigned. This was done by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 831) as an exercise by the Senate of its rule making power and is found on page 57 of the latest edition of the Senate Manual. See Senate Document No. 5, Eighty-second Congress.

Difficulties have multiplied in recent years in attempting to invoke this power to obtain from executive officers of the Government of the United States information essential to the legislative work of the Congress. In numerous embarrassing instances the Senate has been thwarted by these executive officers when it has relied on usual or standard procedures to obtain the necessary information. Most of the resulting contests between Congress and the executive branch have been fought in arenas other than the courts. It is the purpose of this resolution to afford a basis for forcing the issue and obtaining an adjudication by the courts.

In *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, supra, involving the Teapot Dome scandal and the investigation by the Senate of Attorney General Daugherty and his office, the Supreme Court made the nearest approach to a flat recognition of the fitness and propriety of the investigative process in relation to the supervisory power of Congress over executive administration. The Court, however, went only so far as to declare the investigation of the Attorney General necessary and proper on the ground that the information requested was needed for the efficient exercise of the legislative functions. Said the Court:

"We are of opinion that the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. It was so regarded and employed in American legislatures before the Constitution was framed and ratified. Both Houses of Congress took this view of it early in their history—the House of Representatives with the approving votes of Mr. Madison and other Members whose service in the convention which framed the Constitution gives special significance to their action—and both Houses have employed the power accordingly up to the present time. The acts of 1798 and 1857, judged by their comprehensive terms, were intended to recognize the existence of this power in both Houses and to enable them to employ it more effectually than before. So, when their practice in the matter is appraised according to the circumstances in which it was begun and to those in which it has been continued, it falls nothing short of a practical construction, long continued, of the constitutional provisions respecting their powers, and therefore should be taken as fixing the meaning of those provisions, if otherwise doubtful.

"We are further of opinion that the provisions are not of doubtful meaning, but, as was held by this Court in the cases we have reviewed, are intended to be effectively exercised, and therefore to carry with them

such auxiliary powers as are necessary and appropriate to that end. While the power to exact information in aid of the legislative function was not involved in those cases, the rule of interpretation applied there is applicable here. A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it. Experience has taught that mere requests for such information often are unavailing, and also that information which is volunteered is not always accurate or complete; so some means of compulsion are essential to obtain what is needed. All this was true before and when the Constitution was framed and adopted. In that period the power of inquiry—with enforcing process—was regarded and employed as a necessary and appropriate attribute of the power to legislate—indeed, was treated as inhering in it. Thus there is ample warrant for thinking, as we do, that the constitutional provisions which commit the legislative function to the two Houses are intended to include this attribute to the end that the function may be effectively exercised."

With respect to the Senate resolution, the Court said further:

"It is quite true that the resolution directing the investigation does not in terms avow that it is intended to be in aid of legislation; but it does show that the subject to be investigated was the administration of the Department of Justice, whether its functions were being properly discharged or were being neglected or misdirected, and particularly whether the Attorney General and his assistants were performing or neglecting their duties in respect of the institution and prosecution of proceedings to punish crimes and enforce appropriate remedies against the wrongdoers, specific instances of alleged neglect being recited. Plainly, the subject was one on which legislation could be had and would be materially aided by the information which the investigation was calculated to elicit. This becomes manifest when it is reflected that the functions of the Department of Justice, the powers and duties of the Attorney General and the duties of his assistants, are all subject to regulation by congressional legislation, and that the Department is maintained and its activities are carried on under such appropriations as in the judgment of Congress are needed from year to year.

"The only legitimate object the Senate could have in ordering the investigation was to aid it in legislating; and we think the subject matter was such that the presumption should be indulged that this was the real object. An express avowal of the object would have been better; but in view of the particular subject matter was not indispensable."

This precedent obviously does not go far enough. Therefore, in view of past experience, it is time that the Congress either force the issue or quit trying to compel executive officers to produce information essential to the enactment of legislation on an informed basis.

This resolution cannot be said to be a reflection on, or a threat to, the new executive administration. But it should be considered as notice, long overdue, to executive officers generally that Congress intends to have that information which it deems essential to the exercise of its legislative powers, and that if this fails, other constitutional powers and prerogatives will be brought to bear on that matter.

Senate Resolution 16

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, of any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to the Central Intelligence Agency, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to the Central Intelligence Agency a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty of such employee.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I have submitted a resolution (S. Res. 16) relating to loyalty checks on Senate employees.

The suggestion has come to the chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee on several occasions that it would be highly desirable and certainly proper for the legislative department of government to have the same standards regarding loyalty as are supposed to exist in the judicial and executive departments. It is incontrovertible that certain individuals who have been unable to qualify under the loyalty tests for an executive department, have been and may now be employed "on the Hill," where no loyalty requirements are established under the reorganization bill or otherwise.

Several factors must be recognized:

1. Any Member of Congress probably has the right to employ assistants in his own office at his own discretion. It must be recognized that a prohibition against the employment of any person who was a member of a Communist organization would operate to deny to a Communist Member of Congress, if such should be elected, the right to employ assistants of his own party.

The Reorganization Act made no attempt to legislate as to the office staff of Members of Congress, but did set up certain standards for employees of committees. Hence, it is logical to follow this same pattern in connection with the present proposal.

2. The mechanical difficulties of providing for the loyalty check are recognized. Nevertheless, it is equally apparent that both Houses have the office of the Secretary or the Clerk, with staffs to handle various and sundry matters; also existent are the offices of the Sergeant at Arms of the respective Houses and the disbursing officers. It would not be an insurmountable task for a prospective employee to be checked against the files of the FBI, the CIA, and the Un-American Activities Committee. In the event no derogatory information is uncovered, it could well then be left within the discretion of the committee itself as to whether a further report should be requested through the usual facilities of the Government.

It must be recognized that assuming responsibility in an executive or judicial department of this Government is restricted, or supposedly so, to those who can pass the loyalty test. This is not true of the legislative branch.

It is further recognized that there are various degrees of loyalty tests required, varying with the nature of the work of the Government employee; and, in some instances, the requirement is waived, either temporarily, to expedite the work of the department, or in some instances permanently. It is further recognized that any employee of the Senate or the House subscribes to a general loyalty oath, as is true throughout the Government.

Against possible objections to this proposal is the indisputable fact that employees of committees drafting legislation, supervising hearings, writing reports, and otherwise participating in the law-making function of the legislative body, are in a most strategic position for the consistent and subtle and extremely effective accomplishment of objectives, good or bad, but nevertheless influential beyond measure on the lives of every person in this country.

S. 251

A bill to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees

Be it enacted, etc., That the first item listed in section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"$20 on trial or final hearing (including a default judgment whether entered by the court or by the clerk) in civil, criminal, or admiralty cases, except that in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction where the libellant recovers less than $50 the proctor's docket fee shall be $10."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill (S. 251) to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees. This bill originally was proposed for introduction by the Attorney General (then Mr. McGrath). A memorandum respecting this bill was placed in the RECORD at the time it was introduced by me on January 29, 1952, as S. 2547 of the Eighty-second Congress. This memorandum can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, page 567.

That memorandum, I believe, together with the report from the Attorney General on the bill provides almost all that would be necessary for a committee report on the measure. The bill has obvious merit and should be enacted into law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, Eighty-third Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952, modifying and supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the Presi-

dent will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952, modifying and supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

The convention of 1948 was transmitted to the Senate with my message of March 12, 1949. It is presently under consideration in the Committee on Foreign Relations (S. Ex. I, 81st Cong., 1st sess.). It is requested that the supplementary convention be considered together with the convention of 1948.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention.

The supplementary convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) supplementary convention between the United States and Belgium relating to taxes on income, signed September 9, 1952.)

HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have released to the press today, announcing that next week hearings will be held by the Committee on Foreign Relations relative to the proposed nominations of Secretary of State-designate John Foster Dulles, Under Secretary of State-designate Walter Bedell Smith, and Mutual Security Administrator-designate Harold Stassen, pursuant to the suggestion of the President-elect that the Cabinet appointments be confirmed on Inauguration Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I believe that every reasonable effort should be made to consider the nominations of President-elect Eisenhower's official Cabinet and other high appointees with dispatch, consistent with the Senate's right to determine the views and backgrounds of the nominees.

I believe in particular that the present critical world situation requires that there be no gap in continuity of American leadership in foreign affairs after noontime of January 20.

Accordingly, I am happy to agree with several of my distinguished colleagues who have already spoken on this subject. I shall submit to my associates on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at our first meeting, which may be next Wednesday, the day following the Senate's approval of committee assignments, that executive sessions be held and that we hear from Secretary of State-designate John Foster Dulles, Under Secretary of State-designate Walter Bedell Smith, Mutual Security Administrator-designate Harold Stassen.

Thus, if the Senate has organized its committees by next midweek, I hope these hearings can be held on Thursday and Friday so that by the following Tuesday, January 20, we will definitely be ready to report the nominations to the Senate.

I believe that my Democratic and Republican colleagues on the committee are most anxious to cooperate to the fullest possible extent with General Eisenhower, especially in promptly reviewing these key foreign policy appointments.

I very definitely believe, however, that no executive nominee for diplomatic or other post should be confirmed by the Senate until after hearings have been held. Hearings are in the best interest of the record of the nominees themselves. They are in the best interest of the incoming administration, and in the best interest of the Congress and its constitutional prerogatives.

I conferred with Mr. Dulles on Thursday afternoon in my office, and he indicated that he and General Smith would look forward to coming together with the committee the latter part of next week.

General Eisenhower has moved during the 2 months since November 4 with admirable dispatch and decision, and I believe that we in the Senate should do likewise without, however, in any way sacrificing our traditional right of advice and consent.

ALLEGED VIOLATION OF SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT BY KANSAS CITY STAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week the Government filed charges against the Kansas City Star for an alleged violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

For several months there has been evidence that the President was going to insist on such action through his own Justice Department before he left the office of the Presidency.

On September 29 I released a statement in which I said:

Reports come to me from reliable sources that President Truman, angered at the stream of revelations by the press of the scandals in his administration, is going to strike back at a number of newspapers.

The plan, according to my information, is for Mr. Truman's Department of Justice to subpena files, letters, memoranda and records of newspapers and subject them to thorough examination by Truman appointees during the closing weeks of this political campaign. Something like this attempt at political intimidation could have been predicted September 11 when President Truman blasted the newspapers of the country at a press conference. Later that day the White House released an official statement emphasizing his remarks.

Mr. President, the suit that has been filed by the Justice Department is proof that my statement and predictions were correct.

Those of us who are somewhat familiar with the campaign of the Kansas City Star against the Pendergast machine—one of the most corrupt machines in the United States—and the exposing of election frauds and distruction of ballots, could well anticipate this vindictive action on the part of the President.

It is a dangerous situation when a newspaper of the standing of the Kansas City Star, interested in sound, clean government, can be harassed by the agents and representatives of any administration in power for taking steps to keep our Government free from graft, corruption, and crooked politics.

This is a punitive action on the part of the President and one that I assure you, Mr. President, must not go unchallenged by the press and our citizens generally.

It is my sincere hope that the new administration will further check on the fact that the FBI, which was sent into Kansas City to make investigations, was by direct order from the top, restricted to a strictly limited investigation.

There can be no question as to the fraud and corruption that was covered up by the administration in power.

I sincerely hope that the new administration will act courageously in this matter.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made on September 29, 1952.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

Reports come to me from reliable sources that President Truman, angered at the stream of revelations by the press of the scandals in his administration, is going to strike back at a number of newspapers. It smacks of strongarm attempts to browbeat.

The plan, according to my information, is for Mr. Truman's Department of Justice to subpena files, letters, memoranda, and records of newspapers and subject them to thorough examination by Truman appointees during the closing weeks of this political campaign. Something like this attempt at political intimidation could have been predicted September 11 when President Truman blasted the newspapers of the country at a press conference. Later that day the White House released an official statement emphasizing his remarks.

The Truman administration is hostile to the press. The press has had a major hand, despite all the official efforts to cover things up, in telling the American people all about the mess in Washington. The nasty political flavor of these election-year attacks on newspapers was emphasized when the first newspaper to be involved in this election year was the Kansas City Star, all of whose records and files have been subpenaed. It is significant that in his September 11 statement, Mr. Truman said: "So far as I can remember, I never had the support of the metropolitan press in Missouri when I was running for the Senate."

The sending of a horde of Government agents into the newspaper offices during an election campaign may be Truman's idea of silencing opposition. It will not work. He will learn on November 4 that the revelations by the free press of the United States have compelled our people to demand a change. The newspapers merely told the truth about the scandalous years in Washington during the Truman administration.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of the Kansas City Star to the United

States Government's antitrust charges filed against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The reply referred to appears in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

UNEXPENDED BALANCES IN FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to unexpended balances in Federal appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I make this statement relative to estimated unexpended balances in appropriations, and other authorizations for Federal expenditures, as of July 1, 1953.

It appears that in addition to appropriations yet to be made by Congress in the current session, unexpended balances remaining as of July 1, 1953, in old appropriations will approach $100,000,000,000, with more than $75,000,000,000 in general and special fund accounts, and the remaining $20,000,000,000 in business enterprise and revolving fund accounts.

Among the civilian agencies this includes $8,600,000,000 in general and special fund accounts and $18,100,000,000 in business enterprise and revolving fund accounts.

Unexpended balances in the Military Establishment are estimated at $63,000,000,000. Unexpended balances in foreign aid accounts are estimated at approximately $10,500,000,000.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-SEVENTY-FIVE-BILLION-DOLLAR TOTAL

It has been reported that the President in his budget message on Friday will estimate expenditures in the fiscal year beginning July 1 at $75,000,000,000 to $80,000,000,000, and that he will request new appropriations, effective as of that date, totaling $70,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000.

If such new appropriations should be authorized by this Congress, total funds available for expenditure as of July 1 would approach $175,000,000,000. It is true that a substantial part of these balances have been obligated by contractual agreements but the term "obligated" has no uniform meaning and many agencies of Government report the funds to be obligated even though no contract has been entered into. In any event, unexpended balances in old appropriations, as of the beginning of the new fiscal year, will be greater than the new appropriations expected to be requested by the President.

EXPENDITURE CONTROL LOST

The fact remains that this availability of funds in unexpended balances is not generally reviewed by Congress, under ordinary procedures, during consideration of regular appropriation bills.

It is obvious that this procedure of piling up unprecedented unspent balances is not a healthy fiscal policy. It makes much more difficult the congressional task of effecting economies and controlling expenditures.

Under the Truman policy of the past several years, about half of the Federal expenditures have been from previous appropriations, and about half from current appropriations; unspent balances in appropriations have been carried over in amounts equal to a full year's expenditure or more.

As a result of this procedure, Congress has virtually lost control over annual expenditures.

NEW CONGRESS OBLIGATION

At a time when one of the most difficult problems confronting Congress is to balance the budget and reduce taxes, it is most unfortunate that the fiscal situation is so confused by these huge unexpended balances.

In my judgment, one of the most important obligations of the new Congress is to review the unexpended balances in previous appropriations to each agency of the Federal Government before new appropriations are made. It should be made incumbent upon each agency fully to justify any additional appropriations when huge balances are already available. Then a study should be begun promptly so that in the future appropriations can be enacted on a current basis.

It is true, of course, especially in the military, that Government agencies should have the power to contract beyond a 1-year period, but Congress should so reform its fiscal procedure to regain expenditure control on a current year basis. This could be accomplished without interference with national defense requirements.

Estimated unexpended balances reported by civilian agencies and summarized estimates for military and foreign aid accounts follow:

Summary of unexpended balances in appropriations and authorizations to agencies of the executive branch as of July 1, 1953, showing general and special fund accounts and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts (estimated)

Department or agency	General and special fund accounts	Business enterprise and revolving fund accounts
	Thousands	Thousands
Executive Office of the President:		
The White House Office	$78	.....
Executive Mansion and Grounds	145	.....
Bureau of the Budget	156	.....
Council of Economic Advisers	2	.....
National Security Council	18	.....
National Security Resources Board	33	.....
Office of Defense Mobilization	213	.....
Funds appropriated to the President:		
Emergency fund for the President	29,999	.....
Independent offices:		
American Battle Monuments Commission	9,863	.....
Atomic Energy Commission	3,147,631	$25
Civil Aeronautics Board	307	.....
Civil Service Commission	2,080	3,127
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	.....	33,000
Defense Production Administration	206	1,855,723
Defense Transport Administration	185	.....
Economic Stabilization Agency	1,000	.....
Federal Civil Defense Administration	32,782	3,061
Federal Communications Commission	206	.....
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	158	.....
Federal Power Commission	392	.....
Federal Trade Commission	200	.....
General Accounting Office	2,000	.....
Government Printing Office	10,463	.....
Indian Claims Commission	3	.....
Interstate Commerce Commission	775	.....
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	84,041	.....
National Capital Housing Authority	10	.....
National Capital Planning Commission	178	.....
National Labor Relations Board	762	.....
National Mediation Board	97	.....
National Science Foundation	3,033	.....

Summary of unexpended balances in appropriations and authorizations to agencies of the executive branch as of July 1, 1953, showing general and special fund accounts and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts (estimated)—Continued

Department or agency	General and special fund accounts	Business enterprise and revolving fund accounts
	Thousands	Thousands
Independent offices—Con.		
National Security Training Commission	$11	.....
Railroad Retirement Board	30,172	.....
Renegotiation Board	242	.....
Securities and Exchange Commission	264	.....
Selective Service System	6,083	.....
Small Defense Plants Administration	400	$1
Smithsonian Institution	317	.....
National Gallery of Art	107	.....
Subversive Activities Control Board	18	.....
Tariff Commission	97	.....
The Tax Court of the United States	51	.....
Veterans' Administration	250,687	48,303
Export-Import Bank of Washington	.....	2,229,565
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	.....	4,410,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	.....	837,906
Tennessee Valley Authority	.....	203,941
Federal Security Agency	587,919	403
General Services Administration	1,732,906	17,104
Housing and Home Finance Agency	15,303	3,871,943
Department of Agriculture	1,066,734	4,419,931
Department of Commerce	135,719	44,088
Department of Interior	229,547	14,904
Department of Justice	18,962	4,013
Department of Labor	12,232	3,238
Post Office Department	180,579	.....
Department of State	104,267	212
Department of the Treasury	878,956	7,617
Total, civilian agencies	8,579,328	18,099,060
		Billion
Total, civilian agencies, including general and special, and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts		26.7
Total, Department of Defense, including general and special, and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts		63.0
Total, foreign aid, including general and special, and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts		10.5
Grand total, including general and special, and business enterprise and revolving fund accounts		100.2

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have received from the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay Warren, a letter dated January 8, 1953, regarding the progress and work of his agency. I am sure that all other Members of the Senate, and probably all Members of Congress, have received a similar letter. It is of such significance in calling attention to the work of the General Accounting Office, which is an agency of Congress, and the results which that agency has accomplished, particularly in matters of economy and in reducing personnel and in recovering for the Government sums which have been more than sufficient to pay the operating cost of the agency for the past 10 years, that I believe it merits being placed in the RECORD for the information of all who are interested in affairs of the Federal Government. In my judgment, Mr. Warren deserves the

warm praise and commendation of the Congress for the record he has made, one that other agency and department heads might well emulate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR: A few years ago, during a conversation with several Members of Congress, I was amazed to learn how little information Congress as a whole had about the General Accounting Office and its place in our Government. At the suggestion of those Members, I sent a short letter to the Congress pointing up certain facts about the Office which I thought every Member would want to know. Since that time, I have sent a similar letter at the beginning of each new Congress. That is the reason for this letter, which requires no reply.

The General Accounting Office is in the legislative branch. It is the agency of the Congress to audit and settle accounts and claims of the Government and to advise and assist the Congress and the departments and agencies on matters relating to public expenditures. The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

I have said on a number of occasions, and I have no hesitancy in repeating it at this time of intense discussion of budgets and expenditures, there is not a department or agency in the Government that cannot reduce the number of its employees, providing there is a will to do so. It is not an easy job, even if you have the will, but I think the results we have achieved in the GAO without any mandate from the Congress furnish ample proof that it can be done. In April 1946 the number of our employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 6,204 employees on January 1, 1953. This is a reduction of 8,700, or nearly 60 percent, in the last 7 years. Of this number, 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department.

Our accomplishments in reducing personnel have been brought about by constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present-day conditions. In cases where changes were needed, but legal obstacles precluded them, we asked and received from the Congress revisions in the law. In bringing about changes we have always tried to make sure there would be no loss of control of public funds. There has not been. In fact, the revised procedures are enabling the GAO and the Government generally to do a far more competent job.

I know statistics are dull, but these will give some idea of the volume of our work last year: 2,000,000 vouchers audited; 508,000 claims settled; 264,000,000 checks reconciled; 12,000 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made by investigators of 691 different Government offices; 28 audit reports submitted to the Congress, including reports of 1951 audits of all Government corporations; work on accounting systems done in nearly every department and agency of the Government; 820 reports made to the Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to individual members of Congress.

The GAO has continued to make collections of amounts illegally or otherwise improperly paid out far in excess of the cost of operating the office. The GAO is one of the few agencies in the Government that more than pays its way. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1952, total over $816,000,000. It is a fair statement to say that little of this amount would have ever been recovered except for the work of the GAO. Naturally I am proud of this record. But I feel of greater importance is the work the office is doing to prevent illegal or improvident use of funds by the improvement of accounting and auditing throughout the Government.

In the past few years the GAO has placed a great deal of emphasis on the joint program of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General for the improvement of accounting, budgeting, financial reporting, and auditing in the Government. Equal emphasis has been placed on the adoption by the GAO of comprehensive and other on-site audits of the departments and agencies. The concepts of these two programs were unanimously adopted by the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. Remarkable results are being achieved. Although we who are working with the programs every day know we are just commencing to get beneath the surface of many of the problems involved, actual savings already accomplished run into millions of dollars each year. In addition, improved efficiency of operations in the accounting and auditing fields, which cannot always be estimated dollar-wise, has been of great significance.

With the tremendous growth of Government activities and their supporting appropriations, we in the GAO are keenly aware of the financial problems facing the Congress. The magnitude of expenditures makes it of utmost importance that the Government seek every possible means of obtaining full value for each taxpayer's dollar spent. In our work, we are making an all-out effort to create a greater cost consciousness on the part of every department, agency, and bureau. This goes not only to keeping the public spending within the laws enacted by the Congress, but to exposing or better yet preventing extravagances which, although legal, cannot be tolerated under present-day conditions. Yet you and I both know that economy in government cannot be accomplished by any one agency or individual. Each and every officer and employee of the Government and each and every citizen must make his contribution, for real results can only be achieved through a day-by-day, continuing attack by all of us.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Role of the Minority," delivered by Senator KEFAUVER before the New York County Lawyers Association at New York City, on December 11, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, at Harrisburg, Pa., November 17, 1952.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Text of a radio broadcast by Tris Coffin on January 7, 1953, on the program entitled "The Chesapeake & Ohio News Summary," in which reference is made to Senator TAFT.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Letter from Secretary of Commerce Sawyer to the President of the United States submitting a review of European business and economic problems and progress.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address by His Excellency Jacques Leger, of Haiti, at ceremonies in the Haitian Embassy, Washington, D. C., honoring Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning.

By Mr. IVES:

Address entitled "The Election Results and the Business Outlook," delivered by Eliot V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week, at dinner meeting of the Economic Club of New York, in the Hotel Astor, New York City, November 18, 1952.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Address delivered by Clarence Manion, former dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

A statement by Joseph H. Freehill, newly appointed Director of Price Stabilization.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Editorial entitled "The Senate's Rules," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 5, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "A Man of Learning," written by Hon. Tom R. Underwood, and published in the Lexington, (Ky.) Herald of recent date.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "The Propaganda Program of Our Academic Hucksters," written by E. Merrill Root and published in the American Legion Magazine for December 1952.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Our Liberty Must Be Guarded," published in the Ohio State Journal of December 19, 1952.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 18, dealing with the number of Members on certain committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 18) proposing changes in the number of Members on certain standing committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the meeting of the Senate on Wednesday last, I have been working steadily on the question of the number of Members on certain standing committees, with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], the distinguished minority whip [Mr. CLEMENTS]; also the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other Republican Senators. We have conferred with various Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and we have reached an agreement which requires a modification of the resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 18 be modified in the following respects——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the modified form been printed, or is it in such form that we can see it? I do not wish to delay consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. A memorandum has been prepared. I shall explain it as I go along.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 18 be modified in the following respects:

On page 2, line 9, strike out "eleven," and insert "nine." That would reduce the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia to nine.

Strike out lines 10, 11, and 12, dealing with the Committee on Government Operations. That would leave the Committee on Government Operations with 13 members, as now, instead of 11.

On page 2, after line 24, strike out line 25, and also lines 1 and 2 on page 3, dealing with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That would leave that committee with a membership of 13, as at present, instead of changing it to 15.

On page 3, line 11, strike out "eleven," and insert "nine." That would reduce the membership of the Committee on Rules and Administration to nine.

On page 3, line 15, strike out "18" and insert "14," which would permit 14 Senators of the majority party to hold membership on three committees.

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, namely, "the Committee on Public Works."

Under the modification the membership of nine committees will be increased by two. Those committees are the Committee on Appropriations and eight other committees.

The membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was increased during the previous Congress, will remain at 13.

The Committee on Government Operations, instead of being reduced to 11 members, will remain at 13, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will be reduced to 11 members. The Committee on Public Works will be reduced to 11 members. The Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Rules and Administration will be reduced to nine.

The net result is that there will be 18 additional places on the 9 committees on which membership is most desired and which have the heaviest load of work to be done. There will be two committees of 13, two committees of 11, and two committees of 9, also very much in proportion to work which is to be done.

From the point of view of Senators, there will be 18 more places on desirable committees, and there will be 12 fewer places on committees for membership on which there has been very little application. Eighteen additional places will be available on the 9 committees on which membership is most desired and which handle the heaviest work. Two committees will consist of 13 members, 2 committees of 11 members, and 2 committees of 9 members.

The net increase in total committee membership is 6, which makes it necessary to provide that 3 members of the majority and 3 members of the minority may serve on 3 committees, in addition to the 11 members of the majority who already may serve on 3 committees.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared showing the result of the proposed plan.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that it is a mimeographed statement which is available for distribution.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

THE COMMITTEE PLAN AS AGREED TO BE AMENDED

1. To increase nine standing committees by 2 members each (1 majority, 1 minority), and to reduce two by 2 and two by 4 and to leave two as they are.

2. To permit 14 Senators of the majority and 3 of the minority to serve on a third standing committee—Civil Service, District of Columbia, or Government Operations. (Present rules do not include Civil Service and do not recognize the minority.)

This will present the following committee picture:

Twenty-three members instead of 21: (1)—Appropriations.

Fifteen members instead of 13: (8)—Agriculture, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Interior and Insular Affairs.

To stay at 13 members: (2)—Government Operations, Labor and Public Welfare.

Eleven members instead of 13: (2)—Civil Service, Public Works.

Nine members instead of 13: (2)—District of Columbia, Rules and Administration.

The resolution as thus amended should—

1. More evenly distribute the workload of all committees and of all Senators.

2. Preserve the values of experience and long service in the Senate and extend it for the minority on Civil Service, District of Columbia, and Government Operations.

3. Make better use of talent and experience found in new Senators.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish personally to thank the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader for their action with regard to the subject to which I invited attention last Wednesday, in connection with the proposed reduction of membership of the Committee on Government Operations. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I made my statement on Wednesday in the interest of what I thought would be sound organization of this body. I had no personal interest in the matter. Having served on the committee both as a member and as chairman, I am familiar with the volume of work and the importance of the work over which the committee has jurisdiction, and which it will be required to handle in this session of Congress. I believe that the majority leader and other Senators were very wise in modifying the pending resolution so as to permit membership of 13 Senators on the Committee on Government Operations.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. TAFT. After examining the conditions, we found that probably the Committee on Government Operations would be confronted with a good deal of reorganization legislation, and that it would conduct also quite a bit of investigatory work, which is also within the scope of the committee, and therefore the committee would require the additional members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before action is taken on the resolution I wish to reiterate the points stated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion the proposal as now submitted is in much better form than the one submitted at the session of the Senate on Wednesday last. The resolution, with the proposed amendments, gives to the minority the exact number of additional assignments which the previous Congress gave to the minority. If the resolution is agreed to, it will serve to lessen the stress on the steering committees of the Senate.

I wish to commend the majority leader for his evident fairness. I desire also to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has worked long and late in an effort to provide a fair and equitable arrangement. I express the hope that on procedural matters in the future we can be as successful and harmonious as we have been in this instance.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified as I have indicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is modified in line with the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), as agreed to, is as follows:

Resolved, That section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (a) (relating to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(2) by striking out "twenty-one" in subsection (b) (relating to the Committee on Appropriations) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three";

(3) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (c) (relating to the Committee on Armed Services) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(4) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (d) (relating to the Committee on Banking and Currency) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(5) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(6) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (f) (relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia) and inserting in lieu thereof "nine";

(7) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (h) (relating to the Committee on Finance) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(8) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (i) (relating to the Committee on Foreign Relations) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(9) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (j) (relating to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(10) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (k) (relating to the Committee on the Judiciary) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(11) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (m) (relating to the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(12) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven"; and

(13) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (o) (1) (relating to the Committee on Rules and Administration) and inserting in lieu thereof "nine."

SEC. 2. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed fourteen Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed three Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on three standing committees and no more."

FURNISHING BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF A LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 19, and that the resolution be immediately considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 19), as follows:

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a full and complete list of all offices, positions, places, and employments, listing the same by departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, and independent establishments, including the government of the District of Columbia, unofficial observers, special attorneys or special agents, and Federal employments of all kinds, with the amount of salaries of each attached, under the Government of the United States and not under civil service rules and regulations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submitted the resolution because I believe certain information should be made available to the Senate. It is a typical resolution. It is an exact duplicate of a resolution which on a previous occasion was submitted by the former Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKellar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Kansas referring to the resolution concerning which he spoke to me?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that I have examined the precedents and I have conferred with the ranking minority member of the committee. So far as I know, there is no objection to the resolution.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE WORK AND WORKLOAD OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from time to time it has been my custom to report to the Senate upon the work and workload of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate.

A final report on the Judiciary Committee's work and workload during the two sessions of the Eighty-second Congress has been completed.

Mr. President, the workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the two sessions of the Eighty-second Congress, as of July 7, 1952, comprised 47.1 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 59.3 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; and 50.2 percent of all bills and resolutions, irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than has any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than has any other committee. Of 2,121 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,226, which represents 57.8 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 7,145 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, and 2,216 cases involving adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

At the close of the Eighty-second Congress, the Judiciary Committee had received 1,936 Senate bills and resolutions and 854 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,790 bills and resolutions.

As of the close of the Eighty-second Congress, the committee had disposed of 1,185 Senate bills and resolutions and 722 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,907 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of, 173 were general bills, other than claims or immigration; 453 were private relief bills; 1,230 were private immigration bills; 18 were general claims bills; and 33 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 598 Senate bills and resolutions and 632 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,230 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 4 of the 1,230 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably, 107 were general bills, other than claims or immigration; 280 were private relief bills; 821 were private immigration bills; 11 were general claims bills; and 11 were general immigration bills.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 587 Senate bills and resolutions, 90 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 677 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 66 were general bills, other than claims or immigration bills; 173 were private relief bills; 409 were private immigration bills; 7 were general claims bills; and 22 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee as of the close of the Eighty-second Congress included 751 Senate bills and resolutions and 132 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 883 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 148 are general bills, other than immigration and claims bills; 134 are private relief bills; 581 are private immigration bills; 15 are general claims bills; and 5 are general immigration bills.

Committee action, Mr. President, in most cases must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. As of July 7, 1952, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports have been requested, but not received, was 609, of which 60 were general bills, other than claims or immigration measures; 49 were private relief bills; 491 were private immigration bills; 8 were general claims bills; and 1 was a general immigration bill.

Thus, Mr. President, it will be seen that of the 2,790 bills and resolutions referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in the Eighty-second Congress, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted, but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled 274, of which 88 were general bills, other than claims or immigration measures; 85 were private relief bills; 90 were private immigration bills; 7 were general claims bills; and 4 were general immigration bills.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that the committee has disposed of 722 House bills and resolutions, of 854 such measures referred to it, leaving only 132 House bills and resolutions pending at the close of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress.

This means the committee took action on 84.5 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, of 1,936 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the Committee on the Judiciary acted upon 1,185, leaving 751 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to start from scratch in all such cases, action was taken on 63.3 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General and adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, are, under authority delegated by the Congress, reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending in the committee 2,761 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 10,529 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 13,290 cases, of which 7,145 were approved, 2,568 were held for further consideration, and 81 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving

3,496 cases in process as of the close of the Eighty-second Congress.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending 845 cases of adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, to which were added 2,448 additional cases submitted during that Congress, making a total of 3,293 cases, of which 2,216 were approved, 28 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 514 were held for further consideration, leaving 535 cases in process, as of July 7, 1952.

Through July 7, 1952, at the close of the Eighty-second Congress, the committee received 151 executive nominations, of which 41 were Federal judges, 52 were United States district attorneys, 40 were United States marshals, 1 was Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, 1 was Assistant Commissioner of Patents, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 1 was Deputy Attorney General, 2 were Assistant Attorneys General, 2 were Examiners in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office, and 10 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As of the close of the Eighty-second Congress, nominations pending totaled eight, two of which were received in committee after July 3, 1952.

Mr. President, I make that report to the Senate at this time because, by dint of circumstances, the senior Senator from Nevada will not be chairman of the Judiciary Committee during this session of Congress. I pledge to whomsoever may be chairman my best efforts in assisting him in the arduous and trying work of the Committee on the Judiciary. I make this report, not merely on my own behalf but on behalf of the 13 members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate who handled this voluminous mass of business. No Member of the Senate, outside the Judiciary Committee, can fully appreciate the load of work that is done by that committee. I am glad to see that the number of Senators on the Judiciary Committee has been increased. This has been needed for a long time. It will relieve to some extent the burden upon each individual member.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to take advantage of this moment to express my heartfelt gratitude to the fine members of the Judiciary Committee who have worked with me during the time I have been its chairman. They have given their best efforts; they have labored arduously and have worked long hours. I desire also to extend my gratitude to the fine staff that has served the Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a memorandum showing that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported a larger number of bills which became public laws during the Eighty-second Congress than did any other Senate committee.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As of the close of the second session, Eighty-second Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary had reported 70 of the 594 bills and resolutions which were enacted into public laws. The 70 measures reported by the committee are as follows:

Public Law	Bill No.	Title
5	H. R. 335	Sedgwick, Kans., Commissioners.
6	H. R. 1000	Alien spouses.
14	H. R. 2339	Federal regulations re subversive aliens.
31	H. R. 3291	Bankruptcy.
32	H. R. 3292	Do.
56	H. R. 389	For relief of State of Maryland.
60	H. R. 3576	To amend Displaced Persons Act.
61	S. J. Res. 51	Commemorating Independence Day.
62	H. R. 2924	Parole of prisoners.
65	H. R. 2396	Passport frauds.
71	H. R. 1746	Bankruptcy.
75	S. 1042	Motor Carrier Claims Commission.
79	H. R. 2395	Secret Service—basic authority.
93	H. R. 1899	Amending charter—Daughters of American Revolution.
98	H. R 2455	Parole of prisoners.
114	H. R. 400	Expeditious naturalization of former citizens.
116	H. R. 3142	Japanese evacuation claims.
117	H. R. 3442	To protect emblems, etc., of Girl Scouts.
126	S. 248	Audubon Centennial Year.
128	S. J. Res. 42	Interstate oil and gas compact.
129	H. R. 4106	Permitting photographic reproductions of business records as evidence.
141	S. 15	Employment agency fees.
154	S. 24	Customs Bureau land and building facilities.
194	H. R. 4693	Bankruptcy (Long Island R. R.).
220	H. R. 1181	Payment of claims re correction military or naval records.
223	H. R. 4945	Refunding of forfeited bail.
225	H. J. Res. 308	Stephen Foster Memorial Day.
232	S. 1482	Relief of town of Mount Desert, Maine.
248	H. R. 3899	To amend certain titles of United States Code.
250	H. R. 2176	Relief of Fort Pierce Port District.
256	H. R. 4087	Withholding patents for security purposes.
261	H. J. Res. 314	Citizenship Day.
281	S. 1345	Court fees for the District of Columbia, United States District Court.
283	S. 1851	Preventing illegal entry of aliens (wetbacks).
300	S. 1184	Youth Correction Act for District of Columbia.
301	S. 1212	Federal Savings and Loan Association.
303	S. 1415	War Claims Act (increased compensation, etc.).
304	S. 1669	War Claims Act (persons under legal disability).
306	S. 2266	Pay increases of certain Navy Department employees.
307	S. 2549	Relief of sheepherding industry.
313	H. J. Res. 423	Temporary extension of emergency statutes.
324	H. J. Res. 382	National Prayer Day.
333	S. 2160	Admission of State prisoners to Federal prisons.
342	S. 1365	Rehabilitation of Federal prisoners.
344	H. J. Res. 445	Proclaiming Olympic Week.
350	S. 2322	Protecting the name of "Smokey Bear".
368	S. J. Res. 156	Extension of emergency statutes to June 15, 1952.
378	S. 302	Amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.
395	S. 1932	Establishment of facilities for detention of aliens.
414	H. R. 5678	Revision and codification of immigration laws.
432	S. 2198	Relating to theft or receipt of stolen mail.
435	S. 908	Interstate compact relating to mutual military aid.
437	S. 1537	Extension of patents of World War II veterans.
438	S. 2214	Amending Criminal Code regarding use of word "national."
439	H. R. 404	Military Personnel Claims Act.
440	H. J. Res. 477	Emergency powers continuation.
456	S. 2234	Bankruptcy Act—clarifying amendments.
457	S. 2240	Bankruptcy Act—salaries of referees.
458	S. 2545	Federal employees travel expenses.
473	S. 3276	Correction of an error in Public Law 342, 82d Cong.
480	S. 2393	For the relief of the State of New Hampshire.
490	H. R. 4100	Printing and distributing Statutes at Large.
514	S. 2149	Jurisdiction of crimes committed on airplanes.
516	S. 2922	Salaries of members of Subversive Activities Control Board.
532	S. 3195	Jurisdiction of Court of Claims to determine certain claims.
537	S. 2199	Abolition of Appeals Board of Office of Contract Settlement.
575	H. R. 3589	Amending copyright laws regarding literary works.
581	H. R. 948	Terms of court at West Palm Beach and Fort Myers, Fla.
582	H. R. 3975	Permitting copatentee to sue in Court of Claims.
593	H. R. 7794	Codification of patent laws.

Twenty-one bills and resolutions bypassed Senate committees, among which were Senate Joint Resolution 40, amending War Claims Act, House Joint Resolution 284, one hundredth anniversary of John Howard Payne, Senate Joint Resolution 147, Bataan Day, House Joint Resolution 481 and House Joint Resolution 490, temporary extension of emergency powers, which normally would have come to this committee.

Public laws resulting from bills reported by other Senate committees, are:

Agriculture	30
Appropriations	38
Armed Services	62
Atomic Energy	1
Banking and Currency	23
District of Columbia	53
Finance	65
Foreign Relations	12
Government Operations	19
Interior and Insular Affairs	63
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	38
Labor and Public Welfare	11
Post Office and Civil Service	34
Public Works	36
Rules and Administration	5
Total	503

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

It may be that in this particular session I may not be a member of the Judiciary Committee, but I should like to say to the Senate that during the 10 years I have served on that committee, particularly in the years I have served under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, he has done an outstanding job, not only for the Senate of the United States, but also for the people of the United States. During those years the committee with the help of its staff has been able to take care of the enormous load which was placed upon it. The distinguished chairman has always seen to it that the work was done, and done well. I think the Senate and the people owe a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his splendid leadership of the Judiciary Committee. He is a former judge, he understands the judiciary, he understands the problems which confront the Justice Department and the judiciary, and in my opinion, he has always labored for the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in

commendation of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary presented by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I have not been a member of that committee, but I have followed the work of its Subcommittee on Internal Security, and I think that we certainly owe a debt of gratitude to the committee for the work which it has done.

BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 16)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President pro tempore lay before the Senate the message from the President of the United States transmitting the budget so that it may be read at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the budget message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the message.

(For full text of message from the President of the United States submitting the budget, see House proceedings today, pp. 295–310.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message and budget will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and will be printed.

MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement. The Minority Steering Committee will meet on Monday, January 12, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the Democratic Policy Committee room on the third floor of the Capitol Building. I hope that all members of the committee will take notice of this announcement and arrange to be present.

I also give notice to all members of the minority who have not notified the secretary to the minority, Mr. Felton Johnston, of the committee assignments they desire, to send to Mr. Johnston before tomorrow noon letters stating their desires.

TITLE TO CERTAIN COASTAL AND OTHER SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 39 other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this time in this Senate the precise measure which passed both Houses in the last Congress, but was later subjected to the veto of the President, known as Senate Joint Resolution 20, or perhaps better known as the quitclaim tidelands measure. I have prepared a written statement for myself and the other Senators who join me in submitting the joint resolution, and I now ask unanimous consent that the measure itself be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and that the prepared statement likewise be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. MCCARRAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Submerged Lands Act."

TITLE I

DEFINITION

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(a) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" includes (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which were covered by waters navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, and all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as herein defined; the term "boundaries" includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof;

(b) The term "coast line" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters, which include all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea;

(c) The terms "grantees" and "lessees" include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions, municipalities, public and private corporations, and other persons holding grants or leases from a State, or its predecessor sovereign, to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated, or of its predecessor sovereign: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed as conferring upon said grantees or lessees any greater rights or interests other than are described herein and in their respective grants from the State, or its predecessor sovereign;

(d) The term "natural resources" shall include, without limiting the generality thereof, fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but shall not include water power, or the use of water for the production of power, at any site where the United States now owns the water power;

(e) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" shall not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States;

(f) The term "State" means any State of the Union;

(g) The term "person" includes any citizen of the United States, an association of such citizens, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

TITLE II

LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN STATE BOUNDARIES

SEC. 3. Rights of the States: It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the said natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the property law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof; and the United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, moneys, improvements, and natural resources, and releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters. The rights, powers, and titles hereby recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and their grantees are subject to each lease executed by a State, or its grantee, which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, and such rights, powers, and titles are further subject to the rights herein now granted to any person holding any such lease to continue to maintain the lease, and to conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions, for the full term thereof, and any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued such lease: *Provided, however*, That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on and before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however*, That all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease and the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, which have not been paid to the State or its grantee issuing it or to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, shall be paid to the State or its grantee issuing such lease within 90 days from the effective date hereof: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States

now owns or may hereafter acquire the water power or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the ninety-eighth meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: Any State which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line, or in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary of the United States. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond three geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this act: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this act—

(a) all specifically described tracts or parcels of land and resources therein or improvements thereon title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, provided such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the title to such lands and resources in accordance with the statutes or decisions of the courts of the State in which the lands are located; and

(b) such lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and such interests therein as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, none of which includes any of the proprietary rights of ownership, or of use, development, and control of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and others by section 3 of this act.

(b) In time of war when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect in any wise any issues between the United States and the respective States relating to the ownership or control of that portion of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, described in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The statement presented by Mr. HOLLAND was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND IN EXPLANATION OF TIDELANDS JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY HIM TODAY

For myself and 39 other Senators I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution relating to the so-called tidelands question. The primary objective of this measure is to preserve and restore unimpaired to the several States their fundamental property rights and to prevent further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights of the States in this respect. This joint resolution will confirm to the maritime States the rights which they had respectively enjoyed, since the founding of our Nation and up to the date of the decision in the so-called California case, in their coastal lands and waters lying within their constitutional boundaries. It will restore to all of the States their full control and property rights in the lands and waters defined as inland waters, and will also confirm to the Great Lakes States title and control of their lands and waters lying within their State boundaries in the Great Lakes.

The Members of the Senate who were here during the second session of the Eighty-second Congress will recall the extended debate of the then pending tidelands measure. The Senate joint resolution which I have just offered is identical to the measure which passed the Senate during the last session as Senate Joint Resolution 20, as amended, by a vote of 50 to 35. Including those Senators who declared their position on the record but did not actually vote, the division of the Senate in passing this measure was 57 to 36. This measure was later agreed to by the Senate-House conferees and the report of the conferees was adopted by both Houses. The Senate joint resolution as passed by the Congress was vetoed by the President. No effort was made during the last session to bring up the veto message for consideration. The House of Representatives adopted the conference report which was identical with the bill we have introduced by a vote of 247 to 89 or nearly 3 to 1.

The Senator from Florida and the other Senators associated with him, as we did last year, have confined ourselves in this resolution to the presentation of the problem whether the States should receive back from the Federal Government by grant of Congress, their rights in the submerged lands within the constitutional boundaries of the respective States which they were fully enjoying prior to the action of the Supreme Court of the United States in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases. Insofar as coastal lands are concerned, this resolution covers only those lands extending out to the 3-mile limit in most cases and in two cases to a greater distance because of the fact that the constitutional boundary of the west coast of Florida and the constitutional coastal boundary of Texas go out 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico or about 10½ miles. Also, the Senate joint resolution which we have introduced permits any State which has not yet done so to extend its boundary 3 miles seaward from its coast line or to the international boundary of the United States in the Great Lakes.

We can ill afford to set up a federalized bureau here in Washington which shall direct what shall be done and what shall not be done over the thousands of miles of coast line of all the maritime States, and probably later to have jurisdiction over the lands and waters defined as inland waters, and over the lands and waters of the Great Lakes out to the State boundaries. If we do, we will have gone further astray in the field of federalization than in any other field where we have proceeded heretofore. The great majority of the problems of the use of these submerged lands are local and State problems.

I should like to emphasize at this point that the question of oil and gas is temporary and is but a small part of this problem. In my own State of Florida oil has not been discovered in the offshore lands, but we are vitally interested in what happens to our piers, built-up lands, bulkheads, groins, facilities for the disposal of sewage and industrial waste, the control of our fisheries and our sponge, shrimp, and oyster industries, the use of sand, gravel, and shell, and other matters which our people have been accustomed to controlling on a State and local basis ever since we were purchased from Spain, and before that time. The States and their local communities have always had the handling of these problems. They thought they had the right to handle them, and under sound democratic government they should have this right. The sponsors of the joint resolution just introduced are unwilling to permit the continued overexpansion of Federal Government, which I believe the majority of our people now recognize is a real hazard to our continued existence.

For the sake of clarity, and so that there will be no misunderstanding whatever, the joint resolution specifically provides in section 6 that the United States retains all of its powers of regulation and control of the offshore lands and navigable waters for the purpose of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs. It is of course obvious to all that these powers are clearly granted to the United States by the Constitution, and neither this bill nor any other bill could take them away.

The effect of section 7 is to preserve the status quo in respect to the Federal and State powers and functions referred to in the body of Federal law dealing with water resources, particularly reclamation and flood control, as well as the structures built under those statutes heretofore or hereafter. In other words, the language of section 7 is to preserve intact the body of laws known as the reclamation law and the important Flood Control Act of 1944 and other similar laws.

This joint resolution in no way affects any issues between the United States and the respective States in regard to the ownership or control of that portion of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside the 3-mile limit or the constitutional boundary limit of the respective States, whichever is greater.

Other important features of the joint resolution are those which quitclaim to the States all rights to submerged lands under inland waters and under the Great Lakes. The wording of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the California case and the clearly expressed position of the Federal attorneys in that case questioning the soundness of the rule which gives the States control of their inland waters has given just cause for apprehension to all States of the Nation.

We are all distinctly of the feeling that it is in the interest of good government and sound public policy to again confirm to the States complete jurisdiction and control of their own waters and the lands lying under those waters out to the constitutional boundaries of the States because the States are confronted with the doing of so many things and the performance of so many duties which relate to that little shoestring of land and

water and because likewise the question of the enjoyment of the use of that strip of land and water relates largely to the development and serving of the coastal communities and States which are affected.

I call to the attention of the Senate that the Congress has passed on two occasions, first in 1946 and later in 1952, bills safeguarding to the States their traditional control in their coastal belts and both bills have been vetoed. From his public announcements, there is every reason to hope that the new President who will be inaugurated within a few days, will approve this bill and I firmly believe that the great majority of the Members of the Congress are exceedingly anxious as a matter of sound public policy to enact legislation on this subject during this session. I strongly urge that the Senate committee to which this resolution is referred take prompt action to hold early hearings and report the resolution to the Senate so that it may be scheduled for early action on the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may make a brief statement, rather than read the prepared statement, the joint resolution just introduced on behalf of 40 Senators is a measure which would confirm and establish to the maritime States the title which they enjoyed so long and so fully during all the history of this Nation from its beginning until the time of the decision in the California case, and extending over that area of land and water from the low-water mark seaward to the constitutional boundaries or original boundaries of the several maritime States. The measure covers also the so-called inland waters areas of all the States, both the maritime States and the inland States; and also covers the lands and waters sometimes referred to as inland waters, but generally referred to as in a different classification, in the case of the Great Lakes States, extending from their shore line out to their State boundaries in the Great Lakes, which in most instances are international boundaries with the Dominion of Canada.

Let me say quite briefly that the Senators who sponsor this measure are not only strongly convinced that it is in line with equity, decency, and sound public policy to return and confirm to the States, both the maritime States and all other States, the areas in their respective boundaries which have been placed in question by the opinions of the United States Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, but also it is our very strong feeling that it would be unsound and most unfortunate to permit the trend to continue which has been manifested in those decisions, and which has been sought to be followed up heretofore by legislation which would give to the Federal Government plenary authority over the areas seaward from the low water mark in the maritime States, and which might just as fully, so far as the principle is concerned, be established in the case of the inland waters and the Great Lakes waters. It is our very deep conviction that it would be unsound from the standpoint of good democracy, unsound from the standpoint of good government, to permit the trend toward federalization of those great areas to continue to completion. It is our belief that one of the gravest weaknesses in the Federal Government at this time is that it has grown too great, that it fills too many fields, with the result that it cannot be comprehended by the minds of those who are giving all the time they have to the effort to understand and well serve the Federal Government.

We think, too, that the problems arising from this question pertain so directly to the rights and interests of the States, and more particularly to the rights and interests of the individual local communities which are coastal communities or which lie along the great water courses of our Nation, or which are found upon the shores of the Great Lakes, that we cannot longer delay taking this action which, once and for all, would clearly exclude the Federal Government from the jurisdiction and handling of all those problems in this great field, which are clearly local.

In closing these brief remarks, I strongly request of the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee which will handle this measure, the senior Senator from Nebraska, that it be made the subject of early public hearings in order that the measure may come back at as early a date as possible, consonant with proper public hearings, for disposition on the floor of the Senate.

SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in defense of my State of Texas, as its attorney general, I suffered through one of the so-called tidelands decisions to which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has referred. I have joined as one of the cosponsors of the measure referred to by the Senator from Florida. I now introduce for appropriate reference a related bill, which, in addition to the matters included in the Holland joint resolution, would also take care of the problem of the Continental Shelf and extend the jurisdiction of the United States and of the adjacent States to that portion of the Continental Shelf which lies seaward of the original boundaries of the States. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 294) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within original State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for jurisdiction, use, and control of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying outside of the original State boundaries, introduced by Mr. DANIEL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

The bill which I have introduced would resolve the controversy between Federal officials and the States over the ownership and development of submerged lands.

This is a bill for all 48 States. Its purpose is to provide a clear, precise, and unmistakable declaration of congressional intent concerning the Federal Government's policies and practices regarding ownership of all submerged lands, both inland and coastal, which were affected by the Supreme Court's decisions relating to the so-called tidelands.

Historically, it has been the policy of our Federal Government to gradually divest itself of title to public lands, granting those lands to the States for educational purposes, to land-grant colleges, and to homesteaders. Over 98,000,000 acres of Federal lands have been granted to the States to assist them in financing their own systems of public education. Texas is the only State which has received no lands for this purpose, it having been thought for over 100 years that the Federal Government owned no public lands in our State, all of such lands having been retained by Texas upon annexation and dedicated by the State to our public-school fund.

Only in recent years has there been an attempt to change this historic policy. The attempt has succeeded to the extent that the Federal Government now owns 24 percent of all the land within the continental limits of the United States, not including the recently claimed submerged lands. This covetous land quest by the Central Government is not consistent with the concept of decentralized government under which our Nation was formed as a Union of sovereign States.

Historically, the Federal Government recognized State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States for more than 100 years. These lands have been possessed and controlled exclusively by the States.

The bill I have introduced takes from the Federal Government no land holdings over which it has ever actually exercised control. On the contrary, while confirming the title to lands now controlled by the States, this bill adds to the public domain much new wealth to benefit the entire Nation.

Applied equitably to all States, it must be acknowledged that this bill will benefit many Northern and Eastern States—such as New York, Illinois, Minnesota, etc.—substantially more than it benefits the tidelands case States of Texas, California, and Louisiana. The doctrine of law applied to the three States involved in the three tidelands suits would cause a far greater loss to States such as New York when, as it would eventually be, applied universally to all 48 States giving the Federal Government paramount rights over the port installations, harbors, river beds, and nonmineral resources.

Actually, the States will not realize any profit or extra benefit by legislation entitling them to keep what they have always had. Under this bill, however, the entire Nation will benefit by sharing in the resources of the Continental Shelf lying beyond the historic boundaries of coastal States through application of the Federal share of such proceeds toward payment of the national debt.

Title I of this proposed act contains appropriate definitions.

TITLE II

Title II would recognize, confirm and establish in each of the 48 States the title to all lands beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries as they existed when each State entered the Union. This portion of the act would simply write the law for the future exactly as it was understood to be for the first 148 years of the history of this Nation. It would apply to all the States, whether inland or coastal, and to all their navigable waters, whether rivers, bays, lakes, or marginal seas, and to all the resources of their lands and waters, whether fish, shrimp, kelp, iron, coal, oil, or structural improvements such as ports, harbors, and piers.

Every State has submerged lands and valuable resources and improvements in or upon this type of property. Title II of this proposed act recognizes that the States have

claimed and developed these lands in utmost good faith and restores to all the States alike full title to and control of these lands, resources, and improvements. Every State needs this legislation in order to be secure in its ownership and development of submerged lands. This has led the Council of State Governments and the governors and attorneys general of the States to ask for its enactment.

This legislation is necessary also in order that the Congress may once and for all express its disapproval of the Federal seizure of State or private property under the newfound theories of "paramount rights" and "inherent powers."

Title II of this proposed act is substantially the same as the submerged lands bill which was passed by the Congress and vetoed by President Truman in 1946 and is precisely the same as the Holland bill which was passed by the Congress and again vetoed by the President in 1952.

TITLE III

Title III of this bill deals with that portion of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying outside of the original seaward boundaries of the States. Its purpose is to officially extend the jurisdiction of the United States over this area, to add it to the public domain, and to make it subject to the police, conservation, and taxing powers of the 21 adjacent coastal States.

International law on this subject has developed to the point that this action is proper if our own Nation is to develop and obtain the resources of this land rather than have them fall into the hands of other nations. Title III proposes a plan for immediate leasing and development of this property under fixed terms, with published notices, and sales to highest bidders. I have proposed that the management and details of leasing be handled by the established State leasing agencies of the adjacent States, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the other terms of this act, because:

1. The States already have leasing agencies which are established going concerns with experienced personnel who can handle management details without the expense of creating a new and costly Federal agency for this purpose. All leases by State agencies would be strictly controlled by the terms of this act and subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior.

2. If left to State management under the terms of this bill the revenues received from leases will be far greater than those received by the Department of the Interior for similar leases under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act. For instance, the State of Texas, under the system of management and lease terms from which this bill was patterned, has averaged $20 per acre for its leases on submerged lands of the marginal belt while the Federal Government received only 50 cents per acre for similar leases. Texas has received approximately $8,000,000 from lessees who would have paid only $200,000 to the Department of the Interior for the same leases if they had been sold by the Department under the present system of leasing Federal lands.

Title III provides that all moneys paid on leases of the Continental Shelf shall be deposited in the United States Treasury and that 37.5 percent thereof shall be paid each year to the States within whose extended boundaries the leased land may be located. This is exactly the same percentage which is now paid to the States from leases on federally owned lands located within their boundaries. It is provided that the remaining 62.5 percent of the revenues shall be applied by the Secretary of the Treasury to the payment of the principal of the national debt.

In introducing this bill I should like to have it understood that there is no conflict between this proposal and the joint resolution introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida on behalf of himself and other Senators. As heretofore stated, I have joined the Senator from Florida as one of the cosponsors of his resolution, and title II of this bill is the same as the Holland measure. The only difference in my proposal is the additional title III which would also dispose of the problem as it relates to that portion of the Continental Shelf lying outside of original State boundaries and thus hasten development of this additional important area of submerged lands. I have introduced the basic legislation with this addition in order that the entire subject matter may be considered and solved by the Congress at the same time.

INDEPENDENT LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 7, the junior Senator from Nevada introduced a measure which would create an effective independent loyalty review board.

The occasion for the introduction of such a measure arose from the ineffectiveness of the presently constituted department loyalty boards and the functioning of the President's General Loyalty Board in the current case of John Carter Vincent, a case in point, in which the President intervened and nullified the work of the Board.

The Chairman of the present Loyalty Review Board has demonstrated his fitness and ability to handle the job if the Board can be made independent of interference.

REMINGTON—MICHAEL J. LEE (EPHRAIM LINOVI LIEBERMAN)

As a further illustration of the need for such an independent loyalty board, in March of 1950, the junior Senator from Nevada submitted in the Senate, and the Senate adopted, a resolution providing for an investigation by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the integrity and loyalty of Michael J. Lee, formerly known as Ephraim Linovi Lieberman, a Russian born in China, then Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

This investigation resulted in the discharge of Mr. Lee and Mr. William Remington. Mr. Remington found himself indicted in New York within a few days following his discharge. Mr. Lee was cleared of all charges of disloyalty prior to his discharge by Mr. Sawyer, then, as now, Secretary of Commerce. This further illustrates the abuse of the present system—an agreement between the chairman of the committee and Mr. Sawyer to stop the hearing if these two men were discharged—since I was never able to get the committee to continue the hearings.

BLAISDELL—GLADIEUX

Mr. Thomas Blaisdell, Assistant Secretary of Commerce at that time, and Mr. Gladieux, assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, resigned almost immediately after their actions in the support of Lee became known to the committee, for reasons best known to themselves.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Gladieux resigned because there was a direct connection with Communists, apparently; at least we thought there was, and we are still working on it—and he is now with the Ford Foundation, I am informed. So that these men continue their work, even after they become disconnected with the Government.

I should like to ask the Senator, again, whether he is familiar with the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada, following disclosures by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and with the discharge of Mr. Remington and Mr. Michael Lee, following an investigation conducted by the Commerce Committee, after the junior Senator from Nevada had offered a resolution on the floor of the Senate and asked that a committee be appointed to investigate the loyalty and general work of employees of the Department of Commerce.

Following all those disclosures, and the firing of these two characters, one—Remington—quit immediately, but Mr. Lee hung on. He, at first, had been held to be not actually disloyal. This was prior to the time of the hearing conducted by the Commerce Committee. But he was held to be a dangerous security risk. The junior Senator from Nevada was aware of that, when he was questioning him. But Lee refused to resign. Remington resigned, after Mr. Sawyer fired him. He was almost immediately indicted, and now, as the distinguished Senator has outlined so ably, he has been convicted.

Is the distinguished Senator from Michigan aware that before Secretary Sawyer finally fired Mr. Lee he cleared him of any charges of disloyalty, despite the fact that he had been found actually disloyal by the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce, and therefore, as the distinguished Senator has explained, Mr. Lee could go back to work at his old job, if any Department of Commerce head saw fit to hire him? There is nothing on his record; he has been cleared of all such charges. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am only familiar with it from reading the press. Naturally, I did not follow it as closely as did the Senator from Nevada, because he was greatly interested in the Lee case and has followed it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it may be well to complete the record regarding Remington. I hold in my hand the latest dispatches which show that Judge Gregory F. Noonan, before whom the case was tried, this afternoon sentenced Mr. William W. Remington to the maximum sentence possible for his crime, namely, 5 years' imprisonment and a $2,000 fine. I think it is gratifying that the judge at least has recognized the enormity of this situation.

What interested me was the point made by the Senator from Michigan as to the position Remington had occupied as Chairman of the Export Control Board. I should like to call the Senator's attention, in that connection, to the testimony of General Marshall before our committee, that there was an embargo for 10 months on the shipment of the matériel to the Chinese Nationalists; that thereafter the embargo was lifted; but General Marshall said that for 10 months thereafter it proved impractical to resume shipments. Apparently Mr. Remington was a key to the situation. In other words, the downfall of the Nationalists apparently was contributed to in no small measure by the manipulations of this man, and our boys are paying the price and the

penalty for it today. That is the long reach of the activities of a man who finally, after this long time, stands convicted.

I hold in my hand the record of hearings on the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, when some of us, on February 23 and March 22, 1949, seriously questioned Mr. Blaisdell about Mr. Remington, and when Mr. Blaisdell defended Mr. Remington. I have here the statement by Mr. Blaisdell when he was defending Mr. Remington. He said he was a nice fellow, he had known him, and he was all right. I asked Blaisdell whether Remington had not misled him in getting a job. He said he did not think he had; he thought he was all right. So I read now the very question of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] quizzing Mr. Remington in this other hearing, which is found on page 22 of the hearing:

"Mr. FERGUSON. Now do I understand today that you want to leave this with the committee, that you in effect misled Blaisdell on not having knowledge of certain facts, that you stated it in such a way as to conceal certain facts?"

Mr. Remington—and I think this does him some credit—admitted to me as follows:

"I now believe that I misled him."

The thing that intrigues me is that, although Remington admitted to the Senator from Michigan that he had testified that his superior, Mr. Blaisdell, when he was getting his job, was defending him saying he was just an innocent young boy, yet Remington was considered a suitable man to carry out a tremendous responsibility.

I notice that the Senator from Nevada in his statement of March 1950, when we were still trying to get consideration in the matter, stated that it was not a "red herring." The Senator from Nevada pointed out that when an investigation is made, the investigators will run into some curious phenomena. For instance, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Thomas Blaisdell, a protégé of Henry Wallace, has been defending Michael Lee; he also defended William Remington. Remington, it will be recalled, admitted cooperating with Elizabeth T. Bentley, a confessed Soviet spy.

Blaisdell seems to have had Remington with him in the National Resources Planning Board, the War Production Board, the Naval Intelligence in London, and the Department of Commerce. I now understand that Remington is back in the Commerce Department, but supposedly carefully kept away from the "sensitive" jobs.

I admit, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, that we receive a little more cooperation from the executive departments than we get from the top. The Secretary of Commerce was before us, and he testified that he had not been informed about it. He said, "I did not know of this." He was asked, "Who is responsible for not knowing about it? Now that you know about it, what are you going to do?"

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I pointed out that it is absolutely true that after Congress gets the grand jury to recognize the facts and to indict a man for perjury in connection with his relation and his activities in the Government, the Department of Justice is able to obtain evidence and get a conviction beyond a reasonable doubt. But think of it: It was possible to convict this man Remington in a court of justice beyond a reasonable doubt—not an imaginary doubt, but a reasonable doubt. Yet he was cleared of disloyalty charges before a mere executive board.

Mr. BREWSTER. And the department for which he worked could find no reason to dismiss him.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Blaisdell resigned from the Department of Commerce a few days before Remington went on trial, knowing, I assume, that he was going to defend him. He probably decided that it was time to get out. We know Lee's record; we know Remington's record. He is a convicted felon. We know the record of Gladieux, who was connected with the Ford Foundation. How much more there is in that case Senators can check——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada pointed out that Mr. Gladieux was Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and presumably, though there is no valid proof, because the evidence had not reached the Secretary, according to his statement, it was assumed by everyone that Mr. Gladieux was involved. He claimed to be innocent of the whole thing. Mr. Whitney, if he were so inclined, could blow the lid off a great many of these things.

Mr. BREWSTER. In his resignation I think he made it quite clear that the reasons for quitting were good and sufficient. I refer to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. MALONE. At the time the junior Senator from Nevada made his statement on the floor and asked for a committee to investigate the subject, there must have been someone in the gallery who attended to it—it could not have been done in any other way—for an evening newspaper carried the usual denial and stated that he had been cleared of the charges.

Mr. Macy's testimony in the hearings on Senate Resolution 230 on March 28 to April 4, 1950, admitted that he was in error in saying that, notwithstanding the junior Senator from Nevada, although he did not disclose it at that moment, had definite information that while Mr. Lee had not been convicted of absolute disloyalty, the recommendation was made that he was a poor security risk. So the junior Senator from Nevada asked that he be sworn as all other witnesses were sworn. If he had stated under oath that he was cleared, we would have had Mr. Macy; and if he had admitted it, we would have had Mr. Lee. It was one or the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the whole question is one of security.

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the column of David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of January 5 relative to the strange technique with respect to Mr. Vincent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE TECHNIQUE ON VINCENT—ACHESON BOARD CLEARED DIPLOMAT, TRUMAN BOARD ORDERED HIM FIRED; NOW NEW ACHESON GROUP TAKES OVER

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman has suddenly kicked overboard the usual procedure for detecting and punishing persons in the Government employ concerning whom there is reasonable doubt as to loyalty.

In deference to the views of Secretary of State Acheson, who refuses to believe that anybody in the Foreign Service of the State Department could possibly be influenced by Communist intrigue, Mr. Truman has publicly repudiated what is known as the President's Loyalty Review Board. This is his own tribunal, set up to weigh the evidence collected from the FBI and other sources.

But just as the late President Roosevelt publicly repudiated the Supreme Court of the United States because of its 5-to-4 decisions and announced himself in favor of appointing more judges to overcome that majority, so Mr. Truman now scraps the Loyalty Review Board's 3-to-2 decision in the case of John Carter Vincent and yields to a recommendation from Mr. Acheson that another loyalty board of five be appointed to see if they can't come up with some other decision.

This is a strange technique with which to confront the people of the United States in the face of the crusade against Communists and Communist influence in the Department of State. But what is worse—by the device of suppression on orders from the President—the American people now have no way of knowing even the names of the members of the panel of the President's Loyalty Review Board who ruled on the Vincent case or to learn the facts given in testimony before this Board or to read the analysis made by the Board's own examiner who studied all the evidence and made a 90-page report.

These are ordered to be kept secret by Mr. Truman's edict, but Secretary Acheson, on the other hand, is privileged to give his one-sided analysis of the testimony and to discuss it in public with the excuse that he is merely replying to the brief summary supplied in the formal letter of transmittal from Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the President's Loyalty Review Board.

Actually, as Mr. Acheson in his public statement concedes, he has had access to all the documents and hence his comments deal with matters not revealed in Mr. Bingham's letter, which thus far is the only document in the case the public has been authorized to see.

In order to understand the peculiar sequence of events in the Vincent case, it is necessary to know that the Department of State has its own loyalty and security board, which cleared Mr. Vincent. Then the case came before the President's Board in what is known as a "postaudit." This system was established in order that a department would not be the final judge of the loyalty of its own personnel, since most of the departmental boards are made up of officials who have known the accused or have a special interest in upholding the good name of their department.

But now, after the President's Board has rendered its verdict, the head of the State Department goes to the President and persuades him to allow another State Department appointed board to advise him whether or not to accede to the verdict of the President's Board which recommended that Mr. Vincent be fired. There will, therefore, be no further opportunity for the President's own Loyalty Review Board to review the new proceeding.

Mr. Truman owes it to all employees of the Government who have been declared ineligible heretofore to give them a similar chance to have their case tried by new tribunals set up by the department from which they have been removed as a consequence of a recommendation by the President's Loyalty Review Board.

The new board or panel to consider the Vincent case consists of eminent men, but they are requested to give their advice to Mr. Acheson, whose term as Secretary of State expires in about 2 weeks. Can any panel give thorough examination to this case in that brief time? The documents are estimated to be so voluminous that they weigh about 60 pounds. There are 15 volumes comprising 5,000 pages of sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Committee where Mr. Vincent was interrogated by Senators MCCARRAN and FERGUSON. Will Mr. Acheson tell the public whether he himself read that record?

The examiner who sifted the evidence and analyzed it spent 2 months on that task, and his own report is a lengthy one. It took the panel of five of the President's Loyalty Review Board a month to decide the case. In the face of this time element, does it mean that the new board will give cursory treatment to all the evidence and report in a few days? Will it sit day and night for 2 weeks to reach a conclusion? Will it have time to reexamine any of the witnesses? Will it continue to function past January 20

and does this mean Mr. Acheson will have passed the buck to the new administration?

The inference is inescapable that neither President Truman nor Secretary Acheson dared to affirm a decision which meant that a high Foreign Service officer was influential in steering American policy in China the wrong way—a policy which helped to bring about Communist domination of China and a Korean war in which the American casualties alone now have reached about 130,000.

When the new President and Secretary of State come into office, it will be incumbent upon them to make public the examiner's report, if nothing else. Mr. Acheson has chosen on his own initiative to analyze the testimony and to give a one-sided impression. The American people are entitled to know both sides. It is as important to Mr. Vincent as it is to the United States Government and to future procedures in all cases of alleged disloyalty.

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Vincent's Case," published in the Washington Daily News of January 5, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. VINCENT'S CASE

It should surprise no one that President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson refuse to accept the conclusions of the President's Loyalty Review Board in the case of John Carter Vincent, the State Department official whom the Board suspended on the grounds of questionable loyalty.

Mr. Vincent was one of the principal architects of the disastrous China policy which the President and his Secretary of State accepted and carried out as their own. Mr. Truman was in the embarrassing position of having to repudiate his own Board or of confessing he had been a dupe.

Rather than make the latter admission, the President refused to accept the Board's findings. But instead of pronouncing final judgment in the case—the logical and courageous thing to do under the circumstances—Mr. Truman has accepted an out suggested by Mr. Acheson. So a new Board selected by Mr. Acheson is to be asked to review the conclusions of what until now has been the board of final review.

Since Mr. Acheson himself has overruled the review board point by point in a carefully prepared brief, which the President seems to have approved, any further proceedings seem an absurdity. If it is the plan to restore Mr. Vincent to good standing so that he can resign with full pension rights, there is no way to prevent that. But whether through discharge or resignation, this newspaper believes that Mr. Vincent should be separated from the Government.

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of December 4, 1952, written by Roger Stuart. This article covers the case of the appointment of Mr. Gladieux. After all this information had been made available, Mr. Gladieux was appointed to a board, to advise on the organization of administrative government in Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE PROTEGE TO HELP STREAMLINE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—ADVISER LINKED TO LEE, ECONOMIST FIRED AS SECURITY RISK

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, December 4.—Bernard L. Gladieux, who has made a career out of being "the man behind the men in charge," has a new job right down his alley.

Mr. Gladieux has been appointed adviser to the special committee which will look into possibilities of streamlining the Government's executive branch. Nelson A. Rockefeller heads the committee.

CALLED WALLACE PROTEGE

Although the nature of his work keeps Mr. Gladieux behind scenes much of the time, he made news 2 years ago when he was described at a Senate hearing as a protege of Henry Wallace.

It was Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) who said that of Mr. Gladieux.

At the time the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee was investigating the qualifications and efficiency of Commerce Department employees. The emphasis was on the case of Michael J. Lee. Mr. Lee had been investigated by a Commerce Department loyalty board and cleared. Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer accepted the board's decision, but, nevertheless, later fired Mr. Lee from his economist job on security grounds.

LOYALTY PROGRAM CITED

Besides calling Mr. Gladieux a Wallace protege, Senator MALONE pointed out that Mr. Gladieux, as executive assistant to the Commerce Secretary, had much to do with the Department's loyalty program.

The Senator said there was some information to the effect that Mr. Gladieux probably had influence on the original board decision to clear Mr. Lee of disloyalty charges, but Senator MALONE did not elaborate on that.

Mr. Gladieux, 45, is known as an expert on public administration.

LONG AN ADVISER

He was born in Toledo and educated at Oberlin College, at the Zimmern School of International Summer Studies in Geneva, Switzerland, and at Syracuse University, from which he received his master's degree in 1943.

He was a teacher and principal of the American School in Tokyo from 1930 to 1934. Then he returned to Toledo as executive secretary of the City Manager League. From 1936 to 1939 he was administrative consultant of the public administrative service in Chicago.

Mr. Gladieux's Government service began in 1940, when he became a Budget Bureau management consultant and Chief of the Bureau's War Organization Section. Two years later he was named administrative assistant to Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board. He left in 1944 to become a deputy chief of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The following year he became executive assistant to the then Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace. He stayed with the Department until 1950.

AUTHOR ON PLANNING

For the last 2 years Mr. Gladieux has been assistant to the president of the Ford Foundation and a resident of Scarsdale, N. Y.

He's the author of several books on Government planning and management.

Mrs. Gladieux is the former Persis Skilter. They have four children.

Mr. MALONE. All this information and investigations prove beyond a doubt that we need an independent loyalty review board which cannot be interfered with by the President or anyone else.

I intend to discuss this subject at greater length at a future date.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 9 (legislative day of January 6), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Francis Shackelford, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Ross L. Malone, Jr., of New Mexico, to be Deputy Attorney General. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Rowland F. Kirks, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Charles S. Lyon, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Charles B. Murray, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Vernon D. Northrop, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, terminating recess appointment. Vice Richard D. Searles, resigned.

Joel D. Wolfsohn, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, terminating recess appointment. Vice Dale E. Doty, resigned.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Seymour J. Rubin, of Illinois, to be Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, pursuant to section 406 (a) of Public Law 329, Eighty-first Congress, and as authorized by section 501 (d) of Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1958, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1957, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Eugene H. Merrill, of Utah, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Wilson L. Townsend, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring

June 30, 1955, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Clarence Arthur Beutel, Sr., of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

J. Howard Rossbach, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1957, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATION

Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Joseph H. Freehill, of New York, to be Director of Price Stabilization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Paul J. Wedel, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Joseph G. Solari, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1953.

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1954.

Alex U. Miller, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring July 15, 1955.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27, 33 U. S. C. 642), a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler, relieved.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Margaret Daly Campbell, of Highland Park, N. J., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy. (Mrs. Campbell is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

Elmer F. Keim, of Chanhassen, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn., in place of Albert H. Kleffman, deceased. (Mr. Keim is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Monroe Mark Friedman, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Joseph Earl Cooper, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, District of Alaska. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Grace M. Stewart, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. She is now serving under a recess appointment.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Allen Reginald Hawkins, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Robert Kiyoichi Murakami, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Ronald Barrie Jamieson, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Wilford D. Godbold, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeons, effective dates indicated

Max M. Van Sandt, September 1, 1952.
John J. Hanlon, October 1, 1952.

To be surgeons, effective dates indicated

Bryan A. Dawber, September 1, 1952.
Gerald M. Barbour, September 1, 1952.
James H. Baxter, September 1, 1952.

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

Warren A. Rasmussen, August 19, 1952.
Frank London, September 1, 1952.
Richard A. Prindle, September 1, 1952.
Daniel Steinberg, September 1, 1952.
G. Gilbert Ashwell, September 1, 1952.
Tamarath K. Yolles, September 1, 1952.
Edmund J. Talbott, September 1, 1952.
Roger L. Black, September 1, 1952.
Glenn G. Golloway, September 1, 1952.
Clifford E. Nelson, September 1, 1952.
Raymon E. Lawton, September 1, 1952.
Norman P. Boas, September 1, 1952.
Joseph E. Jack, September 1, 1952.
Benjamin P. Bradford, September 1, 1952.
Harold J. Crecraft, September 1, 1952.
John M. Buchness, October 10, 1952.
Bertha L. Moore, October 20, 1952.
Harold R. Wood, October 21, 1952.
Craig S. Lichtenwalner, November 1, 1952.
E. Du Bose Dent, Jr., November 1, 1952.
Philip M. Fox, December 8, 1952.
John H. Edgcomb, January 1, 1953.
John L. Meyer II, January 1, 1953.
Joseph A. Falsone, Jr., January 1, 1953.
Thomas N. P. Johns, January 1, 1953.
John H. Ackerman, January 1, 1953.
Robert F. Clark, January 1, 1953.
William L. Ross, Jr., January 1, 1953.

To be assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

Herbert M. Seybold, September 1, 1952.
William M. Smith, September 1, 1952.
Warren J. Boyer, Jr., September 1, 1952.
Crawford J. Daniel, November 1, 1952.
Arden A. Flint, Jr., January 1, 1953.
Calvin L. Young, January 1, 1953.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer, effective date indicated

Lester M. Klashman, July 25, 1952.

To be senior assistant scientist, effective date indicated

Martha K. Ward, October 6, 1952.

To be senior assistant veterinarians, effective dates indicated

Karl R. Reinhard, September 1, 1952.
William Kaplan, October 1, 1952.
Donald D. Stamm, December 13, 1952.
Robert W. Menges, January 1, 1953.

To be assistant sanitarian, effective date indicated

Harold V. Jordan, Jr., October 20, 1952.

To be nurse officers, effective dates indicated

Helen M. Danley, September 1, 1952.
Jane Wilcox, September 1, 1952.

To be dietitian, effective date indicated

Edith A. Jones, September 1, 1952.

To be therapists, effective dates indicated

Elizabeth M. Finke, September 1, 1952.
Esther Anderson, September 1, 1952.

(NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

To be senior assistant surgeon, effective date of acceptance

Fred L. Stricker

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

James T. Foster — George Roush, Jr.
John W. McFadden — Allen T. Jones

To be assistant veterinarian, effective date of acceptance

John G. Wadsworth

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance

John A. Alford — Frank Eisenberg, Jr.
Robert R. Omata — Charlotte M. Damron

To be assistant scientist, effective date of acceptance

Tod E. Mittwer

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Senior surgeons to be medical directors, effective dates indicated

George G. Holdt, July 31, 1952.
Roy E. Butler, July 31, 1952.
George G. Van Dyke, July 31, 1952.
Arthur W. Newitt, July 31, 1952.
Anthony Donovan, July 31, 1952.
Havelock F. Fraser, July 31, 1952.
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., July 31, 1952.
Alexander A. Doerner, July 31, 1952.
Russell E. Teague, July 31, 1952.
Mabel Ross, July 31, 1952.
Ira Lewis, July 31, 1952.
Erwin C. Drescher, July 31, 1952.
Virgil J. Dorset, July 31, 1952.
Eugene W. Green, July 31, 1952.
Charles P. Blankenship, July 31, 1952.
Frank S. French, July 31, 1952.
Harold M. Janney, July 31, 1952.
Herman E. Hilleboe, July 31, 1952.
John R. McGibony, July 31, 1952.
Theodore L. Perrin, July 31, 1952.
Harris Isbell, July 31, 1952.
David J. Zaugg, July 31, 1952.
Howard D. Fishburn, July 31, 1952.
James P. Lane, July 31, 1952.
John N. Bowden, July 31, 1952.
Vernon B. Link, July 31, 1952.
Norman H. Topping, July 31, 1952.
James A. Grider, Jr., August 1, 1952.
Byron J. Olson, August 1, 1952.
Harold R. Sandstead, October 1, 1952.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons, effective dates indicated

Carl J. Mankinen, July 31, 1952.
Ray H. Vanderhook, July 31, 1952.
David E. Price, July 31, 1952.
Charles L. Williams, Jr., July 31, 1952.
Charles C. Shepard, July 31, 1952.
James L. Baker, July 31, 1952.
Wayne W. Carpenter, July 31, 1952.
Selwyn H. Drummond, July 31, 1952.
Timothy J. Haley, July 31, 1952.
Linden E. Johnson, July 31, 1952.
James M. Hundley, July 31, 1952.
Russell I. Pierce, July 31, 1952.
Luther L. Terry, July 31, 1952.
Joseph H. Bragdon, July 31, 1952.
Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 31, 1952.
Robert E. Miller, July 31, 1952.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 31, 1952.
Michael J. Clarke, August 27, 1952.
Leonard S. Rosenfeld, September 13, 1952.
Leslie H. Thomasson, November 15, 1952.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1952.

Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1952.
Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1952.
Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1952.
James A. Hunter, Jr., December 29, 1952.
Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1952.
Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1952.
George A. Shipman, December 29, 1952.
John C. Cutler, December 29, 1952.
David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1952.
Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1952.
George W. Comstock, December 29, 1952.
William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1952.
Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1952.
Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1952.
James F. Maddux, December 29, 1952.
Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1952.
Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1952.
Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1952.
John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1952.
William H. Errgong, December 29, 1952.
James L. Elliott, December 29, 1952.
Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1952.
Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1952.
Arthur Kornberg, December 29, 1952.
Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1952.
Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1952.
LeRoy R. Allen, December 29, 1952.
Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1952.
Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1952.
Mary Walton, December 29, 1952.
Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1952.
Robert W. Rasor, December 29, 1952.
William W. Richards, December 29, 1952.
Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1952.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1952.
James A. Salmons, December 29, 1952.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1952.
Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1952.
Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1952.
Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1952.
Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1952.
Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1952.
William G. Hollister, December 29, 1952.
J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1952.
William Roemmich, December 29, 1952.
Paulo do A. Pamplona, December 29, 1952.
James O. Davis, December 29, 1952.
Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1952.
George Adams, December 29, 1952.
James T. Hearin, December 29, 1952.
Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1952.
Isaac M. Zigler, January 1, 1953.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons, effective dates indicated

Kirkland C. Brace, July 31, 1952.
Charles S. McCammon, July 31, 1952.
John D. Talbert, July 31, 1952.
John H. Tuohy, July 31, 1952.
Edgar A. Swartz, July 31, 1952.
R. Raymond Green, July 31, 1952.
Richard A. Malmgren, July 31, 1952.
Roger K. McDonald, July 31, 1952.
Luther M. Mace, July 31, 1952.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 31, 1952.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 31, 1952.
Clarence A. Imboden, Jr., July 31, 1952.
Robert O. Scow, July 31, 1952.
John F. Montroy, July 31, 1952.
Walter M. White, Jr., October 20, 1952.
Ralph F. Patten, December 2, 1952.
Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1952.
Charles M. Gillikin, January 1, 1953.
Robert F. Wettingfeld, January 1, 1953.
Edward B. Lehmann, January 1, 1953.

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

Melvin R. Davis, August 13, 1952.
Henry M. Gelfand, August 13, 1952.
Rudolph J. Muelling, Jr., August 13, 1952.
Robert J. Trautman, August 13, 1952.
David C. Miller, August 13, 1952.
Paul M. Kegan, August 13, 1952.
Frank L. Weaver, Jr., August 13, 1952.
Warren H. Proudfoot, August 13, 1952.
Margaret S. Spies, August 13, 1952.
Cameron L. Self, August 13, 1952.
Sidney S. Lee, August 13, 1952.
Bernard G. Keizer, August 13, 1952.
Gordon F. Wise, August 13, 1952.
James L. Goddard, August 13, 1952.
Clayton R. Haberman, August 13, 1952.
Donald W. Tharp, August 13, 1952.
John A. Googins, August 14, 1952.

Senior dental surgeons to be dental directors, effective dates indicated

Robert A. Scroggie, July 31, 1952.
Leonard R. Etzenhouser, July 31, 1952.
Walter J. Pelton, July 31, 1952.
Frank E. Law, July 31, 1952.

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons, effective dates indicated

Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1952.
George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1952.
Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1952.
Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1952.
Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1952.
John C. Heckel, December 29, 1952.
Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1952.
Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1952.
Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1952.
John W. Holt, December 29, 1952.
David B. Scott, December 29, 1952.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons, effective dates indicated

Charles J. Gillooly, July 31, 1952.
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr., January 1, 1953.

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective dates indicated

Judson C. Hickey, August 13, 1952.
James L. Field, August 13, 1952.

Senior sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineer directors, effective dates indicated

Frank E. DeMartini, July 31, 1952.
Vernon C. MacKenzie, July 31, 1952.
Gordon F. McCallum, July 31, 1952.

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated

Ralph J. Van Derwerker, July 31, 1952.
Paul D. Haney, July 31, 1952.
Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1952.
Charles D. Yaffe, August 25, 1952.
Robert R. Harris, August 31, 1952.
Malcolm C. Hope, September 10, 1952.
Frederick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1952.
Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1952.
Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1952.
Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1952.
Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1952.
Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1952.
Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1952.
Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1952.
Ralph C. Palange, December 29, 1952.
Richard S. Green, December 29, 1952.
Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1952.
Arthur H. Neill, December 29, 1952.
George D. Clayton, December 29, 1952.
Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1952.
Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1952.
Hershel Engler, December 29, 1952.
Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1952.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1952.
Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1952.
Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1952.
Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1952.
Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1952.
Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1952.
Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1952.
George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1952.
Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1952.
Graham Walton, December 29, 1952.
Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1952.
Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1952.
William W. Payne, December 29, 1952.
Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1952.
William E. Holy, December 29, 1952.
Richard J. Hammerstrom, December 29, 1952.
Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1952.
Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1952.

Assistant sanitary engineers to be senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated

Albert L. Platz, September 18, 1952.
Frederick Nevins, September 18, 1952.
Leo Weaver, September 18, 1952.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., September 18, 1952.
George R. Schultz, September 18, 1952.
Paul W. Eastman, Jr., September 18, 1952.
Morton I. Goldman, September 18, 1952.
Donald M. Keagy, September 18, 1952.
Howard E. Ayer, September 18, 1952.
James P. Sheehy, October 1, 1952.
Robert A. Gerber, December 1, 1952.

Junior assistant sanitary engineers to be assistant sanitary engineers, effective dates indicated.

Ralph K. Longaker, August 13, 1952.
David H. Howells, August 13, 1952.
Robert L. Harris, Jr., August 13, 1952.
James D. Mickle, August 13, 1952.
Eugene T. Jensen, August 13, 1952.
Walter L. Dunn, August 13, 1952.
Frederick A. Flohrschutz, Jr., August 13, 1952.
Harold W. Wolf, August 13, 1952.
Edward R. Williams, August 13, 1952.

Senior pharmacist to be pharmacist director, effective date indicated

George F. Archambault, July 31, 1952.

Pharmacist to be senior pharmacist, effective date indicated

Francis R. Ellis, July 31, 1952.

Senior assistant pharmacists to be pharmacists, effective dates indicated

Henry L. Verhulst, July 31, 1952.
William E. Dudley, July 31, 1952.
William M. Hanna, July 31, 1952.
Abraham Wolfthal, September 30, 1952.

Assistant pharmacists to be senior assistant pharmacists, effective dates indicated

Paul H. Honda, August 13, 1952.
Boris J. Osheroff, August 13, 1952.
Lowell R. Pfau, September 18, 1952.
Adelbert E. Briggs, September 18, 1952.
Edward J. Vesey, September 18, 1952.

Junior assistant pharmacists to be assistant pharmacists, effective dates indicated

Carl H. Brown, August 13, 1952.
George J. Gruber, August 13, 1952.
Edward J. Martin, August 13, 1952.

Senior scientists to be scientist directors, effective dates indicated

Sidney H. Newman, July 31, 1952.
John C. Keresztesy, September 1, 1952.

Scientists to be senior scientists, effective dates indicated

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1952.
Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1952.
Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1952.
Roy F. Pritz, December 29, 1952.
Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1952.
H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1952.
John A. Rowe, December 29, 1952.
Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1952.
Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1952.
George A. Hottle, December 29, 1952.
William J. Bowen, December 29, 1952.
Falconer Smith, December 29, 1952.
Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1952.
William C. Frohne, December 29, 1952.
Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1952.
Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1952.
Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1952.
Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1952.
Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1952.
David B. Lackman, December 29, 1952.
Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1952.
Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1952.
John H. Hughes, December 29, 1952.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1952.

Senior assistant scientists to be scientists, effective dates indicated

Frederick L. Stone, August 1, 1952.
Robert J. Fitzgerald, August 12, 1952.
Paul P. Weinstein, August 12, 1952.

Senior assistant sanitarians to be sanitarians, effective dates indicated

Louis J. Ogden, July 31, 1952.
Joseph L. Minkin, August 26, 1952.

Assistant sanitarian to be senior assistant sanitarian, effective date indicated

Morgan S. Seal, November 17, 1952.

Veterinarians to be senior veterinarians, effective dates indicated

William T. S. Thorp, July 31, 1952.
Robert T. Habermann, September 1, 1952.
James H. Steele, December 29, 1952.

Senior assistant veterinarians to be veterinarians, effective dates indicated

John F. Winn, August 23, 1952.
Arthur H. Wolff, September 17, 1952.
John H. Scrugga, December 13, 1952.
Herbert G. Stoenner, December 29, 1952.

Senior nurse officer to be nurse director, effective date indicated

Margaret G. Arnstein, July 31, 1952.

Nurse officers to be senior nurse officers, effective dates indicated

Virginia Arnold, July 31, 1952.
Martha B. Naylor, July 31, 1952.
Frances E. Taylor, July 31, 1952.
Mabelle J. Markee, July 31, 1952.
Genevieve R. Soller, July 31, 1952.
Alice E. Herzig, July 31, 1952.
Rosalie C. Giacomo, July 31, 1952.
Madeline Pershing, July 31, 1952.
Louise O. Waagen, July 31, 1952.
Daphine D. Douter, July 31, 1952.
Edna A. Clark, July 31, 1952.

Senior assistant nurse officers to be nurse officers, effective dates indicated

Jeannette E. Westlake, July 31, 1952.
Henrietta Smellow, July 31, 1952.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 31, 1952.
Apollonia F. Olson, July 31, 1952.
G. Alice Boore, July 31, 1952.
Mary E. O'Connor, July 31, 1952.
P. Jean Williams, July 31, 1952.
Ann F. Matthews, July 31, 1952.
Jeannette E. Potter, July 31, 1952.
Genevieve E. Garrett, July 31, 1952.

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers, effective dates indicated

Marion E. O'Neil, November 8, 1952.
Nina A. Ramacciotti, November 11, 1952.
Doris I. Dodds, November 15, 1952.

Junior assistant nurse officer to be assistant nurse officer, effective date indicated

Florence A. Canada, August 13, 1952.

Dietitian to be senior dietitian, effective date indicated

Myrtle M. Morris, July 31, 1952.

(NOTE.—The above-named officers were promoted during the last recess of the Senate.)

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons

Benjamin J. Chester	Birdsall N. Carle
Norman B. McCullough	Clinton C. Powell
	J. Russell Mitchell
James A. Finger	George A. Spendlove
Wade H. Etheridge	R. Carl Millican
Marvin O. Lewis	Lawrence L. Swan
Eliah M. Nadel	Lawrence Kilham

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons

William A. Walter, Jr.	Carl G. Baker
Charles O. Metzmaker	Gerald D. Barton
John F. Lowney	Elmore P. Kalbaugh, Jr.
Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr.	Clifford H. Jope
Carlyle F. Stout	Henry H. D. Sterrett, Jr.
Richard A. Saavedra	Arnold W. Pratt
Stewart M. Williams	John M. Vogel
Glenn M. Gordon	Chester S. Murata
John P. Utz	Robert W. Hartley
R. Guy Lewis	William W. Quisenberry
John W. Cashman	Roger M. Cole
Noah L. Krall	Katherine M. Herrold
Delmo A. Paris	Leroy E. Duncan, Jr.
John S. Benson	
Andrew Ranier	
Robert L. Price	

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons

William J. Braye	Robert W. Bonds
Robert W. Anderson	Samuel S. Herman

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers

Sylvan C. Martin	Floyd B. Taylor
Howard W. Spence	John D. Faulkner

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers

Charles R. Bowman
Earl H. Arnold
Keith S. Krause

Assistant sanitary engineers to be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Mary R. Fulmer
Frank A. Bell, Jr.

Senior assistant pharmacist to be pharmacist

Reede M. Ames

Scientists to be senior scientists

Robert E. Serfling	Isadore Zipkin
Milton Silverman	James E. Birren
Louis J. Olivier	Morris B. Ettinger
Alan W. Donaldson	Herbert A. Sober
Joseph Greenberg	Ruth Sumner
Libero Ajello	William M. Upholt

Senior assistant veterinarian to be veterinarian

Monroe A. Holmes

Senior assistant sanitarian to be sanitarian

Kent S. Littig

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

George W. Nelson	Garrett Van A. Graves
William P. Hawley	William B. Scheibel
Hans F. Slade	Alfred W. Kabernagel
Romeo J. Borromey	Bret H. Brallier
Frederick A. MacGurn	George H. Miller
Donald B. MacDiarmid	John W. Malen

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Theodore A. Dahlburg	James McIntosh
Ferdinand Lederle	Maynard F. Young
Fred F. Nichols	Harold Land
Theodore F. Knoll	Mark A. Whalen
Frank H. Nelson	William F. Cass
Alf S. Lie	Frank J. Hicken
Frank M. McCabe	Roger M. Dudley
Harold L. Durgin	Albert F. Wayne, Jr.
Thomas B. McKinstry	Robert J. Brown
Ellis S. Gordon	Clement Vaughn, Jr.
Myron W. Caskey	Chester I. Steele
Forrest A. Tinsler	George E. Dobbins
Wayne L. Goff	Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Ronald M. Freeman	
Joseph A. Ciccolella	Edward O. Clark
Ralph S. Feola	Paul E. G. Prins
Howard W. Schleiter	Lester E. Carlson
Richard H. Fairman	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Clarence N. Daniel	Charles F. Fornason
Harold D. Seielstad	Larry L. Davis
Lloyd B. Kennedy	Alan Mason
Joseph W. Naab, Jr.	Stanley J. Rovinsky
Merton Hatfield	Roderick Y. Edwards
Corliss B. Lambert	Alexander W. Wuerker
James W. Leek	Kolbjorn Hansen
Victor E. Bakanas	

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

William H. Fuller	Aubrey L. Digga
Bernard T. Clark	Louis L. Lague
William B. Daughtry	Percival A. Williamson
Ralph J. Davidson	Oskar F. Aune
Roland H. Estey	Freeman H. Harmon
Hans A. Jensen	Sidney W. Douglas
Arthur I. Roberts	Henry J. Cookson
Leonard T. Toner	Antonie Simon
John T. Cherry	Wesley J. Cumberland
John B. Klapperich	James K. Hannewyk
Arthur E. Muffler	Joseph Gnas
Oswald R. Olsen	Carl A. Heintz
Hubert F. Wren	Harold A. Hutcheson
William S. Cochrane	Charles H. Langlois
Clifton E. Mosher	William Lieberson
Gregory E. Smith	Theodore McWilliams
Willem deJong	Gerald E. McGovern
Arthur P. Minor	Charles C. Bennett
James C. Waters	David Oliver
Emmett P. O'Hara	Ben B. Dameron
Roderick C. Davis	Wilfred C. Gray
Albert J. Summerfield	Arnold E. Carlson
Walter Curwen, Jr.	Gene R. Gislason
David M. Alger	William D. Hemeon
August Kleisch	Allen H. Graham

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

John D. McCann	Robert R. Pope
Sumner R. Dolber	Albert E. Flanagan
Garth D. Clizbe	Earl S. Childers
Julian E. Johansen	Thomas J. Hynes
Lilbourn A. Pharris, Jr.	William G. Fenlon
	Louis Hopper, Jr.
Harold L. Davison	John W. Day
John M. Austin	John H. Tooley
Theodore C. Rapalus	Wilmer Clark
Clarence R. Easter	Thomas G. Condon
Harley E. Dilcher	Albert J. Guillemette
Frank Barnett	James W. Swanson
Marion G. Shrode, Jr.	Paul McGill, Jr.
George F. Thometz, Jr.	Harry U. Potter
Arthur A. Fontaine	Maurice W. Tiehen
Frederick W. Hermes, Jr.	George L. Oakley
	Elvin F. Yates
James T. Maher	Charles R. Leisy
Gordon F. Hempton	Milton B. Williams, Jr.
George A. Warren	James E. Edwards
William H. Boswell	Stanley G. Putzke
Vance K. Randle, Jr.	James S. Cooper
Ricardo A. Ratti	William H. Schmidt
George W. Wagner	Leo M. Bracken
John J. Fehrenbacher	William J. Donnay
Raymond G. Parks, Jr.	Thomas J. Fallon
James H. Durfee	Paul S. Hofmeister
Richard P. Arlander	Albert P. Hartt, Jr.
Clarence S. Hall, Jr.	Robert A. Lemmon
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.	Gwyn A. E. Williams
Enoch A. Poulter	Louis N. Donohoe
Jack S. Thuma	Richard C. Ragan
Joseph M. Weber	Herman S. McNatt
Fred T. Merritt	George E. Tooloose
James E. Nesmith	William E. Sale

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Thomas W. Wolfe	William S. Schwob, Jr.
Edwin L. Knowles	William E. Clark
Frank E. McLean	George M. Rynick III
Robert H. Sabin	Anthony F. Fugaro
Willard L. Higginbotham	Gordon K. Loftin
	Reginald W. Raynor, Jr.
Joseph C. Fox	
Karl F. Peterson	Norman B. Binns
John E. Wesler	Clarence H. Tannel
William R. Fearn	Robert C. Sedwick
Lawrence J. Hoch	Harold A. Faulsen
James S. Gracey	Herbert A. Johnson
Richard T. Penn, Jr.	Richard S. Dolliver
Charles L. Blaha	Sidney A. Wallace
Thomas E. Hawkins	Jules B. DuPeza
Ernest R. Tindle	George K. Burkman
John A. Flynn	Kenneth R. Spreen
Neal E. Williams, Jr.	Joseph W. E. Ward
Frank L. Shelley	Albert D. Young, Jr.
William T. Adams II	Robert Schuerch, Jr.
Lee C. Nehrt	Herbert M. Hartlove
Arne J. Soreng	Nicholas Ivanovsky
David F. Lauth	William H. Shaw, Jr.
Gordon W. Brockway	John M. Clark
William H. Stewart	Herbert H. Mulvany
Charles E. Larkin, Jr.	Royce A. Lewis
Richard J. Mayer	Harry H. Keller, Jr.
Henry A. Cretella	Wilfred H. Shaw
Norman M. Sawyer	Paul W. Meyer
Irwin R. Pahl	Andrew F. Nixon
Donald B. Russell	Forrest E. Stewart

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard G. Donaldson	Edward S. Castle
David E. Metz	William T. Sode
Robert J. Ryan	Charles A. Bova
Bruce N. Donnelly	Thomas F. McKenna, Jr.
Sherman G. Sawyer	
Joseph A. Macri	Richard D. Hodges
Richard J. MacGarva	William D. Harvey

The following-named persons be commissioned warrant officers in the specialties indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

Floyd J. Jester, chief pay clerk.
Thomas C. Crabe, chief pay clerk.
Alton E. Fowler, chief machinist.
Edward W. Powers, chief machinist.
Charlie H. Hale, chief machinist.
Guy R. Hunter, chief machinist.
Joy A. Weatherford, chief machinist.
Milton H. Bradley, chief radio electrician.
Peter J. Byrne, chief boatswain.
Alton W. Meekins, chief boatswain.
Harlan E. Sterling, chief boatswain.
James Lindquist, chief boatswain.
Aksel F. Jorgensen, chief boatswain.
Benjamin F. Lombard, chief boatswain.
Gene V. Gray, chief boatswain.
Henry McAllister, chief boatswain.
Charles E. Hargis, chief boatswain.
Robert J. Mohr, chief ships clerk.

IN THE AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be colonel

Air Force

Crawford, Troy William, 968A.
Card, Bernard, 1005A.
Heintz, Leo Harold, 1017A.
Weller, Richard Cole, 1146A.
Armstrong, Burton Wilmot, Jr., 1160A.
Ogden, Alban Boardman, Jr., 1194A.
Davis, George Winzer, 1200A.
Tyler, Charles Bernard, Jr., 1222A.
Lee, Joseph Day, Jr., 1263A.
Mallary, Eugene Cobb, 1309A.
Thompson, Miles Howlett, 1311A.
Holcomb, George Lawrence, 1322A.
Eriksen, John Gordon, 1330A.
Mauldin, Whiteford Carlisle, 1335A.
Horrigan, William Kienle, 1339A.
Ostrander, Don Richard, 1343A.
Parker, James Young, 1345A.
Prentiss, Augustin Mitchell, Jr., 1361A.
Smith, Leo Belton, 1371A.
Croker, George William, 1373A.
× Hanson, William Hart, 1375A.
Huddleston, Joseph Jenkins, 1376A.
Roberdeau, Neywood Hutchings, 1377A.
Teal, Gilbert Earle, 1378A.
Smith, Samuel McClure, 1379A.
Musgrave, Charles Lafayette, 1380A.
Thomson, James William, 1382A.
Harvey, Daniel Martin, 1387A.
Blase, George Herman, 1388A.
Martin, Carlton Julian, 1391A.
Hamrick, William Lester, 1392A.
Thorup, Louis Gordon, 1393A.
Segrist, Charles Chaney, 1394A.
Friedman, Robert Joseph, 1397A.
Andrews, Carl Woodrow, 1398A.
O'Neill, Frederick Mauger, 1400A.
Oberdorf, John William, 1401A.
Hall, Donald Pierce, 1403A.
Waller, Henry Hall, Jr., 1404A.
Breitweiser, Robert Allen, 1406A.
Preuss, Paul Theodore, 1407A.
Kelley, Harold Killian, 1408A.
Kieffer, William Brett, 1409A.
Skaer, William Kenneth, 1412A.
Spicer, Prescott Miner, 1413A.
Crouch, Henry Leland, Jr., 1414A.
Coleman, Glenn Craddock, 1415A.
Heflebower, Roy Cleveland, Jr., 1416A.
Buckland, Sherwood Ernest, 1417A.
Ryan, John Dale, 1418A.
Sturdivant, Frank Pleasants, 1421A.
Johnson, Lloyd Earl, Jr., 1422A.
Kenzie, Howard Doan, 1423A.
York, Edward Joseph, 1424A.
Harrison, Bertram Cowgill, 1425A.
Kincaid, William Keith, 1426A.
Macomber, Clifford Field, 1427A.
Polhamus, Douglas Clinton, 1428A.
Coira, Louis Edward, 1429A.
Snider, Robert Lee, 1430A.
Saunders, Donald Ward, 1432A.
Chavasse, Nicholas Horace, 1435A.
Huglin, Henry Charles, 1436A.
Morrison, Harry Cornelius, 1437A.
Bromiley, Richard Franklin, 1438A.
Lemon, Maurice Raymond, 1439A.
Zoller, Virgil Lee, 1440A.
McBride, Robert Carleton, 1441A.
Van Sickle, Neil David, 1442A.
Pitchford, John Cozart, 1443A.
Hawes, Philip Robert, 1444A.
Blanchard, William Hugh, 1445A.
Conner, Castex Paul, 1446A.
Wallace, Hugh Douglas, 1447A.
Luper, James Rhea, 1448A.
Dean, Fred Murray, 1450A.
Miles, Vincent Morgan, 1452A.
Young, Charles Mathes, 1458A.
Pardue, Littleton James, 1460A.
Ford, Wallace Stafford, 1461A.
Reddoch, Joseph Claude, Jr., 1462A.
Isbell, James Horace, 1463A.
Hardison, Felix Moses, 1465A.
Means, Howard Monroe, 1466A.
Davis, Waymond Austin, 1470A.
Dalton, Lloyd Henry, Jr., 1471A.
Chickering, Edwin Shepard, 1474A.
Orth, Robert Carl, 1476A.
Arnold, Walter Erath, 1478A.
Bridges, Walter Moore, 1480A.
Luedecke, Alvin Roubal, 1486A.
Spicer, Henry Russell, 1487A.
Kreps, Kenneth Ray, 1490A.
Campbell, Blaine Ballif, 1492A.
Blaine, Mayhue Delbert, 1494A.
Nichols, Howard Fish, 1495A.
Klein, Philip Beeton, 1496A.
Moore, Frederick Lawrance, 1498A.
Funk, Ben Ivan, 1500A.
Simons, Richard William, 1501A.
Hardy, John Spencer, 1502A.
Donicht, Harry Louis, 1503A.
Eskridge, Ladson Green, Jr., 1504A.
Finn, Ryder Waldo, 1506A.
Zehrung, Paul Wietzel, 1508A.
Pierce, Arthur Jenkins, 1509A.
Worden, Robert Francis, 1510A.
Bennett, Thomas Alan, 1513A.
Thorne, Henry Garfield, Jr., 1514A.
Lawrence, Baskin Reid, Jr., 1515A.
Triffy, Sam Philippe, 1516A.
Young, Earl Bernard, 1517A.
Schriever, Bernard Adolf, 1519A.
Watson, Harold Ernest, 1520A.
Wilson, Cy, 1521A.
Rogers, Craven Clark, 1522A.
Curry, William Lewis, 1523A.
Walker, Audrin Rotha, 1524A.
Peeler, Calvin Ely, 1525A.
Montgomery, John Beverly, 1528A.
Way, John Allen, 1529A.
Ferguson, James, 1530A.
Keese, William Brewer, 1531A.
David, William Bell, 1533A.
Burnham, Robert Francis, 1534A.
Box, Clyde, 1535A.
Paul, Franklin Kendall, 1539A.
Cooper, Marcus Fleming, 1543A.
Caldwell, Robert Melville, 1545A.
Thomas, Joseph Abbott, 1546A.
× Reynolds, Elbert David, 1547A.
Garman, Ralph Sheldon, 1548A.
Demler, Marvin Christian, 1550A.
Childre, Cecil Hampton, 1551A.
Brogger, Jacob Jerval, 1552A.
Keating, Ernest Wilbur, 1555A.
Brewer, George Sutton, 1556A.
Branch, Irving Lewis, 1557A.
Eades, William, 1559A.
Eisenhart, Donald William, 1560A.
Maddux, Sam, Jr., 1561A.
Stewart, Robert Reed, 1563A.
McNown, William Klahr, 1564A.
Tacon, Avelin Paul, Jr., 1566A.
Herlick, Conrad Joe, 1567A.
Helmick, Paul Franklin, 1569A.
Johnston, Robert Loughery, 1570A.
Roberts, James John, Jr., 1571A.
Wade, David, 1582A.
Taylor, J. Francis, Jr., 1583A.
Sutterlin, Frederick John, 1585A.
Bywater, Murray Alston, 1586A.
Wilson, Delmar Edmond, 1587A.
Winstead, Joshua Thomas, Jr., 1588A.
Jones, Charles Duncan, 1589A.
Beverly, Ernest Haywood, 1590A.
Schaetzel, George Edward, 1591A.
Huish, Frederic Grenville, 1592A.
Putnam, Claude Edwin, Jr., 1593A.
Rouse, Frank Edwin, 1595A.
Stintzi, Vernon Lake, 1596A.
Edwinson, Clarence Theodore, 1597A.
Cochran, James Carroll, 1598A.
Rison, Whitmell Tompkins, 1599A.
Atkinson, Gwen Grover, 1601A.
Bicking, Charles Wesseler, 1603A.
Hild, Fred Edward, 1604A.
Howard, Vincent William, 1606A.
Chick, John Holiday, 1607A.
Sansom, Byron Manning, Jr., 1608A.
Wheless, Hewitt Terrell, 1609A.
Poff, Clarence Glynn, 1610A.
Holman, Leslie Wallace, 1611A.
Gerrity, Thomas Patrick, 1613A.
Powell, Kenneth Rader, 1614A.
Kofahl, Harold Eugene, 1616A.
Riddle, Kyle Loyd, 1617A.
Compton, John Thornal, 1619A.

Medical

Fair, George Kenneth, 19066A.
Kirk, Ronald Fisher, 19088A.
Bramlitt, Charles Henry, 19094A.
Gould, Lloyd Ethan, 19625A.
Benford, Robert Joseph, 19107A.
Browning, Levi Martin, 19116A.
McGraw, John Robert, 19123A.
Love, Robert Campbell, 19123A.
Oliver, Andres Gilberto, 19127A.

Dental

Welker, William Kenneth, 18835A.
Schonen, George Everett, 18839A.
McCue, Edward Harry, 18843A.
Bell, Morris Barrington, 18844A.
Cummings, Francis Emmett, 18860A.

Veterinary

Karr, James Ralph, 18877A.

Medical Service

Nolan, Elmo Dorman, 19389A.
Henderson, Arthur Melville, 19387A.

Chaplain

Guin, Howell G., 18704A.
Marteney, Charles Walton, 18714A.

To be lieutenant colonel

Air Force

Absalom, Evaline May, 21236W.
Briggs, Willa Mae, 21252W.
Horseman, Reginald James, 5296A.
× Wheeler, Charles Alfred, 5304A.
McNabb, Stephen Robert, 19647A.
Klaas, John Henry, 5305A.
Smith, Ira Hyatt, 5306A.
Mitchell, Howard Albert, 5307A.
States, Charles Adelbert, 5308A.
Siemon, August Francis, 5309A.
Whiteside, Sam, 5310A.
McNew, Glen Talmage, 5311A.
Adams, Irving Winthrop, 5313A.
Arietta, Frank, 5314A.
Roberts, Tracy Lloyd, 5315A.
Heaton, Herman Shelby, 5317A.
Clist, Angus Southey, 5319A.
Sharp, Douglas, 5320A.
Badley, Burton Elmore, 5321A.
Berry, Ralph Clifton, 5322A.
Jennings, Cleveland Hall, 18065A.
Davis, James Beatty, 5323A.
× Alexander, Marvin, 5324A.
Hooks, Claud Hardy, 5326A.
Springfield, Robert Walter, 5327A.
Niskanen, William, 5330A.
Gephart, Harry Lane, 5331A.
Stickle, Horton Whitefield, Jr., 5332A.
Yount, Dean Burdette, 5333A.
Downing, John Weaver, 5335A.
Tarson, Herbert Harvey, 5338A.
Schmidt, Eugene E., 5339A.

Hodson, James Albert, 5341A.
Barrett, Buford Russell, 5344A.
Spence, George Gillies, 5345A.
Bullock, William Wilson, 5346A.
Sargeant, Bliss Pilgrim, Jr., 5347A.
Gibbs, Howard Jefferson, 5348A.
Smith, Edward Cecil, 5349A.
Gordon, Edward Louis, 5350A.
Herndon, George Berry, 5351A.
Cone, Charles Louis, 5352A.
Newman, Samuel William, 5353A.
Quattlebaum, Arthur Cecil, 5354A.
Lindberg, Leif William, 5356A.
Strandberg, Earl Rodell, 5358A.
Terry, James Bell, 5359A.
×Hall, Claude Newton, 5360A.
Tolle, Carroll Keith, 5361A.
×Tucker, Temple Arthur, 5362A.
Heath, Lester Ellis, 5363A.

Medical

Tousignant, Harvey George, 19204A.
×Harney, John Philip, 19205A.
Ferrell, Lee Frank, 19206A.
×Boysen, John Edward, 19207A.
Brightwell, Richard Justice, 19208A.
Sabin, George Milnar, Jr., 19567A.
×Block, Herbert Edward, 19210A.
Kossuth, Louis Caspar, 19211A.
Mills, Edward Kernaghan, 19212A.
Hoffman, I. Louis, 19213A.
Alderson, Donald Marr, 19214A.
Dye, Fred Charles, 19562A.
Regner, Mathias Frederick, 19215A.
Rothrock, Vance McCormick, 19216A.
Bess, George Calvin, 19554A.

Dental

Early, Frank Stoltenberg, 18886A.
Henahan, James Patrick, 18887A.
McClench, George Spencer, 18888A.
×Allen, Leslie Ray, 19615A.

Veterinary

Clark, Marley Charles, 18984A.
Scott, Rolland Orno, 18985A.
Hummer, Robert Leo, 18986A.
Wilder, Claude Otto, 18987A.
×Walters, Ralph Durward, 18988A.
Nettles, John Robbins, Jr., 18990A.
×Day, Robert Wayne, 18991A.

Medical Service

Bullard, Perry Cecil, 19417A.
Bryant, Russel Lee, 19418A.
Peterson, Carmen Anthony, 19419A.
Coker, Richard Jack, 19420A.
Hill, William Alton, 19421A.
Pierce, John Foster, 19422A.
×Stine, Robert Christian, 19423A.

Chaplain

MacLeod, Roy Malcolm, 18731A.
Stadta, Raymond Martin, 18735A.

To be major

Air Force

×Dulch, Paul Anthony, 6904A.
Bock, Floyd Oscar, 10258A.
Espinosa, Lorenzo, 10282A.
Platz, Constant Victor, 10303A.
Moultrie, Homer Howard, Jr., 10306A.
Messall, Lawrence Emory, 10317A.
Heissenbuttel, William George, 10323A.
George, Paul Ernest, 10324A.
Maxey, Robert Lafayette, 10381A.
×Crawford, Robert, 10333A.
Patten, Ronald Oscar, 10334A.
Miller, William Alexander, 10336A.
Cotter, James Daniel, 10337A.
Wells, Earl Muncey, 10338A.
Moore, Ballinger Bryan, 10339A.
Rogers, James Morical, 10340A.
Brooks, Donald Leroy, 10341A.
Nibouar, Grover Cleveland, Jr., 10342A.
Kiel, Kenneth J., 10343A.
Sprinkle, James Frank, 10344A.
Collins, Hamilton Purcell, 10345A.
Szapiel, Stanley Vincent, 10346A.
Blackwell, Anslum McLaurin, 10347A.
Smith, Leighton Clifton, 10348A.
Rogers, Charles Wesley, 10349A.
Bowers, Waldo, 10350A.
Craft, Albert Olaf, 10351A.
Kemp, Otto Carl, 10352A.
Malley, John Davidson, 10353A.
Brewer, James Franklin, 10354A.
Cooper, Roy D., 10355A.
Kluender, Carl Albert, 10356A.
Eisert, Fred Joseph, 10357A.
Jensen, Howard Warren, 10358A.
Weidman, Roy Andrew, 10361A.
MacAaron, Kenneth Abbott, 10362A.
×Bean, Joe Merritt, 10363A.
Collings, Orval Dwain, 10364A.
Fetterly, Donald John Walter, 10366A.
Boyd, Robert Watson, 10367A.
×Anderson, Richard William, 10368A.
Thomas, Glen, Jr., 10369A.
Kidd, Campbell Augustus, 10370A.
Olson, George Andrew, 10371A.
Brown, John Todd, Jr., 10372A.
Bush, Beverly Oliver, 10373A.
Brengle, Paul Staley, 10374A.
Kearny, Clinton Charles, 10375A.
Perry, Paul Lawrence, 10376A.
Davison, Walter Corwin, 10378A.
Boren, Francis Terance, 10379A.
Baliga, Joseph Robert, 10380A.
×Mittelstadt, Frederick William, Jr., 10382A.
Poole, Joseph Ray, 10384A.
×Schumacher, Otto Henry, 10385A.
Maurser, Paul Henry, 10386A.
Stetson, Alvin Elliot, 10387A.
Cox, Omer Loraine, 10389A.
Ballinger, Edward Paxton, 10390A.
×Buckhiester, Wendell McCall, 10391A.
Godsey, Joseph Daughety, 10392A.
Rudd, Robert John, 10393A.
Smith, Merton Vincent, 10394A.
Wiese, Keith Irwin, 10395A.
Teasley, Joel Hunt, 10396A.
Timms, George Deeson, 10397A.
Pelaez, Emanuel Antonio, 10398A.
Townsley, Howard Beshoar, 10399A.
Frost, Jack William, 10400A.
Clark, Wallace Nichols, 10401A.
×Vaut, Bert A., Jr., 10402A.
Mork, John Henry, 10403A.
Boston, James Dwight, Jr., 10404A.
Wenzinger, Harlan Joseph, 10405A.
×Switzer, Alfred Joseph, 10406A.
Feser, Joseph Leonard, 10407A.
McAlister, Ira Norton, 10408A.
Zweig, Louis Emil, Jr., 10409A.
Klucarich, Stephen, 10411A.
Duda, William, 10412A.
Tietz, Edward Christian, 10413A.
Williams, Charles Irwin, 10414A.
Oliver, Paul, 10415A.
Frink, Earl Eby, 10416A.
Ely, Kenneth Eugene, 10417A.
Poston, Denzil, 10418A.
Gianatsis, James Arthur, 10419A.
Putnam, Royal Augustus, 10420A.
Miller, Jesse William, 10421A.
Quenin, James Henry, 10422A.
×Longridge, Thomas Maxwell, 10423A.
Halber, Alexander Dominic, 10424A.
McKee, Eustis Ewart, Jr., 10426A.
Filios, John Edward, 10427A.
Thornton, John Mack, 10429A.
Gosnell, Emmett, 10430A.
×Westmoreland, Ivey Teddy, 10431A.
Kanter, Merwin, 10432A.
Kilman, Ray Richard, 10433A.
Weinheimer, Jacob, 10434A.
Hanger, Harry Hunter, 10435A.
Hill, Gordon, 10436A.
Rulien, Donovan Waldamore, 10437A.
Hale, Ivan Lee, 10438A.
×Garrison, John Henry, Jr., 10439A.
Fitz, Robert Ernest, 10440A.
×Huard, Norman Phillip, 10441A.
Agne, Howard Charles, Jr., 10442A.
Lower, Charles, 10443A.
Lutz, Reed Woodrow, 10444A.
Smith, Raymond Earl, 10445A.
Egert, John, 3d, 10446A.
Shek, William, 10447A.
Hanson, Marshall Everette, 10448A.
×Walsh, Raymond Lee, 10449A.
×Duckworth, Ernest Marion, 10450A.
Watson, James Wallace, 10451A.
Epperson, Virgil Roland, 10452A.
Leighten, George David, 10453A.
Glettler, Bernard Urban, 10454A.
Wilson, Gerald Phillip, 10455A.
Boyd, Wilmer Ellsworth, 10456A.
Ray, Gerald Harmon, 10457A.
Arnold, Harold Mort, 10458A.
Bell, Thomas Angus, 10459A.
×Peterson, Conrati Reginald, 10460A.
Kiesel, Chester Gustav, 10461A.
×Bryant, James Robert, 10462A.
Tillotson, Floyd Murray, 10463A.
Gordon, Vincent Paul, 10464A.
Malone, Francis Mathew, 10465A.
Bonner, Thomas Woodrow, 10466A.
Akers, William Dale, 10468A.
Steigner, John Martin, 10469A.
Klotz, Robert Charles, 10470A.
Ash, Stanley James, 10471A.
×Mitchell, William Joseph, 10472A.
Mays, Harold Douglas, 10473A.
Morris, James Harl, 10474A.
White, George Gillette, 10475A.
DePriest, Wilson Marshall, 10476A.
Covell, Paul Michael, 10477A.
McCabe, James Selby, 10478A.
Beck, James Alston, 10479A.
Alexander, Woodrow Ervin, 10480A.
Blair, Duane Charles, 10481A.
Worthington, William Jacob, Jr., 10482A.
Young, Robert Warren, 10483A.
Neal, George Clayton, 10484A.
×Havens, John Jacob, 10487A.
Ivey, James Monroe, Jr., 10488A.
Howell, James Ralph, 10489A.
Stewart, Donald Sylvester, 10490A.
Pope, Fred William, 10491A.
Hopkins, Harold Jessie, 10492A.
Thrash, James Andrews, Jr., 10493A.
Hayes, Oliver Thomas, Jr., 10494A.
Mysza, John Edward, 10496A.
Mathews, Gerald Arthur, 10497A.
Dickert, James Ray, 10498A.
Vernon, Damon Arthur, 10499A.
Watkins, Thomas Green, Jr., 10500A.

Medical

Shackelford, Allen Louis, 19640A.
×Johnson, Robert Leroy, 19532A.
×Giffen, Martin Brener, 19319A.
×Wright, Thomas Clinton, 19320A.
Crompton, Robert Edwin, 19557A.
Harten, James Nash, 19321A.
Misch, Harry James, 19322A.
×Quinnell, Robert Kay, 19323A.
×Peat, Alexander Cranston, 19324A.
Hood, Oliver Clough, 19325A.
Rosen, Irwin Elwood, 19326A.
Osborne, Horace Henry, 19605A.
Westbrook, William Hudson, 19327A.
Marsh, Frank Fontaine, 19328A.
×Barry, Francis Edward, 19330A.
Dugan, Charles Clark, 19592A.
Simons, David Goodman, 19331A.
Mays, Oliver Aiken, 19332A.
×Chancey, Robert Lee, 19333A.
×Osetinsky, Venedict Michaelovich, 19334A.
Mebane, John Cummins, 19336A.
Brazina, Edward Sharp, 19337A.
Plowright, Thomas Rider, 19339A.
Aiken, David Wyatt, 19341A.
×Moorehead, Si Fried, Jr., 19342A.
Kollar, Edward Joseph, Jr., 19344A.
Schafer, George Ezra, 19345A.
Culver, Warren Tuttle, 19346A.
Ketring, Eldon Grant, 19347A.

Dental

×Huchel, Paul Elwood, 18946A.
Schulte, William Charles, 18947A.
Long, Richard Eifort, 18948A.
Wendt, Douglas Charles, 18949A.
×Hombs, Roger, 18950A.
Fricke, Vernon Stanley, 18951A.
Gross, Willis Charles, Jr., 18952A.

Veterinary

Hempy, Jack Howard, 19003A.
MacEachern, Neil Gordon, 19004A.
Beckcom, Edwin A., Jr., 19005A.
Stephens, Seidel Miles, 19006A.
Gorman, Harry Arthur, 19007A.
Kadets, Martin, 19008A.

Medical Service

Hahn, George Louis, 19479A.
Otter, Henry Frederick, 19480A.

Wehrman, Edwin Melvin, 19631A.
Blue, Lonnie Knox, 19481A.
×Eslick, Orville Jefferson, 19482A.
Martindale, Robert Warren, 19483A.
Magness, Willie Cleveland, 19484A.

Chaplain

×Kessler, John Nicholas, 18789A.
×Seizler, Norbert Edward, 18790A.
Rinkowski, George Michael, 18791A.
Goodhand, Vernon Myers, 18792A.
Blatz, Roman Theodore, 18793A.

To be captain

Air Force

Hogan, Raphael Julien, 19784A.
Payne, William Raymond, 17170A.
Harer, Richard James, 17171A.
Taylor, Charlie Tilphord, Jr., 17172A.
Fellows, Charles Warrenton, Jr., 17173A.
Hendricks, William Tillman, 17174A.
Embery, Robert Lee, 17175A.
LaRoche, Harold Douglas, 17176A.
Bradley, Ernest Elmore, Jr., 17177A.
Norberg, Marcus Lynn, 17178A.
Lewis, Theodore Shelby, 17179A.
Brauneis, Ernest Frederick, 17180A.
Orlando, Michael Amato, 17182A.
Davis, Marion McDonald, Jr., 17183A.
Norris, Lee Glenn, 19785A.
Cavnar, Bobbie Joe, 17184A.
Hardy, Charles Raymond, 17185A.
de Vries, John Atwood, 17186A.
Fox, Victoria Elizabeth, 21303W.
Guay, Georges Raymond Joseph, 17187A.
Christensen, Swen Aage, 17188A.
Crawford, David Frank, 17189A.
Donahue, John James, 20028A.
Guilfoyle, William Andrew, 20029A.
Moore, Frank Grae, 17190A.
Heckel, Charles Clark, 17191A.
Kenworthy, Robert Barclay, 17192A.
Collins, David Carter, 17193A.
Pohlen, Paul Donald, 17194A.
Nissen, Jim Christian, 17195A.
Lowry, Merlin Dolynn, 17196A.
Shadel, William Noel, 17197A.
×Ahern, Timothy Ignatius, 17198A.
Hudson, Jack Lorance, 24261A.
Garcia, Ray Joseph, 17199A.
Collins, Harold Edward, 17200A.
Slay, Alton Davis, 17201A.
Frith, Thomas John, 17202A.
Greenspun, Morris Joseph, 21432A.
Blackmon, Waldo Neely, 17203A.
Hislop, Sherman LeMoyne, 17204A.
Smith, Howard Persons, Jr., 17205A.
×Hummel, Richard Edward, 17207A.
Pelzel, Alfred Otto, 17208A.
Davis, Richard Lee, 17209A.
Boyes, Peter Edwin, 17210A.
×Koski, Raymond Julius, 17211A.
Cunningham, O. D., Jr., 17212A.
Timmie, James Davis, 17213A.
Ewing, Donald Edward, 17214A.
Warden, Rex Wall, Jr., 17215A.
Ellis, Calvin Kemp, 17216A.
×Girardin, Robert Laurent, 17217A.
Glass, Lawrence Stuart, 17218A.
Bork, Ervin Francis, 17219A.
Loesch, George Peter, 17220A.
Holland, Thomas Marion, Jr., 17221A.
Blanck, Eugene Louis, 21433A.
Sinclair, William Donald, 17227A.
Goodwyn, Marvin Williams, 20030A.
Graves, Grover Cleveland, Jr., 17226A.
Kramb, John Henry, 17229A.
Disharoon, Jerry Benton, 17230A.
Chille, Peter Joseph, 17231A.
Houck, Warren Putnam, 17232A.
×Hoyt, Thurber Lewellyn, 17233A.
Ventres, Robert Lee, 17234A.
Henck, Noel Joseph, 17236A.
Tarrant, Edward Wayland, 17237A.
Schoonover, Orville Geralle, 17238A.
Prince, Robert Allison, 21779A.
Wolf, Daniel Warren, 17239A.
Lavender, Emory Candler, Jr., 17240A.
Shupe, Bennie Allan, 17241A.
Nelson, Thomas O'Neil, 17242A.
Linn, Julius, Jr., 17243A.
Eichelberger, William Rex, 17244A.
×Bandy, George Richard, 20031A.
Draper, Russell C., 17245A.
Hughes, Robert Malcolm, 17246A.
Klingler, Ralph Reno, Jr., 17247A.
Temple, Robert Joseph, 17248A.
Latella, John Joseph, 20032A.
Kelley, Carroll William, 22992A.
Troutman, George Glenn, 17249A.
Blades, Leo Leslie, 17250A.
Philips, Robert James, 17251A.
Boutwell, Rufus Cecil, Jr., 20033A.
Melendez, Michael John, 17252A.
Adams, Donald Dee, 17253A.
Eger, Charles Henry, Jr., 17255A.
×Winters, Melvin Percy, 17256A.
Thompson, John Arnold, 17257A.
Watson, Allan Ray, 17258A.
×Bechtold, Louis Addison, 17259A.
×Hyde, James Richard, 17260A.
Fiansaas, Glenn Arthur, 17261A.
Laughlin, William Edward, 17262A.
Marcarelli, John Alphonse, 17263A.
Lebell, Jonah, 19786A.
Meyers, Roy Lee, 17264A.
Gagnon, John Arthur, Jr., 17266A.
Smithson, Daryl Purdy, 17267A.
Kimbel, Bruce Keirce, 17268A.
Ferguson, Charles Laird, 17269A.
Bjorgen, Leonard Leroy, 17270A.
Bryant, William Anthony, 17271A.
Nave, William Patrick, 17272A.
Booz, Robert Burnett, 19787A.
Lamb, Charles Melford, Jr., 17273A.
Davies, John Vencil, 21780A.
Davis, William James, 17274A.
Stockton, Lyle Edward, 17275A.
Smith, Charles Ames, 17276A.
Allen, Nelson, 21434A.
Gold, Morton Joseph, 20034A.
Holland, Billy Sheridan, 21781A.
Weigelt, Winfred Hamilton, 17278A.
Holtorf, Arthur Miles, 17279A.
Neff, Benjamin Groff, 17280A.
Wortman, John Junior, 17281A.
Wiley, John Clinton, 21782A.
Simmons, James Albert, 17282A.

Medical

Wippermann, Edgar David, 19843A.
Lofton, Joseph Edgar, 19844A.
Hartmann, Ernest Rudolph, 21735A.
Stull, Fred Edward, Jr., 23167A.
Berger, Walter Jesse, Jr., 23168A.
Roundtree, William Coleman, 20016A.
Wilke, Joseph Edward, Jr., 20017A.
Thompson, William Wesley, 24122A.
Weed, Allen Stanley, 22953A.

Dental

Dunham, David Russell, 18970A.
Jamieson, Glenn William, 18971A.
×Detamore, Robert Jay, 19624A.
Mack, John Francis, 21734A.
Milbourn, Arthur Lee, 21849A.
Reese, Robert Thomas, 19629A.
×Cofer, John Wesley, 20552A.
Carbonaro, Emanuel Anthony, 21427A.
Lee, Donald St. John, 20015A.
Bergmann, Robert William, 21764A.
Louis, John David, 20058A.
×Hartley, Jack L., 18972A.
Segreto, Vincent Augustus, 22405A.
×Jaslow, Charles, 20553A.

Veterinary

Nettles, William Douglas, 19845A.
Nichols, Wilbert Charles, 19920A.
×Couch, J. B., 21601A.
Kyner, Roy Eugene, Jr., 21602A.
Armstrong, James, 21603A.
×Weil, Frederick, 21604A.
Hayman, William Paul, Jr., 21866A.

Medical Service

Craycraft, Ralph Edwin, 19531A.

Chaplain

Bennett, John Stuart, 21856A.
Borderlon, Vernon, 20856A.
Barringer, John Daniel, 20857A.
McPeak, William James, 21857A.
Cole, Connor Garton, 21858A.
Brenner, Arthur Emil Kalk, 20858A.
Finneran, Michael Joe, 20859A.
Mulligan, Edward Benedict, 20860A.
Mattheson, Raymond Thomas, 20861A.
Pullen, Oden Mallory, 21859A.
Ahern, Patrick Joseph, 21860A.
Hoop, George Edgar, 21861A.
Saul, Laurence Everett, 21862A.

To be first lieutenant

Air Force

Huffman, Robert Dale, 23761A.
Scurlock, Robert, 23763A.
Chambers, William Henry, Jr., 23759A.
McAlister, Jake Louis, 23760A.
Gordon, Harry Edward, 23764A.
Dinwiddie, James Fearing, 23765A.
Standish, Jesse Edward, 23762A.
MacDonald, Tom Stanford, 23768A.
Pulleyn, Lyle Leverne, 24385A.
Steiger, Arthur Raymond, 23771A.
Kleinman, Robert Bernard, 23773A.
Moore, William Fred, 23774A.
Fielder, James Mario, 21499A.
Evans, Charles Manderson, 21500A.
Gallagher, Kenneth Harold, 22819A.
Quillin, James Arnold, 23775A.
Vitko, James Dale, 19880A.
Tisdail, Artyv Tommy, 22820A.
Stapleton, William Robert, 19816A.
Sterne, Kenneth L., 19814A.
Sharp, David W., 19815A.
Sheffield, Sam Earl, 21501A.
Sanders, Gilmore Lamberth, 22821A.
Reid, Ernest LeRoy, 21502A.
Merritt, Norman Franklin, Jr., 22822A.
Esmond, Thomas Marion, 21503A.
Jacobs, Sidney Monta, 19931A.
Rollman, Robert Oren, 22823A.
Davis, Henry Eugene, 21504A.
Bozeman, Earl Lomax, 21505A.
Parker, Robert Bonwell, 19932A.
Magnotti, Ralph Andrew, 19818A.
Gabosch, Robert Earl, 19819A.
Rowe, Berry W., 18616A.
Woirol, Warren Stanton, 21506A.
Merjanian, Paul Edward, 23778A.
Stalk, George, 23777A.
Saylor, George Henry, 22824A.
Benson, Jack Rayburn, 22825A.
Hamlin, Ross Eldon, 23779A.
Frederick, Lowell William, 21507A.
Bailey, Joseph Durward, 21508A.
Moore, Jackie N., 21509A.
Hales, Ermine Leon, 22826A.
Terry, Morgan Franklin, Jr., 23780A.
McClure, Joseph Adolphus, 24388A.
Ginn, William Henry, Jr., 24386A.
Faulk, John Dillon, 24390A.
Maggard, Andrew McGiffert, 19890A.
Cummings, George Robert, 21510A.
Knapp, Clyde Holman, Jr., 21511A.
Foster, William George, 24389A.
Brown, Charles Lester, 21512A.
Buesking, Albert William, 22827A.
Ward, John Edmond, 23781A.
Darby, Samuel Armistead, Jr., 22828A.
Cooksey, George Dewey, Jr., 22829A.
McClain, Dean Andrew, 19886A.
Skartvedt, Paul Stuart, 23782A.
Alderson, Jerry Dennis, Jr., 19945A.
Akey, Franklyn Raymond, 24387A.
Falls, Johnie Wesley, 23783A.
Boots, Maurice John, 24392A.
Gardner, John Francis, 23784A.
×Long, William Edward, 19891A.
Schmidt, Earl Morris, 21513A.
Fleming, David McClain, 23785A.
McCarthy, Charles Gates, 22831A.
Hammond, Winton Gayle, 24391A.
Novak, Eugene Anthony, 21514A.
Ross, Alfred Emil, 19975A.
Spooner, Richard Henry, 22832A.
Pearsall, Thomas Edward, 19898A.
Jenkins, Donald Marvin, 19902A.
Paper, Harry William, 19895A.
Napier, John Hawkins 3d, 19897A.
Murphy, John Franklin, 19901A.
×Tefas, Steve George, 19900A.
Walter, Alonzo Joseph, Jr., 19896A.
Ward, Morris James, 19894A.
Montgomery, Clarence Leon, Jr., 19899A.
Butler, Henry George, 19893A.
Honaker, John Pleasant, Jr., 22833A.
×McCulley, James Abbott, 19933A.
Hatcher, Cliff Cicero 3d, 21516A.
Behr, Robert McLean, 21515A.

Gibson, Alfred Marion, 19993A.
Gimmi, Richard Farman Bower, Jr. 21517A.
Paulnock, Russell Steven, 21518A.
Fagan, James Butler, 22834A.
Walford, Edward Thomas, 24393A.
Evans, Douglas Kibby, 24394A.
Larsen, Sophus Edwin, 19926A.
×Diehl, Rex Earl, 19924A.
Manners, LeRoy Clyde, 19925A.
Korhnak, Ralph Vernon, 20002A.
Quiram, Helmut Gustave, Jr., 20770A.
Moore, Bill Thomas, 21564A.
McNair, Thomas Earl, 21558A.
Daley, John Francis, Jr., 21559A.
Lee, Robert Edward, 21560A.
Wroot, Wallace Kearney, 21563A.
Smith, Milfred Festus, 21566A.
×Day, Howard Fulton, 21562A.
×Dickson, Enos Jewell, 21567A.
Smith, William Francis, 3d, 21565A.
Isbell, Frances Wyatt, 21720W.
Duclos, Bernard Vincent, 21561A.
Herr, Leonard Charles, 21568A.
Dees, Robert Franklin, 21569A.
Canfield, Robert Donald, 21556A.
×Montague, Harry Victor, Jr., 21557A.
Cale, Myron Ellsworth, 23787A.
Bleyer, Mirian, 23786A.
×Cramer, George Edward, 23788A.
Holcombe, Bondy Hobert, 19948A.
Casey, John Carl, 24395A.
Weinberg, Sidney, 23789A.
Warener, Marshall Rudolph, 19935A.
Gasque, Francis Lamar, 19936A.
Reinke, Richard Carl, 19976A.
Gleason, Joseph Parmelee, 21519A.
Bissell, Robert Joseph, 22835A.
Hale, Verne Dale, 21520A.
Eden, James Irven, 22836A.
Robinson, Jack Kermit, 19977A.
Rankin, Harry Liongino, Jr., 23791A.
Davis, Howard Stanton, 21521A.
Rawson, William Charles, 21522A.
Balega, John Lewis, 24396A.
×Kendall, Gilbert Lonnie, 19941A.
Harris, William E., 19942A.
×Harvey, William Marion, Jr., 21549A.
Flake, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., 22837A.
Kaufman, William Carl, 22838A.
Pratt, Clifford LaMar, 19946A.
Ettredge, Victor Lloyd, 23792A.
Parrish, Henry Grady, Jr., 22839A.
Roark, Bob, 23794A.
Colvin, Wilton Louis, 21523A.
Perrine, Walton Francis, Jr., 19984A.
Hamilton, Darwin R., 19985A.
Ginn, William Arthur, 19978A.
Adams, Lester Morgan, Jr., 19980A.
Helms, John David, 19982A.
Limbocker, Frank Adams, 19987A.
×Tomb, Glen Charles, 19979A.
Alden, George Bernard, 19986A.
Cole, Dorsey Eugene, 19983A.
Retaliack, William Glen, 20419A.
Wason, Charles Plumer, 20047A.
Bryant, Thomas Lee, 19992A.
Perriter, John Joseph, 24397A.
Jakes, Julian E., 20053A.
Sinclair, Richard Rue, 20426A.
Gordon, Henry Charles, 21650A.
Cameron, Robert MacNair, 21663A.
Peede, Floyd Appling, Jr., 22840A.
Thompson, James Wilkinson, Jr., 22841A.
Street, James Arthur, 19994A.
Lewis, Mortimer Joseph, 19998A.
Gray, Robert Asa, 19996A.
×Alvord, Ray Warren, 19995A.
Hopkins, Arthur Paschal, 19997A.
Elliott, Michael Bernard, 23796A.
Clifford, Thomas Edward, 20048A.
May, Hugh Edward, 24399A.
McCarthy, Charles John, 19999A.
Johnson, Peter Charles, 20000A.
Colaianni, Paul Vernon, 23798A.
Taylor, Abbott Lawrence, 23799A.
Uzelac, Milton John, 20080A.
Bryant, Duane Kelley, 20065A.
Eisele, Edward Dean, 20069A.
Hill, Edgar Hunter, 20071A.
Detlie, Martin Oliver, 20079A.
O'Connell, Kenneth Brotnov, 20064A.
Heyboer, Jay, 20076A.
Rascoe, Robert Leonard, 20077A.
Abbott, Richard Leon, 20074A.
Beaman, James Addison, Jr., 20070A.
Darden, Oliver Caldwell, 20081A.
Beall, James Robert, 20073A.
Goldsmith, Lawrence Donald, 20066A.
Corley, Melvin Vardai, Jr., 20072A.
×Gallaher, Bernard Arthur, 20078A.
Neubert, Ernest Francis, 23801A.
Harrison, Stephen E., 23800A.
Waggoner, Thomas Hugh, 24401A.
Gillette, Charles Bertrand, 24400A.
Rose, John [illegible]ilton, Jr., 24398A.

Medical Service

Wood, Glen F., 21877A.
Bodner, William Clark, 21878A.
Meyer, Albert Mathew, 21649A.
Venaglia, John, 21879A.
Alder, Albert Vernon, 21880A.
×Sparling, Kenneth Gray, 21881A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonel

Nurse

Zeller, Verena Marie, 20913W.

To be major

Nurse

×Conroy, Elizabeth Julia, 21925W.

To be captain

Women's Medical Specialist

Cook, Janet Elizabeth, 22085W.
×Clevenger, Ruth Eleanor, 21192W.
Bodycomb, Joyce, 20897W.

To be first lieutenant

Nurse

Slater, Helen Marie, 22465W.
Rau, Margaret Louise, 24179W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. George Taylor Fitz, pastor, St. John's Evangelical and Reformed Church, Johnstown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, the source of all light and life, the origin of all power and might, we thank Thee that Thou hast made it possible for us men to seek Thy guidance and Thy help in the daily conduct of our lives. At the beginning of this day, then, we give Thee our humble thanks for Thy provident care, beg Thy merciful forgiveness of past errors, and pray for strength to meet the burdens of this day.

Thou knowest, our Father, the tremendous pressure and the heavy responsibilities that rest upon the men of this Congress. In behalf of all Thy children, whose destinies shall be determined by their actions, we pray that they will face their obligations with the courage of those who are aware of their obligations to Thee. May they ever be conscious of their dependence upon Thee, and do Thou guide and direct them in the paths of human progress and divine destiny. Abide with us all throughout this day and every day.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 7, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Monday next. I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House on Tuesday next for the same time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 16)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting with this message the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

This budget represents my judgment as to the amount of funds needed to carry forward our programs for the security and welfare of our people and for world peace. It is based, like all those I have transmitted in previous years, on the policy that the Government should undertake to do only what is essential for the safety and well-being of the Nation, and that what must be done should be done in the most efficient manner.

This budget has been prepared under unique circumstances. It is the first budget since the adoption of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution to be presented to the Congress by a President who will leave office a few days after its transmission. My successor will be inaugurated as President on January 20. His will be the Executive responsibility during the time when this budget is being considered by the Congress, and his will be the responsibility for the administration of Federal programs for the period of time covered by this budget. I have done all in my

power to ease the problems of transition to the new administration, including informing the President-elect, through a representative of his choice, of the background and considerations which have entered into the preparation of this budget. However, I wish to make it clear that neither my successor in office nor any of his staff has participated in the decisions herein represented. The President-elect has no responsibility for the amounts included in this budget, and will be entirely free, of course, to propose changes in them.

Because of the particular circumstances, there is one significant difference between this budget and others I have transmitted. In previous years, the budget estimates have included the cost of new legislation which I recommended to the Congress. Such a practice is a sound rule for Federal budgeting. This year, however, I am not transmitting specific proposals for new legislation. Accordingly, the usual estimates of the fiscal effects of such legislation are not included. For example, neither estimated expenditures for aid to medical education nor estimated receipts from increased postal rates are included. I still support these and certain other legislative proposals as strongly as ever, but since I will not be in office during the fiscal year 1954, I do not think it proper for me to transmit specific new legislative proposals or to budget for them. However, funds are included in this budget to carry forward certain activities already under way which will require renewed legislative authority to continue into the next fiscal year, such as the programs under the Mutual Security Act and the Defense Production Act.

In this budget, I am recommending that the Congress enact 72.9 billion dollars in new authority to incur financial obligations during the fiscal year 1954. Total expenditures, from these funds and from balances of authorizations previously enacted, are estimated at 78.6 billion dollars. Receipts under present tax laws, which provide for the expiration of some of the post-Korean tax increases, are estimated at 68.7 billion dollars. On this basis, the deficit is estimated at 9.9 billion dollars. The following table shows the budget totals for the five fiscal years 1950 through 1954:

Budget totals

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
New authority to incur obligations	$50.2	$84.1	$92.9	$80.8	$72.9
Expenditures	40.1	44.6	66.1	74.6	78.6
Receipts (under existing tax laws)	37.0	48.1	62.1	68.7	68.7
Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−3.1	+3.5	−4.0	−5.9	−9.9

These figures show very clearly the budgetary impact of the defense mobilization program on which we embarked after the Communist aggression in Korea in June 1950. This program required, among other things, that we increase our active military forces by about 2 million men and women, equip those larger forces with new and improved weapons, and maintain them for an indefinite period. These were steps judged necessary not only to carry out the commitment we undertook in Korea, but also to increase our defense preparedness in the light of the continuing possibility of fighting on a much larger scale. We are now well along in this program. Our Armed Forces have long since reached the level of 3.6 million; the initial equipment to outfit them has been ordered, and much of it has been delivered.

New obligational authority, primarily to finance the purchase of military weapons and equipment, rose sharply after the attack on Korea and reached a peak of 92.9 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952. Since then, new obligational authority has been declining. The amount recommended for the fiscal year 1954 is 20 billion dollars less than the amount enacted for 1952.

Although new obligational authority is declining, expenditures are still rising. This is due to the long lead time involved in the procurement of military equipment—the time required to design, produce, test, and deliver such complex items as planes, tanks, ships, and guns, after contracts are let. Because of this long lead time, most items of military equipment are not usually delivered and completely paid for until 2 or sometimes 3 years after they are ordered.

Each year from 1951 through 1953, new obligational authority has exceeded expenditures, because new obligational authority represented for the most part orders being placed, and expenditures represented for the most part payments for goods being delivered. In the fiscal year 1954, fewer orders will be placed, but more goods will be delivered. As a result, expenditures are expected to exceed new obligational authority for the first time since before Korea.

Under our present defense program, military expenditures are expected to reach their peak in the fiscal year 1954 and to start declining in subsequent years. If our Armed Forces are stabilized at their presently approved goals and if no new aggressions occur, new obligational authority and expenditures may be expected to level off in future years at the amounts necessary to maintain these forces and to replace current equipment with new and better items as they are developed. It is difficult to forecast with any precision the amount by which total Federal expenditures may be expected to drop in future years under these assumptions, but it may be in the neighborhood of 15 billion dollars. In my judgment, however, a drop of this magnitude cannot be expected for at least 2 or 3 years.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

This budget is dominated, as the last three have been, by the cost of national security. About 73 percent of all budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1954 will be for six major national security programs—military services, international security and foreign relations, the development of atomic energy, the promotion of defense production and economic stabilization, civil defense, and merchant marine activities. In the fiscal year 1954 these programs will cost approximately 57.3 billion dollars.

An additional 14 percent of budget expenditures in 1954 will be for interest and for veterans' services and benefits. These expenditures, which will amount to approximately 11 billion dollars, represent for the most part a continuing cost of World War II; in addition, they include the costs of services and benefits for the growing number of veterans of the fighting in Korea.

The remaining 13 percent, or 10.3 billion dollars, will be for all other activities of the Government. Some of these activities—such as the port security program of the Coast Guard and the internal security program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—have a direct bearing on our national security. Others—such as our programs for agriculture, housing and community development, education and general research, labor, social security, welfare, and health—help to assure our continued social and economic progress and to strengthen the Nation for the long, hard period of world tension that lies ahead of us. Still others represent basic functions of Government, such as making and enforcing the laws, collecting taxes, and maintaining Federal records and property.

As the following table indicates, expenditures for major national security programs not only dominate this budget, but also account for most of the increase in total budget expenditures since 1950, the last full fiscal year before the attack on Korea.

Budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Program	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Major national security	$17.8	$26.4	$47.2	$53.2	$57.3
Veterans' services and benefits	6.6	5.3	4.9	4.5	4.6
Interest	5.8	5.7	5.9	6.5	6.4
Other	9.6	7.9	9.0	10.4	10.3
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement	+.3	−.7	−.9	.....	.....
Total	40.1	44.6	66.1	74.6	78.6

EXPENDITURE POLICY

In the preparation of this budget, every Government program—including those directly concerned with national security—has been reviewed in the light of the current outlook for international developments, in the light of the heavy tax burden, and in the light of the long-term needs of the Nation. The recommended estimates reflect our constant effort to adjust expenditure programs to make sure they are at the minimum level consistent with our national objectives. Proposals for military procurement, for example, reflect our policy of relying, wherever possible, on a continuing flow of weapons and equipment from production lines, rather than on the accumulation of large inventories of reserve stocks.

Increased funds have been included in this budget only for those programs where, in my judgment, a clear and definite need exists that cannot be longer

deferred without impairing the public interest. In the case of several regulatory agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission, earlier cut-backs were so severe that steps have been taken in this budget to restore some of them. Even in these instances, however, the policies have been strict. Funds have been provided for handling increased workloads or backlogs of unfinished work only when failure to do so would result in delays which would have to be made up later at an even greater expense, or in a serious impairment of an agency's ability to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it by law. It would be shortsighted to do less.

Because of the overriding requirements of the national security programs, many important Government services to businessmen, farmers, and the public at large have been held, in recent years, to levels below those justified by our growing population and expanding economy. Rising prices have also increased the cost of Government and have reduced the actual service to the public per dollar spent just as they have reduced the purchasing power of private individuals and firms. When defense spending has declined, we must bring these services to levels consistent with the long-range development of the Nation and its resources.

The recommended appropriations anticipate increases in efficiency resulting from reorganizations, improved management procedures, and better programing of the work to be done. Substantial progress has been made in strengthening Federal management in the last few years so as to get more work done at less cost. This progress is reflected in this budget, and will continue to be a factor in future budgets.

Government organization and procedures are not static. They must be continually reviewed and modernized in order to adapt the machinery of Government to its current tasks. An examination of needed actions to improve Government organization and management is now a regular and continuing part of the process of preparing and administering the Federal budget. Reorganization plans transmitted under the Reorganization Act of 1949 have made a number of far-reaching improvements in providing officials of the executive branch with more effective organization and more adequate authority to do their jobs. I believe it will be found to be most desirable to extend the authority in that act, which expires April 1, 1953, as one of the steps needed to assure continued progress in increasing the efficiency with which the executive branch is managed.

TAX POLICY

I have always held that the Government's fiscal policy should aim at promoting the stable growth of our economy. This means that normally in times of high employment and rising national income the Federal Government should operate with a balanced budget.

In the years following the end of World War II, when the economy was operating at a full-employment level, my budget messages called for balanced budgets and debt reduction. During the four fiscal years 1947 through 1950, the Government had an over-all net surplus of 4.3 billion dollars.

After the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, I recommended that we finance our rearmament effort on a pay-as-we-go basis. In response to my recommendations, the Congress raised tax rates in 1950 and again in 1951. These tax increases were substantial. They helped produce a budget surplus in the fiscal year 1951, but they have not met our subsequent revenue requirements. The fiscal year 1952 ended with a deficit of 4 billion dollars. A deficit of 5.9 billion dollars is now estimated for the current fiscal year. An even larger deficit, 9.9 billion dollars, is estimated for the fiscal year 1954.

Under present law, a number of the tax increases enacted in 1950 and 1951 will terminate in 1953 and 1954. The excess-profits tax on corporations is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1953. Under the Revenue Act of 1951, the rate increases on individuals' income will terminate on December 31, 1953, and the increases in normal rates on corporations' income will expire on March 31, 1954. Virtually all of the excise tax rate increases under this act will also expire on March 31, 1954. The purpose of the Congress in setting termination dates was to assure early review of the tax increases enacted after Korea. Responsibility for this review falls on this session of the Congress.

If the increases are allowed to expire as scheduled, the Government will lose about 2 billion dollars in revenue in the fiscal year 1954. The full effect of the expirations will be an annual revenue loss of approximately four times this amount.

The continuing increase in expenditures for national security and the prospect of a substantial deficit in the fiscal year 1954 pose an immediate and serious problem in tax policy. While I do not wish to make any specific recommendations, I do wish to make it clear that in my judgment it would not be wise to plan for a large budget deficit during a period when business activity, civilian employment, and national income are reaching unprecedented heights. The course of prudence and wisdom would be to continue to strive for a balanced budget and a pay-as-we-go policy in our rearmament program.

In its consideration of the level of tax rates, I hope the Congress will also give serious consideration to improving the equity of the tax system. The injustices and loss of revenue arising out of loopholes in the tax laws should be eliminated. Confidence in the equity of tax laws is essential in a democracy.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

The following table shows the source of estimated budget receipts for the fiscal year 1954, compared to revised estimates of receipts for the current fiscal year and actual receipts for the fiscal year 1952. The estimates for 1954 are based on present tax laws.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Direct taxes on individuals:			
Individual income taxes	$29,880	$33,551	$33,394
Estate and gift taxes	833	895	940
Direct taxes on corporations:			
Income and excess profits taxes	21,467	23,700	23,300
Excises	8,893	9,795	9,869
Customs	520	590	590
Employment taxes:			
Federal Insurance Contributions Act	3,569	4,000	4,293
Federal Unemployment Tax Act	259	271	280
Railroad Retirement Tax Act	735	650	660
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act	10	11	11
Miscellaneous receipts	1,803	1,745	2,130
Deduct:			
Appropriation to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	−3,569	−4,000	−4,293
Refunds of receipts	−2,302	−2,511	−2,559
Budget receipts	62,128	68,697	68,665

BORROWING AND THE PUBLIC DEBT

On the basis of the present fiscal outlook and existing tax laws, the public debt is expected to increase from 259 billion dollars at the beginning of the current fiscal year to about 264 billion dollars by June 30, 1953, and 274 billion dollars by June 30, 1954.

Last spring substantial revisions both from the standpoint of increased rate and increased intermediate yields were announced in the savings bond program, designed to put these widely held issues on a basis more nearly comparable with alternative investments. Holders of almost three-quarters of the maturing savings bonds are taking advantage of the new arrangements under which interest continues to accrue on bonds not presented for cash redemption at maturity.

EXPENDITURES AND AUTHORIZATIONS BY MAJOR FUNCTION

The following table shows estimated expenditures and recommended new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1954, classified by major function. It also compares estimated expenditures in the fiscal year 1954 with revised estimates for the current fiscal year and with actual expenditures in 1952. A more detailed breakdown of expenditures and new obligational authority by major function is contained in special analysis B, in part IV of this document.

Expenditures and authorizations by major functions

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Military services	$30,727	$44,380	$46,296	$41,535
International security and foreign relations	5,208	6,635	7,861	8,011
Finance, commerce, and industry	241	458	275	88
Transportation and communication	1,923	2,056	2,016	2,061
Natural resources	2,948	3,370	4,097	3,459
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1,045	1,943	1,827	1,435
Labor	243	252	268	278

Expenditures and authorizations by major functions—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Housing and community development	$735	$757	$909	$691
Education and general research	171	272	288	177
Social security, welfare, and health	2,491	2,594	2,579	2,563
Veterans' services and benefits	4,863	4,546	4,564	4,617
General government	1,411	1,385	1,547	1,478
Interest	5,934	6,520	6,420	6,420
Reserve for contingencies	-------	25	40	50
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement	−855	-------	-------	-------
Total	66,145	74,593	78,587	72,883

The estimates for 1954 include several hundreds of millions of dollars of receipts, authorizations, and expenditures relating to foreign credits and currencies for which no comparable figures appear in the 1952 and 1953 totals.

Until now foreign credits and currencies have been available to certain agencies without the normal processes of budgeting. Recent legislation requires that foreign credits be budgeted and reported in the same manner as regular funds of the Government. This step is desirable in order to obtain adequate control over the use of such credits, to promote effective utilization of the foreign credits on hand or otherwise available in lieu of dollars, and to make full disclosure of the Government's financial operations in the budget totals.

Accordingly, this budget includes appropriation estimates for the dollar equivalent of the agencies' estimated use of foreign currencies in 1954. The appropriations would be used to purchase foreign currencies from the Treasury as they are required for expenditure. These transactions will add the same amount to both budget receipts and expenditures, and will therefore have no effect on the deficit.

MILITARY SERVICES

This year we are budgeting for the fourth fiscal year following the attack on Korea. During the past 30 months, we and our allies of the United Nations have been fighting and holding the Communist aggressors. In addition, we have been expanding our Armed Forces toward larger goals—21 Army divisions, 3 Marine divisions, a Navy of 408 combatant ships with air support, and an Air Force of 143 wings. This is an expensive program, but our national security depends on it. We cannot afford to lower these goals until the free world is secure against the Communist menace.

In order to appraise properly the budgetary impact of our rearmament program, it is necessary to examine the four fiscal years 1951 through 1954 as a single time span, and to bear in mind the relationship between new obligational authority and expenditures. In the fiscal year 1951, new obligational authority for the military functions of the Department of Defense totaled 48.2 billion dollars, and in 1952 it reached 60.3 billion dollars. In the current fiscal year, it is expected to drop to 48.1 billion dollars, and I am recommending a further reduction to 41.2 billion dollars for 1954.

Because of the long lead time involved in military procurement, expenditures for most types of weapons and equipment occur many months after the Congress has enacted the authority for their purchase. Thus, as a result of the 1952 peak of new obligational authority, expenditures are expected to reach their peak in the fiscal year 1954. If we maintain the force level I am recommending in this Budget, expenditures for the military functions of the Department of Defense should begin to decline in the fiscal year 1955 and should continue to decline until they reach the level required to keep our Armed Forces in a state of readiness. On the basis of present rough estimates, that level may be in the neighborhood of 35 to 40 billion dollars annually.

In addition to the military functions of the Department of Defense, the military services category includes certain supporting activities such as the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, the research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Selective Service System. Expenditures for all programs in the military services category are estimated at 46.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954. This is an increase of 1.9 billion dollars over 1953 and 6.6 billion dollars over 1952.

Military services

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Cost category, program, or agency	New obligational authority				Expenditures			
	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Department of Defense, military functions:								
Military personnel	$8.4	$10.8	$11.6	$11.7	$7.0	$11.0	$11.4	$11.2
Operation and maintenance	11.1	12.4	11.1	10.3	5.4	12.2	9.8	10.6
Major procurement and production	(22.8)	(29.2)	(19.8)	(14.2)	(4.9)	(11.6)	(16.5)	(17.4)
Aircraft	10.1	14.9	13.8	8.2	2.4	5.4	7.4	8.7
Ships	.8	1.9	.7	1.1	.4	.6	.9	1.0
Other	11.9	12.4	5.3	4.9	2.1	5.0	8.2	7.7
Military construction	2.4	4.0	2.3	.7	.4	1.8	2.3	2.7
Civilian components	.8	.7	.7	.9	.5	.6	.7	.8
Research and development	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.8	.7	1.1	1.4	1.6
Industrial mobilization	.3	.2	.1	.6	.2	.2	.1	.1
Department-wide activities	1.2	1.5	.8	1.0	.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
Subtotal	48.2	60.3	48.1	41.2	19.7	38.9	43.2	45.4
Activities supporting military services:								
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	2.9	.6	.1	.2	.7	.8	1.1	.9
Other	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	(1)	.1	(1)
Total	51.2	61.0	48.3	41.5	20.5	39.7	44.4	46.3

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

Military personnel: Expenditures for military personnel are for the pay, subsistence, clothing, and transportation of our Armed Forces. This budget provides for an average strength of more than 3.6 million service men and women, an increase of more than 2.1 million since the beginning of the Korean conflict and slightly above the average provided for in the 1953 budget.

Despite the slight increase in average strength, expenditures for military personnel in the fiscal year 1954 are expected to be 200 million dollars less than in 1953 since expenditures in 1953 include outlays for a retroactive combat-duty pay and mustering-out pay.

As a result of two amendments to the 1953 Department of Defense Appropriation Act placing percentage limitations on officer grades and restricting the retirement of officers, the Department has been unable to administer our military personnel program in the best interests of the Government and the men. One amendment, which limits the proportion of officers of each rank, unduly restricts the flexibility of the services in assigning rank commensurate with responsibility. Apparently intended to slow down promotions of officers in the higher ranks, it has had its greatest impact on those in the lower ranks. The second amendment discourages the voluntary retirement of certain officers when it might be in the best long-run interests of both the Government and the officers to encourage some of these retirements. It has the damaging long-range effect of limiting the number of career-minded young junior officers from whom we must draw our future military leaders and on whom we must depend for the future effectiveness of our military forces. While I am in sympathy with the basic purpose of these two amendments, I believe they are doing more harm than good. Therefore, I believe they should be repealed as soon as possible.

Operation and maintenance: To operate and maintain the divisions, ships, and aircraft of our Military Establishment in the fiscal year 1954, I am recommending 10.3 billion dollars in new obligational authority. This is 800 million dollars less than the amount estimated for 1953, and 2.1 billion dollars less than the amount enacted for 1952. The decline is due primarily to the fact that the Congress has already provided a large part of the funds needed to fill the pipeline for supplying our expanded forces, to complete the rehabilitation of our military installations, and to pur-

chase a mobilization reserve of spare parts and soft goods. Expenditures for operation and maintenance are estimated at 10.6 billion dollars, which is 800 million dollars more than the estimate for 1953. The 1954 estimate makes no specific allowance for additional costs that would result from the continuation of combat operations in Korea.

Major procurement and production: The Congress has already authorized most of the funds needed initially to purchase aircraft, ships, vehicles, artillery, weapons, ammunition, guided missiles, electronics, and other major items of military equipment for our defense buildup. A large part of this equipment has been placed on order and is in production. Deliveries are increasing substantially. However, additional funds are required to bring us closer to our armed force goals and to replace weapons and equipment that are worn out, obsolescent, or destroyed or consumed in battle.

In this budget I am recommending 14.2 billion dollars of new obligational authority for major procurement and production, compared with 19.8 billion dollars estimated for 1953 and 29.2 billion dollars enacted for 1952. About 58 percent of my 1954 recommendation is for aircraft, about 34 percent is for artillery, ammunition, and other major items, and nearly 8 percent is for shipbuilding.

Expenditures for major procurement and production, which largely reflect deliveries, are expected to reach a peak of 17.4 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954. Under our present production plans, they should thereafter begin to decline gradually toward the level necessary to keep our Armed Forces equipped with modern weapons.

In this budget, as in the 1953 budget, maximum reliance is placed on maintaining a continuing flow of production along with the ability to expand that production rapidly if necessary, rather than on the accumulation of large reserves of weapons and equipment. In general, the production of reserve stocks for full mobilization is scheduled at the minimum rate which would preserve as many of our existing military production lines as possible in operation for a long period in the future. A noteworthy exception to the application of this general principle is ammunition, for which additional funds may be required in the spring of 1953 unless it becomes clear that combat consumption will cease during the calendar year.

Military construction: To properly house, train, supply, and deploy our expanded military forces, it has been necessary to repair, rehabilitate, and construct military installations from which our forces operate. For the three fiscal years 1951 through 1953, Congress has enacted 8.7 billion dollars of new obligational authority for this purpose. An additional 700 million dollars is recommended in this budget for building projects which have already been authorized by the Congress, but for which funds have not yet been provided. Almost all of this 700 million dollars is for Air Force bases in the United States and overseas. Nearly 60 percent of the post-Korean military construction program has been for Air Force operating bases here and abroad. These are necessary to accommodate the increased number of air wings which are being formed. The problem of the need for additional authorizations is being studied by the Department of Defense.

Although the new obligational authority recommended for 1954 is considerably below the amount enacted in each of the preceding 3 years, expenditures for military construction are expected to rise from 2.3 billion dollars in the current fiscal year to 2.7 billion dollars in 1954 as work already under way nears completion.

Civilian components: The civilian components of the Armed Forces consist of the Organized Reserve, the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. These units provide the trained nucleus around which a rapid expansion of our active military forces could be accomplished in a minimum time. This budget provides for an increase in the strength of our civilian components receiving drill pay from 845,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1953 to 878,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1954, because an increasing number of men who are released from active service are becoming members of the civilian components.

Research and development: As a result of research and development work done in the past few years, our forces are now being equipped with many new types of weapons and equipment far superior to those of World War II. Additional new and improved weapons are now going into production, and we are making intensive efforts to perfect still others which will contribute directly to our military strength in the years immediately ahead. These new developments will eventually give our forces capabilities far beyond those of the present. Advances in almost every field of science are being applied to weapons and techniques of warfare. These developments are complex and costly, and the time required to translate new ideas into practical military weapons is long. Our gratification in the progress we are making must be sobered by the realization that parallel developments are undoubtedly under way behind the iron curtain.

Expenditures of the Department of Defense for research and development are estimated at 1.6 billion dollars in 1954, an increase of 200 million dollars over 1953.

Industrial mobilization: The industrial mobilization activities of the Department of Defense include (1) the maintenance of reserve industrial plants and tools, (2) engineering and management studies to improve manufacturing methods and to reduce the quantities of the scarce critical materials now being used, and (3) mobilization planning in conjunction with other agencies to insure the availability of industrial capacity which can be expanded to meet the requirements of total mobilization. All of these programs are essential to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base.

Since Korea, our military procurement program has added to our mobilization base, and the need for separate industrial mobilization activities has thereby been reduced. However, there are still deficiencies in our capacity to swing rapidly into full-scale production of the military items needed in wartime. A study is now being made to determine the nature and extent of these deficiencies.

For the purpose of filling such gaps in the mobilization base, I am recommending that 500 million dollars be appropriated to the Department of Defense to purchase the plants, tools, and productive facilities that would be needed. Most of this fund will be used to acquire tools and facilities beyond those needed for currently planned procurement. The requested amount will be adequate for the first year, but additional amounts may be needed later.

A second problem of industrial readiness concerns the maintenance of existing elements of the mobilization base. As the production and procurement of military equipment decline during or after the fiscal year 1954, a part of the expanded capacity for producing military items will be converted to civilian production, or otherwise disappear from the mobilization base. Steps should therefore be taken to prevent such loss. The cost of acquiring these facilities will be borne by this new fund in an amount not to exceed 100 million dollars as well as by regular appropriations to the Department of Defense.

It should be made clear that present legislative authority, and the funds herein requested, will not meet the needs of the mobilization base outside the capacity which is directly related to the production of military items. For other elements of the base, such as certain kinds of basic industrial facilities, new legislation and funds may be needed.

Stockpiling: During the fiscal year 1954, it is estimated that nearly 900 million dollars worth of strategic and critical materials will be added to our stockpile. By the end of 1954 our stockpile inventory will be valued at 5.5 billion dollars in June 1952 prices. This is more than double the value of our stockpile inventory at the end of the fiscal year 1950, and represents nearly 75 percent of our total objective, which amounts to 7.4 billion dollars.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The budget recommendations for international security and foreign relations are designed to further the common effort of the United States and other free nations to establish the foundations for lasting peace and security. In this joint undertaking, we are helping our allies to build the strength needed by them and by us to resist the forces which jeopardize the peace and threaten our security. If this aid is to be effective, it must meet the particular and most urgent needs of each individual country. In some instances, it consists largely of the weapons necessary for the expansion of military strength. In others, it takes the form of goods, services, and the technical skills needed to help millions

of people in their struggle against poverty, disease, and starvation—conditions which create unrest and invite subversion. By providing this assistance, we are helping ourselves just as much as we are helping our allies. When the members of a flood-threatened community join together to build a dike, each man's effort helps to protect his own house as well as his neighbor's.

During the past 2 years, under the mutual security program, we have made significant progress in helping our allies to achieve greater military strength, economic growth, and political stability. I am confident that the Congress, by extending the Mutual Security Act, will make it possible to continue this progress.

The magnitude and duration of future grant aid programs, and the attainment of the long-range objectives of our foreign economic policy, will depend on the success of efforts to increase the level of United States imports, and United States private and public investment abroad.

International security and foreign relations

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Military and economic assistance:				
Present programs	$5,026	$5,775	$5,559	$89
Mutual Security Program (proposed legislation)	.....	.....	2,000	7,000
Conduct of foreign affairs:				
Overseas information and education, including acquisition and construction of radio facilities	90	101	123	135
Participation in international organizations and other	143	159	179	187
Total	5,208	6,035	7,861	8,011

Military and economic assistance: This budget includes 7.6 billion dollars in new obligational authority for the mutual security program, 1.1 billion dollars more than the Congress enacted for the fiscal year 1953. This increase is required primarily because of the urgent need to help our allies meet certain critical deficiencies in equipment and supplies for their armed forces. Another factor is the necessity of expanding our efforts to deal with critical economic problems in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

As of November 1, 1952, we had shipped to our allies more than 3 billion dollars worth of weapons and military equipment, including 17,230 tanks and combat vehicles, 92,700 military transport vehicles, 1,403,213 small arms and machine guns, 19,843 artillery pieces for the ground forces, 432 naval vessels, and 2,673 aircraft. Deliveries are rising, and in the fiscal year 1954 are expected to rise still further.

In Europe, economic assistance has been an indispensable factor in expanding military forces. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, our economic and technical assistance has been an important element in helping to raise food production, improve health standards, and increase the technical knowledge needed to build stronger economic and political institutions.

Aid to Europe: During the fiscal year 1954 our aid will enable the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to improve the combat effectiveness and increase the size of present land, naval, and air forces. A year ago, firm goals for December 1952 were set at 50 divisions, 4,000 front line operating aircraft, and 1,600 naval vessels. These goals are now being reviewed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris.

As new units are added to the growing defense budgets of our NATO allies it becomes increasingly important to weigh carefully the added military strength achieved against the new economic burden which is incurred. European defense expenditures have more than doubled since Korea and are continuing to increase. In spite of this effort, the European nations are still unable to provide and maintain, out of their own resources, all the complex and expensive modern weapons required by their armed forces. The mutual security program helps to provide the crucial margin of resources they need.

An increasing volume of the required weapons and equipment is being purchased in Europe under United States contract. This off-shore procurement is essential to the expansion of military production capacity in Europe. Such capacity will not only increase the ability of our European allies to provide their own weapons in the years ahead, but also will support prolonged combat operations in the event of aggression. During the fiscal year 1952, contracts for offshore procurement totaled 621 million dollars. In the current fiscal year, this amount is expected to nearly double. This budget assumes a further increase in the fiscal year 1954.

Economic aid will be needed by several European countries. France will need this type of assistance in order to meet her NATO commitments and still continue her fight against the Communist guerrillas in Indochina. The United Kingdom also will need economic assistance to carry forward her expanded defense effort in the face of a severe drain on her dollar reserves. Some economic aid also will be needed by other European nations to enable them to fill critical gaps in the NATO defenses.

Assistance to other areas of the free world: In areas outside of Europe there are many friendly nations, containing nearly half of the earth's population and much of its material wealth, which are struggling against conditions that threaten their continued existence as free nations. Our economic and technical assistance is helping the people of these nations to help themselves—to develop the economic and political strength required to combat the threat of Communist imperialism. Where necessary, we are supplying military aid to help these nations resist aggression and thereby secure time for the economic changes which will make them less vulnerable to subversion.

In the Middle East, we are assisting in the relief of Arab refugees through our contribution to the United Nations refugee agency. Point 4 technical assistance is being provided most countries in the Middle East to help them expand and strengthen their economies. In some instances, notably Israel and certain Arab states, this technical assistance is supplemented by limited economic aid.

In Indochina, our military assistance has been a crucial factor in strengthening the troops of France and the Associated States of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia in their fight against a powerful, Communist-led revolt. The security of the island of Formosa has been markedly increased. The Communist-led uprising in the Philippines has been reduced to small proportions through the energetic efforts of the Philippine Government, aided by United States military equipment. Further military assistance is needed if these countries are to continue their resistance to aggression.

Our economic assistance to India and to other nations in Asia is helping them to continue the progress they have already made toward alleviating famine and disease—the necessary first steps in their efforts to improve the living conditions of their peoples. These countries can make a vital contribution to the strength of the free world if their economic development programs are given the extra momentum which outside aid can provide.

In Latin America the United States has helped finance economic development mainly through loans from the Export-Import Bank. This area also offers attractive fields for private United States investment, which in the calendar year 1951 increased by nearly 200 million dollars. In order to further economic development in Latin America, the United States has for a number of years extended technical assistance on a grant basis for certain projects undertaken jointly with Latin-American governments.

Conduct of foreign affairs: The efficient functioning of our diplomatic and consular missions, and our extensive participation in the United Nations and other international organizations, constitute vital links in the chain of international security which we are seeking to forge.

Expenditures for the conduct of foreign affairs in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 302 million dollars, an increase of 42 million dollars over the current year. This increase is due, first, to the fact that the dollar equivalent of foreign currencies spent by the United States is included in the 1954 estimate for the first time; second, to the added workload of investigations and clearances required by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 in connection with the issuance of visas and passports in the United States and at our overseas missions; and third, to an anticipated increase in expenditures for construc-

tion of overseas radio facilities for the Voice of America.

I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of our overseas information and education program. In this budget I am recommending appropriations of 135 million dollars to continue and expand this vital work.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

The vast expansion of our productive capacity which we have achieved since Korea would not have been possible without the authority granted under the Defense Production Act. To assure further progress toward our mobilization goals, I believe it is necessary to continue this legislation through the fiscal year 1954, including authority to allocate critical materials and equipment, provide incentives for the expansion of defense production, and stabilize prices, wages, and rents. No new obligational authority will be needed to provide financial assistance for expanding defense production, but 54 million dollars has been included in this budget for administering production and stabilization and export controls.

More than 90 percent of the 1954 expenditures for finance, commerce, and industry programs will be for the promotion of defense production and economic stabilization. These expenditures are expected to decline in 1954 as military and economic expansion goals are achieved.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Promotion of defense production and economic stabilization:				
Expansion of defense production	$128	$320	$200	.....
Production and stabilization controls and other:				
Present programs	148	107	2	.....
Proposed legislation	.....	4	50	$54
Business loans and guaranties (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−37	−4	−10	.....
Promotion or regulation of trade and industry	20	26	28	28
Promotion or regulation of financial institutions	−24	5	5	6
Total	241	456	275	88

Expansion of defense production: Under the authority of the Defense Production Act and related legislation, the Government has offered a wide variety of incentives to private industry to expand defense production and to broaden the economic base for any future mobilization effort. Producers of aluminum, copper, machine tools, and other critical commodities have received long-term purchase commitments totaling about 3 5 billion dollars to guarantee markets for the output of their new facilities, and the Government has bought 1.5 billion dollars of scarce materials for resale to private business. In addition, nearly 400 million dollars in loan commitments have been made, as well as grants for the exploration of mineral resources, for the subsidization of high-cost production, and for the purchase of equipment to be leased to defense contractors. The transactions already approved total about 6 billion dollars, and additional transactions totaling 2 billion dollars have been authorized. Since most of this assistance either will not involve Government expenditures or will be repaid, the net ultimate cost is expected to be less than 800 million dollars. In addition, a substantial volume of private defense production loans have been guaranteed and large investments in defense facilities have been stimulated by permitting accelerated amortization of these investments for tax purposes.

Budget expenditures for expansion of defense production in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 200 million dollars, primarily from commitments already made. Since much of the planned expansion has been completed, new commitments are expected to decline substantially.

Small business: The Small Defense Plants Administration, the Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies are helping small businesses to make their full contribution to the defense effort. Under an agreement between the Small Defense Plants Administration and the Department of Defense, more than 200 million dollars in defense contracts has already been reserved exclusively for small firms. The total amount of defense contracts going to small business is, of course, substantially larger. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made many loans to small businesses which have not been able to obtain private credit. Nearly 300 of these loans, amounting to 37 million dollars, have been made upon recommendation of the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Business loans and guarantees: New lending activity under the regular business loan authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been sharply reduced from the levels prevailing before Korea. The 1954 budget assumes no significant increase in new loans. Accordingly, the Corporation plans to close a number of local offices, maintaining only small information units to provide advice and assistance to loan applicants.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Federal programs in the fields of transportation and communication are designed to help assure that these important services are adequate to meet the needs of a peacetime economy, as well as possible mobilization needs in the event of war. In carrying out these programs, the Government provides facilities and services which private enterprise cannot suitably supply, grants subsidies where authorized, and regulates economic and safety aspects of transportation and communications operations. In the fiscal year 1954, expenditures for these programs are estimated at 2 billion dollars, or 40 million dollars below the level for 1953. This reduction is due mainly to an expected decline in ship construction expenditures.

Transportation and communication

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Promotion of merchant marine:				
Maritime Administration	$229	$235	$150	$167
Inland Waterways Corporation	1	.....	.....	.....
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:				
Coast Guard	205	244	246	246
Corps of Engineers	106	110	113	111
Panama Canal Company	−19	2	3	.....
Provision of highways:				
Bureau of Public Roads	447	573	500	628
Alaska roads and other	23	21	22	22
Promotion of aviation (Civil Aeronautics Administration)	170	167	178	163
Postal service (deficit)	740	666	669	669
Regulation of transportation	18	17	16	16
Other services to transportation	−4	15	21	31
Regulation of communication	7	6	8	8
Total	1,923	2,056	2,016	2,061

Merchant marine: Through subsidies for ship construction and operation, the Government helps to maintain an active maritime industry adequate to the needs of defense and commerce. In recent years, this continuing subsidy program has been supplemented by emergency measures arising from defense mobilization needs. The Maritime Administration, for example, is building 35 cargo ships of advanced design to meet special defense requirements for high-speed ocean transportation. This program will be largely completed during the fiscal year 1954. The reduction in expenditures for this emergency program will be partly offset by the cost of building other vessels which I believe should be started in the fiscal year 1954. An appropriation of 108 million dollars is recommended for construction of four passenger-cargo ships needed for commercial operation on essential trade routes, and an appropriation of 11 million dollars for the construction of a prototype high-speed tanker incorporating design features important for defense operations. Experience gained from the prototype project will enable the Maritime Administration to expand construction of this type of ship rapidly in the event of a future emergency.

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, the emergency operation of Government-owned cargo ships by the National Shipping Authority has helped to overcome a world-wide shortage of shipping capacity. As the shortage of private capacity has eased, the Government has steadily withdrawn from this operation, and has returned its ships to inactive status in the reserve fleet. By the end of the fiscal year 1954, only about 50 ships will remain in active operation under this program, as compared to a maximum of 538 during the fiscal year 1952. This budget includes funds to maintain the reserve fleet in a condition to meet any future emergency.

Navigation aids and facilities: Construction of navigation facilities by the Corps of Engineers is limited in this budget to projects already under way, and to those which should not be deferred any longer in view of national defense requirements or essential civilian needs. To permit the efficient handling of essential water-borne traffic, five new starts are recommended, including the Warrior River Lock and Dam in Alabama for the replacement of obsolete and structurally unsound locks, and harbor improvements at New York, Duluth-Superior, Redwood City, Calif., and Portland, Maine. In addition, an extension of the existing sea wall at the Galveston harbor project will be started to protect a highly developed urban area. These new projects will involve a total cost of 42 million dollars, of which an estimated 4 million dollars will be spent in the fiscal year 1954. Maintenance activity on existing projects is being held to minimum levels required to permit continued operation and prevention of excessive deterioration.

Highways: Federal assistance for highway improvement is provided principally through grants to State and local governments. Construction activity, which had been retarded by the steel shortage and other factors, has expanded considerably in recent months. As a result, Federal-aid expenditures for highway construction are expected to increase from 417 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952 to 511 million dollars in 1953, and 540 million dollars in 1954.

The level of highway grants in any given year is determined by legislative authorizations previously enacted by the Congress and by the volume of State and local construction activity on Federal-aid road systems. Therefore there is little control over the expenditure level of this program through the budget process. For example, the funds included in this budget for the fiscal year 1954 represent merely an estimate of the grants that will be required to meet commitments incurred under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. The Highway Act of 1952 increased the annual authorization from 500 million dollars to 575 million dollars and will cause expenditures to increase in the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

In addition to Federal-aid highway grants, the Bureau of Public Roads will spend 50 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954 for other highway programs, such as forest highways and access roads to defense plants, military installations, and sources of strategic materials.

Aviation: Despite major technological and financial gains in recent years, the aviation industry is still in a developmental stage, and continues to need substantial Federal assistance in order to realize its full potential growth. Such aid is provided principally through the Federal airways program, grants-in-aid for airport construction, and airline subsidies.

In keeping with the general restriction on public works activity during this emergency, airport construction grants to State and local governments have been curtailed in recent years. With the continued growth of air traffic, serious airport inadequacies have developed. To permit increased Federal assistance for the most urgently needed projects, it is recommended that new obligational authority for this program be increased from the 14 million dollars enacted for the fiscal year 1953 to 30 million dollars for 1954.

Subsidies for airline operation are now merged with compensation for carrying mail, and are included in postal expenditures. However, recent studies by the Civil Aeronautics Board provide for the first time an official estimate of the cost of this subsidy program. For the fiscal year 1954, it is estimated that airline subsidies will amount to 71 million dollars, or slightly more than half of the total air-mail payments.

Postal services: With presently authorized rates, the postal deficit for the fiscal year 1954 is estimated at 669 million dollars, about the same as in 1953.

Unless postal rates are increased, the fiscal year 1954 will be the sixth consecutive year in which the postal deficit will exceed one-half billion dollars. The largest part of these deficits results from the grossly inadequate postal rates being charged for magazines and other second-class mail, and for advertising circulars and other third-class mail.

I have repeatedly urged the Congress to relieve the taxpayers of this unnecessary burden by increasing postal rates sufficiently to reduce the postal deficit to the cost of handling Government mail, airline subsidies, and other items which are properly chargeable to general tax revenues—a cost in the neighborhood of 170 million dollars.

Regulations: Recent reductions in the appropriations for the regulatory agencies—particularly the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission—have seriously impaired their ability to carry out the responsibilities assigned to them by law. The administrative expenditures of these agencies are small in relation to the importance of their activities to the Nation's economy. This budget provides moderate increases for these agencies to enable them to overcome serious backlogs of pending cases, and to deal more effectively with emerging new problems.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Expenditures for natural resources programs in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 4.1 billion dollars, an increase of 727 million dollars over the current fiscal year and 1.1 billion dollars over 1952. Almost all of this increase is in the atomic energy program, which will account for two-thirds of the expenditures for natural resources in 1954. Other major expenditures will be for flood control, irrigation, and multiple-purpose river basin development, including related power facilities. The remaining expenditures will be largely for the management and development of the national forests, parks, and public lands, and for our mineral resources program.

The money we spend for the orderly conservation, development, and use of our natural resources represents a sound investment. In many cases the activities are wholly or partially self-liquidating. But what is more important, they contribute to our military strength and to long-range economic progress. They are prerequisite in many fields to the needed expansion of private investment. While exercising the utmost economy in these programs, I believe we should allow for some work made urgent by the continuing drain on our resource base and by the postponement of needed development during and since World War II.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Atomic energy	$1,670	$2,000	$2,700	$1,997
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers:				
Flood control and multiple-purpose projects	487	499	495	552
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Reclamation: Irrigation and multiple-purpose projects	249	226	229	235
Power transmission agencies	61	70	81	80
Indian land resources	30	40	42	42
Bureau of Land Management and other	10	15	16	16
Tennessee Valley Authority	185	232	243	254
Department of State and other	16	19	19	16
Forest resources	95	104	106	106
Mineral resources	56	65	59	56
Fish and wildlife resources	30	38	38	35
Recreational use of resources	33	34	39	39
General resource surveys and other	26	28	30	31
Total	2,948	3,370	4,097	3,459

Atomic energy: Ten years ago, scientists working at the University of Chicago under Federal sponsorship brought about the world's first nuclear chain reaction. Since then, our efforts in the development of atomic energy have of necessity been devoted primarily to meeting the needs of national security. Two major expansions of facilities for the production of fissionable materials and atomic weapons have been authorized by the Congress since the attack on Korea. The first was authorized in the fiscal year 1951 and the second early in the fiscal year 1953. The rise in atomic energy expenditures results largely from construction work on the new facilities. As a result of this expansion, our ability to meet the threat of aggression will be significantly increased.

The new obligational authority which I am recommending for 1954 is substantially less than the amount enacted for the current fiscal year, because the bulk of the construction funds needed to finance the expansion programs has already been provided. However, I am recommending an increase in funds for operations. These funds will provide for

increases in our reserve of atomic weapons and for the development and testing of improved weapons. I am also recommending an increase in funds for the development of atomic power for naval ships. The keel of the first nuclear-powered submarine was laid last summer. The funds recommended for aircraft reactor research will enable this program to proceed at an effective pace.

Research in the peacetime uses of atomic energy shows steady progress. We have developed new techniques in medical research, and substantial progress has been made in the fields of physics, chemistry, and biology. This research will continue in 1954. This budget also provides for continuing research in the development of atomic reactors for the production of electric power—a program which promises to have a major impact on future power developments.

Land and water resources: In the fiscal year 1954, the Federal Government will spend 1.1 billion dollars for the development of land and water resources. More than half of this amount will be for the 133 river basin development projects and units now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Much of this work is multiple-purpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power, creating substantial benefits for industry and agriculture and making an important contribution to defense. Seven flood-control projects and seven irrigation projects or units will be substantially completed during the year.

The major part of the task of developing our river basins is still ahead of us. I believe we should no longer defer certain flood-control and power projects which we have repeatedly postponed since the beginning of World War II. I am therefore recommending funds in the 1954 budget for starting construction on eight new projects and five additions to existing projects, where planning is for the most part well advanced and where there is clear economic justification. This new work is required to protect important areas which are highly vulnerable to floods, or to meet defense or essential civilian power needs in critical shortage areas. The ultimate cost of these new projects and features is estimated at 325 million dollars, of which about 16 million dollars will be spent in the fiscal year 1954. Funds also have been included in this budget for advance planning of some high-priority projects already authorized by the Congress.

Six of the new projects I am recommending are for flood control. These include Toronto Reservoir in Kansas, and five local protection works at Wheeling-Benwood on the Ohio, Sny Basin in Illinois, Lake Pontchartrain in Louisiana, Cape Girardeau in Missouri, and on the Little Missouri River near Murfreesboro, Ark.

This budget also includes funds to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to start construction of a steam-electric plant in the western part of the system, and to begin installation of additional units in the Kingston and John Sevier steam-electric plants. These facilities are required to meet the growing power needs of the area for defense, industrial, and domestic purposes. I also recommend that construction be started on Ice Harbor lock and dam in the Pacific Northwest and that work begin on the installation of power facilities in three reclamation projects. These are the Deer Creek power plant of the Provo River project in Utah, the American Falls power division of the Minidoka project in Idaho, and the Roza power plant in the Yakima project in Washington. I also believe that the Congress should authorize the Hells Canyon power project in the Pacific Northwest.

The situation regarding the St. Lawrence project is somewhat different now from what it has been. When the last Congress did not approve the 1941 Canadian-United States agreement calling for joint construction of both the seaway and power phases of the project, Canada and the United States proceeded with alternate arrangements, under which the main river control works necessary for power development would be built by appropriate entities in the two countries, and Canada would build the necessary additional works to provide a deep waterway between Montreal and Lake Erie on the Canadian side of the international boundary. As I have repeatedly informed the Congress, I regard these alternate arrangements as much less desirable than the 1941 agreement but in the absence of congressional action they represent the only way to get the project built.

The alternate arrangements are well along. The International Joint Commission has approved the plans for the main dams and control structures in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The Province of Ontario is ready to construct the Canadian share of these works. Applications are pending before the Federal Power Commission for a license to build the United States share. The Government of Canada is prepared to construct the waterway. Under these circumstances, the Canadian Government has informed us that they consider it no longer practicable to revert to the 1941 agreement.

I believe, however, that there is still an opportunity for the United States to join, as we should have long ago, in building the St. Lawrence seaway. If the new administration and the new Congress propose practical arrangements for sharing the cost and the construction of the seaway, I believe the Canadians will, even at this late date, admit us to partnership in the seaway. I hope very strongly that this will be done, for it is clearly in the best interest of both countries that this important waterway along our common boundary should be built and controlled by both countries together.

Water resources policy: In the past few years I have frequently informed the Congress of the need for new concepts and procedures to modernize the outdated ways of handling our water resources development. I have supported efforts to plan and operate water resources projects on a regional basis. From time to time I have reported to the Congress that certain projects failed to meet standards for sound Federal investment, and have indicated that present Federal law is in need of clarification or revision.

In 1950 I established the Water Resources Policy Commission to examine these problems and report their findings to me. At my request, the Bureau of the Budget has been making an intensive study of the Commission's findings, recommendations, and legislative proposals, working with representatives of other Federal agencies and consulting with State and interstate bodies and private associations.

Also at my request, the Director of the Budget has recently established uniform standards and procedures to be used in reviewing proposed water resources programs and projects. These guides will strengthen and improve Executive Office review of water resources development proposals. However, major changes must be made in present Federal legislation before up-to-date policies for comprehensive development of water resources can be made fully effective.

I also suggest that the Congress may wish to study its own machinery for dealing with water and related land resources programs in order to provide a sounder basis for consideration of interrelated, multiple-purpose programs.

A year ago, I established a Missouri Basin Survey Commission to study the policies and organizational problems involved in the water resources development of this basin, the scene of two serious floods within the past 2 years. The forthcoming report of this Commission should make a substantial contribution to the sound program planning and improved administration needed for the balanced development of this large basin.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Our agricultural programs are designed primarily to achieve three related goals: First, to preserve a healthy farm economy; second, to conserve and improve our soil resources; and third, to assist farmers in attaining the high level of production necessary to meet the food and clothing needs of our people.

Net expenditures for agricultural programs in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 1.8 billion dollars, 116 million dollars lower than the estimate for the current fiscal year.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:				
Price support, supply, and purchase programs (including the International Wheat Agreement)	−$70	$801	$729	$282
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	38	67	75	173
Sugar Act	60	65	65	65

Agriculture and agricultural resources—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income—Continued				
Federal crop insurance	$7	$6	$5	$8
Agricultural production programs	10	10	8	8
Financing farm ownership and operation:				
Farm Credit Administration and agencies	92	70	49	49
Farmers' Home Administration	167	173	175	175
Disaster loans	13	22	−5	------
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones	244	233	239	200
Agricultural land and water resources:				
Agricultural conservation program (Production and Marketing Administration)	274	275	254	252
Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention, and other	67	74	79	82
Research and other agricultural services	143	147	154	152
Total	1,045	1,043	1,027	1,455

Stabilization of farm prices and income: Expenditures for stabilization of farm prices and income are made under the agricultural price-support program, the International Wheat Agreement, the permanent appropriation for removal of surplus agricultural commodities, the Sugar Act, and the Federal crop insurance program.

Net expenditures for price support, made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, represent primarily the excess of outlays for loans and purchases over loan repayments and proceeds from sales of inventories. Whether the Corporation has net receipts or net expenditures in any particular fiscal year depends mainly on factors affecting the supply and demand for commodities under price support—such as the acreage planted, weather conditions, food needs in this country and abroad, and general economic conditions. Estimated expenditures of 729 million dollars in 1954, including the costs of the International Wheat Agreement, are 72 million dollars below the current estimate for 1953. This is due largely to an expected decline in outlays for wheat, offset in part by increased outlays for corn. The substantial change between the net receipts in 1952 and the large estimated expenditures in 1953 is accounted for mainly by the increase in corn and wheat production and the decrease in wheat exports between the 2 years.

The present International Wheat Agreement expires on July 31, 1953. Further negotiations for its extension will be undertaken this month. This budget assumes that United States participation in the agreement will be continued.

Financing farm ownership and operation: Agricultural credit programs supplement private credit sources. The loan programs of the Farmers' Home Administration help new farmers and low-income farmers unable to obtain credit from other sources to develop and operate efficient family-size farm units. Despite the numerous applications for these loans, other budgetary requirements impel me to recommend that the program be kept to approximately the same level as in the fiscal year 1953.

The programs supervised by the Farm Credit Administration—including the activities of the Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and banks for cooperatives—are also directed toward achieving more efficient family-size farm operations, and toward the development of farmers' cooperatives.

Financing rural electrification and rural telephones: The rural electrification program has made great strides since its inception in 1935. Less than 11 percent of all farms had the benefit of central station electric service in that year; less than 12 percent were without this service on June 30, 1952. The loan program which I am recommending for rural electrification is 30 million dollars less than in 1953, but it allows 135 million dollars for further progress toward bringing electricity to the Nation's farms.

The 1950 census showed that only 38 percent of our farms had telephones—a smaller percentage than in 1920. Furthermore, many farms with telephones had unreliable service. I am therefore recommending an increase of 30 million dollars in the loan program for rural telephones.

Conservation of agricultural land and water resources: From the long-run view, conservation of our soil resources is the most important of our agricultural goals. Without adequate conservation measures, neither a high level of production nor a healthy farm economy can be long maintained.

For this reason I recommend that the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation payments program in the crop year 1954 be continued at the 250-million-dollar level authorized by the Congress for the 1953 crop year. I am also recommending an increase of 2 million dollars in the Soil Conservation Service appropriation to provide technical services to new soil-conservation districts, which are being established at the rate of about 125 each year. This is the minimum program which I feel is compatible with the sound management of our soil resources.

Effective soil and water conservation is an indispensable part of our Nation's efforts to prevent and control floods. By increasing the amount of water held on the land on which it falls, by slowing the rate of runoff, and by controlling the course which the water takes in major watersheds, we not only prevent loss and improve the productivity of the soil, but we also lessen the danger of flood damage and siltation on the main streams. Thus far, however, flood-prevention efforts of this kind in the upper reaches of our rivers have generally lagged behind the flood-control work we have been doing on the main streams. For that reason this budget recommends appropriations of 22 million dollars to accelerate upstream flood-prevention work, compared with 8 million dollars in the current fiscal year. Fourteen million dollars of the total amount recommended for 1954 will be allotted to the 11 watersheds on which work was begun in 1947; 8 million dollars will be for work to be started on seven new watersheds and for investigations and surveys. The commencement of work on the new watersheds is recommended because it will not only have important flood prevention and conservation benefits, but also because it will enhance the value of downstream projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and non-Federal interests. The 18 watersheds on which work is either being done or is proposed in this budget represent only a small fraction of the agricultural and forest lands on which work needs to be done.

Research and other agricultural services: Expenditures for research and other continuing basic services for agriculture, such as extension work and insect and pest control, are expected to increase from 147 million dollars in the fiscal year 1953 to 154 million dollars in 1954. This is due largely to construction of the laboratory for research on foot-and-mouth disease for which the Congress appropriated funds last year. Also, I am recommending increases in a few of the most essential research activities, such as the Federal grant to State experiment stations, marketing research under the Agricultural Marketing Act, and research on plants and animals and on insect and disease control.

LABOR

The labor programs of the Federal Government help to promote the effective use of our manpower resources, which is necessary for the strengthening of our military defenses and for the continued vigorous growth of our economy. These programs furnish basic economic protection to the working force against the hazards of unemployment, safeguard workers against substandard wages and working conditions, bring together the job opportunity and the job seeker, and speed the movement of manpower into defense industries.

In the fiscal year 1954, expenditures for labor programs are estimated at 263 million dollars. Eighty percent of this amount will be for direct grants to the States for the administration of employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including the recently established unemployment compensation program for veterans. Increases in these grants will account for most of the rise in labor expenditures over 1953. Small increases are recommended to strengthen Federal labor-management relations activities and to enable the Department of Labor to cooperate with the States in finding more effective ways to deal with the distressing economic and social problems of migratory farm workers and their families. In addition, increases in appropriations for employment service, industrial safety, and apprentice training programs are recommended to enable the Department to continue work previously financed through a special appropriation for defense production activities.

Labor

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Placement and unemployment compensation administration:				
Department of Labor	$192	$201	$215	$225
Railroad Retirement Board	10	11	11	11
Defense production activities: Department of Labor	2	2	(1)	
Labor standards and training:				
Department of Labor	14	13	14	14
Mine safety (Department of the Interior and other)	4	5	6	6
Labor relations	13	13	15	15
Labor information, statistics, and general administration	8	7	7	7
Total	243	252	268	278

[1] Less than ½ million dollars.

Placement and unemployment compensation administration: Part of the estimated increase in grants to the States for administration of unemployment compensation is due to changes in legislation. The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provides for unemployment compensation payments to veterans who do not find work after release from the Armed Forces. These payments are administered through State employment security agencies under agreements with the Secretary of Labor. Another factor in the increase is that the cost of administering the Federal-State unemployment compensation program is greater because State salary rates continue to increase and the expanded coverage under State laws results in more claims for unemployment compensation even though the general level of unemployment remains low. Finally, experience now indicates that a higher claims load than was assumed in the last budget will develop in 1953 and continue in 1954, as a result of temporary unemployment due to industry-by-industry adjustments. These increased workloads, which could not be foreseen at the time the 1953 budget was prepared, will require a supplemental appropriation tentatively estimated at 6.7 million dollars for grants to the States in the fiscal year 1953.

Although some State unemployment compensation programs have been strengthened by extending coverage, there is still need for basic improvements in the Federal-State system along the lines I have previously recommended.

More attractive job opportunities in industry for the domestic labor force make necessary the recruitment of additional workers from Mexico for seasonal farm employment. These workers are brought in under conditions which protect them from exploitation and protect the employment opportunities and labor standards of available United States workers. About 275,000 Mexican workers will be needed to meet farm production requirements in 1954. Legislation authorizing such recruitment expires on December 31, 1953. I believe it will be necessary to continue this program.

Labor standards and training: Increasing defense production has reversed a downward trend in accidents on the job. In 1951, more than 2 million workers were injured, resulting in a loss of 140,000 man-years of working time. To reduce these individual tragedies with their accompanying losses to national production, the Department of Labor is planning to intensify its safety training program in cooperation with safety organizations, private industry, and State and other Federal agencies. Provision also is made in this budget for enforcement of the recently enacted Coal Mine Safety Act.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship will continue to encourage and assist in establishing training programs for apprentices needed to meet critical shortages in skilled occupations essential to defense production. Greater emphasis will be given to general programs for training semiskilled and unskilled workers on the job to increase their productivity and skills in a wide variety of defense production occupations.

The report of the Commission on Migratory Labor in 1951 pointed up the unique social and economic problems of migratory farm workers, which call for special attention by Federal and State governments and local communities. That report has stimulated increased interest and action by a number of States. This budget includes 156 thousand dollars to enable the Department of Labor to start a program of cooperation with the States in developing more effective ways to bring to these workers and their families a reasonable share of the advantages normally enjoyed by other citizens.

Unemployment trust fund: Receipts of the unemployment trust fund in the fiscal year 1954 are expected to be slightly higher than in 1953. Benefit payments are also expected to be slightly higher, because more unemployed workers will be eligible for benefit payments under the expanded coverage of State laws, even though it is assumed the level of unemployment will remain low. These receipts and payments are not included in the budget totals.

Unemployment trust fund

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	$1,459	$1,351	$1,387
Interest	184	202	209
Payments:			
State and railroad withdrawals for benefits	−1,057	−926	−977
Net accumulation	586	627	619
Balance in fund at close of year	8,654	9,281	9,900

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Federal Government, by insuring and guaranteeing private loans, has helped to finance the construction of nearly half of the 7 million new homes built since the end of World War II, as well as the purchase and improvement of many million existing homes. A large number of these units has been bought by veterans of World War II with the assistance of loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Since the attack on Korea, special emphasis has been placed on providing housing and community facilities in critical defense areas. The record levels of construction both before and since June 1950 have materially improved the housing of the average American citizen. Adequate housing is still unavailable, however, for millions of low-income families.

Net expenditures for housing and community development in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 509 million dollars, a decline of 248 million dollars from the current fiscal year. Principal factors in the expected decline are a lower volume of mortgage purchases and direct loans for veterans' housing, and substantial net receipts instead of expenditures for the public-housing programs.

Housing and community development

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Defense housing and community facilities:				
Present programs	$12	$77	$29	
Proposed legislation			50	$100
Aids to private housing:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Federal National Mortgage Association	458	460	354	
Federal Housing Administration	−29	−38	−63	
Other	−15	−26	−23	
Veterans' housing loans (Veterans' Administration)	70	80	−12	
Farm housing (Department of Agriculture)	22	19	19	19
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−6	−7	−7	
Public housing programs	136	18	−48	51
General housing aids:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
College housing loans	1	22	40	
Other	10	7	6	5
Urban development and redevelopment	6	17	33	350
Provision of community facilities	9	31	51	16
Civil defense	33	84	74	150
Disaster loans and relief	28	13	6	
Total	735	757	509	691

Defense housing and community facilities: To help meet the most urgent defense requirements, Federal assistance has been granted or is planned for about 200,000 new housing units in critical defense housing areas and near military posts. Private builders are constructing most of these homes with the aid of liberal Federal mortgage insurance backed in many cases by Federal mortgage purchase commitments.

In those areas where private builders, even with these special financing aids, are unable to provide the needed housing, the Federal Government is supplying 19,000 temporary units to meet short-term needs near defense installations.

Federal grants and loans are also helping local communities to finance the expansion of community facilities where defense activities have made such expansion necessary. To provide a small part of the additional temporary housing units urgently needed near military installations, I am recommending supplemental appropriations of 12.5 million dollars for the current fiscal year. Moreover, since it is now apparent that we cannot complete the needed minimum program before the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act expires next June 30, I believe that the major provisions of the act should be extended for another year, with increased authorizations and additional appropriations of 100 million dollars.

Aids to private housing: Most of the private housing built in critical defense housing areas is being financed with mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Since the successive relaxations of real estate credit controls in 1951 and 1952, applications for Federal insurance of mortgages in other areas have been rising steadily. If this trend continues, it is expected that there will be a need in the fiscal year 1954 for mortgage insurance commitments to finance nearly 300,000 new housing units. In addition, it is estimated that there will be a need for the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages covering purchases of more than 200,000 existing houses and 2 million other loans for improvement and repair of existing housing. To meet these needs will require increases of 1.5 billion dollars in the maximum mortgage insurance authorizations and 500 million dollars in the authority to insure property-improvement loans. Neither of these steps is likely to increase budget expenditures, since the premiums paid for the insurance usually exceed administrative expenses and losses.

The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized by law to purchase certain mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration also has authority, until June 30, 1953, to make direct loans to veterans in areas where guaranteed loans are not readily available. Over the past 2 years, both substantial purchases of veterans' housing mortgages and direct housing loans to veterans have been necessary, because the 4-percent-interest rate on the guaranteed mortgages has been unattractive to many private lenders. The expenditure estimates in this budget assume that under the restrictive policies adopted last fall a smaller volume of veterans' mortgage purchases will be necessary in the fiscal year 1954. Purchases of defense housing mortgages are expected to increase under the additional authority provided by the Congress last summer.

Public housing: Since the attack on Korea, the low-rent public housing program has been held far below the average annual level of 135,000 starts authorized in 1949. For the fiscal year 1953, the Congress has limited the program to 35,000 new units, which will meet only a small part of the needs of low-income families now living in substandard units. For the fiscal year 1954, I am including in this budget, as I did for 1952 and 1953, provisions for starting a minimum of 75,000 new units.

In this program, local authorities construct and operate the housing units. The Federal Government lends the authorities money or underwrites private loans to start construction, and pledges an annual contribution to help maintain the rents at levels which the tenants can afford. During the fiscal year 1954, the local authorities expect to sell substantial amounts of long-term bonds to private investors, using the proceeds to repay short-term loans from the Federal Government. As a result, receipts are expected to exceed expenditures for new loans under this program. In addition, the Public Housing Administration plans to sell 16,000 war housing units built during World War II. This will mean a further increase in receipts.

College housing loans: In May 1950, the Congress authorized 300 million dollars in loans to help educational institutions obtain adequate housing for their students and faculty. This program has been held at low levels and has been confined to defense-related housing construction. However, applications for loans which qualify under these limitations have been increasing, and expenditures are expected to rise substantially in the fiscal year 1954.

Urban development and redevelopment: The broad program for slum clearance and urban redevelopment authorized by the Housing Act of 1949 has been moving slowly, partly because of the time required by the local communities to make specific plans for projects which meet both local needs and Federal requirements. At present, about 130 cities are actively planning projects, but actual clearance and redevelopment operations have begun on only 23 approved projects in 14 cities. By the end of the fiscal year 1954, it is expected that 10 projects will be completed and about 110 others will be under way.

Under the original statute, additional loan and grant authority totaling 350 million dollars becomes available in the fiscal year 1954. However, because of the limited progress of the program to date and the plans to use private funds to replace most of the direct Federal lending, expenditures are estimated at only 33 million dollars.

Civil defense: Recent advances in the techniques of warfare make it imperative that we immediately provide the essentials of a civil-defense program. I have repeatedly warned that failure to do so could leave a fatal gap in our security structure. Passive civil defense of the World War II type cannot be effective against atomic warfare. Rather, the emphasis must shift to strong preattack measures, the success of which depend largely on advance warning. In this budget, therefore, I am recommending appropriations which would enable the Federal Government to complete the air-raid warning system in the 191 cities which are likely to be principal targets in the event of an enemy attack on the United States. Because the effectiveness of civil defense organizations and techniques depends so directly on an adequate Nation-wide warning system, the Federal Government should pay the full cost of the warning program. The Government also should continue to accept full financial responsibility for the stockpiling of a national reserve of medical and engineering supplies and equipment. The present 50 percent matching arrangement should continue for other civil defense programs, since primary responsibility for organization and training of voluntary forces remains with the States and cities.

I am recommending total appropriations of 150 million dollars for civil defense in the fiscal year 1954. Because of anticipated delays in deliveries of medical and engineering supplies, expenditures are expected to decline from 84 million dollars in the current fiscal year to 74 million dollars in 1954.

EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH

Expenditures for education and general research in the fiscal year 1954 are estimated at 288 million dollars, an increase of 16 million dollars from the present fiscal year. These expenditures, of course, do not include the amounts spent for education and research in carrying out military, veterans', atomic energy, and other programs.

Sixty-five percent of the expenditures for education and general research in the fiscal year 1954 will be for grants to those local school districts that have been overburdened by defense activities. Another 10 percent will be for grants to States to help support their vocational education programs and their land-grant colleges. The Federal Government also assists Howard University and educational institutions for the deaf and blind, and it maintains major library and museum services at the National Capital. Expenditures for general-purpose research are for the work of the Census Bureau, the National Bureau of Standards, and the National Science Foundation.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Promotion of education:				
Office of Education:				
Assistance for school construction and operation in defense-affected areas	$92	$192	$187	$70
Vocational education	26	25	25	26
Grants for colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	5	5	5	5
Other	3	3	3	3
Educational aid to special groups	6	8	11	5
Library and museum services	11	11	13	13
General purpose research:				
National Science Foundation	1	4	8	15
Census Bureau	18	13	24	34
National Bureau of Standards	9	11	12	9
Total	171	272	288	177

Promotion of education: Payments to help build schools in districts overburdened by Federal Government activities and for children living on Federal prop-

erty are estimated at 140 million dollars in the current fiscal year and, because of the expiration of the law authorizing these payments, will decline to an estimated 111 million dollars in 1954. Under present law, payments will be made only on applications filed before last July, and expenditures will be made from appropriations now available. Nearly 1,000 school districts are being helped to build more than 1,200 schools under this program.

Payments for school operating costs in overburdened districts and for children living on Federal property are estimated at 76 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954, a rise of nearly 25 million dollars over 1953. The increase results largely from the fact that enrollments and costs per pupil are rising. This program covers more than a million children in 2,600 school districts. The law authorizing these payments will expire on June 30, 1954.

These programs to aid school districts affected directly by defense activities have been very useful. They do not, of course, help the thousands of other school districts which are struggling with the problems of overcrowded schools, underpaid teachers, and obsolete or inadequate buildings. I hope the Congress will consider ways and means of helping the States to meet these needs.

National Science Foundation: The National Science Foundation was created by the Congress in recognition of the need to formulate an adequate scientific research policy for the Nation, to remedy gaps in our basic scientific knowledge, and to overcome shortages of specialized manpower. However, sufficient funds have not been appropriated to permit the Foundation to perform these functions effectively. As I have pointed out in previous messages, the Foundation should become the primary instrumentality through which the Federal Government gives support to basic research that is not directly related to the statutory functions of other Federal agencies. For this reason, the appropriation recommended for the Foundation in 1954 contains amounts for support of basic research and for fellowships which would otherwise be included in the estimates of other departments and agencies.

I urge the Congress, in the light of these considerations, to provide the Foundation in the fiscal year 1954 the full 15 million dollars authorized by present law. The law should be amended so as to permit a higher level of appropriations in the future.

Census Bureau: Expenditures for census work will rise substantially in the fiscal year 1954 because the Census Bureau will take the basic 5-year censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries, and will begin preliminary work on the 1954 census of agriculture. As a result of improvements in the methods of collecting and compiling data, the total expenditure for the censuses of business and manufactures will be less than the last time they were taken despite increases in salary rates and other costs.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE, AND HEALTH

Expenditures for social security, welfare, and health are estimated at 2.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954, approximately 15 million dollars less than the estimate for the current year. The chief factor in the expected decline is a drop in expenditures for hospital construction.

More than half of the expenditures for social security, welfare, and health are in the form of Federal grants to the States for public assistance. Most of the grants are for assistance payments to the needy aged. At present, 20 percent of the people over 65 years of age depend on this program for support.

Social security, welfare, and health

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Retirement and dependents insurance (Railroad Retirement Board and other)	$772	$684	$695	$695
Public assistance	1,179	1,342	1,342	1,342
Promotion of public health	328	339	309	294
Aid to special groups:				
Vocational rehabilitation (Federal Security Agency)	22	23	24	24
School lunch (Department of Agriculture)	84	84	83	83
Indian welfare and other	47	53	58	59
Accident compensation (Department of Labor)	36	37	37	37
Prisons and probation	23	30	28	29
Defense community facilities and services (Federal Security Agency)	(1)	2	3	
Total	2,491	2,504	2,579	2,563

[1] Less than ½ million dollars.

Railroad retirement: Budget expenditures for railroad retirement are mainly transfers of railroad payroll taxes to a trust account. The expenditures for the fiscal year 1954 also include approximately 35 million dollars as the final installment of a 1949 appropriation of 167 million dollars from general revenues to the railroad retirement account to cover the cost of granting railroad workers credit for time spent in military service during World War II.

Public assistance: The Federal Government makes grants to the States to pay part of the cost of monthly payments to four categories of people in need—the aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and dependent children. In the fiscal year 1954, these grants are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars, the same as in the current fiscal year. Although the number of beneficiaries on State and local rolls is somewhat lower than last year, individual payments have been rising steadily. This reflects action by the States to cover earlier increases in the cost of living and to provide more adequate relief. It also reflects congressional action last summer increasing Federal contribution rates, effective from October 1, 1952, for a period of 2 years.

The need for public assistance should decline as more and more people acquire the protection of old-age and survivors insurance and qualify for higher benefit payments. Eighty percent of the gainfully employed people in the United States are now covered by this insurance. These people can look forward to monthly benefits in their old age as a matter of right, and at their death their dependents may also be entitled to monthly payments. This system of contributory social insurance was designed as our principal instrument for providing social security. It is now beginning to achieve that position. At present, the total of old-age and survivors insurance benefits is about equal to the combined expenditures of the Federal, State, and local governments for public assistance payments for all persons in need. Further improvements in our social insurance program should be made; they will quicken the rate at which public assistance can be reduced to its intended role as a second line of defense against want, filling gaps in the social insurance program.

Promotion of public health: Federal expenditures for all public health programs—exclusive of medical care for military personnel and veterans—are estimated at 309 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954. About half of this amount will be for grants-in-aid to State governments and local communities for hospital construction, general health services, maternal and child health, and the control of such major diseases as tuberculosis, venereal disease, cancer, mental illness, and heart ailments. Other expenditures are for operation of Public Health Service hospitals, for payments to medical schools and universities for medical research and training, and for clinical and laboratory research conducted by the Federal Government. This budget also includes appropriations for grants administered by the National Institutes of Health to private and public institutions for construction or major alteration of medical research facilities.

The expected decline in expenditures for these programs is due to several factors. Federal payments for hospital construction grants are expected to be 32 million dollars less because of prior year reductions in new obligational authority. Construction outlays for health research facilities are expected to drop by 11 million dollars with completion of the clinical research center during the current year. These decreases will be partly offset by increases in expenditures for research.

Several problems in the health field require congressional attention. We do not have enough doctors, dentists, and nurses to serve the whole population. Many localities are without adequately staffed health offices. Measures are needed to bridge the financial gap between good medical care and the average family's ability to pay for it. The Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, which I established a year ago to study and report on long-term health requirements, has now published its findings and recommendations. I urge the Congress to give this report prompt and careful study to the end that appropriate action may be taken to meet our national needs.

Aid to special groups: Essential improvements in hospital, school, and employment services for our 400,000 native

Indians will require some increase in expenditures for these services in the fiscal year 1954. Most of this is for a program to provide Indians with training for employment in industry and agriculture and to help them make satisfactory adjustments in new locations. A small increase is recommended for the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program, which now helps about 65,000 disabled persons annually to become capable of gainful employment. Under another federally aided program, low-priced school lunches are now available to one-fourth of our school children.

Trust funds: Each of the three major civilian retirement systems sponsored by the Federal Government is financed through a separate trust fund with payroll contributions as the principal source of revenue. For the fiscal year 1954, receipts in these trust funds are expected to exceed the benefit payments by 2.6 billion dollars. This will raise the balances in the three accounts to nearly 30 billion dollars. It is desirable to build up reserves now because the cost of benefits will increase over the years as more and more people become eligible for retirement. The interest earned by the reserves which are being accumulated will help to meet this future cost.

Social security, welfare, and health

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	$3,569	$4,000	$4,298
Interest and other	363	435	452
Payments of benefits and administration expenses	−2,067	−2,650	−3,169
Net accumulation	1,865	1,785	1,611
Balance in fund at close of year	16,590	18,375	19,986
Railroad retirement account:			
Receipts:			
Transfers from budget accounts	708	684	695
Interest	79	90	98
Payments of benefits, salaries, and expenses	−391	−466	−482
Net accumulation	456	308	311
Balance in fund at close of year	2,901	3,209	3,520
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Employee contributions	418	434	450
Transfer from budget accounts and other	310	321	430
Interest	189	215	250
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses	−300	−367	−384
Net accumulation	617	603	696
Balance in funds at close of year	5,054	5,657	6,353

In the case of old-age and survivors insurance, present law provides for gradual increases in the tax rate. Effective January 1, 1954, the rate is scheduled to rise from 1½ percent to 2 percent each on employers and employees.

The receipts and payments of these trust funds are not included in the budget totals.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

In the fiscal year 1954, the Federal Government will spend an estimated 4.6 billion dollars for a wide variety of veterans' services and benefits, ranging from medical and readjustment assistance to service pensions and burial benefits. These services and benefits are provided to veterans or dependents of veterans who died or were disabled in the service, and in many instances also to veterans without service-connected injuries or to their families.

Expenditures for veterans' programs have declined 38 percent from the post-World War II high of 7.4 billion dollars. However, the total for 1954 continues at about the 1953 level, and the outlook for future years is for increases rather than decreases.

Veterans' services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Compensation and pensions	$2,178	$2,444	$2,546	$2,546
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities	216	102	66	62
Hospitals and medical care:				
Current expenses	661	660	691	717
Hospital construction	123	103	83	100
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	1,325	854	809	810
Other (Veterans' Administration and Department of Labor)	122	144	158	158
Other services and administration (Veterans' Administration and other)	238	239	211	224
Total	4,863	4,546	4,564	4,617

Two main factors point to an upward trend in expenditures. The basic factor is the rapid growth of the veteran population. Since 1940 the number of veterans has increased from 4.3 million to approximately 19.8 million. New veterans are now being discharged at a rate of approximately 2 million a year. If our Armed Forces continue at their present size, most of the people in the United States will eventually be veterans or dependents of veterans.

The second factor which points to an increase in outlays is the extension and liberalization of veterans' benefits through legislation. In the last 10 years the Congress has enacted more than 500 laws affecting veterans' benefits. Because eligibility conditions and benefit rates are fixed by basic statutes, four-fifths of the expenditures of the Veterans' Administration are not subject to direct control through the budget process.

I strongly support the policy of providing assistance to veterans, particularly those injured in the service, in assuming their normal places in society. In considering new veterans' legislation, however, recognition should be given to the extensive development in recent years of general welfare programs, such as social security, which serve both veterans and nonveterans. There is overlapping at present between the two sets of programs which should be corrected.

Compensation and pensions: It is estimated that an average of 3,348,000 individuals and families will receive veterans' compensation and pension payments totaling more than 2.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954. Expenditures for these programs are increasing steadily. Even if no new legislation is enacted and no allowance is made for a further increase of the veteran population, it is estimated that expenditures for veterans' compensation and pensions will double in the next 30 to 40 years.

Insurance and servicemen's indemnities: Under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 the Government pays 10 thousand dollars to the family of each serviceman who dies on duty or within 120 days thereafter. This supersedes the optional system of national service life insurance. In the case of policyholders who acquired national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance before the indemnity law was enacted, the Government continues to reimburse the trust funds for deaths traceable to war hazards. Expenditures for indemnities are expected to rise from about 6 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952 to nearly 15 million dollars in 1954, while Government payments to the insurance funds are expected to decline from 210 million dollars to 51 million dollars.

Hospital and medical care: The increase in current expenses of the veterans' hospital and medical program reflects the opening of new hospitals being completed under the construction program authorized after World War II. My budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1954 provide for an estimated daily average beneficiary load of 136,250 in veterans' hospitals, in contract hospitals, and in State homes. By June 30, 1954, the Veterans Administration is expected to have in operation 170 hospitals and 17 domiciliary homes. This budget includes a recommendation for new obligational authority of 80 million dollars to build the final four hospitals in the current construction program, and 20 million dollars for modernization, improvement, and repair of existing hospitals.

Readjustment benefits: Expenditures for readjustment benefits in the fiscal year 1954 are expected to decline slightly from the level now estimated for 1953. Expenditures for benefits to World War II veterans are declining, but outlays for benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict are rising, because the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 extended to the veterans of the current emergency benefits similar to those which had been provided under the GI bill to World War II veterans. In the fiscal year 1954 it is estimated that about 70 percent of the readjustment expenditures will be for benefits under the new law.

The estimated 1954 expenditures provide for an average enrollment in school, job, and farm training courses of 715,000 veterans, of whom 475,000 are expected to be veterans of the Korean conflict. They also provide for unemployment allowances of 47 million dollars under the new law for an estimated weekly aver-

age of 55,200 veterans, and 75 million dollars to cover interest gratuities and losses under the veterans' loan guarantee program. It is expected that 368,000 new loans totaling 3.1 billion dollars will be guaranteed during the year.

Trust funds: Under the national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance trust funds, 50 billion dollars of insurance continues in force in about 7 million policies issued before the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951. In the three fiscal years 1952 through 1954, expenditures from these funds are expected to exceed receipts by a decreasing margin as special dividend payments decline. The receipts and payments of these trust funds are not included in the budget totals.

Veterans' life insurance funds

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$203	$85	$47
Interest on investments	201	201	200
Premiums and other	473	431	419
Total	877	717	666
Expenditures:			
Dividends to policy holders	556	276	185
Benefits and other	532	511	525
Total	1,088	787	710
Net withdrawal (−)	−211	−70	−44
Balance in funds at close of year	6,561	6,491	6,447

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Expenditures in the general government category are largely for making and enforcing laws, collecting taxes, managing the public debt, administering Federal records and property, and for payments to the Civil Service retirement trust fund.

Expenditures for general government are expected to increase from 1.4 billion dollars in the current fiscal year to 1.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1954. The increase is chiefly due to higher Federal payments to the Civil Service retirement system and to increased expenditures for maintenance and repair of Government buildings.

Federal financial management: Under the reorganization plan approved by the Congress last March, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has reconstituted its Washington office, decentralized certain supervisory functions to 17 newly established districts, and made its inspection service independent of the rest of the Bureau. Well-qualified personnel have been selected to fill the key positions, all of which, except the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, are now part of the classified civil service. These steps, by strengthening supervision and more clearly defining responsibilities, should not only tighten enforcement of the revenue laws, but also permit the Bureau to give better assistance to taxpayers. This budget provides for increased activity in the collection of delinquent taxes.

Large numbers of savings bonds purchased during World War II are now reaching maturity. The owners of most of these bonds are continuing to hold them under the extension program authorized in 1951. Nevertheless, more than one-quarter of these bonds are being presented for redemption. These redemptions, plus an increase in current sales of new savings bonds, have sharply increased the workload of the Bureau of the Public Debt. I am therefore recommending an increase in the Bureau's appropriation.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Legislative and judicial functions	$70	$76	$77	$75
Executive direction and management	9	8	7	7
Federal financial management:				
Tax collection	270	273	281	273
Customs collection, debt management, and other	168	173	186	182
Other central services:				
Central property and records management	191	164	205	202
Civil Service Commission	20	21	21	20
Other	24	22	23	40
Retirement for Federal civilian employees	313	324	430	430
Protective services and alien control:				
Federal Bureau of Investigation	91	70	76	77
Immigration and Naturalization Service	40	41	47	48
Other	33	21	21	21
Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia	50	59	59	59
Other general government:				
Payment of claims and relief acts (Treasury Department)	76	76	65	(1)
Weather Bureau	26	27	27	28
Other	30	30	22	16
Total	1,411	1,385	1,547	1,478

[1] Less than ½ million dollars.

Central property and records management: Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, the General Services Administration has taken major steps to manage more efficiently the buildings owned or operated by the Federal Government, to buy more economically the items used by many Government agencies, and to reduce materially the cost of handling and storing Government records.

The sharp reductions in appropriations last year have made it impossible to maintain and operate public buildings properly. I am therefore recommending an increase to restore these services to levels more nearly adequate—but still below those maintained by operators of comparable private buildings. I am also recommending increases to permit necessary repairs to Government buildings, to finance the first installment of a 3-year program for modernizing major post-office facilities in the interests of increased efficiency, to extend the central procurement of common-use items, and to obtain the increased savings that may be expected from wider use of surplus equipment and supplies. The funds recommended in this budget would also finance the last 2 of 10 record centers started 2 years ago, and thus would complete a program which has already made large savings through better utilization of space and release of filing equipment.

Civilian personnel management: The great improvements made in the Federal civilian service in recent years have brought us nearer to our goal of a real career service throughout the Government, in which all appointments and promotions are based on merit and the conditions of employment provide positive incentives to honest, efficient work. To continue this progress, the funds proposed in this budget would increase the proportion of placements made through competitive examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission and boards of examiners in the agencies, extend the Commission's inspections of personnel management in the agencies, and bring certain overseas personnel under the competitive civil service.

The Classification Act of 1949 authorized a limited number of positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 created under that act. This authorization has been amended by a series of subsequent enactments, frequently in appropriation acts, each allowing a few positions for selected agencies and programs. The lack of consistency in these several statutes constitutes an obstacle to effective management and should be eliminated through the enactment of a single general authorization covering the requirements of all executive branch agencies. For this reason, appropriation requests do not include authority to individual agencies for additional positions in these grades.

Retirement for Federal civilian personnel: I am recommending appropriations of 427 million dollars to cover the Government's obligations to the Civil Service retirement and disability fund and 3 million dollars to pay annuities under special laws. The Government's obligations to the Civil Service retirement and disability fund include 59 million dollars to cover the cost for 1953 and 1954 of the temporary increase in benefits voted last summer for persons then receiving annuities from the Civil Service retirement system, and 368 million dollars for its contribution as employer for the fiscal year 1954. The amounts I am recommending do not provide for payments on the Government's outstanding liability to the fund, since this is one of the problems to be studied by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel recently established by the Congress.

Protective services and alien control: The Immigration and Nationality Act, which became effective on December 24, 1952, has considerably expanded the responsibility of the Department of Justice and other departments in such fields as investigation, deportation, inspection, and naturalization. The law also expands Federal controls over alien crewmen and registered aliens, increases visa requirements, and adds new grounds for exclusion and deportation. Also, the Government must pay almost all of the costs of detention, hospitalization, and deportation which were previously borne

in part by private carriers. To finance the substantial increases in staff necessary to administer the new law, as well as to strengthen enforcement along the Mexican border, it is recommended that the appropriation for the Immigration and Naturalization Service be increased to 48 million dollars in 1954, and that a supplemental appropriation of 1.7 million dollars be enacted for 1953.

I continue to believe that the new law contains many provisions that are unwise, unfair, and incompatible with our foreign policy objectives. The Commission on Immigration and Naturalization has now published its findings and recommendations. I urge the Congress to give them its prompt attention.

INTEREST

Interest payments constitute a large and growing charge on the budget. They represent mainly the current cost of the fivefold increase in our public debt which occurred as a result of World War II. As fixed charges, they cannot be reduced by congressional or Executive action, but vary only as securities are issued, retired, or refunded under changing interest rates and with varying payment periods.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1954
	1952 actual	1953 estimated	1954 estimated	
Interest on public debt	$5,853	$6,450	$6,350	$6,350
Interest on refunds of receipts	76	65	65	65
Interest on trust deposits	5	5	5	5
Total	5,934	6,520	6,420	6,420

Interest on the public debt: The cost of interest on the public debt in the fiscal year 1954 is estimated at 6,350 million dollars. The decrease of 100 million dollars from the 1953 estimate does not indicate a reversal of the upward trend in interest payments, but merely reflects an unusual situation which occurred during the fiscal year 1953. More than 15 billion dollars in certificates of indebtedness which paid almost a year's interest at maturity were refunded early in the fiscal year 1953 into new obligations on which interest payments for half a year or more are due on June 1, 1953. Thus, about 20 months' interest on this portion of the debt falls due during the current fiscal year.

Although interest expenditures in 1954 will be lower than in 1953 because of this unusual situation, interest costs are still rising. These increases are due in large part to the higher interest rates paid on securities issued or refunded during the past 2 years. In addition, each year an increasing amount of special issues is held by Government agencies and trust funds. The interest rates on these issues are slightly above the average rate on the debt as a whole. Furthermore, these interest rates tend to increase when the average interest rate on the total debt rises.

Recent increases in the size of the interest-bearing debt are the second major reason for the rise in interest costs. By the end of the current fiscal year, the outstanding debt will have increased by 6.5 billion dollars since Korea, and the 9.9 billion dollar deficit estimated for the fiscal year 1954 will cause a further increase.

My interest in and study of the Federal Budget began many years before I became President. As President, I have given the budget my constant attention. It should receive that same attention from the Congress, particularly because of one basic fact often overlooked and often misunderstood.

This fact is that the financial program of the Government cannot be planned in terms of a single fiscal year. It must be planned in the light of security, economic, and budgetary goals—not just for the ensuing year but for 3 and even 4 years ahead.

The budgets I have transmitted have always reflected such planning. My recommendations on taxes and appropriations have had as their objectives the meeting of all our responsibilities for the security and welfare of our people and for a growing economy with a stable currency and a balanced budget.

Budget and fiscal policies are tools of national policy. As such, they are subjects of controversy and evolution. I believe that the policies I have supported are sound, and that the recommendations in this budget will enable us to meet our national needs in the fiscal year 1954 in the light of the Nation-wide and world-wide objectives of the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 9, 1953.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1951, and 1952, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, 79th Cong.).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 54)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This detailed report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

COMMISSION ON THE HEALTH NEEDS OF THE NATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress volume 1 of the Report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation. I recommend that this volume, and the four supplementary volumes to be made available shortly, receive the careful study of each Member of the Congress.

This report deals with one of the most valuable resources of our Nation—the health of our people. At a time when we are devoting our energies to strengthening our country in the world-wide struggle against Communist aggression, we can ill afford to neglect the essential needs of our people in the protection and improvement of their health.

It was for this reason that I established the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation some 12 months ago. At that time, I pointed out that bitter and partisan opposition to various proposals for the solution of our health problems had confused our people about the proper course of action on subjects vital to their welfare. I therefore appointed this Commission, composed of 15 distinguished citizens, and asked them to make a fresh appraisal of our health resources and our health needs. I urged them to give us

the benefit of their objective and constructive consideration of these problems which are so important in the daily life of every American.

The Commission members accepted this challenging assignment. Their findings and recommendations, after 12 months of intensive work in public hearings, panel discussions, and Commission sessions, are now available in this volume.

Despite the wide divergence of viewpoints represented by its membership, the Commission is unanimous in its findings that there are great problems in the health field which demand immediate attention. It concluded that, among other things, we are in urgent need of programs to provide more physicians, dentists, nurses, and health technicians. We must have additional health facilities including medical schools, hospitals, and local public health units. And positive action must be taken to bring adequate health care within the financial means of all our people.

Throughout its report the Commission has stressed its belief that good health care must start at the grass roots—with the Federal Government taking the leadership, where necessary, in the promotion of good health rather than in extensive direct operation of health services. With this point in mind, the Commission has endorsed the principle of Federal grants-in-aid for State and local activities in the health field. The Commissioners also agreed that most of the people who now lack adequate health services find themselves in this position because of cost factors that are beyond the individual's control.

In the past, I have recommended that the problem of the high cost of health care be met by a national health insurance system. While the Commission majority felt that this approach required further study before coming to any final conclusions on its merits, it recommended immediate attention be given to a proposal for Federal grants-in-aid to State plans for comprehensive personal health services.

This latter proposal has the virtue of affording local and State groups the initial opportunity for the establishment of workable health services plans. It likewise may encourage the most effective use of private and public health facilities at the local level in providing essential health services. For these reasons it may well be desirable at this time to devote our efforts to the establishment of a program which will give the States a chance to bear the major responsibility in bringing the cost of health services within the means of all our people.

The members of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, through their conscientious and tireless efforts over the past 12 months, have pointed the way to a fresh and constructive approach in meeting our problems in the all-important health field. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will give immediate consideration to the findings and recommendations of this Commission and thus continue our efforts to protect and improve the health of all the people of this Nation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1953.*

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed an examination of the report filed by the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. I have read the report with disgust. It is not worth the time and money expended on it.

When the Commission was created, last September, in the midst of a political campaign, it was quite obvious to me that the true aim of this move was an attempt to gain the vote of the so-called foreign-language groups by wooing some of the narrow-minded leaders of the so-called nationalities and the professionals in that field. Reading the Commission's report fully confirms my misgivings regarding its true task.

The Commission started out by corralling certain professional social workers who have helped in bringing to the United States over 400,000 displaced persons and who are understandably eager to continue their jobs, imperiled by the termination of the emergency immigration program.

In the Commission's own words:

> The New York sessions set the tone of the hearing * * * the very first person to appear before the Commission was the director of field operations for the refugee service * * * with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. * * * In addition, members of the state displaced-persons commissions or committees and their staffs * * * (who) had been engaged over a period of years, in assisting in the reception, resettlement, and supervision of the nearly 400,000 persons brought to the United States under the displaced-persons program * * * (made) the most eloquent pleas to the Commission for recommendations for changes in the law.

Having thus conclusively demonstrated that there exist groups of professional immigrant-handlers for whose benefit a large-scale immigration program should be authorized, the President's Commission proceeded to criticize the new Immigration and Nationality Act not so much for what it contains but for what it does not embrace, namely, a reenactment of displaced persons legislation. Using clairvoyance rather than intelligence, the Commission evaluated the effect of the act, held hearings, and filed their final report before the 1952 law became effective. But by that they were not disturbed. They also wrote a series of sweeping recommendations and sent their report to the Public Printer exactly 2 days before operations began under the new act.

The Commission has deemed it proper to recommend many of the very things which the new law does, without apparently noticing that flagrant plagiarism is being committed in the process. For instance, the Commission recommends the repeal of all oriental exclusion clauses, full equality for all races, equality of both sexes, the enactment of provisions helping to unite families—nonquota status for spouses and children of American citizens, and so forth. All of these recommendations are parts of the Immigration and Nationality Act, now embodied in our statutes, but by recommending them, the Commission is obviously trying to engage in a one-sided popularity contest with the United States Congress.

However, when it comes to spreading all over the world malicious propaganda aimed at presenting the United States Congress as a villainous enemy of European refugees and prospective emigrants, the Commission has successfully exceeded the venomous language used by Radio Moscow, which in commenting on the McCarran-Walter Act referred to those who "unmasked" the new law in America—page 52 of the report.

Faithful to its political character, the Commission has shown very little respect for facts and even less respect for what we lawyers call evidence of probative value. It is truly amazing to see how completely the Commission has disregarded every judicial rule of collecting and presenting evidence.

When evidence supporting the Commission's preconceived findings and precooked recommendations was flimsy and inconclusive, it was simply twisted around and blown up out of proportion—see manpower considerations, pages 34–36. When evidence was lacking, arrogant and demagogic verbiage was poured into the report—see anthropological dissertations, pages 91–96. Where witnesses submitted evidence contradicting the Commission's deeply imbedded opinions, they were browbeaten and submitted to vicious third-degree questioning—see Richard Akagi testimony, pages 1729–1737 of the hearings. When the Secretary of Labor made an inconclusive and properly guarded statement to the effect that "the future may hold for us a fairly tight manpower situation," the Commission jumped to the conclusion that "the United States needs more manpower"—see pages 34–35. When representatives of the National Grange and the National Farmers Union warned that mechanized farming diminishes the number of jobs on the wide grain fields of the Prairie States and that there is surplus agricultural labor in certain areas, while there are spotty shortages of such labor in other parts of the country, the Commission deemed it proper to belittle these factual statements and contradict the wise recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor made 2 years ago. Similarly disregarded and partially distorted by the Commission's report is the study of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report on underemployment of rural families.

To give one more example of the Commission's strange evidence-gathering methods: The late CIO President Philip Murray's statement made in 1946 against curtailment of quota immigration—then attempted—is being twisted around in the report and made to sound like an endorsement for the increase of our annual immigration quotas.

When it comes to overlooking congressional action and praising the job of bureaucrats, the Commission knows how

to give an excellent performance. Reporting on the displaced-persons program, the Commission puts it in this very strange way:

> The United States took over 400,000 displaced persons through the Displaced Persons Commission and then goes on to say, "The Displaced Persons Act also brought to the United States, 55,000 German expellees and 2,000 Italian refugees."

The average reader of the Commission's report would think that it was not the Congress that authorized the humanitarian operation undertaken under the DP Act, but that it was a Commission, hardly distinguishable from the one rendering the New Year's eve report.

Similarly, when the Commission notes in the report that the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration has successfully undertaken the task of resettlement of European emigrants, there is no mention in the report of the fact that the ICEM—formerly PICMME—has been established through congressional initiative through the cooperation of three congressional committees and with the participation of six Members of Congress in the organization's constitutional meeting in Brussels, Belgium, in 1951.

The basic recommendation of the Commission is to create a bureaucrat's dream empire in the field of immigration. The Commission does not believe in the existing quota system under which each nation of the world gets its share of the American immigration quota calculated on a basis first authorized in 1924 and rather well serving our national interests until now. Instead of the system of fixed quotas under which no favors could be accorded to individuals, pressure groups, organizations, or nations, the Commission prefers to have an annual quota pool of 251,162 visas for the use of loosely defined groups, such visas to be distributed, at will, by seven appointees of the President, ready to play favoritism and politics and ready to select immigrants from all over the world, with their own heart's delight as the only gage.

Of course, the operations undertaken under the new law, as well as foreign and domestic conditions which might have a bearing on our immigration policy, require close scrutiny. The Congress has recognized the necessity of such continuous study and, in section 401 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, has created a joint congressional committee entrusted with this task and authorized to recommend legislation whenever deemed necessary. I expect this joint congressional committee to be organized soon and to undertake the study authorized by the statute. I am sure that should the joint congressional committee decide to study the advisability of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, or the advisability of the enactment of a new emergency law admitting an additional number of refugees, it would turn for advice to economists, to impartial and disinterested community leaders, statisticians, businessmen, farmers, leaders of veterans' organizations, and so forth. I am sure that the joint congressional committee would want to find out how many more people we can assimilate, and how fast we can do it, what our natural resources situation is, do we or do we not have housing and employment for the returning Korean veterans and the almost 3,000,000 boys now in the armed services.

The joint congressional committee would certainly want to find out what the results of the forthcoming leveling off of our armament production would be, how plausible the predictions of a forthcoming recession are, and many other things pertinent to the conduct of a sound immigration policy.

The joint congressional committee would do what the Commission has also neglected to do, namely, make an inquiry regarding the number of aliens who are illegally in this country; the number of seamen who jumped ship; the number of stowaways apprehended in our ports but not yet sent back; and the part these illegal immigrants play in the evergrowing crime waves sweeping our waterfronts, particularly those of New York and New Jersey.

In that respect, the President's Commission report is plainly useless. The Commission has, as it obviously wanted, helped a few candidates for political office in foreign-language areas and made campaigning more difficult for some others. That is all. I feel that we can safely file the report away for now, but I am quite certain that it will be taken up again, come next election.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a budget calling for obligating authority for the fiscal year 1954, beginning July 1 next, of $73,794,540,000. This request alone indicates that the budget has been submitted of such size that it is an invitation in itself to cut.

But that is not the only confusing thing about the submission. On page A5, in column 4 at the bottom, it shows budget expenditures for 1953 of $74,593,000,000; on page A12, in the last column, at the bottom of the page, it shows budget expenditures of $74,592,831,757; on the daily Treasury statement for January 6, the latest one available, it shows total budget expenditures for 1953 of $79,028,000,000, with a budget deficit of $10,292,000,000.

An estimated public debt of $267,505,000,000 is shown as of the end of the year, and on the budget itself, in column 2 of the last line, $263,900,000,000 is shown.

The whole picture presented is that of utter confusion on the part of those submitting the budget, and very evidently they have no means of communication between the Treasury and the budget. Where are all the telephones that the public is paying for in Washington?

I have been able to go into the details of items that are suggested for appropriations only in a very cursory manner, but I wish to call attention again to some things that to my mind mean that there is a very considerable opportunity to place the Government's house in order.

On the 1st day of July there was available to the Department of Defense, including carry-overs and appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, the approximate sum of $107,500,000,000. The expenditures for the first 6 months run, according to the daily Treasury statement, $21,810,327,781, and the expenditures have not advanced markedly in the months beginning with the 1st of July. The average is not as high as it was in July. This means that we can count on military expenditures of approximately $43,620,000,000 for the year.

If you deduct from both the amount available and the probable expenditures in 1953, $14,000,000,000 for the annual charge for paying, feeding, allowances, and housing of military personnel, you get a balance of $93,463,000,000. You get expenditures out of that during the year 1953 for material, including the guns, tanks, airplanes, ships, and ammunition, of $29,620,000,000. You divide $93,463,000,000 by the annual expenditures for such purposes, and you find that on the first of July they had the funds available to carry them for three full years for other than current items, which is way beyond the lead time which is reasonable for that kind of a set-up, and means that we are in a position in making appropriations to take that situation into account.

If you turn for a moment to the mutual-security situation, we find that for military assistance the amount available on July 1, including appropriations and carry-over, was $12,631,000,000. The expenditures for the first 6 months run $1,669,000,000, or at an annual rate—and they are not showing an increase from month to month—of $3,338,000,000. In other words, the Mutual Security has funds to last for 4 years, which is an absolutely ridiculous figure.

If we have 4 years' lead time on contracts, that means the production would be 50 percent obsolete at the conclusion, and it is way out of line. There are so many other situations where that same thing applies that I am not going to spend my time here in pointing them out. The queer figures which I quoted first, and the surplus of funds that is unquestionably available, means that we must have a very clear picture of what is needed, and that we must recover funds that are not needed away from the departments.

So that the people may be able to see just what the situation is, I am attaching to this memorandum some sheets that have been prepared by the Appropriations Committee staff showing the month-by-month expenditures of the different agencies, the amount available on July 1, and the total expenditures for the 6-month period that ends December 31.

The table referred to is on file in the Appropriations Committee.

THE TAX PROBLEM

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important problem facing the American people today than that of taxation. For the past 20 years taxes have been increasing at an alarming rate, until they have reached a point where they constitute a well-nigh unbearable burden on our people and a serious threat to our economy. There is imperative need of a reduction all along the line.

Between April 30, 1945, and June 30, 1952—a period of 7 years of which almost 5 years were peacetime years—the Federal Government collected $323,000,000,000 in taxes, which is $75,000,000,000 more than the $248,000,000,000 collected during the entire previous life of the Republic beginning with 1789.

At the same time the expenditures of the Federal Government have been appalling, and there have been huge waste and extravagance. In five peacetime years, from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1950, the period immediately preceding the Korean war, the Federal Government spent $214,000,000,000, an amount greater by $34,000,000,000 than the total amount spent during the 152 years from the beginning of the Republic in 1789 to July 1, 1941. In 1931 the cost of the Federal Government was $30 for each man, woman, and child. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, it was over $300. It has since been increasing steadily.

Throughout the country the people are aroused, and movements have been started to amend the Federal Constitution so as to limit the taxing power of Congress.

The issue is a vital one, and upon its correct solution depends the future welfare of our people.

It is not an overstatement, I think, to say that in the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government, or, second, socialism. If we are to continue with our present system, we must take steps to prevent its destruction through the abuse of the taxing power.

In his attempt to destroy the capitalistic or private-enterprise system with its right of private property, Karl Marx incorporated in his Communist manifesto 100 years ago the following two planks:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

By this means Marx knew that he could dry up the sources of private capital, which are essential to the continued existence of the capitalistic system.

In order to operate successfully, industry must have a steady continuing supply of new capital. The capital required for the maintenance and expansion of industry comes from the savings of corporations and individuals. Excessive taxation lessens or destroys the incentive to produce, save, and invest such capital in industry and, at the same time, reduces the supply by the amount of the tax.

Much of the capital for the maintenance and expansion of our industries is supplied by the persons having the larger incomes. The heavy progressive income tax strikes directly at this source of supply.

In this country we already have a heavy progressive income tax. Under the present law the taxes on individual incomes are graduated from a low of 22.2 percent on incomes of not over $2,000 to a high of 92 percent on incomes of over $200,000. The rates on the larger incomes amount to virtual confiscation.

In the case of the death tax, the rates levied by the Federal Government run to a high of 77 percent, and are in addition to the inheritance taxes imposed by the States.

The large increase in population which is anticipated for the current decade and the consequent necessity of greatly increasing our labor force and the quantity of goods produced in order even to maintain our present scale of living will require large additions to the capital supply. Furthermore, it should be noted that despite the apparent healthy appearance of business the shortage of venture capital has been serious, the true effects of which have been hidden in inflation.

If this capital is to be supplied, there must be a marked change in our taxing policy.

With these facts in mind, on September 13, 1951, I introduced in the House a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 323. Thereafter, on October 11, 1951, Senator DIRKSEN introduced an identical resolution in the Senate—Senate Joint Resolution 108. The amendment which we proposed deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes at any time and limits the power of Congress to impose income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, with power, however, by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House, to raise the rate to 40 percent each year, and with the further power by a like vote to suspend the limitation completely in time of war.

The gift tax was included in the limitation because it is merely auxiliary to the death tax.

Our amendment has been attacked on several grounds. The principal objection made is that the amendment imposes a rigid limitation upon the amount of revenue which the Federal Government can raise and would, therefore, lead to deficit financing and would impair the Government's credit.

This objection is not sound. However, without debating the question here, let me say merely that such fears can be allayed by a change in the form of amendment, without prejudicing the attainment of our basic purpose. With this in view, I have made certain changes in the amendment and am introducing it in the House in its revised form.

The changes in the original amendment are confined to section 2 relating to the income tax. The principal change consists of a provision giving Congress the power by a three-fourths vote to fix a maximum rate in excess of 25 percent, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, with a low rate of 20 percent, the maximum rate could not exceed 35 percent. This provision is substituted for the provisions of the earlier amendment authorizing a maximum rate of 40 percent in peacetime and giving Congress the power to suspend the limitation completely during a major war. The new provision, as in the case of the old, applies to both individuals and corporations.

By removing all limitations on the amount of revenue Congress may raise from income taxes, either during war or peace, the principal objection made to the earlier amendment is met, and also the necessity of a wartime escape clause disappears. At the same time a curb on excessively high rates is provided by a limitation on the degree of progression where the top rate exceeds 25 percent. Under the new provision it would be in the interest of every taxpayer to keep not only his own rates but the rates of other taxpayers as low as possible.

It should be observed that, due to the personal exemptions and credits for dependents which have become a well-established feature of our tax laws, the possible degree of progression under the proposed amendment would be substantially greater than the 15 percentage points spread. For example, under the present law a person with $2,400 of such credits and net income of $4,000 before deducting the credits would have his tax cut by the credits from $936 to $355.20, thus making the actual effective rate of tax on his $4,000 income about 9 percent instead of 23.4 percent. As incomes increase, the effect of these credits on the rates diminishes, thus increasing markedly the real degree of progression in rates between the smaller and larger incomes. It can readily be seen that credits of $2,400 would have but little effect on the rate of tax on a $100,000 income.

Any objection to the proposed amendment on the ground that it discriminates in favor of the higher-income groups is not well taken. The graduation of the rates in the present law from 22.2 percent to 92 percent is discrimination of the most extreme character, amounting to virtual confiscation in the higher brackets with the most harmful economic effects. What the amendment does is not to create a discrimination but to remove in part an existing one, to the benefit not only of those in the higher brackets, but of the people as a whole.

The preservation of the private-enterprise system is just as important to those with small incomes as it is to those with medium and large-sized incomes. It is this system that has made possible the high wages and the high scale of living for the people of this country.

In the case of individuals, 70 percent of the taxable income is in the first bracket, which includes incomes under $2,000.

Moreover, 85 percent of the revenue from the individual income tax is produced by the first-bracket rate of 22.2

percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets.

Contrary to popular belief, the bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with the higher incomes but from the taxpayers in the lower brackets, for that is where the income is.

Any immediate loss in revenue from the individual income tax occasioned by the amendment could be made up if necessary by a larger tax on corporations. However, the anticipated reduction in expenditures by this Congress should make this unnecessary. Furthermore, in the long run the lower rates will undoubtedly produce the greater revenue.

This principle is well recognized by students of the subject.

For example, in his book, Taxation: The People's Business, published in 1924, Mr. Andrew W. Mellon, then Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, said—page 16:

> It seems difficult for some to understand that high rates of taxation do not necessarily mean large revenue to the Government, and that more revenue may often be obtained by lower rates. There was an old saying that a railroad freight rate should be "what the traffic will bear"—that is, the highest rate at which the largest quantity of freight would move. The same rule applies to all private business. If a price is fixed too high, sales drop off and with them profits; if a price is fixed too low, sales may increase, but again profits decline. The most outstanding recent example of this principle is the sales policy of the Ford Motor Co. Does anyone question that Mr. Ford has made more money by reducing the price of his car and increasing his sales than he would have made by maintaining a high price and a greater profit per car, but selling less cars? The Government is just a business, and can and should be run on business principles.

Again, in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on July 5, 1951, regarding the then pending revenue bill, Dr. Willford I. King, economics professor emeritus of New York University, said:

> This analysis [covering Federal income tax rates and revenues for the years 1913 to 1942, inclusive] reveals the fact that the levying of confiscatory rates destroys the income from which the fiscal authorities have expected to gain revenue. Surprisingly enough, this destruction occurs to such an extent that income tax rates taking more than 26 percent of the incomes of individuals have succeeded in raising no more revenue than could have been obtained by a 26 percent rate. * * *
>
> The thing which the levying of rates higher than that level has actually accomplished is to prevent the possibility of saving by the wealthy, and thus to dry up what formerly was the chief source of venture capital for founding new enterprises and for expanding old enterprises (pp. 389, 391).

Under both forms of amendment Congress is deprived of the power to impose death and gift taxes at any time, and this means of raising revenue is left exclusively to the States, thus ending an undesirable duplication of taxes. These taxes constitute but a trivial part of the Federal budget—about 1 percent at the present time, which is only enough to pay the expenses of the Government for about 3 days.

The experience of other countries, and most recently that of England, should be a warning to us. For many years England has had a heavy graduated tax on both incomes and inheritances. These taxes have so reduced the supply of capital that there has not been enough to provide her industries with the capital needed for modern machinery and equipment. And now, after 70 years of work by the Fabian Socialists, England has definitely accepted socialism and a large part of her industries has already been nationalized. The effect has been to decrease efficiency and production, so that today there is not enough even of such necessities of life as food and coal.

If anyone thinks the fear that socialism will be established in this country is an imaginary one, let me refer him to the following statement of Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State under President Franklin Roosevelt, made to the Temporary National Economic Committee before the Second World War:

> The government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be [mean] inevitably that the government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States.

The amendment to the Constitution which I am proposing, by limiting the taxing power of Congress, would provide a safeguard against the substitution of socialism for our present freedom and repair a serious omission in the sixteenth amendment adopted in 1913.

Failure of Congress to act now may result in its being forced to call a convention to propose the amendment. Under article V of the Constitution, if the legislatures of two-thirds of the States adopt a resolution requesting Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments, Congress is required to do so. Amendments proposed by the convention become effective after ratification by three-fourths of the States.

A number of State legislatures, starting with Wyoming in 1939, have passed resolutions in one form or another requesting Congress to call a convention to propose such a tax limitation amendment. It is claimed that as many as 28 States have taken such action. This is within 4 of the required 32. It includes several States that have since sought to rescind their earlier action, a power which the proponents of the resolution deny that the State legislatures possess.

The legislatures of all except four of the States meet in 1953. I am advised that these four States have already passed the resolution requesting a convention. I am also advised that an effort is to be made to get a number of other States this year to pass such a resolution. It is apparent, therefore, that Congress may be forced eventually to call a convention.

In calling such a convention Congress would be following an uncharted course, and one fraught with serious danger. If the job has to be done, Congress itself should propose the amendment and submit it to the States for ratification in the usual way.

It should be remembered that Congress is not the sole party in interest. The States have at least an equal interest and should be given an opportunity to vote on the proposal which so many States have already expressed a desire to do.

The text of the resolution I have this day introduced is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 103

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however*, That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint-stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or excise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight of the day of ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect."

THE LATE PROF. CHARLES E. MERRIAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remark the passing of one of the most distinguished and beloved of my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, Prof. Charles E. Merriam, who for many years was chairman of the political science department of the University of Chicago, and whose influence in the cause of good government was unsurpassed by any educator in the history of our country. He was the friend and counselor of President Woodrow Wilson and of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the governors and the mayors of Chicago during a long period. He was truly a great American, of towering stature, and I know that my colleagues would wish that fine woman who was his life's companion, and the other members of his family, to know that the Congress of the United States joins with them in a sense of great loss.

A PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Sunday Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Eighty-third Congress, will you please give me your attention for just a few moments? The subject which I want to discuss will not be long remembered in my words, but it will be the main issue of untold numbers of future generations of this world, until we either have peace or we have the awful and frightful spectacle of another world war which could wipe out civilization as we know it. It is so vital to us that I believe it should receive the first consideration of this and every other lawmaking body on the face of the earth.

I am introducing today a bill to create a Department of Peace. I introduced this bill in the Eighty-second and Eighty-first Congresses. A hearing was held in the Eighty-second Congress and other hearings have been held during the Eightieth and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

If I could impress upon your minds the importance of this matter, our children and our children's children might live with hope and faith in a fuller and more prosperous life.

All down through the ages the leading nations of this world have armed for war instead of using their powerful influence for peace. They have all fallen by the sword.

We are the mightiest nation in the world today, and have been abundantly blessed by the good Lord. We should take advantage of our might and our world leadership to wage a hard and determined campaign for world peace.

I was encouraged to read in the Sunday Star of December 21, 1952, that Publisher Frank Gannett has proposed to President-elect Eisenhower that the Federal Government establish a Department of Peace, headed by an official with full Cabinet rank. I include the entire Star article on this subject.

This has long been my idea and I shall give my full support to such a step. I say again, as did Mr. Gannett, that now is the time. President-elect Eisenhower and you Members of the Eighty-third Congress, it is imperative that we act at once. These are times of decision.

I believe every civilized nation in the world today has a department of war or similar department for defense, but not one has an instrument of government devoted exclusively to promoting peace throughout the world.

America is built of the noblest blood and the finest brains of many races. We are avowed leaders in the world today. It is, therefore, imperative that we take the lead in forming the basic foundation for international peace and security. It is not enough that we fight wars to save the world for democracy, but we must work as hard for security. Surely after two wars in a quarter of a century we have no delusions about peace. The people have been unwilling to listen or heed the cry of the hosts of heaven at the birth of the Master of Galilee when they said to the shepherds "Peace on earth to men of good will."

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE WITH CABINET RANK URGED BY GANNETT

ROCHESTER, N. Y., December 20.—Publisher Frank Gannett has proposed to President-elect Eisenhower that the Federal Government establish a Department of Peace headed by an official with full Cabinet rank.

Mr. Gannett said in a letter, made public today, to the General that opposition to war was not enough—that there should be "definitely planned and organized promotion for peace."

The publisher suggested that the State Department be incorporated within the proposed Department of Peace along the same lines in which the various branches of the armed services have become a part of the Department of Defense.

NO EISENHOWER COMMENT

Mr. Gannett, publisher of the Rochester Times-Union and other newspapers, said unification for peace was "just as essential for our national security as unification of our Armed Forces."

The letter was under study at General Eisenhower's New York headquarters, which made no immediate comment.

"A Department of Peace, such as I urge you to undertake, involves a reorientation and broadening of our international relations," Mr. Gannett wrote.

"Our foreign policy is administered by our State Department. Far too often our State Department officials, both here and abroad, are more concerned with the manner and protocol in which that policy is carried out than with the primary purpose of the policy, which should be peace.

"OTHER PEACE EFFORTS

"A State Department which handles the day-to-day and month-to-month official relations with foreign governments is as necessary for inclusion in a Department of Peace as is a Department of the Air Force essential for a Department of Defense. But the State Department should not be the sole agency for conducting peace, any more than the Department of the Air Force should control other armed services in the Department of Defense.

"Peace is too precious to be entirely in the hands of diplomats. It should be all-prevading rather than confined to diplomacy or subordinate to it."

Mr. Gannett said diplomacy moved in traditional, rigidly defined channels and that it was too much to expect that a State Department representative in a foreign country would be familiar with all possible implements to peace.

Mr. Gannett said these implements included "such matters as youth organization; exchange of students, teachers, librarians; exchange of ideas between scientists, medical men, agricultural experts; the common yearning of all religions."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DINING FACILITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the older Members of the House are well aware, and those who have just come in this session soon will be aware that the House has never taken care of itself. We not only attempted to provide for our own folks as we should but we have provided more than generously for people abroad. In fact wasted billions in that effort.

A resolution was introduced early in the session to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to provide for a dining room down on—well, I hope—down on the street level and west side of the Capitol, so that if a Member wanted to entertain some of his constituents who contributed rather generously in time and money to his election and necessarily following that to the welfare of the people and the security of the Government, and who came here to give us constructive suggestions, a Member might take him down to a House dining room and discuss matters of interest to the constituents, to the Congressmen and to the people as a whole without having someone come along, tap you on the shoulder and say, "Someone else wants this table." "Other Congressmen are waiting in the hall for a chance at this table."

It is an absurdity for us to crowd in down in our present room. It makes me think of the old days down on the farm when we went out and did a little shouting and some of the animals came up to be fed.

We do not have a chance to get a meal. We do not have an opportunity to visit with our constituents, they do not get to talk to us as is their right, our time is too limited and we are too crowded in our present quarters. The idea of feeding 435 people and their guests down in that little room. It is an absurdity. We ought to look after ourselves and those who pay the taxes. I hope some of the Members who just came in will look into the proposal to give our visitors a chance here on the Hill. A new properly operated facility would earn a profit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POLK, for week of January 12 to January 18, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 2 weeks, on account of

surveying countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PELLY and to include copy of a letter he has addressed to Mr. Evans, Librarian, Library of Congress.

Mr. BETTS and to include a column from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "In Defense of Our Congress."

Mr. BEAMER and to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include a letter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an editorial.

Mr. TEAGUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and to include an article appearing in the Minneapolis Star.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include an address delivered by Hon. Alf Landon.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. TABER) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. TABER) in three instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an editorial.

Mr. SCHENCK.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCVEY.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. FORRESTER and to include an article entitled "Human Events" particularly relating to the subject of the immigration uproar.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a splendid address made Saturday last by our distinguished new colleague, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1952, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

302. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, for the year ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

303. A letter from the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

304. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

305. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of activities of the Department of Agriculture relative to the disposal of foreign excess property under title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, pursuant to section 404 (d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

306. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

307. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report and findings on the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project, California, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

308. A letter from the chairman, Future Farmers of America, transmitting the report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, and a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers Supply Service for the period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 14, paragraph (b), of Public Law 740, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

309. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report for the period ended May 31, 1952, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

310. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain and other similar bulk cargoes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

311. A letter from the executive officer, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 284, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 482), approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

312. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

313. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

314. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, and sections 2550 (a), 2558 (b), and 3220 of the Internal Revenue Code, to clarify the classification of narcotic drugs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Second annual report pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Report pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, pertaining to a study of consumer commodity prices and margin spreads; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1372. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Holly River State Park to the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1373. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1374. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 382), relating to appropriations for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Eklutna project, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 1375. A bill to provide for the payment of certain unrecovered costs incurred by producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals for use in the prosecution of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1376. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 1377. A bill to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for administration); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 1378. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1379. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1380. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1381. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1382. A bill to provide that the procedural limitations placed upon the conveyance of certain restricted Indian lands belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes shall apply only to Indians of the full blood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1383. A bill to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding $500, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 1384. A bill for improvement of the inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1385. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2), Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 10), relating to income-tax exemption of certain employees, by including certain veterans' organization employees, and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1386. A bill to create the office of Delegate at Large in the House of Representatives for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1387. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1388. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income-tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1389. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1390. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1391. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1392. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1393. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1394. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1395. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1396. A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 1398. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 1399. A bill to authorize the construction of certain flood-control improvements on the Calumet Union drainage ditch in the vicinity of Harvey, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1400. A bill to increase to $1,000 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1401. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1402. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1403. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1404. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1405. A bill to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to reevaluate certain rivers and harbors and flood-control projects in order to determine the advisability of prosecuting such projects to completion; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1406. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1407. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1408. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1409. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1410. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1411. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1412. A bill to provide for the construction of a Post Office Terminal in Denver, Colo., on the site which has been acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1413. A bill to amend subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1414. A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1415. A bill to allow to a retail dealer in gasoline a refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline which is lost by the retailer through evaporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1416. A bill to provide rates of pay for training periods of substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1417. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 1418. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to take an active part in political management or political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 1419. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize Congress to establish daylight-saving time for any year by concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1420. A bill to provide a system of transcontinental superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1421. A bill to create a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1422. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1423. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1424. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1425. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal transfer air-mail field clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1426. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1427. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1428. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to rebuild Jackson's Ramparts and to designate particular sites with proper markers and to appropriate funds for this purpose; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1429. A bill making an appropriation for the construction of a post-office terminal in Denver, Colo., on the site which has been acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1430. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1431. A bill to amend section 113 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 1432. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1433. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1434. A bill to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1435. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1436. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1437. A bill relating to the annual adjustment of the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1438. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to full-time representatives of certain recognized State organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1439. A bill to provide for advancement to the commissioned and warrant officer grades for enlisted musicians of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1440. A bill to provide relief for certain officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1441. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to wrestling matches held as competitions between high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1442. A bill to authorize a program for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Green River watershed in Kentucky and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 1443. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1444. A bill to provide an adequate channel in Old and Atchafalaya Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as Shut-in's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to provide for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution permitting articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Far East Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May in each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution making January 19 and 20, 1953, holidays for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the meetings of the United Nations Assembly, and similar world organizations of which the United States is a member, should be opened with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy to observe the provisions and intent of the act of Congress section 208 (d) Department of Justice Appropriation Act of 1953, and suspend the further prosecuting of the action pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, entitled "United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 61. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 63. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 63. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 64. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a hearing and study as to the reasons for periodical interruptions of shipping through the port of Seattle; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Res. 66. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Res. 67. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to a civil defense and disaster compact entered into between the States of New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Thomas I. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Adele Van-dan Busch Oosterwyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Cecylia Goldberg (nee Morgenstern); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Hyeng Pok Sunoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Paula Kurz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Domenico la Torraca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Julia Stapinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Vladimir Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Kenneth McRight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Fotini X. Parisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Ilona Elizabeth Carrier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Dertouzos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Helga Rossman and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Peppas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mieczyslaw Wolny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Velio Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Michael Chirco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Gaspari Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Elias Manolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Domenico Manzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bossio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Calogero Bartoliotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of John George Nicholaros alias John Nickols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Bommarito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of J. Paul Bisnaire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Heveran (nee Rigby); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Stevan Cuckovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Joseph Hendrykowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Schoenauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Karoline Mahr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Igo Sobel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of the Fulton Trouser Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of John Lemons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie A. Dablias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Joseph Koprak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Bolandineh Baitoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Elly S. Angelides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of William H. Marnoa, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Sportservice Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Henry Rang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Ralph Moschitta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of Szyja Morgenstern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Frejdla Fogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Eric Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Phillip Bonino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Wiktor Grygielko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Lech Prvszynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Roman Smolemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Trzcinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of Andrew Radlicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mordechay Dinewitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Sahag Vartanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jessie Sibert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Margarete Dillinger and Gudrund Dillinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1512. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ching Tseng Teng and Mrs. Hsi (Dora) Teng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of Sato Hamako; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of Clint Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (by request):

H. R. 1515. A bill for the relief of Max Hermann Keilbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Corp. Predrag Mitrovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11. By Mr. BUSH: Resolution of the Commissioners, Lycoming County, Pa., to amend existing Social Security Act so as to make the benefits of social security available to any and all political subdivisions desirous of adopting a plan for its officials and employees, whether or not such subdivisions have in effect a present existing pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

12. By Mr. HOWELL: Resolution of Cape May County Bar Association, adopted December 20, 1952, petitioning the Congress to amend title 28 of the United States Code, particularly sections 110 and 133 of said title, increasing the number of judges for the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey from six to seven, and providing that in said district, court shall be held at Atlantic City, Camden, Newark, and Trenton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Racine, Wis., in support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, at noontide the voice of our prayer rises to Thee. We come asking for strength that we may toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal. Only when our vision is cleansed and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting. Like tillers of the soil who stand reverently with bowed heads, listening to the music of holy bells, so at the beginning of this day's deliberations we would pause to become spiritually aware of silvery notes from a pealing belfry no human eye can see, or ear hear.

Send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled kindness which is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 9, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1952.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 78, Eighty-first Congress, I transmit herewith for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission its final report.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

NOTE: The report was transmitted to the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operation from April 1, 1952, to September 30, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the calendar year 1952, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"Whereas the National Government through the excessive use of its tax power has greatly encroached upon the tax-revenue sources of the several States; and

"Whereas the very existence of our dual system of government is dependent upon strong and economically sound State governments; and

"Whereas the continued preemption of available tax sources by the Federal Government will seriously impair the tax structure of the several States, thus tending to further centralize the Government on a national basis: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of Louisiana respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon, or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the

United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeal such action as often as such emergency may require.

"'SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"'SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect;' be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

The memorial of Thomas O. Glenn, of Austin, Tex., remonstrating against the appointment of O. N. Bruck as postmaster at Austin, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Paul M. Gallaher, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., relating to the seating of Senator LANGER as a Member of the Senate for the term beginning January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Pan Arcadian Federation of America, Chicago, Ill., favoring the return of the island of Cyprus to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the PanArcadian Federation National Convention, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing an additional quota of immigrants from Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Regina Gingold, of Coronado, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Helen B. Werblin, of Somerville, N. J., relating to the sale of land to the Government for official business (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Sara Lee Babcock, of Oxford, Ohio, relating to racial discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. Nettie Brown, of Stanley, N. Y., relating to old-age pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert E. Haas, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys, at Highland Park, Ill., favoring an increase in personnel of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys, at Highland Park, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to intercept communications in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Alameda, Calif., relating to temporary war housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Erna Lisette Hadra, past president, Santa Monica Bay Chapter, American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., Santa Monica, Calif., embodying a request for a resolution favoring an investigation by the Senate of the Memorial National Home Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Doris Turgeon, a citizen of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FLOOD DAMAGE ON REDWOOD RIVER, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MARSHALL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Marshall, Minn., on December 15, 1952, citing flood damage to the city and calling upon the Congress to assist, in matters beyond the jurisdiction of the city, to improve the flow of the Redwood River.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Marshall has suffered disastrous floods during the spring of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, caused by waters of the Redwood River overflowing the river banks and flooding large areas of public and private property within the city causing damage to property and losses in excess of $1,000,000; and

Whereas in the interest of promoting public health and safety, and in consideration of safeguarding the public property of the city, and the private property of residents within the city from future disastrous floods, it was deemed imperative to take immediate measures to control the waters of the Redwood River for the prevention of future floods within the city; and

Whereas the city of Marshall has already expended, since April 1952, the sum of $16,000 for the construction of dikes, cleaning and dredging the river channel, and constructing diversionary channels, all of which have placed a severe burden upon the taxpayers and taxable property of the city; and

Whereas the full benefit of the flood-control measures taken by the city will not be realized unless and until the channel of the Redwood River lying downstream from the city is cleared of trees, debris, and other matter which causes ice-jamming retarding the flow of the river and resulting in a swelling of the river in the channel within the city limits; and

Whereas the city of Marshall has no right or jurisdiction to carry on the necessary clearing and snagging operations downstream and outside the city limits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Marshall, Minn., That an appeal be made to the Members of the Congress of the United States apprising them of the damages caused by floods to the city of Marshall and the nature and costs of measures taken by the city to control the flood waters of the Redwood River, a tributary of the Minnesota River; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to take such measures as are necessary and expedient to improve the flow of the Redwood River outside and beyond the jurisdiction of the city of Marshall.

Passed and adopted by the common council of the city of Marshall, Minn., this 15th day of December 1952.

THE COMMON COUNCIL,
By O. T. BUSSARD,
Chairman of the Common Council.

Attest:

H. N. HARMON.

I hereby approve the foregoing resolution this 15th day of December 1952.

GEORGE ABRAHAMSEN,
Mayor.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that several resolutions, adopted by the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, at its seventieth convention held on October 6 through 8, 1952, in Minneapolis, Minn., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 11

Introduced by Delegate Stewart, etc., representing Grain Millers Union No. 1, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway bill has been repeatedly defeated through the influence of large eastern interests; and

"Whereas such an outlet to the sea would be a boon to the industry of Minnesota and the great Middle West; and

"Whereas the existing railroad freight rates give Minnesota a disadvantage to that of the rest of the Nation, and these conditions are slowly strangling industry in Minnesota: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the convention go on record to petition Congress to pass the St. Lawrence waterway bill."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 13

Introduced by Delegate Stewart representing Grain Millers Union No. 1, Minneapolis.

"Whereas whole grain is being exported to foreign countries without being milled in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the milling industry is now operating at 75 percent of total capacity; and

"Whereas previously the law required at least 25 percent of all wheat exported had to be milled in the United States of America, thereby creating additional work for members of our union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, The convention go on record that the law be reinstated as it previously existed; that 25 percent of all exported grain be milled in the United States of America."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 18

Introduced by Delegate Tschirley Noreen representing Post Office Clerks Union No. 65, St. Paul.

"Whereas many substitutes in the post office are required to work as many as 14 hours per day and as much as 80 hours per week without receiving overtime; and

"Whereas apparently the only way to eliminate the use of substitutes is to make them too expensive to hire thereby creating a situation whereby all employees will eventually become regular employees; and

"Whereas substitutes are not paid for time spent on military leave as in the case of regular classified employees; and

"Whereas the present method of granting annual and sick leave according to the number of hours worked each pay day by hourly employees deprives these employees of full credit on annual and sick leave in many cases: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in State convention assembled in Minneapolis August 6, 1952, support and instruct their national leaders to seek legislation in the next session of Congress that will:

"1. Grant overtime to all hourly paid employees in the postal service for all time worked in excess of 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week.

"2. Guarantee a minimum of 2 hours work to all hourly paid employees each time they are ordered to report for duty.

"3. Make it mandatory that a maximum of 1 hourly paid employee for every six regular classified employees be established.

"4. Extend to all hourly paid employees the benefits of paid military leave on a 40-hour week basis the same as regular employees.

"5. Credit to all hourly paid employees annual and sick leave on a monthly basis instead of the present method of requiring a certain number of hours to be worked in order to obtain full benefits."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 19

Introduced by Delegate Bergman representing State Employees Council Union No. 8.

"Whereas the objectives of the organized State employees affiliated with the Minnesota State Federation of Labor are:

"(a) To advance the economic, social and general welfare of public employees.

"(b) To foster and promote a liberal and progressive public attitude toward public administration.

"(c) To extend and uphold the principle of merit and fitness in public employment."

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 30

Introduced by delegates representing Radio Broadcast Technicians, Union No. 1216, Twin Cities.

"Whereas Radio Station KSTP and its owner and operator, Stanley Hubbard, have unfairly locked out members of the A. F. of L.; and

"Whereas the radio station has consistently refused to negotiate an agreement between the station and locked out employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, in the seventieth annual convention assembled, take the necessary action which would result in refusal of each and every commercial advertiser utilizing the broadcasting facilities of radio station KSTP of St. Paul, Minn.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That any increase in power and renewal of license by the Federal Communications Commission be denied to KSTP; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Federation circularize the affiliated unions requesting that they send two communications to the Federal Communications Commission protesting renewal of the license of KSTP for increased power on the basis of the antilabor record of the station. Also that the station is not being conducted in the public interest. That copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota and released to the press."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 32

Introduced by Delegates representing Retail Clerks Union No. 1116, Duluth.

"Whereas the American Federation of Labor went on record in favor of H. R. 6785; and

"Whereas, this bill provides that the interstate shipments of goods produced on premises leased from a State or municipality be prohibited, and

"Whereas if this bill was passed in its present form many of our members would be out of work: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor here assembled go on record requesting changes in the law so as to exclude projects set up by the Minnesota Iron Range Resources Rehabilitation Commission and projects of a similar nature."

The committee recommended that paragraph 4 be amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That if any Federal legislation is introduced in the future, similar H. R. 6785, that the Minnesota State Federation of Labor go on record as taking the position that such legislation be confined to prison work and similar work performed in public institutions in competition with private industry and when so amended recommend concurrence in the resolution. The report of the Committee was adopted."

The committee reported that resolution No. 33 was withdrawn by its authors.

Resolution 41

Introduced by delegates representing Post Office Clerks Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas despite the repeal of the gag laws ostensibly giving postal employees union recognition, and

"Whereas despite the tremendous growth and advances made by organized labor, and

"Whereas the failure to carry on relations with employee organizations has resulted in a lowering of morale, along with an increasingly large labor turnover, and

"Whereas employee group representatives believe themselves to be intelligent and realistic, capable of meeting with administrative officials on an equal basis regarding postal policies, and on a national as well as a local level, and

"Whereas the Rhodes-Withrow bill H. R. 571, referred to as the "Union Recognition Bill" as now reported in the Congress of the United States is without its two most important provisions, namely; punitive redress against postmasters and supervisors not enforcing its provisions and secondly, recognition of the majority employee organization as bargaining agent; and

"Whereas these two provisions provide the fundamental strength and potential success of any union recognition law enacted and without which no union recognition can actually be accomplished or assured: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor assembled in convention use every possible means to gain support and effect eventual enactment of Union Recognition legislation by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor take a strong stand on behalf of the principles 'punitive redress and majority recognition' to be included in any union recognition law enacted."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 42

Introduced by Delegates representing Post Office Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the right of the citizen to vote, freely express his opinion on public questions, whether it be in private conversation or in public discussion, and to join with his fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes, must be regarded as a right never to be abridged, if we accept the theory that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and

"Whereas by means of the abridgment of the right of the citizens to fully exercise his citizenship, small but powerful economics groups have succeeded in many instances in controlling elections; and

"Whereas because of legislation such as the Hatch Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, certain sections of the United States Criminal Code, as well as the Civil Service Regulations, Government employees for many years have been subjected to a constant and increasing encroachment upon their rights as American citizens by the enactment of laws which have restricted their rights to participate in political activities vital to their interests; and

"Whereas existing laws deny certain constitutional rights to an ever increasing number of American citizens being veterans of the Armed Forces that risked their lives to preserve those constitutional rights: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor favors the restoration to all Government employees (not in a supervisory capacity) of full citizenship rights, including the right to vote, the right of free speech on public questions, and the right to join with their fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That no individual in his administrative capacity shall be permitted to use his position to exert pressure to influence the political views of others with whom he may have official contact, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this convention urge the repeal of the Hatch Act and other various restrictions placed upon political activities of the Federal employees with adequate legislative safeguards being retained which will protect employees from administrators or others in a position to determine their tenure, or welfare, or advancement in their employment."

The committee recommended that the resolution be amended in the first resolve to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor favors the restoration to all Government employees of full citizenship rights, including the right to vote, the right of free speech on public questions and the right to join with their fellow citizens in organizing for political purposes, and when so amended, recommends concurrence in the resolution."

The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 48

Introduced by Delegates Nilan, Schebloom, Lindahl, Herschay and Johnston representing Post Office Clerks' Union No. 125, Minneapolis.

"Whereas the present cost of living has more than doubled for the postal clerk over the cost of living for the 1939–40 period; and

"Whereas the postal clerk is unable to properly fulfill his family obligations in regards to education, medical and dental care and the other necessities of life on his present postal salary; and

"Whereas the pay raise received by postal clerks in 1951 was wholly inadequate to meet the constantly rising cost of living: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., October 6, 7 and 8 go on record as favoring a pay raise of $600.00 in the next session of Congress for Postal employees."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 51

Introduced by Delegates representing Building Trades Council, Duluth.

"Whereas the Social Security Act does not now contain any provision for workers covered by the act in cases where they become physically disabled; and

"Whereas such workers otherwise must become recipients of public welfare or relief: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Duluth Building Trades Council does go on record as requesting the Minnesota State Federation of Labor to draw up and forward to our Minnesota congressional delegation a resolution which would provide payment of Social Security Act benefits to all workers who become disabled (and have less than 10 years left) to qualify for Social Security Act benefits."

The committee recommended that the resolve of the resolution be amended to read as follows:

"That the Duluth Building Trades Council does go on record as requesting the Minnesota State Federation of Labor to draw up and forward to our Minnesota Congressional delegation a resolution which would provide payment of Social Security Act benefits to all workers who become disabled and when so amended recommended concurrence in the resolution."

The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 57

Introduced by delegates representing Minnesota State Culinary Council.

"Whereas the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits is at an all-time high, and has reached the proportions of being an unfair and discriminatory tax; and

"Whereas such tax is resulting in decreased State and Federal revenues from alcoholic beverages, and an apparent increase in illegal distilling of spirits, both of which affect the employment, welfare, and security of persons employed in the dispensation of alcoholic beverages at retail level; and

"Whereas unless some relief from these excessive tax burdens is forthcoming the jobs of many people so engaged will be adversely affected: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in convention assembled this 6th day of October 1952, go on record as supporting and strongly urging a reduction in the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits to a reasonable level of $6 per gallon, and that the convention urge all members to take an active part in supporting this resolution, and a copy of the resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Minnesota."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

Resolution 53

Introduced by delegates representing State Employees, District Council No. 3.

"Whereas the idea of according preference in examinations to honorably discharged veterans of the wars of the United States originated in non-civil-service examinations for Federal Government appointments following the war between the States and has been developed so that today the United States Government, the State governments, and nearly all subordinate jurisdictions with civil-service systems make some preference provisions for veterans generally by granting additional points in civil-service examinations; and

"Whereas the United States Government as the leading Nation in the international association of nations known as the United Nations is presently engaged in and has been engaged for many months in a nonaggressive undeclared war in Korea to protect our own Nation and other democratic Nations of the world against the determined aggression of the Communist states; and

"Whereas the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who serve in the Korean war are subjected to the rigors, the hardships and the dangers which have been experienced in other wars: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the delegates to the eighth international convention of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees assembled in Milwaukee, Wis., April 28 to May 2, 1952, recommend to and urge all the States which conduct competitive examinations for employments and all the subordinate jurisdictions in the States which conduct examinations for positions, to provide by law preference in examinations to veterans who shall have served in the Korean conflict so that such veterans will have opportunities in examinations for positions comparable with the opportunities accorded to veterans of World Wars I and II, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the international president and the international secretary-treasurer be mailed to the President of the United States, and to the clerk of the United States Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE (S. REPT. NO. 7)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Committee on Postal Service, submitted, pursuant to section 12 (d), Public Law 233, Eighty-second Congress, the final report of that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 352. A bill for the relief of Joanna Maria Drucka-Podberezka; and

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Li Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Inger Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 355. A bill for the relief of Wanda Luceri, also known as Sister Cecilia; Maria De Padora, also known as Sister Rosanna; Anna Santoro, also known as Sister Natalina; Valentina Ruffoni, also known as Sister Severina; Cosima Russo, also known as Sister Carmelina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 356. A bill for the relief of certain Greek aliens;

S. 357. A bill for the relief of Jung Yong He; and

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Nesbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 359. A bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 360. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 361. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 362. A bill for the relief of William Clark Vyse;

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Mildred T. Sackman;

S. 364. A bill for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; and

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Sister Concepta (Ida Riegel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 367. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Frederick P. Knows Gun; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 368. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower;

S. 369. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 370. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Georgia Andrews;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Thomas T. Asami; and

S. 373. A bill to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 374. A bill to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of North Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Rei Ishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 376. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 377. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 378. A bill to expedite the naturalization of certain German and Austrian scientists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 379. A bill to permit the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenditures made by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 380. A bill to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Donald Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 382. A bill to prevent discrimination against any type or strain of white clover seed in the application of any price-support programs for such seed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Francisca Egurrola;

S. 384. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Webster; and

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Anna Solennani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 386. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of David Wong;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Wesley John Peterson;

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Morusi;

S. 390. A bill for the relief of Marie Haddad;

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Arsenios Peter Gligorievitch;

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Athanasios C. Papathanasiou; and

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Ivan Grbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 394. A bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 395. A bill to extend national service life-insurance benefits to certain members of the Armed Forces who died in combat with the Japanese forces prior to April 20, 1942, or whose deaths are traceable to capture, seige, or isolation by such forces;

S. 396. A bill relating to the payment of national service life insurance of Leo E. Chavez; and

S. 397. A bill to establish a separate customs collection district comprising the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 398. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; and

S. 399. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 400. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Roberta Madrigali;

S. 403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Gallegos;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Renzo Petroni;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Louis Rachid Habid;

S. 406. A bill for the relief of Genovieve Bolf;

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Steinhoff;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Jee Gene Wong;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Maximiliano Barajas;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Michael Miakos;

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Maria Messinesi;

S. 413. A bill to encourage the making of contracts with the United States by requiring the inclusion of an escalator clause to provide adjustments for approved price and wage increases;

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Hilary Hess;

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Sam H. Ray; and

S. 417. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 418. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; and

S. 419. A bill to correct an injustice by providing for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 420. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, relative to periods of service of certain employees for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 421. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control on the Rio Hondo at Roswell, N. Mex.;

S. 422. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas; and

S. 423. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida E. Horton; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 425. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Petre and Liubitze Ionescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 427. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng;

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Hsian-Yun Hsu Teng, Wing Teng, Chie-Ling Teng, Yin Teng, and Fei Teng;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Klaus W. Jonas and Ilsedore Barkow Jonas;

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale; and

S. 432. A bill for the relief of Rodion Michael Akulshin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Dr. John J. Ristow and family;

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Colette Joli; and

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 436. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 437. A bill for the relief of Lillian Kontou Coussoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Don B. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 440. A bill to amend section 24 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the disallowance of certain deductions); and

S. 441. A bill to prohibit the procurement for the Armed Forces of any article produced in, or imported from, Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Karen Kaye Simpson (Keiko Utagawa); and

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 444. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, to make grants to States to assist distressed school districts in construction of urgently needed school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 446. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Foster Creek reclamation project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali);

S. 448. A bill for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.;

S. 450. A bill for the relief of Gregorios Athanasiou Fraggias;

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Gina Bellagamba;

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Imre Kapusy, Sr.;

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Holger Wilhelm Sjoblom;

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Connie Joyce May (Ayako Goto); and

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Johan Gerhard Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cappelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna;

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta; and

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Daphne Lherrison Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 460. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Cass Lake, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes; and

S. 461. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for post-graduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 462. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 463. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 464. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 465. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 466. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 468. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 469. A bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to create a Great Lakes Water Level Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GREEN):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to establish a commission to assist in making a proper and equitable settlement of the submerged lands problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL AID TO STATES FOR SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 359) providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS ON SCHOOL-CONSTRUCTION BILL

This bill is designed to afford some measure of relief to the children of the country who are being forced to attend schools whose buildings are inadequate, unsafe, unsanitary, and overcrowded. These children have a national birthright to an adequate education, and that education must be given them in adequate facilities, or it becomes empty. We hear complaints almost every day from parents who fear for the safety of their children who must attend school in dilapidated and overcrowded buildings. Even, there have been parents' strikes against these intolerable conditions.

While many people may consider that the primary responsibility for education lies with the States and local school districts, we must admit that there is a national responsibility also. This bill will afford a minimum of Federal aid in the form of funds for school buildings. It is based upon a ratio of school-building cost to school-age populations in the several States. The Federal share is fixed on the same formula as found in the Hill-Burton Act, which has operated so well in our hospital-construction programs. It appears to be an equitable method for meeting the need in school construction. The adoption of this bill would tend to solve a pressing problem and be the means of housing our children in adequate school buildings.

RETROCESSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, if enacted, would give the people of the District of Columbia the same rights of citizenship enjoyed by other citizens of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 374) to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, introduced by Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 394) to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE ON PROPOSED BILL CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the appointment of the Collectors of Customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs under the classified civil-service system, because it seems to me that consideration should be given at this time to placing all revenue collectors in the same category. The President's reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which was approved by Congress last year, provided not only for revamping of the Bureau but for the appointment under civil service of those occupying positions now held by collectors.

There are 44 collectors of customs and 6 comptrollers of customs now appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are collectors of import duties for the Government and administrators of the Customs Service. Their responsibilities are, roughly, the same as those of the present collectors of internal revenue. Whatever the ultimate plan may be for the organization of a consolidated revenue service in the Treasury Department, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, it seems entirely logical that collectors of customs should be appointed in the same manner as those performing the functions of collectors of internal revenue. The bill I have introduced is simply in the interests of logic and consistency, therefore, and is not intended to cast any reflection on present customs officials or agents or to offer a comprehensive plan for reorganization of the Customs Service.

Some curious twists in the development of laws and administrative regulations governing appointments of customs officials have occurred through the years. For example:

First, all the comptrollers of customs are political appointees except the person performing these functions at San Francisco, who is a career official.

Second, all those performing the functions of appraisers of customs are career officials, except the one at New York, who is a political appointee.

Third, 44 collectors of customs are Presidential appointees, and yet 2 other officials performing the same duties in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are under Civil Service.

These inconsistencies highlight the need for the corrective legislation which I have proposed in the bill.

In this connection I wish to quote from the report to Congress of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government relative to the reorganization of the revenue services of the Treasury Department, as follows:

"One of the chief handicaps of effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of Collectors of Internal Revenue and of Customs, and certain other officials. The Commission recommends that all officials in the Department below the rank of Assistant Secretary should preferably be appointed from the career service without Senate confirmation."

The bill which I have introduced merely would place Bureau of Customs people in the same category as Bureau of Internal Revenue people as determined by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. This simple and logical step would in no way interfere with further consideration of over-all

reorganization of the revenue services along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

CARLOS D. MARKYNA

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna.

The subject of this bill is the foster son of Ted Pierce, Columbus weather man.

Markyna was born in Ecuador. He is a United States Army veteran and was wounded in Korea. He has been ordered deported, but physical deportation has been suspended because of my notice to the Immigration Department that I intended to introduce the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 457) for the relief of Carlos D. Markyna, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ANGELO GURISETTI PODESTA

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta.

John and Leah Podesta, of Cleveland, while in Italy, adopted an Italian boy. They are now paying for his support there but have not seen him since his adoption in April of 1952.

This bill would permit the child's entry to the United States as the natural-born alien child of the couple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 458) for the relief of Angelo Gurisetti Podesta, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DAPHNE LHERRISON RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Daphne Lherrison Rodriguez.

Daphne Rodriguez is a resident of Columbus, Ohio. She came to this country from Jamaica with an aunt. Apparently, her visitor's permit expired and she did not go home. That all happened in 1928.

Daphne is married to a lawful resident of the United States. She worked at Lazarus for 16 years, and now lives in Columbus. The bill would regularize her status without compelling her to return to Jamaica for reentry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 459) for the relief of Daphne Lherrison Rodriguez, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SECRETARY TO THE MAJORITY

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That William T. Reed, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

REVIEW OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That, pursuant to its responsibilities under the second paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, the Senate requests and urges the President to take immediate steps under the provisions of article 109 of chapter XVIII of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter, and

That in furtherance of this purpose the Senate also urges the President to take such initial steps as are necessary to fix a date and place for the holding of the general conference and to secure the approval of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and of seven members of the Security Council for the calling and holding of this general conference under the provisions of the article and chapter of the United Nations Charter referred to in this resolution.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. IVES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is modified as follows:

1. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22."

2. The first paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "on the following calendar day but one," and inserting in lieu thereof, "on the twelfth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays)."

3. The second paragraph of subsection 2 is amended by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn," and inserting in lieu thereof, "by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate."

4. Subsection 3 is hereby deleted.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Inaugural address delivered by Gov. Edward F. Arn, of Kansas, on January 12, 1953, at Topeka, Kans.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Statement prepared by him relative to Senate bill 107, providing for the interim oil operation of submerged lands.

By Mr. WILEY:

Press release issued by him, in connection with new type bill for United States participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, an editorial entitled "Seaway Will Be Built—Will United States Buy In?" published in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, January 10, 1953; and an editorial entitled "Revive St. Lawrence," published in the Providence Evening Bulletin of January 7, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him relative to the retirement of Senator O'Conor, of Maryland.

Declaration by the National Foreign Trade Council entitled "A Foreign Economic Policy for Americans," published in the New York Times of January 6, 1953.

Statement entitled "Facts on Liquor Taxation."

By Mr. HUNT:

Editorial entitled "A Great Senator," published in the Wyoming Eagle of January 9, 1953, referring to the senatorial career of Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

By Mr. WELKER:

Address delivered by President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., of the First Presidency, Church of Latter Day Saints, at Utah State Farm Bureau Federation convention, Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 21, 1952.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "Lynching: It Vanishes Without Federal Assistance," published in the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer of recent date.

Editorial entitled "In Behalf of the Filibuster," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 8, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Senate's Rules," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 8, 1953.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Editorial entitled "Free Trade Needed," published in the Stillwater (Okla.) News Press of December 24, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Higher United States Tariffs Would Set Europe Back," published in the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of December 26, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Republican Trade Policy," published in the Washington Post of recent date.

Article by Sumner H. Slichter entitled "Slichter Urges Bold New Imports Policy," reprinted from the Atlantic magazine of January 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "When Policies Collide," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 3, 1953, dealing with conflicting foreign policies.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Statement entitled "In the Balance—The Christian World," published in the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Kerr
Anderson	George	Kilgore
Barrett	Gillette	Knowland
Beall	Goldwater	Kuchel
Bennett	Gore	Langer
Bricker	Green	Lehman
Bridges	Griswold	Long
Bush	Hayden	Magnuson
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Mansfield
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Martin
Capehart	Hill	Maybank
Carlson	Hoey	McCarran
Case	Holland	McCarthy
Chaves	Humphrey	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Cooper	Ives	Morse
Cordon	Jackson	Mundt
Daniel	Jenner	Murray
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Ferguson	Kefauver	Potter
Flanders	Kennedy	Purtell

Robertson	Smith, N. J.	Tobey
Russell	Smith, N. C.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Sparkman	Welker
Schoeppel	Stennis	Wiley
Smathers	Taft	Williams
Smith, Maine	Thye	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] attended the inauguration yesterday of Governor Phil Donnelly at Jefferson City, Mo., and is therefore necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appointment of committees under rule XXIV.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. I submit a list of Republican members, including the chairmen, and ask that it be read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by direction of the Democratic Steering Committee, I submit the proposed Democratic membership of the standing committees of the Senate. The composition of these committees is based upon the 49–47 ratio which exists in the Senate. It is my understanding that traditionally it has been the obligation of the majority to make assignments of members who may not be members of either of the major parties.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Texas. However, the ratio in the Senate is not 49–47. The ratio is 48–47–1. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated that he is not a member of the Republican Party and does not wish to be assigned to committees by the majority. We have not undertaken to assign him to committees. I do not wish to be understood as being in agreement with the statement made by the distinguished minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. What the Chair was going to suggest was that, without objection, the two lists be read for the information of the Senate. The reading of the lists would not mean that the committee assignments as listed would be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving my right to object for the moment, to even the reading of the lists, I should like to say that I appreciate very much the majority leader's characteristic fairness in making the observation that the Republican majority had decided not to assign the junior Senator from Oregon to a committee, and I wish to say to my good friend from Texas that, as a matter of parliamentary rule, it is my judgment that he is in error in his assumption that the assignment of a member of a minority party, who is not a member of either one of the so-called major parties, is the responsibility of the majority. In order to keep the record straight, and so that the observation may come at this point in the RECORD, it is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that the assignment should come from the Senate as a whole, and I propose to argue that proposition a little later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to have his list read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I shall shortly make my list available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the two lists which have been submitted will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK read the lists, as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: George D. Aiken, of Vermont, chairman; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Herman Welker, of Idaho; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky.

On Appropriations: Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, chairman; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington.

On Armed Services: Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, chairman; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey; Francis Case, of South Dakota; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri.

On Banking and Currency: Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, chairman; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

On the District of Columbia: Francis Case, of South Dakota, chairman; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; ————; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Willis Smith, of North Carolina; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana;

————.

On Finance: Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado, chairman; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana.

On Foreign Relations: Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, chairman; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; William Langer, of North Dakota; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; William F. Knowland, of California; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana.

On Government Operations: Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, chairman; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Stuart Symington, of Missouri.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, chairman; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; James E. Murray, of Montana; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Price Daniel, of Texas.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire, chairman; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Andrew W. Schoeppel, of Kansas; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida.

On the Judiciary: William Langer, of North Dakota, chairman; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Herman Welker, of Idaho; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Willis Smith, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri.

On Labor and Public Welfare: H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, chairman; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Irving M. Ives, of New York; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; James E. Murray, of Montana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Frank Carlson, of Kansas, chairman; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; William A.

Purtell, of Connecticut; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Price Daniel, of Texas.

On Public Works: Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; ————; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; ————.

On Rules and Administration: William E. Jenner, of Indiana, chairman; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the assignments to committees as proposed by the majority and by the minority. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to make a statement?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to make a statement, or a further addition to the lists?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a statement on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is before the Senate and it is debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that it is debatable. I shall wait and let the Senator from Oregon make his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make a statement. The Chair understands that there is no controversy with regard to committee assignments, except with respect to four committees. In other words, the assignments to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on the District of Columbia are the assignments to which the Senator from Oregon wishes to raise some question. Therefore, the Chair was going to suggest that so far as the remaining committees are concerned, the assignments to them could be agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to explain that the Republicans have nominated Republicans. We have not undertaken to assign the Senator from Oregon to a committee in making up our list of committee assignments.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon has stated very definitely on the floor of the Senate that he does not want to be assigned to committees by the Republican caucus, we have assigned only the 48 Republican Senators to committees, and have, of course, selected the committees to which we wish to assign them.

The present status is that neither the Republican Senators nor the minority Senators are able, under the rules, to nominate the whole list; and there are two committee assignments to which up to date fall short by one of the total authorized by the rule, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized and may make his own presentation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, that I think he and the other Republican Senators were exactly correct in their procedure in not assigning me to any committees, not only because of my statement of the other day on the floor of the Senate that I did not wish to be so assigned by the Republican caucus, but also because it is my view that under the Reorganization Act I am entitled to assignment to committees as a member of a minority party, and by action of the Senate as a whole, acting as the Committee of the Whole, so to speak.

Mr. President, I think it is only fair that at the very outset of this discussion this afternoon I be permitted to make the formal statement I wish to make in regard to what I believe to be an exceedingly important problem before the Senate, so that all my colleagues at least will have an opportunity to hear my point of view, if they wish to listen to it, or at least so far as the RECORD is concerned will have been placed on notice regarding that point of view.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall proceed to read my statement, and I wish to read it without interruption. This statement is based upon very careful research which I and my staff have conducted for the past several days in regard to what I believe to be a very historic parliamentary point which I propose to raise on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Whether the junior Senator from Oregon receives the committee assignments to which he believes himself justly entitled is not the issue which is now before the Senate. This great parliamentary body, which should be a symbol of justice under law in these perilous days of contention between the free countries and the slave countries, must decide whether it will apply the Constitution and laws of the United States and the precedents of decades in the fair, impartial manner which characterizes democratic society and which sets it apart from the opportunistic totalitarian doctrine that the end justifies the means.

The case which the Senate must decide is new. No such combination of facts and law has been before the Senate in precisely the same posture. There are precedents which arose from similar controversies, but they have been sufficiently different to require that the discerning attention of every Member of this body be given to the present case.

I stand before the Senate, not as a member of either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, but as an independent. Third parties are not new in this great Nation, and some have served high purposes. The Republican Party, when it was fresh and new, was a spirited creature which outran the Whig Party, whose trembling, infirm hands could not hold the reins of power and responsibility. The Populist Party served the great purpose of regenerating the two major parties by sharpening the issues which perplexed the Nation in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Theodore Roosevelt was as much a Bull Mooser as a Rough Rider.

Today I stand alone in this Chamber as the representative of the independents. As a Senator I represent the people of Oregon, who twice elected me, and I also am spokesman of hundreds of thousands of independents who refuse to accept kinship with the donkey and who cannot and will not follow the lumbering meanderings of the elephant.

No Senator would contend that he represents only those of his party who live in his State. This would be a mean admission of myopic partisanship and provincialism. We represent our States; and we seek to advance, each according to his lights, the welfare of all the people.

As I said in my State about 3 weeks ago, in a series of major speeches which I made across the State, I have for 8 years represented in the Senate of the United States all the people of my State, including those who have voted against me as well as those who have voted for me. In the remaining 4 years of my present term in the Senate of the United States I shall continue to represent all the people of Oregon in accordance with my best judgment on the merits of issues as I see them, including a representation of those who voted for me as well as a representation of those who voted against me. In those speeches, Mr. President, and in the open-forum periods which followed them, I went on to make very clear my reply to a series of resolutions which I have received from various Republican committees and organizations in my State which have asked that I resign from the Senate of the United States because I have resigned from the Republican Party. However, my reply to them was the same as my reply to them today, namely, that when I took the oath of office as a Member of the Senate of the United States I did not become the property of the Republican Party. I became a representative of all the people of my State, and I took that oath of office with a determination to keep faith with a pledge which I made in 1944 and again in 1950, namely, that I would exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of the issues in accordance with the facts as I found them or believed them to be, always subordinating, in the best interests of my country, what I consider to be political partisanship to what I consider to be sound political principle.

Mr. President, my record in the Senate of the United States for the next 4 years will be no different from what my record has been in the past 8 years. I shall continue to keep faith with that pledge. I wish to say that in my judgment it is the highest type of representation for a member of any party, be he Democrat or Republican or independent, to follow in the Senate of the United States.

As I have said, Mr. President, I represent independents. They merit recognition. The number of their representatives in the Congress of the United States may grow, I believe. They may serve to accelerate the realinement of forces within the present national parties. In either case, these hundreds of thousands of American citizens cannot be ignored merely because they have not yet learned the ways of the local political clubhouse.

Each of us here is a member of a party, but each of us here represents a constituency defined by the Constitution of the United States. Naked power can

deny to our constituencies the representation they deserve and expect; but if the junior Senator from Oregon can be denied the committee assignments to which the Constitution, the laws, the rules, and the precedents governing this body entitle him, no Senator or no constituency is safe. In my judgment, this situation is a challenge to democracy.

Mr. President, I see a constitutional issue before the Senate this afternoon.

Article V of the Constitution provides:

> No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The history of this sole unamendable provision of our charter is well known. It was designed to balance representation between the small and large States. It represents a compromise in the noblest sense of the term—a harmonization of conflicting and legitimate principles.

To deny any fraction of the normal rights of a Senator, not in his own capacity but as a representative of a State, is to compromise, in the ugliest sense of that term, a basic guaranty without which the infant ailing confederation could not have been reborn into a thriving Federal Union.

It is the history of liberty that it is eroded into bondage, not boldly attacked and subdued.

Each State and its representatives must stand equally in this forum. Any detraction from that equality is an abridgment of constitutional guaranties—in this case those which should protect the people of Oregon. Tomorrow, it could be any State in the Union.

Whether I remain on the committees on which I have served and whose work I have learned for many years is not a matter of grave importance to me as an individual. I will stand at this desk—or another—and make my views known and fight for what I believe to be true, honest, good, and in the public interest. Relegation to a minor committee might be punishment designed to make my task more difficult.

But punitive measures of this sort are not designed to punish the offending. As we well know, it is a terroristic device to inhibit the timid and shackle the weak. And for what purpose? To require regularity, compel compliance, and insure against insubordination. Who, then, is to be the judge of orthodoxy and the censor of this body? The recent past is replete with examples of freemen voting such power to their future inquisitors.

If this is not the issue, then is the issue one of party discipline? Again, I ask, for what purpose?

I believe profoundly that the majority party must have responsibility for whatever legislative program it plans. That is why, Mr. President, when there was a running debate in the press some weeks ago as to what position the junior Senator from Oregon would take on any question of organizing the Senate, each and every Member of this body who knows me should have known, without it being necessary for the junior Senator from Oregon to say so, of my deep conviction that party responsibility ought to rest upon the majority party in the Senate of the United States. I was somewhat astounded, Mr. President, that the question should continually arise, "What is the junior Senator from Oregon going to do?" When I realized that people were taking seriously the doubt as to what I was going to do, I issued my statement, and my statement was exactly that everyone should have expected. I said, "On the reorganization of the Senate of the United States I shall vote with the Republicans, because I think it perfectly clear, as a result of the election of November 4, that legislative responsibility should be placed upon the Republican Party."

I said it, Mr. President, when some doubt was expressed, at least in the press, as to what the outcome of the final official vote in some States might be as to who was going to control the Senate of the United States. I wanted my position perfectly clear, that, in my judgment, I could not possibly have justified sitting in the Senate of the United States on the basis of the result of the votes on November 4 and not vote in favor of the Republican Party organizing the Senate. But I also said in that statement, it will be recalled, that "every Republican on the floor of the Senate knows that within the hour after they get through disciplining me—I said then, "on January 3," but, of course, referring to the time when the discipline was to be imposed—that "within 1 hour after the time they got through disciplining me on January 3, if an issue came before the Senate on the merits of which I thought the Republican side of the aisle was correct I would vote with the Republicans."

Therefore, my Republican colleagues knew full well that whatever discipline they sought to inflict upon me was not going to cost them anything so far as my position on the merits of the issues immediately following the discipline or at any other time was concerned. And that is true today, because never do I intend to lower myself to the level of partisanship. I shall never sit in the Senate of the United States and cast a vote on the basis of partisanship, irrespective of what partisan punishment may be inflicted upon me for my views or course of action in the Senate of the United States. So I repeat, Mr. President, that a punitive measure of this sort is not designed to punish the offending. As we well know, it is a terroristic device to inhibit the timid and shackle the weak.

If this is not the issue, Mr. President, then, I ask again, is the issue one of party discipline; and if so, for what purpose? I not only believe profoundly that the majority party must have responsibility for whatever legislative program it plans, but to discharge that responsibility it must have the authority to report and act upon bills, and so far as Senate organization is concerned, in my judgment it is entitled to a party majority on each and every committee of the Senate of the United States. So I say it cannot exercise that party responsibility unless its avowed members have a numerical majority on each committee and can effectively move legislation through committees to consideration on the floor of the Senate. Only in that manner can our kind of representative government function, and only in that manner can a party be held accountable for what it does and what it fails and refuses to do.

No party is unitary and wholly united. I have no counsel to offer today to the two Republican Parties to enable them to act as one party.

There was a time when the minority party—the Republican Party of the 1850's—had only one or two members on some committees and none on many others — McConachie, Congressional Committees, 1908, cited in Haynes, The Senate of the United States, page 288, paragraph 4. As I go along, I shall cite my authority for each statement I make by a documentation of the authority, because I believe that on this particular issue the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should show the documentation. Of course, the reference now is to McConachie, Congressional Committees, 1908, cited in Haynes, The Senate of the United States, page 288, paragraph 4. Our form of government and the Republican Party apparently do not long sanction such inequality. The Republican Party came into power from a small minority in 1861, after the election of 1860.

There is a recognized and proper role for a minority to perform. And no one minority has a monopoly on that role—if, indeed, some live up to it at all.

Recognition of the rights of minorities is not a matter of charity, nor is it a measure of power. The Constitution is devoted in large measure to the protection of minority rights to the end that the free interchange of independently formulated ideas may enrich our society.

There is also the candid recognition that what is today a minority or a group may grow and emerge and coalesce into a new and different majority. We must look to the future and balance the precarious advantage of the hour against the uncertainties of the future.

The Senate has a constitutional obligation to apply its rules governing committee assignments even-handedly.

Haynes, the authoritative historian of the Senate, at page 294 of his book previously cited, states:

> Once placed upon a congenial committee, a Senator is likely to retain that assignment as long as he remains in the Senate, or until he requests to be excused from further service thereon.

I repeat, Mr. President, because in my study of the precedents of this problem, I think Haynes is right, save and except for the one exception to which I shall refer shortly, that the history of the Senate of the United States, so far as the matter of committee assignments is concerned has been that, once placed upon a congenial committee, as Haynes points out, a Senator is likely to retain that assignment as long as he remains in the Senate, or until he requests to be excused from further service thereon.

I digress at this point, Mr. President, because I think it is an appropriate place to insert it, that I would have my colleagues in the Senate this afternoon not treat the term "seniority" as referring merely to one type of seniority in the Senate of the United States. I would have my colleagues keep in mind, if they will study the history of the development of the Senate rules, that seniority is a two-pronged phenomenon, seniority in the Senate and seniority in committee.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues that seniority in the Senate is a matter of senatorial jurisdiction by the entire body over each Member of the Senate, and seniority within committee is a matter of jurisdiction by the parties represented on the committee. In my conversations with some of my colleagues I respectfully say that in some instances they were not, in my opinion, drawing this distinction, because each and every Member of this body has a precious interest in seniority in its total meaning in the Senate of the United States—seniority in the Senate and seniority on committees.

Mr. President, I want to say, because I always put my cards on top of the table, that I assumed that in the assignment of committees the Senate of the United States would not weaken the precious right of every Member of this body to his seniority in the Senate when it came to the assignment of Members to committees, and that it would follow the precedent established by the United States Senate, which, with one exception, has been to leave a Senator on a committee until he himself asked to be removed from it. But if left on the committee I fully expected—and I would have taken the position that it was the right of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States to take such action—to be reduced to the bottom of the committee table, so far as seniority on the committee is concerned. It is my view that as a member of the committee and a member of a third party, I would have to stand, so far as my seniority rights on the committee were concerned, with reference to my membership in the party, and that would make me, from the standpoint of committee seniority, a freshman on the committee. But that would not be my seniority status in the Senate of the United States. As the statistics will show, I am one of the "upper classmen" in the Senate, so far as Senate seniority is concerned.

The all but unbroken rule of this body is that a Senator once assigned to a committee is not thereafter removed in contravention of his seniority without his consent. I am talking, in that sense, about Senate seniority and not committee seniority. To do otherwise, to apply special rules to individual cases, is to deny equal representation in the Senate to each State.

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

No issue of committee assignments, whether to rebels who remained in a party, to those who incurred the wrath of party leaders, or to third-party representatives, ever came before the Senate when legislation governing committee assignments was in force.

Rule XXV—page 40 of the Manual—provides in part:

4. Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

No such explicit enactment was on the books when similar, but different, cases were before this body.

Mr. President, the rule requires that each Senator shall serve on two committees. That is mandatory language. The remainder of the sentence is permissive and points up the command of the first portion.

The purpose and application of this provision are most relevant to its requirements.

Congress, after many years of considering measures of this type, enacted this remedial code of conduct. In main part it was designed to eliminate the confusion and duplication of some 34 committees which had no defined jurisdiction. Some old committees, such as that on manufactures, were eliminated as useless and as unused as the human appendix. Other committees of similar and overlapping jurisdiction were combined. This was a rational act for a rational purpose.

Senate committees were to function as the opposite number of the same committee in the House and of the principal Government agencies. Only by specialization by committees and members could the Congress cope with the growing complexities of Government. Committee membership was designed to impart the knowledge and expertness which only long association and experience can give.

This in miniature was a parallel to the decision of the Founding Fathers who chose a 6-year term for Senators—one not so long as to breed an autocratic body out of touch with the people, but with sufficient tenure to provide continuity, experience, and stability to the Republic.

This was well expressed in the Federalist—No. 62:

Another defect to be supplied by a Senate lies in a want of due acquaintance with the objects and principles of legislation. It is not possible that an assembly of men called for the most part from pursuits of a private nature, continued in appointment for a short time, and led by no permanent motive to devote the intervals of public occupation to a study of the laws, the affairs, and the comprehensive interests of their country, should, if left wholly to themselves, escape a variety of important errors in the exercise of their legislative trust. It may be affirmed, on the best grounds, that no small share of the present embarrassments of America is to be charged on the blunders of our governments; and that these have proceeded from the heads rather than the hearts of most of the authors of them. What indeed are all the repealing, explaining, and amending laws, which fill and disgrace our voluminous codes, but so many monuments of deficient wisdom; so many impeachments exhibited by each succeeding against each preceding session; so many admonitions to the people, of the value of those aids which may be expected from a well-constituted Senate?

I am not reading about the Government of the United States in 1953, Mr. President, although this language aptly applies, in my judgment, to the Government of the United States in 1953. I am reading from the Federalist, about the problems which arose legislatively almost at the time of the birth of the Nation itself.

A good government implies two things: first, fidelity to the object of government, which is the happiness of the people; secondly, a knowledge of the means by which that object can be best attained.

This was in the forefront of the minds of those who fashioned the Reorganization Act. Senator La Follette, who fathered and guided the measure through the Senate, stated during the debate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, page 6533:

The second principle was in that process to gather together in the jurisdiction of the reorganized committees the principal and related subject matters of their respective areas of jurisdiction, in order that Senators might become familiar with those subjects, in order that they might become better informed, and in order that those who did so become informed through service would bring the light of their experience and information to bear, insofar as possible, upon all matters of a similar nature. That thread runs all the way through this reorganization proposal.

I think that is a pretty sound statement, Mr. President, one which my colleagues in the Senate should keep uppermost in their minds today as they come to pass upon the issue which I raise before the Senate.

That was the position taken by one of the fathers of the Reorganization Act. There sits on this floor today a Senator from Oklahoma, the other major author of the Reorganization Act [Mr. MONRONEY]. I dare say that if he wishes to participate later on in the afternoon in this discussion as to the meaning and the purpose of the Reorganization Act, upon the basis of which the junior Senator from Oregon rests a part of his case, he will agree with the quotation which I just read from the former Senator from Wisconsin when he referred to the action taken by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Senator White, of Maine, then the minority leader, stated in the course of the hearings—hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, page 394:

It is a perfectly terrific headache * * * to make committee assignments. We have * * * in the Senate followed the practice that seniority has been the determining factor.

Senator Burton also endorsed the merits of committee assignment by seniority—in the same place, page 812.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], then a distinguished Representative and a recognized student of parliamentary organization, observed that the seniority system had weaknesses, but stated that he could offer no practical alternative—in the same place, page 72.

And of great force are the precedents of 157 years of Senate practice which, under the ordinary rules of legislative construction, may be taken to have been adopted and ratified by the act.

The application of the act in 1947, the first year of its use—at the outset of the famous Eightieth Congress—further supports this view.

The long-time chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], was ranked on that committee above colleagues of less seniority who came from the Military Affairs Committee, such as Senators HILL and KILGORE, by virtue of his lengthier service on the Committee on Naval Affairs. And, quite obviously, in compress-

ing military and naval affairs it was the less senior on both who gave way to the more senior on both.

Of the 95 other Senators in this present body, only 27 have had continuous service predating that of the junior Senator from Oregon—11 Republicans and 16 Democrats. I say to them, as I say to the newest freshman Senator, the principles which you apply to me are the selfsame principles that apply to you. They are the rules which have advanced and will advance you in recognition of years of service and experience.

I read in the newspapers, which, by choice, is where I learn about the Republican Party, that there is some slight misunderstanding about senatorial courtesy and the distribution of patronage. Tomorrow one or more of my colleagues may find themselves in open conflict with the adopted leader of their party.

The majority and minority leaders have today introduced, not an order for committee assignments, but a flashing two-handled samurai sword. Mr. President, in addition to two handles, that sword has two glistening edges. Indeed, it is far too big to rend merely one Senator. It may have so much momentum that the Senate will look like an Alice in Wonderland garden party.

PAST ACTIONS OF THE SENATE

I have researched the precedents of the Senate and consulted the erudite Parliamentarian of the Senate, and plumbed biographies and political commentaries.

I can report that this search has uncovered but one instance, out of many conflicts, in which a Senator has been removed from a committee in contravention of his seniority.

That single reprisal is a disgraceful one which occurred in 1871, the first year of General Grant's administration. I suggest that the crusade of the new administration avoid such militant examples.

Senator Sumner, who had served so admirably during many years, came into collision with the general on a matter of foreign policy. The Republican caucus not only voted to demote Sumner from the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, but excluded him from that committee entirely. Sumner refused to accept any other committee assignments thereafter—Haynes, The Senate of the United States, 1938, pages 302–303. In all its history, no political disagreement, no political divorce, led to such an outcome.

There were several instances in which overage Senators, or Senators who opposed party leaders, were denied continuation as committee chairmen; but in no such case was the Senator who fell or fought from favor removed from the committee on which he sat.

So the redoubtable Stephen Douglas, who had supported Buchanan for the Presidency, bitterly and publicly opposed him on the important issue of the Kansas Constitution. In 1859, Douglas was not continued as chairman of the Committee on Territories, but remained as next ranking member and retained his post and seniority on another major committee—Johnson, Life of Stephen A. Douglas, 1908, pages 277–279, 395–396.

Senator Cummins was passed over for continuation as a committee chairman, primarily because of old age; but unpopular views were a consideration. Nonetheless, he was ranked as second among his party on that committee—Haynes, pages 303–304.

Senator Ladd and three colleagues who were Republicans, or had accepted committee assignments from the Republican Party, had campaigned for "Old Bob" La Follette for President in 1924. La Follette died before the Senate organized in 1925. The victorious Republicans excluded his supporters from the party conference, and voted to demote Senator Ladd from the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee.

I am always appreciative when kindness is shown me. There is this difference between the situation now and that in 1925, when Senator Ladd and the others were excluded from the party conference: I was not excluded from the party conference. The Republicans were very kind to send me an official invitation, as every other Republican in the Senate received one, to attend the party conference. But I felt, under the circumstances in which I found myself, and in view of the course of action I intend to pursue in American politics as an independent, that it certainly would not be in good taste for me, or very sporting of me, to attend a conference of a party to which I no longer belonged. However, I wish to say to my Republican friends in the Senate that I deeply appreciate the invitation.

In 1925 the situation was a little different, Mr. President. The Republicans who, so the records show, had supported, old Bob La Follette in 1924 were not invited to the party conference, but neither were they removed from their committees. They did deny to Senator Ladd his committee chairmanship but not his committee membership. At least that is what the research on this subject shows. Over the opposition of Senators Norris and Borah, the Senate upheld that determination. But none was banished to the captive city of the District of Columbia. Each continued on the committees on which he was serving—some with loss of intracommittee seniority—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 67, part 1, pages 14–17, 41 and the following, April 7 and 9, 1925, Haynes, page 291.

It should be noted that Ladd asserted that he remained a Republican and did not seek appointment as an independent. I would not contend that a nonmember of the majority should be a committee chairman, as I have already stated. Nor would I contend that a nonmember of the majority should even be assigned to committees by the majority, except as members of the majority act as individual Members of the Senate on the floor of the Senate, considering this problem as a problem of the Committee of the Whole.

Norris himself later campaigned for Al Smith, while Senator Heflin crossed over to support Hoover. Neither was subjected to any reprisal, and Norris continued in the powerful chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee.

Referring for a moment to the situation in 1925, Burton K. Wheeler, a Democrat, who was vice presidential candidate on the ticket in 1924 with La Follette, called me some time ago and said he wanted to tell me he knew what I was going through, and that he greatly sympathized with the position in which I found myself. He then went on to discuss with me briefly, over the telephone, some of the incidents of 1925, and he pointed out that no so-called party disciplinary action was taken against him as a result of his campaign for the vice presidency on a third-party ticket. I may say again that such disciplinary action does not concern me one way or the other, Mr. President. But he went on to say that his seniority rights, insofar as his committee positions were concerned, were in no way affected by his course of action.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF INDEPENDENTS

Early newly elected independents did not fare too well. Senators Hale and Salmon P. Chase, Free Soilers, refused appointments as Whigs or Democrats and sought to act as their own committee on committees in the 1850's. They were given no assignments, but the rules did not require committee service, as the Legislative Reorganization Act does today. In 1853 the Whigs refused to name Sumner to a committee, but left a vacancy on a minor one, to which the Democrats appointed him. But in 1855 the emerging Republicans were given a role in committee assignments, and were not merely put on committees without consultation—Haynes, pages 287–288.

In later years Populists and Farmer-Laborites were given a voice in their committee assignments.

Haynes sums up the situation as follows:

> The shifting of party strength or the advent of a new party group may call for readjustment most easily met by the enlargement of the committees (Haynes, p. 278).

I wish to repeat that sentence, because it will deal with one of two possible motions which I shall make later this afternoon. Haynes states:

> The shifting of party strength or the advent of a new party group may call for readjustment most easily met by the enlargement of the committees.
>
> Thus * * * in the Sixty-eighth Congress additional places were provided for the members of the Farmer-Labor Party upon several of the committees to which they were assigned (Haynes).

It is just this plan which I propose to the Senate. I would add that my proposal is reenforced by the Reorganization Act, which certainly was not in force in the instances cited. Moreover, I have an accumulated seniority which none of the Populists, nor Farmer-Laborites, nor Free Soilers had when they made their claims.

I suggest to the Senate that I will be no less vocal nor active when labor or defense legislation is before the Senate if I am not on the committees which consider such measures.

I shudder to think that some of my colleagues would prefer my absence from committee deliberations for the reason that I have some unique experience to offer—such as my unsettling survey of military waste in NATO, based upon an inspection tour of NATO bases requiring

more than 30,000 miles of travel during the past fall, with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. This was an investigation the results of which, in part, will be set forth in a committee report which we intend to release to the Senate within the very near future; and we shall release to the Armed Services Committee, in executive session, certain observations which, for security reasons, should not be made public in a Senate report.

THE SENATE IS A CONTINUING BODY

At the very opening of this Congress the Senate engaged in a historic debate over its rules. Many Senators argued that new rules could be adopted by a majority on the theory that the Senate is not a continuing body. The opponents of the rule change, led by the majority leader, contended vociferously that the Senate is a continuing body.

In support of this stand, the Republican policy committee brief—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1953, pages 165 to 178—cited the continuing nature of Senate committees—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1953, page 170. In my comments upon this controversy I argued that new rules could be adopted—but supported the argument that this body continues to exist without a break.

I digress to say one day during that debate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said to me in the cloak room, "I have not heard you participate in the debate." I replied that I was listening to the debate, but that he had not heard me participate in a discussion of the issue of whether or not the Senate was a continuing body because I had grave doubts about the legal validity of the argument that the Senate is not a continuing body. A check of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that when I came to the point of making my final decision as to the position I should take on the Anderson motion, I made it clear that I was taking my position not on the basis of the issue as to whether or not the Senate is a continuing body, because I stated that there were those of us in the Senate who favored the motion, but for another reason.

I then set forth my position, that I favored the Anderson motion on the basis of the argument that, as a matter of sound public policy, I believed that at the beginning of this session of Congress we should amend rule XXII, not on the ground that the Senate is a continuing body, or is not a continuing body, but on the ground that I felt that the beginning of the session offered the best time opportunity for amending a rule which, in my judgment, must be amended if the Senate is ever to return to the application of the majority-vote principle.

The precedents of the Senate show that all committees continue without changes in membership except those necessary to insure numerical control and chairmanship by membership of the majority party.

Haynes, the Senate historian, observes:

> When a party gets the opportunity to reorganize the Senate committees, therefore, it does not mean a wholesale overturn. To cite the illustration of most moment in the Republican reorganization in 1919: In the previous Congress the Committee on Foreign Relations had included 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans. Under the new organization that ratio was precisely reversed. The Democrats were reduced to 7 by dropping the minority Senators who had seen shortest service on the committee; to bring the Republican membership up to 10 there were added to the 6 holdover Republicans 4 new men.

I submit to the Senate that it cannot one week argue that the Senate is a continuing body and then the next week take a contrary position for political expediency. It is the history of this body that a Senator once elected has continuous membership in the Senate. It is the practice of this body that once assigned to a committee, a Senator has continuing membership upon that committee unless he is the least senior of the minority who must be displaced in order to insure majority control.

There can be no doubt that the Senate has the naked power to do what the majority leader proposes that it do, but the issue of power should not be dispositive in any parliamentary group and is not the determining factor with the electorate.

There is no legal appeal from the decision of the Senate, but Senators must justify their action to the American people and to their consciences.

What the Senate does today may live to plague many Members here. Any breach of law and precedent which they permit themselves to indulge in may be designed to injure me for partisan political purposes today. I will not be injured. But, I warn the Senate that the history of the decay of democracy is pitted with incidents of this kind. The hounds of today may very well be the hares of tomorrow.

It is the duty of Senators today to bolster the rules which have been made for the protection of all the people, each State, and every Member of this body. Only in that way can they protect their future individual integrity as Senators.

In closing I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the full meaning of seniority rights in the Senate of the United States. I believe seniority to mean that each Member has seniority rights as a Member of the Senate itself; and, of course, he has seniority rights, as a member of a party, on committees of the Senate.

I want my colleagues in the Senate to keep in mind the fact that today it may be the junior Senator from Oregon against whom this particular action is taken, an action almost singular in the history of the Senate. Tomorrow it may be someone else in the Senate who answers, as did I, the call of his own conscience as to what intellectual honesty compels him to do in the midst of a political campaign. I have no regrets for answering that question of conscience, and I am perfectly willing to be judged in terms of history by the answers I gave in the course of the campaign, and by future events as they develop with the oncoming administration.

I wish to say to my friends in the Senate: "Keep in mind, whether you like it or not, that history places you in a position this afternoon where you will be voting for the first time on a precedent under the Reorganization Act of 1946, and that a vote in favor of carrying out the proposal now before the Senate would be to remove the junior Senator from Oregon from two committees on which he now presently serves, and thus would establish a precedent which you may some day rue, because you may discover that it was a precedent created at a time when you turned your heads away from the great historic precedents of the Senate."

Mr. President, at the appropriate time—because I propose to listen to the debate on the subject—and so that my colleagues will have notice of what my plan is for the afternoon, I shall move that the Senate elect me a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that I may continue, on the basis of my seniority in the Senate, my many years of service on those committees, and give to them my knowledge and experience gained from my previous work on them.

I may also at a later time make a motion, depending upon the parliamentary situation, that, if the Senate prefers, it may enlarge those two committees by placing on them an additional member of the majority party, along with the junior Senator from Oregon as the member of a minority party.

My study of the parliamentary situation satisfies me that such a motion would be a perfectly appropriate one, although I am aware of the fact that to make it, it would be necessary to serve notice of the motion and have it lie on the table for a day, and then have it taken up at the next session of the Senate.

I may say also that I have sought, and shall continue to seek, to discuss the subject on the basis of principles, not on the basis of personalities. I assure my friends in the Senate that I have no personal bitterness about it. I fully understood, when I took the course of action which I took during the recent campaign, that undoubtedly I would create problems for myself in the Senate parliamentarily and procedurally speaking. However, Mr. President, no one in this body has the right to question the right of a Senator to enter the sanctum of his own conscience. When one enters that sanctum he goes into communion with his Creator.

When I came out of that communion, Mr. President, I had to answer in the affirmative the pounding question of my conscience which had been bombarding me day and night for a period of time theretofore:

> Do you not owe a duty to the country to do more than merely refuse to campaign for your party? Do you not owe a duty, on the basis of the convictions which you have reached, to tell the people of your country why you think the leader of the party to which you have belonged should not be elected President of the United States?

When I came out of that sanctum and communion I knew that the answer to the question was "Yes." I proceeded to act accordingly. I proceeded to keep faith with the principle of political ethics for which I have stood in American politics since I was elected to the Senate.

Back in 1944, when my good friend from Minnesota, Joe Ball, a Republican Senator, campaigned for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President of the United States, I made a public statement then, that when Senator Ball took that position he should have resigned from the Republican Party.

I drew the distinction in 1944—and I have repeated it many times since—that a man holding high office in one of the parties has the right to take a walk. By that I have always explained I meant that he had the right to refuse to campaign for his party's candidate and to remain silent, so to speak; but he had no right, as a matter of political ethics, to bolt his party and campaign for the candidate of the party of the opposition without resigning from his party.

Thus, Mr. President, when I answered the question of my conscience as to what was my duty in the 1952 campaign I proceeded to transcribe a speech for delivery in the State of Oregon, in which I first made my announcement of resignation from the Republican Party. I said that I would keep faith with what I had told the people of Oregon many times, namely, that if I ever found myself in a position where I felt my conscience directed me to bolt my party I would resign from it. That I did. I also told them in that speech, as I have in other speeches, that I would continue for the next 4 years to exercise an honest independence of judgment and to do what was right on the merits of an issue, and then let the people determine in 1956, when I run as a candidate for reelection to the Senate, as an independent, whether they want that kind of representation.

I shall always be glad to abide by the decision of the voters at the ballot box. I may say to my political opposition that I shall do my best in 1956 to bring to the State of Oregon a campaign of political education on the merits of the issues, so that the people of Oregon will know clearly how I stand on the merits of the issues. I have complete confidence that once they know the facts they will approve the kind of independent representation I will have given them for 12 years in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has discussed various constitutional questions and various questions of conscience, which are interesting, and which no doubt will be the subject of discussion, but which, in my opinion, have no relation to the issue before the Senate today.

The problem arises today because of a peculiar situation with respect to the number of Members of the Senate and because of the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act, as amended recently by unanimous vote of the Senate. That fact does not change the basic situation. There are certain fundamental facts on which I believe we can agree and with respect to which the distinguished Senator from Oregon also agrees.

One of them is that in the Senate today there are 48 Republicans and 47 Democrats and 1 independent. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has made that clear. He said in a speech a few days ago:

> I wish to say that I do not want to be assigned to committees by the Republican Party.

We did not assign him to committees. He said further:

> I happen to stand alone in the Senate today as an independent, and there are thousands like me across the Nation.

He said also:

> The last third-party Member of the Senate was the distinguished Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of the State of Wisconsin.

He implied that he regards himself as a member of a third party.

Therefore we have three parties in the Senate. The only reason that we control the Senate, more or less by sufferance at the moment, is that on the 20th of January the new Vice President will take office and under the rule he is permitted to vote when there is a tie. The Republican control of the Senate is not based upon the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I think it is also obvious that we operate under the two-party system.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon made the statement this afternoon that the majority should clearly have control of all committees of the Senate. As a matter of fact, under the La Follette-Monroney Act, no provision was made for a condition in which a majority was acquired by 48 Senators and the Vice President. That act provided for a condition in which the proportion would be 49 to 47, but did not provide for a condition in which a majority would be obtained under such conditions as prevail today.

The result is that we have assigned all the Republican Senators to all the committee positions to which we are entitled under the La Follette-Monroney Act. We cannot put another Republican Senator on another committee. We might shift the committee assignments; but after doing that we still would fall two short of controlling all the committees of the Senate. That is because under the La Follette-Monroney Act there could be only 11 more majority members than minority members on the committees, under the present party membership situation in the Senate. The result is that we can have control of 13 of the standing committees of the Senate, but we cannot have control of the other two standing committees of the Senate. I did my best to persuade the distinguished minority leader and the minority whip and the other minority members that they should do their best to give us 15 more members who could serve on three committees. But they were not open to persuasion. Perhaps they might be later. However, the action taken had to be taken by substantially majority consent, and I had to yield on that point.

Consequently, under present circumstances there is no way by which we could assign the Senator from Oregon to two committees and still could avoid creating such a situation that the Senator from Oregon, together with the Democratic Members of those committees, would be in control of the committees. Therefore, Mr. President, the present situation is that there are two committees which the Republicans in the Senate cannot control. That is the only reason why the present action has been taken.

I certainly disown any idea of vengeance or punishment, so far as I am concerned. I only say that if we cannot control two committees, by reason of the present situation, it seemed to me or to the Republican conference, at least, that the only thing we could do was to lose control of the two least important committees in the Senate. That is the only reason why the assignment position of the distinguished Senator from Oregon is as it now is. We left vacancies on those two committees; we have not appointed a majority of Republican Senators to the Committee on the District of Columbia or to the Committee on Public Works. We have appointed a minority of Republicans to those two committees. As I have said, I do not know any alternative.

I would not have objected to the motion which the distinguished Senator from Oregon says he would like to make, namely, that two additional Senators be added, one of whom may be a Republican and one of whom may be himself. But if that is going to be done, I do not think we can hold up the appointment of committees while it is done. I suggest that such a resolution be submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that serious consideration be given to the problem.

I have been very much interested in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I shall not be chairman of that committee, but I shall still be a member of it. So far as I am concerned, if that committee were organized with eight Republican members, six Democratic members, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I would be delighted to have him serve on the committee. I do not raise the objection on that point.

The same thing is true, I believe, of the Committee on Armed Services. But I do not see what choice we have under the present circumstances.

I do not think there is any inherent right of the Senator from Oregon not to be "bumped" off of committees. A number of Democratic Senators are being "bumped" off of committees today, under the rules. The distinguished Senator from Oregon claims some right because he was on those committees; but he was on them as a Republican Senator. He was not on those committees as an independent. If he has started a third party and if now he asks assignment as a member of a third party, I cannot see what seniority as a Republican Senator has to do with the question of where as a minority party member he shall be assigned, or that any constitutional question is involved or that there is any reflection on the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He simply faces a condition of the rules under which there seems to be no choice except for us to say, "Very well, if there is not to be Republican control of all the committees, then we are going to vacate control of the two least important committees in the Senate." That is the whole case here, Mr. President.

We have not proposed committee assignents for the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. We have undertaken to propose appointment of a majority of Republican Senators to the 13 most important committees of the Senate. Thirteen of the standing committees are the most to which we could assign a majority of Republican Senators.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would not the distinguished majority leader say, as well, that we recommended assignments to committees until we ran out of requests, and the two vacancies are those for which we had no requests?

Mr. TAFT. That is essentially the condition.

Mr. CASE. Yes. Would not the distinguished Senator from Ohio also say that under the seniority principle where there was on a committee a vacancy that was available to the Republicans, it was only natural to make the assignment within the requests available?

Mr. TAFT. I think that was really our duty to those who are members of the Republican Party.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has come up in reference to the mechanics of the committee situation, I should like to make one or two observations. I do so pursuant to the studies which it became necessary for me to make when I was asked by the chairman of the Republican conference to serve as chairman of a special committee on the size and numbers of committees.

One does not deal with that problem very long before he recognizes that there is a certain tyranny in numbers, and that when there is an odd number of committees and an odd number of assignments to each committee, it becomes mathematically impossible, in view of the existing limitations, to arrive at a situation where an extra single Senator can be assigned to any given committee; that is to say, it becomes mathematically impossible to assign an additional Member who is an independent to a committee unless an additional majority member is assigned to that committee, for otherwise the possibility of majority control would be destroyed.

The reform the Senate adopted the other day when it adopted the amendment to the rule regarding the size and number of committees will, in my judgment, go down as one of the most important reforms that have been made in the organization of the Senate.

When we had 15 committees, the Appropriations Committee with 21 members, and 14 other committees of 13 members each, the workload was presumed to be about the same for all 14 of those other committees. However, practice and experience have demonstrated that the workload on some committees is greater than that on other committees. That was particularly noticeable, perhaps, in the case of the Committee on the Judiciary, which was reporting more than half of the bills acted upon by the Senate.

We had 13 members assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations to handle relations with the world; we also had 13 members assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia to handle affairs of only the Capital. We had 13 members assigned to the committee charged with the housekeeping of the Nation—namely, the Committee on Finance; and we had 13 members assigned to the committee charged with the housekeeping of the Senate; namely, the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Operation under that rule, when there was a fairly close-party division of the membership of the Senate, and particularly when a large number of new Members came to the Senate, was difficult for a minority party. It was difficult 2 years ago when a number of new Senators came in on the Republican side. It was difficult this time—perhaps even more so, in fact—when the Democratic side, with a loss of two members, lost control of the committees, and had to lose not merely those two positions, but also the 11 committee assignments to which they had been entitled under the Reorganization Act, under which 11 members could serve on a third standing committee.

The change in the rule which we recomended the other day and which the Senate adopted—whereby certain committees were increased by two members, to the extent of a total of nine committees, being the Appropriations Committee and eight other standing committees—created 18 new positions in committees in which there were most requests for assignments. Two committees were left as they are at 13 members. Two committees were reduced by two members each. Two committees were reduced by four members each. These changes, coupled with the change in the rule, whereby not merely 11 but 14 members of the majority might serve on a third committee, along with three additional minority members, preserved the old 11-member margin or difference for the majority, but did make possible the assignment of 18 more Senators on the desired committees and 12 fewer assignments to committees for which there were fewer requests. The difference of 6—between the 12 decreases and the 18 increases—was accomplished by permitting the three additional majority members and 3 minority members to serve on a third committee.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon in his remarks this afternoon has used the word "discipline." In the deliberations of the committee on the size and number of committees, a special committee within the Republican conference, and in the deliberations of the committee on committees of the Republican conference, the word "discipline" was never used within my hearing. The final action of the Republican conference, as has been indicated by both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, was simply taking the statement of the Senator from Oregon at his word the other day when he said that he did not desire an assignment by the Republican caucus or the Republican conference. He said that on the floor January 7, so the Republican conference did not presume to give him an assignment. But after following his request in that respect, the Republican conference found that it could not then refuse assignments to complete the Republican quota for the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor, when there were Republicans who had asked for those committees, and who were entitled under their seniority to ask for those assignments. So that all that happened was that finally there were two spots left, one on Public Works and one on District of Columbia, for which there were no requests. That is the situation which confronts the Senate today.

The suggestion by the Senator from Oregon that he hopes at some time to propose an increase in the membership of those two particular committees, by permitting the majority to add a member and permitting a second minority, the independent, also to add a member, is a matter which may have considerable merit.

As a matter of fact, that would have been accomplished, had the first proposal of the committee on size and numbers of the committees been accepted. That was the proposal, that the majority be permitted to have 18 members on a third committee, the minority to have 3 members. That would have established a difference of 15 between the majority and minority spots.

But we were unable to reach agreement on that, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, so that we had to revert to the 14 majority and 3 minority, maintaining the old 11 marginal difference between the two. That is a technical situation that can be considered, and I think it would be a legitimate subject for the Senator from Oregon to propose and for the Senate to consider at an appropriate time. But as of today, under the rule which the Senate adopted the other day, there was nothing that could be done except to respect the request of the Senator from Oregon that he not be assigned by the Republican conference. Consequently, that was the final action taken. He was not assigned or recommended for assignment by the Republican conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I want to make a few replies to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from Ohio pointed out that as he sees it the Republican Senators had no choice but to follow the course of action they followed. I shall give him another choice before the afternoon is over, and he will have to decide on the merits of the two respective choices.

He points out in the second place that other Members of the Senate are being bumped from committees by this report. But by that argument, Mr. President, he fails to recognize the difference between my seniority rights as a Senator and the seniority rights of a committee member. The only bumping that can be justified under the rules of seniority is bumping the low man on a committee when an election changes the majority control of the Senate from one party to another. However, my case is not that kind of a

case. My case rests upon my 8 years of seniority in the Senate. The Senator from Ohio is referring to another type of seniority and to the long established precedent that the policy has been to eliminate from committees the members of the committees who have low committee seniority.

There is no objection to that. That is a problem of committee seniority within a party. I would expect that by the Republicans to Republicans and by the Democrats to Democrats. The Democrats cannot all stay on the committees after the majority has changed.

But I would remind the Senator from Ohio of the important fact which distinguishes my case from the cases that he has cited. The matter being dealt with here is that of replacement of a minority Member of the Senate on committees to which he has 8 years of seniority. What seniority is going to control so far as that minority Member is concerned? By simply saying there is no other choice it is impossible to wash away the fact that this given minority Member has 8 years of seniority in the Senate of the United States. It is impossible to wash away the fact that, save and except for the one precedent I suggested, involving Sumner, the Senate, in its 157 years of history, has not removed from a committee a Member of this body when he has asked to retain his membership on the committee. All the Senate needs to do is to respect my seniority rights as a Senator if it is to keep faith with the historical precedents of the Senate.

Then I would make the point—and in this respect I certainly agree with the Senator from Ohio, and I have said so from the beginning of this controversy—that I think the majority ought to be placed in a position where it has full responsibility for committee actions; which means they must be given a majority on the committees.

Let us take a look at the Armed Services Committee for a moment, and its record. There are on the floor, several members of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I see no others present at this time, except the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who, at least until this moment, is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am perfectly willing to say in their presence as my witnesses that I do not think they can cite a single vote in the Armed Services Committee, since the junior Senator from Oregon has been a member, that can be classified in the slightest degree whatever as a party-line vote. When we have walked into the Armed Services Committee, we have parked all partisanship at the door, because as 13 men we have always been aware of the great peril that confronts our country, and in my judgment, that peril is greater at this hour than it has been at any time since the close of the military hostilities of World War II. In 41 of the reports of the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Service Committee—and they are all the committee reports we have submitted—the members of the subcommittee of which it has been my honor to be a member, have been unanimous. Never have we submitted a report, Mr. President, which has not been unanimous. An effort may be made by a process of rationalization, to leave the impression that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee endangers the control of that committee by the Republicans. There is no basis in reality for that fear because so long as I am on that committee I shall continue as I have in the past, to approach each and every problem of that committee, in view of the great peril which confronts our country, as a nonpartisan, as I believe all Democratic and all Republican members of the committee have done. Let us not make a great issue out of a mere matter of form.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in one second. So far as the Armed Services Committee is concerned, Mr. President, I submit it is an argument of form and not of substance to argue that if the junior Senator from Oregon is left on the Armed Services Committee, the Republican majority control of that committee will be jeopardized.

I now yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not state that I know that what the Senator from Oregon is saying is true. Having been chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which worked practically around the clock during the closing days of the previous session of the Congress, I know of the long hours the Senator from Oregon devoted to that subcommittee. He is one of the best experts in America as to what our defense bases cost.

I was with the Senator from Oregon on a trip during which we inspected a great number of military bases. We spent approximately 6 weeks working on the problem. Last year we reduced the authorization for those bases approximately 30 percent without affecting the ability of the Nation to defend itself one bit. We ascertained where reductions could be made without imperiling defense or reducing our ability to fight, and at the same time made it possible to spend our money in a way which would give our Nation a better defense program.

I very much regret leaving the Committee on Armed Services, although I have always had an ambition to be on the Committee on Finance. I know that the Senator from Oregon has given very great service to the Nation on the Committee on Armed Services, and it would be a loss to the Nation to be deprived of the services of the junior Senator from Oregon on that committee. I hope something can be worked out so that the Senator will continue to serve on that committee and give the Nation the benefit of the long study we made last year with regard to the costs of all defense bases, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars. Personally, Mr. President, I am convinced that perhaps billions of dollars can be saved without in any way reducing the ability of the Nation to fight, if sufficient effort is made to reduce the amounts requested.

The Senator from Oregon has given a great amount of study to the subject, and I hope he will continue as a member of the committee.

I might say, Mr. President, that the committee voted to reduce the amount of money being authorized for almost every defense base in America on an average of approximately three and one-half million dollars for each base last year. The vote was unanimous on every occasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say that I would be very much less than human if I did not appreciate very much the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana. He is well aware of my very high opinion of the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee. I desire on this occasion to extend to him my sincere thanks for the expression of confidence in me which he has just made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is true that the distinguished majority leader and the junior Senator from Oregon have not agreed on all phases of the Taft-Hartley Act, but what is not generally known by the public is that the Senator from Ohio and I are in agreement in principle on more proposals for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act than we are in disagreement.

In 1949 the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] held a series of personal conferences with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and myself. My recollection—subject to correction, but I think it is an accurate time bracket—is that those consultations continued, off and on, over a period of approximately 10 days. We reached many agreements in principle on what the amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be in 1949——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is not quite correct to say that the conferences were personal conferences. They were meetings of all the Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, including the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself. At that time the Senator was conferring as a Republican, trying to reach a Republican program upon which we could all agree.

Mr. MORSE. We were trying to reach a public program, not a Republican program. There is quite a difference.

Mr. TAFT. It was, however, a caucus of the Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to accept that correction, but with one modification, because I want to help the Senator refresh his memory a bit. I think he will recall also that there were some instances in which private conversations were held between the Senator from New York, the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Oregon, as to what position we would take when the matter reached the floor of the Senate.

I can recall distinctly one conference among others, in the cloakroom, when I said to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio that I agreed with many of the proposals for amendment which the Senator from Ohio was suggesting, but I did not want to go along with the package proposal, because, as the Senator will recall, the great difference which existed between us was a difference over the direction that amendments to the injunction issue and the secondary boycott issue should take.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I well recall some of the things which occurred in 1949, and I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Oregon a question.

Does he really think that as an independent, no longer affiliated with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, he should be a swing man, in a position where, by his one vote, he could decide questions as between the two parties?

Mr. MORSE. That is just the point I am about to discuss.

Mr. IVES. I wish the Senator would discuss it, because if that is his position, I do not agree with him.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to discuss it, because the question itself, Mr. President, shows a political emphasis which I do not share. The question put by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] implies that when we sit in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we are motivated by partisan considerations; that we are going to place partisan considerations first, and are going to think in terms of whether we are going to swing one partisan way or the other in the committee.

I submit most respectfully, Mr. President, that only one principle should guide us on that committee or on any other committee, and that is the principle of what happens to be the merits of the issue before the committee from the standpoint of the welfare of the country. That is the issue, and that is the only issue the Senator from Oregon has ever voted on in committee or will ever vote on in committee. The Senator from New York has been a distinguished and exceedingly able and valuable member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare——

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I have never known the Senator from New York to cast any vote because of a partisan interest. If I continue on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a vote of the Senate, I shall continue in exactly the same attitude that has characterized my work on that committee for 8 years.

I think the Senator from New York knows that full well, and he knows that deep conviction of the junior Senator from Oregon, and that is that a party label is not going to be a determining factor in his voting on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one way or the other on the merits of any issue. He will vote in accordance with what he thinks is right. I know that is what the Senator from New York himself does on that committee.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York would like to point out that he appreciates what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said about him. I have always tried to vote on that particular committee and at all other times in accordance with what I believed to be for the best welfare of the United States. But let it be understood that the Senator from New York at no time has or will ever set himself up as the one who decides finally as to what is best for the United States of America. The Senator from New York is inclined to yield to the majority when it finally insists on its way—sometimes with reluctance, but always with the feeling that the majority should have its way.

The Senator from Oregon is apparently attempting to put himself between the two sides which are to be divided equally, to determine, himself, what is best for the United States of America, assuming the two sides happen to be in disagreement.

That is where I disagree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say most respectfully, in reply to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that the attitude which he accredits to me or with which he charges me, if I am allowed to retain my membership on that committee, is a figment of his own imagination. It has no basis in fact whatsoever.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield when I finish my statement.

It has no bearing in fact whatsoever on the attitude of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, if he is allowed to retain his membership. The Senator from Oregon on the Labor Committee, will continue to cast his votes on the merits of issues, giving great weight, as he frequently has in the Labor Committee—many times controlling weight—to the will of the majority of that committee, by saying, as the records of the committee will show many times, "I am going to yield to the judgment of a majority of my colleagues on this committee, because I must be wrong; I do not have an answer to some of the points that have been made in this debate."

Mr. President, whenever I am satisfied that there is a doubt as to the merits of an issue, one—but, mark you, one—of the factors to which I give great weight in reaching my own final conclusion on an issue is the position taken by the majority, irrespective of what party alinements may be represented by the majority. In the matter of the control of the Labor Committee, many times the majority has been comprised of Democrats and Republicans. It has been a combined majority; it has not been a majority of Democrats or a majority of Republicans.

I shall continue to act as I have in the past. But I may say to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that I do not accept his analysis of what my mental attitude will be on the Labor Committee if I am assigned to the committee by the entire Senate. His attempt to picture me as one who seeks to impose his will upon an otherwise majority by functioning as a swing man or censor of the majority is a status of his imagination.

I have never voted in the past, and I shall never vote in the future, so as to place my judgment as to what the public interest may be above the judgment of everyone else on the committee. In reaching my judgment I shall consider the judgment of other Senators. But as soon as the whole case has ended, as we lawyers say, then I have the responsibility to render my own honest judgment as to where the merits lie. When we come to that, no partisan issue is ever consciously, knowingly, or intentionally going to control the junior Senator from Oregon.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Assuming that all the Senator from Oregon says is true—and for the sake of argument I will assume it to be true, so far as his own attitude is concerned—and understanding that he believes the majority in the Senate should control committees, does the Senator from Oregon think that he himself should be placed in a position where he, in turn, in the final analysis, may, under certain circumstances, control the activities of a committee as between the two major parties?

In this particular instance, I am not talking about combinations of Democrats and Republicans, which frequently occur in all committees, and frequently occur in the Senate Chamber. I am talking about committee responsibility and party responsibility in any set-up wherein he himself is the odd number as between those who are members of the committee in the two-party system.

For instance, there are 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Six would be Republicans, and six would be Democrats. The Senator from Oregon would be the deciding factor in any party issue that might arise. Does the Senator, believing in party responsibility, as he himself says he does, think he should be placed in a position in which he personally would make the decision as between the two parties?

Mr. MORSE. I have already answered the Senator's question.

Mr. IVES. No; the Senator has not.

Mr. MORSE. I have answered the question several times this afternoon, but I will answer it again for the benefit of the Senator from New York and other Senators.

It is my position that it would be a great mistake for the Senate this afternoon, under the Reorganization Act, to establish for the first time a precedent whereby a Senator would be removed from a committee without his consent, simply because he has become a member of a minority party. Under the Reorganization Act he is entitled to assignment to two committees, and, in my judgment, fairness and equity entitle a minority member, under the provisions of that act, to retain his present committee assignments, under his seniority rights as a Senator, without being transferred to any other committee, on the basis of any such argument as the Senator from New York has advanced,

which, reduced to its essence, is an argument of partisanship.

If the Senate wishes to act on the basis of partisanship, the doors are wide open for the Senator from New York to follow a course of action which I think should have been followed in bringing in the report this afternoon, namely, so to enlarge, by motion, the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the particular procedural problem the Senator discusses would not have been created.

In essence, so far as debate techniques are concerned, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is attempting to maneuver me into a position of taking responsibility for the failure of the Republicans to come before the Senate today with a committee proposal that would protect the rights of all minority party members. It is the Republicans who in the first instance should have submitted a motion to enlarge the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare by adding another Republican to each one of them so that a minority Member of the Senate, who has seniority rights in the Senate, could have his seniority rights protected. The Senator from New York is trying to maneuver me into the position of saying that procedurally there is nothing else the Republicans could do than what they have done.

There is much they can do, Mr. President. In a few moments I am going to give them an opportunity to do something else. I am going to give them an opportunity to vote for my motion to enlarge the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services by one Republican, so that the minority Member, who is now making the argument, can retain his seniority rights in the Senate by continuing, as other Senators have continued in the past, with one exception—Sumner, back in the time of Grant—to serve on his committees.

Mr. IVES and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out my understanding that the leadership of the Republican Party—I stand to be corrected by the Senator from California, who just rose—made every effort to persuade Senators of the Democratic Party to go along with exactly the kind of increase in committee membership to which the Senator from Oregon now refers.

I wish to have it definitely understood that, so far as I know, the Republican Members of the Senate are not responsible for this impasse. It is one that has been thrust upon us by conditions outside of our control or that of the minority leader.

I wonder if the Senator would be willing to yield for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request that such an amendment be adopted, and the committees be increased here and now before the committee membership question is finally decided?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since my name has been mentioned——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me to continue to answer the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] for the sake of continuity in the RECORD? Then I shall be glad to yield.

The fact that the Senator from New York has asserted that the Republicans have done everything they could does not make it so. The fact still is that the Republicans have not brought to the floor of the Senate a resolution or motion to enlarge the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and such action will not be taken here this afternoon in the absence of such a motion.

I am perfectly willing to make a motion, but I respectfully submit that, as a minority Member of the Senate, I do not think I should be the one to be placed in the position of submitting a resolution to do what I think, in fair play, the majority ought to be doing in order to protect the minority Member I am talking about. It is the majority that ought to be bringing in the resolution or the motion, not the junior Senator from Oregon. I shall make such a motion in due course, and I hope I may have a record vote on it, because I have no intention of prolonging this debate ad infinitum.

I think I have made my points, but I wish the RECORD clearly to show that I do not accept the premises of the Senator from New York; I do not accept the premises of the Senator from Ohio; and I do not accept the premises of the Senator from South Dakota. I will dismiss the comment of the Senator from South Dakota merely by saying that it is not necessary to use the word "discipline" in discussions in party caucuses for every one present to know that discipline is being applied. The Senate can take judicial notice of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] regarding the diligent, patriotic, and nonpartisan manner in which the junior Senator from Oregon has functioned as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. No member of that committee has made a finer contribution to the work of the full committee and that of the preparedness subcommittee than that of the Senator from Oregon.

In regard to the suggestion of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] I should like to say that we are not about to agree to any unanimous consent request to increase the membership of the committee on the floor of the Senate, without consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. We are not about to agree to any proposal to increase the membership of the committee by one Republican and one recent Republican. I am amazed that the Senator from New York should make such a suggestion.

We in the minority are operating with 47 Members. We have the same percentage of committee assignments that the Republicans had with 47 Members. In the apportionment of the total committee assignments, the Senate agreed a few days ago that the majority should have sufficient committee assignments to permit two standing committees for each of 49 Senators, and in addition thereto 14 further assigments, so that certain Senators could serve on a third committee.

In the amendment adopted by the Senate the minority was given two standing committee assignments for each of its 47 Members, and in addition three assignments permitting certain Senators to sit on a third committee.

As previously stated—although I believe the statement was challenged—I am informed by Senate aides that it has been the traditional obligation of the majority to assign members of a party other than the two major parties. Because of the obligation and responsibility to which I have referred, the minority agreed the other day that sufficient positions should be provided so that the majority would have assignments on two standing committees for each of 49 Members.

I have great respect for the Senator from Oregon and for his service to his country and to this body. As I say, his work on our full committee and our subcommittee has been of extremely high quality. He has been very patriotic. Moreover, I have a personal feeling for him. But, Mr. President, this is a situation in which a division must take place.

I have been given my allotment, my share of assignments, to distribute among Senators for whom I speak. The majority has been given assignments on two standing committees for each of 49 Senators. I might have been a little presumptuous, but I expressed the hope that the Senator from Oregon could continue to serve on the two committees on which he had rendered outstanding service. However, that was merely a hope, because it was none of the business of the minority to tell the majority how to assign its members to committees, and we do not propose to do so. I do not propose to start adding to committess here and there without proper consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The majority has certain assignments to make, and if it has not made them, I do not want it to be indicated on this floor that it is through some fault of the minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. ANDERSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from California. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico, following which I wish to reply to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the first place I think the Senator from

Oregon is mistaken when he says that the statement made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was based upon partisanship. I did not so interpret it. I think it was based upon party responsibility, which is an entirely different thing. Of course, we do have the two-party system.

The Senator from Oregon has correctly pointed out that this situation is unprecedented. It is perhaps unparalleled in the history of the Senate. The action which was taken was taken at the instigation of the junior Senator from Oregon himself. He publicly declared that he was no longer a member of the Republican Party. He publicly declared that he did not intend to participate in the Republican conference, which he had an absolute right to do.

Furthermore, he made a speech on the floor of the Senate which has been quoted by the majority leader, in which he stated that he did not want the majority conference to make the committee assignments.

With all due respect to the Senator from Oregon, I think he is quite wrong in his analysis of the situation with respect to seniority in the Senate. So far as committees are concerned, he has no seniority that he does not get from membership in the party to which he belongs. His entire movement in the committees of the Senate is up the ladder of party seniority, depending on which side of the table he happens to sit.

By the action of the distinguished Senator from Oregon himself he took himself out of the line of seniority in the Republican Party and made himself the most senior independent in the Senate, and the most junior independent in the Senate. Despite the fact that he intends to discount the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is quite correct and quite sound in pointing out to the Senate the mechanics of the Reorganization Act and the mathematical problems faced by the committee on committees and the other committee which the Senator from South Dakota headed.

I point out that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was quite correct when he stated that the Republican majority had endeavored to obtain a change in the rules which would have permitted the majority to control all the committees of the Senate. That question was submitted to the minority. After all, the minority on the other side of the aisle is a great minority. Under the rules of the Senate, whether the Senate be considered as a continuing body or as a new body, the Members of the minority are not compelled to accept the dictum of the majority and make a blank-check endorsement of any suggestion which we might make with respect to changes in the rules.

We offered to negotiate with the minority. In their judgment they made a decision which they felt was sound from their point of view; and it may have been sound from the point of view of the entire Senate.

I think the attitude which has been taken by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for whom I hold a very high regard, is entirely sound. The Members of the minority have had this question before them for consideration. They have negotiated within their policy committee. They have discussed the question with the steering committee. They have undoubtedly discussed it with other Members on the other side of the aisle. Finally they said to us, in effect, "This is as far as we feel we can reasonably be asked to go." We could not even have made the change which we did make without the cooperation of Senators on the other side of the aisle. The rules were slightly modified.

Finally, the majority is faced with the problem of the seniority of Members, even though they may have entered the Senate only a few days ago, who have requested assignments to what are generally considered to be the more important committees of the Senate. I do not discount the importance of the other two committees to which reference has been made, because the District of Columbia Committee has some important problems to consider. It has a great history. It is entitled to high-grade consideration of its problems, and I know that those problems will receive such consideration under the chairmanship of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and other members of the committee who will serve with him, both members from the Democratic side and members from the Republican side.

But the cold, hard fact of the matter is that the majority was entitled to assign its membership to committees based on Republican seniority. What does that leave as a mathematical situation? It leaves two unassigned committee places. One of the places is on the Committee on the District of Columbia; the other is on the Committee on Public Works. As the most senior member of an independent party, as well as the most junior member in seniority of the independent party, those two places fall to the Senator from Oregon. All that the Reorganization Act says is that each Senator shall serve on two committees. The provisions of the Reorganization Act will be carried out when the junior Senator from Oregon serves on those two committees. I repeat that that was not done primarily by action of the Republican Party itself, but was based on the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon, to the effect that he had read himself out of the party and wanted no assignment as a Republican and did not even want the Republican conference to make an assignment.

Mr. MORSE. I yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was wondering whether the Senator from Oregon had reviewed any of the precedents. I call to mind the election of 1944, and I believe I saw in the Senate Chamber a few moments ago the former distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Ball, who supported the Democratic candidate for the presidency in the 1944 election. Does the Senator from Oregon recall any disciplinary action that was taken at that time?

Mr. MORSE. I discussed the Ball case. I also pointed out, in the case of the so-called insurgents, that those Senators did not resign from the Republican Party, and therefore their cases are not on all fours with the case of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the election of 1932 I recall that the Republican Senator from my own State, Mr. Cutting, fairly openly supported Mr. Roosevelt, and thereafter was identified with a great many proposals of President Roosevelt, which he supported. I am wondering if there has ever been a case in which a Senator has been disciplined because he decided to move away from his party, so to speak.

Mr. MORSE. I referred to the Ball case in my speech. I may summarize my speech at this point by saying that whether or not the element of discipline is present in this instance, the fact remains that the proposal before the Senate today is a very singular one with regard to the disposition of the position of the Senator from Oregon on committees.

Let me briefly reply to the Senator from California, because in his argument he left open a very wide barn door, through which all of his horses have escaped. The Senator from California does not discuss the fact that it was within the power and prerogative of the majority to bring forth a resolution or a motion under the Reorganization Act which would have proposed the kind of committee alinement which I understand the Republicans who have discussed the subject this afternoon believe would be a fair and meritorious one. Certainly I am at a loss to understand why the Republicans should sit back and rely upon the very weak reed of argument advanced by the Senator from California, namely that after all the minority is a very powerful group and the majority just cannot impose its will upon them. The question is whether or not on the merits it would be a sounder organization of committees of the Senate to adopt a proposal to increase the membership of the Armed Services and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees by one majority member and retain the junior Senator from Oregon as a member of a minority party on those two committees.

If the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had heard my main argument this afternoon he would have heard me say that I make no contention for seniority rights on the committees themselves. I said I took the position that if retained on those committees I expected to go to the foot of the table so far as seniority rights on the committees are concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Oregon has mentioned my name. I wish to say that I listened to the entire speech of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If he listened to my entire speech apparently he missed that part of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I heard it, but I do not believe it changes the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to the second part. What the Senator from California has completely overlooked—and I am willing to let the RECORD speak for itself—is the action of the Senate in Congresses gone by with respect to the disposition or disciplining of Senators who have become members of a minority party. The fact remains that they have not been removed from committees. Therefore, when the Senator from California talks about party responsibility, I believe it was the clear responsibility of the Republican Party this afternoon to bring to the Senate a motion—which I infer they do not believe to be a bad motion at all—that the size of those two committees be increased by one member of the majority party and that the Senator from Oregon as a minority party member be allowed to remain as a member on those two committees.

I wish to say only one word to my good friend from Texas. Of course, I appreciate his comments with reference to my service on the Committee on Armed Services. However, I respectfully disagree with his conclusion as to what the responsibility of the majority party in the Republican caucus was in connection with assignments to committees. I take the position that it was not for either the Republican caucus or the Democratic caucus to make any assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon, but that under the Reorganization Act it is the responsibility of the full Senate to make the assignment. That is all that I have been pleading for.

I have concluded my main argument, Mr. President. I shall now proceed to make a series of motions.

My first motion, so that we may have it as a matter of record, is this: I move to amend the proposed order now at the desk by adding a member of the majority party to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to add the junior Senator from Oregon to the same committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, a motion to amend the order is a motion to amend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also understand that 1 day's notice must be given of a motion to amend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I make the point of order that the motion is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from Oregon has been talking a great deal about establishing precedents. If the Senate should establish the precedent which is sought to be established by the Senator from Oregon it would mean that any member of the minority, if he becomes the lowest ranking member of the minority, or of a prospective minority, could prevent being bumped off a committee by merely saying, "I have become an independent. I ask you to increase the size of the committee by one so that I may stay on the committee, and you can put on another majority member to offset me."

If we establish that kind of precedent, committees will be swollen out of all proportion, and it will create a situation which will plague the Senate forever.

Mr. MORSE. I may say that the technique of reducing to the absurd is always interesting in debate for illustrative purposes, but usually very unrealistic. However, if we take the Senator from South Dakota at his word, if a condition should arise so that another Member of the Senate decides to join my party, I say that I will meet him with open arms and welcome him, and that we will fight for his seniority rights as a member of that party.

However, Mr. President, I say that the argument of the Senator from South Dakota is not sufficiently persuasive to evade what I believe is the phase of seniority which he and other Senators must face up to this afternoon. It is that issue of seniority in the Senate, in terms of the history of the Senate, that I do not believe the Senate should ignore.

I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. Am I correct in my understanding that the Chair has sustained the point of order raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as the acting majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say, Mr. President, so that the RECORD will be clear, that I was fully aware that such a ruling would be made, because I, too, had checked into the parliamentary situation.

I made my motion only for the purpose of serving notice that the motion is on the desk and also, to be very frank about it, for the purpose of strengthening my position in the case of the next motion I shall make, for when we come to vote on my next motion, Mr. President, each Member of this body will know that I have pending at the desk a motion which will go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I assume. It is a pending motion which will carry out what I understand from some of my Republican friends who have talked to me privately about this matter today is the point of view of a good many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. Mr. President, the Democratic Members, as well as the Republicans, are not unanimously of the opinion that there should not be this change in the rule if what some of them tell me privately can be relied on, as I know it can be.

So I am assuming now that my motion to add a member of the majority party to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that the junior Senator from Oregon also be assigned to those two committees is now officially before the Senate and will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

I move to amend the proposed order by adding a member of the majority party to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the junior Senator from Oregon to the same committees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon wishes me to do so, I shall move that the motion be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. I shall appreciate that very much.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Oregon be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion of Mr. MORSE was reduced to writing in the form of a resolution, and the resolution (S. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended by adding, for the period of the Eighty-third Congress, a member of the majority party to the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be assigned to service on the same committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with that resolution before the Senate, each Senator has due notice that adding me to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, if he so votes this afternoon, will not necessarily create the dire situation to which the Senator from New York has alluded. If Senators wish to regard committee assignments as a matter of pure party balance, and wish to assume that I would sit on those two committees and would vote there on a pure partisan basis, they will know that at the appropriate time, when the committee reports, that situation can be corrected, if we think a correction is necessary, by having a majority of the Senate vote to add a majority member to each of those two committees.

Therefore I move that the order pending before the Senate at this time be amended by placing the junior Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, no order is pending before the Senate. There is before the Senate the nominations to committees to be appointed by the Senate.

I do not know exactly how the motion of the Senator from Oregon could be in order. It seems to me that the Senator from Oregon is free to have himself nominated or to nominate himself as an additional candidate for these committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my understanding was, as I checked into the parliamentary situation, that the appropriate motion for me to make when the Senator from Ohio presented what

has been referred to, at least, in discussions with me as the order for assignment to committees, was a motion—and I understood that I would be at liberty to so move—that I be added to the Armed Services Committee; and that I make another motion, when the question of membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was before the Senate, that I be added to that committee.

I suppose that, parliamentarily speaking, my motion should await the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the Senate proceed to consider the assignments to the Committee on Armed Services. With that understanding and with that motion pending before the Senate, to come up the moment when the Senator from Ohio moves to have the Senate take up assignments to the Committee on Armed Services——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that the present motion of the Senator from Oregon would, if agreed to, actually increase the number of Senators on the Armed Services Committee, which would be in violation of the rule, or would constitute a change in the rule; and such a motion has already been ruled out of order.

Therefore, the only thing which it seems to me the Senator from Oregon could do at this time would be either to place himself in nomination or to have himself placed in nomination for membership on that committee, in which case, if such action were taken by the Senate, there would be an excess of one member on that committee—a difficulty which the Senate would have to resolve by vote.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the effect of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is in effect a nomination of himself for assignment to the Committee on Armed Services. If the Chair is correct, the Chair would think that at this time there are 16 nominations for assignment to 2 different committees, 1 of them being the Committee on Armed Services.

Did the Senator from Oregon nominate himself for one committee or for two?

Mr. MORSE. I intend by my motion to place myself in nomination for the Armed Services Committee; and later I intend to make a similar motion for membership on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I can speed the procedure a little by making the following request: I ask that the proposed membership of the 11 committees as to which there is no difference of opinion—namely, all the committees except the Armed Services Committee, the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works—be confirmed, by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that now we proceed to consideration of membership on the Armed Services Committee. For that purpose several lists of names have been submitted. I have submitted a list of names, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted a list of names, and the junior Senator from Oregon has submitted a name. Those names are before the Senate. I should like to know by what method the Senate proposes to vote under the rule which provides:

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same.

Under that rule I suggest that it would be desirable at this time to select, first, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand there is a group A, which I submitted, made up of the names of eight Senators; and there is a group B, submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], consisting of the names of seven Senators; and there is a group C, consisting of the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The question about which I have been puzzled is whether the ballot should be by voice vote, upon the calling of the roll, or by paper ballot. I should like to know what the rule is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that in the past the custom has always been to call the roll. A Senator can vote for one Senator or for as many Senators as he desires, up to the permitted number on the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Then, as I understand, there are now 15 candidates for 14 positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, 15 candidates for 14 positions.

Mr. TAFT. So, as the roll is called, a Senator who wishes to vote for the names submitted by the majority and the minority groups will vote for group A and group B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If any Senator wishes to vote for the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], such Senator will then have to indicate some Senator on the other lists whose name he will omit from his vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a Senator could vote for himself or for the Senator from Oregon and for any 13 other Senators, so as to constitute the total of 14.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to vote now on reorganization of committees; but I wish to inquire of the Chair whether the motion which has just been made in any way affects or lessens the rights of the junior Senator from Oregon in this matter in connection with the two committees he has mentioned, namely, the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Before propounding my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. Of course there are different ways of casting this vote. The way suggested by the Senator from Ohio is one way.

I wish to suggest another way, because I am perfectly aware of the procedural problems which confront me in regard to getting a clear-cut vote on the issue of whether I should be appointed to the Armed Services Committee. If I can get a clear-cut vote on that issue, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the decision of the Senate. Of course I shall accept it, anyway; but in that case I shall accept the decision with a much better feeling in my heart, for then I shall realize that at least I got a fair "break" in the case of the procedural handling of this matter.

Therefore I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the clearest way of facing the issue which the Senator from Oregon has raised this afternoon is to vote on his motion, first, by roll-call vote, that he be added to the Armed Services Committee. If the Senate so decides by a majority vote, then he should be added to the Armed Services Committee. It is then up to the leaders of the two caucuses to decide what adjustment they want to make in their present committee proposals to the Senate. If they vote against the junior Senator from Oregon on that clear and cleanly drawn issue, that ends the matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my request that the Senate proceed with a roll-call vote on the motion of the junior Senator from Oregon that he be elected under the Reorganization Act as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to that proposal. It seems to me it is not at all in accordance with the rule. I think there is a little doubt under the rule as to whether the vote should be by written ballot or by calling the roll, but, since the Parliamentarian has said the custom has been to proceed by calling the roll, I think we should proceed according to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand correctly that the Senator from Ohio makes a point of order?

Mr. TAFT. It was only a suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is not in order, because it would have the effect of increasing the membership of the Armed Services Committee. I think the Senator might be able to get the direct vote he wants if he will move to strike out the name of Senator John Jones and insert the name of Senator WAYNE MORSE, rather than going through the process of voting for 14 names.

I do not know what the precedents of the Senate have been, but I do not believe his motion to add an additional name is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point the Chair would read from rule XXIV:

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

1. In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the point of order is sustained by the Chair, and if then the motion made by the Senator from Ohio comes before the Senate, I should like to inquire how those of us who wish to vote in support of the junior Senator from Oregon can do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that there are 14 members yet to be nominated on the Armed Services Committee. There are 15, including the junior Senator from Oregon. The Senator from New York or any other Members of the Senate could vote for any 14 of the 15.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it will be necessary, in order to vote to seat the Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee, to designate on the list the Senator whom the voter desires to replace with the Senator from Oregon. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He would eliminate 1 from the 14.

Mr. AIKEN. We may eliminate one from either the Democratic list or the Republican list; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From either the majority or the minority list.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Inasmuch as we are voting on 14 names, it seems to me that if the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader is to be followed, it should be done by ballot rather than by a yea-and-nay vote. Suppose I wanted to vote for the Senator from Oregon to displace someone else. I would have to put his name down and 13 other names. I suppose that is the reason for the word "ballot" being used in the rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington. I think it would be easier for every Senator to put 14 names down on a piece of paper.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A Senator could vote a straight party ticket in that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had risen to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Presiding Officer as to the meaning of the word "ballot." If the framers of the Reorganization Act meant at the time they presented it to the Senate, and the Senate had meant at the time it passed the act, that in a situation calling for a ballot we would vote by a yea-and-nay vote, the word "ballot" would not have been used. I submit that the word "ballot" as used in the act means that Senators should write out a ballot in accordance with the common meaning of "ballot" in the English language.

Each one of us may take a piece of paper and write on that paper the names of the Senators we think should serve on the Armed Services Committee.

The rule then goes on to provide: "and a plurality of vote shall appoint."

I think that clearly emphasizes that, with the ballots coming to the desk, the membership will be elected on the basis of the plurality of the votes cast.

I respectfully request a ruling from the Chair as to whether it is appropriate for the Senate to proceed by written ballot.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed by secret written ballot.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. Are we to sit at our desks and write out 14 names? Are we not generally agreed that the 14 names which are already written are the 14 names which should be considered in connection with the nominations? Should not our activities in writing out our ballots be confined to those 14 names and that of the junior Senator from Oregon? Is it not a much more simple process to pass out ballots containing the 14 names already listed in the committee organization proposal which has been distributed, and allow us to scratch out any name and substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon, thereby expediting the process?

If we follow the course suggested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] we will be here all night.

Mr. ANDERSON. If a plurality of votes is obtained, the language of the rule will be conformed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether there is at hand a list of the Senators who have been designated by the majority and the minority.

Mr. TAFT. I have lists prepared covering the majority and minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator a sufficient number for all Senators?

Mr. TAFT. I have a sufficient number. Any Senator who wishes to vote for the distinguished Senator from Oregon will have to cross out a name and write in the name of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the proposal before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that 14 members of the Armed Services Committee be named by the Senate from the list of 15 who have been nominated, and that it be done by secret, written ballot.

Mr. MORSE. I respectfully submit that that is not quite accurate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that that is as the Chair understands it.

Mr. MORSE. I know that to be the fact, but it is my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico made very clear that the selection would be made from the 14 remaining nominees, plus the additional nominee contained in my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are 15 nominees now on the ballot, and that 14 would be selected from the 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] already having been selected as chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since this apparently is a new action now proposed, at least I have never seen this procedure followed in the almost 8 years I have been a Member of the Senate, because there are some Senators absent, obviously, if we are to pass out ballots I wonder whether the roll should not be called, and as the roll is called each Senator deposit his ballot at the desk for the tellers to count. Then there will be no question of each Senator properly voting when his name is called, and no question as to whether he was here to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes the suggestion to be sound. Certainly we do not want any double voting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not greatly concerned about the issue on which the ballot is about to be taken, but I desire to put the prediction in the RECORD that if action is taken here today to vote by secret ballot, the precedent will recur to plague the Senate, and cause unspeakable confusion in the committee assignments in the days to come. If the Senate is ever as nearly equally divided as it is at the present time, composed of Members with different political views within both major parties and equally divided on each side of the aisle, there will be confusion, and the committee system will mean nothing if the committees are chosen by secret ballot, as is proposed. No man can foretell what would be the result of it.

As a Senator I shall vote against the motion, because I do not like to see precedents established which in my opinion would not be conducive to orderly procedure in the Senate. The Senate is no place for secret voting.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator feel that the lists should be given to each Senator, and that he should state the names he desires on the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be highly preferable to the idea of voting by secret ballot.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the majority leader.

It seems to me that a very simple and practical solution would be to classify the nominations by the majority as group A, and classify the nominations by the minority as group B. That would save voting all the names. Then, when a Senator's name was called, he could indicate whether he wanted to vote for group A or group B, and strike out one if he wanted to vote for the Senator from Oregon. That would save going over the whole list of 14 names when the list came to Senators. It seems to me that would simplify the procedure.

As a substitute for the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico, I move that the roll be called, and that each Senator respond by voting for group A, which would cover the majority nominations, or group B, which would cover the minority nominations, and then have a group C, which would be the Senator from Oregon, with the right to each Senator to substitute, as he may see fit, the name of the Senator from Oregon for some other name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it the suggestion of the Senator that the vote be by ballot, or by roll call? I do not see any objection to Senators voting by secret ballot. I do not know whether anyone is in doubt as to whether I am going to vote for the Senator from Oregon or not, but I do not object to a secret ballot, and I do not see why anyone else should object. Senators have a right to vote secretly. The rule says "ballot." It does not say "roll call." I intend to vote for the Senator from Oregon. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about that. I am willing to take the responsibility for that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I sympathize with the views of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not know of anything that should be voted on secretly in the Senate. I dislike the idea of creating a precedent to vote by secret ballot on any question. I think it would be a rather unfortunate precedent. So I agree with the Senator, and I should be glad to second the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that as a Senator's name is called, then a Senator may respond to group A, or group B, or vote for whomever he desires to vote for. He himself makes the record, and whether he votes for group A or group B, or some Senator by name, is up to each Senator. But I myself join with the Senator from Georgia in his feeling against secrecy in Senate proceedings. I am obliged to agree that I believe taking such action would set an unfortunate precedent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When I said "ballot," I was not thinking in terms of secrecy. I thought the Senators would vote when their names were called.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator want the ballot sent to the desk and have it read?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be a signed ballot, spread on the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was about to make the suggestion just urged by the Senator from Washington. Frankly, I do not know what the word "ballot" in the rule means. This is the only place where the word "ballot" is mentioned. In other places the reference is to "roll call."

I also agree with the Senator from Georgia. We do not vote for the President pro tempore in secrecy, and I do not believe we should establish the precedent of voting in secrecy on any question in the Senate of the United States. Therefore, I join with the Senator from Washington in urging that as the roll is called each Senator deposit his ballot at the desk, to be a signed ballot, so that there will be no question as to the responsibility of the Senator in voting, and what his choice is.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator make that as a motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let the ballot be spread on the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. It seems to me that complies with the use of the word "ballot," and at the same time does not establish a precedent of secrecy. I should like to make the motion, if I may, that the Senate proceed by roll call to ballot on the Committee on Armed Services, that as each Senator's name is called, he publicly deposit his ballot at the desk, marking it for either the names which have been submitted by the majority or the minority, or, in the event he desires to substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon, he obviously would scratch one name off, so that the number would not be greater than the number of the committee positions; and that the ballot be signed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think that is an exceedingly fair and proper procedure, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, although he is a strong defender of the secret ballot in other circumstances.

I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia that in the Senate of the United States we do not use the secret ballot, but here we are on record, and we should transact the public's business on the record.

Although, I may say, very good naturedly, I do not have any doubt in my own mind that I might fare much better under a strictly secret ballot, in my judgment I have no right to ask for a secret ballot, because, as the Senator from Georgia has said, and as the Senator from Ohio has agreed, I believe we ought to protect the procedure of the Senate by having the transaction of business on the record and not in secrecy. I think that is a fair solution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the present occupant of the chair [Mr. HOEY] withdraw his motion, so that the motion of the Senator from California may be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair withdraws the motion he made from the floor, and the substitute motion may now be offered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer my motion as a substitute.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, while I have supported and shall continue to support the junior Senator from Oregon, I think that, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated, we might be creating a precedent that will be very troublesome in the future, and may come back to plague us.

In recognition of the fact that the Republicans are in the majority, and it has always been customary for the majority party to control, it would seem to me that the sound way of caring for this situation would be to increase the membership of the two committees in question so that the Senator from Oregon could still remain a member of those committees, without necessarily affecting the control of the majority party on the committees.

I believe that the wise thing for the Senate to do now is to proceed with the confirmation of all the committees that have been nominated here today, with the exception of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the resolution that has been submitted by the Senator from Oregon may go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in accordance with the rules, to come out after 1 day's notice and be voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committees have already been approved, other than those in controversy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think this may become a bad precedent. The Senate can vote to confirm all except these two committees, and the committees that have been confirmed can proceed with their business immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has already been done.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am afraid that by proceeding to vote on the make-up of the two committees mentioned in the manner before the Senate, we may be settting a bad precedent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask for a clarification of the situation. As I understand, as the name of each Senator is called, his ballot is to be handed in. If the Senator handing in a ballot chooses to vote for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], he is to write in the name of Senator MORSE, and is then to scratch out or fail to vote for 1 of the 14 Members who have been named by the majority or minority committees.

Is the ballot then to be signed, and to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the RECORD tomorrow will show just whom each Member of the Senate was willing to knock off the particular committee involved in order to vote for the Senator from Oregon? Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, it will be an unhappy day tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was the intention that the ballots would be signed and handed in.

I understand that the Senator from Indiana has a suggestion to make.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the motion of the able Senator from California, which would provide that after the signed ballots have been delivered to the clerk, and when the balloting has been finished, the clerk will read the names

of the Senators and their votes, so that they may become a part of the RECORD. I move to amend the motion to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is that necessary? The motion provides that the votes shall become a part of the RECORD. Is not that enough, without having to read them all?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I think they ought to be read. I think the clerk ought to read them, so that they will become a part of the RECORD. I am against secret ballots. I favor making everything public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the benefit of the Senator from Indiana that when the ballots are signed and cast, they will become a part of the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand. My motion is to amend the motion made by the able Senator from California by providing that the clerk shall read the ballots or the votes of the Senators individually, so that they may be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, and modify my motion to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California who offered a motion, which the Chair will not repeat because it has already been discussed, has accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is obvious to me by this time that the method set forth in the rules for electing members by ballot is totally impractical. It would seem to me that this matter could readily be settled by a simple motion.

I am sure the Republicans would prefer to select their members and that the Democrats would prefer to select theirs. The only question that would arise would be in case the Senator from Oregon were to become a member of the committee, would his membership be charged to the Democratic side or to the Republican side, or on what basis would the question be settled?

The Senate should determine to which two committees the Senator from Oregon should be assigned. On those two committees there should be an equal division between Republicans and Democrats. I should like to propose that the Senator from Oregon be assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare instead of to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

I realize that under the rules members of committees should be elected by ballot, and my motion might be subject to a point of order, but I hope that no Senator will object, and I am sure we can quickly dispose of the matter if the Senate is prepared to vote on such a motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield at this point, I suggest that the Senator allow the Senate to proceed in the manner that has been suggested, because, in effect, what the Senator is now suggesting is that the Senate amend its rules at this time.

The rules provide that committees shall be elected by ballot. I think that if the Senate proceeds in a public way, with no secret ballot, we can expedite the whole matter, we will comply with the rules, and we will not be establishing a dangerous precedent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is a motion before the Senate. That motion has been modified. It seems to me that we ought to vote on the motion. When the Senate is acting as a committee of the whole, I think it must vote for the whole list. I do not think each side can vote for the particular Senators for whom it wishes to vote.

Under the rules of the Senate, and in the name of common sense, as far as I am concerned, whatever the minority leadership has done, whomever they have nominated, they are going to get my vote. I think they will get the votes of most Republicans. I hope that the minority will feel similarly with respect to voting for the list of Republicans as submitted by the Republican leadership.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say that the minority conference has selected certain candidates for the places on the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare. The Republican conference has done the same thing. I do not propose to strike from this list any nominee of the minority conference in order to substitute the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I am sure that whatever privileges I claim for myself I should grant to my fellow Senators. I do not propose to tell the Republicans what Senators they should place on the Committee on Armed Services. They have control of the allotment. They can assign Senators as they choose. But if we select Senators whom we want on the Democratic side, and then inject ourselves into the question of Republican nominees, and select favored Republicans or independents, then, should the Republicans do likewise, the majority soon would be picking every member of every committee in the Senate. I can see no more dangerous day that could ever face a minority.

Mr. President, I think that the majority conference and the minority conference have labored long, thoroughly, and well, and have produced the best nominees for these committees that they could. I propose to vote for the Senators who have been named by the Democratic conference and for the Senators who have been nominated by the conference of the other party. To do anything else would some day result in a bare majority of one dictating every member of every committee on the minority side. I hope that that day may never come.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my good friend from Texas forgets that the independent party has had its caucus. It is unanimously agreed as to the committees on which its membership should belong. The Senator from Texas has not paid any attention, it seems to me, to the rights of that minority party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment.

Furthermore, let me say good naturedly, that this minority party finds himself in the position in which no committee assignment has been made at all, and he does not want either the Republican or Democratic caucus to make the assignment. He is now asking the Senate to make the assignment on the basis of the vote of his caucus. He is asking that his party be represented on the Armed Services Committee and on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in keeping with his 8 years of seniority in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Chair if the bell for a roll call is now about to be rung?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bell will not be rung until the roll call is ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion until we can act on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]? Let us settle the method.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I withhold the suggestion of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] as modified. For the information of the Senate, it might be well for the Secretary to state the motion as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, as modified, is that the roll be called and that Senators, as their names are called, submit signed ballots showing the names of 14 Members voted for; and that when the roll call is completed the Secretary read the names.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to see the name of the Senator from Oregon added to the membership of the two committees which have been referred to, but I recognize the fact, as we all do, that no Senator desires to "bump off" any of the Members nominated by the two parties through their authorized committees. As I understand, it has already been agreed by the Senate that the final disposition with regard to the membership of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will not be made today, save in the event that the Senator from Oregon presses his motion. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. No. We are about to vote now on the membership of the Armed Services Committee, and then we shall vote with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and complete action upon all committees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Earlier in the afternoon I asked whether the motion made by the distinguished majority leader would jeopardize or affect the right of the Senator from Oregon to move that the size of those committees be increased by one member. The answer which I believe I received from the distinguished occupant of the chair was that it would not jeopardize or affect the rights of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Oregon made a motion which was substantially a motion to change the rules. That motion in the form of a resolution was referred—not

with his consent, but without dissent—to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I can assure the Senator from New York that I will at least urge the Committee on Rules and Administration to give serious consideration to that question. However, I am certain that such consideration will require a long period of time, if this case is like most cases involving rules. I do not think we should wait until such a determination can be made. Once that question is taken up for consideration, the Committee on Rules and Administration will have before it many other questions involving committees. So I think we should not wait. I think we should choose the membership of committees and organize the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, there is not much reason for me to pursue the subject. I believe that my suggestion has a very substantial element of soundness in it. I repeat that I do not wish to delay the organization of the committees any longer than is necessary. In the case of 13 of them, their organization does not need to be delayed even for a minute. I wish we could have some assurance that the two motions made by the Senator from Oregon and put in the form of a resolution, and which has now been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, will be promptly reported from that committee, so that it may be before the Senate the next time it convenes. In the meantime the organization of those two committees could be held in abeyance. It seems to me that the suggestion which I have made would take care of the situation in a substantial way and not create precedents which would be unfortunate. I share the view of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that we may be creating precedents which will be serious in their impact and their implications in future years.

I ask that the suggestion which I have made be accepted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. The ballots which have been distributed carry 15 names now——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we not vote on the pending motion and settle upon the method we are to follow, and then have a quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified, which is offered as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I, for one, realize that it is always proper for the party itself to make its nominations; but the Senate cannot avoid its responsibility for the assignment of independent members of this body. I do not know what the practice of the Senate has been. I have not found any case in which independents have been separately assigned. However, I recall that Senator La Follette formed at one time the Progressive Party, which certainly separated itself from the Republican Party, but there was no change in his committee assignments so far as I have been able to learn.

My only interest is to see to it that hereafter, if there are independent Members of this body, there shall be a method whereby they may be assigned to committees.

I should like to support the motion which the Senator from Oregon made to increase the size of certain committees. I do not like to cast a vote which would substitute the name of someone else for that of a regularly constituted nominee of the party. However, I believe that until we arrive at a method of assigning independent members of this body to committees, we shall not be meeting our responsibility. I understand that to a certain extent the House of Representatives has successfully handled that problem.

It is a well known fact that there was elected from a certain district in New York a Representative in Congress named Marcantonio. There were many members of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives who did not want the responsibility for assigning Mr. Marcantonio to committees.

However, that was the responsibility of the party, and the majority acted and assigned Mr. Marcantonio to committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to insert in the RECORD my judgment that Mr. Marcantonio was never an independent, and never belonged to the party of the junior Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not trying to identify him with the party of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I think this is a question which we must meet someday by the assignment of individual Members to committees of their choice. I do not think it would be fair to take away from Republicans the right to have a majority on any committee. Therefore, I hope that someday a rule may be devised which will allow an opportunity for the proper assignment of Senators to committees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am in the same position as the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to vote to assign the Senator from Oregon to the two committees which have been mentioned. However, I think we are missing the point. The Independents who have been in the Senate or the House have been duly elected under their State laws under the label of a certain party, whereas in this case the rules of the Senate still describe the election of the Senator from Oregon as the election of a Republican.

I do not wish to interfere with Republicans assigning their own members, but I wish there were some rule whereby I could express my opinion that the Senator from Oregon, whether or not he was elected as an independent, should be assigned to those two committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senate already selected and elected the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has already been done, and all members of committees, with the exception of the four which are involved now, have been chosen, one of which is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding is that we have elected the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, but we have not yet proceeded to elect the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The Chair was in error as to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senate having already chosen, exclusive of the committees which are now under discussion, the chairman and members of such committees, the question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, to proceed to the election by ballot of 14 members of the committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel an independent streak coming on, Mr. President, and I may want to form an independent party. May I do so at any time I wish?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. It is a political question, which the Chair declines to answer.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as amended by the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Daniel	Hoey
Anderson	Dirksen	Holland
Barrett	Dworshak	Humphrey
Beall	Ferguson	Hunt
Bennett	Flanders	Ives
Bricker	Frear	Jackson
Bridges	George	Jenner
Bush	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.
Butler, Nebr.	Gore	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Green	Kefauver
Carlson	Griswold	Kennedy
Case	Hayden	Kerr
Chaves	Hendrickson	Kilgore
Clements	Hennings	Knowland
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Kuchel
Cordon	Hill	Langer

Lehman	Murray	Smith, N. C.
Long	Neely	Sparkman
Magnuson	Pastore	Stennis
Malone	Payne	Taft
Mansfield	Potter	Thye
Martin	Purtell	Tobey
Maybank	Robertson	Watkins
McCarran	Russell	Welker
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Wiley
Millikin	Schoeppel	Williams
Monroney	Smathers	Young
Morse	Smith, Maine	
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Chair is informed that ballots have been distributed.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, Senators may use any form of ballot they wish to use, and they are not restricted to using the ballot which has been distributed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The ballots have been distributed as a convenience to the Members of the Senate. The Committee on the District of Columbia has nine members, and each side has placed four members on it. That leaves one vacancy. The Committee on Public Works has 11 members, and each side has placed 5 members on it. That leaves one vacancy. On the Committee on Armed Services there are 15 members. The chairman of the committee having been selected, the vote will be for 14 members, instead of 15. Without any motion to the contrary, the Chair understands that the vacancies will be voted on en masse at one time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that apparently the ballot which has been distributed shows the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as chairman. He has already been elected chairman. I suggest that any Senator who uses the typewritten ballot before him should cross out the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] before he casts his ballot.

As I understand, a vote in favor of the ballot as written is a vote for the Republican and Democratic selections A and B, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has referred to them. Any Senator who wishes to vote for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have to write in the name of the Senator from Oregon if he uses the prepared ballot. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Any Senator may, on a separate piece of paper, write in all the names of Senators for whom he wishes to vote.

Mr. TAFT. All votes will be read by the clerk; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The votes of each Senator will be read.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio. He suggested that those of us who wish to use the piece of paper or proposed ballot that has been placed on our desks, strike out the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Of course, the Senator from Massachusetts has already been elected chairman of the Armed Services Committee. It seems to me that we could ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts be ignored by all of us. Then we would not have to go to the trouble of striking out his name.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that if the name of the Senator from Massachusetts is not scratched out, it be ignored, because he is here designated as chairman of the committee, and he has already been elected chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] shall be scratched out or ignored. [Laughter.]

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The roll will now be called. The Chair assumes that each Senator will send his signed ballot to the desk, to be kept at the desk until all the ballots have been cast, whereupon all of them will be read. The procedure is rather unusual, of course.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. AIKEN, whereupon Mr. AIKEN sent his ballot to the desk, and the Chief Clerk commenced to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ballots will not be read until all the ballots have reached the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had understood that the ballot of each Senator would be read at the desk. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, each Senator's ballot will be read at the desk, at the end of the casting of the ballots.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that it will be infinitely simpler to have each ballot read as it is submitted; and I had understood that to be the purpose of the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was my understanding that that would be the procedure, namely, that as each ballot reached the desk, it would be read at that time, in conformity with my motion and the modification proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was that the names on the ballots not be read until the end of the roll call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—for I believe it will save time and will simplify the situation—that the names on the ballots be read as the ballots are presented.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, unfortunately I have been carrying a little fever. Dr. Calver tells me that I should go home. May I ask the clemency of the Senate to cast my ballots out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; they will be cast out of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Oregon rise?

Mr. MORSE. The Chair has pending a request as I understand, as to whether we should proceed in the way the Senator from California has suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair put that question, and the Chair thought the Senator from Vermont was rising to object. However, the Senator from Vermont did not object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was rising to reserve the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon reserves the right to object to the request of the Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that if what has now been suggested is the will of the Senate, of course I shall accept it. However, I respectfully suggest that I think the word "ballot" in the rule means something, and I think the fairer procedure would be to have each Member of the Senate submit his ballot when his name is called; and when all the ballots are in, then let us have the results of the ballots read, for if what the Senate had wanted when the Reorganization Act was passed was a straight yea-and-nay vote, I think the rule would have so stated.

I make very clear that I am not asking for a secret ballot, Mr. President; but I believe it is only fair to ask that all the ballots be filled out and placed at the desk and then read. I need not tell my colleagues in the Senate that we are not acting in a vacuum. As the ballots are read, if we follow the procedure suggested by the Senator from California, the result might be somewhat different than it would be if we followed the procedure suggested by me.

So, Mr. President, in keeping with the meaning of the word "ballot," I believe the better interpretation and the fairer procedure would be, after each Senator's name is called, to have him hand to the page boy, for delivery to the clerk at the desk, his ballot; and when all the ballots are in, have them read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I have stated heretobefore, my only interest in this matter is in the precedent that our action will establish. Any action establishing a precedent of secrecy in the administration of the public business has no place in the Senate of the United States. The best way to proceed with the balloting is either to have each Senator rise when his name is called and state the 14 names on his ballot, or else send the ballot to the desk and have the names read at the desk at the time the name of each Senator is called. The word "ballot" has no significance here except to indicate the selection will be by voting. It does not require the use of the Australian ballot.

Any attempt to have the secret ballot apply in the Senate of the United States is, in my opinion, completely out of keeping with the character of the Senate as a public body, as a body composed of representatives of the people who should be sufficiently courageous to stand up and let their every act be known to all the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the Senator from California to wait a moment, please.

Let the Chair state that the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the motion of the Senator from California was agreed to. The Chair is informed that that motion provided that Senators should send their ballots to the desk, and that the ballots should be read, each one separately, after the roll call is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not hear such a statement made, or else I would be debating it at this good moment.

The motion I heard made was that the ballot of each Senator be sent to the desk and then be read by the clerk. That is perfectly in keeping with the character of the Senate as a public body composed of representatives of the people.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; the motion was to have the ballots read at the time when they were cast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no interest in the question of whether the ballots be read when cast or be read after all the ballots are cast.

Under the usual procedure, the ballots will be read as cast.

Mr. RUSSELL. But, Mr. President, I submit that it is more in keeping with procedure in the Senate for a Senator's ballot to be read when it is cast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks that the motion be read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the motion was made by me, and I accepted a modification of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair now understands that the Senator from California made the motion and accepted a modification, which the Chair is informed provided that all the ballots be cast and then read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, Mr. President; I respectfully suggest that certainly that was not my intent in the situation. I was trying to obtain a procedure which would meet the requirement of the ballot under the rule and at the same time not have any degree of secrecy. In working out the procedure, my understanding was that Senators would sign the ballots and would send them to the desk, and then the clerk would read them, and we would proceed with the roll call—in short, that each ballot would be read as it was received at the desk. That was my intent, regardless of whether I made it clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the effect of the modification of the motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If that is the case, of course that procedure will be carried out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California has made a perfectly accurate statement of what certainly was the import and intent of the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

After having listened to the Senator from Georgia, let me say that I believe it is perfectly clear that, at least momentarily, the procedure I first suggested would amount, at least for that period of time, to a secret vote in the Senate of the United States. It is true that whenever there is a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate we hear each Senator state how he votes when his name is called. Of course there is no doubt, Mr. President, that because of our reliance on the judgment of our colleagues, who often serve on committees of which we are not members, and thus are more familiar than we with certain of the measures before us, that we place great reliance on their judgment. Sometimes the explanation of the vote we cast is that we voted on the basis of the best judgment of certain of our colleagues on the committee concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that under the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified by the suggestion made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], each Senator's ballot will be read as it is sent to the desk, and in that way the names contained in each ballot will be read as the ballot is received at the desk.

The Secretary will resume the call of the roll; and as each Senator's name is called, he will send his ballot to the desk, and the names contained in the ballot will then be read at the desk.

The legislative clerk again called the name of Mr. AIKEN, and his ballot having been sent to the desk, was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. ANDERSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BARRETT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BEALL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BENNETT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BRICKER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BRIDGES, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUSH, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. BYRD, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CAPEHART, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CARLSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CASE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CHAVEZ, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CLEMENTS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. COOPER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. CORDON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DANIEL, whereupon his ballot was

sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DIRKSEN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DOUGLAS, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DUFF, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. DWORSHAK, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. EASTLAND, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. ELLENDER, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. FERGUSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. FLANDERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests, under the unanimous consent request heretofore agreed to, that the vote of the Senator from Vermont be now announced.

Mr. FLANDERS' ballot was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. FREAR, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. FULBRIGHT, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GEORGE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GILLETTE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GOLDWATER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GORE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GREEN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. GRISWOLD, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HAYDEN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HENDRICKSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HENNINGS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HILL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HOEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HOLLAND, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HUMPHREY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. HUNT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. IVES, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. JACKSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. JENNER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KEFAUVER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD,

JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KENNEDY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KERR, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KILGORE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KNOWLAND, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. KUCHEL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. LANGER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. LEHMAN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. LONG, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MAGNUSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and it was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MALONE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MANSFIELD, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MARTIN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MAYBANK, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MCCARRAN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MCCARTHY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MCCLELLAN, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MILLIKIN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MONRONEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MORSE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, MORSE.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MUNDT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. MURRAY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. NEELY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. PASTORE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name Mr. PAYNE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. POTTER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. PURTELL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. ROBERTSON, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. RUSSELL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SALTONSTALL, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, whereupon his ballot

was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMATHERS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, whereupon her ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SPARKMAN, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. STENNIS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. SYMINGTON, who was not present.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. TAFT, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. THYE, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. TOBEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, MORSE, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WATKINS, whereupon his name was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WELKER, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WILEY, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. WILLIAMS, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The legislative clerk called the name of Mr. YOUNG, whereupon his ballot was sent to the desk, and was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

BRIDGES, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, HENDRICKSON, CASE, DUFF, COOPER, RUSSELL, BYRD, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, STENNIS, SYMINGTON.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] attended the inauguration yesterday of Gov. Phil Donnelly at Jefferson City, Mo., and is therefore necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The balloting has been completed. The Chair wishes to inquire whether there are any Senators who have not cast their ballots. If so, the ballots will be received at this time.

There will be a short delay while the recapitulation of the balloting is being completed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I should obtain the floor for 2 minutes, would I be interrupting the roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that there be no interruptions while this particular function is being completed; otherwise there might be confusion.

The tabulation having been completed, the clerk will announce the result.

The legislative clerk announced the result, as follows:

Mr. BRIDGES, 88 votes.
Mr. FLANDERS, 88 votes.
Mrs. SMITH of Maine, 86 votes.
Mr. HENDRICKSON, 88 votes.
Mr. CASE, 88 votes.
Mr. DUFF, 88 votes.
Mr. COOPER, 83 votes.
Mr. RUSSELL, 88 votes.
Mr. BYRD, 88 votes.
Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, 88 votes.
Mr. KEFAUVER, 88 votes.
Mr. HUNT, 88 votes.
Mr. STENNIS, 88 votes.
Mr. SYMINGTON, 86 votes.
Mr. MORSE, 7 votes.
Not voting—8: BYRD, DOUGLAS, DUFF, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, FULBRIGHT, MCCLELLAN, SYMINGTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The results speak for themselves. The Committee on Armed Services is so constituted.

Does the Senator from Oregon wish to press his motion with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I shall make my own announcement, Mr. President.

I am willing to take judicial notice that if we were to proceed to ballot on the same motion with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the result would be either identical or so close to the same result that in my judgment it would be a waste of the time of the Senate for me to press such a motion. Therefore I shall not do so.

I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate that I accept, with good grace, the decision which has just been rendered. The Members of the Senate will have to live with the precedent they have established with respect to the status of minority parties in the Senate in the future, when a minority party is a party other than one of the two parties to which we refer as the major parties.

Let me say to my good friend from Ohio, the majority leader [Mr. TAFT], that I think, if he agrees with the parliamentary point that I now raise, that it would be very appropriate if a recommendation were made to the Senate in regard to the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon to committees. I respectfully submit that the report pending at the desk, which does not specifically assign the junior Senator from Oregon to committees, is technically out of order.

I have no intention or desire to raise any technical point. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in behalf of the Senate, make an assignment, because I do not think it would be wise to leave the record in a situation in which, shall we say, a sort of garbage can principle is applied, the principle that the minority takes what is left.

I shall always discuss these matters above the level of personalities. Irrespective of the persons involved, I respectfully suggest that assignments to committees should be positive, and not

negative. Therefore I suggest to my good friend from Ohio, not in his capacity as the leader of a caucus, but in his capacity as majority leader in the Senate, that he place in nomination the junior Senator from Oregon for assignment to such committees as the Senator from Ohio thinks, under the parliamentary circumstances in which he finds himself, are most appropriate for the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oregon kindly withhold that suggestion until the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is agreed to?

Mr. MORSE. I was only making a suggestion. The Chair misunderstood me if he thought I was pressing it as of this moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in what capacity I do not know, but as a Senator from Ohio I submit the name of WAYNE MORSE to be a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and also a member of the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Public Works——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, after submitting that name I wish to follow through and ask unanimous consent that all the names of members of the three committees, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works, be now approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall be very brief—I wish the RECORD to show that I am not objecting to the parliamentary procedure of considering the nominations made by the Senator from Ohio. I shall vote against the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, on this question I feel that we should accept the judgment of the Senator from Oregon. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Oregon submitted two resolutions to increase the size of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A point of order was made, and those resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon will agree with me or not, but it seems to me that until a report has been made by the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate has an opportunity to consider the question of increasing the size of those committees so as to include the distinguished Senator from Oregon, we should not dispose of the two committee assignments of the Senator at this moment, unless the Senator from Oregon wishes that to be done. I still very much hope that the resolutions will prevail. I believe they are just, fair, and entirely in accordance with the traditions of our country and of Congress. Therefore I should like to have the two resolutions brought before the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Is there objection to my unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon reserves his right to object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. I wish to make my position clear on the parliamentary situation. I do object to being assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia and to the Committee on Public Works. However, the Senate can vote to assign me to those committees, even though I shall vote against such assignment. In view of the fact that I do have pending before the Senate a motion that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be enlarged by adding one member of the majority to each of the committees, plus adding the junior Senator from Oregon to such committees, which has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I would suggest that I not be assigned to any committee this afternoon. If it will make it helpful to my colleagues I shall make the request as a personal point of privilege that I not be assigned to any committee by the Senate this afternoon.

I have checked the rule and I do not see anything in the rule which would prevent a Member of the Senate from requesting that he not be assigned to a committee and the Senate's abiding by that request until such time as the Committee on Rules and Administration can consider the question of whether there is merit, as the Senator from Oregon contends there is merit, in his motion, that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be enlarged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]?

Mr. MORSE. If the unanimous-consent request is that the Senator from Oregon be assigned to the two committees mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, he does object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I distinctly understood the Senator from Oregon to ask that he be assigned to those committees. That is the only reason why I submitted his name for assignment to the committees. I now withdraw the submission of his name for assignment to those committees.

I wish to point out that the rule requires that every Senator shall serve on two committees. I do not object to temporarily postponing the assignment of the Senator from Oregon, in accordance with his request, but I believe it ought to be clearly understood by the Senate that the rules of the Senate provide that each Senator shall serve on two committees. I believe that if a Senator is assigned to a committee he must serve on such committee.

It seems to me that we could go ahead this afternoon and set up the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the District of Columbia, with a vacancy on each of them. That procedure has been followed before. I see no reason why it cannot be done today.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that all Senators whose names have been submitted for membership on the three committees be assigned to those three committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the only point that bothers me about this procedure is that I understood the Senator from Oregon earlier to suggest that his assignment to committees be made by the Senate, which I believe is entirely proper procedure. Such assignment should be made by the Senate. However, the Reorganization Act states very clearly that each Senator shall serve on two committees. The rights of the Senator from Oregon, in the event the rule should be changed, if the Senate should so determine, would in no way be jeopardized by his serving on two committees, as required by law.

However, I must strenuously object to what in effect would be a wajver of the Reorganization Act by having the Senator from Oregon not assigned to two committees, as required by law.

Mr. TAFT. I merely made the suggestion that the assignment should be postponed, at the request of the Senator from Oregon. I do not want to insist on it. I do not believe there would be involved any violation of the Reorganization Act by not making the assignment today. I do not believe the Senator from California should press his point if the Senator from Oregon wants to delay action.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to assure the Senator from Ohio that I never wish to have any misunderstanding between us, without its being cleared up immediately, with respect to the accuracy of a statement by me to him or by him to me. I believe he will find, if he checks the RECORD, that I did not ask him to assign me to those two committees. I made the broad suggestion in good faith that I believe the report in its present form needed to be corrected so that it will contain an assignment of me by the Senate to two committees. Such action would then give me the opportunity of making the point that I have made, namely, that I wish to have the matter postponed until further consideration and reflection can be given to it by my colleagues in the Senate in connection with the motion which will be before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It seems to me to be perfectly clear that so long as there is a possibility that the Senate might follow a different course of action than the one it took this afternoon—and I believe it is a remote possibility, although I am a very hopeful fellow—and until there is finally settled the decision on the motion which I have pending, final action on my committee assignments should not be taken.

I believe the Senator from Ohio is right in his reply to the Senator from California. All I am asking for parliamentarily is a postponement of the assignments as suggested by the Senator from Ohio in his capacity as a Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it should be pointed out in that connection that the problem would not be solved merely

by adding two Members to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Such action would leave us in a situation where the Committee on Public Works would have assigned to it 10 Members—5 Republicans and 5 Democrats. The same situation would hold with respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Four Republicans and four Democrats would serve on that committee. In other words, we would leave those committees with an even number of majority and minority Members. If we are to change the set-up and preserve majority control, we must add more than one Member from each side.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to participate in the discussion between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon as to what seems to them to be the parliamentary situation. I wish briefly to state that I resent the idea that the Committee on Public Works is not a fine committee of this body. As a matter of fact, it is the only committee which is nonpolitical. It is the only committee that takes care of floods in Republican Kansas, as it takes care of floods in Democratic Mississippi. Irrespective of personnel, either Republican or Democratic, that committee takes care of mud in Missouri irrespective of politics, as it takes care of mud somewhere in Florida.

I am leaving that committee as chairman. We have had 13 members on it. According to my recollection the membership has been reduced to 11. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] will be the chairman of the committee. Not once, when it came to a question of flood control, a question of building roads, a question of navigation, or a question of rivers and harbors, did the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the former Senator from Washington, Mr. Cain, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], or the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] interfere in any way whatever from a political standpoint. There was not any time either when the Democratic majority acted purely on political grounds. Mr. President, if we wish to keep the committee out of politics let us vote for a Republican committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the debate, many of us on this side of the aisle would have liked to have voted to place the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon on the two committees on which he formerly served. However the parliamentary situation became such that it was almost impossible for me to vote affirmatively for my good friend the Senator from Oregon without also voting against a Senator whom the Republican caucus had placed on the committee. I do not want yet to put myself in that position. I may not agree with the Republican caucus; but it is their caucus, and they have a right to do what they wish there.

I thought the solution of this problem would be the addition of new members to the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senator from Oregon has submitted a resolution, and it has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope speedy action will be taken by the committee on the resolution. I am in favor of the resolution, and I will vote for it.

At this time, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I wish to ask unanimous consent that my name appear on the resolution, as one of its sponsors, when the resolution comes before the Committee on Rules and Administration. I now ask such unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask the same unanimous consent, namely, that I be permitted to have my name included as one of the sponsors of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been trying to discover, in conversation with some of my colleagues, what we might do to assure rather speedy action by the Committee on Rules and Administration one way or another on the resolution of the Senator from Oregon. I would not suggest what kind of action the committee take; but once a resolution is referred to a committee, it may, for some reason or other, find itself in somewhat difficult straits in regard to finding its way out of committee.

Therefore, with all due respect to the precedents of this body, I move that the Senate instruct the Committee on Rules and Administration to report not later than Thursday the resolution now before it, as submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Minnesota is not in order at the moment, because a unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Oregon is pending, namely, that he not be assigned to any committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I believe the request was a matter of personal privilege by the Senator from Oregon, namely, that he not be assigned to any committee at this time. It was predicated upon the resolution to which I now refer, namely, the resolution which would increase the size of the Armed Services Committee and of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is my belief that we wish to expedite action on this matter. I strongly feel that in view of the outstanding service of the Senator from Oregon in this body, he should be placed on these two committees.

I found myself in exactly the same predicament in which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] found himself, and it was not easy for me to vote in favor of the committee assignments as proposed by the caucus. I wish the Senate at least to have an opportunity to make an honest determination as to whether the Senator from Oregon shall be privileged, as a member of the minority party—as he has made perfectly clear—to participate as a member of the committees upon which he feels, in view of the precedents of the Senate, he has a right to serve. He has been a member of the Armed Services Committee and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Today we have honored the precedents of the Senate in the case of the majority and the minority parties. The Senator from Oregon has made his case for his right as an independent Senator to sit on two committees

Therefore, Mr. President, when there is no other business before the Senate—for there was no objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that his committee assignments be held in abeyance—I shall move that the Committee on Rules and Administration be instructed by the Senate, as has been done by the Senate in the case of vital legislative proposals, to report the resolutions not later than Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair still insists that the request of the Senator from Oregon must be disposed of before any other matter is considered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me suggest that what is before the Senate at the moment is the appointment of members of committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has held that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota is not in order. However, the Senator from Oregon has requested that he not be assigned to committees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chair has misunderstood me. I only objected to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the appointments to the two committees be made as nominated or suggested by the Senator from Ohio. I said that I would object to that request unless there could be an understanding as to the postponement of my assignment to committees.

Mr. TAFT. And I have so agreed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, let me now modify my request for unanimous consent, by asking unanimous consent that the assignments to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be made as submitted by the majority and minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether that request may be amended by adding a provision regarding action by the Rules and Administration Committee on the resolution now before it, namely, that pertaining to the assignment of the Senator from Oregon to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think such a provision is germane.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Minnesota object to my request for unanimous consent? My request is not a modification. Unless the 13 proposed members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are appointed by unanimous consent to the committee, we shall have to proceed to elect them. Do we have to elect them? That is what I wish to ascertain.

Already we have confirmed the proposed appointments to 11 committees. We took that action by unanimous consent. Now I am suggesting the same procedure in the present case, if there is no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My point is whether it will be in order to modify the unanimous-consent request by providing that the Committee on Rules and Administration be required to report not later than Thursday the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon, pertaining to his appointment to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would not be in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the proposed assignments of Members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as submitted. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the chairman of the committee been named?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair supposes that has been included in the order which was submitted.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it includes both the chairman and all the other members of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the unanimous-consent request, other than its present form. I believe the matter would be solved if we proceeded with an oral vote on the question of whether we shall elect the proposed members.

Mr. TAFT. I take it that that is an objection to my request, Mr. President.

I then move that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be elected chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now move that there be elected to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the following 12 additional members: the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the eight members nominated or proposed for membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia, as submitted by the majority and the minority, be elected to that committee, leaving one vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not press my point at this time, let me say that I think unless the period during which there will be a vacancy on the committee is to be a relatively short one, we should not in effect amend the La Follette-Monroney Act by not assigning every Senator to two committees. If the action proposed to be taken is to be taken by unanimous consent, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Oregon, so that this matter may be held in abeyance for only a few days, I shall not interpose objection.

On the other hand, if we were to let such an arrangement continue for an extended period of time, in my judgment that would constitute a violation of the Reorganization Act. Certainly the Senate should not proceed to amend that act in such a manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the eight Senators proposed for appointment be elected members of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether in this case the chairman of the committee has yet been elected.

Mr. TAFT. The unanimous-consent request covers both the chairman and all other members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio in the case of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 10 Senators whose names were submitted as proposed members of the Committee on Public Works be now appointed to that committee, leaving one vacancy on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the request include the chairman of the committee?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it includes the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We have just voted for the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Is that committee so constituted at this time that I can call a meeting to organize the committee, in order to comply with the request which was sent to me, namely, to have an early meeting to consider the nomination of the Secretary of Labor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey can call a meeting of the committee at any time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not clear, in view of the fact that we were awaiting action on the Morse resolution, and the committee was held over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that would not affect the power or right of the committee chairman to call the committee together.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join as a sponsor of the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Oregon today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say the resolution is open for the endorsement of any colleague who wants to join with me in this cause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is required for any Senator to add his name to a bill or resolution that has been introduced or submitted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the Senate who wishes to join in the endorsement of that resolution be allowed to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the large unions of the American Federation of Labor has come out in support of pay raises for Members of the legislative branch of the United States Government. I request unanimous consent to insert at this point in the body of the RECORD a signed editorial from the current issue of the Government Standard. The Government Standard is the voice of the American Federation of Government Employees, an American Federation of Labor affiliate with some 100,000 members in all States and Territories. The editorial is signed by James A. Campbell, president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

It is significant that a labor union should be one of the first to come out urging salary increases for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Do you know that United States Senators and United States Congressmen receive a salary of only $12,500 a year? Do you realize that this meager salary is a disgrace when you place the duties and responsibilities of a Senator and Congressman alongside of his salary?

Here we have the richest and strongest nation in the world, yet we pay our Congressmen and Senators so little when compared to others that it is a wonder that so many sincere, conscientious, and loyal citizens are willing to stand the trials and tribulations of political campaigns to serve people so faithfully.

It's time to recognize that the servant of the people is worthy of his hire. Most Congressmen and Senators have to maintain two homes, one here in the expensive Nation's Capital, and one in his home State. The very nature of his position makes it necessary for him to meet more than the ordinary social obligations to keep up political contacts. This at times is rather expensive and is a real hardship to those who do not have outside income. Yes; they receive allowances for office staff, etc., but these allowances are used in the interest of

the people they represent, not for personal expenses of the Congressmen and Senators.

We expect our Congressmen and Senators to become experts in the many phases of Government and its operation so that they can intelligently legislate in the interest of the Nation and the people.

Those ramifications of Government include foreign relations and policy, internal security, atomic power, taxation, crime, and many other phases of governmental operation. Most Congressmen and Senators spend hours and hours of study to familiarize themselves with the problems facing them in sincerely performing their duties to the people and the Nation.

It would seem that the least we could do is to demand that they establish a wage commensurate with their services to the people. We, in the American Federation of Government Employees, believe in the doctrine that the laborer is worth his hire.

We are well aware of the reluctance of the Members of the Congress to take the initiative on this subject because of the risk of unjustified criticism. We believe therefore that public sentiment should be aroused to this need.

In reality these public servants are employees of the people and their employers should be made aware of the conditions inherent in their employment which make higher pay, commensurate with their services, mandatory.

Election to Congress ought to represent an honored opportunity to serve rather than a problem how to get by.

We know about this because we have talked to those who did not stay beyond one term because of the pay as well as to those who stay and supplement their income by writing and speech making and other pursuits.

As matters stand, we are trying to run the world's biggest business on shoestring salaries. We believe that it is just pure hard common sense to pay a salary sufficiently large and in line with the responsibilities in order that good qualified men will continue to seek public office. What is your opinion? We would like very much to have your ideas on this subject.

We suggest, make it $20,000 a year.

JAMES A. CAMPBELL,
National President, AFGE.

Mr. WATKINS. I request further unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a front-page news item which appeared in the same issue of the Government Standard. This story was written by Hal Miller, a capable and experienced newspaperman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-THOUSAND-DOLLAR SALARY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PROPOSED TO IMPROVE LEGISLATIVE WORK—INCREASE ADVOCATED FOR SOLONS

(By Hal Miller)

The American Federation of Government Employees favors a pay raise for Members of Congress, to at least $20,000 per annum.

Congressional salaries are completely out of line with salary rates in private industry for positions of similar prestige and responsibility. In fact, congressional salary rates are thoroughly out of line with rates in the executive and judicial branches of the Government itself.

IT'S TAXED, TOO

A United States Senator now receives $12,500 per annum plus an expense allowance of $2,500. The $12,500 salary is taxed exactly as is the personal income of any other Government employee or citizen. So much of the $2,500 expense allowance item as is not actually used in expenses is likewise taxable as personal income.

It is, of course, entirely proper that senatorial and congressional salaries should be subject to regular taxation, the same as any other individual. No special treatment should be given for any individual or group in this country.

TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS COMMON

Salaries of $25,000 are plentiful, if not actually commonplace in American industry today. In fact, such salaries are not unknown in our own labor organizations.

The Eighty-first Congress in Public Law 359 proposed establishment of $22,500 as the basic annual rate of compensation for the heads of the various executive departments, $20,000 for the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and $18,000 for the sub-Cabinet positions of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force. Necessary expenses for travel and subsistence in connection with the performance of official business were also provided for these officials.

That same law authorized $20,000 for each of two Presidential administrative assistants and for the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council. Two other White House secretaries were authorized salaries of $20,000, three more at $18,000, and seven at $15,000.

FIXED BASIC PAY

Public Law 359 fixed the basic compensation of Under Secretaries of the various departments, the Deputy Postmaster General, the Solicitor General, the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Federal Security Administrator, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of General Services, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator at $17,500 per annum.

The basic rate of compensation for the Chairman of the Munitions Board and a long list of officials at the head of various other Government agencies was fixed at $16,000. Assistant heads of a long list of Federal agencies and a number of other positions, including the Governors of the various Territories and possessions, were set at $15,000.

THEY TOP CONGRESS

The positions referred to above carry rates of compensation equal to and in excess of Senators and Congressmen.

It is important to note in this connection that they are appointive officials and as such are not required to bear certain election expenses nor are they subject to the demands of the constituents whose entertainment is a matter of "must" for persons holding electoral office.

In 1951 the Congress authorized the establishment of the so-called super grades in civil service. These grades are GS–16, 17, and 18 and carrying starting salaries of $12,000, $13,000, and $14,000 respectively. Although it was contemplated at the time the act was passed there would be only 400 such jobs, a number of special authorizations have been accomplished and it is estimated that throughout the Government there are approximately 1,500 now in existence. The Central Intelligence Agency is reported to have no less than 130 such positions in that agency alone. These jobs are in the executive civilian service and the incumbents have no campaign expenses and are not up for reelection every few years.

BRASS TOPS CONGRESS

The high "brass" in the Armed Forces also receive salaries and expenses which far exceed that of Senators and Congressmen and even that of Cabinet officers who are their superiors.

It is past time for a practical examination of salaries and expenses of those in the legislative branch and the American Federation of Government Employees is wholeheartedly in favor of Senators and Congressmen passing the necessary legislation to raise their salaries and expenses to an adequate level and the provisions of Public Law 359 are not too high.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—STATEMENT OF WALTER WHITE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Wednesday, at the conclusion of the vote on the Anderson motion, Mr. Walter White, executive secretary of the NAACP, issued a statement on behalf of the 54 national organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which he is the chairman. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We want a rules change that will establish majority rule in the United States Senate and open the way for enactment of FEPC with uniform court enforcement powers and other vital civil-rights bills. This would have been made possible if the Anderson motion had prevailed.

This has been a brief but historic debate. It demonstrates the determination of Senators of both parties and Senator MORSE, Independent, to assert and exercise the constitutional right of the Senate to determine the rules of its proceedings.

This is not a mere procedural question. Control of procedure means control of substance.

As a result of the debate on this issue, the American people have a keener realization of how the procedural matter of Senate rules kills legislation they need and want.

The 54 national organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and composed of members of the three major religious groups, the major labor organizations veterans, and other groups will continue to bring home to their members and to the American people generally, the tragic and dangerous cost in legislation and in our standing in the world of the filibuster road block against majority rule.

In opposing the Anderson motion, the Republican leadership in the Senate pledged itself (1) to enact FEPC and other civil-rights legislation, (2) to obtain the 64 votes necessary for cloture under rule 22, (3) to make revision of rule 22 the first order of business in the Rules Committee of the Senate.

The country will now look to the Republican Party to make good on these pledges.

On behalf of the organizations supporting the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, we express our heartfelt appreciation to all those Senators who joined in support of the Anderson motion.

They have done much to make clear to the American people the fact that the Senate will continue to operate under the ever-present threat of veto by filibuster.

The effort to establish majority rule will continue until the fight is won.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO RECESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to say that when the Senate concludes its work today, I shall propose that it take a recess until Friday of this week, and then from Friday to Tuesday of next week.

HOLIDAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the several executive departments, independent establishments, and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia shall be closed all day on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, Inauguration Day. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such day by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on that day; and such day shall be considered a holiday for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to be known as the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1953. This bill provides for grants and scholarships in postgraduate education in the field of public health. The need for legislation such as this is urgent and it is my hope the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will begin hearings on the bill and on the whole problem of Federal aid to medical education in the very near future.

The bill provides for direct grants through the Public Health Service to all accredited schools of public health on the basis of their enrollment to a total not exceeding $1,000,000 for each of the five fiscal years. Further grants are also provided for construction needs not in excess of $1 million a year and for an additional sum for scholarships not to exceed $250,000 per year. The purpose of the bill and to these grants is to make it possible to continue and extend the training of personnel for public service in the field of public health.

There are today 10 accredited schools in the United States: California, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Tulane, and Yale. Six of these schools are supported by private philanthropy and four by the taxpayers of their States.

I have had a series of discussions with representatives of these schools of public health. It is their feeling—and I agree in that feeling—that the training of personnel to protect the public against disease is an essential part of public responsibility as is the training of personnel for the military forces to protect our Nation against a military aggressor. The request of the schools for Federal assistance to help support and expand their facilities and to aid such new schools as may be established is based on the recognition that our Government has a responsibility for the promotion of such training. The present plan for support of our public health institutions places an undue burden upon six privately supported institutions and upon the taxpayers of four States. Since our Nation gains from the training which these schools afford, it is desirable to equalize to some degree the financial cost which is now unevenly distributed.

The evidence is clear that the schools of public health are physically overcrowded. Their physical plant is bursting at the seams. The sum provided in this bill is a small fraction of what is needed, but it will help materially to provide facilities.

The scholarship section of this bill, section 376, is most desirable although it is less essential than the grants for maintenance and construction.

With specific regard to maintenance funds, a study of the facts makes it unmistakably clear that a number of the schools of public health are faced with the prospect of having to curtail or discontinue their operation unless financial relief can be found for them. In this critical period in our Nation's history, our Government cannot sit back and allow this to happen.

The formula for assistance submitted in this bill is the product of careful study by the schools of public health and by other experts in the field. It differs in some respects from the Federal Aid to Medical Education bill of the Eighty-second Congress which I was proud to cosponsor, and which I plan again to support. Instead of providing a lump sum payment of $1,000 per graduate student plus an extra $1,000 for each student in excess of past enrollment, the bill which I now introduce provides for grants on the basis of 15 percent of basic operating costs of graduate instructions plus an additional $500 for each full-time student in excess of average past enrollment. This proposed formula was arrived at on the assumption that a grant based on a certain fraction of the total operating cost will cover a unit of about 30 students regardless of the size of the school. In addition, we all agreed that the larger the student body the greater is the need for additional funds. When new students arrive in a school—and the need is great, so we must encourage the enrollment of new students—the expansion of school facilities is necessary and hence my bill provides for a bonus clause of $500 for each new student.

As a safeguard, the Emergency Public Training Act of 1953 provides that the total grant to each school may not exceed 50 percent of the basic operating cost of the school. Furthermore, the maximum amount spent shall not exceed $1 million a year. It is also noteworthy that we determine average past enrollment on the basis of a sliding scale considering preceding fiscal years rather than any given calendar or academic years.

Finally, I wish to make it clear that in introducing this Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1953 I am in no way minimizing the importance or the desirability of enacting an omnibus Federal aid to medical education bill. We have tried to enact such legislation for a number of years and to no avail. It is my hope that some future Congress may enact the bill. We cannot wait for that period, however. The time to act in the field of public health is now. It is for that reason I have agreed to introduce this special legislation designed to cover the public-health phase of the medical problem on its own merits.

It is my hope that this legislation will become law during the Eighty-third Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 461) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of seven bills and a concurrent resolution designed to make civil rights an increasing reality for all Americans, regardless of their race, religion, color, or national origin. In presenting this legislative program, I am proud to be joined by a distinguished array of my colleagues.

This is not the first time that I have stood before the Senate to make a plea for an end to discrimination against American citizens, nor am I the first Member of this body to do so. The struggle for civil rights has been a continual one since the beginning of our Nation. The story of our country's growth has been a story of an expanding democracy.

Our Nation stands today as the freest and most democratic power in the world. We are proud of the progress that we have made as a country in expanding opportunity, security, and human welfare for our citizens. There is no area of our life which has not developed toward greater democracy.

To be proud of our Nation and its progress, however, is not to be blind to the imperfections that still remain within our society. The most evident of

those imperfections and the one which cries the loudest for immediate remedy is in the area of civil rights. Discrimination based upon bias and prejudice still exists and so long as it is alive, we must be vigilant to eliminate the cancer from our body politic. Democracy is more than achievement, more than material progress, more than elections and government. Democracy is essentially a faith of freedom, of equality, of human dignity, and brotherhood.

This is a lesson which we now strive to get accepted in the world if our Nation is to avoid war and preserve its liberty. The struggle against the totalitarian forces of Stalinism is not merely of a military character. It is political and ideological in nature as well. We stand opposed to the doctrines which enslave men, reduce men to mere automatons. We believe in the inherent dignity and worth of man, that man is an end in himself, that only in a genuinely free society can man attain his true nature. We believe that given equality of opportunity, each individual, irrespective of color, religion, national origin, or race, can realize his true self. These are the great values for which we are currently engaged in the struggle against communism.

Those of us who strive for the enactment of civil-rights legislation by the Congress, do so because we are convinced that the enactment of such legislation will help us as a nation in the world struggle against communism; and we do so because we believe that even if there were no Communists in the world, the discrimination which exists within our country must be eliminated if our democracy is to survive and be true to itself. We strive to strengthen the spirit and the fabric of democracy.

We have seen changes take place before our very eyes and within our own lifetime. These changes have been in our mores, in legislation, and in judicial decisions. We are all aware that this striving for full democracy has become a matter of real concern to all of us. Altogether, organizations representing more than 65 million citizens have gone on record favoring legislation assuring full civil liberties to minorities. These organizations varying in purpose and composition have loaned their names, their time, and their effort to the promulgation of legislation at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. Churches of all denominations, veterans' groups, labor organizations, chambers of commerce, civic and community organizations, racial and ethnic groups—all are in the midst of the effort. The platform of each of the major political parties contained planks calling for an end to discrimination and the enactment of civil-rights legislation. The voice of the American people is being unmistakably heard.

We have just completed a national election. Both political parties came to the American people and said that they were champions of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks excerpts from the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The President-elect came to the American people and on many occasions stated his opposition to discrimination and his convictions in favor of equal opportunity. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of these remarks, excerpts from some of his statements.

It remains for the Congress to act in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the American people.

For these reasons, we bring again to the Senate a program for civil rights, fully consistent with the traditions and wishes of the American people. These bills are as follows:

First. Antilynching.

Second. Anti-poll-tax.

Third. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights.

Fourth. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation.

Fifth. A bill to strengthen existing civil-rights statutes.

Sixth. A bill to protect the right to political participation.

Seventh. Antipeonage.

Eighth. A resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated at the close of these remarks, brief statements in connection with each of these bills.

Members of the Senate will take note of the fact that there is not included among these eight civil-rights bills, a proposal dealing with equal opportunity in employment. Such a bill will soon be introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and I will be pleased to join with him as a cosponsor. Members of the Senate are aware that such a bill was introduced by me during the Eighty-second Congress and was known as S. 1732. Under my chairmanship, the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, held extensive hearings on the problem of equal opportunity in employment. As a result of those hearings, a new bill, S. 3368, was reported to the floor of the Senate with the cosponsorship of 17 Senators. It became known as the Humphrey-Ives bill. After conversations with the distinguished senior Senator from New York, we have decided to have the bill introduced this year by him as a genuine gesture of bipartisanship in this crucial area of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that statements and certain other matters I have prepared in connection with the bills and concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills and concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the statements and other matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as follows:

S. 462. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 463. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 464. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 465. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 466. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 468. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is established a Joint Committee on Civil Rights (hereinafter called the Joint Committee), to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee to make a continuing study of matters relating to civil rights, including the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to study means of improving respect for and enforcement of civil rights; and to advise with the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to civil rights.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 193, 194), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. Within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. Funds appropriated to the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

SEC. 6. The joint committee may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of State and local governments and private organizations as it deems advisable.

The statements and matters presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

I. ANTILYNCHING—A STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON S. 462, A BILL TO PROTECT PERSONS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES FROM LYNCHING

It is a source of real satisfaction for all Americans to know that the crime of lynching is disappearing from the United States. In recent years, the number of lynchings reported to police-enforcement officials has been negligible. A generation ago, our newspapers reported an average of 50 or more lynchings a year. Last year the record shows that no lynchings were officially reported.

This fact is a tribute to the determination of the American people—of our people in every section of the country, North, South, East, and West—to make civil rights and personal security an increasing reality for all Americans, regardless of their race, color, or creed. Proof that we stand united upon that determination is the fact that both the Republican and Democratic Parties have pledged their efforts in behalf of legislation in the Congress to make lynching a Federal crime.

The need for effective Federal antilynching legislation remains in spite of the statistics. The statistics with regard to the extent of lynchings reflect not only community awareness, but also the fact that the techniques of the crime have been modified. We have no record of the number of people who have disappeared, the number who have received injuries from mob violence and remained silent, and the vast number of families and their friends who heed in silent terror a lesson that a Negro is not yet a free American. The fear of physical violence, because of their race, color, or creed is still a reality for many Americans.

Antilynching legislation is not new legislation. It has been before the Congress for 23 sessions. It has frequently passed the House of Representatives, only to fail before the parliamentary tactics of a minority in the Senate determined to obstruct the bill. It is time the majority which favors antilynching legislation acted to enact the bill. Until we, as a Nation and as a people, have removed every vestige of the crime in the United States, our moral position in the world is undermined. We must make it clear to the world that all Americans know the meaning of that most fundamental freedom, freedom from fear.

The present need for effective Federal antilynching legislation was clearly pointed out as recently as 1947 in the thoughtful and painstaking report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. That distinguished committee, headed by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who was then president of General Electric and is today Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, strongly urged the prompt enactment of adequate legislation. Moreover, the committee made specific recommendations as to the content of the necessary legislation. Our bill conforms in detail with those recommendations.

1. The Committee on Civil Rights urged that lynching be given broad definition. Our bill in section 5 (a) defines lynching as mob violence which is committed because of the victim's race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or which is committed against the person accused of crime as a tragic substitute for the ordinary processes of criminal justice.

2. The committee urged that legislation, to be adequate, must condemn both private individuals and public officials who "mete out summary punishment and private vengeance" and must also condemn public officials who are derelict in their duty to bring members of lynch mobs to justice. Our bill in sections 6 and 7 is carefully drawn to accomplish these objectives.

3. The committee urged legislative authorization so that suspected lynchings can be investigated by the Federal Government immediately. Section 8 of our bill directs the Attorney General to institute such full and prompt investigations.

4. The committee urged "adequate and flexible penalties ranging up to $10,000 and 20-year prison terms." Section 6 of our bill provides for a fine of $1,000, or 1 year's imprisonment, or both, for anyone who aids, abets, or participates in a lynching. If, however, the lynching results in death or maiming or serious physical or mental injury or in serious damage to property, penalties up to a $10,000 fine or 20 years' imprisonment may be imposed. Section 7 of our bill deals specifically with governmental offices or employees and provides for fines up to $5,000 and up to 5-year prison terms for officials who fail to make all diligent efforts to prevent lynchings or who are derelict in bringing members of lynching mobs to justice.

5. The committee, in discussing the general policy of sanctions in civil rights cases, said that "the potential use of civil sanctions * * * is very great." Our bill specifically provides for civil action in behalf of a lynching victim or his next of kin for damages resulting from his injury or death. Any person who violates this law, whether a private individual or a Government official, is to be held civilly liable as well as the State or governmental subdivision thereof in which the lynching takes place, unless the officers responsible for police enforcement have carried out their duties with diligence.

Lynching has robbed thousands of Americans of their lives, millions more of their freedom to walk erect in their own land, and has done serious damage to the prestige of our country here and abroad. The responsibility for lynching is national in scope. The prompt enactment and the vigorous enforcement of this bill will help discharge that responsibility.

II. POLL TAX—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON S. 463, OUTLAWING THE POLL TAX AS A CONDITION OF VOTING IN ANY PRIMARY OR OTHER ELECTION FOR NATIONAL OFFICERS

This bill would outlaw once and for all the poll tax in national elections. In decreeing that no State shall exact a price of admission to the Federal voting booth, it advances the United States a long step forward on the road to universal suffrage.

The evil of the poll tax has long been recognized. Although Congress has exempted servicemen from the poll tax and the tax has been abolished by State legislatures in all but six States, there are still millions of Americans to whom the priceless heritage of voting is a luxury. Today, when the very meaning of freedom is challenged by the ruthless forces of totalitarianism, Americans can no longer tolerate this excise on democracy.

To eliminate this obstacle in voting, our bill declares it unlawful "to levy, collect, or require the payment of, any poll tax" as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives. The bill empowers Federal district courts to enjoin or otherwise prevent violations of the act and authorizes the aggrieved voter or the Federal Government to bring civil suit for relief should a violation take place.

The basis of a democracy is that its government rests on the consent of the governed. The machinery for expressing that consent is the right to vote. The history of our Government has been one of an expanding democracy. The efforts of our people have been to enlarge the area of suffrage. We have, with slow and yet deliberate movement, been removing the blights on our democracy. Property, religious, and sex qualifications have all disappeared. Racial qualifications have now largely been abolished and exist only by subterfuge and indirection.

It might be of interest for the Senate of the United States to recall that during our early days immediately following the Revolutionary War our Colonies had many types of suffrage qualifications. The Colonies of New York, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire required the ownership of real estate stated in terms of value as a condition for voting. The Colonies of North Carolina and Virginia required real estate stated in terms of acres as a condition of voting. Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Georgia, South Carolina, and Maryland required either real estate or other property. In New Jersey it was necessary to possess 50 pounds of proclamation money before a resident could vote. In Pennsylvania it was necessary for an individual to have paid the public taxes before he could vote.

These property and taxpaying qualifications for voting have all been removed. They have been removed as the people have constantly demonstrated their faith in democratic government and as they have come to earn for themselves and gain for themselves the power to rule. It will be observed from a table which I am hereby incorporating in the RECORD at this point that these undemocratic and restrictive qualifications are now all removed and have been removed in most of our States for many years.

TABLE 1.—*Duration of property and taxpaying qualifications*

	Property qualifications ended in—	Taxpaying in—
Connecticut	1818	1845
Delaware	1792	1897
Georgia	1789	1798
Maryland	1810	(1)
Massachusetts	1821	1863
New Hampshire	1784	1792
New Jersey	1844	(1)
New York	1821	1826
North Carolina	1856	1868
Pennsylvania	(1)	1933
Rhode Island	1842	(?)
South Carolina	1778	1810
Virginia	1850	(1)
Tennessee	1834	(1)
Ohio	(1)	1851
Louisiana	(1)	1845
Mississippi	(1)	1832

[1] Had none.

Vermont and Kentucky came into the Union in 1791 and 1792, respectively, and Indiana in 1816 but without property or taxpaying qualifications. After Mississippi, in 1817, no State came in with a property or taxpaying qualification.

One other restriction on suffrage and thus an obstacle to democratic government was the sex qualification on voting. It was not until 1920 when the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was adopted that the full suffrage was granted to women.

The change came about slowly and in parts. Women were first given the right to vote on school matters in certain States. Then they were given the right to vote on tax and bond loans. Finally they were given the right to cast their ballots on the same terms as men.

The most serious obstacle to the suffrage that remains is the poll tax. It has its roots in an attempt by a number of States to prevent the Negro from voting. Its effect, however, is frequently also to disenfranchise the poor white as well.

The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution once and for all prohibited the States from denying the suffrage to any American on account of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Prior to that, of course, the Negro had been considered a slave and was thus excluded by law from voting in most States. It is interesting, however, that even prior to the Civil War the States of

Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont never excluded the Negro from voting.

Poll-tax laws were enacted following the period of recontruction. There are historical reasons for these laws, Mr. President, and I fully appreciate them. The North must never forget and never ignore its share of blame for the serious injury done the South in the period following the Civil War. All the poll-tax laws now in effect were enacted between 1899 and 1903. That sorry era in our national history explains to a large extent the reason for the lingering prejudices which still continue to exist in many sections below Mason and Dixon's line.

In an attempt to keep the Negro from voting, a number of States used ingenious legal devices. The most famous of those are the grandfather clause, the white primary, and the poll tax. The one that remains today is the poll tax.

Whatever historical reasons there may be for the poll tax, however, there can be no justification for this undemocratic infringement upon the franchise. The purpose of the poll tax was to limit the electorate and that it has done. In Virginia, for example, one of the six remaining poll-tax States, the number of votes cast in the election of 1900, the last election before the enactment of the poll tax, was 266,000. The number voting in Virginia in the election of 1902, the next election after the tax was enacted, was 136,000. The poll tax evidently caused a reduction in the electorate of 49 percent. Another State which illustrates the extent to which the poll tax was successful in limiting the electorate was Mississippi, which enacted its poll tax in 1890. The number of votes cast in the election prior to the enactment of the tax was 117,000. In the very next election the number voting was 52,000, a reduction of 56 percent.

The poll tax continues to disenfranchise American citizens and frustrate the principles of majority representative government. I have asked the Library of Congress to analyze for me the laws which now govern payment of poll tax in the six remaining States, and I include a summary table of the poll-tax-payment requirements and laws in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 2.—*Poll-tax requirements in 6 States*

State	Annual poll-tax payment	Possible maximum poll-tax payment
Alabama	$1.50	$36.00
Arkansas	1.00	2.00
Mississippi	2.00	6.00
Tennessee [1]	1.00	2.58
Texas	1.00	1.75
Virginia	1.50	5.01

[1] General elections only. Poll tax abolished in primary elections.

Alabama: Payment must be made on or before the 1st day of February preceding the election. Amount, $1.50, payable by persons from 21 to 45 years of age. Back taxes must be paid (constitution, art. VIII, sec. 178, 194; code (1940), title 14, sec. 71; title 17, secs. 12, 136–138; title 51, secs. 237–248).

Arkansas: Payment must be made before October 1. Amount, $1 (constitution, art. III, sec. 1, art. XIV, sec. 3; amendment No. 8; Stat. Ann. (1947; Supp. 1949), secs. 3–104.1, 3–106, 3–108 to 3–109).

Mississippi: Payment must be made on or before the 1st day of February preceding the election. Amount, $2, subject to increase by county supervisors to not more than $3. All persons between the ages of 21 and 60, except those who are deaf and dumb or blind or who have lost a hand or foot, are subject to the tax. Taxes for the 2 years preceding the election must be paid (constitution, art. XII, secs. 241, 243; Code Ann. (1942), secs. 3235–3236, 9751; as amended Laws 1950, ch. 338).

Tennessee: Payment of tax for the year preceding the election must be made 60 days before election. Amount, $1, payable by male inhabitants between the ages of 21 and 50, except those who are deaf, dumb, blind, or incapable of labor and of earning a livelihood (constitution, art. II, sec. 28; art. IV, sec. 1; art. XI, sec. 12; Code Ann. (Williams, 1934), secs. 2027, 4820, 10239).

Texas: Payment must be made before the 1st day of February next preceding the election. Amount, $1.50, payable by persons between the ages of 21 and 60 who resided in the State in the January preceding the levy, except Indians not taxed, and persons insane, blind, deaf, or dumb, or those who have lost one hand or foot, or are permanently disabled. Counties may levy an additional tax of 25 cents, cities an additional tax of $1 (constitution, art. VI, sec. 2; art. VII, sec. 3; art. VIII, sec. 1; Civil Stat. Ann. (Vernon, 1939), arts. 1030, 2955, 2959, 7046).

Virginia: Payment must be made at least 6 months before the election. Amount, $1.50, payable by all persons over 21, except veterans of the War Between the States and the wives or widows of such veterans. Taxes for the 3 years next preceding the election must be paid (constitution, art. II, secs. 18, 20, 21; art. XIII, sec. 173; code (1950), secs. 24–17, 24–22, 58–49 to 58–51).

Today the statistics clearly demonstrate that those States which have the poll tax thus exclude from a meaningful right of citizenship many millions of people who, because of the poll tax, are prevented from voting. This is serious not only to the States involved. It is also serious to the Nation, since Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives elected from those States vote on crucial matters of national importance when they arrive in the Congress and occupy positions of national power.

It will be of interest to the Senate to see certain statistics in connection with the election of 1948 in those States which had the poll tax in that year. This material was supplied to me by the Library of Congress, and is based on reports of the United States Bureau of the Census and the House of Representatives. I am hereby incorporating it in the RECORD at this point:

Voting population and votes cast in poll-tax States, 1948 and 1952

	Voting population		Presidential votes cast		Percent voting	
	1948	1952	1948	1952	1948	1952
Alabama	1,676,000	1,709,000	214,980	426,120	12.8	24.9
Arkansas	1,048,000	1,070,000	242,475	404,800	23.1	37.8
Mississippi	1,141,000	1,176,000	192,190	285,519	16.9	24.3
Texas	4,573,000	4,845,000	1,147,245	2,076,846	25.1	42.8
Virginia	1,942,000	1,979,000	419,256	619,689	21.6	31.3

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current population reports, Series P-25, No. 63, Aug. 31, 1952. New York Times, Dec. 13, 1952, p. 12.

Voting population and voting participation in presidential elections, 1948 and 1952, by State

	Voting population [1]		Presidential votes cast		Percent voting	
	1948	1952	1948	1952	1948	1952
United States	94,916,000	98,377,000	48,833,680	61,547,861	51.4	62.5
Alabama [2]	1,676,000	1,709,000	214,980	426,120	12.8	24.9
Arizona	416,000	495,000	177,065	260,569	42.6	52.6
Arkansas [2]	1,048,000	1,070,000	242,475	404,800	23.1	37.8
California	7,237,000	7,333,000	4,021,538	5,141,849	55.6	70.0
Colorado	761,000	880,000	515,237	630,103	67.7	71.6
Connecticut	1,368,000	1,445,000	883,518	1,096,911	64.6	75.9
Delaware	212,000	220,000	139,073	174,010	65.5	79.1
Florida	1,683,000	1,978,000	577,643	988,986	34.3	50.0
Georgia	2,057,000	2,114,000	418,760	651,303	20.4	30.8
Idaho	339,000	352,000	214,816	276,254	63.4	78.5
Illinois	5,810,000	5,967,000	3,984,046	4,481,058	68.6	75.1
Indiana	2,517,000	2,626,000	1,656,214	1,955,325	65.8	74.5
Iowa	1,643,000	1,688,000	1,038,264	1,268,773	63.2	75.2
Kansas	1,189,000	1,276,000	788,819	896,166	66.3	70.2
Kentucky	1,655,000	1,655,000	822,658	993,148	49.7	60.0
Louisiana	1,522,000	1,613,000	416,326	651,952	27.4	40.4
Maine	561,000	545,000	264,787	351,786	47.2	64.5
Maryland	1,498,000	1,570,000	596,735	902,074	39.8	57.5
Massachusetts	3,249,000	3,220,000	2,155,347	2,383,398	66.3	74.0
Michigan	4,009,000	4,264,000	2,109,509	2,798,592	52.6	65.6
Minnesota	1,869,000	1,899,000	1,212,226	1,379,482	64.9	72.6
Mississippi [2]	1,141,000	1,176,000	192,190	285,519	16.9	24.3
Missouri	2,564,000	2,656,000	1,578,628	1,892,062	61.9	71.2
Montana	347,000	362,000	224,278	265,037	64.6	73.2
Nebraska	823,000	882,000	488,930	609,660	59.4	69.1
Nevada	105,000	115,000	62,117	82,190	59.3	71.5
New Hampshire	340,000	351,000	231,440	272,952	68.1	77.8
New Jersey	3,249,000	3,476,000	1,949,555	2,419,554	60.0	69.6
New Mexico	317,000	376,000	185,767	238,608	58.6	63.5
New York	10,155,000	10,476,000	6,274,327	7,128,241	61.8	68.0
North Carolina	2,167,000	2,326,000	791,209	1,216,910	36.5	52.1
North Dakota	316,000	350,000	220,716	270,127	63.7	77.2
Ohio	5,340,000	5,350,000	2,936,071	3,706,758	55.0	69.2
Oklahoma	1,295,000	1,372,000	721,509	948,984	55.7	69.2
Oregon	1,025,000	1,035,000	524,080	695,059	51.1	67.2
Pennsylvania	6,823,000	7,043,000	3,735,149	4,580,562	54.7	65.0
Rhode Island	530,000	533,000	326,098	414,498	61.5	77.8
South Carolina [2]	1,042,000	1,112,000	142,571	341,121	13.7	30.7
South Dakota	376,000	398,000	250,105	294,283	66.5	74.0
Tennessee	1,911,000	1,930,000	550,283	892,553	28.8	46.2
Texas [2]	4,573,000	4,845,000	1,147,245	2,076,846	25.1	42.8
Utah	377,000	414,000	276,305	329,554	73.3	79.6
Vermont	230,000	231,000	123,382	153,557	53.7	66.5
Virginia [2]	1,942,000	1,979,000	419,256	619,689	21.6	31.3
Washington	1,565,000	1,543,000	905,059	1,102,708	57.8	71.5
West Virginia	1,120,000	1,128,000	748,750	873,548	66.9	77.4
Wisconsin	2,132,000	2,251,000	1,276,800	1,607,370	59.9	71.4
Wyoming	169,000	180,000	101,425	129,251	59.9	71.8

[1] Voting population is defined as those persons eligible to vote because of age alone—21 years of age and over, in all States except Georgia which is 18 years of age and over.

[2] States now having law requiring poll tax payment as prerequisite for voting.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census. Current population reports, Series P-25, No. 63, Aug. 31, 1952. New York Times, Dec. 13, 1952, p. 12 (1952 official vote by States).

The poll tax is a threat to democracy not only because of its undesirable political consequences but because it has damaging social consequences. It affects that segment of the population which has the lowest per capita income. When those individuals are denied their voice in the choosing of the Government, it is only logical to assume that their desires as to how the Government is to be run will in fact be ignored. We cannot be certain that we indeed have representative government in America so long as we cannot be certain that the Representatives elected to the Congress are chosen by the majority of the people in their respective districts and States.

I think it is fair for me to state that all who have the best interests of our Nation at heart will agree that the poll tax must be abolished. The legislative debate that now takes place in connection with this issue more directly hinges on the question of how the poll tax is to be abolished. Many advocate a constitutional amendment as the means to accomplish this objective. In my honest judgment, Mr. President, I believe that an anti-poll-tax bill enacted by the Congress would be constitutional without an amendment.

There are many who say that the poll tax should be abolished by State action and by State action alone. They, too, condemn the poll tax but believe the most effective way to rid our Nation of its consequences is through local action. Local action, Mr. President, is, of course, always preferable but we have waited too long. These laws have been on the books in most cases for about 50 years. There are resistances to changing the poll tax within the States that now have such a tax because the very forces controlling the instrumentalities in the State government which have the power to abolish the tax are the very ones who benefit most from it. It is expecting a great deal to expect a genuine repeal of the tax by those whom the tax has put into authority.

President Truman in his message on civil rights in 1947 said, "We cannot await the growth of a will to act in the slowest State or the most backward community. Our National Government must show the way." The responsibility rests on the Congress. I pray that the Congress will live up to its responsibilities and accept the challenge.

III. Reorganize Department of Justice—Statement by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on S. 464, To Reorganize the Department of Justice for the Protection of Civil Rights

The Federal Government has a responsibility in all its branches to protect the civil rights of the American people. This bill is designed to strengthen the Department of Justice in its responsibilities to protect civil rights of all Americans.

This bill calls for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a civil-rights division of the Department of Justice. If the Federal Government is to live up to its responsibilities to enforce the civil-rights statutes now part of the established law of our land, it is essential its law-enforcement agency be strengthened so that it can effectively perform its duties. The protection of civil rights is now and must become further a foremost activity of the Department of Justice. We must be vigilant so that we demonstrate both to the peoples of the world and to our own citizens that our Government is dedicated to the preservation of freedom and democracy. Violations of liberty must therefore be met effectively, immediately, and energetically by the arm of the Federal Government. The existence of a civil-rights division is thus a fundamental part of a realistic program.

Our bill also makes provision for increasing the personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to carry out the duties of the Bureau in its investigation of civil-rights cases. We also provide for the Bureau to include a special training program for its agents responsible for the investigation of civil-rights cases. Here too is an essential plank which should receive the unanimous support of the Congress. Law enforcement is one of the most vital needs of the American society.

IV. No Segregation in Transportation—Statement by Senator Humphrey on S. 465, Providing Relief Against Certain Forms of Discrimination in Interstate Transportation

Millions of Americans took pride and satisfaction in recent decisions of the Supreme Court declaring segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate transportation to be illegal. The Supreme Court has again affirmed the basic creed of the American people and their faith in liberty and equality for all men. This bill is introduced to implement and support the existing Supreme Court decisions.

The illegality of racial discrimination in interstate transportation has been conclusively adjudicated in *Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 372 (1946)) and *Henderson* v. *United States* (339 U. S. 816 (1950)). Legislation must be enacted now to provide adequate remedies for such discrimination.

This bill provides that all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States should be entitled to equal treatment in any public conveyance engaged in interstate commerce, without segregation or other discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

This bill would also make punishable by fine and subject to a civil suit the conduct of anyone who denies or attempts to deny equal treatment to travelers of every race, color, religion, or national origin in the use of a public conveyance, or carrier.

A final provision of the bill would make it unlawful for the bus, railroad, or other public carrier facility engaged in interstate commerce to segregate or otherwise discriminate against passengers based on race, color, religion, or national origin. It would also make it unlawful for an officer, agent, or employee of such carrier to so discriminate.

V. Civil-Rights Statutes—Statement by Senator Humphrey on S. 468 To Strengthen Existing Civil-Rights Statutes

The need to enlarge the scope of Federal legislation protecting the rights of individuals to liberty, security, and citizenship is very clear. This can be achieved by enacting new legislation and it must also be achieved by strengthening existing civil-rights laws. One such law to be strengthened is a criminal conspiracy statute (18 U. S. C. 241) which has been used to protect rights secured by the Federal Government against encroachment by private individuals and public officers. Section 201 of our bill is designed to achieve that effect. It does so by extending the protection of the Federal Government to any inhabitant of the United States, not just to a citizen alone. Our courts have ruled (*Baldwin* v. *Franks* (120 U. S. 6788)) that an alien does not come within the protection of the statute. In deciding that case the Court stated:

"It may be by this construction of the statute some are excluded from the protection it affords who are as much entitled to it as those who are included; but that is a defect, if it exists, which can be cured by Congress, but not by the courts."

The amendment which our bill proposes would bring the language of the statute into conformity with other supplemental protective statutes (18 U. S. C. 242). Under the broader statutes, the courts have already decided (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)) that an inhabitant is protected from interference by a State official in his constitutionally protected right to vote in a congressional election or primary. There is more than the need for conformity to support this section, however. The protection of inhabitants is a well-established public policy of our country. We, in fact, subscribed to that policy in the United Nations Charter to promote respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

This bill would make a further change in the existing statute by protecting inhabitants not only when their Federal rights are infringed upon as a result of the conspiracy but also where the infringement is performed by persons acting individually. Whenever a person enjoins, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any inhabitant of the United States in the free exercise or enjoyment of his rights and privileges, that inhabitant should be protected by our laws.

Our bill would also plug gaps in the existing laws insofar as civil remedies to the aggrieved are concerned. The present statute (sec. 47, title 8) appears to provide a civil remedy whenever a citizen's rights are interfered with as a result of a conspiracy. Even this remedy is inadequate, as demonstrated by a recent Supreme Court decision (*Collins* v. *Hardyman*, June 4, 1951). It appears to me, and I am pleased to report that this and the other recommendations of the bill apparently have the support of the Department of Justice, that a civil remedy should be provided the injured person, either where he has been the victim of a conspiracy or the victim of individual action to interfere with his rights and privileges as an inhabitant of the United States. Such an individual, therefore, should have the right to sue those found guilty of violating the law, whether the violators are public officials or private citizens. These suits should be brought in the Federal courts or appropriate State courts, no matter what the sum of money involved in the controversy.

One other question has been raised by the courts (*Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91)) with regard to the rights, privileges, and immunities which inhabitants of the United States should enjoy. The courts have held (*Pullen* v. *United States* (164 F. (2d))) that our statutes protect inhabitants only against being deprived of their constitutional rights willfully. The proof of a general bad purpose alone may not be enough. We therefore consider it essential to enumerate in some detail some of the rights to be protected by our laws. All of these rights have already been sustained by the courts and are not new. The rights we desire specifically to set forth follow:

1. The right to be immune from exaction of fine without due process of law (*Culp* v. *United States* (131 F. (2d) 93)).

2. The right to be immune from punishment for a crime except after a fair trial and confession after due process of law (*Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91); *Crews* v. *United States* (160 F. (2d) 746); *Moore* v. *Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86); *Mooney* v. *Holohan* (294 U. S. 103)).

3. The right to be immune from physical violence applied to compel a confession of a crime or to exact testimony (*Chambers* v. *Florida* (309 U. S. 227); *United States* v. *Sutherland* (37 F. Supp. 344)).

4. The right to be free of illegal restraint such as being detained by a sheriff without jurisdiction (*Catlette* v. *United States* (132 F. (2d) 902); *United States* v. *Trierweiller* (52 F. Supp. 4)).

5. The right to protect the person and property without discrimination by reason of race, color, or national origin (*Catlette* v. *United States; Yick-Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 35)).

6. The right to vote as protected by Federal laws (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *United States* v. *Saylor* (322 U. S. 385); *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)).

VI. Right To Vote—Statement by Senator Humphrey on S. 468, To Protect the Right to Political Participation

The Hatch Act (18 U. S. C. 594) now makes it a crime for anyone to intimidate or coerce an American citizen for the purpose of interfering with his right to vote as he wishes in elections for national office. This law was enacted in 1939, at a time when there was doubt in Congress as to the constitutionality of Federal regulation over nominating primaries. It is clear, however, today that the Federal Government does have the right to regulate the nominating primaries system. This has been so since 1941 and the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (317 U. S. 299). It is therefore essential that our laws be clear and unequivocable in this respect.

This bill therefore provides that it is a crime to intimidate or coerce an American citizen and thus interfere with his right to vote in primary and special elections, as well as general elections for Federal office. This bill also makes certain minor technical changes in the existing laws so as to unequivocably declare it to be the right of citizens to vote at any election without distinction as to race, color, religion, or national origin; and that interfering with that right by anyone is a crime. These changes have been requested by the Justice Department, which has been responsible for carrying out the provisions of the law and protecting the rights of the citizens.

It is clear that discrimination against voters on the basis of race or color is a direct violation of the fifteenth amendment (*Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)), and the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment (*Nixon* v. *Herndon* (273 U. S. 536); *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73)). Our courts have continually ruled that discrimination in voting based on religion or national origin is arbitrary, unreasonable, and "by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded on the doctrine of equality."

This bill further strengthens the existing civil-rights statutes insofar as voting is concerned by providing in addition to criminal penalties that the party whose voting rights are interfered with can bring a suit for injury against the person or persons who interfered or attempted to interfere with his right to vote. One other provision of our bill would authorize the Attorney General to bring a law suit in the courts to prevent violation of the law or provide relief if the violations take place.

VII. Antipeonage—Statement by Senator Humphrey on S. 467, To Strengthen the Criminal Laws Relating to Peonage, Slavery, and Involuntary Servitude

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the Department of Justice received 85 complaints concerning possible peonage and involuntary servitude. I am informed that since that date, the complaints have continued. Peonage, of course, is a form of involuntary servitude rising out of a payment of a debt. It is essential that our laws be strengthened so that this form of involuntary servitude will be eliminated once and for all from our society. This is certainly the intent of the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution.

Our existing laws (secs. 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, U. S. Code) declare the following to be a crime: holding or returning persons to conditions of peonage, arresting persons with the intent of pressing them or returning them to conditions of peonage; kidnaping, arresting, or carrying away persons with the intent that they be sold into involuntary servitude or held as slaves; enticing, persuading, or inducing persons to go on board vessels with the intent that they be made or held as slaves; and knowingly and wilfully holding persons to involuntary servitude or selling a person into any condition of involuntary servitude.

There are two basic changes which must be made to strengthen these laws. First, it is essential to make clear that to hold an individual in involuntary servitude is punishable; secondly, it is important that not only the acts described above be considered criminal, but an attempt to commit the acts be in itself criminal. Every human being must have the right to be protected in this most vital area of his personal security and human dignity.

VIII. Joint Committee on Civil Rights—Statement by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, a Concurrent Resolution To Establish a Joint Committee on Civil Rights

This concurrent resolution would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to be composed of 14 members, 7 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, with due regard for party representation. The duty of the joint committee is to make and conduct a study relating to civil rights and civil liberties, to study means of improving responsibility for an enforcement of our laws protecting civil rights; and to advise, with the committees of the Congress who have the legislative responsibility relating to this vital area of our democratic heritage.

It is essential that this joint committee, like any other joint committee of the Congress, should be authorized to hold whatever hearings it deems necessary, with the power of subpena to carry out its functions. One of the important activities should also be that of consulting with representatives of State and local governments and with private organizations vitally interested in the preservation of human rights.

I urge upon the Senate that it act speedily and effectively to enact the provisions of this concurrent resolution. Whatever considerations there may be calling for further study of other proposals dealing with the area of human rights, there can be no excuse and no justification for further delay as it affects the basic provision of this bill. This problem is a serious one and a most complex one which calls for constant study, constant evaluation, and constant effort.

Political Party Platforms on Civil Rights

Republican Platform

The Republican Party will not mislead, exploit, or attempt to confuse minority groups for political purposes. All American citizens are entitled to full, impartial enforcement of Federal laws relating to their civil rights.

We believe that it is the primary responsibility of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, and this power, reserved to the States, is essential to the maintenance of our Federal Republic. However, we believe that the Federal Government should take supplemental action within its constitutional jurisdiction to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin.

We will prove our good faith by—

Appointing qualified persons, without distinction of race, religion, or national origin, to responsible positions in the Government.

Federal action toward the elimination of lynching.

Federal action toward the elimination of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting.

Appropriate action to end segregation in the District of Columbia.

Enacting Federal legislation to further just and equitable treatment in the area of discriminatory employment practices. Federal action should not duplicate State efforts to end such practices; should not set up another huge bureaucracy.

Democratic Platform

In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the Eighty-third Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after a reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

The Democratic Party is committed to support and advance the individual rights and liberties of all Americans.

Our country is founded on the proposition that all men are created equal. This means that all citizens are equal before the law and should enjoy equal political rights. They should have equal opportunities for education, for economic advancement, and for decent living conditions.

We will continue our efforts to eradicate discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin.

We know this task requires action, not just in one section of the Nation, but in all sections. It requires the cooperative efforts of individual citizens and action by State and local government. It also requires Federal action. The Federal Government must live up to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and must exercise the powers vested in it by the Constitution.

We are proud of the progress that has been made in securing equality of treatment and opportunity in the Nation's Armed Forces and the civil service and all areas under Federal jurisdiction. The Department of Justice has taken an important part in successfully arguing in the courts for the elimination of many illegal discriminations, including those involving rights to own and use real property, to engage in gainful occupations and to enroll in publicly supported higher educational institutions. We are determined that the Federal Government shall continue such policies.

At the same time, we favor Federal legislation effectively to secure those rights to everyone: (1) the right to equal opportunity for employment; (2) the right to security of persons; (3) the right to full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, free from arbitrary restraints. We also favor legislation to perfect existing Federal civil rights statutes and to strengthen the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights.

Statements by President-Elect Eisenhower on Civil Rights

"Let us once and for all resolve that henceforth we shall be guided in our relations with our fellows by the American creed that all men are created equal—and remain equal. All of us who salute the flag, whatever our color or creed or job or place of birth may be, are Americans entitled to the full rights and the full privileges of our citizenship. In a time when America needs all the brains, all the skills, all the spiritual strength and dedicated services of its 157,000,000 people, discrimination is criminally stupid." (Eisenhower, American Legion, New York City, August 25, 1952.)

"Equality of opportunity was part of the vision of the men who founded our Nation. It is a principle deeply imbedded in our religious faith. And neither at home nor in the eyes of the world can America risk the weakness which inevitably results when any group of our people are ranked—politically or economically—as second-class citizens." (Eisenhower, Columbia, S. C., September 30, 1952.)

"We must make equality of opportunity a living fact for every American—regardless of race, color, or creed. To do that is part of the unfinished business of America.

"Equality of opportunity has its strongest roots in our religious faith. Every individual act, every law, every political maneuver, every pressure which infringes on the political and economic rights of any American or

any group of Americans weakens America. It gives powerful ammunition to America's enemies. It will eventually betray the freedom of each of us." (Eisenhower, Los Angeles, October 9, 1952.)

"Now I bring you another question obviously of great interest to you people. We know that America has not achieved under its great Constitution that full perfection of operation that it should with respect to equal opportunity for all citizens. There is discrimination. This crusade is pledged to use every single item of leadership and influence it has to eliminate it. It intends to enforce the full Constitution, not part of it." (Eisenhower, Harlem, October 25, 1952.)

"I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second-class citizenship for anybody." (From a summary of campaign pledges released by Eisenhower's New York headquarters November 1, 1952.)

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 469) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to discuss the bill for about 15 minutes.

Mr. President, widespread and continuing dissatisfaction with the notoriously antiquated and sickenly slipshod system in which the Federal Government handles fiscal matters has been expressed by many persons in and out of Congress. That is especially true of the way appropriations measures are expended. The other day, our colleague, the very able and experienced new chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, very properly pointed out that Congress is employing the same techniques in appropriating eighty billions that it used when appropriations were less than five billions annually. The facts are that the important function of making appropriations in these days of huge expenditures has gotten completely out of hand. The very weight of the fantastic size of present-day appropriations has broken the back of congressianal fiscal machinery. Appropriations must be modernized and streamlined and we must not spare the horses in doing so.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is generally known as a keen and painstaking student of Federal fiscal policies, has been calling attention to the huge, but almost forgotten, unexpended balances in the current accounts of various departments of the Federal Government. He suggests that our unexpended balances may reach the colossal total of $100,000,000,000. While everyone admits the amount is huge, no one in Government can pinpoint the exact number of dollars involved. It is said that it will require many months to find out the precise status of our unexpended balance. Any banker or industrialist in the United States who did not know to the last penny the precise amount of his unexpended balance would be sent to a hospital, a bankruptcy court, or on a job-hunting tour. To not know and to not make fiscal calculations accordingly is no way for Congress to handle the people's hard-earned money. It is an understatement to say the people are shocked by the Byrd disclosures. They must feel that the Members of Congress who represent them in Washington are little children lost in the woods when it comes to finances.

Something must be done to bring order out of such chaos. In that spirit and with that objective very much in mind, I have devised a new, streamlined, and very simple appropriation bill model or, rather, a pattern for an appropriation bill. It is a one-package appropriation bill and is so completely streamlined that it consists of but four pages, and yet, in my opinion, it provides more pertinent fiscal information for the people and for Members of Congress than did the conventional one-package appropriation bill which in 1950 consisted of 482 pages.

Here [exhibiting] it is, Mr. President, as compared with the bill of 1950. Anyone can see what a voluminous document the bill of 1950 is.

My percentage appropriation bill is devised to give the Members of Congress and the man on the street a comprehensive perspective of Federal expenditure that he cannot get by long study of the Federal budget report which ordinarily is three times as large as a Sears, Roebuck catalog; or by reading the customary 20 appropriation bills of 50 pages each; or even the one-package appropriation bill of 482 pages advocated by many Senators.

The percentage approach first determines that $70,000,000,000, or some other amount, shall be the over-all total of appropriations for the following fiscal year. Every schoolboy knows that a total of anything is 100 percent. Accordingly, my bill splits that total of 100 percent up into many smaller percentages, the sum of which equals 100 percent, and then it allocates these percentages instead of dollars to the various departments and functions of Government. Dividing that 100-percent pie on the basis of the relative importance and proper support for each Federal function is the very essence of the difficult technical job which the Appropriations Committees of Congress are called upon to make.

From long observation, I am convinced that the average Senator and the average American citizen does not make much of a distinction between thousands and millions or even thousands and billions. I have seen the Senate, many times, spend hours debating the virtue of an appropriation for $100,000 and then without batting an eye vote appropriations of $50,000,000,000 in a few seconds of time. On the other hand, percentages are different. They deal with the relationship of the support of functions rather than with unrelated amounts of dollars. Very naturally, with respect to such things, there is much understanding and great interest.

Before I can grasp the actual appearance of some new object, I must make mental comparisons between it and things with which I am familiar. If someone should undertake to describe an elephant to me and I had never before heard of the ponderous symbol of the Republican Party, I might ask: "Is it as large as a donkey? A greyhound? Or even a Greyhound bus?" By making comparisons with things with which I am familiar I could get a fairly accurate picture of a pachyderm.

Almost anyone, in or out of Congress, comprehends when it is said that the Department of Agriculture is allocated but slightly more than 1 percent of the revenues of this Government; or that the Department of the Interior, including Reclamation, gets less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of those revenues, or the legislative branch receives one-tenth of 1 percent, or the District of Columbia receives one one-hundredth of 1 percent, while the military, including civil functions, receives almost 62 percent of the total revenues of the United States. Relativity carries the same vital significances in appropriations as in Einstein's cosmic universe.

Keeping Federal appropriations in the proper adjustment with respect to public functions as a whole on a basis of value to the people is vital to the progress of this great country and its contentment. Balance is vital alike to the circus performer and to a fiscal policy.

The sad state of inflation, with which this country is sorely afflicted has been brought about by blind and reckless fiscal policies with no regard for an over-all balanced budget. The new administration has made a solemn pledge to the American voters to cease indulging in deficit spending. Congress cannot do less than to give the new President full support in his efforts to straighten out the Nation's fiscal problems. It is my earnest and considered opinion that the adoption by Congress of my suggestion for a streamlined appropriation bill with a fixed ceiling for the over-all total appropriation and a fixed ceiling for each departmental appropriation and the opportunity for the Budget Bureau to review and control each executive department's appropriation after it is made as well as before, will be a long and constructive step toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal fiscal matters.

The figures and percentages used in my calculations have been assembled merely to illustrate the new approach to the difficult task of determining the correct size of all Federal appropriations. I do not say that any of them are correct as to amount. I lifted them bodily from last year's appropriation bills and am using them here only to indicate how my plan would operate.

Doubtless, the Appropriations Committees would want to change somewhat every percentage point. I used the over-all total of $70,000,000,000 because the press had reported that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT] and President-elect Eisenhower have agreed upon $70,000,000,000 as a proper total for the fiscal year. My own views are that $60,000,000,000 would prove to be a far wiser fiscal target. However, that is a matter for the Appropriations Committee members to determine out of their long experience and more intimate

knowledge of Federal fiscal problems. But, I do contend that some over-all specific total must be determined and tenaciously adhered to, come what may, and so I make it a fixture in my bill and build all appropriations around it.

Mr. President, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 601, section 138 of which directed the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the two Appropriations Committees to meet and to set some figure as the ceiling for appropriations for the fiscal year in which Congress was legislating.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD at this point section 138 of Public Law 601.

There being no objection, section 138 of Public Law 601 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the allocation of the exact percentage ceilings to each department and and function of government would follow after exhaustive hearings and study by the Appropriations Committees. If one department or function is given more by the committees or by the Congress under my plan some other department or function must receive less. The time-honored custom has been to allocate funds to each function on a basis of the successful salesmanship of the department in convincing Congress of its requirement and then to boost the total to accommodate the increase. Under the old system "log rolling" becomes an art. Under such a system it is small wonder that in this current year we have a deficit of $10,000,000,000 which, I might add, is a national disgrace. To indulge in deficit spending in the year in which we are enjoying the greatest prosperity of all time, with employment and production at an all-time high, is reckless beyond description. In such a year we are bonding our children's children to pay for our indulgence, our weakness, and our waste. When honestly analyzed that is exactly what deficit spending means. Here is a truth which cannot be successfully denied. Without the active leadership, enthusiastic support and inflexible determination of the executive, no legislative body can effect economies in government.

I am sure every Member of the Senate who has ever been the Governor of a State will agree with my statement. Legislative bodies simply cannot balance budgets. That is equally true of city councils, State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States.

The founding fathers who wrote our Federal Constitution did not recognize the significance of that fact and accordingly neglected to employ two very vital devices for handling Federal finances. They failed to give the Chief Executive the power to veto separate items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole measure, and they failed to make all appropriations by Congress for which no revenues have been provided null and void except in cases of war, insurrection, or rebellion. Colorado, as do many States, has such provisions in its constitution. I believe there are 14 States which make such provision. As a result, there can be no deficit spending in such a State and the governor can keep his State's finances in perfect balance and in orderly adjustment if he has the courage and the will to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement by Mr. Paul Hoffman, who, as will be recalled, was at one time president of the Studebaker Corp., and who served as head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which administered the Marshall plan. Mr. Hoffman has made some very wise observations, and I desire to have them made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What a special group has one year it expects to get the next year. And what one group gets another group wants. At the very least this process has a devitalizing effect on our political life.

There are two effective ways of counteracting long and numerous Government subsidies. One is to insist that they all be openly and clearly defined, so that everybody knows who is getting what and why he is getting it. The second is continually to challenge every subsidy from the general taxpayer's point of view. Those hand-outs that are necessary to the national welfare would, as a result, not only survive but have more general and informed public support. And those which were just habits of past years could be weeded out.

The whole problem of governmental management with its attendant overhead needs unremitting scrutiny.

We need new ground rules, chief among which is legislation enabling the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills, instead of getting the all-or-nothing alternatives that confront him now. In this way the financing of major and necessary programs would not be jeopardized by the inclusion of irrelevant or self-serving riders that get approval only because the President cannot strike them out without vetoing the whole bill.

So long as the armament race continues, a major hope of really living within our means, even with present high taxes, lies in getting more defense per dollar spent. This was important 3 years ago when we hoped to stabilize military expenses at $12,000,000,000 a year. It is imperative when we find ourselves spending nearly $60,000,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Federal Constitution had provided such safeguards for its Treasury I am satisfied the Federal debt would be merely a fraction of its present gigantic size and there would be no undeclared wars.

The percentage appropriation bill virtually gives the President the power to veto items through the Bureau of the Budget's authority, control, and direction to scrutinize congressional appropriations for the executive departments after they are made and before expended by the various executive departments. My bill does not give the President or the Bureau of the Budget any veto or control power over legislative or judicial appropriations. My bill does not encroach on the executive branch nor does it permit the executive to encroach on the judicial or legislative branches.

It should be noted that neither the President nor the Bureau of the Budget can in any way boost an appropriation. An appropriation can be reduced by curtailing expenditures. That is all that can be done. The President cannot shift an appropriation from one function of government to some other function of government. Under my bill that condition remains just as it is at present, under present procedure.

Frankly, greater use should be made of the Bureau of the Budget in dealing with the Federal fiscal problem, and that is an important feature of my bill. It is a large Bureau with many trained and experienced technicians. It has 462 employees, who are paid a total annual salary of $3,181,000, and an average salary to each of nearly $7,000 a year. In addition, it is given an annual expense item of $340,200. I am not being critical of this Bureau, its operation, its size, or its costs. If its costs were three times as great I would not complain, because the Bureau of the Budget should be the watchdog of our Treasury, and good watchdogs cost money.

At present the Bureau of the Budget compiles volumes of vital data on appropriations before they are enacted by Congress, and thereby form a basis for the President's recommendation to Congress. So far so good; but the percentage appropriation bill contemplates that in addition to that necessary service they ride herd on every expenditure of every executive department of the Federal Government after Congress has voted a lump-sum appropriation to such department. If that were done, the President of the United States could protect the Treasury in the expenditure of every penny allocated to a Federal executive department. I have full faith that the President-elect will assume his full responsibility with respect to expenditures if Congress will give him the opportunity to do so.

The Washington Daily News has come up with a very sound, yet very simple, plan for cutting spending. According to the News, here are the ABC's on how their plan would be made effective:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at

this point an article entitled "Here Are the ABC's of How To Cut Spending," published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here are the Washington Daily News' A, B, C's:

A supervisor is a man who bosses other people. Call him a foreman, a straw boss, a sergeant, a corporal. In Government, he's called a supervisor.

In business and industry, he's the one whose performance, in the last analysis, decides whether an operation is efficient or inefficient, whether it turns a profit or runs in the red.

He does well in business and industry. But in the Federal service, he simply never gets a chance. We propose that he get a chance.

We propose two simple (but magic) things:

1. That each Government supervisor be told—in the form of a simple, working budget—exactly how much he spends. At present, astonishing though it seems, most supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

2. That each and every supervisor then be invited, encouraged, and challenged to make it his personal responsibility to figure out ways of spending less.

Incredible though it may seem to businessmen outside Government, that isn't being done in Government now, either.

Here is what would be done under the News plan that isn't done under the present system:

Once an agency receives its funds from Congress, it would give each and every bureau its own working budget for the year. (This is done now in most agencies—but not in all.)

Once a bureau received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its divisions. (This isn't done now in most agencies.)

Once a division received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its branches. (This isn't done now—except in rare cases.)

Once a branch received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its sections. (This isn't done now.)

Once a section received its budget, it would give budgets to each of its units—if there existed distinct budgets within the section. (This isn't done now.)

And finally, once every supervisor had his own budget—every supervisor of every bureau, division, branch, section, and unit—he would be encouraged, by every means possible, to regard it not as an invitation to spend, but, instead, as a guide to saving.

He would be encouraged to make saving part of his job.

It's as simple as that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This plan does not conflict in any way with my percentage appropriation bill. Rather, it complements it. My plan, as we recall, contemplates a lump sum appropriation to each division of Federal Government. The Washington News plan takes over from there. I think the Bureau of the Budget, representing the Chief Executive as it does, should supervise the News plan and see to it that it is carried out orderly and with positive certainty. No plan can be made self-executing. Every plan must have direction, and that direction in Federal Government, if it comes at all, must come from the President of the United States.

I commend the Washington News most heartily for submitting their timely plan to cut spending and for the splendid articles they have published in support of their vital and realistic approach to the difficult problem of spending $80,000,000,000 without waste. Mr. John Cramer, a reporter for many years on the staff of the Washington News, has written eight intensely interesting articles covering the whole field of Federal spending. I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in connection with my statement at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CRAMER'S SIMPLE PLAN

John Cramer has been a reporter on this newspaper for some years. His beat: Your Government.

His daily column is designed primarily to deal with the interests of our readers who are also Government employees.

He doesn't worry about the high-level politics or the kind of news that usually gets the national headlines.

He's concerned about what makes the Government tick for the Government workers—the chores of the administrative employees and the things that affect their jobs.

On this assignment, our Mr. Cramer has learned a lot about government; about its detailed, hum-drum, day-to-day operations.

Like so many of us, he has seen waste, extravagance, and duplication.

Like so many conscientious Government employees, he wondered what can be done when government gets that way.

Possibly because he has seen at first hand and for so long the bafflement of sincere Government workers; possibly because he has been sympathetic to the frustrations of the dedicated public servant, wincing at his job when he hears governmental spend, spend, spend denounced from hell to breakfast. He has been sympathetic because he knows the average Federal employee wants to do a good job, is trying to do a good job, and yet can see for himself the validity of the criticism. The average sincere Federal worker of, perhaps, modest responsibilities, feels frustrated because he can do nothing about it.

He would do something about it if he could.

Mr. Cramer hit on a plan which will give him a chance to do something about it.

Yesterday we told you how the plan generally would work.

In Mr. Cramer's story today you will find specific examples.

Yesterday we described how the identical element that makes a well-run business successful is missing in Government, and we described how it could be added.

This element would counteract the natural tendency to bureaucratic expansion by putting on the Government supervisor the same checks that are put on a manager—no matter how modest his responsibilities are—in business. This element is simply a cost sheet.

In the Government a unit is the smallest segment. Units make a section, and several sections make a branch, branches make up a division, and divisions make up a bureau.

It's an astonishing fact, but true, that in most of this sprawling hierarchy the supervisors of these subdivisions make no budgets. They don't even know how much they spend.

Our idea is simply to give them that responsibility. In other words, to start budget making and money saving at the bottom. As it is now, it mainly is a matter of guesswork at the top.

This change that we propose is general practice in big business.

It has been tried in a few Government units with convincing success.

There's no mystery in it. It isn't revolutionary. It has been done for years wherever businesses have been efficiently run.

All it would take to make it Government-wide policy is an order from the White House.

Several of General Eisenhower's advisers have shown a lively interest in this plan.

Senator FRANK CARLSON, who will head the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the new Congress, thinks it could be the real answer to the economy problem.

However, we don't offer it as a cure-all. It is not a cure-all any more than a good shop foreman is a cure-all for ills which have their roots in some other facet of a business, such as, for instance, its sales policy or its pricing system.

But he can run his shop economically.

He can in Government, too, if he is given the chance.

There are about 100,000 supervisors in our Government. Mr. Cramer estimates that only about 5,000 of them ever have a chance to work against operating costs, and to try to improve their performance records in those terms.

These 100,000 know where the rat holes are. If they are given the job, they will know how to plug them up.

That's all there is to it.

We hope you'll read Mr. Cramer's story today.

We hope the new administration's interest in it will continue to grow, and that steps will be taken to put such a plan into general effect.

Your interest in it will help accomplish this.

AN INCENTIVE PLAN FOR FEDERAL BOSSES

(By John Cramer)

A brand new Government economy idea, first presented by the Washington Daily News in its 9 to 4:30 column on October 27 has attracted the enthusiastic interest of persons close to General Eisenhower.

They are saying it may be Ike's golden opportunity. It may be his chance to deliver on his campaign promise to make the Federal service cost less.

Estimates of the potential savings run to hundreds of millions annually. Perhaps even billions, ultimately.

In a nutshell, the idea is: A working budget for every Government supervisor.

It is a proposal that every Federal agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple, working budget—and challenge him to cut it.

This is done in most efficient businesses. It is not generally done in Government.

Here is a hair-raising fact—one which can't be repeated too often:

The vast majority of Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

In distilled essence, the News' proposal is simply that Government supervisors be told (for the first time) how much they spend—and invited (for the first time) to work at saving.

Those who have studied the idea are convinced that its possibilities are almost unlimited.

Through it, they say, the entire Federal service would be encouraged to think in new terms—in terms of savings.

A complete new atmosphere would be created—one of governmental economy.

Supervisors at all levels would be put on notice that the business of saving was an important, major part of their jobs.

In the process, they would require a new sense of participation, responsibility, and pride in their work.

And Government as a whole would acquire an important new yardstick of management—the yardstick of continuing dollars-and-cents measurement of efficiency at every level of supervision. It would have:

A yardstick for present operations.

A yardstick for the evaluation of new and improved systems and methods which might be applied in the future.

And a yardstick for the appraisal of the supervisors themselves—an instrument for

identifying the able and weeding out the inefficient.

In the vast majority of Government's sprawling bureaus, there is no such yardstick now.

There is little or no emphasis on economy, as everybody knows.

And most specifically, there is almost no attempt to enlist the aid and ideas of the first-line supervisor in the all-important business of saving. (Definition of a first-line supervisor: One who has no subordinate supervisors under him.)

In one form or another, the budget-for-every-supervisor already is widely used in industry.

Variations of it are in operation in several small units of Government—units, incidentally, which can show amazing but convincing proof of dollars-and-cents efficiency.

The idea would not require legislation.

It could be put into effect by Presidential order.

And it's so simple, so inexpensive, that it would not require a single penny of additional appropriation by Congress.

In the military, there's a saying that an army is no better than its sergeants.

SHOCKING FACTS

And the bureaucrats delight to paraphrase this by saying that government is no better than its first-line supervisors.

But where the Army spares no effort to make its sergeants efficient at war, the civilian Federal Government does next to nothing to make its supervisors efficient at saving.

Here are more shocking facts:

Out of an estimated 100,000 supervisors in Government, only about 5,000 ever see anything which even faintly resembles a working budget for the units they manage.

Most of the 5,000 who do have budgets (of a sort) tend to regard them as ceilings on spending, rather than incentives for saving.

And for the remaining 95,000 supervisors, there are no budgets, no emphasis on economy, and little or no encouragement to save.

The News presents the budget-for-every-supervisor proposal in the firm conviction that thousands of Government supervisors know millions of ways in which to economize.

They just haven't been asked.

The News believes that they sincerely want to economize; that they'll do so if given the chance.

SIMPLE BUDGET

It believes that the Federal Government, unhappily, has deprived most of its supervisors of one of the basic satisfactions which comes with doing a good job—the satisfaction of knowing they have done it economically.

A supervisor's budget would be in no way elaborate or costly. It would contain only a few simple lines.

It would show items such as these:

The supervisor's prorated share of his agency's appropriation for normal overhead.

For office supplies.

For equipment.

For office space.

For communications.

For employee salaries.

For travel expenses.

Once given this budget, it would be the supervisor's job to cut it if he could.

We think he would.

Appalling Government waste can be prevented.

It is waste which runs to millions and billions.

This article will cite concrete examples.

It also will show how the waste could have been prevented by a simple, inexpensive plan which the Washington Daily News presented in detail yesterday.

We'd like to call it a magic plan—because it has so many unrealized possibilities for almost-miraculous savings. But it's too easy to be labeled magic.

The waste exists because the 2,500,000-man, $80,000,000,000-a-year Federal service somehow has lost sight of the simple, fundamental, basic concept that there can be no true economizing—in Government as well as industry—unless saving is the day-to-day business of every person who has the power to spend.

The waste is fostered by basically able, loyal Government servants—good people, and we really mean it—who spend tax dollars heedlessly, because they've never been asked to heed.

And the waste will continue endlessly, in a trail of increasingly ruinous taxation, unless Government sets out to make saving the main job of those who do the spending.

In Government as in industry, the spenders, obviously, are the bosses, the supervisors, foremen, straw bosses, unit chiefs, and office sergeants—all those who have been raised to places of command, however modest.

The News' proposal for making savers out of spenders is one which always has been standard practice in efficient private industry—yet one which, incredibly, has been lost and forgotten in the maze of government.

The News' proposal is simply this: That every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and then challenge him, by every possible means, not only to live within it, but, more importantly, to cut it. Let him be rated on his performance.

Under the present system, unfortunately, there is rarely thought of cutting budgets (in the very few places where real working budgets exist) and far too much thought of spending every penny the budget allows.

But let's talk about Government waste.

Let's talk about prime steaks fed to dogs, expensive copper tubing in bundle lots used as reinforcing rods in driveways, about telegrams versus airmail letters, about $4,000,000, and about a piddling $400,000.

In a certain small Government agency, a certain division recently discovered that it has $400,000 more than it possibly can spend.

The budget officer of this agency went to a higher officer and said: "What do you want to do with it?"

Fortunately, for all of us, the higher budget officer had definite ideas. "As far as I'm concerned," he said, "there's only one thing we're going to do with it. Turn it back to the Treasury."

But he knew, and you and I know, and everyone with any knowledge of Government knows that that ordinarily just isn't done. Ordinarily, a way would have been figured out to spend that $400,000—it happens to be just about 3 percent of the agency's total appropriation.

But let's suppose for a moment.

Let's suppose that every single supervisor in this particular small agency had his own individual budget. Let's suppose that each supervisor knew it to be part of his job to save. Let's suppose that he knew his chances of advancement would depend on how well he saved.

In that case, quite obviously, no budget officer would ever think of trying to find ways to spend an extra $400,000.

He would know he couldn't even give the money away.

An electric typewriter costs only a few hundred dollars. Nice to have, too.

A section chief asked a division chief for an O. K. to buy one. He said electric typewriters were good for cutting stencils.

The division chief asked a simple question: "How many stencils do we cut a year?"

The section chief said he'd find out, and came back a few hours later to report, rather sheepishly, that the electric typewriter probably wasn't necessary, after all.

It turned out that during the previous year less than a dozen had been cut.

The division chief says: "If that man had been trying to economize * * * if he had been trying to reduce a personal budget * * * he never in a million years would have suggested buying that particular typewriter."

The information division of a small agency recently began renting a wire service news ticker, delivering the news in much the same way it's delivered to newspapers.

Many agencies have use for such machines. This particular agency has no use for one. Not twice in a year will the ticker carry news so urgent that it really ought to be delivered to agency higher-ups before they can get it from newspapers.

The News suggests that the head of this agency's Information Division ought to have his own personal budget—and thereby be forced to evaluate the real worth of his spending before he orders it.

Here is a simple tale of $4,000,000.

In the closing days of last June, there was a Navy captain who was slightly frantic. The Government year would close at the end of the month and he had in his unit some unexpended funds—$4,000,000.

It was the clear understanding of this captain that he was expected by the Navy to spend the money; that otherwise Congress probably would give his unit less next year. And the Navy—God bless it—never gives up.

Though it took some doing, the captain finally made it.

Presumably, however, it would have taken a lot more doing had the supervisors under his command—and those above him, too—been bucking for promotions on the basis of what they could save.

This reporter has been told of a not-too-distant house which was built, completely, of material stolen from an Army camp. Of another house which was wired with stolen electric cable. Of a Navy shop where all employees have the almost-unattainable Outstanding Performance ratings—because they know too well the thievery of the foreman. Of junkyard-destined planes which were painted and repainted simply to keep a large crew busy. Of an $80,000 saving which was accomplished over the strenuous objections of two Government purchasing officials whose only complaint was that a certain purchase would not follow a certain well-loved system. Of expensive brass dumped overboard, in truckload lots, from a nearby Navy establishment simply because it was known that another variety of brass (complete with braid) would soon make an official inspection. Of a nearby military establishment where there is a concrete roadway reinforced with brass tubings—this same in package lots. Of those 200-word telegrams (you've heard about them) which OPS once sent to mayors of all cities of more than 100,000—including four cities which didn't even exist.

For a certain Government photographic unit, Congress made a mistake.

It cut the staff by roughly 80 percent. But it neglected to cut its $1,000,000 annual appropriation for supplies.

With its reduced staff, the unit had no way to spend the million. But, over the strong protests of its supervisor, it bought $250,000 worth of supplies every 3 months; kept them for a certain number of days in wangled (and costly) storage space; and then declared them surplus.

This was done to keep Congress from knowing that the unit didn't really need the supplies.

It wouldn't be done if the News plan of making savers out of spenders were adopted.

Wherever this reporter has discussed the News' budget-for-every-supervisor plan with Government officials he has encountered a curious—and perhaps significant—reaction.

The officials suddenly began thinking aloud.

A Cabinet officer was outraged because his subordinates had asked him to make the decision between buying adequate but reasonably economical electronic calculating equipment as against buying twice as costly

equipment which would do more—but nothing more of any real value to his agency. He thought his subordinates should have made the decision themselves. The order was one involving many millions of dollars.

A high-ranking military agency civilian talked of the millions of waste which occur because the military orders X number of dollars spent for X volume of supplies—and then never seriously reexamines to see if the supplies really are needed as much tomorrow as they appeared to be needed yesterday.

A former Government administrator said: "In my agency we really thought we were trying for economy. But, come to think of it, there really wasn't much trying below the Secretary's office."

A Government personnel officer told of the surprising number of recommendations for promotions which were on his desk when he took office. When he told each of his section chiefs exactly how much they had left to spend for the balance of the Government year, most of the recommendations were withdrawn.

In each of these cases, the Government official was convinced that great economies would have been possible had his subordinates been economy-minded—as they would be under the News budget-for-every-supervisor plan.

This is our story about appalling Government waste and how to cut it—about how to make savers out of Federal employee spenders.

It is the story of precisely how we drifted into the incredible situation where most Government supervisors simply do not know how much they spend.

Many have worked at the job of making Government more economical.

Many have wondered why it continues so extravagant.

But almost all have missed one simple, extremely fundamental fact.

It is this:

In the past 20 years, the controls over Government spending gradually have drifted further and further away from the point of spending.

Historically, this was an accident.

There is no evidence it was part of any evil design.

But accident or no, it is a fact.

It has brought us to the point where many Government officials spend heedlessly, blindly, and even contemptuously.

And only when it is recognized and identified in all its terrible implications will we return to a situation in which these officials will know how much they spend—and will work at the business of saving.

The Washington Daily News has proposed a simple, inexpensive plan to reverse the historical trend toward extravagance.

It has proposed that every Government agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible to cut it.

In essence, this is simply a proposal that the controls on spending (and the incentive to save) be moved back where they always have belonged, which means to the point of spending, which means to the supervisor.

This is so elemental that many will find it incredible that it should even be necessary to suggest it.

Historically, however, two things have happened:

1. As Government mushroomed in the New Deal era, Congress lost much of its former tight control on Government spending. How and why we'll explain in a moment.

2. As congressional controls relaxed, agency controls relaxed, too, but in a different way.

And now we're in a mess.

Here's what has happened to congressional controls:

If an agency is small, Congress traditionally votes what amounts to a lump-sum appropriation for the entire agency. If it's a larger agency, Congress votes appropriations individually for each major bureau of the agency.

This has been the system for years. Unfortunately, it did not change as Government expanded.

In the old days when agencies and bureaus were smaller, the system gave Congress relatively minute controls over spending.

But as the bureaus expanded, this control became increasingly less effective.

Mere sections of bureaus became larger than the bureaus themselves once were.

But Congress continued to appropriate to the bureaus.

And it lost control.

Here's what's happened to agency control of spending:

In the old days, when Congress still was exercising its own control, the agencies were much more alert against extravagance. They had to—because it was fairly easy for Congress to pin-point waste.

In those days, each major agency and bureau had an official known as a chief clerk. He was quite a guy. He was hell-bent on economy.

Tradition says he wore a green eyeshade. When an employee asked for a pencil he got a stub. He was, they say, a very parsimonious gentleman. And because the unit under his control was small, he could make his parsimony effective.

It's different now.

Here's how the spending controls (or lack of controls) work now:

Congress appropriates to a bureau, let's say. The bureaus quite frequently divide up the appropriations among their divisions, telling each the total it may spend. But echelons below the division level almost never are told how much they may spend. They are told merely that they must fire so many employees or hire so many employees; increase their spending for travel or decrease it.

The great mass of Government supervisors are given no individual responsibility for saving.

The unit chief, section chief, branch chief, division chief, and even bureau chief just aren't asked to economize.

In many agencies the only real pressure for economy—the only real pressure to turn back to the Treasury whatever excess funds may have been voted by Congress—comes from the agency budget officer.

And in most cases he is much too far removed from the actual spending to make his pressure really effective.

The controls on spending have moved too far away from the point of spending.

This has led to two widespread, unhealthy, and almost-criminal attitudes which must be reversed if the Federal service ever is to become truly economical again.

One is the attitude that whatever is available is there to be spent.

The other (and far the more vicious attitude) is that economies imposed by Congress must be resisted at all cost—on the theory that Congress doesn't quite know what it's doing.

It is this attitude which causes the colonels and generals of the civilian government army to tolerate and even encourage the spending, in the last weeks of the Government year, whatever sums remain unspent up until then.

And it is this attitude, more than any other, which has convinced the majors, captains, lieutenants, and sergeants of Government that saving not only is unadmired—but actually is something a little undesirable.

What a sorry, sorry mess.

The Washington Daily News proposal would change all this.

It would put the dollar sign squarely in front of supervisors at all levels of Government management. It would tell most of them (for the first time) exactly how much they spend—and for what.

And it would invite all of them (for the first time) to make saving part of their jobs.

Only one thing is necessary to make a multi-million-dollar tax-saving success of the Washington Daily News proposal for turning spenders in the Federal service into savers for all of us.

That is common sense.

Common sense to see the simple fact that most Government employees sincerely want to do a good job.

Common sense to understand the present system (in which most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend) deprives many Federal employees of the chance to do a good job.

Common sense to provide the leadership which will give them the chance.

The Washington Daily News proposal is a simple, inexpensive, business-tested one.

It is merely that every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

It is merely that supervisors be told (for the first time) how much they spend, and invited (for the first time) to make saving part of their job.

Does that make sense?

It makes sense to the Washington Daily News because we happen to believe in human nature; believe that most Government people are good people; that they really, truly, and sincerely are anxious to do a good, efficient, economical job.

We think it's a shame that so many of them have been deprived of the opportunity.

It doesn't take too much common sense to realize that Federal employees—most of them, at least—do, in fact, want to do a good job.

They are human beings. And history says that human beings always rise, quite magnificently, to their challenges.

But more than that, they are carefully-selected human beings, most of them picked for their jobs through fairly rigid examinations, most of them required to conform to fairly high standards of conduct.

They are, as it happens, the victims of many public misconceptions.

It isn't true, as some would have you believe, that they want to spend, spend, spend. (They simply haven't been asked to save.)

They are not, as a group, lazy, indifferent to the public welfare, or bent (any more than the rest of us) on maintaining their own small empires.

By any reasonable yardsticks, they are above the average run of American human beings.

In its original, October 27, presentation of the budget for every supervisor proposal, the Washington Daily News said it did not believe that Government employees were efficient.

It said they couldn't be—with Government itself putting so little emphasis on efficiency.

But it also said that it believed Government employees had untapped capacity for great efficiency, if properly led.

Now let's talk about human beings.

This reporter remembers listening last June to Bishop Sheen, on TV, when he seemed to be walking to the very end of a limb—and inviting several million irate listeners to saw it off.

He was urging what amounted to a new industrial revolution, saying that workers everywhere must be given a greater voice in management, and a share of profits, too.

And this reporter, somewhat distressed, was saying to himself: "This could boomerang on Uncle Fultie."

But then, as he talked on, the pieces became a pattern.

He said that man's human dignity, as man, demanded that he have much more than a time clock, a machine to tend, and a weekly pay check.

The God-given nature of man, he said, required a job which could enlist not only his hands, but also his brain, his heart, and his enthusiasm. Somehow, he said, we must

restore to daily toil the dignity, the sense of "this is mine" which existed before the industrial revolution.

The Washington Daily News suggests that however much private industry must have lagged in providing worthwhile incentives for its human beings, Government has lagged far more.

Government has given its bosses and office sergeants little or no responsibility for the dollars-and-cents management of its great affairs.

It hasn't even bothered to let most supervisors know how much they spend.

The Washington Daily News simple proposal is that Government supervisors, at all levels, now be given, for the first time, the opportunity to say:

"This is mine * * * my opportunity to make or break * * * by spending or saving."

We don't think it takes too much common sense to see the magic in this.

It takes only a little.

The Washington Daily News' plan for cutting appalling Government waste is not a new plan.

It has been standard practice for years—it's simply taken for granted—in efficient private industry and business.

It works in Government, too. It produces astonishing results—in the very few units where it's been tried.

In fact the only thing really new about the Washington Daily News' plan is the proposal that all of Government return to a practice which industry and business have used all along.

It is a practice which Government itself once used.

But it also is one which Government somehow lost in the vast bureaucratic expansion of the past 20 years.

The Washington Daily News' proposal is simply this:

That every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

In that way the controls on Government spending (and the incentive to save) will be moved back where they've always belonged, which means to the point of spending, which means to the individual supervisor.

This article will cite specific examples of Government agencies where plans very similar to the Washington Daily News' plan already are producing remarkable results.

But first let's talk about how the plan operates in private industry.

Here at the Washington Daily News, for example.

Here at the News, every principal supervisor of every major department has his own working budget.

It tells him how much his department has been alloted for the year—and for what items.

At regular intervals he receives statements telling him how much his department actually has spent—and for what items.

He regards his personal budget seriously. He simply takes it for granted that trying to cut it is part of his job.

He has no disposition—believe me—to spend every cent the budget allows.

If he over spends, in any particular item, he quickly is notified.

If he achieves savings, he's commended. He tries to achieve savings.

And he finds it a little incredible, even as you and I, that such a simple system, so widely used in business and industry, is not used in Government.

To him, it's almost incomprehensible that most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

One of the really efficient units of Government is Federal Security Agency's 6,000-man Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance in Baltimore.

Where direct comparisons are possible, it has records to prove that its costs compare very well with those of private industry. (Few Government bureaus can say as much.)

OASI achieves its efficiency by a plan very similar to the Washington Daily News' plan.

In the OASI plan, probable unit costs have been worked out for more than 100 different types of operations.

And the challenge to economy is the challenge to constantly reduce these units costs.

Were the News' plan of a budget-for-every-supervisor adopted, many agencies undoubtedly would find it desirable to use these budgets as a basis for determining unit costs in many operations.

But in addition, the News' plan goes one step further.

It also would put the spotlight on the particular items of expense (salaries, office space, travel, communications, supplies, and equipment) which goes to make up those costs.

It would spotlight these costs—and make it part of the job of the supervisor to try to reduce them.

For their outstanding efficiency, the 235 employees of Civil Service Commission's Retirement Division recently received cash awards of $25 each.

This division too, achieves its economies by keeping the dollar sign squarely and constantly in front of the supervisor.

Instead of unit costs, however, it uses time-per-unit, its standard of efficiency measurement.

In other words, its yardstick is: How many minutes and seconds does it require to perform a particular operation?

Unlike the cost-per-unit yardstick, this one remains valid even though a congressionally approved pay raise, for example, increases unit costs.

The Retirement's Division's challenge to economy is the challenge to cut time-per-unit of production.

And its excellent chief, Warren Irons, is one of those who points out that the Washington Daily News' plan effectively could operate side-by-side with the Retirement Division's own plan.

He pointed out that the News' plan would spotlight chances for economy—in office space, supplies, and equipment, for example—which was not spotlighted in the Retirement Division's plan.

The Defense Department is extremely proud of its Military Sea Transport Service.

By the application of business methods of cost accounting—and business-proved incentives to saving—it has reduced its costs to a point where its services cost much less than they would cost if procured from private shipping lines.

How many Government agencies can make a comparable boast?

Here again, however, the approach is the same: MSTS has achieved its economies by putting the dollar sign squarely in front of the supervisor—and keeping it constantly there.

In the current reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, there will be installed a plan identical to that proposed by the Washington Daily News.

We are glad to report that it is not our plan.

Instead, it is the plan of Treasury Personnel Director Jim Hard, a down-to-earth, common-sense Government administrator, who was urging budgets-for-every-supervisor long before the idea occurred to the News.

In the Internal Revenue plan, supervisors will have their own individual budgets.

They will be told how much they spend—by every item of principal expense.

And they will be challenged to work at the business of saving—to make it part of their job.

Is there any other way?

This is a story we'd prefer not to write—one we didn't intend to write.

It's another story about the Washington Daily News plan for turning spenders in the Federal service into savers for all of us—by making saving part of their jobs.

We'd prefer not to write it for a very particular, and rather personal reason, which is this:

It's always seemed to us that people who present plans (or ideas, if you please) have the bad habit of becoming much too devoted to every single feature of their brain-children.

Overly proud parents, you might say.

Deliver us from that.

We prefer to think of the Washington Daily News plan as an ugly duckling, quite possibly underdeveloped, which others, in time, will make healthy and beautiful.

The Washington Daily News plan is a very simple one.

We have proposed that every Government agency give every individual supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him to cut it.

That is the Daily News plan.

We think it makes sense. We know it works in business. We're astonished that it isn't used in Government. We're deeply convinced that it, or some simple variation of it, is the only possible approach to real economy in Government.

But—

We also believe that the practical mechanics of putting into effect the Washington Daily News plan should be worked out by others.

We intend to leave it to others.

As it happens, however, a number of people who have been impressed by the simplicity of the Washington Daily News plan have raised a question which, fundamentally, is this:

It looks simple. But is it really simple? Simple in operation?

In this question lies, implicit, the suggestion that Government somehow differs so much from business that business-tested ideas can't possibly work in Government.

Government does differ.

But not that much.

In this story, we'll demonstrate that the business-tested Washington Daily News plan could and would be simple in Government operation.

Although we hope many minds will work at making the Washington Daily News plan a real instrument for Government economy, a few basic principles are all important:

1. The budget-for-every-supervisor proposal should be kept barebones simple. Spare us, please, the red tape artists, who inevitably, will dream up ways of making it complex.

2. It should not be administered by what the military calls staff officers—functionaries with no real authority to command. It should not, for example, be administered by agency budget officers. At best, their command authority is vague and uncertain.

3. It should be administered by what the military calls line officers. In the Government, this means the supervisors, the managers—the bureau chiefs, branch chiefs, section chiefs, and unit chiefs.

4. It should be personally administered by these line officers. It should be made their personal responsibility. They should be given to understand it's part of their job—just as is the business of saving in industry.

Let's talk about one simply way the Washington Daily News plan might be put in operation.

Congress votes funds. Bureau X receives its appropriation.

At this point, we'd propose that the chief of Bureau X give simple working budgets to each of his colonels (division chiefs).

The colonels, in turn, would prepare simple working budgets for the majors; the majors for the captains.

And so on down to the sergeants. They're the important guys.

We ask you to bear in mind here one simple thought: Not too many colonels serve

under any one general. Not too many sergeants are under a lieutenant.

That is important because it points up the fact that the job of budget preparation never could become a large or burdensome chore for any one supervisor in any one chain of command.

What would the budgets contain? How complex would they be?

Initially, they might be as simple as six-line statements, telling the supervisor how much his particular unit had been allotted during a particular year for:

1. Salaries.
2. Travel expense.
3. Office supplies.
4. Equipment.
5. Office space.
6. Communications.

The challenge to economy—the challenge to the supervisor to make saving part of his job—would be the challenge to cut these individual items of expense as much as possible.

It would be the challenge to try to show a saving at the end of the year.

Quite possibly, this idea could be taken one step further.

Instead of being given a budget statement every year, the supervisor might be given a statement every month.

Such a statement would use basically on the same expense items listed above.

But it might present them in a slightly different way.

It might, for example, tell the supervisor:

1. How much he had been allotted for salaries for the entire year.

2. His average allotment for each month (4 weeks) of the year.

3. His actual expenditures for salaries for the preceding 4 weeks.

4. His average expenditure for each 4-week period of the year to date.

Other items of expense—travel, equipment, etc.—would be broken down in the same way.

Is all this really simple?

The answer: Yes, it is.

Bear in mind, again, that there are not too many colonels under a general.

Thus, the burden of preparing even detailed monthly budget statements, such as the one proposed above, would not fall too heavily on any one supervisor.

The real workload (and again it wouldn't be large) would fall on the sergeants and lieutenants—on the first-line supervisor and the supervisor immediately above him.

An appreciation of this is extremely important to any real understanding of the plan which the Washington Daily News proposes.

Here is why the workload would fall on the lieutenants and sergeants.

It would be necessary for the sergeants to keep the lieutenants constantly informed of the expenditures or savings which changed the budget situation of the sergeants.

It would not be necessary for the lieutenants to approve these changes individually any more than they do now.

It would only be necessary that they know about them—and keep a simple record of them.

Let's illustrate by example:

If an office sergeant decided he could get along without filling a vacancy in his unit, and thereby reduce his salary budget, he would notify the lieutenant (or the lieutenant's secretary). And the sergeant's next monthly budget statement would reflect this change.

Whenever he ordered supplies, equipment, travel, or other items of budgeted expense, the sergeant likewise would notify the lieutenant (or the lieutenant's secretary). And these costs would be properly charged to his own individual account.

This would not involve any tremendous bookkeeping or accounting system.

It is very similar to what is being done right here—at the Washington Daily News.

It does work in business.

It would work in Government.

In this piece we propose to demolish a myth.

A false and insidious myth about something called the profit motive.

In Government, there are two standard alibis for the extravagance of Government.

One is the alibi that the only way to cut Government costs is to cut Government services. This is a Truman administration favorite.

The other is the alibi that Government can't possibly be as efficient as industry because the profit motive doesn't operate in Government.

Let's talk about the profit motive.

Specifically, let's talk about it in terms of the Washington Daily News' proposal for cutting appalling Government waste by making savers for all of us out of Federal employee spenders.

The News' proposal is simply that every Government agency give each individual supervisor, at every opportunity a simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible, to cut it.

And in this article we propose to beat the very daylights out of some popular notions about the profit motive.

It's vastly overrated.

We Americans like to think that the thing which makes American industry so efficient is the profit motive.

This could be one of the great misconceptions of our time.

Take any large industry. A lot of people own it. They are what economists like to call absentee owners. But—and this is important—they are the only ones who get profit.

The real managers of these industries rarely are cut in on the profits. A few at the very top may get specific rewards—perhaps in the form of bonuses—for specific performance. But many other real managers, further down the line, get no specific, cash-on-the-barrelhead reward. None whatever.

So the thing which drives industry—the thing which makes it efficient—isn't really the profit motive.

It's something else.

Take a platoon of combat troops. It can be extremely efficient at a very ugly business which all of its members most assuredly despise.

Obviously it isn't profit motive which makes an infantry platoon efficient.

It's something else.

In our fine country, with its every-lad-is-a-potential-President way of thinking, we've given large freedom to the human being.

It is not merely freedom to do or not to do.

Most importantly, it is freedom for the human being to realize, to the fullest, his great potential.

The Washington Daily News suggests:

The real success of American industry—of any efficient industry—is based not on the profit motive, but, instead, on an accurate, factual appraisal of human beings. It rests upon the simple understanding, which all of us possess, that human beings respond quite well to the challenge to do a better job.

We also suggest that the secret of what is called American efficiency, far from resting on the profit motive, actually rests on methods.

These methods—this great American idea—are methods of tapping the full potential of the human being.

If all this is true, and we think it is true, then the methods of industry will work just as well in government as they work in industry.

One of the methods of industry—one of the ways it achieves efficiency, which means economy, which means saving—is that of keeping the dollar sign squarely before those who do the spending.

It does this by giving them budgets, making them economy-conscious, challenging them to save.

That is what the Washington Daily News proposes (it is all it proposes) for government.

Take a personnel director. Most especially a government personnel director.

He has become, unhappily, a custodian of frustration.

The system which the personnel director is forced to operate (and which, in part, he has created) is one which binds and hamstrings and confuses and impedes—rather than one which brings forth from the human being his best.

His has become the science of how to move papers, how to maneuver through a particular variety of red tape.

What should his job be?

First of all, it should be not a science—but an art. The personnel director (in government and elsewhere) should be a great artist, playing on human nature like a Kreisler plays a fiddle.

Here is what his role should be:

It should be that of exploring, discovering and developing new ways of tapping (and exploiting, if you please), the potential of the human being—exploiting it to the advantage and profit of management—but also inevitably (and don't miss this) to the greater satisfaction, and greater well-being, and greater sense of well-being of the human beings.

It should be the role of the personnel director to keep the pipes open, and constantly develop new and greater pipes, so that human potential can flow more easily to its destined ends.

That, of course, is not his role now.

The Washington Daily News suggests, as a simple matter of common sense, that government should adopt one method of industry—and begin working a little more hardheadedly to tap the potential of the human being.

One fine day—and oh, what a beautiful morning—the great publicity mills of Government will be grinding out a steady stream of press releases such as:

"John Jones was promoted today from Grade GS-5 to GS-7. In his 16 months as a Grade 5, the unit he supervised reduced its budget by 6 percent."

Or—

"James Smith has retired as chief of Division X—after 13 years of successive reduction in the operating expenses of the division."

On that fine day, all the supervisors of Government (all the Jack Jones and Jim Smiths) will be economizing instead of spending.

Saving will be part of their jobs—just as it always has been for their counterparts in industry and business.

And Government once more will be thrifty instead of extravagant—with millions and perhaps billions in saved tax dollars for all of us.

This fine day needn't be far off.

It can arrive quickly, indeed, if Government merely will adopt one simple, method of business: That of keeping the dollar sign (and the challenge to save) squarely and constantly before its supervisors.

The Washington Daily News has proposed one simple way of doing this.

It has proposed that every Government agency give every supervisor, at every level, his own simple working budget—and challenge him, by every means possible—to cut it.

We have pointed out:

That most Government supervisors simply don't know how much they spend.

That they rarely are invited to work at the job of saving.

That only about 5 percent of all Government supervisors have budgets of any sort.

That even those who do have budgets work under a system which encourages them to

spend its full amount—rather than save what can be saved.

That the system has grown up because, in the last 20 years, the controls on Government spending gradually have drifted farther and farther away from the point of spending.

That, as a result of this drift, most Federal agencies now make the tragic mistake of trying to operate their pressures for economy through staff (advisory) officials. Where the pressures should operate, as any business knows, is thru line officers—those in the direct chain of command.

That this system means, among other things, that most Government supervisors have been deprived of personal responsibility for saving—to their own great loss, and the loss of all of us.

That the system inevitably results in appalling waste. We have cited many examples which could and would be prevented by the Washington Daily News plan.

Our files are full of them. Let's cite just one more.

About a year ago, the News reported how National Production Authority spent $22,000 for a telegraphic poll of a certain group of manufacturers—a poll which a reputable Washington direct mail firm estimated could have been delivered, airmail, for a mere $872.

NPA insisted it used telegrams, instead of airmail, on the advice of a high official of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

And the high BLS official was completely astonished that anyone should question the expense.

As delighted as a 12-year-old with his own personal telegraph set, he blandly explained: "Why, it was the best poll I've ever managed."

The News submits that this kind of thinking couldn't possibly exist if all Government officials, including the BLS bigwig, had their own personnel budgets—and knew that their chances of advancement depended, in large part, on how well they saved.

In this series the Washington Daily News also has pointed out some of the specific, concrete things its budget for every supervisor proposal would accomplish:

It would install in Government a system which always has been standard practice in efficient industry and business. There it's simply taken for granted.

It would reverse the trend which has seen controls on spending moving further and further away from the point of spending.

It would put the controls (and the incentive to save) in the place where industry puts them—in the direct chain of command.

It would destroy the all too prevalent and almost criminal idea that every penny which Congress votes is a penny to be spent.

It would create new and continuing yardsticks for Government, yardsticks at every level of supervision, for the evaluation of present operations, for the evaluation of improved methods applied in the future, and for the evaluation of the supervisors themselves. This, we think, has long-range possibilities which fully equal the initial economies the Washington Daily News plan would achieve.

It would create a whole new tone and atmosphere for the Federal service—one of economy.

It would invite the people who know most about how Government money is spent (the supervisors) to work at the business of telling all of us how Government money can be saved.

It would make saving the personal responsibility of the supervisor.

It would give him a greater sense of participation, and through this, greater happiness and greater incentive to advance.

It would make saving part of his job.

What They Say

A former Hoover Commission member: "A wonderfully exciting new idea. I'm surprised it hasn't been presented before. I'm surprised that we on the Hoover Commission didn't think of it.

A Truman Cabinet member: "This could be it—the way to give Government a real substitute for the profit motive."

A Republican Senator: "A great national service * * * the new administration definitely will examine it from all angles."

A civil service commissioner: "The impact on the Federal service would be enormous."

A Navy supervisor-inspector: "Give me my own budget. I'll save 50 percent."

A former Government administrator: "It's completely revolutionary. * * * A really substantial idea * * * I can see the whole Federal service being given a tremendous lift by capitalizing on the interest and effort of the great mass of supervisors."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of percentages, reduced to dollars.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How the Johnson proposal would work if the percentage of appropriations each agency received for fiscal year 1953 were applied to a 70-billion-dollar appropriation for fiscal year 1954

[70 billion dollars equals 100 percent]

Agency	Percent of total appropriation	Reduced to dollars
Legislative branch	0.0960	$67,200,000
The Judiciary	.0340	23,800,000
Independent offices:		
Executive Office of the President	0.0090	6,300,000
American Battle Monuments Commission	.0010	700,000
Atomic Energy Commission	5.1322	3,592,540,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	.004732	3,312,000
Civil Service Commission	.4260	298,200,000
Commerce—Maritime Activities	.2230	156,100,000
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration	.178147	124,702,000
Defense Production Administration	.0030	2,100,000
Defense Transportation Administration	.0020	1,400,000
Economic Stabilization Agency	.0740	51,800,000
Federal Communications Commission	.0080	5,600,000
Federal Power Commission	.0050	3,500,000
Federal Trade Commission	.0060	4,200,000
Federal Security Agency	2.0507	1,435,490,000
Federal Civil Defense Administration	.0535	37,450,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	.0100	7,000,000
General Accounting Office	.0390	27,300,000
General Services Administration	.4910	343,700,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.1300	91,000,000
Indian Claims Commission	.0001	70,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	.0137	9,590,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	.00001	7,000
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	.0083	5,810,000
Mutual Security	7.4744	5,232,080,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	.0835	57,750,000
National Capital Housing Authority	.0001	70,000
National Capital Park & Planning Commission	.0008	560,000
National Science Foundation	.0059	4,130,000
National Labor Relations Board	.0012	840,000
National Mediation Board	.0014	980,000
Renegotiation Board	.0067	4,690,000
Revolving fund, Defense Production Act	.0019	$1,330,000
Railroad Retirement Board (self-supporting)	.000	
Securities and Exchange Commission	.0065	4,550,000
Selective Service	.0458	32,060,000
Smithsonian Institution	.0048	3,360,000
Subversive Activities Control Board	.0004	280,000
Tariff Commission	.0024	1,680,000
Small Defense Plants Administration	.0047	3,290,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	.4185	292,950,000
Tax Court of the United States	.0011	770,000
Veterans' Administration	4.8164	3,371,480,000
Department of Agriculture	1.0428	730,660,000
Department of State	.2948	206,360,000
Department of Justice	.2296	160,720,000
Department of Commerce	.585821	410,074,700
Department of the Interior	.6793	475,510,000
Department of Labor	.2771	193,970,000
Department of Defense:		
Civil functions	3.5031	2,515,170,000
Military functions	58.0047	40,603,290,000
Department of the Treasury	.8157	570,990,000
Post Office	3.4655	2,425,850,000
District of Columbia	.0137	9,590,000
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:		
Interest on the public debt	7.6586	5,361,220,000
Other	1.4616	1,023,120,000
Grand total appropriations	100.0000	70,000,000,000

NOTICE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, to be held for the purpose of organization, and to meet the Postmaster General designate, Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield, if he is present.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday, January 16.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1953:

Federal Trade Commission

John Carson, of Michigan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1952. (Reappointment.)

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Earle A. Deily, effective December 1, 1952.

To be commissioned commander

Joseph E. Waugh, in accordance with law.

To be commissioned lieutenant commanders

Harry D. Reed, Jr., effective December 24, 1952.

Emerson E. Jones, effective December 24, 1952.

Gerald L. Short, effective January 18, 1953.

John O. Phillips, effective January 18, 1953.

To be commissioned lieutenant

Harley D. Nygren, effective March 8, 1953.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1953.

Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1953.

Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1953.

Barbour C. Stokes, Jr., effective January 18, 1953.

Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1953.

To be commissioned ensigns

Wilfred V. Warner, effective December 9, 1952.

Carlton S. Frost, effective December 16, 1952.

Edwin K. McCaffrey, effective December 17, 1952.

Clifford W. Tupper, effective December 17, 1952.

Richard K. Houlder, effective December 23, 1952.

George E. Cook, effective January 7, 1953.

Howard A. Garcia, effective January 11, 1953.

Lionel D. Kelley, effective February 12, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Edward Mallory Almond, O4666, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us to be partners with Thee in building the Kingdom of God, wilt Thou inspire us with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

May we daily see the transforming energy of Thy divine spirit remaking our world and lifting all mankind to higher levels of blessedness.

Grant that nothing may ever daunt or discourage us as we strive for peace on earth and good will among men.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 9, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con Res. 1. Concurrent resolution making the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members present this morning who have not taken the oath of office. If they will kindly present themselves in the well of the House the Chair will administer the oath of office.

Mr. COLMER and Mr. FARRINGTON presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE—AMENDMENT OF CLAUSE 4, RULE X

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 68), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That clause 4, rule X, of the rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4. All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I think I should say that I have discussed this with the minority leader; as a matter of fact, we have had it under discussion for several days, and I am authorized to say that the resolution meets with his approval as it does with mine.

Let me explain as briefly as I can what the situation is: I do not need to say to the membership that the numerical division between the majority and minority in this Congress is paper thin, to say the least. Following the usual practice the Speaker, and I as majority leader met with the minority leader and the minority whip to determine the division between the majority and minority on the various committees of the House. We, of course, had before us the over-all membership of the committees as they were starting back after the Reorganization Act before the Eightieth Congress and continuing on through the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. We determined substantially on the over-all numbers of the committees as they have been through the years. Then, of course, one must also recognize that it is most important and necessary that on all of those committees the majority party have some majority in numbers; however, recognizing the close division in the House, we shaved the division on many of the committees right down to the very edge. One of them I have in mind is 14 to 13, another is 16 to 14. Obviously, if the majority were to give another place to the minority we would no longer be in control of the committees.

After we had made that determination on the over-all size of the committees, and having regard, I may say, in some instances, to the situation on the minority side where Members have served on committees for a long time and are valuable members of those committees; and having regard for the over-all responsibility and work that needs to be accomplished by the committees, we added up the places on the majority side and that addition came to 237. We have 221 Members on the majority side. The Speaker is not assigned to a committee, and it has been the practice on our side that the majority leader is not assigned to a committee. So, net we have 219 Members to fill 237 places on the majority side.

But here is where our trouble arose. Under the Reorganization Act it is specified that Members, except for four committees that are named, cannot serve on more than one committee. I think we all recognize the intent and the purpose back of that provision. It was felt by a great many people that it would be better for each Member to have one committee and be permitted to devote his full and complete attention to the work of that committee rather than try to serve on many committees as had been the situation before, and sometimes not doing a very good job with any of them.

In presenting this resolution I want to point out that the net effect of it is to remove, at least for this Congress, the rule set forth in the act that requires that a Member serve only on one committee.

Perhaps, I need not explain why we find that necessary. Obviously, if we just assigned our 219 Members there would be vacancies on the Republican side on a number of these committees which would result in the minority party having more Members on the committee than there would be Republican Members and (of course, as I say, that just would not provide the proper situation under which we could function.

As far as I have been able to determine and certainly speaking for myself, the adoption of this resolution to meet this practical situation that confronts us, and which cannot be met in any other way, does not mean that the bars will be let down and that any number of Members will be assigned to more than one committee. It is, therefore, our intent and our purpose and our firm determination to appoint to two committees just enough individual Members on the majority side to permit us to fill these places which have been assigned to the majority on the various committees, and when that is accomplished there shall be no more serving on two committees. In other words, may I emphasize that this course has been adopted as the only reasonable, practical way to handle the situation that confronts us.

It does not in any way represent any retreat or departure from the original purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act. That original intent and purpose shall be and will be followed by us, but this is the way that we have determined we must, for the purpose of this Congress, meet the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 78, Eighty-first Congress, I transmit herewith for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission its final report.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, which has been made to me under date of January 1, 1953. This report is the work of a Commission of seven members, appointed by me in accordance with Executive Order 10392, September 4, 1952. The Commission was authorized and directed to make a survey and evaluation of the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States, and to make recommendations for such legislative, administrative or other action as in its opinion might be desirable in the interests of the economy, security and responsibilities of this country.

The Commission's report and recommendations are based on hearings held in 11 cities from coast to coast between September 30 and October 29 last. Four hundred statements were received orally or in writing during the hearings, and 234 more written statements were filed with the Commission after the hearings were over. In some instances, individual witnesses represented a number of different organizations, so that approximately 1,000 individuals and organizations, representing many millions of people, made their views known to the Commission.

Through the cooperation of EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the record of the hearings and statements has been printed, and is available for study.

The Commission, which is to go out of existence by the end of this month, is composed of the following members:

Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, Chairman (formerly Solicitor General of the United States; formerly city solicitor of Baltimore; secretary of State of Maryland; assistant attorney general of Maryland).

Earl G. Harrison of Pennsylvania, Vice Chairman (attorney; formerly United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and formerly dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania).

Monsignor John O'Grady, of Washington, D. C. (secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities).

Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, of Minnesota (president, Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul, Minn.; chairman, Minnesota State Displaced Persons Commission).

Clarence E. Pickett, of Pennsylvania (honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee).

Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee (legal adviser to State Department; formerly general counsel of Atomic Energy Commission and Solicitor of the Department of Commerce).

Thomas G. Finucane, of Maryland (Chairman, Board of Immigration Appeals, Department of Justice).

These Commissioners brought to their work the benefit of long and distinguished experience in public affairs, and great talent in the evaluation of facts and in ability to reach fair and impartial judgments. Their appraisal of the injurious effect of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 merits your earnest and prompt consideration. Their recommendations for new provisions and new policies, embodied in their report, are in accordance with our finest traditions. Such recommendations, if enacted into law, would do much to convince the peoples of the free world that we have not lost an iota of our faith in the great principles upon which this Nation was founded, and upon which it has risen to a place of preeminence among all nations.

The report and the record of hearings and statements are documents of the greatest possible value to all those interested in legislative and administrative action to formulate and enforce policies in strict accordance with the doctrines laid down in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. The recommendations are designed to eliminate from our immigration laws the unfortunate provisions which apply discriminations based on national origin, race, creed, and color; and to substitute provisions worthy of our people and our form of government.

I am confident you will join me in my gratitude to the members of the Commission for the splendid services they have so generously given at my request.

I am sending a copy of the Commission's report, and of the record of the Commission's hearings, as they appear in the committee print of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to General Eisenhower.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1952, to September 30, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the thirty-eighth annual report of the committee covering the fiscal year 1952.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1953.*

INAUGURATION HOLIDAY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. J. Res. 120), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the several departments, independent establishments, and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia shall be closed all day on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, Inauguration Day. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such day by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on that day; and such day shall be considered a holiday for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the

purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the city of Alexandria, Va.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this joint resolution is to provide that all Federal employees in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., will have a holiday on Inauguration Day, Tuesday, January 20.

My attention has been directed to the fact that, under existing law, only those employees working in the District of Columbia are entitled to such a holiday. The inequity of this situation is obvious.

Under this joint resolution the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., is defined as the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the city of Alexandria, Va.

It seems to me it is only fair that Government employees in the vicinity should have opportunity to attend one of the greatest events in the history of our country.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ACT TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF AGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, together with my colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], I am today introducing a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age. I hope very much that Members will give serious attention to the age problem. It is anticipated that the number of those over 65, who now number about 11 million, will by 1975 come close to doubling, being about 18 million.

The problem facing our older citizens who have given their best years to building of our country is mainly the lack of opportunity for productive work. They are much too soon considered to be obsolescent by American business and industry, and denied equal opportunity for employment or forced into retirement. Half of them live on social security or other small incomes.

I feel that this problem of our older citizens is one to which the Congress should direct its attention, especially with a view to constructive activities in the way of self-help and of work opportunity for people regardless of their age, so long as they can do the job.

This bill will make it an unlawful employment practice for an employer "to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, otherwise lawful because of the individual's age." The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor is given the necessary authority to issue cease-and-desist orders and to bring about reinstatement or hiring with or without back pay. Judicial review is provided for as are processes of conciliation, technical advice, and other aids to employer and employee.

The bill is intended to deal with the problems of those over 45 who are seeking employment and also to deal with the problem of forced retirement of effective employees at some arbitrary age level. Nothing in the bill prevents assessments of health, strength, hardihood, and similar job requirements. The bill deals with one of the fundamental problems facing our older citizens, that of the ability to continue at productive work. It is a basis for a solution to the other problems affecting our older citizens—rehabilitation and retraining, housing, recreation and retirement, including pensions and social security.

There have been some outstanding examples of the utilization of older workers in business and industry, and these are very laudable. According to the United States Census Bureau, over 70 percent of our citizens 65 and over have less than $1,000 a year in money income. Sixty years ago 68 percent of all men over 65 were in gainful employment; yet this figure has dropped to around the 40-percent mark now. Those who have employed older workers have testified to their steadiness and reliability, to their low absentee and accident records. Problems of fitting them into existing private pension systems, which seem to militate so heavily against their employment are problems of mechanics and assume a lack of recognition on the part of the older worker himself as to what is fair to him and to other employees. The problems do not begin to compare in importance with the social implications of age discrimination in employment and forced retirement.

AUSTRIAN SOCIALIZING CHARGED TO TRUMAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to my colleagues' attention an article which appeared in the Sunday, January 11, 1953, New York Times. These are grave charges which are leveled against the Truman administration by one of the leaders of one of the political parties of Austria. For some time, Members of Congress have been receiving reports that American taxpayers' money is being used to further socialistic schemes in other countries. I have received many of these reports myself and have had an opportunity from time to time to actually check into some of them. Unfortunately, there seems to be a great deal of basis of fact. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to completely review the manner in which American funds have been spent abroad. By taking this specific charge in Austria, which is a relatively small country, and following it through in detail we could gain real insight into the entire picture. I suggest it is this kind of interference with the internal government of other countries that has produced the picture we now have—the expenditure of vast sums to gain friends, resulting in resentments rather than friendships.

AUSTRIAN SOCIALIZING CHARGED TO TRUMAN

VIENNA, January 10.—The Truman administration and its representatives in Vienna were charged today by Ferdinand Graf, state secretary and People's Party leader, with an attempt to further "Socialist collective tendencies" in Austria.

Herr Graf made his statement in an election speech in Klagenfurt. It was the second such accusation made by the People's Party. Foreign Minister Karl Gruber said in a speech last October that "many radical groups" had been helped by the western powers.

Herr Graf said: "We trust that through the change of Government in America the attempt to further Socialist collective tendencies in Austria will also come to an end. * * *

"We want to construct our state and our economy according to our own needs. We hail the end of the election in America and the assumption of power by Eisenhower, who knows and is friendly toward Europe."

The People's Party probably resents most the fact that the Americans, who have believed that the People's Party-Socialist coalition Government was the best bulwark against communism, permitted the Nazi-tinted League of Independents to be formed as a separate party in 1949, whereas the People's Party had hoped to obtain the Nazi vote and with it to make itself independent of the Socialists.

THE KANSAS CITY STAR

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the remarks made by the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Senator from Kansas, as made on the floor of the Senate January 9, and the remarks made by Roy A. Roberts, president, Kansas City Star, in defense of the Kansas City Star in the antitrust suit filed against them by the Department of Justice. Senator CARLSON made the statements that I intended to make today, but since the Kansas City Star reply has already been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to commend Senator CARLSON for his initiative in placing this information before Congress.

The question is raised as to whether this indictment is politically inspired, inasmuch as the Kansas City Star has been such a critic of the Truman administration. If this were the case, then the question of freedom of the press would be involved. I believe, however, that the Kansas City Star will be vindicated. However, as of now, this matter is placed in the hands of the Federal

court, both to try and to judge; and nothing can be said until a verdict has been reached.

If and when the Kansas City Star is vindicated, then I intend to press to find out if this was politically inspired and those who were responsible for it.

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the Eightieth Congress I introduced H. R. 4482, a bill to outlaw the Communist Party. Hearings were held on that bill by the Committee on House Administration, but Congress adjourned before full consideration of this important legislation could be completed.

I am today introducing another bill that has for its purpose barring the Communist Party or any un-American party from the election ballot. This bill is as follows:

A bill to bar un-American parties from the election ballot

Be it enacted, etc., That no political party—

(1) which is affiliated with the world Communist movement or any part thereof, or with any foreign government, organization, agency, or political party; or

(2) which directly or indirectly advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, or by any unlawful means; or

(3) which directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids, or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition, or treason against the United States.

shall be permitted to have the name of any individual printed on a ballot as its candidate for an office in the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any individual to file as a candidate for, or otherwise to attempt to secure election to, any office in the Government of the United States—

(1) as the candidate of a political party described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of the first section of this act; or

(2) if such individual is a member of such a political party.

Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this much needed legislation will be enacted into law at an early date.

BUICK'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial and an article from the Flint Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLARDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ROYALTIES FROM MINERAL LEASES SHOULD BE USED FOR GRANTS-IN-AID IN EDUCATION AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution to provide that the royalties from mineral leases covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall be used for grants-in-aid of education and national defense.

This resolution is applicable only to the areas outside of inland waters—that is, to submerged areas outside of inland waters and beyond the tideland strip. Lands under inland navigable waters including those of bays, rivers, and lakes, belong to the States in which they are situated, and the Supreme Court has so held on numerous occasions. Such lands were specifically excluded from the off-shore cases and they are likewise excluded by the terms of my resolution.

The Supreme Court has ruled three times that the submerged coastal lands beyond the low-tide mark and extending seaward belong to the people of the United States as a whole.

Geologists estimate that the oil under these seas is worth more than $40 million. By earmarking these tidelands oil royalties for educational grants-in-aid to the States, Congress has the magnificent opportunity of securing our first line of defense—the education and training of our citizens, and to do it without any cost to the taxpayers.

Under the terms of this resolution, the individual State would get 37½ percent of the royalties that the Federal Government receives for the oil produced off the shores of that State within the 3-mile limit. In addition, such State would share equally with all other States on a pro rata basis in the remaining 62½ percent of the royalties obtained by the Federal Government. This appears to me to be very generous treatment to California, Louisiana, and Texas, as well as to any other State off whose shores mineral deposits may be produced.

President-elect Eisenhower should make a careful and deliberate study of the Supreme Court decisions and also reexamine the wisdom of his own campaign promise before he recommends the biggest give-away in the history of any Congress—the donation of what belongs to all the people—to just three States, Texas, California, and Louisiana.

Bills have been introduced to donate to these three States this great public treasure which belongs to all 48 States—this great public treasure which the Supreme Court has three times decided belongs to all the people of the United States.

I believe that Members of Congress should give thoughtful consideration to this matter before they vote to deprive their constituents and their State of their proportionate share of this national heritage.

My resolution also provides for proper conservation of these rich oil-bearing deposits in the interest of our national security.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Joint Resolution 135 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with regard to the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives. This resolution provides as follows:

When vacancies happen in the representation in the House of Representatives from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall have power to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature of the State may direct.

Under the present Constitution when a vacancy occurs in the House of Representatives by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise, there is no provision made whatsoever for filling this vacancy until a special or general election can be held in the district in which the vacancy occurs. The district therefore has no representation from the time a vacancy occurs until the calling and holding of an election for filling such vacancy. By reason of the vacancy the district suffers the loss of representation during such a period.

In addition to the loss of representation there is an enormous expense on the taxpayers of the district where such vacancy occurs of holding an election and the cost of holding an election has become very expensive.

The purpose of this resolution is therefore twofold: First, it would provide continuous representation for the district by conferring authority on the executive of the State affected to make temporary appointments until a general election. Second, it would save the cost and expense of holding special elections.

This amendment would provide the same course and procedure for vacancies in the House of Representatives as is now provided for vacancies that might occur in the Senate.

Under amendment 17 of the Constitution, it is provided "that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancy by election as the legislature may direct."

It has, therefore, become a custom and practice for the executive of a State to make an appointment to fill the vacancy in the Senate and this temporary appointment is usually made to fill such a vacancy until the next general election. For instance, in my State of Florida the

legislature has provided in chapter 26870 of the General Laws of Florida of 1951, as follows:

100.171 Filling vacancy of United States Senators: Should a vacancy occur in the Senate of Congress or in the State representation, the Governor shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancy at the next general election and make temporary appointments to serve until noon of Tuesday after the first Monday of January following the general election.

Thus, since United States Senators, by amendment to the Constitution No. 17, are elected by the people thereof, and since vacancies can be temporarily filled by the executive authority of such State in that body, there is no valid reason or excuse why vacancies should not be temporarily filled in the House of Representatives by a similar method and procedure.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is well indeed that President Truman has submitted in his special message the report of his Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

At long last, there is public and official repudiation of one of the basic fallacies of our immigration policy. I refer specifically to the national origin theory which has been imbedded in our immigration law for over 3 generations. This discriminatory distribution of immigration quotas was carried forward into the McCarran Immigration Act and riveted to the structure of our law. This report represents a solidification of public sentiment against it. The national origin theory upon which our immigration law is basic has played havoc with our foreign relations, breeding resentment against us in foreign countries and mocking our protestations based on a question of equality of opportunity for all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Remedial legislation is a necessity to wipe out provisions that create second-class citizens to assure equality of treatment. Does our internal security demand that only Communists be barred from entry and that Nazis and Fascists be allowed to come in unimpeded? There is no doubt that a number of Members of the House and Senate with the full information carried to them by the President's message and his Commission's report, will offer remedial legislation, taking into studied consideration the recommendations forwarded. I certainly shall offer remedial legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the membership of this House will not reach any hasty conclusions concerning the immigration and naturalization laws which were enacted at the last session of the Congress.

I think a great menace to America lies in the fact that so many professionals, including professional Jews, are shedding crocodile tears for no reason whatsoever. In the Immigration and Naturalization Act recently enacted there is not one single thing that anybody could charge with being anti-Semitic or antianything. That law was recommended to the Congress after 4 years of careful consideration. It was not devised hastily. The only concrete criticism that I have seen since the President's Commission was set up for the purpose of discrediting this law and filed its report came from the fact that some poor French sailors—about one-third of the crew—were unable to spend Christmas in New York. I went to the trouble to find out who those poor French sailors were. Finer samples of throat slitters could not be found in any other crew. It is, indeed, significant that within a few hours after this French vessel was docked the *Queen Elizabeth* and *Queen Mary* came into New York, and within an hour and a half every member of her crew was on Broadway or wherever sailors go when they arrive in New York.

Let us not be stampeded. Let us not commit ourselves too hastily. I know the pressures you are under. I have had some experience with those pressures.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT VERSUS CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the tidelands decisions of the Supreme Court are bad enough but their interpretation by the Department of the Interior makes them worse, and this in direct defiance of the Swamp Land Grant Act of Congress of 1849.

Thus in the body of the opinion the Court said that the Government has paramount power and control over the tidelands areas in two capacities, namely: first, for the purpose of national defense; and, second, for the purpose of conducting foreign relations. But far from holding, the Supreme Court specifically refused to decree that the Government actually owns or has legal title to the submerged lands themselves.

Again the Court said that the rights held by the Government in those two capacities—national defense and foreign relations—extended over the marginal sea. But the Court refrained from holding exactly at what point inland waters terminate and the marginal sea begins. It left this job to a special master appointed by the Court.

The Department of the Interior, however, is arrogating unto itself the power to determine that certain inland waters are part of the marginal sea. It has drawn an arbitrary line along the coast of Louisiana and is saying with effrontery and arrogance: Whoever operates on the seaward side of the line is a trespasser even if the land now under shallow water was transferred by the United States to the State of Louisiana under the Swamp Land Grant Act of Congress of March 2, 1849, and patented by the State of Louisiana to private individuals. Whatever may be said about the tidelands decisions, the Court certainly did not hold that they could be used as a means of destroying title to property derived from and granted by the United States itself. Yet that is exactly what the Department of the Interior is doing.

Let me outline a specific case where the Congress of the United States classified a tract of land in my State as low or swamp land, had the low or swamp land surveyed by Federal surveyors and transferred it to the State of Louisiana as such, where the State of Louisiana, deriving title from the United States, in turn, transferred or patented the same property to a private individual and where the Department of the Interior, under the guise of the Supreme Court decisions in the tidelands cases, is claiming that the successors in title of the United States itself are trespassers.

In the early 1840's, Congress decided to transfer certain low or swamp lands to the State of Louisiana. Pursuant to this plan machinery was set up to survey these lands and to divide them into townships and sections.

Accordingly, in January 1846, E. D. Richardson and A. J. Powell, Federal surveyors, surveyed township 19 south, range 18 east, and township 19 south, range 19 east, located in the southeastern land district of Louisiana, Parish of Plaquemines, La. The Federal surveyors meandered the streams and divided the townships into sections in the usual way. Mr. R. W. Boyd, the then surveyor general for Louisiana, approved the township plats. The plats, like all others, in regular course were filed in Washington and with the officials of Louisiana as the basis for the transfer of the lands as swamp lands to Louisiana and as the basis for the issuance of patent covering the designated sections by the State of Louisiana to private individuals.

On March 2, 1849, Congress adopted one of the several Swampland Grant Acts.

On May 6, 1852, pursuant to this act of Congress, sections 29, 30, 31, and 32 of township 19 south, range 19 east—along with a vast area of other swamplands—were transferred to the United States to the State of Louisiana. In law this means that this land was segregated from the sovereignty or public domain and thus that the United States parted with its title in favor of the State of Louisiana.

Preparatory to issuing patents to private individuals, the State of Louisiana, in 1873, caused the two townships and the sections above-mentioned to be resurveyed by L. N. Polk, a State surveyor. His findings, of course, conformed with the Richardson and Powell survey, except that certain sections were renum-

bered. Thus section 31 of township 19 south, range 19 east, was given a different number, but this is unimportant and I will refer to it as section 31.

The State of Louisiana patented section 31, along with other property, to John Beckwith in 1873. The patentee, John Beckwith, was assessed with and paid taxes on the property to the parish of Plaquemines and the State of Louisiana from 1873 to and including the year 1880.

Beckwith failed to pay taxes for the ears 1881 and 1882 and pursuant to the constitution and laws of the State the property was adjudicated to Louisiana for the unpaid taxes of those 2 years. Title to the property thus became reinvested in the State of Louisiana. Here then is the chain of title of section 31:
(a) 1852, United States to Louisiana;
(b) 1873, Louisiana to John Beckwith;
(c) 1833, John Beckwith to Louisiana.

In accordance with the constitution and laws of the State of Louisiana, State mineral lease No. 195, covering section 31 and other property, was granted by the State of Louisiana to the Gulf Refining Co. in 1928, or 25 years ago. The Gulf Refining Co. paid a substantial consideration for the original lease and has maintained it in force until the present time by virtue of producing oil wells in what is popularly known as the Grand Bay oil field.

In 1951, the Gulf Refining Co. commenced the drilling of an oil well on section 31, known as well No. 53 QQ, with a projected depth of 11,500 feet.

Now the drilling of an oil well costs money; real money. After drilling 9,773 feet, and before reaching the expected pay dirt at 11,500 feet the Gulf Refining Co. received the following remarkable and highhanded letter from the Department of the Interior on July 13, 1951:

> In the circumstances, this Department must take the position that the drilling of well No. QQ 53 is contrary to the decree which the Supreme Court entered in *United States* v. *Louisiana* on December 11, 1950 (340 U. S. 899), and that it is incumbent upon this Department to inform the Attorney General regarding the trespass, so that he may take such action as he may deem to be appropriate for the effectuation of the decree in the *Louisiana* case.

Faced with this threat, the Gulf Refining Co. had to abandon operations on section 31.

The following pertinent questions arise:

Did the Department of the Interior know that section 31 had been surveyed by Richardson and Powell?

Did the Department know that section 31 had been transferred by the United States to the State of Louisiana?

I must inform the House that the Department did know or must have known that by virtue of the Richardson and Powell survey and the act of Congress of March 2, 1849, section 31 was segregated from the public domain and transferred to Louisiana. I say so because in drawing the line purportedly delimiting inland waters from the marginal sea geological quadrangle maps prepared by or under the supervision of the Department of the Interior were used. On these maps section 31, as well as other sections I have mentioned are clearly shown. The designated townships and sections on the quadrangle maps constituted a red flag warning that this area was private property, or certainly anything but the marginal sea because as everyone knows the marginal sea was never surveyed and numbered with townships and sections. Nevertheless the Department simply took a red pencil and drew a line through and across these sections and takes the position that whatever area is seaward of the red line constitutes the marginal sea. In this instance it takes the position that if it happens that title to section 31 was transferred by the United States to Louisiana; that Louisiana granted a lease on it to Gulf Refining Co.; that Gulf Refining Co. paid for the lease and spent what to a private person would amount to a fortune developing it, and that if an oil well in prospect happens to be located there—well, according to the Department of the Interior, that is just too bad: the Gulf Refining Co. and the State of Louisiana are still trespassers.

The above recital of facts illustrates the purely arbitrary manner in which the Department of the Interior drew the line separating inland waters from the marginal sea and the Department's complete indifference to the equities involved, the expenses incurred in good faith and the rights of the State of Louisiana and its lessee, Gulf Refining Co.

Mr. Speaker, previous to the tidelands decisions the Supreme Court in a long series of adjudications over a period of 150 years had held that the tidelands belonged to the States. It is bad enough that the Court, as presently constituted, overruled and struck down the time honored jurisprudence of its predecessors. But here we find the Department of the Interior nullifying an act of Congress in their zeal to effectuate the grab. I knew the Supreme Court had a right to overrule its own decisions but I never realized that a bureaucrat had the power to repeal an act of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenge to Congress and we should meet it promptly and head-on by enacting legislation restoring to the States their just title to the tidelands.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN KOREA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, together with some of my colleagues, I have introduced a resolution providing for the establishment of a select committee to investigate atrocities and other crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Communists in Korea.

After carefully studying the evidence compiled by the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre, established by the Eighty-second Congress and headed by Hon. RAY MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, and evaluating additional information which has since come into my possession, I have noted that the reports of alleged Communist atrocities in Korea closely follow the pattern established by the Reds in Katyn and in other places in Communist-dominated countries.

The similarity between the method used by the Russians in massacring thousands of Polish Army officers during World War II, brought to full public view by Congressman MADDEN's committee, and the reports of Communist crimes committed against their prisoners of war in northern Korea, is so striking that it demands further investigation.

The people of the United States, and the free people all over the world, have the right to know what is happening to those of our soldiers who fall into the hands of North Korean Communists, as well as the brutality that is the lot of civilians in lands captured by the Communists. If, as the reports indicate, atrocities have been perpetrated by the Communists against these prisoners since 1950, they should be exposed to public view.

Crimes against humanity are the concern of free people everywhere. It is on this basis that the Democrats in the Eighty-second Congress, with bipartisan support from the then-minority party, authorized an investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre. The impartial and thorough way in which Congressman MADDEN's committee conducted the investigation brought credit to its membership, and its findings were accepted by the free world which was shocked by the revelation of the beastly crimes committed by Russian Communists.

I feel that the reports of North Korean atrocities should be investigated with equal thoroughness and impartiality, and I earnestly hope that these resolutions providing for the establishment of a select committee will receive the same bipartisan support that the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre received in the Eighty-second Congress. I am therefore joining my colleagues in presenting this vital matter to the House, urging that the resolutions be given immediate consideration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SISTER ELIZABETH KENNY

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a little over a month ago the world was saddened by news of the death of Sister Elizabeth Kenny. A woman of great ability, sterling character, unbounded courage, she

devoted her life to the service of mankind, and her efforts contributed much to the easing of pain and suffering. As a physician I can attest to the value of her contribution in the fight against polio. It was my privilege to be associated with her in the early days of her service in America, and it was the medical profession in Minnesota which made facilities in Minneapolis available for her to start her work. While the world will miss her presence, the work in which she played so important a part will go on and she would ask no other reward. I would like to include in the RECORD the following tribute to Sister Kenny from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune:

SISTER ELIZABETH KENNY

The bright flame of purpose which burned in Sister Elizabeth Kenny was never extinguished in her lifetime. From the day she encountered her first case of infantile paralysis in the back country of Australia as a young nurse she dedicated herself to the treatment of that crippling disease with a rare and single-minded devotion.

In those years of dedication she was in frequent disagreement with the medical profession. Controversy dogged her efforts everywhere, but it did not abate either her faith in her revolutionary system or herself. Rather it seemed to feed that faith and strengthen her determination to pioneer along the trail of her unorthodoxy.

That trail led her to many honors. It brought her to Minneapolis, where the Elizabeth Kenny Institute was to become a monument to the effectiveness of her methods. It proceeded gradually toward a widening acceptance of those methods and an ever-growing respect for the valorous spirit of determination which never compromised or wavered.

Minneapolis knew Sister Kenny as a proud and blunt woman whose flashes of temperament could never conceal the great sense of duty and compassion which lay behind her hard-driving life of dedication.

Sister Kenny never spared herself. She was tireless in her tender ministrations to the polio sufferer. When death came to her this week in her modest red-brick home in Australia, she knew beyond any doubt that her dedicated life had saved thousands of polio victims from death, or from the crippling effects of the disease.

Sister Kenny would have asked no richer satisfaction from life than that knowledge. Nor would her many friends in Minneapolis have wished her any greater satisfaction. Those friends will be deeply saddened by the news of her death. For them it means the passing of a great and gallant spirit.

EDITORIAL CRITICISM

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] seeking recognition?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks. There is nothing else going on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I spoke about this little two by four room we have down in the House restaurant, so-called, where they expect each day to feed on an average say 300 Members of the House and some of their guests. Now, some Members of the Eighty-second Congress thought that they had some ability, and I guess they thought they were honest, decent citizens. Probably some of these folks who are Members of the Eighty-third Congress who were first elected last November have the same idea. But may I caution you to be careful—and all the Members—about that before we all get any such opinion of ourselves. Read the press—but please, please do not believe all you read.

On the editorial page of the News of yesterday there is this little squib. The fellow who wrote it thought it was funny. Do you? He wrote:

Representative CLARE HOFFMAN wants to build a quiet dining room in the Capitol for Congressmen.

Of course, that is not true. I was thinking of my constituents and the votes that they might cast at the next election if I am a candidate and of the good advice they want to give and of the news from home.

Now, listen to this. Here is an editorial appearing in one of the big papers in Washington:

One where you can't hear a lobbyist pick up a check.

That is a nasty insinuation that we go down to lunch with and take somebody to lunch in order to get a bribe or a little dirty money out of a lobbyist.

As well might I ask how many editors or publishers are willing to take something from some of these foreign governments for slanting their views on the news and for editorial opinion? I wonder why some of them do not quit their money-making businesses and come to Congress to serve the people without what might be called adequate compensation. Why do so many editors and columnists in a paper like to belittle Congressmen? They do not do it when we meet them.

INAUGURAL CEREMONY TICKETS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement of interest to all Members.

The tickets for the Members to the inaugural ceremony to be held at the Capitol will be available after 10 a. m. on tomorrow, January 14, at the office of the Sergeant at Arms in the Capitol.

Members must come in person and sign a receipt in order to obtain their tickets.

The Chair will further say that this simply refers to the tickets of each Member so that he may be permitted to go to the Capitol steps. These are tickets for each individual Member.

OUR OUTMODED OXCART METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Congressman Lea, of California, introduced a House joint resolution proposing to change the method of electing our President and Vice President. He proposed that the electoral college be abolished; that each State retain the same number of electoral votes it has now, based upon population, plus two extra, corresponding to its two United States Senators; that the electoral votes of each State be divided in proportion to the number of votes cast for each candidate for President and Vice President in the State; that the voters cast their ballots directly for the office of President and Vice President; and that the candidates receiving the highest number of electoral votes be declared the duly elected President and Vice President.

Congressman Lea made an exhaustive study of our outmoded, oxcart method of electing Presidents. In 1947 he presented the result of his study to the House in a series of 10 speeches. In those 10 speeches he set forth very clearly the defects of the present electoral college, explained the original purpose of the electoral college, and listed the mechanics of his proposed new system. Anyone who has ever associated with Congressman Lea knows how meticulous, how precise, how sincere, and how thorough he was in his congressional work.

Congressman Gossett, of Texas, took up the battle for this election reform where Congressman Lea left off. He introduced the Lea resolution in the Eighty-second Congress and worked earnestly for its passage. When two such truly great Americans as Congressman Lea and Congressman Gossett sponsor and advocate a constitutional change, it must be worthy of serious consideration.

Personally, I am convinced that the election reform—proposed, sponsored, and championed by Congressman Lea and Congressman Gossett—is sound and workable. If adopted it will go a long way toward correcting the defects of our electoral college system.

Mr. Speaker, the following are some of the defects that are today quite evident:

First. Our present electoral college system does not reflect the will of the American people.

Second. It does not meet the needs of a people that have outgrown their colonial swaddling clothes.

Third. Through the use of unit voting it disregards entirely the minority vote of each State.

THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN

The essential features of the proposed new plan for electing future Presidents and Vice Presidents are as follows:

First. It would assure each State its present relative weight and importance in the election of future Presidents.

Second. It would permit the voters of each State to cast their ballots directly for President and for Vice President—as they do now for all State and local officers—with complete assurance that their votes would have full weight in the final result of the election.

Third. It would give each candidate his proportionate share of the electoral votes of each State because the unit voting rule would be abolished.

Fourth. It would make impossible a deadlock in the election of a President, because the candidate receiving the highest number of electoral votes would be declared elected. There would there-

fore be no necessity for the House of Representatives to act in case of a deadlock, as presently provided.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the difference in the results that would be obtained if we discarded our outmoded electoral college system and adopted the proposed new system, let us take the State of Illinois.

In the election of 1948 some 2,000,000 Illinois voters voted for the 27 Dewey electors, and some 2,033,000 Illinois voters voted for the 27 Truman electors. Because the Truman electors received a plurality of 33,000 votes, all 27 Illinois electors went to President Truman. Under the proposed new system the electoral votes of Illinois would have been divided in proportion to the votes cast—Truman getting 14 and Dewey 13.

In the 1952 election some 2,500,000 Illinois voters voted for the 27 Eisenhower electors and some 2,100,000 Illinois voters voted for the Stevenson electors. Ike received all 27 Illinois electoral votes; Stevenson received none. Under the proposed new plan Ike would have received 15 and Stevenson would have received 12.

What is true as far as Illinois is concerned would also be true of every other State. Proportional distribution, or allotment, of the electoral votes of each State according to votes cast in the State would go a long way toward encouraging and developing a two-party system in the South, because it would be a real incentive to get out a strong minority vote. Virginia has for two decades been voting 60 percent Democratic and 40 percent Republican on national issues, but because her electoral votes have always gone for the Democratic presidential candidate, with two exceptions, there has been no real incentive to build up or to get out a strong Republican vote in Virginia. The same is relatively true of all other Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Gossett inserted a very clear statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when he spoke on the floor of this House on February 9, 1949. In that statement he made a very cogent argument in favor of the abolition of the electoral college. He argued that our present system gives altogether too much power and influence to minority groups, organized along racial, economic, and religious lines. These minority groups are concentrated in a few of our large cities in key States, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan. Quoting Congressman Gossett:

> The electoral college system permits and invites irresponsible control and domination by small organized minority groups within pivotal States. As a result the political strategists in both parties make appeals to these organized groups as such. To be specific, both major political parties wrote into their platforms in 1944 and again in 1948 an FEPC plank. The platform makers of both parties will tell you frankly—off the record, of course—that this was done as a bid for the Negro vote. There are enough Negroes in New York City, in Philadelphia, in Chicago, and in Detroit—when voting as a bloc—to determine the presidential electors in those pivotal States, and, in all probability, the presidential election.
>
> Also in the large pivotal States above-mentioned the organized labor vote controlled by the Political Action Committee of the CIO is a tremendous, potential, political force and threat. If cast en bloc these votes would also be sufficient to swing the electoral votes of those States and thus perhaps elect a President. Hence, both parties pussyfooted on the labor question in the 1944 and 1948 campaigns.

Thank heaven, not in the 1952 campaign.

Continuing, Congressman Gossett said:

> There are 2,500,000 Jewish people, 1,000,000 Italian people, 2,000,000 Irish people, 500,000 Polish people, and other large racial groups in the city of New York alone. A similar situation exists in our other large cities. It is within these large cities that these racial, economic, and religious groups are found, and in which they are organized in blocs. Through our electoral college system a few big cities have held the balance of power, and have elected in the past—and would probably continue to elect in the future—Presidents of the United States.

By abolishing our archaic electoral college and adopting the proposed new method of electing Presidents we can take away from these minority groups much of their present ability to dominate and influence future presidential elections.

Mr. Speaker, we elect all State and local officers on the basis of direct votes cast for them. Why, then, should we not elect our President and Vice President in the same way? Why bother with a complicated system of electoral votes if and when we discard the electoral college? Congressman Lea has given us the answer to that question. The following are his words:

> The answer to that question is obvious. Such a change would eliminate from the Constitution two very important provisions, each intended for the protection of the States.
>
> One provision so eliminated would be that which assigns two electoral votes to each State regardless of population, corresponding to the assignment of two Senators. The other provision that would be eliminated is that which assures each State electoral votes in proportion to its population, not in proportion to the number of its votes. An amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct election of the President regardless of State lines would vastly concentrate power in the States of greatest population, with a corresponding decline in the strength of every other State.

Mr. Speaker, the disadvantages of the electoral college system and some of the advantages of the proposed new system are further set forth in the following editorial taken from the Cleveland Press of November 4, 1952. I include it as a part of my remarks:

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

At today's election, no one will cast a vote directly for Dwight D. Eisenhower or Adlai E. Stevenson.

All votes will be for Presidential electors, pledged to support one candidate or the other.

Under the Constitution, each State is allowed one elector for each of its Senators and each of its Representatives in Congress. In the present electoral college, four States, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming, have the minimum of three which every State is allowed. New York tops the list with 45, followed by California and Pennsylvania with 32, Illinois with 27, and Ohio with 25.

This arrangement deserves criticism because under it, Nevada will have 1 electoral vote for every 12,000 popular votes for the winner in that State, while it will take about 70,000 popular votes to produce 1 electoral vote in California and about 75,000 to produce 1 for the winner in New York.

Even more objectionable under the existing constitutional provision a candidate wins the whole electoral vote of a State by getting a simple plurality of that State's popular vote.

This made it possible for Benjamin Harrison to defeat Grover Cleveland by 233 electoral votes to 168, despite the fact that Cleveland had a popular majority in the Nation of 95,713.

This happened because the Republicans carried some of the largest States by small majorities—Illinois by 22,000, Ohio by less than 20,000, New York by 13,000, and Indiana by 2,000—while Cleveland's big majorities in the South swelled his popular vote without adding to his strength in the electoral vote.

Minority groups in the large-city States have become the major factor which they have in national elections largely because they hold the balance of power in the northern and eastern centers of population because of this arrangement.

A more equitable system, in this paper's opinion and the opinion of advocates of the Lodge-Gossett amendment now pending in Congress, would be to distribute the electoral vote of a State in exact proportion to the division of its popular vote.

Such a pro rata distribution of the electoral vote would also encourage the development of a two-party system in the South, since it would make it worthwhile to get out a strong minority vote.

THE McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything else today except to speak about a bill I was introducing today to prohibit age discrimination in employment. But I was on the floor when my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER, referred to the opposition to the McCarran Act as coming from, and I quote from my recollection but I believe accurately, "professional Jews."

I feel very much compelled to say something about that although it is not easy. Judge WALTER is a very respected member of the Committee on the Judiciary and I have the deepest respect for his views. We differ on the McCarran Act. That is incipient in our duties here. We are all men of conscience. He feels as keenly as I do about this particular piece of legislation.

It is very significant that both presidential candidates, the winning candidate General Eisenhower, and the losing candidate, Governor Stevenson, called for the rewriting of the McCarran Act.

STATEMENTS OF EISENHOWER AND STEVENSON ON M'CARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

General Eisenhower said at Newark, N. J., on October 17:

> The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and oppressed.

Governor Stevenson said at New Haven, Conn., on October 27:

> I regret to say that the act controlling our present immigration policies is in some ways

a very bad act. It is unfair to many people such as the Italians and the Poles.

I introduced a resolution here on the first day of the session stating nothing but General Eisenhower's words in the way he put them himself in his speech at Newark, N. J., in which he called for the rewriting of this act. Now, I do not think that General Eisenhower can be characterized in any particular fashion as one who would feel that an act ought to be rewritten unless he believed it in the highest interests of our country and in the best spirit of Americanism.

In addition, there are Protestants and Catholics, as well as Jews, who have taken a strong position against this act.

From a release of the Chairman of the President's Commission I find that among the Catholic clergy who expressed or on whose behalf there was expressed criticism of the McCarran Act to the Commission were Cardinal Mooney of Detroit, Archbishop Cushing of Boston, Archbishop Ritter of St. Louis and Bishop McVinev of Providence, as well as Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles, and many other distinguished prelates. Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, stated, according to this report:

> It is my considered opinion that the act should be amended to purge it of several un-Christian and un-American provisions.

And among the prominent Protestant churchmen whose testimony before the Commission was critical of the McCarran Act were Rev. Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director, department of international good will, National Council of Churches of Christ; Rev. Earl F. Adams, director, Washington office, National Council of Churches of Christ; Rev. Wynn C. Fairfield, executive director, department of church world service, National Council of Churches of Christ; and Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean, Washington Cathedral.

When I attended the hearings before the President's Immigration Commission, there immediately preceded me as a witness opposed to the McCarran Act the Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia. It is very important to note that the people who complain most bitterly about how this particular act bears upon them are people from southern and eastern Europe—Italians, Greeks, and of other similar nationalities. They are indeed remote from "professional Jews."

A quick survey from the best information I could find, in the short time available, bearing on this point showed the following organizations of religious faiths and national origins groups, among many other organizations—labor, civic, and veteran—opposed to the McCarran Act: A. H. E. P. A. (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association); American Friends Service Committee; Independent Order of Sons of Italy in America; Latvian Relief, Inc.; National Catholic Welfare Conference; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, with representation from Baptist World Alliance, Presbyterian Church, National Lutheran Council; Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, Inc.; United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.

The important thing, it seems to me, is this: We are going to consider changes in this act. I think everything that the gentleman said about the situation of the French vessel *Liberté* and what it means to our foreign relations, coupled with the other facts I have given, indicates that we will consider changes. Even the proponents admit some changes are needed. Let us consider them not in these sweeping terms of "professional Jews" or of any particular religious group or particular national-origins group in the community seeking amendment. Let us each assume, as I assume about my friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER, that we are acting out of most sincere motives and for the best interests of our country. Surely, the sacrifices of blood and treasure which all have made in common for the security and freedom of our country are a guaranty that love of country and of freedom will be our only motive.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman, when he revises and extends his remarks, include a number of the non-Jewish organizations that have protested the passage of this bill in toto or in part, and include in that list organizations like the National Lutheran Conference, the Quakers, the Mennonites, the Catholic Welfare Association, and other similar groups that have protested against the entire fabric of the bill or portions thereof?

Mr. JAVITS. I will. I will also include the verbatim statement of both presidential candidates.

May I conclude by saying that I hope what I have said will be constructive. I hope very much that we may discuss the McCarran Act without any sweeping generalizations about any religious or national origins or any other kind of group. And that if any of my colleagues feel that some particular person or persons, regardless of their faith or national origins, have done or said something that they disagree with, then let us name names. Let us not deal in sweeping generalities which such bitter and recent world history, including the present murderous persecution of Jews behind the iron curtain going on right now, has shown can lead to results so mischievous to human society.

THE McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all love and respect our friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and we can all agree with what he says about hoping that there will not be any hard feelings, no bigotry or narrowness of mind in the consideration of the McCarran-Walter Act. Of course, we can all go along with that thought—but I wonder where some people, it does not make any difference what their color or creed or religion is, I wonder where they get the idea that people in other countries have a right—a right, I say—to come to this country and become citizens. It is a strange situation when we subscribe to a doctrine that a country cannot protect itself, or, if you prefer, choose those who are to become its own citizens.

There is not a country in the world that I know of where an American can go, as a matter of right, establish himself, and participate in the government of that country.

Yet, when the Congress attempts to do what it thinks is right to protect this country, immediately it is assailed as being narrow-minded, bigoted, uncharitable, possessing almost every undesirable quality that a man could have. To my mind, it would be about as sensible to contend that I have a right to become and be treated as a member of your family, an absurdity on the face of it.

If I understand this McCarran-Walter Act correctly, it was years in the writing. On our side, we had our colleague from Pennsylvania, LOUIS GRAHAM. There never was a more kindly man in this House, at least not within my memory, nor a more liberal-minded man. We had over on that side the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER, respected, as our friend from New York said—a man in whom we all have confidence, a man who, while just and liberal, is a lover of America—one who glories in the greatness of his country, who has not only an intense desire but a determination that its security shall continue—not be destroyed by a horde of people who do not understand, who do not want to live under our form of government. I know from what we saw him doing; you all know from what you saw him doing here for years, 4 years, I think it was, that the bill was in the writing, he was doing his very best, spending many an hour studying the reports, trying to get a law that he thought would be just and equitable to everyone and at the same time protect this country of ours. He and those who worked with him, and especially our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], in the opinion of more than two-thirds of the Congress, did a remarkably fine job, gave us a fair, just, workable law.

Now, everyone—and I have no pride of ancestry—I come from Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Dutch, round-headed, wooden-headed, ignorant, and stubborn, they say, and I do not care. I am like an Irishman. You tell an Irishman he is an Irishman, and what does he do? Tell him he is a drinking, fighting Irishman, and what does he do? He takes another drink, maybe a pint or a quart—I do not know how much an Irishman drinks, but he takes one more drink—jumps up and says: "Let's have it out right now." He is never offended because somebody calls him an Irishman. I am never offended because anyone calls me a stubborn, wooden-headed Dutchman from Pennsylvania; I just forget about it. So, why do some people, instead of being proud of their homeland,

their race, or creed, get peevish when those things are mentioned. We are all equal in the sight of the Lord and no doubt will all make the same kind of dust—but that is no reason why we all want the same things.

I cannot subscribe to this idea that those who wrote the McCarran-Walter Act were motivated by anything except a desire to be fair to everyone everywhere and at the same time protect this country of ours. Amendments may be necessary; I do not know of any law that was ever written which could not be improved. Every once in a while I write a speech and even I am always dissatisfied with what I write. I am never absolutely satisfied with what I do, say, or write; I never had a talk my secretary wrote that I was satisfied with, though at times a colleague insists that it was so written—that is, if someone thought it was worth while.

So I can go along with those people who want to amend the act, but I cannot go along with the thought that we must for one minute abandon the idea that our first duty is to protect our own country, our own people. There is no reason on earth why we should open wide our gates and let everyone abroad who has the funds to get here or some friend here who will bring him in—let him come in; I cannot subscribe to that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BERRY and to include an editorial.

Mr. VELDE and to include a telegram.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. HORAN.

Mr. SADLAK and to include an address delivered by Dean Manion.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland and to include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York in two instances and to include articles.

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a copy of a resolution.

Mr. MASON on the subject of The Much-Discussed Walter-McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act, and to include a memorandum prepared by Mr. Besterman, legislative assistant to the Committee on the Judiciary, on the same subject.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in six instances and to include in each extraneous material.

Mr. D'EWART and to include a report by Mr. POULSON of a trip to Europe.

Mr. JENKINS.

Mr. SPENCE and to include a report made by the Honorable Michael DiSalle, special assistant to the Economic Stabilization Agency.

Mr. PERKINS in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY and to include an address delivered by Dr. Douglas Stillwell Freeman before the Richmond Chamber of Commerce January 8, 1953, on the subject A Foreign Policy the Next Step.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a report he made on the North African air bases to the former chairman of the committee, Hon. CARL VINSON, which has been the subject of a great deal of controversy in recent months.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a short editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas and to include a short editorial with reference to the retirement from Congress of a noted statesman, Hon. Tom Connally.

Mr. FINE (at the request of Mr. CELLER) on the subject of world brotherhood.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ENGLE) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an article from the Post-Gazette.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution adopted at the last D-day dinner in Gary.

Mr. CANNON.

Mr. HARDY and to include a magazine article, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $315.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. BEAMER and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial appearing in the Boston Globe January 8, entitled "Farewell to Congress."

Mr. SHAFER in three instances.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. HESS and to include an editorial.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include a sermon delivered Sunday, January 11, 1953, entitled "The Ramparts We Watch," by the Reverend Edward Elston, minister of the National Presbyterian Church.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. BATTLE).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 14, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

315. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and proceedings of the national gathering of the Disabled American Veterans held in Boston, Mass., August 11–15, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 249, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration covering operations of the Administration for the fiscal year 1952 (H. Doc. 62); to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

317. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 and for other purposes, in the amount of $2,334,667,550, together with several proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

318. A letter from the Acting Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work executed during the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413); to the Committee on Armed Services.

319. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list by rank and age groups, the number of such officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

320. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer to the town of Milford, Conn., of one 42-foot retriever boat (hull No. 21191), for use in rescue and patrol work, pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897; 34 U. S. C. 546f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

321. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

322. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1952; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

323. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1952; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

324. A letter from the department adjutant, Department of Alaska, the American Legion, transmitting copies of a resolution adopted at the thirty-third Annual Convention of the Department of Alaska, the American Legion, on June 21, 1952, at Ketchikan, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

325. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the report of claims paid by

the Department of Labor for the period ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

326. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

327. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 6 (c) of the act of July 3, 1930 (Public Law 536, 71st Cong.), and section 1504 of the act of June 22, 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong. (H. Doc. No. 8)); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1519. A bill providing for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1520. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1522. A bill to promote economy and efficiency through certain reorganizations and the integration of supply and service activities within and among the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1523. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1524. A bill to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1525. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1526. A bill to authorize the consolidation of the area of Vicksburg National Military Park, in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1527. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1528. A bill to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1529. A bill to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1530. A bill to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1531. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1532. A bill to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1533. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1534. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services and to provide for a copy of disability record and to provide for presumption of service-connected injury or disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1535. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing 5-year limitation on the period of time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1536. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1537. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1538. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1539. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1540. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1541. A bill to provide reduced postage on air-mail parcel post sent to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in certain areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1542. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in the United States or elsewhere; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1543. A bill to provide hospital care and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans residing abroad for service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 1544. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1545. A bill to waive the payment of premiums on Government life insurance and national service life-insurance policies for certain aged and destitute veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1546. A bill to provide paid-up insurance for certain aged veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1547. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 1548. A bill to provide two rest periods per day of 15 minutes each for certain employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1549. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to review the operation of the projects for flood control for Red Lake River, Minn., with a view to determining whether further projects are necessary; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1550. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the provision that a woman must be living with her husband to be entitled to a wife's insurance benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1551. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1552. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 1553. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1554. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 1555. A bill providing for an investigation and study by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the adequacy and convenience of passenger carrier facilities and services and the reasonableness of fares in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1556. A bill to provide annuities to the widows of justices, judges, or former justices or judges of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1557. A bill to amend section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments received because of disability arising solely out of employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1558. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1559. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 1560. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1561. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the

State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1562. A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1563. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon the death of the beneficiary-payee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1565. A bill providing for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1566. A bill to allow a widow or widower to deduct, for income-tax purposes, amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1567. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1568. A bill to amend section 6 of chapter 786 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 323; title 48, sec. 103, U. S. C.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1569. A bill to provide for an additional district judge for the third division of the district court for the district of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1570. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 50 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1571. A bill to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 1572. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to provide the appropriate committees of Congress with staffs adequate to enable them to keep fully informed, at all times, as to the appropriation needs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1573. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1574. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 1575. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 1576. A bill to bar un-American parties from the election ballot; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1577. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the time for filing individual income-tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1579. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1580. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 1581. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1582. A bill to exempt from income taxation interest received by individuals upon United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1583. A bill to provide for the regulation and control by farmers of their surplus agricultural commodities, to provide for the establishment of farmer-elected control boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1584. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide for research and study, and, in cooperation with the States, to establish appropriate safeguards, with respect to weather modification operations and the problems related thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1585. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1586. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1587. A bill to repeal section 1701 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from tax admissions to certain events, conducted for the benefit of religious, educational, and charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1588. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, and certain other articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1589. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861–65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1590. A bill to authorize, under regulations of the Civil Service Commission, the withholding, upon request, from compensation of Federal employees amounts for the payment of certain life and hospitalization insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1591. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

H. R. 1592. A bill to prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing on public lands in violation of State or Territorial laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1593. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 1594. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to wrestling matches all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of an elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1595. A bill authorizing construction of works to restore to Palo Verde irrigation district, California, a means of gravity diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River and providing certain benefits to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 1596. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1597. A bill to permit civil officers and employees of the United States to be members of certain State and Territorial boards and commissions having duties relating to State or Territorial merit systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1598. A bill to change the names of the Gatun Locks, the Gatun Dam, and the town of Gatun in the Canal Zone to "Sibert Locks," "Sibert Dam," and "Sibert," respectively, in memory of the late Maj. Gen. William L. Sibert, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1599. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1600. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1601. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1602. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1603. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership-share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1604. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1605. A bill to amend section 3672 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to requirement of filing notice of lien for taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1606. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1607. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to encourage the making of loans at low rates of interest to veterans, and to the widows of veterans, who wish to purchase or construct homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1608. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1609. A bill to provide that commutation in lieu of uniforms for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps shall be fixed at a rate sufficient to cover the full cost of such uniforms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1610. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1611. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1612. A bill providing aid to States for the purpose of assisting school districts in constructing urgently needed school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1613. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in San Diego, Calif., to the city of San Diego; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1614. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1615. A bill to amend the Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers to provide a method for the promotion of substitute rural carriers to the position of regular rural carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution admitting the State of Ohio into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives increasing term to 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of certain mineral leases issued by the States covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf and for the issuance of certain other mineral leases on such lands by the United States, to provide that the royalties from such leases shall be used for grants-in-aid of education and national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution creating a Great Lakes Water Level Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a Commissioner of Claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution providing that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Res. 69. Resolution creating a commission on the problems of aging and elderly people; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. Res. 70. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of atrocities and other crimes against humanity alleged to have been committed during the Korean hostilities or in the course of efforts of totalitarian countries to dominate the free world; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 71. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the field service of the Post Office Department, for the purpose of considering and devising plans for the complete reorganization of such field service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 72. Resolution encouraging a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 73. Resolution providing funds and expenses to conduct a hearing and study as to the reasons for periodical interruptions of shipping through the port of Seattle; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Res. 74. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of atrocities and other crimes against humanity alleged to have been committed during the Korean hostilities or in the course of efforts of totalitarian countries to dominate the free world; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 75. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate Korean Atrocities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 76. Resolution proclaiming October 11 a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Res. 77. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of atrocities and other crimes against humanity alleged to have been committed during the Korean hostilities or in the course of efforts of totalitarian countries to dominate the free world; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 1616. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Hilda Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Garabed Meghrigian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 1619. A bill for the relief of Viviani Quirino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Jose do Rego Dias Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Samuel and Gregory Goekjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Augustin Mondreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Serojini Dongre Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIN:

H. R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Catalina Felicia Guerra y Rodriguez (also known as Catalina Felicia Guerra); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Melody Yvonne Sitterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:
H. R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Ghulam Nabi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BROWNSON:
H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Mr. Johann Groben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
Br. Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Sister Lelia Juditta Roral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CHENOWETH:
H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Miss Aiko Ikehara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. CHURCH:
H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of the Lake States Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CLEVENGER:
H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Dieter Joseph Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. COUDERT:
H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DOLLINGER:
H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Mordechai, Rivca, and David Epelbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FEIGHAN:
H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Paul A. Bajan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GREEN:
H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HORAN:
H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Berta Wandl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Gina Bellagamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Sriramamurti Venkata Yadavalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of George W. McLarand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Maria Adam (Maria Adam Schattauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Pinero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1644. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. KEE:
H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Salim Mohamed El Masri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Chakib Kassem Aboul-Hosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gerlando Faldetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1652. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Harry Constantopolous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1654. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Signorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of Nachum Samuel Leitner and his wife, Anna Leitner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1656. A bill for the relief of Castrenze DiGaetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1657. A bill for the relief of Antonio Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:
H. R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Donato De Stefanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1659. A bill for the relief of Placido Parato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1660. A bill for the relief of Sister Concepta (Ida Riegel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus C. Karde and Ingeborg Karde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 1662. A bill for the relief of Stephania Hnatiw and Maria Hnatiw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1663. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LANHAM:
H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Col. William Henry Boshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LANTAFF:
H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Martha Farah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LATHAM:
H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Magna Drummond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Micele Pizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Stephen Maniaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Yousef Samaan Rauhana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Henryk Blaszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of James I. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McGREGOR:
H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Brother Julian Chrosciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Frank Morettin or Frank Francesco Morettin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Carlo Giovanni Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Antonino Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Herbert McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Henryk S. Rynlewicz-Wisniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Nicholas De Lorence-Piguiewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MADDEN:
H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Paulus Youhanna Benjamen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H. R. 1686. A bill for the relief of Jose Gomes Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1687. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Latifi Assad Hid (also known as Latify Shaker and Latify Mtanous); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Henry Ty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1689. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Tax Court of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the United States against the Frank M. Hill Machine Co., Inc., of Walpole, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MILLER of California:
H. R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russi Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Leonore Evelyn Lazaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Quan Hing Fay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of William L. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:
H. R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Costas Kikilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORGAN:
H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vagianos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1696. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Fortunato Salamone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Kathe Bartke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'KONSKI:
H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Angelo and Fernanda Salciccioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of Rev. Roger Knutsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PELLY:
H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Robert Keith Slotvig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RAINS:
H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TEAGUE:
H. R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Donald Eugene Stovall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. THOMAS:
H. R. 1703. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janie Ng Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. UTT:
H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:
H. R. 1705. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

14. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition in support of the Bryson bill from citizens of Racine, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

15. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Montcalm County, Mich., requesting legislation for the return of no less than 50 percent of the Federal gasoline tax to the respective States wherein it is collected; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, as we go forth into the hours of this new day, may we be deeply concerned about accomplishing something that will add to the happiness and security and richness of human life.

In all our plans and policies may we be conservative without being reactionary, liberal without being radical and conciliatory without ever compromising or breaking faith with the principles of righteousness and justice.

May we continue to pray and labor in eager and earnest expectation and with the confidence that the lofty hopes and aspirations which we cherish for our troubled and confused world are going to be brought to fulfillment and fruition.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members who have not yet received the oath of office. If they will present themselves in the well of the House the Chair will administer the oath.

Mr. HOLIFIELD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ECONOMIC REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 33)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1953.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review, January 1953, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

INAUGURAL HOLIDAY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many are involved and what is the cost?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not have the exact number. It relates only to those in the District and those in the immediate vicinity and adjacent as set forth in the resolution.

It is similar in form to a resolution passed 4 years ago except in one particular. The present one provides for a 1-day holiday instead of 2 days as was provided in the resolution 4 years ago. Those employees in the city of Washington would have a holiday without the resolution, although there seems to be some question, in my opinion.

This resolution clarifies the situation for those in the District and includes those immediately near by.

The House passed House Joint Resolution 120 which I submitted yesterday, authorizing a legal holiday on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, which is Inauguration Day. This extended the legal holiday which the law provided for employees in the District of Columbia to Federal employees in adjacent areas.

Before the House had messaged over to the other body that it had passed House Joint Resolution 120, the other body took up Senate Joint Resolution 20 and passed it.

Senate Joint Resolution 20, which I have asked to be taken from the Speaker's table and passed, is identical to House Joint Resolution 120 to which the House had already agreed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This follows the Truman policy of giving the Federal employees a little more time off.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; the gentleman is mistaken. This is a policy of the Eighty-third Congress. The holiday is for only 1 day. It applies only to those employed in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not object, because I think it is a good thing and they ought to attend.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman's statement that the employees should have the opportunity to attend this great and important event.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the several executive departments, independent establishments, and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, shall be closed all day on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, Inauguration day. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such day by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on that day; and such day shall be considered a holiday for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY FLOOR LEADER PERSONNEL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 87) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1953, the positions of legislative clerk, clerk, and messenger in the office of the minority floor leader, at the basic salary rates of $3,060, $3,000, and $1,560 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated, and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, the compensation of two or more employees for the minority floor leader to be appointed by him at basic rates of compensation totaling not more than $7,620 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY WHIP PERSONNEL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 78) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1953, the positions of clerk for the minority whip

and messenger in the minority caucus room at the basic salary rates of $3,000 and $1,740 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated, and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, the compensation of two or more employees for the minority whip to be appointed by him at basic rates of compensation totaling not more than $4,740 per annum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, just one word in explanation of these two resolutions. I do not know that any is necessary, but it simply permits the minority leader and the minority whip to make a different arrangement about the division of the pay allotted to them for help in their offices without increasing the amount at all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 79) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-third Congress the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LONG asked and was given consent to address the House for 1 hour on February 4, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order to bring to the attention of the Congress in these early days of the session a matter which has been under the investigation of the Bonner subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for the past 2 years.

Everyone has been asking: How is Congress going to be able to cut the budget and not interfere with our defense build-up?

Well, I have a copy of a release from the Department of Defense dated January 6, 1953, on the subject of distribution of military coffee. I am going to insert the entire statement in the RECORD but what I want to point up is the sixth paragraph of this release:

On the basis of current military coffee consumption in the United States the Board (Munitions) reckons a reduction of $50,000,000 in green bean inventories together with parallel savings in storage space and personnel costs.

There is no estimate of the cost in savings on the storage space, but realizing that the military was in the last Congress asking around $3,000,000,000 for building additional warehouses it must be considerable; certainly the savings in personnel costs will be considerable. In other words, we are talking about savings which I suggest will total $100,000,000.

Now I wish to call further attention to the fact that when the Bonner subcommittee went into the investigation of military coffee-roasting plants and distribution we very clearly pointed out that we were simply using coffee roasting as an example and a test study; that there were hundreds of other civilian type activities that the military had moved into which were similar to coffee roasting.

It is a study of the field of what I personally have termed to be military socialism. Our committee had a report prepared which I trust will be printed for the Members' benefit by the new Committee on Governmental Operations. If the Congress were to completely study these military activities, I suggest we would find that the savings to the taxpayer would be in the billions of dollars. Just 10 operations, like coffee roasting, cut down, as the directive of the Department of Defense has provided, would save $1,000,000,000. One hundred would save $10,000,000,000.

But I wish to point out the second to the last paragraph of the Department of Defense statement:

The directive on the roasting and distribution of coffee is the result of the first Munitions Board study undertaken in the supply systems study project, which project is "to develop and recommend such changes to existing organization, policies, standards, and procedures governing the supply operations within the Department of Defense as will maintain or increase military effectiveness and produce the optimum efficiency and economy of these supply operations from the initial requirements and resources planning stage to final consumption or other disposition."

This is just the first study the Munitions Board has made. Well, it is imperative that the Congress continue to see that these studies are made. It is not unfair to say that if the Bonner subcommittee had not been making the study on coffee roasting nothing would have been done at all and the $100,000,000 saving which we can anticipate in our present budget would not be forthcoming. But in making this study the first thing necessary is to require the military to set up cost-accounting systems so it can be determined what it actually costs the Government to engage in these civilian-type activities. At the present time the military has no sound cost-accounting system for any of these operations and much of the actual cost is hidden in general appropriations.

However, I am not taking the floor to praise the Munitions Board or the Department of Defense for the stand they have taken on the subject of coffee roasting in spite of the fact that they tell us they will save approximately $100,000,000. Why am I not praising them? Because, in my opinion, the saving should be three times that amount. The pressure from the Bonner subcommittee has produced nothing more than a strategic retreat. The real answer is the military has no business whatsoever being in the coffee roasting and coffee distribution business.

They give us a lot of guff about the importance of good coffee to the morale of the men and the fact that they cannot get the high quality blend from the civilian market. Yet it is a fact that when they put Government coffee on the shelves at the commissaries along with standard brands the people paid more to get the standard brands than the military product.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point in reference to the question of waste?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not only coffee that has been made. As the gentleman has mentioned, I understand from the report you made on it, which I had an opportunity of reading, that there are at least a dozen other items which they are making—for example, paint. The gentleman could name others I am sure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; certainly I could. I have tried to emphasize coffee roasting which is simply a study of one example which is nothing more than an example, and I suggest that there are at least 100 fields similar to coffee roasting that we could well go into, and you multiply 100 by 100,000,000 and you have the $10,000,000,000 savings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand this was with reference to the Army only?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The marines I have found out have a coffee-roasting plant also.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. These agencies are engaged in civilian activities. If they continue to go into these activities, create new activities and expand the ones they are in and put the ordinary businessman out of existence, where are you going to get the tax dollars so that the services can operate?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is certainly a very important point. One of the things we are interested in is to broaden our tax base rather than lessen it. Every time the military goes into a civilian type of operation we limit the tax base.

Incidentally, in my opinion at least, that is one reason why our military budgets are so large. They are duplicating civilian enterprises, and that is a costly thing to do.

Coffee roasting is a field where it is impossible for the military to make a case. In fact, the case can be made the other way. This is a field which should be exclusively civilian. Whether in war or peace, we have theoretically the same number of coffee drinkers. The amount of coffee drunk is based upon the population, not whether a man is wearing a uniform or in civvy clothes. In time of war the amount of coffee roasted should be no more than in time of peace, and any increase would be solely the result of people drinking more coffee in times of stress.

If the military goes into the field of roasting coffee, it must have plants that will roast coffee for the big bulge of personnel in wartime. In peacetime then its plants will be idle. This is unadulterated and unnecessary waste.

Now, it worried me a little for some time why the American coffee-roasting industry was not up in arms about this bit of military socialism. Because, frankly, the work of the Bonner subcommittee was not inspired by the coffee industry. Quite the contrary. They hung back in their cooperation and their testimony. One member of the industry, however, who allowed his patriotism to show, took me aside and gave me the answer. The military get more people drinking coffee, and get them accustomed to a better and therefore higher-priced brand. For that reason the military coffee roasting and distributive program is doing what otherwise the coffee industry would have to be doing with their own money and through their own efforts by intelligent advertising.

Well, I say the cigarette industry has to spend its own millions on advertising to get the American people to smoke cigarettes. Let the coffee industry do the same. But do not let us pass the cost of teaching the American people to drink more and higher-priced coffee onto the taxpayer through the process of military socialism.

And if the military wants to make something of the subject of coffee drinking as it relates to health and morale, let us see some medical statistics to back it up. Certainly private enterprise can provide all the coffee the military will need in time of peace or in time of war. The fact that our supply of the coffee bean is cut off through the process of war, as happened in World War II, has nothing to do with who is roasting the coffee. It has to do with whether under the circumstances of short supply the military should not have preference over the civilian. But this preference can be granted for the roasted coffee as effectively as it can for the green bean.

And if the military is afraid of having some of its fringe benefits cut off, as is stated on page 23 of the Semiannual Report of the Secretary of Defense, and I quote:

> Under these circumstances it is essential that our desire for economy does not lead us to reduce unnecessarily the military equivalent of industry's fringe benefits, such as retirement pay, medical care for dependents, and allowances for the shipment of household goods.

Let me refer the military to the letter from the Comptroller General's Office about the legality of fringe benefits such as Government coffee sold at the commissary cheaper than the cost of processing it. I will insert the entire letter and the letter it was in response to for the Congress, and I hope, the military who might read this speech.

And let me further say about the crocodile tears wept over shipment of household goods. Until Congress got onto this racket the top military was permitted 24,000-pound allowance, while the top civilian Government employee had only a 7,000-pound allowance. Incidentally, a study of household goods indicated that 1,000 pounds is a good rule of thumb for one room of furniture.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say something about warehouses, and a substantial amount of money asked to be appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, sir. I referred to that item.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much money did they ask for these new warehouses?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I recall in our military budget—and I should like to have the figure exact—if any Member of the committee concerned with this item is present I would appreciate the exact figure—it was around $3,000,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. $3,000,000,000?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did the committee look into the fact that there are a great many empty warehouses throughout the country?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; we were trying to pinpoint our study on one sample case of coffee roastings; but, incidentally, it did come to our attention that there were a number of empty warehouses right in St. Louis, my own district. Jefferson Barracks has lots of idle warehouses, idle rail spurs, idle facilities; and there also is a large multistory building in St. Louis city proper suitable for office space which is being used for warehouse purposes. It is an utterly uneconomic procedure.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I can tell the gentlemen that the same condition exists in my State: we have empty warehouses, but the Government has not seen fit to store any of their commodities there. They want to build more warehouses, however, I am glad the gentleman from Missouri has called this to the attention of the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and point out as he is pointing out that here is another example where we could have at least a $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 saving if we dug into it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who was chairman of this subcommittee. It was under his chairmanship that this work was done, and I honor him.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman's fine compliment, but, in turn, I want to say that the gentleman himself and the other members of the subcommittee, Mr. BROWNSON, Mr. MEADER, Mrs. HARDEN, Mr. LANTAFF, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. FINE, and other Democratic Members, and the able staff of the committee made it a success. I do not desire to take the time of the gentleman, but there is an item in the hearings, field supply management, issued June 24 and 25 and July 1, 1952, which I think should be called to the attention of the House and should be called to the attention of the Committee on the Merchant Marine. The Committee on the Merchant Marine is doing all possible, this House and this Government is doing everything to subsidize and keep the American Merchant Marine afloat and keep the American flag on the high seas; yet the military transport has entered into the field and is now the largest competitor of private enterprise to the American Merchant Marine.

With respect to the cost of the operation and the savings claimed, when Mr. McNeil, the Comptroller of the National Defense, was before the committee I asked Mr. McNeil as to all costs in figuring out the savings made by the Military Transport Service, and here is his answer:

> All costs are included except the capital value of the ships.

Now if you give to various private shipping lines ships for nothing then, of course, they can operate very efficiently and at quite a profit. But you give the Military Sea Transport fleet cargo ships and combination ships to enter into competition with private operators and the private operators are at a great disadvantage. I have written operators in the trade asking what the percentage of cargo in the Pacific is today divided between the Government operation and private, the Army fleet, and the private fleet. It would be interesting if the Committee on Merchant Marine of the House should look into this matter, because you cannot expect private operators or ships to compete with an operation in which the capital value of the ships is not included as part of the cost. It is my thinking that private operators can handle cargo for Korea more economically.

The gentleman from Missouri is making a fine presentation here this morning and I appreciate it very much. This whole question should be brought home clearly to the House and the Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina and I want to point out that this is an example of the matter of the cost-accounting system used not only by the military department but by other Government agencies in trying to estimate costs. I remember in going into this subject of repair and overhaul of civilian type trucks and automobiles that we inspected a plant down in Atlanta, Ga. I asked the colonel of the Army in charge of that operation whether his salary was included in the cost of overhauling these vehicles. He said, "Well, no. The Army would have to pay me the salary anyway." That is an example of the lack of a cost-accounting system.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who has been of great assistance to this subcommittee in carrying on these studies.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. On the point the gentleman has just raised in connection with the matter of cost accounting for operations in the military service may I say that the subject was brought up very forcefully in the hearings held by the Bonner committee last December. These hearings are now in galley form and I understand

will be available to the Members of the House in the next 2 weeks.

I would like to point out that under Thirty-first United States Code, section 66 (a), (b), (c), the General Accounting Office is required to prescribe principles of accounting for the executive departments and to assist them in establishing accounting systems, then is required to review executive agency accounting practices from time to time.

In the light of that requirement of the statute and in the light of the testimony before the Bonner committee in December, which disclosed that there was no cost accounting in connection with these commercial type activities, it seems to me that the Government Operations Committee might very well follow up the very useful and worth-while work of the Bonner committee. I believe we should ask the General Accounting Office to make a study of some of these commercial type activities in order to see whether or not they are being handled more economically than they could be through contracts with commercial firms.

That is not the whole question, as the gentleman has pointed out, and as was pointed out in the committee staff report, I hope, with the gentleman, a report on this subject will be filed by the Government Operations Committee. It should have been reported out long before this.

Whether the Government can roast coffee more economically than it can purchase coffee from a commercial concern is not the question. Under that theory the Government might take over the whole production system of the United States if it could show figures indicating that its costs were lower. Commercial operators are entitled to a profit. They pay taxes. The matter of economy is not the sole, or the basic question; however, it is an important question because it is the basis upon which the Navy and the Army are expanding these commercial type operations. They do not know, the Congress does not know and the people of the country do not know whether or not they are conducting these operations more economically than the same products and services could be procured under contract with private concerns.

It is important that that study be made and I hope the Government Operations Committee will ask the General Accounting Office to make it because I would not trust the services to make their own study. They would make the facts fit their purposes.

If the gentleman will yield further, I think it might interest the House to have some additional information on this point from testimony before the Bonner committee.

As a result of the Bonner committee's study of military-supply management, the Secretary of Defense issued Directive No. 4000.8, dated September 5, 1952, seeking to eliminate overlapping and duplication in procurement and supply in the armed services. With reference to the subject we are discussing here, namely, commercial operations of the armed services, the directive had the following to say:

B. COMMERCIAL- AND INDUSTRIAL-TYPE FACILITIES

1. Commercial- and industrial-type facilities (including, among others, warehouses, motor repair shops, bakeries, and laundries) operated by each of the military departments shall be made available to the maximum extent for the use of any of the military departments. Existing commercial- and industrial-type facilities shall be surveyed to determine the need for their continued operation and retention. Such facilities will not be continued in operation where the required needs can be effectively and economically served by existing facilities of any department or where private commercial facilities are available except to the extent that such private commercial facilities are not reasonably available or their use will be demonstrably more expensive or except where the operation of such facilities is essential for training purposes. No facilities, not in operation, shall be retained unless necessary for mobilization reserve. Cost-accounting methods will be employed to assist in formulation of decisions concerning cross-servicing, establishment, or continuance of such activities in or under the Department of Defense.

2. Additional facilities of these types shall not be established or acquired by a military department unless the required needs cannot be effectively served by existing facilities of all the departments or by private commercial facilities. Except in a zone of action (e. g., Korea), no such addtional facilities shall be established or acquired without prior approval of the Secretary of Defense.

In the hearings of the Bonner committee held on Thursday, December 4, 1952, there was some very revealing testimony on the very point I have been making, namely, that the accounting procedures of the military services are wholly inadequate and the services do not really know whether their commercial and industrial operations are economical or not. I quote the following from the testimony of Mr. Harold L. Pearson, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army:

In the United States our very large rebuild programs are partly conducted with our own facilities and partly under contract. I do not know the percentage. I can learn it for you and will be glad to do so.

I recall within recent months approving a sizable number, counted by dozens, of contracts directly with industry to accomplish rebuild work, particularly on MDAP things, those which the Army operates within the United States being well supervised, well set up, and very effective, those that I have seen.

But we do not know what they cost and, as businessmen, neither Mr. Johnson nor I, are happy in that environment. We do not have for so many Army activities business-like, solid, cost-accounting figures to guide in judgment. We are then guided more by habit and by the habit of thought and by the circumstances of the moment.

The task of installation of businesslike accounting in the Army is a tremendous task. We are 100 years behind business, or certainly 50 years behind business in that respect.

The jobs of all of us in these procurement and distribution activities would be much more attractive if we could walk on the solid ground of solid facts in reaching conclusions rather than in the hazy elements of incomplete facts.

The Honorable Earl D. Johnson, Under Secretary of the Army, confirmed the above statement and announced his own individual belief that the military services ought not to be engaging in commercial-type operations where the same products or services could be furnished by civilian enterprise. His testimony was as follows:

Lastly, and certainly not the least, is the fact that I think once we get these costs identified, we are not going to find that we do it any more cheaply. If you make corrections for the length of time you keep that plant idle, standing by during, let us say, the years of uninterrupted peace, and when you have that big plant in Government hands just standing there, that is a carrying charge, a capital carrying charge under any private means of accounting.

I am not so sure that it is going to cost you as much when you do it by private industry. Your individual end product figured against your immediate cost, I am sure figured on the basis that the Government costs are figured, you can show that Government will produce cheaper in a lot of cases, but, if you take it over a cycle, then I am not sure you would.

I think the gentleman from Missouri has done a real service to the country in the opening days of the Eighty-third Congress by pointing out that in the case of coffee a specific economy of substantial size has resulted from the efforts of the Bonner committee.

The lesson should be clear to this House that if we will employ the investigative power we possess, if we acquire able and competent staffs for our committees to dig into these huge executive expenditures, we can make very substantial reductions in Government costs without harming but, on the contrary, improving the quality of service in useful Federal functions. If we fail to turn the spotlight and the microscope on these Federal expenditures, we will have to resort to the old and unsatisfactory device of meat-ax cuts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his fine contribution. I have no worry about going into this subject of cost accounting to find out whether the Government or the military can do something cheaper than private enterprise. There is no question, in my opinion, in reference to any of these fields. If you let private enterprise do it they can do it at a profit and the net result will be a less cost to the Government, our taxes will be less and we will not have socialism.

However, to proceed with the matter of coffee roasting and the strategic retreat made by the Department of Defense in their new ruling. Not only are they not going out of the coffee business but they are going to come before the Congress and ask for about $2,500,000 more in order to install the machinery necessary to vacuum pack the coffee they continue to roast. Well, if they stay in the coffee business, perhaps they should vacuum pack it for an overall saving. But private industry is already set up to vacuum pack and we do not need that additional equipment in our economy.

It sounds good—spend $2,500,000 because we are saving $100,000,000. I say, what sounds even better, spend nothing and save $300,000,000 and sell your coffee roasting plants; then turn the proceeds over to the General Treasury; use your

warehouses, office space, and officers' time for real military jobs.

The strategic retreat consists not in really unifying the coffee business the military is in, but in parceling it. This term "parcel" is a beauty and it was supplied to me by one of the high military men testifying before our subcommittee last December. Our committee was studying the possibilities of the unification of medical supply procurement and distribution for the Army, Navy and Airforce. To further the study we urged the test made at Alameda, California, where the Army took over the job of supplying all services in the west coast area, including most of the overseas areas off the west coast and, most important of all, including supplying Korea, where a war is going on. The result, to the horror of the Navy, in particular, showed the test to be eminently successful.

We thought then the answer would be for the services to immediately unify all medical supply procurement and distribution in one service, incidentally, in accordance with the very clear language of Secretary Lovett's directive setting up the test.

Not at all. We come up with the parceling idea. The Army will handle the show for the Navy and Air Force in the West; but the Navy will get its parcel and handle the show for the Army and Air Force in another area; and the Air Force, not to be without a parcel, will set up a medical supply system and force—because it has none now—so it can assume its parcel and service the Army and Navy in that area.

Absurd. Yes, but absurdity makes no difference to men fighting for their own bureaucratic empires. This is exactly what has been done under this coffee-roasting directive, only they added the fourth service, the Marine Corps, and it is exactly what was done in regard to petroleum inspection. Parceling out.

Well, parceling out is not unification, and it is not saving the taxpayers' money. It costs money. And when I say money, I am talking in terms of billions, not millions. The cost of the Air Force setting up its own supply system for common-use items which it was embarked upon before the Bonner subcommittee got active on this matter would have cost at a low estimate about $2,000,000,000.

So I conclude my remarks on this limited subject by saying: Yes, the Department of Defense is saving us $100,000,000 by this directive. It could be saving us twice or three times that amount and at the same time make our military organizations more effective because it will take generals and admirals, captains and colonels away from the problems of roasting and distributing coffee and put them back to wrestling with military problems, in which field they have received their training.

This is only one wee beginning. There are at least 100 fields where other $100,000,000 can be saved. That is $10,000,000,000. This would enable us to balance the budget and reduce taxes.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1953.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, *Chairman,*
Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of November 24, 1952, acknowledged December 4, requesting a decision as to the legality of the sale of Government-manufactured coffee through military exchanges, commissaries, etc., to personnel without the inclusion of all direct and indirect costs.

On October 1, 1952, the Munitions Board issued a staff report on coffee roasting operations of the Department of Defense which, among other things, shows the costs included in the sale prices of coffee by each of the services under the Department of Defense. Since it is understood that a copy of that report was furnished to you, it is not believed necessary to repeat here any portion thereof. Of course, as disclosed in the excerpts of testimony before your committee, which were attached to your letter, certain indirect costs in the coffee-roasting operations are not included in the sales price to the commissaries and post exchanges. As indicated in your letter, this conceivably might be considered as violating at least the spirit of section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874 (5 U. S. C. 71) and section 1765, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 70), prohibiting generally the receipt by Federal personnel of additional compensation in any form whatever.

It consistently has been the view of the General Accounting Office that, in the absence of specific statutory authority, the providing of benefits and advantages to certain classes of personnel at public expense without reimbursement therefor is not authorized. See the special report dated August 10, 1949, B-45101, of this Office to the Congress on the improper handling of certain funds received primarily from revenue-producing activities. As stated in that report, section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States provides, in effect, that only the Congress shall have the power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States in *Royal Indemnity Company* v. *United States* (313 U. S. 289, 294), citing that constitutional provision said:

"Power to release or otherwise dispose of the rights and property of the United States is lodged in the Congress by the Constitution * * * subordinate officers of the United States are without that power, save only as it has been conferred upon them by act of Congress or is to be implied from other powers so granted."

No statutory authority has been found for the sale of coffee roasted in Government-owned plants to the commissaries and post exchanges at prices insufficient to recover all direct and feasibly ascertained indirect costs. In fact, the aforementioned staff report states that the only statutory authority relied upon by the Department of Defense for even operating the roasting plants is the reference thereto in annual appropriation acts, the only one in the case of the Army being the one for the fiscal year 1913 (37 Stat. 569, 578), and as to the Navy the appropriation acts for the naval service beginning with the fiscal year 1858 (11 Stat. 243, 244).

In answer to your specific question, it is the view of this office that there is no legal basis for the sale of Government-manufactured coffee through exchanges to personnel without the inclusion of all direct and indirect costs.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. FISHER,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1953.

DISTRIBUTION OF MILITARY COFFEE CONSOLIDATED BY MUNITIONS BOARD

Provisions for the ultimate consolidation and cross-servicing of all military coffee roasting and supply have been included in a Department of Defense directive, the Munitions Board announced today.

The directive authorizes continued operation under their present control of four regional coffee-roasting plants to meet the needs of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force facilities in each of four areas. It also provides for the phasing out of two plants now in use and the termination of Army contracts for the commercial roasting of military coffee as green-bean inventories are consumed.

Plants to be continued are maintained at the Naval Supply Facility, Brooklyn, N. Y., to supply military installations in the Northeast; the Army General Depot, Atlanta, Ga., for the Southeast area; the Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif., for the Southwest area; and the Auburn General Depot plant of the Army, Seattle, Wash., for the Northwest.

The plants at the Army Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill., and the United States Marine Corps Depot, Philadelphia, Pa., will be discontinued as inventory stocks are depleted.

The phasing out of the plants to be discontinued and the commercial roasting contracts should be completed within a year, the Munitions Board estimates.

On the basis of current military coffee consumption in the United States, the Board reckons a reduction of $50,000,000 in green-bean inventories together with parallel savings in storage space and personnel costs.

In addition to central unified storage, roasting and distribution of coffee, the directive also requires that all processed coffee, except that destined for nearby installations, be vacuum packed to maintain freshness, and that shipments be made in carload or truckload lots, insofar as possible, directly to the using facility.

Liaison will be established between inventory control units at the operating plants and the single-service Army purchasing office to assure maximum exercise of judgment in accepting or rejecting bids on green coffee.

Green-bean inventories at each of the plants will not exceed 120 days of expected demand and will be stored at the using plant to the maximum extent possible.

Green coffee purchased for roasting overseas will continue to be shipped to the maximum extent possible, direct to ports of embarkation or to overseas consumers.

Contracts for the direct shipment of green coffee to overseas areas from South American ports are already in effect. Likewise, the transfer of green-coffee stocks from depots to the four principal operating plants has been undertaken.

A temporary committee, with representation from each military department, with a staff member of the Munitions Board as chairman, is being set up to facilitate putting the directive into effect and to develop details of interservice supply support.

Regulations of the various services and interservice agreements formulated under the directive must be submitted to the Chairman of the Munitions Board by April 30, 1953.

The details of the directive were worked out with industry through the National Coffee Association.

The directive on the roasting and distribution of coffee is the result of the first Munitions Board study undertaken in the supply systems study project, which project is "to develop and recommend such changes to existing organization, policies, standards,

and procedures governing the supply operations within the Department of Defense as will maintain or increase military effectiveness and produce the optimum efficiency and economy of these supply operations from the initial requirements and resources planning stage to final consumption or other disposition."

Review of previous studies of subsistence supply systems indicated that the coffee roasting operations of the military departments represented an area in which economies could be achieved by the further development of cross, common, or joint servicing agreements to reduce crosshauling of the green and roasted product.

NOVEMBER 24, 1952.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
The Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.
Attention: Mr. Lyle Fisher, General Counsel.

DEAR MR. WARREN: On August 25–26, 1952, the Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations held hearings at Oakland and San Francisco, Calif., with respect to the operation of coffee roasting plants by the military departments.

During the hearings it developed that coffee roasted in Government-owned plants is sold through military exchanges, commissaries, etc. It was also testified that the coffee may not be sold by the roasting plants to the exchanges at a price that includes all direct and indirect costs to the Government, and consequently the final selling price to military personnel may be less than the total cost to the Government. If so, this, of course, constitutes a subsidy or a salary differential for the benefactors of the system.

You will note from attached excerpts of testimony that Rear Admiral Royar states that this method of costing stems from the fact "In the appropriation act we only make direct charges against the appropriation. Depreciation is an indirect charge, and that is handled in a special appropriation where we go up to Congress and ask for money for new machinery."

It, therefore, seems to be the position that coffee costs to the exchanges can only amount to the direct charges against current operating appropriations.

You will also note that coffee manufacturers complain that Government-manufactured coffee is sometimes sold through exchanges for a price that is less than the cost of the green bean. We have not had the time to verify this point.

Your decision as to the legality of the sale of Government-manufactured coffee through exchanges to personnel without the inclusion of all direct and indirect costs will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who came here for the first time in January of this year are entitled to a great deal of credit because they have attended the House sessions so often and stayed here so long to listen to some of these talks.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has been on the Bonner subcommittee. Do not forget, my Republican colleagues, that the majority of that committee has been Democrats. The majority came from over on that side. Their party has been in power here for about 20 years. Their party is responsible to a large extent for the situation which exists. The gentlemen are entitled to credit, together with others in the other body, for bringing the facts which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred to our attention, because without their aid—and let me repeat, they have had control of these committees and directed the activities of these committees—we would not have had these facts.

The situation is this. It has grown so bad that, conscientious as they are, and having the welfare of this country at heart, they cannot take it any more. Now it is up to us whether we follow through.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. May I say this to the distinguished gentleman who will be chairman of the full committee——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe.

Mr. BONNER. In all fairness, this has not been a political investigation. The Republican members of this committee have been most fair. We are looking into something that is not a political matter. It is something that has grown up in the armed services. It is something that has been brought to pass by the failure of the Congress itself in writing the Unification Act to spell out just what Congress meant.

General Eisenhower was a splendid witness before our committee.

He is on record with respect to certain things. This is something that all of us should get together and do. It is something that I do not think is political. The incoming Secretary of Defense should go into this matter at once and carry out a great many of the recommendations of this subcommittee, together with the recommendations that General Eisenhower made to this subcommittee, when he said that the Secretary of Defense had the authority to correct these troubles. The recommendations of the retiring Secretary of Defense to the President is in keeping with the recommendations of the Bonner committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He was right about that.

Mr. BONNER. I am going to work with the gentleman and his administration to do constructive work. I will criticize only when I think it is not being done. This is something that goes beyond the scope of the question of who heads up the Department of Defense. The Chiefs of Staff have the problem in their hands today. The Munitions Board has been improved by the work of our subcommittee. The gentleman and his party can carry on the work and bring about a great improvement, without going into any political angle. It must be remembered that for the major time in which the Democrats have been in power a Republican has been Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman in that there is no political aspect to the thing at all. It is just the saving of the dollars we all have to contribute. If the gentlemen on that side will go along with the Republican leadership in the plans we have in mind as faithfully and as often as we did with you when you had a real issue, we will be very grateful and we will be successful. We just ask that that be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly, I yield to the distinguished leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was just going to ask what plans you have in mind. I was thinking of the Reorganization Act, which expires shortly, and which extension I shall support. I want it understood that I do not take one position when the Democrats are in control and another when the Republicans are in control. I shall support the recommendation as vigorously as possible in giving the new President the powers to reorganize the executive branches of the Government. If I had my way I would return to him the two-body veto instead of the one-body veto that we put through and thus give the President real power to do it. What is the position of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, on that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, now the gentleman knows where I stand. He thinks he has me over a barrel. I would not give to a Republican President one bit of power which I would not give to a Democratic President. That is, so far as the powers are concerned which the Constitution reserves to the Congress. Now, I will tell you where I stand. I am opposed to the basic reorganization law because the Constitution expressly states—the first 15 words in the Constitution state that the legislative power is granted to the Congress of the United States. Not a word of authority to legislate is given to the President. There is no reason that I can see for that procedure and I think it is unconstitutional for this Congress to follow a procedure which enables a President, and I do not care who may be the President—enables a President under the name of a plan to send down a bill, and provide that that bill shall become a law of the land unless one House of the Congress, or as the gentleman from Massachusetts would have it, both Houses veto it. It reverses the constitutional procedure. The only reason we ever did it was because we were too indolent, too indolent I repeat, to assume the task ourselves. Now, the President can send down his recommendations and I have no doubt, that in spite of any protests that I or anyone in this House can make, the power of the President to send down reorganization plans will be continued beyond March 31, and if they are continued and the President does send down a worth-while plan, I shall support that, of course, just as I did some of the plans sent down by President Truman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman thinks he has me over a political barrel.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He does not know my district or my people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now that is unkind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just off on the side.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is impugning the honesty of my motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. My motives are pure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never have questioned, I never will question the gentleman's motives.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend, my dear friend, knows I might disagree but I would never impugn his motives and he should not impugn my motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will withdraw that if the gentleman does not like my language—though I in no manner question his motives. All the gentleman is doing is just sticking a political pin in me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not even that. If you have trouble in your committee, I will support you, you know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You always have on matters of procedure where a practice or custom had been established.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait a minute, I have a code I follow. I recognize the leadership. Even if I may disagree with the leadership, I am backing the leadership on your side on organization matters.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may need it, too, next week if I am lucky enough to get on the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what responsible leadership should do, and we do it. But coming back to the other observation, and I know the gentleman's position to be sincere and I respect him for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have heard that many times before.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not delegating legislative power when we give the President authority to reorganize when we prescribe proper legislative standards to follow and that is done. My only observation, and the only reason I am asking the question is to show that we Democrats in this little technical minority position that we occupy—minority only in name and not in fact—as I say, I want to show that we Democrats are going to be a constructive influence and that on many occasions when President-elect Eisenhower, after he becomes President, makes recommendations which are in the best interests of the country that the Democrats will save him——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will do what? What is that?

Mr. McCORMACK. We Democrats will save him from his own party, or at least save him from some of the Members of his own party.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you think about that? Of all the—that sounds like H. S. Truman.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is one illustration where the chairman of a committee in good faith is opposed to a recommendation which will come from President-elect Eisenhower, that is which will come up from President Eisenhower after he is inaugurated, and we Democrats will support President Eisenhower.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope that has been taken down, and I hope the gentleman will remember that. And I sure will call that to the gentleman's attention to that statement the first time he jumps the fence, all right enough. Remember one of these last reorganization bills on the Internal Revenue Department where we warned the gentleman that if that went through, and Mr. Truman got the authority, he would do just exactly what he did—he took over a lot of the career positions in the Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department. He took over those jobs and those positions and gave them to politicians. Reform, economy, efficiency? Nonsense. Political plunder was what it was. It was simple, but it was not pure. It was just exactly what some of us expected. What they have been in the habit of doing all during the last two sessions of Congress has been to take the Hoover label and pin it on every quack political remedy that the President or any of his advisers could think of, and then come down here and offer it in the interest of good government. I do not want any more of that kind of dope sent down here. I will tell the gentleman——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes so that I may talk about what I came to the well to speak on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I got up to say was this: That the Bonner subcommittee has pointed the way to savings, the way by which we can cut the appropriation bills. It is a fine thing for a committee to do what the Bonner subcommittee did—call attention to those places where there is waste and unnecessary expenditure. Make recommendations which, if adopted, will give us efficiency and cost less. But every member of that committee will, I think, tell you that we will never get anywhere as long as we support these appropriation bills as they come in. We will have to rely upon the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], when they offer amendments, and then follow through.

May I repeat that statement? Just as long as we vote the money, provide the funds, present practices will bring about waste and extravagance. Both will continue.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I think the gentleman has the nub of the question about cutting the fat out of appropriation bills. It can be done only by work like the Bonner committee has done, showing the areas where the waste is. I would like to quote the statement made by Mr. Pearson before the committee:

> The task of installation of business methods, like accounting in the Army, is a tremendous task. We are a hundred years behind business, or certainly 50 years behind business in that respect.

I would also like to call attention to the statement of the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Johnson, in which he takes the same position that the Bonner committee took, that is, that the Army, the Navy, or any other military service has no business engaging in commercial-type operations. If they were eliminated, a lot of money could be saved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with you, but they pay no attention to what we say. Our only remedy is to send some of these appropriation bills back to committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

ELECTION TO MEMBERSHIP ON STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 80), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber (chairman), New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; T. Millet Hand II, New Jersey; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Allan Oakley Hunter, California; Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Hamer H. Budge, Idaho; Charles R. Jonas, North Carolina; Otto Krueger, North Dakota; Roman Hruska, Nebraska; Sam Coon, Oregon; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte (chairman), Iowa; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; Patrick J. Hillings, California; William C. Cole, Missouri; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen (chairman), Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Henry J. Latham, New York; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed (chairman), New York; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Howard H. Baker, Tennes-

see; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; Victor A. Knox, Michigan; James B. Utt, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: Jere Cooper, Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; A. Sidney Camp, Georgia; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; Hale Boggs, Louisiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 82) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon, Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.

Committee on House Administration: Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; Omar Burleson, Texas; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward S. Garmatz, Maryland, Ken Regan, Texas; James W. Trimble, Arkansas.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; John E. Lyle, Jr., Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 83) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. GAVIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HYDE and to include an editorial with regard to Senator BEALL.

Mr. LATHAM and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $280.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

Mr. BROYHILL and to include an editorial with regard to Representative SMITH of Virginia.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL in two instances.

Mr. HOWELL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Friday, January 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

328. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom" was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1706. A bill to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 1707. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1708. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a minimum average monthly wage of $100 for purposes of computing the amount of old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1710. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 1711. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1712. A bill to provide automobiles for veterans of World War I who are entitled to compensation for the loss of use of one or both legs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1714. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931 and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1715. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 1716. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project, California, to the State of California or an agency thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1717. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1718. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1719. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1720. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1721. A bill to correct inequities in the Universal Military Training and Service Act by allowing credit for prior service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1722. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to establish daylight-saving time throughout all time zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1723. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1725. A bill to grant additional income tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 1726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation by air of servicemen who have been ordered to duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1727. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1728. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1729. A bill to increase the income tax exemptions, including the additional exemption for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1730. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1731. A bill for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 1732. A bill to provide a method for the advancement of certain substitute rural carriers in the postal field service to the position of regular rural carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1733. A bill to regulate the repayment of certain advances made to public agencies for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 1734. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline, where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1735. A bill to correct inequities in the grade classifications of certain employees in the postal field service who have not benefited by the grade eliminations or upgradings heretofore provided by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1736. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1737. A bill to provide for a 25 percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1738. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1739. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1740. A bill to provide for the gratuitous distribution of daily copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1741. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and survivors insurance benefits shall be increased proportionately with increases in the per capita income of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1742. A bill to provide that information concerning applicants for and recipients of public assistance under any State plan approved under the Social Security Act shall be restricted to purposes directly connected with the administration of assistance under the plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 1743. A bill to provide that no suit against a State may be commenced or maintained on behalf of the United States without the consent of such State, except with prior congressional authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1744. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1746. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1747. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1748. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce the amount of the deductions which may be made on account of outside income from the benefits payable to certain individuals thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1749. A bill to grant preference to disabled veterans of World War II in making homestead entry on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1776. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the emergency hay program of the Department of Agriculture until April 30, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution to create the Joint Committee on Extraordinary Methods of Protecting the National Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 84. Resolution providing for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Res. 85. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives favoring the revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Marchilio Sardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of William Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGrafft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrohelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mire Piantoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1756. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Eugene de Thassy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Danuta Krystyna Reszke-Birk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Rachmiel Kawer and Ida Kawer (nee Grodner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Ester Andreasen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 1760. A bill for the relief of Erna Szilinsky Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1761. A bill for the relief of Pierino Pavese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1762. A bill for the relief of Sugako Nakai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1763. A bill for the relief of Kurt Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 1764. A bill for the relief of Ian McKay Valentine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 1765. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daisy M. Soros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1766. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Giacopelli and Antonina Giacopelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1767. A bill for the relief of the alien Hanna Florian Sulner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 1768. A bill for the relief of Claire Louise Carey and Vincent F. Carey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Oscar F. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 1770. A bill for the relief of Isabella Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of Slavko Nikola Bjelajac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1773. A bill for the relief of Marie Anne de Carvallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1774. A bill for the relief of Margaret Wurmser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1775. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Monseu, Maria Monseu, and their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1777. A bill for the relief of Kurt Erwin Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1778. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Di Scala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of Alessandro, Carmela, Pasqualina, Massimo, and Michele D'Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Shea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Wolf Zolmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Ivan Grbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Rito Solla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Mosley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Lynn Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Dario Del Basso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Wanda Luceri, also known as Sister Cecilia; Maria De Padova, also known as Sister Rosanna; Anna Santoro, also known as Sister Natalina; Valentina Ruffoni, also known as Sister Severina; Cosima Russo, also known as Sister Carmelina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Julian Kania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Johanna Antonia Steinhaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Choi Suk Jin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Lee Lai Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Robert Julius MacGavin and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Helena Shostenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Jimy Okuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of L. M. Anderson, Jr., and many other residents of Tampa, Fla., proposing that financial support be withdrawn from the United Nations unless assurance is given that the United Nations and agencies do not remain a base for espionage and subversion, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as for this moment we look away from waiting tasks to Thee, Thou judge of all men, strip us of our illusions, chasten us for our willful blindness, cleanse our hearts, capture our wills, clarify our minds. With the drab duty of common days illumined and made glorious by the light within, lead us in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. With Thy benediction may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience. We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon, for purposes of organization, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CAPEHART, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittees of the Committees on Government Operations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the sessions of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES FROM THE SENATE TO THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ADVISORY GROUP

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been asked to appoint delegates from the Senate to the International Wheat Agreement Advisory Group. The Chair has consulted with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. AIKEN], and with himself, so to speak, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The Chair will then appoint from the Foreign Relations Committee the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]; from the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]; and from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

THE ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 33)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1953.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my economic report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review, January 1953, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1953.*

NOTE: The report was transmitted to the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, Eighty-first Congress, I transmit herewith the Second Annual Report of the National Science Foundation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1953.*

REPORT ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Information and Educational Exchange Program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 63)

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on United States contributions to international organizations, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of surplus property credit agreements, foreign policy guidance to other executive agencies, disposal of industrial equipment allocated to the United States as German reparations and disposal of foreign excess property owned by or in the custody of the Department of State, for the period January 1, 1950, through June 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the finances of the Federal Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their official duties, suffered losses for personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of a Treasury Claim Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NARCOTIC DRUGS IMPORT AND EXPORT ACT, AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO CLARIFICATION OF CLASSIFICATION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 (a) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, and sections 2550 (a), 2558 (b), and 3220 of the Internal Revenue Code, to clarify the classification of narcotic drugs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASE IN PER DIEM ALLOWANCE OF AGENTS ASSIGNED TO PROTECT THE PRESIDENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY AT SEA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage and securing of grain and other similar bulk cargoes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SNAKE RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSIONS INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated April 30, 1951, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of certain alien seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL RETRIEVER BOAT TO TOWN OF MILFORD, CONN.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the town of Milford, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer one 42-foot retriever boat for use in rescue and patrol work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN NAVAL AND MARINE OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law, for the 6-month period preceding January 9, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Labor, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposal of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations, expenditures and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying

report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the Bureau of the Budget, a letter of comment from the Department of Commerce on the Department of Agriculture's supplemental report to the Missouri River Basin agricultural program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MRS. PENNIE P. RIGGS ET AL.

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mrs. Pennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration and its operations under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, together with a set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of the operations of the Selective Service System up to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FLYING PAY BY UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual flying pay report of the United States Air Force, for the period March 1, 1952, to August 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DEFENSE

A letter from the Administrator, Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations under that act, for the period July 24, 1952, through December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

A letter from the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work executed by the Coast Guard, for the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Frederick S. Hill, of the firm of Steptoe and Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., for the year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors of the Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, and an audit report on the Future Farmers Supply Service, for the calendar year 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the War Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplementary report of that Commission on war claims arising out of World War II (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF U. S. S. "CONSTITUTION" AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN OTHER VESSELS

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBAL COUNCIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the tribal executive committee of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribal Council, Red Lake Band, Cass Lake, Minn., calling upon the Congress for certain appropriations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Minnesota Chippewa Tribal Council has the management of tribal property and business of all Chippewa Indians in Minnesota except the Red Lake Band, and over the years has been given additional duties by the Department of Indian Affairs and has thereby expended large amounts of its funds thereby relieving the Government of considerable expense required to maintain the Department; and

Whereas our funds are now almost exhausted at a time when additional services are required to aid and encourage our members to earn a livelihood; and

Whereas it is important that we make available for rental many lake frontages by the construction of roads and clearings, and otherwise develop our properties, all of which can furnish work and income to our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the Congress to appropriate funds to be used by us for the following purposes:

1. $30,000—this sum to be expended through a period of five (5) years in the payment of mileage of the Tribal Executive Committee after which time the Tribe expects to be in a position to meet its own expenses from various incomes, such as leases, rentals, etc.

2. $70,000—this sum to be used to develop our lake frontages and other properties; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Indian Office with a request for their assistance in this proposed appropriation, and that copies also be sent to our Congressmen and their aid enlisted.

ED. M. WILSON,
Chairman, Tribal Executive Committee,
Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

IMPROVEMENT OF HARBOR, SHEBOYGAN, WIS.—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF SHEBOYGAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have recently received from Mr. J. E. Leberman, city clerk of Sheboygan, Wis., a resolution adopted by the common council of that fine city urging congressional participation in the improvement and extension of the local harbor project. I send this resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas since 1949 the city of Sheboygan, Wis., jointly with the Sheboygan Association of Commerce, supported by the wholehearted cooperation of local industry, organized labor, commercial and civic groups, has sought Federal participation in the improvement and extension of local harbor project; and

Whereas the continuity of interest and effort is motivated by awareness that such program, economically justifiable, is of urgent need to local industry to permit operations in competition with like establishments more favorably situated; and

Whereas despite the handicaps and difficulties now existing, last year's use of the harbor for water shipments of lumber, stone, clay, coal, as well as fishing operations, cumulated the evidence that this port is increasing in importance and vital necessity to the area; and

Whereas the Sheboygan Harbor project will be subject to congressional action in the current year, having been submitted with a favorable report to the House Committee on Public Works: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, That by and through adoption of this resolution, we, as

representatives of the community organizations and individuals, having concern in the successful promotion of the harbor program, reaffirm the keen continuing awareness and concern of having the Federal Government participate in the local project and to extend the eager willingness of all interested parties to cooperate with congressional representatives and committees in their study of the matter; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is directed to certify copies hereof to GEORGE DONDERO, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, as well as to Congressman WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, and Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

PARTIAL REPORT OF AN INVESTIGATION OF ATTORNEY AND OTHER CONTRACTS WITH THE INDIANS (S. REPT. NO. 8)

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted a partial report on an investigation of attorney and other contracts with the Indians, which was ordered to be printed, together with the individual views of Senator LEHMAN.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK, WASH., AND HEAD OF SAND ISLAND (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I submit a report requested by committee resolution on June 1, 1948, from the Secretary of the Army, being a review of report on the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the Head of Sand Island, and I request that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Julia Ann Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 471. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. IVES, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FREAR):

S. 472. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRISWOLD (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 473. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRISWOLD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Yutriago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 475. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 476. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 478. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide permanent price support for oats, rye, and barley at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 479. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank McLaughlin Countryman; and

S. 480. A bill for the relief of Tryfon Papageorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 481. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend for three additional years the requirement that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Jean Tokuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 484. A bill for the relief of J. Don Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 485. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Che Kil Bok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 487. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 488. A bill for the relief of George Takehara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 489. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Josephine Reigl;

S. 491. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dimitri Alexandrovich Afonsky;

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Ruth Scott-Wood; and

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Edward Ting-Ho Tan, Patricia Woo Tan, and Edward Hung-Chi Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 494. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by widows in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; and

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecelia T. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 497. A bill providing for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 498. A bill to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 499. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 500. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, so as to require that motor vehicles operated for pleasure purposes in the District of Columbia by minors licensed to drive in the District of Columbia shall carry emblems or devices calling attention to the fact that such motor vehicles are being operated by minors; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 501. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margareth Weigand;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Rev. John T. MacMullen;

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell;

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex; and

S. 509. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 510. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater;

S. 511. A bill to establish a Commission on the Public Debt of the United States; and

S. 512. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 513. A bill for the relief of the Lake States Engineering Co.;

S. 514. A bill for the relief of John David Burk (Yutaka Iwao);

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Ami Kanagaki and her child;

S. 516. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning;

S. 517. A bill for the relief of M. Roman Decker;

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain;

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Stephania Ziegler (Sister Benitia), Anna Hagel (Sister

Klara), and Theresia Tuppinger (Sister Romana);

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan H. Aylesworth;

S. 521. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents;

S. 522. A bill for the relief of George F. Ruckman; and

S. 523. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 524. A bill to authorize the release of the personnel files of Federal officers and employees to congressional committees at the request of such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 525. A bill to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 526. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENDRICKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 527. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 528. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 529. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Wilburton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 530. A bill for the relief of the city of Winona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 531. A bill relating to the release of water from the Elephant Butte Reservoir, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 532. A bill for the relief of Guiglio Squillari, Mrs. Barbero Margiorina Squillari, Rosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 533. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 534. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal rights in places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 535. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 536. A bill to authorize grants to the States for public elementary and secondary school construction; and

S. 537. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PRAYERS OF FORMER CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE, REV. PETER MARSHALL

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 31,950 additional copies of Senate Document No. 86 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, 1947–49; of which 9,900 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 22,050 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION OF DESERTIONS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CLEMENTS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas the public press has reported that during the last 2 years large numbers of members of the Armed Forces have deserted or have absented themselves from their places of duty without leave, and that many such persons remain unapprehended; and

Whereas the existence of an abnormally high rate of desertions and absences without leave from the Armed Forces would seriously impair the military effectiveness of such forces and threaten the success of the national defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation to determine (a) whether there has been or now exists an abnormally high rate of desertions and absences without leave from the Armed Forces, (b) if so, the causes which have produced or contributed to such condition, and (c) what remedial legislation, if any, is necessary or desirable for the elimination of any such causes. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e) as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I send to the desk a Senate resolution for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 38), submitted by Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Interests and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom not more than seven shall be of the same political party, as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems affecting consumer interests in the present national

emergency and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys, together with its recommendations. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

In carrying out its duties the committee shall give special attention to prices charged the ultimate consumer for food, fuel, and clothing and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the Eighty-third and succeeding Congresses at such times and places, whether or not the Senate is sitting, has recessed, or had adjourned; to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 39), as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate be, and they are hereby, tendered to Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during his term as Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am very glad to offer this resolution. I do it most seriously, with a desire to express also my personal thanks to Vice President BARKLEY for the manner in which he has performed the duties of his high office. I have served with him here for 14 years, during a portion of his service as a Senator and during the entire time he has been Vice President. No matter what the circumstances may have been, he has invariably displayed a sense of great good humor and his fine Kentucky wit and ability to recount anecdotes have often served to relieve tense situations and to illustrate points he desired to make. At all times he has been fair in the decisions he has been called upon to render. He has been a close friend to many Senators, and my close friend; and I am glad to offer this resolution, which I hope will afford him some pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree that the resolution is most appropriate. I am grateful that the Senator from Ohio has seen fit to offer it. I hope it is an indication of the quality of the resolutions that may come from the other side of the aisle in the future.

We on this side of the aisle feel that Vice President BARKLEY is the noblest Democrat of them all, a man of great vision, of boundless energy, and wise judgment. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was very happy to listen to the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio with regard to our retiring Vice President. I did not rise to my feet at the time, because I felt that in all probability some of those who had served in the Senate longer than I would desire to speak before me in tribute to our great and beloved presiding officer.

Mr. President, I certainly would not want to miss this opportunity to express publicly my profound admiration and my overwhelming respect for the great man who has presided over the Senate for so long with such devotion and ability. He has given of himself without stint. He has shown a quality of fairness which has evoked the admiration of every Member of this body, regardless of party. He has been a tower of strength for us all, for he has acquired great wisdom during the long years of his service to his fellow men and to his country. He has earned our affection to a degree that has not been equaled by any other man. I think I could even say that ALBEN W. BARKLEY is today the best loved man in this country.

I am grateful for the opportunity to make these few and very inadequate remarks, because I want the RECORD to show my deep admiration and affection for the distinguished gentleman who, as a Senator from Kentucky for many years, and then as President of the Senate and Vice President of the United States, has added a new luster to the pages of his country's history. He was a truly great Senator, a powerful majority leader, and a profoundly wise and just President of the Senate. But above all he was and is a great American, a beloved citizen of our country. As he retires from his office he leaves his imprint immemorably upon this body and upon the country.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the distinguished majority leader of the Senate submitted a resolution concerning the Vice President of the United States and his service as President of the Senate. There is nothing I can say about him and his service to the Nation that is not known to all. But even beyond his service to the Nation, we know that his character and integrity, his humor, and pathos, and his sympathy for the people in their struggles and aspirations, have made thousands of Americans think of him as a warm and personal friend. As he nears the close of his service as Vice President, I would like to record again the respect and affection in which he is held by the people of Kentucky, his own State. Without regard to political party, they have taken pride in his successes and his achievements. They have believed that he has honored them, and they have appreciated his record of service to the State and to the Nation. They have recognized in him the qualities of physical ruggedness, of loyalty, and of great love of liberty which characterized the first Kentuckians and the first pioneers of this land. Personally, I am glad that I have known him and that I have enjoyed his friendship during my entire life; and so, with Pope, I would say—

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honour clear;
Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
Who gain'd no title, and who lost no friend;
Ennobled by himself, by all approv'd,
And prais'd, unenvied by the Muse he lov'd.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, most heartily do I concur with the distinguished majority floor leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the sponsor of this resolution, in the sentiments he has expressed, and wholeheartedly do I join with the other Senators who today have paid tribute to Kentucky's most distinguished son, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States. His is a long, constructive, and, indeed, glorious career in the public service of his State and Nation.

As he has said himself, he has been in public life too long ever to completely retire to private life—nor will he. The retiring Vice President, who will be so sorely missed from the halls of Congress—where for so long his combined wisdom and sound judgment, his graciousness and sparkling good humor have been a tremendous factor in steering the ship of state—now becomes an elder statesman, to whom the Congress and the Nation as a whole will continue to look for guidance and advice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MCCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed

$189,000 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 251, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to January 24, 1952, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO MAKING OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, which was inadvertently omitted when the joint resolution was introduced, and that the joint resolution be reprinted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF PROCUREMENT FOR ARMED FORCES OF ARTICLES PRODUCED OR IMPORTED FROM COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED COUNTRIES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on January 13, 1953, the bill (S. 441) to prohibit the procurement for the Armed Forces of any article produced in, or imported from, Communist-controlled countries, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Finance. It should have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Forces.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

OIL FOR EDUCATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 107) to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relative to the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and will be printed; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL UPON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE OIL FOR EDUCATION AMENDMENT TO THE ANDERSON INTERIM OIL BILL

As Senators know, the principal purposes of S. 107 are to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, and to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries.

Petroleum experts of the United States Department of the Interior and of the private oil industry tell us that under the Continental Shelf off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana are vast deposits of oil and natural gas worth at least $50,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 at present prices.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled three times—once in 1947, and twice in 1950—that these oil-rich submerged coastal lands beyond the low tide mark, often erroneously termed tidelands belong to the United States as a whole—that is, to all the people of the 48 States—and are not the property of the three adjoining States.

These decisions had nothing to do with the true tidelands—the lands between the points of high and low tide—nor with our inland waterways which belong to the individual States.

I do not believe the American people want the Congress to overrule the Supreme Court and give away their national inheritance as is proposed by several quitclaim bills that have been introduced in the Senate and House. The question that should concern the Congress is not how to give the oil and gas away, but how to keep it and use it in the national interest. This vast national patrimony belongs to the people of the entire Nation and must be used for their benefit and the benefit of succeeding generations.

In introducing S. 107, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated that the bill is the same as that reported last year by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, plus amendments adopted on the Senate floor before the Holland bill was substituted for it. One of the amendments—and it is one of the provisions in S. 107—was cosponsored by a large number of us who offer the oil for education amendment today.

That amendment sought to allay the unfounded fears of some of the inland States that the Federal Government was somehow threatening their ownership of inland waters by having Congress confirm by specific legislation, the unchallenged title of the States to the resources of the tidelands and inland waters, such as rivers, bays, the Great Lakes, and all other lakes, filled-in lands, jetties, piers, docks, and other harbor facilities.

S. 107 is exceedingly generous to the coastal States in allocating to them—and our amendment does not change this—37½ percent of the revenues deriving from lands under the sea within the 3-mile limit.

Our amendment deals with the balance of the revenues—62½ percent within the 3-mile limit and 100 percent beyond the 3-mile limit going out to sea. The provisions of the amendment are simple:

First. The money from this oil, this great natural resource of the Nation, is to be dedicated now for the long-range needs of the education of the Nation's children—all its children—and placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States.

During the present critical period, the funds may be used for national-defense purposes. They shall be employed only for urgent developments to be specifically determined by the Congress. Thereafter this special account shall be devoted to our children's education as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Second. Every State or political subdivision which has issued any mineral leases or grants covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf and every grantee of such State or political subdivision shall file with the Attorney General of the United States by December 31, 1953, a statement of the money or other things of value received by such State, political subdivision, or grantee thereof from such leases or grants. The Attorney General shall submit these statements to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954. The object of this provision is to find out what benefit particular States have already had from this property which belongs to all the people.

These two points are the essence of the amendment.

The oil-for-education amendment was first submitted in the Senate only about 18 months ago, with but 11 sponsors. The extent to which the amendment has continued to gain support is indicated in the close vote of 47 to 36 by which the amendment was tabled in the last session. Senators will observe that a switch of six votes would have defeated the motion to table.

The sponsors of the amendment now number 22.

The heavy mail that I and other cosponsors of the oil-for-education amendment are receiving shows how widespread and acute is public concern over the serious problems confronting American education today. The concern is also shown in the widespread editorial commendation of the amendment that has appeared in daily newspapers in every section of the country, including such well-known journals as the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, the Atlanta Journal, the Denver Post, the St. Petersburg Times, and the Birmingham News.

The amendment is actively supported by a large number of local and national organizations, including the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Library Association, the American Vocational Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the Co-op League of the United States of America, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Oil Workers International Union, the Communications Workers of America, the Textile Workers Union of America, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Americans for Democratic Action, the Consumers Cooperative Association, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Switchmen's Union of North America, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, American

Train Dispatchers' Association, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Railroad Yardmasters of America, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers' Association, International Longshoremen's Association, the Order of Railway Conductors, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

I want to emphasize that the oil-for-education amendment proposes no new departure into uncharted seas. It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—the use of revenues from public lands for educational purposes.

Millions upon millions of acres of our public lands were in the early days granted to the States to establish and support grammar schools and high schools, State universities, and our land-grant colleges in every State. The use of public-lands resources set us on the road to realizing the dreams of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Lincoln, and other great statesmen of our early history for a great system for the dissemination of knowledge.

Every Senator and every Congressman, and every hard-pressed parent, teacher, and taxpayer knows the desperate financial straits of American education—grammar schools, high schools, colleges, and universities, in every State in this Union.

Here we are given the opportunity—and this one, I can assure you, really does knock but once—to devote the Nation's wealth under the sea to our children.

Adoption of the oil-for-education amendment would be like placing an oil well on every school and college campus in America.

I urge the Senate to pass S. 107 with the oil-for-education amendment, that immediate development of all the Nation's vast undersea oil resources may proceed and yield for our schools and the education of our children the desperately needed millions of dollars in revenues—without taxes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address entitled "Impressions of Latin America," delivered by him before the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at New Orleans, La., on January 13, 1953.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at the meeting of Alexandria and Arlington Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, First Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., Sunday, January 11, 1953.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "What Agriculture Can Expect From the New Administration," delivered by him at the eighty-second annual meeting of the State Board of Agriculture at Topeka, Kans., on January 15, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Address delivered by Senator ANDERSON before the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Seattle, Wash., on December 10, 1952.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and vice president of the Quartermaster Association, before the national convention of the Quartermaster Association, at Atlanta, Ga., October 17, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Article from Film Daily, of January 12, 1953, and an article from Variety, of January 14, 1953, relating to the death of Joyce O'Hara.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Memorial address on Charles H. Leavy, delivered by Frank Funkhouser, member of the Spokane (Wash.) bar, on December 15, 1952.

Article entitled "A Million Dislocated Humans Reclaimed," published in the New York Post of March 25, 1952.

Press release from National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., relating to the need for a permanent Small Business Committee in the Senate.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Ohio Can Use More Fuel Gas," published in Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of December 17, 1952.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Andrews In and Influence Out," published in the Richmond News-Leader of January 14, 1953, dealing with appointment of T. Coleman Andrews as United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial from Pennsylvania Farmer of December 13, 1952, relating to the career of E. S. Bayard, editor emeritus.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Editorial entitled "Good Italians, Too," published in the Burlington (N. C.) Times-News of January 12, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial from magazine America of January 17, 1953, commenting on report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "Solidarity Can't Be Taken for Granted—Latin-American Countries Seen Swinging to Political Left," published in the Miami (Fla.) Herald of January 12, 1953.

INFORMATION CONCERNING EXISTING STATUTES RELATING TO CERTAIN PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement, prepared by the legislative counsel at my request, outlining the law as to public officials having dealings in private interests.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR BYRD

This memorandum is transmitted pursuant to your request for information concerning existing statutes relating to possible conflicting interests of officers of the Government.

This memorandum does not include statutes forbidding particular acts of misconduct on the part of Government officers, but is limited in scope to those which are directed at private interests of such officers which may conflict with their official duties. It is divided into two parts. The first part contains the text of all statutes of general application which appear to affect principal officers of the executive branch. The second part includes a number of examples of certain special statutes which are applicable only to named officers or officers of a class described therein.

I. STATUTES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," contains the following pertinent sections:

"SEC. 281. Compensation to Members of Congress, officers and others in matters affecting the Government

"Whoever, being a Member of or Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, either before or after he has qualified, or the head of a department, or other officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, directly or indirectly receives or agrees to receive, any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, agency, court martial, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and shall be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

"Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status.

"This section shall not apply to any person because of his membership in the National Guard of the District of Columbia nor to any person specially exempted by act of Congress."

"SEC. 283. Officers or employees interested in claims against the Government

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or of the Senate or House of Representatives, acts as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or aids or assists in the prosecution or support of any such claim otherwise than in the proper discharge of his official duties, or receives any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any such claim in consideration of assistance in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"This section shall not apply to any person because of his membership in the National Guard of the District of Columbia nor to any person specially excepted by enactment of Congress."

"SEC. 434. Interested persons acting as Government agents

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

"SEC. 1901. Collecting or disbursing officer trading in public property

"Whoever, being an officer of the United States concerned in the collection or the disbursement of the revenues thereof, carries on any trade or business in the funds or debts of the United States, or of any State, or in any public property of either, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and shall be removed from office, and be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

"SEC. 1914. Salary of Government officials and employees payable only by United States

"Whoever, being a Government official or employee, receives any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality; or

"Whoever, whether a person, association, or corporation, makes any contribution to, or in any way supplements the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States—

shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

II. SPECIAL STATUTES AFFECTING PARTICULAR OFFICERS OR CLASSES OF OFFICERS

Section 243 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 243) imposes the following special restrictions upon the Secretary of the Treasury:

"No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or Treasurer shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in the carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel, or purchase by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State, or of the United States, or take or apply to his own use any emolument or gain for negotiating or transacting any business in the Treasury Department other than what shall be allowed by law; and every person who offends against any of the prohibitions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of $3,000, and shall upon conviction be removed from office, and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States; and if any other person than a public prosecutor shall give information of any such offense, upon which a prosecution and conviction shall be had, one-half the aforesaid penalty of $3,000, when recovered, shall be for the use of the person giving such information."

Basic statutes creating certain independent agencies of the Government contain specific provisions which require the members of such boards or commissions to devote their full time to the affairs of those agencies, or prohibit them from engaging in any other business or employment while serving as such members. Agencies as to which such limitations are applicable include the following: Atomic Energy Commission (see sec. 2, Atomic Energy Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 755, 42 U. S. C. 1802 (a)); Federal Reserve Board (see sec. 10, Federal Reserve Act, 38 Stat. 260, as amended; 12 U. S. C. 241); Federal Tariff Commission (see sec. 330, act of June 17, 1930, 46 Stat. 696; 19 U. S. C. 1330 (c)); Federal Trade Commission (see sec. 1, Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 717, as as amended; 15 U. S. C. 41); and Tennessee Valley Authority (see sec. 2, Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, 48 Stat. 59; 16 U. S. C. 831a).

In the case of certain other independent agencies of the Government, more specific restrictions have been imposed to insure that members of such boards or commissions will have no pecuniary interests which might conflict with their official duties. Examples of such restrictions are contained in the statutes cited below.

Section 11 of the Interstate Commerce Act (24 Stat. 383; 49 U. S. C. 11), creating the Interstate Commerce Commission and prescribing the qualifications of commissioners thereof, provides in part:

"No person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any common carrier subject to the provisions of this chapter, or owning stock or bonds thereof, or who is in any manner pecuniarily interested therein, shall enter upon the duties of or hold such office. Said commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment."

Section 4 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1066; 47 U. S. C. 154 (b)), which provides for the appointment of commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission, provides in part:

"No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or of apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any such company; nor be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any person subject to any of the provisions of this chapter, nor own stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to any of the provisions of this chapter. Such Commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment."

Sec. 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (as amended by act of September 21, 1950, 64 Stat. 873; 12 U. S. C. 1812), providing for the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and prescribing the qualifications of its board of directors, provides in part:

"No member of the board of directors shall be an officer or director of any insured bank or Federal Reserve bank or hold stock in any insured bank; and before entering upon his duties as a member of the board of directors he shall certify under oath that he has complied with this requirement and such certification shall be filed with the secretary of the board of directors."

Sec. 1 of the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063, as amended; 16 U. S. C. 792), providing for the establishment of the Federal Power Commission and prescribing the qualifications of its Commissioners, provides in part:

"No person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any licensee or to any person, firm, association, or corporation engaged in the generation, transmission, distribution, or sale of power, or owning stock or bonds thereof, or who is in any manner pecuniarily interested therein, shall enter upon the duties of or hold the office of Commissioner. Said Commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment."

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 885, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 78d), establishing the Securities and Exchange Commission and prescribing the qualifications of its Commissioners, provides in part:

"No Commissioner shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Commissioner, nor shall any Commissioner participate, directly or indirectly, in any stock-market operations or transactions of a character subject to regulation by the Commission pursuant to this chapter."

JOHN C. HERBERG,
Assistant Counsel.

JANUARY 14, 1953.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE LATEST COMMUNIST OUTRAGE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, because I have a rather important appointment very shortly, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement, of approximately 3 minutes, in connection with a matter which I think should appear in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is of the utmost importance that the American people recognize the serious implications of the latest Communist outrage.

I refer to the fantastic charge from Moscow that nine Soviet Jewish doctors were acting as agents for the United States Intelligence and the Joint Distribution Committee, and had murdered two Politboro members and marked for death other high-ranking members of the Soviet Defense Department.

This is a continuation of the systematic and ruthless program of extermination of religion which has been fundamental in the Communist philosophy.

The basic philosophy of the totalitarian state was expressed by Karl Marx, when he said:

> The democratic concept of man is false because it is Christian. It holds that each man has a value as a sovereign being. This is the illusion, dream, and postulate of Christianity.

Another totalitarian, since departed, Adolf Hitler wrote:

> To the Christian doctrine of the infinite significance of the individual's human soul, I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and insignificance of the individual human being.

The most outspoken opposition to communism within Russia has emanated from those who have resisted the attempts of the Bolsheviks to replace belief in God with the materialistic philosophy of communism.

For a period during and after the war, the Communists attempted to erect a facade of tolerance in order to build national unity and to retain existing churches as instruments of Soviet foreign policy.

Even an elementary student of dialectic materialism, the philosophy of Marx and Lenin must realize, however, that antireligious propaganda and the degradation of the individual form an integral part of Communist education.

It was, and is, ridiculous to talk, as some have talked, about the return of religious freedom to Russia. There can be no such thing as freedom to worship God in an atheistic Communist state. The recent Slansky trials in Czechoslovakia were but forerunners of the religious purge which is about to take place within the Soviet Union.

Anti-Semitism is now a new development within Communist Russia. Unfortunately for the 3,000,000 Jews who are now under their dominance, however, the masters of the Kremlin have decided that their aggressive designs can now be advanced by the persecution of these people.

I pray that I am wrong, but I warn the American people that we may anticipate a series of "trials" wherein Jewish victims will be dragged before prejudiced courts and confessions extorted by torture.

The Russians today are interested in developing ties with the Moslem world. It is convenient, therefore, for the Politboro to denounce international Zionist conspirators. The Russians are interested in the consolidation of the hard-core Nazi Party in East Germany. They believe persecution of the Jews will rally those forces to the hammer and sickle. The Communist Party in the Soviet Union has internal tensions for which scapegoats must be found. The Jewish people are victims near at hand. The Soviet rulers apparently have decided that the Jewish people are no longer essential to the operation of their state, and can now be liquidated.

The preposterous charge that these hapless Jewish doctors were secret agents of the United States emphasizes the extent to which the masters of the Kremlin will go in their vicious anti-American propaganda.

The people of America must realize that the torture and probable future execution of these nine Jewish doctors is merely further proof that the Soviets are determined to fan into flame the long-smoldering anti-Semitism which has characterized all totalitarian states.

It is in the Christian spirit to attempt to forgive our enemies, but as Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle said recently:

I do not think we can say of the new enemies of Christ that they know not what they do. They know coldly and clearly what they are about.

The Communists are going to try to exterminate and spread the godless state to which they subscribe. Today it is the Jews; yesterday it was the Catholics; tomorrow the Protestants and the Moslems.

As God has given us conscience, we must face this threat and deal with it with all of the united moral force at our disposal. The world cannot again sit idly by while the noblest and highest spiritual ideals of man are destroyed in a gas chamber.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soviet Anti-Semitism," published in the New York Times of January 14, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Taking one more leaf out of Hitler's book, the Stalin regime has now openly and unmistakably adopted anti-Semitism as a weapon in its own internal dissensions and as an instrument of both Communist tyranny and Soviet imperialism. This fact becomes patent with the sensational arrest in Moscow of nine "terrorist" doctors, most of them Jews, on charges of murdering two top Soviet leaders and plotting to kill others in the service of internationalist Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organizations which are accused of acting as agents of American and British warmongers. The anti-Semitic aspect of the case, backed by the now familiar "confessions" of the accused, forms the main burden of an almost hysterical Soviet propaganda regarding the alleged plot. As a result a new wave of anti-Semitism is sweeping through the lands behind the iron curtain.

The Moscow arrests are the latest phase of a long-simmering anti-Semitic campaign in Soviet Russia which began with the suppression of Jewish cultural and religious life, progressed to the elimination of Jews from higher offices and attacks on homeless cosmopolitans and finally erupted in the open in the satellite countries with the Prague trial. Now, undeterred by world-wide revulsion against a revival of the Nazi madness, the Soviet rulers have put their stamp of approval on it, and neither their disclaimers of racial bias nor their differentiation between Jews and Zionists can disguise their adoption of the Hitler technique.

As in the case of Hitler, the Soviets are obviously using anti-Semitism for several ulterior purposes. One is to put pressure upon the Jews themselves as elements suspected of a Western orientation and of loyalties to a different divinity than the totalitarian state. Another purpose is to find scapegoats for the mass misery imposed by a Communist regime, in which respect the Soviet rulers follow the example not only of Hitler but of the Czarist police. And a third purpose, which explains the timing in this case, is to use an open anti-Semitic campaign as an instrument of a Soviet policy which has now turned against Israel and seeks to cater to both the Arabs and the remaining Nazi elements in Germany. In that effort, following Hitler's propaganda injunction of lumping all one's enemies in one pot, the Soviets put the Jews, Israel and Zionism in the same camp with American and British "warmongers" and are thus able to concentrate their propaganda against one synthetic enemy instead of scattering their broadsides against many.

But there appears to be an additional factor here, and this is the struggle for power among the Soviet chieftains themselves. Under the circumstances, this now becomes a struggle for Stalin's succession. The precise ramifications of this struggle are necessarily unclear, but two facts are significant. One of the men whom the accused physicians are supposed to have killed is Andrei Zhdanov, the Politburo member who launched both the Cominform and the drive against the cosmopolitans and was at one time regarded as heir to the throne. His place was taken by Malenkov, regarded as the present crown prince, who purged Zhdanov's followers. It may well be, therefore, that the representation of Zhdanov's death as a "Jewish" murder involves a drive against Malenkov. The other fact is that the Soviet press accuses both the State Security authorities and the Health Ministry leaders of lack of vigilance, which would suggest that a new and wider purge is in the making which might involve another aspirant to Stalin's place—namely Secret Police Chief Beria. In any case, these new developments are such an obvious testimony of a sense of insecurity among the Soviet leaders that they belie the aspect of monolithic strength which the Kremlin seeks so sedulously to display.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 16, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Walter Bedell Smith, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army) to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROGRAM FOR INAUGURATION DAY AND THE REMAINDER OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. WILEY. I should like to inquire as to plans for the transaction of business by the Senate, particularly with relation to its next meeting. Is the majority leader in a position to inform the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the program—and I believe all Senators present would like to know what it is—is to recess today at the conclusion of the Senate's business until Tuesday. On Tuesday it is proposed that the Senate meet in its Chamber at 11:30 a. m., proceed in a body to the east front of the Capitol for the inauguration ceremonies, and immediately after their conclusion to return to the Chamber to consider the Executive nominations for the Cabinet posts. I expect also that possibly the Senate will meet on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of next week, because undoubtedly there will be a flood of additional nominations coming to the Senate. If the committees are able to act on them and report them to the Senate it may be possible for the Senate to consider those nominations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand the distinguished majority leader intends to have the Senate consider on Tuesday any Cabinet nominations which may be reported to the Senate by the committees.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, with reference to the nominations which have been approved by the committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Ohio in a position to give assurance to the Senate that there will be available at that time copies of the hearings which are being held in connection with the nomination?

Mr. TAFT. I have asked the chairmen of the committees to endeavor to have the transcript of the hearings prepared for printing, and the printing clerk has undertaken to have the Government Printing Office work overtime in order to have the printed proceedings available at that time. Certainly they will be available on Tuesday morning, and any Senator who wishes to have a copy may obtain it when he reaches his office on

Tuesday morning. He can send for a copy on Tuesday morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As the distinguished majority leader knows, the minority is disposed to extend all possible courtesies to the new President by cooperating in acting promptly in the confirmation of Cabinet nominations. However, the minority would not like to have action taken on any report of a committee with reference to any nomination to a Cabinet post without first having made available to every Senator the printed hearings of the committees.

As the minority leader stated to the majority leader this morning, an opinion has been expressed that the hearings will not be available. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio is now undertaking to assure the Senate that he has taken steps to make certain that the printed hearings will be on the desk of each Senator before action is taken on the proposed nominations.

Mr. TAFT. I believe they will be available on Tuesday morning, so that any Senator may send for them on Tuesday morning before coming to the Chamber.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for the information.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished majority leader to state that the Senate would take action on Tuesday on the nominations to Cabinet posts.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under the rule, if a Senator objects to consideration of a nomination, the nomination would have to lie on the desk for 24 hours.

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator is mistaken with reference to the provisions of the rule. As I understand the rule, it provides that nominations submitted to the Senate shall be referred to the appropriate committee unless otherwise ordered by the Senate. Therefore, by majority vote of the Senate the nominations may be taken up for immediate consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say that a question has been asked of me in regard to the matter, and I have stated that naturally the nominations would have to lie over because the committees had not been organized. However, as I understand, the committees of the Senate were organized on Thursday of this week. I wish to congratulate the committees for holding hearings on the nominations. Of course, I do not know what the hearings will show, but it has been called to my attention that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has held extensive hearings on the nomination of Mr. Benson, and that the hearings will be available on Tuesday. Therefore, instead of there being an interval of 24 hours, or perhaps 72 hours, or even 100 hours, the nominations may be considered on Tuesday. I wish the RECORD to show that fact.

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVESTOCK

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to remove from the Office of Price Stabilization the authority to grade or to keep price ceilings on livestock.

Cattle growers especially know the difficulty of grading livestock in a fair and equitable manner. Keeping price ceilings on livestock at this time does nothing to contribute to the stability of prices, as the market price for live cattle is far below the OPS ceiling price.

This amendment will reassure raisers of cattle, sheep, and hogs that they may plan without the worry of being unduly hampered by arbitrary price ceilings and grading requirements. It will not in any way interfere with the authority of the Department of Agriculture to carry on its usual functions of grading and inspection under statutes other than the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The sponsors of this amendment join in urging its immediate consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 473) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock, introduced by Mr. GRISWOLD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEDUCTION OF CHILD-CARE COSTS BY WIDOWS FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit widows to deduct for income-tax purposes certain child-care costs.

I am introducing the bill here in the Senate with the hope that the Finance Committee will give it the consideration it justly deserves, and will see fit to incorporate its provisions in those of the tax bill when it comes to us from the House.

In these days of high taxes it is difficult for many of us to stay in step with the relentless and ever-increasing pace of the cost of living; particularly it is difficult for working widows in the lower income brackets who have to hire someone to care for their children while they are at work.

This bill would permit a widow who is gainfully employed outside of her home and who has one or more children under 16 years of age living at home to deduct expenses incurred to provide care for such child or children during her workday.

In order to qualify under the provisions of this proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code the adjusted gross annual income of such widows shall not exceed the sum of $6,000, plus $500 for each child under 16 years of age, and the amount deductible shall not exceed $40 of such expenses paid or incurred in any week.

The work-a-day baby sitter bills of bread-winner mothers do impose an extraordinary financial burden upon these homemakers. In the interest of more stable homes, wholesome environment, and better care for minor children, I am convinced that relief such as I have indicated is long overdue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 494) to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by widows in providing care for their children while they are at work, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HIGHWAY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley.

The purpose of this bill is merely to authorize a continuous highway generally following along this great midcontinent river from its source to the sea. The recommended plan for the highway was set forth in a joint report of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior submitted to the Congress on November 28, 1951. Under the recommended plan, the highway would be developed and administered over a period of years by the Highway Departments of the Mississippi Valley States in cooperation with the Federal Government.

The plan recommends the use of carefully selected existing highways which would be gradually improved and coupled with the construction of new sections "where the traffic, scenic, historic, or engineering considerations indicated that a new development would be desirable and useful."

The people of the 10 Mississippi River States originated the proposal for such a highway almost two decades ago. It would provide an important connection between the many industrial centers and populated areas from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, would link major east-west highways, and would have many additional benefits in terms of recreation and conservation of national historic and cultural points of interest.

Mr. President, I hope that the Congress will authorize the proposed highway so that all of the Mississippi River States may undertake more detailed planning for the development of the vitally needed, continuous, midcontinent valley highway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 497) providing for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RELIEF BILLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference relief bills for Mrs. Margareth Weigand, Gerdina Josephina Van Delft, Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens, Reverend John T. MacMullen, Horst P. W. Dittmar, and Heinz-Erik Dittmar, Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell, and Alfred Theodor Ex.

I mention these bills particularly because I want everyone to know that I am introducing some more relief bills.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator a bill for the relief of the taxpayers?

Mr. LANGER. I have already taken care of most of them in North Dakota.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margareth Weigand;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Rev. John T. MacMullen;

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Horst P. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell; and

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I am introducing a bill providing for the establishment of a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Neither my interest in this subject nor the bill itself is new.

As a matter of fact, I have been seriously concerned with the subject for a good many years.

My experience during a long period of service in the New Jersey State Senate as a member of the New Jersey State Commission on Interstate Cooperation—established in 1935, the first such commission in the United States—and as a member of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, all served to impress upon me the importance of these questions of interlevel and interjurisdictional relationships in American Government.

I hope my colleagues will bear with me while I relate another bit of personal history, which I present not because I want to try to impress anyone with my great wisdom and foresight but because the facts are relevant to my subject.

This experience at the State level prompted me to introduce a similar bill in the Eighty-first Congress on February 8, 1949, less than 1 month after I took my oath of office as a Member of this body.

The bill which I then introduced, S. 810, was sponsored jointly by seven other Senators and myself, and on the House side by the Honorable Caleb Boggs, now the distinguished Governor of the State of Delaware.

The Senate and House Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations held joint hearings on this bill, at which time a considerable number of distinguished public officials—Federal, State, and local—testified for the bill.

The bill was revised and amended and reported out in the second session as S. 1946, but failed of passage during the Eighty-first Congress.

I do not claim that this proposal is the first one calling for a study of intergovernmental relations.

There had been several bills and resolutions calling for a study of some phases of this problem, particularly its tax and fiscal aspects, but this bill was—I believe—the first calling for a comprehensive study of the whole field.

While I do not minimize for a moment the importance of the financial phases of the problem, I am certain that no solution of the problem as a whole is possible simply by dealing with segments of it.

To continue, briefly, Mr. President, with the historical background of this proposal, may I point out that in the Eighty-second Congress, I again introduced a bill, S. 437, which was similar to the one which I present today.

Also in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, our distinguished former colleague, Senator Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, introduced a bill for this purpose.

This was S. 1146, which was reported out of committee, and was passed by the Senate on July 23, 1951.

Unfortunately, on the following day, the bill was recalled from the House, as a result of what I believe was some misunderstanding as to its nature and purpose. I dislike to think, Mr. President, that the misunderstanding was political, but all signs at that time pointed to partisanship.

No further action was taken upon it during the Eighty-second Congress.

Now, at the beginning of the Eighty-third Congress, we have a new opportunity to do something that may open the way for constructive action in this important field.

The purposes of the Commission, Mr. President, are clearly stated in the text of the act.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks those purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement of purposes was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This Commission is established for the purpose of studying and making recommendations to the President, and the Congress, in an effort to bring about—

(1) The finding of ways and means of establishing a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government. Major aspects of this problem include the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the increasing demands made upon the Federal Government and the States for tax-sharing and grants-in-aid, without following any consistent overall pattern;

(2) The elimination of duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions, and the securing of a better coordination of such services, activities, and functions among the several levels of government;

(3) The attainment of such an allocation of governmental functions among the several levels of government as will contribute to economy in governmental administration on the one hand, and maximum service to the public on the other;

(4) A reduction in the total governmental expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(5) The development, within the existing constitutional framework, of a governmental structure, and such cooperative policies and procedures as will tend to overcome existing obstacles to efficient governmental administration, and to lay a sound foundation for future development.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are under obligation to give consideration to these important problems.

Not only was the establishment of such a commission recommended by the Hoover Commission, but in the recent campaign, both political parties and their candidates took a strong position in favor of doing what could be done to stem the tide toward further and further concentration of authority in the hands of the Federal Government here in Washington.

I shall not burden you nor impose upon your time by a lengthy recital of arguments in support of this proposal.

It is a proposal at this stage simply to find out what the facts are, so that we may at a later date be in a position to take constructive action.

How anyone can logically oppose a move to discover and disclose the facts, it is difficult to understand.

Actually there has been little real opposition to this proposal, while there has been evidence of a great deal of active support.

This support comes from both official and unofficial sources.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to one very interesting fact.

For the past several years, it has been true in session after session that approximately one-third of the Members of this body have served at some time as the governors of the States from which they come.

Beginning with the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, these former governors have, without regard to party affiliation, lined up 100 percent—I believe—behind this proposal for a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Some of the most distinguished political scientists in the country have given their full support to this proposal.

I mention only three at this time: Professors White, of the University of Chicago; Gaus, of Harvard; and Anderson, of the University of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a concise statement containing quotations of these estimable scholars be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prof. Leonard D. White, of the University of Chicago, recognizing that these interrelationships present many difficult problems, believes that "such a commission is badly needed" and that "it might do a lot of good in proposing answers to some of them." Prof. John M. Gaus of Harvard University believes that "there are all kinds of improvements we can make in the operation of the various levels of Government in this matter of relationships and the preparation of programs without any new legislation being required at all." So do I, and I believe that the findings of such a commission will open up many of these to us. Prof. William Anderson of the University of Minnesota writes, "If the establishment of a commission could lead to some intensive studies, and not to mere pronouncements of general policies, it would be worth the expenditure of a considerable sum of money. Our own studies in Minnesota indicate that there are many phases of intergovernmental relations that have not been brought to light."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, support for the proposal also comes from many public officials and statesmen as well.

Support likewise comes from many people at the Federal level and from those at the State and local levels.

In 1950, the American Municipal Association, in its National Municipal Policy Statement, gave enthusiastic support to the movement for such a commission, specifying only that the cities should have direct representation—which, of course, has always been intended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a pertinent part of this statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, proposed as S. 1946 (the revised bill in the 81st Cong.), should be enacted at the earliest possible date. Clarification of the difficult questions arising between Federal and local governments can be accomplished best by such a commission. Few activities are more urgent or more important as a means of proving that a democratic Federal Government can work effectively and harmoniously.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the National County Officers Association, the National Municipal League, the Council of State Governments, and many other organizations have given their support. The national assembly of the States, sponsored by the Council of State Governments and meeting in Chicago only last month, adopted a resolution urging Congress to enact legislation such as I propose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that appropriate parts of this resolution be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our system of government can be maintained only if the authority and responsibilities of the several States are preserved. The growing encroachment of the Federal Government into activities which traditionally have been, and should be, the function of the States has become a matter of grave concern to all the States. The tax policies of the Federal Government have made it increasingly difficult for State and local governments to obtain the revenues which they require.

The Federal Government should be responsible for the administration and financing of national responsibilities; State and local governments should be responsible for the administration and financing of their responsibilities; and the responsibility for the administration of joint functions should be jointly financed upon a carefully defined basis. It is our firm conviction that more efficient service to the citizens could be rendered at lower cost if certain of the taxes now levied by the Federal Government were abandoned to the States in lieu of Federal grants-in-aid.

Accordingly, this eleventh general assembly of the States strongly recommends that—

(1) The Congress of the United States enact legislation to create a representative agency authorized to study and make recommendations with respect to the administration and operation of functions performed by, and the tax responsibilities of, each level of government.

(2) The Council of State Governments cooperate enthusiastically with any such agency that may be created by the Congress.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to point out some of the definite benefits that I would hope might flow from the work of such a commission.

In the first place it would, as I have indicated, get the facts—facts without which intelligent programing and long-range planning are impossible.

An explanation of how we got where we are is a necessary prerequisite to the planning of future action.

The second benefit that I would have to realize as a result of the work of such a commission would be the development of a sort of blueprint for the future—a long-range guide to the determination of policy and procedure.

Third, I believe, that there should be in the Federal Government some kind of central coordinating agency, whose duty it would be to achieve some degree of uniformity in both policy and procedure among the various departments and agencies having relations with the States.

There is at the present time no general policy and no coordination.

I have some ideas as to what the nature of this machinery should be, but for the present I refrain from further comment upon them, on the theory that the Commission should make a specific recommendation as to a proper means of executing the plan which it will present.

Finally, Mr. President, I would hope that this study of Federal-State, interstate, Federal-local, and State-local relations might serve to point up the need for some central clearinghouse for all kinds of information dealing with State and local government, law, and administration.

At the present time agencies concerned with the collection and analysis of such data are scattered all over the city of Washington—in the Library of Congress, the Federal Security Agency, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Labor, Agriculture, and many more.

There is confusion, absence of essential information in some areas, duplication of effort in others.

There should be, and I believe there is, an appropriate means of bringing some semblance of order out of chaos.

I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 526) to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REGULATION OF RELEASE OF WATER FROM ELEPHANT BUTTE RESERVOIR, N. MEX.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to regulate the release of water impounded in the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, so as to maintain in the reservoir sufficient water for the preservation of fish and wildlife therein.

This matter is of vital importance to the people living near and below the Elephant Butte Reservoir. There are many tons of fish in this reservoir and it has been nearly empty at certain seasons of the year for the last 3 years, and at one time sufficient water was retained only by order of the court. If the reservoir should be drained, fish would be scattered all along the Rio Grande River below the dam and would create a hazard to the health and welfare of the people living in Truth or Consequences and other settlements along the river.

I recognize this is a difficult legal question and that the legislative counsel has spent considerable time in studying it. I have also had some discussions with friends and particularly attorneys in New Mexico concerning this problem and they have given me some comments and suggestions that may be pertinent to this subject. I think it would be helpful in dealing with this problem if these comments and memorandum were printed in full in the RECORD.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a letter which Mr. Harry B. Littell, assistant legislative counsel, wrote to Mr. G. W. Lineweaver, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, and Mr. Lineweaver's reply; also the comments of Mr. Littell and the views expressed concerning this problem by a prominent attorney, Mr. Quincy B. Adams, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill,

together with the letters, views, and comments, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 531) relating to the release of water from the Elephant Butte Reservoir, N. Mex., introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the reclamation laws, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall regulate the release of the waters impounded by the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico so as to maintain in the Elephant Butte Reservoir that amount of water which is necessary for the preservation of the fish and wildlife in such reservoir.

The letters, comments, and views presented by Mr. ANDERSON are as follows:

NOVEMBER 6, 1952.

Mr. G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Interior Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to my telephone conversation with you and Mr. Bennett, I am submitting a number of questions relating to the Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs in New Mexico. As you know, we have been requested by Mr. Wood, of Senator ANDERSON'S office, to look into the possibility of legislation to prohibit the lowering of the water level in these reservoirs beyond that level necessary for the preservation of fish and other wildlife in the reservoirs.

1. When, and under authority of what law or laws, were the dams and other works appurtenant to the Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs constructed?

2. Does the United States have complete jurisdiction and administration of the two reservoirs?

3. Are the Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs used solely for irrigation purposes? If not, what are the other uses?

4. Is the United States considered to be a party to the Rio Grande compact, approved by the Congress on May 31, 1939?

5. If the United States is not a party to the Rio Grande compact, is it nevertheless bound by the terms of the compact in its proprietary capacity as administrator of the Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs?

6. Can you furnish us citations to the suit brought by the town of Truth or Consequences, N. Mex.? If there are no recorded decisions can you furnish us information as the court in which the suit was brought, the grounds for the suit, and the decision of the court?

Any other information or opinions you may be able to furnish pertaining to the basic problem posed will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you, I remain,

Truly yours,

HARRY B. LITTELL,
Assistant Counsel.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1952.

Mr. HARRY B. LITTELL,
Assistant Counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LITTELL: On November 14 the Acting Commissioner acknowledged your letter of November 6 requesting certain information concerning the Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs in New Mexico. The following information is responsive to your inquiry, arranged numerically to correspond to the numbered questions in your letter:

1. The construction of Elephant Butte Reservoir was authorized by Congress on February 25, 1905 (33 Stat. 814), under certain conditions as to finding of feasibility. A part of the purpose of the authorization was to carry out terms of a treaty with Mexico then under negotiation and later proclaimed on January 16, 1907 (34 Stat. 2953). An appropriation of $1,000,000 was made toward construction of the dam (March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1295, 1357)), the balance of the cost to be met by allotments from the reclamation fund pursuant to the Reclamation Act (June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388)), as amended and supplemented. The principal construction of Elephant Butte Dam took place from 1912 to 1916. Other features of the Rio Grande project are a regulating reservoir at Caballo Dam below Elephant Butte and, of course, diversion structures designed to make water available to lands in New Mexico and Texas.

The El Vado Reservoir is on the Rio Chama, in the upper tributary area of the so-called Middle Rio Grande section of the drainage system. The El Vado Reservoir was constructed by irrigation interests without Federal participation, and thus constituted one of the assets of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District which was organized in 1925. The reservoir, together with other irrigation features, is affected by the Middle Rio Grande project of the Bureau of Reclamation which provides for rehabilitation and construction of projects works and other necessary and related arrangements. For detailed reference, see Flood Control Act of 1948 (June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1171, 1179)); House Document No. 243, Eighty-first Congress; House Document No. 653, Eighty-first Congress; Flood Control Act of 1950 (May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163, 176)); and contract between the United States and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of September 24, 1951, designated 178r–423.

2. First it should be noted that in section 6 of the original Reclamation Act above cited, the second proviso states as follows: *"Provided*, That the title to and the management and operation of the reservoirs and the works necessary for their protection and operation shall remain in the Government until otherwise provided by Congress."

This covers the question as to Elephant Butte, and the references under No. 1 supra show the authorizations with respect to El Vado.

3. The answer is in the negative. Elephant Butte Dam is used for the generation of power (subject to operational requirements for project irrigation and treaty commitments) which power is transmitted to users on the New Mexico and Texas sides of the Rio Grande.

4. The Rio Grande compact was executed on March 18, 1938. Congressional consent was given by the act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785). Reference for this action is to the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 10, clause 3. There is nothing in the act of Congress just cited, nor (as far as we are aware) in any other act of Congress to indicate an intention that the United States should be a party to the compact.

5. The premise to this question is referable to the answer in 4 above. The matter of "proprietary capacity as administrator" is outlined in 1 and 2 above. The bare question, then, is whether the United States is bound by the terms of such a compact. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co.* (18 How. 421, 432 (1856)), it appears that congressional consent to a compact cannot inhibit the later enactment of constitutional legislation and that such legislation, if it is inconsistent with the compact, will have the effect of overriding the compact. Thus far at least the United States cannot be said to be bound by such a document. Your attention is, however, invited to the provision in that portion of the Flood Control Act of 1948 dealing with the Middle Rio Grande project that "at all times all project works shall be operated in conformity with the Rio Grande compact as it is administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission." Thus, the Congress has specifically directed officers of the executive branch to comply with the terms of the Rio Grande compact in administering the Middle Rio Grande project.

6. Appellate action was completed by the United States Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit in the case of *State of New Mexico and City of Truth or Consequences* v. *Labon Backer, et al.* (No. 4453), on appeal from the judgment of dismissal of the action in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico entered on January 15, 1952. The decision of the Court of Appeals affirms the judgment dismissing the action under date of October 22, 1952. These actions of the district court and the court of appeals are or will be available in the advance sheets of reports.

If you require further information, please advise us.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Assistant Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR ANDERSON

This memorandum is submitted in response to the inquiry set forth in the letter of October 29, 1952, from your administrative assistant, Mr. Wood, with respect to whether the Congress can validly enact legislation to prevent the draining of all of the waters impounded by the Elephant Butte and El Vado Dams in New Mexico. To provide a satisfactory solution to the problem giving rise to the inquiry, it appears that it would be necessary to retain in the reservoirs an amount of water sufficient to maintain the fish and other wildlife therein, whether the primary purpose for retaining such waters is to prevent the creation of health hazards, to provide recreational facilities, or to provide a fish and wildlife preserve.

The Elephant Butte Dam, authorized by the Congress by the act of February 25, 1905 (33 Stat. 814), under certain conditions as to finding of feasibility, was constructed under authority of the basic reclamation law of 1902 (32 Stat. 388). It is owned by the United States and administered by the Bureau of Reclamation, subject to the provisions of the reclamation laws.

According to information received from the Bureau of Reclamation, the El Vado Dam was constructed by irrigation interests without Federal participation and is an asset of the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district organized in 1925. This dam, together with other irrigation works of the district, is affected by the Middle Rio Grande project approved by the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1171, 1179). Under the authority of this act, the United States and the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district have entered into a contract which provides, during stipulated periods, for control and operation by the United States of the irrigation works of the district and for transfer to the United States of legal title to the various works. At the present time, however, the United States has no proprietary interest in the El Vado Dam. When the El Vado Dam is acquired by the United States under the contract entered into with the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, its operation will also be governed by the provisions of the reclamation laws (62 Stat. 1171, 1179; see also section 32 of contract no. 178R-423, dated September 24, 1951, entered into between the United States and the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district).

The problems raised by the proposed legislation must be considered in the light of the Rio Grande Compact of 1939 (53 Stat. 785). The compact, entered into by Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, with the approval of the United States, achieved a system of regulation concerning the distribution of the water in the Rio Grande Basin,

looking to an equitable distribution of water among the contracting States. It should be noted that the act authorizing the Middle Rio Grande project requires that the project works be operated in conformity with the Rio Grande compact.

We have also been informed by the Bureau of Reclamation that the waters of the Rio Grande Basin are owned by the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. While there may be some question as to the legal ownership of the waters concerned, we have assumed that such waters are not owned by the United States. This fact, together with the present system of distribution of the water prescribed by the Rio Grande Compact, necessitates consideration of the constitutional problems which are raised by the proposed legislation. These constitutional problems involve or are affected by (1) the question of navigability of the Rio Grande, (2) the constitutional powers of the Federal Government which may sustain the proposed legislation, and (3) the question of whether the action required by the proposed legislation would affect property rights downstream from the dams in such a manner as to require payment of just compensation under the fifth amendment to the Constitution. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider the various results that might ensue depending upon a determination of navigability of the Rio Grande, upon which Federal power is exercised and the purpose for exercise of the power, and upon the requirements of payment of compensation for property rights affected by the exercise of Federal power.

I. IF THE RIO GRANDE IS DETERMINED TO BE NAVIGABLE AND IF FEDERAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION CAN BE SUSTAINED AS AN AID TO NAVIGATION, THEN THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION WOULD BE VALID AND COMPENSATION FOR WATER RIGHTS AFFECTED WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED

The extent of Federal power with respect to navigable streams is remarkably greater than with respect to nonnavigable streams. The determination of whether a river or stream is navigable is a judicial function. For an excellent example of the various factors considered by the courts in making this determination see *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Company* ((1940) 311 U. S. 377). No attempt will be made in this memorandum to ascertain the navigability of the Rio Grande in New Mexico, since it is apparent that a judicial determination of navigability must rest upon the factual situation, and the application of the rules of law to the factual situation, in each particular case. (It should be noted that the Supreme Court in 1899 in *United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company* (174 U. S. 690) found the Rio Grande in New Mexico to be nonnavigable.)

Federal power over navigable streams is not expressly granted in the Constitution but is derived from the express power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. *Leovy* v. *U. S.* (1900) 177 U. S. 621, 632. The power to regulate commerce is complete within itself, may be exercised to the utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than those which are prescribed in the Constitution. *Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois* v. *U. S.*, 289 U. S. 48, 56 (1933); *McDermott* v. *State of Wisconsin*, 228 U. S. 115 (1913); *Hoke and Economides* v. *U. S.*, 227 U. S. 308 (1913). All navigable waters are under the control of the United States for the purpose of regulating and improving navigation, and although the title to submerged soil may be in the various States or individual users under them, it is subject to the servitude in respect of navigation created in favor of the Federal Government by the Constitution. *U. S.* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.*, 229 U. S. 53 (1913); *Gibson* v. *U. S.*, 166 U. S. 269 (1897).

The decisions of the Supreme Court also hold that navigable waters are under the control of the United States when it is exercising its power over them for a purpose other than to regulate or improve navigation to the same extent as when it is exercising its power in aid of navigation. A discussion of the possible results in the exercise of Federal power over navigable streams in this type of situation will follow in part II of this memorandum.

Even in the case of an exercise of power under the commerce clause to aid navigation, the question arises as to the extent to which property rights may be affected by Federal action before there is a taking of property for public use within the meaning of the fifth amendment requiring that just compensation be paid for rights taken. The commerce power is subject to the fifth amendment. *U. S.* v. *Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Co.*, 282 U. S. 311 (1931); *Monongahela Nav. Co.* v. *U. S.*, 148 U. S. 312, 336 (1893). However, that is not to say that every taking under the commerce power is compensable. Rather the cases establish that riparian lands are subject to the obligation to suffer the consequences of the exercise of the dominant right of the Government over navigation. The dominant power of the Federal Government extends to the entire bed of a stream which includes the lands below ordinary high-water mark. The exercise of the power within these limits is not an invasion of any private property right in such lands for which the United States must make compensation. *Gibson* v. *U. S.*, 166 U. S. 269 (1897); *Greenleaf Johnson Lumber Company* v. *Garrison, Secretary of War*, 237 U. S. 251 (1915); *Hughes* v. *U. S.*, 230 U. S. 24 (1913); *Jackson* v. *U. S.* 230 U. S. 1 (1913); *Scranton* v. *Wheeler*, 179 U. S. 141 (1900). In *U. S.* v. *Willow River Co.*, 324 U. S. 499, 509 (1945) the Court said:

"High-water mark bounds the bed of the river. Lands above it are fast lands and to flood them is a taking for which compensation must be paid. * * * Lands below that level are subject always to a dominant servitude in the interests of navigation and its exercise calls for no compensation."

Also, see *Jackson* v. *U. S.*, 230 U. S. 1, 23 (1913), and *U. S.* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.*, 229 U. S. 53 (1913).

Thus it appears that in the case of an exercise of the Federal power to aid navigation, the question of requirement of compensation for property rights, including water rights, affected depends upon the location of the property affected by the exercise of Federal power, as well as upon the kind of injury inflicted. If there is a direct or physical invasion of property rights above the ordinary high-water mark such as a flooding of property, then such an invasion would be a taking within the purview of the fifth amendment and compensation would have to be paid. *Monongahela Navigation Co.* v. *U. S.*, 148 U. S. 312, 336 (1893); *U. S.* v. *Cress*, 243 U. S. 316 (1917). But, if the damage or loss incurred is treated as an indirect or consequential injury to riparian or water rights, such as a reduction in the flow of water, then such damages are not compensable under the fifth amendment, but must give way to the exercise of the dominant power over navigation. *Gibson* v. *U. S.*, 166 U. S. 269 (1897); *Scranton* v. *Wheeler*, 179 U. S. 141, 153 (1900), *Bedford* v. *U. S.*, 192 U. S. 217, 225 (1904); *Jackson* v. *U. S.*, 230 U. S. 1, 23 (1913); *U. S.* v. *Commodore Park, Inc.*, 324 U. S. 386 (1945); *U. S.* v. *Willow River*, 324 U. S. 499 (1945).

It is apparent that Federal action in regulating the release of waters impounded by the Elephant Butte and El Vado Dams in such a manner as to maintain therein a minimum amount of water would be quite unlikely to result in any flooding or other direct injury to riparian lands downstream from the dams. The only property rights likely to be affected by such action are the rights to the use of the waters in the Rio Grande. But recent decisions of the Supreme Court hold that, because of the dominant power of the United States over navigable streams, no private property rights (as against the United States) exist in the waters of navigable streams. *U. S.* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co., supra; U. S.* v. *Willow River Co., supra.* (See also Justice Douglas' concurring opinion in *U. S.* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.* (1950) 339 U. S. 725.) The result of these cases is that compensation is not required by the fifth amendment for any injury, resulting from an exercise of the power to aid navigation, to the rights that an individual may enjoy under State laws to the use of the waters of navigable streams.

Thus it is seen that the Federal power to aid navigation under the commerce clause, presents a wide field for Federal action, both with respect to Federal power to undertake any particular action and with respect to the extent of Federal action before compensation must be made for private property rights affected. But the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.* ((1950) 339 U. S. 725), cautions that the avowed purpose of aiding navigation must be a bona fide one as well as one of the primary purposes for undertaking a particular project, if it is to be sustained as an exercise of the power to aid navigation. In that case, owners of lands downstream from Friant Dam in the central valley project in California sought compensation under the reclamation laws for injuries to water rights resulting from a diminishing (almost amounting to a stoppage) of the waters of the San Joaquin River. The Federal Government defended on the ground that the dam was in aid of navigation and cited acts of Congress which gave the aiding of navigation as one of the purposes for constructing the dam. The Court closely scrutinized all the facts including the acts of Congress and came to the conclusion that the project was predominantly for reclamation, that the reclamation laws were therefore applicable to it, and that since those laws require payment of just compensation for property rights taken it would be necessary for the Government to pay for the water rights adversely affected. The Court said:

"Even if we assume, with the Government, that Friant Dam in fact bears some relation to control of navigation, we think nevertheless that Congress realistically elected to treat it as a reclamation project."

While the Court found it unnecessary to decide any constitutional issues in the Gerlach case, and made no statements in conflict with the rule of Federal dominancy over navigable streams, it is significant that the Court went to some length to reach the conclusion that, under the facts presented, the Congress in authorizing the project had not invoked its dominant power over navigation.

In the present case, if the action required by the proposed legislation can be sustained as an aid to navigation, there would be no question of the Federal power to undertake such action, and compensation would not be required for any injury to water rights affected by such action.

II. IF THE RIO GRANDE IS DETERMINED TO BE NAVIGABLE BUT IF THE FEDERAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION IS NOT SUSTAINABLE AS AN AID TO NAVIGATION, THEN THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROBABLY CAN BE VALIDLY ENACTED, BUT COMPENSATION FOR WATER RIGHTS AFFECTED POSSIBLY WOULD BE REQUIRED

While Federal power over navigable streams is derived from the commerce clause of the Constitution (particularly the power to aid navigation), at least one recent decision of the Supreme Court holds that the United States enjoys the same extent of power over navigable streams even when the purpose of Federal action is not to aid

navigation as it does when the purpose is to aid navigation. *U. S.* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co.* (1940) 311 U. S. 377. The rationale of this position seems to be that the commerce power vests in the United States complete control of the waters of a navigable stream for the purpose of aiding navigation; therefore no private property rights as against the United States can exist in navigable waters or their flow or level; therefore the United States has complete control of navigable waters for purposes other than navigation.

Whether or not one agrees with this reasoning or with the end result, the decision of the Appalachian case has not been challenged and the rule of law announced therein has been cited in subsequent cases. *U. S.* v. *Willow River Co., supra.* Justice Douglas' concurring opinion in *U. S.* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.* (1950) 339 U. S. 725, 756 states:

"I think it is clear under our decisions that respondents are not entitled to compensation as a matter of constitutional right. For we have repeatedly held that there are no private property rights in the waters of a navigable river. See *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.*, 311 U. S. 377, 424; *United States* v. *Commodore Park*, 324 U. S. 386, 390–391; *United States* v. *Willow River Co.*, 324 U. S. 499, 510. That is true whether the rights of riparian owners or the rights of appropriators are involved. See *Gibson* v. *United States*, 166 U. S. 269; *United States* v. *Rio Grande Irrigation Co.*, 174 U. S. 690. As the Appalachian Power case makes plain (311 U. S. 424, 427), the existence of property rights in the waters of a navigable stream are not dependent upon whether the United States is changing the flow of the river in aid of navigation or for some other purpose."

However it should be noted that the majority opinion in the Gerlach case expressly reserved passing upon the question of the extent of Federal power to divert or stop the flow of navigable streams to the detriment of water users, and the Supreme Court has never ruled specifically on this point. Almost invariably the judicial problems that have arisen with respect to the Federal power over navigable streams have involved Federal action in raising the level of streams. Only a few cases have arisen from a diversion of navigable waters and these have involved the rights of riparian owners to use the diverted waters for navigation purposes or purposes related thereto. (See *Gibson* v. *U. S.* (1897) 166 U. S. 269; *U. S.* v. *Commodore Park, Inc.* (1945) 324 U. S. 386).

A full application of the rule of the Appalachian case, as amplified by the concurring opinion in the Gerlach case, would lead to the conclusion that whatever rights to the use of the waters of a navigable river individuals may have as against others they would not exist against the United States in the exercise of its power over navigable streams, even if that power is being exercised for a purpose other than to improve navigation

But, as stated above, the Court has never had to rule upon the question of the extent of Federal power to divert for non-navigation purposes the flow of navigable streams to the detriment of water users, that is, whether such a diversion would be an exercise of the power over navigable streams which the United States could make without being required to pay compensation for water rights taken or rendered useless thereby. Nor has the Court had occasion to explain the application of the doctrine of the Appalachian case to rights to the use of water as distinguished to rights in the flow or level of the water (as in the Willow River Co. and Commodore Park cases). Nor has the Court had occasion to draw a distinction, which it well may, between the extent of Federal power over navigable streams when it is exercising this power to aid navigation and the extent of this power to accomplish some other purpose.

Therefore, it would be premature to state categorically that the extent of Federal power over navigable streams to accomplish a purpose other than to aid navigation is the same in all respects as Federal power over navigable streams to aid navigation. If the Court should hold that rights to the use of the waters of navigable streams for irrigation or agriculture, as distinguished from rights in the continued flow or level of the waters for power or navigation purposes, are entitled to special consideration when the purpose of exercise of Federal power is not in aid of navigation, or if the Court should make a more fundamental distinction in the extent of Federal power generally over navigable streams when the purpose of the exercise of Federal power is not in aid of navigation, then it becomes necessary to inquire whether Federal action in diminishing the flow of a navigable stream would have such an effect on the rights of users of the waters therein as to require payment of compensation to the owners of such rights under the fifth amendment.

It would be expected that a determination of what constitutes a taking of property for public use within the meaning of the fifth amendment would be a comparatively simple matter. But such has not been the case. Although, as stated above, the court has held that as against the United States there are no private property rights in the waters of navigable streams, we believe it may safely be assumed that rights to the use of such waters do exist under State laws in behalf of individuals as against other individuals—subject to the dominant Federal power to aid navigation—and that such rights constitute property within the meaning of the fifth amendment if the dominant Federal power to aid navigation cannot be invoked.

The question of what constitutes a taking of property is one that has not received a uniform answer throughout our constitutional history. The question has usually arisen in cases in which the United States has not instituted any legal action to acquire an interest in property which has been affected by an exercise of power. The question then presented to the Court is whether the Federal action which has affected an individual's property constitutes a taking of, or only an injury to, the property. If there has been a taking, compensation must be made; but if there has simply been an injury as a consequence of the exercise of Federal power, the fifth amendment does not require compensation. *United States* v. *Lynah* (1903) 188 U. S. 472; *Gibson* v. *U. S.* (1897) 166 U. S. 269. (See the many cases cited in *Rank* v. *Krug* (1950) 90 F. Supp. 773, 786).

Earlier cases tended to be rather restrictive in determining what constituted a taking, practically requiring a showing of actual appropriation of an individual's property by the United States. (For example, see *Gibson* v. *U. S.* (1897) 166 U. S. 269.) Apparently the destruction or rendering useless of property, as distinguished from an appropriation for use, did not constitute a taking. But some recent decisions of the Supreme Court indicate a relaxation of this rule. In *U. S.* v. *Dickinson* (1947) 331 U. S. 745, 748, the Court said:

"Property is taken in the constitutional sense when inroads are made upon an owner's use of it to an extent that, as between private parties, a servitude has been acquired either by agreement or in the course of time."

In this case the Court required compensation for erosion to lands not actually flooded by a Federal project and, in addition, required compensation for intermittent flooding of lands.

In *U. S.* v. *Kansas City Life Insurance Co.* ((1950) 339 U. S. 799) the Court held that compensation was required when Federal action in permissibly raising the level of a navigable river also raised the level in a tributary which prevented proper drainage of lands on the tributary, thus rendering it unfit for some agricultural purposes.

In *U. S.* v. *General Motors Corporation* ((1944) 323 U. S. 373, 377) the Court laid down some rules to assist the determination of this perplexing question. The Court said:

"The critical terms are 'property,' 'taken,' and 'just compensation.' It is conceivable that the first was used in its vulgar and untechnical sense of the physical thing with respect to which the citizen exercises rights recognized by law. On the other hand, it may have been employed in a more accurate sense to denote the group of rights inhering in the citizen's relation to the physical thing, as the right to possess, use, and dispose of it. In point of fact, the construction given the phrase has been the latter. When the sovereign exercises the power of eminent domain it substitutes itself in relation to the physical thing in question in place of him who formerly bore the relation to that thing which we denominate ownership. In other words, it deals with what lawyers term the individual's 'interest' in the thing in question. That interest may comprise the group of rights for which the shorthand term is 'a fee simple' or it may be the interest known as an 'estate or tenancy for years,' as in the present instance. The constitutional provision is addressed to every sort of interest the citizen may possess.

"In its primary meaning, the term 'taken' would seem to signify something more than destruction, for it might well be claimed that one does not take what he destroys. But the construction of the phrase has not been so narrow. The courts have held that the deprivation of the former owner rather than the accretion of a right or interest to the sovereign constitutes the taking. Governmental action short of acquisition of title or occupancy has been held, if its effects are so complete as to deprive the owner of all or most of his interest in the subject matter, to amount to a taking.

"But it is to be observed that whether the sovereign substitutes itself as occupant in place of the former owner, or destroys all his existing rights in the subject matter, the fifth amendment concerns itself solely with the 'property,' i. e., with the owner's relation as such to the physical thing and not with other collateral interests which may be incident to his ownership."

In spite of the clarity of these statements, cases inconsistent, or at least irreconcilable, with them may be easily found. In the present term of the Court, it has held that a destruction of private property by our Army in Manila during World War II to prevent it from falling into enemy hands was not a taking for which compensation was required by the fifth amendment. *U. S.* v. *Caltex, Inc.* (December 8, 1952).

The most that can be said, therefore, is that the Court will look to the facts of each case to determine whether there has been a taking. What importance must be given to the purpose of the Federal action giving rise to the claim is conjectural.

We come to the conclusion then that the United States can exercise its power over navigable streams for a purpose other than to aid navigation, but, in any such case, it may be required to pay just compensation for the water rights affected if it is found that the injury to such rights amounts to a taking.

III. IF THE RIO GRANDE IS DETERMINED TO BE NONNAVIGABLE, THEN THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROBABLY CAN BE VALIDLY ENACTED BUT COMPENSATION FOR WATER RIGHTS AFFECTED PROBABLY WOULD BE REQUIRED

Obviously Federal power over navigable streams cannot be used as a basis for exercising power over nonnavigable streams, unless perhaps in connection with an exercise of this power over a navigable stream. Even in such a case, the Court still holds that a valid exercise of the power over nav-

igable streams which results in consequences on a nonnavigable tributary does not carry with it, insofar as the nonnavigable tributary is concerned, the extent of Federal power over the navigable stream, particularly with respect to the freedom from liability for payment of compensation for property rights affected. *U. S.* v. *Cress* (1917) 243 U. S. 316; *U. S.* v. *Kansas City Life Insurance Co.* (1950) 339 U. S. 799.

Therefore authority for Federal action with respect to nonnavigable streams must be found elsewhere in the Constitution. This authority has been found in the power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8). Thus Federal authority to institute reclamation projects, projects to protect fish and wildlife, projects to prevent soil erosion, and others have been sustained under the Federal power under the general welfare clause. In *U. S.* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.* (1950) 339 U. S. 725, 738, the Supreme Court said:

"Thus the power of Congress to promote the general welfare through large-scale projects for reclamation, irrigation, or other internal improvements is now as clear and ample as its power to accomplish the same results indirectly through resort to strained interpretation of the power over navigation."

See also *In re U. S.* (1939, D. C., N. Y.) 28 Fed. Supp. 758, 764; "The General Welfare Clause," Senate Document No. 46, Seventy-ninth Congress, page 19.

As was pointed out earlier, the Elephant Butte and El Vado Dams have been (or will be) constructed or acquired under the reclamation laws and, at present, are required to be operated subject to the provisions of such laws. Since the proposed legislation (if not enacted as an exercise of the power over navigable streams) would likely be sustainable only under the Federal power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare, either as a supplement to the reclamation laws or for some other permissible purpose under the general-welfare clause, it is necessary to examine the extent of Federal power under that clause.

Of course, at the present time, the distribution and use of water in Federal reclamation projects is for the most part controlled by State laws under the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 8. That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof: *Provided*, That the right to the use of water acquired under the provisions of this act shall be appurtenant to the land irrigated, and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right."

In addition, the distribution and release of waters from Elephant Butte and El Vado Reservoirs is affected by the requirements of the Rio Grande compact. But let us disregard these factors for the purpose of considering the basic problem of the extent of Federal power under the general-welfare clause.

It was not until recent years that the Supreme Court found it necessary to resolve the historical conflict regarding the meaning of the general welfare clause. In the famous case of *United States* v. *Butler* ((1936) 297 U. S. 1), the Supreme Court held that article I, section 8, clause 1, of the Constitution conferred upon Congress an independent power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare. In that case, the Court held that the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 could not be sustained as a valid exercise of the power under the general welfare clause because it invaded the reserved rights of the States to regulate and control agricultural production.

Two of the prerequisites to a valid exercise of power under the general welfare clause appear to be firmly established. First, there must be either a taxing or a spending (or there may be both) in the exercise of the power. See *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1); *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co.* v. *Adkins* ((1940) 310 U. S. 381); *Bastian* v. *United States* ((1941) 118 Fed. (2d) 777); see also the General Welfare Clause (S. Doc. No. 46, 79th Cong.). Second, the purpose of the taxing or spending must be the general welfare, not a particular welfare. *Helvering* v. *Davis* ((1937) 301 U. S. 619); *First Federal Savings and Loan Assn.* v. *Loomis* ((1938) 97 Fed. (2d) 831); the General Welfare Clause, supra).

The question of achieving regulatory purposes under the general welfare clause in fields outside the scope of express powers conferred upon the Congress by the Constitution is unsettled. In particular the question of how far the Federal Government can achieve regulatory purposes in the field of the States' police power has no definite answer. While the Supreme Court has not overruled its decision in the Butler case that the Congress cannot use its power under the general welfare clause to impose a regulatory plan which would otherwise be outside its power, cases decided since then certainly appear to be inconsistent with this decision. (E. g. *Helvering* v. *Davis* ((1937) 301 U. S. 619); *Oklahoma City* v. *Sanders* ((1938) 94 Fed. (2d) 323.) In addition, it must be remembered that the Court has sustained under the commerce power similar regulatory plans which would not meet the test of the Butler case if enacted under the general welfare clause. (E. g. *Mulford* v. *Smith* ((1939) 307 U. S. 38), upholding the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.)

The above discussion applies equally to an exercise of power under the general welfare clause in the field of reclamation and in other fields in which the exercise of power under the general welfare clause has been sustained, such as the establishment of wildlife refuges, the reforestation of lands, and soil-erosion programs. Although the Court has shown an inclination to uphold tax laws in which a regulatory plan is inherent and perhaps the main purpose (see *Sonzinsky* v. *U. S.* (1937) 300 U. S. 506; *U. S.* v. *Sanchez* (1950) 340 U. S. 42), the limit of Federal regulatory authority under the power to tax and spend for the general welfare can only be said to be uncertain.

The discussion in part II of this memorandum with respect to the requirements under the fifth amendment of compensation for property taken for public use would also apply to Federal action under the power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare. It must be remembered, however, that in the exercise of this power with respect to nonnavigable streams, there is no dominant Federal power over lands below the ordinary high watermark as in the case of navigable streams, and the rule that there are no private property rights against the United States in the waters of navigable streams has not been held to apply to nonnavigable streams. The fifth amendment would require that just compensation be made for all property rights taken. The question of whether the Federal action required under the proposed legislation would amount to a taking or only to an injury to the water rights affected would be determined upon the principles discussed in part II.

Since the Court has consistently treated Federal power over navigable streams to aid navigation as a dominant power, the Court, in dealing with the results of Federal action involving nonnavigable streams under the power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare, might be inclined to take a more liberal view with respect to private property rights affected. That is, the Court might be inclined to find there has been a taking of, rather than an injury to, property rights when the Federal power over navigable streams is not a factor in the case. However, any such supposition would be purely conjectural.

It is our opinion that if the Rio Grande is determined to be nonnavigable, the Federal action required by the proposed legislation would probably be sustained under the power to tax and spend to provide for the general welfare, but that payment of compensation for water rights affected probably would be required.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY B. LITTELL,
Assistant Counsel.

DECEMBER 22, 1952.

COMMENTS OF QUINCY ADAMS

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Albuquerque, N. Mex.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I have read with interest your file concerning the proposed bill to be introduced in the Senate requiring that the Secretary of Interior regulate the release of waters impounded by the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico so as to maintain in the Elephant Butte Reservoir that amount of water which is necessary for the preservation of the fish and wildlife in such reservoir.

You have asked me for my comments regarding this proposed bill and the other matters contained in your file. Although I have not had time to make any extended research into the matters mentioned, the following thoughts occur to me:

1. I have read the memorandum of law prepared for you by Mr. Harry B. Littell, assistant counsel in the office of the Legislative Counsel for the United States Senate. Mr. Littell has gone into the matter quite thoroughly and his opinion is well supported by the authorities mentioned. In general, I agree with the conclusions which he has reached. I understand from his memorandum that in his opinion the proposed legislation would be constitutional, but that payment of compensation for water rights affected probably would be required. I agree with this conclusion, but I seriously question whether in New Mexico, in view of the New Mexico law, there would be any water rights affected by the proposed legislation. I say this for the following reasons:

(a) Prior to the construction of the Elephant Butte Reservoir, the law of this State provided:

"No person owning or controlling any reservoir, lake, or body of water into which public waters flow, and which furnishes the water supply in whole or in part to any stream containing game fish, shall divert or lessen such water in flow or supply to an extent detrimental to the fish in such stream, reservoir, lake, or body of water." (Laws 1912, ch. 85, sec. 65; Code, 1915, sec. 2488; C. S., 1929, secs. 57-307; 1941 N. M. S. A., secs. 43-412.)

It is my view that the rights of users of water for irrigation purposes have at all times since 1912 been subject to the provisions of the above statute and that the proposed legislation does no more than require that the Secretary of the Interior, in the operation of reclamation projects, abide by the provisions of New Mexico law. Consequently, I cannot see where there would be any taking or damaging of water rights by the proposed legislation.

(b) The Supreme Court of New Mexico in *State* v. *Red River Valley Co.* (51 N. M. 207, 182 P2 421), has held that the waters in a public stream belong to the public and that public waters cannot be said to have been appropriated because they were impounded by the construction of the dam, but that

waters are not appropriated until application to use has been affected. This case also holds that public waters of the State have been dedicated to the use of the public for fishing and recreation. This case had reference to the Conchas Dam Reservoir in New Mexico.

The following portion of the opinion is of interest in connection with the Elephant Butte Reservoir and other reclamation projects within the State:

"Nor can we approve the theory that even though these be public waters subject to such appropriation, nevertheless they cannot be used by the public until appropriated by the public for such use. That would be saying that the public must first appropriate its own property, the very waters reserved to it and which have always belonged to it, subject, of course, to being specifically appropriated for private beneficial use.

"Opportunities for enjoying general outside recreation, sports, and fishing are recognized as one of the outstanding attractions of our State, as, indeed, they are of many of the States. The invitation to enjoy these activities is urgently and consistently extended by this and other States similarly situated, and millions of dollars are spent by tourists from less attractive areas who have come to enjoy them. 'Indeed, courts have recognized, and now more than ever before recognize, the public's interest in pleasure and sports as a measure of public health * * *. While the public right may have originated in the older use or capacity of the waters for navigation, such public right having once accrued, it is not lost by the failure of pecuniary profitable navigation, but resort may be had thereto for any other public purpose. * * * The small streams of the State are fishing streams to which the public have a right to resort so long as they do not trespass on the private property along the banks'." *Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Co.* v. *Railroad Commission*, 201 Wis. 40, 228 N. W. 144, 147, 229 N. W. 631.

"And, under the civil law, as it pertains to public waters, inherited by us from Mexico with the acquisition of the territory in question, fishing rights of the public always appertained to all public waters."

It is my understanding of this case that the law in New Mexico is to the effect that all public waters remain such even though impounded by a dam, until such waters have actually been applied to the land by private appropriators for some beneficial use, and that the public has always had the right to fish in the public waters of the State, that it is not necessary for the public to appropriate such waters for such use, since that would be saying that the public must first appropriate its own property. It would follow, in my opinion, that the right of private appropriators to appropriate the public waters of the State is subject to the prior right of the public to use these waters for fishing and recreation, and consequently the passage of legislation which merely enforces recognition of this public right would not deprive private appropriators of any water rights to which they are entitled.

2. As stated above, it seems to me that the proposed legislation does no more than require the Secretary of the Interior to comply with existing State law. I believe he is already under obligation to do this by reason of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, which is quoted in Mr. Littell's memorandum. However, I was never able to obtain a decision on this point in the case of *State* v. *Backer*, because it was dismissed upon the collateral issue that the United States was a necessary party to the litigation. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Interior has not complied with the New Mexico statute above quoted prohibiting the drainage of reservoirs to the detriment of fish, since the Alamogordo Lake, a reclamation project, was drained three times and all of the fish killed. It, therefore, seems necessary that Congress give more specific directions to the Secretary in this regard.

3. If there is any doubt about the validity of the proposed legislation without including a provision for compensation of those whose water rights might be adversely affected, I should think that a provision might be inserted which would provide a method of compensation if it was determined by the courts that any private persons had property rights of which they were being deprived for public use. The amount of water which it would be necessary to keep in the Elephant Butte Reservoir for the protection of the fish would be comparatively small, not over 15,000 or 20,000 acre-feet, and the cost of buying this amount of water, if necessary, for the use of the public as a place for fishing and recreation would be insignificant in comparison with the benefits received. The same is true as to other lakes, such as El Vado, which would require only about 5,000 acre-feet and Alamogordo Lake, which would require about 5,000 acre-feet.

Another thing which it seems to me should be given consideration is legislation giving the consent of the United States to be sued in an action of the type of *State* v. *Backer*, where the State or some municipality thereof seeks to require compliance by Government officials with State laws relating to the protection of public property and the abatement of a threatened public nuisance. I am unable to agree with the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit that the United States is a necessary party in such an action, but, nevertheless, the court has so held and unless the United States gives its consent to being sued in such an action there is no possible way of compelling Government officials to comply with the laws of the State designed to protect its property and to protect the public health.

The question was also raised in the case of *State* v. *Backer* that the Secretary of the Interior is a necessary party and the district court so held. Under existing law, the only place in which the Secretary of the Interior can be sued is in the District of Columbia. It would seem to me that legislation might also be enacted which would make it clear that in cases of the type of *State* v. *Backer* the Secretary of the Interior is not a necessary party, or if he is, that he may be sued in the State where the action arises.

Very truly yours,

QUINCY D. ADAMS.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 13 I introduced a series of eight bills to protect the civil rights of all Americans. I now send to the desk another bill to accomplish the same objective to be known as the Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1953.

There are sincere and honest differences of opinion with regard to the role of the Federal Government in protecting the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. My own position as to the responsibility and powers of the Congress to act are clear to all. I believe the Congress should act firmly and promptly in a manner consistent with our traditions and our Constitution, and I have introduced proposed legislation to that effect. The Senate, however, has not seen fit to agree with my position or, I should say, has not had the opportunity to vote on the proposals advanced to achieve equal rights for all of our people.

This is so, not only because of honest differences of opinion among us as to the merits of these bills, but also because the rules of the Senate allow a minority to prevent the majority from acting when that minority chooses to engage in a filibuster.

I have never, Mr. President, believed in an all-or-nothing approach to any of the major social, economic, or political problems which face our Nation. I should like to remind Senators that there is plenty of room for compromise and for understanding. Therefore I urge the Senate to find a middle approach and take some steps to spell progress. There are many millions of Americans who do not today enjoy full protection of their civil rights and who look to the Congress for some steps which will improve their situation and which will demonstrate to them that our Government is interested in their welfare and is committed to protecting all their constitutional liberties.

It is in that spirit that I submit this bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government. I can see no reason why the Senate of the United States cannot unanimously pass this legislation and help us take the civil-rights question out of partisan or sectional controversy and off dead center. This is a minimum program upon which all should agree. I ask the Republican leadership to join with me in pressing for this legislation, and I ask my colleagues from the South to demonstrate their good faith and their basic allegiance to the principles of the Declaration of Independence which we all share by joining in the effort to pass this bill.

The bill which I propose is a simple one. It would create a commission of five members appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate. The Commission would have the duty to gather information affecting civil rights, appraise the activities of the Federal Government with respect to civil rights, evaluate the status of civil rights in the Nation as a whole with a view to determining what activities adversely affect civil rights, and make an annual report to the President and the Congress on its findings and recommendations. The bill also provides that the Commission, at the request of the President or in its own judgment, advise the President with respect to any civil-rights matter.

The bill provides that the Commission should consult with representatives of State and local governments and private organizations to help carry out its functions.

It authorizes the Commission to hold hearings to carry out its functions of study and to make recommendations to the President and the Congress for legislative or administrative changes under law to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

It is my conviction that a Commission on Civil Rights such as I have proposed would provide a constructive and factual approach to a problem which is torn with emotionalism. It is not a substitute for other legislative proposals, but it may in fact turn out to be a preliminary step that must be taken to bridge the gap between divergent opinions and establish a foundation for a more constructive and positive legislative program. In fact, I shall continue to devote my efforts

to the enactment of the full program which I have presented to the Senate.

Nor do I believe that the establishment of a commission makes it less necessary that the Congress act quickly to enact other civil-rights legislation. In fact, should our efforts to enact that legislation be successful, the Commission's functions would be no less valid. It would serve to enhance the democratic progress we will have made, conduct studies, investigations, and research to safeguard that democracy, and assist Federal and local instrumentalities of government in protecting and extending the civil rights of all Americans. Mr. President, I fervently hope that this bill will become law in the Eighty-third Congress. It is predicated upon the principle of voluntarism. It includes no provision for compulsion or enforcement. It has been believed that education can be of great help in forwarding civil rights and equal rights for all our people. It places its emphasis upon information, research, study, truth, and cooperative enterprise among the several areas of government.

From reading the political platforms and studying the speeches of both General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson, I know this bill provides for the irreducible minimum. I call upon those who have at times been most persistent in opposition to what are known as remedial or enforcible bills to look upon this measure with candor and frankness, and with a spirit of understanding and cooperation.

I do not introduce this bill merely to have another bill in the legislative hopper. I introduce it as an honest, sincere compromising approach in the most controversial field of legislation before this body. I solicit the earnest consideration of my colleagues in the spirit of fairness and understanding. I hope the bill will be studied in that spirit.

The bill (S. 535) to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to be known as the School Construction Act of 1953. In connection with this bill I have prepared a statement which outlines what I consider to be the needs for school construction and the relationship of the Federal Government and the local jurisdictions of government in school activities.

I make note of the fact that while this bill is a Federal-aid bill, it has nothing whatsoever to do with curricula. It has nothing whatsoever to do with teachers, teachers' programs, or salaries. It has to do only with the physical plant which the school system of the Nation needs.

I have in my possession two volumes of factual studies made in connection with the survey of school facilities as a result of Public Law 817, of which I had the honor to be the author. These two progress reports on school facilities demonstrate that there is a minimum need for 325,000 classrooms in America today. I say what I have said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, that the failure of the American public to take care of public education may well be one of the most weakening and disastrous developments in American democracy. If there is any respect in which progress is needed in America today, it is in the field of education. It is nothing short of shocking to find that the American people spend more for commercial recreation, more for all forms of entertainment, and more upon intoxicating beverages than they do on the entire program of public education for the whole of this land. I remind my colleagues that the birth rate in this Nation is not decreasing. It is increasing. We shall have more and more children in the schools of America. By 1960 the population will be almost 175,000,000. Instead of growing older, America is growing younger.

I say with equal candor that the school facilities of America are deteriorating year after year. We are continuing to build more race tracks, more baseball fields, and more country clubs, but we have fallen behind in the program of providing school facilities.

This program does not enter the many controversial areas involved in Federal aid to general education. It applies to public education and to public facilities. I speak with some pride as the father of four wonderful children. However, I am shocked to see the overcrowding of classrooms. In many areas of America the youth of our land are compelled to attend schools conducted in facilities which are unfit for human habitation. We would permit no employer to employ labor in the facilities to which we send our children to be educated. If the United States is as rich and mighty as every report indicates, it is rich enough, strong enough and productive enough to provide school facilities for children and teachers for the future as well as for the present.

I now introduce the bill to which I have referred, and ask that the accompanying statement be printed in the RECORD. I hope something will be done about this problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 536) to authorize grants to the States for public elementary and secondary school construction, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The problem of school construction is one that has interested me for many years, dating back to my period of service as a mayor of Minneapolis. It was one of my first legislative activities. Members of the Senate will recall that during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee To Study School Construction Needs in the United States and to recommend legislation to meet those needs. One of the concrete legislative proposals which resulted from those hearings was the enactment of a bill, S. 2317 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), which provided emergency school construction assistance to those communities directly affected by the impact of the Federal Government activity. Many communities near Army encampments or near Federal defense establishments have found their educational facilities overrun and overcrowded. It is impossible for them to meet those educational requirements and since the Federal Government activity is responsible for the added strain, our legislation recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to help defray the cost of building additional school facilities in those communities.

The school-construction problem facing the cities and the parents of America extends far beyond the federally impacted areas. The legislation we enacted during the Eighty-first Congress recognized that fact and, likewise, recognized the fact that the Federal Government had a responsibility to meet school construction needs wherever they exist in the United States, and wherever the local communities are in no financial condition to meet those needs. We, therefore, provided for a survey of long-range school construction needs to be undertaken by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency.

The results of that survey are now with us. It remains for the Congress to act to meet the dire need which the survey so well and so scientifically demonstrated. It is to meet that need I introduce a bill originally recommended by the Subcommittee on School Construction of the Eighty-first Congress. That bill is designed to meet the long-range school construction needs of our Nation. During the time we worked on the bill, it met with the approval of all educational groups and Government agencies concerned with meeting the school-construction problem.

Dr. Earl G. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, in making public the results of the survey, said: "Additional floor space equal to a one-story building, 52 feet wide, extending from New York City to San Francisco, Calif., is needed adequately to house the Nation's public elementary and secondary school population." The study, he said, indicates a need now for about 708,000,000 additional square feet of school building space for nearly 9,250,000 pupils in public elementary and secondary schools.

The significance of these figures is that they do not provide for increased enrollment next year and in succeeding years. It is clearly evident that this increase beginning next September will be sizable. The statistics show an expected public school enrollment of more than 31,000,000 in 1956 and 32,000,000 in 1958. Unless the Congress acts to meet this crisis, the mothers and fathers of our young children will have a right to feel that their children and their children's education has been neglected by the Congress.

It is estimated that from my own State of Minnesota a total amount of $165,959,000 will be needed to meet our needs. Seven percent of that is for remodeling and rehabilitation; 90.5 percent of that is for new construction; 1.5 percent for sites; and 1.1 percent for buses. Even should every local school district and our State government appropriate to its total legal capacity, there would remain a deficit of more than $46,000,000, or 27.8 percent of the total need.

The results of the survey show that more than 325,000 instruction rooms and related facilities are currently needed this year to relieve overcrowding and to replace obsolete facilities. To relieve present overcrowding alone, 155,000 additional classrooms are required today. To replace obsolete facilities another 170,000 should be provided.

These are more than statistics, Mr. President. The facts are that approximately one-third of our Nation's public elementary and secondary school children are attending classes in buildings whose safety against

fire is questionable. About 18 percent of our school children are attending classes in schoolhouses that do not meet fire safety conditions.

It is estimated that the cost for building the necessary schools is $10,700,000,000. There is no question but that the preliminary responsibility for meeting this financial need lies with the State and local governments, but the laws and methods for voting bond issues or raising funds through assessments on property can only bring $5,800,000,000 from States and local school districts. This leaves a deficit of $4,900,000,000.

The relative ability of States to finance their school construction needs varies greatly. Three States, for example, have total income payments of less than $4,000 per enrolled pupil. Three other States have total income payments of over $13,000 for each enrolled child. To provide school housing currently needed, one State would have to invest 11.3 percent of its total income payments for 1 year to build additional schools. Another State, on the other hand, would have to divert only 2.7 percent of its total income payments for 1 year to fill its school construction needs.

It is clear to me, as a result of these statistics, that our so-called emergency problem has become a Nation-wide problem and is forming a national pattern. It is, therefore, essential that we turn our thoughts, not only to developing and extending our assistance to those schools in federally impacted districts, but also that we formulate a well-formed national plan, based on a firm administrative foundation and designed to meet the needs of our school children in a continuing, uniform and equitable formula. At a time when our Nation is spending billions to promote and protect democracy throughout the world, our children must not be prevented from receiving the finest education that democracy can provide. The needs of American children cannot be met in crowded schools requiring half-day classes, or in buildings that are dangerous firetraps.

The long range bill which I today introduce is designed to meet the needs of American school children. It provides that State educational agencies will have full control of planning and developing new buildings, and in setting up construction priority programs for each State. Allocation of funds is based on the number of children and the per capita income payments in each State. The bill would establish a sound administrative pattern within which the Federal Government could fulfill its responsibility for housing the growing school attendance without interference with State administration. The actual amount of money to be made available would be decided by the Congress each year, depending upon the immediate need and the over-all budget requirements.

I fully appreciate that this bill, first formulated during the Eighty-first Congress, undoubtedly needs to be revised, in the light of further thinking on the subject. It is for that reason I hope the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold hearings on school construction. I have no vested interest in the bill I submit. I am interested more in meeting the need.

Other school-construction bills have already been introduced extending the operation of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress which relates directly to the federally impacted areas. This is a program well established in the Congress and is a basic minimum.

I conclude by again expressing my hope that hearings on school construction will begin immediately. There is no excuse for delay, for the need is great.

I ask unanimous consent that the first progress report and the second progress report of the school facilities survey, authorized by Title I, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, known as the Humphrey School Construction Act and prepared by the school housing section of the Office of Education, be printed as a Senate document. I also want to pay my tribute to Dr. Ray L. Harmon, Chief, School Housing Section of the Office of Education, who was the coordinator of the survey findings.

TEMPORARY SUPPLEMENTARY AID FOR SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another bill, which would provide some immediate relief under Public Laws 874 and 815. This bill is needed desperately. I worked closely for 3 years on the problem of school facilities. I speak with some intimate knowledge, having been chairman of a subcommittee which, for more than a year, investigated this problem. I shall speak up for the parents and children of America. Somehow we must meet the problem.

The bill (S. 537) to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few years ago the work load of the Committee on Foreign Relations became very heavy, and it was necessary for the committee to obtain authority to employ two additional clerical assistants. Last year this authority was renewed. However, unless it is again extended, it will expire on the 20th of this month. Meanwhile the work load of the Committee on Foreign Relations has in no way decreased. Rather, it has increased. Indeed, I expect that it may be even heavier during the Eighty-third Congress.

Therefore, by unanimous direction of the committee, I submit a resolution further renewing the authority of the committee to employ these additional staff members. The resolution is exactly like those previously agreed to by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to August 1, 1951, and Senate Resolution 249, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants, is hereby continued until January 31, 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but I believe the rules require that such a resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. All such resolutions from various committees must go to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration. I should not like to depart from that practice, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my recollection is that the authority will expire on the 20th of this month, which is just around the corner. I am only seeking to do what has been done in previous years in this connection. These persons are now employed, and it is very necessary that the committee have them. I may say that the committee has been organized. We have already held a hearing with relation to the nomination of Mr. John Foster Dulles. We are now organizing our subcommittees. I am sure that consideration of the resolution at this time would not interfere with the rules of the Senate. The rule could be suspended in this instance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I shall have to object. I believe that when the Senate undertakes an expense in addition to an expense provided by the rules a resolution to provide such additional funds should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I recognize the fact that the resolution under discussion would do no more than has been done at other sessions of the Senate in recent years. However, if we were to make an exception in this instance we would be asked to make the same exception in other instances. Therefore, I must ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as required by the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I bow to the dictates of the majority leader. I believe he was present in the committee and consented to the provisions of the resolution. Therefore, we expected cooperation from him. Since we are not getting it from him we shall now go to the next order of business.

First, I should like to ask another question of him. Does the distinguished majority leader have any objection, after the resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration to have it acted on today if the Committee on Rules and Administration agrees to have such action taken?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all; I would have no objection. I merely feel forced to insist that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have the same feeling with reference to all such resolutions.

The resolution (S. Res. 33), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. On behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to provide for

the unity of Ireland. It is not designed nor contrived as an appeal for votes or for political purposes.

I am not Irish, and I approach the matter without bias or prejudice of any kind. I have a deep conviction on the subject, and I have given some attention to it. A similar resolution, agreed to in the House some time ago, expressed the sense of the House for a free and undivided Ireland and that the six most northern counties of Ireland, which presently have their own government and their own representation in the British Parliament, as well as their own Prime Minister, might ultimately join the rugged and sturdy people of Ireland, so that all 32 counties in Ireland might become a part of the Republic of Ireland. When we talk about a free world, in my book freedom is like charity—it begins at home. We should put aside pretense and what looks to me a little like hypocrisy. That is where we must first put the ax in solving the freedom problem. I believe the problem of Irish freedom speaks eloquently on what is necessary to be done in that field.

I visited Ireland in 1919 when the principal street in Dublin was in ruins. I was then a soldier. There was opportunity to puzzle over the manifestation of intense spirit which was reflected in the ruins of Sackville Street in the Irish Capital, and I went back to reexamine some of the history of this sturdy Irish people which goes back to the Christian era when Ireland consisted of the five kingdoms of Ulster, North Leinster, South Leinster, Munster, and Connacht.

The whole history of the Irish people is marked by a fierce and unquenchable determination to make their own destiny and to suffer whatever hardship and sacrifice might be necessary to accomplish this purpose.

It was in January 1919 that strife began in Ireland which lasted until May of 1921 and was concluded by a treaty in December of that year whereby Eire became a sovereign and independent state. Independence, however, was only partial, because six counties in Northern Ireland are still under the domination of an outside power which can occupy the seaports, airfields, and harbors in these counties if it so desires. These counties have a governor and prime minister of their own and have special representation in the British Parliament. This then poses the question of a divided Ireland and of a division which makes sovereignty and independence only partial in character.

I can well imagine how we in Illinois would feel if some outside force should occupy or exercise domination over the Great Lakes ports and rail centers of our State. We would quickly rebel.

Now it may be easily said that what happens between Ireland and Great Britain with respect to the complete and unrestricted and undivided independence and sovereignty of Ireland is no concern of ours. That proposition merits some examination.

In 1917 President Wilson, in his celebrated fourteen points, uttered the principle of self-determination for all nations large and small, and that principle was actually carried out in the case of small nations, such as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, until its purposes were thrown overboard by Soviet annexation.

At that time Woodrow Wilson also referred to the impartial adjustment of colonial claims in which the interests of the populations concerned shall have equal weight with the claims of any government whose title might be in question. At that time the principle of self-determination, which is basic and fundamental in itself was fully recognized.

In 1941 when Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill affixed their signatures to the Atlantic Charter in the interest of a better world, they there declared "the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live and to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof."

Certainly no words in the English language could more clearly express the right of self-determination. There is involved, therefore, in the Irish problem this question of self-determination as one of the key concepts in a so-called free world.

Today's imperative is human freedom without qualification, for in my judgment there can be neither peace nor progress without it. It appears to me, therefore, that as we so glibly speak about the free world, the term begins to reflect a kind of hypocrisy unless we are willing to spell it out without qualification and stop compromising with the principle which is involved.

France still holds on in Indochina on the theory that she will vacate the premises as soon as the Indochinese are able to exercise independence and maintain themselves against Communist threats.

In 1775 we did not wait for someone to determine for us whether we could walk alone before achieving our freedom.

Today small countries like Tunis and Morocco striving for unrestricted freedom are having a difficult time to even have their cases heard in the United Nations. The Dutch still strive to keep their failing imperialism alive in the Orient. Belgium still holds sway in Africa, and strangely enough, we are in the unhappy position of supporting these losing imperialisms against the tides which are so evident in all corners of the earth.

But nowhere is the example more eloquent than in the case of Ireland. Here you have the spectacle of a Republic of Ireland with 3,000,000 sturdy people from whom is divorced the 6 counties in Northern Ireland with a population of about 1,140,000.

For years the Irish people have sought to end this divorce and make Ireland an undivided republic by means of a plebiscite, but the British Government has steadfastly refused to concur in this course.

Can we with any degree of grace and sincerity speak about the free world when we are confronted with so glaring an example of the failure of complete and undivided freedom in a country whose culture goes back to the Christian era and which has made so great a contribution to every nation in the Western World.

We are presently committed under the provisions of the United Nations charter to a global crusade not only to hold aggression but to make freedom a reality. If that be the case, then freedom, like charity, should begin at home, and the Irish question should be quickly and amicably resolved, as an example to all the world of the sincerity of the nations that have given leadership to the United Nations idea.

If it is our duty to assert the cause of the free world, then it is inevitably our duty to assert it in a case like this.

If we are generous enough to aid Britain as we have done, then we should be bold enough to memorialize her on the subject of Irish freedom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 35), submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare the contrary.

FAVORING ACTION BY CONGRESS TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution which I think should be read at this time. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives should proceed without delay to carry out the provisions of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget.

Mr. President, I was a member of the joint committee several years ago which fashioned the Legislative Reorganization Act. In that act was included a section calling for the preparation of a legislative budget so as to assure that the power over the purse shall be properly lodged where the Constitution places it, namely, in the Congress. We had several sessions of the two tax committees and of the appropriations committees in 1947 and 1948. In 1949 an effort was made on the floor of the Senate to modify or to suspend the operation of the legislative budget section of the Reorganization Act. Since that time nothing has been done, and we are in the paradoxical and unhappy position of completely ignoring our own mandate. The language is that these committees are

authorized "and directed"; but we have failed to respond properly to our own directive.

Now we are confronted with an $80,000,000,000 budget. Today we have an astronomical public debt. Private and municipal debts are going up at the rate of $30,000,000,000 a year. This is a critical fiscal situation, and in consequence I think it is the solemn duty of Congress to carry out its own mandate that it fashioned for itself, namely, to create a legislative budget as a target for our activities for the next fiscal year.

So this simple resolution, Mr. President, simply memorializes this body, strange and paradoxical as it may seem, to do its duty.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Eightieth Congress, as I remember, did make a gesture toward complying with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, that we made more than a gesture. I was on the subcommittee and also on the present committee of 103 members, and we labored earnestly. We fashioned the target. The subcommittee chairman of the House Appropriations Committee came in with the estimates, and the final appropriations came rather close to them. At that time for the first time in 17 years, under a Republican Congress, and operating within the framework of the Legislative Reorganization Act, we did balance the budget. We sequestered sufficient funds for the Marshall plan; we gave the country tax reduction; and we did a number of other notable things.

In my humble judgment all that is necessary is that Congress have the will and determination to carry out that section of the act.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Since that time no effort at all has been made to comply with that provision of the act; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. None, to my knowledge.

Mr. CASE and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield first to my friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], because he has introduced a measure which undertakes to reduce the President's budget on a percentage basis, using a factor for every department and agency. Therefore, I now yield to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Let me say that I did call attention to section 138 of Public Law 601, and I have written a letter to Mr. Lindsay Warren, suggesting that the fact that the Congress does not observe the legal processes in making appropriations might very well invalidate the appropriations themselves.

I wish to join the Senator from Illinois in his remarks today in regard to this very vital and important subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate that support from my friend. I yield now to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I also served on the joint committee at the time when the Legislative Reorganization Act was observed during those 2 years. I felt that the act was observed. All it required the committee to do was to make a report to the Congress. Whether the Congress subsequently adopted the report was another matter. However, we did comply with those provisions of the Reorganization Act.

The resolution (S. Res. 36), submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROHIBITION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a comprehensive bill to prohibit segregation and racial discrimination in schools, hotels, restaurants, and all other public places in the District of Columbia.

I will do everything in my power to help end segregation in the District of Columbia as General Eisenhower has urged. It should be done not only from the standpoint of sound domestic policy but also as a necessary step in strengthening our international policy. I am afraid that many Americans are not aware of the fact that racial discrimination in Washington, D. C., is doing great damage to the prestige of the United States in the councils of the world. It can be said with complete accuracy that in the years immediately ahead a continuation of racial discrimination in Washington, D. C., which has become the capital of the world, will be interpreted by millions of people in countries of dark skinned populations as a policy of bad faith and hypocrisy on the part of the people of the United States. We cannot hope to build up a foreign policy based on the principles of the good neighbor and in terms of the equality of man and equal justice before the law and not practice those same principles in the District of Columbia. Whether we like it or not our racial practices in Washington, D. C., will proclaim to the people of the world our good faith in squaring our words with our actions.

The bill is based upon the extensive experience of State and municipal laws which prohibit discrimination in employment and in places of public accommodation. At the present time States such as New York and Massachusetts bar racial discrimination in such matters. A total of 11 States ban discrimination in employment.

The bill creates a small commission which would engage in educational and conciliation activities to root out discrimination in the Nation's Capital. If informal methods, which have proved so successful in the States, should fail, the commission would have power to conduct formal hearings based upon sworn charges filed by those who claim that they have suffered discrimination. Accused parties would have the right to be represented by counsel, introduce evidence, and examine and cross-examine all witnesses. Should the commission find that unlawful discrimination has occurred, it would have the power to issue a cease and desist order. The commission is to function really as a one-man court with all the safeguards of judicial protection.

All commission activities would be subject to the limitations of the Administrative Procedures Act and provision is made for review by the District Court of the District of Columbia.

If the Federal court should uphold the findings and order of the commission, it would issue its own decree. Violation of the decree would be punishable by contempt. In addition, if there are two judicially found violations within any 1 year, the Commissioners of the District would be required to suspend the license of the restaurant, store, or other establishment for a maximum of 60 days.

Enactment of a measure of this type is long overdue. It would be an effective means of eliminating discrimination and is at the same time absolutely and impartially fair to all those accused.

The bill emphasizes the informal procedures of mediation and conciliation and provides for an advisory council composed of District residents. That council would engage in educational activities and promote community understanding of this vital measure.

Discrimination in the Nation's Capital is a national disgrace. It is the solemn obligation of Congress and the new administration to end it immediately.

The President-elect has given his solemn word time and again that his administration would stamp out segregation in the District. Following are a few statements made by Eisenhower during the campaign:

I will not only express myself, but I will be merely repeating myself in what I have said numbers of times both publicly and privately long before I thought I would be standing in such a spot in such a capacity.

Your taxes go into the money that is expended in that District of Columbia. As far as I know, there will never be anything done with my authority or under my direction to discriminate against you or (the Negro) race in any possible way.

So far as the authority vested in me is concerned it will be exercised with the belief that the conviction you are not only equal but that if I do not protect and support your rights, I will lose my own.

That is the way I feel about it. Possibly I should have been a bit more specific. I believe we should eliminate every vestige of segregation in the District of Columbia.

On September 5, 1952, Eisenhower made that statement in a conference of Republican Party leaders in Chicago, Ill.

On September 24, 1952, in Wheeling, W. Va., Eisenhower said:

Segregation in the Nation's Capital must be abolished. Likewise there must be an end to such segregation as still remains in the Armed Forces. In no operation of the Federal Government is there a place for discrimination of any kind. We must work for the abolition of restrictions remaining anywhere on the basic American right to vote.

In Los Angeles on October 9, 1952, Eisenhower said:

Even worse is the betrayal by those who seek to turn this problem to their political advantage.

Let's look at one simple fact.

For 20 years leaders of the administration party have been making promises. For 20 years the government of Washington and the District of Columbia has been their responsibility. And yet after those 20 years racial segregation still exists in our Nation's Capital.

I am for wiping out every inequality of opportunity. And I am for starting to do that right in our Nation's Capital as well as in every other operation, military and civil, of our Federal Government.

We must have an administration in Washington whose example, continuously exerted influence, constant study, and publicizing of all the facts, will put and keep this problem on the conscience of our people.

The example and influence of such an administration will speed progress toward solving the problem at every level of government, in industry, and in every area of community life.

In Harlem, on October 25, 1952, Eisenhower had this to say:

Specifically, something has been said about my past efforts to eliminate segregation in the services—that has gone on. It is well under way, and I pledge you that it is going to be done promptly and without any further alibis or excuses.

Next, my friends, in the Nation's Capital we have had the poorest possible example given to those of other lands of what this country is and what it means to each of us. So far as there is power placed in me as an individual or officially, I shall never cease to work with all the power I can to get rid of that kind of thing in the District of Columbia. Let me extend that. Wherever the Federal Government has responsibility; wherever it collects taxes from you to spend money, whether it be in a contract for recreational facilities or anything else that it does for a citizen of the United States, there will be no discrimination as long as I can help it in private or public life based upon any such thing as color or creed or religion—never. Wherever funds are used, where Federal authority extends, there will be fairness.

What I promise you is work, never-ending work, to make certain that justice is done.

Mr. President, the Republican platform states:

The Republican Party will not mislead, exploit, or attempt to confuse minority groups for political purposes. All American citizens are entitled to full, impartial enforcement of Federal laws relating to their civil rights.

* * * * *

We will prove our good faith by:

* * * * *

Appropriate action to end segregation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I read in this morning's newspaper that it seems to be the present policy of the Republicans to take the matter under advisement, at least. They now say that they propose to move cautiously on this issue. They did not say anything like that during the campaign. Some Republicans are quoted this morning as saying that it cannot be done overnight, of course, the subject is going to require study. Eisenhower did not, during the campaign, talk about studying it. He talked about doing it immediately. Of course, he was making campaign promises then. He was raring to go then for immediate action on ending segregation in Washington, D. C. The press reports this morning indicate that he is now becoming cagey about this issue. I propose to keep the heat on him, because I insist that he gave the American people his word that he stood for immediate, not delayed, action on the problem of ending segregation in the District of Columbia. He did not talk during the campaign about staging a study of the problem. We need no political stage scenery for a make-believe performance on this issue. We need action, and action immediately.

Mr. President, the problem has been under study for many years, and to study it further would be "passing the buck." The question now is whether a campaign pledge is going to be kept immediately on the basis of statements unequivocally made during the campaign that action would be taken immediately.

The facts are clear to all of us that segregation exists in this Capital City as an awful, disgraceful representation to the people of the world that we say one thing about a good-neighbor policy, equal justice for all, and equality of men, but that we practice an entirely different doctrine in the District of Columbia. We maintain a system of second-class citizenship. It is un-American.

Mr. President, I close by saying that, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, speaking in behalf of his party, he will do whatever he can to bring to an end this terrible human disgrace that exists in the District of Columbia; to bring to an end this awful example we are setting for the world, an example by which we do not practice the democratic principle of equality of men, nor do we practice the Christian principle by which we should live, namely, of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us.

I issue to Eisenhower the challenge to keep faith with the promise he made during the campaign, namely, to end segregation in the District of Columbia. The action that Congress and the President-elect take on this bill will test the good faith of Eisenhower's campaign pledges as well as of the good faith of the Republican platform on this very important issue. I shall cooperate in any revision of the bill by way of amendment which seeks to strengthen it and not weaken or scuttle its objectives.

The bill (S. 534) to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal rights in places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, tomorrow is the two hundred and forty-seventh anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, whose genius in statecraft contributed so much to the structure of American liberty and independence.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we are proud to proclaim Benjamin Franklin as our first citizen. It is appropriate on this birthday anniversary to pay tribute to his greatness as a champion of human freedom, and to recall his vast service in the cause of world progress.

Dr. Franklin's philosophy was based upon his unfailing devotion to the cardinal virtues of morality, industry, thrift, and tolerance—and his firm belief that "God governs in the affairs of men."

I need not discuss at length Dr. Franklin's illustrious career as a diplomat, scientist, inventor, author, publisher, and businessman. Many volume have been written in his praise. I should like, however, to point out that there is guidance in the teachings of Benjamin Franklin to meet the grave problems that press upon our Republic today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has made about Benjamin Franklin, whose birthday anniversary is tomorrow.

Each year on the anniversary of Franklin's birth the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I, as a Senator from Massachusetts, where Franklin was born and lived as a boy, have paid brief tributes to his memory. This year again I join in what has been said by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Benjamin Franklin, one of the founders of our Constitution, was one of our greatest citizens, and today his words are just as sound as they were when he uttered them long years ago.

TRIBUTE TO DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a former member of the Democratic steering committee, I take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the new Democratic steering committee on the fine manner in which they have discharged a very complex and difficult task. I am sure that I am expressing the opinions of my Democratic colleagues when I particularly commend the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for the objectivity, the fairness, and the courtesy which he has constantly shown despite the pressures which bear on the man who serves as his party's leader in the Senate.

In making committee appointments, the Senator from Texas and his colleagues have seen to it that every point of view represented in the great party of democracy will be effectively represented in the Senate where it counts most—in our standing committees. I congratulate the distinguished minority leader on this achievement. I congratulate him, too, on making certain that the ability, experience, and knowledge of the freshmen Senators were given full recognition and will be promptly put to the service of our country through their appointment to major committees.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Texas, as chairman, and the other members of the Democratic steering committee, have proved to the Nation that the Democratic Party is the party of amity and harmony; the party which believes in giving effective voice to all its members; the party which practices the efficiency and fairness of which

others talk; the united party which, because of this sort of leadership, will soon again be entrusted with the task of guiding America's destiny.

ACCIDENT AT UNION STATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I desire to speak for about 2 minutes. Within a short time after it occurred, I viewed the scene of the accident at Union Station where a Pennsylvania passenger train crashed through the gates and dropped through the concourse floor into the baggage room below.

While it is too soon to fix responsibility for this accident, the investigations already under way will disclose whether it was mechanical or manpower failure. I was amazed at the efficiency of the railroad officials and employees in coping with what to me seemed a muddled mass of confusion. Even as I watched, new rail was being laid and cars were being pulled back out of the chaos. Out of something that looked like it might take days to overcome, order was already present in the calm and sure directions of those in charge.

With the exception of the locomotive, the passenger cars, even to the windows, had withstood the shock of a terrific impact. Had it not been for their strong construction, more people surely would have been injured.

I was told that no one was killed, but that quite a number were shaken up and slightly injured, and only a few seriously. From what I could gather from railroad people, passengers, and witnesses, lives were saved because railroad men, trained to act quickly in any emergency, had responded in this instance in a manner that deserves commendation.

As I understand it, word was flashed ahead by telephone that the train was in trouble when it entered the yards; that something was wrong. Whether it was the brakes or not, I do not know. But because of this warning, all persons in the stationmaster's office, the newsstand, and adjacent concourse area were enabled to get clear of the train.

The remarkable thing about the whole accident is that no one was killed. It is a tribute to the employees of the railroad—and Union Station employees in particular—that they performed their duties so well under the stress of emergency.

THE ROSENBERG CASE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure that other Senators have had the same experience I had when a number of delegations called on me about the Rosenberg case and importuned me to do what I could about it. As a result, I have caused to be prepared a summary of the case and some findings. I believe they will be helpful and useful to all Members of the Senate, and I should like to have the summary and findings printed in the RECORD. I therefore request that it be so printed.

There being no objection, the summary and findings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1953.

SUMMARY OF [JULIUS AND ETHEL] ROSENBERG CASE

I. CHRONOLOGY

July 17, 1950: Arrested by FBI.

August 17, 1950: Indicted by Federal grand jury in New York City.

January 31, 1951: Reindicted by grand jury.

March 29, 1951: Verdict of guilty entered by jury in United States District Court, Southern District of New York, Judge Irving R. Kaufman presiding.

April 5, 1951: Sentenced to death by Judge Kaufman.

February 25, 1952: Verdict and sentence affirmed by United States Court of Appeals, second circuit (195 F. (2d) 583).

April 8, 1952: Rehearing on affirmation denied by this court of appeals (195 F. (2d) 609).

October 3, 1952: Petition for review denied by Supreme Court (344 U. S. 838).

November 17, 1952: Rehearing on petition for review denied by Supreme Court (344 U. S. 889).

November 21, 1952: Order issued by Judge Kaufman for execution of death sentence during week of January 12, 1953. The precise date was fixed by the United States Marshal at 11 p. m., January 14, 1953.

December 1, 1952: Application to set aside or correct the sentence pursuant to applicable Federal procedural provisions (28 U. S. C. 2255) denied by Judge Sylvester Ryan, in United States District Court, Southern District of New York.

December 31, 1952: Denial of application to set aside or correct sentence affirmed by the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit.

January 2, 1953: Application for judicial clemency, or reduction in sentence, denied by Judge Kaufman.

January 5, 1953: Limited stay of execution granted by Judge Kaufman on condition that counsel for defendants petitions the President for clemency by Saturday, January 10, 1953. The stay will begin on the filing of this petition, and will end 5 days after the President has made his determination. If the President's ruling is adverse, a new date for the execution of sentence will be set 5 days after such ruling.

II. SUMMARY OF JUDICIAL RULING

The following summary is derived from the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals (195 F. (2d) 583 affirming the judgment of conviction in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York. The statement of the trial judge, Irving R. Kaufman, rendered when pronouncing sentence, is not reported in the Federal Supplement, but is set out in the New York Times, April 6, 1951, at page 10, and is digested herein under Item *6 of the summary of the rulings of the Court of Appeals.

Facts:

Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were indicted, along with Anatoli Yakolev (a Russian consul in New York City who escaped arrest), David Greenglass (brother of Ethel Rosenberg), and Morton Sobell. The charge was conspiring to violate 18 U. S. C. 794, between 1944 and 1950, by combining to communicate to Russia information relating to the Los Alamos Atomic Experiment Station, its location, personnel, equipment, and diagrams pertaining to the construction of the atomic bomb.

Harry Gold and Ruth Greenglass, wife of one of the defendants, were named in the indictment as conspirators, but not as defendants. David Greenglass pleaded guilty and received a sentence of 15 years. A trial jury found the defendants, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell, guilty as charged. Sobell was sentenced to imprisonment for 30 years, and the Rosenbergs were sentenced to death.

Held:

In affirming the judgment of conviction, the Court of Appeals made the following major rulings:

1. Judge Kaufman's instruction to the jury that the status of Russia as an ally during the period of the conspiracy was immaterial was correct. The statute which the defendants were convicted of violating makes criminal the communication of prohibited information to the advantage of any foreign nation, irrespective of the status of said foreign nation as friend or enemy, and notwithstanding the fact that such communication did not injure the United States (*Gorin* v. *U. S.* (1941) 312 U. S. 19, 29–30).

2. The statute is not void for vagueness (*Gorin* v. *U. S.*, op. cit.); nor was the indictment founded thereon defective because it failed to allege that the information transmitted by the defendants had not been made public. The statute also does not violate the guarantees of freedom of speech contained in the first amendment.

3. The defendants' attack on the reliability of the testimony of the Government's chief witnesses was disposed of, as follows: the defendants' attack was based largely on the fact that these witnesses, including Ruth Greenglass and Harry Gold, were self-confessed spies, one of whom (Ruth Greenglass) the Government did not prosecute, and the other of whom received a relatively mild sentence (David Greenglass, who pleaded guilty). The court of appeals conceded that if the testimony of these witnesses was disregarded, the conviction could not stand; but ruled that in a jury trial, it is the province of the jury, and not of the court, to pass on the credibility of the witnesses and on the reliability of their testimony. The court of appeals also concluded that the evidence, on review, was more than ample to sustain the verdict.

4. The allegations of improper conduct on the part of Judge Kaufman were held to have been refuted by the remarks of the defendants' counsel. In conjunction with his motion for a mistrial, the latter acknowledged that the trial judge's faults had been "inadvertent." Later, in summing up for the jury, defense counsel reiterated that the trial had been conducted with dignity and decorum. The court of appeals found that the trial judge stayed well within the discretion allotted to him; and that his interjection into the case via questioning of the defendants was for purposes of clarification only. Moreover, the trial judge admonished the jury not to form erroneous impressions as to the importance of any aspect of the trial on the basis of an appraisal of the judge's behavior.

5. The trial judge, having cautioned the jurors not to determine guilt on the basis of membership in the Communist Party, was not guilty of any error in admitting evidence as to the defendants' preference for the Soviet form of social and political organization and of their party membership. Such evidence, though acknowledged to be highly inflammatory, as defendants contended, was held to be competent to show that the defendants would commit espionage for Soviet Russia.

6. The death penalty was properly imposed by Judge Kaufman, notwithstanding the defendants' contentions that they did not act from venal or pecuniary motives, that, except for this conviction, their records are unblemished, that the receiver of the secret information which they conveyed was at the time of the receipt an ally of the United States, and that the death penalty was unprecedented in this case inasmuch as it had hitherto been imposed in two cases of treason only. An appellate court has no power to modify a sentence which is within the limits allowed by a statute.

In imposing the death penalty, Judge Kaufman took note of the fact that, under the law as written, espionage committed in wartime may entail a penalty of death or imprisonment up to 30 years whereas the maximum penalty for espionage consummated in peacetime may not exceed imprisonment for 20 years. He added, however, that he considered the defendants' crime as "worse than murder. * * * In committing the act of murder, the criminal kills only his victim. * * * But in your case, I believe your conduct * * * caused * * * the Communist aggression in Korea, with resultant casualties exceeding 50,000. * * * By your betrayal you undoubtedly have altered the course of history to the disadvantage of our country. * * * If this [the fact that Russia was an ally] was your excuse, the error of your ways in setting yourselves above our properly constituted authorities and the decision of those authorities not to share information with Russia must now be obvious. * * * I feel I must pass such sentence * * * which will demonstrate with finality that this Nation's security must remain inviolate, that traffic in military secrets, whether promoted by slavish devotion to a foreign ideology or by a desire for monetary gains must cease. * * * [The defendants] were conscious that they were sacrificing their children, should their misdeeds be detected."

7. The contention that the death sentence, as imposed in this case, violates the constitutional prohibition of cruel and unjust punishment was rejected. No existing popular antipathy was discernible which would justify a finding that this sentence "shocks the conscience and sense of justice of the people of the United States."

Sources: New York Times; *United States* v. *Rosenberg* ((1952), 195 F. (2d) 583).

INTERNATIONAL OIL CARTELS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, from time to time—and in the opinion of the junior Senator from Iowa, too often—certain developments occur in official life which seem to many of our people to constitute a threat to the basic principles on which we have built this great Nation. In most cases time shows that these principles are so firmly established that they can survive the threat, but once in a while a threat presents itself which needs attention. Such a threat, in my opinion, has occurred within the past week or 10 days.

I should like to address a few questions to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] with reference to a Federal grand jury proceeding in the District of Columbia. Let me say that I advised the distinguished chairman of my intention to present these questions to him. He has read the questions. He has been called from the Chamber. He asked me to announce that he would make a reply in the Senate to these questions at his earliest opportunity.

But before submitting the questions, let me preface them with a brief account of the situation which gives rise to my inquiries. I shall not take more than 15 minutes of the Senate's time.

In September 1951, the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Alabama, voted to request the Federal Trade Commission for reports on the subject of monopoly. One of these reports concerned the international oil business.

Last August the Small Business Committee and its Subcommittee on Monopoly under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Louisiana published the Staff Report of the Federal Trade Commission—Committee Print No. 6, Eighty-second Congress, second session—on the subject of the International Petroleum Cartel. Publication of this document, I should add, came after intensive efforts by the present senior Senator from Missouri to have the secrecy label, which had been imposed on it by the administration, removed so that its contents could be made public.

This 378-page document is a detailed account of the relationships among the world's seven largest oil companies, five of which are dominant in our domestic oil industry.

Shortly after its publication the Attorney General of the United States requested the Federal Court in the District of Columbia to impanel a grand jury to investigate the facts disclosed in the report and any additional evidences of possible violations of our antitrust laws.

Since that time the case has been delayed chiefly by motions by the attorneys for the oil companies involved.

But in addition to the usual court procedures, there have been signs of political maneuvers and efforts behind the scenes to persuade the Government to drop its interest in the case and to discharge the grand jury.

If the newspaper accounts of the events of the past few weeks relating to this case are correct, and I have no reason to doubt their accuracy, the actions of some officials charged with the administration of the law are making a mockery of our judicial system, and even worse, making a pawn of the great institution which we know as the grand jury.

The question arises in this connection whether the court has apprised the members of the grand jury of their powers and duties. The law is extremely clear on this matter, even though few people seem to know the law. When there is tampering with the grand jury there is tampering with the very foundation of our system of government.

Mr. President, the jury system is the very foundation of our liberties. The sixth amendment to the Constitution secures the rights of the individual citizen and in criminal cases assures him the right to trial by jury, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to examine witnesses, to have counsel, and all the other rights which are so highly prized by the American citizen.

But, Mr. President, before a citizen can be haled into court the fifth amendment to the Constitution provides that he shall not be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, excepting on a presentment or indictment by a grand jury. Because that is the very cornerstone of the jury system our various judicial jurisdictions provide regulations under which there can be no tampering and no opportunity for tampering with a grand jury. In fact, in most jurisdictions, by definition of criminal law, any attempt to predicate a dismissal by or failure to prosecute by a grand jury, or for any other reason to cease or stop a prosecution under any other conditions whatever, is known as compounding a felony.

The Supreme Court, in *Hale* v. *Henkel* (201 U. S. 43), has said that under the practice of this country:

> The grand jury may proceed, either upon their own knowledge or upon the examination of witnesses, to inquire for themselves whether a crime cognizable by the court has been committed.

And a Federal judge in *In re Kettle* (180 Fed. 946), has described the grand jury as—

> The voice of the community accusing its members, and the only protection from such accusation is in the conscience of that tribunal.
>
> Therefore, except in sporadic and ill-considered instances, the courts have never taken supervision over what evidence shall come before them, and, with certain not very well-defined exceptions, they remain what the grand assize originally was, and what the petit jury has ceased to be, an irresponsible utterance of the community at large answerable only to the general body of citizens from whom they come at random and with whom they are again at once merged.

Not only is it the duty of the grand jury to return indictments, if in its belief the evidence warrants such action, but, as Mr. Justice Field of the Circuit Court has pointed out—Second Sawyer, Circuit Court, page 667—the function of the grand jury is a safeguard for the citizen, a bulwark between him and oppression.

Another district judge, in *In re Grand Jury Proceedings* (4 F. Supp. 233), said:

> The inquisitorial power of the grand jury is the most valuable function which it possesses today and, far more than any supposed protection which it gives the accused, justifies its survival as an institution.
>
> As an engine of discovery against organized and far-reaching crime, it has no counterpart. Policy emphatically forbids that there should be any curtailment of it except in the clearest cases.

Mr. President, I am indebted to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for an article which he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 11, pp. A4128–A4129, on The Federal Grand Jury: Its Powers and Duties. The article was prepared by the Honorable Anthony W. Fitzgerald, counsel of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York. Therein Mr. Fitzgerald quotes the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, as having described the grand jury in the following terms:

> The last stronghold of initiative by the layman in criminal law, for, regardless of the wishes of the district attorney or of the judge, the grand jury, on its own motion, can take steps against criminals and misconduct by public officials.

Let me place the events of the past week in their chronological order and against the background of this question of the integrity of the grand jury:

On Monday morning, January 12, the daily newspapers reported that the United States Government had decided to drop the international oil cartel suit as strategically risky. They reported

that the decision to cancel this controversial oil cartel probe was made by the President on the recommendation of the National Security Council. According to the Washington Post:

The council acted Friday—

That is a week ago today—

after a stormy session, with at least one member fighting until the end to keep the grand jury investigation alive.

The high policy group decided, however, that to seek criminal indictment at this time involves too great a risk to the global interests of the Nation.

Disclosures—

Continued the Post story—

which would be made to the grand jury and at subsequent trial are matters of the utmost sensitivity. They involve data on American explorations abroad, proven and estimated reserves, the financial arrangements with foreign governments, and technical details which have never been revealed.

The afternoon newspapers of Monday, January 12, then published the text of a letter from the President to the Attorney General, a part of which I shall read. The President wrote:

I am of the opinion that the interest of the national security might be best served at this time by resolving the important questions of law and policy involved in that (oil) investigation in the context of civil litigation rather than in the context of a criminal proceeding.

However, I believe that this would be the case only if the companies involved agreed to the production of documentary material which the companies are required to produce under an existing order of court based on grand jury subpenas.

Consequently, I ask that you promptly confer with representatives of the companies to ascertain if they will agree to enter into a stipulation to that effect. If they will, I ask that a civil proceeding be instituted accordingly and that appropriate steps be taken to cause the termination of the pending grand jury proceeding.

Mr. President, if that is not compounding a felony I do not know what is. It amounts to a promise that prosecution will be dropped if a grand jury will do or neglect to do certain things.

Commenting on the situation, Commissioner Stephen J. Spingarn, Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, was quoted as saying that the oil companies, in persuading the Government to call off the grand-jury investigation, had performed "one of the greatest snow jobs in history," and that abandoning the investigation would play into the hands of Soviet propagandists.

I am not here concerned, Mr. President, with the merits or lack of merits of the positions taken by the various participants in this complex affair. My concern at the moment is with the effect of certain of their actions on the integrity of our judicial system and, particularly, of the grand jury, which is so essential a part of that system.

To continue the account: on Monday afternoon last, the 35 attorneys for the oil companies met with Attorney General McGranery. He is reported to have interpreted the President's proposals as meaning that the oil companies must do the following:

1. Agree to allow the Government to file a skeleton injunction suit immediately and to fill in the details later.

2. Stipulate that they would not try to get dismissal of the suit until 60 days after all the documents held in this country and already subpoenaed by the grand jury are in the hands of the Justice Department.

3. Produce additional documents as properly called for at a later date.

These conditions did not meet with the approval of the oil company attorneys. They are reported to have come "storming" out of the meeting with the Attorney General. They are said to have refused to accept the Attorney General's interpretation of the President's letter, and they promptly appealed to the Honorable James R. Kirkland, district judge, to dismiss the outstanding subpenas.

The judge thereupon postponed until January 28 the date for the production of documents, after berating the attorneys for both the Government and the companies for their handling of the case.

While I have not had an opportunity to review the entire record of the various hearings on motions that have been held, or to read the full text of the lectures which the judge is reported to have administered to both Government and company attorneys on Tuesday, enough has been printed in the newspapers to suggest that his case has, to say the least, some highly extraordinary aspects.

For example, in admonishing the Government attorneys, the judge is quoted in the Washington Post as saying:

The court does not want telephone calls. Do not send letters to the court. I want no more hearings without notice to the other side. From now on everything is going to be on the record.

While the company attorneys were told in connection with their failure to produce the subpenaed documents:

Some of your officials may have to decide whether to repose in jails abroad or take a vacation in the Washington asylum and jail.

There is, in addition, however, one thing in this series of events which disturbs me more than the maneuvers of both sides to which the judge made reference. That is the report in the Washington Post of January 13 which reads as follows:

There is an apparent lack of harmony between the executive branches of the Government. Judge Kirkland described Washington today as in a "dead center" because of the approaching change of administration.

He said he wanted to give both the present and the future administration time to decide what to do with the case.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that a grand-jury proceeding of this significance should be placed on the auction block of politics. Yet that is evidently what is transpiring in this instance.

If there is anything more destructive of our judicial system than interference in its functions by the executive branch, it is the submission of the judiciary to the will of the Executive.

Furthermore, neither the President of the United States nor any other executive officer has the power to interfere in a grand-jury proceeding. The President has only the power to pardon, not to prevent the judicial arm of the Government from acting.

A grand jury of its own motion can indict—*Ex parte*, United States Reports, page 287; United States Reports, page 241—and I believe that a grand jury has the right to undertake an investigation independent of, and even against, the wishes of the United States attorney or his subordinates.

This is a proceeding in connection with possible violation of the antitrust law. The antitrust laws envisage an enforcement program as follows: Grand-jury proceedings to punish criminally for past actions and civil proceedings by way of an injunction to prevent future violations. It is difficult to accept the peculiar proposition that one proceeding may be quashed if the parties are willing to submit to the other proceeding, or vice versa. This kind of barter does not promote healthy legal procedure or a favorable judicial atmosphere.

Mr. President, I said I would state the three questions I had presented to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Before reading them, I wish to say that I know nothing about the facts in connection with whether there is an international cartel or whether there has been a violation of existing law. But I do know, Mr. President, that everyone, whether a large oil company or the meanest individual citizen, is entitled to full protection under the law. I take the further position that the oil companies or any other concerns cannot advance the plea that their feelings may be hurt. If their patriotism is of such a diaphanous structure that it cannot stand the strain, or if it is so tenuous that it does not have the tensile strength to face financial losses, then it is too bad, because every other American citizen is faced with that situation.

Mr. President, it has often been said that history repeats itself. Perhaps I may be forgiven if I call attention to the fact that in 1941 and in the years following there was pending in a Federal court of the United States an action for the recovery of over a billion dollars of damages. In that action some 23 companies were defendants. The Department of Justice used almost 2 years in preparing its case, and filed its case along about August 1941. After the case was filed, 22 of the 23 defendants were made members of the National Petroleum Commission. The National Petroleum Commission recommended that in the interest of saving their feelings and protecting their patriotism, the suit of a billion dollars against them be quashed; and it was. The interchange of correspondence between the present speaker, the junior Senator from Iowa, and the then Attorney General, Robert Jackson, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and the subsequent Attorney General, Tom Clark, now also an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and all other correspondence in connection with that matter appear in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall not take time now to read the correspondence; but for the purpose of citation, if anyone else is interested, let me say that it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-seventh Congress, volume 87, part 5, pp. 4875 to 4877; in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-eighth Congress, volume 90, part 3, pp. 3163 to 3164; and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eighty-first Congress, volume 95, part 9, pp. 12472 to 12474.

I do not wish to charge these companies or any others or any individuals or groups with any lack in patriotism. On the other hand, they are not above the law; they are not beside the law. If they are guilty, then that guilt may be determined through the machinery of our judicial system. If they are innocent, they will be acquitted through the machinery of our judicial system. However, until that is done the President of the United States—past, present, or future—or any other individual in the Government, in either the executive branch or the legislative branch, has no right whatever to attempt to interfere with the functions of a grand jury in carrying out its responsibilities, which are laid down so clearly in our legal system and are protected by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have left certain questions with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He has them now, and I shall read them at this point:

First. In view of the history of this case which I have just outlined, on the basis of published reports and newspaper articles, does the able Senator not agree with me that the Senate has the duty of making a thorough inquiry into the facts and circumstances of the case?

Second. May I further ask the able Senator in his capacity as chairman of the Judiciary Committee if he does not believe that the Judiciary Committee should conduct a complete investigation and hold public hearings on this mattter, and should call before it the principal actors in this drama, both from the executive and judicial branches of the Government?

Third. Has the chairman contemplated, or does he now contemplate, taking up this matter with the Judiciary Committee, so that the facts may be known and the integrity of the grand-jury system be preserved?

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVESTOCK AND PROGRAM OF LIVESTOCK GRADING

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise for a few moments to speak about matters which are covered in a proposed bill which has been introduced today by my friends, the former Governor of the State of Nebraska and now a colleague in the Senate [Mr. GRISWOLD], and Senator BUTLER, the senior Senator from Nebraska. Today they introduced a bill proposing the abolition of price ceilings on livestock, and a Federal program of livestock grading. I had prepared a bill which I had intended to introduce which was quite similar to that introduced by my distinguished colleagues, Senator BUTLER and Senator GRISWOLD. Rather than introduce that measure, I am joining with my colleagues, Senator BUTLER and Senator GRISWOLD, in the measure which they have introduced.

I am happy to join with the Senators from Nebraska in what I consider to be a most proper approach to a troublesome question.

I recently had the honor of speaking before a cattlemen's convention in Kansas City, Mo., and in my speech I set forth some of the ideas and views which I had with reference to price control, rollbacks, and some of the Federal grading practices. Among other things in that speech, and at the close of my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent to have the speech included in the Appendix of the RECORD, I pointed out that on the retail level there had not been, in my judgment, a proper effort on the part of the consuming public to buy United States grade Good beef.

I am happy today to note and to report to the Senate that, following the convention of that great livestock association in Kansas City, a number of outlets within this area and other sections of the United States have gone to the public with advertisements which I think are most practical and most helpful.

At this point in my remarks I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a very excellent advertisement conveying a message by a great chain outlet in this area, the Food Fair, a supermarket organization. It is headed: "Important Memorandum to Mrs. Consumer: Subject, The Beef Story."

Then it goes on to say:

In the following three paragraphs we have attempted to clear the air of any confusion resulting from our offering of two grades of beef. We think they present the facts clearly and we earnestly recommend that you read them.

Then it continues as follows:

United States Government grading is based upon standards set forth by the Department of Agriculture. These standards are interpreted to the best of their ability by trained Government graders and inspectors. At the present time, however, according to Government specifications, there is a very fine line of distinction between "United States Government graded Good" and "United States Government graded Choice." At present, Food Fair is offering for sale both grades for your selection. With respect to "United States Government graded Good," Food Fair buyers are constantly on the alert to secure only the top quality beef that closely approaches that line between "United States Government graded Good" and "United States Government graded Choice." This beef is offered to you under the "United States Government graded Good" stamp with a resultant tremendous saving to you. Remember you are buying what is, in our opinion, the top grade beef no matter which grade you choose.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that this advertisement of Food Fair be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANT MEMORANDUM TO MRS. CONSUMER: SUBJECT, THE BEEF STORY

In the following three paragraphs, we have attempted to clear the air of any confusion resulting from our offering of two grades of beef. We think they present the facts clearly and we earnestly recommend that you read them.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT GRADING

United States Government grading is based upon standards set forth by the Department of Agriculture. These standards are interpreted to the best of their ability by trained Government graders and inspectors. At the present time however, according to Government specifications, there is a very fine line of distinction between "United States Government graded Good" and "United States Government graded Choice." At present, Food Fair is offering for sale both grades for your selection. With respect to "United States Government graded Good," Food Fair buyers are constantly on the alert to secure only the top quality beef that closely approaches that line between "United States Government graded Good" and "United States Government graded Choice." This beef is offered to you under the "United States Government graded Good" stamp with a resultant tremendous saving to you. Remember you are buying what is, in our opinion, the top grade beef no matter which grade you choose.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

In our considered opinion "Good" beef is your best buy now. Unbalanced supply conditions have brought about the large differential in price between "Good" and "Choice" grades. Consumer purchases of "Choice" grade have been abnormally high; therefore, "Good" grade has not moved as readily. Food Fair, in its eagerness to perform a valuable service to the consumer, is offering you both grades in ample supply, clearly marked, so that you may examine both and formulate your own opinion as to what is your best buy.

FOOD FAIR SUPER MARKETS POLICY

Food Fair Super Markets' policy, as always, is based upon "service to you." We will continue to offer for sale in our stores what we feel represents the finest values at all times. We will continue to be most exacting in our standards of quality. You have our assurance that regardless of what your selection is, either "United States Government graded Good" or "United States Government graded Choice," it will be the finest available anywhere. We will continue to offer for sale "United States graded Good" beef as long as we can obtain top quality in this grade and the price difference between "United States Good" and "United States Choice" is substantial. Remember your complete freedom of choice is always available to you at your neighborhood Food Fair Super Market.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am glad to say that another great food outlet on the retail level, known as Food Town, has something to say on the subject. Its advertisement was published in the Washington Star of Thursday. It is a rather significant news item for the benefit of the consuming public. It states:

Food Town temporarily alters its policy of selling U. S. Choice beef only because U. S. Good beef continues peak quality at 3-year-low price.

I wish to commend these great retail outlets for being practical about the matter, and for going to this expense in order that the consuming public may

know what a fine grade of beef is available at lower prices than have heretofore been offered. That was the subject of very careful and complete discussions at the great livestock convention in Kansas City on January 5, 6, and 7 of this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address which I delivered at that convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL, OF KANSAS, JANUARY 7, 1953, BEFORE THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

YOU CAN'T EAT GOVERNMENT CONTROLS OR BEEF ROLLBACK ORDERS

One hundred and seventy-seven years ago, the representatives of the Original Thirteen Colonies affixed their names to that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence. That historic document not only proclaimed the independence of the Thirteen Colonies, but laid down these fundamental truths, that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted, which derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

On April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson, addressing the Congress of the United States, asked that body to declare that a state of war existed, to the end that the United States might help to make the world safe for democracy. We went to war to preserve the inheritance that had been passed down to us by the founding fathers, and to make that way of life possible for any other nation that might desire to pattern its course in our footsteps.

From the very inception of our struggle for independence, in the establishment of the fundamental law of the land, the overriding principle has been to guarantee freedom of opportunity for the individual and to insure that government remain the servant, and not the master, of the people. That was the basic foundation upon which our country was established.

From the very beginning of our national life we have zealously guarded the liberty and freedom that has been our heritage. As early as 1778 the American Continental Congress, recognizing inherent dangers found in a doctrine of price control, declared in a formal resolution that—

"It hath been found by experience that limitations on the prices of commodities are not only ineffective for the purposes proposed but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals."

We grew and prospered under the American system of free enterprise. In 1933, however, because of world conditions and circumstances beyond our control, a depression was visited upon us, and with it was born a new, strange philosophy.

For 20 long years we have watched men in high office deliberately, or through sheer ignorance, create one crisis after another, in order to perpetuate themselves in office and to establish a basis or excuse to foist Government control upon the American public.

For many long years we have permitted men to deride and seek to destroy the free enterprise system—the system which our forefathers fought and died for—the system upon which our greatness was built.

For years we have seen many alien concepts foisted upon the American way of life—concepts of socialization and nationalization, philosophies which preach a glorification of weakness, laziness, and dependency, philosophies absolutely contrary to the American way of life.

It is high time that we begin teaching a little Americanism and a little less "one world-ism." It is high time that positive steps be taken to eliminate this so-called controlled economy system and return to the American system which permits men through hard labor, courage, and individual ingenuity to move ahead in life.

It is high time that we return government to the people for whom it was established—and I believe these changes to be on the way.

It is high time that we eradicate from high office in Washington this strange breed of administrators and coordinators who have infested Washington for the past 20 years—remove them and place men in their stead who believe in the philosophy that government is the servant of the people, and not the master. Men who believe in the doctrine of free enterprise.

On April 30, 1953, Public Law 429, which provides the authority for price controls, expires unless it is renewed by act of Congress. It is my intention, in the light of existing conditions, to vigorously oppose the renewal of the section of the law concerning price controls, because I believe it to be a hoax and a fraud perpetrated on the American people for vote-getting purposes. I will not be of that number who remain ignorant, in spite of experience—and the evidence is overwhelming—that throughout all human experience price controls throttle private enterprise, destroy personal freedom, and at their best have always been miserable failures.

The whole direct control program of the administration has been fraudulent since its inception. The administration has been promoting inflation with all the resources at its disposal, while maintaining the myth that the same inflation was being curbed by controls. When the President overrode the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board (which I choose to call the Wage Stimulation Board) in the case of the mine workers, the smoke screen was blown away and the deceit of the entire controls program became clear and apparent.

Everyone, except such as have difficulty with thinking, must realize that the price control program has added to the consumers' food bill, has lowered the producers' income, and has been costly to the processors.

I share your interest in the problems of the cattle industry, for my home State of Kansas can properly be called the livestock State as well as the wheat State.

I wish I could get across to certain bureaucrats in Washington the simple economic fact that government planning and price fixing do not produce meat animals. Whether through sheer ignorance or pure design, some of these fellows just cannot seem to grasp the fact that there is a whale of a difference between the theoretical side and the practical side of raising beef. They just can't seem to realize that the terms "cattle" and "beef" are not synonymous terms.

As you well know, there are two ways to increase our beef supply: One is to produce more cattle, and the other is to put more weight on the existing beef animals. We all know that the range-to-feeder-to-processor method is the way most of our beef gets to the consumer. But the wise boys in control of this program in Washington haven't learned this as yet. These so-called specialists seem to believe that if the Department of Agriculture reports an increase in the number of cattle, that of necessity means an increase in beef for the consumer's table.

They can't seem to get through their heads that when Government controls are slapped on live cattle and rollbacks are threatened, the trade in feeder animals slows down, live and finished weights slacken off; that feeders with no hope of profit quit business, or cut their programs, and the Nation goes back to too many grass-fed beef or short-weight cattle, the net result being the loss of at least one-third of the potential beef supply of the country.

These armchair stockmen can't seem to realize that the raising of livestock is a year-round job, and almost a 3-year job if you want to produce a top-flight animal. That by the time the stockman has combated disease, pestilence, and the weather, it is too much to plague him with governmental restrictions and bureaucratic red tape. They just can't seem to realize that the only way an abundant supply of meat can be assured is to provide conditions that will insure that the business of raising cattle will be profitable.

I believe the feeling of cattlemen is pretty well stated by Joe Finley, Jr., of Encinal, Tex., who wrote the following to Congressman LLOYD M. BENTSEN:

"When Mr. DiSalle can tell me how to make it rain or how to write a regulation that will hold back the frost, or stop a norther, then I'll begin to believe in regulations. But until he can do these things by regulations, I will know that this business of cattle raising just can't be carried on from Washington by a Government agent who never saw a live cow. Let me take my chances with nature, but please save me from the schemes of the do-gooders who sacrifice me and my business in order to develop fine figures and stop beef production."

Yes, today, restrictions are bad enough, but I will long remember the efforts of the controllers and the rollbackers in Washington, who attempted to put the entire cattle industry in an economic straitjacket.

But for the alertness of your leaders, the support of the packing industry, and the help of some of us who are concerned with this great industry, the situation would have been far worse.

Some of you well remember when the controller, Mike DiSalle, in 1951, ordered a 10-cent rollback in the price of beef. The very next day Mr. Eric Johnston approved a wage increase of from 9 to 11 cents to the packing-house workers. On this merry-go-round the consumer, the cattleman, and the taxpayer picked up the check.

If we allow the continuance of price controls on the cattle industry, and administered by people who are not informed as to the hazards and risks inherent in the business, we can expect nothing but turmoil.

You men in the business know that livestock products account for approximately 60 percent of all farm income. With farm wages, taxes, interest rates, and necessary production items going up in cost—and with the price of livestock declining—the eventual result can only be a decline in farm income.

The fact is, that although the year 1952 turned out to be a record production year for agriculture, declining farm-product prices has led to speculation in some circles that a new agricultural recession might be in the making. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two opened with the level of farm prices at 105 percent of parity, but by the end of the year the price level had dropped below the parity goal for the first time in nearly 2½ years.

The net result has been that the amount farmers had left was less than in the previous year, despite the fact that the volume of production was larger. The new income for the year has been officially estimated at $14,200,000,000 compared to $14,300,000,000 in 1951 and a record of $16,700,000,000 in 1947.

Farm price declines, as you well know, were sharpest for beef cattle. They closed the year about 25 percent lower than at the start. The farm debt climbed above the $14,000,000,000 mark, an increase of nearly $2,000,000,000 during the year.

On the other hand, all reliable predictions are that the income of industrial workers will reach a record high in 1953.

If we are to live under controls and price programs, such as we have experienced, it will mean that a squeeze will be put on the livestock producers because it will further hold down the selling price of livestock. And, if history repeats itself, it will hold up the prices of things a livestock farmer has to buy, including feed of all kinds, wages, and machinery.

The fact is that the farmer and the stockman is not as well off as the average city consumer thinks he is, and the American people had better be told about it. It's about time that a lot of this hog wash that has been spread by the controllers in Washington be exposed for what it actually is. It is about time that the American consumer learn the truth about the price-control myth. Well do I know that the American consumer has been led to believe that although prices are high, they would go still higher if it were not for price control. But let's look at the facts.

The price of top fat steers on the Denver market dropped from $40.25 a hundredweight in August of 1948 to $34.50—yet in March 1952 retail prices on T-bone steak went to $1.16 per pound from 85 cents per pound in August 1948; chuck pot roast to 72 cents from 59 cents; and hamburger to 77 cents from 57 cents.

Cattle prices dropped from $30.30 a hundred pounds in April 1951 when OPS ceilings were imposed to $27.20 in January 1952.

During the same period that cattle prices declined nearly 10 percent, the retail price of beef increased. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that steak prices increased from $1.06 in April 1951 to $1.13 in January 1952. Rib roast rose from 85 cents in April to 88 cents in January.

Farmers were receiving an average of 3 cents a pound less for their cattle in January than they were in April. This would ordinarily cause a reduction of 6 cents a pound in the retail price of beef.

Instead of going down 6 cents a pound retail prices under OPS regulations rose 5 cents a pound on round steak and 3 cents a pound on rib roast.

Every one in this audience knows that the price of beef has dropped severely in recent months, and yet this is not reflected in the retail price to the consumer.

Just before leaving Washington I conducted a little survey in the leading chain grocery stores. In every instance for day-in and day-out operations all of the big stores were charging the full OPS ceiling price for the various cuts of beef. Occasionally as a leader, to bring in customers, an advertised special is offered. But the point is that for normal operation the retail outlets consider the OPS ceiling price as the minimum price to be charged the consumer and every one of them puts the price tag on accordingly.

One of the chains refused to handle Good-grade beef. In response to my inquiry as to the reason why, the answer was, "We give the public what it wants; why should we go to the expense of putting on an educational program?"

Three other chains were putting Good-grade beef in their cases for the first time, and selling it, mind you, at ceiling prices, but making no effort to push it.

While prices are being beaten down in the stockyards and in the wholesale markets, they still remain constant on the consumer's table. By keeping meat prices to OPS ceilings, the retailers prevent the normal price fluctuation which would be caused by supply and demand. What is actually happening is, that the ceiling prices established by OPS have become the floor on meat products.

I imagine there isn't a stockman within the sound of my voice who would not be delighted to sell all his cattle at the present OPS ceiling price, but the fact is, those prices are not being offered the producer while they are being charged the consumer. Whereas the OPS prices on live cattle are Prime, yielding 52 percent meat, is $37 a hundredweight; U. S. Choice, yielding 50 percent meat, is $34.20 a hundredweight; U. S. Good, yielding 56 percent, is $31.50 a hundredweight; Commercial, yielding 53 percent, is $27.30 a hundredweight.

These grades on the market do not bring anything like those prices. The retail price of meat has not been reduced proportionately to the consumer because the middlemen are utilizing the lowest price of beef to absorb additional freight and wage increases. The one who suffers, naturally, is the cattleman and farmer.

I know the American consumer has been led to believe that it is the producer who has been getting the lion's share of the money that the housewife pays for food products. But again let's look at the facts. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics the wheat farmers' share of the retail price of bread declined from the post-war high of 23 percent in 1947 to 16 percent in June 1951. Out of the 16 cents that the consumer paid for a loaf of bread, the farmers' share was 2.6 cents.

Out of every dollar that is spent for fruits and vegetables, the farmer gets 31 cents, and 69 cents went to the middleman. Out of every dollar spent for dairy products the farmer got 54 cents, and the middleman got 46 cents. Out of every dollar spent for meat the farmer got 68 cents, and the middleman got 32 cents. Whereas in 1951 the farmer got 50 cents of the consumers' food dollar, and the balance went to the middleman, in 1952 the farmers' share of the consumers' dollar was 46 cents in October—4 cents less than a year earlier and the smallest since Korea.

No one will deny that food prices seem high in comparison with our memories of prices we paid before World War II. But the real test of whether or not food prices are high is to be found when we compare the relationship of food prices to consumer incomes.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food in 1935–39. Today consumers are spending 27 percent of their disposable income for food, but they are eating better.

If the American housewife today would be willing to accept the same quantity and quality of food which cost 23 percent of disposable income in 1935–39, the cost would only be 19 percent instead of 27 percent. In addition to buying more food and higher quality food, the American housewife is demanding better service, better handling, better packaging, and all this costs more money. And let me again remind her that she is paying more for marketing and distributing of food products than she is paying for the food itself.

I am not attempting to speak to you today as an expert, since I am well aware that most of you know more about this subject than I do. I do know that the cattle industry has a problem, and that put together we must intelligently seek a workable solution to it.

If my information is correct, on the present market Choice cattle is bringing 10 percent less than a year ago, while Good grades have suffered a more severe drop of 25 to 30 percent.

Acting in good faith and encouraged by the Government, the American cattleman in 1950 increased his herds in order to make more meat available for the consumer in 1953. The Korean war, the international situation, the high consumer purchasing power, and the increased population were all factors that indicated an expansion in the number of beef cattle needed and desirable. In 1953, therefore, we face the prospect of 93,000,000 or more cattle, over 8,000,000 higher than any time in our history.

The situation has very nearly reversed itself in one short year. Although the supply of Choice is still somewhat short, the supply of Good is glutting the market, and prices have fallen over $9 per hundredweight in 1 year. At these prices you producers who bought cattle 2 years ago, when they were high, are losing your shirts.

It is only natural that when the cattle producer is suffering the losses he is today, he seeks to fix responsibility for the situation upon some group, or upon some Government agency, perhaps.

Since United States Choice graded beef is bringing more money than United States Good, there are many who believe that the solution to the industry's problems lies in the upgrading of beef with resultant higher prices to the producer.

Many of you know my position on this subject. For a long time I have been in favor of greater latitude in meat grading. I realize it is a tremendous problem—it is recognized, also, by all of us that a human element enters into the grading process.

I do not think, however, that it is the immediate solution to your problem.

I took the time to review the records of the Meat Grading Service of the Department of Agriculture, to make sure of some facts and dispel some myths that are prevalent.

Before the days of OPA, in 1940, there were on the average approximately 100 Government graders whose services were requested by the various meat processors who desired to have the meat examined and stamped with the United States Government grade. (Now, the pros and cons of why the meat packers found it advantageous to have Government-graded meat I will not at this time discuss.) The fact is, that the program was initiated at the request of the packing industry.

When the OPA was established and compulsory meat grading became mandatory, the meat-grading services hired a total of 526 graders and 42 supervisors.

The qualifications for those graders were at least 3 years' experience, actively engaged in the grading of meat at wholesale levels. Three-fourths of the graders were recruited from the packing industry.

When OPA was discontinued 200 meat graders were dropped, but the industry still requested the services of 300 graders, the expenses of which, remember, were borne by the packing industry.

In 1947, in the days between OPA and OPS, there was a voluntary grading system, and they had 275 graders and 32 supervisors.

Under OPS in June 1952 there were 531 graders and 63 supervisors, and it is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that in 1953, if OPS is abolished, and we hope it will be, we will have 350 graders and about 50 supervisors under the voluntary system.

I mention these figures because I think it is important that the cattlemen realize that under the voluntary system of grading, approximately 80 percent of the packers will continue to request the services of the Government-grading service.

I do not know, based on the evidence which I have, whether a horde of untrained, inexperienced meat graders has been foisted upon the cattle industry. I would welcome any evidence that sustains the view of those who claim that such has been the case.

Some cattlemen of long experience and sound judgment feel that since the United States grade determines the selling price, the spread between low Choice and high Good should be slight, since the division is almost arbitrary, based upon the individual grader's opinion and judgment.

As an illustration—if the spread between United States Choice and United States Good is 10 cents, whereas in fact the actual value of the beef in the low Choice category as compared with the high Good is only 2 cents, the situation would be remedied if the grading system were adjusted so that an intermediary grading between United States Choice and United States Good could be established—one which would allow a category

into which could be placed the marginal cattle.

This, in the opinion of some, would enable the producer to receive a much better break in the sale of his high Good cattle, which at the present time are just a shade under the United States Choice requirements, and yet which are forced to sell at a price differential of from 10 to 12 cents a pound.

If the spread between Good and low Choice could be reduced, in the opinion of some producers, it would mean as much as from $50 to $60 per head on thousand-pound steer. This would mean the difference between breaking even on a 12-months' operation or a ruinous loss.

I shall do everything within my power to see that OPS is not renewed when it comes to an end in the spring of the year. We will then have a voluntary, and not a compulsory grading system. I will give thoughtful consideration to any suggestions which may emanate from this group or from any committee of this group as to suggested changes in the present grading system which will be helpful to the cattle industry and to the American consumer.

Such proposals as seem to be valid and constructive I will give my fullest support.

As I have studied the present situation in the cattle industry, I have attempted to seek some constructive solution to the problems which face us. I offer several of these for your consideration.

First, if the information which I have from the Department of Agriculture is correct, there will probably be a 15 percent decline in the number of hogs on the market this coming year.

This will undoubtedly increase the price of pork products. Assuming that the purchasing power of the consumer remains at its present high level, and with the normal increase in the beef-eating population, I should imagine that by spring there will be more of a demand on the part of the consuming public for beef. I should think this would stabilize prices to some degree.

Cattle prices are being driven down at the present time, no doubt because there is an oversupply in the market, and bad drought conditions have prevailed in many cattle areas, requiring liquidation.

It is interesting to note my own State of Kansas, reflecting the lower prices for livestock, and the record crop of wheat with livestock producers accounting for only 46 percent of the total farm income during the first 10 months of 1952, compared to 66 percent during the same period last year.

I am sure some of this can be charged to the Government's meddling in the livestock business, causing a downward trend in prices and premature liquidation to get out from under.

In all probability, to prevent too rapid a liquidation and to prevent the losses which face the cattle industry, if these downward trends continue it may be necessary for us to seriously consider longer-range loans of some type, and some type of ceiling or floor, which many of you abhor.

Second, I think the cattle industry, including the retailer, the packer, and the cattle raiser, has a job of merchandising to do. The people of the United States have become educated, perhaps overeducated, on the subject of Choice meat; whereas no comparable effort has been made to point out the very definite advantages to the consumer who wisely selects and uses Good grade of meat. I suggest that there are definite advantages in the use of Good grade meat.

In my opinion, if the cattle industry engaged the services of some independent group to investigate the problem and to launch an educational and merchandising program, tremendous benefits could accrue, and not only to the cattle producers and to others of the industry, but to the American consumer.

My observations have led me to conclude that, regrettable though it may be, the fact is that today, regardless of price differentials, too many American consumers with more money to spend will not buy United States graded Good meat.

There is no rhyme or reason to this purchasing pattern. The cattle industry should not allow the condition to exist when it can be so easily remedied by the education of the consuming public. It is up to the cattle industry—the processing industry and the retailers—to constantly remind the American public that in many instances it is economical and intelligent to buy various grades of meat.

It is high time someone educated the military purchasing agencies also, that Good-grade beef properly prepared, is just as good as Choice.

I have only sympathy for any person who believes that the American farmer and cattleman will raise livestock on which he loses money.

I know that price controls, rollbacks, and tinkering with slaughter quotas will not help your situation—it will only add to your declines, your losses—and discourage the industry that produces meat for consumers.

In closing, I want to say that the men of this industry are to be congratulated on their ruggedness, on their refusal to be subsidized, because you well understand that subsidies and handouts carry with them obligations and the loss of the right to run your own business and accept the hazards that you men are accustomed to accepting.

There seems to be a tendency nowadays to classify these rugged characteristics as old-fashioned, something to be discarded—but I want to say to you that those are fundamental virtues which, if practiced and persevered in, will bring us back to Government policies that have stood this Nation well in former days. The cry for constructive, free enterprise is never greater than at the present time, now when we are at the beginning of the change in Government views.

I think Garet Garrett, the writer, summed up some facts pretty fundamental to consider when in March 1951, he said:

"If private enterprise cannot read it, and read it grimly, not omitting a few tears in the graveyard of its own principles, then one may be permitted to wonder if it knows why it is losing its world to the welfare state. * * *

"What has become of that deep American institution, that unlimited government is the enemy of freedom, and will in the end devour it?

"The importance of getting the question reduced to that form is that all the ideological words are put aside. You look straight at the thing itself; and the thing itself is government.

"The staggering political fact of our time is the sudden rise in the power and authority of government * * * with the consent of the people.

"Continuously, year after year, morning and afternoon, occasion by occasion, the sphere of government expands, the usages of compulsion become more and more familiar, and the world of private enterprise contracts.

"If this continues the sequel may be foretold. You do not have to find the ideological name for it.

"By any name it will be the planned life, in which the individual will have exchanged liberty for status, plus a delusion of security. * * * Events are impatient and swift, and the fatal fact is that many of them are irreversible, at least for a long, long time. To realize this you have only to remember what the world of private enterprise was like less than one generation ago."

So I leave you today with the admonition, keep your livestock industry free, fertile, rugged, and competitive. We are on the road back, and I am hoping controls, roadblocks, and the tinkering of planners, are on the way out. That is the way I shall work, argue, and vote.

THE McCARRAN ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very important editorial on the McCarran Act and on the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, which appeared on the January 3 issue of the New York Journal-American and in all the Hearst publications across the country. This editorial in the Hearst papers represents a reversal of the traditional policy of this chain of newspapers toward immigration. The Hearst policy for years has been in favor of curtailing immigration and establishing the highest possible barriers to further immigration.

In view of the significance of this editorial I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARRAN ACT

We welcome the opposition report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization on the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which went into effect just 10 days ago.

We welcome it because (1) it is of the utmost importance to this Nation, both as concerns its integrity at home and reputation abroad, to set up quotas of admission that will deal fairly on the basis of humanity with those who yearn to work and live in peace among us.

And (2) because it is of supreme importance to this Nation, in the interest of security and strength, to protect itself against admitting those who hate democracy and whose purpose is to destroy it.

SUPPORT REPORT

The report of the President's commission is a summation of months of research and hearings and carries the signatures of distinguished and intelligent men. It has also the endorsement of distinguished and intelligent men.

It cannot be dismissed as a document written in the haste of spleen, nor one that follows an ideological line. We think that Senator PAT MCCARRAN, for whom we have a great deal of admiration, was in error in saying the report was a rehash of the radical, left-wing slant.

Members of the President's Commission included Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; the Reverend Thaddeus F. Gullixson, president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul; and Clarence P. Pickett, honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee.

Among those who endorsed the report were Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston; the Rev. Walter W. van Kirk, executive director of the Department of International Goodwill of the National Council of Churches of Christ; Henry Edward Schultz, national chairman of the Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of the American Jewish Congress.

President-elect Eisenhower indicated during his campaign that he considered certain phases of the law ought to be rewritten. In his October 16 speech he said, "We must resolve * * * to take from our own statute books any legislation that implies the blasphemy against democracy that only cer-

tain groups of Europeans are welcome on American shores."

The chief protest is that by retaining the national-origin system of quotas, the McCarran Act discriminates in favor of northern European countries and against southern and eastern Europe.

TOUGH ON REDS

On the other side, McCARRAN and his associates worked hard and earnestly over this act. The Senator insists his act does not contain one iota of racial or religious discrimination. His act, he says, "is tough, very tough on Communists, criminals and other subversives"—and we would be the last to want to weaken that.

And his act, codifying scrambled legislation accumulating over 150 years, contains progressive measures. It eliminates the bar to naturalization of aliens of Oriental birth, it ends a long-standing ban on Oriental immigration although within strict limits, it eliminates sex discrimination in filling quotas, it accords preference to foreign parents of American citizens, and removes quota restrictions from foreigners married to women who are United States citizens, or the brides of service men.

But the evidence is strong that the McCarran act does contain sections that tend inevitably to racial and religious discrimination and we feel that these sections should be rewritten and amended. The whole matter is of such importance that we think the act should be re-examined, studied, discussed, and argued by the new Congress.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Tuesday next at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, January 20, 1953, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 16, 1953:

IN THE ARMY

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, O10197, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edwin B. Dodson, minister, the Methodist Church, Berryville, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the privilege of working with Thee in the building of a better world. We are grateful for the responsibilities that have been entrusted unto us and we pray for strength to shoulder them in a way that shall be pleasing in Thy sight.

Look graciously upon us as we make our many decisions. May they be tempered not only with wisdom but with a spirit of love and mercy toward all mankind.

Bless us, O Lord, and our friends and our enemies; and may we so conduct ourselves that we can be used by Thee in speeding the day when peace shall reign on earth and good will in the hearts of men.

Hear us as we seek to offer our prayer in the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 14, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PROCEDURE ON TUESDAY NEXT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Tuesday next. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11:30 o'clock Tuesday morning. In order to go out on the official platform, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

That, the Chair thinks, covers the announcement that he was requested to make.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Is it pertinent to the statement that has just been made by the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Similar to it, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is it pertinent to the particular statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Partly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, is it in order now to make a point of order that a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER. It certainly is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I will not make it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan make a point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

TRANSPORTATION OF MEMBERS FOLLOWING INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, many Members have inquired of me, as a member of the Joint Inaugural Committee, with respect to transportation from the Capitol following the inauguration ceremonies to their seats in the reviewing stand for the parade.

The entire parking lot next to the New House Office Building is being reserved for the cars of Members of Congress. No car will be admitted to the lot which does not display the green tag on the windshield. Each Member was given one of these green tags by the Sergeant at Arms.

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol, Members can proceed to get their cars at the parking lot and Pennsylvania Avenue will be open to them until 1:15 to drive to the Ellipse, which is south of the White House on Constitution Avenue. Parking space has been reserved there for the cars of Members of Congress displaying the green tag.

In this connection I call your special attention to the instructions on the back of the green tag.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, now some of us do not have those green tags. The Member from New York tells me she has not, and I have not.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, those tags were put in the package. They came in my package of tickets.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, they did not in mine.

Mr. ARENDS. Here is one that has been handed to me. Will the gentleman look in his package?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if that applies to taxicabs. I have no automobile in Washington, and I will have to use a taxicab, and there are other Members of Congress in the same situation. If we put the tag on, will it be all right?

Mr. ARENDS. If you put the tag on, I think it will work.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the President delivers his message, will seats be available to any but Members and former Members? My point is, Will children be allowed on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is making inquiry with respect to a possible visit of the President later?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; delivery of a message or joint session. The purpose or the reason for it is that at other meetings here we have had as many as three seats occupied by children, and

some former Members as well as some Members could not get in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will investigate the complaint of the gentleman and make a decision later when the occasion arises.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I thought I would save embarrassment for the Members.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 44)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith a report on the operations of the Mutual Security Program covering the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, insofar as statistics are available at this date. Since this is the last such report that I shall furnish to the Congress, I am taking this opportunity to review, in broad outline, the origins of the program, its accomplishments, and the kind of policy decisions that it will present to the new administration and Congress.

In October 1951 the Congress combined most of the major aspects of our international programs in the fields of defense, economic development, and technical assistance into one statute authorizing the Mutual Security Program.

The story of this program and its predecessors is the story of a crowded and dangerous period—a period of historic decisions. And mirrored in the evolution of this program is the story of a great national awakening, of a people in reluctant transition from wishful thinking to a firm acceptance of the responsibilities of free-world leadership.

There is no need here to recall the state of the world at the end of hostilities—the destruction, the dislocations, the misery, and the demoralization of great areas and great segments of humanity. It was natural that American sympathy should go out to peoples everywhere suffering from the aftermath of history's most destructive war—and that our sympathy should be expressed in the form of generous assistance to the hungry and the sick and the displaced.

We already knew from painful experience that what happens in the rest of the world necessarily affects our own domestic life; that we cannot live secure and prosperous, isolated from a world community that is insecure and depressed. But not long after the end of the war we found that the problem was more than just physical relief from disaster. Gradually we realized that the world was suffering not only from the wreckage and wastage of war, but from deep social unrest—and from the predatory acts and intentions of a former ally.

In 1947 we were faced with a great decision. The British could no longer afford to carry the burden of support to the Greek Nation in its fight against Communist insurrection. On March 12, 1947, I addressed the Congress and explained the urgent need for a program of military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey, which was also under Communist pressure. In that address I reminded the Congress that the problems of Greece and Turkey were parts of a fundamental challenge facing the American people, and I said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.
>
> I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.
>
> I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes.

The implications of these propositions soon became clear, as did the next steps that needed to be taken on the difficult course upon which we were embarked. The scattered aid that we were giving—to Greece and Turkey and China in the form of military and economic aid, to France and Italy and Austria in the form of grant economic assistance, to Great Britain in the form of a loan, and to many countries through support of the United Nations special agencies—clearly was not adequate in amount or in form.

For in early 1948—just 5 years ago—large areas of Greece were still held by the still-powerful Communist forces.

Across the Adriatic Sea from Greece, 5 years ago, a new democratic government in Italy faced an election in a chaotic country—an election which, it was widely feared, might be won by the Communists.

Across the Alps in France there were unemployment and increasing hunger, black markets, and strikes—and bankruptcy ahead.

On the other side of the English Channel the British people were struggling against terrible odds to repair the dreadful damage of war and to feed a population which grows about one-third of the food it needs.

Western Germany lay prostrate, and the Kremlin was completing its plans to drive the Western Allies out of Berlin.

The peoples of Western Europe, aided by stop-gap American help, had made a gallant effort to get up and stand on their own feet after the end of World War II, but the odds were too great. The inescapable fact was that they did not have and could not earn the dollars they needed to buy the things that were required to restore economic and social order in time to prevent chaos. In desperation, they were forced to seek relief in nationalistic economic and financial restrictions which, in the end, could only make the situation worse.

It was a situation that was made to order for the Kremlin—and the Kremlin made the most of it by promoting strikes and riots, by sabotaging recovery through its puppet Communist Parties, by political maneuver, and by massive injections of propaganda. It looked as if Western Europe might well fall to the Communists through economic and political collapse.

That, in broadest outline, was the state of Europe and its dependencies, and it boded no good for the peace of the world nor for the security of the United States.

Elsewhere in the world, the symptoms were not less alarming. The forces of Nationalist China were giving way before the Communists; fighting was under way in Indochina; there was violence in Burma and in Malaya; in Indonesia a new state was emerging with difficulty and uncertainty; the subcontinent of India had been divided and the long struggle for national security and stability was just beginning; Iran and Turkey were still subject to Soviet pressure. There were other areas of danger and potential danger in the Middle East, north Africa, and elsewhere.

The threat that this posed to the security of the United States needs no emphasis.

On both sides of the Atlantic the realization was growing that the problem of restoring economic and social stability in Europe could not be solved cheaply or quickly—nor by separate national efforts. What was required was a sustained cooperative undertaking. The ground work for this was laid in an address in June 1947, by Secretary of State Marshall. He said that if the nations of Europe would come together and prepare a plan of self-help and mutual aid, the United States was prepared to provide the critical margin needed for a successful recovery program. He specifically stated:

> It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.

That meant—among other things—that if the Soviet Union were prepared to enter into a cooperative international program of economic recovery, the United States would help in that endeavor.

This put Soviet policy to the test, and it soon became clear what the real Soviet intentions were with respect to Western Europe. When the then foreign ministers of the United Kingdom and France issued invitations to all of the governments of Europe to meet and discuss the implications of this American proposal, Mr. Molotov came to the conference, denounced the whole idea, and walked out to set up the Cominform which promptly set out to sabotage the recovery of Western Europe. The Soviet-dominated nations of Eastern Europe were forbidden by the Kremlin to participate in the European Recovery Program, but 18 nations enthusiastically went ahead with this unprecedented international venture. By spring of 1948 the Congress had enacted the Economic Cooperation Act which got the Program under way and a scant 2 years later, these things had happened:

The industrial production of Western Europe had greatly exceeded prewar levels, and agricultural production had almost recovered.

The dollar deficit in the balance of payments of all the 18 countries participating in the recovery program had been reduced from $7 billion in 1947 to less than $2 billion in 1950.

Trade among the participating countries had more than doubled.

With the exception of Italy, Germany, and Belgium there was virtually full employment.

Rationing of almost all consumer items had been abolished and recourse to black markets for the necessities of life had been virtually eliminated.

Relative industrial peace had been established.

Measured by all indexes—parliamentary strength, party membership, membership in Communist trade-unions, circulation of party newspapers, et cetera—Communist strength in Western Europe was on the wane.

The organization for European Economic Cooperation was providing general direction to the recovery program on a basis of unprecedented international cooperation; Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg were forging an economic union; the Council of Europe had been established; and the idea of European unification was gaining ground.

The principle of common defense of the west was accepted and the first great organizational steps were taken. In 1948, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg concluded a defense treaty and established central headquarters in France. In April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization had been established linking together the greatest potential aggregation of military power, industrial strength, and human skills ever brought together in a common enterprise. Shortly thereafter, the Congress enacted the Mutual Defense Assistance Act to contribute to a moderate increase in the military defenses of the free world.

The statistical story of physical recovery during the first 2 years of the European recovery program was deeply impressive. But more important than exact quantitative measurements was the reversal of trends toward economic deterioration, political weakness, and spiritual despair and the emergence of trends toward economic growth, political strength, and spiritual hope. By far the major part of this record was due to the efforts of the Europeans and the vitality and imagination of European statesmanship. The role of the United States was to supply the missing elements without which the program could not be undertaken.

All this was accomplished in spite of every effort—diplomatic pressure, political intrigue, propaganda onslaught, and actual sabotage—on the part of the Communist Parties of Western Europe to wreck this program.

In short, by 1950, the Kremlin's plot to take over Western Europe had been frustrated: The nations of Western Europe were still free, still democratic, and had new hopes and a new faith in the future. There was no longer any great likelihood that Western Europe would collapse internally and fall into the arms of the Kremlin.

Meanwhile, China had fallen to the Communists and the Nationalist Chinese had retreated to Formosa. The China-aid program, conducted by the Economic Cooperation Administration, was continued in Formosa and, under special authorization, funds from that program were used in other far eastern countries which were either subject to direct or indirect Communist attack or were in economic difficulties. In addition, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act had made funds available to provide military equipment required by these countries to combat overt Communist efforts to take them by force. Despite the serious impact on the economy of Formosa of the arrival of thousands of refugees, the island was kept away from the Communists and the first steps had been taken to relieve the impact upon its economy. This assistance, particularly to Indochina, began to have effect in building up strength to resist direct or indirect Communist aggression. In short, the Kremlin's plot to take over all of Asia had been frustrated also.

By 1950 we were starting the next great step on the difficult course upon which we had embarked in 1947—the point 4 program to provide the technical assistance needed to lay the basis for economic and social progress in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Working directly with individual nations, and through the United Nations, we began the long process of attacking hunger, disease, and illiteracy. Programs began to take shape to bring scientific knowledge and modern techniques to the underdeveloped areas, mainly in the fields of agriculture, public health, and education.

Hope for a decent life had begun to dawn for tens of millions in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

But in the fall of 1949 the Soviet Union had produced its first successful atomic explosion. In the summer of 1950 came the Kremlin's decision to test the courage and the will of the free world by instigating aggression in Korea. These two events forced the United States and its allies to shift regrettably from a program which emphasized economic recovery to a program which emphasized urgent rearmament, especially in Europe. Rearmament on the scale undertaken after the Korean invasion could not even have been considered had it not been for the economic recovery and the restoration of hope and confidence that already had taken place.

Since 1950, our principal efforts in the Atlantic community of nations have been directed toward the establishment of military security.

And since then these things have happened:

The first international military command in the peacetime history of the world has become a going concern.

The NATO nations, originally 12 and now 14, have agreed on a common strategic plan for the common defense.

These nations are building, together, balanced collective forces.

Armed forces of the original NATO nations have more than doubled and to those have been added the powerful forces of Turkey and Greece.

Intensive joint training exercises and war games have been carried out on land, sea, and in the air by the armed forces of many nations.

The consultative machinery originally established under NATO has been transformed into a permanent working organization.

While the nations of Western Europe and the Atlantic world are not yet secure against Soviet invasion, they have created and will continue to strengthen a powerful military deterrent to any aggression.

At the same time there has been real progress toward the establishment of a Western European community of nations, including the Federal Republic of Germany. The Schuman plan—one of the most imaginative acts of statesmanship in our times—has led to the establishment of a six-nation merger of coal and steel resources. The same six nations are considering ratification of a treaty to establish a common defense force with a common budget under supranational control; other projects are pending for economic integration; and work has been started on a draft constitution for political federation. There have been disappointments and setbacks; we face a number of difficult problems right now. But, over-all, the movement toward greater unity in Europe is still continuing.

In short, what began as international cooperation for economic recovery in Western Europe is growing into collective defense, economic integration, and political unity. This is one of the most hopeful—and essential—developments in our time.

All this has been accomplished despite every effort short of general war which the Kremlin could devise to stop us. It has been done, too, with conscious regard for the economic and social consequences of the diversion of resources from economically constructive purposes to the military program that has been forced upon us.

Since 1950 the United States—principally through the Mutual Security Program—has been helping many nations outside of Europe to strengthen their military security. We helped equip the armed forces of France and the Associated States of Indochina in their gallant and exhausting fight against Communist insurrection; we helped supply the forces of the Philippines to put down the Communist-inspired Huk rebellion; we concluded mutual defense treaties with Japan and with the Philipines; we completed a tripartite treaty with Australia and New Zealand for common defense of the South Pacific; we provided both military and economic assistance to the free Chinese on Formosa; we continued to help bolster Iranian defenses; and we are helping to supply our Latin American friends with military equipment in line with the Western Hemisphere defense alliance concluded in the Rio Pact.

The heavy emphasis we have placed on military preparedness in the past few years has been brought about because we have been confronted with a military threat, because we and the other free nations considered it urgent to mobilize the military and industrial resources of the free world for mutual defense against this threat, and because the initiative in this imperative task clearly lay with the United States.

But we have not lost sight of the fact that the Soviet design for conquest counts on subversion as well as military aggression. In contrast to the false

promises of food and better living conditions offered by the Communists, we have joined with other peoples, particularly in the underdeveloped areas, in tangible cooperative programs that strike directly at hunger, disease, and illiteracy. We have aided and participated in basic economic development projects in many parts of the world. Technical assistance programs are now under way in 41 countries and also in many overseas territories of European nations.

These programs of technical assistance would be vitally important quite apart from the existence of the Communist conspiracy. Our basic desire is to help other people to help themselves build decent conditions of life in which they can find political and social security. When we strike against the enemies of mankind—poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease—we work for freedom also; when we build the conditions in which freedom can flourish we destroy the conditions under which totalitarianism can grow. Moreover, the resulting increase in production and trade help, in turn, not only the underdeveloped countries but also the United States and the whole free world.

The present Mutual Security Program has grown, by evolutionary steps, from our first postwar efforts to bring relief from the destruction of World War II. Today it combines our major efforts to win a global struggle against totalitarianism and misery.

It is appropriate and desirable for the new administration and the Congress to review the Mutual Security Program. Any program that occupies such a central part of our foreign policy structure, that requires such a large investment of our resources, that affects so many people in so many ways, should be so reviewed as a matter of course.

The rapid pace of events would itself require a reevaluation at this time to determine the appropriateness of the timing, the scope, and the emphasis of the Mutual Security Program. Without seeking to influence such a review, it may be helpful to the new administration and the Congress to indicate what appear to me to be several basic considerations to be taken into account.

We know that the men now in the Kremlin are the center of a vast conspiracy whose inexorable purpose is to blot out human freedoms throughout the world because those who direct this conspiracy deny the worth of the individual human being and despise the concept of human dignity. It is clear that the threat directed against us is simultaneously military, economic, political, and psychological; that it might move more aggressively with any or several of these weapons in any number of places at any time; and that a prime objective of current Soviet strategy is to split the free world and especially to destroy the unity of the western alliance, that it may divide and conquer.

Clearly we cannot undertake to do all of the things that we should like to do to meet and overcome this threat everywhere and simultaneously. In the end certain choices have to be made—hard choices based on the best judgment we can bring to bear—as to how we shall allocate our great but not unlimited resources between use at home and use abroad, between use in various areas of the world, and between various types of programs designed primarily to strengthen our defenses, strengthen the free-world economies, or strengthen the political and social forces that are working generally for the preservation and extension of freedom.

We must face the existence of a major military threat and the consequent economic burdens of rearmament and yet we must also continue to strengthen our economies apd to help build sound political and social institutions upon which free societies rest; we must honor our military commitments in the Far East and recognize the military problems in other parts of the world and yet we must also preserve in our pursuit of military security in the North Atlantic area; we must be prepared to cope with unpredictable crises and yet we must design and administer our programs with a view to the long pull ahead.

There is no longer any responsible body of opinion in the United States that questions the rightness of the concept of mutual security in the free world nor of the need for American leadership and the investment of American resources in this common enterprise. The questions that arise concern mainly the relationship of the Mutual Security Program to our over-all political, military, and economic policies; the magnitude of the program; the proper balance between military, economic, and technical assistance that should apply within the program; the proper emphasis of effort by geographic area; and choices involved between the relatively short-term results and the relatively long-term results that we are seeking.

There are three aspects of these difficult problems which I think should be given particular attention:

1. The Mutual Security Program must be viewed within the framework of foreign and national security policy as a whole and tailored so as to provide the maximum support to that policy. This requires a grasp of complex interrelationships. We must understand that the requirements of our own Armed Forces have to be related to the requirements of the armed forces of our friends and allies, based upon a recognition that the security of the United States depends upon strong military defenses beyond our shores. We must recognize that the need for assistance has to be tied to achievement of stated foreign policy objectives—for example, the ability of France to sustain the military burden of war in Indochina directly affects her position in the North Atlantic Alliance and the progress of the European Defense Community. We must realize that the development of strong economic and social institutions in the free world is dependent upon increased productivity and economic growth in the underdeveloped areas. In particular, we must appreciate the relationship between our foreign economic policies and our domestic economic policies which are, in fact, so closely interrelated as to be, for most practical purposes, inseparable. Fluctuations in the general level of business activity in this country can have a profound impact on the economies of other nations; the continued expansion of our own industrial economy depends directly upon increased production abroad of essential raw materials; the role of United States private investment abroad and United States public loan policies affect the ability of other countries to develop and become independent of United States aid; our tariff policies and customs procedures have a great deal to do with the ability of other nations to earn their own way in the dollar markets. All these factors act and react on each other. If we are to make the greatest possible progress and the most effective use of our resources, all of our policies and programs—foreign and domestic—must be internally consistent and must mutually support each other.

2. Programs to help build collective strength in the free world can no longer be considered as emergency measures, but as essential to the security of the United States in the cold war struggle which may be with us for a long time. We have a great stake in maintaining strong economies and strong defenses among the nations of the free world and for some time to come this will require assistance on the part of the United States. As for the underdeveloped areas of the free world, economic development and technical assistance programs are long-range by nature.

The time has come to stop thinking about mutual defense and foreign economic programs as stopgap measures and to think about them as activities which for the sake of our own security require considerable forward planning. I do not mean to suggest that grants from this Government should continue indefinitely. But so long as there is need for any aid, there will also be need for careful planning on a longer and more consistent basis than has been provided by our traditional process of annual appropriations. We must work out measures which will enable longer range planning than is now possible, without impairing the proper responsibilities of the Congress for appropriating funds and overseeing their expenditure.

We must all realize that the Mutual Security Program is a joint endeavor requiring substantial contributions by each and every partner, because the program is directed at objectives in which all participants have a large common interest. For our sake and for our partners' sake, it will be desirable to develop a longer range approach than the 1-year review and renewal of our programs which has been the practice since the end of the Marshall plan.

3. We need to examine anew our programs in the underdeveloped areas. It has become increasingly clear that the steady but slow contributions from technical assistance must be complemented, in one form or another, by capital development. Funds are needed to help the underdeveloped countries build such key facilities as dams, power plants, and transport, and to increase the production of basic commodities—raw materials and food—which are essential to the achievement of an expanding free-world economy, including our own.

There are several other aspects of the Mutual Security Program that warrant

study and possible adjustment. For example, we need to find methods to expedite delivery of end-item military equipment and to achieve the optimum volume of offshore procurement. Naturally, the essential requirements of Korea and other active combat areas must first be satisfied. But, beyond this, in allocating military equipment, we must hold to the principle that those who may be called upon to fight first should be adequately equipped first. The armed forces of our allies in Europe and in critical areas in other parts of the world are manning the frontiers of freedom. We will be sacrificing a substantial measure of our own security if we do not see to it that these forces are speedily and adequately equipped.

With respect to offshore procurement, we need to recognize that the development of a production base abroad is essential if the free world is to have the necessary equipment and supplies should war come and if our friends and allies are to be in a position ultimately to assume responsibility for their own defense. Mutual security funds must be so directed as to assure achievement of this basic security objective.

We need to keep constantly in mind the crucial fact that the end objective of mutual security arrangements is the preservation and strengthening of free-world unity. The essential unity of aims and major policies of the western alliance is so steadfast that we can afford to disagree over details and methods. This, in fact, is the basic strength of a democratic relationship—that we each have views and express them—and then work out our differences. But we must be forever alert to the certain efforts that will be made by the Kremlin to seize these differences and exploit them as issues, to convince our friends and allies that they have lost their independence and that the United States is using the lever of "aid" to coerce its allies into following policies and programs unilaterally laid down in Washington. The donor-recipient relationship—the suggestion of charity—implicit in the term "foreign aid" is psychologically unhealthy. It is well known that this has caused increasing anxiety on the part of some of our allies. We may regard this as a welcome sign of independence and vitality on the part of people who rightly resent any suggestion of United States dominance over their own affairs. The term "foreign aid" is obsolete, unsound and unworthy as a conceptual basis for the great ventures in international partnership upon which we are engaged. As partners in a free association of independent nations we have grown in strength and unity. As such—but only as such—can we find together still greater strength and greater unity.

It has been our conscious purpose to maintain a high degree of flexibility in the Mutual Security Program. Such flexibility implies the need for continuing review and reevaluation by both the Congress and the executive branch. I am pleased and proud that as I leave office the Mutual Security Program is a going concern with a record of splendid accomplishment. The great forward strides toward collective defense, toward economic progress, and toward free world unity that have taken place under the Mutual Security program will stand out as dramatic and historic accomplishments in the twentieth century struggle for peace and decency for mankind.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1953.*

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee, which was read:

JANUARY 16, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. SCHEER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1953.*

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 64)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, Eighty-first Congress, I transmit herewith the Second Annual Report of the National Science Foundation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1953.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement to our side that we are calling a conference of all the Republican Members to meet here in the Chamber at 10 o'clock next Monday morning, with the view of presenting there to the Republican Members the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for committee assignments. Those committee assignments as recommended by the committee will be made public today. The action of the conference, of course, will be the final action on them, it being our purpose then to present the Republican assignments on committees to the House for action at noon on Monday next.

THE FEDERAL SALES TAX ON INEXPENSIVE HANDBAGS, TOILET PREPARATIONS, AND ELECTRIC-LIGHT BULBS SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, tax reductions are on everyone's mind. One-third of the average person's income today is consumed by direct taxation on the Federal, State, and local levels. Indirect taxes and excise taxes add to this tax burden. It is the consensus that something must be done to relieve our citizens of this back-breaking burden before we reach the point of diminishing returns and stultify ambition and thrift.

Before we talk about general tax reductions, however, careful study should be made of some of our present laws to see whether first priority should not be accorded to rectifying unfair and discriminatory provisions in existing tax laws. I refer specifically to certain Federal sales taxes, euphemistically designated excise taxes.

To illustrate, in levying the Federal sales taxes, we have discriminated against American womanhood. I say it is time to give women the break they deserve.

These taxes have hit hard the women's pocketbooks theoretically and literally. The taxes on women's purses are topped only by those on cosmetics. And who can dispute that cosmetics for our attractive American women today are necessities?

How anyone can imagine that a woman's purse is a luxury is something I cannot understand. There are 13 pockets in the man's average suit. It seems just as sensible to tax these pockets. They serve the same purpose. Yet what

a howl would arise, were we to equalize the burden thrown on the women by adding a Federal sales tax to men's suits as a luxury tax on pockets. The tax on women's purses costing less than $15, and on toilet preparations should be terminated.

The removal of this 20-percent sales tax certainly would not break the Government but to the individual woman in modest circumstances, this extra cost is a distinct hardship. It hits hardest those who can least afford to pay.

There is a very serious question whether, even from a dollar-and-cents standpoint, this tax adds 1 cent more to the Federal Treasury than it would gain in increased sales if the excise tax on purses and cosmetics were removed. Therefore, I am today reintroducing a bill to terminate these sales taxes on inexpensive handbags, toilet preparations, and on another household necessity, electric-light bulbs.

We are justly proud of the appearance of our American women. I see no sense in penalizing them and discriminating against them. Let them have their less-expensive handbags tax free, although their contents still confuse me. Let them gild the lily by permitting them to buy their cosmetics without these sales taxes which add 20 percent to the cost of their loveliness.

To indicate that I am not alone in my opinion of this discriminatory tax, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Brighton-Pittsford Post entitled "Why Not Tax Men's Pockets, They Tax Women's Carrying Rights":

WHY NOT TAX MEN'S POCKETS, THEY TAX WOMEN'S CARRYING RIGHTS

The place where the Federal Government hits the ladies worst, is right in the pocketbook.

Every time milady buys a handbag of leather, she must hand the Federal Government 20 percent for the privilege of carrying her vital necessities.

Here is one place where laws made by men have little understanding of the little lady's needs.

Where in the world can a lady put all her change, keys, notebooks, pencils, pens, lipstick, and comb, if she doesn't have a handbag to put them in?

Pockets are a man's luggage compartments, and in profusion and in every nook and cranny about his person are pockets so lavishly built in, as to make the misplacing of any little item, a matter of utter confusion and an FBI intensive search before the lost article is brought to light.

Did any Federal lawmaker ever suggest putting a tax on men's pockets? At a modest tax per pocket, the Federal Government could clean up.

But taking advantage of a poor woman who never had a pocket beyond decorative design in all her clothes all her life, the Federal Government taxes her right to carry her belongings about with her with a nice fat tax wallop right in her pocketbook. Before she even starts doing business with the merchant, before she can step out on the street casually dressed for morning shopping, she first pays tribute to Uncle Sam for carrying a stout leather handbag with her.

At least, if only for chivalry, for courtesy, by the same token which bids a man to lift his hat when he meets a lady on the street, the legislators in Washington should try to give the ladies a lift for 1953 by so readjusting this 20 percent tax, as to make certain price limit bags tax-exempt, and others graduated, if taxed at all.

EFFICIENCY OF PUBLIC SAFETY AGENCIES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, disaster strikes without warning. Yesterday two tragic happenings marred the pre-inaugural celebration here in Washington. A runaway train crashed into the Union Station, injuring more than two score people and a fire and explosion in the northeast section of the city yesterday injured an additional 40 persons, including the Chief of the Washington Fire Department, Millard Sutton, who is in critical condition at Casualty Hospital.

Of particular significance was the immediate and effective work of policemen, firemen and resuce workers, nurses, doctors, and emergency agencies. There was no panic in any case, and the conduct of all concerned is a credit to previous training and calm judgment.

Public safety agencies are efficient only to the extent that they are prepared to meet the totally unexpected disasters and the urgent requirements of emergency. In this regard the public safety forces of Washington measured up yesterday to a standard of which any city in the land might well be proud.

All are deserving of a well done from the Congress, and it is the sincere hope of all of us that the injured will soon be returned to full health.

AMENDMENT TO RECLAMATION ACT OF 1939

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to curb the arbitrary and undemocratic method used by the Secretary of the Interior in the authorization of public works projects. Under the present law the Secretary can make a report of engineering feasibility and authorize the project, thereby bypassing the regular committees of Congress.

My bill will require the Secretary of the Interior, in addition to the finding of engineering feasibility, to report a breakdown of cost and uses to be derived from the project. His findings would not be effective until the Secretary has submitted to the Congress such report with the comments of the President and the affected State or States, and the Congress shall have approved such report.

This bill will give flexibility to the Secretary of the Interior, at the same time protecting the interests of the areas affected and retain to the Congress its legislative prerogatives.

FARM PROGRAM

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills—companions to like bills introduced in the Senate today by Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota. Both are agricultural bills and both set forth the views expressed by President-elect Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn., and at Brookings, in my home State of South Dakota, last fall during the campaign.

Declining farm prices and increasing operating costs present one of the most serious domestic problems facing this Congress. In my State of South Dakota, according to the State Federal Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, farm prices dropped 6 percent between November 15 and December 15, last. Commodity prices were below a month ago by the following amounts: Cattle $2.90 a hundredweight, hogs 50 cents a hundredweight, and lambs 90 cents a hundredweight, butterfat 3 cents a pound, eggs 6 cents per dozen, and rye 5 cents a bushel. The farmers' share of the consumer dollar is the lowest since the war. On the other hand, the farmers' operating costs are the highest in history, with no relief in sight. This, then, is the agricultural picture as we shift from Democratic to Republican administration. It is up to the Republican administration to stop this disastrous trend before it is too late. With that thought in mind, I have introduced these two bills which will act as a check on the tailspin we now find agriculture in.

One of the bills that I have introduced, Mr. Speaker, would extend the life of the present 90-percent support program through the years 1955, 1956, and 1957. The present 90-percent support program expires in 1954. By extending the life of this program for three additional years, we will assure the farmers of this country that we will not let them down. In the meantime, we should bend every effort to find a program that will give our farmers full 100 percent of parity which they are justly entitled to. Mr. Speaker, this extension of the present 90-percent support program is absolutely necessary because farmers do not operate on a year-to-year basis, but the farmer operates in the future in much the same manner that the manufacturer or processor does. The only protection for the farmer in this planning ahead is a program of long duration.

At Kasson, Minn., President-elect Eisenhower said in substance that oats, barley, rye, and soybeans should be given the same protection that is available to the major cash crops. The second bill I have introduced would accomplish just that. It would extend the 90-percent support program to oats, barley, rye, soybeans, and grain sorghums. In all fairness, producers of oats, barley, rye, soybeans, and grain sorghums should be given the same protection, as President-elect Eisenhower said, as is given

under the present law to corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

I sincerely hope that the House Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, will give early consideration to both of these bills which are so important to the welfare, not only of our farmers, but the country as a whole.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE NARCOTICS SITUATION

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would increase the penalties for violation of certain narcotic laws. One can scarcely pick up a newspaper today that does not give an account of one or more arrests of individuals who are trafficking in narcotics of some nature.

It seems certain that laws already enacted do not offer a sufficient deterrent to those, with plunder in their hearts, who would degrade the morals and undermine the health of our people. Before coming to the Congress I spent many years in the field of education on both the high-school and college level, and I look with horror upon the devastating effect of narcotic drugs upon the young people of our country, not to mention the all too frequent examples set by their elders.

It is my hope that something will be done in this session of the Congress to remedy a situation which has reached alarming proportions in many sections of the Nation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ACCIDENTS SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Washington was shocked by the runaway train accident, the Federal Express from Boston, which came into Union Station on yesterday. I would like to commend the engineer for riding to what he must have known or thought was his certain death, and also I want to commend the behavior of all the persons connected with the accident. I am asking the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation immediately. During World War II I was in an accident at the Baltimore Tunnel. My arm was cut. Shortly afterward, I was in a stateroom and the shade came down and shattered all over me. Fortunately, I sustained only minor cuts.

We have had too many railroad accidents such as the ones on the Long Island railroads in New York and on the troop trains in the South. These accidents are too frequent. A complete and exhaustive investigation should be made. It is a horrible thing to have defective machinery in our transportation systems.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 94

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the railroad accident which occurred in the District of Columbia on January 15, 1953, when a runaway locomotive and train crashed into the concourse of the Union Station, giving particular attention to the causes of such accident and the possibility that sabotage, or other damage maliciously or intentionally inflicted upon the operating mechanism of the train, was involved.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Supenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION AND A PROCEDURAL INNOVATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I can readily realize the concern that is felt by each Member of this body with respect to the catastrophe of yesterday to which reference has just been made. I refer to what happened at the railway terminal in Washington, the subject matter of which comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I wish to assure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and all other Members, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is aware of the accident, and as soon as the committee is appointed, this matter will be given consideration by that committee.

I also wish to bring to the attention of the House what might seem to be an innovation with respect to a committee procedural matter. I am certain it will meet with the approval of the entire membership. I shall speak for only a moment at this time about the contemplated program of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which I have referred.

I realize that it is a little early to do so, since the committee has not yet been formally organized, but I wish now to indicate some of the plans so that the Members of the House may be informed, and so that the various agencies concerned may give their attention to it during the interim until the Committee commences to function.

First. The Members of the House who introduce bills which are referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration will be invited to appear before the full committee to outline and to discuss the reasons for the proposed legislation. I earnestly hope that each Member will avail himself of this opportunity to appear before the committee on the measures which he sponsors.

For this purpose a day will be set aside each week to hear the sponsors of legislation introduced during the preceding week and referred to the committee. This will give an opportunity to Members of the House to have a quick and preliminary hearing on their bills. It will enable the committee to judge the importance of the legislation and thereby assist the committee in determining the relative importance of the proposed legislation and its proper place on the calendar for full hearing. Thus the committee members will have full knowledge of all pending legislation before the committee.

On each of said designated days in addition to hearing the sponsors of legislation, the committee will also be glad to hear from any member as to any subject which they may feel should be brought to the attention of the committee for examination and investigation. I am most hopeful that the Members of the House will feel constrained to take advantage of this invitation. It is our desire that every Member shall feel the utmost freedom in bringing to our attention in this informal manner from time to time such general subjects falling within the committee jurisdiction which it is believed the committee should look into and consider. I am very desirous that the committee prove to be the helpful and useful agent of the House in carrying out the purposes for which you have created it.

Secondly, the various agencies falling within the committee's jurisdiction under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the rules of the House, will be requested to appear before the committee and review with us their work and the operation of the statutes which they administer. This will serve the purpose both of acquainting the new members on the committee with the

scope and composition of the agencies, and of providing opportunity for the committee again to be brought up to date on what these agencies are doing.

This review of each agency will encompass: (a) its jurisdiction; (b) its organization; (c) its administrative policies; and (d) such changes, additions, or modifications in these which their administrative experience may suggest.

Thirdly, the various persons and industries affected by such legislation and subject to the administrative procedures of these agencies will be invited to discuss with us their opinions as to the effectiveness of the administration and to suggest any changes which their experience during the years indicate now may be desirable in the public interest.

In connection with this review with the agencies and with affected persons, I am concerned primarily with fundamental issues and policies and not with small or inconsequential procedural details, unless such have an over-all adverse effect on the work of the agency.

A number of years have passed since most of the legislation was enacted and the agencies established. It seems most appropriate, therefore, now to review them in the light of the accumulated experience of these years, to reexamine the basic purposes underlying the statutes, the reasons prompting the original enactment, their continuing application and desirability, the changes which time may have shown appropriately should be made or new legislation required, all from the viewpoint of most fully and effectively meeting the public interest.

Some of the subject matters under the committee's jurisdiction which will be taken up under the program I have described are:

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ADMINISTERING LAWS RESULTING FROM BILLS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COMMITTEE

First. Department of Commerce:
(a) Bureau of Standards.
(b) Civil Aeronautics Administration.
(c) Weather Bureau.
(d) Inland Waterways Corporation.

Second. Department of the Interior:
(a) Oil and Gas Division.
(b) Oil interstate compacts.

Third. Federal Communications Commission.

Fourth. Federal Power Commission.

Fifth. Federal Security Agency:
(a) Public Health Service.
(b) Food and Drug Administration.
(c) Social Security Board—in connection with Railroad Retirement funds.

Sixth. Federal Trade Commission.

Seventh. Interstate Commerce Commission:
(a) Railroads generally.
(b) Motor carriers.
(c) Freight forwarders.
(d) Certain inland water carriers.
(e) Standard time regulations.
(f) Petroleum pipelines.

Eighth. Railroad Retirement Board.

Ninth. National Mediation Board—re railroad labor.

Tenth. Petroleum.

Eleventh. National Science Foundation.

Twelfth. Civil Aeronautics Board.

Thirteenth. War Claims Commission.

Fourteenth. Department of Justice: Office of Alien Property.

Fifteenth. Securities and Exchange Commission.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

VIRGINIA APPLE CIDER VINEGAR

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the last session, the Congress enacted an amendment to the Defense Production Act providing that no price ceiling should be placed on any fruit or vegetable in fresh or processed form.

I hold in my hand a ruling of OPS that vinegar made from Virginia apples is not fruit in processed form. I do not want to elaborate on the opinion, but it states that the vinegar is an alcoholic beverage. Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice that our Republican friends have received a great deal of publicity lately relative to the sale of alcoholic beverages in the new and fancy clubhouse of theirs here on the Hill, and I rise to suggest that they will get along better if they drink Virginia vinegar instead of any other form of alcoholic beverage. Some of my friends amongst the Republican leadership, judging from the expressions on some of their faces, must have been drinking vinegar as a beverage for a long time. But I recommend to them that in that new and fancy clubhouse, when the waiter asks: "What'll you have?", they say: "Make mine Virginia vinegar, the finest cocktail ever served, according to the OPS."

TIDELANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to voice my most emphatic objection to the action of the President in attempting again fraudulently to deprive the people of Texas of their rights and true title to the so-called tidelands. This, unfortunately, is simply another attempt on the part of the Socialists in the administration to find some way whereby they can perpetuate the injustice which the American people clearly voted in the last election to correct. They are now attempting by this illegal method to do that which they cannot get the Congress to do, and they strike me as a bunch of thieves who have been caught in the act and are now trying to find a legal hole in which they can hide the swag.

THE PRESIDENT'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO THE NATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of President Truman's television and radio address of Thursday, January 15, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

I am happy to have this opportunity to talk to you once more before I leave the White House.

Next Tuesday, General Eisenhower will be inaugurated as President of the United States. A short time after the new President takes his oath of office, I will once again be a plain, private citizen of this Republic.

That is as it should be. Inauguration Day will be a great demonstration of our democratic process. I am glad to be a part of it—glad to wish General Eisenhower all possible success, as he begins his term—glad the whole world will have a chance to see how simply and how peacefully our American system transfers the vast power of the Presidency from my hands to his. It is a good object lesson in democracy. I am proud of it, I know you are, too.

During the last 2 months, I have done my best to make this transfer an orderly one. I have talked with my successor on the affairs of the country, both foreign and domestic, and my Cabinet officers have talked with their successors. I want to say that General Eisenhower and his associates have cooperated fully in this effort. Such an orderly transfer from one party to another has never taken place before in our history. I think a real precedent has been set.

In speaking to you tonight, I have no new revelations to make—no political statements—no policy announcements. There are simply a few things in my heart I want to say to you. I want to say good-by and thanks for your help. And I want to talk with you a little about what has happened since I became your President.

I am speaking to you from the room where I have worked since April 1945. This is the President's office in the west wing of the White House. And this is the desk where I have signed most of the papers that embodied the decisions I have made as President. It has been the desk for many Presidents, and will be the desk of many more.

Since I became President, I have been to Europe, Mexico, Canada, Brazil, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—Wake Island and Hawaii. I have visited almost every State in the Union. I have traveled 135,000 miles by air, 77,000 by rail, and 17,000 by ship. But the mail always followed me, and wherever I happened to be, that's where the office of the President was.

"CAN'T PASS THE BUCK"

The greatest part of the President's job is to make decisions—big ones and small ones, dozens of them almost every day. The papers may circulate around the Government for a while but they finally reach this desk. And then there's no place else for them to go. The President—whoever he is—has to decide. He can't pass the buck to anybody. No one else can do the deciding for him. That's his job.

That's what I've been doing here in this room, for almost eight years now. And over in the main part of the White House, there's a study on the second floor—a room much like this one—where I have worked at night and early in the morning on the papers I couldn't get to at the office.

Of course, for more than three years, Mrs. Truman and I were not living in the White House. We were across the street in the Blair House. That was when the White House almost fell down on us and had to be

rebuilt. I had a study over at the Blair House, too, but living in the Blair House was not as convenient as living in the White House.

The Secret Service wouldn't let me walk across the street, so I had to get in a car every morning to cross the street to the White House office, again at noon to go to the Blair House for lunch, again to go back to the office after lunch, and finally take an automobile at night to return to the Blair House. Fantastic, isn't it? But necessary, so my guards thought—and they are the bosses on such matters as that.

Now, of course, we're back in the White House. It is in very good condition, and General Eisenhower will be able to take up his residence in the house and work right here. That will be much more convenient for him, and I'm very glad the renovation job was all completed before his term began.

Your new President is taking office in quite different circumstances than when I became President eight years ago. On April 12, 1945, I had been presiding over the Senate in my capacity as Vice President. When the Senate recessed about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, I walked over to the office of the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, to discuss pending legislation.

As soon as I arrived I was told that Mr. Early, one of President Roosevelt's secretaries, wanted me to call. I reached Mr. Early, and he told me to come to the White House as quickly as possible, to enter by way of the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance, and come to Mrs. Roosevelt's study.

When I arrived, Mrs. Roosevelt told me the tragic news, and I felt the shock that all of you felt a little later—when the word came over the radio and appeared in the newspapers. President Roosevelt had died. I offered to do anything I could for Mrs. Roosevelt, and then I asked the Secretary of State to call the Cabinet together.

TELLS OF POTSDAM MEETING

At 7:09 p. m., I was sworn in as President by Chief Justice Stone in the Cabinet room.

Things were happening fast in those days. The San Francisco Conference to organize the United Nations had been called for April 25. I was asked if that meeting would go forward. I announced that it would.

After attending President Roosevelt's funeral I went to the Hall of the House of Representatives and told a joint session of the Congress that I would carry on President Roosevelt's policies.

On May 7, Germany surrendered. The announcement was made on May 8, my sixty-first birthday.

Mr. Churchill called me shortly after that and wanted a meeting with me and Prime Minister Stalin, of Russia. Later on, a meeting was agreed upon, and Churchill, Stalin, and I met at Potsdam, in Germany.

Meanwhile, the first atomic explosion took place out in the New Mexico desert.

The war against Japan was still going on. I made the decision that the atomic bomb had to be used to end it. I made that decision in the conviction it would save hundreds of thousands of lives—Japanese as well as American. Japan surrendered, and we were faced with the huge problems of bringing the troops home and reconverting the economy from war to peace.

All these things happened within just a little over 4 months—from April to August 1945. I tell you this to illustrate the tremendous scope of the work your President has to do.

All these emergencies and all the developments to meet them have required the President to put in long hours—usually 17 hours a day, with no payment for overtime. I sign my name on the average 600 times a day, see and talk to hundreds of people every month, shake hands with thousands every year, and still carry on the business of the largest going concern in the world.

There is no job like it on the face of the earth—in the power which is concentrated here at this desk, and in the responsibility and difficulty of the decisions.

I want all of you to realize how big a job, how hard a job, it is—not for my sake, because I am stepping out of it—but for the sake of my successor. He needs the understanding and the help of every citizen. It is not enough for you to come out once every 4 years and vote for a candidate, and then go back home and say, "Well, I've done my part, now let the new President do the worrying." He can't do the job alone.

Regardless of your politics, whether you are Republican or Democrat, your fate is tied up with what is done here in this room. The President is President of the whole country. We must all give him our support as citizens of the United States. He will have mine, and I want you to give him yours.

A NEW SET OF POLICIES

I suppose that history will remember my term in office as the years when the "cold war" began to overshadow our lives. I have had hardly a day in office that has not been dominated by this all-embracing struggle—this conflict between those who love freedom and those who would lead the world back into slavery and darkness. And always in the background there has been the atomic bomb.

But when history says that my term of office saw the beginning of the "cold war," it will also say that in those 8 years we have set the course that can win it. We have succeeded in carrying out a new set of policies to attain peace—positive policies, policies of world leadership, policies that express faith in other free people. We have averted world war III up to now, and we may already have succeeded in establishing conditions which can keep that war from happening as far ahead as man can see.

These are great and historic achievements that we can all be proud of. Think of the difference between our course now and our course 30 years ago. After the first World War we withdrew from world affairs—we failed to act in concert with other peoples against aggression—we helped to kill the League of Nations—and we built up tariff barriers which strangled world trade.

This time, we avoided those mistakes. We helped to found and to sustain the United Nations. We have welded alliances that include the greater part of the free world. And we have gone ahead with other free countries to help build their economies and link us all together in a healthy world trade.

Think back for a moment to the 1930's and you will see the difference. The Japanese moved into Manchuria, and free men did not act. The Fascists moved into Ethiopia, and we did not act. The Nazis marched into the Rhineland, into Austria, into Czechoslovakia, and free men were paralyzed for lack of strength and unity and will.

Think about those years of weakness and indecision, and World War II which was their evil result. Then think about the speed and courage and decisiveness with which we have moved against the Communist threat since World War II.

The first crisis came in 1945 and 1946, when the Soviet Union refused to honor its agreement to remove its troops from Iran. Members of my Cabinet came to me and asked if we were ready to take the risk that a firm stand involved. I replied that we were. So we took our stand—we made it clear to the Soviet Union that we expected them to honor their agreement—and the Soviet troops were withdrawn.

And then, in early 1947, the Soviet Union threatened Greece and Turkey. The British sent me a message saying they could no longer keep their forces in that area. Something had to be done at once, or the Eastern Mediterranean would be taken over by the Communists.

On March 12, I went before the Congress and stated our determination to help the people of Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. Today, Greece is still free and independent; and Turkey is a bulwark of strength at a strategic corner of the world.

SAYS PLAN SAVED EUROPE

Then came the Marshall plan which saved Europe, the heroic Berlin airlift, and our military aid programs.

We inaugurated the North Atlantic Pact, the Rio Pact binding the Western Hemisphere together, and the defense pacts with countries of the far Pacific.

Most important of all, we acted in Korea.

I was in Independence, Mo., in June 1950, when Secretary Acheson telephoned me and gave me the news about the invasion of Korea. I told the Secretary to lay the matter at once before the United Nations, and I came on back to Washington.

Flying back over the flat lands of the Middle West and over the Appalachians that summer afternoon I had a lot of time to think. I turned the problem over in my mind in many ways, but my thoughts kept coming back to the 1930's—to Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Austria, and finally to Munich.

Here was history repeating itself. Here was another probing action, another testing action. If we let the Republic of Korea go under, some other country would be next, and then another. And all the time, the courage and confidence of the free world would be ebbing away, just as it did in the 1930's. And the United Nations would go the way of the League of Nations.

When I reached Washington I met immediately with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and General Bradley, and the other civilian and military officials who had information and advice to help me decide what to do. We talked about the problems long and hard.

It was not easy to make the decision that sent American boys again into battle. I was a soldier in the First World War and I know what a soldier goes through. I know well the anguish that mothers and fathers and families go through. So I knew what was ahead if we acted in Korea.

But after all this was said, we realized that the issue was whether there would be fighting in a limited area now or on a much larger scale later on—whether there would be some casualties now or many more casualties later.

So a decision was reached—the decision I believe was the most important in my time as President.

In the days that followed, the most heartening fact was that the American people clearly agreed with the decision.

And in Korea, our men are fighting as valiantly as Americans have ever fought—because they know they are fighting in the same cause of freedom in which Americans have stood ever since the beginning of the Republic.

"WE MET THE TEST"

Where freemen had failed the test before, this time we met the test.

We met it firmly. We met it successfully. The aggression has been repelled. The Communists have seen their hopes of easy conquest go down the drain. The determination of free people to defend themselves has been made clear to the Kremlin.

As I have thought about our world-wide struggle with the Communists these past 8 years—day in and day out—I have never once doubted that you, the people of our country, have the will to do what is necessary to win this terrible fight against communism. Because I have been sure of that, I have been able to make necessary decisions even though they called for sacrifices by all of us. And I have not been wrong in my judgment of the American people.

That same assurance of our people's determination will be General Eisenhower's greatest source of strength in carrying on this struggle.

Now, once in a while, I get a letter from some impatient person asking, why don't we get it over with? Why don't we issue an ultimatum, make all-out war, drop the atomic bomb?

For most Americans, the answer is quite simple: We are not made that way. We are a moral people. Peace is our goal, and justice and freedom. We cannot, of our own free will, violate the very principles that we are striving to defend. The whole purpose of what we are doing is to prevent world war III. Starting a war is no way to make peace.

But if anyone still thinks that just this once, bad means can bring good ends, then let me remind you of this: We are living in the eighth year of the atomic age. We are not the only nation that is learning to unleash the power of the atom. A third world war might dig the grave not only of our Communist opponents but also of our own society, our world as well as theirs.

Starting an atomic war is totally unthinkable for rational men.

Then, some of you may ask, when and how will the cold war ever end? I think I can answer that simply. The Communist world has great resources, and it looks strong. But there is a fatal flaw in their society. Theirs is a godless system, a system of slavery; there is no freedom in it, no consent. The iron curtain, the secret police, the constant purges, all these are symptoms of a great basic weakness—the rulers' fear of their own people.

In the long run, the strength of our free society, and our ideals, will prevail over a system that has respect for neither God nor man.

STATE OF UNION MESSAGE CITED

Last week, in my state of the Union message to the Congress—and I hope you will all take the time to read it—I explained how I think we will finally win through.

As the free world grows stronger, more united, more attractive to me on both sides of the iron curtain—and as the Soviet hopes for easy expansion are blocked—then there will have to come a time of change in the Soviet world. Nobody can say for sure when that is going to be, or exactly how it will come about, whether by revolution, or trouble in the satellite states, or by a change inside the Kremlin.

Whether the Communist rulers shift their policies of their own free will, or whether the change comes about in some other way, I have not a doubt in the world that a change will occur.

I have a deep and abiding faith in the destiny of freemen. With patience and courage, we shall some day move on into a new era—a wonderful golden age—an age when we can use the peaceful tools that science has forged for us to do away with poverty and human misery everywhere on earth.

Think what can be done, once our capital, our skills, our science—most of all, atomic energy—can be released from the tasks of defense and turned wholly to peaceful purposes all around the world.

There is no end to what can be done.

I can't help but dream out loud a little here.

The Tigris and Euphrates Valley can be made to bloom as it did in the times of Babylon and Nineveh. Israel can be made the country of milk and honey as it was in the time of Joshua.

There is a plateau in Ethiopia some six to eight thousand feet high, that has sixty-five thousand square miles of land just exactly like the corn belt in northern Illinois. Enough food can be raised there to feed a hundred million people.

There are places in South America—places in Colombia and Venezuela and Brazil—just like that plateau in Ethiopia; places where food could be raised for millions of people.

These things can be done, and they are self-liquidating projects. If we can get peace and safety in the world under the United Nations, the developments will come so fast we will not recognize the world in which we now live.

A DREAM OF THE FUTURE

This is our dream of the future—our picture of the world we hope to have when the Communist threat is overcome.

I've talked a lot tonight about the menace of communism—and our fight against it—because that is the overriding issue of our time. But there are some other things we've done that history will record. One of them is that we in America have learned how to attain real prosperity for our people.

We have 62,500,000 people at work. Businessmen, farmers, laborers, white-collar people, all have better incomes and more of the good things of life than ever before in the history of the world.

There hasn't been a failure of an insured bank in nearly 9 years. No depositor has lost a cent in that period.

And the income of our people has been fairly distributed, perhaps more so than at any time in recent history.

We have made progress in spreading the blessings of American life to all of our people. There has been a tremendous awakening of the American conscience on the great issues of civil rights—equal economic opportunities, equal rights of citizenship and equal educational opportunities for all our people, whatever their race or religion or status of birth.

So, as I empty the drawers of this desk, and as Mrs. Truman and I leave the White House, we have no regret. We feel we have done our best in the public service. I hope and believe we have contributed to the welfare of this Nation and to the peace of the world.

When Franklin Roosevelt died I felt there must be a million men better qualified than I to take up the Presidential task. But the work was mine to do, and I had to do it. I have tried to give it everything that was in me.

Through all of it, through all the years that I have worked here in this room, I have been well aware I did not really work alone—that you were working with me.

No President could ever hope to lead our country, or to sustain the burdens of this office, save as the people helped with their support. I have had that help—you have given me that support—on all our great essential undertakings to build the free world's strength and keep the peace.

Those are the big things. Those are the things we have done together.

For that I shall be grateful, always.

And now the time has come for me to say good night and—God bless you all.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. STIGLER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my deep personal sorrow over the death of our late friend and colleague, WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of Oklahoma, which occurred during the recent adjournment.

In his decade of service in these Halls we all came to know him, to respect him, and to have a deep affection for this man who so completely personified the term "American."

Of Choctaw Indian descent and a duly enrolled member of that tribe, he came of forebears who were a part of this land long before this Nation existed. Indeed, our late colleague was born in the Oklahoma Indian Territory before it became a State.

His greatest but by no means his only interest was in the advancement of the welfare of the people of his district. He had the breadth of view and understanding to see the larger national interests of the United States as a whole. He fought in World War I in the Meuse-Argonne and other battles as an infantry officer, later serving in the army of occupation and attending a French university.

Returning home, he was admitted to the bar and successively served his community as city attorney and State senator before his election to the Seventy-eighth Congress to fill a vacancy. Thereafter, he was regularly reelected.

His activity in behalf of the town of Stigler, which was named for his father, and where he was born, and in behalf of the State of Oklahoma and every welfare, church, and community cause, was widely recognized. He was honored by election as State commander of the American Legion in recognition of his long service on behalf of veterans and as an officer of the State bar association for his outstanding record as a lawyer.

We will miss this sturdy American in our deliberations here, and I want to extend to his family my deepest sympathies.

VIRGINIA APPLE CIDER VINEGAR

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], if I got the import of his talk correctly, was trying to tell us something about the advisability of using vinegar in cocktails. We all realize the greatness of the State of Virginia. I do not know whether they have furnished more than half of the Presidents, but at least many have come from that glorious State. Virginia is a wonderful State and the Virginians are wonderful people. They are getting all kinds of money paid out by the Federal Government to Federal employees, who in turn let go of much in the rental charges they put on us. But the thing that gripes me right at this moment is: Why can they not be consistent? For years they have forced the people of the District of Columbia to pay an exorbitant price for their milk. Sure, it is good milk, but other States have good milk. You cannot—if you live in Washington—get milk from Michigan, you cannot get milk from Pennsylvania, or from any other State other than from Maryland and Virginia. The people of the Capital are forced to pay Virginians a high, stiff price for the

milk they use. Virginia is the "mother of Presidents," all right. They also want the exclusive right to wean and then bottle feed all babies on Virginia milk. Yet now they come along and want us to mix vinegar with the milk we are forced to buy. That seems just a little rough.

FARM PRICES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as far as obtaining full justice through the Federal Government, the Nation's farmers might as well be living in another world.

The figures which I will disclose may shock some of the Members of this House. I hope so, because every facet of the Federal Government needs a good shocking on this tragic subject of farm income. Before I start, let me say that all these figures can be readily verified in the January 1953 edition of Economic Indicators, which reached the desks of the Members of Congress this morning, and previous editions of this same Government publication.

Now, as I proceed, please keep in mind, especially you representatives of metropolitan centers, how often farmers are bludgeoned and blamed and crucified for high food prices.

Fact of life No. 1 concerning farm income is this: Since 1947, net farm income has dropped 23 percent. During that same time, prices farmers have to pay for goods of all kinds in order to stay in business have increased 42 percent.

Fact of life No. 2 concerning farm income is this: Up until about 2 months ago, and through the last elections, political rah-rah boys, who tried to convince farmers they have been living in Utopia, have been able to say, as a half-truth, that farm income has increased since 1947. I say this was a half-truth because, until a couple of months ago, gross farm income was higher than in 1947. But, in terms of purchasing power and indebtedness, net farm income is what counts. We have seen that net farm income has dropped 23 percent since 1947. And now, according to latest figures, total or gross farm income is 6 percent lower than it was in 1947.

Who in this House or anywhere else knows of another major industry in the United States, comparable to agriculture, where net income has dropped 23 percent and gross or total income 6 percent since 1947? If I held my breath waiting for an answer, I would suffocate.

Fact of life No. 3 concerning farm income is this: Despite all the prattle to the contrary, farmers are not to blame for high food prices and I will now prove it beyond the slightest doubt. Metropolitan Representatives, please tune in. Since 1947, while net farm income has dropped 23 percent, retail food prices to consumers—your constituents—have increased 38½ percent. On the basis of these official figures, I defy the most rabid antifarmer to offer any proof whatsoever that farmers are to blame for high food prices.

Mr. Speaker, this drop in net farm income is one of the worst discriminations in the history of our country. Is it any wonder that farm population is decreasing, resulting in fewer and larger farms? This is a sure road to corporation, chain, collectivized, or Bolshevik farming, whatever you want to call it, a far cry from the American family farm which has been one of the strongest vertebrae in the Nation's backbone.

Can anybody in his right mind possibly believe that this Nation has an adequate farm program when net farm income drops 23 percent since 1947, while in the same period, food prices to consumers increase 38½ percent?

This discriminatory drop in farm income would have been prevented if the Eighty-first or Eighty-second Congress had enacted the cost-of-production farm bill that I introduced, or, before that, the cost-of-production bill that the late William Lemke introduced session after session.

I am now preparing another cost-of-production farm bill for early introduction. Like the others, it will take into consideration the labor of the farmer and his family, which the fraud of the parity does not, and will protect American farmers from reckless importation of foreign farm products, which present laws and programs do not.

Meanwhile, I hope you metropolitan Representatives become interested in the spread of food prices from farms to consumers and in the general question: What makes food prices so high? It is a cinch your constituents are interested.

VICE ADM. JOEL T. BOONE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall include as a part of my remarks a letter from the Surgeon General of the Navy regarding the work of Vice Adm. Joel Thompson Boone, Medical Corps, who is now the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration and who is doing a remarkable work in trying to keep the veterans' hospitals running in spite of the cuts in appropriations that the Congress unwittingly made in the last session.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from the Surgeon General of the Navy reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1952.

From: The Surgeon General of the Navy.
To: Vice Adm. Joel Thompson Boone, Medical Corps, United States Navy (retired).
Subject: Letter of appreciation.

This memento commemorating the first helicopter landing on a United States Navy hospital ship with a battle casualty, is presented to Vice Adm. Joel T. Boone, Medical Corps, United States Navy (retired), in recognition of his valuable contribution to the national defense effort in the Korean conflict. Materialwise this pictorial record is not much but its significance is of great moment.

While serving as inspector general, medical, in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy, Admiral Boone, in September 1950, during an inspection tour of naval medical facilities in Korea, recognized the need for the speedy evacuation of combat casualties directly to hospital ships where specialized medical and surgical treatment would be available to the seriously and critically wounded. It was consequent to that observation that the individual we honor here today made the first official recommendation for the installation of landing platforms for helicopters on hospital ships of the United States Navy.

To determine the feasibility of helicopters landing on hospital ships, this intrepid pioneer arranged for an experimental flight from the Korean shore to a hospital ship, which terminated when he descended to the deck of that ship via the helicopter's hoist cable. The materialization of his recommendation by bringing together the surgeon and the patient within the golden hour has been directly responsible for saving the lives of hundreds among the combat troops of the United States Armed Forces and of the United Nations forces fighting in Korea. That the lives of untold hundreds yet to come will likewise be saved through the same instrumentalities, may be taken as a matter of course.

Coincidental, but nevertheless of exceeding interest, is the fact that beyond a doubt one of the lives in the salvation of which the helicopter played a determining role was that of Lt. Slade W. Sibley, United States Marine Corps, Admiral Boone's godson.

For more than 36 years as an officer in the Medical Corps of the United States Navy, before and through World Wars I and II, during their respective postwar eras, and in the Korean conflict, Admiral Boone, by reason of his enduring and dynamic interest, has donated abundantly toward the creation and maintenance of the present-day high standards of Navy medicine. Indeed it may be said that he not only has marched in medicine's amazing pageant from the horse and buggy to the jet airplane, but he moreover has contributed monumentally to the progress and to the glory of that pageant.

An abiding passion to serve and to better the lot of his fellowman, and the courage to make the cause of others his own, have been with him dominant attributes—so dominant in fact, that upon at least one occasion, and there were doubtless others, he carried these attributes to so far an extreme as to merit and receive in attestation therefor the supreme distinction possible within the Nation's power to award him, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The qualities that merited for him that distinction have, it would appear, constituted a constant and integral part of a life which has for in excess of threescore years been that of the Navy's nonpareil—Joel T. Boone.

LAMONT PUGH,
Rear Admiral, Medical Corps, United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have the deepest respect and admiration for Admiral Boone in his fight for the care of our disabled men, a care that all too frequently is not accorded them. We have appropriated billions and billions of dollars to equip them with material and send them to war, but there is a disposition on the part of some to forget, in the stress of things, that horrible conflict now raging in Korea and to forget our duty and our obligation to

care for them when they are disabled. Admiral Boone, however, does not push these men aside, and he is fighting with all the strength that he has for their adequate care and protection.

WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, having been on a leave of absence from this body for some 4 years, I believe I am in a little better position to express the feelings of some of the citizens of this country than many of you who have spent the major portion of your time here in the Nation's Capital. To sum it up in a very short and concise statement, I would say that our people are sick and tired of wasteful Government expenditures, and that goes for Congress as well as the executive branch of the Government. I have two concrete examples to present, together with suggestions for the saving of Federal funds.

For the past few mornings on the way to work, incidentally, in my own automobile, a small Studebaker, I passed many cars, usually large, expensive models, bearing Government plates, with a chauffeur at the wheel, carrying Government employees to work. I do not know who these men were, but I see no reason why any Government employee with the possible exception of the Chief Executive and other top-ranking officials who need special protection, should have a Government-supported chauffeur. I also recall an incident occurring some 5 years ago before the Public Lands Committee. We had occasion to call a certain Army colonel before our committee. He informed us by phone that it would be impossible for him to appear before the committee, because his chauffeur was not available to bring him from the Pentagon to the Capitol. Our committee was, therefore, required to postpone its hearing for some hours awaiting the time when the colonel could make connections with his chauffeur. Yesterday, I found through checking with the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office that the Army is at present hiring civilians, how many I do not know, to serve as chauffeurs for some of its top officials, and although restrictions have been written into the law during recent years for cutting down the number of chauffeurs on the public payroll, I have also been told, and I wish the Appropriations Committee would investigate this matter, that in some cases the law is being avoided by classifying chauffeurs as messengers or giving them jobs in some other nonrestricted classification. Now, I do not know how many secretaries, assistant secretaries, generals, colonels, and others may be supplied with such luxuries, but I certainly think it is about time the Appropriations Committee started to work right here at home by cutting out such wasteful expenditures.

The second suggestion I have to offer relates to the waste of time in the House of Representatives. I refer to the time consumed in roll calls in the House. It is my understanding that it takes approximately one-half hour to call roll. With the numerous roll calls we have in the House, I have estimated that we lose approximately 1 month out of the entire year's session in answering roll calls. In Congressmen's salaries alone, this is a loss of more than $435,000 a year, and this does not include any of the House employees. To some of you who are used to dealing in billions, this may sound like chicken feed, but out in my State it is real money. In fact, almost enough to operate two of our smaller junior colleges for over 2 years. Now, of course, you may say that Congressmen's salaries go on just the same, but the fact remains, too, under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to be in adjournment during the month of July and out in our districts with our constituents or investigating matters which will come before the Congress. If we continue with the archaic, time-consuming method of recording roll calls, we will continually find ourselves in a jam here in the House.

I have, therefore, introduced a measure to install automatic mechanical voting devices in the House. This method will not only save considerable time, but will also result in a fuller tabulation of each Member's vote on measures before the House.

Now, these two suggestions are just a beginning, but if I am any judge of the sentiments of our people at home, they are asking us to get our own house in order in the Nation's Capital before we start to reduce appropriations affecting functions of Government at home. Now is the time to set the example, and I urge your support of these proposals.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Heller subcommittee of the Eighty-second Congress which undertook a study of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The subcommittee did an excellent job, and its final report, which was released in December, is very worth-while reading.

The group concludes that its investigation "reveals a shocking story of errors, indifference, and evasion on the part of the Commission and its staff." The report accuses the Commission and its staff members of being either asleep at the switch or deliberately ignoring the facts that were available to them.

Here we have another Federal agency improperly administering the law which Congress has set up to guide it. The Heller subcommittee's findings reveal much evidence that all has not been what it seems in the administration of the Securities Exchange Act.

The Heller report also presents a forceful picture of the increasing practice of officials of a Government commission resigning and then immediately returning to practice law before that commission. Quoting from the conclusion of the Heller subcommittee:

> We do not look with favor upon the rapid turn-over of Commissioners, especially when shortly after their resignation they return to practice before the very agency whose laws they sought to administer.

Similar situations have reflected unfavorably on other boards and commissions. I sincerely hope the incoming administration will take positive steps to prevent recurrences of this practice in the future.

The Commission's refusal to investigate the circumstances surrounding the divorcement of the West Kentucky Coal Co. from the North American system, as was recommended by the Heller subcommittee, was a deliberate affront to this very efficient group. This subcommittee had held extensive hearings on the matter. Witness after witness testified to the behind-the-scenes control of the West Kentucky Coal Co. by the same group who controlled the destinies of the supposedly scattered North American Holding Co. That there has been plenty of dirty work at the crossroads in this case was plainly evident to the committee, as their conclusions testify. To those of us interested in this and similar cases of outside control of local industries through directors who own no stock in the industry and who exercise control by devious methods, this particular case is a striking example.

I am sure that the news release by the SEC calling attention to the many cases handled by their group and implying that they should be forgiven any error because, like that of the Dickens' character, "It was such a little one," will not find much favor among Members of the Eighty-third Congress. It has been said in excuse of the Commission, that the subcommittee only questioned five cases out of the hundreds the Commission handles. But, as it happens, those five cases are the only ones into which the subcommittee really investigated. I cannot but wonder if the Heller subcommittee has only scratched the surface in its exposure of bias, failure to investigate properly into matters before the Commission, the rapid turn-over in the Commission and staff, the reprehensible use of influence and rewards for the faithful.

The Securities Exchange Act should be either enforced without fear or favor or it should be nullified. If the public and small stockholder are to be left to the tender mercy of the unrestricted corporate monopolies, while their supposed protectors hide behind legal technicalities and self-imposed barriers, the country would be better off without such a law. I hope that this Congress will take whatever action seems necessary to insure the proper administration of the act.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did I correctly understand that the Chair

was to read a list of the names of the Republican appointees to committees?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter that will properly come up on Monday. The Republicans under their regulations are obliged to submit that question to the conference, which will meet on Monday, as the gentleman from Indiana announced earlier.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So we will have no knowledge until Monday of the committee assignments?

The SPEAKER. I think the gentleman from Indiana would be delighted to tell any Member who asks him as to the committee assignments.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say for the information of the gentlewoman that I shall be glad to tell her of any assignments in which she is interested. As a matter of fact, the recommendation of the Committee on Committees on our side will be released to the press this afternoon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think all the Members of the House, on both our side and the other side, will be interested in those assignments.

Mr. HALLECK. All the gentlewoman has to do is come up here and ask.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to announce that the Democratic Committee on Committees has completed its work. The committee assignments will be released for the press this afternoon. The list is now being prepared by the Clerk, and as soon as it gets here, it will be released to the press. We, on this side, will be prepared to offer our resolution on Monday, following the resolution of the majority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, might I say, based upon my experience as a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees for 10 years, and also as majority leader, knowing the difficulties of both the Democratic Committee on Committees and the Republican Committee on Committees, which have the same basic problems, I want to say I think both committees, and the members thereof, should be congratulated for the speedy work that they have done. They have both given a remarkable exhibition of getting to work quickly in this particular Congress with reference to the assignment of Members on committees. Usually, this matter takes longer. Speaking for myself, and basing my observations on my experience in this body, and having had experience too as a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees for 10 years, as I said, and also as majority leader for some years, I simply want to commend the committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has so kindly and I believe well said, the Members who have had the responsibility of making these committee assignments have labored diligently and, in my opinion, well. Of course, it now appears that by the time of the inauguration on next Tuesday our committee assignments will have been made and the committees can be officially organized and we shall be ready to work on the business of the session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CANFIELD and to include a letter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a report from the Committee on Un-American Activities in regard to Aaron Copland.

Mr. HORAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH in two separate instances, in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. PRICE in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked to include in an extension of remarks a report by Michael V. DiSalle, special consultant to the Economic Stabilization Agency. I am advised by the Printing Office that it exceeds the two-page limit and is estimated to cost $560. I renew my request as I think it contains much valuable information which will be useful to the Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL in two instances.

Mr. BENDER in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a letter of comment from the Department of Commerce on the Department of Agriculture's supplemental report to the Missouri River Basin agricultural program (H. Doc. No. 530, 82d Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Agriculture.

330. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a corrected report of the United States Air Force Annual Flying Pay Report, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

331. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend sections 203 and 403 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.), as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

332. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the second report under provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, up to June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

333. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the first report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

334. A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, transmitting the fifth quarterly report of the operations of the Small Defense Plants Administration, pursuant to section 714 (g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

335. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the second report of the Department of State on its activities pursuant to section 404 (d) title IV, of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong., 63 Stat. 377, June 30, 1949); to the Committee on Government Operations.

336. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

337. A letter from the national commandant, Marine Corps League, Inc., transmitting a report of proceedings and activities, including a complete statement of reports and expenditures during the preceding calendar year, pursuant to section IV of the act of Congress which incorporated the Marine Corps League, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

338. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated April 10, 1951, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore-leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

340. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the ninth semiannual report on the international information and educational exchange program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

341. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting the supplementary report of the War Claims Commission on war claims arising out of World War II, pursuant to section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and to the letter of the President, dated January 16, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

342. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase

of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 568. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the White House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 1797. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Wilburton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1798. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $250 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1799. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1800. A bill to provide that judges of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1802. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1803. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to reduce the rate of tax applicable to distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1805. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1806. A bill to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 1807. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 1808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the excess-profits tax shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 1809. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1810. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 1811. A bill authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to obtain automatic voting equipment for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1812. A bill relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1813. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1814. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1815. A bill to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1816. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1817. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1818. A bill to impose a 5-percent Federal excise tax in the case of pari-mutuel betting on horse and dog races and other events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 1819. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late George Herman (Babe) Ruth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1820. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1821. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight and other unlighted cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1822. A bill to provide that the period of active service required of any person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be reduced by any period of active service which such person may have performed before such induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 1823. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1824. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 1825. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1826. A bill making an emergency authorization of an appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Bluefield, W. Va., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1827. A bill to permit enlisted service previously counted as double time, to be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1828. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide permanent price supports for oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, and soybeans at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1829. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend for three additional years the requirement that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 1830. A bill to increase the penalties for violation of certain narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to prohibit the sale of beer by manufacturers to consumers and to prohibit the sale of beer and light wines by wholesalers to consumers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1833. A bill to pay tribal funds to issue of members of the Ojibway or Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1834. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1835. A bill to restrict the application of section 1154 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the dispensing of intoxicants to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1836. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1837. A bill to confer civil and criminal jurisdiction on the State of Wisconsin in certain cases involving Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1838. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1839. A bill to permit reviews of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1840. A bill to prevent persons who engage in activities contrary to the interest of the United States from pursuing a course of education or training in a foreign country under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1841. A bill to provide a further opportunity for veterans of World War II who were in active military, naval, or air service of the United States on the delimiting date for initiating a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and who had not initiated a course prior to said date, to initiate such a course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1842. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1843. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1844. A bill to permit the allocation of funds under the Federal Highway Act for the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of highway approaches to certain toll bridges which are part of the strategic network of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1845. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (Public Law 609, 81st Cong.), as amended, so as to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States who as a result of service in Korea are hospitalized outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1846. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, with respect to the computation of disability payments in the case of certain seamen and other persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1847. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1848. A bill to provide that certain service rendered by disabled retired members of the uniformed services shall be computed as double time for retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1849. A bill to authorize an improved entrance and channel for Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 1850. A bill to prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing on public lands in violation of State or Territorial laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 1851. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of the Third National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1852. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1853. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1855. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the $50 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1856. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1857. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1858. A bill directing that special consideration be given to excess agricultural commodities produced in the United States when entering into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1859. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life insurance and United States Government life (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1860. A bill to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1861. A bill to channel into Government hands excess production of basic commodities needed for defense purposes and to prevent the price depressive effects of such production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1862. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal payment for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled shall be $30 per recipient per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1863. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1864. A bill to permit the sale of lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1865. A bill to provide more adequate price support for cotton produced to meet defense needs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1866. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1867. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1868. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1869. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to medical expenses); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1870. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 1871. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote observance of the civil rights of all individuals, and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution assisting the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution regarding the revocation of certain reclamation projects for which construction funds have not been appropriated; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution calling for the publication and reexamination of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 88. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 89. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. Res. 90. Resolution authorizing and directing the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other Federal activities pertaining to Indians; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 91. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 92. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means and subcommittees thereof to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-third Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 93. Resolution providing for compensation for two special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective January 1, 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 94. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the railroad accident which occurred at Union Station in the District of Columbia on January 15, 1953; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 95. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine means by which the national interest may best be served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. Res. 96. Resolution investigating means of expanding foreign investments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 97. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the use of facilities and manpower by the Department of Defense and by other departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Lounsberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Michel Bandak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Cesar Grana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Mir Kazem Kashani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Denning Mills, a copartnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Erwin Irving Spira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Bernard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Ezra H. Y. Eliahou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1880. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission school; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Pasquale De Leonibus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Portilla Delgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Goon (Goon Mei Chee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Gary Matthew Stevens (Kazuo Omiya); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Cecil Wilson Hinkson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Hugo Skala, Maria Skala (Skalova), his wife, and Paul Skala, his son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Castagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Nicola, Lucia, and Rocco Fierro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael S. Sideris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Mauro Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Lech Saczepan Korgol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty E. Lamay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Sister May Jacinta, nee Elena Natalia Carvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Herminegilda Sanz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1900. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Samuel T. Pomess, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Hertzog; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Montgomery of San Francisco, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Anna E. Hollander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Letizia Pugliares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Francois Kloo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Arusik Tchakalian, Samuel Tchakalian, and Manuel Tchakalian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Wally Krausnick Paeschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Hayik (Jirair) Vartiyan and Annemarie Vartiyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of William B. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Anne Stephenson (Shizuko Hosokawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Hirshorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

17. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of residents of the State of Iowa urging transfer of revenue from tidelands oil to the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

18. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Racine, Wis., in support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

19. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. M. Anderson, Jr., Clearwater, Fla., relative to presence of subversives and spies in United Nations and urging Congress to rid this international organization of espionage and treason; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that Thy thoughts toward us are always those of peace and good will, of love and mercy.

We humbly confess that we are frequently greatly troubled as we face problems for which our fallible and finite minds seem to have no adequate and worthy solution.

May we never surrender to despair or allow our efforts to languish. Make us confident that the spiritual resources are mightier than all the forces of evil which are arrayed against us.

Grant that our newly chosen President and leaders, in the business of statecraft, may be inspired with unerring wisdom and indomitable courage as they daily set themselves to the adventurous crusade and arduous task of building a nobler era of understanding and concord among the nations of the earth.

In all our hopes and endeavors may we be guided and sustained by the invincible spirit of our blessed Lord in whose name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 16, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are two Members present this morning who have not taken the oath of office. If they will present themselves in the well of the House, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

Mr. FERNANDEZ and Mr. BLATNIK presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 98) which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-third Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 36 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 29 members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 29 members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 29 members; and

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 29 members.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 99) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope (chairman), Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Ernest K. Bramblett, California; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Clifford G. McIntire, Maine; James S. Golden, Kentucky; William R. Williams, New York; Karl C. King, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; William C. Wampler, Virginia.

Committee on Armed Services: Dewey Short (chairman), Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Leroy Johnson, California; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; Charles P. Nelson, Maine; James P. S. Devereux, Maryland; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Wint Smith, Kansas; William G. Bray, Indiana; Robert C. Wilson, California.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott (chairman), Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Gordon L. McDonough, California; William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Myron V. George, Kansas; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania; William E. McVey, Illinois; D. Bailey Merrill, Indiana; Charles G. Oakman, Michigan; Edgar W. Hiestand, California; Douglas R. Stringfellow, Utah.

Committee on District of Columbia: Sid Simpson (chairman), Illinois; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Charles S. Gubser, California; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland; Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Missouri.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell (chairman), Pennsylvania; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Wint Smith, Kansas; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Harold H. Velde, Illinois; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Charles J. Kersten, Wisconsin; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; William H. Harrison, Wyoming; Albert H. Bosch, New York; Joseph P. Holt, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; Stuyvesant Wainwright II, New York; Peter J. Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert B. Chiperfield (chairman), Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Jacob K. Javits, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Alvin M. Bentley, Michigan.

Committee on Government Operations: Clare E. Hoffman (chairman), Michigan; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; George H. Bender, Ohio; Charles B. Brownson, Indiana; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; George Meader, Michigan; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Katharine St. George, New York; William E. Miller, New York; Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Missouri; Richard H. Poff, Virginia.

Committee on House Administration: Oliver P. Bolton, Ohio.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: A. L. Miller (chairman), Nebraska; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Norris Poulson, California; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; William H. Harrison, Wyoming; J. Ernest Wharton, New York; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; H. R. Gross, Iowa; George H. Bender, Ohio; William A. Dawson, Utah; Jack Westland, Washington; John R. Pillion, New York; Clifton (Cliff) Young, Nevada; Craig Hosmer, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton (chairman), New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Robert Hale, Maine; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois; John V. Beamer, Indiana; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Herbert B. Warburton, Delaware; Steven B. Derounian, New York; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; J. Arthur Younger, California.

Committee on the Judiciary: Chauncey W. Reed (chairman), Illinois; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Edgar A. Jonas, Illinois; Ruth Thompson, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Shepard J. Crumpacker, Jr., Indiana; William E. Miller, New York; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; George Meader, Michigan; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; John M. Robsion, Jr., Kentucky; DeWitt S. Hyde, Maryland.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Alvin F. Weichel (chairman), Ohio; Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Connecticut; Timothy P. Sheehan, Illinois; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; Walter Norblad, Oregon; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey; Stuyvesant Wainwright II, New York; Kit Clardy, Michigan; John H. Ray, New York; William S. Mailliard, California; Francis E. Dorn, New York.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees (chairman), Kansas; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Katharine St. George, New York; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; William C. Cole, Missouri; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut; Charles S. Gubser, California; Edward J. Bonin, Pennsylvania; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; Oliver P. Bolton, Ohio.

Committee on Public Works: George A. Dondero (chairman), Michigan; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Myron V. George, Kansas; Charles B. Brownson, Indiana; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Charles G. Oakman, Michigan; Frank Small, Jr., Maryland; Herbert B. Warburton, Delaware; Will E. Neal, West Virginia; Frank J. Becker, New York; S. Walter Stauffer, Pennsylvania; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Harold H. Velde (chairman), Illinois; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Kit Clardy, Michigan; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers (chairman), Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William L. Springer, Illinois; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Russell V. Mack, Washington; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Edward J. Bonin, Pennsylvania; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; William S. Mailliard, California; Paul A. Fino, New York; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 100) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Pat Sutton, Tennessee; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson, Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; George P. Miller, California; Harold A. Patten, Arizona; Charles E. Bennett, Florida.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence, Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Richard Bolling, Missouri; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Pat Sutton, Tennessee; John E. Moss, California.

Committee on Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; Wingate H. Lucas, Texas; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Charles R. Howell, New Jersey; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Lee Metcalf, Montana; Howard S. Miller, Kansas.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: James P. Richards, South Carolina; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; Laurie C. Battle, Alabama; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Thurmond Chatham, North Carolina; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, Texas; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., New York; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson, Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri;

John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Sidney A. Fine, New York; Bill Lantaff, Florida; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Frank Ikard, Texas; Jack B. Brooks, Texas; Lester Holtzman, New York; Robert L. Condon, California; Thomas J. Dodd, Connecticut; Robert H. (Bob) Mollohan, West Virginia; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina.

Committee on House Administration: Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Courtney Campbell, Florida; John E. Moss, California; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Clair Engle, California; Ken Regan, Texas; Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., Texas; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Samuel W. Yorty, California; James G. Donovan, New York; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; Walter Rogers, Texas; Mrs. Gracie Pfost, Idaho; James A. Haley, Florida; George A. Shuford, North Carolina.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Robert Crosser, Ohio; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; P. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter P. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Louis B. Heller, New York; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky; J. Frank Wilson, Texas; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; Woodrow W. Jones, North Carolina; E. L. Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John F. Shelley, California; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; James J. Delaney, New York; Martin Dies, Texas; Mrs. John B. Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Don Magnuson, Washington; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray, Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; James C. Davis, Georgia; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Jr., Michigan; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Garrett L. Withers, Kentucky; John Dowdy, Texas; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Hugh Q. Alexander, North Carolina; Frazier Reams, Ohio.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley, New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; John J. Dempsey, New Mexico; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; John C. Watts, Kentucky; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Michigan; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Vera Buchanan, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague, Texas; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; George S. Long, Louisiana; Harlan Hagan, California; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Brady Gentry, Texas; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Armistead Selden, Alabama.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 101) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Monday, January 19, 1953, it stand adjourned until 11:15 a. m. Tuesday, January 20, 1953; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Thursday, January 22, 1953.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow, January 20, 1953.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I leave the office of President, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress several recent actions designed to provide a better basis for the development of our water and related land resources.

These resources are a foundation, upon which rest our national security, our ability to maintain a democratic society, and our leadership in the free world. All too frequently their significance has been obscured among the dramatic events which have characterized our time.

Realizing the importance of properly planned water resource development, in 1950 I appointed a special commission to recommend a consistent and forward-looking national policy for the conservation, development, and use of our water and related land resources. This was the Water Resources Policy Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris L. Cooke.

The Commission reported to me in 1951. Their report has been under careful and detailed study by the executive branch agencies since then. I now am transmitting formally the Commission's report to the Congress for its consideration in treating problems of resource development. I believe that the report is of great value. The Commission's understanding of cooperative effort in the American system, its clarification of the complex problems of multiple-purpose planning, its detailed professional analysis of water management, and its recognition of the broad public interest make the report an important public document.

The general studies of the Commission will shortly be supplemented by specific field studies of resource development in three major regions of the country. After Congress authorized the basic surveys in 1950, I established Federal interagency committees to study the New England-New York region and the Arkansas-White-Red Basins. Those committees were organized, and they have been at work for 2½ years. They will report upon the multiple-purpose development of those regions next year. The committees have been directed to draw upon the experience and ideas of the people of the regions to the greatest extent possible. The committees also have been directed to present fully coordinated recommendations for all the purposes served by water and land development. The governors of the affected States or their representatives are participating in the committee work, and their views will be reflected in these reports.

In 1952 I appointed a bipartisan Missouri Basin Survey Commission to assemble the facts and report its judgments upon the proper procedure for further development in that vast territory. The report of this Commission will be available within a few weeks. The Commission, which is composed of Members of Congress and leading citizens of the Missouri Basin, has conducted intensive hearings throughout the basin States. This Commission's report will be based on first-hand expressions by the people of the basin of their views on the future development of this vital region in the heart of our country.

Thus we shall soon have three important additional field checks for particular regions upon the desirable pattern of development for each area.

These studies have been undertaken against a background of great accomplishment, and in accord with the Nation's well-established tradition of public interest in its water and land resources. I believe them to be in accord with our record of vigorous action to protect the public welfare in river-basin development, a record which dates from the first years of this century.

The first real impetus to sensible river-basin development came as a part of the conservation movement which was led by President Theodore Roosevelt. He and his advisers realized that the continuing misuse of our natural resources through unbridled private development would seriously endanger the Nation's welfare within a very few generations. His dynamic leadership brought the first real safeguards to assure that benefits from resource development would accrue to all the people, rather than just to special interests. At the same time, he sought to assure permanently productive forests, waters, and lands.

During the period prior to the First World War the Congress also demonstrated a bipartisan interest in publicly beneficial river-basin development. Indeed, its interest in waterway development and flood control in the nineteenth century marked the beginnings of Federal water policy.

The interest of both the Congress and the executive branch in comprehensive

treatment of our river basins was reflected in the enactment of laws which established and provided for the administration of the national forests—one main purpose of which was to protect important watersheds which are sources for many streams. It was shown in the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902 to provide Federal aid for the development of irrigation on the arid lands of the West. The interest continued, as indicated by passage of the Federal Water Power Act in 1920. That act required selection of electric power projects or plans which developed and used water resources most efficiently. The interest was further illustrated in the 1927 authorization of the Corps of Engineers 308 reports, which specifically provided for comprehensive planning.

Although the dynamic influence of Theodore Roosevelt was important in the conservation movement, the legislation enacted to conserve and to develop our water and land resources for the most part was broadly supported by both parties. The steps taken were in recognition of the overriding public interest in sound resource management.

The experience of this early period of public action showed that constant vigilance and competent professional guidance are essential to prevent irreparable losses. In spite of earlier efforts, whole sections of our national resource foundation were crumbling as recently as 20 years ago. We had not yet fully awakened to some of the dangers to national interest which lay in short-sighted private actions. Our lands were disappearing in gale and flood; our streams still were destructive giants unchained.

During the two eventful decades which have followed since 1933, the Nation has undergone some deeply moving experiences, like the appearance of the Great Plains Dust Bowl which directly or indirectly affected millions of people. In part under the stimulus of catastrophe, but with the advantage of wise counsel during those years, we have changed greatly our attitudes toward using our lands and waters.

We have learned that the mark of a well-managed land lies in the care a Nation gives to its rivers. We have learned that rivers truly can be our servants, harnessed to provide vast additions to our wealth. And as we have learned we have been working to restore the crumbling parts of our resource foundation in a manner which has captured the imagination of the world.

During these years I believe that we demonstrated for all time the efficiency and the humanity of comprehensively planned multipurpose river-basin development. Compare the Tennessee Valley of 1933, which lacked even hope, with the vigorous region TVA in 1953 is assisting the people to build further. There you now will find several million people who are working aggressively to make the best use of their resources. A unified management of their watershed has helped them to create new opportunities.

Or compare the great dams and thousands of acres of fertile green fields which are beginning to grace eastern Washington State, with the sagebrush and scabland of a few years ago. Look at the great works of the Central Valley, or of the Colorado, which literally move rivers from one basin to another. Look at the great developments which are getting under way on the Missouri and in the Southwest.

No wonder professional visitors from all over the world come to see our works, and to study our ideas. The stream of several thousand professional visitors who come every year to study the Department of Interior's, TVA's, the Department of Agriculture's, and the Corps of Engineer's work is not a matter of chance. Only something solid and stimulating could be so lasting an attraction.

During those 20 years, we have learned the true place of electric power-generating facilities in our national life. They are vital to the Nation—physically, economically, socially. We now know they are so vital that never again can we trust to haphazard planning for their construction.

We know that electricity can be produced and sold cheaply; and that when it is so produced, the market for it is of hitherto undreamed size.

We know that large reserves of generating capacity are vital to economic health and to national security.

We know that the public construction of main transmission lines from generators to wholesale distribution points unlocks this generating capacity for the public at large, and eliminates the danger of monopoly.

We know these things because we had the foresight to commence multiple-purpose river development.

TVA proved a lot of these things to us, and our works in other parts of the country have confirmed and extended that proof. I need hardly remind you that without the electricity of the TVA and Bonneville systems, which resulted from Federal multiple-purpose development, we should not have had enough aluminum for planes, and we should not have had the timely atomic-energy program of the last World War. In fact those two public power systems are still the energy life lines for that greatest development of our time.

We have learned much more. We now know that fertilizer can be produced and sold more cheaply than it was in the past. That can be done through having low-cost electric power in the right place, as for the huge phosphate deposits of the Pacific Northwest. Or it can come through new processes, as have been developed by TVA. Both means help us to produce more food and clothing. And the fertilizer has been made to help the upstream farmer keep his soil on his farm. That is where the soil belongs, and not in the flooded basements and on the warehouse floors of valley cities.

We have learned that private citizens—farmers, ranchers, forest owners—in their own interest as well as that of the Nation, should plan the use of the resources they control so that those resources will be more fruitful as the years go by. All across our country individuals and private companies have demonstrated the value and the practicality of effective conservation in the daily management of their own enterprises.

We have learned that the farmer can have electricity in his dairy barn, and his wife can electrify her kitchen—at rates which he can afford.

We have learned that small towns can compete with cities for the location of industry and factory jobs without having the disadvantage of high electricity rates, and without the disadvantage of high transportation rates for their materials and goods. Frequently dams which produce electricity also make it possible for vessels to move at low cost on a river.

We have learned that the advantages of flood control can be extended on a large scale through multiple-purpose reservoirs and watershed improvements, aiding town and farm alike.

All these now nationally acknowledged benefits of comprehensive river basin development were little but the vision of a few foresighted men 20 years ago. But they were visions which had existed for many years before we were able to act upon them. I hope that the demonstration we now have before us will never be forgotten, nor its significance lost sight of.

I am happy to report that we have made impressive additions to our resource foundation during my administration. We have continued on the programs which were so well started in previous years.

Since 1945, we have added about 2,700,000 irrigated acres to our farm lands. By the middle of 1953, works constructed by the Federal Government will be supplying irrigation water to 135,000 farm units in the West. Several million additional acres would be irrigated under projects which have been authorized by the Congress but not yet constructed.

Since 1945, also, we have made substantial progress toward the protection of our many valleys from disastrous floods. We have provided additional flood control on the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Columbia, in New England, the Southwest and California, and in the mid-Atlantic States. We have made encouraging progress on the vast works for control of the giant Missouri, probably our most important remaining problem in river development. Between 1945 and 1953, about 3,000,000 acres of valley land were given flood protection. Works now under way will provide protection to an additional 7,600,000 acres. Three hundred and fifty communities and 2,700,000 people are located in the areas which will be protected.

In this period we have continued to improve our navigable waterways. We now have 28,600 miles of them, 11,100 miles to a depth of 9 feet or more. They are important parts of the Nation's transportation system, and their use has increased greatly in these years.

We have continued our soil conservation program. In these last 8 years, 1,296 new soil conservation districts were formed. This addition nearly doubled the number of such districts in the country.

Our additions to the country's means of producing and distributing electric energy have also been great in this period. During these 8 years, the Federal Government alone has constructed 5,000,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. This has increased the size of our public power systems by 50 percent.

Further ultimate capacity of 10,600,000 kilowatts will be added when we complete projects now in construction.

Since 1945, we have constructed 12,200 miles of main transmission lines. They assure widespread benefits to the people from public power.

Through the direct efforts of the Rural Electrification Administration since 1945, we have brought electricity to 1,500,000 farms which never before had it. More than 88 percent of our farms are now electrified, as compared to 46 percent in January 1945. Through the lines constructed by the Department of the Interior and the TVA we also have brought the benefits of low-rate public power to 65 additional municipalities.

I have not the slightest doubt that these works, by the example they gave as well as the electricity they delivered, were an important reason for the small change in our rates for electric service throughout the Nation during this period when many prices rose sharply. Since 1945, during a period when private utilities have experienced unprecedented prosperity, national average residential and commercial electric rates actually have decreased, and industrial rates have increased less than 10 percent. Compare that to the general rate increase of almost 80 percent authorized in the same period for rail freight rates. Without multiple-purpose river basin development, I believe that few of these accomplishments would have been possible.

I have been privileged to see during this administration the beginning or completion by our Federal Government of great dams, gigantic irrigation enterprises, huge generating stations, and other monuments which will stand as symbols of the truths about water and land developments we have now accepted as a Nation.

I might speak of the engineering accomplishments alone: The Corps of Engineers' McNary Dam on the Columbia, the Bureau of Reclamation's Grand Coulee irrigation diversion in Washington, and its Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, the corps' Fort Randall Dam on the Missouri; and TVA's Shawnee steam plant, to be the largest in the world. These are among the great engineering accomplishments of all time.

Yet it seems more important to me that all these, and other projects too, are symbols of the things we have learned about efficient, orderly, organized development of river basins.

We built the Bureau of Reclamation's great new Hungry Horse Dam in Montana not as an isolated structure, but as a part of the Columbia Basin system. Its value lies much more in the water it stores for use in a score of places down the long Columbia system than in its own sizable electricity production.

We are building TVA's Shawnee plant where it is because we want to make the best possible use of the whole TVA electrical system for the development of atomic energy in the interest of our national defense.

This is what we must do for every one of these great works that we plan or build in the future. If we are to use our money and our effort wisely, they must all be planned and built with the full needs of the region and the Nation in mind. Each new structure must be recognized as part of a plant which comprises a whole system of river development. In planning for each function, we must be mindful of its relation to all other purposes.

And we especially must make sure that we safeguard the use of these resources for the benefit of all the people. Where the public moneys are invested, the resulting gains must accrue to the public, and not be diverted to the undue benefit of any private group.

As we consider what the Nation has done, and what we now know, we must admit that we still have much to do. But a great deal will depend on the way we do it. We now are at a stage where we can capitalize on the extensive groundwork which has been laid for unified planning and management and multiple-purpose development of our regional water and land resources.

There are many reasons why we should take steps as soon as possible to improve further our resource development policy and administrative machinery, and why we must modernize Federal Government techniques which determine the speed, justice, and efficiency we can muster for this work.

The national investment in resource development from all sources has taken a sharp upward turn since the end of the Second World War. The Federal Government alone is now spending about a billion dollars a year to help develop our river basins through irrigation, power, flood prevention, navigation, watershed treatment, and in other important ways. The Congress has authorized over $10,000,000,000 of projects for undertaking in the future. However, in the face of this program, Federal organization for carrying out water resources responsibilities remains diffuse, and there is no uniform congressionally approved Federal water resources policy to govern large parts of this program.

More and more people are beginning to realize the importance of immediate changes to assure wise investment. There is an encouraging tide of rising interest in this hitherto specialized technical field by farmers, businessmen, workmen, civic organizations, and others. Increasingly large volumes of publicity are being given to definite proposals for changed policy and organization; some of these have real merit, and some, if adopted, would be very harmful.

Finally, some of our regions are in need of immediate help. I cannot think of the wasting resources of the Rio Grande Basin, the Arkansas Basin, the Red River, or New England without considering what a unified multiple-purpose program might do for each of them, and in helping them, what it might do for the Nation. These are not jobs for isolated, unrelated single-project development. They demand comprehensive plans for water and land alike. We cannot escape the obvious relation of such improvements to our national security.

For these reasons I commend to the Congress for its serious attention several lines of action.

First, we should organize more efficient means of regional river basin planning and management in those parts of our country which need such improvement.

The type of organization need not be the same for all regions. The breadth of our land and the number of rivers in it inevitably have given rise to many differing needs. A fixed pattern may not be the sole answer to the problems of all these rivers.

But whatever the outward form, the objectives should be the same. The organizations we decide upon should be strong enough to uphold the people's interest in their resources. They should be strong enough to be efficient. They should be strong enough to see that unified multiple-purpose development is planned for, and works operated harmoniously in each basin-wide comprehensive system. Their responsibilities should embrace related land as well as water programs.

The Water Resources Policy Commission recommended in favor of decentralized but unified or coordinated administration for these resource programs. The need for better coordinated basin administration also was recognized by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, which reported earlier to me and to the Congress.

Second, we should increase our efforts to see that every affected State and every affected community in a region is given opportunity to share in the responsibility for basin development. I think it is a good rule that where States and communities assume a greater share in administrative or planning responsibility, they should also assume greater financial responsibility.

We hear more and more of management and planning by the States from the regions where work now is being done, or is about to be undertaken. But we have found, I regret to say, that this growing demand for local administrative responsibility, with few exceptions, is not matched by an equal willingness to relieve the Federal Government of financial responsibility for a proportionate share of the required investment. The assumption of greater State and community financial responsibility is one of the ways we can avoid irresponsible special pressure for undesirable projects.

We can view with favor the increasing local awareness of the necessity of planned, cooperative improvement of our streams, but we also must foster an understanding of the huge size of the job. There is much more to it than Federal Government funds are likely to accomplish in a reasonable time.

We must also see that improved Federal organization accompanies increased local and State participation. States and communities cannot cooperate effectively with the agencies of the Federal Government where sharp differences of opinion exist and where machinery for resolving these differences is cumbersome or absent.

Third, we should strengthen and simplify our Federal procedures for selection among the great volume of project proposals which come to the executive offices and the Congress every year.

It has been estimated that full development of our water and land resources over the years may require the investment of as much as a hundred billion dollars by private citizens and their Government. Not far in the future the

mold will be formed which will determine the pattern of works for most of our important regions. Whether or not the investment is to be sound or unsound, for all the people or for a fortunate few, will be decided by what the Federal Government does within a few years.

Thus far we have not even been able to compare projects on the same basis. There are a number of Federal resource-development laws, and they establish differing procedures and differing standards. We have had to judge irrigation proposals by one standard, flood control by another, pollution control by a third, and so on. In some cases, we have not even been able to get the facts as to whether or not benefits will be greater than costs, even though the proponents always assure us of the great value of their particular proposal. You cannot make rapid progress without effective means for selecting projects wisely.

I am pleased to report that we have found it possible to move forward by Executive action toward better project selection. With my approval, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recently has issued a budget circular which establishes standards to be used by the Executive Office in reviewing all reports on water projects and programs. I believe this circular is a significant step toward improved evaluation and cost-allocation procedure. But it is only a first step. Many of the problems we encounter result from statutes which can be corrected only by congressional action.

Furthermore, I suggested in the 1954 budget message that Congress might wish to examine its own intricate procedure for reviewing resource proposals. In each House of the Congress, there are several committees and subcommittees which consider different programs and projects, even though many projects are on the same rivers and watersheds. The Congress might find that revision of this structure would have helpful effects upon the now complicated operation of the Executive resource-development agencies.

Fourth, we must find a better answer to the question: "Who pays and how much?" Our present policy was developed piecemeal over more than a century. During most of this period equitable sharing of costs took second place to the need for development. For example, consider our flood-control policy. When its main outlines were developed in the 1950's, material, resources and the labor of our citizens were begging to be put to work. Now we face the opposite situation. There are many urgent and competitive uses for materials and manpower.

Our reimbursement policy for all water development should be reoriented to help us meet these problems. The cost of resource projects should be paid more by those who benefit directly from them. Such a change can have a double effect. It would remove some of the burden for payment from the taxpayer-at-large, and it would make the proposers of projects more careful about investigating the soundness of their ideas. And we should clarify our repayment procedures so that every citizen can learn exactly where his tax dollar has gone, and what chance his Government has of getting it back.

Fifth, we should see that our development procedure is so designed that it can provide the most in farms, and jobs, and opportunity for business enterprise for every dollar spent. With these objectives in mind, we should modernize our laws for promoting additions to cultivable land, and adapt the revision to the needs of the 48 States. We should retain the requirements of acreage limitation but we should modernize them, in order to make them a true instrument for encouraging the settlement of family farms. We should further see that balanced industrial employment opportunities and private business opportunities are available, and that Federal resource works are used to provide them wherever and whenever possible and necessary.

Toward these ends the Bureau of the Budget has been preparing legislative proposals for desirable changes in policy and organization. The results of this work will be available to the new administration.

To the people of the Nation through their representatives in Congress I commend certain objectives toward which the Government should continue to move in our national programs of water and land development.

We should help make available jobs and business opportunities in manufacturing, industry, and trade in the different regions of the country—as they are needed. The Government should help supply the basic needs of private enterprise, including electric power, water transportation, water supply, and flood-protected industrial sites to make the best use of the resources of each region. It should do this in ways which will encourage the development of the skills and capacities of the people who are there or who may move there.

In the regions where the Federal Government has become an important utility, like the Tennessee Valley or the Pacific Northwest, the Government should continue to supply new generating plants in adequate number. We must not permit brown-outs, or the turning away of new industry well suited to these areas.

In developing new generating capacity, and in disposing of public power, we should endeavor to make possible electricity rates which permit all homes to have modern comforts, and which allow farm tasks to be lightened by modern machines.

The Government should continue to help make available new family farms at reasonable prices and on reasonable terms.

The Government should continue to improve its practice of sustained yield management of public lands and forests, and to strongly promote the similar management of private property.

The Government should continue to encourage more local and State responsibility. This does not mean promising the States or communities something for nothing—far from it. Administration by the States of Federally provided dollars alone is not real responsibility. Indeed, full reliance on the Federal Treasury is in anything but the best interest of the community, the State, and the Nation.

This job of getting our land and water developed, I repeat, is so big that we must enlist the participation of all agencies—Federal, State, community, private enterprise. The results can be timely and economical only if States and communities invest their dollars, as well as the Federal taxpayer.

I report finally, then, that we now have well charted the obstructions to efficient national water resource development of widespread benefit. In doing this we have found much that is good, and I would hold fast to it. But I also believe that a more certain route to these benefits can be planned. When that is done, the Nation can build even more surely and more rapidly than before.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1953.*

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," approved May 22, 1951 (Public Law 38, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "February 15, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to state that this bill was favorably reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means and those of us on the minority side are glad to join our distinguished chairman in requesting consideration and passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York if this is not the fact about this legislation, that we have had this matter up several times so far as the principle involved here is concerned but this time we are happy to say that all the conflicting interests that have heretofore been so divergent have somewhat come together and this seems to be a measure which is satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this measure and it has the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, in reporting this bill, H. R. 568, to the House, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the members of the

Ways and Means Committee and to others of our colleagues who have cooperated in advancing the legislation for expedited consideration. Your committee, in its unanimous report, has set forth the statistical and factual background for the measure, and I will now simply discuss some of the overtones which will highlight what we wish to accomplish.

Existing law provides for the suspension of the import tax on copper until February 15, 1953. Since 1940 all imports of copper have been tax free, except for a few months in 1950–51. Throughout the war, and into 1946, the Government itself imported copper without tax, either through the Navy acting under Executive order, or by the Metals Reserve Company, a subsidiary of RFC. Then in 1947, after extensive hearings, and since 1947, the Congress itself has suspended the tax by appropriate legislative action. Your committee has been thoroughly familiarized with the facts, not only through leaders of every branch of the copper industry, producers, fabricators, and consumers alike, but through unanimously favorable recommendations from every department and agency of Government having to do with copper and our Nation's need for it.

Recognizing the imminence of the expiration date in the present law, I introduced H. R. 568 when Congress convened. My bill merely extends the expiration date until June 30, 1954. That is all there is to it. Adequate safeguards for the protection of our domestic mine industry are already present in the law, and you may be sure I would wish to see that fact emphasized, particularly because of the peril point provision. Thus, if the price of copper should fall below 24 cents per pound and remain at that level for a period of 1 month, as determined by the Tariff Commission, the suspension of the import tax would be revoked upon proclamation by the President within 20 days after report to him of the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Congress prescribes the standard to be applied, the Commission finds and reports the facts, the President thereupon acts as the law provides. It is a simple, workable device which may well serve as a model in comparable situations where the best interests of the country may so require. The important point to note is that the Congress itself remains in complete control and Congress defines the applicable standard which governs action thereafter.

Aside from the principle I have emphasized, the important aspects we have taken into account may be quickly summarized: First, our standard of living, the highest in the world, depends for its maintenance upon adequate supplies of copper. Second, employment of millions of industrial and construction workers is bound up with copper. Third, more than half of the free world's supply of copper is consumed in the United States. Fourth, our domestic copper-mining industry, despite all efforts to increase production, falls far short of meeting our annual copper needs. Fifth, our defense requirements and our stockpile needs depend vitally upon available copper.

Perhaps the dramatization of the last point will clearly serve to highlight the whole picture. During World War II, some 800 pounds of copper were required for a tank. At least 2,000 pounds went into each large bomber. A battleship will consume some 2,000,000 pounds. A 50-plane squadron expended about 14,000,000 pounds of copper in only 1 minute of action. Other wartime uses for ammunition, for communications, for trucks, for electrical and electronic devices can readily be imagined.

On the peacetime front, copper is essential to the electrical industry for wire and cable, for transformers and turbines, for radiant heat and all forms of conduction.

In the automobile world some 50 pounds of copper go into every car or truck, for wiring, for alloys, for carburetors and radiators. On an annual productive basis of 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 units, it can readily be seen that assurance of adequate supplies of copper will mean continued employment for millions of workers employed by thousands of concerns, large and small, who are engaged in the production of the essential items necessary for every completed unit.

Our construction industry and its millions of workers need copper for all types of plumbing, heating, roofing, and hardware requirements.

In the appliance and equipment field, as well as in utensils for the home, every housewife is brought daily to an easing of her tasks and to a more comfortable state of existence by copper.

I have said enough to demonstrate some of the important factors to which your committee has given consideration in its study of the problem over the years. At each suspension date, we have gone into the subject, and always we have found that our Nation must have imports.

Under these circumstances, it would be folly indeed to require that our Nation, for defense and stockpile, and our public, for civilian needs, be required to pay $40 per ton import tax to procure a metal so vitally needed. A different situation might confront us if domestic producers were able to meet our demand, but they, too, have joined in urging prompt action on this bill.

Only one word more, and I will conclude. Since we have imported some 40 percent of our consumable copper since 1940, and since Chile has supplied us with about 60 percent of these imports, it is important that there be no break in the continuity of shipment. Contracts for the purchase and shipment of copper are written around the law as it stands. Reimposition of the tax, even for a brief time, could play havoc with the price and contract features attendant upon the movement of copper through customary channels, especially since copper is a fluid, world commodity in demand elsewhere as in the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move the prompt passage of H. R. 568.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed and also that Members who so desire may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 92) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, for the past two sessions of the Congress I have introduced and Congress has adopted my amendment to five appropriation bills which amendment sought to reduce Federal employees by filling only one vacancy out of four until the personnel in the respective agencies of government had been reduced 10 percent below budget requests. Here is a good example of what can be done. The Comptroller General has successfully accomplished the purpose of reducing Federal employees. I want to read just one short paragraph.

In April 1946 the number of our employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 6,204 employees on January 1, 1953. This is a reduction of 8,700 or nearly 60 percent in the last 7 years. Of this number 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department.

That reduction, Mr. Speaker, was achieved mostly by not filling vacancies.

The complete letter of the Comptroller General is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 8, 1953.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A few years ago, during a conversation with several Members of Congress, I was amazed to learn how little information Congress as a whole had about the General Accounting Office and its place in our Government. At the suggestion of those Members I sent a short letter to the Congress pointing up certain facts about the Office which I thought every Member would want to know. Since that time, I have sent a similar letter at the beginning of each new Congress. That is the reason for this letter, which requires no reply.

The General Accounting Office is in the legislative branch. It is the agency of the Congress to audit and settle accounts and claims of the Government, and to advise and assist the Congress and the departments and agencies on matters relating to public expenditures. The Comptroller General is ap-

pointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

I have said on a number of occasions, and I have no hesitancy in repeating it at this time of intense discussion of budgets and expenditures, there is not a department or agency in the Government that cannot reduce the number of its employees, providing there is a will to do so. It is not an easy job, even if you have the will, but I think the results we have achieved in the GAO without any mandate from the Congress furnish ample proof that it can be done. In April 1946 the number of our employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 6,204 employees on January 1, 1953. This is a reduction of 8,700, or nearly 60 percent in the last 7 years. Of this number, 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department.

Our accomplishments in reducing personnel have been brought only by constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present-day conditions. In cases where changes were needed but legal obstacles precluded them, we asked and received from the Congress revisions in the law. In bringing about changes we have always tried to make sure there would be no loss of control of public funds. There has not been. In fact, the revised procedures are enabling the GAO and the Government generally to do a far more competent job.

I know statistics are dull, but these will give some idea of the volume of our work last year: Twenty-one million vouchers audited; 508,000 claims settled; 264,000,000 checks reconciled; 12,000 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made by investigators of 691 different Government offices; 28 audit reports submitted to the Congress, including reports of 1951 audits of all Government corporations; work on accounting systems done in nearly every department and agency of the Government; 620 reports made to the Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to individual Members of Congress.

The GAO has continued to make collections of amounts illegally or otherwise improperly paid out far in excess of the cost of operating the office. The GAO is one of the few agencies in the Government that more than pays its way. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1952, total over $816,000,000. It is a fair statement to say that little of this amount would have ever been recovered, except for the work of the GAO. Naturally, I am proud of this record. But I feel of greater importance is the work the office is doing to prevent illegal or improvident use of funds by the improvement of accounting and auditing throughout the Government.

In the past few years the GAO has placed a great deal of emphasis on the joint program of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General for the improvement of accounting, budgeting, financial reporting, and auditing in the Government. Equal emphasis has been placed on the adoption by the GAO of comprehensive and other on-site audits of the departments and agencies. The concepts of these two programs were unanimously adopted by the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. Remarkable results are being achieved. Although we who are working with the programs every day know we are just commencing to get beneath the surface of many of the problems involved, actual savings already accomplished run into millions of dollars each year. In addition, improved efficiency of operations in the accounting and auditing fields, which cannot always be estimated dollarwise, has been of great significance.

With the tremendous growth of Government activities and their supporting appropriations, we in the GAO are keenly aware of the financial problems facing the Congress. The magnitude of expenditures makes it of utmost importance that the Government seek every possible means of obtaining full value for each taxpayer's dollar spent. In our work, we are making an all-out effort to create a greater cost consciousness on the part of every department, agency, and bureau. This goes not only to keeping the public spending within the laws enacted by the Congress, but to exposing, or better yet, preventing extravagances which, although legal, cannot be tolerated under present-day conditions. Yet you and I both know that economy in Government cannot be accomplished by any one agency or individual. Each and every officer and employee of the Government and each and every citizen must make his contribution, for real results can only be achieved through a day-by-day, continuing attack by all of us.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

STANDARD TIME ACT

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, to provide for daylight savings throughout the Nation on the standard time zones, and to provide that the standard time shall be the measure of our time throughout the year.

This act is particularly requested by people in interstate commerce. For 35 years we have been changing the time sporadically, and it has caused a tremendous amount of confusion. In a few weeks we will have before us a bill to change to daylight saving for the District of Columbia. I hope at that time that this bill which I have introduced will be adopted instead. Only by such a law can we have orderly time procedure. This is in keeping with the request and wishes of the television people, the railroads, and others engaged in interstate commerce, and the general convenience of the public.

There are many people who are opposed to daylight saving because of the confusion that it causes, who are not opposed to a daylight saving on a nationwide basis. All of the work that has been built up for years in developing standard time for our country is negative and destroyed during the summer months. No one can predict accurately what the time is in any community of the United States unless he is advised whether or not it observes the standard time or some deviation thereof, referred to as daylight saving.

This bill, H. R. 1722, if enacted into law will be an intelligent compromise which will give us an orderly time system.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to remind Members that when they come tomorrow to bring their hats and coats, as they will probably need them outside.

Furthermore, the Chair wishes to remind the Members that there is only a limited capacity and no guests will be permitted. There is one seat for each Member of the House. That does not permit ex-Members or children to come.

PROPER GARB FOR INAUGURATION CEREMONIES

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, your reference to hats and coats tomorrow was very timely. I, with many more of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, am thoroughly confused about the costumes for tomorrow. It is a matter of protocol and a matter of economics. For many years I have been letting out my long-tail morning coat. I understand we are to wear morning clothes and a Homburg hat, which to me has become the badge of the State Department. I think it has done more harm to the State Department than the Alger Hiss affair.

Four years ago, as I recall, our distinguished Speaker wore a derby—a bowler, as the English would say. I fully intend to wear my high silk hat and my morning coat. I only hope I will get some light as to whether that will constitute my first break with the new administration, which I hope to work with. I would be happy if my distinguished friend would tell me whether it would be proper for me to go in what I think is the proper garb. If we were rigging a ship, I think we would call it a rig that has been set officially as a hermaphroditic rig.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's request is referred to the committee on etiquette.

ADVICE TO THE NEW SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this 1 minute to call the attention of the House to an article that appears in the issue of the Pathfinder magazine dated January 21. The title of the article is "An Open Letter and Warning to the New Defense Secretary." I would not have made this the title of the article; I would have said, Mr. Speaker, "Advice to the New Secretary of Defense."

The article embodies much of the information and many of the facts and observations of the Subcommittee on Government Organization of which I had the honor to be chairman for the past 4 years. If the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Speaker, will carry out the suggestions made in this article, then millions of dollars can be saved to the taxpayers of America.

I shall follow the proceedings and the work of the committee as it goes on under this Republican administration. It was with deep regret that I had to select another committee and give up the Committee on Government Operations, but I hope it will proceed and do the splendid work in the future that it has done in the past.

(The article referred to follows):

AN OPEN LETTER AND WARNING TO THE NEW DEFENSE SECRETARY

(By M. K. Wisehart)

WILSON HAS A YEAR TO SHOW HE'S BOSS OF THE PENTAGON—IF HE CAN'T, HE'LL BECOME A VICTIM OF THE SYSTEM

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Your great task as Defense Secretary, the job for which Eisenhower has designated you, is to establish civilian control over the Pentagon. Part of the main task has to do with unification of the armed services, and the other has to do with the reorganization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Candidate Dwight Eisenhower, in his September 25 speech in Baltimore, said unification has failed. Instead of abolishing a duplicate system of supply (with Army-Air Force as one unit and the Navy as another), unification, Ike said quite correctly, has resulted in a triplicate system. The result, as Ike pointed out: Inefficiency, unnecessary depot systems, and scandalous waste.

Unification was frustrated by high-pressure service lobbies. They caused Congress to write a confusing and contradictory law. The services stridently resist economy procurement moves, standardization of items and proper management of personnel—not because they prefer to be wantonly wasteful, but because they fear unification means less power for each service in dominating appropriations and controlling its own spending.

Now consider the Joint Chiefs of Staff setup. Vannevar Bush, distinguished engineer and administrator and wartime head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, says our defense planning—for which the Joint Chiefs of Staff is responsible—is lamentably weak, due not to deficiencies of our military leaders but to a faulty system that produces frustration and confusion.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is best described as a two-hat system. It has a chairman who has no power and no vote. The three members of the committee are the chiefs of Army, Navy, and Air Force. Each member wears the hat of his own service when not attending a Joint Chiefs of Staff meeting. He represents his own service and is sometimes narrowly loyal to it in his demands. When he goes to a Joint Chiefs of Staff meeting he changes his hat. There he is supposed to be purely an adviser. But actually he is a special pleader for the desires and aims of the service he represents. This, as Bush says, makes the Joint Chiefs of Staff merely a bargain counter with each of the three chiefs working not for over-all objective defense planning but for the particular aims of his own branch of the service.

Your predecessors tried to do something about unification and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They failed—and for the same causes that may operate in your case.

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson strongly favored unification. Without knowing what he was doing—because of the way the Pentagon system works—he signed a directive which said each service should have its own supply system.

Like Johnson, the late James A. Forrestal favored unification but let himself be used to scuttle it. In his published diary Forrestal says that when he had been in the Navy 6 years his knowledge of the Department was only fractional. No man, he said, who comes in to run the three branches can possibly know enough about what he has to do and must ultimately find himself in the hands of the Chiefs of Staff. This, he says, is exactly what the military want. Forrestal cracked under the pressure and committed suicide by jumping out a window.

Your friend and one of your predecessors, retiring Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett, is regarded by congressional investigators as a weak man who failed at his job because he lacked force. He, too, was taken over by the system. He ruled that many questions (over which he himself had authority if he wanted to exert it) were problems for the military to decide. This was one of the big causes for his failure to live up to expectations as a great Defense Secretary.

Americans admire your achievements as a great industrialist. Many expect miracles. But, frankly, Senate and House investigators of the Pentagon system doubt that you will succeed any better than the others. They think they know what you are up against. They think—for all your vast experience—you do not know. In their minds the question is simply: How soon will you be taken over by the system? This, they say, is the way the system will work to take you on the same giddy ride it gave other secretaries before you:

1. Soon after you take over, the Navy will plan a ship dedication or some other public appearance for you. When you protest that you have not been on the job long enough to know what you want to put into a speech they will answer: "Oh, never mind that. We'll write it for you." If you submit to this you will discover later that you have made commitments the extent of which you did not realize at the time.

2. You will be surrounded with military aides. The system will select them for you if you permit it. When you call in an officer for consultation he will be accompanied by an aide. Your aide will also be there. In theory, these aides flocking around the Defense Secretary are there to help him, but actually they are placed in key positions to discover any move toward civilian control—such as unification, change in depot systems, or personnel. Your own aide, if not carefully chosen, may narrowly represent the view of one particular service. "Beg pardon, sir," he will intervene, "I think this is the way it is," and he will present the military aspect of the thing in a way to suggest that a change is inconceivable.

3. Of the three services, the Navy is most resistant to civilian control and unification. It will give you the luxury treatment, try indoctrination by flattery. No one expects you to fall for that, but some of your predecessors have succumbed little by little to the deference and flattery conveyed by that obsequious and constant mode of address, "Mr. Secretary."

4. If the system has its way you will appear before a congressional committee to testify long before you are adequately prepared. This will compel you to rely upon the aide or aides the military furnish. Congressional investigators will tell you these aides have often given well-meaning civilian secretaries "wrong dope" and "bum steers" inspired by narrow service aims or a desire to cover up. It would be smart if you asked congressional investigating committees to furnish you with examples of how Navy, Army, and Air Force comptrollers have furnished civilian Secretaries with misleading information in financial matters.

5. The system will try to put what congressional investigators call "service stooges" in key spots. When, for instance, the Munitions Board undertakes a basic study on personnel, supply procedure, or depot systems, a key man will be where he can see to it that the report—prepared by men who get their promotions from the service—recommends what the military want. Reports, arrived at by bargaining among the services, will be laid on your desk with this persuasive observation: "We have complete agreement on this. All you have to do is sign it."

But a Secretary who goes at it the right way can lick the system that has been built up to frustrate civilian control. If you manage it, you will go down in history as a great man—the first to earn that estimate as civilian Chief of Defense. These are some of the things you must do to lick the system:

Get under way quickly and make basic changes the first year—before they get onto your curves. You have only 1 year to show who's boss. If you fail, you will be hopelessly entangled in the same web of interservice rivalries that have enmeshed your predecessors and stymied defense planning.

To do the right things quickly you must get the right people in key spots—your own staff, Assistant Secretaries, staff of the Munitions Board, staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. You want people with an objective over-all defense point of view, not people with a "dedicated" single service viewpoint. Bring in or consult with men of this kind whose careers and testimony before Congress show they have an objective viewpoint.

Besides yourself, 24 people in the Defense Department must be confirmed by the Senate. Ask the Senate to inquire to make sure these appointees are in favor of unification and not opposed to it.

Get your Secretaries of the three services together frequently and give them an overall view of the Defense Department and what you propose to do. Do this before they become ardently devoted to Army, Navy, or Air. As soon as a Secretary loses a broad, objective defense viewpoint and becomes narrowly loyal to one service, get rid of him.

When you and the new men you bring into your Department are told by old-timers in the military system, "Go slow. You can't do this because the law says we are separately administered"—all you need to do is to follow Ike's prescription. Ike says the Unification Act of 1949 gives a Defense Secretary all the power he needs for direction, control, and reorganization, if he has only one thing in addition—"guts."

Above all, take Eisenhower's Baltimore speech on defense problems as your charter. Ike said: "(a) The Unification Act has failed and must be made effective; (b) to bankrupt America is more the Soviet goal than to conquer by arms; (c) to achieve both security and solvency we must have the economies that depend upon unification; (d) the defense program has suffered from lack of farsighted direction."

This last could only refer to the inadequacy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council. The reform of these inept organizations is also within your power.

The law already gives you a lot of leeway. Congress is ready to give you more. You need only that thing for which Ike gave the word—"guts."

FLORIDA ORANGE JUICE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as the old order changeth I would like to point to the fact that one of the better programs instituted under the Democratic administration will continue in operation. Florida orange juice still flows in the cloak rooms. In the days to come, as we look back with regret on the passing—temporarily of course—of the good old days, we suggest that you regale and refresh yourselves at the cloak-room founts where golden, delicious, healthful, in-

vigorating orange juice made available by the Florida Citrus Commission, under a plan developed by our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], is waiting for all of you.

THE HOMBURG HAT

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] had to say regarding the attire Members of Congress should wear tomorrow or at any other formal function during the new regime. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that in my judgment the question is not the hat or the coat, but what is underneath that hat and underneath that coat; that is what counts. I am quite certain that the heart underneath the coat General Eisenhower will wear, and the brain underneath his hat, will give us the direction we need and for which our country voted last November 4.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as President Truman leaves office tomorrow he carries with him the respect of the American people without regard to whether they agreed with him on everything he has advocated during the past 7½ years; the American people respect him for his sincerity and for his courage.

He assumed office a little over 7½ years ago as a result of the tragic death of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt. During the period since he has had many challenging questions confront him. Some may differ with him in his decisions, but I do not think anyone can differ as to his sincerity, as to the honesty of his decisions, and as to his courage. There is no question but what every action of his has been actuated by a desire to strengthen America and to advance the national interest of our country.

Without going into detail as to the many acts that have taken place during his administration, I simply recount the atomic era, the Greece-Turkey Act, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, the Military Assistance Act, the decision to resist open aggression, the first act of open aggression after World War II, which brought about the North Korean conflict, and many other important decisions.

I recognize that Americans may honestly disagree on some of them, and in this disagreement I respect their views, I know that President Truman does, too, but as he leaves office I am sure that I speak the sentiments of my colleagues and the American people, the great majority of the American people, in wishing President and Mrs. Truman Godspeed, and that God will shower upon both of them for many, many years to come His choicest blessings.

President Truman has been a strong and courageous President, a man who employed his unusual ability in an outstanding manner and now that differences of opinion and the conflicts that exist disappear, I know that we all wish for him and Mrs. Truman every happiness and success during the years that lie ahead of them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GRAHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and include copy of a letter by Father Hurley to Monsignor O'Grady concerning immigration.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include an editorial from the New Haven Register.

Mr. RIVERS and to include an editorial from one of the oldest papers in the United States, celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, the Charleston News and Courier.

Mr. MULTER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include two articles from the Communist Daily Worker demanding repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN in five separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT and include excerpts from several essays.

Mr. HIESTAND and include an article from the January 12 issue of the Burbank Review entitled "Money and Wealth."

Mr. SHORT and include an address he delivered at the Marine Corps League at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., last Friday night.

Mr. BENDER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) pursuant to House Resolution 101, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 20, 1953, at 11:15 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

343. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

344. A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

345. A letter from the general counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the orderly settlement of certain claims arising out of acts or omissions of civilian employees and military personnel of the United States in foreign countries and of civilian employees and military personnel of foreign countries in the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

346. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, as well as a complete set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions; to the Committee on House Administration.

347. A letter from the Administrator, Defense Transport Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of certain provisions of sections 1 and 420 of the act of February 4, 1887, as amended, relating to transportation of certain traffic in time of war or threatened war, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

348. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of action taken or instituted by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the saline water program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 448, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

349. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

350. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fifth annual report of claims paid by the Department during the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

351. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting Report No. 23, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, Public Law 498, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

352. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter relative to Public Law 586, Eighty-second Congress, relating to long-range shipping; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1916. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1917. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1918. A bill to provide for the issuance of four special postage stamps in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the

Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 20 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1921. A bill to settle possessory land claims in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 1922. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that those monthly insurance benefits which under present law are not payable until age 65 shall hereafter be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1923. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1924. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1925. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1926. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service testing of jet-transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1927. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1928. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1930. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1931. A bill to set aside Executive Order No. 10426 relating to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1932. A bill to terminate certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1933. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 396, relating to the importing and transporting of obscene books and other material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1934. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to historical sites and museums operated by the United States, the several States, or political subdivisions thereof, or by any municipality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1935. A bill to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 1936. A bill authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1937. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1938. A bill to create the position of mail handler in charge in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1939. A bill to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1940. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1941. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide that voluntary agreements for the coverage of State and local employees under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may include positions covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1943. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), to provide overtime compensation for employees of the Postal Transportation Service for service in excess of 32 hours performed in any calendar week in which a holiday occurs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1944. A bill to amend Section 1020c, Title 12, Banks and Banking, United States Code, and to provide for payment by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution defining certain terms, defining and extending certain boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 102. Resolution authorizing and directing an inquiry by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives into the commercial and proprietary activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 103. Resolution for the relief of Ida Seringer Sanford, widow of Robert Edgar Sanford, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of J. Don Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of Hugo Nicolas Solamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shig-Liang Sheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pung Hwa Liu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of the Union Oil Co. of California and the Matson Navigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of Hebbani Krishnamurthi Jairaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Cecile Lorraine Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Paula Vetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Alvio Innamorati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Khadr Su'od Sad ed Din; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Abdel Karim Ahmad Ali Sham'a, also known as Abdel Sham'a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Khalil Abus Su'd Sa'd ed Din, also known as Charlie Sood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Nakako Kano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Owsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of the Edwards Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Schillings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Khalil S. A. Aoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virgina (by request):

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Dezso Szilagyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1967. A bill to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of David Demarest Swift, Anne Hathaway Swift, and Samuel Hyde Swift; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXII,

20. Mr. PATMAN presented a petition of Fred D. Garner, of Winnsboro, Tex., and 97 other citizens of Franklin County, Tex., to amend existing Social Security Act so as to make benefits equal to all recipients, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, January 16, 1953)

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hath made and preserved us a nation, on this solemn day of farewell and hail we pray the benedictions of Thy grace upon him who, with the approbation of his colleagues and the abiding love of the Nation, goes from this exalted chair of governance after notable years of public service; and we beseech Thee impart Thine enabling might to him who comes to preside over this body. As reverently he takes into his hand this day the historic gavel into which has seemed to enter every decision since the Nation's founding, may the mantle of the great public servants whose hands have grasped it fall in double portion upon him and upon all who here serve the public weal. Give them, we pray Thee, fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in man that is more than coronets.

And as before the twilight falls a new Chief Executive of the Republic turns to problems more tragic and thorny than any man in history ever knew, may there be given to him and to his advisers in Government the wisdom that is from above, as our ship of state plows on through perilous seas. In spite of rock and tempest roar, in spite of false lights on the shore, bring our national barque to the desired haven of peace, with victory for truth and justice. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President Pro Tempore.

Mr. MILLIKIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 16, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on January 16, 1953, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) making January 20, 1953, a holiday for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Symington
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young
Gore	McCarran	
Green	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

CONVENTIONS ON MIGRATION FOR EMPLOYMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for January 20, 1953.)

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Second Report on the Mutual Security Program, covering operations during the first 6 months of 1952 in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.). The report reviews the steps that we have taken with other nations to work for peace and security.

The Mutual Security Program is a positive program for peace. It is absolutely essential to the security of the United States. At a time when one nation is bent upon world conquest—as the Soviet Union is today—other nations, large or small, have but two real choices: to pay the ransom of appeasement or to pay the price of building together sufficient strength—military, economic, political, and moral strength—to keep the peace. The United States and other free nations have chosen to build up their strength. That is what the Mutual Security Program is all about.

During the 6-month period reviewed in this report, real progress was made in strengthening the free world. Although much remains to be done, we are heading in the right direction. If we keep on, if each of the partners in this joint effort makes every effort to meet problems in a sensible manner, we shall eventually reach our goal of a secure, peaceful, and confident world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 18, 1952.*

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to development of water and related land resources, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See similar message printed in full in RECORD of House proceedings of January 19, 1952, pp. 438–441.)

MARITIME SUBSIDY PROGRAMS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read,

and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 16, 1953.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In approving the recently enacted long-range shipping bill, Public Law 586, of the Eighty-second Congress, I expressed my disappointment at its failure to provide a really thorough adjustment of existing maritime subsidy programs. I was particularly disappointed in its failure to deal with those provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which extend liberal tax privileges—amounting to indefinite tax deferment—to companies receiving operating subsidies.

The conference committee which handled this legislation recognized that further attention would have to be given to this matter of tax benefits by the next Congress, and expressed the view that: "• • • the Department of Commerce and the Treasury Department should immediately begin to gather all information relative to the extent and effect of tax deferment and tax-exemption benefits to the maritime industry. • • •" Concurring as I did with the committee on the need for a thorough analysis of the problem, I requested the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to revise and supplement studies which their Departments had previously prepared. I am transmitting herewith the studies of these Departments, entitled respectively, "American Merchant Marine and the Federal Tax Policy," and "Scope and Effect of Tax Benefits Provided the Maritime Industry." I hope that these studies will be of value to the Congress in its further consideration of this subject.

After reviewing these reports carefully, I am more firmly convinced than ever that the tax benefits which now are provided to this industry are unsound. As a hidden, indirect and uncontrollable form of assistance, they are basically inconsistent with one of the original purposes of the 1936 act, which was to place maritime aid on an open and direct basis. I feel sure that the Congress in 1936 could not have contemplated that these tax benefits would eventually assume their present importance. For example, it could not then be foreseen that corporate tax rates would reach their present maximum level of 70 percent. Though given little specific emphasis in the enactment of the 1936 act, the tax provisions of that legislation have yielded benefits estimated at $155,000,000 through the end of 1951. This amount is roughly equivalent to the net operating subsidies granted during this same period, despite the fact that such operating subsidies were originally intended to be the principal form of maritime aid.

Clearly, the shipping industry will face difficult economic problems in the future, and tax benefits could help in solving them. However, I find nothing in the present studies which would indicate that such benefits represent the best possible means of meeting these problems, either from the standpoint of the Government, or from the long-term interest of the shipping industry itself.

The principal problem that has been cited as possibly requiring the continuation of tax benefits is that of financing vessel replacement at high postwar construction costs. This problem for shipping companies will be relatively more difficult than the comparable problems of equipment replacement for other industries. However, available evidence indicates that tax concessions do not provide the most suitable solution for this problem.

By their nature, these benefits furnish the greatest assistance to those companies whose operations are relatively most profitable, and hence which may have the least need for special aid. This basic defect is especially significant in view of the wide variation in profitability between the various routes operated by the subsidized shipping companies. As a result, tax benefits may provide some operators with more financial support than they actually require, while at the same time affording little or no relief to other operators.

A further objection is that tax benefits place the Government in the position of providing financial aid for a possible future problem, the scope of which cannot be meaningfully estimated at present. Benefits are now accruing in relation to the possible replacement needs that may exist some 10 to 15 years hence. The magnitude of this future problem will depend upon a large number of variable factors, none of which can now be predicted with any assurance. It is therefore possible that tax relief provided at this time would prove to be in excess of actual future need. I am not aware of any other Federal program where the Government is asked to provide aid on a current basis to meet such a long-range, conjectural future need, and I feel it is unreasonable to expect the Government to continue to do so in the case of the shipping industry.

For the above reasons, I feel most strongly that the tax benefits now provided by the Merchant Marine Act should be repealed at the earliest opportunity. In their place, I feel that the Government should undertake to provide direct and open assistance for the fleet replacement problem. A suitable and equitable solution to this problem might be found through a liberalization of the Federal ship mortgages which already provide the primary method for financing the purchase of new ships.

Under present law, mortgages on vessels built with construction subsidy require a minimum down payment of 25 percent, whereas certain other vessels can be sold by the Government for a minimum down payment of only 12½ percent. By amending the law so as to authorize the lower down payment for all vessels, the Government could cut in half the estimated cash requirement for replacement of the presently subsidized fleet, and thereby solve this aspect of the financing problem for almost all of the operators. One defect of this solution is that it would increase correspondingly the annual fixed charges for mortgage retirement, which would be relatively high even with a 25 percent down payment. However, this burden could be eased by adjusting the terms of the mortgages, including possibly a reduction of the interest rate from its present level of 3½ percent to 3 percent.

From the Government's standpoint, a more liberal loan policy of this nature would offer a number of advantages in comparison with the tax benefit system. This alternative method of assistance would merely increase the size of the Government's loan, and would require an eventual repayment by the operator. Secondly, this would represent a measureable and controllable form of assistance. Since this aid would be given only as part of an actual replacement transaction, it would be directly related to the accomplishment of its objective, and would not be subject to the haphazard incidence of tax benefits. Finally, a liberalized loan program provides a flexible device which could be adjusted to meet the individual financial problem of any operator.

I have given full consideration to the argument that present tax benefits should be retained in order to provide some degree of parity with the favorable tax treatment enjoyed by foreign ship operators. However, I do not find this argument persuasive. The recent studies by the Commerce Department and the Treasury Department have corrected the widely held impression that foreign governments generally provide special tax privileges for ship operators. With relatively few exceptions, it now appears that the shipping industry in most foreign countries receives no more favorable tax treatment than is accorded to other industries in those countries.

Furthermore, there is no reason why this Government should attempt to place American shipping companies in the same tax position as their foreign competitors, unless it is clearly established that this particular form of relief is essential in order to permit them to compete effectively. It has not been demonstrated that this is the case. If this Government is prepared to assist directly in the financing of vessel replacement, it should not be necessary to retain the existing tax benefits in this country merely because the general tax burden may be lower for companies operating in some foreign countries.

Quite apart from the above considerations, tax relief does not lend itself to the type of flexible adjustment which would be needed if one were to attempt to establish parity with foreign tax treatment. Tax laws in foreign countries vary widely as to rates, depreciation allowances, and other factors. Since tax treatment cannot suitably be varied between the several American-flag companies, it would be coincidental if the tax situation of any particular American operator approximated parity with the particular tax status of his foreign competitors.

In the process of reviewing maritime-tax policy, the Commerce Department study has touched upon various other problems affecting the American merchant marine. A major policy issue of immediate importance is the question of extending operating subsidies to types

of shipping services which are not covered under the present program. A sound decision on this issue depends upon a more precise definition of the essential requirements which this Nation must satisfy in terms of an active merchant fleet. I believe that the one compelling justification which now exists for subsidizing an American-flag merchant fleet is the national defense requirement. For this purpose, we cannot reasonably expect to keep in active peacetime operation the number of ships that would be needed in the event of war. We must instead concentrate upon maintaining a modern and efficient nucleus fleet, capable of rapid expansion in the event of mobilization. We must supplement this active nucleus with a well-maintained reserve fleet of inactive vessels, and with an effective shipbuilding industry. If we satisfy fully such defense requirements for an active fleet, we could at the same time satisfy, in large measure, whatever requirements may exist for an American merchant marine for national economic and national prestige reasons.

It is, therefore, important that determinations be made of the size and character of the fleet that must be maintained as a national defense nucleus. Until this is done, it is not possible to reach any firm conclusions as to the justification for extending subsidies to operations not now covered. Since the cost of supporting even the presently subsidized fleet has grown substantially in recent years, the Government should, I believe, be most hesitant to undertake commitments for even broader subsidies, unless a compelling national defense need is established.

Two other problems mentioned in the Commerce Department study merit concern. One is the need for developing a more orderly vessel-replacement program in order to avoid block obsolesence of the present fleet during the period 1962–66, when the war-built vessels will reach a 20-year age. A solution for this program is needed, not only to simplify the vessel-replacement program of the operations themselves, but also to maintain a reasonably steady flow of ship construction activity, and thereby assure the retention of an adequate shipbuilding nucleus. Since most of the ships now in operation are adequate in size and speed to meet existing competition, the shipping lines have little incentive to incur the higher capital costs of postwar replacements until their present ships reach a normal retirement age of 20 years. This problem could be overcome by a temporary amendment to the 1936 act, authorizing the Maritime Board to provide liberal trade-in allowances as a special incentive for advance replacement of a portion of the present fleets.

Another problem which requires immediate attention is the possible shortage of tanker capacity in the event of full-scale mobilization. This shortage might develop, despite the present world-wide tanker-construction program, because of the excess of wartime tanker requirements in relation to peacetime needs. There is not now in existence any reserve fleet of idle tanker capacity, comparable to the reserve fleet of cargo ships, to supplement normal commercial capacity in the event of war. To develop such a tanker reserve, the Government might provide special financial incentives to tanker operators, encouraging them to trade in their existing ships in advance of normal obsolescence. Careful consideration should be given to the possible need for such a program, as a temporary defense preparedness measure.

I hope that the Congress will give early attention to these important problems affecting our maritime industry and its ability to meet the needs of national security.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION RELATING TO AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3185, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning amendment of section 3185, title 18, United States Code, relating to fugitives from justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AID TO CERTAIN AMERICAN NATIONALS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize aid to needy American nationals in connection with their repatriation from foreign countries, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CERTIFYING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION TO BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR THE PROMOTION OF ARBITRATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State, during the calendar year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition of working capital funds of the Department of Defense, for the year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SALINE WATER PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Saline water program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT, 1950

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 203 and 403 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1245), as amended, so as to authorize certain Government officers to assist in carrying out civil defense aid between the United States and neighboring countries; to modify the loyalty oath so as to allow nationals of neighboring countries or of countries that are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to participate in State civil defense programs without impairing their citizenship; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT, 1950

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the orderly settlement of certain claims arising out of acts or omissions of civilian employees and military personnel of the United States in foreign countries and of civilian employees and military personnel of foreign countries in the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Carmen Vazguez, and sundry other citizens of Puerto Rico, praying for the prompt approval of the constitution for Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROCEDURE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in a few moments the Senate in a body will proceed to the east front of the Capitol to participate in the inaugural ceremonies, following which the Senate will return to its Chamber and reassemble. I ask Senators to return promptly, so that the work of today's session may be quickly completed.

We shall receive nominations from the President of the United States. It is my purpose to ask that the nominations for the Cabinet, with the exception of those relating to the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, be confirmed today. We hope that we may complete those proceedings before 1:30 o'clock p. m., when the parade will start.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to its Chamber, it reassemble in executive session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND VICE PRESIDENT

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 40 minutes a. m., the Senate, headed by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Sergeant at Arms (Forest A. Harness), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the spaces assigned to them on the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The House of Representatives, headed by the Doorkeeper (Thomas J. Kennamer), had preceded the Senate to the platform and taken the spaces assigned to them on the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The Governors of the States were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, with their aides, were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Diplomatic Corps were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the Cabinet-designate of the President-elect were escorted to the places assigned to them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, preceded by the Marshal (T. Perry Lippitt) and the Clerk (Harold B. Willey), were escorted to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices being seated immediately to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and the Vice President of the United States, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, were escorted to the inaugural platform by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives (William F. Russell) and Senator HAYDEN and Representative RAYBURN, members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements. The President and Vice President were seated immediately to the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

Mrs. Harry S. Truman and Mrs. Alben W. Barkley were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

The President-elect of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Kansas, was escorted to the inaugural platform by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Arrangements, consisting of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman; Senator HERMAN WELKER; Senator CARL HAYDEN; Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.; Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS; and Representative SAM RAYBURN, and accompanied by the Secretary of the Senate (J. Mark Trice).

INVOCATION

The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, offered the following invocation:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Our Father, in Thy most Holy Name we pray Thee, to renew Thy gifts in the minds and hearts of those who, today, are entrusted with the august office of governing our beloved country.

Give to those who frame our laws to know clearly the path of rectitude. Urge them by Thy grace to seek to serve Thee best, by serving most unselfishly the citizens of the land.

Let Thy justice be made manifest in our judiciary, and thereby enrich and comfort the world with the vision of equal and impartial justice for all men before the law.

Bless with every needful grace, and abundantly endow the mind and heart and will of our President with all the divine gifts and helps that make bearable the great burdens of his high office. May Thy Holy Spirit descend upon him with the gift of wisdom, to lead, and understand to know Thy holy will, together with knowledge to enlighten him in whatever difficulties he may encounter. Impart to him the divine gift of piety by which he may walk humbly with Thee in the stern way of duty and honor. Fill him with courage to face his gigantic tasks with serenity and infuse into his spirit that charity whose first law is, by Thy will, the love of his fellow man.

Pour forth, we beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy grace into the hearts of all of us, that we may be always true to Thee and to our country, so richly endowed with all Thy blessings. Amen.

SINGING OF NATIONAL ANTHEM

Miss Dorothy Maynor sang the Star Spangled Banner, accompanied by the United States Marine Band, led by Lt. Col. William F. Santelmann.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Senator KNOWLAND, of California, administered to the Vice President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, RICHARD M. NIXON, solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

SOLO

Mr. Eugene Conley sang America, The Beautiful, accompanied by the United States Marine Band.

PRAYER

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, who art beyond our knowledge but near to our hearts and our needs, we pray this day for Thy servant, Dwight D. Eisenhower, as he takes up the burdens of the high office of President of these United States of America.

Keep him with great kindness, O Thou ruler of nations, and give him a wise and understanding heart that he may lead Thy people in these shadowed times, in truth and steadfastness, in patience, and in love.

Guide his hands to Thy purpose and his will unfailingly to Thy service. May he be the bringer of good tidings and the architect of a new hope for our country and for mankind.

May Thy spirit rest upon the Vice President of the United States and upon all the chosen representatives of our Government.

Be gracious, O Lord, unto our land and our people. Help us to preserve our blessed heritage of freedom and to make secure our institutions of law, equality, and justice. May it be given unto us to walk always in the dignity of free men secure in our rights and faithful in the obligations of our prized citizenship.

Make us all of one heart, O God, so that together as one people we may move forward unafraid to the tasks and challenges of the inscrutable years which lie ahead. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Fred M. Vinson, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

My friends, before I begin the expression of those thoughts which I deem appropriate to this moment, would you permit me the privilege of uttering a little private prayer of my own, and I ask that you bow your heads.

Almighty God, as we stand here, at this moment, my future associates in the executive branch of Government join me in beseeching that Thou wilt make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng and their fellow citizens everywhere. Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby and by the laws of this land.

Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people—regardless of station, race, or calling. May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political beliefs, so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and for Thy glory. Amen.

My fellow citizens, the world and we have passed the midway point of a century of continuing challenge. We sense with all our faculties that forces of good and evil are massed and armed and opposed as rarely before in history.

This fact defines the meaning of this day. We are summoned, by this honored and historic ceremony, to witness more than the act of one citizen swearing his oath of service, in the presence of his God. We are called, as a people, to give testimony, in the sight of the world, to our faith that the future shall belong to the free.

Since this century's beginning, a time of tempest has seemed to come upon the continents of the earth. Masses of Asia have wakened to strike off shackles of the past. Great nations of Europe have waged their bloodiest wars. Thrones have toppled and their vast empires have disappeared. New nations have been born.

For our own country, it has been a time of recurring trial. We have grown in power and in responsibility. We have passed through the anxieties of depression and of war to a summit unmatched in man's history. Seeking to secure peace in the world, we have had to fight through the forests of the Argonne, to the shores of Iwo Jima, and to the mountain peaks of Korea.

In the swift rush of great events, we find ourselves groping to know the full sense and meaning of the times in which we live. In our quest of understanding, we beseech God's guidance. We summon all our knowledge of the past and we scan all signs of the future. We bring all our wit and will to meet the question: How far have we come in man's long pilgrimage from darkness toward light? Are we nearing the light—a day of freedom and of peace for all mankind? Or are the shadows of another night closing in upon us?

Great as are the preoccupations absorbing us at home, concerned as we are with matters that deeply affect our livelihood today and our vision of the future, each of these domestic problems is dwarfed by, and often even created by, this question that involves all human kind.

This trial comes at a moment when man's power to achieve good or to inflict evil surpasses the brightest hopes and the sharpest fears of all ages. We can turn rivers in their courses, level mountains to the plains. Ocean and land and sky are avenues for our colossal commerce. Disease diminishes and life lengthens.

Yet, the promise of this life is imperilled by the very genius that has made it possible. Nations amass wealth. Labor sweats to create—and turns out devices to level not only mountains but also cities. Science seems ready to confer upon us, as its final gift, the power to erase human life from the earth.

At such a time in history, we who are free must proclaim anew our faith.

This faith is the abiding creed of our fathers. It is our faith in the deathless dignity of man, governed by eternal moral and natural laws.

This faith defines our full view of life. It establishes, beyond debate, those gifts of the Creator that are man's inalienable rights, and that make all men equal in His sight.

In the light of this equality, we know that the virtues most cherished by free people—love of truth, pride of work, devotion to country—all are treasures equally precious in the lives of the most humbled and of the most exalted. The men who mine coal and fire furnaces and balance ledgers and turn lathes and pick cotton and heal the sick and plant corn, all serve as proudly, and as profitably, for America as the statesmen who draft treaties or the legislators who enact laws.

This faith rules our whole way of life. It decrees that we, the people, elect leaders not to rule but to serve. It asserts that we have the right to choice of our own work and to the reward of our own toil. It inspires the initiative that makes our productivity the wonder of the world. And it warns that any man who seeks to deny equality in all his brothers betrays the spirit of the free and invites the mockery of the tyrant.

It is because we, all of us, hold to these principles that the political changes accomplished this day do not imply turbulence, upheaval, or disorder. Rather this change expresses a purpose of strengthening our dedication and devotion to the precepts of our founding documents, a conscious renewal of faith in our country and in the watchfulness of a divine providence.

The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use. They tutor men in treason. They feed upon the hunger of others. Whatever defies them, they torture, especially the truth.

Here, then, is joined no pallid argument between slightly differing philosophies. This conflict strikes directly at the faith of our fathers and the lives of our sons. No principle or treasure that we hold, from the spiritual knowledge of our free schools and churches to the creative magic of free labor and capital, nothing lies safely beyond the reach of the struggle.

Freedom is pitted against slavery; light against dark.

The faith we hold belongs not to us alone but to the free of all the world. This common bond binds the grower of rice in Burma and the planter of wheat in Iowa, the shepherd in southern Italy, and the mountaineer in the Andes. It confers a common dignity upon the French soldier who dies in Indochina, the British soldier killed in Malaya, the American life given in Korea.

We know, beyond this, that we are linked to all free peoples not merely by a noble idea but by a simple need. No free people can for long cling to any privilege or enjoy any safety in economic solitude. For all our own material might, even we need markets in the world for the surpluses of our farms and of our factories. Equally, we need for these same farms and factories vital materials and products of distant lands. This basic law of interdependence, so manifest in the commerce of peace, applies with thousandfold intensity in the event of war.

So are we persuaded by necessity and by belief that the strength of all free peoples lies in unity, their danger in discord.

To produce this unity, to meet the challenge of our time, destiny has laid upon our country the responsibility of the free world's leadership. So it is proper that we assure our friends once again that, in the discharge of this responsibility, we Americans know and observe the difference between world leadership and imperialism; between firmness and truculence; between a thoughtfully calculated goal and spasmodic reaction to the stimulus of emergencies.

We wish our friends the world over to know this above all: We face the threat—not with dread and confusion—but with confidence and conviction. [Applause.]

We feel this moral strength because we know that we are not helpless prisoners of history. We are free men. We shall remain free, never to be proven guilty of the one capital offense against freedom—a lack of stanch faith.

In pleading our just cause before the bar of history and in pressing our labor for world peace, we shall be guided by certain fixed principles.

These principles are:

(1) Abhorring war as a chosen way to balk the purposes of those who threaten us, we hold it to be the first task of statesmanship to develop the strength that will deter the forces of aggression and promote the conditions of peace. For, as it must be the supreme purpose

of all free men, so it must be the dedication of their leaders, to save humanity from preying upon itself.

In the light of this principle, we stand ready to engage with any and all others in joint effort to remove the causes of mutual fear and distrust among nations, and so to make possible drastic reduction of armaments. The sole requisites for undertaking such effort are that, in their purpose, they be aimed logically and honestly toward securing peace for all; and that, in their result, they provide methods by which every participating nation will prove good faith in carrying out of its pledge.

(2) Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. [Applause.] For in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains.

(3) Knowing that only a United States that is strong and immensely productive can help defend freedom in our world, we view our Nation's strength and security as a trust upon which rests the hope of free men everywhere. It is the firm duty of each of our free citizens and of every free citizen everywhere to place the cause of his country before the comfort of himself.

(4) Honoring the identity and heritage of each nation of the world, we shall never use our strength to try to impress upon another people our own cherished political and economic institutions. [Applause.]

(5) Assessing realistically the needs and capacities of proven friends of freedom, we shall strive to help them to achieve their own security and well-being. Likewise, we shall count upon them to assume, within the limits of their resources, their full and just burdens in the common defense of freedom. [Applause.]

(6) Recognizing economic health as an indispensable basis of military strength and the free world's peace, we shall strive to foster everywhere, and to practice ourselves, policies that encourage productivity and profitable trade. For the impoverishment of any single people in the world means danger to the well-being of all other peoples.

(7) Appreciating that economic need, military security, and political wisdom combine to suggest regional groupings of free peoples, we hope, within the framework of the United Nations, to help strengthen such special bonds the world over. The nature of these ties must vary with the different problems of different areas.

In the Western Hemisphere, we join with all our neighbors in the work of perfecting a community of fraternal trust and common purpose.

In Europe, we ask that enlightened and inspired leaders of the western nations strive with renewed vigor to make the unity of their peoples a reality. Only as free Europe unitedly marshals its strength can it effectively safeguard, even with our help, its spiritual and cultural treasures.

(8) Conceiving the defense of freedom, like freedom itself, to be one and indivisible, we hold all continents and peoples in equal regard and honor. We reject any insinuation that one race or another, one people or another is in any sense inferior or expendable. [Applause.]

(9) Respecting the United Nations as the living sign of all peoples' hope for peace, we shall strive to make it not merely an eloquent symbol but an effective force. And in our quest of honorable peace, we shall neither compromise, nor tire, nor ever cease.

By these rules of conduct, we hope to be known to all peoples.

By their observance, an earth of peace may become not a vision but a fact.

This hope—this supreme aspiration—must rule the way we live.

We must be ready to dare all for our country. For history does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak or the timid. We must acquire proficiency in defense and display stamina in purpose.

We must be willing, individually, and as a nation, to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us. A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both.

These basic precepts are not lofty abstractions, far removed from matters of daily living. They are laws of spiritual strength that generate and define our material strength. Patriotism means equipped forces and a prepared citizenry. Moral stamina means more energy and more productivity, on the farm and in the factory. Love of liberty means the guarding of every resource that makes freedom possible—from the sanctity of our families and the wealth of our soil to the genius of our scientists.

So each citizen plays an indispensable role. The productivity of our heads, our hands, and our hearts is the source of all the strength we can command, for both the enrichment of our lives and the winning of peace.

No person, no home, no community can be beyond the reach of this call. We are summoned to act in wisdom and in conscience; to work with industry, to teach with persuasion, to preach with conviction, to weigh our every deed with care and with compassion. For this truth must be clear before us: Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

The peace we seek, then, is nothing less than the practice and the fulfillment of our whole faith, among ourselves and in our dealings with others. It signifies more than stilling the guns, easing the sorrow, of war.

More than an escape from death, it is a way of life.

More than a haven for the weary, it is a hope for the brave.

This is the hope that beckons us onward in this century of trial. This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God. [Great applause.]

BENEDICTION

Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill pronounced the following benediction:

Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit our Nation. The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace, now and forever.

At 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the President and Vice President of the United States, escorted by the Joint Committee on Arrangements, retired from the platform, followed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other distinguished guests who had been invited to witness the ceremonies.

EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE SENATE

Following the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies, the Senate reassembled in executive session at 1:15 o'clock p. m., when it was called to order by the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, of California. [Applause, Senators rising.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the messages from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The messages were read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1953.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

I nominate George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

I nominate Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

I nominate Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

I nominate Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

I nominate Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

I nominate Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

I nominate Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1953.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

NOMINATION OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the nomination of John Foster Dulles, to be Secretary of State, in view of the fact that a hearing on the nomination has already been held and copies of the hearing and the report are on the desks of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the nomination of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the proposed nomination of Mr. John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State. The transcript of the hearing has been printed and is available to all Members of the Senate. At the conclusion of that hearing, the committee met briefly in executive session and unanimously agreed to the following motion:

If and when the nomination of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State comes to the Senate on January 20, the chairman of this committee is authorized and directed to state to the Senate that this committee recommends the confirmation of Mr. Dulles without further reference to committee.

I am happy to make that recommendation, Mr. President. Few men have come to the office of Secretary of State with the training and experience which Mr. Dulles brings with him. His outstanding record and his attainments are well known, not only to the Senate but to the entire country. Almost his entire adult life has been devoted to international affairs. He was a senior adviser to our delegation at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, and he has been intimately associated with the U. N. since then. He was the architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the related security treaties in the Pacific; and the splendid work he did in that connection needs no additional elaboration from me.

Mr. Dulles also served with distinction as a Member of the Senate from the State of New York; and I am sure all Senators who served with him at that time retain the most favorable memories of his ability, his devotion, and his grasp of complex world problems.

His qualifications need no elaboration from me, and I do not intend to detain the Senate; but I do want to call particular attention to a statement which Mr. Dulles made to the Foreign Relations Committee in answer to a question I asked as to his conception of the relationship between the Senate, the President, and the Secretary of State in the formulation and the execution of foreign policy. This is what Mr. Dulles said:

I believe that the Executive should consult with the Congress, both branches of the Congress, with respect to the development of foreign policy, and not merely present the Congress with some result as an accomplished fact which the Congress, or the Senate, as the case may be, has to take or leave. * * * I believe in bringing the Congress in, as far as practical, at the formulative stage of policies, rather than letting it wait until the policies are consummated and * * * cannot be upset without serious consequences.

That is a tremendously heartening statement; and I want to assure the Senate that, so far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, we welcome that kind of teamwork, and we will make every effort to be constructive and helpful in our criticisms and suggestions.

I hope the nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that these nominations may be taken up by motion today for consideration and debate, but that on the basis of an objection from any Senator they cannot be voted on today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the rule by the Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection to a discussion and a debate on the nominations, but I shall object to a vote on the nominations today, for the reasons which I shall state.

We have had placed on our desks a few minutes ago the reports of the committees of the Senate which considered the nominations and a copy of the hearings held in conection with the nominations. However, Mr. President, confirming nominations of Cabinet officers places upon each Member of the Senate such a solemn obligation that, speaking for myself at least, I do not desire to vote on the nominations until I have had an opportunity to read the reports of the committees and the transcripts of the hearings.

It is my judgment that in all probability, when I do finish reading the committee reports and the transcripts, I shall agree with the decisions of the committees. Nevertheless, I cannot substitute the committees' judgments for my own responsibilities. I do not agree that there is any great need for haste in connection with these nominations. The various departments will continue to function under subordinates until the Cabinet officers are confirmed. I believe it to be much more important that we demonstrate to the American people in this democracy of ours that we do not approve of nominations quickly and hastily until each one of us has had at least an adequate opportunity to study the record. I believe such action on our part is in conformity with the checks which our constitutional fathers intended we should exercise with respect to the Executive, as they also gave the Executive checks against the actions of Congress. In my judgment, Mr. President, it would not be in keeping with what I consider to be the checks-and-balance system of our form of government for us to proceed to approve the nominations this afternoon without first having had an opportunity at least for a thorough study of them by any Member, or all Members of the Senate, who may wish to take the time for such study.

Therefore, in fairness to my colleagues in the Senate and to the majority leader, as well as because of all the activities which are planned for this afternoon, I believe it to be only fair that I announce at the beginning of the session that I shall object to a vote on any of the nominations today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the hearing on the nomination of Mr. John Foster Dulles took place 5 days ago. The hearing was open to the public and it was open to the Senator from Oregon. The report of the committee and the copy of the hearings were available yesterday afternoon to all Senators. Therefore I hardly believe that the objection of the Senator from Oregon is sound.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Oregon is within his rights, of course, to interpose an objection to a vote on the nominations. The parliamentary situation is that the motion to proceed to the immediate consideration of the nominations, however, is in order, and may be passed on today. I shall make similar motions with respect to the other eight Cabinet nominees, and we shall take them up this afternoon, and consideration of them will be in order tomorrow, when a vote on them can no longer be prevented.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Just for the record, Mr. President, let me say that the junior Senator from Oregon never saw the reports of the committee or the copy of the hearings until he arrived on the floor of the Senate today. He has checked with his office, and he has been informed that the reports were not delivered to his office. The junior Senator from Oregon is neither a messenger boy nor an errand boy who must run errands around the corridors of the Capitol or of the Senate asking for committee reports on matters which are of so great importance to our country as are these nominations. If the Republican leadership felt that there was a need to rush these nominations through the Senate today it could have at least called a meeting of the Senate for yesterday for a preliminary discussion of the nominations and a delivery of the committee reports to the Senate. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that the nominations be taken up tomorrow, after we have had adequate time for study and consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLIKIN in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio. Under the rule, in the face of objection, the nominations cannot be voted on until tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. For the record I should like to state that the nominee for the Office of Attorney General——

Mr. TAFT. At the present moment I have brought up only the nomination of Mr. John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State. I shall also move consideration of the other nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object to a vote on the nomination at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the point of order is well taken, and the nomination goes over.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe the record should be very plain in relation to this particular nomination, as

well as in respect to the other nominations. The record should show plainly that a request has been made by the President of the United States. We have just listened to an address by him in which he stressed the fact that probably today we are in the most critical period of our Nation's history.

It has been a known fact for weeks that the President of the United States would send the nominations to the Senate today. While, of course, I realize that every Senator has his privileges, and that every Senator should exercise them, there has been a custom, as I remember, that with relation to his official family, special consideration should be given to the wishes of the President of the United States. In view of the President's statement that we are now in a critical period in our history, it seems to me that we owe our country the duty of proceeding in these matters with dispatch. I hope that my dear associate from Oregon will not object to a vote on the nominations, particularly in view of the fact that he has in front of him the report of the committee and the testimony relating to the character and ability of the nominees. I say it with no reflection upon the purpose of the objection. However, I believe there comes a time when collaboration and cooperation mean something when we are told by the Chief Executive of this country that we are in a very serious situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin in pointing out that the committee reports are in front of me. Certainly he did not imply, I hope, that therefore I should accept what is between their covers without having an opportunity to read them.

Furthermore, I may say to my good friend from Wisconsin that on this side of the aisle I have heard the view expressed—and I myself have joined in the expression a good many times in criticism of the Democrats—that we have been moved for a good many years by the argument of one emergency after another, when actually the cry has been "Wolf! Wolf!" It is somewhat humorous now that the Republicans are in power to hear them resort to the same fear argument when they want to steam roller something through the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that I know of no emergency of the present hour which involves any jeopardy to our country if we take the time we need to take in order to study the record with respect to these nominations.

I believe that the rule was put in the rule book for the purpose of having it apply to exactly such a situation as confronts us today, and I intend to follow the rule.

I may say also that I have a great deal of respect for the wishes of the President of the United States, but I also have a great deal of respect for our system of checks and balances. They are applicable to the President as they are applicable to the Senate. His expression of a wish will not turn me at any time into a rubber stamp. I shall judge his requests on the basis of the record before me. I have not had the time to study the record, and, under the rule, until I have had the time to do so, I shall press my objection.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to add just a word. It was not my position for one moment that my associate from the west coast should act as a rubber stamp. However, I think there is something to the argument of the majority leader, coupled with the facts which I have recited. The hearing was public. If there was any interest then, as contradistinguished from interest now, there could have been attendance at the hearing. Questions could have been asked by others, as they were asked by the entire committee. But be that as it may, I would not in any way attempt to detract from the right of a Senator. I simply suggest that I think there is a basis for immediate action.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish only to call the attention of Senators to the fact that I gave full notice of the procedure to be followed. It was reported in the newspapers that at the last meeting of the Senate, on Friday, I said:

> I have asked the chairmen of the committees to endeavor to have the transcript of the hearings prepared for printing, and the printing clerk has undertaken to have the Government Printing Office work overtime in order to have the printed proceedings available at that time. Certainly they will be available on Tuesday morning, and any Senator who wishes to have a copy may obtain it when he reaches his office on Tuesday morning. He can send for a copy on Tuesday morning.

There has been no session of the Senate since that time. As a matter of fact, I sent for copies of the hearing on Monday morning. Copies of this hearing, with four others, were available yesterday morning. Copies of the other three were available this morning. So I do not think the distinguished Senator from Oregon has any legitimate complaint as to the care with which we have tried to obtain expedition in this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I do not suppose the Nation will fall if the confirmation of these nominations is delayed for 1 day, although, of course, during this period many departments will be without heads.

I shall move to take up the other nominations en bloc when they are reached; and if the same objection is to be interposed, they will be taken up tomorrow under the rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to underscore what the distinguished majority leader has said. The Republican Policy Committee also requested that the printing of the hearings be expedited. I believe five or six of them were available yesterday to any Senator who wanted them. Some were available even earlier than that. I understand that some were available on Saturday of last week.

I think it is very unfortunate that the President of the United States, after having been sworn into office, should be left without a single constitutional adviser at a time when a war is going on in Korea, and when there are very dangerous international tensions throughout the world. The President of the United States will not have available to him a single constitutional adviser. The precedents have been exactly the opposite. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt came into office in 1933 the nominations of members of his Cabinet were confirmed on the day he took the oath of office. I think it is a considerable responsibility for a single Senator to undertake to delay confirmation of these nominations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from California that I am perfectly willing to assume that responsibility, in keeping with what I think is the preservation of a sound system of checks upon the Executive of our country, which our constitutional fathers clearly intended. I believe that the rule which I have invoked today is but an instrumentality for carrying out such checks.

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Democratic minority and the minority floor leader for the cooperation which they have shown in this matter in the attempt to have these nominations confirmed immediately.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations without reference to committee:

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I raise the same objection to a vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been held to be good. This is merely a motion to proceed to the consideration of the nominations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of and by authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to report that at a hearing held yesterday the committee unanimously approved the nomination of Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General of the United States, with the recommendation that when the nomination is received it be confirmed by the Senate without reference to the committee.

I may add that the report of the committee has been printed and is lying on the desks of Senators.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, yesterday an open public hearing was held on the nomination of Mr. Herbert Brownell, Jr., to be Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Brownell appeared before the committee and, in my judgment, made a very fine showing. He was interrogated by nearly every member of the committee who was present.

Speaking for the minority side, and as the ranking minority member of the committee, I hope that this one nomination, at least, can be confirmed today, because it would not be a wholesome situation in a nation such as ours for the Department of Justice to be without a head, even for 24 hours. I hope that the nomination of Mr. Brownell may be confirmed today, as the committee has recommended.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have been directed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to state to the Senate that the committee has conducted informal hearings on the nomination of Mr. Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, as Secretary of Commerce; that the committee has unanimously approved the nomination, and requests that it be considered by the Senate without further reference to the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 15 the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the anticipated nomination of Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture. Ample notice was given of this hearing. The public was invited to attend, and anyone who had anything to say with regard to Mr. Benson's fitness for the position was invited to testify. No person aside from members of the committee indicated any desire to examine Mr. Benson.

Mr. Benson met with the committee. He was examined by several members of the committee, and at the conclusion of such examination the committee instructed its chairman to say to the Senate that it did not desire to have Mr. Benson's nomination, if and when it came to the Senate, referred to the committee for further consideration.

One Member indicated that he might vote against the confirmation of Mr. Benson's nomination for this position, but he also indicated that he had no desire to delay confirmation of Cabinet nominations or to interfere in any way with the smooth operation of the United States Government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Friday, January 16, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was formally organized and a hearing was held by the committee on the prospective nomination of Mr. Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor. The committee unanimously agreed to the following:

> If and when the nomination of Martin P. Durkin to be Secretary of Labor comes to the Senate on January 20, the chairman of this committee is authorized and directed to state to the Senate that this committee recommends the confirmation of Mr. Durkin without further reference to committee.

In accord with that authorization and direction of my committee, I am happy to recommend confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Durkin without further reference to our committee. I hope the nomination will be confirmed.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 15 in number, held a meeting on January 15, at which every member was present, and at which every member took some part in the questioning of Douglas McKay, who appeared before us in connection with his nomination to become Secretary of the Interior. Rather extensive hearings were conducted, in which every member participated, a copy of which is on the desks of Senators today. The following motion was made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

> I move that the chairman be authorized to make a report that the committee endorses and confirms unanimously the nomination of the distinguished Governor of Oregon as Secretary of the Interior.

The motion was seconded by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and, as I say, was agreed to by the unanimous vote of the committee. It is our desire, speaking for the committee, that no further reference be made to the committee. We feel that we have finished with the required hearings, and so far as the committee members are concerned, they are ready to report to the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, yesterday the Senate Finance Committee had an open hearing on the nomination of George M. Humphrey, to be Secretary of the Treasury, and on the nomination of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby to be Federal Security Administrator. I may say the committee hearings were open. All members of the committee participated in the questioning. The committee members present unanimously voted to report both nominations favorably to the Senate, without further hearings. I earnestly urge the Senate to confirm both of these favorably reported nominations.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been authorized and directed to announce that our committee has unanimously agreed to recommend favorably the confirmation of Arthur E. Summerfield as Postmaster General of the United States without referring his nomination to the committee.

On January 14 our committee met in executive session and Mr. Summerfield made a statement concerning his background and experience. The committee was impressed by the forthright statement of Mr. Summerfield. I am certain the members were favorably impressed by his attitude and desire to conduct the affairs of the Post Office Department as economically and efficiently as possible.

The hearings of our committee in connection with this matter have been placed upon the desks of the Members and I am certain any questions may be answered by referring to these hearings.

For many years, the Postmaster General designate has been engaged in the automobile business in Flint, Grand Rapids, and Clio, Mich. He stated that he has resigned as president of these Chevrolet companies and has divested himself of any official position in connection with them. He also stated that he has resigned his position as chairman of the Republican National Committee, which he so ably filled during the past several months.

Mr. President, I ask that this body unanimously approve the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General of the United States. Personally, I believe that he has all the necessary qualifications for the office to which he has been appointed. I can vouch for his loyalty, honesty, character, and good reputation. He is a great citizen of the United States and will lead the Post Office Department to render greater service to the public at less cost to the taxpayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I understood the Senator from Kansas to propose a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, and, by way of comment, let me say I do not share the view expressed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that failure to confirm these Cabinet nominees will in any way interfere with the administration of the Federal Government by the executive branch for any period of time whatever. There is not a department that today does not have a subordinate officer who is going to carry on whether the nomination of the department head is confirmed by the Senate or not. Mr. Hoover is still going to function in the FBI. There are other top but subordinate officials in the Department of Justice who are going to carry on the functions of the Department. The same situation exists in every other executive department. Therefore, I object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON rose.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the President of the United States has authority to permit those subordinates to carry on until the nominations of the Cabinet officers are confirmed.

One more point, and I shall yield to the Senator from New Jersey in one moment. In reference to the precedents, Madam President, they have not been uniform. There have been a good many occasions when there have been discussions at the beginning of an administration in regard to various Cabinet officers, and Senate debate has gone on in some instances in our history for several days. So the junior Senator from Oregon today is not taking a position that is at all out of line with the history of this country. The position he is taking is in keeping with what at least I consider to be my obligation in the Senate, and that is not to sit here and vote on a matter so important as confirming the nominations of Cabinet officers until I know what the record shows. The committee records have

been submitted to me a few brief minutes ago. I intend to study them between now and tomorrow, and I shall be ready to vote tomorrow in accordance with the spirit and intent of the rule.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, the junior Senator from New Jersey would like to ask the junior Senator from Oregon whether he attended any of the hearings on any of these nominations of Cabinet officers?

Mr. MORSE. I did not attend any of the hearings. I was not a member of any of the committees. I now ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, is it his position that, because I did not attend any of these hearings, therefore I have no right to exercise my rights on the floor of the Senate under the rule?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is partially my position; yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say I think it is a highly fallacious one.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I disagree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may disagree all he wants to, but what the Senator is saying to me, a Senator who is not a member of the particular committees involved——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, the Senator from Oregon knows the crucial position which confronts this country today.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that I have the floor, and when I have completed my remarks I shall then be glad to yield to him.

I may say further to the Senator from New Jersey that with all these committee meetings, some of them taking place at the same time, I could not be in several places at once. I had a right as a Member of the Senate to await the action of my colleagues on these committees and then to consider their reports. That is the basis of the committee set-up in the Senate. It is not the obligation of a Member of the Senate to be running from committee to committee on which he does not serve. I have the right to wait until I receive their reports; and I got the reports this noon. I am going to read them tonight. Our forefathers in their wisdom provided to Members of the Senate exactly the protection I am exercising today in order that time might be afforded to judge the actions of their committees. These committees do not act with finality, and, in my judgment, we should not let them act in such great haste as is proposed here today. I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to infer that in the future the Senator will insist that all reports be delivered to his office some time in advance, in order that he may have sufficient time to read them, even though the committees might hold open hearings on each nomination, and upon other matters?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan is quite mistaken, as I am inclined to think he knows, in trying to place that interpretation upon the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. But the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today's proceedings will show that the Senator from Oregon has only said that he did not see these reports until he arrived on the floor of the Senate today. He has just got through saying to the Senator from New Jersey that he had the right to rely upon the committees to proceed with hearings and to make a report, at which time he could pass judgment on the committees' conclusions, once the reports were submitted to the Senate. The reports were submitted to the Senate today.

The majority leader, in his argument, to which I replied, and to which I think the Senator from Michigan was referring, pointed out that these reports were available as of Tuesday morning, as I understood him to say. I simply reply to that by saying they were not made available to the junior Senator from Oregon on Tuesday morning. I never saw them until I came on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator think that if he has it in mind that he wants to read a report, he should make inquiry as to when the report will be ready, or was ready?

Mr. MORSE. Of course not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Oregon not feel that responsibility?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the junior Senator from Oregon feels that he should be able to rely on the procedures of the Senate, and that is what he has done. Under the procedure of the Senate, the reports were placed upon his desk today, and he has seen them today for the first time. He is going to read them tonight and vote tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I should like the RECORD to show that the report on the hearing held in connection with the nomination of Ezra Taft Benson, to be Secretary of Agriculture, was available in print last Saturday morning.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine legislative business was transacted:

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 22. Resolution extending the time for study by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; without amendment; and

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the time for investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of certain transportation and communications problems; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(2) civil aeronautics;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) maritime matters generally, and particularly port security and conditions at harbors, ports, and other waterfront facilities which may affect the national health, safety, and interest; and

(5) the duties and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce in the field of foreign commerce and international trade, including a reappraisal of the effectiveness of measures and efforts instituted by Government agencies to control the shipment or transshipment of exported materials to foreign countries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-third Congress, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 538. A bill to amend section 311 of the Communications Act; and

S. 539. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make mandatory the installation of certain railroad communication systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until Wednesday, January 21, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 16), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be colonel

John F. Patton, MC, O251190.

To be lieutenant colonels

John Martin, MC, O401158.
Charles J. Thuss, Sr., MC, O284235.

To be majors

Richard B. Austin III, MC, O417840.
Carl L. Schwab, MC, O332713.

To be captains

Richard F. Barquist, MC, O957129.
Beekman Budd, JAGC, O2018998.
Donald C. Carlton, MC, O972652.
Bartlette M. Cheatham, MC, O991907.
Proctor L. Child, MC, O976685.
Richard L. Conde, MC, O992750.
Philip A. Deffer, MC, O474626.
David L. Deutsch, MC, O470606.
Edward J. Fadell, MC, O958514.
Robert E. Haan, MC, O1754941.
Herman R. Hansen, MC, O975002.
James C. Hayes, MC, O2041308.
Kenneth K. Hodge, MC, O975690.
Robert C. Innes, MC, O971618.
Kenwyn G. Nelson, MC, O1916704.
Raymond A. Skeehan, Jr., MC, O976389.
Albert W. Stratton, MC, O1922196.
Herbert G. Tearse, MC, O957133.
Joseph A. Worrall, Jr., MC, O955131.

To be first lieutenants

Hal H. Bookout, JAGC, O1171024.
Harold Borko, MSC, O988060.
Julian B. Carrick, Jr., MSC, O947170.
Harry A. Claypool, MC, O496939.
Cecil L. Cutler, Jr., JAGC, O1295682.
Robert J. Everhart, DC, O988386.
Milton P. Garner, JAGC, O963686.
James V. Harvey, JAGC, O985605.
Rex D. Jones, DC, O1290312.
Ernest R. Kolovos, MSC, O446554.
Walter J. Limbacher, MSC, O981121.
John J. Mayer, DC, O980577.
Lloyd B. McCabe, MC, O972869.
Billie D. McGrew, DC, O2095179.
Grace G. Palmer, WAC, L1010000.
Halbert H. Schwamb, MC, O986926.
Thomas J. Smith, DC, O988457.
Grant D. Stelter, MC, O986980.
James E. Stodgel, JAGC, O1295103.
George I. Uohara, DC, O1923002.
Charles J. Zersan, Jr., MC, O1042214.
Louis Zialis, DC, O988456.

To be second lieutenants

Rachel H. Adams, WMSC, M2834.
Mary G. Bauer, ANC, N805368.
Cecil R. Baxter, MSC, O964937.
Barbara R. Brown, ANC, N900127.
William J. Christopherson, Jr., MSC, O967881.
Sidney A. Couch, MSC, O741541.
Russell R. Dalton, MSC, O987179.
Mary E. Doyle, ANC, N901275.
Norman E. Eggleston, MSC, O987879.
Catherine E. Fuller, ANC, N901190.
Elmer B. Gausepohl, MSC, O990421.
Betty M. Gieldseth, ANC, N792140.
Miriam K. Ginsberg, ANC, N805127.
David D. Haworth, MSC, O989542.
Robert A. Hedeen, MSC, O990336.
Robert S. Hiatt, MSC, O988522.
Louise Hill, ANC, N804070.
William G. Hill, MSC, O989541.
William R. Knowles, MSC, O990423.
Martha L. Leiman, WAC, L1010561.
John J. Litrio, MSC, O991755.
David W. Marble, MSC, O2202726.
Warner D. McClure, MSC, O1887898.
Norman G. Miller, MSC, O1927661.
Henry C. Mitchell, MSC, O987855
Gerald G. Morgan, MSC, O979556.
Francis B. Neiswender, MSC, O988521.
Margaret L. OVery, ANC, N805564.
Ruth W. Payne, WAC, L1010616.
Joan M. Polidori, ANC, N805357.
Kathryn C. Pollack, WAC, L1010251.
Kenneth N. Ports, MSC, O988088.
Kendrith M. Rowland, MSC, O987821.
Herbert G. See, MSC, O987878.
Emil G. Shaw, MSC, O984562.
Jeanne Sherburne, WMSC, R2615.
William E. Sievers, MSC, O988018.
Elizabeth J. Starkey, ANC, N805130.
Helen V. Suess, ANC, N900322.
Kenneth R. Van Skike, MSC, O982880.
Thelma M. Williams, WAC, L1010619.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Littleton A. Roberts, O28991.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Medical Corps, Regular Army, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be captain

Robert C. Garner, O58733.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

James B. Blunk, O933854.
Arthur H. Laedlein, O990141.
Harvey M. Smith, O513221.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Howard G. Allbee, O2208206.
Harvey G. Dickerson, Jr., O948367.
Raul L. Greene, O965605.
Robert C. Kendrick, O2204010.
John J. Kirchenstein, O555979.
Jode R. Wilson, O2206015.
Langhorne P. Withers, O2210185.

To be second lieutenants

Paul G. Adams, O2021299.
Jack R. Albrecht, O1878761.
Hubert F. Alexander, Jr., O2203796.
Harry E. Allen, O1881829.
Juan B. Aponte-Vazquez, O1685798.
Charles T. Arnold, O1883663.
Jesse J. Atkins, O1861553.
Joe Bailey, O2209234.
John E. Baird, O2203565.
Olin J. Baird, Jr., O960299.
Talbott Barnard, O1883953.
Richard E. Beaulieu, O1885594.
James D. Bell, O1893728.
Charles M. Belt, O1893679.
Arthur M. Bennett, Jr., O1886750.
Donald J. Benson, O2208136.
Virgil M. Bishop, O975735.
Ronald L. Blaine, O970823.
Gerald B. Bobzien, O967706.
Gene T. Bond.
Willis L. Bond, O958182.
DeForrest Brooke, O984076.
John M. Browder, O1915652.
Gaston S. Bruton, Jr., O1340855.
Robert J. Burke, O2021795.
George H. Burnett, Jr., O1928753.
Robert S. Carlin, O1916434.
John M. Carr, O1883160.
John B. Carter, O1928773.
Joseph C. Carter, Jr., O2204708.
James W. Chism, O989727.
William Claggett, O1887868.
Lawrence L. Clardy, Jr., O1930990.
William C. Clune, O971916.
Harbin A. Constance, O1883776.
Raymond L. Cook, O2206610.
Elder T. Crawford, Jr., O1886756.
George W. Curran, O990658.
Harry E. Czarnetzki, O1883305.
John C. Dashiell, O1340268.
William W. Davidson, Jr., O1886757.
Alvah B. Davis, Jr., O2004140.
Clifford A. Davis, O2004750.
Jack L. Demmons, O1927668.
George H. Doerman, O2203338.
Freddie A. Dyer, O1925042.
Richard A. Ehlert, O1890010.
Harold O. Ernst, Jr., O2203957.
Leon P. Estrada, O982359.
John B. Ewing, O1182360.
Clarence Faaborg, O2204823.
William F. Faught, O1891314.
Roy K. Flint, O1882312.
Allan T. Ford, O2002847.
Efraim S. Garcia, O1880118.
Frank T. Gartman, O1889312.
Harold V. Gaskill, Jr., O973970.
George F. Germond, O1916162.
Louis G. Gibney, Jr., O1335144.
Robert W. Gleason, O1330411.
Joseph C. Greenlee, O980321.
Alton W. Griffeth, O2204891.
John A. Grubbs, O2004871.
Robert N. Habermehl, O2205697.
Jerome J. Haggerty, O964737.
Francis G. Hall, O2203531.
Henry R. Hall, Jr., O1886765.
Bobby J. Harris, O1886766.
John R. Harris, O1880104.
John E. Hazelwood, O2202462.
Thomas M. Henry, O963378.
Robert E. Hewell, O1887154.
Peter E. Hexner, O990069.
Millard F. Hill, O2202491.
Roy W. Hill, Jr., O1880319.
Richard A. Hiscox, O1330312.
John S. Holeman, Jr., O1338598.
John H. House, O2205196.
Halvor E. Hude, O2017858.
William R. Hudson, O1880169.
Charles R. Hutchins, O2207033.
Harry C. James, O1891686.
Hunter C. Johnson, Jr., O1886912.
Ralph R. Johnson, O1599107.
Arthur P. Keenan, O2202722.
John L. Kennedy, Jr.
Earl H. Kifer, Jr., O1880300.
Enzo P. Klinner, Jr., O1925087.
Tunis P. Lang, Jr., O1886768.
Richard E. Lee, O970292.

Gerald A. Liebert, O978624.
Oscar P. Liebreich, Jr., O956199.
Thomas W. Lilliker, O1916422.
Howard L. Littleton, O900275.
William J. Livsey, Jr., O1886769.
Domenic P. Longo, O990528.
John M. Longstreet, O1536074.
Graham P. Lowe, Jr., O1886771.
Gary C. Mahan, O1889927.
William E. Malone, O1879691.
David C. Mangum, O1886721.
Thomas J. Manning, O1890036.
Eldon L. Mansfield, Jr., O1886772.
Gene E. Martin, O1887838.
Raymond L. Martin, O988665.
William L. Martin, O2205835.
Bruce D. Mather, O949858.
Leon McCall, Jr., O2205932.
Joseph A. McDade, O986290.
John C. McGill, O2205915.
Frank A. McGregor III, O1925654.
Robert B. McJilton, Jr., O1881796.
William A. McSpadden, O1916241.
Dale E. Mellinger, O1892493.
Raymond E. Measter, O1876505.
Robert L. Miller, O965917.
John C. Moon, O2202461.
Donald R. Moore, O972892.
James E. Moore, O1886774.
James H. Moore, O2206474.
Paul R. Motta, O2021764.
Lawrence E. Mullen, O967697.
Joe D. Nanny, O1888101.
Lawrence A. Neer, O2210981.
George H. Nestlerode, O1883463.
Roy G. Nikkel, O2021850.
William B. Nolde, O2021769.
Lowell E. Oder, O2021290.
Eugene F. Overholt, O1883181.
Marvin M. Peel, O1916412.
William S. Perrin, O1886776.
Floyd E. Petty, O1341902.
Lloyd J. Petty, O1341903.
James W. Phillips, O1916160.
Billie R. Pierce, O2206516.
Charles C. Pierce, O2207295.
William T. Poor, O1886778.
Charles C. Pritchett, O2004752.
Robert A. Pulsifer, O958259.
Earl B. Pulver, O963420.
Robert A. Purple, O2003567.
Thomas P. Rametta, O2021863.
Philip J. Reilly, O1885644.
Albert W. Robbins, O1875640.
Antonio Rodriguez-Balinas, O1685780.
William T. Rogerson, O1882620.
Raymond R. Roth, O2203713.
John R. Rothgeb, O2209762.
William C. Rousse, O1930835.
James R. Rowe, O1887038.
Robert E. Ryan, O2209283.
Anthony J. Sammons, Jr., O1925755.
Neal W. Sanders, Jr., O531591.
Oscar J. Sanders, O2205019.
John M. Sanderson, Jr., O2209607.
Conne M. Sandven, O1885192.
Julien A. Scott, Jr., O1892196.
Ansley H. Shuler, O1332324.
Eugene F. Smallwood, O2250105.
Albert T. Smith, Jr., O960218.
Billy R. Smith, O1887762.
Clarence A. Smith, Jr., O960358.
Harrison S. Smith, O1116811.
Ralph H. Smith, O1886783.
Emory M. Sneeden, O979597.
John F. Spaid, O960596.
Leonard A. Spirito, O1883483.
James H. Stephens, Jr., O1886784.
Walter J. Stetter, O1884040.
Norman T. Templeton, O1885167.
John J. Tominac, O1321210.
Jules C. Trepagnier, Jr., O1886785.
Robert S. Trotti, Jr., O1883416.
George M. Turner, O1882254.
Bibb A. Underwood, O1916161.
Jonathan M. Weaver, Jr., O2202658.
Ezra J. Westbrook, Jr., O1879394.
Franklin J. Wilkinson, O2021974.
Harvey D. Williams, O2202984.
Royce C. Williams, O1886786.
William R. Williams, O953717.
Lee H. Witt, Jr., O1886266.
Howard K. Wohlfarth, O1888179.
Jesse L. Yaden, Jr., O1886787.
John A. Zalonis, Jr., O1948690.
Alexander R. Zens, O1881595.
Charles E. Zimmer, O1890987.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, and also subject to physical qualification:

Darwin E. Yoran, O1002863.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and also subject to physical qualification:

Charles O. Ashley
Rusian B. Bailey
Duard D. Ball
Walter L. Barnett
Edward Battey III
Robert L. Beach
Robert R. Bell
Wiley W. Bell
James M. Bowers
Raymond J. Broderick, O1892701
Clarence B. Brooker, Jr., O1883533
Robert Byrom
Lee B. Cannon, Jr.
Robert L. Carter, O1890780
John R. Cauthen
Coy M. Collinsworth
Salvatore A. De Marco
Dale Dewberry
Harvey M. Dick, O2003523
Marvin K. Dishman
James H. Dunn
Donald R. Eckles
James L. Evans
Oscar C. Fewell, Jr., O2005036
Anthony F. J. Finnerty
Joseph H. Fox, O2104683
Charles N. Gilbert
Raymond D. Gillaugh
Willis A. Godowns, Jr.
Elmer A. Goetsch, O1882904
Murray M. Golub
Samuel J. Grant, Jr.
James C. Greenquist, O1875286
Dolph F. Hamby, Jr., O1884009
Edward B. Hare
Ronald L. Harris
James A. Harsant
Lawrence W. Hedin
Albert P. Hodges
Harvey B. Hoffman
James M. Ideman
Thomas G. Irwin, O2105105
Frank F. Johnson, Jr., O2003141
Cecil A. Kaiser, Jr., O1879401
J. D. Kimmel, O1928663
Frederick W. Knoebel
Joe E. Land, Jr.
Robert M. Landau
Robert E. Langford
Arthur D. Leach
Fred W. Leuppert
Michael D. Macomber, O1882992
Robert L. Maranville, O1890811
Joseph Mas
Stanley I. Mast
Theodore L. McDaniel, Jr.
Robert I. McElroy, O1888204
Luna V. McNeese, Jr., O1879559
J. Carroll McReynolds
John E. Meanor
Leslie C. Meyer
Jerome C. Milam, O1879049
William J. Mitchum
Robert Mooney
Roger F. Nelson
Edward I. Nemeroff
Guy E. New
Myrl J. Norris, Jr.
Robert D. Ogg
Joseph C. Olson
Charles W. Overstreet
Bidwell A. Owens, O2005003
Rex E. Pensinger, O1916472
Theodore W. Pratt, O1883201
Lionel Rabinowitz
Thomas P. Rademacher
Grady G. Reese, O2003615
Jack L. Rinehart, O1927445
James R. Satterfield, O1889350
Byron N. Schriever
Rudy P. Schuver
Nathaniel Scott
Thomas E. Skelton
Bailey B. Smith III
Donald E. Smith, O1889632
James D. Smith, O1879159
Vernard J. Smith
Darwin H. Sorenson
George P. Stanley
Robert P. Steele
David F. Stoutamire, Jr.
Gary B. Sutton
Carroll E. Swain, O1872350
Carl O. Swanson, Jr.
Hiram J. Thomas
Harry L. Thompson
James A. Tietjens
Kenneth W. Tullos, O1879436
Raymond M. Vawter
James T. Walker, Jr.
Arthur A. Walsh, Jr.
Raymond M. Warren, Jr.
Raleigh W. Weaver
Roland C. Williams
Ronald E. Williams
William A. Wilson
William J. Yantis
Greyson T. Yetter
Charles D. Yoder
Joe L. Youngker

(NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on either July 18, 1952, August 28, 1952, September 18, 1952, October 14, 1952, November 6, 1952, December 11, 1952, December 15, 1952, or December 16, 1952.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be major, United States Air Force (Medical)

Wistar L. Graham, AO428043.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

James S. Boren, AO2212509.
Walter J. Brower, AO2212447.
James E. Cassidy, AO1906984.
Paul F. Eggertsen, AO975907.
Elmer P. Gillespie, AO976841.
Henry L. Hines, AO2213344.
Robert M. Hodges, Jr., AO2213435.
Hugh A. Innes-Brown, AO972455.
Robert W. Morrissey, AO964979.
Thomas C. Regan, AO2212518.
William H. Schlattner, Jr., AO958505.
Harold J. Shaner, AO976278.
Edward J. Shea, AO970966.
Thaddeus C. Siwinski, AO2238967.
J. Lewis Smith, Jr., AO1906868.
Charles W. Westerbeck, AO2213315.
Wilber R. Whitsell, Jr., AO2212105.
Paul C. Wilkins, AO953812.
Raymond A. Yerg, AO435412.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Dental)

Kenneth H. Baldwin, AO947111.
Charles C. Flanders, Jr., AO2213038.
Joseph J. Kreutzer, AO937742.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical)

Vincent J. Bagli, AO2238736.
William H. Burba, AO2238740.
Vincent P. Cappelluzzo, AO2238744.
William N. Chambers, AO855983.
Edward P. Didier, AO2238747.
William H. Elswood, AO2212654.
Richard G. Fullam, AO2064759.
Upton W. Giles, AO1855975.
John B. Harmon, AO750383.
Harold F. Hartman, AO798294.
Robert J. McCann, AO2238741.
Joseph T. Melton, AO2238755.
Keith Moffatt, AO2080427.
Charles L. Randolph, Jr., AO2238743.
Luther J. Smith II, AO722381.
Robert P. Waldmann, AO2238773.
Richard J. Ward, AO2212283.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (Dental)

Norman C. Shaw, AO2239006.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Veterinary)

Robert W. Bailey, AO2213717.
Richard E. Benson, AO2212309.
Robert A. Crandell, AO2212964.
Donald C. Houk, AO2212510.
Gene C. Phelps, AO2213142.

Donald W. Ringley, AO2080135.
John L. Terry, Jr., AO2213140.
Robert J. Young, AO2212943.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical Service)

Joseph E. Hodge, AO1541879.
Harold C. Hodgkins, AO1313096.
Eugene K. Lindsay, AO946490.
Adolph H. Swimmer, AO1535310.

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical Service)

Henry P. Ames, Jr., AO2232016.
James R. Briley, AO2213662.
Emery B. Busch, Jr., AO2234963.
Alexander J. Cardarelli, AO2239063.
Francis P. Chiaramonte, AO1860031.
Frederick J. Diedrich, Jr., AO2215164.
Hal G. Etter, AO2213785.
Sheldon L. Freud, AO2213779.
Thomas B. Gibble, AO2239022.
Llewellyn B. Griffith, AO2057148.
Raymond O. Haas, AO666281.
Bruce Jones, AO2213909.
Robert L. Little, AO2213642.
Ralph S. Long, Jr., AO1862936.
Lester R. Loper, AO2238897.
Walter V. McIntyre, AO2213931.
Gene H. Parker, AO2239365.
Donald G. Pitts, AO1866000.
Toxie W. Richardson, Jr., AO1864907.
William L. Williams, AO1859927.

The following named-persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 101 (c), Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (Nurse)

LaVerne M. Collavo, AN2243937.
Esther M. Momrow, AN1912826.
Mildred F. Schooley, AN1906246.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of judge advocate duties:

To be captain

John O. Green, AO432948.

To be first lieutenants

Alton G. Burckle, Jr., AO1854113.
Thomas W. Burks, AO834119.
Atticus A. Calhoun, AO1859533.
Jack C. Dixon, Jr., AO1856815.
James M. Heidelberg, AO1553274.
Jack L. Hudson, AO779144.
Elden G. Marquardt, AO2068707.
Stuart R. Reichart, AO782958.
William V. Richards, Jr., AO825985.
Robert J. Torvestad, AO829592.
William S. Windes, AO801536.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Lionel C. Allard, Jr., AO833869.
Curtis H. Arrington, Jr., AO1855621.
Albert E. Audick, AO2101204.
Orville R. Baisden, AO2064503.
Gerald W. Batson, AO828916.
Robert H. Becker, AO739239.
Glen E. Booton, AO2059400.
James E. Braddock, AO589871.
Robert S. Brown, Jr., AO590838.
Stewart Burgin, AO788700.
Harry R. Cattrell, AO2084795.
George A. Cavalli, AO2076546.
Frederick L. Christopher, AO718245.
Bryce C. Connor, AO1909019.
Walter A. Czekaj, AO2070781.
Lloyd C. Edwards, Jr., AO710074.
Herbert P. Egender, AO733292.
James J. Ford, AO670375.
Earl Furnace, AO711175.
Harry T. Galpin, AO835023.
Claude S. Haigler, AO670893.
Roland P. Hall, AO2080167.
Elsey Harris, Jr., AO680893.
Arnold E. Hector, AO770098.
Richard L. Hellwege, AO590157.
Alfred S. Hess, AO787504.
James A. Hill, AO768546.
James D. Hudson, AO816314.
LaVern C. Hutchins, AO767045.
Robert P. Jagitsch, AO715974.
Willard D. Jenkins, AO2094875.
George A. Johnson, AO2077669.
Wendell A. Johnson, AO869495.
Charles D. Jones, Jr., AO2077319.
Henry I. Jones, Jr., AO754286.
Edgar L. Kellam, AO2075218.
William C. Kester, AO590952.
Stephen J. King, AO808429.
Charles B. Knudson, AO2015142.
Leo S. Korpanty, AO2056983.
George Krynovich, AO705716.
Joseph A. Kuhn, AO763231.
Richard G. Leech, AO704603.
Kenneth R. Lindow, AO704954.
John C. Ludden, AO837010.
Bill T. Macauley, AO867723.
Paul E. Malone, AO806484.
Lyle E. Mann, AO774229.
John W. Maxwell, AO788577.
William L. McDonald, AO772455.
Walter A. Merritt, AO1849137.
Jack B. Morris, AO784507.
Joseph M. Morrissey, AO811715.
Hugh A. Moy, AO590791.
Frank F. Nicaise, AO820556.
David B. O'Hara, AO744743.
Carl A. Pacharzina, Jr., AO700045.
Clarence B. Pate, Jr., AO2082091.
John W. Paup, AO1638232.
Howard W. Peterson, AO661369.
Wendell Phillips, AO766941.
Forrest S. Pine, AO766944.
Charles S. Reed, AO800940.
Daniel W. Riordan, AO798679.
Dale L. Samuelson, AO699865.
William Savidge, Jr., AO1908966.
David J. Schmidt, AO757300.
Carl G. Schneider, AO1903257.
Van H. Shepard, AO2074249.
Norman S. Smith, AO776426.
Donald L. Soderberg, AO764814.
LeRoy E. Stapleton, AO2081826.
William J. Sullivan, AO2058898.
Victor K. Syphers, AO727801.
John F. Thornell, Jr., AO797743.
Albert T. Watson, Jr., AO2067239.
Robert B. Wiley, AO2072383.

To be second lieutenants

Robert E. Adair, AO876614.
Franklyn R. Akey, AO1909448.
William T. Alexander, AO1865903.
Jack G. Allison, AO2072085.
John P. Allred, Jr., AO837761.
Robert H. Anderson, AO1865630.
Bernard R. Babcock, AO1863086.
John L. Balega, AO816028.
Steven L. Bartalsky, AO834352.
James R. Bedford, Jr., AO682604.
Douglass S. Benham, AO838509.
Robert G. Bensing, AO772260.
Robert L. Berg, AO702747.
Justin L. Berger, AO721325.
Bernard Berman, AO970862.
Charles C. Bock, Jr., AO2084775.
Maurice J. Boots, AO835134.
Arthur F. Bouton, Jr., AO703181.
Thomas M. Brandom, Jr., AO1864182.
Lee A. Brewer, AO2075636.
Jack F. Brown, AO742840.
Richard S. Brown, AO1912058.
George E. Brunsman, AO2078428.
James E. Burford, AO756472.
Wendal L. Busboom, AO2086772.
John O. Canfield, AO816992.
William E. Carey, AO1858941.
John C. Casey, AO832344.
Fred J. Christman, Jr., AO2079695.
Guy P. Clark, Jr., AO2032026.
Roy T. Clark, Jr., AO510282.
Wilmer F. Cline, AO2077735.
Marc J. Colvin, Jr., AO2084541.
Lloyd I. Cooney, AO1859505.
Robert P. Corker, AO2087406.
John A. Cotter, AO694126.
Joe I. Cottle, AO780528.
Fred R. Crawford, AO754075.
Robert F. Crossland, AO691353.
Bohdan Danyliw, AO872165.
Albert P. Davis, AO1910577.
Cecil Davis, AO1856596.
Marvin R. Davis, AO705345.
David C. Dellinger, AO831386.
Robert Dias, Jr., AO1911975.
Joe T. Dickinson, AO839951.
Jack E. Downhill, AO667500.
Charles O. Downs, AO815667.
Joseph M. DuBois, AO677682.
Sterling W. Dukes, AO675047.
Mathew T. Dunn, AO719901.
Edwin C. Eanes, AO700866.
Wyley E. Eaton, AO771353.
Howard R. Ebersole, AO1640415.
Douglas S. Eden, AO1997861.
Darrell H. Egbert, AO1857870.
Jack H. Egginton, AO770210.
Douglas K. Evans, AO1849482.
Stephen F. Farry, AO778760.
John D. Faulk, AO1904588.
Robert P. Ferguson, Jr., AO1864198.
John J. Ferriter, AO1851915.
George H. Finefrock, AO697344.
John W. Fippen, AO688810.
Francis X. Forster, AO833070.
Jack R. Foster, AO754489.
William G. Foster, AO838532.
Albert H. Francis, AO721686.
Alexander Gabrielis, Jr., AO2027199.
Thomas J. Gamm, AO811618.
Francis R. Gerard, AO810646.
Richard V. Gerdau, AO775317.
Eldon E. Gill, AO837466.
Charles B. Gillette, AO1909909.
William H. Ginn, Jr., AO1909297.
Richard A. Goldfogle, AO1849082.
Carl D. Gould, AO839459.
Howard K. Grasher, AO928556.
Charles K. Grimes, AO839965.
William S. Hagen, AO534316.
John F. Hallgren, AO2066339.
Winton G. Hammond, AO838397.
Vincent S. Haneman, Jr., AO822431.
Jerry Hanjian, AO781564.
John S. Harpster, AO677267.
John W. Harpster, AO776298.
Minnis C. Harr, AO834805.
Allen C. Hart, AO728274.
Edward M. Head, AO825394.
Robert J. Heard, Jr., AO836115.
Dick Hickson, Jr., AO675999.
Thomas F. Hines, AO841713.
George E. Holy, AO2086838.
Donald H. Hooten, AO1858992.
Joseph A. Horne, Jr., AO2089621.
Henry G. Hostetter, AO840096.
Hugh P. Hunerwadel, AO835018.
John F. Hunter, AO1862591.
James G. Johnson, AO719362.
Norman J. Johnson, AO771042.
Harold K. Jordon, AO2000239.
George F. Jubber, AO2084317.

James H. Kasler, AO2221728.
Paul V. Kelley, Jr., AO1865430.
Robert V. Kieckhaefer, AO735600.
William L. Kincaid, AO1904723.
Bruce F. King, AO942231.
Clarence B. Kirby, AO830479.
Donald D. Kirsch, AO1862403.
Burt S. Koons, AO772411.
William G. Krause, AO2044925.
Daniel J. Kuchta, AO2070366.
Thomas J. Leonard, AO888666.
Willis E. Lorey, AO1910010.
Royal C. Lua, AO2061736.
Donald A. Luttrell, AO760343.
Boyd H. Lynch, AO782574.
Robert A. Madden, AO2067016.
Thomas C. Marsters, AO714953.
Harry H. Matthews, AO719703.
Hugh E. May, AO1856673.
George F. McCarthy, AO838781.
Joseph A. McClure, AO1909744.
William L. McKeever, AO777748.
Francis J. McNamara, Jr., AO829251.
Roger N. Mercer, AO897052.
Jack W. Messmore, AO2009360.
Ernest P. Middleton, Jr., AO817993.
Alfred L. Miller, Jr., AO784212.
Donald E. Miller, AO818406.
George R. Miller, AO2088792.
Bruce E. Morrell, AO1860214.
Maurice L. Mullen, AO771495.
James S. Munn, AO803036.
Jack G. Murray, AO769172.
Emmett E. Muterspaw, Jr., AO2078107.
Charlie C. Myers, AO783616.
James E. Neeley, AO840125.
Alan G. Nelson, AO1910119.
Garnold S. Nelson, AO813558.
James T. Nelson, Jr., AO1854316.
William L. Nicholson III, AO1858440.
James A. Nolan, AO828495.
Charles W. Norton, Jr., AO842438.
John J. Nunemaker, AO766927.
Frank W. Nunnally, AO784335.
Robert Q. Old, AO938896.
Wayne E. Owens, AO821765.
Wallace J. Palmer, AO2062402.
Laurence C. Parfitt, Jr., AO834206.
Alan L. Parker, AO2064433.
Joseph R. Peartree, AO799241.
Robert W. Pipher, AO723676.
William L. Polhemus, AO1911820.
George P. Poston, AO2070868.
James C. Prior, AO769552.
Gerald G. Probst, AO807871.
James V. Proffitt, Jr., AO1855905.
Lyle L. Pulleyn, AO692435.
Henry W. Purser, AO2092335.
Bryan C. Rambo, AO1852935.
James C. Rankin, AO787196.
Charles J. Rauch, AO2060367.
William P. Reaver, AO2088192.
Ernest J. Reeves, AO838450.
Frank P. Reggio, AO1910476.
Robert E. Renz, AO948332.
William P. Riley, Jr., AO2067888.
Edward W. Roberts, AO1683536.
Frederick A. Roll, Jr., AO756711.
John M. Rose, Jr., AO820329.
Allen C. Rossa, AO2062306.
Robert L. Savage, AO1695521.
Stanley V. Scharling, AO2057089.
Calvin C. Schneider, AO1849290.
Richard P. Schumann, AO1847272.
Richard H. Schutte, AO1860682.
Nathaniel P. Secrest, AO838813.
Fred M. Sherman, AO826786.
Robert W. Shively, AO804241.
Ralph L. Slaten, AO2075712.
Arthur C. Smith, Jr., AO927320.
John R. Smith, AO783642.
Thomas B. Spalding, AO826545.
David B. Stevens, AO828824.
Homer J. Stewart, AO745535.
Clifford A. Stodghill, AO680537.
Frank Swanberg, Jr., AO2093245.
Leo E. Sweeney, Jr., AO2099637.
Albert H. Sweet, AO2065851.
Howard R. Thorp, AO872378.
Tom B. Tischoff, AO831024.
Eugene W. Traendly, AO1301716.
James L. Trueheart, AO2067042.
Herbert W. Truett, AO1183437.
John E. Vastine, AO1911620.
Thomas H. Waggoner, AO1909948.
William L. Wagner, AO832294.
Edward T. Walford, AO712958.
Clarence W. Walker, Jr., AO2066952.
James S. Wall, AO2071761.
Neil W. Wallace, AO1855105.
Billy R. Ward, AO2057470.
Ralph R. Waters, AO2079167.
Eugene C. Watkins, AO2062916.
James M. Watson, Jr., AO821125.
William J. H. Watson, AO825515.
Herbert G. Webb, AO1855396.
Lawrence W. Weber, AO760496.
Jerome C. Weiler, AO714547.
Laurence D. Wells, AO1857679.
Robert M. White, AO823186.
Donald S. Williamson, AO938358.
Robert C. Woldt, AO2067595.
Willard E. Woldt, AO2080838.
David A. Woods, Jr., AO1910967.
Robert C. Wright, AO770072.
George E. Yale, AO770075.
Everett O. Young, AO768792.
Richard H. Zaroban, AO2214867.
Frederick H. Zeitz, Jr., AO2101404.
Vincent V. Zettler, Jr., AO721573.
Irving Zippel, AO2221592.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighteth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be first lieutenant

Dorothy L. Neely, AL1908812.

To be second lieutenant

Vera H. Fink, AL891456.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Robert E. Milstead, AO2219299.
Robert J. Mitchell, AO2219300.
Richard J. Wood, AO2219411.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Karl C. Allan
Ralph J. Astrella, AO2222493
William B. Boyd
David A. E. Cady
Leland W. Carter
Arnold P. Christenson, AO2222495
Carl S. Conrad, AO2222331
Alfred J. Dickhaus
Forist G. Dupree
Claude J. Ford, AO2223326
Frederick C. Freeman, Jr.
Clarence L. Frowein, AO2223328
Jerry E. Fullerton
Walter H. Grady
Delos F. Hamlin, Jr.
Robert B. Hill
Earl J. Hoag, Jr.
Richard E. Kahler
Theodore F. Lemcke
James J. Malone
Lycurgus M. Mitchell, Jr.
Richard L. Myers, AO2223096
David L. Oakes
Robert W. Robinson
Loren F. Rodewig
Clarence B. Schmidt II
William E. Singer
Richard E. Stoltenberg, AO2222525
Charles B. Stratton
Bryan Sumner
James C. Swarts
James K. Thompson
Jack H. Turbervill
Garrison N. Valentine, AO2223108
Bernard Vise
Ian G. Walker, AO2223109
Melvin K. Walker

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be major, United States Air Force (Medical)

Edwin W. Turner, AO422449.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

Horace S. Bell, AO440875.
Werner F. Cryns, AO2241370.
Ray F. Fitch, AO2213291.
Brian P. Flanagan, AO965577.
Rufus R. Hessberg, Jr., AO1718973.
John W. Lane, AO2213358.
Rowlin L. Lichter, AO2212429.
William R. V. Marriott, AO936881.
Henry G. Moritz, Jr., AO1906858.
Henry G. Nixon.
Douglas F. Powers, AO2212984.
Victor E. Scherer, AO2238797.
Palmer H. Warren, AO1736530.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Dental)

Russell V. Brown, AO2212876.
Carroll C. Gillespie, Jr., AO1776110.
Charles B. Malloy, AO2212370.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (medical)

Charles M. Berfield, AO713096.
Sanford L. Billet, AO2238766.
Richard S. Bryan, AO527776.
Carmen T. Ciatteo, AO2074950.
Wilbert H. McElvain, AO713671.
John S. Orth, AO2078653.
Nicholas V. Parapid, O730948.
Dean M. Ring, AO1863487.
Wesley A. Roads, AO440951.
Henry K. Shoemaker.
Lyle M. Shum, AO1906328.
Robert J. Solomon, AO2213357.
Hubert E. Wuesthoff, AO2212131.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Dental)

Ambrose G. Grant, AO797518.
Clifford E. Loper, AO1906543.
Charles J. Mahan, AO1906195.
Edward W. Roy, AO1906159.
Kenneth L. Stewart, AO781098.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Chaplain)

Charles D. Bayha, AO2233611.
John F. Denehy, AO1860337.
Thomas M. Groome, Jr., AO862475.
Thomas M. Jelfico, AO962249.
William J. King, AO1864455.
Vernon F. Kullowatz, AO531806.
Robert M. Mooney, AO2218441.
David B. Schuck, AO1863300.
Benjamin J. Shinn, AO971215.
Robert H. Verbeke, AO2215058.
Henry C. Wolk, Jr., AO540309.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force,

under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighticth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

John S. Albright, AO625395.
Henry W. Bennett, AO537082.
Otis O. Benson, AO1906121.
Donald J. Brush, AO769714.
Alexander P. Butterfield, AO1909559.
John M. Carlson, AO1909461.
Henry W. Compton, AO2059985.
Jean L. Coover, AO1908305.
Dave Counts, AO688926.
Harry J. Crespy, AO2094306.
Marcus B. Crisman, Jr., AO933381.
James U. Cross, AO787781.
Earl J. Drew, AO2080007.
Aubrey O. Farrar, AO615113.
William P. Farrell, Jr., AO2001408.
Martin D. Fishel, AO715755.
Leo F. Flaherty, AO2083552.
Carl S. Fraser, AO1848290.
James C. Gibbs, AO590907.
Wilbur J. Giesler, AO1909296.
Carroll H. Goyne, Jr., AO774882.
John T. Hale, Jr., AO2056957.
Russell S. Harmon, Jr., AO1848173.
Roy B. Hebel, AO1909305.
Victor H. Jashinski, AO2057930.
James C. Johnson, AO1848049.
Robert M. Johnson, AO2066848.
Joseph L. Jones, AO704003.
Charles H. Keutman, AO722725.
Richard Lamprecht, AO1908433.
Robert E. LaPierre, AO1909336.
John E. Madison, AO766595.
Wendell L. Mason, AO2101813.
Robert R. McAnaw, AO712114.
John G. McCormick, AO1909349.
William C. McCormick, Jr., AO590991.
Hayward W. McEver, AO800040.
Thomas R. McNeal, Jr., AO591203.
Ollie D. Miller, AO708739.
Russell H. Miller, AO1908939.
Gordon E. Mulvey, AO698083.
John J. Murphy, AO842236.
James M. Neale, AO938403.
Norman L. Phillips, AO2073210.
Leroy D. Pigg, AO704406.
Gerald J. Post, AO2083994.
John F. Reid, AO842072.
John R. Reynolds, AO778567.
Thomas P. Ryan, Jr., AO743509.
Lloyd M. Scott, AO1909647.
Clarance E. Shillings, AO1848649.
William L. Skiiar, AO1908859.
Milton Stamatis, Jr., AO775173.
Roy H. Stewart, AO928802.
David A. Tilton, AO1903162.
Claude H. Turner, Jr., AO1856620.
John J. Voynich, AO938936.
Charles E. Walker, AO1904269.
Lee W. White, AO590476.
Jack A. Young, AO744119.

To be second lieutenants

Clarence R. Anderson, AO875527.
Richard T. Andrews, AO1695492.
Phillip E. Appleby, AO1910820.
Sam Asseo, AO1911533.
Edwin R. Bayer, AO1863466.
William J. Beard, AO928777.
Benjamin B. Benigno, AO1852507.
Francis P. Bouchard, AO2075410.
James M. Boyle, AO940354.
Floyd B. Brown, Jr., AO839722.
Larry P. Brown, AO589872.
Wayne H. Bruns, AO2071532.
Roderick W. Clarke, AO707013.
David I. Cleland, AO1904927.
Lew V. Coats, AO2214989.
Charles C. Coen, AO2091584.
William H. Copp, AO944796.
Robert C. Corrigan, AO1862757.
Harold M. Cox, AO2073485.
Edward R. Cresap, AO1862799.
Raynolds Drake, AO2056358.
Joseph K. Enright, AO1858375.
Allen T. Enslen, AO1856886.
Richard R. Erbachloe, AO838932.
Robert L. Erdmann, AO1857837.
George E. Esser, AO2093008.
Myron M. Everton, AO1910313.
Urban A. Feero, Jr., AO1853662.
Charles E. Garrison, AO1857715.
Calvin C. Gaskins, AO936360.
Paul K. Gordon, AO1863868.
Franklin R. Greenspan, AO828316.
James W. Hackett, AO2063411.
John R. Hall, AO2079348.
Armond E. Harris, AO1910874.
Robert E. Hays, Jr., AO1910738.
Andrew Henry, AO2078540.
Ployer P. Hill, AO938075.
Charles D. Holland, AO1857206.
Francis A. Humphreys, Jr., AO1911423.
Carl S. Jennings, Jr., AO672862.
Donald B. Jones, AO1858005.
Duke S. Kimbrough, AO719683.
Florian T. Kokoszka, AO2068411.
James N. LaMont, AO1857711.
Donald R. Lapworth, AO2090592.
Raymond G. Lawry, AO1847202.
Nathaniel H. Lebish, AO836889.
Sidney D. Leverett, Jr., AO1904605.
Alfred Z. Lobell, AO2098548.
Robert S. Lorch, AO1847128.
Norman R. Lucia, AO1860447.
Theodore N. Mace, AO1911351.
George Matecko, AO833162.
Louis S. Mauro, AO1859604.
Dwight C. McDowell, AO944088.
Francis H. McGovern, AO722515.
Ernest A. Mianecke, AO2015365.
Edward L. Miller, AO2074523.
Deane H. Mitchell, AO704709.
Alvin R. Moorman, AO830051.
Lawrence D. Morrison, AO785719.
Thomas D. Moyle, AO1857216.
Augie T. Ong, AO839404.
William M. Palmer, AO1904732.
Robert V. Rayner, AO2078678.
David E. Rippetoe, Jr., AO842445.
Hurl Risner, AO1910645.
Victor R. Robinson, Jr., AO1291560.
Rigoberto Rodriguez, AO2027126.
Merrill A. Rogers, AO591412.
Robert L. Rossel, AO1862512.
James A. Rowe, AO1910188.
Floyd H. Russell, AO786344.
Thomas M. Ryan, Jr., AO1911731.
Russell S. Ryland, AO1906279.
Robert N. Saye, Jr., AO1911050.
Meri E. Sayers, AO1910787.
Raymond N. Sehon, AO1847574.
Dale Severtson, AO936056.
Frank W. Shipman, Jr., AO717523.
Robert C. Shoemaker, AO1848538.
Clarence E. Showers, AO779640.
Clyde S. Smithson, Jr., AO1903987.
Elmer E. Stanley, AO2085031.
Gerald W. Stewart, AO1862616.
Edwin A. Stillwagon, AO1860003.
William L. Stringer, AO1904541.
James W. Taylor, AO1857575.
Maurice C. Thomas, AO1911952.
Gordon W. Thompson, AO591436.
William M. Timm, AO1848543.
Calvin C. Tipton, AO1858725.
George P. Tourtellot, AO1911180.
Elbert M. Underwood, AO2093149.
Walter S. Van Cleave, AO1911954.
George D. Van Huss, Jr., AO1911457.
Arthur C. Voudouris, AO1851624.
Thomas D. Wade, AO1862519.
George S. Walters, AO944929.
David E. Waterbury, AO942384.
Charles A. Watry, AO786126.
James A. Webb, Jr., AO1856172.
Jack M. Wellinghurst, AO1854529.
Elbert W. Whitehurst, AO1912257.
Reuben E. Williams, AO1854794.
Walter A. Williams, AO1910964.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighticth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eighticth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenant

Jessie P. Nielsen, AL1860120.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighticth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

George S. Akers, AO2219417.
Thomas E. Anding, AO2219418.
Aldred W. Jones, AO2219546.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighticth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eighticth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenants

Martha E. Ellis, AL2219490.
Norma G. Vanderheide, AL2219681.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighticth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Michael J. Adams, AO2225901.
Charles L. Allen, AO2225402.
Nelson Allen, AO2224990.
Glen W. Allison, AO2224918.
Melvin H. Anderson, Jr., AO2226421.
Edward L. Asher, AO2224842.
Jere L. Barnes, AO2224789.
John E. Batten III, AO2223915.
John F. Baumann, AO2225647.
William W. Berkman, AO2224569.
Robert B. Blass, AO2223502.
Jack P. Blomgren, AO2225910.
Robert W. Boyden, AO2225154.
Dean H. Branson, AO2225136.
Nelson E. Campbell, Jr., AO2226535.
John A. Cargill, AO2224971.
Mark A. Casmus, AO2226824.
Eugene B. Catherman, AO2224423.
George G. Clausen, AO2225583.
Ted N. Clay, AO2225002.
Byrum W. Cooper, AO2222880.
Ronald M. Davis, AO2225167.
Jerome R. Dodson, Jr., AO2225169.
Jack E. Doty, AO2224381.
Sanford F. Dunning, Jr., AO2226444.
Elbridge P. Eaton, Jr., AO2224399.
Francis P. Finnegan, Jr., AO2225079.
Ralph E. Friel, AO2225831.
McLean M. Grant, AO2224698.
Russell D. Greiner, AO2226311.
Russell W. Grunewald, AO2226312.
James W. Guiles, AO2226673.
Torr W. Harmer, Jr., AO2225176.
Sammy L. Hartman, AO2225422.
Harold G. Hartley, AO2225467.
Arthur F. Hebberger, AO2226553.
Martin P. Henderson, AO2225178.
Gerald E. Herbener, Jr., AO2224388.
Leonard G. Hillebrandt, Jr., AO2224759.
Warren A. Holway, AO2224530.
Emory R. Howell, AO2226464.
Robert D. Howell, AO2226320.
Robert C. Hubbard, AO2225557.
Frederick B. Jacobus, AO2225093.
James K. James, AO2225036.
Graeme B. Jones, AO2225656.
Robert L. Jones, AO2225705.
Roland M. Joslyn, AO2226051.
Frank J. Kinney, AO2226852.
Henry S. Knudsen, AO2223948.
Walter H. Lane, AO2226326.
Charles E. Lewis, AO2226329.
Robert L. Little, AO2225853.
Lewis M. Lyons, AO2224672.
Donald R. March, AO2224787.
James N. McClelland, AO2225046.
Daniel S. McIntire, Jr., AO2224940.

Robert E. Messerli, AO2224009.
Bobby J. Meyer, AO2225487.
William R. Mitchell, AO2224452.
Robert B. Moler, AO2225488.
Billy L. Morrow, AO2226486.
Robert G. Nabors, AO2226716.
James H. Nagel, AO2226717.
Isaac M. Newberry, Jr., AO2226570.
Duane E. Newton, AO2226065.
Ronald G. O'Connor, AO2225566.
Chester J. Payne, AO2224400.
David G. Palmer, AO2224012.
Wesley W. Pennington, AO2226492.
Larry E. Plaster, AO2224950.
William R. Pogue, AO2225627.
Paul A. Renne, AO2225632.
Don F. Rettberg, AO2226868.
Joseph V. Schramm, AO2225212.
Thomas C. Smith, AO2226875.
Clayton C. Snow, AO2226579.
William P. Stacy, AO2225220.
Theodore M. Stolk, AO2226918.
Robert E. Stone, Jr., AO2226730.
Lowell M. Strong, AO2225129.
Jack W. Suggs, AO2224800.
Cyrus B. Sweet III, AO2225264.
Herbert B. Tartt, Jr., AO2225438.
Alvin D. Thomas, Jr., AO2224643.
Russell G. Thompson, AO2224023.
Robert M. Thor, AO2225507.
Thomas A. Varble, AO2225510.
William M. Vois, AO2226517.
Reginald C. Wagner, Jr., AO2225415.
James A. Watkins, AO2224029.
Richard B. Wareing, AO2226740.
Bayard D. Waring, AO2226282.
Benjamin M. Whitaker, AO2223013.
Arnold Whitten, AO2224687.
Merrill B. Wish, AO2226884.
Edwin L. Williams, Jr., AO2226090.
Roger E. Wright, AO2226224.
Sam P. Young, Jr., AO2225516.
Donald L. Zaworski, AO2225278.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1953

The House met at 11:15 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, we acknowledge, gratefully, that Thou hast been our refuge and strength in ages past and art our only help and hope for today and tomorrow; and we now beseech Thee humbly and penitently that Thou wilt kindle within us a sacred flame of noble idealism and make our minds and hearts the sanctuary of Thy love and light, Thy truth and peace. And grant that on this solemn and sacred day in the calendar of our national life all the citizens of our beloved country may lift their voices in joyous harmony to invoke the blessings of Thy grace and favor upon Thy servants, our chosen representatives, who are to take the oath of office and the pledge of loyalty and service.

We pray that our President, our Vice President, our Speaker, and all who are leaders in the affairs of government may be good men and women ruling in the fear of the Lord. May they be faithful in the performance of their duties; give them that favor and influence with their fellow men which come from following Thee. Inspire us, O God, with a greater desire to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord as we strive to bring in that glorious and blessed day of brotherhood and of peace; and hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION FOR LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Congress may consider appropriate, an authentic text of a convention (No. 97) concerning migration for employment (revised 1949) and an authentic text of a recommendation (No. 86) concerning migration for employment (revised 1949), both of which were adopted on July 1, 1949, by the International Labor Conference at its thirty-second session, held at Geneva from June 8 to July 2, 1949.

I transmit also the report of the Secretary of State with regard to the convention and recommendation, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State setting forth the coordinated view of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government with respect to the convention and recommendation. It will be noted that those departments and agencies do not recommend any Federal legislation, as they are of the view that existing Federal legislation is in substantial compliance with the basic intent and purposes of the convention, including Annex III thereof, and in addition conforms to the most important provisions of the recommendation and Annexes I and II of the convention.

For action and advice with respect to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for transmission to the governments of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in order that those governments may give consideration to the enactment of legislation or other action, I am sending texts of the convention and recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1953.*

(Enclosures: 1. Authentic text of convention. 2. Authentic text of recommendation. 3. Report of the Secretary of State. 4. Letter from the Secretary of Labor (copy).)

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce to the House that we will leave here in a body to go out on the official platform for the inaugural ceremony. In order to get on the platform it will be necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The seats to be occupied by the Senate and the House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair also desires to state that, pursuant to House Resolution 101, on the conclusion of the ceremonies on the east front of the Capitol the House will stand adjourned until noon on Thursday next.

The Speaker pro tempore, preceded by the Clerk, will head the procession, and the Members of the House will form in double column following them.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a. m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker pro tempore and the Clerk, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 101, stood in adjournment until Thursday, January 22, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

353. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working-capital funds of the Department of Defense at June 30, 1952, and the results of their operation for the year then ended, pursuant to section 405 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

354. A letter from the Administrator, Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, transmitting the second semiannual report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Public Law 213, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the final report for the fiscal year 1952 on the reassignments and transfers of property within executive agencies where such reassignments and transfers are between activities which are financed by different appropriations, pursuant to section 202 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

356. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of the semiannual reports of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 1969. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at Summit, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution designating the period beginning on the Sunday before Thanksgiving Day and ending on the Sunday after Thanksgiving Day of each year as Homemakers' Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 104. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the alleged atrocities committed on the members of the armed services of the United States since the start of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WARBURTON introduced a bill (H. R. 1970) for the relief of Wieslaw Jan Bartnicki which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

21. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of the Commissioners of Clinton County, Pa., urging the Congress of the United States to amend the existing act of Congress so as to make the benefits of the Social Security Act available to any and all political subdivisions desirous of adopting the said plan for its officials and employees, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1953

The Senate met in executive session.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

At the beginning of a new administration, let us offer a prayer for the United States, by George Washington:

Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And, finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 20, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the leaders on both sides of the aisle. I am compelled to leave the Senate floor at approximately 4 o'clock this afternoon, and I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time, as in legislative session, that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from that time for a period of 2 weeks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations; and Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director for Mutual Security, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

George W. Nelson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Earle A. Delly, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. TAFT. What is the business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of the following-named persons for the offices indicated:

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarran
Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Long	Tobey
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of the persons whose names have been read?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to speak for a few minutes on the principles which, in my judgment, are applicable in connection with the confirmation of nominations of persons to be members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

I drove down Constitution Avenue this morning, by the Department of the Interior, and I saw it still standing. Likewise, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture and of Treasury were there in brick and stone, as they were yesterday, and as I am sure they will be for many years to come. I took judicial notice—as I think it was proper for me to do—of the fact that the activities of those departments were continuing as usual. Those employed in the departments appreciate the fact that no emergency was created by the failure to confirm the nominations of the heads of those departments yesterday.

As I recall, it was on May 7, 1945, that I presented to the Senate, I believe in connection with the nomination of Robert Hannegan for Postmaster General, a résumé of some research work

which occupied me for a good many days prior to my speech at that time on the history of confirmation fights in the Senate. With the assistance of members of my staff, I had previously analyzed to the best of my ability the results of that research. We analyzed the history of every confirmation fight in our entire history with respect to which we could find any printed record. Without repeating in detail certain excerpts from that speech today, but giving only a résumé of it, I ask to have inserted at this point in my remarks excerpts from the speech to which I have referred. In the course of that speech I also discussed the Henry Wallace nomination.

There being no objection, excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That leads me to the remarks which I wish to make in regard to the tests which I have always applied, and always will apply, until someone can show that I am in error, in connection with the matter of nominations to the Cabinet. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Tennessee made some reference to my having voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace. At that time I tried to explain to him that he was mistaken as to the basis on which I voted for the confirmation of that nomination. I shall now try to explain in greater detail the tests which I think should be applied by the Senate in considering nominations.

At the time of the Wallace nomination I made as thorough a study as I could of the question of rejections of Cabinet nominations in the history of this country. The record shows that there have been seven rejections, out of a total of almost 400 nominations. One of them occurred in the administration of Andrew Jackson; four in President Tyler's administration; one in President Johnson's administration; and one in President Coolidge's administration.

When we make an analysis of those great Senate discussions we find, in my humble judgment, that there are four major tests, and then I think another one which runs through all four of them. The first is the character test. Is the man of good character, as that term is generally used by all? Second, is he one who believes in our form of government and who seeks through our form of government to bring about any particular reform which he advocates? Third, is he one who is not disqualified because of some professional or personal or financial interest in the job, so that he cannot render impartial, honest service? The Senate will remember that at the time of the Warren controversy in 1925, when President Coolidge had nominated Warren to be Attorney General, the charge was made that his connection with certain great business interests or organizations in the State of Michigan and throughout the country rendered it questionable whether he could meet the test of impartiality as Attorney General, when it came to administering the antitrust laws. It is not for me to say whether the Senate was right or wrong, although on the basis of a study of the record, I am inclined to believe that had I been a Member of the Senate at that time I would not have voted for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Warren. I say that because, looking at the situation as it is now set out in the books, and records, I have grave doubt whether his professional connections met the test I have just mentioned.

Then, of course, there is the fourth test of mental soundness. At the time of the debate on the nomination of Mr. Wallace, when I discussed this particular test with some of my Republican colleagues, one said to me, "What do you mean by that, Wayne? Do you mean that he just is not nuts?" I said, "What I mean is that the test of mental soundness, as we apply it in the law, should be applied to any Cabinet nominee or to any nominee proposed by the President for any office."

I applied what I consider to be the four major historical tests to the Wallace nomination, and in my honest judgment he met the tests, and on the basis of those tests I voted for the confirmation of his nomination.

On the basis of those tests I will vote for the confirmation of Mr. Hannegan, unless I can be shown that he does not meet those tests.

There is also a fifth test which I think we must take into account, namely, the so-called test of competency. It is a highly subjective test. It is one which must be watched in its application lest there be a possibility that one may be influenced by partisanship. I think it is sometimes rather easy for us to assume that the fellow in the other party is not competent, when what we mean is that his success has shown his outstanding competency, to our party's disadvantage. Nevertheless, I think it is true that when we function under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, insofar as the confirmation of nominations is concerned, we should give weight to the question of competency, from the standpoint of whether in the particular job for which the President has appointed an individual he will be able to render service which will be for the public good and will protect the interest of our citizenry as a whole. I felt that Mr. Wallace met that test, and I have yet to be shown that Mr. Hannegan does not meet it.

However, I think it is only fair that we have at least a committee hearing on the nomination, to study the nominee's qualifications from the standpoint of meeting these tests.

Senators may disagree with me in respect to its application as a legal proposition, but let me point out that the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution is in the form of language of limitation. The appointive authority is given by the Constitution to the President. Hence, I agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in essence, I think, if I correctly understood the remarks he made a few minutes ago. I agree if by those remarks he meant that a presumption exists in favor of a Presidential nomination. I say that because we do not have joint appointive authority with the President. The framers of the Constitution did not use such language.

What the framers of the Constitution did say, in speaking of the Presidential appointive power, was—

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States."

In my judgment the advice-and-consent language of the Constitution is language of limitation. It means that the presumption should be resolved in favor of the President, unless we find that the particular nominee falls short in respect to one of the tests I have enumerated. There is nothing among those tests, and I find nothing in the debates on the great historic cases, which would justify the making of any finding on the basis of partisanship. By that I mean that I do not think we have a right to sit here and do either one of two things: First, object to the nomination of a Cabinet officer because we do not like his politics or because he is of a political party different from ours. I think we should act nonpartisanly, from that standpoint. Neither do I think we are justified in applying the test "Would we appoint him if we were in the appointing position?" That right was not given to us by the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution did not say, "The President and a majority of the Senate shall appoint Cabinet officers."

Neither do I think a Cabinet nomination should be made use of in the Senate for carrying on political warfare against the President, regardless of the party to which he may belong. I do not intend, in connection with the consideration of any Cabinet appointment, to seek to make political capital out of it. I do not think a single thing said today by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Donnell] would justify any such interpretation of his remarks. However, such interpretations already have been made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in that speech in 1945 I pointed out that in all the confirmation fights in the Senate in relation to Cabinet positions, there seemed to be the following major criteria along with others more minor which the Senate applied. Those criteria can be summarized in these quotations:

Is this particular nominee loyal to our form of government?

Is he a man of good character?

Is he a man who possesses the competency to carry forward the policies of the President?

Is he mentally sound?

Does he in any way have a personal or selfish interest in connection with the particular position to which he has been nominated which, from the standpoint of public policy, would disqualify him in any respect for the office?

In the main, I believe that if we examine all the confirmation fights in the history of the Senate, we shall find that those criteria have been the ones which have guided the Senate.

In the 1945 speech I pointed out that under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution the Senate does not have the power of appointment. It is not a question whether or not a President of the United States is appointing to his Cabinet a man whom any Senator would appoint if he were the appointive power. The advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution in respect to the confirmation of nominations of Cabinet officers has naught to do with any power of the Senate to appoint. Under the Constitution the appointing power vests in the President of the United States.

I repeat today in essence what I said in 1945. I have no right to take the position, in connection with a single one of these nominations, that I will not vote for the nominee because I do not like his policies; that I will not vote for him because he is not the one I would appoint; or that I will not vote for him because I think his appointment might place me in a position in which I would find myself at issue with him on the merits of certain proposals which might subsequently come to the Senate. I have no right to pass that kind of judgment on any one of these nominees.

I made a similar statement in 1945 in regard to the appointment of Henry Wallace. I knew full well, when I announced in 1945 that I would support the nomination of Henry Wallace, that I would be subjected to criticism from those who felt that he should not be

appointed because they did not like his policies. It was not a question of whether I liked his policies or not. It was a question as to whether or not he met the tests of the historical criteria which have been applied in connection with confirming the nominations of Cabinet members.

At the time the Senate confirmed the nomination of Henry Wallace the so-called Progressive Party movement had not started in this country. I did not hear a word on the floor of the Senate or in the cloakrooms at the time of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace which reflected at all upon his political ideology or raised any question as to his Americanism. To the contrary, the consensus of opinion among all those with whom I talked was that he was an ardent New Dealer. He was probably one of the most ardent of all the New Dealers. The fact that on this side of the aisle, so far as political philosophy was concerned, we were unanimously of the opinion—and I emphasize the word "unanimously"—that some of the basic tenets of the New Deal were not in keeping with what some of us considered to be sound constitutional liberalism, had nothing whatsoever to do with the question as to whether or not we should vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Henry Wallace. To the contrary, one of the questions before us at the time was: Is he loyal to our form of government? Incidentally, I did not hear anyone in 1945 raise any question about his loyalty. But, of course, Mr. President, I will say today that I believe he was mistaken in his political judgment and as to how the policies which he advocated should be carried out.

No question was raised as to his character. I heard no one question his character. I would not question his character or his loyalty if the same nomination were before us today.

As to his competency to carry out the policies of the then President of the United States, I do not believe anyone could question it. At least I felt at the time he had competency to carry out the policies of the then President of the United States. There was no showing that he had any selfish economic interest in the position which would disqualify him. Therefore, I said I would vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Of course, I have since learned that when one stands up in the Senate of the United States and fights for what he considers to be sound constitutional principles, including the principle of checks and balances in our Government, he must expect to be misunderstood and abused, and sometimes he must expect also to be criticized as being motivated by a spirit of vindictiveness or revenge or retaliation. But more of that a little later.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish my remarks first. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the RECORD will show that in my previous statement on the floor of the Senate in connection with the subject of confirmation I indicated my belief that the President of the United States is entitled to have his official family consist of men in whom he has confidence and men whom he believes will carry out the policies which will characterize his administration.

After an analysis of the record which was submitted to us when the Senate convened yesterday at noon I am satisfied that the nominees whose nominations were sent to us yesterday meet the tests I have just enumerated. I have one question to ask later in regard to one of them, because I do not believe the record is entirely clear about it. I am sure it will be cleared up quickly. But speaking of them as a group I do believe the nominees meet the criteria which I have mentioned. I believe the President of the United States is entitled to have their nominations confirmed.

I think also, Mr. President, that each Member of this body was entitled at least to have what I sought yesterday, namely, an opportunity to study the record affecting each one of them. Having had that opportunity we can today, as we come to a vote on the nominations, feel assurance in the knowledge that we are fulfilling our representative responsibilities to the people of our States. We can be confident that we have kept faith with the trust inherent in the oath which we took when we were sworn in as Members of this body that we would act on the basis of our judgment, not on the basis of accepting without analysis the judgment of a committee of the Senate.

That leads me to make a few brief comments about the position which the junior Senator from Oregon took yesterday. Of course, he is well aware of the fact, and was well aware of it yesterday, when he took a position in opposition to immediate confirmation in the face of the great desire to speed through the nominations so that we could go out to see the beautiful and symbolic inaugural parade, that there would be those who would say that the junior Senator from Oregon was motivated by a spirit of vengeance, retaliation, or vindictiveness.

Those who know me, of course, were aware that I would take the position I took yesterday irrespective of the action taken by the Senate in regard to what I considered to be my rights in connection with committee assignments.

My action yesterday was based entirely on my conviction that hasty action in confirming Cabinet nominees is a mistake and not in the public interest. I shall continue, as I have in the past, to support my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle when I consider them to be right, and to oppose them when I consider them to be wrong. Mr. President, others may differ with my judgment, as some did yesterday, but not all in the Senate yesterday disagreed with me, judging by the 17 Members of this body who up until noon today had said to me, either in personal conversation or over the telephone, that they were glad I took the position I did yesterday. They expressed views agreeing with me that it was important that the principle of checks and balances in our Government, which I endeavored to uphold yesterday, should be protected. They know that I was not then, and am not now, activated by the motivations that some attributed to me.

But, be that as it may, my skin is thick when it comes to such matters. I am not afraid of being defeated, and I am not going to do things necessary to be reelected if doing those things cannot be squared in my judgment with the political principles in which I believe.

Mr. President, many people share the point of view which I expressed yesterday. I have received many telegrams also of the opposite nature—critical telegrams—but I have received a good many telegrams which endorsed the position I took yesterday. I have taken a sampling of them, and I ask unanimous consent, without the names of the senders being printed, to have the telegrams inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *January 21, 1953.*
United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please know that in not furthering the approval of the unknown men nominated for Eisenhower's Cabinet you acted with the usual incisive genius America has come to expect of you. Again you demonstrated your brilliance and unparalleled grasp of the difficult problems facing our Nation; your action wasn't abysmal asininity. Your selfless sacrifice will doubtless be well rewarded.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

If what I hear is true, you are blocking appointment of Mr. Wilson to President's Cabinet because his interest in General Motors. I congratulate you. Stick to your guns.

INDIANAPOLIS IND., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on Cabinet stand. Even Harding didn't dare pick 17 millionaires. Go after this clay-footed outfit.

ARVERNE, N. Y., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your honest and forthright stand on the side of our basic concept of American law. America looks to you to help slow down reaction from running rampant over the tried and workable principle of governmental checks and balances. We respect your lone stand against being a rubber stamp.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

God bless the few who remember the many. Listened to reports of you during recent campaign. Admired then as now your firm stand on principle. This was reaffirmed by your refusal to stand with "popular" majority in steamrollering through Eisenhower Cabinet appointments. Congratulations.

PASADENA, CALIF., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a lifelong and active Democrat and a delegate to the last two National Democratic

Conventions, I congratulate you on your stand today. May God bless you.

ELKHART, IND., *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire you in January as we did in November. Congratulations and best wishes.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations from four young Democrats on your courageous stand today and also your integrity shown through recent campaign.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your courageous record for truth prompts following: President asked Americans to put "country above self." Wilson's failure to sell stock indicates "money above country." Fear Wilson's example serious loss of morale to troops called upon for supreme sacrifice. As veteran I trust you will block his appointment. Best wishes.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *January 20, 1953.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for your courageous stand in repulsing an array of official arrogance not matched since they tried to convict Andy Johnson. More power to you. We will need you next to help save TVA from our new "government of men."

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Stick to your guns. You are many times more right than you even imagine. Thank God for your independence.

VAT NUYS, CALIF.
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations on courageous stand checking arrogant Wall Street usurpation American democracy.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Your action regarding confirmation most excellent. Congratulations. We are behind you. Let us not bow to corruption.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Dig them again, Wayne, we are with you all the way.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 21, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
In view of the censure you may receive because of your action of January 20, might we say we think you are terrific. Wish we lived in Oregon so we could vote for you in 1956.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1953.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Thank God we have one Senator with guts enough left who will question the incoming Cabinet as to their fitness to hold office. This is according to the Republican Eightieth Congress' own law. Keep the good work up.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one incident occurred since yesterday which I believe ought to be made a matter of record. I believe it to be a very symbolic incident. It is one which every one of the Members of the Senate should be on guard against. It represents a type of emotionalism and hysteria which exists in certain quarters of our country, and which does not augur well for the protection of our basic liberties and freedoms.

Late yesterday afternoon I received the following telegram from a citizen. He says:

This is from—

He gives his name and address—

After your talk today and after so great an inaugural address by Dwight D. Eisenhower, our President, I condemn you as a Communist. Prove to me otherwise.

Mr. President, I would not comment on the telegram if in my judgment it were not indicative of a growing danger in our country. Because I believe it represents the type of reaction which must be stopped aborning, I sent the following telegram in reply:

I am turning your wire over to the FBI and respectfully advise that I shall hold you legally responsible for any further such slanderous statements.

By special messenger I sent the following letter to J. Edgar Hoover:

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I am enclosing a wire which I have received from—

I give the man's name—

I am enclosing a copy of my reply. I respectfully request that a check be made into his actions, because I think it is important that such irresponsible and false charges as—

I give his name—

has made in his wire be stopped. I say that as a loyal American who believes in our constitutional system of government, but one who views with growing concern the tendency to smear liberals as being Communists if they express any difference of opinion with the new administration.

With best wishes always,
Sincerely yours,
WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in fairness to the sender of the telegram to me, whose name I shall not disclose, that I am today sending to Mr. Hoover two other telegrams I received today, one received from this individual's wife and another received from the individual concerned. I can understand how a fellow human being in the heat of anger might thoughtlessly do what this fellow American did yesterday in sending his slanderous telegram to me. His reflection on his own conduct, following receipt of my telegram, is perfectly satisfactory to me, and I am of forgiving heart as a Christian. So I am today asking Mr. Hoover to make no investigation of this individual, in view of the telegram I received from the individual's wife and the telegram I also received from him today. The telegram I received from his wife reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: My husband when he sent the telegram was under the influence of liquor. Please accept our apologies.

The subsequent telegram received from the sender of the original telegram reads as follows:

Please accept my humble apology.

Mr. President, it is important to separate the individuals involved in these incidents from the principles involved. It is of no moment that the present criticism is made of me as an individual, but it is important to protect the purity of our governmental system that in the absence of fact, those holding positions in the Federal Government should not be subjected to the kind of slanderous attack to which this individual subjected me. A few incidents of that kind, if the same lesson is taught, I believe will be of advantage in checking this dangerous threat to liberty and to free speech and to all the other basic guaranties of the Bill of Rights which we need to protect.

Mr. President, I close my general statement regarding the nominations with this statement: In my judgment, the President of the United States himself rebutted any argument in favor of quick action yesterday on the Cabinet appointments, when he did not see fit to send to the Senate the nomination of the Secretary of Defense. I say that because if there were anything to the emergency argument, I believe it would be fair for us to assume that the position of Secretary of Defense would be one of the first positions to receive early action by the Senate. Of course if action or that Cabinet position could wait until after the parade and until later this week, I submit that action on the other Cabinet positions also could wait until we had time to study them.

I wish to make this comment upon the nomination for Secretary of Defense, for I understand that the Armed Services Committee will go further into the matter tomorrow. Of course, if I were still a member of that committee, I would discuss with it the principle which I now wish to enunciate. In my judgment, the underlying principle involved in the question of confirming the nomination for Secretary of Defense is not at all a question of law but is a question of public policy which would not be changed one iota by the existence or nonexistence of the present statute on the law books. The question is one of public policy which goes to the fact that as of approximately July 1, 1952, General Motors Corp. had, in round numbers, $2,900,000,000 worth of defense contracts with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. President, General Motors Corp. has done a magnificent job in connection with those defense contracts. It has made a great deal of money, too. As of December 1, General Motors Corp. had in the neighborhood of $5,000,000,000 of defense contracts with the Defense Establishment. In fact, I am very reliably informed, I believe, that the figure is closer to $5,000,000,000 than to $4,000,000,000.

Mr. President, there is a basic principle in the administration of American justice, namely, that when we come to qualify jurors for service on a jury a lawyer does not have to waste a precious peremptory challenge in eliminating from the panel a prospective juror who has the slightest financial interest in the outcome of the case. The court does that for him; the court removes such a prospective juror for cause. That is done because we, as a free people, have always taken judicial notice that when one sits in judgment on a matter it is asking a little too much, or at least it

is testing human frailties to a point that is not safe in the interest of good government, to have representing justice and representing government in a seat of judgment persons who might benefit financially from the outcome of the case. We also recognize that there are a great many persons who, having such an interest, would lean over backward against their own interest, which would not be fair to them. It does not follow that if there is placed on a jury an American who has some interest in the outcome of the case his action will be motivated in the slightest degree to benefit himself. To the contrary, each Member of the Senate knows that there are a great many of our fellow citizens who, if we left them on a jury under those circumstances, would lean over backward and would do themselves an injury by proceeding to take a position in which they would give to the litigant a benefit in the case to which, on the merits, he would not be entitled. Some people serving as jurors would do so in order that no one could say they were motivated in any way by any selfish interest of their own. So, Mr. President, in the administration of this rule of justice it is equally important that we protect the prospective juror against himself, as it is that we protect the litigant against a juror who might not lean over backward to do justice to the litigant.

Thus, Mr. President, I say that in the case of the Wilson nomination, the only criterion which disturbs me is, not the criterion of his loyalty to our country, not the criterion of his character, not the criterion of his devotion to the policies of the President, but, rather, the criterion of whether as a matter of public policy it is wise and sound, in the abstract—without any reference to the specifics of this case—to confirm the nomination, as Secretary of Defense, of one who has been president of a company which has such a tremendous financial interest in the administration of the defense contracts of the Department of Defense.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I have said I would not yield until I have finished my statement.

Mr. President, I recognize the delicacy of even a discussion of a set of facts such as these, because I have no desire to impute any improper motive to Charles Wilson. I want to discuss the case as an abstract problem separate and distinct from the personality of an individual concerned. We ought to hold ourselves to the discussion of the public-policy principle involved. It makes no difference to me, Mr. President, what changes may be made in the existing law or what techniques of form one might advocate adopting, the controlling fact, so far as the public-policy question is concerned, is that this individual has been president of a corporation that has tremendous interests in defense contracts. Therefore, I think someone else ought to be appointed Secretary of Defense, no matter what formal changes or changes in form may be made in the law. Why? Because, colloquially speaking, Mr. President, under the circumstances, he is "behind the eight ball" before he starts. He is bound to be suspect, no matter what he does within the Department of Defense, in any matter that can be directly or indirectly related to General Motors. Find some other post for him, but not this one.

To say that he would merely agree to disqualify himself when it came to passing upon any matter affecting General Motors would not satisfy millions of our people. He would still be Secretary of Defense and his subordinates would be passing on General Motors interests in defense contracts. I do not think it fair to him or fair to the President that he should be placed in such a position, nor is it fair to those of us who must vote upon the question of confirming the nomination. I want to vote to confirm everyone whom the President nominates for his Cabinet, if I can possibly do so, but I want the President also to think of the position we are in. I want him to keep in mind that the facts of this particular case are such that millions of Americans, in my judgment, are going to say, "I care not what kind of modification may be made to the existing law, it still would have been better public policy not to nominate and confirm a man whose company has that particular interest in defense contracts." In my opinion, this financial interest of General Motors is much more serious, Mr. President, than the other common criticism one hears of this particular nomination, and that is——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point? The Senator speaks of this as a nomination. It is not a nomination today. Mr. Wilson has not been nominated. There is no nomination before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from South Dakota will be able to get the floor in his own right when I finish. He is technically correct, there is no nomination, although the Armed Services Committee has been meeting and holding hearings on Mr. Wilson. I believe it would be accurate to say that the Armed Services Committee has been proceeding upon the assumption, shall I say, that Mr. Wilson is the nominee-designate, and, in my judgment, the Armed Services Committee has been justified in relying on that representation. There is no question about the fact that the American people have also been led to assume that the nomination of Mr. Wilson will be sent to the Senate.

So, completing the statement I was about to make, I think the question of public policy in regard to the financial interest of General Motors in defense contracts is much more important—at least it gives me much more concern, Mr. President—than another common criticism one hears of this particular proposed nomination. I refer to the fact that General Motors, along with du Pont, is presently at least involved in one of the major antitrust suits filed by our Government. That does bother me, also as far as Wilson's nomination is concerned, although I do not think it is of such serious importance as the financial interest objection. However, it is serious. Here again, I think it a mistake to nominate for a Cabinet position one who has been president of a company that is involved, at least until the suit is dropped—if it is dropped—in a pending antitrust suit. I would assume—and I think it a fair assumption—that if that suit were pressed to prosecution and trial, somewhere along the line the past president of General Motors would be called as a witness; in which event I can hear people say—and I do not believe it wise to permit such a situation to develop—that when a Cabinet member is one of the witnesses in a major antitrust suit, his fellow Cabinet member charged with the responsibility of administering the law would at least be in a somewhat embarrassing position. At least many people feel that they would be embarrassed under the same circumstances, even though the Attorney General might not be.

I know full well, Mr. President, how unpleasant it is to discuss these matters, and I do not do it happily. However, in conformity with what I consider to be my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, so long as I sit here, I shall consider that I owe it to the people of my State at least to raise these questions. I desire to say further that I stand ready today, subject to what may develop in debate, to vote for the confirmation of the nominations that were sent to the Senate yesterday by the President, except that I should like to have a little clarification in the RECORD as to one case. I refer to the financial holdings of the nominee for Secretary of Treasury and the relationship of those holdings to his responsibilities.

I close by saying that I am as well aware of the fact that many of my colleagues in the Senate do not share my views, as I am that many do. I want to say to them all that I intend to continue to discuss the questions involved in this and other issues on the basis of the principles on which I have sought to discuss this delicate subject this morning.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from Oregon has largely answered the question the junior Senator from Nevada had in mind. I think we all realize that in the future there may be severe differences of opinion as to policies, but the question before us at this time is whether these men are loyal Americans and whether there is involved any violation of the Constitution or of any existing law. Of course, most of us, I am sure, feel that the President is entitled to his choice, because he will be responsible for the policy.

Mr. MORSE. That has always been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon, since he has been a Member of the Senate, on the confirmation of all nominations for the Cabinet.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, these nominations are all before the Senate en bloc. If any Senator wishes any of them separately considered, I should like to know. Otherwise, they will be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have read with a great deal of interest

the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior-designate, Douglas McKay. I do not wish to delay the confirmation of his nomination, but, after reading his testimony in answer to questions of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and of my junior colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on the question of public power and of statehood for Alaska, I find that his views are so opposed to my views and concepts of public power and its development in the Pacific Northwest, that I should like the record to show that fact.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the consideration of the nomination of Mr. McKay. I appreciate the fact that the President has a right to make appointments, but I feel that Mr. McKay's views on the very serious question of the development of power in the Pacific Northwest and on the question of statehood for Alaska are so different from the views of the people of the Northwest, as I interpret them, that I want the record to be perfectly clear, so that we will all know that if he becomes Secretary of the Interior these views will be pursued.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at a later time I intend to discuss in a number of speeches in the Senate some of the views expressed by the former governor of my State on the questions mentioned by the Senator from Washington. Although former Governor McKay and I are on what are generally referred to in my State as the opposite sides of many political issues, I have the highest respect for him as a man, and the highest respect for his honesty and sincerity of purpose. He is a clean, loyal, fine American.

My differences with Mr. McKay are on the merits of many questions, including some involving our national resources. I read with great care his testimony before the committee a few days ago, and I find myself so completely at odds with him on the implications, as I understood them, of some of his comments, that I want the RECORD to show today that I disagree with him on the merits of certain issues involving the natural resources of our country. But he is highly competent to carry out what I believe to be the policy of the new administration in the field of natural resources, and, therefore, in my judgment, highly qualified to serve as Secretary of the Interior.

I may say to the Senator from Washington that I have been working on a speech which I thought I might deliver today, prior to the confirmation of this particular nomination, but, in my judgment, that speech should wait, because it has nothing to do with the qualifications of Mr. McKay to serve as Secretary of the Interior.

Although some unkind words have passed between us in the past in connection with Oregon politics, I say to Mr. McKay from this floor today that he has my sincere congratulations and my best wishes for a very successful and happy administration. I hope we shall be able, on the basis of evidence we shall present to him from time to time, to cause him to agree with us on the merits of at least some of the positions liberals take on natural resources problems.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I feel about former Governor McKay the same as does the Senator from Oregon. I cast no reflection upon his character or his ability to do the job but I want the RECORD to show that the implications of his answers are so contrary to what I think is the correct policy for the development of our natural resources in the Pacific Northwest, that, with no reflection upon the man himself, I shall vote to confirm his nomination, subject to this clarification of views.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has a right to differ with former Governor McKay as to his policies, of course——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted the RECORD to show that, like the junior Senator from Oregon, I think Mr. McKay is a man of great integrity and ability and has made a fine record as governor.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator does not say, does he, that Mr. McKay is opposed to the construction and operation of power dams by the Federal Government in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have read very carefully his testimony before the committee, and I cannot quite understand the implications of his statement. His public statements after he accepted the nomination or the call from the President-elect were somewhat inconclusive. I feel that his statements in regard to the turning over of the development of public power dams to private resources and the sale of revenue bonds are so much in conflict with my conception of what should be done in the Pacific Northwest that his policy and mine will be in complete conflict.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like the Senator from Washington, I wish to be recorded with regard to certain of the views, as I read them, of the Secretary of the Interior-designate, former Gov. Douglas McKay. As Members of the Senate know, I have always been a strong believer in the conservation and the public development of our rapidly dwindling natural resources which, in my opinion, belong to the people of the United States, and which should be developed and operated for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I have read the testimony of former Governor McKay, and it seems to me that in many ways it is contradictory, and that the implications, as I understand them, are that he is definitely not in favor of furthering public development of the water resources of the country and that he is not as vigorous in his pursuit of the conservation of our other natural resources as I should like the Secretary of the Interior to be.

I believe in the conservation principles of great Americans, such as President Theodore Roosevelt, the Pinchots, Harold Ickes, Oscar Chapman, and I want to see the policies they advocated pursued. I do not wish to see them scuttled or reduced to the detriment of the interests of the people of this country. Even if water power resources are turned over to units of government other than the Federal Government, I am anxious that proper safeguards be provided in any license that is granted by the Federal Power Commission.

I know that Governor McKay has said that he believes in the principles enunciated by the Federal Power Commission, but, in my opinion, the Members of the Senate, and all other Americans, are justified in watching to see what happens and in endeavoring to make certain that the interests of the people in the natural resources of the country are not bartered away or given away to the detriment of the people.

So I wish to be recorded in accordance with the views I have expressed. I hope there will be careful scrutiny of all the acts of the Department of the Interior.

I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Gov. Douglas McKay because, in the first place, I believe strongly in the four criteria that have been enunciated by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I believe that the President of the United States, save under unusual circumstances, some of which may come before us in the next few days, should be given a free hand in selecting the men and women who will carry out his policies. I believe also that, from everything I have heard, the Secretary of the Interior-designate, Governor McKay, is a man of high character and of good intentions. Therefore, after making the record as I have made it, I am willing to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think it is unnecessary to rise on the floor of the Senate to defend Governor McKay in any respect. His life is an open book. Anyone may read its pages and determine for himself how this high-minded public servant has written his views—many of them, we can be thankful, by action.

I shall not attempt to put any words into the Governor's mouth. As time goes along, he will express himself—and he can express himself. However, I did sit through the hearing when the Governor was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A fair reading of the testimony taken at that hearing will indicate areas wherein the Governor differed from those who believed in socialized power. I am certain that he does differ with them, and I am happy that he does. I am happy to join him in that position. He said very frankly that he believed that public power and private power could and should operate together, and he called attention to an operation now being conducted in the Pacific Northwest where there is such cooperation.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is a broad difference between public power and Federal public power.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I also attended the hearings when Governor McKay was before the committee. Is it not a fact that his statement of views on the question we are discussing was in substantial accord with the Republican National Platform of 1952?

Mr. CORDON. I understood that that was the purport of his statement.

Mr. WATKINS. I wished to make it clear that Governor McKay revealed himself in full accord with the 1952 Republican platform on matters under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I read the testimony, the Republican platform on the question of the development of public power was read to the Governor, and he said that he wholeheartedly agreed with the Republican platform, as I recall.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I am calling to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is in the testimony. I happen to disagree with it, and that is the reason for my statement.

Mr. CORDON. A question has been raised with respect to the views of Governor McKay in connection with what were termed revenue bonds and similar securities. Inasmuch as it has been necessary to take an extra day in order to read the record, let us take a little time to analyze it. When that is done, it will be found that Governor McKay called attention to certain statements made in the Pacific Northwest by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, indicating that the Administrator was in favor of the creation of a local public entity to take over the electric power generation systems of the Northwest now operated by the Federal Government.

If the record is read, it will be found that Governor McKay, commenting on the statement by Dr. Raver, said he had talked with the senior Senator from Oregon 30 days before the Raver statement was made, and that the Raver statement reflected the statement of the senior Senator from Oregon. That is a correct statement.

Since the conversation to which he referred, Dr. Raver has made his statement, and later the Secretary of the Interior made a statement. Let me now add that all of them are correct. I did request the studies to be made, looking toward doing what I believe should be done, and looking toward doing that which is contained in the platform of the Republican Party, and so presented to the American people by the present President of the United States, namely, the basic proposition of trying to achieve partnership between the Federal Government and State or other local entities, and getting local areas not only to obtain benefits, but also to assume responsibility.

Before this session of Congress is over, I hope to present to the Senate legislation to carry out that very salutary proposition.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Nevada are both members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I listened very carefully to the testimony of Douglas McKay. I understood him to say that he was for Government development of multiple purpose projects when it was not consistent for private enterprise to develop such projects. Is that true?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I also understood Governor McKay to say that when such projects were completely paid off, he favored having such projects belong to the States or the areas in which they were located.

Mr. CORDON. I do not recall that statement. It well may be that it was made. It would be along the lines of Governor McKay's thinking, as I understand it.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, he favored having the States run their own business, after the obligations the Government incurred in financing a project had been discharged, instead of having the central government run it.

Mr. CORDON. I cannot answer the Senator's question, because my memory is not clear that that matter was adverted to in the hearings, and I do not wish to run through them at the moment in order to answer the question. However, that statement would be in conformance with the general tenor of Governor McKay's views.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a practical matter, the suggestion made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is correct. A reclamation bureau district in a certain Western State would go into debt for 40 or 45 years. However, after the obligation is paid up, the project goes back to the local people. That is basic.

Mr. CORDON. It should go back. It does not, but it should.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Presumably when the obligation of $40,000,000 or $60,000,000 is paid up at the end of 45 years or 44 years, the property is then supposed to go to the people who are using the water for irrigation.

Mr. CORDON. I must differ with the Senator as to whether or not that is the law. I think it should be the law, and I hope we shall see the day when it will be the law.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada believes, along with many other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that very soon Congress must lay down a policy with regard to public power.

Mr. CORDON. There is no question about that. I think everyone is agreed on that.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada would like to see such a policy laid down. In his own State there is a project which is almost completely paid out. I refer to the Lahanton project. It is the best mortgage security in any bank in the world. However, we have been unable to get the title transferred to the people of the district. That is a very important thing.

Furthermore, with respect to Boulder Dam—now Hoover Dam—the Government is planning to take the revenues from that project following the completion of the payments. It is planned to have the Government keep the project and spend the income throughout the United States. It so happens that that dam is located in Arizona and Nevada. The Grand Coulee project is in Washington. There are other such projects in Oregon and other States. However, the junior Senator from Nevada believes that when those projects are paid out, the income from them should go to the State or the area in which the projects are located. The Hoover Dam loan is now one of the best bank loans in America. It is paying 3 percent interest, which is more than the Government pays. The income from such projects should go to the States or areas in which the projects are located, and not to Washington, for the benefit of some other areas, or possibly for expenditure in Europe, to build dams in Italy or some other country. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CORDON. That philosophy is the same as the philosophy entertained by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] spent many months interviewing various persons and meeting with the platform committee. The committee drafted a platform for the Republican Party. When the people of the United States voted for Mr. Eisenhower for President, they voted for that Republican platform. The question I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon is this: Will the nominee, Mr. McKay, carry out the platform adopted by the Republican Party and voted for by the people?

Mr. CORDON. Of course I cannot put words in his mouth, but I have every faith that he will carry it out. If we do not want him to follow through on the basis of the platform under which the President was elected and a majority was given to the Republican Party in both Houses of Congress, then let us not confirm the nomination.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that it is the duty of the Cabinet member and also of the President of the United States, to carry out the policy fixed by the Congress? The Congress will lay down policies with respect to reclamation matters and the development of our resources. The officials of the Government in the executive departments should carry out the policies laid down by the Congress. Of course, the President has the right to recommend. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with my statement?

Mr. CORDON. It appears to be a sound statement of our constitutional

separation of legislative and executive powers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It has been my observation that a Cabinet officer has a tremendous amount of influence on public opinion; and eventually public opinion will drift into this Chamber, too.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to make one further brief statement, and then I shall be through.

When Governor McKay appeared before the committee, he made one very significant statement, and followed it with an example, so that all might understand what he was talking about. The Governor said, in substance, that he did not believe that local units, such as a State, or an area less in size than a State, should ask the Government to do that which it could do for itself. Illustrating his point, he called attention to the fact that his own State and my State of Oregon suffered a terrific holocaust in 1934 in the fire loss of 14,000,000,000 board-feet of standing timber. He pointed out that the State had gone about the rehabilitation of that terrifically burned-over area without requesting aid from any other source, and that the State itself floated the bonds for the rehabilitation and is spending the money reforesting the area. It is doing so wholly as a State project. Governor McKay pointed out that the value of the timber, when it comes in, will be adequate to reimburse the State. That is his idea of local interests and local governments looking around and trying first to help themselves. I hope we can all indulge that policy. I consider it an honor to have an opportunity to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Governor McKay to be Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana did not have the opportunity or the pleasure of knowing Governor McKay prior to the time he appeared before our committee. However, let me say that I shall be delighted to vote for the confirmation of his nomination, because the junior Senator from Louisiana would like to see a Secretary of the Interior who does not believe in further expanding the powers of the Federal Government, particularly those of the Department of the Interior, and who does not believe in building an empire within that Department.

Likewise, the junior Senator from Louisiana is delighted to see a Secretary of the Interior who is a former governor, holding that there are certain rights which the States reserved to themselves under the Constitution, and believing that the State government has a very proper place in our American system.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has never been one to believe that there are any powers belonging to the Federal Government other than those which were directly spelled out in the Constitution or clearly implied therefrom. That issue has been before us on various occasions. There are some who believe that there are great paramount rights and inherent powers possessed by the Federal Government, to be found nowhere in the Constitution, on the theory that the States did not create and join a Union, but that the Federal Government existed long prior thereto. That is a theory about which many of us never heard prior to the time we came to the United States Senate. Yet there are those who believe that the Federal Government has vast inherent powers, to be found nowhere in the Constitution, either explicitly stated or clearly implied, or, for that matter, even remotely implied by the Constitution.

The Senator from Louisiana is one of those who believe that those are dangerous theories of government. He believes that the Secretary of the Interior occupies a very important position, too important a position to entrust to one who would pursue such theories. The junior Senator from Louisiana believes that the rights which the States reserved to themselves when they joined the Union should be respected and likewise that such rights exist in favor of all the States which came into the Union thereafter.

Therefore the junior Senator from Louisiana is happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of a Secretary of the Interior who indicates a desire to return to the theory of the Constitution, namely, that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and who believes that the States have a very proper and important function to carry out, that their rights should be respected, and that we should all cooperate in helping the States perform the obligations which they owe to their citizens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there has been a great deal of discussion with respect to the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior-designate, Douglas McKay, there should be placed in the RECORD, so that it will be clear what we are talking about, the Republican platform plank so ably authored by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on the question of western reclamation and western development. I happened to author the Democrat platform plank on the same subject.

I may say that we are in some disagreement on the matter I believe that we ought to be clear about what Mr. McKay believes in. He unequivocally endorses the Republican platform. In part the platform provides:

> We vigorously oppose the efforts of this national administration, in California and elsewhere, to undermine State control over water use, to acquire paramount water rights without just compensation, and to establish all-powerful Federal socialistic valley authorities.

I presume that Mr. McKay in endorsing the platform, is opposed to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am in favor of it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. He was asked a question with respect to the tidelands issue. On page 12 of the hearing he was asked this question by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

> What do you think about tidelands?

He replied:

> I am on the side of Texas and Louisiana.

It is only natural that the Senator from Louisiana should vote for his confirmation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to express my opinion on this matter for the record. I have the greatest respect for former Governor McKay's integrity, but I feel the record should show that we are going to run into a head-on fight if Mr. McKay attempts to carry out, as I am certain he will attempt to do, the views which he has expressed on the question of further development of the Pacific Northwest. I merely want the record to be clear.

Mr. LONG and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to delay the confirmation of his nomination, and I shall not insist on a separate yea-and-nay vote. I merely want to make the record clear.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very frequently we talk about speaking for the record. We had an inauguration yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was there, and so was the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. General Eisenhower was emphatically elected by the people of the United States at the November election.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The people of the country were familiar with the Republican platform. They also were familiar with the Democratic platform. Based on that knowledge, the people emphatically voted for General Eisenhower for President. I do not understand, therefore, why a Cabinet officer in the present administration would not carry out the Republican platform. The American people knew what they were doing, or at least I hope they knew what they were doing. They emphatically elected Dwight D. Eisenhower President of the United States based on that platform.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, every time I look at the distinguished occupant of the chair or think of yesterday I am forced to be reminded of that fact. I merely wanted the record to show my views on the subject. That is all I attempted to do. I have no objection to Mr. McKay personally, and I have the highest regard for his integrity and ability. I am sure of his zeal to carry out the Republican platform.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Washington realizes that the junior Senator from Louisiana is not the only one who agrees with the former Governor of Oregon with reference to his position on the tidelands question. A majority of the Senate, a majority of the House of Representatives, 90 percent of the governors of our States, and 90 percent of the attorneys general, among whom there is a very good personal friend of the Senator, all agree with that view.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand; and I am in complete disagreement with them on that subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Washington has made his position very clear at this time, and I believe he had made it clear previously as well. However, I wish it to be crystal clear that the position of the distinguished former Governor of Oregon on both issues, as made clear years ago, did not seem to present any great trouble in his being elected Governor by his own people.

I remember perfectly well that I sat as a member of the Senate committee which heard testimony on the proposal to create a Columbia Valley Authority, which would follow in general the lines laid down in the Tennessee Valley Authority. I remember perfectly well that the distinguished former Governor of Oregon, who now has been nominated to be Secretary of the Interior, appeared before our committee and testified very strongly to the effect that he felt that the five States whose areas lie partly or wholly within the basin of the Columbia River had substantial rights and interests, and he felt that he did not want those rights to be bypassed, and did not want the water rights, which have so much to do with the economic development of the resources of those States, to be submerged beneath an all-powerful Federal set-up.

He did not announce his position after the adoption of the campaign document which has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator, but years before he made it crystal clear. Since that time, as I recall, he has been highly honored by the people of his fine State of Oregon.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington also to the fact that at this hearing there appeared the distinguished Governor of his own State of Washington. Several times since then, and earlier, he has been honored by the people of his State by being elected Governor. He, along with the Governor of Idaho, and, as I recall, the governors of all the States affected, took that position. Certainly it is an honorable position. Apparently it is a position which is highly regarded by the people in the area which is directly affected.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he feels that the distinguished former Governor of Oregon, Mr. McKay, made his record long ago, long before the plank was written into the 1952 Republican platform. The Senator from Florida welcomes the fact that the distinguished former Governor of Oregon is consistent and is still following the course of action which he followed then, and which the distinguished Governor of Washington followed then in appearing before our committee to make their position abundantly clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. If Senators will indulge me for a little while I should like to advert to the so-called tidelands question. I recall—and I am very sure that my recollection is correct—that the Governor of the State of Washington appeared before the Senate committee and very strongly supported the position which the States involved have taken and which was set forth in the bill which was passed by both Houses of Congress last year, namely, that the States are entitled to have preserved, confirmed, and reestablished their rights in connection with their coastal shoestring of land and water, and that it is not safe or sound democratic government for their local coastal problems to be assumed and taken over by Federal authority. The people of those States felt that it was not good government to force them to come to Washington, remote as it is, to find out whether they could build sewage lines which are necessary to serve their cities, or could put in outlets for industrial waste, or could set up controls for their fisheries or sponge industry, or for various other industrial activities, or to determine whether submerged sand and gravel or oyster shell could be used for coastal development, or whether submerged lands in the shallow areas could be improved or become developed taxable property, or whether piers could be constructed, or whether any such development could be made to serve as an addition to the important economy of the maritime States.

The reason for mentioning the point at this time is that the Western States, particularly the Northwestern States, for which the Senator from Washington assumes to speak this afternoon, all rather clearly, by their attitude in selecting their governors, and by expressions through their governors, as well as by expressions of the majority of their duly elected Members in the Senate and House of Representatives, and through adherence to the principles in issue which were set forth rather clearly in the Republican platform in the past election, have shown that they subscribe to the very principles against which the distinguished Senator from Washington has always been very clear in his opposition. Of course there is controversy on these questions, but the fact remains that the governors of the States in that great Northwestern area have consistently opposed the position taken by the Senator from Washington.

In view of the fact that those States, in their voting in the presidential elections, have consistently—and unanimously, I believe, in the last one—taken that position, for as Senators will recall no States outside of the South and the border States failed last November to support the presidential nominee who was overwhelmingly elected, and who was inaugurated yesterday, it seems to me that the senior Senator from Washington clearly expresses a minority position. Although the Senator from Washington is entitled to express it, it seems to me it is important that the RECORD show that he is definitely, distinctly, and completely in the minority in his own area, and in the minority insofar as the whole Nation is concerned.

With reference to the national question that is involved, I hope Senators will allow me to refresh their recollection. Last year we had the so-called tidelands proposed legislation before us. Despite the fact that the administration then in power was using all its powerful influence against the States and despite the fact that the majority of the oil companies were throwing their weight behind the administration's effort because they wanted the solution which was offered under the leadership of the former distinguished Senator from Wyoming—despite all those facts—the Senate voted 50 to 35 to support the theory that the States have individual interests which needed to be preserved and under that proposed legislation it was preserved. Furthermore, the very essence of that statement was put into the Republican Party's platform later on. I recall that it was in the same party's platform in 1948. Although that platform does not happen to be my platform or the platform of my political party, I am not so blind as to fail to see that excellent things were contained in it. The matter to which I have just referred was one of these good things and was a matter which certainly was sustained and supported by the vast majority of the Members of the Senate, for not only did the Senate pass the proposed legislation by a vote of 50 to 35, but if Senators will examine the RECORD to see the declarations appearing therein, I believe they will find that at that time the sentiment in the Senate was approximately 57 to 36, as the votes and positions were shown and declared openly upon the RECORD. Furthermore, my recollection is that in the House of Representatives—and I see that we are fortunate enough to have in the Senate at this time several Members who were Members of the House of Representatives last year—the vote was nearly 3 to 1 in support of the position of the States.

So although I respect highly and am very fond of my friend, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I wish to remind him that I desire to have the RECORD show that the two positions he has mentioned, and which he has said are adhered to by the distinguished nominee, whose nomination to be Secretary of the Interior, I hope the Senate will shortly approve, are positions supported strongly and tenaciously not only in his area of the Nation—by the governors and most of the congressional representatives—but supported likewise very strongly by both Houses of Congress; and, by the way, they were supported in Congress as long ago as 1946, when a similar measure was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Since the question of submerged lands has arisen, I wish to say that I am sure the Senator from Florida is familiar with the fact that a former Member of this body from the State of Washington strongly supported the point of view advanced by the Senator from Florida, whereas the new Senator from the State of Washington supported the Federal point of view, and was elected by one of the largest majorities a candidate has ever received in the State of Washington, even though General Eisenhower carried the State. So I wonder how my friend, the Senator from Florida, would rationalize that situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it is easily rationalized. I think the former Senator from Washington had taken positions on the floor of the Senate other

than the one now under discussion. I think there were a number of other issues beside that one in the election.

Mr. ANDERSON. Could not there have been issues other than the tidelands issue in the last election?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I hope the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to speak in my own time.

As I recall, the State of Washington still insisted on continuing in office a governor who had that belief, and likewise insisted on going into the Republican column in the national election. So it would be just as illogical to say that that was the sole issue that put the State there, as it would be to say that it was the sole issue that removed a former Senator who took a position contrary to that taken by our esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Washington.

If I may continue presenting my thought, let me say that when the Governor of California, the Governor of Oregon, the Governor of Washington, and the Governor of Idaho, when most of the Representatives and Senators from those areas take that position, when such officials are elected over and over again—and, as I recall, certainly one of the issues upon which the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], running under the peculiar system which prevails only in his good State as the nominee of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, was most vocal was the question of the preservation of the States' traditional interests and important rights in the tidelands—and then when the entire western area of the Nation refuses to listen to some of the ultraliberal ideas, including opposition to this particular tidelands measure, which were voiced by another party, but insists upon going along unanimously, without the exception of one State, in support of the new President, I believe those things make a rather good case.

On the other hand, when one Senator from Washington rises to say that this strong case is negatived by the fact that one Senator happened to lose in the election, and that that defeated Senator happened to have taken, on this issue, a position which was in line with the position of the great majority, I believe the Senator who makes that statement to us at this time is straining at a gnat, because the overwhelming weight of the evidence is that the West and the great Northwest wish to preserve and safeguard the rights of the States, both with reference to the question of water rights in the development of their great river systems and also with reference to the narrow coastal belt of land and water, 3 miles wide in the case of all three of the Pacific Coast States, which has so much to do with their development and their strength and the prosperity of their various coastal communities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again to my friend, the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Florida is becoming unduly excited about the political opinion of the Northwest. I know the people of my State elected our good Governor on several occasions. On the other hand, I wish to remind the Senator from Florida that I have been elected on several occasions; and our views on these matters do not coincide at all.

I am not saying whether the opinion I have expressed was the majority or minority opinion in my section of the country. I merely rose to say today that I disagree with the views of Governor McKay on the question of water development and on the tidelands question. I said that is my opinion. I wish the Senator from Florida would permit me to take it back to the people of my State and see what happens to me. I have been in the Senate a long time. I do not know how long I shall remain here. However, that is my opinion. I have been consistent about it, and I merely wish the RECORD to show that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me say that I hope the Senator from Washington will continue in the Senate a long time. Certainly his relationships with me have been most pleasant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, let me point out that another MAGNUSON has been elected to Congress—in this case, to serve in the other body.

Mr. HOLLAND. The point with which I was concerned, and about which I arose, was the idea I had received from the earlier remarks of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, namely, that if this particular distinguished Governor is named as Secretary of the Interior, he would attempt to ram down the throats of the Senate and the House of Representatives something which was not acceptable, something which would constitute a new and hurtful theory, whereas my understanding of what has happened in that great section of the country is that on nearly all occasions when they have had a chance to do so, the people there have clearly shown that they disapprove the position now urged by our good friend, the Senator from Washington, who has so many virtues that he has been returned to the Senate consistently on account of those virtues, for which I rise to plead; in fact, I wish I could plead for them "like angels, trumpet-tongued," because those virtues are almost innumerable.

On the other hand, when the Senator from Washington rushes upstream and butts his head against a wall and seeks to give the impression which I understood he was seeking to give, namely, that the present nominee for Secretary of the Interior is following a theory and philosophy alien to the theory and philosophy of the senior Senator from Washington and not approved by the Senate or the House of Representatives, I was trying to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Washington about the fact that quite recently—in fact, as late as last summer—Congress rather overwhelmingly passed the tidelands bill in the face of very strong opposition from an administration which at that time was pulling every string it could pull in the other direction, and which had marshaled nearly all the oil companies to support it in that position, in an all-out effort to prevent the passage of that proposed legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield further——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to say that I do not wish to delay the proceedings here. I hope no one has received the impression that I thought Governor McKay would try to ram anything down anyone's throat, or that his philosophy was alien to us. There has been a great controversy in our section about these matters. I happen to hold to one philosophy and one approach to them. I am sure that he is not going to try to force anything down the throat of anyone, but I am very fearful that the philosophy, which I am sure he has accepted honestly, since he is an intellectually honest man, is going to run counter to my philosophy in the matter. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that fact. It is not alien to us, for we have lived with it. I have lived with it in my State for 20 years.

I may say to the Senator from Florida that, 20 years ago this month, as a member of the State Legislature of Washington, I introduced, fought for, and obtained passage of a bill to allow municipalities to sell power outside the city limits. The measure was fought by every private power interest within the area, including the same interests which are now advocating the turning of the dams over to the private utilities and the sale of revenue bonds. Mr. President, if that means my political defeat, it will have to mean that, because I do not believe that we developed our country in the far West in that manner. We have used the Federal Government's assistance during the past 20 years, and we have done a good job. I do not want to see that job scuttled. I do not imply that Douglas McKay would scuttle it. I simply do not agree with his philosophy, and I want the RECORD to show that. Everyone in the Pacific Northwest knows how I stand on this matter, for it has been the subject of many political controversies. Douglas McKay is a fine man. We happen to disagree on this question, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if it is understood now that the Senator from Washington is really supporting the confirmation of the nomination of Governor McKay, the Senator from Florida will have nothing further to say, but he, at least, got the impression during the earlier impassioned speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington that Governor McKay held to certain ideas which were so variant from those which prevail here that we might just as well understand that, in the event we confirmed the appointee, we were facing a terrible battle and were going to be overrun from that source.

Since the Senator mentioned the fact that, over 20 years ago, he was in the Legislature of the State of Washington—and I am sure he did an excellent job there, as he has been here most of the time since—the Senator from Florida feels that he will be pardoned for mentioning the fact that 20 years ago he, too, was in the legislature of his State, since which time he served as chief executive of his State, and is now serving in the United States Senate, and he knows

perfectly well the position with reference to the tidelands taken then and later by the State government which was completely contradictory to that now taken by the Federal Government, which had not been taken at that time.

For instance, when war broke out, I recall well that the defense authorities, and Mr. Ickes, who was then the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, were knocking at our door, insisting that the State speedily make arrangements with its offshore areas so that they might be explored, and so that, if oil were found there, it could be produced. I remember likewise that from the same source strong representations were made to the effect that certain rare minerals, zirconium, for instance, being one of them and rutile—and there were others—existed in large quantities in the sands of our submerged coastal belt, and that they would greatly appreciate it, if the State, in the exercise of its sovereign jurisdiction, would speedily enter into contracts under which those sands might be explored and utilized, so that these rare and needed minerals could be produced for the wartime use of our Government. The Senator from Florida remembers that not only has the Florida legislature taken the position consistently that that area belonged to the State, as will appear from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the Legislature of the State of Florida unanimously passed such a resolution and sent it here, and our governors throughout the intervening years, though sometimes of differing philosophies, have all taken that position. The position has been taken likewise by the governors and by the cabinet members as members of the official boards which operate our State. Those views have been taken consistently by the entire congressional delegation from our State, and there has not been one drop of oil ever found in the offshore areas of our State.

It is not the oil question which primarily concerns us, but the fact that all the other factors, of which I mentioned but a few a few minutes ago, relate so definitely to the performance of local functions and to the carrying out of local responsibilities and also relate so directly and definitely to the prosperity and growth of our great coastal communities that they should not be subjected to the paralyzing hand of Federal control. Therefore, we should not be a party to setting up an additional octopus at Washington, to add to the already too large Federal Government, which, by its greatness of size, baffles almost any mind that tries to grasp its many problems. So I will very gladly yield the floor, since I now understand that the distinguished Senator from Washington, my good friend, is not now arguing against the confirmation of the nomination of Governor McKay as Secretary of the Interior—far from it—but that instead he now wishes his nomination to be speedily confirmed, and he was simply voicing his own views in opposing some of the philosophy of Governor McKay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the confirmation of the nominations of all the members of the Cabinet appointed by President Eisenhower whose nominations are now before the Senate. I shall do this, not sullenly, but gladly, and with heartfelt approval. I think they are excellent men. Furthermore, I am sure that we on the Democratic side want the administration of General Eisenhower to be a success.

Unexpectedly, this discussion, however, turned into a skirmish on some of the issues which may shortly come before this body in connection with the power policy and the offshore oil policy. I desire to speak very briefly on the last point, merely to define the issue so we will know what the coming struggle will be about.

The issue is not tidelands oil, though that phrase repeatedly occurs. The Supreme Court on many occasions has affirmed that the land which is daily washed by the tides between the low-water mark and the high-water mark belongs to the States.

We who take a different position on this matter from the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida certainly do not wish to change that decision of the Court; indeed, we are perfectly willing to affirm that position by statute, so that no later Court can reverse it. We believe that the land washed by the tides belongs to the States. That is not the issue. Neither is the issue the ownership of the submerged lands underneath the bays. That land belongs to the States, according to the courts, and we are willing to affirm it by statute. Neither is it the ownership of the land underneath inland lakes and rivers. That also belongs to the States by court decisions, and we are willing to affirm it by statute. The issue is simply the ownership of and the paramount rights in the submerged land seaward from the low-water mark. That is the point, and as we move into that debate it is highly important that the issue be at once narrowed and be understood.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. It is with great reluctance that I feel compelled to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson is an exceptionally fine person. He is an honest, able man, and one of high integrity and purpose. No one could question his devotion to the cause of agriculture. My vote against his confirmation as Secretary of Agriculture is solely because I disagree with his apparent views on farm price supports and some other important phases of agricultural programs.

My vote against his confirmation is difficult because I am not certain as to what his views really are. His public statements and those that he made before the Senate Agriculture Committee when he appeared for confirmation were not clear as to what his policies will be.

After reading a biographical sketch of Mr. Benson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star under date of January 15, 1953, one would be led to believe that he is opposed to all price-support programs. The article itself may not give an accurate picture of what Mr. Benson's views are. Many other news stories, purportedly quoting from his speeches since being appointed, would also lead one to believe that his views on this important farm program are contrary to those expressed by President Eisenhower so clearly in his many farm speeches during the campaign.

President Eisenhower not only has committed himself to the continuance of 90-percent supports but in his speeches he indicated he believed they were most necessary. I quote the following from his Kasson, Minn., speech on September 6, 1952:

> And here and now, and without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

Later in the campaign at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, he had this to say:

> I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

Certainly no one statement could more precisely state his views in support of the continuance of 90-percent supports for at least basic farm commodities. Many of us in Congress, during the course of the campaign and over a wide area of the United States, quoted time and time again from President Eisenhower's speeches. We told the farmers that if General Eisenhower were elected he would continue these programs, and I am convinced that is his intention now. I am sure he believes in their necessity.

Personally, I believe that the continuance of at least 90 percent price supports are more necessary now than for many years past. For example, the Government of the United States has asked for increased production of many farm commodities and particularly major crops such as wheat, cotton, corn, and many feed grains which are vital to our war preparedness program. Certainly so long as we have large Government-sponsored surpluses, a farmer could never expect to receive a fair cash price. It is well known that even a 5-percent surplus of almost any commodity will greatly depress prices. Likewise, a 5-percent shortage will greatly inflate prices.

Farm income has been dropping steadily for the past 4 or 5 years and very sharply in the past year. Farm income last year alone dropped approximately 12 percent. Farmers now are in a bad way economically even with price-support programs which, in many respects, are inadequate. Farm indebtedness is increasing at an alarming rate. To abandon the price-support program now, or even in years to come, unless there is some drastic change in our food supply and price situation, would mean not only disaster for the farmers, but it would put our entire economy in a tailspin. Indeed, even with our present

price-support program, a depression may be difficult to forestall.

Some may argue that Mr. Benson has promised to carry out present price-support laws. Unless the Secretary really believes in the necessity of farm price-support programs, he could carry out our present law as written and still eliminate over one-half of our present vitally needed price-support operations. For example, under the law, price-support programs for oats, barley, rye, soy beans, many grass seeds, perishables, and others are optional with the Secretary of Agriculture to support at from zero to 90 percent of parity. On all these commodities and others the Secretary would be in compliance with the law if he, in his own judgment, deemed it advisable not to have any price-support program whatever.

Many Members of Congress and others told farmers during the course of the campaign that, if elected, General Eisenhower would continue the important price-support program and that he sincerely believed in it. We who thus quoted what we believed to be General Eisenhower's position on price-support programs would be in a most embarrassing situation, to say the least, if Mr. Benson decided to discontinue these programs.

In many speeches, both in North Dakota and as far away as California, during the course of the campaign, I told farmers—including my three farmer sons—that General Eisenhower believed in price-support programs just as I did and, if elected, would continue them. Mr. Benson, in my opinion, has not expressed himself plainly and clearly as to what his position will be, which leads me to think that he does not believe in price supports. I may be wrong in my appraisal of Mr. Benson's views, and I hope I am. If I am wrong, I shall be the first to make public apology for having today opposed the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the indebtedness of the farmer in the Northwest at the present time is larger than it was even at the time of the depression?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. I would say to my distinguished colleague that that is exactly correct. The financial situation of the farmer is deteriorating day by day, and that in spite of favorable crops over most areas of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that we are receiving more letters from farmers of the Northwest trying to obtain loans than we have received at any other time in the past?

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly more than I have received during my term in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. And it is becoming more and more difficult to obtain loans?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the confirmation of the nomination, but in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota referred to the address which President-elect Eisenhower delivered at Brookings, S. Dak., and related it to his position with reference to the nomination of Mr. Benson to be Secretary of Agriculture, I should like to say very definitely that my voting to confirm the nomination of Mr. Benson does not mean that I am abandoning in any sense the position I have taken with respect to support prices.

With the indulgence of the Senator from North Dakota, I should like to call attention to the fact that the hearings now before us show that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota read to Mr. Benson during the hearings this paragraph from the statement of President Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4:

> I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

After reciting that, the Senator from North Dakota asked Mr. Benson:

> Do you agree with his policy?

The hearings show that Mr. Benson replied:

> Yes. I think the General and I are in general agreement, Senator, on this matter.

I merely wish to say that I expect to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Benson. While perhaps there may be some phases of his administration with which I will not agree, yet under the criteria which have been discussed for the confirmation of Cabinet appointments, I think I may vote for confirmation of his nomination, although, as I have indicated, occasions may arise in his case, as in the case of other nominees, when I will not wholly agree with his views. So in voting for the confirmation of their nominations, I reserve the right to disagree on specific issues, if I feel that I should do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to commend highly the Senator from North Dakota for bringing to the attention of the Senate the most vital question of price supports for agriculture, not a give-away program of any kind, not a shored-up program, but simply a program that will give agriculture a chance to get some kind of fair break in the market places and a chance to come out even and perhaps make a little profit from time to time.

I myself am in favor of 90 percent of parity—rigid, mandatory price supports for basic farm commodities. I certainly hope that the new Secretary of Agriculture, if not already fully persuaded to that viewpoint, will come around to it, not as a favor to agriculture, but because it is a necessary part of the machinery of our economy, to keep agriculture from becoming bankrupt, and thereby dragging down the industrial and labor segments of our economy.

I think the most vital domestic decision the Eisenhower administration will have to make is with respect to the question of what should be done to provide a sound program for the maintenance of agricultural prices that will keep the agriculture segment of our economy from going bankrupt.

I read the Senator's statement before he made it on the floor of the Senate, and I commend him most highly for raising this important question now and for the soundness thereof.

I understand that Mr. Benson is a Christian gentleman of very fine character, a man of outstanding ability. I believe that the President of the United States, after making sure that his nominees are men of character and ability, has a right to make his own choices. I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Benson with the understanding that I have the right, along with other Senators, to try to persuade him to our viewpoint, and to vote against his policies if he does not come around to our way of thinking.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. He has made a fine statement; and coming, as it did, from one of the best friends agriculture ever had in the Senate, it is greatly appreciated.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been interested in the statement of the Senator from North Dakota. It seems to me that it is not Secretary-designate Benson whom he puts on the spot, but it is President Eisenhower, because President Eisenhower's statements were made during the campaign. It was after those statements were made that he chose his Secretary of Agriculture.

Does the Senator believe that the man President Eisenhower chose to be his Secretary of Agriculture would repudiate that basic part of his campaign policy?

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that I do not think he would. I want to make sure campaign commitments are kept. Nowhere in the campaign speeches did I hear President Eisenhower advocating flexible price supports. Yet Mr. Benson, in answering questions, led me to believe that he may favor flexible supports over rigid 90 percent supports. As I said before, I may be wrong. If I am, I will be the first to apologize.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that while the nominations of department heads must be confirmed by the Senate, such officers may be removed at will by the President? Is it not reasonable to suppose that if a Cabinet officer should repudiate the President's position, the President could easily remove him?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that we are jumping at conclusions to assume that at the request of the President Mr. Benson would take an office which he did not seek, with a determination to violate the campaign promises of the man who has nominated him for that office. It is hard for me to believe that such a situation could exist. I hope the Senator

from North Dakota will change his position and vote with the other Senators for the confirmation of Mr. Benson's nomination.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire the floor in my own right, when the Senator from North Dakota has finished yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As the Senator knows, the Senator from Florida also was upon the committee, as was the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who interrogated Mr. Benson at some length with respect to his views upon various agricultural matters.

My only question is this: Does not the Senator well remember that, not once, but several times during the course of the hearing, Mr. Benson made it very clear, by specific statements, that he regarded himself as being solely an administrative officer; that he would be there solely to carry out future policies that may be enacted by Congress, and present policies that have been passed by earlier Congresses?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy that the Senator from Florida has raised that question, because it is an important one, so far as I am concerned.

The law now provides that all farm commodities can be supported up to 90 percent of parity. I think there are about 150 farm commodities altogether. Over half of the commodities now receiving price supports are on a discretionary basis with the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be acting in complete compliance with the law even if he were to eliminate the price-support program we now have for many commodities, including oats, barley, rye, flax, soybeans, grass seed, cottonseed, and many others. Elimination of price supports on these crops is optional with the Secretary of Agriculture. He would be acting in complete compliance with the law if he wiped out that phase of the program tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The comment by the Senator from North Dakota and his feeling that he cannot support the nominee relates entirely to nonbasic crops, not to the basic crops, of which, of course, wheat is one of the principal ones, and is the principal crop in North Dakota, for which fixed-price supports are provided in the law now existing.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. Wheat is one of the commodities. Cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and dairy products are a few that have mandatory supports at from 75 percent to 95 percent of parity. Where the price-support program is mandatory under the law, the Secretary has no alternative but to carry out the program. However, under the law, as I pointed out before, all of the crops except potatoes are eligible for price supports but the Secretary can support them or not with the exception of a few commodities that have mandatory supports. That is what makes it really important to know what the position of the Secretary of Agriculture is with respect to price-support programs. If he is enthusiastic about the need of price supports, then he might be expected to continue these programs. If he is opposed to them in principle, then we could expect either their complete elimination or support at lower levels.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I then to understand that the position of the Senator from North Dakota is based upon the fact that certain prices are flexible, and that he is unwilling to approve the nominee for Secretary of Agriculture because he favors flexible price supports except as to basic crops?

Mr. YOUNG. I have not been able to find out what Mr. Benson's thinking is. I gather from General Eisenhower's speeches that he was for 90-percent supports as against flexible supports. At least all the leading publications of the Nation, including large magazines such as Time, Newsweek, and others, assumed that he was in favor of 90-percent supports. Nowhere in those publications did I see any statement to the effect that he favored flexible supports. Indeed, he never advocated them during the campaign. But after Mr. Benson was appointed there were several news stories to the effect that he was inclined toward flexible supports, or perhaps no supports at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the basis of the Senator's position, then, primarily that he does not favor flexible price supports for any commodities, even the nonbasic commodities?

Mr. YOUNG. There are some commodities for which I think flexible price supports have a place, but certainly not with respect to basic commodities. When the Government is asking for increased production, and large surpluses are being created by the Government, the farmer could not possibly hope to receive a fair cash price under such circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the merits of a rigid 90-percent support program at this time. I do not question the statement of the Senator from North Dakota with regard to the plight of the farmer today. The farmer's plight today is serious, but that can in no way be charged to Ezra Benson, whose nomination has not yet been confirmed, and who could not perform a single official act.

The plight of the farmer today is due to a considerable extent to the misapplication of the law as intended by the Congress. The plight of the North Dakota grain farmer today is due largely to the fact that the late administration permitted the importation of price-breaking quantities of low-quality grain from Canada.

It is due partly to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture placed upon the market 50,000,000 bushels of corn and a great quantity of wheat—I think 15,000,000 bushels of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned wheat were placed upon the market at the height of the marketing season this fall. There could be no other result than a break in the price. I am not going to discuss that question today, because it would take too long. I simply wish to point out that the points made by the Senator from South Dakota were raised in the committee meeting last Thursday when Ezra Benson appeared before the committee for examination. The Senator from North Dakota there raised the points which he has made today.

The other members of the committee did not share his alarm or fear that Ezra Benson as Secretary of Agriculture would destroy or weaken the farm programs which are now in effect. In fact, Mr. Benson said that he would strengthen them to the best of his ability. I am sure he will do so. The Republican platform states that "a prosperous agriculture, with free and independent farmers, is fundamental to the national interest." That is a worthy objective. I am sure that Mr. Benson will do everything within his power to achieve that objective. We did not feel that it was fair to Mr. Benson to ask him to tell us today what his position would be 3 or 4 years from now, or whether he would approve this or that method of maintaining a prosperous agriculture at some future time. No one knows what we shall have to do to maintain a prosperous agriculture and a healthy economy 3 or 4 or 5 years from now. We simply cannot see that far into the future. But we do have the objective of a prosperous agriculture, with free and independent farmers. I know of no man who is better equipped with sound thinking and integrity to undertake to achieve that objective than is Mr. Benson.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the people of Utah are justly proud of one of Utah's great citizens, who was chosen by General Eisenhower to be Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson did not seek this position. He was not acquainted with General Eisenhower, but he had many friends throughout the United States who knew of his service to agriculture, his understanding of agricultural problems, and his sympathy with the farm people of this country. It was largely as a result of this widespread support that his nomination as Secretary of Agriculture was brought about.

I regret that my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] finds himself in the position of being unable to vote for Mr. Benson. I think probably Mr. Benson's position is as clearly stated as was that of any of the other men who appeared before the various committees to give their views on the problems involved in the various departments before confirmation of their nominations.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that Mr. Benson is pledged to support the Republican platform for 1953. Mr. Benson has affirmatively stated that he subscribes to the policies outlined by General Eisenhower. I could read many quotations to support that statement. Later I shall ask to have the entire hearing printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

At that hearing Mr. Benson made very clear his support of General Eisenhower's farm program.

Mr. Benson has stated that he will support the present price-support program so long as it endures.

Mr. Benson told the committee that he will not change the present support policies over night, but will study them before he acts. That statement refers to the discretionary matters which are left within the Secretary's control.

Mr. Benson has said that he will give the producers the level of support guaranteed by law. In other words, he will carry out the law.

Mr. Benson declared that our objective should be full parity. That, of course, is in line with the Republican platform.

Mr. Benson has said that he wants the soil-conservation program continued.

Mr. Benson told the committee that he will be aggressive in carrying out the mandates of Congress with respect to agriculture and other matters. That is one of the most important statements of them all. If he carries out the mandates of Congress which fix the policies under which this Government is to operate, then we should be satisfied.

As to his character, his sincerity and his honesty in carrying out the pledges he makes, there can be no doubt among those who know him. Mr. Benson is an honest man, and a Christian gentleman. He believes in the great destiny of this country. When he makes a pledge, as he has done in his statement to the committee and to General Eisenhower, I am sure that the people of the country, particularly the farm people, can accept that pledge at 100-percent value, with the firm assurance that it will be carried out.

I do not care to prolong this discussion. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, on the nomination of Ezra Taft Benson to be Secretary of Agriculture. From that hearing it will be learned that Mr. Benson answered frankly all questions asked of him that would give light on his views on, and support of, General Eisenhower's farm program.

There being no objection, the transcript of the hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE-DESIGNATE

(Thursday, January 15, 1953)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 2 p. m., in room 324, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, presiding.

Present: Senators AIKEN (chairman), YOUNG, THYE, HICKENLOOPER, MUNDT, WILLIAMS, SCHOEPPEL, WELKER, ELLENDER, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, HOLLAND, ANDERSON, and CLEMENTS.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The primary purpose of calling this meeting today is to invite the members to meet the prospective Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Benson.

Mr. Benson has not yet been nominated and, of course, he cannot be nominated for the position until General Eisenhower takes the oath of office next Tuesday.

In the interest of continuity of the work and of saving time, most of the committees that are having to consider prospective Cabinet members are having advance informal meetings. They have to be informal. We are meeting officially but Mr. Benson cannot be officially a nominee until he has been named by the President.

In the event that the members here decide—after talking with Mr. Benson and questioning him on whatever they want to—that they are satisfied with his qualifications to handle the job, then as I understand it when the nomination is placed before the Senate next Tuesday, I will be in a position to get up and say that the committee members have considered Mr. Benson, have looked him over, decided that he is all right, and that we are not interested in having the nomination referred to the committee, in which case it can be acted upon immediately by the Senate so that the work of the Department may continue without any break.

We have asked Mr. Benson to meet with us here today. Let me say that immediately following this part of the meeting I would like to have a short executive session because there are certain things that we have to do before we can officially get under way for the session's work.

I think it might be a good idea, Mr. Benson, if you will start out by telling this committee who you are, what you have done, and anything else that you think is pertinent. Tell us something of yourself.

STATEMENT OF HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY-DESIGNATE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BENSON. Senator, members of the committee, I consider it a great privilege and a great honor to come here today. It is a bit embarrassing to talk about myself. There is not much to say. I of course have always been interested in agriculture. I am a native of the State of Idaho, born and reared on a farm in that State, one of 11 children, all born on the same farm in the same farm home, and in the same room.

I worked on the farm, later operated my own farm and later was a county agricultural agent. For a period I was with the State land-grant college doing extension work in marketing, and later did some graduate work at Iowa State College at Ames and the University of California, and engaged in some livestock business, feeding, running livestock on the range. My whole background and interest have been in agricultural work.

I was here in Washington for a period of 5½ years as a representative of one of the farm groups, as you know, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Mr. BENSON. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, as its executive secretary. I served on some agriculture committees and have been intensely interested in the industry and I am very proud to be associated with it.

I do not know that I need say more, unless there are some questions on my background and experience in agriculture. I have, of course, a deep love for the people who are close to the farms. I have great confidence in them. I think they are a solid, substantial segment of our society. I think they represent one of the real bulwarks we have in this country against many of the movements and programs that may destroy our way of life.

I do not suppose there is any other group that knows so well that "As ye sow, so shall ye reap." I have always been proud to be associated with them, to serve them, and I feel very much indebted to them for what they have done for me.

I am very happy over the prospect of possibly helping to serve further this important segment of our population.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very good general background picture that you have given us, Mr. Benson. I expect that some of the members of this committee may have some more things they want to know about you and your work.

It seems to me that in the interest of saving time, perhaps, and efficiency, we might have each member of the committee ask you such questions as they wish to. Personally, I have known you for a long time and I do not know at this moment of anything that I wish to ask you.

I will start with Senator YOUNG and then alternate back and forth across the table.

Senator YOUNG. I would like to ask a few questions of you, Mr. Benson. First, I want to say that you do enjoy an excellent reputation. Certainly no one could question your loyalty to farm causes and your devotion to all the problems of agriculture. There may be some honest differences of opinion and I am particularly concerned about some views that you might have.

I think we all know that agricultural income has been dropping steadily and severely for the past 6 years. I have some market quotations with me that are of significance. For example, farm prices for oats in North Dakota are 60 cents a bushel based on Bismarck, N. Dak., as of this week. The support price is 90 percent of parity or 69 to 72 cents a bushel average in the State. The low farm price is due largely to the importation of Canadian oats. Largely because of imports, and I think some improper handling of the present price-support program, and lack of exports, prices are in a bad way.

The outlook for the future is not too good. I would like to know if you subscribe to the policies as outlined by General Eisenhower in his campaign speeches. I would like to read two or three short quotations and ask if you agree with them.

In his Kasson, Minn., speech on September 6, 1952, General Eisenhower had this to say:

"And here and now, and without any 'if's' or 'but's,' I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity."

Later on at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, he had this to say:

"I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

Do you agree with his policy?

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I think the general and I are in general agreement, Senator, on this matter. If I could, in answer to that, I would like to read to you just two or three paragraphs which represent my views as I understand my views now.

Of course, I am new, as you know, and I am not as familiar with all the programs of the Department as I hope to become. I have felt that we have sufficient programs and policies already established in the Congress that can pretty well get at this problem of prices. I know we have a problem. Some prices have been declining. Congress has provided the machinery to help to meet these situations as they arise. I am in sympathy with that machinery.

I say this: To me the object of all labor on the farms is to provide consumers of the Nation with food and fiber at reasonable prices and, at the same time, to improve the productivity of the basic land resources and to contribute to rising levels of nutrition and living.

I think that we have not reached the standard of living yet that we are hoping for for rural people, or people in the cities, either. The reward of such labor must be a steadily rising standard of living for our farm population fairly related to that of the other great productive groups of the Nation. I believe that firmly.

I believe our agriculture policy should aim to achieve full parity prices and parity income in free markets as the long-term objective. This objective can be achieved only with general prosperity, high employment and production, along with increased output per worker, throughout the national economy.

There is an interrelationship. Agriculture today is not like it was a generation or so ago. The most important method to me of promoting agricultural and national welfare is the support, from a long-term standpoint, of adequate programs of research and education in the production, processing, marketing, and utilization of farm products, and in problems of rural living.

This is the way which has enabled our farmers in the past to do their full share in providing the American pepole with the highest standard of living in the world. The development, however, of modernized, mechanized, commercial agriculture which has made possible these great advantages has placed the family farm in a vulnerable economic position. I think this is generally a point that is not recognized because farm prices and income decline more rapidly than farm costs.

There is always a lag. Hence, the guarding of farm standards of living requires a program of price supports as an insurance in case of declining prices or a depression. These supports should be designed not only to serve the welfare of farmers but also, in the widest national interest, to prevent disaster to the farm producing plant and in safeguarding the food supply of the Nation.

That is essentially my thinking to date, Senator. I hope that we can actually, as time goes on, improve on the present program. I am in harmony with the statements made by General Eisenhower as I understand them.

Senator YOUNG. I would like to read a paragraph or two from a letter I received from a feed dealer in Minneapolis, with an office in the Minneapolis Flour Exchange. The reason I read this particular letter is because it is typical of many that I received. It says:

"Everyone in the Middle West seems to feel that Mr. Ezra Benson, the new Secretary of Agriculture, is opposed to 90 percent of parity Government guaranty and will permit farm commodity prices to slide off from day to day.

"As a matter of fact, that is just exactly what has been happening to wheat, corn, oats, soybean meal, and butter since the 1st of November. The silence of the new Secretary of Agriculture has encouraged professional traders to sell the market on grains down from day to day, and will continue to do so to the distress of the farmer if the Secretary of Agriculture or even the newly elected President keeps silent about the Government's attitude with regard to farm commodities."

This letter is very typical of many others.

Mr. BENSON. Yes. It is on the books, and I assume we are committed for it, Senator. I have not felt that I should make any public pronouncements. I am not Secretary yet. I hope to have something to say when and if I am sustained as Secretary.

I realize that there has been some decline in the markets of many of our farm products. It is not because of any lack of interest that I have not said anything on the subject. I am in sympathy for the continuation of our present legislation for the duration of the program.

Senator YOUNG. Senator RUSSELL and I on Friday of this week—and I think other Senators may wish to join us—have a bill which is to be introduced. This bill would extend 90-percent support for basics for three additional years.

Would you care to comment?

Mr. BENSON. I would prefer not to, Senator.

Senator YOUNG. I think, Mr. Benson, it is customary for a prospective Cabinet member to answer questions such as that.

Mr. BENSON. I would like time to get better acquainted with the problem involved, with the legislation now on the books, before making any commitments for the future. I think it would be unwise for me to make any commitment beyond the extent of the present legislation, at least at this moment.

Senator YOUNG. You would agree, though, if General Eisenhower himself said that the party is for sustaining 90-percent supports, and in the absence of any speeches supporting the flexible idea of supports, that his position would be for 90-percent support?

Mr. BENSON. I understand he is committed for 90-percent support for the next 2 years at least.

Senator YOUNG. There is another very important part of the Kasson, Minn., speech I would like to read to you:

"As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops."

In other words, he advocates extension of the same supports now enjoyed by basic farm commodities to oats, barley, rye, and soybeans.

Mr. BENSON. That involves some very serious problems. I am not prepared to say anything further on that.

Senator ANDERSON. In addition to major cash crops?

Senator YOUNG (reading). "Should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops."

Senator ANDERSON. Beef is a major crop.

Senator YOUNG (reading). "As available to the major cash crops."

That would be basics; would it not?

Senator ANDERSON. It would not. I think if you look at the sources of farm income——

Senator THYE. You would consider oats, barley, rye, and soybeans comparable to rice and peanuts; would you not?

The CHAIRMAN. Dairy products, however, are one of the leading cash crops of American farms, and meat animals are right up at the top, also.

Senator YOUNG. The present farm-support programs for dairy products are 90 percent of parity and are mandatory at 75 to 90.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. Corn, one of our largest crops, is not a cash crop in the ordinary sense of the word, inasmuch as 80 percent of it is marketed in another form.

Mr. BENSON. Used for feed.

The CHAIRMAN. I think there is a difference between basic and cash crops.

Senator YOUNG. As you know, there is always great concern with farmers as to what their future price outlook will be. This is directly affected by the price-support program, which I think is most necessary. General Eisenhower made some plain statements as to what his position is going to be. That was followed by statements of other Republicans like myself, all the way from California to North Dakota.

Some of us may be washed out politically if the administration follows a different policy than was definitely promised in speeches.

I think that is all, Mr. Benson. I wish that I could get a more clear-cut statement as to your position on these matters. It might well affect my vote in the Senate.

Mr. BENSON. I am in full support with the present legislation, Senator, and I am hopeful that we will be able to study the present programs very carefully, if possible improve upon them, and certainly there should be some protection for the producers not only of the basic commodities, so-called, but other commodities as well. I am in full sympathy.

We want to get the very best policy we can, and I do not think Government supports are a substitute for a fair price in the market place. The whole thing is involved in the problem. I would like time to study the question and become more familiar with it before I commit myself.

Senator YOUNG. Of course, the uncertainty of your public statements, Mr. Benson, is having an adverse effect on farm prices now. I do not know of anything that would bolster farm prices now more than a clear-cut statement from you with respect to these price-support programs.

Will there be a lowering of price-support programs or will they be maintained at the present levels?

Mr. BENSON. Do you mean immediately when I take office? No.

Senator ELLENDER. You could not change it overnight.

Mr. BENSON. No; it is not going to change. I will be in full support of it.

Senator YOUNG. Many of these price supports are optional. Oats, barley, rye, and soybeans, and maybe 50 others that we are now maintaining, are optional with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BENSON. We plan to use the machinery that is available to support the prices for the farmers. That is my feeling.

Senator YOUNG. At what level?

Mr. BENSON. At whatever level is provided for in the law.

Senator YOUNG. Most of them are nothing to 90 percent. Oats, barley, rye, all the grass seeds, many, many others, probably most of the price-support programs we are operating now, are only optional with the Secretary.

Mr. BENSON. The object I have, of course, is parity prices for the farmers. That is what they are entitled to.

Senator YOUNG. That is the objective of all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Benson, would you be willing to say that when you become Secretary you will use the powers of your office as far as possible to see that, when producers of a commodity are guaranteed a certain level of support under the law, they will receive that support?

Mr. BENSON. Yes, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. At present we know that, although certain growers have been guaranteed 90-percent support, they have actually been forced to sell for 70 percent and various other levels. Would you go so far as to say that you will do all within your power to see that, when a certain support price is guaranteed, it is made available——

Mr. BENSON. Yes; that is my idea.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). To those who receive the guaranty?

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I think that would be my duty to do so, and I would so intend to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly such situations as the offering of 50 million bushels of corn on an overburdened market, as has been done in the last 3 months, must be contributory to the declining prices. If those things can be handled differently, then there is greater assurance than when 90 percent is guaranteed that the farmer will actually get 90 percent.

Senator YOUNG. Just one more question. I am not clear on your position on supports for, say, oats, barley, rye, and soybeans. Presently they are supported at 80 percent of parity, and I think largely because of the switch-over to the parity formula which drops the parity.

The formula next year, I believe, is announced at 85 percent of parity. Would you be inclined to continue that level of support?

Mr. BENSON. I would be inclined, Senator, to continue whatever level is necessary to try to get the farmer full parity for his commodities—100 percent of parity—within the existing law, and to try to give an honest administration of the various programs which are now on the statute books.

Senator YOUNG. I am not quite satisfied with the answer, Mr. Benson, but I will pass for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Benson, of course I realize your position. Not being Secretary yet, you may be at a disadvantage to tell us what you want to do. I do not think you need fear being frank with us in answering the questions, whether you are Secretary or not.

You said that you believe farmers should get full parity?

Mr. BENSON. I think that should be our objective; yes.

Senator ELLENDER. How are you going to do that? I think you should be able to tell us. We have been trying—at least ever since I have been in the Senate, and I have been here 16 years now—I have been trying to obtain that goal.

Mr. BENSON. I know you have.

Senator ELLENDER. It is all sweet words. You favor the farmers getting full parity. I would like to have you tell me or tell the committee how you expect to obtain that goal.

Mr. BENSON. I do not know that I have the answer offhand, Senator. I think we need to place a lot of emphasis on our existing programs for more adequate research and education.

Senator ELLENDER. That would mean more production.

Mr. BENSON. And better distribution—more effective distribution, utilization, and marketing of our farm products. I presume we will need some supports to prevent undue disaster.

Senator ELLENDER. When you say "supports" do you mean along the same lines as are provided in the present laws?

Mr. BENSON. Possibly. I hope we can even improve on them.

Senator ELLENDER. Why can you not be more specific?

Mr. BENSON. Because I have not had an opportunity to study the present program in detail.

Senator ELLENDER. You have been in the farming business all your life?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; that is right.

Senator ELLENDER. I am surprised that you did not keep up with the development of the program.

Mr. BENSON. I know something about it, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. You know something about it?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I know something about it.

Senator ELLENDER. You knew enough to criticize it; did you not?

Mr. BENSON. Well, no; I do not think I have criticized it unduly.

Senator ELLENDER. This 90-percent program on basics, if that question comes up in the next 2 years, are you willing to say now whether or not you will oppose it?

Mr. BENSON. No; I do not think I am ready now, Senator. I want to study it very carefully. I am anxious to get the very best program possible for our farmers.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you think that that is the proper method to obtain this millennium that you are talking about of getting parity for the farmers?

Mr. BENSON. I think it has been effective in large measure. It does not mean that it is perfect by any means. I know a lot of study has gone into it. We are trying it out. Certainly there is legislation now to give it an adequate trial. We can tell better about the effects of it after it has run for another year or so.

Senator ELLENDER. I remember reading somewhere where you took the position that it would probably be possible to handle a good deal of our surpluses through cooperatives.

Mr. BENSON. I do not remember ever making that statement.

Senator ELLENDER. What is your view?

Mr. BENSON. I have said, I think, in general, that anything that will improve our marketing machinery, our methods of distribution, will be of benefit not only to the farmer but to the producer.

I have been hopeful that we might do more toward developing industrial uses and all possible uses of farm products. I have been interested in that, and in the development of further foreign markets for our agricultural products.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you think that can be done? If so, how?

Mr. BENSON. I think it ought to be explored very carefully. I am not sure but what it can be done.

Senator ELLENDER. We have been exploring it, to my knowledge, for many years. I have found this, at least in recent years: So long as we furnish our friends across the seas with money with which to buy our farm products, we have no trouble disposing of them. Have you any clear-cut views as to how you propose to create a better market for our farm surpluses abroad?

Mr. BENSON. I have not worked them out in any detail, Senator. I am not at all convinced, however, that there are not opportunities to develop some markets abroad.

Senator ELLENDER. A man assuming the Secretaryship of Agriculture, it strikes me, ought to have some definite views on such a subject as that. It has been before us for many, many years. I have contended for a long time that we ought to be able to sell more abroad, but somehow we have not found any good solution to the problem.

I am wondering if you have studied the subject to such an extent that you might be able to give us an inkling of how you think that will be accomplished.

Mr. BENSON. I have thought many times as we give this foreign aid, give our dollars to foreign countries, that there could be some arrangement so that they would be required to spend at least a portion of that for our agricultural products here.

Senator ELLENDER. That is when we are giving foreign aid. I hope we will not have to continue that. What I am talking about now is when we get back to normalcy.

The CHAIRMAN. You are an optimist.

Senator ELLENDER. Congress has been appropriating in the past few years quite a few billion dollars to help our friends across the seas. I do not believe that we are going to be as liberal in the future as we have been in the past. So, let us put that out of the picture for the time being.

Assuming that that will occur, what specific suggestions have you to offer to the committee as to how you hope to expand these foreign markets?

Mr. BENSON. There was a time, Senator, when we did quite a lot, I understand, in the Department of Agriculture, to help to promote the use of our own products abroad. I think we have not done so much in recent years along that line. I would hope that possibly we could do more of that in the future, encouraging the use of our own products in the foreign countries, or release many of them to exporters of food.

If they do not get the food products from us, they will get them from some other countries. I believe there is a potential there that we might well study and consider carefully and help to promote.

Senator ELLENDER. But you have no specific program?

Mr. BENSON. No; I have no detailed program formulated, Senator. I would be very glad to know of any program that has been formulated, a workable program, along that line. If you have any suggestions, I would be glad to have them.

Senator ELLENDER. I am looking for some. I cannot offer any now. I am looking for some myself.

Mr. BENSON. I am, too.

Senator ELLENDER. As Senator YOUNG just indicated, the price of wheat and other commodities has gone down considerably. Speaking for the cotton area where I come from, last October, as I recall, cotton was selling for over 38 cents and today it is almost down to 31 cents. You remember the Department of Agriculture urged the farmers to plant a great big crop. The goal was 16,000,000 bales. The Lord only knows what would have happened to the price of cotton had they produced that much.

We fell short a million bales of that goal; yet prices have gone down and down and down. Have you any remedy to suggest as to how we could help that segment of our economy?

Mr. BENSON. Possibly we need to be a little more careful about setting goals.

Senator ELLENDER. But of course what we expected, you understand, was that the foreign consumption would be around 6,000,000 bales, but it happened to be only 4,000,000. I believe that was because we did not give them enough money with which to buy our own cotton.

Your remedy in that case would be then to lower the goal?

Mr. BENSON. I think that if we are going to have the price supports at a high level then the question of acreage goals, production goals, becomes very important.

Senator ELLENDER. You are familiar with the statement made by our present administration that food in all probability is going to win the peace and for that reason we keep on growing a lot of wheat, corn, cotton, and a lot of this, that, and the other.

If you, as Secretary of Agriculture, should set goals for the production of certain commodities, you would of course expect to provide some kind of incentives that those goals would be reached; would you not?

Mr. BENSON. Yes, if there is a need for those incentives.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you not think there would be? In other words, if you requested the farmer to produce so many bushels of wheat, so many bales of cotton, do you not think that he ought to be protected to some extent, at least against any losses in the event that they should reach the goal that you advocated as Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. BENSON. Our farmers have always been pretty willing to produce.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. BENSON. The principal incentive, of course, has been the price in the market place.

Senator ELLENDER. Right.

Mr. BENSON. Of course, I think that is desirable. Because of the relationship of our industry to foreign markets, to our farm program, if that incentive is not sufficient, then it may be necessary and probably will be to add additional incentives. That is what we have done through the price-support program and other programs.

Senator ELLENDER. So that you are of the belief that if you go out to the farmers and say that "You are to produce so much," if that so much is produced they ought to be protected to the extent of at least a fair return.

Mr. BENSON. I think there should be some safeguard, of course.

Senator ELLENDER. Of course. I am interested also—and I presume you are—in the sugar industry. To what extent do you believe that the sugar industry should be protected, the domestic sugar industry?

Mr. BENSON. I am in agreement with the domestic sugar program. I had something to do with it in the early days in my home State. I feel that it has worked quite satisfactorily as far as I am aquainted with it.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you have any suggestions to change the present law?

Mr. BENSON. No; not at this point.

Senator ELLENDER. You think the law now on the statute books——

Mr. BENSON. I understand it is looked upon with considerable favor by the producers as well as the processors.

Senator ELLENDER. That is correct. You are correct in that.

Mr. BENSON. I have had some conferences with growers and with manufacturers in the last few weeks, and I have had occasion to study the program somewhat. I believe, generally speaking, it seems to be satisfactory.

Senator ELLENDER. For your information—you may know it already—there were only four votes against the bill.

Mr. BENSON. I did not know it.

Senator ELLENDER. That is the bill that I fostered at the time, with the help of the other Members of the Senate. As you know, under that act, under the law, both the consumer and the producer must be protected.

The section to which I refer in particular is section 201, which reads as follows:

"In order that such determinations shall be made so as to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry by providing such supply of sugar as will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, the Secretary * * * shall—do so-and-so."

This is, to keep the demand in balance with consumption. I presume that you believe in that method of handling the sugar price.

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I think it is a very grave responsibility to place upon the Secretary of Agriculture. I am in sympathy with it, and I think it has worked quite effectively from all I can learn.

Senator ELLENDER. It is your hope to carry out that particular provision?

Mr. BENSON. It is my hope to carry out every provision that is now on the statute books that has been approved by the Congress, Senator. I have no other desire, no other plans whatever.

Senator ELLENDER. How do you feel about our present soil-conservation program? Do you think it ought to be expanded, decreased, changed, or anything done with it?

Mr. BENSON. I presume there should be something done with it. I am not acquainted with it as I will be later, probably. I think it is very basic and very important that we conserve, protect, and even improve our productive resources.

Senator ELLENDER. Are you satisfied with the present method involved in bringing about this protection to which you refer, the consultation to which you refer?

Mr. BENSON. I think the program has been quite effective, as far as I am acquainted with it. I have seen something of its operations. That does not mean it is perfect by any means. We hope to improve on it as it goes along. We hope our programs will all get better as time goes on.

I certainly think the objective has been worthy and I am sure there has been much good result.

Senator ELLENDER. What position, if any, will you take with respect to the quarter of a billion dollars appropriations that have been recommended for the continuation of the soil conservation program?

Mr. BENSON. I do not know as to the amount.

Senator ELLENDER. But you are for that?

Mr. BENSON. I want to see the soil conservation service program continued.

Senator ELLENDER. Certainly. Along the lines that we are now working?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I think so. I do not know whether the appropriation is what it should be, whether it should be more or whether it should be less, but certainly we want to conserve our resources, and our agriculture resources particularly.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you any views as to whether or not the programs, such as soil conservation and PMA, should be changed in any manner from the way they are now being operated?

Mr. BENSON. I am studying it, Senator. I am not ready to express any views at this point. I would hope that we could work out a coordinated program between PMA and soil conservation, the extension services, all the agencies that serve the farmers at the county and State levels.

Senator ELLENDER. There has been considerable talk here recently that it might be a good idea to transfer the soil-conservation program to the Extension Service. Have you given that matter sufficient study so that you can tell us how you feel about it?

Mr. BENSON. No; I have not.

Senator ELLENDER. Then for the moment it is your view that the programs should be carried on as they have in the past as far as you are willing or able to tell us now?

Mr. BENSON. For the immediate future. I do not contemplate any radical changes as far as I am concerned. We are looking constantly toward improvement of these programs, greater efficiency and more effectiveness of the programs.

I think from an administrative standpoint that there will probably be a need for some adjustments, some changes.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Benson, you have been closely connected, from what I can understand, with the cooperative movement throughout the country.

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I have been.

Senator ELLENDER. To what extent will you permit these cooperatives to compete with private industry, for instance, in the development of the fertilizer industry and things of that kind?

Mr. BENSON. I feel, Senator, that our cooperatives are part of our free enterprise system, they are tools, agents of farmers. They perform essential services. They can be used by farmers to help them in the marketing, in the purchasing of some of their supplies. I think they will not take the place of private operations.

Senator ELLENDER. You would not permit them to supersede private industry, would you?

Mr. BENSON. I think there will always be a place for both. I think it would be a bad thing to have a cooperative monopoly. They only handle a very small proportion now, as you know, of the farm products of the country.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes, but quite a few of them are expanding beyond the expectations of what the law contemplated.

Mr. BENSON. Possibly. I do not know what the law contemplated.

Senator ELLENDER. It was more or less a law for the protection of the farmers so that they could group together, buy together, and sell. I understand that quite a few of these cooperatives have gone far afield in owning oil fields, in owning oil refineries and things of that character. Do you believe that the cooperatives should go that far without paying taxes equal to those in private industry doing the same thing?

Mr. BENSON. The tax question is largely a legal question.

Senator ELLENDER. I know.

Mr. BENSON. I felt always that all of our citizens ought to pay their proportionate share of the taxes, regardless of the type of business they are in.

Senator ELLENDER. If that is true, then, you would be opposed to cooperatives owning oil fields and oil refineries unless they paid taxes to the extent that is being paid by those engaged in a similar business?

Mr. BENSON. There are many types of cooperatives.

Senator ELLENDER. Wait now. Will you answer that question?

Mr. BENSON. If it is a true cooperative, of course, the individual member pays taxes on any savings that come to him.

Senator ELLENDER. Surely.

Mr. BENSON. You are raising the question of taxes on patronage refunds. I think the cooperatives ought to pay their fair share of the taxes as determined by the Congress.

Senator ELLENDER. But let us assume that a corporation makes $100,000 profit. It has to pay I think, 52 percent on the $100,000 less a certain specific exemption. But if you take the $100,000 and divide it among a thousand people the tax might be 4 percent, or 10 percent. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am for cooperatives, understand, but I am trying to get your views since you were so closely connected with cooperatives, on the extent to which you are going to permit them to own and operate, let us say, particularly here, the fertilizer industry.

The Agriculture Department in the last 6 or 8 months has been advocating expansion of the industry. We have, I believe, extended it almost a billion dollars, and the Government has loaned money in order to expand this industry. Most of that has been done by private capital.

Should the question come up as to whether or not that ought to be handled by cooperatives or private capital, what would be your view?

Mr. BENSON. I think there is room for both.

Senator ELLENDER. Room for both?

Mr. BENSON. Surely. There is room for both.

Senator ELLENDER. Should they pay taxes on the same basis?

Mr. BENSON. It is hard to describe.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question?

Senator ELLENDER. I am not quite through.

Go ahead, Senator THYE, if you want to clarify it.

Senator THYE. My only concern here is that we are entering into the field in which the Finance Committee makes studies and determines policy and Congress enacts the law relative to taxes, and the taxes imposed upon all, whether private or corporations. I am just wondering whether we are asking the Secretary of Agriculture a question which is beyond his prerogative.

Senator ELLENDER. Senator THYE, my only reason for asking such a question, as I predicated my question, was that he was very closely allied with the cooperatives, I think, for 4, 5, or 6 years.

Mr. BENSON. Five years.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not mean to say that he is going to lean backward to help the cooperatives or anything like that, but I want to find out what his views are with respect to cooperatives.

I will repeat that I am for them 100 percent. I addressed the cooperatives in New Orleans last Tuesday. I have a lot of friends among them. I was glad to learn from the president, Mr. Brooks, that this great association did not accept all cooperatives because they were of the opinion that some of these cooperatives went far beyond the purview of the present law in getting into business that should be handled by private enterprise. They did not pay the taxes they should pay.

I understand you are aware of the position of the same group.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, I think generally, I would be, Senator, but more than half of the farmer cooperatives of the country claim no exemption of any kind, you know. Under the law they are entitled to certain exemptions. About half of them today, as I recall, are not claiming any exemption of any kind because it involves a lot of red tape, special record keeping, and the like. They just felt it was not worth it, what possible saving they might get from it.

Senator ELLENDER. I have just one more question to ask you. I do not want to take too much time. Are there any laws presently on the statute books affecting agriculture that you propose to change?

Mr. BENSON. I do not think I have the authority to change any laws.

Senator ELLENDER. I mean suggested changes.

Mr. BENSON. No; not offhand. I hope to become more familiar with the agriculture legislation, study it carefully. It may be that I will have several recommendations for the consideration of the committee later.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not understand that as Secretary of Agriculture you would have anything to say about cooperatives?

Mr. BENSON. That is right. It would be pretty much out of my field, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask one question on the matter of cotton. What would be your attitude toward the efforts of several cotton interests, producers and others, to raise a fund to promote foreign markets for cotton? Would you encourage such action on their part or would you say "No, that is the Government's business to work up the foreign markets for cotton, and something that you fellows should keep out of."

I understand they contemplate an assessment of so much a bale to develop their own markets in foreign lands.

Mr. BENSON. I think, Senator, that anything that can be done through private effort, including cooperatives, to encourage the expansion of markets abroad, or at home, should be encouraged.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Senator THYE?

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Benson, the one great question that is in my mind concerns the perishable farm commodities. I introduced a bill since the opening of this session to include oats, barley and rye among the list of the commodities to be supported at 90 percent of parity for the crop years 1953 and 1954.

Am I justified in asking that these major crops, which are storable, should be listed among the basics?

Mr. BENSON. I presume you are justified in asking me that, Senator. I presume it has been debated many times by this committee. I presume there must be good reasons why they have not been included.

Senator THYE. Would you recognize the need?

Mr. BENSON. I recognize the problem.

Senator THYE. You recognize it is a good reason for anyone in the diversified area to include those major crops that are major in some sections of the United States?

Mr. BENSON. I can certainly see why one from those areas would be interested. And I am interested in it, too.

Senator THYE. You are sympathetic to their problem?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I would be.

Senator THYE. The other great question, of course, is the dairy industry. We at the present time have a mandatory support from 75 to 90 percent.

May I ask you this question: Is it your opinion that the Department of Agriculture and the United States Government have made as great an effort as they should have and possibly could have in developing marketing, processing, packaging, and making these perishable commodities storable as they should have? Have we done as good a job in the field of research, in the field of marketing and processing, as can be done?

Mr. BENSON. That is a very broad question.

Senator THYE. It is a broad one, but it ties in.

Mr. BENSON. I think very rarely do we ever do as well as we could. I think it ought to be studied more. I believe it can be improved. I think we can do a better job in the field, in the general field of distribution, marketing, and packaging of our farm products.

Senator THYE. Would you support an endeavor to promote a program that will expand our research field in the marketing and the handling of perishables?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I would. I certainly would. Not only the perishables, but the others as well. I think that is very basic to our program.

Senator THYE. The perishables are our big problem.

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

Senator THYE. We know that the price of pork has dropped drastically to the producer. In fact, it has been way below 90-percent parity at various times in the past 15 months.

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I would be very sympathetic to it.

Senator THYE. You recognize that problem?

Mr. BENSON. I recognize it and I would be very sympathetic.

Senator THYE. While it is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to use not only section 32 funds but to make purchases to stabilize that market, would you be aggressive in the use of your discretionary authorization?

Mr. BENSON. I hope to be aggressive in carrying out the mandates of Congress provided in the various legislation, to help protect the various products of our farms. That is my objective. I hope to be aggressive in it.

Senator THYE. If you are aggressive the authorization is there.

Mr. BENSON. I may not always be as aggressive as some of you may think I should be. I will have to use my best judgment. It is a tremendous responsibility for a man to have. I hope to go forward and do the very best I can with your counsel—the counsel of this committee.

Senator THYE. I suppose Senator YOUNG and Senator ELLENDER have covered all the major questions very thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason there are not many questions that are basic that are left to be asked. I was concerned about the perishables. When I have your assurance that you will be aggressive in your discretionary authorization, then I know that we can maintain a stable market for the perishable commodities.

Mr. BENSON. I hope to do my duty to the best of my ability under the legislation provided by the Congress in carrying it out as they intended it to be carried out.

Senator THYE. Of course, they didn't intend other than that you should have discretionary authorization.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir. That is where the question of judgment comes in.

Senator THYE. That is why I wanted to be certain about it, as to whether you would be aggressive or not.

Mr. Chairman, those are all the questions that I will ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator HOLLAND?

Senator HOLLAND. Are you familiar with the rural electrification program?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; somewhat.

Senator HOLLAND. Are you in sympathy with it?

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I have been in sympathy with it through the years.

Senator HOLLAND. Are you familiar with the rural telephone program that has just gotten well under way?

Mr. BENSON. Not as familiar as I am with the other phase of REA. But I am somewhat familiar with it.

Senator HOLLAND. Are you in sympathy with that?

Mr. BENSON. I remember when the telephone first came into my home. It was a cooperative project which the farmers provided themselves. That was a happy day in our home.

Senator HOLLAND. You understand that the rural telephone legislation on the books gives emphasis to the helping of private telephone projects to better fill the rural field, if that can be done?

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. And that that would have precedence over the organization of new associations under the Rural Telephone Act. Are you familiar with the operations of Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; in a general way.

Senator HOLLAND. What is your attitude with reference to that organization and its usefulness and its place in the picture?

Mr. BENSON. I understood it is performing a very desirable and good service. I want to study it carefully, if you will give me time to do so. I don't know that I am ready to make any recommendations for changes or anything of the sort. In a general way I am familiar with what it is.

Senator HOLLAND. I understand, of course, that two of its large fields of activity not covered elsewhere are in the fields of emergency loan handling?

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. In the case of disaster?

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. And in the field of assistance of submarginal operations to better meet their problem?

Mr. BENSON. That is a very special field.

Senator HOLLAND. And that that is not met by the ordinarily more commercial type of Federal organization?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I understand that.

Senator HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota asked you some questions about perishables. I believe he confined himself largely to the dairy field, whereas the people in a large part of the Nation are more interested in the field of fruits and vegetable production, when the word "perishables" is mentioned, than in the dairy field.

You understand, of course, that the present legislation requires that the section 32 funds shall be used preferentially—or I believe maybe a little different word is used—that the preferred field of operation shall be in connection with the meeting of the problems of crops that do not have price-support programs, with emphasis on perishables, fresh fruits and vegetables?

Mr. BENSON. That is my understanding.

Senator HOLLAND. You will of course be governed by that expression of the law?

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. You realize, of course, that there is much emphasis now on the way to expand markets, export markets in particular, in both the storable commodity fields and also in the perishable fields. Even having that in mind you would still be prepared to give prior emphasis or preferential consideration to the fresh fruits and vegetables and other nonsupported products in connection with these attempts to build export markets?

Mr. BENSON. I think they need a lot of attention. I think some of our major problems have to do with the perishables.

Senator HOLLAND. You are not supporting the Brannan program, are you, Mr. Benson?

Mr. BENSON. I think you know the answer to that, Senator.

Senator HOLLAND. I wanted you to answer it. You are not for the Brannan plan?

Mr. BENSON. No, sir. Not as I understand it.

Senator HOLLAND. To come back to the Farmers Home Administration for a moment, there has been discussion of merging it with other excellent programs. It has always occurred to me that here is a field dealing more with cases of need than the others in which you deal with cases of rightful credit values, and that there is a great dissimilarity between the field covered by the Farmers Home Administration program and the others.

Mr. BENSON. I understood that it fills a special need and is in a special credit field. The field ordinarily is not fully covered by commercial credit institutions, or even by farm credit administrations. It is a special field.

Senator HOLLAND. In this field of credits have you had any experience in the executive field, and particularly in the banking field?

Mr. BENSON. No, not especially.

Senator HOLLAND. You recognize that the Secretary of Agriculture is the head of the largest banking institution in the world?

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. Do you have any views which you would care to communicate to this committee with reference to the need for reorganization of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BENSON. I have this view, Senator: I hope to get around me the very best men that it is possible to get, and men who have experience in those fields where I may be lacking somewhat. I do not have all the answers. I am trying to bring into the Department the very best qualified men it is humanly possible to get. I am finding that you cannot get that type of man always on the basis of Government salaries, but that you can on the basis of public service oftentimes, and the opportunity to help get a job done, even at a substantial sacrifice in salary. I have already had evidence of that. I hope that we can get men on the team who can do the job.

Senator HOLLAND. You know, of course, that the present legislation permits the setting up and utilization of an advisory committee for the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. Which in the opinion of many members of this committee—as heretofore set up—has been a very strong method available to strengthen the soundness of the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but which has not been very much used. Do you have any plan with reference to the making of greater use of that program?

Mr. BENSON. I am a very strong believer in advisory committees, particularly if they can be rather informal committees that are not set up and become another Government institution. I think they can render a very useful service. I was thinking in terms of dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation particularly, where such a committee would be invaluable.

Senator HOLLAND. You recognize that that is one of the fields where material strengthening of the present program is required?

Mr. BENSON. I think that is true.

Senator HOLLAND. One more question, relating to the field of forestry and forestry products, which of course is an important field in the Department of Agriculture. Do you have special experience in that field?

Mr. BENSON. I have lived very close to the national forests. I have run livestock on the national forests. I know something of their operations.

Senator HOLLAND. I am not thinking so much of national forests. I am thinking of the privately owned forests and forest operations and forest products.

Mr. BENSON. I know something of those. I never owned personally a private forest but I know something of the problems and the relationship between the privately owned forests and the national forests.

Senator HOLLAND. You feel that you would be able to give intelligent and aggressive handling to the forest and forest products side of the operations of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BENSON. I would hope to. I would probably need your counsel and the counsel of many others, but I will do the best I can.

Senator HOLLAND. You will probably have the counsel of all members of this committee. Do you have any special plans in your program of service—I see you are already building a program—relating to forests and forest products?

Mr. BENSON. No. No final conclusions, Senator. I have conferred with a number of representatives of privately owned forests as I have made a junket around the country, and have learned something of their views, something of their problems. I will not make a decision until I am in office, of course, and until I know a little more about it myself.

Senator HOLLAND. You recognize, of course, that as our country has grown greater in population and as the forests have been in many places denuded, that the problems in connection with forestry and reforestation have grown more acute until they comprise now one of our greatest fields of national necessity?

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I am familiar with that. I have traveled in many countries abroad where they have suffered as a result of not providing for reforestation.

Senator HOLLAND. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated your belief that an advisory committee would be of value to you. Do you agree that the value of an advisory committee will depend almost fully upon the Secretary giving credence to the advice he receives from such committee and following it if it appears valuable?

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I think that is true. I have already had an example of it. As you know, there has been an interim agricultural advisory committee appointed. I met with them for 3 days. I found that they were very valuable. I took to them some problems for checking. I am sure that such a committee can be very helpful to the Secretary. I would hope that I would have the advantage of the use of such a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to ask you next whether you recommended the establishment of such a committee with advisory powers on a permanent basis?

Mr. BENSON. Yes. I recommended the appointment of this committee to the President-elect. He named the committee at my recommendation. I would hope that there would be a continuing committee, maybe with some change in personnel from time to time to bring in fresh points of view, and possibly to get a wider representation, not only a general advisory committee but it seems to me we need advisory committees probably on commodity products as well, particularly on commodity credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator YOUNG has a question.

Senator YOUNG. Will you be appointing any farmers to these committees? So far as I know you have not appointed any farmers.

Mr. BENSON. Yes; there have been some, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. I hope the Republican National Committeeman in my home State, Albert Mitchell, is regarded as a farmer. He operates the Matador Ranch, runs his own ranch, produces several thousand head of cattle a year, and bought a ranch in the southeastern part of the country.

Senator YOUNG. He is a large rancher, I would say.

Senator HOLLAND. This question emphasizes the nonpartisan and bipartisan nature of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator WILLIAMS?

Senator WILLIAMS. I have no questions at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator ANDERSON?

Senator ANDERSON. May I say, Mr. Secretary, that I am very happy at the answers you have given this afternoon. I am glad that you have not made up your mind on every subject before you have a chance to take advantage of the wisdom that is contained in the wonderful career people who are inside the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BENSON. I am sure there are hundreds of them, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. There was a question a moment ago about soil conservation payments and the amount of $400,000,000 was used. I think other people referred to a quarter of a billion dollars. I hope you recognize that the $400,000,000 or $250,000,000, as it is in the budget, are agricultural conservation payments and that they are not to be confused with soil conservation payments. I made a motion in the Senate to reduce agricultural conservation payments, but the entire discussion was on soil conservation.

Mr. BENSON. I understand they are separate.

Senator ANDERSON. Yes. One is a device to conserve the soil and the other is a separate device to increase agricultural income. I believe people recognize that.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator yields.

Senator THYE. May I just make a brief comment on the last statement of the former Secretary to increase the agricultural income? If Senator ANDERSON would yield.

Senator ANDERSON. Surely.

Senator THYE. What I recognize in that phase of the Federal payment is the incentive to improve the farm techniques, such as the growing of legumes, the application of commercial lime, which assures the farmer that if he puts grass seed in the ground he has a better chance of getting a good stand of grass. What I recognize in the program is that incentive is very, very important. Therefore it does tie in to soil conservation in a degree.

Senator ANDERSON. I do want to remind you that the American Farm Bureau Federation, after carefully studying this and talking it over at the grass roots, at its last meeting in Seattle—which I had the privilege of attending—passed a resolution pretty strongly against agricultural conservation payments for items that the farmer would ordinarily do himself. And the National Grange—I saw Mr. Sanders here a moment ago—has also taken a position of trying to put the payments on permanent practices.

I noticed that the question a moment ago was phrased entirely in terms of soil conservation. I think we will get along better if we frankly label it "agricultural conservation payments," for whatever purposes used.

General Eisenhower got into this discussion. May I call your attention to what he said at Memphis, Tenn., on October 16? I understood this was the last major farm reference that he made in the campaign. He said:

"Here and now let me say to you what I have said to farmers elsewhere: I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books."

As I understand it the price-support laws now on the books have some provision for flexibility in them. They include the Agricultural Act of 1948, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1949. I hope that any of these other utterances do not lead you to believe that he was abandoning the basic agricultural acts.

The Democratic candidate for President in 1948 ran on a program of flexibility and did very well in the farm States, if my memory serves me at all. In 1952 our candidate did not run on flexible price supports but on rigid 90 percent forever and ever. He did not carry a farm State north of the Mason and Dixon's line.

Senator YOUNG. Would you yield?

Senator ANDERSON. I only hope that what General Eisenhower so clearly stated over and over again, to support the basic Farm Act, is not forgotten.

Senator YOUNG. Would you yield?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. The statements by both President Truman and Vice President Barkley were all in favor of 90-percent supports. The Democratic platform itself favored a flexible support, but their own policy was for 90-percent support. Is that correct?

Senator ANDERSON. I am glad the distinguished Senator from North Dakota paid so much attention to the Democratic platform at that particular time—1948. I could introduce the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the campaign documents which the then Senator Barkley presented as the legislative accomplishments of the administration. It was done on the last day and he referred in glowing terms to the Aiken Act, so-called. I have copies of what President Truman said at Omaha and what he said in California, in which he almost endorsed the Aiken Act by name.

Senator YOUNG. Could you produce one speech made by either President Truman or Barkley which did not specify 90-percent support in that campaign?

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to the 1948 election.

Senator ANDERSON. Can you produce one that did say they are for 90-percent price support?

Senator YOUNG. Yes; a great many.

Senator ANDERSON. In the 1948 election?

Senator YOUNG. Yes.

Senator ANDERSON. I am glad you followed that campaign so closely. I campaigned a little bit with the Vice Presidential candidate, Mr. Barkley. He must have skipped it when I was there because he didn't say a word about it. All I am trying to suggest is that the basic agricultural act is on the books, and I hope the Department of Agriculture will try to administer programs under the laws which Congress has passed and not by press release or Presidential speeches.

I say press release advisedly because Mr. Shields was back here a moment ago, who was counsel for the Department, and who recalls how we were hooked by a press release inadvertently issued in 1941. That press release tied the Government up for the expenditure of a lot of money.

I am glad that you are willing to follow the laws instead of the press releases.

Mr. BENSON. I certainly hope I will always be found trying to follow the laws.

Senator ANDERSON. I believe that you will be.

Mr. BENSON. The Secretary does not make those laws.

Senator ANDERSON. No, sir; he is the administrator of those laws.

Mr. BENSON. It will be an honest administration of them.

Senator ANDERSON. I am confident it will be.

I noticed the suggestion about new industrial uses made a moment ago. I hope that the comments mean that you will try to find new uses for products instead of disposing of them without finding new use for them.

May I express the hope that you try to get the amount of research money that is permitted by law. It may be difficult to get it through the Bureau of the Budget. At least if the Department asks for the $60,000,000 that they are entitled to now, it may get a fair-sized chunk of that.

Do you not believe that by the use of this research we can eliminate some of the troubles that the farmers now have?

Mr. BENSON. I am sure it would make a contribution, Senator. I think it is basic to the future growth and expansion and welfare of the whole industry.

Senator ANDERSON. And that we may need this food that will be produced as a result of it.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Let me say in passing that I could not help but notice that you are silent on the drop in grain markets. I hope the silence continues. I do not think you have authority to try to bolster these prices by utterances before you become Secretary, as you do afterward. You may find that you will find it necessary to do it afterward.

Mr. BENSON. I may find that I am not Secretary, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. I hope that does not happen. I do want to commend the suggestion Senator HOLLAND made a moment ago about the use of advisory boards in Commodity Credit. It is a tremendously large banking operation. Members of this committee were very helpful in trying to work out an advisory program that they could approve an advisory committee that they could confirm.

I do not think that advisory committee has come back many times to the Congress for any future suggestions. I do hope that you might find it in your heart to make use of the accumulated wisdom that you find in some of the members of this committee.

Senator YOUNG. Will the Senator yield since you made reference apparently to a remark that I made earlier as to his position on price supports in bolstering markets?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. My thinking is the same as that of most of the people of the Middle West, that a strong statement now by the Secretary on the continuance of price supports would bolster these markets. I think that is perfectly proper.

Senator ANDERSON. If the present Secretary of Agriculture starts to make use of his office to influence markets up and down, people who are on one side of the market will lose and other people on the other side will win.

I hate to think of the possibility of the Secretary of Agriculture going out and making statements in order to rig the market one way or the other. I do not believe it will work, in the first place, and I think it can only lead to grief, in the second place. He is not allowed by law to comment on cotton. I wish he were not allowed to comment on other things.

Senator YOUNG. May I again state, my only thought was that a statement by him on price supports would strengthen the markets, and I think it is perfectly proper. Since when are the departments denied the right to advocate a decent price for farmers, even if there might be some inference that speculators would profit?

Senator ANDERSON. I will only say that there will be many days when people who are on the wrong side of the lard market or something else will try to influence that market. I think the Department of Agriculture had some special announcements that a fellow was unkind enough to leave in the pressroom, telling what would happen with lard, and you gentlemen will recall that. That was done to influence the market. The man who did it I think faced trial for it some time or other.

It is an extremely dangerous thing, I think, if the Secretary of Agriculture should get into that position. I sympathize with what the Senator from North Dakota is trying to accomplish. Heaven knows he has tried steadily and industriously to protect the interests of the farmers. I have never been critical of what he has done. He has been a very fine Senator and a true friend of farmers. I only wanted to express my hope that the Department does not get in the business of rigging the markets. I do not believe it should.

Senator YOUNG. I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of keeping the record straight, the Chair would like to make note of the remark of the Senator from North Dakota earlier in this session. I believe the Senator from North Dakota made mention that farm prices had been steadily falling for the past 6 years. If the records of the Department are correct, the all-time peak in farm income was the years 1947 and 1948. Since 1948 net farm income has fallen 10 percent, while net farm mortgages have increased a little over 30 percent.

That points up the seriousness of the situation and the ineffectiveness, perhaps, of—maybe we had better not say "methods used so far"—we might say failure to use all of the instruments which have been available for the prevention of such decline.

It may have been inadvertent on the part of the Senator from North Dakota. I wanted the record to show that.

Senator YOUNG. In line with your thinking recently they took 18 cargoes of wheat out of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks for European needs. It would have been more proper, if they wanted to maintain prices, to take them out of the market.

Senator ANDERSON. Certainly. I feel quite a good deal of sympathy with what the Senator from North Dakota is saying. I have 180 cattle on full feed. They have been there since the 1st of October. I bought them earlier in the year. They have had 9 months of pasture, 3 months of full feed. If I am lucky I will almost get back what I paid for the cattle originally.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator THYE?

Senator THYE. My observation has been this: 1951 and 1952 have been the most difficult years that the farmers have experienced since late 1939. The expenses of the farmer are at their peak because of the inflationary levels reached in 1950, and the farmer's return, his income has been on a constant decline, but the expenses still remain up there. The farmer is hard pressed and mortgages are being written every single day, as well as delinquent payments, both in mortgages and in chattels, which are being recorded constantly.

That is the concern that I have when I asked the Secretary would he be aggressive in the use of his discretionary authorization in purchases with section 32 funds. We could hope for a better market in the perishables than we have experienced in the past years.

That is my great concern.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SCHOEPPEL?

Senator SCHOEPPEL. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Benson, there is an advantage from your standpoint in getting down to the lower end of the totem pole. I am talking about the Senator from Kentucky and myself. I want to say that generally I am very much in agreement with the answers that you have made to many of these questions. Many of the questions I shall not repeat.

I know you realize that you will approach this from the angle that this is an evaluation proposition, that it is very important to evaluate where we are, what are the causes and conditions that are developing. I am glad you are taking the viewpoint that it has to be studied and it has to be approached carefully. I think that is a mark of good judgment and a practical approach to these things.

You mentioned a while ago something about your attitude and interests in the soil conservation programs. I have had a feeling that the watershed programs were not pressed as vigorously by those in charge of the administration of this important segment of our Government as they should be.

Are you generally sympathetic with the watershed programs and the further expansion of them?

Mr. BENSON. As I understand them, I am, Senator. It seems to me they are very important.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. Some of the recommendations from the Department came down later. I know the Department is pressed for many other serious and what they consider more important matters. They came in too late for this Congress to implement, many of them, the way they felt they should be implemented. I am glad to have your views with reference to that matter. It is a very important approach.

There was a controversy in the program of the Army engineers as related to your Department and others. There will be before you, I am sure, from many of us, plans for expansions in the watershed programs, some from my State and some from other States.

I notice with reference to the advisory councils that you have a belief in their being beneficial and constructive. I might say frankly that I have heard some rumblings already—maybe honestly, maybe because they are a little impatient; although I do not think they are too impatient—about some of those advisory councils or the overall group not being fully representative of the industries that are tied into the agricultural field, and related commodities, for instance, the chemical industry. I understand that the total sum in dollar-and-cent sales value of the chemical industry is next to foods in this country. At least I have been so informed. Would you consider that such councils, to the extent that you think any of them represent the chemical industries, ought to have some representation in the advisory committee?

Mr. BENSON. I think it would be wise on the part of the Secretary to get advice from every possible source. This interim agricul-

tural advisory committee, of course, was relatively a small committee. We tried to select men who had a broad understanding of agriculture. We could not have representatives of every commodity and every industry related to agriculture on the small committee. I would hope that we would have a number of committees.

Mention has been made of having an advisory committee for commodity credit in this operation. I would hope we might have a number of advisory committees on a commodity basis. Maybe there is a need for a special advisory committee on the matter of fertilizers and chemicals. It is very important, certainly. The Secretary is going to need all the help he can get, and even then he will not have all the answers.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. Benson, there is one other angle that many of us in the small grain-producing areas—my State, for example—are very much interested in wheat and the ramifications that follow. Naturally, we are interested in where the price-support program will land. I am glad we have the price-support program on the statute books and, as you indicated, you will carry it out.

When you look at the International Wheat Agreement, ramifications are going to come from that. It is not going to be too pleasant a picture. Do you feel that that is one of the fields of important matters that have to be approached rather realistically?

Mr. BENSON. I think so, Senator. I am studying that right now. As you know, the present wheat agreement expires in July. A conference is being held here with representatives of the Nation, 46 of them, beginning on the 30th of January. That is right on our doorstep.

Senator HOLLAND. It has cost us about $800,000,000 in 3 years.

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I noticed that. That, of course, concerns me. You speak of advisory committees. We have called an advisory committee of the industry—growers, handlers, and processors—to meet here tomorrow as the first step. I understand arrangements have been made so that we can have an advisory committee from the Congress. We, of course, must determine what is being done, the matter of whether that agreement should be continued or whether it should not, and on what basis it should be continued. It is a problem that is right before us now. It concerns me very deeply.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. I know it does. I wanted to throw that out as one of the immediate problems we are going to have to face, which problems are going to have an effect on this great field of grain marketing and price structure.

One other thing and I shall conclude. I have heard much concern expressed. I note that you are interested, and have been for a number of years, in the cooperative movement. They are in my State—and rightfully so—interested in purchasing and distribution of commodities.

In the grain field we have many, many people who operate country elevators, buy, store, and use those facilities for storage purposes. A very troublesome situation, probably because of the approach that might be made by the Department in implementing further restrictions that might develop that will affect the profits in the Pure Food and Drug Division. I know that you are familiar with it.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir. I heard about it in your State.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. It is there, and it goes into Oklahoma and Texas and other States. There is a situation, that I assure you, as Secretary—and you will be the Secretary, God willing——

Mr. BENSON. If He is not willing, I do not want to be.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. That is going to be a problem that will have to be considered. If it is not approached realistically it is going to affect the price that the farmer is going to get for his grain. I am sure you realize that.

Mr. BENSON. Yes; I do.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. I throw that out only for——

Mr. BENSON. It has already been thrown out to me several times on this junket I made aroung the country, Senator. I made that trip on my own initiative—no one suggested it to me—because I felt the need of counsel from leaders throughout the agricultural industry.

I do not mean only farm people. I had representatives of farmers, handlers and processors in, representing various commodities. When I got into the grain belt in Kansas City we had people come in from all over that area—from five or six States—this was one of the problems that was worrying them.

When we had people come in from up in your area, Senator YOUNG, in the cash wheat belt, they were worried about it also. Apparently it is a serious problem.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. It affects not only the man who produces it, the man who buys it for storage and later disposition, but it affects whoever handles it. It is a situation that has to be treated realistically.

Mr. BENSON. Certainly.

Senator SCHOEPPEL. That is all that I have. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CLEMENTS?

Senator CLEMENTS. You mentioned that you would be very aggressive in the support of nonbasic commodities and perishables.

Mr. BENSON. Possibly not as aggressive as some of you think I should be.

Senator CLEMENTS. I recall that. I also heard you express your sympathy for the REA program. About 10 percent of the farmers of this country are still without electricity. Would you be just as aggressive toward getting that 10 percent electricity as you would in the support of these commodities that were mentioned?

Mr. BENSON. My first interest, Senator, as I envision it, is the national welfare. Then closely related to that is the welfare of the farmers. Having been one of them, having been closely associated with them, I think you can count on me being aggressive and helping them.

Senator CLEMENTS. That is, to get the other 10 percent electricity?

Mr. BENSON. I would like to see the conveniences which we enjoy, which many of us in the cities and rural communities enjoy, out on the farms all over the country.

Senator CLEMENTS. What is your attitude on acreage limitations on any of the basic commodities?

Mr. BENSON. I know that generally speaking farmers are independent. They like to be free. They do not like to be controlled, as I understand them. I never did.

On the other hand, if we have conditions of surplus facing us and if we are going to have price supports, which we now have, and they seem desirable, then we are faced possibly with some control. It seems to me it is inevitable, even though farmers may not like it. It is one of the problems, one of the real problems that we face.

Senator CLEMENTS. You recognize the need for it under certain conditions?

Mr. BENSON. Under certain conditions. I wish it was not necessary, but it seems to me it is inevitable.

Senator CLEMENTS. I come from a State that is the largest producer of burley tobacco and our growers are interested in acreage limitation. Only a few weeks ago the farmers in the burley area voted for acreage limitations by nearly 99 percent. I believe the percentage was 98.3 percent.

Mr. BENSON. I had some of them in to see me.

Senator CLEMENTS. I am glad they have been there. I hope you will familiarize yourself fully with the tobacco program.

Mr. BENSON. They seem to be quite happy with the program as it has operated. It is somewhat unique, I must say.

Senator CLEMENTS. But it has not been expensive to the Government. It has not cost the Federal Government a dollar.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator HICKENLOOPER had to leave us briefly to attend another meeting for a few minutes.

In your absence, Senator, we passed over your question period. Now that you have returned, have you any question to ask Mr. Benson?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am sorry, I found myself caught between two confirmations this afternoon, one on the Foreign Relations Committee and one on the Agriculture Committee. I tried to listen in on both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Not entirely separate.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes, they are interrelated, I assure you.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have no particular questions to ask Mr. Benson. I have discussed matters with him heretofore. I think I know generally his agricultural views. I only want to say that I sympathize with anyone who undertakes to solve all the problems of agriculture. I hope to give him what assistance I can in my small way. I think many of the questions that I might have asked have been asked so I will not take further time.

The CHAIRMAN. We also have with us at this first meeting of this committee the newest Agriculture member, possibly qualified as a freahman member—though I am not sure about that—Senator WELKER. I will ask Senator WELKER at this time if he has any questions to ask Mr. Benson?

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to apologize to the chairman and to our distinguished new Secretary. I am sorry I was not in attendance at the meeting.

As did Senator HICKENLOOPER, I had another conflicting meeting. I welcome to Washington a native Idahoan.

I have no questions. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator JOHNSTON, one of our members who had to leave briefly for another committee meeting, has returned now.

Have you some questions to ask the Secretary, Senator JOHNSTON?

Senator JOHNSTON. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We are certainly glad to have this large percentage of the committee present at this meeting. I want to say, Mr. Benson, that we appreciate your appearance here this afternoon, and the frank manner in which you have answered questions as far as you were able to answer them.

Mr. BENSON. Senator, I did not know what this involved. I have not been through it before. I am not an experienced witness as you probably observed.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have you up here undoubtedly after you become more experienced.

Senator ANDERSON. This is mild. Wait until he holds his first press conference.

Mr. BENSON. I would like to say this: Of course this whole thing has come as a great surprise to me, you know. I did not seek it. I did not want it. That is water over the dam. Now that I have accepted, at least the nomination, if the Senate sees fit to confirm me I will do the best I can. That is all any man can do.

I do not expect to spend my time trying to protect my job, because any time the Senate or the President is through with my services I will be greatly relieved and happy to return to what I was doing. But I am determined to use my every energy in the interests of agriculture and in the interests of the welfare of the Nation.

I appreciate this opportunity of coming here and getting acquainted with some of the Members of the Senate whom I have not met, and seeing further some whom I have met.

The CHAIRMAN. I for one have not felt like asking you to tell the committee definitely

what you would do about this matter or that matter because I realize it will take you some time in the Secretary's office to familiarize yourself with these various problems which arise so that you could give what, in your opinion, is a fair and decisive answer.

All I want to know about the next Secretary of Agriculture is whether he has the ability to get hold of the problems as they arise, to hear all sides fairly, and then to make fair decisions. There are problems on which decisions cannot possibly be made to suit everybody. The questions here this afternoon have indicated that you will have both regional and commodity problems arise, and sometimes in different regions different commodities will come in conflict.

I want to express the hope and the belief that we will have full cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in trying to work out the answers to these major problems which now confront us, and to obtain our major objective, which is a prosperous agriculture here in the United States.

As far as this committee is concerned I think we can sum up our objective very briefly by saying that, first, we want to find out what factors are contributing to this disturbing decline in net farm income and increase in farm indebtedness; second, what is contributing to the slump, slump, slump of farm prosperity which we are sadly experiencing at this time, and finally, we want to find out, if we can, what can be done about it.

The symptoms today are so reminiscent of those of a little over 20 years ago with expanding stock market activity and a steady drop, drop of farm income. We know what came of it, and knowing what came of it at that time we ought to be able to recognize the symptoms and do our utmost to prevent such an occurrence as we had during the thirties.

Are there any other questions to ask Secretary-designate Benson before we dismiss him? If not, we will adjourn this public hearing and go into executive session.

I want to announce that the committee has no requests to be heard on Secretary Benson's confirmation from anyone.

(Thereupon, at 3:47 p. m., the committee went into executive session.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise merely to state that I differ very completely with the conclusions which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has drawn as to the testimony before the committee of Mr. Benson, the nominee for Secretary of Agriculture. I tried to express in that hearing my conviction that Mr. Benson had answered in a way which I thought was eminently satisfactory. I certainly was pleased by the fact that he did not come to the hearing with all his conclusions worked out. He was willing to depend upon the very valuable advice which he would get from the career employees and officers of the Department of Agriculture; and he was happy, as well, to let conditions in the country develop as they should develop.

I think it would be too bad if, at the very outset of this administration, an attempt were made to persuade everyone that General Eisenhower throughout the campaign loyally supported 90-percent fixed, rigid price supports, because I believe a careful reading of what he said would indicate something a little different. For example, in the last speech which he made, which dealt very definitely with farm policy, and which was delivered at Memphis, Tenn., on the 16th of October, he said:

> Here and now let me say to you what I have said to farmers elsewhere. I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books.

The laws now on the books dealing with price supports relate to three things. First of all is the Agricultural Act of 1948, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; second, some changes made by the Agricultural Act of 1949, with which my name is associated; and, third, temporary legislation which provides 90 percent support for 2 years.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The law on the statute books provides 90 percent support at the present time, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. It depends on what we mean by the law on the books. There is temporary legislation which expires in 2 years. It provides 90 percent flat support at a time when we need more food to meet the Korean situation, but support levels will then revert to permanent legislation, which is the Agricultural Act of 1948, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1949. That is the only permanent legislation now on the books.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico, in view of his wide experience with agricultural subjects, and in view of the fact that he is a former Secretary of Agriculture, could tell us whether Mr. Benson favors a permanent or temporary 90 percent support program in that connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not wish to speak for Mr. Benson on that subject. I hope that the new Secretary of Agriculture will take the time to find out all the facts involved before he takes a position on it.

I referred in the hearings to the fact that the idea of flexible price supports had been considered very carefully. It is not necessary now to refer to the fact that the Department of Agriculture set up a postwar planning committee and that it spent several years in developing what I regard as the finest type of postwar planning for agricultural price programs. The matter was first presented to the Congress of the United States in committee hearings after there had been extended hearings within the department.

Arising from that study there was adopted a program, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which incorporated the principle of flexible price supports.

The question then arose as to whether in 1948 the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman, seeking reelection, had actually come out for flexible price supports. I made the offhand observation that I could produce the speech he made at Omaha and his remarks at the press conference at Los Angeles, in which he almost mentioned the Aiken bill by name.

In a speech which he delivered strangely enough, at Springfield, Ill., on the 12th day of October, he said:

> Here are the main outlines of the agricultural program we must have:
>
> 1. We must have on a permanent basis a system of flexible price supports for agricultural commodities. Price supports and related measures help us keep our farm production adjusted to shifting market requirements.

The then minority leader of the Eightieth Congress, who later became Vice President of the United States as a result of the 1948 election, Senator Alben Barkley, produced Senate Document No. 203, which was published in 1948, in which he uses this language:

> When President Truman announced in May that he was going to send his formal request for a modernized program to Congress in a few days, the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee got busy.
>
> The committee reported for its long-range farm program May 17, less than a week after the President sent his special message on farm problems to Congress.
>
> The President had succeeded in prodding the Senate committee into action. And the Senate committee's bill was almost a carbon copy of the sensible farm program proposed by the President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to add parenthetically that I am glad to have that language from the distinguished minority leader, who subsequently became our Vice President, because when he speaks of a sensible farm program proposed by the President, it was the program which the Department of Agriculture had worked out and submitted to the President, and which he had in turn transmitted to the Congress of the United States.

As the person who had transmitted it to the President and had helped in drafting the program, I ought to know what was meant by a program of flexible price supports. I had spent long months in hearings and I had spent many months discussing it with officials of the Department whose judgment I had come to respect. Certainly I knew what that flexible price-support program meant. If we need volume upon volume of testimony to do so, I could do what I did once before—put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page after page of testimony indicating that the President knew what he had submitted to the Congress of the United States and what Congress adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator recall that when the Anderson Act, setting up the present agricultural price-support program, passed the Senate there was a tie vote on the Young-Russell amendment, which would have provided 90 percent supports on basic farm products at a time when the farmer was under either acreage controls or quotas, and that Vice President Barkley broke the tie, stating that he had campaigned for 90 percent support and he would keep his word? Would the Senator mind inserting in the RECORD the remarks of the distinguished Vice President at that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not, because I know what he said, and no one in Government was more disappointed than I was by what he said. I did what a kind friend would do. I waited until the incident was well for-

gotten and then reminded him of what he had campaigned for. I think he was grateful to me for not standing up and saying, "You did such-and-such a thing, and this is what you said in your campaign."

I continue to quote from the statement of the former Vice President in Senate Document No. 203:

> The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported a realistic, modern farm bill early in the second session of Congress. Some of the high lights of the measure were:
>
> First. Abundant production would be assured.
>
> Second. Agricultural income would be maintained on a flexible parity base.

Mr. President, those are rather significant words from the then minority leader, the former Senator and former Vice President, Alben Barkley.

> These provisions indicated that the Senate committee had closely followed President Truman's recommendations. But the House refused to go along with the Senate in enacting a realistic farm program.

They adopted an extension of 90 percent supports. Then he said:

> The result was that the farm legislation finally passed by Congress merely extended existing laws until June 30, 1950, and postponed a long-range farm program until that date.

Mr. President, all I am trying to say is that I am not endeavoring today to tell Ezra Benson what he should do. My dealings with him when I was Secretary of Agriculture and he was a representative of agricultural organizations persuaded me to believe that he is an honorable person, with a very fine agricultural background, and that he can be expected to give the farmers of this country a very fine administration. I think it would be very unfortunate if the farmers of America were saddled with permanent 90-percent price-support legislation. If anyone wants to know what happened in that connection, let him examine the scars which I received from the potato program, which was a program providing fixed 90-percent price support.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. In a moment. I should say that 60 percent was fixed subsequently. It was fixed at 90 percent by the terms of the Steagall amendment. I think I know whether it was or was not. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to contradict that statement?

Mr. YOUNG. At the time when we got into trouble the price support program was 60 percent of parity, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it was not. I know of the time when the Senator from North Dakota claims we got into trouble, and I know when I got into trouble.

Mr. YOUNG. I know when the Department of Agriculture got into trouble. It was when $440,000,000 was lost in supporting potato prices at 60 percent of parity.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will look up the record. It happens that we started under the terms of the Steagall amendment, and eventually lost many hundreds of millions of dollars. We subsequently adopted a rigid 60-percent support program, and we continued to lose money. We eliminated that, and the farmers are now getting along a little better with the potato program. I hope that the new Secretary of Agriculture will take time to consider these matters.

I wish to state that I was well satisfied with the answers he gave to the committee, and I hope he will continue to take his time and make up his own mind and study agricultural matters very carefully. I hope that he will not favor a 90-percent price-support program on eggs, for example, or feel that 90 percent of parity is sufficient for dairy products, because there have been many times when 145 percent of parity was not sufficient for dairy products. The laws we now have on the statute books permit the Secretary of Agriculture to go to any necessary levels to which he may need to go in order to obtain proper agricultural production.

I am simply trying to say that I was very pleased with the answers given by the designee to be Secretary of Agriculture, that my past experience with him bore out everything he said, and that I believe he is a sound, sensible, and proper person to administer that great Department; and I shall enjoy voting to confirm his nomination.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was present at the hearing the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry conducted when Mr. Ezra Taft Benson appeared before it. I know that many a pointed question was asked of him in the course of the interrogation. I would have thought less of Mr. Benson had he been specific in saying, "I will do thus and I will do such and I will do the other thing," because he was not then sworn in as Secretary of Agriculture. He was being interrogated in order that we might establish what his general philosophy would be in the field of agriculture.

Mr. Benson is a student of agriculture, and has been for all his adult years. No man can be a student of agriculture and then work against the welfare and interest of the farmer. Being a student of agriculture and a man well grounded in the field of agriculture, I am confident that Mr. Benson will work for an agricultural program which will provide 100-percent parity for the farmer.

Mr. President, we should not endeavor to provide anything less than 100 percent of parity, whether it be for agriculture, or for those in the professional fields, for labor, or any other segment of our economy. As Members of Congress parity should be our endeavor for all the groups in the economy of our Nation; and agriculture is justly entitled to 100 percent of parity, rather than only 90 percent. Similarly, a laboring man is justly entitled to 100 percent of parity in his case.

So I am confident that Mr. Benson's general philosophy and fairness are such that he will endeavor to establish for the producers of our land 100 percent of parity in terms of their income and their share in the national economy.

Mr. Benson cannot foresee what will be the agricultural situation 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years from now. A major drought could bring about a scarcity of many of the agricultural commodities, in which case the question of providing 90 percent of parity would be a forgotten one.

However, Mr. President, I wish to say that 90 percent of parity has in the past been provided for only the six so-called basic agricultural commodities, which are corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Of course it might be said that wheat and corn are crops in which the northern section of the United States has a definite interest. On the other hand, the northern section of our Nation is not engaged in the production of cotton, tobacco, rice, or peanuts. I have often criticized the administration of the agricultural commodity price-support program by reason of the fact that those who produce perishable commodities, such as citrus fruits, dairy products, poultry and meats, have not received the just and reasonable support of the Department of Agriculture in its administrative activities, in that such producers were not supported by the Department of Agriculture in respect to having the prices of the commodities they raise supported at 90 percent of parity.

I believe that as Members of Congress we have a greater responsibility than we have exercised in the past, in endeavoring to settle the question of price supports for the perishable, nonbasic commodities, because therein lies the interest of the family type of farm, the type of farm which will build soil rather than deteriorate and deplete soil fertility. After all, the family type of farm is the one on which we find the youth engaged in the gainful occupation of aiding their parents in the management and operation of such small agricultural units. That is the type of farm with which we must concern ourselves in the future, in respect to the program for price supports for agricultural commodities.

Many a time we have seen the prices of dairy products much below 90 percent of parity. Many a time we have seen the farmers' income far below 90 percent of parity in respect to other perishable commodities, such as poultry and eggs. Yet the philosophy was to support the prices of agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity, but that philosophy was applicable only to the six so-called basic agricultural commodities, rather than to the broad field of the many commodities which are basic in respect to the respective areas of the United States in which they are produced.

So, Mr. President, in listening to the interrogation of Mr. Benson at that session of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was satisfied that he came not only as an able student of agriculture but also as one who has integrity and sincerity and as one who will endeavor with all his might—which is very great, because of his qualifications in that field—to develop and carry out a farm program which will provide for 100 percent parity, rather than 90 percent parity in the case of only six commodities which are only a part of our great agricultural economy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am happy to support and vote for the confirmation of Mr. Benson's nomination.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to price supports for agricultural commodities, is it not true that there are many other policies an administration could carry on which would aid agriculture tremendously, and that support for agricultural commodity prices is not the only method of assuring parity for farm commodity prices?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Utah that if the United States Government in its endeavors had put forth as great an effort in the fields of research, processing, packaging, and storing of agricultural commodities as the effort it has made in the field of the production of those commodities we would not have misused the agricultural commodity surpluses in the manner we have often misused them and prevented them from being consumed by human beings.

So I say we have a tremendous job on our hands, namely, in the field of research to develop a sounder and better farm program than the one we have had in the past.

I am confident that Mr. Benson has the educational background and understanding which will enable us to go forward toward 100 percent of parity for the prices of all agricultural commodities, rather than only 90 percent of parity for the prices of only six agricultural commodities.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks and for his very fine contribution to this discussion.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, Ezra Taft Benson was born in the State of Idaho, and the State of Idaho rejoices in his nomination. We are proud that the Nation will receive the great services of this able man.

Ezra Taft Benson has been a dirt farmer. He has been a scientific farmer engaged in the extension service work throughout my State.

Idaho is primarily an agricultural State, although in addition it has giant forests. Mr. Benson knows and understands every phase of agriculture and forestry.

When I heard Mr. Benson say, the other day, during his appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that he would abide by the law, it was no surprise to me, for I knew he would abide by the laws Congress passes.

I say to you now, Mr. President, that never has the West sent a more able man to Washington than Ezra Taft Benson.

I am distressed that my learned colleague and friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], will not support wholeheartedly the nomination of Mr. Benson. I know Mr. Benson's background and religious training. Never have I seen a finer nominee come before a legislative group.

I urge the Senate to vote for the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. There seems to be a misunderstanding as to the statement I have made. My statement was in no way an attack upon Mr. Benson as a person or for his devotion to agriculture or anything else.

We do have some honest differences of opinion. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate today can tell me what Mr. Benson's views are with respect to 90-percent supports for basics or flexible supports. Which does he favor? That is what I have been trying to ascertain. It is basic to the entire program of price supports for agricultural commodities.

I hope none of my remarks will be interpreted as being derogatory of Mr. Benson himself. He is a fine person. He may have his own views about agricultural matters. I have some different ones.

I am much concerned about whether the Republican Party will carry out its campaign pledges. If the Republican Party does not carry out the campaign pledges of Mr. Eisenhower, it will be a bad day for the country as well as for the Republican Party.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I know that my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, did not attack the honesty or integrity of Mr. Benson. On the other hand, it seems to me that when Mr. Benson said at the committee hearing—in reply to a question which I believe the Senator from North Dakota asked him—that he would enforce the laws Congress charged him to administer, that answered the question.

Mr. President, I am not the least concerned about the possibility that Mr. Benson would destroy the Republican Party. I wish we had in the Cabinet more persons with the great ability of Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield again to me?

Mr. WELKER. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Idaho knows that under the price-support program the Secretary of Agriculture can support the prices of most agricultural commodities at any level, at anywhere from nothing to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. He can provide no support program at all and still can be in complete compliance with the law. In fact, there are as many as 50 price-support operations which are optional in character.

I may point out again that Mr. Benson, as Secretary of Agriculture, could completely eliminate those price supports and would still be entirely in compliance with the law. If he did, I think it would be contrary to the campaign commitments of Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. WELKER. I believe he made the statement that he would be glad to do away with all supports. Well, who, ideally, would not be? If we could live in an economy without supports, if that were in any way possible, I think all of us would be glad to do away with them.

Once again let me say this man has the ability and the integrity that few Secretaries have ever had within the period of my young life. I urge the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Idaho is probably fully aware of the fact that the support programs now in effect are the ones required by law.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. There are numerous types of support which are now in effect. Since the outgoing administration saw fit to put them into effect, plenty of money is available, with plenty of authority, yet they have not seen fit to put supports under certain other commodities as they were authorized to do by law. Mr. Benson certainly could not be expected to do any less under the law than the recent Secretary of Agriculture has been doing. Mr. Benson, as the Senator from Idaho will recall, simply refused to state what he was going to do after 1954.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I maintain that neither the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Idaho, nor the Senator from Vermont can say today what means we would use to promote a prosperous agriculture for free and independent farmers after 1954. We certainly, 3 years ago, did not foresee the conditions which prevail today.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his learned discourse.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont was exactly accurate in his statement? Oats, barley, rye, soybeans, flax, and many other commodities presently are being supported at about 80 percent of parity but on a discretionary basis—not mandatory. They will be supported at 85 percent of parity next year, under the present announcement by the Department of Agriculture, but again I may point out that these supports are not at all mandatory. Mr. Benson can eliminate them next year. That is the thing I was trying to ascertain; namely, what his position might be. As a Member of the Senate, I think I should know that.

Mr. WELKER. As the Senator from Vermont has stated, the controversy arises from the fact that the distinguished nominee would not tie himself down as to what he would do 2 or 3 years hence. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. YOUNG. That was only a passing question. I asked him whether he wanted to comment; he said "No," and that was the end of that particular discussion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Idaho misspoke himself a minute ago when he said he was opposed to all price supports. From conversations I have had with him I know that he is very much interested today, for example, in seeing that the mineral interests of his own State of Idaho are protected, the same as in North Dakota.

Mr. WELKER. If I said that, I certainly shall correct the RECORD. What I wanted to say was that I do not think anyone cherishes the idea of the necessity of supports. Certainly they are necessary at this time. We hope to see our economy develop to the point where they will become unnecessary.

Mr. LANGER. I know from conversations I have had with my distinguished friend that he is in favor of price supports on such items as antimony, tungsten, and all other minerals which come to us from foreign countries, and which have a tendency to tear down the standards in this country.

Mr. WELKER. That is very true, and I thank my friend from North Dakota for calling that to my attention.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a short while ago the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said the former Vice President, Mr. Barkley, was for a flexible program of price supports. During the Eighty-first Congress, when the Agricultural Act of 1949 was being considered, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I offered an amendment which would have made permanent 90-percent supports when basic farm crops were under acreage control and quotas. In that connection, Vice President Barkley had this to say:

> On this question the yeas are 37 and the nays are 37. Before voting, the Chair would like to ask the Senate for the privilege of doing what a Senator may not do, and that is to explain his vote.
>
> The position of the Chair heretofore has been in favor of support at 90 percent. In every speech he made last year he declared the same position. He cannot now repudiate it and, therefore, votes "yea."

The foregoing remarks of Vice President Barkley appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 10, page 13774.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will yield for a moment, in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico, I should like to have the RECORD show that the remarks which he attributed to the Vice President were made in the fall of 1948, and that farm programs and farm legislation did not become political footballs until the spring of 1949.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Benson and the other nominees whose names are before the Senate; but I do want to state for the RECORD that I think we can be assured that under such a Secretary as Mr. Benson the farmers of the Nation will have every protection that can be given by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I may say also, by the President of the United States, who, at Kasson, Minn., said:

> I give you the assurance of the new administration that it is not going to pull the rug out from under the farmers.

In other words, he stated at that meeting, for the benefit of the farmers of the United States, that the rug would not be pulled out from under them. I know he meant what he said. I feel that Mr. Benson, as an employee of his, so to speak, as Secretary of Agriculture, is going to carry out that promise. I know that he will do so.

Mr. Benson will be taking over the Department of Agriculture at a time when farm prices are declining. We have some very critical situations, particularly in the livestock industry. But I know very definitely that though this is happening at a time of high employment of labor and high industrial production, agriculture will be protected.

I am very happy over the nomination of Mr. Benson. He is a man who is thoroughly familiar with the problems affecting agriculture. He is a man of high character, a Christian gentleman. I again want to assure the Senate and the farmers of the Nation that they need have no fear that the rug will be pulled out from under them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this morning, when I discussed the entire nomination problem, I stated that in my study of the record last night I had become perfectly satisfied that the eight nominations which had been sent to the Senate yesterday should be confirmed. I said I had one question in regard to one of them that I would like to have clarified for the record. I have had a conversation with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and by prearrangement I now ask the Senator from Colorado this question, so that he may make his statement for the record. I refer the Senator from Colorado to the language on page 12 of the committee's report, and on page 22 of the committee report, dealing with nominee-designate for the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey. It is that language which has left me, shall I say, a little bit in confusion as to the financial interest that Mr. Humphrey may have, that might bear somewhat upon his duties as Secretary of the Treasury. I wish also to make clear for the record, Mr. President, that I am not one who holds to the point of view that men of wealth should not be appointed to high Government positions.

On the contrary, Mr. President, I think it is very desirable that many of them be in Government positions representing a sound cross section of the economic life of our country.

I might say that I think it is also true that men without wealth are not disqualified for Government service on any implication that because they have not wealth they may not have ability. Many persons have entered public service and made great personal sacrifices economically by doing so. Had they entered business or the professions instead most of them would have made as much money as some of those wealthy men who, now in their older years, are being nominated for Cabinet positions.

My only point is that when persons enter public service, irrespective of their economic status at the time they enter it, poor, medium well-to-do, or wealthy, they owe it to the country to make certain that they divest themselves of any financial interest which would place them in an embarrassing position where anyone can suspect an improper motivation of any value judgment they render.

So I ask the Senator from Colorado, chairman of the committee, on whose judgment I place great confidence, if he is satisfied that Mr. Humphrey has divested himself of financial holdings, particularly in connection with the Hanna Co. and the subsidiaries of that company to the point that, in the opinion of the Senator from Colorado, there is no phase of Mr. Humphrey's work as Secretary of the Treasury that would cause him any embarrassment because of his connections with those companies?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I do not believe the situation is different from that disclosed by the record or that it is such that it would cause embarrassment. I do not believe Mr. Humphrey would allow it to cause embarrassment.

Let me say that before Mr. Humphrey went on the stand I told him that we usually heard in executive session testimony as to nominations, but that I intended to call an open meeting. He said, "By all means call an open meeting. There is nothing secret that I have to conceal."

The record shows his testimony as to all directorships and that his maximum interest in any of the companies with which he has been associated was approximately 5 percent; that his family has a possible additional 5 percent, but that neither has majority control or practical control. He testified that he would not attempt in any way whatsoever to influence the businesses with which he has been associated.

I am quite sure, Mr. President, that he impressed all the members of the committee as being an honest man. An honest man, if confronted with an embarrassment, finds a way out of it without stultifying himself or his position.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I shall vote for the confirmation of all these nominations. I think they meet the criteria which I mentioned earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my belief that these nominations will be approved speedily. I have no desire to delay their consideration, and, at the conclusion of a very brief statement, it is my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum.

For personal reasons of pride and sentiment I wish to say a few words about that great American, my fellow Texan, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. We Texans are very proud that Mrs. Hobby has been nominated for this high position. But it is not merely gratification that a leading citizen of our State has thus been honored. It is a pride based upon deep conviction that it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to find anyone better qualified.

Mrs. Hobby has proven her outstanding ability on the national scene. She has demonstrated her preeminent talents both as an administrator and as a policy maker who has the courage to stand firmly upon her convictions.

Those of us who can claim the privilege of friendship with Mrs. Hobby know her as a woman of grace, charm, and tact. Those of us who have worked with her in Texas and in Washington know

her as a public official of integrity and capacity.

Those qualities she will bring to bear upon one of the most difficult and most exacting posts within the Federal Government.

The problems before the Federal Security Administration are enormous. They reach into every American home. They involve the future and the well-being of millions of our citizens. They should be handled only by an administrator who combines the highest attributes of the head and of the heart.

In Mrs. Hobby, the new President has found such an administrator. We Texans are honored that a citizen of our State will fill this important post. We are happy that the country will be so well-served.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the committee gave a full hearing to the nomination of Mrs. Hobby, and we were delighted with her and with her testimony and were very glad unanimously to recommend the confirmation of her nomination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of those Senators who will vote for the confirmation of the nominations sent to the Senate by the President. I think each one of them is a patriotic and loyal American. I want particularly to associate myself with those who would vote for former Governor McKay as Secretary of the Interior, and for the good lady from the State of Texas. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and when we were in the majority I handled the particular appropriation bills which dealt with the Federal Security Administration. I am sure that when President Eisenhower recommended Mrs. Hobby to be the head of that administration, he had nothing but the interest of the country at heart, and I am very confident that she will be a good administrator and a good American.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to express a word of appreciation to the chairman and the members of the Finance Committee for the hearing which they held on the nomination of Mr. Humphrey to be Secretary of the Treasury. I have known him for many years as an able businessman and as a great citizen of my State and of our country. I desire to commend the President for the nomination, and I want to say to the Members of the Senate that Mr. Humphrey will be an officer of whom the Nation will be proud. He will bring to the Government service the same honesty, integrity, and devotion to the public interest that he has applied to the interests which he has heretofore served in a private capacity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The senior Senator from North Dakota wishes to express his regret that President Eisenhower did not see fit to appoint to the Cabinet a man or a woman from North Dakota. During all the history of the United States, no one from North Dakota ever has been appointed to a Cabinet position, although at one time, as I have pointed out on many occasions, there were six members of the Cabinet from the State of New York at the same time.

In the last election North Dakota made an outstanding record. It came within a decimal point of being the leading Republican State in the entire United States, being excelled only by the State of Vermont.

North Dakota has a great many citizens who are eminently qualified to fill any position in the Government, so I express the hope that if a vacancy should occur at any time in the future a man or a woman from North Dakota will be appointed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that all the nominations submitted yesterday by President Eisenhower will be voted on en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the intention of the Chair to put the question in that manner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Before the absence of a quorum is suggested, I should like to state that the minority has been very much pleased to cooperate with the majority in the preliminary hearings on the nominations the President-elect indicated he would submit for the appointments the Senate is now considering. It is my understanding that all the nominations President Eisenhower sent to the Senate yesterday will be acted on en bloc shortly after the quorum call. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I intend to vote for all the nominations now pending before the Senate, but I wish to say that I personally am acquainted with the distinguished citizen of Michigan who has been named Postmaster General. I am sure that as a result of his experience in life and his possession of outstanding talent he will, as Postmaster General, render excellent service to the Government and to the people of the United States. I pay tribute to Arthur E. Summerfield as a great citizen of Michigan and an outstanding citizen of the United States. I know that his loyalty and fidelity to the institutions of his country, coupled with his desire and ambition that we have good government in the United States, will be felt when he takes the office to which he has been appointed, or in any place where he is called upon to render public service.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope that the vote on the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield will be unanimous.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarthy
Anderson	Green	McClellan
Barrett	Griswold	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Goldwater	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of the following-named persons for the offices indicated:

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

The nominations were confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the President be notified at once of the confirmation of the nominations.

The motion was agreed to.

DUTIES AND STATUTES APPLYING TO OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement, prepared by the Office of the Legislative Counsel, outlining the duties of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. I make the request because these appointments will soon be pending.

I also ask unanimous consent to have the statement followed by an editorial from the New York Times, and to have printed also in the body of the RECORD a memorandum from the Office of the Legislative Counsel with respect to sec-

tion 434, title 18, of the United States Code.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR BYRD

This memorandum is transmitted pursuant to your request for the text of present statutes prescribing the principal powers, functions, and duties of the Secretary of Defense. Such provisions are set forth hereinafter. Portions of those statutes which do not pertain to the Secretary of Defense, or to the principal responsibilities and powers imposed or conferred upon him, with particular reference to functions involving procurement, contracting, and the transaction of business with industrial enterprises, have been omitted.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED (ACT OF JULY 26, 1947, 61 STAT. 495, AS AMENDED)

"SEC. 202. * * *

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. Under the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this act, he shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense.

"(c) * * *

"(4) The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * *

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall not less often than semiannually submit written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the Department of Defense, accompanied by (1) such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate, (2) separate reports from the military departments covering their expenditures, work, and accomplishments, and (3) itemized statements showing the savings of public funds and the eliminations of unnecessary duplications and overlappings that have been accomplished pursuant to the provisions of this act.

* * * * *

"(f) The Secretary of Defense may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provisions of this act or other specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department of Defense as he may designate.

* * * * *

"SEC. 210. There shall be within the Department of Defense an Armed Forces Policy Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Deputy Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The Armed Forces Policy Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the Armed Forces and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"SEC. 211. * * *

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall perform the following duties, in addition to such other duties as the President or the Secretary of Defense may direct:

"(1) Preparation of strategic plans and provision for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) Preparation of joint logistic plans and assignment to the military services of logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) Establishment of unified commands in strategic areas;

"(4) Review of major material and personnel requirements of the military forces in accordance with strategic and logistic plans;

"(5) Formulation of policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(6) Formulation of policies for coordinating the military education of members of the military forces; and

"(7) Providing United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations."

* * * * * *

"SEC. 213. * * *

"(b) The [Munitions] Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall, subject to the authority of the Secretary of Defense and in respect to such matters authorized by him, have the power of decision upon matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Board, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. * * *

"(c) Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense, the Board shall perform the following duties in support of strategic and logistic plans and in consonance with guidance in those fields provided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe—

"(1) coordination of the appropriate activities with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the Department of Defense;

"(2) planning for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military departments and planning for standardization of specifications and for greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common-use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) preparation of estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) determination of relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) supervision of such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) regrouping, combining, or dissolving of existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) maintenance of liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and making of recommendations as to policies in connection therewith; and

"(9) assembly and review of material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and making of recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * *

"SEC. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of a chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall, subject to the authority of the Secretary of Defense and in respect to such matters authorized by him, have the power of decision on matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Board, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. * * * The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense, the Board shall perform the following duties and such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe:

"(1) preparation of a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) advising with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs;

"(4) formulation of policy for the Department of Defense in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the Department of Defense; and

"(5) consideration of the interaction of research and development and strategy, and advising the joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith.

* * * * *

"SEC. 401. * * *

"(b) The Comptroller [of the Department of Defense] shall advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in performing such budgetary and fiscal functions as may be required to carry out the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this act, including but not limited to those specified in this subsection. Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Comptroller shall—

"(1) supervise and direct the preparation of the budget estimates of the Department of Defense; and

"(2) establish, and supervise the execution of—

"(A) principles, policies, and procedures to be followed in connection with organizational and administrative matters relating to—

"(i) the preparation and execution of the budgets,

"(ii) fiscal, cost, operating, and capital property accounting,

"(iii) progress and statistical reporting,

"(iv) internal audit, and

"(B) policies and procedures relating to the expenditure and collection of funds administered by the Department of Defense; and

"(3) establish uniform terminologies, classifications, and procedures in all such matters.

"SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary of each military department, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, shall cause budgeting, accounting, progress and statistical reporting, internal audit and administrative organization structure and managerial procedures relating thereto in the department of which he is the head to be organized and conducted in a manner consistent with the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense.

* * * * *

"SEC. 403. (a) The budget estimates of the Department of Defense shall be prepared, presented, and justified, where practicable, and authorized programs shall be administered, in such form and manner as the Secretary of Defense, subject to the authority

and direction of the President, may determine, so as to account for, and report, the cost of performance of readily identifiable functional programs and activities, with segregation of operating and capital programs. So far as practicable, the budget estimates and authorized programs of the military departments shall be set forth in readily comparable form and shall follow a uniform pattern."

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951, AS AMENDED (ACT OF OCTOBER 10, 1951, 65 STAT. 373, AS AMENDED)

"SEC. 506. (a) In the case of aid under this act for military end items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—

"(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

"(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

"(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

"(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel; and

"(5) the movement and delivery of military end items.

"(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense. The apportionment of funds between countries shall be determined by the President."

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1953 (ACT OF JULY 10, 1952, PUBLIC LAW 488, 82D CONG.)

"SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated under this act by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds appropriated under this act, and by making available or causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting agencies of the Department of Defense information as to commodities and services produced and furnished by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated by this act.

* * * * *

"SEC. 638. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and for the purpose of achieving an efficient, economical and practical operation of an integrated supply system designed to meet the needs of the military departments without duplicating or overlapping of either operations or functions, no officer or agency in or under the Department of Defense, after the effective date of this section, shall obligate any funds for procurement, production, warehousing, distribution of supplies or equipment or related supply management functions, except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense."

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT, 1953 (ACT OF JULY 15, 1952, PUBLIC LAW 547, 82D CONG.)

"SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."

Respectfully,

JOHN C. HERRING,
Assistant Counsel.

JANUARY 21, 1953.

[From the New York Times of January 19, 1953]

MR. WILSON'S PREDICAMENT

General Eisenhower's selection of President Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, to be Secretary of Defense was favorably received by almost everybody except those who disapprove of successful businessmen on principle. Mr. Wilson must be the more chagrined that his candidacy has now run into substantial opposition in the Senate on the ground that his refusal to get rid of his GM stock would, if he took office, controvert a Federal law and be contrary to the public interest.

The last thing in the world that Mr. Wilson proposed, we are sure, was to disregard a law or injure the public interest. As he must have seen the situation, he was giving up a private income which has reportedly run above half a million dollars a year in return for a public income of $22,500 a year, and was doing this to serve his country. No one can doubt his utter integrity. His bitterest critics would not suggest that he would take a public position in order to serve a private interest.

But a law is a law, and even if the law which seems to fit the present case does not actually do so, or could be amended to exempt Mr. Wilson, the moral responsibility would remain. We cannot distinguish, in law or in principle, between persons who are above temptation, as Mr. Wilson surely is, and those who are not. The good and honest man must accept restraints in order that the bad and dishonest may not run loose.

The restraints that at first glance Mr. Wilson might have to accept are severe. In addition to sacrificing most of his present income he would be asked to dispose of his stock under circumstances requiring him to pay a heavy tax. He would, in a sense, be paying the Government a considerable sum in order to be permitted to work for it. But does not a soldier who loses his life, limb, or health in battle take an even greater loss? Mr. Wilson may conclude, after he has thought the matter over, that patriotism may well demand sacrifices in one case as in the other.

To sum up, we believe that Mr. Wilson would find it intolerable to deal as a public official with a great corporation in which he continued to have a financial interest. We believe it will be the part of wisdom for him either to divest himself of his corporate holdings or withdraw his acceptance of the designation. We hope he will choose the first course.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

This memorandum is transmitted pursuant to the request of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, made on motion of Senator BYRD, for information concerning the meaning to be given to the words "directly or indirectly" as used in section 434, title 18, United States Code.

That section provides:

"Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

The words "directly or indirectly" are used in that section to characterize two kinds of interests which an individual may have with respect to a corporation or other business entity: (1) interests in its pecuniary profits, and (2) interests in the contracts of such entity.

The press of time has prevented any undertaking to search the entire legislative history of section 434 from the date of its enactment in its earliest form (sec 8, act of March 2, 1863, 12 Stat. 698). Such a search might disclose some indication of congressional intent with regard to the content of the quoted phrase, but it would require a considerable period of time and might prove to be completely unrewarding. Accordingly, other aids to statutory construction have been used in the preparation of this memorandum.

ABSTRACT DEFINITIONS

Webster's New International Dictionary (2d ed., 1947) contains the following definitions:

"Direct: In a direct manner; directly; immediately; straight; absolutely" (p. 738).

"Indirect: Not direct; specifically, (a) Not straight or rectilinear; deviating from a direct line or course; circuitous; oblique; * * * (d) Not resulting directly from an act or cause, but more or less remotely connected with, or growing out of, it; as indirect results" (pp. 1266–1277).

As suggested by those definitions, the words "direct" and "indirect" are not terms of absolute connotation, but are used ordinarily to express a degree of relationship which may vary with the subject to which they are applied. Thus precise meaning can be ascribed to those terms only as they are used in connection with a particular subject, situation, or relationship. As noted in *People* v. *Boylan* ((C. C. D. Colo., 1885) (25 Fed. 594, 595–596)):

"The word 'direct' is of large use in the language, and it has been adopted into the law in many relations. We have direct descent, direct taxes, direct interest, direct route, and so on, until we have come now to direct payment. Any effort to assimilate its meaning in all the places and connections in which it may be placed must fail for obvious reasons. One meaning of the word, as given in Webster's Dictionary, is immediate, express, unambiguous, confessed, absolute. In my judgment, this is clearly the sense in which it is applied to payments. A direct payment is one which is absolute and unconditional as to time, amount, and the persons by whom and to whom it is to be made."

In considering the power conferred upon the Congress by the commerce clause of the Constitution, which has been construed to apply only with respect to direct burdens upon or obstructions to interstate commerce, it has been stated (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Bradford D. Ass'n* (C. C. A. 1, 1939, 106 F. 2d 119, 121–122)):

"Only as thus qualified may an act of Congress be construed as exercising that control within constitutional bounds. Acts which only indirectly affect the flow of commerce between the States are not within the control of Congress, but are left to the control of the several States. Direct in respect to sequence, either in point of time or result, means mediate, nothing intervening."

CONJUNCTIVE USE OF TERMS

The terms "directly" and "indirectly" are not used separately in section 434, but are used in conjunction with each other to characterize collectively the quality of interest to which the section is directed. When so used, those terms if taken literally can be given a very broad meaning—so broad as to be virtually synonymous with the expression "in any manner." In a very early case decided by the Court of Appeals of Maryland (*Davis* v. *Barney* (2 Gill & J. 382 (1830)), in which it interpreted the phrase "direct or indirect" in relation to "opposition" as contained in a contract, that court said (p. 402):

"The word 'indirect' seems to us to have been used for the special purpose of guarding against any kind of interference by the defendant, in aiding or in any manner promoting, the establishment of, or carrying on, any opposition. Our construction therefore of the contract is, that the defendant could not, without violating the contract, set up

or carry on, or knowingly aid or intermeddle, or in any way whatsoever, directly or indirectly, be concerned in setting up or carrying on any line of stages on that road, in opposition to the appellants; he was bought out for the purpose of being put entirely out of their way. Under any other construction, the word 'indirect' would lose its office, and the object of the contract be defeated."

Whether a meaning of such inclusiveness is to be ascribed to the phrase "directly or indirectly" when used in any particular statute must depend upon the language employed in the full text of the statute, interpreted with a view to effectuating the purpose for which it was enacted.

APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 434 TO SHAREHOLDERS

Whatever may be the full import of the words "directly or indirectly," present concern as to that matter appears to center chiefly upon the question whether that phrase, as used in section 434, includes the interest of a shareholder in a corporation. As to that question, the critical words of the section are these: "Whoever, being * * * directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation * * *." Those words are used to describe the class of persons to whom the section can be applied if any such person should engage in conduct of the kind prohibited by the language which follows therein.

Determination whether the phrase "directly or indirectly" applies to shareholders requires recognition that the word "interest" also is one which may differ in meaning according to its use. *See Burton* v. *United States* (202 U. S. 344, 371 (1906)). As stated by the Acting Attorney General in an opinion dated March 31, 1942 (40 Op. A. G. 168, 170), "It was the obvious purpose of the statute to prevent an officer of the United States from transacting business with a corporation in such a way that his action might result in direct or indirect personal pecuniary benefit to the officer." Taking into account that purpose, the word "interested" referred to in section 434 probably refers to a private gain through the acquisition of money or some other thing of value. The phrase "directly or indirectly interested," as used in relation to the words "pecuniary profits or contracts," suggests that it was intended to include something more than an absolute, presently existing, legal title to profits or contracts.

It is very clear that a shareholder is not a legal owner of corporate property. *Humphreys* v. *McKissock* (140 U. S. 304, 312 (1891)); *Rhode Island Trust Co.* v. *Doughton* (270 U. S. 69, 81 (1926)); *Wabash Ry. Co.* v. *American Refrigerator Transit Co.* (7 F. (2d) 335, 342 (C. C. A. 8, 1925)). As stated by Chief Justice Taft in the Rhode Island Trust case (p. 81):

"The owner of the shares of stock in a company is not the owner of the corporation's property. He has a right to his share in the earnings of the corporation, as they may be declared in dividends, arising from the use of all its property. In the dissolution of the corporation he may take his proportionate share in what is left, after all the debts of the corporation have been paid and the assets are divided in accordance with the law of its creation. But he does not own the corporate property."

Shareholders are, however, the beneficial owners of corporate property. *Koehler* v. *Black River Falls Iron Co.* (67 U. S. 715, 721 (1862)); *Ashman* v. *Miller* (101 F. (2d) 85, 91 (C. C. A. 8, 1939)). In the Ashman case, the court states (p. 91):

"Equity recognizes that stockholders are the proprietors of the corporate interest and are ultimately the only beneficiaries thereof. Those interests are in virtue of the law intrusted through the corporation to the directors and from that condition arises the trusteeship of the directors with the concomitant fiduciary relationship."

The nature of a shareholder's interest in the profits of a corporation is clearly described in a comment which appeared in the Yale Law Journal in 1925 (34 Y. L. J. 652, 662–64):

"It is said that a corporation holds its property in trust for the individual shareholders. In accordance with this statement and in description of shareholders' rights in undivided profits as recognized in the decided cases, it seems proper to say that accruing profits come into the hands of the corporation impressed with a trust in favor of the shareholders who would be entitled to receive them, were they then divided. The norm is the corporation with only one class of shareholders. In such a concern the stockholders take their equitable interests in accruing profits in proportion to their holdings. Before the accrual of such profits the stockholder has merely an expectant interest analogous to the expectancies of the law of real property. After their accrual he is the beneficiary of a trust, whose res is the undivided profits and whose terms are settled by the law of corporations and the contract between the parties. The expectant interest of the common stockholder, as the norm, is that given by the law as an incident of the shareholder relationship when the nature of the expectant interest of the shareholder is not the subject of express contract. To designate shares as 'preferred,' 'cumulative,' 'noncumulative,' and so on is to contract expressly as to the nature of this expectant interest in profits not yet in esse. The cumulative preferred stockholder has during the first year an expectant interest in that fraction of the first year's profits which equals the promised percent of his holdings—say 7 percent. If profits are earned, this expectant interest becomes actual and immediate; if not, it continues merely expectant, and during the second year such stockholder will have an expectant interest in the second year's profits equal to 14 percent of his holdings; and if in the second year there are likewise no profits, then in the third year he will have an expectant interest equal to 21 percent, and so on. In other words, his expectant interests for the various years accumulate, when they are not realized, and it should be noted that, although they are realized as actual and immediate equitable interests in undivided profits, these latter relapse to mere expectant interests if the profits—the subject matter of the equitable interest—are lost through the chances of the enterprise, and continue as such until again realized. The expectant interest of noncumulative shareholders differs from that of the cumulative shareholder only in this, that the expectant interests of the former for the various years never accumulate; they must be realized, if at all, out of profits for the corresponding years."

In an opinion referred to above (40 Op. A. G. 168), Acting Attorney General Fahy gave cognizance to the interest of a shareholder in corporate profits in expressing the view that an individual who was both an officer and a shareholder in a corporation could not be appointed as a liaison officer of the War Department to have dealings with that corporation. He stated, with regard to section 41 of the Criminal Code, from which section 434 was derived (pp. 169–170):

"No man can serve two masters. The statute in question is clearly grounded on this assumption. Its manifest purpose is such that any attempt to reconcile it with the proposed employment runs into difficulties. Some of these difficulties are pointed out by the Judge Advocate General of the Army in his opinion on the question. Others are equally apparent. No matter how high are the motives of the Army officer who advises, he is likely as a realistic matter to be consciously or unconsciously influenced by the fact that his actions may benefit the corporation of which he is an officer and a stockholder. To a degree his salary as an officer of the corporation would be affected by whether his advice leads the War Department to enter into a procurement contract with his company. To a larger degree his share in the earnings of the corporation as a stockholder would be affected by his advice.

"The advice of the officer would probably also materially influence the nature and extent of the contracts entered into with his company. Conflict between the interests of the United States, the interests of the corporation, and the interests of the Army officer as an officer and stockholder of the corporation are more than likely to arise. Such conflicts and results were doubtless intended to be avoided by the statute. In this case, the officer would clearly be a person directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits within the meaning of the statute."

The foregoing discussion as to the nature of a shareholder's interest in corporate profits leaves little doubt that such an interest in a corporation as to which a Government officer "is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business" is of the kind included within the scope of section 434. In that interest is not direct, it is almost surely an indirect interest within the meaning of that section. However, this is not to say that the mere existence of some interest as a shareholder would necessarily and in all instances result in the application of section 434. There remains for consideration the question whether, in giving effect to the ultimate purpose of section 434 as a criminal statute, the courts might apply an additional test to determine whether an existing interest of that kind is actual and substantial or merely nominal and trivial. A discussion of that question appears in a later section of this memorandum.

OPINIONS DISTINGUISHED

Certain opinions examined in the preparation of this memorandum have appeared at first impression to be at variance with the view expressed above, but on closer examination have been considered inapplicable to the question now under consideration. The following are the principal opinions of that kind.

An opinion of Attorney General Mitchell dated April 16, 1929 (36 Op. Atty. Gen. 12) gave consideration to the eligibility of Andrew W. Mellon to serve as Secretary of the Treasury. The statute there considered (presently 5 U. S. C. 243) provided in part that no person appointed to that office "shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce." The Attorney General took the view (p. 18) that "the words of the statute would not be deemed by those who wrote it as appropriate words to describe one who simply received dividends from stocks which he owned and took no active part in the management or control of the corporation which issued them." Relying in part upon the decision of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Delaware & Hudson Co.* (213 U. S. 366 (1909)), the Attorney General concluded (p. 19):

"My conclusion is that Secretary Mellon is not disqualified from holding the office of Secretary of the Treasury by reason of the fact that he owns stock in business corporations. To give the statute any other construction would be to sacrifice the spirit to the letter, and under modern conditions would probably exclude from the office a great majority of the men most competent to hold and administer it efficiently without accomplishing any good."

The Supreme Court opinion there relied upon involved an interpretation of the so-called "commodities clause" of the Hepburn Act (34 Stat. 584), which provided in part that it shall be unlawful for any railroad company to transport in interstate commerce "any article or commodity * * * manufactured, mined or produced by it * * * or which it may own in whole or in part, or in which it may have any interest direct or indirect * * *." The Court held that commodities produced by a company

which was not a railroad company, but in which a railroad held stock, were not included within the prohibitions of the clause. In so doing it relied (p. 414) upon the legislative history of the clause, which showed that the Senate had rejected a proposed amendment which by express language would have made the clause applicable to such commodities.

Because of differences in the statutory language involved neither the opinion of the Attorney General dated April 18, 1929, nor the Delaware & Hudson case appear to be particularly helpful with regard to the question considered here. The statute considered by the Attorney General was concerned with direct or indirect interest in "carrying on the business of trade or commerce." The statute considered by the Court was concerned with direct or indirect interest in any article or commodity produced by a corporation. Both seem readily distinguishable from a statute which, like section 434, is not directed at participation in the affairs of a corporation or concern with its products, but is aimed instead at a direct or indirect interest in the pecuniary profits resulting from the activities of a corporation.

DEGREE OF INTEREST WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED

As suggested above, and in an earlier memorandum of this office dated January 16, 1953, on the interpretation of section 434 (p. 9), it is quite possible that the courts in giving effect to that section may inquire into the extent of the shareholder's interest possessed by a Government officer.

The possible implications of giving to section 434 a literal and mechanical interpretation have been discussed in a recent article by Edwin McElwain and James Vorenberg in the April 1952 issue of the Harvard Law Review. In that article it is stated (65 Harv. L. Rev. 955, 964–965):

"Section 434, although it applies mainly to businessmen and other nonprofessional persons, is a further hurdle which the lawyer thinking of entering Government must watch for.

* * * * *

"More important problems arise out of the fact that many Government employees, lawyers, and others, have small investments in the stock of corporations which transact business with the Government. Obviously section 434 would prevent a contracting officer from letting a contract to a corporation in which he owns a controlling interest, but does it apply when he holds only a few shares of stock in General Motors, General Electric, or some comparable enterprise?

"If one looks at the language of section 434, the answer seems to be inescapably 'Yes.' Almost by definition, a stockholder of any size is 'interested in the pecuniary profits' of the corporation. And the use of 'directly or indirectly' before 'interested' would seem to bar any technical escape based on the nature of the stockholder's interest. On the other hand, it is almost inconceivable that a contracting officer would let such an insignificant interest influence his decision. As a matter of mathematics, it is unlikely that even the most venal act could make more than a few cents difference to him. Further, a rigid interpretation of 'interested in the pecuniary profits' could give ridiculous results; it could lead to the application of section 434 to an employee who owns shares in an investment trust, or, even more absurdly, who owns life insurance in a company which holds stock in a corporation with which he is dealing for the Government.

"The only escape from applying section 434 to small stockholders is to remember that the section was enacted in substantially its present form in 1863 when stockholding by people of modest income was rare. In enacting the section, Congress presumably was concerned with the Government employee who had a substantial interest in a corporation, not with people who might invest their savings in a few shares of stock in order to enjoy a moderate income from dividends. The fact that the Congress did not specifically use the word 'stockholder' but only 'officer, agent, or member,' supports this argument."

A possible means of escape from the logical dilemma described in that article is suggested by the disposition of a case of like kind by the Supreme Court of North Dakota, *State* v. *Robinson* (2 N. W. (2d) 183 (Sup. Ct. N. D., 1942)). In connection with a criminal prosecution, the State district court certified to the Supreme Court certain questions with respect to a State statute (Comp. Laws, N. D., 1913, sec. 9829) which provided:

"Every public officer, being authorized to sell or lease any property or make any contract in his official capacity, who voluntarily becomes interested individually in such sale, lease, or contract, directly or indirectly, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

From the questions certified, it appeared that the defendant, acting in his capacity as motor vehicle registrar of the State, prepared and approved vouchers of the motor vehicle department in payment for gasoline, lubricants, and repairs furnished for State vehicles by a corporation in which the defendant was both secretary and a stockholder. The first question certified was whether his status as secretary and stockholder made him "interested individually" in the corporation within the meaning of the statute. After reviewing a number of opinions of other State courts to the effect that the holding of stock in a corporation disqualifies a public officer, under the laws of such States, from contracting on behalf of the State with such corporation, the Supreme Court answered that question (so far as defendant's status as a stockholder was concerned), as follows (p. 189):

"The interest contemplated by the statute may be either direct or indirect but it must be an interest that accrues to the officer personally and not in a representative capacity such as that of receiver, trustee, or administrator. The interest of a stockholder in a corporation is a personal interest. Gains or losses of the corporation may redound to the interest of the stockholder personally. If his interest in the corporation is substantial, it undoubtedly comes within the purview of the statute even though it may accrue through the holding of stock. On the other hand, we do not imply that the holding of one share of stock in a large corporation makes an officer criminally liable in every instance wherein he makes a contract with that corporation. Criminal liability must depend upon evidence as to interest other than the bare existence of the relationship of a stockholder in a corporation. The interest made criminal by the statute is a question of fact that does not depend entirely upon the relationship that a stockholder bears to the corporation in which he owns a share of stock."

In substance, the Court declared that in determining such a case it would inquire into the degree to which the defendant was interested in the corporation, and would apply the penalties of the statute if the interest should prove to be substantial, but not if that interest was nominal or trivial. No indication was given as to the test which would be applied in making that determination.

In the Chemical Foundation case (see prior memorandum dated January 16, 1953, pp. 4–6) the Federal courts concluded that, upon all the facts there presented, the mere holding of qualifying shares in a corporation did not create an interest which violated section 41 of the Criminal Code, from which section 434 was derived. That result is in harmony with the view expressed by the North Dakota court as to that element in the Robinson case. Whether, upon a similar state of facts arising under section 434, a Federal court would follow the North Dakota court in taking one more step in the direction of looking to a substance, rather than form, and require a showing of a substantial interest, remains an open question. Such a course would be consistent with the observation made by the Supreme Court in the *Chemical Foundation* case (272 U. S. 1, 19) to the effect that the transactions reviewed "did not involve any of the evils aimed at by section 41."

CONCLUSION

The words "directly or indirectly" used in section 434 are not words of absolute meaning. Their content must be ascertained from the use to which they are put in context with other language of the section, taking into account the purpose for which the section in its entirety was enacted.

The evident purpose of that section was to prevent an officer or employee of the United States from transacting business with a corporation or other entity in such a way that his action might result in direct or indirect personal gain through the acquisition of money or some other thing of value. Inclusion of the word "indirectly" in the phrase "directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of such corporation" suggests that the section extends to private gains which flow recognizably from profits or contracts even though the gains pass through other hands or instrumentalities before realization by the officer concerned.

In the light of the relationship existing between a corporation and its shareholders, it seems quite clear that the interest of a shareholder in a corporation is of the kind included within that phrase. However, as a criminal statute, section 434 will be strictly construed, and it is very doubtful that the bare existence of such an interest would be regarded as sufficient ground for the visitation of criminal consequences. A clear showing of the presence, in a material degree, of the substantive evil at which the section is directed would seem to be a necessary element of proof. The existence of a nominal or trivial interest, such as the possession of a single qualifying share, or the possession of naked legal title to shares in which the beneficial interest is held by others, probably would not be enough. But a showing of an actual and beneficial interest of such magnitude as to demonstrate a probable influence upon the official actions of the officer concerned would seem to be sufficient. The sufficiency of proof of such influence necessarily presents a question to be determined from all evidence presented in each individual case, and any endeavor to state a generalization applicable to all cases would seem inadvisable.

It must be noted, by way of precaution, that a showing of the requisite degree of interest by a Government officer in the profits or contracts of a corporation or other business entity does not of itself establish the existence of any crime punishable under section 434. That is but one of two basic elements which must be present before any crime occurs. The second necessary element is a clear showing that such officer has been employed or has acted as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such corporation or entity. That element, too, presents a mixed question of fact and law, and its establishment will depend largely upon the factual showing made in each case as to the legal responsibilities of the officer concerned and the functions actually performed by him.

Respectfully,

JOHN C. HERBERG,
Assistant Counsel.

JANUARY 19, 1953.

AUTHORIZATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING THE RECESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the ad-

journment of the Senate the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, and that they be referred to the appropriate committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] be relieved of his position on the Committee on Rules and Administration and be appointed to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] be relieved of his position on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and be appointed to a position on the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say that I believe that as a matter of complete propriety a question of that kind should be taken up by the majority conference. However, under the circumstances, and without creating any precedent, I shall not object. I do not believe that any objection will be raised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, inasmuch as this change is a change which is made by consent of all the parties concerned, the position with respect to seniority on the committees should be the same as though this arrangement had been made when the Members were first appointed. To accomplish that purpose, the order of seniority on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will now read:

H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, chairman.
Robert A. Taft, of Ohio.
George D. Aiken, of Vermont.
Irving M. Ives, of New York.
Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska.
William A. Purtell, of Connecticut.
Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.
James E. Murray, of Montana.
Lister Hill, of Alabama.
Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia.
Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.

The order of seniority on the Committee on Rules and Administration will be:

William E. Jenner, of Indiana, chairman.
Frank Carlson, of Kansas.
Charles E. Potter, of Michigan.
William A. Purtell, of Connecticut.
Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming.
Carl Hayden, of Arizona.
Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island.
Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa.
Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The same remarks which I made a while ago with respect to the original suggestion apply also to this one. I have no objection, but I am acting without setting any kind of precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON INTRA-AGENCY PROPERTY TRANSFERS

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on intra-agency property transfers, for the fiscal year 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Four telegrams in the nature of petitions from Frederick E. Munschauer, R. W. Dean, Otto Kiel, Jr., and E. D. Heinz, all of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the prompt confirmation of the nomination of Charles Wilson to be Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by Calloway County Post, 5638, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kirksey, Ky., favoring the issuance of a special stamp in honor of Nathan B. Stubblefield, inventor of wireless telephony; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRIESTE—LETTER FROM MASSACHUSETTS STATE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S ITALIAN CLUBS, INC., BROOKLINE, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter dated January 6, 1953, which I have received from Mrs. Charles W. French, president of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Italian Clubs, Inc., of Brookline, Mass., embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, relating to Trieste.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S ITALIAN CLUBS, INC.,
Brookline, Mass., January 6, 1953.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: At a recent meeting of the executive board of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Italian Clubs, Inc., the following resolution was adopted:

"Because Trieste, which is predominantly Italian in population, in culture, in history, and location, should remain Italian; and

"Because it was the agreement of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, by their declaration in March 1948, that they recommend to the Security Council of the United Nations the return of the Free Territory of Trieste to Italy as the best answer for the furtherance of stability and peace in the area; and

"Because the above-mentioned powers have since violated their agreement by urging that this problem be settled between Italy and Yugoslavia: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Italian Clubs, Inc., petition immediate action by our Department of State to carry out the agreement contained in the declaration of 1948 of the three above-mentioned governments and return the Free Territory of Trieste to Italy."

Sincerely yours,

ELVIRA M. FRENCH,
Mrs. Charles W. French,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. Res. 37. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; without amendment, and under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 17), submitted by him on January 7, 1953, and which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-third Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION AND STABILIZATION, BANKING AND HOUSING POLICIES, ETC.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original resolution providing for an investigation of problems relating to economic mobilization

and stabilization, banking and housing policies, and certain other matters, and I submit a report (No. 9) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 42), reported by Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1953, to January 31, 1954, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic mobilization and stabilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities in the present national emergency; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) war disaster insurance.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-third Congress, until January 31, 1954, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $23,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 248, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to on January 24, 1952.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF LATE SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Honorable Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 540. A bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor; and

S. 541. A bill to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 542. A bill for the relief of Pedro Goicoechea Bengoechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Sarah Kabacznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 544. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 545. A bill to increase to five the number of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 546. A bill to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 547. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympeha Shpak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 548. A bill to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 549. A bill for the relief of Marie Del C. R. Jablonski;

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Robitscher;

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Memertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka;

S. 552. A bill for the relief of Anna Urwicz;

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen;

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Walburga Buchner Medeiros and Linda Buchner;

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Gallagher;

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Marinella Talleti;

S. 557. A bill for the relief of Andreas E. Devletoglou;

S. 558. A bill for the relief of Pertti Aulis Muttilainen;

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Edward Joseph Wentworth;

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein;

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Charles Chardon Brooks; and

S. 562 (by request). A bill for the relief of Robert J. Saar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 563. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Shields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 564. A bill to require certain individuals receiving income from unlawful sources to furnish information with respect to their net worth in connection with their income-tax returns; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 565. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 566. A bill for the relief of Kerupe Herant Liman, Mrs. Violet Liman, and Hilda Annik Liman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 567. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGrafft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 568. A bill to establish a policy with respect to the granting of special exemptions to organizations and corporations from taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Giovanni DePinto; and

S. 571. A bill for the relief of Josef Burger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Fernand Jean Soques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was Senate bill 719 in the Eighty-second Congress.

The purpose of this bill, as Senators will remember, is to establish and confirm by legislation the doctrine already affirmed by the Supreme Court that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor.

This bill passed the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress and died in the other body.

This is the legislation which somehow acquired the misnomer of the "basing point bill." I mention that not by way of lending any support to that description, which is highly inaccurate; but only so that the Senate may know precisely what the legislation is which I have reintroduced.

The bill (S. 540) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, introduced by

Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF DETENTION BENEFITS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948 TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which provides for the extension of detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States.

The persons who are the subject matter of this legislation number approximately 1,500 employees of certain contractors who were engaged in the construction of airfields, fortifications, and ship facilities on Pacific Ocean islands prior to the commencement of World War II. When war broke out these men were captured by the Japanese forces while taking part in the defense of Wake Island, Guam, and the Philippines in late 1941 and early 1942. After their capture they spent the remainder of the war in Japanese prison camps throughout the Orient.

These employees of contractors were confined in prisoner-of-war camps and were considered by the Japanese authorities as "civilian prisoners of war," and as such were treated in the same manner as the military prisoners with whom they were captured and imprisoned.

It should be pointed out at this juncture that the people or persons that this legislation will benefit have received no detention benefits or other type of compensation for forced labor and inhumane treatment as has been awarded both the military prisoners of war and those classed as internees. The persons dealt with here have received their pay and allowances for the period of their capture and have been provided with certain medical privileges and compensation for permanent injury benefits as provided by the Longshoremen's Act.

Payments which will be made under this proposed legislation will come from the War Claims Fund and not out of the Treasury of the United States. The War Claims Fund was created by the War Claims Act of 1948 and consists of funds covered into the Treasury after liquidation of German and Japanese property vested by the Alien Property Custodian pursuant to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The reason that the persons who would be benefited by this proposed legislation do not receive compensation is reflected in subsection (a) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, wherein it was stated that persons of this category were excluded from that act.

In this connection, the American Federation of Labor, in a letter dated March 7, 1952, and in reference to S. 2678, which was a bill intended to accomplish the purpose of the legislation I am now introducing, stated:

> The persons to which your bill, S. 2678, applies, who were held as prisoners of war by the Japanese, were forced to work during their entire internment or until the time of their death and they received only those benefits due them under the provisions of the contract. They were, however, excluded from the benefits accorded to the civilian internee and military prisoners of war.

The bill (S. 541) to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT RELATING TO JUDICIAL RELIEF

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on January 7, I introduced Senate bill 34, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a statement explaining the need for the legislation and its purpose, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after subsection (g) thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Any person eligible for a return under this section who has timely filed a notice of claim for return or who may hereafter file a notice of claim within 2 years from the date of seizure by or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, may institute a suit in equity to recover such money or other property in the manner provided by subsection 9 (a) hereof and with like effect: *Provided,* That said suit may be filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of this subsection, anything in section 33 hereof to the contrary notwithstanding, but in computing such 1 year there shall be excluded any period during which there was pending a claim for return: *Provided further,* That the court in which suit is filed shall advance the cause for hearing and determination with all possible dispatch."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

During World War II, the property of persons who were not enemies of the United States was vested by the United States for protective purposes. After the war, the Congress passed, and the President approved, an amendment to the law under which this property had been vested. The amendment, which became section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, was enacted to facilitate the return of their property to these nonenemies. However, return of this vested property was made an administrative function without the imposition of any restraint in the form of judicial relief or review.

The bill which I have just introduced is designed to insure a judicial remedy to those claimants. It springs from the creeping pace at which returns to eligible claimants are being made, from the arbitrary manner in which some of these claimants are being denied returns, and from the fact that the expiration of the statutory time limitation for filing claims for administrative relief by these non-enemies has been held to deny judicial relief notwithstanding the fact that the claim had been timely filed for administrative consideration. In consequence, these nonenemies (some of whom are Americans) are being stripped of their property contrary to the intention of Congress and without resort to the courts.

The proposed amendment is modeled after section 9 (c) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The proviso for advancement of the cause on the dockets of the district courts is copied in haec verba from 22 United States Code, section 403 (formerly sec. 240) which provides for the restoration of certain property seized by the Government. In many cases claimants have been waiting 5 years or more for restoration and in numerous instances the seized property is all that will shield the claimant from destitution. It is well known that district court calendars are crowded and that an early return of property can be insured only by awarding such cases a priority on the court calendars.

A case history will outline the problem.

Carl G. Pass, a native-born citizen, returned to the United States in August 1946 and filed his claim with the Alien Property Custodian on September 23, 1946. At first he could not obtain a return because the Custodian construed section 32 to deny returns to so-called dual nationals, that is, Americans who, Germany could claim, were also German nationals by reason of marriage or parentage. This indefensible interpretation was set aside by Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress, second session. Thereafter the Claims Branch of the Office of Alien Property advised that Mr. Pass could not obtain a return for the reason that he had violated Nazi Exchange laws in an effort to conceal his American assets from the Nazis so as to escape Nazi coercion to transfer the assets to Germany.

Meanwhile, Mr. Pass instituted suit under section 9 (a) of the act. The suit was dismissed under section 33 as coming too late. Section 9 permits a citizen to seek either administrative or judicial relief or both. It contains no warning that administrative relief is a mantrap, that claimants should avoid it in favor of the judicial remedy. Originally section 33 provided that the period for bringing suit should be tolled by the filing of an administrative claim. Senate Report No. 1839 (79th Cong., 2d sess.) which accompanied section 33 said (p. 3) that "fairness requires" that the period during which a claim was pending before the Administrator be subtracted from the time for filing suit. When section 33 was amended in 1948, the tolling clause was inadvertently omitted with respect to some claimants, but retained with respect to others. The legislative history shows that this discriminatory omission was never intended. The consequence is that Mr. Pass, a resident American who owns the vested property, will be deprived of his life work, contrary to the intention of Congress, unless the inadvertence respecting tolling in section 33 is corrected so that he may ask judicial protection of his rights. This is just one example.

The amendment goes beyond relief to American citizens in that section 32 includes refugees and persecutees. It is almost 6 years since Congress provided relief in section 32 for those unfortunate victims. In the interim the mountain of these claims has not been appreciably reduced. If the Congress wishes these claimants to enjoy their property during their lifetime, it must open the courtroom doors and order that their cases be advanced for hearing.

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION ACT OF 1953

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled, "National Literacy Education Act of 1953." I introduced a similar bill in 1948, and during each Congress since that time. I am introducing it again now because I am

more convinced than ever of the seriousness of the problem of illiteracy, of its national importance, and of the urgency of the need to do something about it. This is a bill "to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes."

I am introducing this bill early in the session in the hope that each Senator and Representative will have an opportunity to study the problem, and in the hope that the appropriate committee will hold adequate hearings on the bill, and that the Congress will finally enact it into law.

In my speech introducing the bill 4 years ago, I called attention to the extent of illiteracy in the Nation, basing my conclusions on the 1940 census. We now have the 1950 census data available, and I regret to inform you that during the decade the situation changed only slightly. In fact, in spite of the extensive literacy education program of the Armed Forces, and many other similar programs, the number of functionally illiterate adults was reduced by less than one-half million.

As further explanation and justification for my concern about this problem of illiteracy, I wish permission to insert in the RECORD an article which I wrote for the March 1952 issue of School Life, the official organ of the United States Office of Education, and a brief analysis of the 1950 census data by Dr. Ambrose Caliver, Assistant to the United States Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the article and analysis will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 544) to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The article and analysis presented by Mr. KILGORE are as follows:

LITERACY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

(By HARLEY M. KILGORE, Senator from West Virginia)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my views on the problem of illiteracy to the Nation through the columns of School Life. My interest in the problem is of long standing. It goes back to the days when I, just out of the University of West Virginia, taught public school in my native State. Later, as judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va., I saw at first hand many of the tragic results of illiteracy.

It will be remembered that in 1948, I introduced a bill in the second session of the Eightieth Congress to assist the States in the removal of the blot from our Nation. I again introduced a similar bill in 1949 in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. And it is my intention to continue to do everything in my power to solve this problem until the Nation is aroused to its importance and the Congress assumes its responsibility in the matter. The reasons for my interest are fundamental, and may be stated very simply and directly.

ILLITERACY SLOWS NATIONAL DEFENSE

Adult illiteracy is a serious problem to our defense authorities. The loss in manpower because of illiteracy during the last war is well known. The number of men rejected by the Selective Service System would have made 40 Army divisions. Even today, with our limited mobilization, the military could do a much more effective and speedy job of preparation if they did not have to contend with the illiterates. It is estimated that approximately 75,000 male youths who are functionally illiterate (had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling) reach registration age each year, and that the corresponding number of females is approximately 50,000. Unless means are provided to lift this mass of undereducated youth to a level of functional literacy, and if we face all-out mobilization, the Defense Establishment will find itself saddled with the burden of training as was the case during the last war. To the extent to which this is necessary, it will, of course, divert the time and energies of the military from their primary task of defense.

ILLITERACY RETARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our economic strength is an important link in our defense program. The industrial and agricultural activities which are at the foundation of our economic strength are becoming highly mechanized, requiring an ever-increasing amount of literacy. Lack of ability to read makes the illiterate a menace to himself and his fellows in industry and prevents the agricultural worker from benefiting fully from the services of Government bulletins, county agents, and other sources of helpfulness. The products of industry and farm are second only to manpower in our defense efforts. Anything, therefore, which impedes their flow, as does illiteracy, is an enemy within our ranks. It retards economic growth and development and should be stopped without delay.

Normally, when our economic establishment should be geared to the scientific and technological progress of our times, illiteracy is as much of a deterrent as in times of emergency. It is well known that industrial wages and farm income of individuals, communities, and States rise in proportion to the rise in literacy. Retail sales also are closely related to literacy. The flow of interstate commerce, the interdependence of individuals and groups, and the elimination of geographical boundaries by modern transportation and communication facilities are more and more becoming matters of national concern. And anything which affects them, as does illiteracy, becomes a national responsibility.

LITERACY PROMOTES SOCIAL PROGRESS

Social progress is dependent upon individual progress. One of the most important ingredients of this progress is the ability to use effectively the tools of modern communication. The ability to function effectively as a worker, as a citizen, and as a member of a family is a powerful contributor to the general welfare of society. And the extent to which an individual can communicate with his fellows and understand the printed page, to that extent will he contribute to social advancement. In order to do these things a command of the skills of communication is necessary. This includes not merely the ability to read and write but also the ability to speak and listen with discrimination. The complexity and tempo of our civilization make these abilities mandatory. Employers do not want illiterates because they cannot meet the exacting requirements of the average job. The duties of a citizen in a modern community today call for competencies which illiterates do not possess. The relationships among the different members of the family today call for knowledge, skills, appreciations, and attitudes which are almost impossible for the illiterate to acquire. If, therefore, the Nation's progress and welfare depend on the efficiency of its workers, the competencies of its citizens, and the wholesomeness of the relationship of its families, it follows that anything that will contribute to the achievement of these goals—as does literacy—becomes an urgent responsibility of the Nation.

ILLITERACY ENDANGERS DEMOCRACY

Democracy, more than any other form of government, calls for a literate population. Our founding fathers recognized this, however, they did not specifically provide for its achievement in the organic law. Nevertheless, the principle has been so generally accepted that we have established the most comprehensive system of free universal compulsory education found anywhere in the world.

Despite this fact, we still have millions of adult citizens who are illiterate, whose lack of education is a handicap to themselves, and causes them to become a drag on society and a potential menace to our democratic way of life.

In order to function effectively in a democracy, citizens must possess facts about many things and people. If they are to exercise the kind of independent judgment which our representative form of government requires and are not to be unduly swayed by the rabble rousers, and the bombardment of mass media, they must think clearly and discriminately about those things and people. They cannot think clearly and independently unless they can participate effectively in the arts and skills of communication which is functional literacy.

The extent to which the individual is the cornerstone of our democracy to that extent it is necessary that there be a high rate of literacy among all groups of our population, because, as I have often said, "talk about democracy and our way of life is largely unintelligible to illiterates."

The 1950 census data on illiteracy are not yet available. But according to the 1940 data, and the estimates of the Census Bureau in 1947, the problem is extensive and widespread. As I pointed out in my speech in the Senate on June 3, 1948, "the men and women in the United States who are now in the darkness of functional illiteracy are not all foreigners or Negroes, or members of other underprivileged groups. • • • Educators have long known that a grim percentage of our native-born white citizens have had little or no schooling." I also emphasized in that speech a fact which is not generally known, namely, that illiteracy exists throughout the Nation.

LITERACY IS A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A national program of action is needed for several reasons: (1) It is needed to equalize the burden of education because many States are not able to support an adequate program of education; (2) since each State must contribute its share to the security of the Nation, it is the responsibility of the Nation to assure the effectiveness of that contribution; and (3) the magnitude and complexity of the problem require a concerted, coordinated, and frontal attack.

A national program of action such as I have been advocating will not only serve our own national needs, but will also contribute directly and indirectly to the strengthening of our international relations.

In the speech referred to earlier, I called attention to our contributions to the UNESCO program. Since that time we have contributed huge sums through ECA and point 4. A national program to eradicate illiteracy in the United States could help furnish the know-how in attacking the problem throughout the world. It is conceivable that such a program would also enable us to supply the many requests that come to us from other lands for teachers and leaders. The significance of this possibility is realized when it is recalled that practically one-half of the population of the world

is illiterate, and that communism is making a strong bid for leadership of those masses. If we could thus give a needed emphasis on the human and social aspects of our aid to the world, in addition to our present emphasis on economic and military assistance, I am confident that it would pay handsome dividends—namely, greater faith in our humanitarian and democratic motives.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE ADULT POPULATION (1950)

(By Ambrose Caliver, Assistant to the Commissioner)

Since the publication of the articles here reprinted, the Census Bureau has released preliminary statistics on the educational attainment of the population 25 years of age or over. These data confirm the conclusion stated by the writer in the first article of these reprints, namely, that in spite of the progress indicated in 1947, "there is no reason for gratification or relaxation in our efforts to eradicate the blot of illiteracy from our Nation." In fact there are still over 9½ million adult citizens who are functionally illiterate. This is a reduction of only one-half million during the preceding decade.

An analysis of the data in the table below indicates that significant progress has been made among the nonwhite group. The percentage of this group who had not attended school at all dropped from 10.3 in 1940 to 3.9 in 1950, and during the same period, the percentage who were functionally illiterate (had not gone beyond the fourth grade) decreased from 41.1 to 29.3. This progress is probably due to two major causes—(1) the increased availability and use of educational facilities among Negroes, and (2) the migration of Negroes from rural to urban areas. It will be noted that there were 2,773,836 fewer persons 25 years of age or over in rural farm areas in 1950 than in 1940.

It might be assumed that a large number of these migrants were Negroes, because, according to the Census, there has been a wide-scale movement of nonwhites out of the South, and a tremendous decline in the number of nonwhites employed in agriculture in the South during the past decade. The fact that other nonwhite races comprise only slightly over 1 percent of the total nonwhite population in the southern rural farm areas also supports the above assumption. Among other factors which contributed to the decline of illiteracy among Negroes probably should be included the Army educational program and the Literacy Education project conducted by the Office of Education.

I wish, however, to reemphasize that this is not a sectional or racial problem as the statistics indicate. It is national and worldwide in scope. In view, therefore, of the rapidly changing conditions in our country and throughout the world, and of the urgency of the problems that can be solved only by a literate citizenry, it would be quite unwise to depend on the "natural process" to eliminate illiteracy. I believe that unless we develop an affirmative and concerted attack on this problem without delay, we shall place in jeopardy, not only our national prosperity, but the success of our foreign-aid programs and our national safety as well.

Years of school completed by persons aged 25 years or over, by residence (urban, rural) and color, 1950 and 1940 [1]

Years of school completed	Grand total		Residence						Color			
			Urban		Rural nonfarm		Rural farm		White		Nonwhite	
	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940	1950	1940
Total persons (aged 25 or over)	87,675,000	74,775,836	58,836,000	45,229,242	16,920,000	14,753,758	11,919,000	14,792,836	79,766,000	67,999,523	7,909,000	6,776,313
No school years completed:												
Number	2,299,000	2,799,925	1,816,000	1,606,289	256,000	500,352	227,000	693,332	1,992,000	2,099,995	307,000	699,928
Percent	2.6	3.7	3.1	3.6	1.5	3.4	1.9	4.7	2.5	3.1	3.9	10.3
Less than 5 years of school completed:												
Number	9,630,000	10,104,612	5,843,000	5,078,203	1,952,000	2,012,335	1,835,000	3,014,074	7,312,000	7,322,114	2,318,000	2,782,498
Percent	11.0	13.5	9.9	11.2	11.5	13.6	15.4	20.4	9.2	10.8	29.3	41.1
1 to 4 years of school completed:												
Number	7,331,000	7,304,689	4,027,000	3,471,964	1,696,000	1,511,983	1,608,000	2,320,742	5,320,000	5,222,119	2,011,000	2,082,570
Percent	8.4	9.8	6.8	7.7	10.0	10.2	13.5	15.7	6.7	7.7	25.4	30.7
Median school years completed	9.3	8.4	10.0	8.7	8.9	8.4	8.4	7.7	9.7	8.6	7.0	5.7

[1] Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1950 Census of Population; preliminary report, May 3, 1952, series PC-7, No. 6.

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 9)

On motion of Mr. JENNER, and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That the inaugural address of the President of the United States, delivered on Tuesday, January 20, 1953, be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in New York City on January 10, 1953.

Article entitled "The Illusion of American Omnipotence," written by B. W. Brogan, and published in Harper's magazine for December 1952.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article entitled "The Wilson Predicament," written by Walter Lippmann and published in his syndicated column of January 20, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Proclamation of Governor of Maryland relating to Ukrainian Day.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director for Mutual Security.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 21, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, to be Attorney General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Douglas McKay, of Oregon, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ezra Taft Benson, of Utah, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Martin P. Durkin, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Federal Security Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, in this moment of prayer may we enter more vividly and vitally into the fellowship of Thy divine strength and peace.

Expand and enlarge our minds and hearts with loftier conceptions of Thy wise and beneficent purposes for all mankind.

May we be sensitive to the needs of suffering and struggling humanity and eager to serve our generation in the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Grant that the misunderstanding and strife which prevail among the nations of the earth may soon come to an end.

To Thy name we ascribe the glory and the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 20, 1953, was read and approved.

JOSEPH W. WEINBERG

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Joseph W. Weinberg* (No. Cr. 829–52, criminal docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOSEPH W. WEINBERG, NO. CR. 829–52

TO LYLE SNADER, CLERK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES CONGRESS, THE CAPITOL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 24th day of February 1953 at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Joseph W. Weinberg* and bring with you the minutes books of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives covering the proceedings of that committee for the period from January 1, 1949 to May 25, 1949, inclusive.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.

By FARRELL HOLLINGSWORTH,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 105) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the United States against Joseph W. Weinberg (No. 829–52, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 24th day of February 1953, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena afore-mentioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. R. 106) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Member be, and he is hereby, elected member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii.

Committee on Armed Services: JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 107) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That standing committees of the House shall have authority to approve the employment and compensation of committee employees from January 3, 1953, or such subsequent date as their service commenced.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAIN RADIO EQUIPMENT

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that I have again introduced a proposed measure which would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to compel the installation of radio equipment on our Nation's railroad systems. I think the accident at Union Station on January 15 draws attention to the necessity of some type of train radio communication system. In my opinion this accident might have been avoided if all members of the train crew had been alerted.

I have been listening to the testimony presented before the committee in the other body and I am convinced that had all members of the crew been informed of the impending danger someone in the crew, somewhere along the train, could have applied emergency action which might have averted that terrible accident. It could have been much more serious in the loss of life had it not been for a miracle.

Actually it is shocking to learn that so many of our great railroad systems still rely upon the ancient whistle signals to alert train-crew members of impending disaster.

In my opinion I do not think any of our railroads will oppose the legislation which I am sponsoring in this Congress to promote the safety of employees and travelers. In the past there has been opposition. Some railroads complained of the cost of installation. The accident here last week may well cost the involved railroads more than the cost of radio installation.

It was on January 17, 1946, that I introduced my first bill to authorize the ICC to compel installation of radio equipment on our railroads. In each Congress since my bill has been awaiting favorable action.

CAPT. H. G. RICKOVER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, we are moving into an atomic age. We are engaged in a desperate race with a deadly enemy for the discovery of secrets of nuclear power, the control of which may

well determine our fate and the fate of other free nations. At such a time it is unthinkable that service politics played by a branch of the Armed Forces should be permitted to throw into the discard knowledge which is essential to our well-being. Yet that is exactly what Navy brass proposes to do.

On July 7, 1952, Capt. H. G. Rickover received a commendation from Secretary of the Navy Kimball, reading as follows:

Captain Rickover, more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear-powered ship program. His efforts have led to the laying of the keel of the world's first nuclear-powered ship well in advance of its original schedule.

Secretary Kimball added that—

Rickover has accomplished the most important piece of development work in the history of the Navy.

Yet the next day—the very next day, a Navy Selection Board, in the face of the powerful statement made by the Secretary of the Navy, passed over Captain Rickover for the second time. This, together with his 30 years of service in the Navy, means that he must retire next June 30. It means that he must leave the service.

Mr. Speaker, at this time when we need every expert we have in the field of nuclear weapons, when we need knowledge, vision and imagination, to compel this man to retire from active service is appalling. It is true that no man is indispensable, but in this instance Captain Rickover has exhibited more than any other person in the Navy the vision to adapt thermonuclear power to naval purposes.

To my mind he deserves the promotion which would permit him to remain in the Navy. Even more important, however, it seems to me that it is in the best interests of the Nation that he be given the promotion in order that his talents may continue to be used for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, only God and the members of the Naval Selection Board know what occurs during the deliberations of the Board. It is well known that members of the fighting forces of the Navy are given preference in promotion over members of equal rank in other branches of the Navy service. Disregarding that fact, however, in this case rank discrimination must have been present, for six officers in the engineering branch junior in rank to Captain Rickover received promotions to rear admiral.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Armed Services Committee of the other body should certainly inquire as to why Captain Rickover was passed over again, before it confirms appointments made by the President on recommendation of the Naval Selection Board.

I include an article from Time magazine of August 4, 1952:

ARMED FORCES—BRAZEN PREJUDICE

The Navy's gallantry and efficiency put it close to the United States public's heart. It would be closer except for another Navy quality: brassbound rigidity.

A sample is the case of Capt. Hyman George Rickover, an Annapolis graduate (1922) and an electrical engineer. Six years ago Rickover sparked planning for an atomic submarine. Last June, when Harry Truman laid the keel of the first atomic-powered submarine, Rickover was publicly praised as the man chiefly responsible for its existence. Later, Navy Secretary Dan Kimball pinned the Legion of Merit on Rickover, said he had done "the most important piece of development work * * * in the history of the Navy."

Two weeks ago a 15-man Navy selection board met in Washington to choose 30 new rear admirals. Rickover's name was passed over. Selection boards work in secrecy and never give reasons for such actions. In Rickover's case, people who know how the Navy mind operates believe that the Navy was expressing a deep-seated prejudice against technical specialists. Both the Army and the Air Force have partially broken down similar prejudices. The well-rounded officer in those services is still regarded as the ideal, but they recognize that in a technological age specialization is so valuable and so unavoidable that specialists cannot be barred from high rank.

The Navy's failure to recognize this in Rickover's case promises to cost it a brilliant officer who developed the most important new weapon since World War II. Rickover has now been passed over twice, and has completed 30 years' service. This means that, barring unlikely special action, he must retire—at age 52.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there is any likelihood of any business before the House on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I would say to the distinguished minority leader there will not be. As the gentleman knows, the committees were not organized until Monday of this week. Meantime, we have been quite busy in connection with the inauguration. My understanding is that the committees are rapidly being organized, but there will not be any legislative work before the House, as far as I know, next week.

Mr. RAYBURN. As long as this Congress does not take any action, it is entirely satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 22, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia, effective February 3, 1953.

Sincerely yours,

THOS. B. STANLEY.

JANUARY 22, 1953.

Hon. JOHN S. BATTLE,
Governor of Virginia,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR JOHN: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia, effective February 3, 1953.

Sincerely yours,

THOS. B. STANLEY.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

COMPENSATION OF COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which took effect in January 1947, each standing committee of the House was authorized to employ six clerical employees—four professional staff members. Inasmuch as each Congress goes out of existence on January 3, of each odd-numbered year, the standing committees end their life, and should cease to function at that time, it is my contention that those employees who served, for example, during the Eighty-second Congress, after January 3, 1953, are just out of their jobs. However, in the Eighty-second Congress, some of the committees continued to hold hearings up until the "last dog was hung." So some members of the committee staffs were engaged after January 3 in writing reports, completing the investigations on which they had been working, but at the same time a number of them, having known since the election in November that they would be out of a job on January 3, have not had anything to do. Nevertheless, they contended they were on the payroll, some of them at $10,000, and others at $11,664, and they now expect to be paid.

It is my contention that there is no authority whatever for the disbursing officer to pay committee employees whose employment ended January 3 unless the rules or the law is amended, nor for them to be employed under the Clerk of the House. Prior to 1934 there was something approaching authority existing for such payments for there was in the appropriation bills up to that time an amount for that purpose, but that provision was left out of all appropriation bills after the one which took effect in 1934.

Being somewhat in doubt as to the ruling which might be made though I had none, I wrote the Comptroller General. I will include a copy of his reply with these remarks. He reached the same conclusion I did. I also called the Parliamentarian but he declined to pass on the matter.

When this Congress came in on January 3 the Members were very anxious to organize the committees and begin consideration of proposed legislation;

so some of those who were ranking minority members on committees created by the Eighty-second Congress held hearings and even employed people to get their rules and assignments in shape. There is no authority to pay those employees except that which was passed a few moments ago by the adoption of the resolution offered by the majority leader to deal with that matter. But the situation should be corrected as to those employees who served under the Eighty-second Congress who are asking for compensation, so I introduced a resolution providing that they should be paid, if, and only if, someone with knowledge of the situation certified that they had actually rendered service. For myself, I think if we are coming in here with an economy and efficiency program for the executive branch of the Government—and you recall that we had the Hoover Commission which was supposed to give us economy and efficiency and which some claimed did give us savings of I do not know how many billions of dollars, but quite a number—if we are going along on that course, keeping our campaign promises, then it is up to the Eighty-third Congress itself to, in the beginning, comply with the law and see to it that the tax dollars go only to those who have actually earned them.

A bill which was introduced at the same time had for its purpose an amendment to the legislative Reorganization Act to take care of a similar situation which will exist hereafter.

Because I believe that we should set an example of economy and efficiency in our own household, I ask that we start out with a little house cleaning of our own, practicing a little economy and a little efficiency in our own operations before we continue our complaints about the executive departments.

Employees of the Eighty-second Congress are not employees of committees subsequently created by the Eighty-third Congress unless appointed by the Eighty-third Congress. Nevertheless, there is an implied promise that everyone should be paid for work done and accepted. So, if employees of the Eighty-second Congress performed services of value after January 3, in connection with the work which had been given them by the committees established by the Eighty-second Congress, we should have legislation which authorizes payment for those services.

When the Acting Comptroller General sent up his opinion on January 19, he also sent three proposed resolutions. One of them, draft No. 3, is the resolution adopted on the motion of Majority Leader HALLECK. The Acting Comptroller General said that this draft would—and I quote—"place entire control over the action to be taken in the standing committees elected by the Eighty-third Congress."

But that resolution does not, in my opinion, authorize the payment of any sum whatsoever to any of the employees who were elected by the standing committees of the Eighty-second Congress and who continued to serve after January 3, unless they are appointed by the committees of the Eighty-third Congress.

To show my contention, to prove my point, let us take a hypothetical case: Standing committee (A) of the Eighty-second Congress had a full staff. That staff continued to serve from January 3 until today. They are entitled to compensation if but only if standing committee (A) today as now constituted meets and by a majority vote employs them. If committee (A) does that, will someone please tell me how the employees who have been working under the direction of the present chairman of the committee or by direction of the committee itself can receive compensation for the work they have performed in connection with committee business since January 3?

Obviously, the only legal way they can get compensation would be to qualify as appointed employees of committee (A) as it is now constituted. It is equally obvious that the committee cannot employ them because the basic Reorganization Act limits committee employees to 4 professional employees and 6 clerical members—a total of 10.

Committee (A) of the Eighty-second Congress having had 10 employees and committee (A) of the Eighty-third Congress, in order to compensate them, having elected them members of its staff has exhausted its appointive power and is just out of luck if it contemplates paying its own Eighty-third committee employees unless some legislation similar to that which I proposed is adopted.

Now all I ask is that the Members take a realistic look at the situation.

I believe that those employees who were appointed by the committees of the Eighty-second Congress, and who have actually performed a service since January 3 should be paid. I also believe that those employees who have in good faith been working since, and some of them before, January 3, for those who now constitute committees of the Eighty-third Congress, should be compensated.

Hence, I introduced the resolution which is attached hereto and marked exhibit A.

Exhibit B is a letter which I received from the Acting Comptroller General and exhibit C is the letter which I wrote to our disbursing clerk, who I know, in view of the unfortunate experience of a previous disbursing clerk, wants to abide by the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Exhibit D is a bill introduced by me today.

Oh, yes; one other thought. Though I have been here 18 years, my feet still slip occasionally. I made the mistake of talking about proposing a remedy. Even though the Assistant Parliamentarian stated quite frankly that he did not wish to give an opinion on the question involved, after I had prepared the resolution and the bill introduced today, I submitted it to our Parliamentarian yesterday forenoon. He advised me that he thought the matter could be taken care of by a shorter, simpler resolution.

Whether he advised the majority leader of the situation I do not know. Today the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] came on the floor and offered the third resolution sent up by GAO, which was adopted.

That resolution, in my opinion, as I have attempted to indicate, does not meet the situation. It does not authorize the disbursing clerk to pay employees who were appointed by committees of the Eighty-second Congress, unless as stated, they are again elected by the committees of this Congress—an action which would deprive some committees of the right to compensate their own employees elected for the same period. A committee cannot have a staff of more than 10.

A thought which I also wish to express is this: That it is a little less than encouraging to spend time and effort in the research involved in discovering and reaching a conclusion on a legal problem, in drafting legislation to correct an obvious defect in the law, prevent an unlawful payment of Federal funds, and then have a colleague grab the idea, put a different and completely inadequate cloak on it, and offer it to the House.

Some of us can do so little that, when we do have an idea that is good, we would like to have the credit for it. After all, our constituents are watching us.

EXHIBIT A

House Resolution 108

Resolved, That employees of any standing committee of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress whose services were not terminated prior to noon January 3, 1953, shall continue on the rolls until the date of election of the standing committee in the Eighty-third Congress (except in the case of death or resignation of any such employees prior to said election), unless the services of such employees are earlier terminated by the action of the chairman of a successor standing committee elected by the House in the Eighty-third Congress: *Provided*, That the chairman of the committee during the Eighty-second Congress, or in the event such chairman is no longer a Member of Congress, the majority member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee by the Eighty-second Congress, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall certify to the Clerk of the House that the employees rendered services from noon January 3, 1953, to the date of election of the standing committee in the Eighty-third Congress, or the date of the termination of services by death or resignation, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 2. Effective January 3, 1953, payment is hereby authorized to employees appointed for and performing standing committee work prior to election of the committee by the House of Representatives in the Eighty-third Congress: *Provided*, That appointment is made by the ranking minority member of the committee in the Eighty-second Congress who is also a member of the Eighty-third Congress and such appointment is ratified by the successor standing committee elected by the House in the Eighty-third Congress.

EXHIBIT B

COMPTROLLER GENERAL,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 19, 1953.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Reference is made to your letter of January 8, 1953, requesting that you be advised by what authority the professional and clerical staff of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress will draw compensation after expiration of that Congress.

Standing committees of the House of Representatives are elected under rule X of the House, after the commencement of each Congress. The committees so elected serve

through the Congress for which elected but not thereafter. See Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, page 82 (H. Doc. No. 741, 81st Cong.).

With respect to the professional and clerical staff of the standing committees, section 27 of rule X of the House, which is based on sections 202 (a), (b), and (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, provides as follows:

"(a) Each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority members of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Services of professional staff members may be terminated by majority vote of the committee. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

"(b) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

* * * * *

"(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations may appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as it by majority vote determines to be necessary, such personnel, other than minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe."

It is assumed that the professional and clerical staff of the Committee on Government Operations of the Eighty-second Congress were duly appointed to their positions under the section of rule X quoted above. Also it would seem that under the wording of section 202 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as well as under the rules of the House which have been successively adopted since the effective date of the Legislative Reorganization Act, Congress intended that the professional staff, at least, be permanent employees. However, since, as indicated above, the standing committees of the House cease to exist at the end of the term of Congress, it is doubtful that such staff members, or the clerical personnel, could from a purely technical standpoint remain as employees of the committees after the expiration of the term of the Eighty-second Congress at noon on January 3, 1953. From noon on January 3 until such time as a new committee is elected by the Eighty-third Congress there is no committee in legal existence.

It might be argued that the professional and clerical personnel of a standing committee are employees of the House of Representatives, as distinguished from committee employees, and, as such, would continue on the rolls of the House after the committee itself had expired with the end of the term of Congress. But in contrast to such a position, the rules of the House place the appointive and terminative power over the employment of committee personnel solely in the committees.

It is understood that it has been the practice of the House to carry committee employees on the roll after the end of one Congress until such time as a successor committee is elected by the new Congress. Paragraph 991 of Constitution, Jefferson's Manual, and Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. 739, 81st Cong.) indicates that there is authority for such action. The pertinent part of paragraph 991 reads as follows:

"There is no legal power to fill a vacancy in the clerkship of a committee after one Congress has expired and before the next House has been organized (IV, 4539), but the law provides that during this period the clerks shall perform their duties under the Clerk of the House."

The statement to the effect that after one Congress has expired and before the next House has been organized the law provides that committee clerks shall perform their duties under the Clerk of the House is, in all probability, based on a provision which appeared annually in the legislative branch appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1926 through 1934. However, since the provision was an annual provision and has been omitted from all similar appropriation acts subsequent to 1934, it cannot be considered as permanent law.

While I find no specific authority for employees of the House Committee on Government Operations of the Eighty-second Congress to be continued on the rolls of the House after noon on January 3, 1953, in view of the considerations set out above, particularly the past practice of the House of carrying committee employees on the rolls until election of a successor committee and the apparent intent of the Congress that the professional staff of standing committees be employed on a permanent basis, I cannot say that such action would be without any sanction whatsoever.

Since the question is not entirely free from doubt, the House may wish to consider taking action specifically providing for payment to employees of standing committees of the Eighty-second Congress. In the event it may be desired to introduce a resolution to that end I am enclosing three alternative drafts, each of which would accomplish the purpose depending upon how the House wants the matter to be handled. Draft No. 1 would provide for all employees of standing committees of the Eighty-second Congress to be carried on the rolls of the House until January 31, 1953, unless their employment is earlier terminated by a standing committee of the Eighty-third Congress. Draft No. 2 would provide for employees of standing committees to be carried on the rolls until January 31, 1953, unless earlier terminated, but certification of performance of duties from January 3, 1953, to the date of election of the standing committee by the Eighty-third Congress would be made by the chairman of the committee of the Eighty-second Congress, or in case such member is no longer in Congress by the majority member next in line. Draft No. 3 would place the entire control over the action to be taken in the standing committees elected by the Eighty-third Congress. Section 2 of drafts Nos. 1 and 2 would cover a situation which I am informed has arisen with respect to a clerk designated and performing service prior to election of the committee in the Eighty-third Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States.

EXHIBIT C

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1953.

Mr. J. C. SHANK,
Disbursing Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHANK: Some time ago I pointed out to the Parliamentarian and to the Clerk that no authority existed to compensate employees of House committees of the Eighty-second Congress who continued to perform services after January 3, 1953, or to compensate employees of the same committees of the Eighty-third Congress for services performed before the election of members of the committees.

I passed the results of my research on to the Comptroller General.

At my request, the Comptroller General sent me an opinion on the matter. He also could find no statute which authorized payment of these employees. Accordingly, the Comptroller General attached several alternative drafts of proposed resolutions to meet the situation.

I selected a draft which authorized payment of employees if they worked, but not if they did not work. This draft, with the changes I made, I sent to the Parliamentarian for his comment, and later introduced. Shortly thereafter Mr. HALLECK, having been advised of the results of my research, but never consulting me, introduced one of the other alternative drafts sent to me by the Comptroller General, with changes. This is House Resolution 107, which was immediately enacted.

I am informed that you interpret House Resolution 107 to mean that you can pay all employees of the Eighty-second Congress for the pay period after the end of their employment, regardless of whether they worked, even though the committee takes no action with respect to these former employees. House Resolution 107 cannot be so interpreted.

House Resolution 107 simply gives the committees the authority to approve the employment and compensation of committee employees from January 3, 1953. Unless the committees act to approve such compensation, there can be no compensation. Presumably, the committees will approve compensation for those persons who worked under proper direction during the period in question, but not of those who did not work.

Nothing in the resolution says that either employees of the same committees in the Eighty-second Congress, who ceased to be employees on January 3, 1953, or employees of the Eighty-third Congress employed after the election of members of the committees, will be paid if they did not work, or if the committee does not approve of the compensation, during the period in question.

You are acting at your own risk if you pay employees of the Eighty-second Congress for periods falling within the Eighty-third Congress, unless those employees worked during those periods as attested by the approval of the committees of the Eighty-third Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

EXHIBIT D

H. R. 1995

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended is hereby amended by inserting a new paragraph (g) in section 202 thereof as follows:

"(g) (1) In the case of standing committees of the House of Representatives which terminate with the term of the respective Congress, compensation of employees, whose services are not terminated prior to the expiration of the term of the committee which employed them, is authorized at the rate in effect on the last day of the expiring Congress for actual services between that day and the following January 20, or for part of said period: *Provided*, That no employee shall be so compensated unless the chairman of the same committee in the new Congress shall certify that the services for which compensation is sought have actually been performed.

"(2) Retroactive employment, for a period commencing not earlier than the opening of Congress, by standing committees of the House of Representatives, following the organization of the committee in each Congress, is authorized, if such persons actually performed the services involved in the employment under the direction of the mem-

ber who under the rules and customs of the House would become chairman of the committee and who in fact did become chairman of the committee."

THANKS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate that the Members of Congress recognize and perhaps take some action in order to show the police of the District of Columbia just how much we appreciate the very efficient way in which they handled the crowds here during inauguration.

I have never seen such courtesy exhibited by any police department, and I know the tremendous pressure which was on them. I think the House should by some means recognize the very efficient service they rendered and offer them their thanks for the fine way in which they did their job.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include a poem written by a constituent, Charles A. Richards, in commemoration of the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COTTON and to include a salute to the flag by a high-school student in his district.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Courier.

Mr. WALTER in three instances and to include two editorials concerning the immigration bill as well as two other editorials.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include an address delivered by Gordon R. Clapp.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include a letter from the national historian of the Auxiliary of the United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mrs. BUCHANAN) and to include an editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, January 19, on the subject of the proposed appointment of Mr. Charles E. Wilson as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. KEATING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an article from the United Mine Workers Journal dealing with the welfare and retirement fund.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. ENGLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL in three instances and to include editorials from the Washington Post, the Trenton Times, and the New York Times.

Mr. SHORT and to include an article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and a speech delivered by His Excellency, the Korean Ambassador.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in two different instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINE.

Mr. BAILEY and include an address under the caption "The tariff needs of the United States" delivered over radio station WPIK, of Washington, D. C., by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy.

Mr. REED of New York in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for 4 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

358. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report listing the tort claims approved for payment for the fiscal year 1952 and setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, and a brief description of each claim, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

359. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

360. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting the report of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

361. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

362. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a summary of the report on progress of the synthetic liquid fuels for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to the act of April 5, 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321-325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

363. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $1,000,000 for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

364. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a consolidated summary of net payments arising from correction of military and naval records under Public Law 220, Eighty-second Congress for the period January 1 through June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

365. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

366. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to further increase certain pay for the members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

367. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

368. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize aid to needy American nationals in connection with their repatriation from foreign countries, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

369. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled 'An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union' "; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

370. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

371. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

372. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Second Annual Report by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on Operations Under Public Law 867, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

373. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

374. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residences in the United States for naturalization purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

375. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2151, 2153, 2154, and 2388 as extended to continue in effect the provisions thereof"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

376. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3185 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

377. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

378. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide a government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1971. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 1972. A bill to facilitate the development, management, and use of public-use areas and facilities and improvement of wildlife habitat on the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1973. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1974. A bill to amend the third paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1975. A bill to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act, as amended, to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1976. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the registration of judgments in or from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1977. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1978. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1979. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 1980. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxability of the proceeds from stock sold by individuals in order that they may enter Government service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 1982. A bill to amend section 443 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1983. A bill to equalize taxation on earned income, encourage individual financing of social security, encourage individual ownership of United States Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1984. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1985. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1986. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1987. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial fountain to Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the city of Washington; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1988. A bill to equalize taxation by imposing income taxes on cooperative corporations and on the business income of certain other tax-exempt corporations and organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of certain pharmacists employed in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 1990. A bill to protect striped bass; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1991. A bill relating to certain construction cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields Division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1992. A bill to provide for the refund of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquor lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the 1951 floods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1993. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1994. A bill to provide for the review of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 1995. A bill to provide for the compensation of employees of the committees of the House of Representatives and to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1996. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to reevaluate certain rivers and harbors and flood-control projects in order to determine the advisability of prosecuting such projects to completion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 1998. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide that the spouse of an individual who has been awarded a disability annuity shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity if such spouse has attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2000. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for permanently and totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2001. A bill to provide for the construction of Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2002. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2003. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2004. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide for the naturalization of aliens who serve in the Armed Forces in or around Korea for 6 months or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2005. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide for the naturalization of aliens who serve on active duty in the Armed Forces in or around Korea for 6 months or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2006. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic tin-smelting industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing abhorrence of the use of anti-Semitism by the Soviet Union and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 108. Resolution providing for compensation of committee employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Res. 109. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within

its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Res. 110. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging the rejection of any plan that may be submitted for its consideration and to preserve the ownership of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the people; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2007. A bill for the relief of Severio Tavella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Hemayak Meghrigian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2009. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Ninilchik Hospital Association of Ninilchik, Alaska, for use as a hospital site and related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2010. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Alaska Evangelization Society of Levelock, Alaska, for missionary purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2011. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a camp site and other public purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2012. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a camp site and other public purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2013. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2014. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Community Club of Chugiak, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2015. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Cove, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2016. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2017. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Kenneth B. Laughlin, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2018. A bill for the relief of Daryl L. Roberts, Ade E. Jaskar, Terrence L. Robbins, Harry Johnson, and Frank Swanda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2020. A bill for the relief of Matt Rayner, Frank Rayner, and Ole Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2021. A bill for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2022. A bill for the relief of Don B. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2023. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2024. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Peyton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2025. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2026. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2027. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2028. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Rose Maria Gradelone Calicchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2030. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2031. A bill for the relief of Arch Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2032. A bill for the relief of Clarence D. Newland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2033. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2034. A bill for the relief of Lt. (j. g.) Samuel E. McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 2035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2036. A bill for the relief of Sergio Grappi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2037. A bill for the relief of John Kmiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2038. A bill for the relief of Stefan Protasewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2039. A bill for the relief of Michael Krysanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2040. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Budzynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2041. A bill for the relief of Antonio Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2042. A bill for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2044. A bill to overcome an excludable ground of admission into the United States other than race for John Virag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2045. A bill for the relief of Kyrriakos Tsambis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of Knut Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2047. A bill for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2048. A bill for the relief of Ruth H. Haller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Frank Miranda Doolittle and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2050. A bill for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2051. A bill for the relief of Ivo Markulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2052. A bill for the relief of Betty Ann Finn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 2053. A bill for the relief of F. Yao da Silva and his wife, Soo Chen da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Gordon Victor Currie and his wife, Evelyn Edith Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Oscar Beregi, Sr., and Oscar Beregi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of Maria V. Beregi de Pataky and Coloman de Pataky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Gan Seow Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Ken C. Wu and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Leiss Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Harumi Hirouji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Miss Regine du Planty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

22. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward P. Dameron, commissioner of public welfare, Baton Rouge, La., with reference to a letter to the Louisiana congressional delegation soliciting their support to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

23. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maximo H. Enardecido Ayungon, Negro Oriental, Philippines, relative to life-service insurance and death compensation for his son, Lifardo P. Enardecido, XC6378108; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of our pilgrim years, the day returns and brings us the round of its concerns and duties. As in Thy sight Thy servants stand here in posts of high public office, make them, we pray Thee, solemnly conscious that their thoughts, their attitudes, their words, and their acts are not their own, but go out from this Chamber set as a light on a hill to influence and to mold the whole structure of human relationships around the world. Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be the servants of others.

In times of tension and strain keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, pure in heart, in spite of ingratitude, meanness,

or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable us to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MILLIKIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 21, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 21st instant,

The Secretary of the Senate received on January 22, 1953, during the adjournment of the Senate, messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles E. Wilson, to be Secretary of Defense, and sundry other nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received January 22, 1953, see the end of Senate proceedings of today.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and on Monday, in order to attend the funeral of a dear friend of mine, Mr. Robert Miller, of Bloomington, Ind., who died last night.

Mr. Miller was a great American, a great Republican, and a fine gentleman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow in order to enable him to deliver an address in New York City.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF CERTAIN PAY FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further increase certain pay for the members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO INJURY TO CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2151, 2153, 2154, and 2388 as extended to continue in effect the provisions thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT RELATING TO DETAIL OF CERTAIN OFFICERS FOR RECRUITING SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the acting list for recruiting service, and for duty with ROTC units (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SACRAMENTO CANALS UNIT OF CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Sacramento canals unit of the Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GOVERNMENT FOR TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 17, 1953, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 19, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary to his report on synthetic liquid fuels, for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESIDENCE, FOR NATURALIZATION PURPOSES, OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 17, 1953, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the regional research laboratories, for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HIGH PERCENTAGE OF VOTES CAST IN NOVEMBER ELECTION BY VOTERS OF CITY OF DE PERE, WIS.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the city of De Pere, Wis., which shows that certified public accountants attest that 99.69 percent of the total number of qualified voters in that city voted at the recent election—and I may say, Mr. President, they voted right. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the voters of the city of De Pere, Wis., did, at the general election held on November 4, 1952, cast 4,192 ballots from a possible 4,204 qualified and registered voters for a percentage of 99.69, which fact was attested to by two certified public accountants; and

Whereas the mayor and Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wis., believe this to be a record and to entitle the city of De Pere, Wis., to be recognized as America's No. 1 small city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wis., That the committee which worked many long hours in an effort to achieve a 100-percent vote in the city of De Pere, Wis., be highly commended for its efforts and achievement; and be it further

Resolved, That the voters of the city of De Pere, Wis., be congratulated on their keen sense of civic responsibility in exercising their inherent right to vote, many of whom traveled long distances or arose from sick beds in order to cast their ballots; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to United States Senators Joseph McCarthy and Alexander Wiley, to Congressman John W. Byrnes, to Gov. Walter J. Kohler, and to State Senator Leo P. O'Brien and Assemblyman Harvey E. Larsen.

Adopted by the Common Council this 12th day of November 1952.

Approved November 12, 1952.

E. A. SEYMOUR,
Mayor.

Attest: November 12, 1952.

I. A. SMITS,
City Clerk.

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of

State—for Administration—and I submit a report (No. 10) thereon.

The bill would create a second position of Under Secretary of State—for Administration—to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The new position is requested by Secretary of State Dulles in order that there may be assured efficiency of operation throughout the whole field of foreign relations. It is felt that in so doing great savings could be accomplished and waste cut down. It would be the duty of the new Under Secretary of State to accomplish the purpose which was referred to so frequently in the recent campaign.

I give notice that at the next session of this body I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate act on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred provide for the creation of new jobs?

Mr. WILEY. Under the bill a job would be created for not to exceed 4 years, unless terminated earlier by the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. What salary will be paid?

Mr. WILEY. The same salary as for the other Under Secretary, namely, $17,500.

Mr. ELLENDER. Seventeen thousand five hundred dollars?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. It does seem to me to be one of those useless jobs. It will entail much more in the way of expense than the $17,500, just mentioned by my distinguished friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that he would ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Not now, but at the next meeting of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin intend to make that request without having the bill go to the appropriate committee?

Mr. WILEY. The bill has been unanimously reported by the committee, and a report on the bill will be available.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Would the appointment of the proposed additional secretary, as provided in the bill, entail the appointment of a new staff under him?

Mr. WILEY. The bill provides for the appointment of a new Under Secretary, whose function would be, as I have already outlined rather briefly, to seek to bring a high degree of efficiency throughout the entire field of the operations of the Secretary of State and the State Department. He would make a complete survey of the Department and submit recommendations which, we hope, would enable the Department to do its vitally important job more efficiently and cheaply.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does that mean that under the proposed new Under Secretary of State there would be established an entirely new staff to accomplish the result set forth in the bill?

Mr. WILEY. The bill calls for the creation of only one position, and nothing more.

Mr. ELLENDER. The new Under Secretary, if appointed, will need clerical assistance and office space, will he not?

Mr. WILEY. I cannot say what he will need. However, throughout the campaign it was clearly stated, and it was further stated by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], upon his return from a thorough investigation abroad, that there were many thousands of excess employees; and we have heard admissions from both sides that there have been waste, duplication, and so forth.

Of course, any large business which finds itself unable to balance its budget will employ an efficiency expert, who will find what can be done and how it can be done.

So the purpose of having a new Under Secretary of State appointed, if and when the Senate consents to have that done, will be to take over the job of housecleaning and streamlining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I am very happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that in order to reduce the size of the staff of the State Department, it is necessary to make the staff of the State Department larger?

Mr. WILEY. No, I do not say that; and I do not want the Senator from Illinois to put words into my mouth.

All I say, in all sincerity, is that when the Secretary of State seeks to do what the people want to have done, he must have efficient help to do the job. The bill itself provides a termination date. It is the hope of the Secretary that the job can be done within 2 years, and then the office will go out of existence.

So what is needed now is less partisanship and more efficiency in government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. On many occasions I have heard it charged during the recent campaign, and if my memory serves me right, the newspapers printed statements from prominent Republicans to the effect that many of the Government Departments are overloaded with personnel and that there was much waste. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin and his committee will study this request thoroughly and look into the feasibility of using funds which have been heretofore appropriated in order to carry out the objective sought in the proposed measure. Let us start practicing real economy and not create new jobs to get rid of existing useless jobs, as my friend seeks to do. It is my belief that the State Department has sufficient funds and the power to appoint ample personnel to carry on the new task now proposed.

Mr. WILEY. I believe the committee went quite fully into that matter. It was discussed. The members of the committee are practical men who have had business experience. I repeat that the common experience in business is that if and when an organization finds that it cannot balance its budget, and that it is losing money, it does not use as an efficiency expert a man who already is in the organization and has had a part in increasing its size, with the result that there is an excess of personnel and an absence of profits, but it employs from outside its organization a man who has a new approach and can see where waste and duplication exist and where efficiency can be promoted. Such a person is placed in charge of that operation. That is good business.

Now we expect to have a business administration. So it is that we expect that the new Under Secretary of State, if and when he is appointed, will be a fine, efficient head of that operation, and will soon obtain results in the foreign and domestic services of that agency of the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of the need and the purpose to economize in government, could not a person who now occupies a position in the State Department be assigned the task to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred, so that it would be unnecessary to create a new position? Would not that be the better procedure?

Mr. WILEY. No. It was the judgment of the committee, and it is also the judgment of the executive branch, that it would be better to have a new man—one who could devote his full time to this very important job and obtain some results.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would seem that if a new man is needed to do this job, he could do it in less time than the Senator from Wisconsin has indicated, and would not have to serve for 4 years during the new administration.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say in all frankness to my good friend that that question was discussed. The report which was made was to the effect that it is believed that the job can be completed within 18 months or 2 years. However, the committee recognizes the tremendous extent of the job, the many thousands of employees involved, and the necessity for avoiding the use of a meat-ax operation. The committee believes that the job must be performed in a consistent manner, so that the

proper functioning of the State Department will not be injured. The work must be carried on in such a way that efficiency will result, money will be saved, and the Foreign Service will not be injured.

In view of the fact that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a good Democrat, who returned from his inspection trip only a few weeks ago, stated that he believes that in the Foreign Service there are many thousands of excess personnel—of course, I myself do not know whether that is the case—it seems to me that it would be useless for us to be penny wise and pound foolish in this situtation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr MALONE. In the morning newspaper I noticed a statement to the effect that Mr. Benson, the new Secretary of Agriculture, by means of executive order, has just reduced the number of divisions or agencies in the Department of Agriculture from 12 to 4, I believe.

When Mr. Dulles returns from Europe, I wonder whether he might be able to eliminate or decrease the size of some of the agencies in the State Department, and then use some of the personnel who are excess, as a result of that operation, to work with the other employees of the Department toward the goal of efficiency of operation, which I understand is the purpose of the bill to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred.

Mr. WILEY. I suppose Mr. Dulles will have plenty to do in Europe, so that it will be impossible for him to devote much time to a study of the question we have been discussing, namely, what can be done to increase efficiency in the State Department and reduce its overhead. After all, Mr. Dulles will be concerned with policy matters, whereas the job of the proposed new Under Secretary of State will be to obtain efficiency and to reduce overhead. I personally feel it is a good sign of a better day, that at long last, a Government official desires to take steps to bring about efficiency and reduce overhead—a step long overdue.

NOMINATION OF FORMER SENATOR LODGE TO BE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I report, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, the nomination of our former colleague, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to be the representative of the United States to the United Nations and ask the Senate to confirm it.

Senator Lodge served in the Senate with outstanding ability for 13 years, and for much of that time he was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which his distinguished grandfather was one time chairman. He has also had valuable experience as a newspaper correspondent, as an Army officer on active duty during World War II, and finally as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly in 1950.

He is superbly qualified for his present assignment by his background, his training, and his great native ability.

I think this is an appropriate time, Mr. President, to say a few words in tribute to Senator Lodge's predecessor as United States representative to the U. N., another old friend and colleague of ours in the Senate and in the Foreign Relations Committee, former Senator Warren Austin. Senator Austin has served ably and well through some extremely difficult years. I had the privilege of working with him in the United States delegation to the last General Assembly, and I was reinforced in my conviction that the people of the entire free world owe him a great debt of gratitude for the work he has done.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee heard Senator Lodge in executive session January 22, and discussed with him very frankly the problems which he will face at the United Nations. We were again impressed—as we always were when he was a member of the committee—with his common sense approach, his grasp of world affairs, and his talent for getting to the heart of a matter.

The Foreign Relations Committee unanimously voted to confirm his nomination, and I hope the Senate will do likewise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word at this time in tribute to the fine work which has been done in the United Nations by our chief representative, former Senator Warren Austin, who is leaving that position at this time. It was my pleasure to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the fifth General Assembly of the United Nations and to serve under the able leadership of Senator Austin. He has rendered great service to this country, and we shall long be indebted to him for the excellent leadership which he has shown in his service in the place he is now giving up.

I join with the Senator from Wisconsin and with all of Senator Lodge's former colleagues in wishing him, likewise, a period of great and successful service. I know we can expect that from him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should rather finish the morning hour, if we may. Then I shall ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of several nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. From the parliamentary standpoint, it could be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. I object to considering the nomination by unanimous consent during the morning hour.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD E. STASSEN TO BE DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, with the unanimous recommendation of that committee, the nomination of Harold E. Stassen to be Director for Mutual Security. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have prepared in relation to this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The nomination of Harold E. Stassen to be Director for Mutual Security comes to the Senate with the unanimous recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee that it be confirmed.

The committee heard Mr. Stassen in executive session on January 21 and voted on his nomination the next day.

Mr. Stassen's record of public service is well known and includes much experience in dealing with foreign relations. He resigned as Governor of Minnesota in 1943 to enter the Navy and served during the war on Admiral Halsey's staff in the Pacific. He was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, and has maintained an active interest in foreign affairs since then. He has traveled widely and has written and spoken extensively on international problems.

I want to tell the Senate, Mr. President, that Mr. Stassen made a favorable impression on the committee with his over-all approach to his job. He is very conscious of the principles which President Eisenhower laid down in his inaugural address. He is also very conscious of the fact that Mutual Security is an administrative agency which must operate within policies formulated by the Congress, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the President.

He also gave the committee assurances that he has no financial or commercial interests or connections whatever which would be incompatible with the position of Mutual Security Administrator.

Mr. Stassen intends to leave Washington at the end of this month with Secretary Dulles for a personal inspection of the European situation, at the request of President Eisenhower.

It is important that Mr. Stassen's nomination be confirmed before he undertakes this trip, and I hope that his nomination will be acted on promptly by the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to report favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the nomination of Walter Williams, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Commerce; also the nomination of Robert Blaine Murray, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; also the nomination of Samuel W. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held public hearings on these nominations this morning and they were ordered reported favorably by unanimous vote of the committee. Transcripts of the hearings will be available tomorrow morning in the committee room if anyone desires to read them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed upon the Executive Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 15, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton, counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
C. M. Mouser, chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.46
James M. Kendall, assistant chief clerk	8,735.34	4,367.64
Jean Douglas, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12
Harriet D. Willey, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,272.29
Balance unexpended	5,727.71

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

(Making investigations under S. Res. 256 and S. Res. 338, 82d Cong.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul J. Cotter, chief counsel, to Aug. 31	$11,646.00	$1,941.00
Mary E. Hutchison, clerk, to July 31	4,856.61	404.71
David L. Goodman, stenographer, to July 11	4,187.45	127.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	40,886.03
Balance unexpended	9,113.97

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11,312.73	5,656.32
Herman E. Downey (to Oct. 31), professional staff member	11,312.73	3,770.88
William W. Woodruff (to Oct. 31), assistant clerk	10,732.07	3,577.32
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Kenneth J. Bousquet, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
William R. Bonsell (from Aug. 1), professional staff member	10,068.45	4,195.15
William J. Kennedy, Jr. (from Sept. 15), professional staff member	10,068.45	2,964.57
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	10,068.45	5,003.07
Woodrow R. Davidson (from Dec. 13), professional staff member	11,312.73	565.63
Mamie L. Mizen, assistant clerk	6,959.63	3,479.76
Thomas Boyers IV, clerical assistant	6,672.85	3,336.42
Corinne Bryan, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Lois C. Joy, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Velma M. Lancaster, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Richard C. Venne, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Celka K. Prescott (to Aug. 31), clerical assistant	4,856.61	809.42
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant	4,091.85	2,045.88
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, Staff Director	11,646.00	5,823.00
William V. Sinnott, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Ira E. Gunn, Jr., assistant staff director	9,404.83	4,702.38
Leo C. Nulty (from Aug. 1), agent	9,653.69	4,022.35
Daniel W. Sullivan, fiscal officer	8,644.09	4,322.04
Joseph F. McDonald, Jr., agent	8,644.09	4,322.04
Paul A. Toussaint (from Aug. 1), agent	8,461.89	3,525.65
John M. Laxalt, agent	5,812.53	2,906.22
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Mary Ellen Hutchinson (from Aug. 1), clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,182.90
Jessie E. Stearns, research assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Angela M. Novello, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
John W. Wedge, Jr., clerical assistant	4,761.00	2,380.50
Murry Brophy (to Nov. 30), agent	9,073.03	3,780.40
Milo Farmer (to July 15), agent	9,653.69	402.23
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES		
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of July 1, 1952		$24,151.49
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		None
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		24,151.49
Eighty-second Congress:		
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and Senate Resolutions 162, 204, and 335, as of July 1, 1952		17,728.14
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		13,983.66
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		3,744.48
Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1952, as of July 1, 1952		31,150.46
Receipt of cash advances		3,500.00
Total available for expenditure		34,650.46
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		296.04
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		34,354.42
Funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1953, and Public Law 547, approved July 15, 1952		400,000.00
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		[1] 54,616.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		345,383.28

[1] Includes $51,023.23 payroll of temporary employees.

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William H. Darden, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Mark H. Galusha, staff adviser	11,646.00	5,823.00
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	11,646.00	5,823.00
Herbert S. Atkinson, assistant chief clerk	7,819.96	3,909.98
Georgia P. Earle, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.89
Maurine E. Dantzic, clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.12
Sara Seeliger, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.72
Edna E. Johnson, clerical assistant [1]	4,378.64	1,824.35
M. Therese Winn, clerical assistant [2]	4,378.64	364.87

[1] Resigned Nov. 30, 1952.
[2] From Dec. 1, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenses, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee by S. Res. 166, July 31, 1951	10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee by S. Res. 347, July 2, 1952	10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	30,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	22,330.97
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1952	7,669.03

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anton, James, special counsel, from Nov. 19	$9,073.03	$1,038.51
Bartosh, Ena G., stenographer, to Oct. 13	3,900.68	1,116.00
Bryant, Ashbrook P., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Burns, Hazel L., stenographer, to July 15	3,327.12	138.63
Devlin, Harold M., accountant	9,321.88	4,660.92
Engle Wallace L., investigator	5,430.16	2,575.65
Ginsburg, David, assistant counsel, to Aug. 11	9,653.69	1,099.44
Keadle, Mary Frances, stenographer	3,900.68	1,950.30
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr., attorney	7,150.81	3,575.40
Martin, George W., staff consultant, to Sept. 18	8,005.36	1,734.68
Miller, Mary M., clerk-typist	3,900.68	1,938.34
Reedy, George E., Jr., staff consultant	10,483.21	5,241.60
Rice, Downey, special counsel, to Sept. 19	11,646.00	2,555.65
Robinson, Jane K., stenographer	3,613.89	1,805.90
Sherfy, Laurence P., special counsel, to Sept. 30	10,068.45	2,517.09
Taylor, Willie Day, assistant to staff consultant	4,474.23	2,237.10
Tyler, Lyon L., Jr., assistant chief counsel, to Aug. 15	11,646.00	1,068.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee use under S. Res. 263, agreed to Jan. 28, 1953	$190,000.00
Balance unexpended July 1, 1952	124,884.56
Amount expended to Dec. 31	46,682.22
Balance unexpended	78,202.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 263	190,000.00
Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1952	111,797.66
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	78,202.34

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
A. Lee Parsons, chief clerk [1]	$11,646.00	$4,852.50
Joseph P. McMurray, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
William F. McKenna, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Ira Dixon, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.83
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant [2]	5,908.12	2,461.72
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28

[1] Leave of absence Oct. 1 to 31.
[2] Leave of absence Oct. 1 to 31.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$30,000.00
Amount expended:	
Jan. 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952 (reported)	16,894.68
July 1, 1952, through Dec. 31, 1952	3,622.81
Balance unexpended	9,482.51

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(Under authority of S. Res. 248)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	$8,644.09	$4,322.07
Carter E. Talman, staff assistant	8,644.09	4,322.07
Mary Ryan, clerical assistant [1]	4,569.81	360.81

[1] Through July 31.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$78,000.00
Amount expended:	
July 1 through Dec. 31, 1952	9,770.89
Feb. 15, 1951, through June 30, 1952 (reported)	39,029.85
Balance unexpended	29,199.26

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Mollohan, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Gerhard P. Van Arkel, professional staff member (Sept. 16 to Oct. 22)	11,646.00	1,196.95
William P. Gulledge, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Arlene Williams, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Ruth W. Bryant, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,632.23
Balance unexpended	4,367.77

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10,649.11	$5,324.52
Evelyn R. Thompson, clerical assistant	6,099.30	3,049.62
Janice E. Graybeal, stenographer	6,099.30	3,049.62
Betty Mae Tappy, stenographer	6,003.71	3,001.80
Mary C. Murray, stenographer (July 1 to Aug. 31)	4,378.64	729.76
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk	4,378.64	2,189.28
Serge Benson, professional staff	10,566.16	5,283.06
Fedele F. Fauri, professional staff (July 1 to 15)	11,646.00	485.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	8,854.45
Balance unexpended	1,145.55

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, staff associate	11,646.00	5,823.00
Carl M. Marcy, staff associate	11,646.00	5,823.00
C. C. O'Day, clerk	11,646.00	5,742.20
Pat M. Holt, associate clerk	$11,646.00	$5,742.20
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	5,716.93	2,858.46
Mary Proctor, assistant clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Nancy Hanschman, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
William L. Martin, Jr., assistant clerk [1]	4,378.64	2,189.28
June Pitts, assistant clerk [1]	4,761.00	2,268.95

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 146, Aug. 6, 1951, and S. Res. 249, Jan. 15, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$40,000
Amount expended	21,763.38
Balance unexpended	18,236.62

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

(Under S. Res. 74, agreed to June 30, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Julius N. Cahn, counsel (from Nov. 16, 1952)	$11,646.00	$1,455.75
Lindsay Rogers, special consultant (from Aug. 28 to Oct. 3, 1952)	[1] 25.00	1,035.20

[1] Per day, when actually employed.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$50,000.00
Amount expended	2,640.80
Balance unexpended	47,359.20

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Subcommittee Studying Foreign Information Programs.

JANUARY 7, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,864.04	3,432.00
Emily Z. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Blanche Helder Brox (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Miles Senil, Jr. (to Sept. 30, 1952), professional staff member	10,815.02	2,703.75
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	10,400.26	5,200.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,586.24
Balance unexpended	5,413.76

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

(S. Res. 252)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel. Work performed by staff of Committee on Government Operations.

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 252, 82d Cong., 2d sess	$11,168.21
Total amount expended	673.19
Balance unexpended	10,495.02

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

JANUARY 7, 1953.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$9,321.86	$4,660.92
Edith H. Anderson, assistant clerk	4,474.23	2,237.10
Francis D. Flanagan, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Howell J. Hatcher, chief assistant counsel	11,644.54	5,822.22
William A. Leece, assistant counsel	8,644.09	4,322.04
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	5,621.34	2,810.64
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
Martha Rose Myers, assistant clerk	4,378.64	2,093.68
James F. Sheridan, investigator	7,342.00	3,670.98
Nina W. Sutton, assistant clerk	4,378.64	2,189.28
James H. Thomas, assistant counsel	6,290.49	3,145.20
Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$62,882.92
Amount expended	42,737.27
Balance unexpended	20,145.65

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mills Astin, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.47
Stewart French, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Arthur A. Sandusky, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Charlotte Mickle, clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,619.48
Marie Mathew, clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,619.48
Rosemary Donnelley, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.73
Thelma Leech, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.73

Total funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 82d Cong	$20,000.00
Amount expended	13,361.43
Balance unexpended	6,638.57

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Louis D. Luttrell, staff director	$9,238.93	$4,619.47
Luna P. McWane, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.73
Thomas N. Tappy,[1] consultant	10,900.00	4,450.00

[1] Terminated November 15, 1952.

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended	31,734.81
Balance unexpended	8,265.19

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS INVESTIGATING THE FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mildred C. Brandon, clerical assistant	$4,187.45	$2,093.73

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	15,238.16
Balance unexpended	4,761.85

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	$5,047.77	$2,523.89
Halford G. Davis, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Harriet S. Gray, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.89
Edward S. Jarrett, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Frank Keenan, assistant chief clerk	7,724.37	3,862.19
Vera B. Rudolph, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.86
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.89
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nicholas Zapple, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance June 30, 1952	$12,215.59
Amount expended	4,025.35
Balance unexpended	8,190.24

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Pursuant to S. Res. 258, agreed to January 24, 1952, investigating problems relating to the airline industry, the United States merchant marine, domestic land and water transportation, and radio, telegraph, and telephone communications)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittee for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Pauline Chaternuck, clerical assistant	$5,143.38	$2,571.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance June 30, 1952	$18,348.68
Amount expended	3,482.98
Balance unexpended	14,865.70

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(S. Res. 245, Trading With the Enemy Act)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds

available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John A. Bard, staff member, from Aug. 15	$10,068.45	$3,903.60
Dorothy M. Cassell, clerk, from Nov. 20	4,283.04	487.79
Doris B. Covington, clerk, from Nov. 17	4,091.85	560.10
Raymond S. Cox, Jr., attorney, from July 7	5,430.16	2,624.55
Dorothy Davis, clerk, from Sept. 16	4,952.20	1,444.38
William F. Doyle, Jr., staff member, from Oct. 8	7,819.96	1,802.92
LuDeen R. Earl, clerk, from July 11	4,283.04	2,022.54
Marjorie Garrett, clerk, from Nov. 20	3,709.49	422.46
Robert H. Hagan, investigator, from Nov. 19	6,194.89	722.73
John L. Harris, clerk, from July 8	4,283.04	2,001.93
William A. Kolar, staff member, from Aug. 1	8,370.35	3,487.60
Louella C. McEnroe, clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
Doris L. Mercer, clerk, from Aug. 11	4,187.45	1,628.43
John W. Nairn, attorney, from July 7	8,096.60	3,913.32
Ina B. Weems, stenographer, from Aug. 4	4,187.45	1,709.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong. $100,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong. 44,439.03

Balance unexpended. 55,560.97

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
L. Clair Nelson, professional staff member to Oct. 31	11,646.00	3,882.00
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Drury Blair, professional staff member from Nov. 1	9,404.83	1,567.46
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
James M. Thomson, assistant chief clerk	10,068.45	5,034.18
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Mary Micheo, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Mary Rogers, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Mary Alice Turner, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Orrin E. Creasey, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong. $20,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong. 15,581.85

Balance unexpended. 4,418.15

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEES ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 261, agreed to January 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
William H. Arens, staff member	8,900.07	4,383.32
Drury H. Blair, staff member to Nov. 1	9,404.83	3,134.92
Georgia B. Campion, clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
Dorothy A. Davis, clerk, to Sept 15	5,525.75	1,151.17
Herman E. Fisher, clerk, from Oct. 1	2,827.14	706.77
Katherine S. Florence, clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Marilyn H. Humphreys, clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Ethel L. Johnson, staff member, to Sept. 1	8,824.17	1,470.68
Mary J. McCloskey, clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mary J. MacDevitt, clerk	5,525.75	2,699.10
Guy M. Massey, staff member to Aug. 15	9,404.83	1,175.59
Fred M. Mesmer, staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Frank W. Schroeder, investigator	9,902.55	4,951.26
William H. Webster, clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure. $97,000.00
Amount expended. 82,185.95

Balance unexpended. 14,814.05

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

(Under authority of S. Res. 314, agreed to May 29, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dorothy C. Baker, clerk	$6,481.67	$3,017.74
Roland W. Belanger, clerk (from Aug. 24)	3,709.49	999.48
Carrie Lee Conner, clerk	5,525.75	2,699.10
Donald D. Connors, Jr., investigator	9,570.74	4,785.36
Marilyn J. Cremer, clerk	3,709.49	1,854.72
Edward J. Duffy, investigator	9,907.12	4,453.86
Owen K. Earl, staff member	8,096.00	4,048.26
George W. Franks, clerk	3,709.49	1,854.72
Stephen G. Rauser, research assistant	7,246.41	3,623.16
Elizabeth E. Horton, clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Winton H. King, investigator	7,246.41	3,623.16
William E. Lowell, editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Yvonne G. McDonnell, clerk	5,525.75	2,699.10
Robert C. McManus, research associate (to July 3)	9,653.69	80.44
Maree R. Maher, typist	4,856.61	2,428.26
Benjamin Mandel, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert Morris, special counsel	11,646.00	5,240.70
LuDeen Roylance, clerk (to July 10)	4,823.04	118.97
Naomi W. Somes, clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Marion L. Walker, clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
June D. Whitmore, clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure. $190,218.74
Amount expended. 105,226.36

Balance unexpended. 84,992.38

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul L. Badger, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Charles Bragman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
William H. Coburn, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary Jane Del Balzo, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Vivien T. Harman, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Paul H. Menk, professional staff member [1]	11,646.00	5,823.00
Helen H. Papps, clerical assistant [1]	4,952.20	2,476.08
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Philip R. Rodgers, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Thomas E. Shroyer, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 243.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure. $20,000.00
Amount expended. 14,741.03

Balance unexpended. 5,258.97

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

(Pursuant to S. Res. 244, 82d Cong., 2d sess., agreed to January 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kenneth A. Melklejohn, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Melvin W. Sneed, assistant staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nora K. Piore, research assistant: July 1 to 31, 1952	7,333.19	735.34
Sept. 12, to Dec. 31, 1952		2,280.86
Richard A. Beyer, research assistant	5,525.75	2,762.82
Harriet Gilloyle, stenographer	4,569.81	2,284.86
Adele Heller, stenographer	4,569.81	2,284.86

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong. [1] $139,000.00
Amount expended. [2] 105,137.35

Balance unexpended. 33,862.65

[1] Funds authorized for Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations and Subcommittee on Health.
[2] Amount expended by Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations and Subcommittee on Health.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 244, agreed to January 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth J. Anthony, stenographer	$3,237.76	$1,618.86
Jack Barbash, staff director	11,644.54	5,822.22
Merton C. Bernstein, attorney, to Dec. 15, 1952	7,055.23	3,213.09
Alexander K. Christie, staff member	7,333.19	3,766.56
John R. Delebo, file clerk	4,569.81	1,372.05
Muriel Gimble, stenographer	3,709.49	1,854.72
Curtis E. Johnson, staff member	8,552.84	3,872.50
John Marshall, Jr., minority economist	9,238.93	4,619.46
Arthur E. Naftalin, special assistant to staff director, to July 15, 1952	10,815.02	450.62
Cushing Niles, stenographer, to Aug. 31, 1952	3,805.08	634.18
Marjorie M. Whittaker, clerk-secretary	5,716.93	2,858.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	[1] $139,000.00
Amount expended	[2] 105,137.35
Balance unexpended	33,862.65

[1] Funds authorized for Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations and Subcommittee on Health.

[2] Amount expended by Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, and Subcommittee on Health.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittee for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Virginia Bobo, assistant chief clerk	$5,525.75	$2,762.82
H. W. Brawley, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Mary E. Harper, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,141.52
Mary A. Irwin, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Katherine K. Jennings, clerical assistant, Oct. 1 to Nov. 4	4,569.81	431.58
J. Austin Latimer, chief clerk and counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Olive T. Olson, clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10
E. Luise Shawn, clerical assistant, to Sept. 30 and from Nov. 5, 1952	4,569.81	1,853.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure 83d Cong. (includes S. Res. 233)	$30,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953	1,186.77
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	13,384.14
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1953	5,429.09

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES

(Operating under S. Res. 288, agreed to March 26, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Amidon, investigator-Analyst	$8,005.36	$4,002.68
G. Ross Anderson, Jr., investigator-analyst, to September 15	5,143.38	1,071.82
Nancy J. Brown, secretary	4,665.41	2,133.51
Marcia M. Callaghan, stenographer	5,047.77	2,523.84
Georgia H. Dodd, secretary	4,091.85	2,045.88
Ralph H. Drennen, investigator-analyst	8,461.59	4,230.79
Robert G. Dunphy, investigator-analyst	7,055.39	3,527.58
Hubert H. Finzel, investigator-analyst, to Nov. 14, 1952	8,552.84	2,470.79
Helena G. Fisher, secretary, to Sept. 19, 1952	4,091.85	897.91
Cecil A. Gasque, investigator-analyst	8,005.36	4,002.68
Joseph M. Hart, investigator-analyst, to Nov. 30, 1952	9,073.03	3,780.40
Guy B. Hathorn, investigator-analyst	6,577.27	3,288.60
Gustav C. Hertz, investigator-analyst	10,234.35	5,117.17
Colette E. Homan, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Katherine K. Jennings, stenographer, to Sept. 30 and from Nov. 5, 1952	4,283.04	1,737.00
Edwin C. Johnson, Jr., investigator-analyst to Aug. 7	8,005.36	822.76
Witmer H. Kelley, investigator-analyst	8,552.84	4,086.29
Rudolph H. Kroetz, investigator-analyst	8,005.36	3,639.53
William K. Levin, investigator-analyst	6,481.67	3,240.78
Charles B. Lipsen, investigator-analyst	5,621.34	2,543.10
Edward L. MacDonald, investigator-analyst, from Nov. 20	7,819.96	860.00
William L. Mabry, investigator-analyst, to Aug. 30	8,430.16	905.02
Theo A. Moore, investigator-analyst	6,577.27	3,288.60
Ethel P. Powers, stenographer	4,378.64	2,023.32
Melvin H. Purvis, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
John M. Sangster, investigator-analyst	9,653.69	4,826.82
Lloyd S. Smith, investigator-analyst	8,005.36	3,672.73
Betsy B. Thomas, secretary	3,518.30	1,661.71
Christine Winslow, secretary	4,665.41	2,332.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. (includes S. Res. 53, Feb. 19, 1951; S. Res. 206, Oct. 11, 1951; S. Res. 288, Mar. 26, 1952)	$245,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	221,230.34
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1953	23,769.66

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ellsworth W. Bassett, professional staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Frank Burnett, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Caira May Cook, clerical staff	5,621.34	2,810.67
Otto Dekom, professional staff (minority)	11,646.00	5,480.13
Ercilia Martinez, clerical staff	5,430.16	2,715.08
John L. Martinez, clerical staff	6,481.67	3,161.12
Frances Ortiz, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eloise Porter, assistant clerk	7,437.59	3,718.79
Soviada R. Romero, clerical staff	5,047.77	2,523.88
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,367.09
Balance unexpended	4,632.91

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 128, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Russell C. King, counsel, to Aug. 31	8,552.84	1,425.46
John P. Moore, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
B. Floye Gavin, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
M. M. Rabb, clerical assistant, to Dec. 5	6,003.71	2,584.88
Francis X. Plant, professional staff member, from Oct. 7	8,552.84	1,995.64
Helen M. Smith, clerical assistant, to Aug. 31 and from Sept. 2	4,665.41	2,319.72
Ruth P. Noon, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong	1,176.32
Balance unexpended	8,823.68

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Grace E. Johnson, clerk	$8,279.10	$4,376.52
Genevieve Litwin, stenographer	4,091.85	2,237.07
Israel Margolis, investigator	6,672.85	3,336.42

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jack Poorbaugh, investigator, to Sept. 6	$7,437.59	$1,053.63
Samuel H. Kramer, assistant counsel, Dec. 1	6,194.89	516.24
Allen Goodman, assistant counsel, Sept. 10	6,672.85	2,057.45
Robert Shortley, investigator	8,562.34	2,684.61
Mary Lou Vaughan, clerical assistant	5,525.75	1,381.41
Ruth G. Stout, administrative clerk	4,781.00	296.75
Wellford Ware, assistant counsel	10,068.45	4,866.37
Mary Yanick, secretary	5,047.77	2,523.84

Amount expended:
Expenses $14,366.82
Salaries 33,546.12
Balance unexpended, approximately, to date 105,985.33

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Created pursuant to S. Res. 58, 81st Cong.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Amis, Wm. D. (Sept. 16–Oct. 22), professional staff member	$9,321.88	$958.06
Blair, Saidee F., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10
Byrne, Elizabeth A., clerical assistant	5,621.34	2,810.64
Henderson, Laurance G., (July 1–Sept. 15, Oct. 17–Dec. 31), professional staff member	11,640.00	4,320.15
Hobbs, Patricia W. (Sept. 16–Oct. 24), clerical assistant	4,197.45	453.63
Laskey, Sara Betty, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Noone, Charles M., professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Novak, Gertrude C. (Oct. 20–31), assistant chief clerk	4,378.64	133.79
O'Connor, Blake (July 1–Sept. 15, Oct. 23–Dec. 31), professional staff member	10,068.45	3,909.37
Ruppert, Minna L., chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Stults, Walter B., professional staff member:		
July 1–9	9,819.59	5,382.60
July 10–Dec. 31	10,315.02	
Thomas, Ruth N. (July 1–Oct. 19 and Nov. 1–Dec. 31), assistant chief clerk	6,009.30	2,863.25
Tucker, Margaret W., clerical assistant	4,197.45	1,640.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong $10,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong 9,988.70

Balance unexpended 11.30

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1953.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 329 agreed to June 12, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adams, Walter (July 1–Sept. 6), professional staff member:		
July 1–15	$9,959.63	$1,763.33
July 16–Sept. 6	10,400.26	
Altfriend, Kate W. B. (July 1–Sept. 15, Nov. 1–Dec. 15 and Dec. 29–31), professional staff member	5,047.77	1,710.60
Amis, Wm. D. (July 1–Sept. 15 and Oct. 23–Dec. 31), investigator	9,321.88	3,702.84
Hobbs, Patricia W. (July 1–Sept. 15 and Oct. 25–Dec. 31), clerical assistant	4,197.45	1,640.06
Long, Gillis W. (July 1–2), professional staff member	7,914.11	43.96
Meyer, Joyce B. (July 1–Sept. 15 and Sept. 23–Dec. 31), clerical assistant [1]	3,900.68	1,874.45
Novak, Gertrude C. (July 1–Oct. 19 and Nov. 1–Dec. 31), clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,055.49
Schaffer, Rose (July 10–23), clerical assistant	4,599.81	177.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $50,000.00
Amount expended 15,852.60

Balance unexpended 44,147.40

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

[1] Nee Bissell from Nov. 1, 1952

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 573. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 574. A bill to extend the time for transmitting reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 575. A bill for the relief of Moniek Lemberger, Frida Lemberger, and Peysach Lemberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 576. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Ignatz Kovesi and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Aron Katz and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 578. A bill for the relief of Mozesz Aba Kamien or Mejzesz-Aba Kamien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 579. A bill for the relief of Wong You Henn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Ladislas Gyorki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Kalman Gruman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 582. A bill for the relief of Miklos Friedmann and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 583. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Mendl Feldman and his family; and

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Rosa Euler and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Baock Pyeng Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 586. A bill to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel post rates, size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 588. A bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 589. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 590. A bill for the relief of certain parties liable for the breach of bonds posted in the case of Zelmonas Lebjusas and Yehudith Lebjusas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Samuel V. Geokjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 592. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 593. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 594. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline, where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 595. A bill to increase the level of price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Albano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 597. A bill to amend and extend the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 598. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

S. 599. A bill for the relief of Corp. Robert D. McMillan; and

S. 600. A bill to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 601. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 602. A bill to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage and securing of grain, and other similar bulk cargoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 603. A bill to prohibit labor espionage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Maria Neglia, Angelo Neglia, and Guiseppe Neglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 605. (By request). A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 608. A bill to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 609. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 610. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the National Civil Defense Training Center for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 611. A bill providing for an investigation and study by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the adequacy and convenience of passenger carrier facilities and services and the reasonableness of fares in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 612. A bill providing for the collection of internal-revenue taxes and customs duties and the administration of the internal revenue and customs laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution designating the third Thursday in October as Agricultural Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration to Guam and Hawaii; and

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF PARCEL POST RATES, ETC.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill repealing a provision in the Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1951 which requires the Postmaster General to request the Interstate Commerce Commission to increase rates in fourth-class—parcel post—mail. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], ranking minority member of our committee, has joined me in the introduction of this bill.

In my judgment it is unfair for the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rates on fourth-class mail and leave with Congress the responsibility for setting rates on the other classes of mail.

I believe Congress should have the responsibility of setting all postal rates, and the bill I have introduced will restore to Congress its authority in this important matter.

I hope the Interstate Commerce Commission will defer action in this matter until the Congress has had an opportunity to consider this proposed legislation.

The Senator from South Carolina has also joined me in the submission of a Senate resolution, which I shall offer when resolutions are in order, authorizing the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to study and investigate the business methods, operations, rates, and charges of the postal service.

For some time I have believed the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department does not reflect the proper apportionment of expenditures and revenues against the several classes of mail.

The purpose of this resolution is to determine whether present postal cost accounting methods have kept pace with improvements in cost analysis and cost accounting systems which are used by progressive and modern business in private industry. The committee will also examine the cost of handling, transporting, and distributing mail to determine whether new procedures can reduce such cost by improvements in methods and equipment.

Furthermore, the resolution provides for the creation of an advisory council to secure suggestions and ideas from representatives of the general public, members of accounting and management engineering firms, and representatives of postal employee organizations.

The report of the Hoover Commission on the postal service only scratched the surface with respect to improvements which can be made in the Post Office Department to provide better service to the public at less cost to our taxpayers.

The bill (S. 586) to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel post rates, size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REGULATION OF FARES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in regard to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 588) to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement by Mr. HOLLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND IN REGARD TO A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF FARES FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I have today introduced a bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to fix the rate of fare for the transportation by street railway and bus of school children going to and from

public, parochial, or like schools in the District of Columbia, at not more than one-half the cash fare established from time to time by the Public Utilities Commission for regular route transportation within the District of Columbia.

I have introduced this bill at the request of the Capital Transit Co., in which certain Florida citizens have substantial investments, but only after careful study of the situation by which I have become thoroughly convinced that the subject matter should be dealt with promptly by an act of Congress along the lines of the bill which I have introduced.

In order to get the factual and legal background of this matter, I have consulted with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia. At this point I incorporate as part of my remarks, a letter which I received from the Honorable James H. Flanagan, chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, under date of January 6, 1953:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1953.

Hon. S. L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: In accordance with your request, I am pleased to submit to you the following facts relative to the rate of fare for transportation by street railway and bus of school children going to and from public, parochial, or like schools in the District of Columbia.

The existing school fare is 3 cents. This fare originated in Public No. 733, Seventy-first Congress, approved February 25, 1931. In accordance with the provisions of this act, the Public Utilities Commission, on March 3, 1931, issued its order No. 898, which established a 3 cents school fare.

Paragraph 19 of the Unification Agreement, approved on January 14, 1933, by Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-second Congress, also contained a similar directive to the Public Utilities Commission. Thus, the 3 cents school fare has been in effect in the District of Columbia for more than 20 years.

After public hearings on a petition from the local transportation company for increased fares, the Public Utilities Commission, in its order No. 3686, dated June 28, 1950, made the following special finding of fact:

"2. The 3 cents school ticket fare was established by act of Congress in 1933. Since that time, the cost of service, and other fares, have increased substantially. It is, therefore, apparent that this fare does not compensate the company for the cost of service rendered and imposes an undue burden upon other users of the service."

The 3 cents school fare was initiated at a time when the adult rate of fare, which had been fixed by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on appeal from an order of the Public Utilities Commission, was 10 cents cash, or four tokens for 30 cents, effective July 23, 1930. This adult fare structive remained substantially unchanged until November 3, 1937, except that in its order No. 1210, dated November 25, 1933, the Commission established free transfers and the weekly pass.

Effective January 20, 1952, and again effective August 31, 1952, the Public Utilities Commission found it necessary to grant fare increases to the local transportation company, based upon increased salaries to employees and other increased costs, all of which were made part of a public record and incorporated in the findings and orders of the Commission. In each instance the Commission was unable to afford the company relief through an increase in the school fare, with corresponding reduction in the increase to other passengers, due to the congressional restrictions cited above.

The existing fares, which were established by Commission order No. 3913, dated August 21, 1952, are: Cash, 17 cents; token, 5 for 75 cents; weekly pass, $2.40; school fare, 3 cents.

For your convenience, I am enclosing copies of Commission orders Nos. 898 and 3913.

If you desire further information with respect to any of the points contained in this letter, I shall be pleased to furnish them.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES H. FLANAGAN,
Chairman.

It is thus completely clear that although clothed with ample authority to fix other fares for travel on street railways and buses within the District, the Public Utilities Commission, by the inflexible provision of existing law, has been precluded from effecting any adjustment whatever of the 3-cent fare for school children, which has remained in effect since March 10, 1931, or for almost 22 years.

During the same period other transit rates have greatly increased. The regular adult rate of transportation fare now in effect in the District of Columbia is 17 cents cash or 5 tokens for 75 cents, which is 15 cents per token. These present rates contrast with an adult rate of 10 cents cash and 7½ cents per token in 1931. The token rate has exactly doubled during the years in question.

Again I wish to emphasize that this bill is for the purpose of granting authority to the Public Utilities Commission to fix rates for school children, but it specifically places a ceiling on the authority of the Commission to fix such rates at not more than one-half the cash fare established from time to time by the Commission for regular route transportation.

I am advised by Capital Transit that in 1934, the first full calendar year of operations by Capital Transit, there were 4,218,032 school fares collected at this low rate. Eighteen years later, for the 12 months ended June 30, 1952, the number of school fares at this low rate was 9,472,159. The number of school children now carried is thus more than twice the number carried in 1934, and it is quite obvious that when the 3-cent fare was established, costs were very low in comparison with costs today.

Capital Transit advises that the average cost of carrying a passenger in the first full calendar year 1934, subsequent to the formation of the Capital Transit Co., was 6.15 cents before return. The cost, therefore, in 1934 of carrying school children during the year was $259,409, which meant a loss to the company, before any return on investment, of $132,868.

According to Capital Transit, the cost of carrying a passenger for the year ended June 30, 1952, averaged 13.7 cents before allowance for any return on investment. As previously stated the number of school fares collected during this period was 9,472,159. Thus the loss resulting from the transportation of school children at the present low fare of 3 cents for the year ended June 30, 1952, before return, was $918,800, or approximately seven times the loss resulting from the use of school fares in 1934.

Since June 30, 1952, the company has experienced two wage increases totaling $1,235,000 annually which have increased operating costs so that I am advised the present level of losses from transportation of school children is in excess of $1,000,000. Moreover, additional increases in wage costs will become effective July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1954, which will increase such losses even further.

There is no reason to believe that the number of school children taking advantage of the 3-cent fare will decrease in the immediate future. In fact, the number of school fares has been steadily increasing according to data furnished to me by Capital Transit.

It is clear that one of the reasons in the past which has compelled the Capital Transit Co. to request increases in other fares is the loss suffered in carrying school children at the 3-cent fare. The company believes that the rate which has been in existence for almost 22 years should now be changed to absorb some of the annual losses in carrying such school children, and it seems to me that such a course is both equitable and necessary.

At this point I insert as part of my statement a memorandum from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress which lists fares charged children and students by transit companies in other cities. Attention is called to the net changes in fares since July 1951:

"TRANSIT FARE SCHEDULES FOR CHILDREN AND STUDENTS IN VARIOUS LARGE CITIES, 1952

"BALTIMORE

"The Baltimore Transit Co. charges 8 cents for both children to 12 years of age and students through high school.

"Net change (since July 1951): Fares increased from 7 cents to 8 cents.

"CHICAGO

"The Chicago Motor Co. has merged with the Chicago Transit Authority and the present fare which applies throughout the Authority system is: For children up to 12 years of age and for students through high school, the fare is 10 cents or 5 tokens for 40 cents.

"Net change: Cash fare increased from 7 to 10 cents, with the introduction of 5 tokens for 40 cents.

"CLEVELAND

"The Cleveland Transit System charges 5 cents cash or 6 tokens for 25 cents for children up to 12 years of age. Students through high school may purchase a weekly pass for 70 cents which is good on school days between 6 a. m. and 6 p. m.

"Net change: Weekly pass increased from 60 to 70 cents.

"DETROIT

"The Detroit Department of Street Railways has no children's rates. Students through high school ride for 10 cents, from 7 a. m. to 5 p. m. on school days upon presentation of an identification card.

"Net change: Fare increased from 5 cents to 10 cents.

"KANSAS CITY

"The Kansas City Public Service Co. charges 5 cents for children up to 12 years of age, plus 5 cents on zones outside the city limits. It also has a 50-cent weekly permit for students through high school. Additional rides after school hours are allowed for 5 cents upon presentation of the permit.

"No net change.

"MILWAUKEE

"The Milwaukee Electric Railway Transport Co. charges 7 cents or 4 tokens for 25 cents for children up to 12 years of age. It also has a weekly pass for 75 cents and a suburban pass for $1, for students through 18 years of age. The student rate is effective between 7:15 a. m. and 4:45 p. m., Monday through Friday.

"Net change: The addition of a suburban pass for $1.

"MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL

"The Twin City Rapid Transit Co. has no children's rate. It has a rate of 10 cents for students up to 18 years of age which is good at all times but which is not good on express lines.

"No net change.

"PHILADELPHIA

"The Philadelphia Transit Co. has no children's rate. Students are sold 10 tokens for 75 cents, which are good between the hours of 7 a. m. and 5:30 p. m.

"No net change.

"PITTSBURGH

"The Pittsburgh Railways Co. has fixed children's rates at 10 cents. A weekly pass is sold to students for 85 cents which is good on school days from 6 a. m. to 4:30 p. m.

"Net change: Introduction of a 10-cent fare for children, also an increase of the

charge for the student pass from 75 cents to 85 cents.

"ST. LOUIS

"The St. Louis Public Service Co. has a children's fare of 10 cents which is not good on express lines. Express lines may be used upon payment of an additional 3 cents. There is a 90-cent weekly pass for students which is good on school days from 7 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. This pass may be used at other times upon payment of an additional 5 cents. The pass is not honored on express lines.

"Net change: Children's rate increased from 5 cents to 10 cents, and children's express rates increased from 10 cents to 13 cents. Students weekly pass increased from 75 cents to 90 cents.

"Source: American Transit Association, Transit Fare Bulletin No. 807, November 1, 1952, and Supplement, November 16, 1952."

I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that the general public feels that the present school rate is inequitable and absurd. Various local newspapers have expressed themselves strongly in this matter. The Washington Post on June 7, 1952, in connection with a forthcoming report to Congress by Mr. James M. Landis on transit service said, "One thing we hope he will call to congressional attention is the ridiculousness of the present 3-cent school fare." Again on August 22, 1952, the Washington Post editorially says, "One thing that would help to keep regular fares stable would be a concerted approach to Congress to raise the grossly inequitable 3-cent school fare."

The Evening Star on June 7, 1952, in discussing the local transit outlook said, "Congress meanwhile could help by relieving the company of at least part of the private subsidy which now goes to the city's school children. The requirement by an outmoded law that the company transport students for 3 cents is burdensome and should be changed. Nowhere else in America may school children ride public buses or streetcars for less than 5 cents. Most cities have a 7-cent rate." Again on July 8, 1952, the Evening Star in its editorial columns said, "Congress had an opportunity to help the fare situation here but muffed it. It failed to act on a bill to increase the absurd 3-cent school fare to approximately half the cash fare. The 3-cent rate for school children was fixed by Congress in 1933, when such a low fare was not unreasonable. No other city in the country has so low a school fare today. If this subsidy is to be continued at its present level, the losses should be borne by the general public, not just by transit riders, as now is the situation."

As a further illustration of the feeling of the general public in the matter, I wish to insert as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Ben W. Gilbert which appeared in the Washington Post on August 31, 1952:

"ADULTS MAKE UP OUR LOW SCHOOL FARE

"(By Ben W. Gilbert)

"The prospect of even higher streetcar and bus fares in the District focuses attention on our unique school fare.

"The absurdly low 3-cent fare can have only one effect under our present method of rate regulation: it raises the other rates.

"As costs increase, Capital Transit acquires the right to go before the Public Utilities Commission and ask for higher rates. In the list of costs submitted to the PUC must be any increases in the cost of transporting school children.

"First established in 1931 by order of the PUC, the 3-cent school fare was riveted into the law in 1933. In 1934, CTC collected 4,000,000 fares at the rate of 3 cents a fare, compared to nearly 10,000,000 fares in 1951 at the same rate. CTC claims it lost $132,000 on its school business in 1934 and nearly six times that amount in 1950—even more than that in 1951.

"The adult fare in 1933 was 10 cents cash and 7½ cents for a token. CTC went into the recent fare hearings with a 15-cent cash fare and a token price 13⅓ cents. The new fares effective today at 5 a. m., are 17 cents cash, five tokens for 75 cents and weekly passes at $2.40.

"A popular fare, the school rate has provided a cushion against hardship for low-income families which are forced to send their children great distances to school. Some Congressmen have indicated that it would be politically unwise to vote to abolish the school fare.

"However, its continuation in the face of rising costs has so distorted the city's fare structure that CTC was moved in 1951 to ask Congress to change the setup. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND (Democrat, Florida) introduced the legislation at the request of the company, which is now controlled by the Wolfson group of Florida.

"CTC and Senator HOLLAND realized that it would not be practical to call for outright repeal of the school rate restriction. It was proposed instead that the PUC be allowed to establish a school rate at no more than half the adult rate.

"Such a plan would allow school costs to keep pace with other costs.

"Questioning of witnesses by members of the Senate District Subcommittee to which the Holland bill was referred brought out these points:

"1. That some sort of subsidy for school children is desirable in the interest of their education.

"2. That staggering of school hours would help the transit company handle the load of school children at less expense, but that there was too much opposition to separating school hours from parents' working hours.

"3. That the school pass has been widely abused. Good only for travel to and from school, it is nevertheless used outside of school hours and by youths over 18.

"4. That members of Congress fear that passage of the legislation might be used by the PUC as an occasion for giving Capital Transit a revenue raise that it might not be entitled to. Capital Transit disputed this contention, citing the way costs are rising.

"5. There was a general feeling that school fares should be raised to meet rising transit company costs, but no agreement on the amount.

"6. If Congress had built enough modern school buildings at convenient locations, the transit company would not face the same school fare problem.

"7. Comparable school rates in other cities are substantially higher, although school children generally ride for less than adults.

"8. Some communities drastically restrict school tickets, honoring them only for trips to and from school.

"Mrs. Frank S. Phillips, testifying as chairman of the legislative committee of the school board, agreed that the present fare was 'too low.' Mrs. Leo Raywid, president of the District Congress of Parents and Teachers, expressed the hope that the fare would not be raised above 5 cents.

"Bernard C. Chapman, representing the Northeast Boundary Civic Association, pleaded with the committee not to raise school fares above 5 cents because many northeast Negro children in the lower grades have to travel considerable distances by bus and streetcar.

"The legislation never did get out of committee. The subcommittee nearly reported it out last spring, but deferred action at the last minute to get time to study the Landis report on the Washington transit crisis."

In the effort to get at the facts, I have gone into this matter in detail with the Public Utilities Commission and the Capital Transit Co., and also to some extent with the school authorities of the District. I have likewise discussed it with many of my distinguished colleagues.

My careful study of this matter has convinced me that legislation such as I have introduced is urgently needed, and that it is the duty of Congress to act as soon as possible. The rates charged in other cities clearly show that the rates for school children in the District of Columbia are considerably lower than the rates charged school children in other American cities of comparable size. Obviously this loss of revenue places an unfair burden on other local transit riders in that they must pay ever-increasing fares to make up this deficit. If the District of Columbia is to have a sound, stable, and equitable schedule of transit fares, the Public Utilities Commission must be granted authority to fix rates for school children at a figure more equitable when compared with the general rate structure, and my bill proposes that the new rate shall not be more than one-half of the cash fare established from time to time by the Commission for regular route transportation.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to what has been known as the St. Lawrence seaway project. Joining with me in the introduction of the bill are the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I hope that many other Senators will join in sponsoring this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared in connection with the introduction of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 589) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON INTRODUCTION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION

I am introducing today a new version of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway legislation. I have previously described this legislation in the January 13 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A99.

I am offering this bill today in conjunction with the following colleagues: Mr. TAFT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER.

It is my earnest hope that this version of the seaway bill will constitute the culmination of the three-decade-long fight for this great objective.

Down through the years we have attempted to perfect this legislation to the greatest possible extent. We have made change after change in it. We have reduced the over-all cost involved. For example, when original seaway legislation was objected to on the ground that it would cost the Federal Government money the bill was revised so as to make the project 100 percent self-liquidating.

In last year's version of the bill the cost to Uncle Sam on a self-liquidating basis was to be $566,000,000. This year we have reduced that cost down to $100,000,000.

If ever a group offered legislation in good faith and with every effort to satisfy any legitimate suggestions made by the opposition, it is the group of those Senators and Congressmen who have put forth this great proposal.

On the House side, a similar version of this legislation has been introduced by Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO. Only a few tiny technical changes distinguish the two bills.

It is my intention in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to designate a subcommittee of that group to hold hearings on this legislation at the earliest possible date. I believe that the temper of the Foreign Relations Committee is such that we are certain to report the bill out favorably and by a heavy vote. Thereafter I shall respectfully ask the majority leader and the minority leader for their cooperation in bringing the seaway bill up for final vote.

All possible speed is necessary. This is not an issue which we can allow to wait for the usual last-minute rush of legislation in July. This is something on which we must act, act soon, and, I earnestly hope, act favorably.

Because this is a new-type seaway bill, numerous Senators who have always been highly sympathetic to the seaway, and who are today, have asked additional time to study it.

But for that fact, a great many more cosponsors would be listed on the measure today.

I have taken this subject up both with Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, and they have assured me of their early consideration of this new bill. Secretary of State Dulles had told me that he definitely favors United States participation with Canada in the construction of Great Lakes seaway canals, and we all recall how Ike supported this effort while he was head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I am keenly aware of the fact that the opposition lobbyists have been working night and day to sabotage our efforts once again. It is my earnest hope, however, that they will suffer the defeat which their blind, backward-looking efforts so well deserve.

I respect the viewpoint of those of my colleagues who may still differ with us on the seaway, but I earnestly ask them to take a new look at this new bill and to see if it does not satisfy the last reasonable objection which they may have had to this great effort.

INCREASE OF LEVEL OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR CERTAIN BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the level of price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 595) to increase the level of price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I have introduced a bill to increase the support price on basic agricultural commodities for the years 1953 and 1954 from 90 percent of parity to 95 percent of parity.

Several years ago there was a tremendous surplus of cotton and as a result cotton prices were less than parity. In order to increase the price of this commodity so that a farmer could meet the cost of production, the Congress increased the support price of cotton to 95 percent of parity.

Mr. President, it worked well. It did not injure the cotton exchanges or the trade and it did achieve the goal of the Democratic administration in bringing farm commodities nearer parity levels. This provision applied only to cotton at that time because cotton was the only commodity which had fallen slightly below the parity levels.

All basic farm commodities are now drastically declining. The farmer's costs have not only failed to decline but are actually increasing. American agriculture is caught in a squeeze between falling prices and increasing costs which threatens the entire economy of this Nation. In fact, we hear it predicted on every side that the economic cycle has reached the phase at which it stood in 1929. We have a booming stock market; manufacturing industries were never so prosperous, but America's great agricultural industry faces depression.

According to U. S. News & World Report, farm income will decrease $2,500,000,000 in 1953, while every other economic segment in the Nation will receive an increased share of the national income. We must not repeat the history of the 1920's.

It is the purpose of this bill to moderately increase the prices of basic agricultural commodities in the market place so that agriculture can purchase the products of industry, the farmer can make a profit from his labor and a depression be averted. If this bill is enacted it will not result in an increase in the cost of living. In fact, these moderate increases would not be felt at retail levels.

During the recent political campaign President Eisenhower, speaking at Kasson, Minn., had this to say:

> And I don't have to tell you that unprofitable prices not only threaten the security of our farms but also sap the prosperity and strength of our whole Nation. * * *
>
> I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal. * * *
>
> And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity. * * *
>
> Now I give you this positive assurance. The Republican Party will use every legitimate means to see that American farmers obtain their full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country.

That was a definite commitment to American agriculture that agriculture would receive full parity prices.

Mr. President, during the campaign, the Republicans were critical of the Democratic administration for only offering the farmers 90 percent of parity prices. President Eisenhower stated it was the policy of the Republican Party to secure full parity for American agriculture. This bill is a step toward full parity. It is in keeping with the solemn assurances given the American farmer by the present administration. I believe these promises were sincerely made. There can be no serious objection to the passage of this bill. In the long run it will cost the American Government nothing and will strengthen the entire economy of the Nation.

This bill is not designed as a farm program but as a stopgap device to bolster sagging farm income. The farm program itself must concern itself, as it always has, with the disposal of the surpluses.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a 2-minute statement in connection with the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] in the introduction of this bill which would provide 95-percent supports for basic commodities for a 2-year period. It would be desirable if a high level of support could be maintained by the Government on a wide variety of commodities. I hope the day is not far off when we can have it. A high level of support for basic commodities such as corn, cotton, and wheat would have a direct influence in stabilizing prices of most other agricultural commodities. Basic commodities are vital to the minimum living standard of people all over the world.

Most people of the world have had to exist for centuries with little other than these necessities of life. They are highly important in any war-preparedness program. If we have sizable surpluses, for example, of corn and wheat and feed grains, we can, in a comparatively short period of time, produce large quantities of other food necessities, such as poultry, eggs, pork, and even measurably increase

supplies of dairy commodities and beef. At this time, when we are purposely carrying large surpluses of these basic farm commodities—surpluses which have a serious depressing effect on prices—the least we could do for the farmers of this Nation is to provide them a fair level of price supports.

It would seem to me wise, from a Government standpoint, and particularly in the best interests of the farmers affected, that the Government should stockpile large quantities of these important commodities so necessary in the event of any possible war situation.

Until such time as surpluses created for war purposes are stockpiled, it would seem to me only fair that they be provided at least 95 percent of parity, as provided in this bill. It has always seemed to me rather unfair to carry large surpluses of these commodities under the guise of a farm price-support program when more properly they should be carried in a separate stockpile the same as we do other scarce war materials.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend and extend the Reorganization Act of 1949. In introducing this bill I am joined by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the ranking Democrat on the committee. I may say that the only change proposed in the Reorganization Act passed in 1949 is to provide for a veto by a simple majority, rather than by a constitutional majority of either the Senate or House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I am very happy to join in cosponsoring the bill which he has introduced. I believe the act should be extended, and I believe the provision which has been referred to and which is presently in the act should be modified as proposed by this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, 4 years ago both the Senator from Arkansas, who was then the chairman of the committee, and I, who was the ranking minority member at that time, believed that the Reorganization Act should contain the provision which we are now suggesting. This is not a new position we are taking. We fought for it previously, but were not successful.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, let me say that he will recall that we were in conference on that bill for some 2 months before we were able finally to compromise on the present provisions of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

The bill (S. 597) to amend and extend the Reorganization Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

INCREASE IN PER DIEM ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN AGENTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 6, 1953, relating to the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 603) to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 6, 1953.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of agents assigned to the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation would authorize the payment of a per diem allowance at a rate of not more than $12 to special agents of the United States Secret Service during the time they are traveling within the continental limits of the United States on official business in connection with the protection of the President of the United States or the protection of members of the President's immediate family, the President-elect, or the Vice President. At the present time, such agents receive the $9 per diem allowance provided for other civilian officers and employees of the Government who travel on official business within the United States.

In protecting the President, agents of the Secret Service accompany the President on all trips. The agents travel on the same train, stay at the same hotel as the President. Prices of meals aboard the presidential train are comparable to prices in expensive restaurants, and the daily cost of meals aboard the train frequently exceeds the amount of per diem allowance for subsistence. When the President stays at a hotel, the daily cost of an agent's hotel room, which necessarily must be near the presidential suite, alone consumes the major portion of the agent's per diem allowance, even when more than one agent occupies the room. Agents assigned to accompany the President thus are often required to spend their personal funds for a portion of their subsistence expenses. On extended trips the monetary loss to these agents may be considerable. The practical effect is that an agent assigned to presidential protection duties suffers a reduction in salary. The average daily cost of subsistence to agents accompanying the President is approximately $12 at prevailing prices. The Department is of the opinion that, as this cost represents expenses necessarily incurred by agents traveling on official business for the Government, it should be borne by the Government.

The Department also believes that a higher rate of per diem allowance should be authorized where agents accompanying members of the President's family, the President-elect, or the Vice President are required in the course of duty to incur unusual subsistence expenses. The subsistence expenses of Secret Service agents assigned to accompany members of the President's family, the President-elect, and the Vice President frequently are as high as those of agents who accompany the President. The proposed legislation would provide necessary flexibility in fixing the rate of per diem allowance in individual cases by vesting authority in the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the rate of such allowances, not to exceed $12.

If consideration of the problem indicates that other employees of the Government should also be covered by the proposed legislation, this Department would of course have no objection to its being broadened in that respect.

It is requested that you lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

E. H. FOLEY,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

IMMIGRATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN AS NONQUOTA IMMIGRANTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants.

Members of the Senate will recall that during the Eighty-first Congress I introduced an amendment to the Displaced Persons Act allowing for the entry of war orphans into the United States. That amendment became law. As a result, more than 4,000 European children were brought into the United States. The Displaced Persons Act has now expired, but the need to bring young children into the United States continues.

Within the last few weeks an article appeared in the Pathfinder magazine written by Evelyn Petersen, an outstanding journalist. That article estimated that at least 1,500 children were still available in Europe for immigration to the United States. Miss Petersen asked me if I was planning to introduce legislation to meet this need. I replied: "If enough people write or wire me I will proceed at once." As a result of that article I have received scores of letters from all over the United States from American men and women who desire to adopt children abroad and bring them here. That response proves the need and I am introducing this bill in response to that need.

The United States Children's Bureau estimates that about 80,000 families filed petitions in 1951 to adopt babies. A little more than half of the petitions were for stepchildren or relatives. That left almost 40,000 nonrelative adoptions. Licensed agencies report that for every couple who receive a child today there are 10 to 15 couples who apply and do not get one.

Many Americans have families and relatives in Europe. They know homeless children who would welcome an op-

portunity to grow up as fine American citizens. Yet these children are virtually barred from the United States by our immigration quotas.

My bill provides that the children under 18 may enter the United States as nonquota immigrants if an American family gives satisfactory assurances that these children will be adopted as soon as they come here.

It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will act on this bill without delay.

The bill (S. 600) to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG INSPECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to correct a serious loophole in existing legislation dealing with Federal food and drug inspection.

On December 8 the Supreme Court in an 8-to-1 decision in the case of United States against Ira D. Cardiff held that the sections of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act authorizing plant inspections for possible violations of our laws after first making request and providing criminal penalties for refusing to give consent were too contradictory and uncertain to stand as criminal law. The Court said that the statute as written was not fair warning to the factory manager that if he fails to give consent, he is a criminal.

The result of this decision has been to nullify the enforceability of the factory inspection sections of the food and drug inspection statute. It is clear from an examination of the record that the clear intent of the Congress was to provide for that enforceability. Food and Drug Commissioner, C. W. Crawford, in commenting on the Supreme Court decision said:

> The Supreme Court decision knocks out the enforceability of the factory inspection provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and by so doing it also makes impossible enforcement of other vital sections of the act which require evidence obtained by factory inspections.
>
> All the provisions of the law to protect the consumer's health and pocketbook are most effectively enforced through factory inspection simply because adulterations can best be detected at their source by going into the plant and seeing what is being done. The provision which forbids shipment of foods, drugs and cosmetics which have been produced under unsanitary conditions can hardly be enforced at all except through factory inspection. In those instances where soluble filth gets into the product itself, laboratory analyses cannot be relied upon to detect it, and here again factory inspection evidence is essential. In the field of drugs, there is no other way to check the control methods used by manufacturers to insure purity, potency and correct labels on products which often mean life or death to the patient.

The bill which I introduced is a simple change in wording to replace the ambiguous wording upon which the Supreme Court invalidated the section. The change would require the Food and Drug inspectors to give written notice when they plan to enter the premises. The penalties for refusal would remain unchanged, but the revision would make it clear that the right to inspect is not contingent on obtaining permission of the person in charge. The factory inspection statute has proved workable and highly usable since it was enacted in 1938. This bill would simply restore its validity.

It is my understanding that the trade associations directly involved have expressed themselves as in favor of this amendment. These groups include the American Drug Manufacturers Association, the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the Toilet Goods Association, the Grocery Manufacturers of America, and several other food industries of America.

I want to express my high regard for these groups in this expression of their deep and sincere interest in the public health and welfare.

Mr. President, I may say in concluding that this measure is of extreme importance today, in view of the variety of new drug products coming on the market. I have talked this matter over very carefully with the Food and Drug Administration, and I can assure Senators that unless something is done to plug in a proper way the loophole which was found in this law by the Supreme Court—and I am not criticizing the Court; I think the Court was right in its decision, since the law was not clear—the country can be literally flooded with pharmaceutical preparations and many synthetic food products which will seriously jeopardize the health of the American people.

I point out, Mr. President, that there are so many new products coming on the market that the authority which the Food and Drug Administration now asks for, and which they carefully thought out, is today essential to the protection of the public health.

The bill (S. 601) to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY AT SEA

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain, and other similar bulk cargoes. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Treasury Department outlining the purposes of this proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 602) to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain, and other similar bulk cargoes, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

> TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
> *Washington, January 7, 1953.*
>
> The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
>
> SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of proposed bill to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain, and other similar bulk cargoes.
>
> The International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, was ratified by the United States on April 20, 1949, 64 Stat. part II—and this ratification was deposited on January 1, 1950, with the Government of the United Kingdom. The aforesaid convention will enter into force on November 19, 1952. In regulation 2, chapter VI of the regulations, which constitute an integral part of the convention, there are set forth basic regulations pertaining to the carriage of grain. It is the view of the Treasury Department that these regulations were intended to merely outline a basic minimum of safety standards for the carriage of grain aboard vessels and that additional enabling legislation is required to further effectuate this phase of the safety of life at sea program.
>
> Accordingly, the Treasury Department has prepared the attached legislation which will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make such rules and regulations and to prescribe such restrictions and conditions as he deems necessary for the loading, stowage, and securing of grains, and other similar bulk cargoes that present hazards to the stability of vessels by shifting.
>
> Under this proposed legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury may avail himself of the advice, services, and facilities of any private nonprofit organization, or, with the consent of the head thereof, of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government.
>
> The proposed legislation, if enacted, will not entail any additional expenditure of Government funds.
>
> It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
>
> The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> JOHN S. GRAHAM,
> *Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing to

amend the Constitution of the United States, which would prevent both the Federal Government and the States from requiring the payment of a poll tax as a condition for participation in the election of any Federal official. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on behalf of myself and the other sponsors of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HOLLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND REGARDING POLL TAX AMENDMENT

I have today introduced in the Senate for myself and 9 other Senators from southern States a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors participating in the election of elective Federal officials, including electors for President or Vice President, and Senators and Representatives in Congress. The proposed new article of the Constitution contains three sections, as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The adoption of this amendment as a part of the Federal Constitution would result in preventing both the United States and any of the States of the Union from denying or abridging the right of citizens from participating in the election of Federal officials because of failure to pay any poll or head tax or any tax of any other kind or to meet any property qualification, with the exception of those citizens who by law are denied the right to vote because they are paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions. The adoption of this amendment would, therefore, bring a complete end to the so-called poll-tax controversy and would at the same time prevent the setting up of some new requirement as a qualification for voting, such as the requirement that some other tax be paid or some certain class or amount of property be owned by a citizen in order to qualify him for voting, with the exception just mentioned relating to paupers and persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

It will be recalled that I introduced similar joint resolutions in the Eighty-first Congress and in the Eighty-second Congress for several other southern Senators and myself. These resolutions were never acted upon by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to which they were referred. I am now glad to announce that in reintroducing this joint resolution today I am joined by the following distinguished Senators as cosponors, namely my colleague from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE of Georgia, Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG of Louisiana and Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

We sponsors of this joint resolution strongly believe that the resolution should be speedily submitted by this Congress to the States for ratification, and, if so submitted, we believe that it will be quickly ratified by at least the required 36 States. Because we are so sure that the requisite number of States would speedily ratify the resolution we are quite agreeable to the allowing of any reasonable short period of time for the consideration and ratification of this resolution. In the case that either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Senate feels that such a time limitation should be imposed, we are agreeable to limiting the time of consideration of the amendment by the States to as little as 3 years. We call attention to the fact that when the seventeenth amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators, and opposed on many of the identical grounds heretofore voiced against our proposed amendment, was submitted to the States for ratification on May 13, 1912, the ratification was completed by the 36th ratifying State on April 8, 1913, or less than 11 months after the date of submission. Of the 37 ratifying States 5 of them were Southern States which at the time had in force, under State law, poll-tax requirements for voting. The nineteenth amendment, providing suffrage for women required less than 15 months for adoption.

At the present time, only five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—require the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. While it is true that the State of Tennessee still has a constitutional provision for the payment of a poll tax, this requirement has been removed for all practicable purposes by recent legislative action. Also, I am advised that a limited constitutional convention will be held in Tennessee this year to consider the removal of the poll-tax requirement from the State constitution. For the record, I want the Senate to know that the poll-tax requirement was repealed by the State of Florida by legislative action in 1937, at which time I was a member of the State senate and was one of the supporters of the action by which repeal was accomplished.

The poll-tax requirement, now limited to the five States already mentioned, has been accorded far greater importance than it deserves. The fact of the matter is that the amount of poll tax required to be paid in the several States is so small as to impose only a slight economic obstacle for any citizen who desires to qualify to cast a ballot. This requirement operates, of course, equally on citizens of all races and colors, and is generally subject to important exemptions which limit its application, such as the exemption of veterans, of women, and of citizens beyond a certain age limit.

Notwithstanding the fact that all cosponsors of this proposed amendment feel that the importance of the poll-tax question has been maximized far beyond its actual effect, it is our feeling that the problem has been so widely discussed and has been so generally regarded as the imposition of an undemocratic handicap on Negro citizens who comprise a minority group in our Nation that it would be good public policy and in the interest of sounder democratic government to speedily move, through this proposed amendment, to bring a complete end to the imposition of the poll-tax requirement as a condition of participation in Federal elections. The proposed amendment would have no effect whatever upon the election of officials at the State or local level, but would leave this subject, as heretofore, to the discretion and jurisdiction of the several States.

Since there are many good citizens who have indicated their feeling that this subject matter should be dealt with through the passage of a Federal statute rather than through the adoption of a Federal constitutional amendment, we feel that it is proper to call attention to the fact that, as shown by the debates on this subject over many years in both the Senate and House of Representatives, there are many able constitutional lawyers, coming not only from the South but also from all other portions of the Nation, who have always believed and contended that the only legal way to deal with this question, other than through action by the States themselves, is by Federal constitutional amendment, and that action through Federal statute would clearly violate the provisions and requirements of the Federal Constitution under which the qualification of electors, as prescribed under the laws of the several States, is adopted as the qualification of electors to vote upon Federal officials.

The sponsors of the resolution which I have just introduced have very deep convictions on this matter, and I feel that I should say for each and all of us that we regard the Federal Government as without any authority whatsoever to deal with this subject matter except by the submission and ratification of a Federal constitutional amendment.

While this is no time or place for a full statement of the position of the sponsors of the proposed amendment, I feel that it is proper to call brief attention to the following facts which support our conviction:

1. The framers of the original Constitution in 1787 provided for the election of Members of the House of Representatives under section 2 of article I of the original Constitution, part of which reads as follows:

"The electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

At the very time that the original Constitution was being drafted and while it was being considered by the several States, there appeared in the constitutions of most of the original 13 States specific requirements for electors of the most numerous branch of their respective legislatures, which requirements were described by the use of the very word "qualifications," which requirements comprised either ownership of property of a stated nature or value or payment of taxes in a stated amount, or payment of poll taxes, specifically named as such. In the case of the State of New Hampshire, under its constitution of 1784, payment of a poll or head tax was specifically required as one of the qualifications for a citizen to vote for a member of the House of Representatives of New Hampshire which was the most numerous branch of the State legislature. It was against such an existing background in 1787 that the members of the Constitutional Convention wrote into our original Constitution the provision of section 2 of article I which I have already mentioned and which adopted as Federal qualifications for electors of Members of the House of Representatives the "qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

2. In 1912, 125 years after the drafting of the original Constitution, the Congress submitted the seventeenth amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators. The Congress saw fit at that time to incorporate in the seventeenth amendment and as a part of it the exact words which appear in section 2 of article I of the original Constitution where they apply to the election of Members of the House of Representatives. In other words, in submitting the seventeenth amendment the Congress used, and in ratifying the seventeenth amendment the several States again approved, the specific requirement thus made applicable to Members of the Senate that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legis-

lature." It is, of course, well known to every Member of the Senate that at the time of the submission and ratification of the seventeenth amendment a considerably larger number of States than the five which still preserve the poll-tax requirement, not only enforced that requirement but several States had embodied the same in their State constitutions as a qualification for voting, which fact was well known to the general public and to the Members of the Sixty-second Congress which submitted the amendment. Without arguing the matter at greater length at this time, I simply want to restate the fact that the sponsors of the proposed amendment have strong convictions that the Congress is without power to deal effectively with this subject matter through the passage of a Federal statute and that the adoption of such a statute would bring on protracted and unfruitful litigation, long delay, and questionable results. In the event such a statute should ever be upheld by the Supreme Court in the face of what we believe to be its complete unconstitutionality, it is clear that such a ruling would invite the Congress to adopt further provisions affecting the qualification of electors, as for instance provisions affecting the age requirement, the period of residence in the State or county, or both, and other requirements, all of which would seriously impinge upon the rights of the several States to fix these matters of important public policy within their own respective jurisdictions and based on their own experience and judgment.

The introducers of the proposed amendment are exceedingly anxious that it be acted upon speedily and favorably by the Congress so that this subject matter, which has been the source of such long controversy and fruitless debate, and on which both of the political parties are so fully committed, may be quickly submitted to the States where we believe that it will be promptly ratified. We feel that such a conclusion of this long standing controversy is decidedly in the interest of sound democratic government and stronger unity among all of the people of our Nation. Perhaps the speedy settlement of this issue may lead the way to moderate and clearly legal settlements of other long standing questions on which we have been long divided and sometimes even bitterly divided.

We are offering this amendment in the hope that it may receive friendly, favorable, and speedy action by the Congress. In the event it appears that this hope cannot be realized, but that the issue will again be subjected to long, protracted, and even bitter debate, we would prefer of course that it be laid aside, as the grave national and international problems which confront our Nation do not justify in our judgment the expenditure of any great time or effort or the indulging in any extended discussion of this subject. These perilous times call, in our opinion, for unity and harmony, and for quick, just, and lawful settlement of domestic controversy where such is reasonably possible. Where not possible, we believe that such controversies should be laid aside so that all citizens may unite in the tremendous joint effort which our national and international problems require of us.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION TO GUAM AND HAWAII

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration to Guam and Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me to accompany the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) to extend certain authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration to Guam and Hawaii, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART TO ACCOMPANY PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION TO EXTEND CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO GUAM AND HAWAII

The proposed joint resolution would place Hawaii and Guam in the same position as Alaska already occupies in respect to (1) the maximum mortgage amounts eligible for FHA insurance, and (2) the dollar limitations and advance commitments to purchase FHA insured mortgages applicable to FNMA, thus correcting certain inadequacies in the law which are stopping home construction urgently needed for military personnel in Guam and Hawaii. The authority which would be conferred by the proposed joint resolution for Guam and Hawaii has already been conferred by the Congress with respect to Alaska. The justification for uniform treatment in all three Territories is that they are all important defense outposts having unusually high construction costs and severe financing problems unless primary home mortgage lenders can obtain firm assurance of take-outs.

Because of these high construction costs in Alaska, resulting largely from shortages of materials and skilled labor and from high transportation expenses, the Congress (in the Alaska Housing Act, Public Law 52, 81st Cong.) authorized the Federal Housing Commissioner to increase the dollar maximum amounts for mortgages in Alaska eligible for FHA mortgage insurance. This increased maximum amount cannot exceed the amount otherwise applicable by more than 50 percent, nor the amount determined to be necessary to compensate for higher costs in Alaska. Also because of these higher costs, the Alaska Housing Act permitted the FNMA to purchase Government-insured or guaranteed home mortgages free from certain restrictions otherwise applicable, including the $10,000 limitation on each mortgage eligible for purchase.

Subsequent legislation has extended this special FHA mortgage insurace provision to Guam (sec. 10 (a) of Public Law 531, 82d Cong.) in recognition of the unusually high construction costs in that territory. However, that legislation did not provide the accompanying extension of the special FNMA authority contained in the Alaska Housing Act to purchase the higher-amount FHA mortgages. In practice, that omission has made the provision of FHA mortgage insurance for Guam completely ineffective. This results from the fact that private funds are available for investment in FHA-insured mortgages in Guam but only if authority is granted for their repurchase by FNMA—firm assurance of take-out.

The proposed joint resolution would extend these special FNMA provisions to Guam, thus removing an inconsistency in the present law and permitting urgently-needed home construction in Guam to proceed.

The proposed joint resolution would also extend to Hawaii the special FHA provision now applicable to Alaska and Guam, and would authorize the FNMA to purchase mortgages in Hawaii which are in excess of $10,000, as now authorized in Alaska and proposed for Guam. The facts with respect to building costs in that Territory are similar to those in Guam and Alaska, primarily because of the expense involved in shipping required building materials and equipment which are not manufactured or otherwise available in the Territory. Oahu, the principal island of Hawaii, has been designated a critical defense housing area under the Defense Housing Act of 1951 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.) and 1,000 dwellings, to be constructed by private builders for sale to military personnel, have been programed for Hawaii under that act. The sales prices for these dwellings approved under the defense housing program (especially those constructed on fee-owned land as compared with leaseholds) indicate that a large portion of them cannot be built by private builders unless the FHA is authorized to insure mortgages at higher amounts in the Territory than now permitted, and the FNMA is authorized to purchase these higher-amount mortgages notwithstanding the present $10,000 limitation. The proposed joint resolution would thus permit this defense housing to go forward with FHA mortgage insurance as contemplated by the Defense Housing Act of 1951.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me to accompany the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. CAPEHART TO ACCOMPANY PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 2 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The proposed joint resolution would amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, to increase the Federal Housing Administration's title I loan insurance authorization by $500,000,000 (from $1,250,000,000 to $1,750,000,000). This authorization covers insurance by the FHA of loans, which are generally not secured by mortgages, for the repair, alteration, or improvement of existing structures and, in the case of certain small loans, for some types of new construction.

The amendment would also modify section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act to make it clear that the new dollar limitation governing the title I insurance authorization refers to the aggregate of loan amounts advanced to borrowers, exclusive of financing charges. Thus, where the face amount of the loan note is $200, covering $190 advanced to the borrower and a $10 financing charge retained by the lender, under the proposed joint resolution, the sum of $190, rather than $200, would be charged against the total insurance authorization. This method of arriving at the available title I authorization

would be consistent with all the FHA authorization limitations contained in other titles of the National Housing Act.

The need for an increase in the title I authorization arises from the fact that the statutory limit of $1,250 million was reached during September 1952. Since that time the aggregate amount of loans accepted for insurance has had to be restricted to the amount of amortization and prepayments of loans previously insured. As of January 2, 1953, there was a backlog of over 260,000 loan reports received by the FHA with a face amount of approximately $175,000,000. This backlog, together with the loan reports which have since come in from qualified title I lending institutions throughout the country, must wait upon the liquidation of loans outstanding or upon an increase in the statutory limit of authorization before they can be processed and registered for insurance. In the absence of an increase in authorization, this backlog will soon reach such levels that it will be necessary, as a practical matter, to discontinue insuring operations until the backlog is greatly reduced. Such a disruption of the program would, of course, be harmful to homeowners, lending institutions, building contractors, and suppliers of building materials and equipment.

During the first part of 1952 the need for an increase in the authorization of insurance under title I became evident from the marked increase in both the number and dollar amount of property improvement loans which were accepted for insurance. In the first quarter of 1952, there was an increase over the first quarter of 1951 of 19 percent in the number of loans and 39 percent in their dollar amount. When the April and May 1952 figures showed an even higher rate of increase over the comparable months in 1951, it was estimated such rate increases in future months would exhaust the authorization.

The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in his letter of June 20, 1952, advised the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency of the impending exhaustion of the title I authorization and submitted for the consideration of the committee a draft of a legislative proposal for increasing the authorization. However, there was inadequate time to consider this legislation during the closing days of the Eighty-second Congress. On July 25, 1952, the Federal Housing Administration notified all qualified title I lending institutions that the statutory limit for loans outstanding would be reached within the next few months if the volume of loans continued at the rate reported in May and June. Thereafter, the registering of loan reports for insurance recordation would be limited to the amount of liquidation of loans previously accepted for insurance. The lending institutions were further advised that they could continue to send in loan reports, but there would be a delay in the acceptance of these loan reports for insurance.

When the loan reports for June, July, and August 1952 continued to show substantial increases over the comparable months of 1951, it was estimated that the statutory limit for the title I authorization would be reached on or about September 7, 1952. On the following day restrictions were imposed on the registration of loan reports for insurance in accordance with the procedures explained to the lending institutions. Between September 8, 1952, and January 2, 1953, a total of 660,000 loan reports were submitted for insurance. (The total number of loan reports received in the comparable period a year earlier was 553,000.) During this period 400,000 loan reports were authorized for insurance because of the amortization and prepayments (averaging about $75,000,000 per month) on loans outstanding. The balance of over 260,000 is the backlog of loan reports awaiting processing.

The increase in the statutory limit to $1,750,000,000 for the title I authorization, it is estimated, would be sufficient to accommodate the estimated volume of the eligible property improvement loans through the end of June 1954. This estimate is predicated upon the adoption of the new proposed basis for the measurement of insurance authorization and is also based on the expectation that the dollar volume of loans accepted for insurance will continue at the current rate through the fiscal year 1954.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 30, 1952 (authorizing an investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs), is amended by striking out the date "January 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1953."

(b) Section 3 of such resolution is amended by striking out the figure "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$75,000"; and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the words "or subcommittee, as the case may be."

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF FUEL RESERVES

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45) which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 239, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 374, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to December 21, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 33, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 242, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued through January 31, 1954.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 239, Eighty-first Congress, second session, agreed to August 15, 1950, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 46), and submitted a report (No. 11) thereon; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $150,000, and such sum, together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before January 31, 1954.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 47), and submitted a report (No. 12) thereon; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 245, Eighty-second Congress, relating to an examination and review of the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, agreed to March 24, 1952, is hereby increased by $50,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before June 30, 1953.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN CONNECTION WITH IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution. The resolution deals with an appropriation for the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by the staff, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and, without objection, the memorandum presented by the Senator from North Dakota, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) reported by Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The memorandum presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

Senate Resolution 48, which provides $97,000 additional funds to the Committee on the Judiciary for a 1-year period beginning February 1, 1953, is needed principally to maintain the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. The subcommittee has been maintained exclusively by funds provided by special resolutions since the first session of the Eightieth Congress, which was the first Congress operating under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The subcommittee is presently maintained from funds provided pursuant to Senate Resolution 261 of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress. Senate Resolution 261 provided $97,000 for a 1-year period, and will expire on January 31, 1953. At the expiration of Senate Resolution 261 on January 31, 1953, there will be an unexpended balance of approximately $9,000.

WORKLOAD OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, which, as previously pointed out, was the first Congress operating under the Legislative Reorganization Act, there has been a substantial and ever-increasing workload on the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.

PRIVATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILLS

As shown in the table following, the number of private immigration and naturalization bills referred by the Senate has progressively increased from 58 in the Seventy-eighth Congress to 114 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to 465 in the Eightieth Congress, to 1,448 in the Eighty-first Congress, to 1,811 in the Eighty-second Congress.

Of the 1,811 private immigration or naturalization bills which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary during the Eighty-second Congress, 1,230 were disposed of, of which number 821 were reported favorably to the Senate, and 409 were indefinitely postponed.

The following table illustrates the progressively increasing number of private immigration and naturalization bills:

Comparative table showing the number of private immigration or naturalization bills referred by the Senate during the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, and 82d Congs.

78th Cong.	58
79th Cong.	114
80th Cong.	465
81st Cong.	1,448
82d Cong.	1,811

It is roughly estimated that the time devoted by a staff member to the average private bill is approximately 3 hours. In a typical case this involves:

(a) Docketing of the case and preparation of the file;

(b) Solicitation of reports from Government agencies, sponsor, and interested parties;

(c) Interview of interested parties, study of reports and other information, and preparation of résumé of the facts for the subcommittee;

(d) Discussion of case with the subcommittee, and thereafter in the full committee;

(e) Preparation of report to the Senate on the case if committee action is favorable;

(f) Preparation of letter to sponsor if committee action is unfavorable;

(g) Transmission of information on Senate bills to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases in which an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case the staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

GENERAL IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILLS (OTHER THAN THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT)

There were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary 38 general immigration or naturalization bills during the Eighty-second Congress; 33 of these bills were disposed of, of which number 11 were reported favorably to the Senate and 22 were indefinitely postponed. This accounts for the full-time service of two staff members, plus the service of a stenographer, and is in addition to the work hereinafter set forth on the Immigration and Nationality Act.

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

On June 27, 1952, the immigration and naturalization omnibus bill became Public Law 414 after its enactment over a Presidential veto. The new act went into effect on December 24, 1952. In order to assure fair and effective interpretation and administration of the new act, considerable work hours of the staff have been and will be utilized in conference with enforcement officials, in research, and in the study of rules and regulations and administrative intrepretations.

REFERRAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The subcommittee has an extensive workload of referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised but which necessitates considerable work and accounts for the full-time services of one staff member and two stenographers.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION CASES

Under the immigration laws the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens to permanent resident, but such adjustment of status is subject to affirmative congressional approval in each case. These cases have progressively increased since the conclusion of World War II.

During the Eighty-first Congress the subcommittee had 7,538 cases of suspension of deportation. Of this number, 4,716 were recommended for approval in 33 concurrent resolutions.

During the Eighty-second Congress the subcommittee had for processing 13,290 cases of suspension of deportation. Of this number 7,145 were approved, 2,568 were held for further consideration, 81 were withdrawn by the Attorney General and 3,496 were "in process" as of the close of the Eighty-second Congress.

Under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, a number, not to exceed 15,000, of persons who have gained admission into the United States on a temporary basis may have their status adjusted to permanent residents. Each of these cases is subject to affirmative congressional approval by action similar to the action taken in the suspension of deportation cases.

During the Eighty-second Congress the subcommittee had 3,293 displaced persons referral cases, of which number 2,216 were approved, 28 were withdrawn by the Attorney General and 514 held for further consideration, leaving 535 cases "in process" at the end of the Eighty-second Congress.

Due to the substantial workload of the subcommittee's staff on other matters, only one staff member and one stenographer have been assigned full-time work on suspension of deportation cases and displaced persons referral cases. Other staff members have assisted in this work as their time permitted.

With the passage of the new Immigration and Nationality Act it is felt that more time can now be devoted to the screening of suspension cases for security purposes since, under the new law, only limited classes of suspension cases are required to have affirmative congressional approval.

SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

The present subcommittee staff consists of seven staff members and five stenographers. It is not contemplated that the staff will be increased. As previously pointed out, the instant resolution provides for the same amount to operate the subcommittee during the current period as was provided during the last session of the Congress ($97,000).

Proposed budget, standing immigration and naturalization subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Feb. 1, 1953, through Jan. 31, 1954—Staff expense

Position	Number	Base salary	Gross salary	Monthly salary	Total for period
Staff director	1	$7,320	$11,646.00	$970.50	$11,646.00
Attorney	5	5,640	9,404.83	783.73	47,024.15
Research clerk	1	4,920	8,370.35	660.86	8,370.35
Stenographer	5	3,120	5,525.75	460.47	27,628.75
Total staff expense					94,669.25

Nonstaff expense

Contingent fund	$500.00
Travel	830.75
Stationery	400.00
Telephone and telegraph	600.00
Total nonstaff expense	2,330.75

RECAPITULATION

Total staff expense	94,669.25
Total nonstaff expense	2,330.75
Total expense	97,000.00

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RESPECTING POSTAL RATES AND CHANGES IN HANDLING MAIL MATTER

Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered, and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which

may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than February 1, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, to contract with firms or organizations for personal services, and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations and, with special reference to rate-making in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorial, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Address entitled "States' Rights in Banking," delivered by him before the American Bankers Association on September 29, 1952.

Address delivered by him before the Kentucky Bankers Association on October 21, 1952.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Letter, dated January 22, 1953, addressed by him to the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at a meeting of labor leaders and others under sponsorship of the Jewish Labor Committee, on January 21, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Purge, Unlimited," published in the Washington Post of January 23, 1953.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Address delivered by former Senator Ashurst on the occasion of the Mormon Pioneer Day Celebration at Snowflake, Ariz., on July 26, 1952.

By Mr. TAFT:

Address delivered by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at annual dinner of the Fifty-seventh Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, on December 5, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address delivered by Ralph O. Hilligren before South Dakota State Historical Society at Pierre, S. Dak., on January 21, on the subject of Scandinavians in South Dakota.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered by W. L. Hemingway at a testimonial dinner in his honor, arranged by the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, in St. Louis, Mo., on December 9, 1952.

By Mr. CORDON:

Guest editorial entitled "Sawyer and Straus," written by Robert W. Sawyer, publisher of the Bend Bulletin, and published in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of January 6, 1953.

By Mr. NEELY:

Editorial entitled "The Great Changeover," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of January 20, 1953.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "Trade as Well as Aid Needed," published in the Washington Post of January 7, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Value of Railroads," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of January 13, 1953.

By Mr. MORSE:

Article entitled "Pattern for Revolt," written by Tris Coffin, and published in Red Book magazine for January 1953.

Articles entitled "What United States Can Do in Middle East," written by Georgiana C. Stevens, and published in the Foreign Policy Bulletin for July 1 and July 15, 1952.

Article entitled "Loyalty Oath—Oregon Veterans Declare Faith in Schools," written by Lyle M. Nelson, and published in the Washington Post of recent date.

Editorial entitled "Tch! Tch! Tch! No Oregon Float in Ike's Parade," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of January 13, 1953.

Three editorials dealing with the subject of Senator Morse's committee status in the Senate, viz, an editorial entitled "Senator Morse's Ability More Valuable Than a Label," published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot; an editorial entitled "The Choice Is Ours," published in the Citizen-Advertiser, of Auburn, N. Y.; and an editorial entitled "Old Guard Victory," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 9, 1953.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, within the near future representatives of more than 50 nations will meet in Washington to consider the continuation of the International Wheat Agreement under which the wheat-exporting nations, the United States, Canada, Australia, and France, have been annually selling to the wheat-importing nations of the world some 581,000,000 bushels of wheat or its equivalent in flour. The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee appointed the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and me to represent that committee on the advisory committee of the Secretary of Agriculture who will represent our country at the forthcoming international conference.

All Members of Congress who represent what may be termed "agricultural States" are deeply concerned over the sharp drop in recent months of our exports of farm products, which will undoubtedly be accentuated the coming fall when foreign-rehabilitation aid will have been virtually ended.

In anticipation of the loss of foreign markets for tobacco, the Secretary of Agriculture already has ordered a reduction in the acreage quota for flue-cured tobacco. Action on peanut-acreage quotas has not been announced, and no quotas have been imposed on the production of wheat, cotton, and corn, basic crops eligible to participate in the 90 percent of parity price-support program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

For the past 4 years we have been producing a surplus of wheat, but it has not been a burdensome surplus because a part of that surplus has been exported under the provisions of the Marshall plan and a part under the subsidy program of the International Wheat Agreement. It has been the function of the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay those export wheat subsidies and by the end of next June it is estimated that those subsidy payments will have amounted to $579,500,000. If American wheat growers, following the end of the current International Wheat Agreement, cannot find an export market for approximately 300,000,000 bushels of wheat or its equivalent in flour, we will have a burdensome supply of wheat under Government loan next fall and winter. Whether or not we will have a burdensome supply of cotton will largely depend upon the size of the 1953 crop.

There is no price support on cattle, and last fall cattle suffered the greatest price decline of any farm commodity, because of heavy marketings resulting from drought conditions plus a realization of the fact that cattle on feed had reached unprecedented numbers in this country. The over-all decline of farm prices during the past year has been approximately 14 percent, and in the absence of foreign markets there will be further price declines in the case of wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, vegetable oils, and lard.

In the Monday, January 19, issue of the Christian Science Monitor there is an interesting article by Harry C. Kenney entitled "The Assault on Trade Barriers." The manufacturers of motor vehicles, electrical equipment, and machine tools, and the producers of bituminous coal, have a vital stake in the subject of foreign trade, as well as our farmers. The Kenney article refers to an international conference to be held in Vienna next May, sponsored by the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, at which 1,000 representatives of 50 countries will gather to discuss plans for reduction in trade barriers and the promotion of freer world commerce.

Mr. President, in January 1937, I was assigned to the Ways and Means Com-

mittee of the House of Representatives. For the next 10 years I devoted the major part of my time and energy to the study of taxes and tariffs, which are closely related. During that period I was an enthusiastic supporter of the Hull program of reciprocal trade agreements, under which we would have made real progress in breaking down barriers to mutually beneficial international trade but for the fact that World War II and the Hitler aggression which preceded it commenced before the program could get well under way. During the period of that war, all normal international trade was disrupted, and frankness compels me to admit that we have had no normal international trade since that time. Our exports have been running at approximately double the rate of our imports, but have been sustained by taxpayers funds which we have either loaned or given away to the extent of billions of dollars. Very properly many of the supporters of General Eisenhower last fall who were opposed to that give-away program adopted the slogan "Trade and not aid." They were on sound ground in doing so but the problem now confronting the new administration is how that program is to be implemented.

In addressing the forty-first conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Bern, Switzerland, last August, I indicated how I thought the program could be implemented here and abroad and I wish to place emphasis on that word "abroad" because unless the so-called have-not nations will cooperate among themselves for the removal of trade barriers we are going to be hamstrung in our efforts in that behalf.

When I spoke in Switzerland last summer I spoke with optimism concerning the then budding plans for economic and political unification of the free countries of the world and especially those of Western Europe whose production has been increased nearly 50 percent above that prior to World War II and who will now face the necessity for export markets if they are to continue to import the raw materials essential for their economic stability. Subsequent developments have been very discouraging.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the editorial by Mr. Kenney on the subject which I have been discussing, published in the Christian Science Monitor last week, and also an address I delivered on the subject of international cooperation at a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Bern, Switzerland, on August 30, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSAULT ON TRADE BARRIERS

(By Harry C. Kenney)

NEW YORK.—The meaning of world trade is catching on in the United States. The laborer, the white-collar worker, and the grass-roots people are understanding more clearly what the interchange of goods between nations means to them personally.

Probably at no other time in history have the American people understood so well or have been so informed as today on the fact that the welfare of the free world is becoming a close-knit operation for survival.

Americans are coming to accept the thesis that isolationism—economically, politically, or otherwise—can be a threat to their way of life. They are earnestly sifting the views that would integrate the United States in world activity for their and its own well-being.

They understand more and more the meaning of tariffs and trade barriers and how they affect jobs, production, and income. Much of the credit for this goes to various national and international organizations which have long been in close touch with world trade and are in the business of informing people and governments about the cause and effect of national and international affairs.

Such is the widely known United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. Its declared position on world trade has long been that if the Western World is to flourish, it must achieve a prosperous growth of international trade under conditions which foster private enterprise.

It believes that to this end it is necessary that the American market be opened more freely to foreign goods than it is at the present time. It urges the reduction of United States trade barriers. It is convinced that a considerable increase of imports into the United States, compatible with the maintenance of living standards of our people and of prosperous business conditions for our industries, is entirely feasible.

It believes that growth of world trade is required for continued improvement in living standards and for preservation of sound business conditions both for us and for the rest of the free world. It is promoting two-way trade, not one-way aid.

For many years the chamber has been hammering at governments to get them to tackle some of the basic problems of international trade. It urges the reduction and/or elimination of restriction on documentation—the regulations imposed by each country on the importers and exporters, the shippers, bankers, and the brokers on whom rests the ultimate responsibility for carrying on world trade.

It has struck blows at the many injustices in the various barriers to exports and imports including exchange controls and unfair quotas. The chamber is urging a better basis for currency convertibility throughout the world and is working with many nations on the problems of foreign exchange, customs, and tariffs.

Officers of the chamber are well aware that all these vital economic problems are complicated by traditional international political differences and jealousies.

Warren Lee Pierson, the newly elected chief executive of the council, is proposing a specific approach by urging a citizens commission which would work outside of governments and would specifically advise the United States Government on practical policies.

The commission would examine from time to time whether or not the official United States policies were following the right path. It would provide the President with independent and disinterested political counsel. To prevent undue presidential control, the members of such a commission would be appointed by Congress.

The chamber is also holding a conference in Vienna in May when 50 countries will send 1,000 representatives and experts to discuss and plan for reductions in trade barriers and the promotion of freer world commerce. The theme of the conference is "world trade is everybody's business."

There is not complete agreement in the promotion of free-world trade, however. There are businesses in the United States that do not want any substantial reduction in trade barriers. Their business is national and the import of products in competition with them is unwelcome.

However, there are hundreds of international industries that have been working earnestly and fairly to lower trade barriers in an effort to increase and stabilize world trade.

It should be remembered, however, that tariffs are not the sole obstruction to greater trade. There are many other types of barriers and they all must be dealt with individually and collectively in the broad program of world interchange of goods.

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT FORTY-FIRST CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION AT BERN, SWITZERLAND, AUGUST 30, 1952

One of the great international statesmen of our generation is our former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. For many years I have been keenly interested in the type of international cooperation embodied in the reciprocal-trade program which he sponsored.

I am, therefore, happy to have this opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the Interparliamentary Union—the second oldest peace organization in the world and the first which has attempted to draw the elected representatives of the people directly into the work of international collaboration.

Approaching the agenda topic: "Limits to State Sovereignty," I want to make it clear that my primary interest is in that type of international collaboration which is voluntarily accepted and supported by parliamentary bodies of the respective countries rather than the type which would be enforced by a supranational federation or confederation. I am in agreement with the committees of this Union which studied the problem last April and concluded that any regional parliaments or other bodies established under defense pacts must have national parliamentary counterpoise because they would lose strength unless they rested on political authority and especially because these authorities, despite good intentions, might become a danger to the individual's independence and liberty.

Therefore, economic unification is the best foundation for political union. I am encouraged to feel that we are on the threshold of historic developments and real progress in this field.

The United States was formed as a political union of 13 sovereign States. We had great difficulty in the early days of our Nation in establishing a firm union which would protect the varied economic interests of the several States and we finally succeeded only because our Constitution clearly defined the limitations of Federal powers and reserved all other powers to the States or to the people. But in ratifying that Constitution all States agreed to impose no burden on interstate commerce, and we now have the largest free trade area in the world.

I recognize how much more difficult is the problem of a political union among the peoples of Europe who belong to ancient and varied races, histories, and civilizations, but, at the same time, I must point out frankly that the people of the United States feel that any further economic assistance to the free nations of the world must be conditioned on the willingness of those nations to stand shoulder to shoulder against Communist aggression and in defense of our mutual freedom. We also expect them to show some willingness to compromise their historic differences and to find ways and means of working together to strengthen their respective economies so that when the ravages of the last war have been repaired they may be equal partners in the continuing struggle to preserve constitutional liberty.

The United States has gladly contributed more than $100,000,000,000 in gifts, grants, or loans to other nations in recent years, at a time when this involved further increases in our own national debt and a heavier tax burden. We have done this, not expecting a direct monetary return but because our Nation since its birth has been dedicated to the cause of liberation, and we recognize

that liberty can be achieved and preserved only if men can fulfill their natural longings for better living conditions and for freedom from the scourge of recurring wars. We have realized that these ends will not be promoted by redividing the world's existing wealth, which would merely impoverish the rich without real benefit to the poor, but that we must increase the total wealth so that all may share in greater abundance. This calls not merely for a United States program but for a United Nations program of economic and social development, cooperatively planned and managed, with all participants, as in our Union, dedicated to the general welfare.

Such a program is dependent upon the adjustment of the barriers to increased international trade, whether they be tariffs, currency, or transportation. We in the United States have been encouraged by the progress already made along these lines by the European coal and steel community which organized its high authority less than a month ago (August 10). This plan has brought 155,000,000 people into a single customs area, so far as coal, iron, and steel are concerned, and will permit more efficient distribution of 40,000,000 tons of annual steel production and 230,000,000 tons of annual coal production. Most important, however, is the fact that the community is given stability by parliamentary agreements to leave the system in operation for a period of 50 years.

Equally encouraging is the European defense community now in process of formation by these same nations. By merging their national armies into a European army, these countries will facilitate the more efficient use of their military resources, will bury ancient rivalries and suspicions, and will lay a solid foundation for an adequate European defense system in the years to come. Moreover, by placing defense matters under international authority, which the participating countries themselves, under the treaty, will establish by parliamentary action, these countries will have taken another significant step toward more complete unity.

The ability of six European nations to do these things suggests the possibility of other and larger unions of free nations voluntarily formed for other purposes.

Just as one example of what might be done: Until recent years billions of cubic feet of natural gas were wasted in the United States by allowing it to escape or burning it as it came from the wells where oil was extracted. Then we realized the potentialities of transporting it over distances by pipelines and today millions of people in America are using natural gas for heat and power and it also has become the basis for a mushrooming petrochemical industry.

Meanwhile, however, flaring of gas that has no value because it cannot be moved and marketed continues in most of the world's oil regions outside of the United States, especially in the Middle East from which most of the Eastern Hemisphere gets its oil. I am informed that more than a billion cubic feet of gas is being lost every day in that area.

The idea of laying an international gas artery from the Middle East has been discussed and a preliminary study made by American engineers. They have stated it would be practicable to lay a pipeline 2,500 miles in length from the oil and gas fields to Paris, with deliveries to most consuming centers of Europe via branch lines.

Such a project might cost from $425 million to $775 million, depending on whether a single or double line were constructed and additional investments would be required in various cities which would have to construct local distribution systems. These investments would be sound, however, assuming continued successful operation of the pipeline, because they would make fuel available to the industries of Europe for less than half the present cost of coal or oil.

The one real problem in considering such a vast project is that of mutual confidence among the participating nations from which the capital investment would come. The line would run through many countries, each of which would benefit from it, but any one of them could defeat the project by refusal to give long-term guaranties that there would not be interference with its operations or burdensome regulation or confiscatory taxation of the property.

Experience has shown that there can be the kind of confidence which will encourage vast international investments. In the early days of the United States the British people invested billions of dollars in our country and made possible much of our early industrial development. They were encouraged to do this by the fact that the United States Constitution specifically guarantees sanctity of contracts. It forbids States from impairing contract rights and prohibits the Federal Government from taking private property for public use without just compensation.

International trade has no such constitutional guaranty on which to relie but it can and does prosper when the parliamentary bodies of various nations each indicate their good will and their intention to respect the rights of others. The Western European Coal and Steel Community is just one example of the acceptance of such mutual assurances of fair dealing.

Constitutional and other legal guaranties are important, but the greatest guaranty of the sanctity of contracts is to be found in the character of the people who make and who stand behind the laws. The type of individual character which inspires international confidence and goodwill has been well illustrated down through the years by our host nation—Switzerland.

The world admires the courage of the Swiss; their industrial skill; their modesty and their frugality. But, above all, we admire the sturdy character which was exemplified by the heroic Swiss father and his six sons described by the English poet Byron in his poem The Prisoner of Chillon.

I have visited the major shrines of the world but none has impressed me more deeply than the dungeon of Chillon where Bonnivard and two of his brothers were confined because of their republican principles and their allegiance to the cause of religious freedom.

This union, dedicated to the ideal of universal peace, can achieve that goal only if it is suppported by men and women in every free nation of the type described by the poet when he wrote:

"Eternal spirit of the chainless Mind!
Brightest in dungeons, Liberty, thou art,
For there thy habitation is the heart—
The heart which love of thee alone can bind;
And when thy sons to fetters are consigned—
To fetters, and the damp vault's dayless gloom—
Their country conquers with their martyrdom,
And Freedom's fame finds wings on every wind.
Chillon! thy prison is a holy place,
And thy sad floor an altar; for 'twas trod,
Until his very steps had left a trace
Worn, as if thy cold pavement were a sod,
By Bonnivard!—May none those marks efface!
For they appeal from tyranny to God."

PREVENTION OF THREATENED DEPRESSION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago, Mr. Kenneth Kramer, the executive editor of Business Week, speaking at a meeting of the Independent Oil Men's Association, made the statement that President Eisenhower's administration is likely to run into a business depression of some dimension. He said:

Whether the present boom lasts 6 months, a year, or 2 years or more, the Eisenhower administration probably will have to deal with a business set-back of some dimension before its 4-year lease on the White House expires.

He added that a business downturn likely will come in 1953 or 1954.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement calling upon President Eisenhower to commit himself to the principles of the Full Employment Act of 1946. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The biggest question facing the new administration is whether it will use all the resources of Government to prevent a decline in employment from the full employment which our country is enjoying today.

Eight years ago today, when I first introduced the full employment bill in the Senate, there were many prominent Republican Senators who opposed that legislation. Some of them claimed it would be unworkable. Some contended that it would lead to regimentation. Others sided with that small minority of big-business men who looked upon a floating pool of unemployed as a means of weakening organized labor and upon ups and downs in the business cycle as a means of wiping out small business competition. Like the Russians, they believed that sustained full employment was incompatible with our capitalist system.

The course of events has proved the doubters wrong. For the first time in history a major war has been followed not by a major depression but by sustained prosperity. Under Democratic leadership, we have demonstrated that private enterprise and enlightened government can work together in maintaining full employment.

What will happen under Republican leadership?

If Democrats were to approach this question from a partisan viewpoint, they would say not a word about it. They would merely sit back and wait for a Republican recession—for a Republican recession would inevitably lead to the election of a Democratic Congress in 1954 and a Democratic President in 1956.

But there are certain principles more important than partisanship. The maintenance of full employment is one of them.

I should, therefore, like to point out that there are serious economic dangers that lie ahead—not necessarily in the next few months, but unquestionably over the next few years. If defense spending levels off and declines, unfavorable government policies can lead to similar declines in business investment and consumer purchases—and thus in employment itself.

I am, therefore, calling upon President Eisenhower to pledge wholehearted support to the objective of sustained full employment and to the policy, as set forth in the Full Employment Act, of using the full resources of Government to achieve this objective.

In turn, if the Republican administration commits itself to the principles of the Full Employment Act, it deserves the backing of the minority party on every specific measure that will carry out these principles.

I for one have no hesitation in pledging my vigorous support of any soundly conceived policies the Republican administra-

tion might bring forth to extend into the years ahead the prosperity which our people have enjoyed under Democratic leadership.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEATH OF CHARLES A. EATON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I announce to my colleagues with deep regret the death, early this morning, of Mr. Charles A. Eaton, a former Representative in the Congress of the United States from the State of New Jersey. He was the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

I hope at a later session of the Senate to make some brief remarks with reference to Mr. Eaton's very distinguished career.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it was with deep regret and profound sorrow that I learned this morning of the sudden passing of my good friend, former Representative Charles A. Eaton, who had represented the people of the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey for the past 28 years.

Charlie Eaton was an outstanding Republican Member of the House, and for many years was the dean of the New Jersey delegation. He was elected to Congress in 1924, and served successively in 14 Congresses, retiring from service in the House at the end of the last session.

In the passing of Charlie Eaton I feel a deep personal loss. I considered him among my closest personal friends. He will be mourned by thousands who knew him in his long years of service to his fellowman and country.

He lived a good life, a full life, a worthy life.

For many years before he came to Congress, he was an outstanding Baptist minister. He was a scholar, writer, and statesman in the truest sense. He was a loving father and devoted husband. He was a man possessed of the highest ideals and faith, and he so lived that he was an inspiration to all who knew him.

His unswerving loyalty and devotion to his country are shown by his outstanding record during the 28 years of service to his State and Nation.

I shall not dwell on his long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives. In the House he was chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and he was a delegate to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco and a signer of the United Nations Charter in 1945.

I say of Charlie Eaton what he, himself, recently said in paying tribute to a departed colleague.

I loved him; he was my dear friend. He was a pure-souled man. He stepped in a moment from time into eternity—which is a fine way to go and he was ready to go. He leaves behind him an honored name. His family can be proud of his memory. His State and country can be proud of the service he rendered to God, his country, and his neighbors.

My heartfelt and deepest sympathy goes forth to his family and his dear ones in this hour of bereavement.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I inquire if these nominations were reported unanimously?

Mr. TAFT. I so understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the nomination was reported unanimously. Senator Lodge is known to every Member of this body, and I hope that we may proceed immediately to confirm his nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader discussed with me his unanimous-consent request. Mr. Lodge is held in high esteem on this side of the aisle, and I hope there will be no objection to the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make a statement of my position in the matter.

I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request with reference to confirming the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge today, because there is not a Member of this body who is not familiar with his record in the field of service to which he has been nominated. However, I want to make it very clear that in other cases in the absence of such knowledge the junior Senator from Oregon will feel constrained so long as he remains in the Senate to object to a nomination for a high position in the Government being acted upon on the same day on which it is presented to the Senate.

I wish to state that the fundamental reason for the position I take is that I consider the rule which provides for objection to be a very important rule in carrying out the principle of checks and balances in our system of government and guaranteeing to the American people that at least time will be provided for adequate consideration of all nominations by their representatives in the Senate of the United States. But in this instance, Mr. President, each Member of the Senate is fully familiar with the record of a former distinguished colleague in the Senate, and on the basis of the fact that we can take judicial notice of that record, I raise no objection to the confirmation of this particuular nomination. We have worked with him on foreign affairs and United Nations problems in the Senate and we know full well his philosophy and approach to those problems. If I were in any doubt about his views and record, I most certainly would object to voting on his nomination today. But I think this is a clear case which justifies approving the nomination without delay in keeping with the practice of senatorial courtesy which is extended to an ex-Senator unless good cause is shown as to why it should not be extended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the nomination of Mr. Harold Stassen to be Director for Mutual Security.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether this nomination was unanimously approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. TAFT. It was. I think practically all members of the committee were present after a hearing in which Mr. Stassen appeared before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and at the close of my remarks I shall object—I wish to say that I think the Stassen nomination is a good example of the importance of applying the rule as a check upon the executive department of our Government until time has been available to each and every one of us to review the committee report and the hearings made before the committee. Here again, as was the case last Tuesday, the hearings have not been placed before us. In this instance they have not even been printed. Yet we are asked to approve this nomination on the committee's say-so without even being given the opportunity to read and study the record of the hearings on Stassen. There are certain things about the record which I wish to look into, Mr. President, and to compare the record with some of the statements which I understand Mr. Stassen has made in the past concerning the influence on their internal governmental policies he seems to think we should seek to bring to bear upon foreign governments by way of the expenditure of American dollars for foreign aid. I want to get the exact quotations, because I do not wish to do Mr. Stassen or anyone else an injustice. That is why time will be needed to check into his statements and into what he said before the committee and to what extent the committee itself examined him on this matter.

Based upon newspaper reports, which I recognize are very frequently unreliable, I have read in months gone by something to the effect that Mr. Stassen is of the opinion that we ought to give or ought not to give aid to a particular foreign country, depending upon whether we approve or disapprove the internal policies of the government. As I recall he was reported in the press as having expressed the view that England should not receive foreign aid under a socialistic administration of her government.

As Senators may recall, that arose directly in connection with a newspaper report to the effect that he thought some condition ought to be applied to aid given to the British Government, apparently because Mr. Stassen does not like British socialism. I do not like it either, Mr. President. I happen to be one who believes that whenever a country sets up a state economy, the people of that country sooner or later lose their individual political freedoms and liberty.

However, I also believe that, in the whole question of foreign aid, with its relationship to the great contest of liberty and freedom, on the one hand, versus communism on the other hand, we should avoid giving the impression to any Allied government that they must do our bidding. We should not be a party to any foreign policy principle such as was reported in the press as having been advocated by Mr. Stassen, because that principle, when analyzed, is in essence the principle of dollar diplomacy. It amounts to using the American dollar sign to tell our allies what they should do on the domestic scene in regard to their own governmental policy. I understand there was much resentment in England and France at the time of Mr. Stassen's undiplomatic outburst.

If that happens to be the point of view of Mr. Stassen, then I think it is a serious limitation upon his qualifications for a position connected with the Mutual Security Program. I say that because that program with all the problems of diplomacy which that position involves calls for tact in the handling of foreign affairs. I can well imagine that any such opinion held by Mr. Stassen would be considered an affront by the leaders of some Allied countries.

Therefore, until I have had time to study this particular matter in Mr. Stassen's record, as well as some other points on which I have heard him express his views, which to me amounted to very confused and fuzzy thinking on the part of Mr. Stassen, I shall object to the confirmation of his nomination today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the calendar, and will go over for 24 hours.

PROGRAM FOR SATURDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when the Senate concludes its business today I shall propose that it recess until tomorrow, Saturday, January 24. Probably there will be no serious business except to receive the reports of committees upon various nominations under consideration by committees, so that the nominations may be taken up on Monday.

On Monday we shall proceed to the consideration of nominations that will have been reported, including that of Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense, if his nomination is reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the intention of the Senator from Ohio to have only executive business considered tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. I think I can give that assurance. We will meet tomorrow and do nothing except consider executive business. So far as I am concerned, I shall not call for the confirmation of any nominations tomorrow. We shall meet only to enable committees to make their reports, so that the nominations may be in order for consideration on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos the question just raised by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I wonder if the Senator by his question meant to foreclose the introduction of bills or the presentation of other routine matters for the RECORD by Senators who might not have been here today to do that.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. TAFT. No formal business is expected to be taken up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No formal business other than executive business.

I wonder if I might ask unanimous consent that the President be notified that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Coast Guard, and also the nomination of former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to the United Nations, have been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. TAFT. Does that include the nomination of former Senator Lodge?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. It is not my intention to be in the city tomorrow. I shall, however, cancel an engagement in New York if it is planned to vote on nominations tomorrow. Therefore, I wish to make certain that I understand the majority leader. I understood him to say that it is not his plan to bring up for a vote tomorrow any of the nominations now pending before the Senate, such as the Stassen nomination or any nomination that may be sent to the Senate tomorrow, such as, speaking hypothetically as of now, the Wilson nomination.

Mr. TAFT. That is my intention, yes. I shall not bring them up for action tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the information.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, January 24, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate on Thursday, January 22, 1953, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 21, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter B. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

Carl W. McCardle, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Herman Phleger, of California, to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, resigned.

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of John S. Graham, resigned.

Elbert P. Tuttle, of Georgia, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, in place of Thomas J. Lynch, resigned.

T. Coleman Andrews, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

Ivy Baker Priest, of Utah, to be Treasurer of the United States, in place of Georgia Neese Clark, resigned.

Alma E. Schneider, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

H. Brian Holland, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

Warren Olney III, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

J. Lee Rankin, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Charles R. Hook, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

J. Earl Coke, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Walter Williams, of Washington, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce.

Robert Blaine Murray, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Samuel W. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Robert Clement Watson, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Robert W. Burgess, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the remainder of the term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1953.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be captain

Earle A. Deily

To be commander

Joseph E. Waugh

To be lieutenant commanders

Harry D. Reed, Jr.	Gerald L. Short
Emerson E. Jones	John O. Phillips

To be lieutenant

Harley D. Nygren

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

William R. Kachel	Barbour C. Stokes
Hal P. Demuth	Merlyn E. Natto
Pentti A. Stark	

To be ensigns

Wilfred V. Warner	Richard K. Houlder
Carlton S. Frost	George E. Cook
Edwin K. McCaffrey	Howard A. Garcia
Clifford W. Tupper	Lionel D. Kelley

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be captains

George W. Nelson	Garrett Van A. Graves
William P. Hawley	William B. Schelbel
Hans F. Slade	Alfred W. Kabernagel
Romeo J. Borromey	Bret H. Brallier
Frederick A. MacGurn	George H. Miller
Donald B. MacDiarmid	John W. Malen

To be commanders

Theodore A. Dahlburg	Victor E. Bakanas
Ferdinand Lederle	James McIntosh
Fred F. Nichols	Maynard F. Young
Theodore F. Knoll	Harold Land
Frank H. Nelson	Mark A. Whalen
Alf S. Lie	William F. Cass
Frank M. McCabe	Frank J. Hicken
Harold L. Durgin	Roger M. Dudley
Thomas B. McKinstry	Albert F. Wayne, Jr.
Ellis S. Gordon	Robert J. Brown
Myron W. Caskey	Clement Vaughn, Jr.
Forrest A. Tinsler	Chester I. Steele
Wayne L. Goff	George E. Dobbins
Ronald M. Freeman	Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Joseph A. Ciccolella	Edward O. Clark
Ralph S. Feola	Paul E. G. Prins
Howard W. Schleiter	Lester E. Carlson
Richard H. Fairman	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Clarence N. Daniel	Charles F. Fornason
Harold D. Seielstad	Larry L. Davis
Lloyd B. Kennedy	Alan Mason
Joseph W. Naab, Jr.	Stanley J. Rovinsky
Merton Hatfield	Roderick Y. Edwards
Corliss B. Lambert	Alexander W. Wuerker
James W. Leek	Kolbjorn Hansen

To be lieutenant commanders

William H. Fuller	Joseph Gnas
Bernard T. Clark	Carl A. Heintz
William B. Daughtry	Harold A. Hutcheson
Ralph J. Davidson	Charles H. Langlois
Roland H. Estey	William Lieberson
Hans A. Jensen	Gregory E. Smith
Arthur I. Roberts	Willem deJong
Leonard T. Toner	Arthur P. Minor
John T. Cherry	James C. Waters
John B. Klapperich	Emmett P. O'Hara
Arthur E. Muffler	Roderick C. Davis
Oswald R. Olsen	Albert J. Summerfield
Hubert F. Wren	Walter Curwen, Jr.
William S. Cochrane	David M. Alger
Clifton E. Mosher	August Kleisch
Aubrey L. Diggs	Theodore McWilliams
Louis L. Lague	Gerald E. McGovern
Percival A. Williamson	Charles C. Bennett
Oskar F. Aune	David Oliver
Freeman H. Harmon	Ben B. Dameron
Sidney W. Douglas	Wilfred C. Gray
Henry J. Cookson	Arnold E. Carlson
Antonie Simon	Gene R. Gislason
Wesley J. Cumberland	William D. Hemeon
James E. Hannewyk	Allen H. Graham

To be lieutenants

John D. McCann	Lilbourn A. Pharris, Jr.
Sumner R. Dolber	Harold L. Davison
Garth D. Clisbe	John M. Austin
Julian E. Johansen	Theodore C. Rapalus
Clarence R. Easter	William G. Fenlon
Harley E. Dilcher	Louis Hopper, Jr.
Frank Barnett	John W. Day
Marion G. Shrode, Jr.	John H. Tooley
George F. Thometz, Jr.	Wilmer Clark
Arthur A. Fontaine	Thomas G. Condon
Frederick W. Hermes, Jr.	Albert J. Guillemette
James T. Maher	James W. Swanson
Gordon F. Hempton	Paul McGill, Jr.
George A. Warren	Harry U. Potter
William H. Boswell	Maurice W. Tiehen
Vance K. Randle, Jr.	George L. Oakley
Ricardo A. Ratti	Elvin F. Yates
George W. Wagner	Charles R. Leisy
John J. Fehrenbacher	Milton B. Williams, Jr.
Raymond G. Parks, Jr.	James E. Edwards
James H. Durfee	Stanley G. Putzke
Richard P. Arlander	James S. Cooper
Clarence S. Hall, Jr.	William H. Schmidt
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.	Leo M. Bracken
Enoch A. Poulter	William J. Donnay
Jack S. Thuma	Thomas J. Fallon
Joseph M. Weber	Paul S. Hofmeister
Fred T. Merritt	Albert P. Hartt, Jr.
James E. Nesmith	Robert A. Lemmon
Robert R. Pope	Gwyn A. E. Williams
Albert E. Flanagan	Louis N. Donohoe
Earl S. Childers	Richard C. Ragan
Thomas J. Hynes	Herman S. McNatt
	George E. Tooloose
	William E. Sale

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Thomas W. Wolfe	William E. Clark
Edwin L. Knowles	George M. Rynick III
Frank E. McLean	Anthony F. Fugaro
Robert H. Sabin	Gordon K. Loftin
Willard L. Higginbotham	Reginald W. Raynor, Jr.
Joseph C. Fox	Norman B. Binns
Karl P. Peterson	Clarence H. Tannel
John E. Wesler	Robert C. Sedwick
William R. Fearn	Harold A. Paulsen
Lawrence J. Hoch	Herbert A. Johnson
James S. Gracey	Richard S. Dolliver
Richard T. Penn, Jr.	Sidney A. Wallace
Charles L. Blaha	Jules B. DuPeza
Thomas E. Hawkins	George K. Burkman
Ernest R. Tindle	Kenneth R. Spreen
John A. Flynn	Joseph W. E. Ward
Neal E. Williams, Jr.	Albert D. Young, Jr.
Frank L. Shelley	Robert Schuerch, Jr.
William T. Adams II	Herbert M. Hartlove
Lee C. Nehrt	Nicholas Ivanovsky
Arne J. Soreng	William H. Shaw, Jr.
David F. Lauth	John M. Clark
Gordon W. Brockway	Herbert H. Mulvany
William H. Stewart	Royce A. Lewis
Charles E. Larkin, Jr.	Harry H. Keller, Jr.
Richard J. Mayer	Wilfred H. Shaw
Henry A. Cretella	Paul W. Meyer
Norman M. Sawyer	Andrew F. Nixon
Irwin R. Pahl	Forrest E. Stewart
Donald B. Russell	
William S. Schwob, Jr.	

To be ensigns

Richard G. Donaldson	Edward S. Castle
David E. Metz	William T. Sode
Robert J. Ryan	Charles A. Bova
Bruce N. Donnelly	Thomas F. McKenna, Jr.
Sherman G. Sawyer	Richard D. Hodges
Joseph A. Macri	William D. Harvey
Richard J. MacGarva	

The following-named persons to be commissioned warrant officers in the specialties indicated:

To be chief pay clerks

Floyd J. Jester
Thomas C. Crabe

To be chief machinists

Alton E. Fowler	Guy R. Hunter
Edward W. Powers	Joy A. Weatherford
Charlie H. Hale	

To be chief radio electrician

Milton H. Bradley

To be chief boatswains

Peter J. Byrne	Benjamin F. Lombard
Alton W. Meekins	Gene V. Gray
Harlan E. Sterling	Henry McAllister
James Lindquist	Charles E. Hargis
Aksel F. Jorgensen.	

To be chief ships clerk

Robert J. Mohr

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, January 23, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the Eternal, we thank Thee that Thou art not far off, out on the vast rim of the universe; but nearer to us than breathing; warm, sweet, tender; a present help, waiting to live in us; our daily sustenance, the fountain of a strength and courage that will not fail and of a power that can use our frail weakness as its healing and illuminating channel.

In this confused day, with its noisy voices and contending claims, grant unto these Thy servants that they may be faithful to every trust committed by the people to their hands, giving utterance only to their highest, noblest thought, and that upon their shoulders there may rest unsullied the white mantle of the Nation's honor. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 23, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if there are any insertions to be made in the RECORD, or if there is any other routine business to be transacted, I ask unanimous consent that an opportunity may now be afforded for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fifth Semi-Annual Report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, submitted by the Chairman of the Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ON OPERATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Second Annual Report by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on Operations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF BUDGET CIRCULAR NO. A–45 RELATING TO DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of Budget Circular No. A–45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit No. 101, of Standish Manor, Cassadaga, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation substituting the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

DRAFTING OF FARM BOYS FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the legislative committee of the Freeborn County Farm Bureau on January 10, concerning the drafting of farm boys into the military service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEBORN COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
Albert Lea, Minn., January 16, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The legislative committeee of the Freeborn County Farm Bureau met at the farm bureau office, Saturday, January 10, and drafted the following recommendation for your consideration:

"The matter of drafting farm boys was discussed and the following resolution was passed. We again ask that the draft deferments of farm boys be made through the using of a unit system. We are quite concerned about the loss of experienced labor on the farm because of high wages in town and the enlistment of too many experienced farm boys from the farm."

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted.

L. A. SEATH,
Secretary, Legislative Committee,
Freeborn County Farm Bureau.

RESTORATION OF PARCEL POST SIZES AND WEIGHTS TO REASONABLE LIMITS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by certain members of the Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., at a meeting on December 30, 1952. The resolution urges the restoration of parcel-post sizes and weights to the reasonable limits that were in effect for many years prior to the enactment of Public Law 199 of the Eighty-second Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON REPEAL OF PUBLIC LAW 199 (82D CONG.)

To Minnesota's Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

The following resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of Minnesota retail merchants, wholesalers, and trade association executives present at a meeting on December 30, 1952, called to discuss restrictions on the size and weight of parcel-post packages:

"*Resolved*, That all United States Senators and Representatives from Minnesota be petitioned and urged to vote for the early repeal of Public Law 199 (82d Cong.) for the following reasons:

"1. The present law limiting the size and weight of parcel-post packages discriminates against first-class post offices and against urban communities.

"2. It wastefully increases packing, shipping, and receiving costs because by its restrictive provisions packages are limited to 20 pounds in zones 3 to 8, and to 40 pounds and 72 inches in zones 1 and 2 and between first-class post offices. Former limits in effect for a great many years were 70 pounds and 100 inches. These limits were reasonable and brought efficiency to post-office operations and administration and were less costly for shippers, receivers, and customers.

"3. There is no evidence that the postal deficit has been decreased by the restriction in size and weight.

"4. The limitations deprive many communities of adequate package-delivery services either not supplied or poorly supplied by railway express and privately operated services.

"5. Provisions of the present discriminatory law are difficult for postal authorities, shippers, and receivers to administer."

Respectfully submitted.

N. A. Frandsen, McKesson & Robbins, Minneapolis; F. W. Jasper, Bouteil's Furniture Co., Minneapolis; Tom Bustard, F. W. Woolworth Co., Minneapolis; M. L. Peterson, Northwestern Drug Co., Minneapolis; Philip Halverson, Our Own Hardware Co., Minneapolis; James A. Casey, Choate & Co., Winona; C. R. Vickland, McKesson & Robbins, Minneapolis; Don Bonell, Northrup King & Co., Minneapolis; A. J. McCartin, Juster Bros., Minneapolis; H. A. Burns, Warner Hardware Co., Minneapolis; Paul S. Nickel, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Minneapolis; W. A. Moulton, Farwell; Ozmun Kirk & Co., Minneapolis; M. W. Thompson, St. Paul Association of Commerce, St. Paul; M. A. Askerman, Schmitt Music Co., Minneapolis; W. W. Goodwin, Minneapolis; Jack Sevcik, Minnesota Food Retailing Association, Minneapolis; Perry S. Williams, Minnesota Florists Committee, St. Paul; Clifford Johnson, Harold, Inc., Minneapolis; Bert Larson, Minneapolis; Carleton A. Wildes, Minneapolis Retailers Association, Minneapolis; Ed Straus, Minneapolis Retail Grocers Association, Minneapolis; William D. Naffziger, Executive Director, Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Minneapolis; Thomas H. Hodgson, Executive Vice President, Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Minneapolis; C. T. McGrew, Klad-Ezee Garment Co., National Associa-

tion of Direct Selling Companies, Minneapolis; Walter R. Menzel, Menzel Furs, Associated Fur Industries of Minneapolis, Minneapolis; Mrs. R. F. Waterbury, Williams Hardware Co., Motor and Equipment Wholesalers Association, Minneapolis.

MINNEAPOLIS, *December 30, 1952.*

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY AND ROAD USE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Edine Village Council, of Edine, Minn., on January 12, 1953, requesting additional funds from the Federal Government for highway and road use.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING MORE FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY AND ROAD USE FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas the American Municipal Association at its meeting and convention this year passed a resolution asking the Federal Government for more funds for highway and road use, and inasmuch as this resolution contains the following information: That the Government collects approximately $2,000,000,000 each year from the States, and only about one-fourth of that amount is returned, the balance being diverted for other than highway purposes; and

Whereas none of the Federal funds so returned to the States are spent in municipalities of greater size than 5,000, which eliminates several of our cities in Hennepin County from having this money spent in their corporate limits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the village of Edina, Hennepin County, Minn., go on record favoring this resolution as passed by the American Municipal Association, and also favoring three other resolutions correcting wordings which are now contained in the Federal act, namely, to define more properly secondary roads so that Government funds are available for portions of these roads that traverse incorporated municipalities, and so that the cities of more than 5,000 population can participate in the expenditure of Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That we send copies of this resolution to our United States Senators, our United States Representatives, and our Hennepin County delegation, to the State of Minnesota legislators, to the Minneapolis City Council, and to the cities of Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, Richfield, and Crystal, and that we request their support in this resolution.

This resolution adopted by the Edina Village Council on January 12, 1953.

Attest:

REUBEN F. ERICKSON,
Mayor.

EVALD C. BANK,
Village Clerk.

SURVEY OF RED LAKE RIVER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Pennington County Board of Commissioners, Thief River Falls, Minn., urging further study and survey of the Red Lake River for the purpose of controlling future flood conditions.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the upper reaches of the channel of the Red Lake River between the Red Lake and river mile 154.28 have been straightened, widened, and deepened under the supervision of and in accordance with the survey, plans, and specifications of the United States Corps of Engineers, pursuant to House File No. 345 of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States, and appropriations granted thereunder; and

Whereas the work thus undertaken is substantially completed; and

Whereas said work has been done under agreements wherein the Red Lake drainage and conservancy district, the contracting agency for the local authorities, has agreed to furnish all rights-of-way, supervise, control, and maintain the channel when completed and be answerable for all damages arising out of said construction; and

Whereas the improved channel as now constructed terminates at river mile 154.28, a distance of 4.28 miles farther up the channel than was originally contemplated as the termination of said improvement; and

Whereas the banks of the river are low and undefined, the channel crooked and filled with sand bars and silt within that area originally planned for construction; and

Whereas flooding of farm lands, particularly during spring breakups and the fall freeze-up, has occurred in the area below the termination of said river improvement, which said flooding is claimed to be caused by said river improvement and is giving the farmers within that area considerable concern; and

Whereas claims for damages arising out of such flooding have been filed against the Red Lake drainage and conservancy district upon the claim that such damages are proximately caused by the river improvement in bringing down the floodwaters faster than the channel below the improvement can contain and discharge said waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Pennington, State of Minnesota, That it goes on record urging—

1. That a further study of said river channel be made for the purpose of determining the cause, or causes, of the recent flooding and that a determination be made as to whether or not said flooding is proximately caused by the afore-mentioned river improvement.

2. That the United States Corps of Engineers be requested to make a further survey of the river channel before the project is declared to be completed and accepted.

3. That if said flooding is found to be caused by reason of the improvements heretofore made upon the upper reaches of the Red Lake River channel that steps be taken for the rectification of said condition.

4. That our representatives in Congress request the further study and survey of the Red Lake River channel so that the local communities may be fully apprised of the facts.

5. That our representatives in Congress introduce, and urge the passage of, legislation providing for the necessary funds for such survey.

6. That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Washington, D. C., and to Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN at Washington, D. C., and to the district office of the United States Corps of Engineers at St. Paul, Minn.; and that the same be published in the Thief River Falls Times, the official paper, and made a part of the official minutes of the Pennington County Board of County Commissioners.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Eero and Tina and Karine Waskinen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Altoon Saprichian, and

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 29. A joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF ANNUITIES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on January 9, 1953, the bill (S. 339) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It should have been referred to the Committee on Finance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address by Judge George D. Neilson, of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, in honor of Dr. Juan Bautista de Lavalle, Ambassador of Peru to the Organization of American States.

Address by Dr. Juan Bautista de Lavalle, Ambassador of Peru to the Organization of American States, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor by the Inter-American Bar Association and the District of Columbia Bar Association on January 15, 1953.

Article entitled "Billy Mitchell Versus the Brass," published in the Milwaukee Journal of January 22, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "From One Father to Another" published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 24, 1953.

Editorial entitled "A Taft to Ireland?" published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 24, 1953.

By Mr. BUSH:

Editorial entitled "The Abiding Creed," published in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of January 21, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Peace, But No Appeasement," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of January 21, 1953.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Poem entitled "Let's Go, America!" written by W. E. Lee, editor of the Smith County Pioneer, Smith Center, Kans.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if there is no further routine business to be transacted, I shall move that the Senate go into executive session. It is my intention to move in executive session that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Charles E. Wilson, and then I shall move to adjourn, unless there is some incidental business any Senator wishes to transact; so that on Monday, when the Senate assembles at 12 o'clock, the Wilson nomination will be before the Senate, and we may proceed to consider it at that time.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Stephen F. Dunn, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and messages withdrawing the nominations of Ross L. Malone, Jr., of New Mexico, to be Deputy Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953; Rowland F. Kirks, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953; Charles S. Lyon, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953; and Charles B. Murray, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TAFT. If there are any committee reports to be made in executive session, I hope that they will be presented, so that they may be acted upon as rapidly as possible.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. WILSON TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit the unanimous report of the Committee on Armed Services on the nomination of Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

Under the rules, this will lie over for one session. I hope that the majority leader will bring up the nomination for consideration and discussion in executive session on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received, and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD E. STASSEN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I gave assurance that there would be no formal action taken today on these nominations. Therefore, at this time I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense, that nomination having been reported this morning. Of course, before the question can actually be put the nomination will go over for 1 day.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday, January 26, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 23), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Stephen F. Dunn, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 23), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ross L. Malone, Jr., of New Mexico, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Rowland F. Kirks, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles S. Lyon, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles B. Murray, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1953

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, author of liberty, who hath made and preserved us a nation, may there be forever cherished in this shrine of freedom and, therefore, found in those who are here called to serve the Republic, those spiritual values which alone can bring order out of chaos and peace out of strife. In a time when the world's hopes depend on character may the shield of America's unyielding integrity be lifted always against the arrows of the principalities of darkness and against all betrayal of justice and righteousness. In Thy providence for all the world may this sweet land of liberty, with all its privilege and power, be the quarry where shall be fashioned the white stones of a new social order whose alabaster cities shall gleam undimmed by human tears, as Thy kingdom comes and Thy will is done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 24, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, February 2, 1953, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following resolutions:

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Speaker announced as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. REED of New York, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, and Mr. COOPER of Tennessee; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. TABER of New York, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Speaker announced as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, Mr. BOLTON of Ohio, and Mr. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BECKER, of New York, and Mr. KEOGH, of New York.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 224, Eighty-second Congress, the Speaker announced as members of the United States Commission for the Observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne the following Members on the part of the House to

serve with himself: Mr. ARENDS of Illinois, Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio, Mr. LANE of Massachusetts, and Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Speaker announced that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has appointed the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, RALPH A. GAMBLE, of New York, HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa, PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, and WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, the Speaker announced as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, Mr. HILLINGS of California, Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WILSON of Texas.

Resolved, That pursuant to provisions of House Resolution No. 111, Eighty-third Congress, the Speaker announced as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois, and Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLER of Maryland and Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota and Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. D'EWART, of Montana, and Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. D'EWART, of Montana, Mr. RHODES, of Arizona, and Mr. McCARTHY, of Minnesota.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Speaker announced as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PHILLIPS, of California, and Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CRETELLA, of Connecticut, and Mr. DODD, of Connecticut.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas was excused for an indefinite period from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, because of a death in his family.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAYBANK was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG and Mr. MONRONEY were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the Investigation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate today beginning at 2 o'clock.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine legislative business was transacted:

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Chair has received the resignation of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and, under authority of the act creating the committee, appoints the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to fill the vacancy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 1953

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on fees and expenses of witnesses, Department of Justice, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of moneys credited to the special helium-production fund, and the amount of disbursements made therefrom; and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO BENEFITS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to certain benefits for members of the armed services serving in combat areas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

INSPECTION AND AUDIT OF PLANTS, BOOKS, AND RECORDS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1952, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND EXPENDITURES OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Office of Civil Defense, District of Columbia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of that commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to reaffirm California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED VETERANS' HOSPITAL AT WOOD, WIS.—RESOLUTION OF ALLIED VETERANS COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the very important obligations facing the Congress and the American people is to look after the medical needs of our Nation's ex-servicemen.

In this connection I have received a resolution from Mr. Richard D. Carey, chairman for veterans' affairs of the Allied Veterans' Council of Milwaukee County. This council consists of the following affiliated veterans' organizations: The Grand Army of the Republic, United Spanish War Veterans, Army and Navy Union, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Marine Corps League, Jewish War Veterans of United States, Navy Club of the United States of America, the Catholic War Veterans, and the AMVETS.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas all the member organizations of the Allied Veterans' Council of Milwaukee County recognize the very definite need for a new hospital at Wood, Wis.; and

Whereas the old hospital could be utilized to house domiciliary activities and thus

eliminate the present unsafe, untenable and unsightly domiciliary building; and

Whereas the present hospital has inadequate and outmoded facilities and is highly crowded and inconvenient, awkward to work in, rearranging and remodeling could not correct the errors; and

Whereas Wood, Wis., because of the proximity of nationally known medical schools and the large number of experts in the medical field located in Milwaukee, would be ideally located for the building of such a hospital; and

Whereas the present hospital-bed capacity at Wood, Wis., is inadequate to care for American veterans of all wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a new hospital be requested at Wood, Wis., in an area adjacent to the existing hospital building; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of our United States Senators and each of the Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin, and to Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

JOHN J. KOCIAN,
President.
ALBERT J. OBENBERGER,
Secretary.
RICHARD D. CAREY,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 617. A bill to validate certain conveyances made by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, the Southern Pacific Co., involving certain portions of right-of-way in the State of California acquired from the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 618. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslavs; and

S. 619. A bill for the relief of Hsiao-Min Shuli Ley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 620. A bill to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 621. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the lower San Joaquin River project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 622. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 623. A bill to organize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 624. A bill to facilitate the management of certain land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 625. A bill for the relief of Michael Raymond Juenger (Joji Hatano) and Vivian Nakajima Nobuko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 626. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 627. To provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 628. For the relief of Aloisia Schlotter, and

S. 629. For the relief of Igor Michale Bogolepov (alias Ivar Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolepov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 630. A bill to authorize the conveyance for public-school purposes of certain Federal land in Gettysburg National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 631. To permit veterans to suspend or delay their programs of education or training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, in order to perform services as missionaries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 632. A bill authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school-board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 633. A bill to establish a 2-year period of validity for basic permits issued under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act;

S. 634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the preservation of records, and for other purposes; and

S. 635. A bill to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide penalties for failure to file returns, submit information, or pay taxes as required in certain cases by such chapter; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 636. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 637. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment; and

S. 638. A bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 639. A bill to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware; and

S. 640. A bill to provide for the installation and maintenance of an electric-lighting system on the south bank of the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the first three above-mentioned bills.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of David Arthur de Wolff;

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Toney Maurice; and

S. 643. A bill for the relief of Linnea Dresden and Carl Gustave Howard Mark Paulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. CASE):

S. 644. A bill to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Willwood, and Belle Fourche irrigation districts shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. WELKER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 645. A bill to authorize preliminary examinations and surveys for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 646. A bill authorizing construction of works to restore to Palo Verde irrigation district, California, a means of gravity diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River and providing certain benefits to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 647. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy within the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference sundry bills, five of which relate to amendments of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci;

S. 649. A bill for the relief of Joseph Rosenblum;

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Phillip Schonberger and family;

S. 651. A bill for the relief of Szyja Morgenstern;

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Malica Macesich;

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Metorima Shizuko; and

S. 654. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Kawakami Nader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 655. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes;

S. 656. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes;

S. 657. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to provide for improved procedures of the National Labor Relations Board and to expedite its disposition of cases;

S. 658. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; and

S. 659. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 30. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. J. Res. 31. A joint resolution to establish a Federal Crime Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above joint resolution which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Sena-

tor from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a 2-year period of validity for basic permits issued under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 633) to establish a 2-year period of validity for basic permits issued under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The act presently provides that basic permits shall continue indefinitely or until suspended, revoked, annulled, or automatically terminated. The bill would limit the duration of such basic permits to 2 years, with the result that biennial renewal thereof would be required for a continuation of the business for which the permit was issued. The purpose of this bill is to enable the Treasury Department to reexamine the qualifications of persons applying for renewals of basic permits, including their prospective compliance with Federal law, thus permitting continuous scrutiny of the activities of the alcoholic-beverage industry and facilitating the elimination therefrom of undesirable elements.

The proposed legislation can be an important element in eliminating undesirable elements from the permit privileges of the Alcohol Administration Act by affording the Treasury Department a biennial administrative review of the conduct of these permittees. Under the act as interpreted by the courts, the disapproval of applications for permits offers greater latitude to the Department than the revocation of existing permits. A permit may be revoked only when repeated willful violations of its terms are established. These terms are set forth in the statute. On the other hand, applications may be disapproved if the Secretary finds that an applicant has, within 5 years prior to the date of the application, been convicted of a felony under Federal or State law, or that such person is by reason of his business experience, financial standing or trade connections, not likely to maintain such operations in conformity with Federal law. As a consequence, by this bill, the Department could eliminate many permittees which it could not presently eliminate under existing law.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE FOR PRESERVATION OF RECORDS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the preservation of records, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 634) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the preservation of records, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill provides that every person required to keep records shall retain such records for a period of 7 years after the time of the transactions to which they relate.

Section 54 of the Internal Revenue Code now requires every person liable to any tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code to keep such records and comply with such rules and regulations as the Commissioner may from time to time prescribe. Chapter 1 relates only to income taxes, although its provisions are also made applicable to chapter 2, relating to additional income and excess profit taxes. Accordingly, the proposed amendment would not relate to gift, estate, stamp, occupational, or manufacturers' and retailers' excise taxes.

Under existing regulations the period of time during which books and records must be kept is somewhat ambiguous and uncertain. The proposed amendment would remove these uncertainties as to the length of time the taxpayer is required to maintain his books and records by specifying that they must be retained for a period of 7 years. Inasmuch as the statute of limitations bars prosecution for income tax evasion after 6 years the 7-year requirement for retaining records would appear to be sufficient in ordinary cases.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 27 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide penalties for failure to file returns, submit information, or pay taxes as required in certain cases by such chapter, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 635) to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide penalties for failure to file returns, submit information, or pay taxes as required in certain cases by such chapter, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill provides penalties for failure to file returns, submit information, or pay taxes. The bill's provisions are applicable to occupational taxes, i. e., those relating to the liquor industry and to coin-operated amusement and gaming devices. Subsection (a) of the bill makes it a misdemeanor subject to criminal penalties, in addition to other penalties provided by law for failing to make a return or declaration, to keep records, or supply any information for the purposes of the computation, assessment or collection of any tax imposed by any part of this chapter.

Subsection (d) provides that any person who wilfully attempts in any manner to evade or defeat any tax imposed upon the liquor industry, or upon the coin-operated amusement and gaming device industry, shall, in addition to other penalties provided by law, be guilty of a felony and subject to the fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

The word person as used in this bill is defined as any officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership who, as such officer, employee or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs.

The purpose of the legislation is to close certain loopholes which have become apparent in the administration of the liquor occupational taxes, and the occupational tax imposed upon coin-operated amusement and gaming devices.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO APPEALS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 636) to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill would amend section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, by providing that an appeal may be taken by the United States from district courts to courts of appeals "from a decision sustaining a motion to suppress evidence, when the defendant has been put in jeopardy."

At present the Government has no right to appeal from an order granting a motion to suppress evidence made after an indictment has been returned or an information has been filed. It has a right to appeal from such an order if the motion was made before such return or filing. The anomalous condition exists because in the former situation the motion is considered as being interlocutory in the criminal case, whereas in the latter situation it is considered a separate proceeding in the nature of an equity motion.

The Department of Justice recommended enactment of the bill.

FEDERAL CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a Federal Crime Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to establish a Federal Crime Commission

was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This Commission would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It would be composed of three members, all of whom are prominent citizens and not otherwise members or employees of the Federal Government.

The functions of the Federal Crime Commission would be—

1. The continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country.

2. Reports on such criminal activities at periodic intervals to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate.

3. To make recommendations for hearings to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate or any other appropriate committee in cases in which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may not be the most appropriate, for more intensive investigation requiring the testimony of witnesses under oath.

4. The maintenance of liaison between Federal investigative State and local levels with the dissemination to the latter of information respecting criminal operations as may be required in the public interest.

5. Suggestion and encouragement of legislation designed to expedite, facilitate, and encourage better and more intensive law enforcement at all levels of government.

6. The initiation and development of appropriate social study relating to crime, its punishment, and law enforcement.

7. The maintenance of files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce to be made available, to properly authorized individuals and groups, subject to suitable security measures, but not to conflict with the interests of any presently established Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

The purpose of this bill is to establish an alternate method of accomplishing the same thing that the Federal Crime Commission would accomplish. Its functions would be similar.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. TOBEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A quorum of the committee shall consist of six members.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation and surveillance of—

(1) the manner in which, and extent to which, organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the laws of the United States or of the State in which the transaction occurs; the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made; and the facilities being used;

(2) the manner in which, and extent to which, organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the laws of the United States or of any State;

(3) new methods and techniques of those utilizing the facilities of interstate commerce for the violation of the laws of the United States or of any State;

(4) the activities of Federal agencies charged with the responsibility for enforcement of Federal laws designed to prevent such utilization of interstate facilities and such operations in interstate commerce by organized crime;

(5) the adequacy of the existing Federal laws to prevent such utilization of interstate facilities and such operation in interstate commerce by organized crime; and

(6) the manner in which, and the extent to which, persons engaged in organized crime have infiltrated into lawful business enterprises.

(b) In carrying out its duties under this resolution, the committee shall coordinate its activities and cooperate with any Federal commission which may be established for the purpose of performing functions similar to those imposed upon the committee under this resolution.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena (to be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman) or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of a chief counsel, an associate counsel, and such other experts, consultants, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties. The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives from time to time with respect to the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, and shall make a final report on or before June 30, 1954. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on June 30, 1954.

AMENDMENT OF CODE PROHIBITING FORMER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FROM ACTING AS COUNSEL, ETC.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 637) to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 284. Disqualifications of former officers and employees in matters connected with their former office or employment.

"(a) (1) Whoever, having been an officer (including a commissioned officer) or employee of the United States (other than a person to whom paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection is applicable) and having been separated from his office or employment, within 2 years from the date of separation acts as counsel, attorney, or agent (other than for the United States or any department or agency thereof) in relation to any proceeding or other matter before the agency in which he held office or was employed or assigned to duty, or in relation to any proceeding to which such agency, or any officer or employee of such agency by reason of his office or employment, or the United States on behalf of such agency, is a party; or

"(2) Whoever, having held office as a Member of Congress or as an officer or employee of the Congress or of either House thereof and having been separated from his office or employment, within 2 years from the date of separation acts as counsel, attorney, or agent (other than for the United States or any department or agency thereof) in relation to any legislation, investigation, or other matter before the Senate or the House of Representatives or before any committee thereof or before any joint committee of the two Houses; or

"(3) Whoever, having been an officer or employee of the United States in the judicial branch of the Government and having been separated from his office or employment, within 2 years from the date of separation acts as counsel, attorney, or agent (other than for the United States or any department or agency thereof) in relation to any proceeding or other matter before the court in which he held office or was employed—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) This section shall not apply to any person who, or any class of persons which,

was heretofore exempted by act of Congress with respect to the application of this section, or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 668), or the last paragraph of chapter IV of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 131; 5 U. S. C. 100)."

SEC. 2. The fourth item in the analysis at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 12 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"284. Disqualifications of former officers and employees in matters connected with their former office or employment."

The statement by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The bill entitled "A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment" prohibits former officers and employees of the United States (other than certain legislative and judicial officers and employees who are specifically provided for) from representing clients before their old agency or in proceedings to which their old agency is a party for a period of 2 years after separation from Government service. Former Members of Congress and officers or employees of Congress or either House thereof are prohibited from acting as counsel or agent (other than for the Government), within 2 years from the date their office or employment has ceased, in relation to any legislation, investigation, or other matter before the Senate or the House of Representatives, or before any committee of Congress. Former officers and employees of the United States in the judicial branch of the Government are prohibited from acting as counsel or agent (other than for the Government) within 2 years from the date of their separation from Government service in relation to any proceeding or other matter before the court in which they held office or were employed.

STRENGTHENING OF LAW WITH RESPECT TO BRIBERY AND GRAFT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 638) to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 201. Offer to officer or other person.

"Whoever directly or indirectly promises, offers, or gives, or commits any overt act intended or designed to be or lead to a promise, offer or gift of, any money, emolument, profit, advantage, benefit, position, employment, opportunity, advancement or thing of value or makes or tenders any check, order, contract, undertaking, obligation, gratuity, or security for the payment of money or for the delivery or conveyance of anything of value, to any officer or employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, in any official function, under or by authority of any such department or agency or to any officer or person acting for or on behalf of either House of Congress, or of any committee of either House, or both Houses thereof, with intent or design to influence his decision or action on any question, matter, cause, or proceeding which may at any time be pending, or which may by law be brought before him in his official capacity, or in his place of trust or profit, or with intent or design to influence him to commit or aid in committing, or to collude in, or allow, any fraud, or make opportunity for the commission of any fraud, on the United States, or to induce him to do or omit to do any act in violation of his lawful duty, shall be fined not more than three times the amount of such money or value of such thing or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

"This section shall not apply to violations of section 212 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 202. Acceptance or solicitation by officer or other person.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of, or person acting for or on behalf of, the United States, in any official capacity, under or by virtue of the authority of any department or agency thereof, or an officer or person acting for or on behalf of either House of Congress, or of any committee of either House, or of both Houses thereof, directly or indirectly asks, solicits, seeks, accepts, or receives, or commits any overt act intended or designed to obtain any money, or any check, order, contract, promise, offer, gift, emolument, profit, advantage, benefit, position, employment, opportunity, advancement, undertaking, obligation, gratuity, or security for the payment of money, or for the delivery or conveyance of anything of value, with intent or design to have his decision or action on any question, matter, cause, or proceeding which may at any time be pending, or which may by law be brought before him in his official capacity, or in his place of trust or profit, influenced thereby, shall be fined not more than three times the amount of such money or value of such thing or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both; and shall forfeit his office or place and be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

"This section shall not apply to violations of section 213 of this title."

SEC. 3. Chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 224. Certain former officers and employees of the United States required to report private employment.

"Whoever, having been employed in any executive department or independent establishment of the United States, as a civilian officer or employee receiving compensation at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum or having been a commissioned officer in the uniformed services as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, within 2 years after the time when such employment or service in such department or independent establishment of the United States has ceased, shall accept, receive, or enter into any employment, appointment, agency or service with or for any private individual, firm, company, corporation or contractor which, to his knowledge during the period of service of such officer or employee of the United States, transacted business with such executive department or independent establishment, and shall not promptly notify in writing the department or independent establishment concerned, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft.

In brief, it will discourage the questionable practice which has been constantly called to our attention by congressional committees whereby Government employees who held positions either in the procurement, lending or revenue collecting agencies of the Government subsequently obtained rather lucrative positions with the same corporations they favored in negotiating contracts or loans.

This legislation has been worked out with the cooperation of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States.

In a letter to me under date of August 18, 1950, the Comptroller General says, and I quote,

"The broad subject of Government officers and employees going to work for Government contractors long has been of deep concern to the General Accounting Office. Certainly there can be no objection to any legitimate efforts of such people to obtain employment in private industry, or to efforts of private industry to secure the services of qualified employees. But it is equally certain that arrangements of this kind must be consistent with the public interest. I think you will agree that there is inherent in the public service, and in dealings with the Government, the requirements for exceptionally high standards of conduct.

"The real danger lies in the illicit inducement of Federal personnel by Government contractors, and solicitation by those personnel of an advantage from the contractors. As shown in my reports to the Congress and testimony before its committees, this may take the form of highly remunerative positions, or expensive entertainment, or other things of value, in return for special favors or privileges for the contractors. Often it originates or is implemented by veiled or outright connivance on the part of the Government people involved. Whether consummated or not, such dealings are inimical to the interests of the United States. They are nothing less than plain bribery."

The Comptroller General then suggests certain amendments to strengthen those sections of the criminal statutes, Nos. 201 and 202, dealing with bribery of Government officers and employees, and they are contained in the first part of my bill.

A new section is added at the end of chapter 11. It is designed to provide information which will form the basis for more effective action to implement the criminal statutes as well as the present safeguards for the expenditure of public funds. This section is self-explanatory, and it is as follows:

"SEC. 224. Certain former officers and employees of the United States required to report private employment.

"Whoever, having been employed in any executive department or independent establishment of the United States, as a civilian officer or employee receiving compensation at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum or having been a commissioned officer in the uniformed services as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, within 2 years after the time when such employment or service in such department or independent establishment of the United States has ceased, shall accept, receive, or enter into any employment, appointment, agency, or service with or for any private individual, firm, company, corporation, or contractor which, to his knowledge during the period of service of such officer or employee of the United States, transacted business with such executive department or independent establishment, and shall not promptly notify in writing the department or independent establishment concerned, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The mere existence of this provision on the statute books would have a powerful deterrent effect. The intent and the overt act to defeat the public interest or defraud the United States, by connivance between Government employees and contractors for future employment, would be punishable. Yet those whose arrangements are entirely legal and ethical would not be penalized. They would have ample protection to do what the honest businessman does in the everyday course of business. At the same time the Government, through information given to the agencies, would have effective means to check on the legality of the dealings with special reference to established safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

No one can doubt that such legislation is necessary and I cannot urge too strongly, in view of the expanded wartime Government procurement, that it be given immediate favorable consideration.

ABANDONMENT OF A CERTAIN PART OF FEDERAL PROJECT FOR BROADKILL RIVER IN DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 639) to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army is authorized and directed to abandon the part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware, adopted March 3, 1873, and modified March 2, 1907, which provides for an entrance channel from such river to Delaware Bay.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The bill I have introduced today provides for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware containing some 5.8 acres. This Federal project was adopted March 3, 1873, and modified March 2, 1907, providing for a channel 6 feet deep and 150 feet wide from Delaware Bay to Lewes and Rehoboth Canal (formerly Lewes Creek), and thence 6 feet deep and 40 feet wide to the town of Milton, with a jetty on the northerly side of the entrance channel.

This Government land was acquired in 1907 for constructing the entrance channel from Broadkill River, at its confluence with Lewes Creek, to Delaware Bay. The entrance channel has been very shallow. Vessels navigating between Milton and Delaware Bay have been using the section of Lewes and Rehoboth Canal between Broadkill River and Roosevelt Inlet.

Commerce in Broadkill River has been declining through the years and it appears, since the vessels that do travel between Milton and Delaware Bay have a good alternate route, that the entrance channel from Broadkill River to Delaware Bay could be abandoned. Such abandonment would allow the land which was acquired for the entrance channel to be reported to the General Services Administration, for disposal pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.).

The Secretary of the Department of the Army advises this legislation, believing that its continuance in the hands of the Federal Government is no longer desirable.

It is my hope that this proposed legislation can be given prompt consideration by the Committee on Public Works so that the lands can be declared surplus for further use by the Federal Government and disposed of in accordance with our Federal statutes.

UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY WITHIN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a United States Air Academy within the State of Florida, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 647) to establish the United States Air Academy within the State of Florida, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I have today introduced a measure calling for the creation of an Air Force Academy, for the training of officers to lead the United States Air Force in the same manner and with the same advantages that the Army and the Navy enjoy from having the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., and the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

I have gone further than other advocates of such an academy and have specified that this institution be situated in Florida, which, by a coincidence, is my home State and the State I represent in the Senate.

I added this stipulation to my bill because I think it well from the outset to meet the issue of the location which might otherwise find a number of States in competition.

Long ago the Air Force selected the State of Florida as being the most favorable from the standpoint of flying and training conditions of all the States in the Union. Weather Bureau records indicate that Florida has fewer hours unfavorable to flying time than any other area in the country, and it is among the choicest areas in the world for this activity. The State of Florida already has several of the great permanent aviation training facilities in the country in Eglin Field and MacDill Field, which are operated by the Air Force; Pensacola and Jacksonville, where are located major naval air stations; and Miami, which is one of the two major Marine Corps air stations in the United States. In Florida, also, is situated on Merritt Island, on the mouth of the Indian River near Cocoa, one of the most important Air Force experimental bases established, that of the guided missile's proving ground.

Almost any community or county in Florida would be appropriate for the location of this activity, and any and all of them would welcome such an institution and give it and its directors the fullest cooperation.

I urge most earnest consideration be given to this measure by the Armed Services Committee and the whole Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by Senator BRIDGES before the National Security Commission of the American Legion on January 25, 1953.

By Mr. CASE:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Research To Increase Supply of Pure Water."

Correspondence between himself and Carl R. Gray, Jr., Veterans' Administrator, dealing with Veterans' Administration repeat loans.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "A Real Break for Consumers," written by Albert Q. Maisel and published in the February 1953 issue of Redbook magazine.

Resolution adopted by United World Federalists of Iowa, Inc.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Article entitled "Dixie Boy Claims Best 1952 Corn Yield," printed in a recent issue of the Farm Journal.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Article entitled "How the FBI Tracks Reds and Spies" in the form of an interview with J. Edgar Hoover, and published in the Pathfinder November 5, 1952.

Article entitled "A Nest of Reds," written by Felix Morley, and published in the Pathfinder magazine of November 5, 1952.

Radio address delivered by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress.

By Mr. POTTER:

Article entitled "Sale of Stock Holdings Called Wrong in Cases Like Wilson's," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 26, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Article entitled "Prospect Brighter for Ending Hidden Subsidies on Air Mail," written by Edward A. Harris, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 9, 1953.

THE PETER MARSHALL FOUNDATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday marked the fourth anniversary of the passing of Dr. Peter Marshall, the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, who with such unique sense of understanding and dedication once prayed in this Chamber for the preservation of our health from the physical strains of our duties, good judgment for the decisions we must make, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.

To those of us who knew and loved Peter Marshall and carry in our hearts the memory of him and his marvelous ministry, it is indeed gratifying to know that there has been established at Columbia Theological Seminary at Decatur, Ga., the Peter Marshall Foundation, to honor the memory of Peter Marshall and to provide successors in God's service, to which he was dedicated. We know that he was one of the most divinely inspired and eloquent ministers in American history.

I ask unanimous consent to have read at this time a statement of the council of the Birmingham, Ala., Presbytery on the establishment of the Peter Marshall Foundation. The statement has been approved and adopted by the Presbytery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL TO BIRMINGHAM PRESBYTERY, JANUARY 13, 1953—APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE PRESBYTERY

On December 12, 1927, the Presbytery of Birmingham at a called meeting in the YMCA Building, Birmingham, received Peter Marshall, a young man just from Scotland, as a candidate for the ministry. He was recommended to the Presbytery by the session of the First Presbyterian Church of Birmingham. He remained as a candidate and was guided in his education by the Presbytery's committee until he was dismissed to Atlanta Presbytery May 13, 1931. In less than 20 years he had become pastor of one of Washington's great churches and Chaplain of the United States Senate.

The life and work of Peter Marshall focused the attention of the Nation on the power of God to direct and control at all times and through all circumstances. A continuance of this vital message is an essential in the life of our country.

Peter Marshall's God-given talents received development at the Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga. There, in an atmosphere that is warmly spiritual and definitely devoted to a teaching ministry of a miracle-working God the young Scotsman was encouraged and thoroughly trained.

To honor the memory of this man and to provide successors in the same service to which he was dedicated the Peter Marshall Foundation is being established at Columbia Theological Seminary.

Birmingham Presbytery notes with interest the plans of the committee to start this movement in Birmingham from which Peter Marshall entered the seminary and hopes that before the twenty-fifth anniversary of that date, September 9, 1953, the needed funds will be in hand.

Presbytery would assure its cooperation to the committee: Lloyd K. Boggs, Mrs. Roy Wates, David P. Anderson, John W. McQueen, and Harry H. Bryan in carrying out the plans of the seminary in establishing this foundation.

We commend this endeavor to individuals and to churches and urge that contributions be forwarded to the seminary for this purpose.

Further, we request that a Peter Marshall Sunday be designated at which time special opportunity be presented in the churches for giving to this cause.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the statement be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all Members of the Senate in wishing the greatest success for the noble enterprise known as the Peter Marshall Foundation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Dr. Peter Marshall was in all respects a unique man and minister. We in the State of Georgia have noted with great interest and almost universal approval the proposal to create the Peter Marshall Foundation at Columbia Theological Seminary, in the State of Georgia, from which he graduated. It is a worth-while undertaking.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I feel very privileged to stand on this floor and say a few words in tribute to one who was widely recognized as a great spiritual leader. Spiritual leadership is something the world needs. Peter Marshall was such a leader. Whenever he spoke as Chaplain of the Senate, his words, with their Scottish burr, seemed to resound not only through the corridors of this building but into the very hearts of those who heard him. Everywhere he made an imprint on the minds of his listeners. It was because there was something within him that spoke of the things of the spirit. He truly was a man of God.

I am very happy to join other Senators who have spoken in saying a word to those who have created this memorial. They have done a grand job in memory of a grand soul that has gone on in the journey we all must take.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy that my colleague from Alabama has presented the resolution which originated in the First Presbyterian Church of Birmingham. The people of Birmingham and the people of Alabama are very proud of the part they were able to play in the early life of Peter Marshall. It was the First Presbyterian Church in Birmingham which sent this young man to the seminary and made it possible for him to become the great preacher that he was. He was there as a young immigrant boy. After he had been there only a short time, the members of that church realized that the one great burning passion of his life was to go to a seminary and become a preacher of the Word of God. That was the one great ambition toward which he was working.

Mr. President, we all enjoyed the ministry of Peter Marshall while he was Chaplain of the Senate, and while he was minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. But it was not until after his death and after I had read the remarkable book, A Man Called Peter, written by his widow, that I understood very much of the life of this young man and the facts and circumstances surrounding his career. When I finished reading that book I said to myself, "I wish I had known this much about the man while he was serving us as Chaplain of the United States Senate." He was a great man and a great preacher. He exercised a powerful influence. I know that his memory and the influence of the man and the preacher will continue throughout the years by reason of the memorial foundation which has been established.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all of the statements which have been made this morning commending the purposes of the Peter Marshall movement. My home is near Winder, a small city in Georgia. When Peter Marshall was a student at Columbia Seminary he very often preached in the little Presbyterian Church in my home town. My mother was one of the most active persons in the church, and about half of the membership of the church were members of our family. He often visited in our home. I had an opportunity to know Peter Marshall when he was a young man and to note the influence he exercised on the young people with whom he came in contact. He attended all young people's meetings and was truly a great power for good.

I watched his rise through a number of pastorates to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, and always enjoyed and profited from my association with him during his tenure as Chaplain of the Senate.

He was a good man. I have often heard used the term "consecrated man." If I were to select a man who truly personified that term it would be Peter Marshall. I commend the purposes of this movement in honor of his memory, and hope it will produce other fine men who will labor as successfully as did Peter Marshall in strengthening the spiritual life of our country.

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, the junior Senator from Mississippi wishes to express his satisfaction at the announcement this morning by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with reference to the Peter Marshall Foundation at the Columbia Theological Seminary at Decatur, Ga. It will be a foundation promoted for the benefit of ministerial students, and I predict for this movement an outstanding success. It is not confined to the Presbyterian denomination, of which Peter Marshall was a member. That great man's concepts and his religious basis were broad enough to cover and to encompass spiritual beliefs of all kinds.

I commend to the young men who may be considering following that great profession a serious study of Peter Marshall's life and urge them to follow his example and training, particularly his great and broad interest in humanity. He was one of the big men of our time. I am very glad to join in the sentiments and commendations and encouragement for those who work in behalf of this great foundation.

SEVENTY-THIRD BIRTHDAY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have today heard commendatory remarks regarding two great citizens who have passed on—Peter Marshall and Charles A. Eaton. I ask the Senate to permit me for a moment to pay tribute to the greatest military genius of this age, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who today celebrates the seventy-third anniversary of his birth.

General MacArthur is a son of Wisconsin and one of America's greatest sons of all time. We who remember the circumstances when he returned after being dismissed from his far eastern command recall that all America acclaimed him not only as a great military genius, but as a preeminent citizen. I am very happy to congratulate him upon having arrived at his seventy-third milestone, and I hope that there are in store for him many more years of health, happiness, and great service to the Republic.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. EATON, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, later in this session of Congress much will be said of the talents of the Honorable Charles A. Eaton, a former Representative of the Fifth Congressional

District of New Jersey, whose sudden passing shocked us so deeply on Friday last.

In order that the record of his accomplishments and attainments may speak fully and adequately, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials—one from the Evening Star of Saturday, January 24, and the other from the Washington Post of the same date—be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

CHARLES A. EATON

Representative Eaton was a pillar of strength in the House for nearly three decades. But his most signal service came in the war and postwar years when the bipartisan approach to foreign-policy questions was hammered out in a steady flow of oratory. Senator Vandenberg carried the argument by his force as an orator and by his skill as a political leader who understood the importance of timing; Representative Eaton carried the argument by the force of his character and by his example of unchallenged devotion to the national welfare. He exercised a benign influence over the Foreign Affairs Committee during his chairmanship in the Eightieth Congress. It is doubtful that a man with less patience or less devotion could have held that unruly body to the task before it. He lived his religion and was indeed a true friend of his fellowman, and his passing will be mourned by all who had the joy of knowing him.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

MR. EATON OF NEW JERSEY

Charles Eaton came down to the United States from his native Nova Scotia to attend theological school. He remained here to enjoy a distinguished career, first in the Baptist pulpit, later as an editor, and finally as a statesman in a genuine meaning of the word.

For, as a Republican Representative in Congress from New Jersey, Mr. Eaton became a representative of the American people and their interests in the broadest sense. Mr. Eaton's finest years were his later ones when the maturity of his judgment lifted him above partisanship and placed him in a key role in dealing with our foreign policy during and after World War II. As ranking minority member, and during the Eightieth Congress as chairman, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Eaton was a close associate of the late Republican Senator Vandenberg in making bipartisanship in foreign policy a reality. In this capacity, the New Jersey Congressman earned the confidence and respect of his House colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, and the trust of Democratic Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Mr. Eaton's influence became particularly important and forceful after the war, a period when there were greater temptations to seek partisan advantage in the programs which the Democratic administrations were advocating on the world stage. Mr. Eaton never proposed that his party should accept without question the Roosevelt-Truman plans for economic aid and joint defense efforts. He proposed, instead, that each of them be studied with an honest appreciation of the motives and a careful scrutiny of the methods. He favored criticism that was constructive, and he contributed intelligently to it. "If we," he asked, "could unite to fight the last war of destruction, in the name of God, why can't we unite now for construction?"

There has been great unity and progress in this fight for construction and to Mr. Eaton is due a great share of the credit. Mr. Eaton, who died here yesterday, deserves the gratitude of his own political party and of the American people.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, these editorials speak more eloquently concerning the late Representative Eaton's distinguished career than any words which I could marshal.

It is gratifying to see true greatness recognized with such genuine sincerity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today in Plainfield, N. J., many friends and admirers are attending the funeral service of the late Charles A. Eaton, former Representative in Congress from New Jersey. It is a deep regret to my distinguished colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and me that because of our Senate responsibilities we cannot be present today in New Jersey to pay our respects to our departed friend and to extend our affectionate sympathies in person to his beloved family.

The career of Charles Eaton was in many ways unique. He was born in Nova Scotia in March 1868. From his early childhood he had a profound faith in the guidance of Almighty God in human affairs. He entered the Baptist ministry at the age of 25 and graduated from Newton Theological Institute of Massachusetts in 1893. He served pastorates in Natick, Mass.; Toronto, Canada; Cleveland, Ohio, and New York.

In World War I he felt the call to serve his Government and headed the national service section of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

He was first elected to Congress in 1924 and was reelected every succeeding term until his retirement in 1952. Whether in the pulpit, or in the legislative halls of the Congress, his mission was to reflect throughout his noble life the spirit of human brotherhood.

Representative Eaton's most distinguished service was rendered during the closing years of his life, when with the late Senator Vandenberg, he participated with Secretary of State Cordell Hull in the development of our bipartisan foreign policy during World War II, and in the events that led up to the creation and adoption of the United Nations Charter. During the Eightieth Congress he was chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial of Saturday, January 24, from the Washington Evening Star, entitled, "Mr. Eaton of New Jersey."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. EATON OF NEW JERSEY

Charles Eaton came down to the United States from his native Nova Scotia to attend theological school. He remained here to enjoy a distinguished career, first in the Baptist pulpit, later as an editor, and finally as a statesman in a genuine meaning of the word.

For, as a Republican Representative in Congress from New Jersey, Mr. Eaton became a representative of the American people and their interests in the broadest sense. Mr. Eaton's finest years were his later ones when the maturity of his judgment lifted him above partisanship and placed him in a key role in dealing with our foreign policy during and after World War II. As ranking minority member, and during the Eightieth Congress as chairman, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Eaton was a close associate of the late Republican Senator Vandenberg in making bipartisanship in foreign policy a reality. In this capacity, the New Jersey Congressman earned the confidence and respect of his House colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, and the trust of Democratic Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Mr. Eaton's influence became particularly important and forceful after the war, a period when there were greater temptations to seek partisan advantage in the programs which the Democratic administrations were advocating on the world stage. Mr. Eaton never proposed that his party should accept without question the Roosevelt-Truman plans for economic aid and joint defense efforts. He proposed, instead, that each of them be studied with an honest appreciation of the motives and a careful scrutiny of the methods. He favored criticism that was constructive, and he contributed intelligently to it. "If we," he asked, "could unite to fight the last war of destruction, in the name of God, why can't we unite now for construction?"

There has been great unity and progress in this fight "for construction" and to Mr. Eaton is due a great share of the credit. Mr. Eaton, who died here yesterday, deserves the gratitude of his own political party and of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This editorial ably reflects the very high esteem in which Mr. Eaton was held nationally. The press of New Jersey has reflected the universal affection that the people of our State of New Jersey felt for him.

To me, personally, Charlie Eaton's passing is a great loss. For many years he has been a warm personal friend. His courage, his vision, his glorious sense of humor, and his unswerving faith in God during the crises through which our beloved country has been passing will always be an inspiration to us all. To his beloved family my wife and I extend our deepest sympathy. We are filled with gratitude that we were privileged to know him and to live with him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Carl W. McCardle, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of State; and

Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Lee Rankin, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy; and

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, resigned;

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of John S. Graham, resigned;

Elbert P. Tuttle, of Georgia, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, in place of Thomas J. Lynch, resigned;

Ivy Baker Priest, of Utah, to be Treasurer of the United States, in place of Georgia Neese Clark, resigned;

T. Coleman Andrews, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy; and

Alma K. Schneider, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. WILSON TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McCarthy
Anderson	Goldwater	McClellan
Barrett	Gore	Millikin
Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Griswold	Mundt
Bricker	Hayden	Neely
Bridges	Hendrickson	Pastore
Bush	Hennings	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Purtell
Byrd	Hoey	Robertson
Capehart	Holland	Russell
Carlson	Hunt	Saltonstall
Case	Ives	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jackson	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Daniel	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kennedy	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Symington
Duff	Kilgore	Taft
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Tobey
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the nomination of Charles E. Wilson of Michigan to be Secretary of Defense, the position to which he was appointed by President Eisenhower, has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Wilson is the father of six children. He has 13 grandchildren. He is a good family man. His integrity, his character, his reputation for civic undertakings is of the highest. We all know of Mr. Wilson's great leadership of General Motors Corporation. His ability as an executive and as an administrator is unquestioned.

The problem that concerned the committee in connection with this appointment was one of conflict of interests. General Motors Corporation is one of the largest prime contractors with the Government on equipment for defense. Mr. Wilson told the committee frankly that he owned a little less than 40,000 shares of General Motors stock. He also stated that he had completely divorced himself from the management of the General Motors Corporation and from every other business or civic interest which he believes might in any way conflict with his duty as Secretary of Defense. He has parted from General Motors lock, stock, and barrel with no written or verbal understanding—expressed or implied—regarding any return to that corporation when his term of office as Secretary of Defense shall have been completed.

He has, he told the committee, certain rights under the General Motors bonus and pension plan. He is entitled, for past services rendered, to receive over the next 5 years a certain sum of cash and 1,737 shares of General Motors stock. This is a bonus for past services. That service ended on December 31, 1952. It has nothing to do with any action of Mr. Wilson after December 31, 1952. It was clear to the committee that this bonus was for past services only.

Section 434 of title 18, United States Code, which was made a part of the record of the hearings reads:

SEC. 434. Interested persons acting as Government agents.

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

The conflict of interests which concerned the committee was between the ownership of the stock in General Motors and the duties of the Secretary of Defense. After considerable discussion it became obvious that the committee did not see its way clear to approve Mr. Wilson's nomination so long as he held his stock ownership in General Motors. It was the belief of the committee that Mr. Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, in making policy decisions that affected prime contracts between General Motors and the various agencies within the Department of Defense, might well violate section 434.

Consequently, on Friday of last week, Mr. Wilson came before the committee for a second time and said flatly that he would dispose of all his stock holdings in General Motors on or before April 1, 1953. He stated that all of this stock would be sold, except for not to exceed 20 percent that he might give to members of his family, and he thought the amount would be less than that. This gift would be a complete delivery of the stock, with no strings attached; and he would pay any gift taxes that might be due the Government thereon.

He further told us in a brief afternoon session that the attorney for the independent committee that had the sole responsibility for carrying out the bonus plan of General Motors had agreed to recommend to that committee that any bonus stock to which Mr. Wilson might become entitled when, as and if due under the contract, would be paid in cash at the market value of the stock on the day when Mr. Wilson's nomination as Secretary of Defense is confirmed. Yesterday, Sunday, Mr. Wilson called me to say that Mr. Sloan, chairman of the committee, agreed to carry out the recommendation of the attorney. By such disposal the Armed Services Committee agreed that Mr. Wilson had cleared himself of any possible difficulties under title 18 of the code because of any action he might take as Secretary of Defense, so far as General Motors is concerned. He no longer will own any stock of General Motors, and has severed all connections with its management.

Mr. Wilson further told the committee that if in the future any question of policy arises—and he could not foresee one—in connection with which General Motors might be considered to be involved, and which conceivably he might feel it wiser to get the President, as Commander in Chief, to decide, he had an understanding with the President that he would so do.

Because of Mr. Wilson's known ability as an executive, because of his recognized integrity and character, and because of his clear and unqualified statements that he would dispose of his ownership of General Motors stock and thus completely divorce himself from that company, the committee unanimously recommended that the Senate consent to the confirmation of his nomination as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas voted in the Senate Armed Services Committee to report Mr. Wilson's nomination as Secretary of Defense. I believe he is a patriotic American and a man of integrity. Although I have strong misgivings as to the wisdom of his appointment, I do not intend to obstruct and oppose confirmation of his nomination now that it is before the Senate.

Under our system of government, the President has the grave responsibility of selecting the members of the Cabinet. The Secretary of Defense is one of the leading—if not the leading—officers of the President's official family.

As Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson will be one of the most powerful members of the administration. He will preside over an establishment of more than

5,000,000 people. He will be in charge of spending from fifty-five to sixty billions of dollars a year. In preparedness matters, he will speak—in the public mind—with all the authority of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, for 15 years I have served on committees of Congress dealing with the armed services. For 40 years the President has been intimately acquainted with the Defense Establishment. In the last election, he received a tremendous vote of confidence from the American people.

As one who is convinced of the urgency of organizing our Defense Department speedily, I am anxious to cooperate with the President in carrying out the mandate of the people. Unless there is a violation of some important principle, I believe the President should have around him the men he personally has selected.

The President has selected Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson has finally promised to purge himself of the circumstances which, in the minds of many Senators, stood in the way of his confirmation. Upon that basis, I cannot see my way clear to deny to our new President the type of man he insists upon having as Secretary of Defense.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I can understand the doubts and misgivings in the minds of many Senators. They are doubts and misgivings which I share. They should not be construed as a reflection upon Mr. Wilson's integrity or production ability. I believe those qualities are conceded by everyone.

There are many, however, who quite properly question the wisdom of turning to the largest military contracting firm in the United States for a Secretary of Defense. It may well be that both the President and Mr. Wilson are being asked to make a great sacrifice.

It may prove to be quite embarrassing simply because no private establishment is more important to the Defense Department than is General Motors. At the same time, no establishment of any kind is more important to General Motors than is the Defense Department.

The two organizations have mutual interests. Yet, frequently, what is good for the one is not good for the other and vice versa.

Mr. Wilson has agreed—after some hesitation—to divest himself of his stockholdings in General Motors. For a period of years, he will continue to receive some benefits from that corporation, but there is a firm understanding that those benefits have already been earned, and will not be affected in any manner by his actions as Secretary of Defense.

These benefits are considerable. They amount to 1,737 shares of General Motors stocks and more than $600,000. Mr. Wilson has agreed in advance to dispose of those stocks. He thus hopes to remove himself from any position which might give rise to suspicion.

The facts I have cited above are well known to the President and to the country. We can only conclude that the President has considered them most carefully, and still feels that this appointment is in the best interests of the Nation.

It is not my intention to go behind the President's judgment in selecting his Cabinet officers. He has the responsibility of selection. He must accept the responsibilities for and the consequences of their acts. The formal legal requirements concerning Mr. Wilson's appointment have been met. I have no desire, therefore, to delay consideration of the nomination, and I shall so vote when the roll is called.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senate has before it today the nomination of Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense. Mr. Wilson was designated by President-elect Dwight D. Eisenhower prior to the President's taking office. The President was very familiar with the duties of the Secretary of Defense, for as Chief of Staff and as General of the Army he knew not only the duties of this Cabinet post but also the qualifications a man must have if he is to perform such duties well.

The security of a nation is based upon the ability of its men. The country needs the services of its able people. Our defense effort must be based on manpower and its effective and adequate support. The business of the Defense Department is to save lives insofar as possible through efficient preparedness which will cause a potential enemy to consider the inadvisability of attacking our Nation. When our young men and women expose their lives to the horrors of war, they should be assured of adequate and sufficient training for their protection and the minimizing of the danger of their exposure; but this alone is not enough, for there is also the responsibility of providing the men and of training them with a minimum disruption of their lives.

The lives of the individuals, and soldiers, indeed, of a whole division of soldiers, are dependent upon having the equipment, ammunition, and matériel in the right place at the right time. Because of the great complexity of this task and the enormous variety of equipment and matériel required to be produced by American industry from materials which are in turn taken from the treasuries of our natural resources, it becomes of vital importance that the entire defense effort be ably organized, efficiently operated, and thoroughly coordinated. Otherwise, we would not only needlessly sacrifice the lives of our sons and daughters, but we might also destroy our economy and lose our freedom.

The President, in seeking the best men to do the job, asked Charles E. Wilson to serve as his Secretary of Defense, because of his broad knowledge, experience, and executive ability. Mr. Wilson responded in a patriotic manner and consented to have his nomination go before the Senate for confirmation. The President believed that what a man had done was proof of his capacity to do. Mr. Wilson had headed what is probably our largest industrial organization. He had demonstrated his capacity under our system to produce commodities which people bought, used, and continued to buy and use.

The conduct of the affairs of General Motors is not a one-man job. Neither is the effective and efficient operation of the Nation's Defense Establishment. Each is a job for a team. The man who has been president of that great company knows men, knows how to select them, and how to get results from them to achieve a common purpose. He can judge talent, capacity, and the ability to perform. This talent is greatly needed in the Defense Department, and in all branches of our Government.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have seen first hand how inefficiency and the lack of ability can and do cost the taxpayers billions of dollars. Yes, Mr. President, inefficiency and the lack of ability are even greater thieves of the taxpayer's dollar than is corruption, though no one can discount the effect of corruption upon the public morals and the general welfare. Our defense organization must not be denied men of ability and experience who are willing to serve the Nation. In some instances the evidence shows that in our Defense Department the man who was finally willing to take an assignment was the thirty-third choice—in one case, the fifty-seventh choice. Is it any wonder that the taxpayers are crushed with the tax burden?

At Baltimore, during the campaign, the President spoke of the cost of our national defense. Every taxpayer, large and small, knows that it is the tax dollar and the lives of our men that pay for the defense of our country. Therefore, the President is vitally interested in having the job done efficiently and economically.

The ability of Mr. Wilson is well known and unquestioned, but the question of his prior General Motors connections has been raised and has become, in some minds, the important and the only issue here involved. The question of assumed or possible conflict of interest has always been present in Government work. I have always subscribed to the concept that the public interest is paramount, that there should be no conflict of interest in the performance of a Government job. It has been the common theory and practice in the past that a man could disqualify himself with respect to a particular company or decision without impairing his ability to carry out all the other functions of his office.

Mr. Wilson was under the impression that this precedent would be fully acceptable in his case. However, such procedure has been questioned with respect to the Secretary of Defense, and when he learned of this, Mr. Wilson, being unwilling to assume the duties of the office unless his activities could be held to be above reproach, volunteered to divest himself of his holdings in General Motors.

When he appeared before the committee, he declared:

> In these days when the whole free world is faced with such serious problems it is imperative that the Department of Defense have the united support of the people of our country.
>
> In order to achieve this objective, I have decided, after carefully considering the matter, to dispose of all of the General Motors stock which I now own and any which I am entitled to receive in the future under rights which accrue to me on the termination of my employment.

I interpolate to say that Mr. Wilson has stated, and he has told the Chairman

of the Armed Services Committee, that he has now an arrangement under which the stock which is to be given to him in the future will be immediately paid in cash, that the value will be fixed as of the date of the confirmation of his nomination by the Senate, and that therefore he will receive no benefit, either direct or indirect, as the result of any increase in profits, or in any other way, from General Motors. In his statement to the committee, Mr. Wilson stated further:

Mr. Kyes—

Mr. Kyes is to be his Under Secretary—

has authorized me to tell you that he will do the same thing.

If, during my term of office, I must deal with any matter of business which I may feel might be the subject of misunderstanding on account of my previous relationship with General Motors Corp., I have been assured of the privilege of discussing the matter fully with the President of the United States with reference to any action that may be taken.

I regret exceedingly any interpretation that may have been placed on my previous testimony not consistent with what I have outlined here. For that reason I am grateful to the members of this committee for the opportunity of making perfectly clear the full spirit of my concept of the responsibility I have been asked to undertake.

As a Senator, I feel very strongly that, if we cannot utilize the services of a man because of his previous employment and contacts, even though he is qualified in every way, then we are, indeed, in a sorry position to secure the able men we desperately need.

We must assume that when an honest man takes a Government job, he is going to excuse himself from acting in any case in which he could benefit personally or in any case in which he has a conflict of interest, and will allow someone else who is superior to him to act in his place. We see this in action every day, in our courts, where judges disqualify themselves and refuse to sit in judgment on cases in which they have an interest.

No real American, when called to public service for the good of his country, would put his personal interest or his past association ahead of his Nation.

We must not lose sight of the central fact—the major issue. We are involved in a Korean war, in which lives are being lost as we sit here. The free world is being challenged. The casualties are not statistics to the immediate families and loved ones.

I know that mothers and fathers of boys now in Korea, or who may be going there, were tremendously heartened when President Eisenhower secured C. E. Wilson as Secretary of Defense. The American public applauded this selection. There was genuine and widespread approval across the country.

Why was this? Because the American public recognized that we had secured for the service of the American people one of the greatest industrial organizers this country has ever had. He is a man who has demonstrated that he can handle a big job. He has already organized and directed an important segment of the defense production.

Democrats and Republicans alike applauded his selection because they knew politics had no part in the defense effort where boys' and men's lives were at stake.

With a boy's life at stake now or in the future, who would settle for anything less than the best man we can get for this job? Certainly there are a lot of good men, but this is not the case of getting just a good man. We are anxious to get the very best man to do this job.

Many men in military and Government service have been called upon to make great sacrifices. Yes, Mr. President; they have sacrificed their lives on many occasions. Mr. Wilson, true to this concept of duty, has responded. This has given added confidence to our Nation.

I am happy that our Armed Services Committee has approved the nomination after a full hearing.

As a Senator from Michigan, I consider it a great privilege to endorse his nomination, and urge swift and overwhelming confirmation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in 1945, or possibly 1947, I encountered a man in Berlin who was in the service of his Government and who came back and ultimately became the publisher of a newspaper in the State of Indiana. His name is J. Ward Starr. He became the publisher of the Anderson Herald, in Anderson, Ind., where Mr. Charles Wilson was born.

I allude to this, Mr. President, only because there is what appears to me to be some rather vague thinking on the subject, as evidenced by the first paragraph of the editorial I hold in my hand. Mr. Starr does me the honor, because I knew him in Germany, generously to annotate the editorial in red pencil so that it cannot miss my eye. I think the Senate will be interested in the first paragraph, and I shall ask to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD. The first paragraph reads:

We're mad this morning. Mad and disgusted.

Because this is the day Charles E. Wilson, designated by President Eisenhower for the biggest job in the world, goes before a Senate committee that will debate his fitness for service to the Nation.

I do not know that Mr. Wilson's fitness is involved. At least, in my considered judgment, when I vote I shall vote on the question whether, under the law of the United States of America, there is a conflict of interest which might make it difficult for an individual in Mr. Wilson's status properly to articulate his responsibility as an officer of this Government. To me the interesting aspect of it is that it was 90 years ago, on the 26th of January 1863, that a similar question came to the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Thucydides observed 2,400 years ago that history repeats itself. That may not be precisely accurate, but certainly history does run in interesting parallels.

So, Mr. President, 90 years ago this week the then Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, brought to the Senate floor Senate bill No. 467, in the third session of the Thirty-seventh Congress. Why was that bill, which was the precursor of the statute which is on the books today, brought before the Senate? It was there because the War Department asked for it. It came to the floor of the Senate because frauds and scandals in the Civil War became so bad that the War Department asked for that bill. So, in pursuance of the Department's request, there went upon the statute books a law which tried to define the question of the conflict of interest, and it is the progenitor of the section of the law which is upon the books at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE FOR WILSON

We're mad this morning. Mad and disgusted.

Because this is the day Charles E. Wilson, designated by President Eisenhower for the biggest job in the world, goes before a Senate committee that will debate his fitness for service to the Nation.

We are mad about the tragic state of affairs in which the United States Government finds itself—a state of affairs so snarled up by an intricate network of law that the people of the United States are virtually incapable of making use of one of the finest administrative minds in the world.

We think we have a very special reason to be mad, too. Because this community—to say nothing of this newspaper—has a proprietary interest in C. E. Wilson.

We are convinced that Mr. Wilson is known personally and intimately by more rank-and-file citizens in Anderson than in any other community in the world.

He is known here by the barber who cuts his hair, by the dairyman who delivered his milk, by the physician who tended his ills, by the dentist who filled his teeth, by the trashman who hauled away his garbage, by the newsboy who delivered his newspaper, by the teachers who instructed his children, by the clergyman who nourished his soul.

Through those associations, C. E. Wilson's integrity was tested a thousand times. And never was it found wanting.

This community knows Mr. Wilson because this community made him.

He came here a young engineer. He left an industrial titan.

The people of Anderson could build a mountain of testimonials to his honesty and his basic soundness. Nothing the partisan politician can do or say will shake our faith in our old and trusted friend.

And yet the Nation stands in danger of losing his services—at a time when America needs its most tested and experienced hands at the helm.

Isn't it a curious system that penalizes initiative and punishes success? That requires its public servants to embark upon their careers in Government penniless and destitute—shorn of the fruits of genius and hard work?

Perhaps some of the objectors are conscientious in fearing that General Motors will enjoy undue advantage if C. E. Wilson becomes Secretary of Defense. They forget that General Motors has demonstrated time and again its ability to operate successfully and prosperously without the United States Government—without one single contract for guns or tanks or planes. And they forget, too, that the United States Government in this period of critical mobilization simply cannot operate without the know-how and brains of General Motors.

We believe that Mr. Wilson's talents must be made available to the people of the United States; that the Congress must do whatever proves necessary to remove the barriers to his service.

And we think that we in his home town—we who knew him best in his formative years—have a right to speak longest and loudest in his defense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the debates participated in on the floor of the Senate at that time by Senator Howard and Senator Wilson are very interesting, and I ask that at the end of my remarks a memorandum prepared for me by the Librarian of Congress be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the 2d day of March 1863 the forebear of the law which is involved today was signed by the President of the United States. Who was it who signed it? It was President Abraham Lincoln, from the State of Illinois. So, Mr. President, 90 years ago this week the Senate was busy discussing this very question.

I simply desire to say to those who think that the Senate is captious, or that it is trying to embarrass someone, that there is not involved here the integrity of an individual; there is not involved the question of personal character; there is not involved the question of fitness. I assume, without knowing, that a man who presides over the economic destiny of an empire so great as that of General Motors must have capacity, or his nomination would not be before the Senate.

But there is also before us a statute, which is as clear as crystal. One does not have to pretend to legal lore or to possess a judicial mind in order to understand it, because it provides:

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. President, I do not think the choice is very difficult. There is the law; and the new Attorney General of the United States, when he came before the Judiciary Committee a week ago, responding to a question from one of the members of the committee, said—and I was delighted to hear him say it:

I believe in a government of law and not of men.

Well, Mr. President, this is the law.

So, had Mr. Wilson not divested himself of his General Motors interests, I must, in all candor, say for myself, as a public servant, that I would have found it extremely difficult to vote for his confirmation as I intend to do.

I am satisfied with the report made by the Committee on Armed Services to the Senate today. I am glad that the Government can utilize the services and the extraordinary talents of Mr. Wilson in a place of responsibility, but I want to be certain that the issue is clearly defined.

The Secretary of Defense is empowered to make contracts. Could he retain his interest in a corporation doing the substantial business with the United States and still conform to this statute? Fitness is not the issue. It is merely a question whether he can serve his Government in conformity with a law that has been on the books for nearly 90 years, and which was signed by a President possessed of a fine, sensitive conscience, and inspired by a deep devotion to public duty—Abraham Lincoln.

There has not been much quarrel about this law in 90 years, so I am happy that Mr. Wilson will comply, and that his compliance satisfies those who have sat and examined the testimony in his case. I merely wish to make the RECORD clear as to my views.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 22, 1953.

To: Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

Subject: The statute on interested persons acting as Government officers or agents, considered in connection with the proposed nomination of a Secretary of Defense.

The statute in question is the act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 645, sec. 1; 62 Stat. 709; 18 U. S. C. (1948 ed., supp. V), sec. 434). The original enactment upon which the present statute is based was the act of March 2, 1863 (ch. 67; 12 Stat. 698 (sec. 3)). The present statute reads as follows:

"SEC. 434. Interested persons acting as Government agents.

"Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

The background of the statute and the reasons for its enactment are indicated by its legislative history, as stated in volume 63, CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE (pp. 348, 584), and in volume 64 (for the remaining pages cited below).

Page 348, S. 467, Thirty-seventh Congress, third session, January 16, 1863: A bill to prevent and punish frauds upon the United States, introduced by Senator Wilson of Massachusetts. Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and Militia.

Page 584, January 29: Bill reported without amendment.

Page 913, February 12: Bill considered by the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, in executive session.

Page 925, February 13: Unfinished consideration postponed.

Page 952, February 14: Amendment reported by Committee on Military Affairs read. Explanation of the bill by Senator Howard, who offered a new section (the section in question) as an amendment to the amendment (p. 954). Amendment agreed to.

Senator Howard, presenting the bill, spoke as follows (64 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE 952):

"I will simply say to the Senate that this bill has been prepared at the urgent solicitation of the officers who are connected with the administration of the War Department and Treasury Department. The country, as we know, has been full of complaints respecting the frauds and corruptions practiced in obtaining pay from the Government during the present war; and it is said, and earnestly urged upon our attention, that further legislation is pressingly necessary to prevent this great evil; and I suppose there can be no doubt that these complaints are, in the main, well founded. From the attention I have been able to give the subject, I am satisfied that more stringent provisions are required for the purpose of punishing and preventing these frauds; and with a view to apply a more speedy and vigorous remedy in cases of this kind the present bill has been prepared."

After presenting the provisions of the bill, Senator Howard offered as an amendment the section which became section 3 of the act, the original form of the statute now under consideration. The Senator said (p. 954):

"I offer a new section to come in between sections 8 and 9: *'And be it further enacted*, That no officer or agent of any banking or other commercial corporation, and no member of any mercantile or trading firm, or person directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of such corporation or firm, shall be employed or shall act as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such corporation or firm; and every such officer, agent, or member, or person so interested, who shall so act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, nor less than $500, and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years'."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to, and the Vice President stated that the question was on the amendment of the committee, as amended. The discussion centered mainly on the extent to which trial by court martial as distinguished from trial by the usual civil courts could be provided for offenders against the act. On this point Senator Howard said (p. 955):

"As to the expediency of resorting to this more summary mode of punishment, I will call the attention of Senators to some cases which have arisen during the present rebellion. Persons have been employed to furnish shells for the use of the Army; and in several cases it has turned out that these shells have been filled not with the proper explosive materials for use, but with sawdust; thus making the instrument of no utility whatever, and, by thus practicing a fraud upon the Government, endangering our military operations. A contractor who enters into an agreement to furnish arms for the use of the United States in prosecuting a war may practice the same description of fraud upon us; and I believe that some frauds of a very gross character have already been practiced in the purchase and furnishing of small arms for the use of the Army. * * * Mr. President, it is desirable to enact some law which shall remove the stigma which rests upon the country and the Government in reference to the frauds, corruptions, and peculations which have disgraced our service during the whole of this war. It is one of the crying evils of the period, if report is in any degree to be credited, that our Treasury is plundered from day to day by bands of conspirators, who are knotted together in this city and other large cities for the purpose of defrauding and plundering the Government. And we all know, who are lawyers, and the most of us on this floor are such, that if we refer all these cases to the ordinary courts, and require a proceeding to be taken by a grand jury, and then a trial by a traverse jury, very little good can result."

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, in continuing the debate, said (p. 956):

"Mr. President, these Halls have rung with denunciations of the frauds of contractors upon the Government of the United States. Investigating committees in both Houses of Congress have reported the grossest frauds upon the Government. The Government is doing what it can to stop these frauds and punish the persons who commit them. The Government finds, however, that it has no law adequate to punish them. Senators who object to this bill would do well to show that we have laws which can reach such a case. The law officer of the War Department says there is now no law adequate to meet these cases of fraud upon the Government. This bill is reported for the purpose of ferreting out and punishing these enormous frauds upon our Government; and, for one, my sympathies are with the Government, and not with the men who are committing

these frauds. We have all of us seen enough, since this rebellion broke out, of frauds perpetrated upon the Government, and above all, and more than all, perpetrated upon our soldiers in the field; and I trust that the Senate will pass this bill, or some bill that will put fraudulent contractors in a position where they may be punished for their frauds."

The proposed new section, later section 8 of the act and original form of the present statute, which was offered as an amendment by Senator Howard was not discussed separately and directly in the debate.

After some minor amendments the bill was passed in the Senate (p. 958).

Proceedings on the bill in the House of Representatives were as follows:

Volume 64 CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, page 1002, February 16: Message from Senate asked concurrence of House.

Page 1175, February 21: Bill referred to special Committee on Government Contracts.

Page 1307, February 26: Reported back with an amendment. Passed in the House.

In the Senate, page 1322, February 27: Bill returned amended from House. Amendments concurred in.

In the House, page 1343, February 27: Message from Senate. Agreed to amendment.

Page 1356, February 27: Signed by Speaker.

Page 1361, February 28: Signed by President of Senate pro tempore.

Page 1427, March 2, 1863: Message from President announced he had signed S. No. 467.

The act of March 2, 1863, has not been changed substantially in the two subsequent general codifications. These codifications are the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, sec. 41; 35 Stat. 1097; 18 U. S. C. (1940 ed.) sec. 93); and the act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 645, sec. 1; 62 Stat. 703; 18 U. S. C. (1946 ed., supp. V) sec. 434), the present statute.

JAMES J. ROBINSON,
American Law Section.

JANUARY 22, 1953.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the confirmation of the pending nomination.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express regret to my colleagues for the difficulty any of them may have in hearing me this morning, assuming that anyone wishes to hear my remarks. I may say that earlier this morning, in Bethesda, I had my jawbone scraped, and, speaking facetiously, judging from some of my mail, there are some people who wish that something else had happened to my jawbone besides having had it scraped. However, I shall not speak at great length, and I had no intention to speak at great length even if I had not had the dental surgery this morning.

Mr. President, I speak from the depths of my heart concerning what I consider to be a great ethical safeguard, the perpetuation of which, I think, is essential to the continuation of good government. I speak in support of what I think is a very important protection we ought to retain in our country if we are to have what my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has just mentioned, namely, the retention of government by law instead of by men and by the discretion of men.

In my judgment, the question of Mr. Wilson's financial holdings is very much beside the point, so far as the issue before the Senate today is concerned, because that issue, as I said last week, involves a question of good public policy, not a question of whether Mr. Wilson has met some technical requirement of the law. In my opinion, it does not make any difference what Mr. Wilson does by way of divesting himself, in his own name, of any financial holdings in General Motors. Human nature being what it is, I do not think that he could possibly divest himself of the feeling of affinity he has for General Motors and big business, nor do I think he could possibly divest himself of the affinity of relationship he has with the personnel of that widespread organization known as General Motors.

It is difficult and delicate to discuss the principle involved in a matter such as the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson, because we are dealing with a fellow human being, and we are dealing with him in connection with a situation in which, no matter what is said by way of criticism of the appointment, there will be people who will think that we are dealing in personalities.

Mr. President, what saddens me is that there was not a recognition on the part of the incoming administration of what I consider to be the very important question of public policy that is bound to be involved in such a case as this, so that the nomination never would have come before the Senate in the first place.

Mr. Wilson is not an indispensable man. Mr. Wilson is not a superman. In a population of 160 million fellow Americans, there are, in my judgment, literally scores and scores of men who could be selected for the office to which Mr. Wilson has been appointed and who could fill it as ably as could Mr. Wilson.

I am always a little amused when emphasis is placed on an appointment so as to leave the impression that the particular individual is so exceptionally able that, no matter what might be said against him, if he will only comply in form irrespective of the spirit and intent of a principle imbedded in the law, his nomination ought to be satisfactory to the Senate, and the Senate ought to be willing to confirm it. Those that so argue like to leave the impression that in the national interest it is of the utmost importance that the Nation receive the services of the individual. However, the arguments they advance really are rationalizations of an untenable position which they have taken.

Of course, such rationalization is an interesting, persuasive device, but when it is analyzed, it does not hold up. If, as I have said, the appointment raises a serious question, from the standpoint of public policy, in the minds of many of our people equally sincere as those who urge the appointment, then we ought to stop, look, and listen before we give our consent. It is important in this critical hour that the American public not be divided in regard to the wisdom of making a particular selection for the Cabinet. I say it is divided over this particular appointment. How much so, I would not venture to say, but if we read the press, read our mail, or listen to discussion wherever we go these days, we find there is no unanimity on this appointment. There is no unanimity because there is a sentiment in the minds of many of our people which seems to inspire the query: "Why did Mr. Eisenhower have to select for the office the president of a corporation that has a tremendous number of defense contracts with the very department that the nominee is to head?"

Someone may say, "Well, Senator, whom would you have selected?" Of course, I should be under no duty to make a suggestion, and perhaps it would be presumptuous of me to do so; but I would have no difficulty in selecting one of a great number of men who, I think, could do the job as well. For example, what is the matter with Paul Hoffman, a man of at least equal capacity? In my judgment he is a man with at least equal understanding of the relationship of the problem of the Defense Department to the security of our Nation and to its foreign policy. Mr. Hoffman is a man with a great record of public service.

Thus one could continue, if it were relevant to the discussion—and I do not think it is—to name others in answer to the question, "Whom would you select, Senator?" One could name many others who certainly would be the equal of this particular nominee in capacity, ability, and understanding.

I wish the RECORD to show my feelings about the nominee. I have studied the hearings. When I finished reading the hearings I came to the conclusion that this nominee simply does not possess the sensitivity to ethical standards which I think is essential in one who is to undertake the great public trust of Secretary of Defense. That is not an accusation unsupported by the record. Let us look at the record.

Mr. Wilson seemed to be surprised that any question at all should be raised about his nomination. His language indicated—and I understand that if one had been there he would have gained the impression that his bearing and attitude buttressed what even the cold print shows—that he seemed to think that he was beyond having any question raised as to the propriety of his holding General Motors stocks or of his subordinates holding similar stocks and at the same time discharging the official duties of these public offices.

It was not because he did not know the actual language of the law. I have been reliably informed through sources at the Pentagon Building that he had been advised by officials in the Pentagon itself, in the course of his briefing in preparation for the job, concerning the legal problems which would arise in connection with the confirmation of his nomination. In reading the hearings I formed the impression from the attitude expressed in his language that he apparently thought he ought to be considered above the law, or that the law ought to be waived, and that it was almost a reflection on his integrity to raise any question about whether or not he ought to be required to get rid of his stock. He even thought Senators were pushing him around in that connection. I like the reply of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He said, in effect, "I am sorry that you think anyone is pushing you around. However, as

Senators we, too, have our responsibilities."

How true, Mr. President. Speaking for myself, I think we have the responsibility of leaning over backward in a matter such as this, in the interest of guaranteeing to the American people the preservation of Government by law and not by men. We should take no chances on one who shows such a lack of sensitivity in regard to the ethical principles involved in whether his self-interest, direct or indirect, conflicts with those for which he has been designated.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to the language "direct or indirect." I emphasize the fact that the word "indirect" is a part of the statute. It is my judgment that the so-called meeting of the tests of legal form by Mr. Wilson does not cover the matter of indirect interest which, in my judgment, he will continue to have in General Motors. He will have that indirect interest from the standpoint of the affinity of feeling and comradeship with the officials of General Motors. I think we can assume, that Wilson being human, that indirect interest will continue between him and his former associates in General Motors in the administration of his work as Defense Secretary.

There is still some indirect interest in finances, too. As I read the hearings, there will still be large holdings on the part of the Wilson family in General Motors stock.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] brought out in his statement in support of the confirmation of the nomination that Mr. Wilson is a good family man. So am I. So far as I know, that is true of all our colleagues in the Senate who have families. What do we mean by being a good family man? We mean that we have a deep concern growing out of love and affection for the welfare of the members of our families. We rejoice with them in their successes and we are sad and heavy at heart when they are sad and heavy at heart. We do not deal with members of our families at arm's length. We hold them to our bosom at all times. I am satisfied that such is the attitude of Mr. Wilson toward his family. Yet I note in the record that Mrs. Wilson will have approximately 10,472 shares of General Motors stock, as brought out on page 34 of the hearings.

In his second attempt at testifying before the Armed Services Committee to try to remove some of the serious mistakes of attitude which he obviously made during the first hearing, he testified that he intends to give approximately 20 percent, or some $500,000 worth, of these stocks by way of gifts to members of his family. That statement will be found on page 110 of the hearings. I call that an indirect interest. It is an indirect interest which is not in keeping with the spirit and intent and meaning of the law.

Mr. President, a great deal has been written in the press about the great loss which Mr. Wilson will suffer. It is stated that he will have to pay approximately $600,000 in taxes. On what, Mr. President? On the profits from his sale of stock. One would think that we were taking his trousers off. The taxes he pays are in no way confiscating his capital assets. The taxes he pays are on the profits from the sale of his stock. Why should he not pay the taxes? He should be proud and happy that he lives in such a great country, with its capitalistic system, upon which his political freedom depends, too, and can pay his taxes out of profits.

That fact leads me to make a little comment on profits. When Mr. Wilson's nomination was first submitted I asked the White House to supply me with reliable information as to the amount of the defense contracts which General Motors had at the time of the nomination. The White House said they would supply that information to me, and the next day the information was supplied to me in a memorandum signed by Mr. Charles Murphy, Administrative Assistant to the President. The memorandum advised that as of July 1, 1952, General Motors, including, of course, its subsidiaries—and we are dealing with a very complex industrial empire when we deal with General Motors—had defense contracts in the amount, in round figures, of $2,900,000,000. The memorandum also disclosed that as of December 1, 1952, the amount would be close to $5,000,000,000, and closer to $5,000,000,000 than to $4,000,000,000. That represents quite an interest in the defense effort.

Mr. President, as a former member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am familiar with the production record of General Motors. It is a good record. It constitutes a great contribution to the defense effort. It ought to be a good record for they have had very fine treatment from their Government by way of cooperation and assistance in helping to make it a good record. The Air Force, the Army, and the Navy have cooperated wholeheartedly with General Motors, as they should. The Government has cooperated by providing General Motors with many, many millions of dollars' worth of Government-built and owned facilities for carrying on the defense effort. In fact, I am reliably informed that the Allison division of General Motors has been supplied, in round figures, with $42,000,000 worth of Government facilities for the manufacture of General Motors products for the use of the Government.

I should also like to call attention to the fact that when General Motors speaks about the profits—and they have not been small—which it has made out of defense contracts it is remarkably silent about the millions of dollars worth of Government facilities which have been supplied to it by our Government. That fact is not advertised in its discussion of profits. General Motors does not mention the Government facilities when it speaks about a 11.1 percent profit. The profit would be much higher than that if there were taken into account the advances made by the Government by way of these facilities, at least in the form of a user grant, for the operation of General Motors. Although I do not believe it pertinent to do more than to raise the question of profits today, let me say that if the Committee on Armed Services were to go into the profits of General Motors in connection with our defense program they would find, I assert, a profit in excess of 11 percent. Quite an argument could be made on the question of whether that is too much of a profit to be derived from a program devoted to the security of our Nation. I happen to be one who believes that if we are to draft American boys to fight for the security of our country—and we must draft them—we should also draft profits, leaving only such profits as are necessary to continue the business for the duration of the struggle for the security and the freedom of the Nation.

Mr. President, sometimes I shudder when I consider what American boys and girls are going to think 100 years from now, when they read the history of this era and take a look at the balance sheets and realize the profits which American big business has made and is making today out of the blood and sacrifices of American boys fighting for the preservation of American freedom. It will not be a pleasant page of history to their eyes, Mr. President, mark you well, when they come to read it. An 11 percent profit on a defense contract entered into to help preserve the security of this Nation is too much. That is why at the outbreak of the war in Korea I said, "Never in the history of our country have we taken the profits out of war. Let us do it this time."

Incidentally, Mr. President, at the risk of boring my colleagues, let me keep the record straight once again. The day following the outbreak of the war in Korea, I said on this floor, "This is war." Let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak for itself on that point, Mr. President. It will be found that in the speech I made after the Blair House conference the night before, when the decision was made to send the flag back into Korea, I said, "When that flag returns to the battlefield and American boys start dying under our flag, we are at war." Mr. President, we have been at war ever since.

Shortly after that war started, I joined a small group on the floor of the Senate in urging that we adopt the Baruch plan for fighting that war on the economic front here at home, a plan which would have frozen wages, prices, and credit. It was a tough plan, but one which would have brought home to every American the fact that we were at war. At that time I received a great deal of criticism—just as I shall be criticized following this speech today—for making the statement to which I referred a moment ago, namely, "Never in the history of our country have we taken the profits out of war. Let us do it this time."

Mr. President, a tremendous change in the attitude of the American people in regard to American policies, domestic and foreign, would come over the United States, if we ever were willing to make the economic sacrifice in money which we should make if we are to prove to our boys who are fighting for us that we have no intention or desire to make a profit out of their sacrifice of blood.

Of course the critics say, "We have the profit system; and to make it work, some profit must be maintained." Of course, Mr. President, but all of us know the difference between the amount of profit that is necessary if a factory is to be

kept in operation, the amount of profit that is necessary in the interest of the security and the war needs of our country if that factor is to be expanded, and the profit that accrues to the selfish, economic advantage of those who pocket the profit dollars during war. The last is the profit to which I object. In my judgment the way to preserve the capitalistic system is to remove such war profits. Mr. President, that is the way to live up to what I think were the spirit and meaning of our forefathers when they wrote the general-welfare clause into the Constitution of the United States, having in mind that the primary objective of our form of self-government is to promote the general welfare. However, Mr. President, we are not promoting the general welfare when, in the midst of the casualties we are suffering in Korea, we increase month by month the Government debt, which would be lower if we had taken the profits out of the Korean war.

Mr. President, I believe we should leave to the boys and girls of the United States 100 years from now a better legacy, a richer heritage, than the one we shall leave them in the form of our public debt which now is increasing at such a tremendously rapid rate. That debt is made greater because in our generation we have not been willing to make the economic sacrifices we would have made if, for example, we had adopted the Baruch plan. As of today I do not know the exact figures in that connection; but I do know that when Mr. Baruch appeared before our committee, rather late last spring, as I recall, his testimony in answer to certain questions which I put to him was that if his plan had been adopted, it would, up to that time, have saved the American people $24,000,000,000 of loss which an unchecked inflation had cost them. I am not one to argue with Mr. Baruch upon matters of economic analysis; I am always pleased to offer him as a witness in the economic field.

However, be that as it may, Mr. President, I now close this point in regard to the indirect interest of Mr. Wilson in this Cabinet position by saying that his indirect interest in that position is based not only upon his feeling of affinity for General Motors, but I believe it is only human to expect him to retain a bias in favor of General Motors. After all, human beings being what they are, I shall take judicial notice that Mr. Wilson will retain such a feeling of affinity for that corporation. We who serve in the Senate of the United States cannot by flat change human nature. Furthermore, I also say that on the basis of his family interests Mr. Wilson will continue to have an indirect interest in the financial welfare of General Motors Corp.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am disturbed by the lack of sensitivity on the part of Mr. Wilson in regard to the ethical principle which I believe runs through this issue. No matter what Mr. Wilson says now, no matter what the briefers and the coaches have suggested subsequently, it is important for us to remember that when Mr. Wilson made his record of first impression, he saw no conflict between continued possession of some 38,000 shares of General Motors stock and discharge of the duties of the Secretary of Defense, and even in the second hearing he recommended that Stevens and Talbott should not be required to get rid of their stock. After all, the best evidence of Mr. Wilson's subjectivity is to be found in his attitude when he made his record of first impression. But the second was not exemplary. In fact, as I read this record, I formed the impression that Mr. Wilson's attitude was, "I am willing to make this great sacrifice, and am willing to be the sacrificial goat, but I do not believe we should ask it of Stevens and Talbott."

Of course, Mr. President, it is that major premise of Mr. Wilson with which I disagree. It is not a matter of having anyone make a sacrifice, but it is only a matter of having people keep in mind a great principle of public policy which I believe many persons accept as sound, once they come to reflect upon it, namely, that we should not put men in positions where either they will be suspect or where even the opportunity to be partial, rather than impartial, is enhanced because of these matters of human nature. We recognize that principle through the administration of the law. We have been most careful to keep the scales of justice well balanced and the rule of impartially protected. So it is that we have a fairly good rule which generally is followed in the administration of law, namely, that if a certain procedure could easily be abused, we should modify it in such a way as to get rid of the potentiality of abuse. I believe that situation to be involved in the present question of public policy. We do not allow a juror to sit in judgment on a case if he has the slightest financial interest in it. In fact if we find that he has that kind of indirect interest that grows out of a feeling of affinity for one of the litigants he is excused from the jury. In the administration of justice we guard our legal procedure against the possibility of bias on the part of jury or judge. We should do as much in this instance.

In this instance, Mr. President, in my judgment, the danger of abuse is very great. The danger of bias is very great. The danger of favoritism is very great. I am not talking about willful and intentional acts on the part of Mr. Wilson. I am talking about the danger of unconscious influence, the danger arising from the feeling of affinity to which I have alluded, the danger growing out of the indirect interest through family connections. The danger due to the lack of sensitivity on his part, shown by the record, as to the wisdom, or the lack of it, of Stevens and Talbott being required to get rid of their holdings should not be overlooked. Those dangers are what bother me. Certainly our inquiry leads us into these subjective matters. Let us not overlook them. Let us never overlook them, Mr. President, if we are to preserve a government by law in contrast to the danger of a government by men.

It was on page 111 of the hearings that Mr. Wilson recommended that Stevens and Talbott not be required to divest themselves of stock in companies which do business with the Government, and the record indicates that the Stevens company does one-third of its business, in round figures, with the Government.

Mr. Wilson then testified that he would pass on those contracts, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] asked him this question—page 119 of the hearings:

> Now, on North American and Chrysler, do you think that the Air Force could contract with those companies, too, and Mr. Talbott could still retain his stock in those companies?
>
> Mr. WILSON. I think they could.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. And no law would be violated?
>
> Mr. WILSON. I think so.

I merely submit, to buttress my reaction to Mr. Wilson's testimony, that it shows a lack of sensitivity on his part to this whole problem, to the ethical principle involved, and to the public-policy question I am discussing. I do not think we should take a chance on a nominee who has made a record, based upon both of his appearances before the Armed Services Committee, which shows, to the degree that he exhibited it, this lack of sensitivity. What I think we should insist upon is a keener sense of the ethical responsibilities of a person in the position of Secretary of Defense than Mr. Wilson displayed in his testimony. I am concerned about the fact that, law or no law, he saw no question of morality involved in the self-interest that he and these other men would have in the offices to which they were nominated.

It was not necessary that there should be a law on the books, Mr. President, to cause me to believe that this appointment was unwise. I think it ought to have been recognized by the President that it was unwise from the standpoint of good administration of government, and I would have voted against the appointment in the absence of any law on the subject.

Then, Mr. President, in perusing the record, I was concerned also, with Mr. Wilson's view as to what his position would be as Secretary of Defense when it became necessary to make a final decision in regard to anything affecting General Motors. He feels he can be impartial and that that is sufficient.

But we cannot overlook the fact that subordinates and assistants would handle the preliminary negotiations and arrangements. I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in the memorandum he recently inserted in the RECORD, made it very clear that the Secretary of Defense has the direct responsibility and that he cannot pass that off to subordinates.

But it is the tendency of subordinates to want to ingratiate themselves with the boss. The Secretary of Defense may not in the first instance sit in judgment on a General Motors matter, but his subordinates do not act in a vacuum. They are not unfamiliar with who he has been and who he is.

So I say it becomes risky to confirm the nomination of a man who showed the attitude I have pointed out toward the question as to whether or not it was good public policy for him to occupy the office to which he has been appointed, with the feeling of affinity for General Motors which he entertains—and one may take judicial notice, I think, that he is going to continue to have it—and the lack of sensitivity on his part to

the questionable propriety of his subordinates maintaining their direct interest in businesses which deal with the Defense Department.

I may say also, Mr. President, I did not read much discussion in the RECORD, in regard to other holdings Mr. Wilson has, other than his holdings in General Motors. He has about $800,000 worth of La Gloria Corp. stock. I understand that company is in the oil and gas business; and the oil and gas business is pretty vital to adequate national security. He also has some 9,000 shares of stock in Texas-Illinois Natural Gas Pipe Line stock, as was brought out on page 113 of the hearing. He was examined somewhat on that point, and I thought his response was very interesting, though I did not think it satisfactory. By reference to page 116 of the hearings it will be found that he said that he might ask these companies not to do business with the Government. Yet, if their services are necessary, why should they be put in the prejudiced position wherein they might be asked by the Secretary of Defense not to bid on some defense contract?

Let me say, Mr. President, I do not want to vote for a Secretary of Defense who, because of his connections, is in a position where he might ask some good American company not to bid on some Government defense contract simply because he has some financial interest in that company.

If I were one of the other stockholders in the company, I do not think I would appreciate that.

Mr. Wilson said he might ask the President to rule on it. I say, Mr. President, that is a very clumsy procedure. I say it is time-consuming; it is detrimental to the defense effort. I say further that he loses his point, he rebuts himself, when he admits before the committee that there might be circumstances, because of his direct or indirect interests in some company, which would cause him to want to lay the matter before the President.

With all the available highly qualified men we have in this country for the office of Secretary of Defense, why do we have to confirm the nomination of a man who, by his own testimony, says that because of his connections, past and present, he might find himself in a situation, in which he might have to go to the President and say, "I don't trust myself to make this decision. Give me your advice or your ruling on this question"?

I hope, Mr. President, that we will try in the policies and programs which we adopt in the Senate to save the President from such situations whenever we can. We certainly know that the strenuous nature of the job of President is such that we ought not to compound his difficulties by confirming today the nomination of a man who, on his own testimony, admits that there may be instances as the result of his connections in which it may be necessary for him to let the President render a decision which otherwise the Secretary of Defense would himself render.

Mr. President, I say, let us nominate for the Office of Secretary of Defense a man who has no disqualification whatsoever in the sense that he does not have to lay before the President of the United States a single question for the President to determine or even for thorough consideration, for a decision which otherwise the Secretary of Defense would himself render.

There was some other interesting discussion, Mr. President, in this transcript. At page 116 of the hearings, Mr. Wilson, testifying about possible dealings with oil and gas companies in which he intends to continue his interest, said:

> I do not think they will have any. If they did have, I would try to take some—let someone else take the responsibility for it if it was vital to the Government and had to be done. Otherwise, I would tell the boys, "Don't do that to me. Don't sell to the Government."
>
> That is the other side of it, you know—they do not have to take the business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] nailed that one the way it should have been nailed. He said:

> But it might be in the interest of the Government to enter into a contract.
>
> Mr. WILSON. In that case, I would let someone else rule on it. I would not want to bother the President with too many things, but if it was serious enough I would clear the record, I assure you. And it would have to be clearly in the interests of the Government.

Well, Mr. President, that was not very good testimony in his own behalf, because I think it constitutes at least a plea by confession and avoidance. I also think that there is a danger, with such a mental attitude on his part, that he will make clear to other companies that he will not particularly welcome bids by them or requests for business by them. If that happens I do not think we shall ever know about it, because we know how those things can be done.

So I say I think we ought to have as a Secretary of Defense a man before whom every business in the country can come with a feeling that there is an open-door policy in the Department of Defense so far as having an equal break for all businessmen in getting defense contracts in keeping with our competitive system. Businessmen should have the assurance that nothing in the record of the Secretary of Defense is going to be an impediment to their seeking to get a defense contract.

The next point, Mr. President represents my fear of Mr. Wilson from the standpoint of the best interests of small business in the United States. There is a basis for this fear from the standpoint of thousands upon thousands of small shops, small manufacturing plants, and small machine shops, because since this nomination representations have been made to me by a great many small-business men in the United States that they look with alarm upon this nomination. They point out that the record of General Motors, great as it has been in production, has not been a good record when it comes to the problem of subletting primary contracts to small-business men across the country. In fact, some of us in the past few years have had to fight and fight hard in the Congress of the United States against an attitude in the Pentagon Building during a past administration which has not, in our judgment, been very friendly to small business. The result is that a great many small businesses have had to shut down or to curtail production materially because they were not allowed to participate in the subletting of primary contracts.

I spoke on that subject once on the floor of the Senate last year, and I refer to it now only in passing. But I fear Mr. Wilson, from that standpoint, because I do not think General Motors, great as its record has been in production, has been very sympathetic to the subcontracting of jobs in connection with primary defense contracts which General Motors and its subsidiaries have obtained for production in various parts of the country. On the contrary, I think the policy has been a "freezing-out" policy.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] with whom and with other Senators in time gone by I have worked for the strengthening of the opportunity of small business to participate more in the manufacture of defense items.

I remember one time last year I was called into a conference in my home State by representatives of small business. The conference took place in Salem, Oreg. I met with the manager of the Salem Chamber of Commerce. He had brought in a number of small-business men in that area. They reported to me the difficulties they were having. Many of them were machine shop operators, manufacturing steel products, machine products, machine parts, and so forth. They spoke of encountering great difficulty in getting necessary defense contracts to enable them to maintain their production.

In some instances they said, "Senator, if we do not get contracts, we will have to go out of business. What is happening is that big business is pirating our manpower. If we cannot maintain our employment rolls, because of the curtailment of materials for use in civilian production, what are we going to do? Our employees are going to have to leave the Salem area and go to some of the more populated centers, where the primary contracts are granted to large concerns, and work for the big concerns who are holding on to the primary contracts."

When I returned to Washington, I reported that information to the Senate. I spoke about it to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and to other Senators. I have worked hard in the Senate for a better break for the small-business man. I mean my remarks as no personal criticism, but, rather, as a criticism of what I think has been the attitude of Mr. Wilson and the general policy of General Motors in not giving to the small-business men of the country an adequate share of business by way of subcontracting primary contracts held by General Motors, which now total between $4,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator contend that that is the fault of General Motors, or could it be the fault of the Department of Defense?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is the fault of both. I have criticized the Department

of Defense. I have written the Department many letters about the situation. My colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services—I mean my former colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services [laughter], especially the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]—know, from my cross-examination of witnesses, of my criticism of the Department of Defense.

I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am also satisfied that such a policy has been aided and abetted by General Motors.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator from Oregon amplify that statement?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is certainly in the nature of a charge.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I certainly mean it as such.

Mr. President, I believe an investigation will show, as the Allison investigation showed, that the attitude of General Motors and its subsidiaries has been, "We will take contracts, but we will take them on our terms. If you do not want to give them to us on our terms, we are not interested in them."

They have made it very clear in their negotiations that they were going to determine where the subcontracting was to go; and the subcontracting has not gone in large measure to the small-business men, who have been economically hungry for a fair break in doing defense work.

Mr. President, I have before me a compilation of official rulings and legal decisions, which, even if I were feeling better today, I would not take the time to read, but would ask to have printed in the RECORD. Before making that request, I wish to summarize them by saying that, in my judgment, the Comptroller General has issued a ruling which leaves me very much in doubt as to whether Mr. Wilson has yet complied with the law, so far as his indirect interests are concerned. The Comptroller General has ruled that a person who, as an employee, receives a pension from his former employer, is financially interested in his employer's company. That case involved the application of section 4 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, which provides as follows:

> No member of the commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio, or in any company owning stocks, or other securities or any such company.

The Comptroller General discussed that section. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the following legal memorandum printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Comptroller General has ruled that a person who, as an ex-employee, receives a pension from his ex-employer is financially interested in his ex-employer's company. That case involved the application of section 4 (b) of the Communication Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 154 (b)), which provides:
>
> "No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio, or in any company owning stocks, or other securities of any such company."
>
> In applying section 4 (b) of the Communication Act of 1934 to a situation where an ex-employee of a company engaged in the manufacture of telephone equipment which is a subsidiary of a holding company which has other subsidiary telephone carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Communication Act, the Comptroller General said (22 Comp. Gen. 43) (1943):
>
> "The language of the entire section 4 (b) compels the conclusion that the Congress was intent on prohibiting the employment of any person who could be regarded as having any financial interest whatsoever in any activity or entity subject to any provision of the act, in order that there might be no ground for suspicion that the official services or acts of any employee of the Commission might be actuated, consciously or unconsciously, by any ulterior motive or influence. It is to be observed, also, that the Federal Communications Commission is 'a commission in which is vested by congressional action quasi judicial powers of discretion' (*United States* v. *Mitchell* (89 F. (2d) 805,809)). By the Communications Act, the Commission is given broad powers and wide discretion with respect to the regulation of the companies, etc. under its jurisdiction. These facts tend to establish a sufficient explanation of the alertness of Congress in attempting to insure that the personnel of the Commission shall be wholly free from any self-interest which might conflict with official duties. * * *
>
> "Accordingly, in line with the prevailing view of the courts * * * and in view of other considerations above set forth, I am constrained to hold that any financial interest, whether large or small, direct or indirect, is sufficient to preclude the employment by the Commission of any person so interested. Although the person whose employment is under consideration * * * has no direct connection with the company which formerly employed him, other than his receipt of a pension as a former employee, there would appear to be sufficient basis for holding that he is 'financially interested' in such company, within the meaning of the involved statute. Certainly, he has more than a mere sentimental interest in such company."
>
> The difference in meaning between "financially interested in" and "directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits and contracts of" (if there is a difference) is so slight that in our opinion the Comptroller General, and probably the courts, would rule that the present situation fell within the first part of section 434.
>
> Once this point is reached, section 201 (b) of Executive Order 10182, as amended, plainly prevents such a consultant from making recommendations or taking any action with respect to any individual application of Jones & Laughlin to the Government for relief or assistance under the act. That order treats this as "transaction of business" with Jones & Laughlin under section 434.
>
> The above difficulty could, of course, be remedied by assignment of Mr. Dupka's duties in such manner that he would not take action with respect to an individual application of Jones & Laughlin, nor make recommendation on it.
>
> There remain for consideration the other duties which Mr. Dupka would undoubtedly be employed to perform, namely, making recommendations or taking action with respect to prices of all members of the steel industry, including Jones & Laughlin.
>
> The remaining question under the submitted facts is whether, in these duties, he is employed by the Government for the transaction of business with Jones & Laughlin within the meaning of that phrase in the statute.
>
> On the one hand, it may be contended with some justification that the transaction of business contemplated by section 434 historically means something in the nature of procurement by the United States under contracts. However, the Executive order granting exemptions does not take the procurement approach to the coverage of section 434. True, that order refuses exemption even to appointees otherwise exempted from all the conflict-in-interest statutes (including 434) where they negotiate or execute contracts for the Government. If procurement functions were all that were involved, the Executive order might stop at this point. It goes beyond that, and also withholds exemption where the appointee makes recommendation or takes any action respecting individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance by any entity "in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest." The Executive order took these quoted words from section 434, which is the only one on the conflict-in-interest statutes containing that particular phrase. This shows that the order treats section 434 as applicable to recommending or acting with respect to applications to the Government for relief or assistance. In sum, the order treats "transaction of business" as including more than procurement business, as including in this case a governmental operation not necessarily related in any way to procurement. Then, as to consultants of the type involved in this operation, the order refused to grant any, even limited exemptions, from section 434 or 1914.
>
> There has been little litigation involving the scope of section 434 and its predecessors. *United States* v. *Strang* (254 U. S. 491 (1926)) held that employees of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation were not employees or agents of the United States at all, and thus could not be covered by 434 (then sec. 41 of the Criminal Code of 1909). *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1 (1926)) held that the section was rendered inapplicable by the Trading With the Enemy Act in a situation where the Alien Property Custodian transferred seized enemy property to a corporation formed at the direction of the Government to hold such property in trust for the chemical industry and of which the custodian was serving as president without compensation. *Muchany* v. *United States* (324 U. S. 49 (1944)) was an effort to have declared void a Government option agent's contract, which called for a commission to him on purchase prices. It was not contended that sections 434 or 1914 (then secs. 41 and 113 were violated), but that such sections evidenced a public policy, which the Commission contract violated. The court rejected the contention, with three judges dissenting, saying:
>
> "But these sections relate to a Government official's representation of the Government in matters involving a private corporation or firm in which the Government agent has an interest, or a Government official's receipt of consideration for procuring a contract from the Government for any person or for any service rendered in relation to any such contract, or receipt of any salary or supplement to salary in connection with his Government services from any source other than the Government of the United States. Thus these sections manifest a legislative intent to bar a Government agent from receiving pay for a

third party for assisting that third party to secure a Government contract. * * *

"It is quite clear that these prohibitions against receipt of compensation for third parties for securing contracts were directed at the crime of bribery in its open or subtle form. We do not see that these statutes manifest a public policy against the use of a commission system for public purchases."

Although this quoted language indicates that procurement activities certainly are covered by these sections, at the same time the first sentence quoted above also indicates that other conflicts in interests are proscribed.

In Fortieth Opinions of Attorney General, page 168 (1942), the chief signal officer of the Army was in need of experienced communications personnel to act as liaison officers between the War Department and large private corporations in the communications industry. The duty of such officers would be to advise the Department as to communications services, facilities, and technical personnel available within the corps in question and to advise the corps of the needs and plans of the War Department for communication service. These officers would not have any direct connection with purchase of procurement, of supplies or service, for the Military Establishment but the nature of their duties would be such that their advice might influence the procurement activities of the Department with relation to the corps in question. In several instances, the only available person was an officer and stockholder of the corporation with which he would maintain liaison and it was proposed that such person would retain his status as such officer or stockholder and also receive a portion of his compensation as an officer or stockholder and also receive a portion of his compensation as an officer of the corporation while on duty as an officer of the Army. The Attorney General stated that the legality and propriety of the proposed hiring was so doubtful that the employment should not be made. He said (pp. 170–171):

"This statute is penal in nature. Under established rules of construction it should be strictly construed. But the rule of strict construction must not be applied to defeat the manifest purpose of the statute (*United States* v. *Corbett* (215 U. S. 233)).

"No man can serve two masters. The statute in question is clearly grounded on this assumption. Its manifest purpose is such that any attempt to reconcile it with the proposed employment runs into difficulties * * *. No matter how high are the motives of the Army officer who advises, he is likely as a realistic matter to be consciously or unconsciously influenced by the fact that his actions may benefit the corporation of which he is an officer and stockholder. To a degree his salary as an officer of the corporation would be affected by whether his advice leads the War Department to enter into a procurement contract with his company. To a larger degree his share in the earnings of the corporation as a stockholder would be affected by his advice.

"The advice of the officer would probably also materially influence the nature and extent of the contracts entered into with his company. Conflict between the interest of the United States, the interests of the corporation and the interests of the Army officer as an officer and stockholder of the corporation are more than likely to arise. Such conflicts and results were doubtless intended to be avoided by the statute. In this case, the officer would clearly be a person 'directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits' within the meaning of the statute. So too, the degree of relationship of the officer to the procurement process would be such as to constitute 'the transaction of business with such corporation' as used in the statute. It was the obvious purpose of the statute to prevent an officer of the United States from transacting business with a corporation in such a way that his action might result in direct or indirect personal pecuniary benefit to the officer." (See 14 Op. Atty. Gen. 482.)

The Attorney General also held that the arrangement would violate what is now section 1914.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have been interested in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Oregon with respect to the indirect interest of Mr. Wilson, which the Senator evidently says falls within the purview of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934. I do not think the Senator has made himself very clear on that point, and I should like to ask him this question: Does the Senator hold that the retention of the stocks of General Motors by the family of Mr. Wilson constitutes such indirect interest as is contemplated by the statute?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Supreme Court rule on that question some day.

Mr. COOPER. But does the Senator himself say that it falls within the terms of the statute?

Mr. MORSE. I would not have any hesitancy in making that argument before the Supreme Court.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator have any legal authority to the effect that there has been such a holding?

Mr. MORSE. I am now in the process of presenting my legal authorities. I have just inserted in the RECORD a memorandum dealing with the legal questions involved.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator another question, because this is an interesting argument.

Mr. MORSE. I think that also involved in the question is the indirect interest of Mr. Wilson that grows out of the pension. If the Senator from Kentucky and I were receiving pensions from some company, I have a suspicion, knowing the Senator as I know him——

Mr. COOPER. I hope the Senator will explain the situation.

Mr. MORSE. It is all in a friendly way, let me say to the Senator.

I think we would scan the stock reports of the company each morning. I think that if we were receiving a pension from some company, we would not blind ourselves to the rise and fall of the stock of that company on the stock exchange. I would call that at least an indirect interest.

Mr. COOPER. I know that the Senator from Oregon is a very good lawyer, and I think he understands the point I am trying to reach, so again I return to my question.

In contemplation of this statute and its terms, particularly the words "indirect interest," does the Senator from Oregon hold that the retention of stock by the family of Mr. Wilson, or the affinity of interest, which the Senator has spoken of—the relationship of Mr. Wilson as a former director and officer, and his association with the officers of the company—constitutes an indirect interest within the meaning of the statute?

Mr. MORSE. I hold that it is clearly within the spirit and intent of the law, based upon such a set of facts as is found in this case.

I think that the Court would probably say—and I hesitate to make this as a prophecy, because as a lawyer the Senator knows that legal prophecy is dangerous—"We must look at the facts and circumstances in each case to determine whether or not they constitute in fact an indirect interest within the meaning of the statute."

Mr. COOPER. But at this stage there has been no holding on the question, but the Senator is merely stating his own views as a lawyer.

Mr. MORSE. I am doing that but I am also inserting in the RECORD legal opinions which I think support an inference that in such a case as this one an indirect interest within the meaning of the statute is involved.

Mr. THYE. It was my understanding that, as of the date his nomination was confirmed, Mr. Wilson was divesting himself of all his stocks, and also taking a cash settlement with respect to all pensions and all profits in the future.

Mr. MORSE. My understanding is that the proposed transaction had nothing to do with his pension as such, but related only to any future stocks which might be involved in a payment in connection with a bonus plan.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It is my understanding that Mr. Wilson would be completely separated from General Motors, and that he would divest himself of all the stock, and would take a cash settlement as of the date his nomination was confirmed, for any interest or any benefit derived from General Motors. If that is not the situation, I should like to be informed. However, it is my understanding that, as of the date the Senate confirms Mr. Wilson's nomination, Mr. Wilson will no longer have any benefit or interest, and cannot enjoy any further benefit from General Motors.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say respectfully to my friend from Minnesota that I do not reach the same conclusion from the record that he reaches. The burden of my argument today is that there are indirect interests still accruing to Mr. Wilson. As I recall the record, the stock bonus plan provided for payments in stock over the next few years. After urging by the committee, and particularly Senator RUSSELL, Mr. Wilson attempted to arrange for a present payment in lieu of future bonus payments. But as we argue here, as of this moment, there has been no settlement of the bonus issue. We are asked to confirm the nomination of a man without any settlement having been made of the bonus issue.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the record is clear that the amount of the pension has been determined. The settlement is to be in cash.

Mr. MORSE. How much?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot give the exact figure, but it is in the record.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amount has been determined. There will be no increase. All premiums were paid, so there will be no premiums to pay in the future; and the amount has been determined in cash. The same is true as to the bonus. The stock has been determined to be of a certain value at present. That amount is to be paid in cash. There will be no dividends on the stock, and Mr. Wilson will have no beneficial interest whatever in any future shares of stock, or any profits of the company.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I read the record as submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to all Members of the Senate as of Saturday. I read it over the weekend. I am very much concerned over this nomination, as any other Member of the Senate should be when such a vital question as this is raised in connection with the decision which we must make.

I came to the conclusion that Mr. Wilson was divesting himself of all interest whatsoever in General Motors, and I thought Mr. Wilson was making a terrific sacrifice in order to qualify himself for the job. If Mr. Wilson were not a patriotic man, and if he did not see the danger to the future security of the United States involved in continuance of tremendous defense expenditures, I question whether he would have divested himself of all the earning ability which he enjoyed in connection with General Motors. I read the record as carefully as it was possible for me to read it. I am not a lawyer, but I came to the conclusion that if the gentleman said he would take a cash settlement for any claim that was due him from General Motors, as of the date the Senate confirmed his appointment, I would be in a position to vote for confirmation of the nomination, and I intend to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Let me read a couple of paragraphs from the record.

Mr. THYE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. MORSE. I read from page 146 of the hearings:

Chairman SALTONSTALL. We, who are down here, do understand some of that language. Now we would like to let you go just as soon as possible. That was my understanding.

Mr. WILSON. That is true, and I promised Senator RUSSELL that I would make another effort to see what I could do.

Now, just as I was about to leave after you called me, I got the call back from New York. The legal counsel of the bonus and salary committee of General Motors that has this responsibility, after considerable discussion, said that he would be willing to recommend to the members—and there are five members of it, and he is the legal counsel; he is not counsel of General Motors; he is a separate independent attorney—he said he would be willing to recommend to the committee that they immediately exchange the stock that theoretically I will get someday, into cash at the present market.

Now, if they did that, then this thing would be all cleared up.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that is preferable, Mr. Wilson, if you will permit me to interrupt you.

Mr. WILSON. I can't say they will vote for that, but I have got the legal counsel's word that he will recommend that to the committee.

There is one more thing I thought about, and I don't know that legally I could do it. Maybe I will get myself into some other trouble, but I might be able to sell short the number of shares. Then, if the stock went up I would have to make it up personally, because I would have to deliver it to somebody some day, and the dividends or the dividend equivalents that I would get would have to be paid over to the people that bought the stock which I sold short.

Now, I never was much inclined to that short-sale business. I guess I am sort of an optimist anyway, but that is one thing that has been pointed out to me that maybe I could do, but I can't tell you men today that I can do it because it might be illegal. It is, while I am president of General Motors, or have any relation with General Motors. I know that. I am not supposed to sell stocks short, and I don't know whether as Secretary of Defense, I ought to sell stock short in a company.

You men might take the position, then, that I wouldn't even give General Motors a fair break because I might be trying to help myself on the short sale. You have got me a little confused, but I will work at it.

I just want to tell all of you I am going to do my very best to do what you men think I ought to do to completely qualify on this technical side.

Now you still have a decision to make up your mind whether you want me or not. That is something different, but I will clear that technicality as very best I can. I am so far in now, one little thing more or less now is nothing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I stated in my remarks on the floor of the Senate this morning, Mr. Wilson has stated to me, and I am authorized to state on the floor, that Mr. Sloan has advised him that the advice of the counsel will be accepted, and that the amount will be paid in cash.

Mr. MORSE. Has it been paid?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but it will be paid. I think the record shows that the matter is to be closed by April 1.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. First let me reply to the Senator from Michigan. My first comment is that Mr. Sloan is only one member of the committee. One member has made a certain statement. But the fact remains that the arrangement is still in futuro.

My second comment is that, as of the present time, the transaction has not been completed. We are asked to confirm the nomination before the fact, rather than after the fact. In my judgment the bonus proposal amounts to a request for special treatment by General Motors, which in itself is unwise because it raises a question as to the propriety of a Cabinet designee seeking special treatment from a private company. When this nomination is voted upon by the Senate Mr. Wilson ought already to be in a situation in which he fully complies with the law. As of this moment he does not comply. There is an old saying that "There is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip." That is so often true. We are dealing with the public's business. I believe that only when Mr. Wilson complies with the law, and not one second before he complies, should we consider confirmation of his nomination. For, if we confirm today, he will enter upon duty tomorrow and we must be assured that he will have no conflicting interests when he takes his oath of office.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. If he were in Mr. Wilson's position and had the stock to dispose of, would he see fit to dispose of it without knowing what the action of the Senate was to be even though he did dispose of it?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me assure the Senator from Minnesota that if I had been in Mr. Wilson's position I would not have waited the weeks he has waited to put myself into the position—if I wanted to stand on a technicality—of complying with the provisions of the law. But more important than that, if I had been in his position, I will tell the Senator from Minnesota, I would have said to the President-elect of the United States, "In my judgment, because of my affinity of feeling for General Motors I do not believe it is wise for me, from the standpoint of your best interests as President-elect, to accept this nomination for this particular post."

I would have left it up to the President-elect, if he wanted me in his administration, to find some other position where the suspicion which I believe will always hover around Mr. Wilson's head under these circumstances would never have arisen.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will have to say to my good friend from Oregon that no man in the position of Mr. Wilson could have been expected to divest himself completely of everything that he had until such time as he definitely knew whether or not his nomination would be confirmed by the Senate. If Mr. Wilson has assured the members of the committee and has assured the public and the President of the United States himself that he will divest himself of everything that he may have which in any way would be of benefit to him through General Motors, I believe he is promising us that he will be fully qualified for the position for which he is being considered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. That is my judgment, and I exercise my judgment exactly in the same way that the Senator from Oregon exercises his judgment, both of us being responsible to the people of our respective States to exercise our best judgment in this chamber. That is my judgment. What the judgment of the Senator from Oregon will be will be left to his own discretion.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Minnesota will be kind enough to let me continue I will tell him what my judgment is. The Senator from Minnesota asked me for my opinion. I gave it to

him. It is directly opposite to his opinion. Mr. Wilson should have disqualified himself for this job.

Mr. President, I should also like to add that Mr. Wilson has retained stock in other businesses, too, including stock in two banks which do business with General Motors. I have not heard anything about his getting rid of that stock.

Now, going back to the questions of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I wish to say to my good friend that I do not consider the legal memorandum which I have inserted as being on the nose, as we lawyers say, but I believe it to be of sufficient application to the problem to cause me to hold to the opinion which I have expressed here today that as a matter of law Mr. Wilson still has such an indirect interest in General Motors as to disqualify him for this position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "The Conflict of Interest," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in his syndicated article Today and Tomorrow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By Walter Lippmann)

The lasting importance of the Wilson case may be in the light it throws on the application of the ancient principle, well known already to the Romans, that, as the Bible puts it, no man can serve two masters. This principle has been recognized for centuries in the law of the English-speaking world, and repeatedly it has been enacted in statutes. The one which Mr. Wilson has had to meet was first enacted, so I am told, in 1863 and reenacted in 1948.

While the rule against conflicting interests is, one might say, a self-evident moral principle, its application to concrete cases is not always, perhaps not often, self-evident. The Wilson case revealed more clearly than ever before the complexities of applying the law. It was shown during this past week, I think, that the rule does not mean merely that a man can qualify for public office by meeting certain precise, objective specifications. For the specifications cannot always be spelled out precisely. The rule necessarily includes the question of his subjective attitude toward the principles and the significance of the rule itself.

Mr. Wilson's interests in the General Motors Corp. are not only extensive but they are so intimately a part of his life that there is nothing he could do which would eliminate all the theoretical possibilities of a conflict of interest. It is because a theoretical conflict of interest must inevitably exist for him, as indeed for any man of large affairs—be he a businessman, a politician, or the member of some profession—that his personal philosophy and attitude is so important. This is the kind of rule of law which cannot be enforced fully unless in the subtler cases, which are the most difficult and yet the most significant, the man enforces it upon himself.

Mr. Wilson's stock prevented him from qualifying for Secretary of Defense under the letter of the law, as the lawyers in the Senate understand that law. But what troubled the Senate was whether Mr. Wilson understood fully the spirit of the law. Nobody thought that Mr. Wilson would do one thing rather than another as Secretary of Defense in order to augment the profits of General Motors or the value of his shares. Everybody knew that in any conflict of interest between the national defense and the profits of the corporation, Mr. Wilson would undoubtedly lean over backward.

Mr. Wilson's difficulties with the committee came primarily from his apparent unawareness of the nature of the law, from the surprising fact that he had not taken adequate legal advice, that his conscience in this field was not sufficiently instructed.

That this was the essence of the matter was shown in the quick, unquestioned and cordial confirmation of the new Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey is also a big-business man with very large interests. He had no trouble of any kind. The reason he did not have any trouble is quite plain to anyone who reads his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. Humphrey had made a careful study himself and he had had his lawyers examine for him the law, which is, as a matter of fact, somewhat special for the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey knew what the law is, and why it is what it is, and he had taken all the steps which he and his lawyers thought the law required in order to qualify himself. He had nothing to say about how much that had cost him, or about whether he was making a sacrifice. And while he is by no means a pauper today, he must have given up a lot of money in fact and on paper.

The main point is that there was no doubt at all in anyone's mind that he had a positive and informed understanding of the spirit of the law; and, moreover, that here was a lucid, a rational, and indeed, a commanding figure who would add great strength and confidence to the new administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Businessmen in Government: The New Administration," published in the February 3, 1953, issue of the Reporter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESSMEN IN GOVERNMENT: THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

(By A. A. Berle, Jr.)

In the 20 years between the exit of President Hoover and the inauguration of President Eisenhower, American Government has come full circle. The new Republican Administration is repeating with surprising fidelity the pattern of President Hoover—a government of big business, manned by big business. From this world, Eisenhower, like Hoover before him, has chosen first-raters. All have outstanding records of honesty and achievement in business; all have records of integrity. But there are solid reasons for believing President Eisenhower's government will not be a repetition of Hoover's—save perhaps in slogans. Striking as are the similarities, there are deep and fundamental differences.

For Big Business, 1953 is not the same as Big Business 1929. Its representative men have grown in a different stand of timber. In Hoover's time they represented property and ownership. Now they represent power and administration. Hoover was the owner of large enterprises; Andrew Mellon, his Treasury Secretary, was the dominant stockholder in the Aluminum Co. of America, Gulf Oil Co., and a string of related enterprises. Eisenhower's team are not owners. They have brilliant records as salaried administrators, George M. Humphrey is head of the company which bears the ancient political name of Mark Hanna, President McKinley's old campaign manager; C. E. Wilson and Roger Kyes, respectively Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, are top-ranking officials in General Motors; Randolph Burgess and Robert Cutler are products of big banks; and so straight down the line. Like most big-business men of today, they are professional corporate officeholders. In the previous era, the businessmen turned Cabinet officers were successful risk-takers and developers. In the previous phase of American capitalism, a successful man became a billionaire. Now he manages a multi-billion-dollar corporation at a large salary.

Though the types have much in common, the generation now moving into government has greater assets and also, in some respects, greater liabilities. Assets and liabilities alike differ from those of their predecessors of a generation ago. The comparison is a study in the evolution of American capitalism.

ON THE CREDIT SIDE

On the credit side must be counted the fact that the present group have been professional business politicians, though they do not say so. They have had to operate their businesses in the presence of public opinion—and in the framework of an unrecognized but very real Government structure. The size of their companies made them so clearly a part of the American economic structure that they could not behave as though unemployment, the high cost of living, or even national foreign policy were not their concern. President Roosevelt made the point that America could not run half boom and half bust and that the Federal Government must assure more or less satisfactory conditions. Businessmen hated him, but they caught his point.

In like degree, these men absorbed (though they did not announce) the fact that the Government was an essential factor in their own business. They inveighed against planned economy. But they planned the economies of their own industries wherever they could, and when necessary they invoked Government intervention to help them do it.

Though the fact is little realized even in business circles, twentieth century American capitalism is increasingly a system of Government-industry planning of national scope. Oil, for example, runs on a price-stabilization plan, the heart of which is the interstate oil compact, signed by all the great oil-producing States (except California) and periodically approved by Congress. Under it, the Bureau of Mines estimates the American consumption requirements, the great oil-producing States allocate production to fit the specifications, and the Federal Connally Hot Oil Act makes shipment of unallocated oil a criminal offense. Oil refineries enforce the plan by declining to buy crude oil produced in violation of the arrangement.

This scheme was worked out not by New Dealers but by the oil industry itself. Steel has been operating under a similar though less well worked out plan compelled by the steel shortage in 1946–47. It took form under the Voluntary Allocation Act passed (interestingly enough, at the instance of Senator TAFT) in that year. That act expired, but the scheme was perpetuated in the present Defense Production Act. Dozens of other schemes, from aluminum to sugar, operate under special legislation or under the present Defense Production Act. Evolving these plans has meant constant contact between big-business men and the Government, with frequent appeals by both sides to public opinion.

Finally, as of now, the overpowering stabilising factor (if it is stabilizing) is the fact that Government is the chief customer of big business in practically all fields from alkali to zinc, from electronic equipment to ships and socks. This stabilization, born first of war and now of rearmament, has caused a massive intermixture of political and business action. Under it, the 13 years since 1940 have been a period of the greatest recorded development of the American economy. Business and the public alike depend on its continuance. So far as economics goes, the country is as well satisfied with its lot as Americans ever are.

But to do this, the American businessman has had to be in Washington, at chamber of commerce meetings, or on the air. His public-relations staff has been steadily taking a hand in discussions of political theory; appeal from a failure of governmental cooperation (as the businessman saw it) was taken to the public just as politicians appeal an adverse decision of Congress to the grass roots. The successful administrator of a large corporation has been, willy-nilly, a type of politician. This is a good introduction to Government life.

Such was not the custom of the older generation. The great capitalist-owners of the day of Andrew Mellon or the elder Morgan kept away from the public. The late George F. Baker rejoiced in the fact that in 50 years he had made only two speeches, each of them not more than a couple of sentences long. Contrast this with Benjamin Fairless or Clarence Randall, campaigning in season and out for the position of the steel companies during the steel crisis, or with General Motors, maintaining for years a weekly broadcast over a national network to explain its political philosophy and ideas and to exhort Americans to support the leadership offered by American business.

On the credit side also must be counted the scientific education which American businessmen have thoroughly accepted. There is still complaint by the plant men against the "long-haired know-how boys" in the laboratory and research departments. But the mathematicians, the physicists, the esoteric research men are no longer discarded as impractical. The General Electric laboratory is one of the great scientific institutions of the world. The abstract scientist now is subsidized in universities, by research grants made in volume by the hardest-boiled boards of corporate directors. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., in endowing a fellowship in petroleum exploration science at Harvard, announced that "the petroleum industry was founded on the vision and knowledge of educated people."

The business philosophy is that production will solve everything, and that science and trained men make unlimited production possible. Honor then to the scientific scholar. Properly used, he is a noble part of capitalist civilization.

Many indeed of the great businessmen now emerging in government were technically trained themselves, either formally in universities or less formally through training programs of the companies in which they worked. Engineers, geologists, chemists, lawyers, and, occasionally, renegade university professors—these are the businessmen of today. National City Bank vice president, Randolph Burgess, who will manage the national debt for President Eisenhower, has a Ph. D. in education. These men are a far cry from the shrewd operators, the students of the stock market who carried the banner in Hoover's day. The wider outlook of the new men will stand them in good stead in government.

ON THE DEBIT SIDE

Against these very large credits must be set some substantial debits.

One of the great business virtues may become a vice in certain governmental fields. Businessmen, being rational themselves, believe that with good contacts, astute handling, and tactful discussion, any difference can be bridged. One sector of American business in 1940 sincerely believed that if we had "handled" Hitler carefully we could have "settled up" the issues leading to the Second World War. Even now a substantial group believes we could do business with Stalin—if only we went about it the right way. So it proves in business; why not in foreign affairs?

The lack, of course, is an understanding of intellectual and especially of philosophical forces. Now philosophy is an abstruse subject in universities, but it generates currents that can set millions of armed men marching and tear the world apart. Freemen could no more settle accounts with Hitler and his Nazi philosophers and can no more make effective arrangements with the Kremlin Communists than an atheist could negotiate a viable compromise with the Pope. In its way, the businessman's feeling does him credit: Men ought to be rational. But in certain ranges, where interests are unlimited, men's actions rest on their value judgments. Men will insist on dying for their country and their religion because these involve their lives and their personalities. They will consider it ridiculous to die for Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co. and the therapeutic use of higher interest rates.

They are right on both counts: Business is not a religion exacting loyalty but a practical means of getting the world's work done. Here lack of background can be perilous. Should diplomacy exact another conference with the Kremlin, there is danger that it will be approached as though we were settling a lawsuit, whereas in fact it would be a milestone in a major philosophical and religious conflict.

President Franklin Roosevelt once complained that big business was not bad but was often humanly illiterate. There is no evidence indicating a change in that respect. The big-business men, though they have been in politics, commonly have not done the political work themselves. They have relied on public-relations staffs to write the speeches, publish the house organs, set up the press releases and radio programs, and lay out the propaganda lines. (Let us exclude the less creditable reaches where dwell the influence buyers, the 5-percenters, the Washington lobbyists, and the political law firms.) These men naturally think primarily not of the public but of how best to further general and specific measures and policies serving the financial interests of their companies. Public-relations men are commonly more royalist than the king, but, like all professional propagandists, they convince their clients more than any other group.

Their outpourings make it clear that big business has not thought through and does not talk the language of the new American capitalism but repeats slogans of a generation ago. The theme song is individual initiative—but big business from sulphur to aluminum is more often than not urging or working under a national plan that circumscribes areas of freedom and works on the conception of guided cooperation. The foe is Government in business—though this Government is the largest customer, sometimes the principal supplier of capital, and always the ultimate stabilizer. Factually, big business is now public enterprise, accountable to the community that supports and relies on it. But the social theories it expounds are at complete variance with actual business practice and conditions.

WHOSE FREE ENTERPRISE?

From this arise many of the political difficulties of business. As practical men, corporation executives have sought security of markets and prices and insurance against risk for their concerns. But when labor and individuals, who were in far more dangerous positions, have sought insurance against unemployment and old age, business has talked the language of laissez faire and unsuccessfully fought social security. When health insurance was proposed, business fought it—this time successfully. If an individual was benefited by a public measure, sturdy Americanism was being undermined and creeping socialism threatened the Republic. But it was merely good business to advocate fair-trade laws to allow price fixing, to attack the enforcement of the antitrust laws that forbade agreements restraining free markets, and to plug for high tariffs preventing foreign competition. Corporation theorists have not yet absorbed the idea that free enterprise for General Motors means one thing and free enterprise for Joe Doakes means quite another.

The fact is that the American economy is now substantially an administered economy, founded on a system of basic industries, each dominated by a concentration of three or four industrial giants, generally operating under Nation-wide planning. This writer does not share the horror manifested by some when this state of affairs is revealed. It seems to be very successful and to offer a sound base for tremendous future advance. But the advance must be translated into the terms of individual benefit and self-fulfillment and individual protection. The dogma has generally put business in the position of fighting against measures for individual benefit while demanding measures for corporate benefit as necessary economic arrangements.

An illustration may be found in the announced policy of the incoming administration for handling Government finance. The plan is to allow interest rates to rise to natural levels. The theory is that when the Government borrows from banks, it creates bank deposits which are inflationary, while if it borrows savings from the public at long term, the inflationary effect is avoided. The theory is probably sound; it is upheld by most economists. But as a result, a merchant will pay more at the bank for his borrowing and the home buyer will pay more interest on his mortgage. Long-term Government bonds will be issued at rates of interest higher than the standard rate of recent years. In plain arithmetic, the millions who have bought Government bonds, either as investment or for patriotic motives, will see their bonds go down in value because of the less-attractive yield.

Sympathy need not be wasted on large investors. They are in and out all the time. The banks, the big insurance companies, and financial institutions will make more money than they have for years. But for those who bought bonds at Government urging on payroll plans, talk about natural economic forces working toward balance and thus avoiding inflation will not help much. They were not exhorted to buy to vindicate economic laws but because the country needed money.

A purely political administration, convinced that interest rates had to rise, would make a concession to this feeling. It would offer to exchange the old bonds for the new bonds paying a higher rate of interest with no loss. This is politics. A business Government is more likely to leave a small investor to the tender mercies of the open market.

MORTGAGES AND TAXES

But that is only the beginning. For the Government, allowing the interest rate to go up means running up the long-term interest rate everywhere. The greatest individual impact will be on the borrowers for homes—especially small ones. There the young man amasses a modest down payment and finances the rest on a 20-year mortgage or thereabouts, and he pays the interest on that debt for half of his adult life. To him the effect is to raise the actual price on his house, and on his car, and on his icebox. The ramifications of a rising interest rate are almost unlimited. Banks, the money-lending agencies, and others are prosperous during these periods, and to them all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

Again, the business theory is that taxation of corporate and individual incomes is now so high that it reduces incentive to work hard and make money. Accordingly, the proposal is to reduce these taxes and get in the revenue by a Federal sales tax. For practical purposes, this means raising the prices of most of the goods ordinary people have to buy. A majority of the public will wonder whether this protection from

inflation is not more expensive to them than the original disease.

The point, of course, is simple. To the businessman, business is an agency for production and distribution. The less it is used as a tax-collecting agency, the greater the freedom of action of the directors. They are sure they can handle the money more wisely in the general interest than the Government can. Free enterprise to them means free enterprise for corporation managers. Obviously the freedom of choice for the individual is reduced; a sales tax means that he can buy less and so is more restricted.

This illiteracy runs through the whole line of corporate propaganda. Individuals, it is said, think too much of security—Americans ought to like taking risks, reaping rewards for courage, initiative, etc. But the corporation never runs an avoidable risk. It will stabilize prices, will adjust production to consumption wherever possible, will invoke the help of the Government in time of trouble. The corporate executive who complains when his labor wants a guaranteed annual wage and retirement pension will demand for himself the most elaborate contract and pension rights.

IDEALISM VERSUS COMMON SENSE

And businessmen have one great lesson to learn. In the world of ideas, dreams, and hopes, and in the philosophy that binds motives together and makes a democratic government tick, they are often so many children. In politics, masses of men are swayed by ideas they consider greater than themselves. The American public knows that it reaches for ideals perhaps not attainable in this world: Peace, freedom from fear, reasonable probability that the children will surpass their fathers, a human society free from hatred. Democratic government means precisely canalizing these hopes and dreams and thoughts toward practical action. The United States Government has been doing this since the days when Washington and Madison assaulted the nationalism of the Thirteen Colonies, when Jefferson insisted that education should be Nation-wide, when Andrew Jackson insisted that no part of the country, however new, should be excluded from a share in the country's growth, when Lincoln challenged the vested interest of slavery.

Businessmen, on the other hand (it is to their credit), properly limit their thinking. In any situation they try to find the common-sense step to take, going no farther than is necessary, waiting for the logic of events to indicate the next move. Instinctively and, in their world, probably rightly, they distrust dreamers.

But, of course, business does not need to call on the higher spiritual qualities. This is fair enough. House organs and advertising campaigns that identity the best interests of the company with attainment of the Kingdom of Heaven are likely to be laughed at.

But now, governing the United States, businessmen must ask people to act against their best interests, against the dictates of intelligent selfishness. Intelligent selfishness cannot dictate sacrificing your life or your son's life if there is any way out of it. A government must ask that men stand ready in some measure to lose themselves in a greater loyalty, for a benefit and a glory that will never be reflected in a profit-and-loss statement.

The brilliant group of bankers, steelmasters, industrialists, and financial lawyers now taking over the Government will have to learn a lesson if they are to succeed. The twentieth-century revolution in American capitalism transformed private business to public enterprise. Its aggregate product was not an end in itself; its true end was to furnish means of defense and means of life for hundreds of millions. Philosophers, teachers, dreamers, poets, scholars, artists, actors, editors, journalists struggle to give to that life the means of grace and the hope of glory; without them, it would fall apart. Business could idealize itself as a huge but humble part of this endless search; it has not yet learned to do this.

The corporate executive now directing armies, navies, and air squadrons, exacting sacrifice and toil, prescribing limits for the strong, asked to ameliorate the lot of the weak, must call on the idealism of millions far more than he stresses the practical advantage to individuals. Otherwise the legions do not march, the millions are skeptical, the allies wonder, and the keystone of the free world no longer supports its arch. Learning this is a mighty lesson, often a bitter one. From its splendor and bitterness will be distilled the next phase of American life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Wilson Case Bad Start for New Administration," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of January 25, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON CASE BAD START FOR NEW ADMINISTRATION—A SPECIFIC LAW AND A FINE AMERICAN TRADITION WERE INVOLVED IN DISPUTE OVER THE APPOINTMENT—DAMAGE IS NOT IRREPARABLE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The issue raised in the Senate over Charles E. Wilson of Detroit, chosen by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Defense, arose from a combination of political ineptitude in the President's entourage and the personal quality described as "bullheadedness." No question of personal honesty entered in the controversy, which the President and Wilson eventually decided to dispose of in one of the only two ways that became politically possible after the Secretary-designate testified as to his qualifications before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. But a question of ethical sensitiveness was implicit.

The solution accepted by Wilson, after delaying for several days, while the impression grew that he did not comprehend the ethical factor or even the law involved, was to sell and give to his family his large stock holdings in the company of which he long was president and also to surrender his right to a stock bonus. The only other solution, as Chairman Leverett Saltonstall of the committee was obliged to inform the President, was to nominate another Secretary of Defense.

A FOUR-PART ISSUE

The heart of the matter was composed of four parts—a specific law, a fine American tradition, the potential injury to the administration, and the fact that General Motors is the largest contractor for the department concerned. When the impasse was broken this week end, the wonder grew that its causes had ever been allowed to germinate.

1. The specific law: The statute (sec. 434, title 18 of the U. S. Code), enacted in 1948 by a Republican-controlled Congress, is quite clear. It states: "Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

General Motors has a battery of presumably good lawyers. The President, since he was nominated, has been assisted by other good lawyers, some of whom know politics, too.

But not until Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, a Democratic well-wisher of Eisenhower (BYRD's refusal to support his party's candidate gave the electoral votes of his State to the General), called attention to the law did its existence elicit any visible interest, either at General Motors or in the headquarters at the Commodore Hotel in New York City. And, even after the concern of the Senate committee over the terms of this law had been prominently public for several days, this listless attitude continued. A vivid illustration of the apparent fact that Wilson and his friends either considered Wilson above the law or that Congress would be delighted to modify it to obtain Wilson's public services is this: though the day before the Secretary-designate was to be examined by the committee as to his qualifications a presidential aide was asked by a friendly Senator to apprise Wilson of the situation, the motors executive showed no real comprehension of the statute when he testified.

FINE UNITED STATES TRADITION

2. A fine American tradition: Many times in the past men of large business or financial interests have been called to Government service and have sacrificed holdings at great monetary loss according to the Caesar's wife principle, even when no law definitely required it. Their purpose was not to allow a Government agency and its devoted personnel to be the victims of suspicion, however baseless, that their chief was serving two masters. This was founded in the realization, which anyone who has read the newspapers knows, that controversies arise in administration in which the reputation of the agency can be tarnished by the fact that its chief has made a decision of material value to some company with which he has been associated or in which he still has substantial holdings. It is not the practice of a political opposition to be overconsiderate at such times, as the Republicans demonstrated whenever some of President Truman's appointees were under that kind of fire.

Conforming to the tradition was the late Robert P. Patterson. When Secretary of War Stimson called him to the Department he was just beginning a career of large earnings in the law. He sold every conceivably conflicting interest and left here a poor man. James A. Farley retired from Government in debt because of his scrupulous obedience to the tradition. John Graham, until recently Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, sold his entire family interest in a company—his only important assets—when he was appointed Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue. John W. Hanes sacrificed a fortune to become a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission when President Roosevelt and J. P. Kennedy told him it was his duty to serve. And to become Under Secretary of State in this administration, Gen. W. Bedell Smith, whose means are small, gave up directorships and in so doing was obliged to cut his household staff from two to one.

INJURY TO "CRUSADE"

There are many others called to Government service who belong in the list above. Moreover, when Wilson resisted the committee view that the law, the proprieties and the good name of the administration required that he sell his General Motors stock, the amount he estimated of what his financial loss would be did not impress Members of Congress, who are paid about $12,000 a year before taxes. And it seemed to them that Wilson had already provided abundantly for his or any other family.

3. The injury to the administration if Wilson had stood pat: A major note of the Eisenhower campaign was a call for higher ethical standards in Washington as well as an attack on actual corruption. The General named his campaign a crusade in testimony of his promise to clean up the mess, ethically and morally as well as administratively. If Wilson had insisted on retaining

his stock in General Motors (in addition to the large interest his wife owns), and the President had endorsed this by sending Wilson's name to the Senate, its refusal to confirm him would have been only part of the political damage to the administration. On the first test the opposition would have been equipped to make the inevitable charge that the crusade was over before it began.

4. General Motors' dominance in defense contracts: For days Wilson, nominated to be the Government agent who would make decisions affecting vast profits by General Motors, seemed unable to see the bearing of this, and tried to compromise the principle with the Senate committee up to a few hours before he surrendered. But it is the plainest of all.

The administration has been seriously injured, but not critically, and it can recover. Wilson, however, has made a very bad start with Congress, if not with the public, that may make his Government service brief.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief reference to an incident which occurred in 1942, because it has been reported to me that some persons are saying that one of the reasons for my opposition to Mr. Wilson's confirmation is based upon a so-called run-in I had with him in 1942 when I was one of the public members of the War Labor Board.

Of course, I have long since given up trying to answer charges of motivation, because in that respect people are going to believe what they want to believe, and if they do not like you they will believe the worst.

I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself. I now give a brief summary of the War Labor Board incident which involved Mr. Wilson in 1942. There was a labor dispute at that time involving General Motors and its Frigidaire Division.

Mr. Reuther, as I recall, represented the General Motors employees, and a Mr. Matles represented the electrical subsidiary's employees. Mr. Anderson, who was then labor-relations consultant of General Motors, was one of the principal negotiators, but Mr. Wilson himself took part before the case was disposed of. It was a very technical case. It involved the question of Sunday pay, and whether it should be double time or overtime payment less in amount. It involved the question of whether an arbitration award should be allowed by the Board. An attempt—and this is very interesting—was made on the part of the labor representatives on the Board as well as of the labor litigants involved in the case—Mr. Reuther and Mr. Matles—to get the Board to order the General Motors and the subsidiary company to pay for the Sunday work on the basis of what they claimed the arbitration award had decreed.

Dr. George Taylor, the vice chairman of the Board, had jurisdiction over the case, in that under the procedures of the Board various public members, when cases came up on the docket, were assigned to them for the purpose of doing a great deal of the preliminary work. This case was what we would have called a Taylor case. Dr. Taylor made the recommendation to the Board that it not vote to apply the pay which the union was demanding. As the record will show, he pointed out to us that it was a very complicated case. I believe a fair interpretation is that Dr. Taylor was of the opinion that there might be some doubt as to whether the arbitration award should be affirmed, so to speak, by the Board. The Board accepted his recommendation unanimously. His recommendation was accepted unanimously by the labor members, the employer members, and the public members as I recall. We suggested that Dr. Taylor meet with representatives of the company and representatives of the union, to see whether the case could be mediated. That was a common practice of the Board. In fact, under the Executive order under which we operated, we were charged with attempting to use the peaceful procedures of mediation and arbitration for the settlement of disputes, short of our taking full jurisdiction over a case. It was in the interest of all concerned to try always to settle cases by mediation and thus avoid a formal hearing, and taking all the time that it would be necessary to take in order to have a final decision made by the Board.

Of course, it is easy now, years later, in retrospect not to appreciate fully the terrific importance of the time element in connection with the handling of such major labor disputes in the midst of war. Many a time we worked the clock around, trying to get a case settled, because full production for an effective prosecution of the war was essential to the war effort. In fact, Mr. President, for some 18 months, let me say, I averaged 1 night out of 11 working around the clock, because if an opinion to be read by me the next day might result in preventing a work stoppage in a war plant, it was a small inconvenience to me to work around the clock. Mr. President, as my colleagues on the Board will attest, the Board finally said by way of resolution—all in good humor and good nature, of course, but they meant it—"We will not let you read another opinion until you can give us assurance that you slept 8 hours before you began reading this opinion"—for, Mr. President, more than once the secretaries would hand me the sheets as soon as they were typed, as I read an opinion.

In my judgment that procedure was necessary in such cases, for I did not believe we should waste any time in trying to get such cases settled. I recall that one of the major decisions that was written on an around-the-clock basis was in the famous International Harvester case. If that plant had ever been allowed to shut down during the war, the resultant loss would have been most costly to our war effort. I mention that matter, personal though it is, in order to give some idea why we said to Dr. Taylor, "See if you can get this case settled by mediation."

In that matter the record is perfectly clear. In fact, I have a photostatic copy of the Board's transcript of record before me. The original is now in the Archives, and it shows that Dr. Taylor has had to get permission and priority for airplane travel in order to get the representatives of the union and the representatives of the company to come to Washington for the conference. Dr. Taylor said as much in his answer to Mr. Wilson, when we entered the public hearing on this particular case.

Dr. Taylor had the conference with the company and union representatives. The record shows that it was a dinner conference. Mr. Wilson did not attend and General Motors was represented by Mr. Anderson. Let me say, Mr. President, that as a result of the pace at which we worked, most of my breakfasts were eaten across the conference table with parties to disputes whom I was trying to lead into a mediation settlement of the disputes.

Some point at a later date was made by way of criticism by the General Motors official of the fact that the meeting was a dinner meeting. However, Mr. President, that did not make it any less formal or official. The parties knew what they were there for. When they sat down with Dr. Taylor and proceeded to discuss the case, they knew that he was acting for the full Board in an endeavor to mediate the case.

After that conference Dr. Taylor reported to the Board, and we accepted his report and issued it as an order, whereupon Mr. Wilson in a public statement charged the Board with conducting an ex parte hearing, and made very clear that General Motors Corp. would not follow the decision.

Mr. President, we took the position that if ever a union or an employer successfully defied the Board, the services of the Board would be at an end, and the President would have to adopt some other procedure for the settlement of disputes during the war. So we requested Mr. Wilson to appear before the Board, for an explanation of his critical statement which he had issued against the Board. I was the compliance officer of the Board, as well as one of the public members. The Board had a meeting prior to its meeting with Mr. Wilson. All members of the Board, representing employers, labor, and the public, took the position that Mr. Wilson's charges against the Board were contemptuous, and that the Board would not proceed with the case until Mr. Wilson either clarified his position or retracted his statement. As Compliance Officer of the Board, I was assigned along with the Chairman of the Board Mr. William Davis the responsibility of making clear the Board's position; and I did so.

Let me say that I am satisfied that before Mr. Wilson entered the room that morning he did not understand all the facts. In that War Labor Board case, when Mr. Wilson understood the entire situation, understood the nature of the dinner meeting with Dr. Taylor, and recognized that we had not proceeded to handle the case without having present a representative of the company, Mr. Wilson agreed to comply. He was frank enough and honest enough to say that he did not know what the words "ex parte" meant. I recall that the chairman of the Board, Mr. Davis, said, in effect—of course I do not attempt now to quote him literally, but I am sure I now state his meaning, as a check of the record will show—"I did not think you knew what those words meant, Mr. Wilson; but the unfortunate thing is that the public generally does know, and your statement in effect was a serious reflection on this Board. That is why the

Board is asking for your clarification and retraction."

Mr. President, do you know what happened thereafter, when Mr. Wilson explained to the Board that he did not mean his statement as it had been interpreted, and that in fact he did not know what the words "ex parte" meant? We did not have any trouble settling that case that day very quickly. Furthermore, if Mr. Wilson were a witness before a committee for a discussion of this matter, he would have to say that at the time the case was settled, I expressed to him my great admiration for the way he faced that situation.

That is the so-called run-in I had with Mr. Wilson. In that case I did exactly what I did in many other cases when we had before us an employer or a union leader who stood in defiance of the Board. Let me say to the Senate that the General Motors' War Labor Board case has nothing whatsoever to do with my attitude toward Mr. Wilson insofar as this nomination issue is concerned.

Mr. President, I close by saying that my attitude toward Mr. Wilson is based entirely and wholly upon my views as to the inherent trusts and obligations involved in the job of Secretary of Defense. After having studied the RECORD, it is my opinion that what I said at the beginning of this speech still holds. I summarize it in the following two points:

First, I do not think Mr. Wilson's testimony in the hearings shows that he possesses a sufficient sensitivity to the spirit and intent and meaning of the law which involves the entire question of any direct or indirect interest which he may still have in General Motors.

Second, I am satisfied that Mr. Wilson cannot divest himself of the feeling of affinity for General Motors that I am willing to take judicial notice he is bound to have when he comes to administer the responsibilities of the post of Secretary of Defense. The very fact that General Motors Corp. has several billion dollars' worth of defense contracts with the very department of Government over which Mr. Wilson is to preside plus his past association with the company makes it very bad public policy to put him in charge of the defense establishment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Oregon recalls that on the 21st of this month—last Wednesday, I think it was—he made a speech in which he laid down certain criteria which should govern the appointment of Cabinet officers and the confirmation of Cabinet officers. Does the Senator recall those criteria?

Mr. MORSE. I recall every word. Does the Senator wish to examine me on that speech today?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it the Senator's contention that Mr. Wilson does not measure up to those criteria?

Mr. MORSE. The whole burden of my speech has so indicated. Does the Senator know the particular criterion to which I think he does not measure up?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to know.

Mr. MORSE. The selfish interest he may have in the job is the whole burden of my case. The difference, I assume, between my good friend from New Jersey and myself, is that he is satisfied that certain subjective forces that make human beings behave as they do will not be present in the case of Wilson, whereas we know, from observation of the actions of human beings during the history of our country that such subjective factors are of great influence in motivating human beings.

Lastly, I may say, Mr. President, that I consider it to be my duty to lean over backwards so far as the public interest in the public-policy question is concerned by resolving doubts in favor of a strict application of a policy of not confirming the nominations of men who in my judgment will have the kind of selfish interest which I think the record in this case discloses that Mr. Wilson has. Therefore in the interest of furthering a sound public policy by protecting our people from horrible, bias, partiality, and direct and indirect self-interest on the part of Mr. Wilson I shall vote against confirming his nomination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have studied the hearings before the Armed Services Committee carefully, and I have listened to the debate on the floor of the Senate today. I am deeply concerned over the nomination of Mr. Charles E. Wilson as Secretary of Defense. I know that Mr. Wilson is a man of high character and complete integrity. There is no doubt that, in being willing to accept this position, he has made, or will make, if he is confirmed, a substantial financial sacrifice. I know, too, that the General Motors Corp. is a great company, a great corporation, a great producer of war matériel which is so greatly needed in our defense and in the defense of our friends and allies abroad. I want to make it very clear that I am not against big business merely because of size. As a matter of fact I, think it is probably a fair statement that, until about 25 years ago, when I first entered public life, I might have been included in the category of big business. Certainly I have no prejudice against big business. I have only the highest respect and admiration for many of the things that big business has done in this country for the development of our economy and for social progress. But I do not subscribe for a minute to the thesis uttered by Mr. Wilson at one of the hearings, that what is good for the United States is good for General Motors, and conversely, that what is good for General Motors is necessarily good for the United States. The interests of private capital, of private corporations owned by thousands and thousands of stockholders who desire to have reasonable dividends, may be very much at variance with the interests of the country as a whole, even when those interests are not in direct conflict, they may be and usually are in contest, in connection with the supplying of equipment, matériel, or other products over such factors as price and profit margins and so forth.

I, therefore, believe, Mr. President, that the appointment of Charles E. Wilson as Defense Secretary is a most unfortunate one, and one which I believe will lead to great criticism, loss of confidence by the public, and to lessened efficiency rather than increased efficiency within the armed services.

We cannot forget or overlook the fact that up to a very few weeks ago Charles E. Wilson was president of General Motors Corp.

We cannot overlook the fact that the General Motors Corp. is the largest producer in the entire country of military equipment and matériel needed for our defense and security. I understand that at the end of December the General Motors Corp. had on its books approximately $5,000,000,000 worth of defense orders. That is the largest amount that any producer has or ever has had in the history of our defense effort and in the history of our Nation. I think it is fair, too, Mr. President, to recall the fact that while Mr. Charles E. Wilson has divested himself of his personal stockholdings, there is still a very considerable block of stock held by members of his immediate family. If I have correctly read the testimony at the hearings, there will probably be even an increased amount of stock held by members of his immediate family, because he testified that he might wish to give to members of his family approximately 20 percent of his holdings out of his present 39,000 shares. So that, while he may divest himself of his personal stockholdings, there are large blocks of stock which are held and will be held not by collateral members of his family, but by members of his immediate family, persons close to him by the most definite bonds of immediate relationship.

While I am certain, Mr. President, that Mr. Charles E. Wilson is determined to do the job honestly and that he always has been and is today a completely honest man, I do not believe that we can ever convince the American people that the head of the Department of Defense will not have been, to some extent, at least, been influenced by the holdings of his immediate family.

The point has been raised on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that Mr. Wilson, if his nomination is confirmed, will probably lean over backward in his handling of problems relating to production, procurement, and defense where they concern the General Motors Corp. I think that is very true. I think that in all probability a man of Mr. Wilson's high character would seek to lean over backward. But I say that that might be just as disadvantageous to the interests of the country as if he were to show partiality in the placing of orders and in the handling of procurement and defense. I shall enlarge a little bit on that during the course of my remarks, in a few moments.

First, Mr. President, I want to point out that this is a country with 160,000,000 people and that we have had other Defense Secretaries who were very distinguished and able men; and I am advised that all these Defense Secretaries

willingly and cheerfully complied with both the letter and the spirit of the present law which prohibits dealings between a governmental agency and a corporation or company in which the Secretary has a direct or indirect personal interest.

I want to emphasize the fact that the law says "direct or indirect interest."

The record of the hearing shows that Mr. Wilson said repeatedly that he and his subordinates—the Secretaries of Air, Navy, and the Army would do right. Whenever in the hearings a difficult question arose, concerning just how these officials would operate when matters came up involving both their personal interests and the interests of the Government, Mr. Wilson said merely that the officials in question were honorable men and would do right.

Of course, these are honorable men. They are conscientious men. They are upright men. So is Mr. Wilson.

But that is not the question at all. The question is whether men, however upright, conscientious, and honorable, can as executives properly discharge a public trust and conduct the Government's business in buying, selling, and negotiating when such men have a financial or personal interest in the companies and corporations with which such transactions must be undertaken.

The law at issue here, Mr. President, forbidding so-called conflicts of interest, in just such a connection as is before us, was enacted in contemplation of just such men as the President proposes to nominate for the top positions in the Defense Department.

Mr. President, the law was not enacted in contemplation of the appointment of scoundrels and rascals. The Congress of the United States never assumed that the President, whose position is the greatest and most responsible in the world, would appoint corrupt men to high office or that he would appoint men who would make no distinction between right and wrong.

The philosophy of that law consists in the understanding that a man who holds public office and, through that office, must deal directly, in an executive capacity, with a matter in which he has a personal interest, cannot properly discharge his public functions, however honorable or upright that man is. As I have previously said in my remarks, he may lean over backward. That would be unfair to the company, or unfair to the Government, or to the people of the United States. To do his duty properly, a man in an executive position in Government, with no real checks and balances upon his actions, should lean neither backward nor forward, but proceed in a purely upright manner.

Mr. President, the Senate has rejected numerous nominations on the grounds of conflict of interest. I remember when the Senate rejected the nomination of Mr. Edwin Pauley as Under Secretary of the Navy because of his oil interests. Later this same Mr. Pauley was bitterly criticized because of speculations on the commodity market, and the suspicion was expressed, although he vigorously denied it, that his speculations were based on inside knowledge he received in Government capacities not at all directly connected with the Government purchase of commodities. Mr. Pauley was and is, I am told, an honest and upright man, and an extremely able man. There was, of course, no substantive evidence that be used inside information to make his profits in the commodity market, but the public could not possibly be convinced of that. Subsequently the present law was passed, forbidding the employment by the Government in any capacity of an officer with direct or indirect interest in the buying or selling of commodities or products to the Government. Mr. Pauley, of course, was not even nominated for any further public positions requiring Senate confirmation. This was wise, just as it was probably sound policy to have rejected him for Undersecretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, it is clearly the responsibility of Congress, and of the Senate, to protect not only the integrity of the Government but also the integrity of the people's faith in government. We must preserve not only honesty in government, but we must prevent, to the extent possible, the appearance of evil, the possibility of evil, and the possibility that the people may lose faith in government and the honesty of government.

Mr. President, we may well recall that 2 years ago the President of the United States appointed a Commission of high-minded men, headed by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, to consider the problem of loyalty in government. Some of the members of that Commission were outstanding lawyers in private practice. Their firms had claims and other law suits against the Government, in tax cases, and so forth. The Senate Judiciary Committee refused to waive the conflict of interests statute in those cases, however remote the connection between that Commission's work and the claims these lawyers, or their firms were prosecuting. It may well be that the Senate was wise in making that decision, too.

Mr. President, in this nomination and in the case of others to which it is related, men have been nominated to positions of the highest executive responsibility, men who will be responsible for the expenditure of billions of dollars—yes, many billions of dollars.

We cannot afford to let the public harbor even the shadow of a suspicion. We cannot permit these positions to be manned by individuals, however upright, however able, however conscientious, who have an interest, no matter how remote, in the companies with which their departments do business.

It is not fair to the companies. It is not fair to the men. Most important, it is not fair to the Government and thus to the whole people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have always believed, and I now believe, that the President should have wide latitude in the choice of his Cabinet, and that unless there are very real principles involved, the Senate should confirm his nominees. But I believe that a great principle is involved in this matter which we are debating here this afternoon.

I would not be true to my conscience if by my vote I appeared to sanction a principle of government which I view as unsound, and which I feel might return to plague us dangerously in the future. The law against conflicting interests is simple and direct. But whether or not Mr. Wilson will sell his General Motors stock is a detail, although legally a very important one. In complying with the wording of the law, a nominee is, however, not necessarily complying with its spirit, which unquestionably has far wider implications. There may still remain a substantial conflict of interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a very interesting editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and appearing in this morning's Washington Post and many other papers of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The lasting importance of the Wilson case may be in the light it throws on the application of the ancient principle, well known already to the Romans, that, as the Bible puts it, no man can serve two masters. This principle has been recognized for centuries in the law of the English-speaking world, and repeatedly it has been enacted in statutes. The one which Mr. Wilson has had to meet was first enacted, so I am told, in 1863 and reenacted in 1948.

While the rule against conflicting interests is, one might say, a self-evident moral principle, its application to concrete cases is not always, perhaps not often, self-evident. The Wilson case revealed more clearly than ever before the complexities of applying the law. It was shown during this past week, I think, that the rule does not mean merely that a man can qualify for public office by meeting certain precise, objective specifications. For the specifications cannot always be spelled out precisely. The rule necessarily includes the question of his subjective attitude toward the principles and the significance of the rule itself.

Mr. Wilson's interests in the General Motors Corp. are not only extensive but they are so intimately a part of his life that there is nothing he could do which would eliminate all the theoretical possibilities of a conflict of interest. It is because a theoretical conflict of interest must inevitably exist for him, as indeed for any man of large affairs—be he a businessman, a politician, or the member of some profession—that his personal philosophy and attitude is so important. This is the kind of rule of law which cannot be enforced fully unless in the subtler cases, which are the most difficult and yet the most significant, the man enforces it upon himself.

Mr. Wilson's stock prevented him from qualifying for Secretary of Defense under the letter of the law, as the lawyers in the Senate understand that law. But what troubled the Senate was whether Mr. Wilson understood fully the spirit of the law. Nobody thought that Mr. Wilson would do one thing rather than another as Secretary of Defense in order to augment the profits of General Motors or the value of his shares. Everybody knew that in any conflict of interest between the national defense and the profits of the corporation, Mr. Wilson would undoubtedly lean over backward.

Mr. Wilson's difficulties with the committee came primarily from his apparent unawareness of the nature of the law, from the surprising fact that he had not taken adequate legal advice, that his conscience in this field was not sufficiently instructed.

That this was the essence of the matter was shown in the quick, unquestioned and cordial confirmation of the new Secretary of

the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey is also a big businessman with very large interests. He had no trouble of any kind. The reason he did not have any trouble is quite plain to anyone who reads his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. Humphrey had made a careful study himself and he had had his lawyers examine for him the law, which is as a matter of fact somewhat special for the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey knew what the law is, and why it is what it is, and he had taken all the steps which he and his lawyers thought the law required in order to qualify himself. He had nothing to say about how much that had cost him, or about whether he was making a sacrifice. And while he is by no means a pauper today, he must have given up a lot of money in fact and on paper.

The main point is that there was no doubt at all in anyone's mind that he had a positive and informed understanding of the spirit of the law * * * and, moreover, that here was a lucid, a rational, and indeed a commanding figure who would add great strength and confidence to the new administration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in conclusion, I emphatically repeat that I do not wish in the slightest degree to reflect upon the nominee in question, who undoubtedly is a man of great ability and high character. But because I feel the principle involved far transcends the qualifications of any man, I feel that I cannot vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I proceed to give voice today to my views on the issue before the Senate, I shall be brief, I shall be to the point, and, I may add, as charitable as I can be under the circumstances.

I shall merely spell out the problem before us as I see it from the testimony presented to our committee.

And I hasten to add that, were I not a member of the committee which voted unanimously to report the nomination of Mr. Wilson to be our next Secretary of Defense, my remarks today would be encompassed in one simple word, "Yea," as the roll will be called at a later hour.

Mr. President, it is regrettable that this problem ever had to come before the Senate in its present form. Its ramifications, its impacts, its repercussions, should have been foreseen by someone at the helm during those trying days for our new President in the short period allowed for organization purposes following a great general election. It was not foreseen, so let us waste no words in recrimination at this point on that score.

By his own action—action which, I must confess, as I saw it as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services came with some "labor pains"—Mr. Wilson has agreed to meet both the spirit and letter of the law.

That Mr. Wilson is a truly great American, no one will question. That his genius and unexcelled initiative have served to make millions of our people happy and prosperous, there can be no doubt. That there was never entertained any question of personal honesty or integrity is, again, an undisputed fact.

But, sir, I would respectfully take this opportunity to remind our next Secretary of Defense—and I am sure he will be a great one; at least, that is one of my fondest hopes—that he cannot administer a vital Department of our great Government precisely as one can run a corporate enterprise, as great as that enterprise might be in his own eyes. He himself will very soon learn that there is a real difference between the talents required for corporate management and the art, the great art, involved in leadership in Government.

Mr. President, by a great personal sacrifice, Mr. Wilson has now, in my opinion, qualified himself under the law, or, I should say, he will shortly be qualified. He is following a fine old American tradition.

I compliment and congratulate him. I pray that he will never regret the step he is taking. I wish him every success in the high and important mission upon which he is about to embark.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of Mr. Wilson's nomination, but with the clear understanding, sir, that by that vote I shall not be bound to any future course of action upon nominations which may fall into a similar category, and when requirements are not complied with in the same forthright and courageous manner which Mr. Wilson himself has adopted.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I approach the question of whether or not the Senate should confirm the nomination of Mr. Wilson with a realization that what the Senate does may be construed by those who do not understand the reason why some of us take the position we do as perhaps a reflection upon Mr. Wilson. But I know that that should not be the interpretation placed upon any vote which may be cast against Mr. Wilson's nomination. I am not personally acquainted with him, nor, indeed, have I ever met him or seen him. However, I have had, and still have, great admiration for his ability and integrity, and for the achievement which has been his in the field of industrial management. I respect him very highly for what he has done as the chief executive of a great business organization. I respect him very much for the attitude he has taken with respect to labor-management relations. I think he has given to American industrialists who have not been quite so favorably disposed as he has been toward some of the developments an excellent example. He is an able man, with a great brain, who has evolved a plan which could well be followed by other industrialists.

So I speak to the Senate this afternoon without the slightest prejudice or feeling against Mr. Wilson, either because he is a wealthy man or because he is the head of a large corporation. He has made a great success. I believe that in our society successful men ought to have a right to be proud of their achievements. I do not believe that any aspersions should be cast upon any man because of the fact that he has been successful.

I also believe that when we come to measure the applicability of the law, it should be measured in precisely the same measure with respect to a man who has made a great success as with respect to a man who has attained a lesser degree of success.

I have no feeling because Mr. Wilson happened to take the position he took in the initial hearing before the Senate committee, as reported in the record and as repeated to me by members of the committee. I can understand full well how a man who has spent his life in private production, production which has meant much to America, might not comprehend the ways of politicians or the motives of members of the committee in asking him questions. So I reject any suggestion that Mr. Wilson was not trying to answer frankly and fairly every question propounded to him by any member of the committee.

At the same time, I realize that there is something besides successful business management in the life of every business in America. I know that behind the success of any man there must be a compelling spirit which enables him to mold and direct the activities of other men. Some do it in one way and some in another. Some can do it by enticing men to follow them and do the right and correct thing; others by driving men, under the threat of depriving them of the opportunity to earn a livelihood.

I believe all of us will admit that during the life of the great corporation known as General Motors that organization has rendered a valuable and noble service. I shall always have high praise for the officials of that organization for the achievements which have been theirs. I have no prejudice against any successful businessman or successful corporation. It has been my pleasant opportunity to have many dealings with businessmen and corporations. I know that in order for a man to go as high in the business world as Mr. Wilson has gone, he must possess ability; and, above all, he must be a man of integrity. The businessmen who guide the destinies of our great corporations are perhaps more jealous of the integrity of those with whom they associate and work than are some of the politicians with whom we must deal at times.

So, with an intense admiration for the greatness of this man, for the abilities he has shown, and for the work he has done for our Nation, I would honor him at any time. But I now come back to the question of what is the law in this situation. I wish very much that Mr. Wilson could have been nominated for some other position in the Cabinet, such as Secretary of Commerce or some other office, in which he could have given us the benefit of his great talents. I realize that in making this appointment our great President perhaps did not know about the law or did not think about it.

I can understand full well that in connection with this appointment there may never have arisen in the minds of many of those who favor the appointment the possibility that a controversy might rage over it in the Senate. I believe that we should read again and keep in mind the language of the statute. As we were told today, the statute had its beginnings in the days of Abraham Lincoln. We have a law which, so far as I know, everyone thinks is a good law. It was amended in 1948, and perhaps made a little stronger or perhaps a little

weaker. I am not certain as to that. However, I do know that the law says this:

Whoever—

It does not make any distinction between a big industrialist and the humblest worker—

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. President, there is nothing in that language which indicates that it was not intended to apply to every human being who lives in America, no matter what his station in life might be, no matter whether he might be a most valuable man or a man of little value.

I have read that part of the law which affects the nomination of Mr. Wilson. What are the facts? We have heard the facts discussed today. We have read the reports. I shall not go into very many of the facts, but I wish to remind the Senate that there are similar laws in the same statute which affect the activities and employment of others besides Mr. Wilson.

As was stated a few moments ago, approximately a year or a year and a half ago there came to the Senate from the House a bill to provide a special exemption with respect to members of the so-called Nimitz commission. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It was my duty to confer with Admiral Nimitz and some of the other members of that commission, one of whom happened to be a former Member of this body. I remember how graciously, how pleasantly, and how frankly Admiral Nimitz and the former Senator discussed with me the provisions of the law as we sat in the Judiciary Committee room. I read the law carefully with Admiral Nimitz. I remember clearly the fine attitude he took when he said he thought the law was an excellent law and that the law ought to be what it was. He did not ask us personally for any special dispensation, because he did not need one. However, I was refreshed by the thought that there was a great American, a great admiral of our fleet, who saw that the law should be administered in his case just as it was administered in the case of all other persons. So as I talked with him I came to realize more and more that there were persons who, even though the law might affect them, could still look at the law and see that it was a good and proper law, a wise law, the necessity for which in our Government was seen many years ago.

With respect to Admiral Nimitz and the other gentlemen with whom I talked a year and a half ago, not the slightest question was ever raised as to their character. I assume that many of those men were known to Members of this body. There was not a single man in that group who was not a good American. Every one of them represented the very highest type of American citizenship. It was recognized by us then that those men ought not to receive special dispensation. In the instant case no question of integrity and no question of ability is involved. I wish very much that Mr. Wilson could be appointed to the Cabinet. If there were any other post in the Cabinet in which he could serve, it would be well for America to get the benefit of his services. However, I cannot vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Wilson to this particular position, because I think it would tend to weaken the morale of the American people. After the facts have been disclosed, I do not believe that the Senate should take action which might have such an effect.

I wish to read what the Acting Attorney General Charles Fahy said about the statutes to which reference has been made. In an opinion written by him he gave cognizance to the interest of a shareholder in corporate profits in expressing the view that an individual who was both an officer and a shareholder of a corporation could not be appointed as a liaison officer of the War Department to have dealings with that corporation. Mr. Fahy said:

No man can serve two masters. The statute in question is clearly grounded on this assumption. Its manifest purpose is such that any attempt to reconcile it with the proposed employment runs into difficulties. Some of these difficulties are pointed out by the Judge Advocate General of the Army in his opinion on the question. Others are equally apparent. No matter how high are the motives of the Army officer who advises, he is likely as a realistic matter to be consciously or unconsciously influenced by the fact that his actions may benefit the corporation of which he is an officer and a stockholder. To a degree his salary as an officer of the corporation would be affected by whether his advice leads the War Department to enter into a procurement contract with his company. To a larger degree his share in the earnings of the corporation as a stockholder would be affected by his advice.

The statute refers to a person who is directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation. Is Mr. Wilson directly or indirectly interested in General Motors? Of course today he is interested directly, because he has not yet sold his stock. I do not blame him for not selling his stock. I do not think that up to now we should have expected him to sell his stock and take an enormous loss by way of taxes upon the sale and also possibly through the depreciation of the price of the stock. I believe he has gone as far as we could expect him to go with respect to his stock.

I realize, Mr. President, that when the matter first arose Mr. Wilson did not have any conception of what the law intended to accomplish. In looking through the record I see several instances where Mr. Wilson seemed to be piqued because a Senator asked him some questions. He soon got over it and he realized that it was the duty of the Senators on that committee to probe into every fact that was relevant to the question before the committee.

How can anyone say that he is not indirectly interested now?

Mr. President, it will be recalled that in addition to the Nimitz Commission the Senate also had before it the Pauley case. That was before I became a Member of this body. I understand that some of the Senators who are now sponsoring the nomination of Mr. Wilson took the position that Mr. Pauley had indirect or direct interests in some oil properties and therefore should not serve in the position to which he had been appointed; and his nomination was not confirmed. Is there anyone who is willing to stand up and say that the law in this case is not a wholesome law, or not a proper law, or not a proper exercise of care on the part of Congress in an effort to protect the Government against situations which have arisen in the past and certainly may arise in the future, even though it would not arise in the case of Mr. Wilson?

We must remember that we are setting a precedent today. Who would oppose the Secretary of Defense? Who would say to him, "You are wrong"? Many people are today hesitating to oppose Mr. Wilson because of the far-flung empire known as General Motors and its influence on people in all walks of life. Would an under secretary do it? Would any subordinate of his do it? To ask the question is to answer it. We know that men do not oppose their superiors if they have any hope of promotion in the future. Would a general or an admiral oppose him?

Mr. President, I am sorry to say all of us have seen within the past few years a tendency on the part of military men to knuckle under and to fail to resist the acts of civilians of great authority in our Nation. I believe that a general or an admiral should have the nerve and courage to resist a Secretary of Defense; but I also know that as a matter of human nature we can hardly expect any of them to do it. When we realize that the Secretary of Defense would have the power to promote an individual into prominence or to demote him into obscurity, who below him will have the courage to risk his future, to risk his promotion, and to risk the possibility of a demotion by opposing a man who might be acting contrary to what the best principles and moral law would require him to do?

Therefore, it is for the future that we are establishing a precedent today, not as I wish to make clear again, passing merely on Mr. Wilson's case by itself.

I know that one of the things we must deal with in government—and there is not a Senator who has not had some experience with it to some extent—is a tendency which finds expression in kowtowing in obsequiousness and in sycophancy evidenced toward a man in power and authority. We expect that to happen in a case where one man has authority to deal with a concern of which he is a part of its very life blood. Does anyone believe that an undersecretary or other subordinate would undertake to resist the Secretary of Defense, particularly if his action meant much to him in future life?

Mr. President, I am glad that in considering the pending nomination we need not consider the questions of ability, integrity, and patriotism. It has been demonstrated over and over that all those qualities are possessed by this great American. We know that those qualities are present in Mr. Wilson's case in overwhelming measure. There is no question of politics, and I am glad of that, too. While I do not know

whether Mr. Wilson is a Democrat or a Republican, I would not hesitate to vote for the confirmation of his nomination were it not for the law as it is written.

I admire Mr. Wilson for his willingness to dispose of his holdings. I do not believe it ought to be necessary for an American who has made a great success in life to suffer the loss that Mr. Wilson must suffer. About a year and a half ago I said to some members of the Nimitz Commission that we ought to take some action, perhaps by amending the law, to make it possible for a successful businessman who is called to serve his government to be able to serve without going through all the hocus pocus of transferring, selling, and disposing of his securities and other property. I think so now. I hope that from this instance will come some suggestion for a worth while and sensible amendment of the law that will help the Government and yet at the same time will not bring into the public eye and to public attention, in the case of any one individual, the problems which have arisen in this particular case.

Mr. Wilson recognizes that situations of this sort may arise. I know he realizes that, because in the record we find his statement that if matters about which he has any question arise, he will go to the President about them. That is laudable, Mr. President, and I approve of what he has said. However, does not that statement by him show that in his innermost mind he himself realizes that there may arise questions upon which he, as an honest man, would not wish to pass, but which he would have to take to the President?

While I honor Mr. Wilson for taking that position, I can understand full well that that is another item of proof that he recognizes that there may be some doubt about his qualifications under a strict interpretation of this law.

Mr. President, are there not other big-business men who could qualify and ably fill this position?

In the committee's report, I see some mention of Mr. Stevens, upon whose case we have not yet passed. Mr. Stevens is the only man in this group whom I happen to know, and I know him only casually. However, let me say that I do not believe there is a finer businessman in America than Mr. Stevens. I think he has shown his patriotism and his devotion to his country in many ways in the past several years. I would not hesitate to trust him with anything affecting our country's welfare. I have not the slightest question about Mr. Stevens' honesty and integrity. On the other hand, some persons take the position that Mr. Stevens also must sell the stock he owns in his company—a company organized by his father, and in which Mr. Stevens has a traditional interest which quite naturally could well transcend even the money value of the stock he owns.

Mr. President, I do not think such a sacrifice should have to be made. On the other hand, Mr. Wilson has said that he is willing to make it. I wonder whether we should approve an arrangement which would require an American citizen to give up $600,000 in order to serve his country. Perhaps Mr. Wilson would be much better off if he were not required or even allowed to do that.

Of course, I know that the law which applies to his case, like other similar laws, was made to protect the public in the future, not in the past. I know that such laws are enacted for the purpose of preventing situations such as this one, in which a man may find himself in a dual capacity, a situation in which he would not wish to be found.

Mr. President, in order to show how such matters may arise, I wish at this point to call attention to some of the reports to the effect that it is possible that an investigaion may be made of General Motors Corp., and of what it has done in connection with contracts with the Department of Defense. Let me say that I know nothing whatever about the details of such matters. Regardless of what may have occurred, the able and honest men who have been managing General Motors Corp. will be found for the most part to have done what is correct. But, as I have said, I do not know about the details of such transactions. Therefore, in this connection, I refer to page 135 of part 2 of the hearing before the Armed Services Committee. At that point a certain transaction was referred to by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I never heard of it before; my only knowledge of this transaction comes from what is contained in the committee hearing. The junior Senator from Missouri yielded to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who asked a question; and thereafter the Senator from Missouri asked Mr. Wilson whether he was familiar with an investigation made in 1951 by the Porter-Hardy subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee. Mr. Wilson replied:

No; I am not.

Then the junior Senator from Missouri said:

I would like to read, then, briefly, some of the statements in that report and because Mr. Wilson is not familiar with it, I would suggest that he furnish, as soon as he can, to the committee, his opinion with respect to this congressional report and not try to answer it now.

In June, July, and December of 1951, the Porter-Hardy subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee conducted an "inquiry into the procurement of automotive spare parts by the United States Government."

It held the hearings both in Washington and in Detroit and issued its report, House Report No. 1811, of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, April 25, 1952.

The purpose of the inquiry was to investigate the following practices, described as follows on page 1 of the House report:

"The Government advertised for 1,000 generators of a certain type. Of the bids submitted, two were significant, one from Chrysler Motors for $77.20 each, and one from Electric Auto-Lite for $87 each; investigation disclosed that the generator was in fact made by Electric Auto-Lite and had been previously sold to Chrysler for $52 each."

The committee sought to discover:

1. Why the manufacturer, Electric Auto-Lite, should bid higher than the vehicle assembler, Chrysler Motors;

2. Whether this was a general trade practice;

3. What benefits the Government was deriving from the enormous difference in price between the $52 paid by Chrysler and the $87 paid to Chrysler by the Government.

I refer to this matter in order to show why it is important that we protect the Government of the United States in every way we possibly can. Let me say that I have no comment to make about this particular instance because I do not know about it. No doubt reference could be made to similar instances involving dealings with the Government by various other manufacturers or industrialists.

Mr. President, assuming that Mr. Wilson becomes Secretary of Defense, let us suppose that some company, perhaps General Motors Corp., without Mr. Wilson's knowledge or approval or the slightest information upon his part, were to attempt to engage with the United States Government in a transaction simiiar to the one referred to on page 135 of the committee hearing. In that case, who in the Department of Defense would wish to accuse General Motors Corp. of improper conduct?

I understand that when Mr. Wilson has sold his General Motors stock and has taken the present cash value of his General Motors bonus, he will be out of General Motors Corp. except for his pension. I have no comment to make upon that situation. It will be recalled that in his testimony Mr. Wilson said he would expect to sell some of his stock and would expect to give some of it to certain members of his family. That situation brings me back to the question of whether Mr. Wilson can ever expect not to be indirectly interested in General Motors Corp., so long as members of his family own millions of dollars worth of General Motors stock. Mr. President, I do not believe that any Member of the Senate could be disinterested—certainly he would be at least indirectly interested—in what occurred to a corporation if his wife or some other member of his immediate family owned millions of dollars' worth of the securities of that corporation. I realize that we can build up all sorts of arguments and can spin all sorts of fine points in that connection, but the question is whether Mr. Wilson could possibly dissociate himself to such an extent that he would not be indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits of that concern.

I have not gone into the question of whether the ability of the corporation to pay its pensions or other obligations of that sort should also be considered. But, in any event, I believe that the language of the statute is unmistakable to all of us who take the trouble to read it carefully. The language does not require a great deal of interpretation. I now read from the statute:

Whoever, being a Government official or employee, receives any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality; or

Whoever, whether a person, association, or corporation, makes any contribution to, or in any way supplements the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States—

Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

Mr. President, I felt that today I should state my views about this matter, for I

believe we would be setting a precedent and an example which might arise to plague us in the days, months, and years ahead.

I am sure that all Democrats, including myself, who are Members of this body honestly wish to cooperate with the great President who now sits in the White House, and wish to do so to the best of our ability. Certainly I wish to do that. I never desire to make any captious objections to anything the President suggests. I only wish to do my duty as best I can, as does every other Member of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, the position I take in regard to this nomination is not taken for the purpose of attempting to reflect upon anyone or for the purpose of questioning the judgment of anyone. My position is that today, with the eyes of all America upon us, and also with the eyes of the rest of the world upon us, in the case of the nomination to high office of a man who has given so much of his life to one large company, which is a dominating factor in supplying all sorts of defense items for the United States, we should think very carefully and think twice before we say to the people of the United States that we are oblivious to the possibility of establishing such a precedent as would be established if his nomination should be confirmed.

I have no doubt that if the nomination of Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense is confirmed, he will do a better job in that capacity because of the criticism that has been leveled in the course of this debate, than he would have done otherwise. I am sure he will do the very best he can. I have no doubt about his sincerity or his integrity.

On the other hand, I have no doubt that if Mr. Wilson's nomination is confirmed, in the future it will be difficult for us to say to an official of some other supplier or some other firm, "You cannot hold such a job unless you dispose of all your stockholdings in the company, including the stock owned by your wife or by other members of your family," without harking back to the day when we confirmed the nomination of the head of one of the largest contract suppliers of all.

Mr. President, I wish we did not have to pass upon this question. Although I do not know Mr. Wilson personally, yet I have for him the great admiration which I have for all successful businessmen who have done a great deal for their country. However, I could not refrain from saying what I have said about this matter, for I verily believe that we shall embark upon a dangerous course if we confirm the nominations to such positions of men who previously have dealt with the Government and who necessarily will have to deal in the future, while they are serving as Government officials, with the companies of which they have been and continue to be a part.

I cannot subscribe to the theory which has been advanced that the interests of a man's immediate family should not be considered. I think every Senator will have to consider that his family is a part of himself, and that when he has to pass upon the interests of his family, his wife and his children, he will be just as much concerned, perhaps much more so, in their welfare and in the welfare of their estates, as he is in his own.

I know that questions have been asked which probably should have been asked. I am sure that those who manage the big business of America are generally honest and fair, and I am confident that the officials of General Motors and other large corporations want to serve America properly and correctly. But I am also confident that it is necessary for us to keep the confidence of the youth of America, and avoid all appearance of evil, when we come to pass laws that would benefit a particular individual. While the pending question is on the confirmation of a nomination, nevertheless it has the importance of a law.

I remember recently when Mr. Brownell was before our committee. I asked him one or two questions. I said to him:

> Cabinet members are regarded in two different ways, I find. One is so-called members of the President's family, and there are other people who regard them as public officials, whose primary duty may be to assist the President but on the other hand with a great responsibility to the public, and particularly so since the Senate has to confirm them. What is your feeling about the function of Cabinet officials?

This is the answer:

> Mr. BROWNELL. I think that they are primarily public officials; they would be making a great mistake if they didn't work with the head of the executive division of the Government, which I propose to do, and they would also be making a great mistake if they didn't work in close cooperation with the legislative branch of the Government, which I propose to do.

I read that because I have noted some suggestions that, after all, this very prominent American businessman, Mr. Wilson, would not be such a public official as should be classified with other public officials, but that he should be above them, because as a member of the President's Cabinet he is amenable and answerable only to the President. I do not subscribe to that view of the law and I do not believe that the American people subscribe to that view of the law. I want to cooperate in every possible way I can with the great man who today occupies the White House, and I shall do so in every way that I possibly can. But I do not believe that we should break down the law, or that we should place a certain construction upon the law and approve for this high office a man who has been in the position he has occupied for so many years. I will honor him, and I will be willing to glorify him to any extent, but I do not believe we can afford to confirm the nomination of this fine American, great as he may be, in the light of the law as it has been written and as it still stands on the statute books. Therefore, Mr. President, I do not see how I can vote for the confirmation of the pending nomination, much as I regret to have to take that position.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say I have enjoyed very much this very fine presentation by the Senator from North Carolina, who is an able lawyer, and who was formerly president of the American Bar Association. I should like to ask his opinion on another provision, upon which I do not believe he elaborated. If he will look at the leaflet before him, entitled "Compilation of Certain Legal Material Prepared by the Office of the Senate Legislative Counsel on Conflict of Interest Statutes," he will note that on page 21 thereof the statement is made, in fact, it is the law:

> The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. Under the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this act, he shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense.

Then, if the Senator will look at one other item—there are several of them—I call his attention to the one on page 24. Under the heading "Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended," appears the following provision:

> SEC. 506. (a) In the case of aid under this act for military end items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—
>
> (1) the determination of military end-item requirements;
>
> (2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;
>
> (3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;
>
> (4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel; and
>
> (5) the movement and delivery of military end items.
>
> (b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is on what page?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is on page 24. I refer to those two particular items for this reason: It seems to me that the problem with which we are confronted here relates—of course it does relate—to contracts between the Government and General Motors, in this particular case; and we all know that General Motors is the largest single supplier both to our own national defense and, I dare say, also to the furnishing of the end items in our mutual security aid program. I have heard it suggested that the Secretary of Defense could delegate the handling of these contracts to somebody else. I suppose it would be a delegation to one of the Secretaries, or perhaps he could delegate it to the President; I do not know. But I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to say a few words about that suggestion, as to the power and the right under the law, and particularly under the two sections I have just cited, of Mr. Wilson, if his nomination is confirmed, to delegate the handling of contracts with General Motors, which, after all, will be the largest part of contract handling.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Would the Senator state again which section that is?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is on page 21. It is at the top of page 21.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That simply provides that the Secretary of Defense shall have complete control of our Defense Department, under the President.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The other part I read appears on page 24, about the middle of the page, under the heading "Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended."

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes, I have it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That says he is responsible for all procurement and the establishment of all priorities and contracts relating to the furnishing of end items for our mutual security aid program.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Is the Senator from Alabama asking me how that can be done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whether, under the law, as provided in those sections, Mr. Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, would have the legal right to delegate to someone else the power given to him under those two sections.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. He might have the power to delegate, but if any question should arise, the decision would come back to him, as I see it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In procuring materials for our Department of Defense it is provided that he has the responsibility, under the President.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the furnishing of end items and making contracts under the mutual security aid program he has the primary responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator would say he thinks that under that terminology the Secretary of Defense can legally pass to someone else the power to handle the major portion of procurement in the Department of Defense.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. He might legally pass it, subject to his further consideration; but I think there would arise immediately the question as to whom he is passing the power and in practical, everyday practice what would happen to the man who did not do what he thought ought to be done. I am not talking particularly about Mr. Wilson, but about any man who is placed in that position. It seems to me that since the Secretary would have the authority, he might delegate it subject to certain conditions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HILL. When the statute provides that the Secretary of Defense—and it applies to any such secretary—shall have primary responsibility and authority, can he escape the primary responsibility and authority by delegation to someone else? In view of the language of the statute, would it not really mean that the person to whom the authority was delegated would be acting as his agent? Under the language of the statute, is there any way in which he can escape the responsibility and authority imposed upon him by the statute?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I do not see how he could, in the final analysis.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the final responsibility and the primary responsibility are his.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CASE. That question arose in the committee, and Mr. Wilson stated that he thought there was some difference between his position and that of persons who were subordinate to him in the department. His understanding was that under the law he had the responsibility. He recognized that he had to have the responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. CASE. I was trying to throw a little light on the situation. I think Mr. Wilson is not convinced that he can pass to someone else a responsibility which is his. He recognizes that he has to have the responsibility.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this matter.

I find myself in complete disagreement with the arguments presented by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The nomination was considered by the committee, reported by the committee, and is now before the Senate for confirmation. There is one more step, namely, that a certificate must be issued by the President, just as a certificate would be issued in the case of a marshal or some other person.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said "There is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip." My reply to that is that Dwight Eisenhower, before he issues the certificate, will have ample opportunity to ascertain whether the stock has been disposed of, and to whom.

The distinguished Senator further talked about profits. I submit, Mr. President, that the question of profits, the 11.1 percent spoken of by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has no place in this controversy at all.

I remember very well when President Roosevelt, at the time World War II was declared, said he did not want any profits to be made in World War II, that 70,000 millionaires had been created in World War I, and that he did not want any created in World War II.

Certainly Mr. Wilson is not to blame if profits are made in war. The blame is entirely upon the shoulders of Congress.

We know that Dwight Eisenhower went to Europe, and went from country to country over there, to organize an efficient defense. I doubt whether there is any other man in America more competent or who knows more about the entire subject of defense than does Dwight Eisenhower.

What does he say to us? He says, "I want want Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense."

The Senator from Oregon says, "What about Paul Hoffman?" He might just as well say, "What about Paul Jones?" or "What about Ole Olesen, or John Nelson?"

The President of the United States, and the responsibility is his, says he wants Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be his Secretary of Defense. Certainly, a man who has had the experience which he has had knows more about the subject than does any Senator upon this floor. Certainly, if we get into trouble in San Francisco or in the city of New York, the people will look to the Senate, assuming it has said that Mr. Wilson is not the proper man for the office of Secretary of Defense.

The President has spoken, and I am going to support him.

The President of the United States, in selecting a member of his official family, says he wants Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense. He is in a position to say whom he wants. Mr. Wilson can qualify by selling his stock between the time his nomination is confirmed and the time he receives his certificate. So far as I am concerned, that is that.

It is a serious matter, Mr. President, because the life of everyone in this room may be at stake in this decision. The life of every businessman is at stake in any decision we make here.

When the President, who was chosen by an overwhelming number of the American electorate, says he wants Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense, because he believes he can do the best job to defend this country, he is the man for whom the senior Senator from North Dakota is going to vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a great deal has turned upon the question of conflict of interest. The question of conflict of interest in principle was one which was recognized by the Congress a few years ago when it passed the so-called Unification Act in which it provided that the Secretary of Defense should be a civilian, with the express provision that anyone who had served in the armed services within the past 10 years could not be appointed to the position of Secretary of Defense.

Considerable debate took place at that time on the question of principle, and the background and precedents were considered. During the debate on September 15, 1950, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said:

> I happen to be one who believes that the hour is so dark for America in the crisis which confronts it that we need forthwith to bring into the service of our country, at every post where they can best serve, those persons most qualified to hold the great positions of responsibility in our defense preparations.

At that time there was pending before the Senate a bill to waive the prohibition against a military man being made Secretary of Defense. The Senator from Oregon was then taking the position that the bill should be passed in a specific instance, for a specific person. He said that the law should be changed so that that person could qualify. It was in that connection that he said:

> I happen to be one who believes that the hour is so dark for America in the crisis

which confronts it that we need forthwith to bring into the service of our country, at every post where they can best serve, those persons most qualified to hold the great positions of responsibility in our defense preparations.

Then he took cognizance of the fact that the objection to General Marshall was that he might militarize the post, and he said:

I think it is a mistake, Mr. President, I think it is unfair to George Marshall, to give any impression that his appointment to this position will militarize the post of Secretary of Defense. To the contrary, I think George Marshall will protect and preserve civilian direction of our Military Establishment.

Today the distinguished Senator from Oregon comes before the Senate and says that ours is a government of law; that we should not make exceptions; that there is no way by which Mr. Wilson can divorce himself from his affinity of interest. Yet on September 15, 1950, when he wanted to make an argument the other way, and wanted Congress to pass a law specifically to allow General Marshall to become eligible for the Office of Secretary of Defense, he said that General Marshall could divorce himself from his lifelong career with the Defense Establishment; that he could be impartial as between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and could be impartial as between the Defense Establishment and civilian interests that are intended to be preserved by the Unification Act.

Today he said that we ought to get the best men available. Defense today requires military efficiency. One might say that covers several elements including morale of persons. But today no nation can successfully conduct a war unless it can produce arms. If there is any single qualification that is needed in the man who is nominated to be Secretary of Defense, it is the ability to get production. On that very test, we ought to secure persons who are most qualified to hold positions of great responsibility in our defense preparation.

It seems to me the Senate is warranted in accepting the nomination and voting for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson.

It might be interesting to Members of the Senate to know who voted for the special law that made it possible for General George Marshall to hold the civilian post of Secretary of Defense. When, in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 9646, making General Marshall eligible to be the civilian Secretary of Defense, came to a vote, the yeas were 47, as follows: Anderson, Byrd, Chapman, Connally, Cordon, Darby, Douglas, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gillette, Graham, Green, Gurney, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Hunt, Ives, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Kerr, Kilgore, Leahy, Lehman, Lodge, Long, Lucas, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Morse, Murray, Neely, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Robertson, Russell, Saltonstall, Smith of Maine, Sparkman, Stennis, Thye, and Wiley.

The vote for the actual confirmation of the nomination of General Marshall to be Secretary of Defense, a civilian post, showed an even larger vote. There were 57 yeas to confirm the nomination of General Marshall to that position.

I am one Republican who thinks that in time of war curbs can be placed upon profits. The history of the Renegotiation Act, which was initiated and offered in the House of Representatives 10 years ago this spring, and offered as an amendment to the sixth supplemental appropriations bill of 1942, became the basis on which we attempted to curb exceptional or excessive profits in time of war.

I am one Republican who did not squirm or worry when it was proposed that a salary limitation of $25,000 be imposed upon the incomes of persons in time of war. I thought that was not out of the way. I supported that position when I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

With that kind of background, I sat through the hearings when Mr. Wilson appeared before the Committee on Armed Services. I became convinced that Mr. Wilson wanted to come to the service of the Government with his hands completely clean. He offered to go any route that was necessary, to do everything that was required by law, and to do everything in the spirit of the law, so that he could divorce himself from any interest in the profits of General Motors, so far as it was humanly possible for him to do.

I think the members of the committee were impressed by his evident desire simply to serve the country. When a man has divested himself as clearly and completely as Mr. Wilson has in this instance of every direct interest he could have in the pecuniary profits of General Motors, when he comes before the Senate and says, "I simply have been asked to assume this responsibility; I was asked to do so on the basis of doing something for my country, and I would like to go through with it," he has put himself in the position of many Members of the Senate who could make money in outside professions. I do not quibble or try to be a demagog when a Member of the Senate says to me, frankly and personally, "I know this job will cost me money, because I can make more by practicing law or going into business. But I have been in the public service for some time, and I rather like the idea of continuing in it." It will be a poor day for the country when such men are not attracted to the public service by their hope to do something for their country.

I well remember a time some years ago, when he became Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower's final appearance before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the first budget which he submitted. There had been considerable discussion about the difficulty of getting good men to stay with the Military Establishment after the fighting was over.

General Somervell had been asked to go to the Koppers Corp. at a salary four or five times as large as he had been able to get while serving as general in charge of procurement during the war, and a part of the time in charge of military construction.

General Eisenhower cited instances of other officers who had been asked to go to General Electric and other firms because of the knowledge they had obtained of radar and electronic equipment. The committee was concerned because of the exodus of men of ability who were being attracted to industry immediately following the war.

General Eisenhower, who had been Chief of Staff, said that he was happy that the committee would not place any restrictions upon the grading of different periods of service, longevity, and considerations of that sort, and thus would make it a little more possible for the Army to compete with industry in keeping some of its personnel. One member of the committee, I believe it was former Representative Engel, of Michigan, finally said to General Eisenhower, "After all, when you are asking a man to stay with the Government at $8,000 or $9,000 a year, when he can get $25,000 or $30,000 a year in private industry, how can you expect him to stay with the Government?" President Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, said "Well, Mr. Chairman, you sometimes have to go to these people and tell them that their country needs them." Then he added, "I sometimes think we made a mistake when we started leaving the word 'patriotism' out of our Fourth of July addresses."

I think that in itself explains why General Eisenhower himself consented to become a candidate for President, and why he is in the White House today. It is because of his high sense of patriotism. He felt the call to duty.

He has approached some important men in the country and has asked them to enter the service of the Government at this time, and the statement needs no emphasis from me that this is a time when we need the best men for these positions.

I hope the time will never come when it will become a disqualification for public service for a man to say, "I am willing to accept this job, not because it will pay me more money, but because I want to do something for my country."

To me, it is something like that which was envisioned by the poet who said:

> Breathes there the man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land.

The motive of service to country is a noble motive. When a man divests himself of pecuniary profits so far as it is humanly possible for him to do, and offers to respond to the call of duty at a time when his country needs him, I think his offer should be accepted, especially when his nomination is proposed by the President of the United States, himself, who in his own life has always shown a high sense of responsibility when duty called.

Therefore I shall vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think all of us agree generally with the sentiments which have been expressed by the able Senator from South Dakota. But, after all, we are confronted with a law. The able Senator mentioned the case of General Marshall. No one asked that General Marshall be given high office against

a law which was on the statute books. Instead, Congress was asked to change the law. Congress exercised its discretion and changed the law. But here is a law which says that—

> Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation—

And so forth. I emphasize the words "directly or indirectly."

I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. I think we all admire Mr. Wilson and regard him as a patriotic American. Mr. Wilson having divested himself to the extent indicated by the Senator from South Dakota, does the Senator believe that he is not directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of General Motors Corp.?

Mr. CASE. I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that I should like to have him read the remainder of the statute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I shall be glad to read all of the statute. However, the words which I have emphasized are in it. The applicable provision reads as follows:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, of any firm or partnership; or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. CASE. The reason I asked the able Senator to read the latter part of the provision was that the statute concerned me, as it did every other member of the Committee on Armed Services. I think the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who brought it to the attention of the committee performed a very distinct service. However, the statute does not say that such person shall not be an officer or shall not be an agent of the United States. It says: "is employed or acts as an officer or an agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CASE. So it does not simply say that he shall not be an officer or agent, but that he shall not be an officer or agent for the transaction of business in behalf of the United States with such business entity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator that that is what the language is. If I could get a satisfactory answer to the other question, I should be satisfied; but this question also concerns me. The Senator may have heard me ask a question of the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] a while ago. The Secretary of Defense is made primarily responsible for the whole Department of Defense under the President of the United States. Moreover, under the Mutual Security Aid Act of 1951, he is charged with the primary responsibility of procuring all end items in that program, arranging for priorities, and so forth. I asked the Senator from North Carolina this question, and I should like to ask the able Senator from South Dakota the same question:

Under that provision, does the Senator believe that the Secretary of Defense can separate himself from transactions with the General Motors Corp., which transactions, by the way, constitute the major portion of the business which the Department of Defense does, and probably the major part of the business which the mutual security aid program involves?

Mr. CASE. I shall answer that question directly, but let me say first that when we were discussing with Mr. Wilson the problem of the other secretaries, namely, the Secretary for the Army, the Secretary for the Navy, and the Secretary for the Air Force, I suggested to him that the problem in that connection might be solved—and in his case, too, for that matter—by passing over to the Renegotiation Board, as established by the Renegotiation Act of 1951, the determination of the price in all such business. The Renegotiation Act of 1951 specifically provides that the Renegotiation Board shall be an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government. As the able Senator knows, the Renegotiation Board has acted as a post-check upon prices, and before the final compensation was paid by the Government to a contractor the costs were determined and a fair profit allowed. Anything above that amount was not allowed, or had to be refunded if it had been paid.

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 provided that the members of the Board should be named by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. It also provided that one member of the Board might be suggested to the President by each of the secretaries in the Defense Establishment and by the Administrator of the General Services Administration. But it is also clear by reference to that statute that the President was not bound to name him. So I suggested to Mr. Wilson a proviso which might go at the end of section 434, to the effect that the determination of the compensation should be turned over to the Renegotiation Board. I suggested the following proviso:

> *Provided, however,* That this section shall not be construed to prevent such a person from being an officer of the United States if the determination of the compensation for such business is made by the Renegotiation Board under the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and that no member of that Board was proposed to the President by such officer for appointment.

I thought that might contribute to the solution of the problem, because, obviously, no member of the present Renegotiation Board has been proposed to the President by the persons nominated as secretaries of the several establishments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. CASE. I am reading from page 124 of part 2 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

I pointed out also that if any secretary were to suggest a name to the President he could ignore the suggestion, so that the Board would have no connection whatsoever with the Defense Establishment. This was Mr. Wilson's comment on that suggestion:

> Mr. WILSON. Now is this a proposed change in law that you have in mind to sponsor?
>
> Senator CASE. Yes; it is, Mr. Wilson, and, of course, I recognize that that wouldn't be law, but it seems to me that if that is accompanied by a statement that the officers in question, pending the adoption of such an amendment, simply would refrain from transacting business for the United States with the business entities in question, that they do not run afoul of the existing statute.
>
> Mr. WILSON. I would like to make one statement on that whole matter. There are a number of things that I think could be improved by law. That is not my job.
>
> I am taking the laws just as they are, and figuring out sound ways and honest ways to operate so that whatever it is now we can handle under existing law honestly and without creating any misunderstandings or ill will on the part of the public.
>
> Now I respect the position that the Senate and the Congress are in. You are the bosses. It is right that you should be. That is our American way of doing it. Whatever laws you men pass, I will try to faithfully follow. I will follow them and I will work with you in any way you want me to in connection with any new law you pass.
>
> I don't think I am competent to pass on this one today without studying it. I don't like to do those things.

In other words, what Mr. Wilson was saying to us was, in effect, "I think you are asking me to come through clean so far as it is humanly possible for me to do so under existing law. I am not yet an officer of the Government. I do not think I should place myself in the position of recommending that Congress should change the law merely so that I may qualify."

That was the entire tenor and spirit of Mr. Wilson's statement before the committee. He said, in effect, "I am going to do everything I can to qualify myself under the present law. I am not asking you to change the law for my benefit." It was on that basis that the hearing proceeded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is it not similar to the situation of a man elected to the United States Senate who cannot qualify because he is not old enough? In other words, if he becomes of age in 2 or 3 months he can qualify. Mr. Wilson owns some stock, and therefore he cannot qualify. We can confirm his nomination and then the President of the United States, before he issues his certificate of appointment, and before Mr. Wilson can take office, can say to him, "I want to be sure that you have disposed of your stock so that you can qualify for the position." Is that not the situation here?

Mr. CASE. That is a point that should be made. I believe it should be pointed out also than an officer runs afoul of the law only when he does business with an entity with which he has some identity of interest. In other words, he can hold the office and he can perform every other act connected with his office except the transaction of business with a business entity in which he may have an interest, and unless he does transact such business he would not be violating the law. He can refrain from

any action in which the particular business entity is involved.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I should like very briefly to make known to the Senate my views on the nomination of Mr. Wilson.

I have been a member for 20 years of first the Naval Affairs Committee and then the Armed Services Committee. I do not believe that I have ever known a witness to be examined more extensively about all of his intimate business transactions and connections than was Mr. Wilson. I wish to say that he was very frank, he was very sincere, and he did not try to conceal anything whatever from the committee.

However, Mr. President, this question has been as perplexing as any I have ever had to deal with in my long service in the Senate. It relates to a matter that has been engaging the attention of Congress ever since Congress itself was established, namely, public responsibility on the one side and conflict of interest on the part of Federal Government officials on the other.

Among other applicable statutes, I would say section 434, title 18, United States Code, headed "Interested persons acting as Government agents" is descriptive of the general policy of the United States Government with respect to this subject of conflict of interest.

It seems to me that that law lays down clearly, concisely, and simply the fundamental questions involved in this very vital public matter.

This law originally was passed in 1863. It was reenacted in 1878, in 1909, and in 1948. While this law has come within review for reenactment at least three times during the 90 years it has been on the books, the fundamental principle underlying the statute has not been weakened. As in the beginning, section 434 still, in plain and simple terms, constitutes a code of ethics for Government officials.

It is not an antiquated law, as some have said. It states a solid and sound principle and, in substance, it says that no officer or agent of the United States shall transact business with a business entity in which such officer has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest. This is good Americanism, as I see it.

This section 434 reads:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. President, there are two factors which must exist in order to make the law applicable to any given situation. First, there must be a pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in some business entity; second, there must be an agent or officer of the United States who directs the transaction of business with such business entity.

I am in favor of that law. I would resist to the utmost of my capacity any effort to change or weaken it, regardless of the source of such an effort. It is, as I said, a code of ethics with relation to the question of "conflict of interest."

There are a number of other laws along the same line, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them. Rather, I ask unanimous consent that a statement regarding them may be inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In addition to section 434, which is applicable to all who act as agents or officers of the United States, section 281 of the same title applies to Members of Congress, officers and others in matters affecting the Government. In brief, this section makes it a crime with heavy fine and prison penalties for a Member of Congress, head of a department, etc., to receive or agree to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered in relation to any contract, claim, etc., in which the United States is directly or indirectly interested. It provides further that upon conviction, he "shall be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States."

Sections 216 and 283 of title 18, referring to Congressmen and officers or employees interested in claims against the Government, provide that if any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or any officer of the United States Government acts as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, etc., or receives any gratuity or any share of or interest in any such claim in consideration of such assistance, he "shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned or both."

Section 1901 of title 18, entitled "Collecting or Disbursing Officer Trading in Public Property," provides that if an officer of the United States concerned in the collection or the disbursement of the revenues thereof, carries on any trade or business in the funds or debts of the United States, he "shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both * * *."

Further, section 1914, entitled "Salary of Government Officials and Employees Payable Only by United States," provides that a Government official or employee who receives any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States "shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

In addition to these provisions in title 18, section 243, title 5 United States Code (5 U. S. C. 243) imposes special restrictions upon the Secretary of the Treasury.

There are other restrictions elsewhere in the law with respect to business connections of the Officials of the Atomic Energy Commission, Federal Reserve Board, Federal Tariff Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Interstate Commerce Act provides that no person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any common carrier or owning stock or bonds thereof, etc., shall enter upon the duties of or hold office as a Commissioner in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Federal Communications Act provides that no member of the Commission shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or of apparatus for wire or radio communication or in communication by wire or radio, etc.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act provides that no member of the Board of Directors shall be an officer or director of any insured bank or Federal Reserve bank or hold stock in any insured bank.

Section 1 of the Federal Power Act provides that no person in the employ of or holding any official relation to any licensee or any firm, etc., engaged in the generation, transmission, or sale of power shall enter upon the duties of or hold the office of Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission.

The Securities Exchange Act provides that no Commissioner shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Commissioner nor shall any Commissioner participate directly or indirectly in any stock-market operations or transactions, etc.

In brief, so far as I can ascertain, these provisions, both in title 18 and elsewhere, comprise the major legislation dealing with conflict of interest.

It is well to state here that every State in the Union and every subdivision thereof has laws of similar intent. The conflict of interest principle is well defined in perhaps hundreds of statutes of States, municipalities and local subdivisions. By practice and by law the principle of no business relations between public officials and a concern in which such officials have pecuniary interests is firmly established.

Section 434, enacted in 1863, and repeatedly reenacted—the last time as late as 1948—is the one that most specifically concerned the nomination of Charles E. Wilson as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have given a great deal of thought to the subject, and I have asked for legal advice as to whether the law was applicable to Mr. Wilson. Some persons thought he could divest himself of authority to act. I agree with the Senator from Alabama that he cannot, as Secretary of Defense, divest himself from the responsibility of making contracts or procurements or perform any other duty which would be assigned to him as Secretary of Defense.

I believe that the provision—I do not believe it has been quoted as yet—which makes it impossible for him to divest himself of those responsibilities is contained in section 202 (f), which reads:

> (f) The Secretary of Defense may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of this act or other specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department of Defense as he may designate.

In other words, Mr. President, he can delegate the authority, but must act without being relieved of his responsibility. Therefore, I have contended from the beginning that the Secretary of Defense could not help being considered as having section 434 applicable to him so long as he was Secretary of Defense and so long as he owned a pecuniary financial interest in any company which transacts business with the Department of Defense.

I am not a lawyer. However, as a man who tries to apply common sense to these situations I think it is good law. At least it is the law which is now controlling my vote on this question.

The basic principle enacted by section 434 appears to me to be very clear. First, it must be established that an official or employee of the Government has a direct or indirect interest in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership or other business entity. In this connection, I quote from a memorandum on the law by the Senate Legislative Counsel,

to be found on page 492 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21:

In the light of the relationship existing between a corporation and its shareholders, it seems quite clear that the interest of a shareholder in a corporation is of the kind included * * *. However, as a criminal statute, section 434 will be strictly construed and it is very doubtful that the bare existence of such an interest would be regarded as sufficient ground for the visitation of criminal consequences. A clear showing of the presence, in a material degree, of the substantive evil at which the section is directed would seem to be a necessary element of proof. The existence of a nominal or trivial interest, such as the possession of a single qualifying share, or the possession of naked legal title to shares in which the beneficial interest is held by others, probably would not be enough.

But a showing of an actual and beneficial interest of such magnitude as to demonstrate a probable influence upon the official actions of the officer concerned would seem to be sufficient. The sufficiency of proof of such influence necessarily presents a question to be determined from all evidence presented in each individual case, and any endeavor to state a generalization applicable to all cases would seem inadvisable.

Now, Mr. President, let us see what was the interest on the part of Mr. Wilson in General Motors Corp. I think the facts should be stated for the RECORD in condensed form: Mr. Wilson owns, or did own—I assume that he has not yet divested himself of the interest—approximately 40,000 shares of the common stock of General Motors Corp., which has a market value of approximately $2,500,000. In January 1954 he would have received 605 shares of the common stock of General Motors Corp. and a cash bonus of $238,000. In January 1955 he would have received 640 shares of the common stock and $203,000 in cash. In January 1956 he would have received 333 shares of the common stock and $130,000 in cash. He will receive an annual pension of $40,000 from General Motors Corp., chiefly under a contributory retirement plan; that is to say, he personally made payments to the pension fund.

After looking into the question of the bonus, which was explained in great detail to the committee by Mr. Wilson, I am convinced that the bonus, which was fixed more than a year ago, was determined on the basis of profits made by Gen[illegible]al Motors Corp. prior, by at least 1 year, to the time when his nomination as Secretary of Defense was submitted to the Senate. In other words, the bonus Mr. Wilson will receive will be a bonus for past services, a payment for past services, and in no sense will it be changed by the profits of General Motors Corp. or the business done by that corporation in the 3 coming years in which Mr. Wilson will receive the bonus. General Motors Corp. seems to have a policy of fixing a bonus for 5 years on the past business, then paying it in the 5 subsequent years.

So, Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate, I agree that the bonus is not a payment for current or future services, but is a payment for a debt which now is owing to Mr. Wilson by General Motors Corp. for services which he performed before his nomination was sent to the Senate.

I also agree that the pension of $40,000 a year is a pension earned before Mr. Wilson left the General Motors Corp., especially in view of the fact that he made contributions to the retirement fund.

Questions arose, however, in regard to the shares of stock. Under this pension plan Mr. Wilson would have received 1,800 shares of stock after the time when he began to serve as Secretary of Defense, in the event his nomination should be confirmed. After a great deal of discussion, it was agreed that General Motors Corp. would change the payment, so that Mr. Wilson would be paid in cash for these shares of stock, on the basis of the price of the shares of stock as of today, so that in the event the nomination of Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense is confirmed, he will not receive any benefit because of any increment in value of the shares of stock occurring during the time he serves as Secretary of Defense.

Question then arose as to the possibility of bringing about a situation in which Mr. Wilson divests himself of any pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in General Motors Corp. I believe the committee was satisfied that if Mr. Wilson sold the 40,000 shares of stock which he now has, and if he agreed not to accept the 1,800 shares of stock in the form of a bonus, he would comply with that part of the law.

On the other hand, on the question of having Mr. Wilson delegate to some other Government official the power of the Secretary of Defense to deal with General Motors Corp., and thus avoid any violation of the law, so that he would be able to accept appointment as Secretary of Defense in accordance with the law, the committee agreed that Mr. Wilson could not delegate that power, because the law says definitely that such an official cannot be relieved of his responsibility.

Furthermore, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] pointed out, in view of the fact that the authority of the Secretary of Defense is so supreme over the Department of Defense, he cannot delegate his authority.

Section 202 provides that the Secretary of Defense "shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense."

Certainly that seems to be a very complete and supreme control. That, Mr. President, is the situation with which the committee was confronted.

After most exhaustive study and debate, the committee decided that if Mr. Wilson sold all his stock in General Motors Corp.—every share of it—and then so arranged that no future stock payments would be made to him in the way of a bonus, he would not have a pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in General Motors Corp. We must remember that section 434 is a criminal statute and will be strictly construed. In that way compliance would be had with the first part of the law to which I have referred.

On the other hand, all of us are agreed that because of the language of the law, Mr. Wilson could not divest himself of the responsibility for dealing with General Motors Corp.

I recite these laws and I refer to the situation confronting us because I believe the principle involved should be made very clear to the Senate. Similar questions have frequently come before the Senate. A number of such questions came before the Naval Affairs Committee during my service on it, and have come before the Armed Services Committee during the time I have served on it. Some nominations of this sort have been rejected. The nomination of Mr. Ilgenfritz was rejected on the basis of such a conflict of interest. The nomination of Mr. Pauley was rejected on that basis, and there are other nominations which have been rejected because of similar situations.

I know that all other Members of the Senate will agree with me when I say that we must remember that the Senate attaches great importance to precedents. Once a precedent is established in the Senate, it lasts for years and years to come. I am not willing to help establish a precedent which would result in violation of this basic law which was passed so many years ago and is most important in the case of the possible "conflict of interest."

I may say that no evidence which was presented to the Armed Services Committee would in any way controvert the applicability of section 434 of title 18, United States Code, to the situation presented by the nomination of Mr. Wilson. It was my opinion that unless the nomination were withdrawn, there was only one course of action for Mr. Wilson to pursue, namely, to divest himself completely and irrevocably of all stock in General Motors Corp.

Mr. Wilson advised the committee that whatever action he takes about such General Motors stocks will be irrevocable, and that there is no way by which the stock could return into his hands after he leaves the office of Secretary of Defense, in the event his nomination is confirmed.

Now Mr. Wilson has done these things. There may be some who would say that the fact that his wife owns certain shares of stock in General Motors Corporation—I believe the testimony was that she owns 10,000 shares of stock; and in this connection let me point out that Mr. Wilson told the committee everything about these matters, and did not conceal a thing—shows that Mr. Wilson still will have an indirect interest in the corporation.

However, I believe that a reading of the statute shows that, on the one hand, a person must commit a certain act in order to come within the provisions of the statute. Therefore, I do not believe that ownership of stock by someone else would result in a situation in which Mr. Wilson would have a pecuniary interest in the company, in the eyes of the law.

In closing, it may be well to note for the RECORD that section 434 is applicable to everyone who acts as an officer or agent of the United States Government for the transaction of business with a concern in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which he has a direct or indirect interest. This law does not apply only to high officials of the Government, although some would make it appear that that is the case.

I have received letters from persons who have said, "Why don't you want businessmen to come into the Government service and bring efficiency"—in cases in which it is alleged that inefficiency and waste of money exist. It should be pointed out that this law does not prevent Government service by one who owns stock in a private company or concern, provided that such person, while serving as an agent of the United States Government, does not deal directly with that company. Such person can own all the stock he pleases in a company which does not have dealings with the branch of the Government in which he acts as an agent for transaction of business. On the other hand, once that person is a Government agent, the law forbids him to own stock in a company with which he deals while he is serving as an agent of the United States Government. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate that that is a basic and sound principle which I, for one, would never vote to violate, for, after all, ours is a Government of laws, not a Government of men.

As a rough estimate I would say that section 434 is applicable to at least 400,000 officials and employees of the United States Government who are engaged in making purchases of one description or another for the Government.

Some persons have not seemed to know of the existence of this statute. However, not long ago the Department of Defense thought section 434 so important that it caused a copy of that section to be sent to every procurement officer within the armed services, together with the warning that the letter of this law must be literally obeyed. So this law applies just as definitely to a local Army procurement officer who is purchasing a bushel of potatoes as it does to the Secretary of Defense in connection with the purchase of a jet airplane for the Government.

The power of confirmation of appointments by the United States Senate, let me repeat, Mr. President, is not a perfunctory one. It is one of our most sacred and important obligations.

I recently requested the legislative counsel to prepare a list of all statutes relating to conflict of interest. On January 16 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of these laws as very ably compiled by Mr. John C. Herberg, assistant legislative counsel of the Senate.

Then, on January 21, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another statement prepared by the assistant legislative counsel of the Senate which summarized the duties of the Secretary of Defense as established by the unification law enacted July 26, 1947.

Now that Mr. Wilson has agreed to divest himself of the stock in General Motors he has complied with the law, in my judgment, and I will give him my active and most cordial support. I would not have supported his nomination had he continued to hold his stock or put it in trust, or had he done anything which I thought would be a subterfuge.

I again want to say that he was completely frank in his testimony, and I have the utmost confidence in his integrity, which was never questioned by anyone in the hearings before the committee. His experience as a business executive fits him to deal with the great problem of eliminating the waste and extravagance that exist in the armed services, and thereby result in saving billions of dollars to the taxpayers. In all of this he will have my full support. He will have many difficult problems to solve. Few if any other men in the service of the Government, with the exception, of course, of the President himself, will encounter greater problems than will Mr. Wilson in endeavoring to operate this great Department of the Government that is spending now $55,000,000,000 yearly of the people's money, and do it in an efficient way, on the one hand, to make us militarily strong, and on the other hand, not to waste and squander the people's money. No man, I think, will have greater responsibility or more difficulties than he will have, and I would like to feel that in this great task he will have the support of the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for but one question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator was one of those who were most emphatic about the purpose of the statute on conflicts of interest, when these hearings started. We heard testimony from Mr. Wilson and questioned him for over 5 hours, on two separate days. I think the Senator from Virginia was present during all of those 5 hours, and as I have listened to the Senator during the past few moments, he is now thoroughly convinced and is completely satisfied, after listening to all that testimony, all the ups and downs and differences of opinion with Mr. Wilson, as they appear in the record, that Mr. Wilson has divested himself of his holdings so that he can discharge the duties of the Office of Secretary of Defense without any question of his coming into a conflict of interest under section 434. Am I not correct?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely want to say that I hope very much that we can vote this evening. We can certainly continue the session to 6, half past 6, or so, if necessary, but I hope that Senators who speak will be as brief as possible, so that we can finish.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Ohio that I shall not speak at any appreciable length. I think we have all been torn, Mr. President, between sympathy for the individuals who are concerned in these appointments together with a desire for the new administration to make a success, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a desire to protect the interests of the country in this most important of all posts, a post which involves the security of the Nation, and which, as the Senator from Virginia has stated, involves an annual expenditure of approximately $55,000,000,000.

As we have all watched this situation unfold within the past 10 days, it has seemed in a sense like a Greek tragedy of a conflict of principles, not necessarily opposed, but which came into conflict here, and it is this fact which has transcended our opinion about individuals, and which has raised this issue to a high level.

I am very glad that every Senator who has spoken this afternoon has paid tribute, not only to Mr. Wilson's competence but also to his character. This has been the United States Senate at its best. For what we have here in conflict is not a question of the character of an individual but two sets of interests, not always in conflict, but at times in conflict. In the first place, we want competent, energetic, devoted and, if possible, practical men to direct the executive offices of the country, and this department in particular. At the same time, we want men who will be able to defend the interests of the public with an eye single to the benefit and the welfare of the public. We want men who will neither consciously nor unconsciously be influenced by private interests nor by private friendships. This is a very austere demand. It is a demand which businessmen frequently believe politicians are incapable of comprehending, but this case perhaps indicates that the political standard is more austere, more commanding, and more compelling than the standards which even many of the best businessmen have about public life. Perhaps this whole controversy may serve its purpose best in the education which it gives to the business and industrial community of the country as to what our real duties and functions are.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina, himself one of the eminent attorneys of the country, has stressed the necessity of avoiding what he termed a conflict of interests, and what I believe the legal profession calls "adverse interests," namely that in a given case where there is a conflict one should not sit on both sides of the table at once, one should not represent plaintiff and defendant, or the community and the defendant. We call it in civil life "conflict of interests."

We all recognize, as Mr. Wilson said, that at times the interests of private persons and the interests of the public go together. In fact, we hope and believe that this is generally the case. But certainly he went too far when he originally said, not only that whatever is good for the country is good for General Motors—which I think is true—but added, conversely, that whatever is good for General Motors is good for the country, because that is not always true.

There are questions which inevitably arise, such as the question of which firm is to get a contract, which types of goods are to be produced, what prices are to be paid for the goods, what the profit rates are to be upon them, what the times of delivery shall be, or what severity of inspection standards shall be imposed upon the goods once produced. These are issues upon which good men may differ. But if the representative of the public is also tied to the private interest, we are not likely to have, in this imperfect world, the public interest represented as vigorously and as strongly as it would be if the representative of the

public were divested of this conflicting interest. That is the reason for the statute originally passed, and frequently reenacted. It is an attempt by the much abused and despised group of politicians to see to it that their public life is not affected by a conflict of interests.

I am delighted with the very able statements which have been made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in this case.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but I do not want to prolong the discussion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is discussing the conflict of interests in public service. Is there any material difference between conflict of interests in public service and conflict of interests in private service, if we should assume that the former president of the General Motors Corporation should say, "I am still interested in the corporation"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If Mr. Wilson had persisted in the attitude which he took at the original hearing, much as I would have valued him as a man, I could not have voted to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, these are two difficult sets of qualities to combine—the driving, energetic, practical experience which we need in an executive, and the divorcement from private interests which we need in a public official. Those are two extraordinarily difficult things to combine.

The British have tried to meet this situation by setting up a class of professional civil servants, men who enter government early and who have virtually no private interest or, at least, no practical interest in industry, spending their entire lifetime in government service, a sort of platonic guardianship, if you will. They have been able to maintain an extraordinarily high level of government integrity during the past three-quarters of a century. Before that time, perhaps not.

The British civil service is strong on integrity, and it has men of great ability. But, since they enter government service early, they are frequently lacking in energy, and they do not have the time or the opportunity for actual productive experience, or, as we say, practical experience.

I think this discussion, Mr. President, will bring into the open some of the difficulties which the Roosevelt administration had in its early days and for which it was, I think, somewhat unjustly criticized. The Roosevelt administration brought into Government service persons who the President thought were not swayed by a conflict of interests, persons who he thought would be able to devote themselves, because they lacked private interests, to the public interest. I think that on the whole, whatever one may say, the record was not a bad one.

Our friends across the aisle constantly reminded us that those persons lacked practical experience. They made errors, and gradually a feeling developed in the country that we wanted a divergent type of persons to run the Government. I think that was a factor, though perhaps a small one, in the election last fall. It seems tnat we are now embarked upon the experiment, for the first time in American history, of a government which will be run by business managers in its executive branch. Virtually every appointment which has come down from the President has been that of an industrial manager and almost always a man of considerable or great wealth. Personally, although that is one of the things which I feared, now that the choice has been made I welcome it.

For a long time American business has believed it could run Government affairs better than could the politicians, the civil service, and the professionals or lawyers. Now they will have an opportunity to do it in virtually every department of Government and probably in every independent commission.

I shall not repeat unduly the quip which was uttered recently, that the Cabinet consists of many millionaires and one plumber. I think the admixture will be in an even greater ratio than that.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should prefer to complete my remarks before I yield.

Mr. President, I do not object to making this experiment in Government. I think it should be tried now. I welcome the coming of these men, and, as an American, I want to say that I hope they succeed. I would rather have them succeed in this crucial period of American history and have the Republican Party stay in power forever than for there to be a disaster which would bring the Democratic Party into power. I think that is the sentiment of all Senators on this side of the aisle. We are Americans before we are Democrats. We want the administration to succeed and we want these men to succeed.

But they have this problem which has come up so dramatically in this case and of which the most distinguished gentleman under consideration did not seem to recognize at the time of the first hearing. He did not feel at that time that he would be morally disqualified from acting if he continued to own General Motors stock. He did not feel that he should dissociate himself from any decision which would be made affecting General Motors. He was making a heavy sacrifice in the form of reduced pay, giving up his salary as president of the company and accepting a salary as the Secretary of Defense, but he did not feel that any further sacrifice should be asked of him. That was natural.

In the week between the two hearings it was obvious that a greater realization of the seriousness of the problem had come upon him. He now, as we all know, is willing to sell his stock and pay a capital-gains tax, and is also willing to divest himself of any future appreciation in the value of the stocks he will receive as a bonus, so that I think he is not now directly connected with the company. There will be some indirect connection through the stock which is wife holds and the stock which he will give or sell to members of his family.

But what I fear, Mr. President, is not so much the direct effects, or even the indirect effects upon decisions which Mr. Wilson will make, as the creation of influence which will go on all through the departments of Government. I do not believe Mr. Wilson will ever negotiate a contract with General Motors Corporation. Contracts are not negotiated by the Secretary of Defense. I doubt even that they are negotiated by the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. They are negotiated down below, on the level of colonels and of grades 13 and 14 in the civil service. They negotiate contracts.

I think the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] put his finger on the real issue, though perhaps it may not be the legal issue, namely, that subordinates in any department take their coloration primarily from the man at the top. Most pressure in this world is not overt; most influence is not directly exercised. It comes indirectly with subordinates and members of the staff wondering what the man on top wants.

I am not afraid of Charles Wilson making decisions in favor of General Motors. I feel confident, although I have never met the man, that if such an issue should come up, he would move with complete integrity. But I am afraid that the lieutenant colonels and colonels down below, and grades 14 and 15 in the civil service would know that the Secretary of Defense had once been the president of General Motors, and that when they make their decisions they will be influenced not merely by the fact that Mr. Wilson has sold his stock, but that he also has an affinity of friendship for and a personal interest in the General Motors Corporation itself. In my opinion that is the real danger. I believe that is the real danger which will occur in most of the departments. That is the price which we must pay for getting these types of men into public life. It is a price which commonly is not appreciated.

It is said that we must get practical men into Government. When we get practical men into Government, just because they are practical men and have been practical men they come in with past interests, past friendships, and past affiliations.

Very frankly, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson. However, I shall do so with certain mental reservations. I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination for at least two reasons.

In the first place, I think that, after deliberation, he has made a real effort to divest himself, so far as it is humanly possible, of individual interests by selling his stock, by giving up his salary, and giving up the chance for future profits in the stock which will be given to him as a bonus. I do not hold against him the fact that his family will still retain some stock.

In the second place, I shall vote for the confirmation of Mr. Wilson's nomination because I think that we on the Democratic side of the aisle sincerely want the new administration to be a success. America is bigger than any of us, and America is in trouble. We do not want to do anything which might hamper the war effort. We do not want to put ourselves in such a position that it might be said, that we were hamstringing the new administration. We want to cooperate.

In my own case—and I am speaking only for myself—while I recognize the dangers, nevertheless, because of the seriousness of the situation, because of the steps which Mr. Wilson has taken, and because of the desire for unity, I am willing in this instance to put my doubts and hesitations aside temporarily.

But just as we on our side of the aisle take this position, I beg of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to realize the dangers which are involved in such actions and also perhaps to look more kindly upon some of the administrative actions during the past 20 years. Because the Democratic Party has been trying to preserve the other set of values namely, the protection of the general interest and to prevent that from being dominated by private interests. Perhaps we can learn from each other.

There can never be a perfect mixture of technical, competent, driving energy, and yet complete detachment from individual interests, because we are incomplete, erring human beings. However, we should strive for that combination.

Speaking for myself, I am willing to make a concession on the basis of abstract principle—and I value the opinions of the Senators who have taken the position they have taken—in order to show to our Republican friends and to President Eisenhower that we on this side of the aisle will make it as easy as possible for businessmen to come into the Government, consistent with the principle that they should not directly profit from their decisions and that, so far as possible, they will detach themselves from private interests which might conflict with their public duties. I ask that the real inner meaning of this controversy be studied and considered by those who now hold the reins of political power.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on January 25, 1953, relating to the nomination of Hon. Charles E. Wilson, and ask that it be reprinted in the Senate proceedings. The thesis of this editorial is that Mr. Wilson's stock holdings do not bring his honesty into issue. By the same token, disposal of these stocks do not create integrity where it before failed to exist. The basic issue is that we have asked a man of great ability and outstanding industrial experience to serve this Nation in a highly important and extremely critical position.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOUNTAIN LABORS

It looks now as though Charles E. Wilson—a wiser, sadder, and poorer, but certainly not a more honest man—will be confirmed this week as Secretary of Defense.

This has come to pass by virtue of Mr. Wilson's decision to dispose of his General Motors stock holdings and to make a satisfactory disposition of future stock payments for past services to the corporation.

The question which emerges is whether the public interest is really served by the financial sacrifices Mr. Wilson has been required to make. Presumably he was picked as Secretary of Defense by General Eisenhower because he believes him to be the best qualified man for that job. And from the standpoint of the public interest, especially the taxpayer interest, it is of high importance to have the best available man in that post.

In order to qualify, however, Mr. Wilson first had to sever his connections with General Motors, giving up an income of around $500,000 a year. His salary in the Defense post will be $22,500. Next he had to sell his stock holdings, taking a loss which is uncertain in amount but which has been estimated to be about $600,000. In addition he will take a further loss in disposing of his bonus stock payments.

Why is this assumed to be in the public interest? Because there is a law on the books, passed originally in 1863, which forbids an officer of the Government to transact Government business with any firm in which he has a pecuniary interest, direct or indirect.

The plain purpose of this law is to prevent a Government officer from transacting business with any firm in such a way as to enrich himself. In other words, it is intended to remove temptation from an official's path.

Is Mr. Wilson, having disposed of his stock, more likely to be an honest official than if he had retained it? If any Senator thinks this is the case he ought to vote against confirmation, for a man who would yield to such temptation is not fit in any circumstances to be Secretary of Defense. Most Senators seem to believe, however, that Mr. Wilson is an honest man and that he would not have been a dishonest official if he had kept his stock. If this is correct the law is a futility—another evidence of the infeasibility of trying to legislate such qualities as integrity and character. A man either has these qualities or he has not, and if he lacks them all the laws in the world are not going to make him honest.

Another difficulty with this law is that, if enforced literally, it would produce absurd results. What is meant by the words "directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation?" Would Mr. Wilson have been barred from office if he had owned a single share of General Motors stock instead of some 40,000 shares? A strict application of the statute would bar him, but that would be a patent absurdity. If ownership of 1 share would not bar him, however, what degree of interest is necessary before the statute applies? The answer, presumably, is that this is a matter for the discretion of the Senate. But if the Senators think Mr. Wilson is an honest man, then why compel him to dispose of 40,000 shares, which, after all, represent less than one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding GM stock?

The best practical argument that can be made for requiring Mr. Wilson to dispose of his stock is that, with the law on the books, it would be politically unwise for him to serve and politically unwise for the Senators to vote for confirmation. This is a political consideration, however, which can work against the public interest by barring competent men from public service without producing any compensating advantage. When the furor over the Wilson case dies down the law should be revised to bring it abreast of the facts of life in 1953—facts which differ greatly from those of 1863. And the appropriate aim of revision should be, not to penalize an honest man who wants to serve his Government, but to facilitate the detection and punishment of a dishonest man who might slip through the preconfirmation scrutiny by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, because of illness, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is unable to be present in the Senate today to vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Minnesota be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. President, I regret that my illness today prevents me from being on the Senate floor and voting on the confirmation of Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense.

I regret that there has been the necessary controversy with regard to Mr. Wilson's confirmation. He is an outstanding businessman with a fine record of executive experience and I believe our Government ought to utilize the talents and services of outstanding men in the business world. In addition, I believe that a President ought to be given wide latitude in selecting his cabinet. The position of cabinet member is one closely and personally related to the President as an adviser and associate.

At the same time, the issues raised by Mr. Wilson's appointment are serious and have troubled me. Those issues were crystallized early in the deliberations of the Senate Armed Services Committee by Mr. Wilson's initial refusal to sell his stock in General Motors. Since then, he has agreed to divest himself of his financial interest in the corporation and hence qualifies under the terms of the statute which acted as a bar to his assuming office. There is, in my judgment, however, much more involved in considering Mr. Wilson's qualifications, than the question of whether he divested his financial interest in General Motors.

It is clear to me that Mr. Wilson's conduct, now that he has divested himself of General Motors stock, will be no different as Secretary of Defense than it would have been had he not divested himself of that stock. Mr. Wilson is an honest man and would not allow his financial interest in a corporation to affect his public service. In that sense, the selling of his stock was but a formal gesture to comply with the statute.

My reservations with regard to Mr. Wilson's qualifications are deeper than the mere question of stock ownership. General Motors is the single largest beneficiary of Government contracts awarded by the Department of Defense. Mr. Wilson, in my judgment, has given no evidence that he has, in his own mind, disassociated himself from being personally and emotionally involved in the financial well-being of the General Motors Corporation. The statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee that he believes "What is good for General Motors is good for the country" is an illustration of the attitude to which I refer.

It is not true to say that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. The evidence is clear that on a number of occasions General Motors charged the United States Government excessively high prices, taking advantage, in the words of a congressional staff committee report, "of an emergency situation to reap exhorbitant profits from the Government." Senate investigators reported that General Motors had charged the Air Force 39.8-percent profit on the manufacture of jet engines; that the Air Force complained of this high profit, and that one of General Motors managers replied he had to keep his profits high so that he and his associates could receive a bonus. Furthermore, General Motors has been one of those corporations which has been asking the Government for a normal 12-percent profit on all Government contracts instead of the usual 6-percent profit. No, Mr. President; it is not accurate to say that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. To hold such a view is, in my judgment, not in the best interests of the United States.

The New York Times, on January 19, ran an editorial called Mr. Wilson's Predicament. The concluding paragraph of that editorial reads as follows: "To sum up, we believe that Mr. Wilson would find it intolerable to deal as a public official with a great corporation in which he continued to have a financial interest." Mr. President, I agree with that statement and I would add to it that it is, to me, equally intolerable for Mr. Wilson to deal as a public official with a great corporation in which he continues to have a deep emotional and mental identity.

Mr. Walter Lippmann had a very interesting article in this morning's Washington Post. His text is that "No man can serve two masters." Mr. Wilson, in my judgment, has satisfied the statutory requirements with regard to this Biblical text and this ancient principle of Anglo-Saxon law, but I have serious doubt that he has, in fact, satisfied the spirit of that Biblical text. Mr. Lippmann says:

"Mr. Wilson's interests in the General Motors Corporation are not only extensive but they are so intimately a part of his life that there is nothing he could do which would eliminate all the theoretical possibilities of a conflict of interest. It is because a theoretical conflict of interest must inevitably exist for him, as indeed for any man of large affairs—be he a businessman, a politician, or the member of some profession—that his personal philosophy and attitude is so important."

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

"Mr. Wilson's difficulties with the committee came primarily from his apparent unawareness of the nature of the law, from the surprising fact that he had not taken adequate legal advice, that his conscience in this field was not sufficiently instructed."

My fear, Mr. President, is that Mr. Wilson is so permeated with the spirit of General Motors that he has not caught the spirit of the public welfare.

I was shocked on Friday, January 16, just 4 days before the inauguration of the new administration, to learn of an hour-long television broadcast sponsored by General Motors. Mr. Wilson as Secretary of Defense-designate participated in that program and advertised and sold General Motors automobiles to the public. He did so with apparently no understanding that such an activity was inconsistent with his responsibilities as Secretary of Defense-designate. This is again not to impinge upon Mr. Wilson's sincerity, integrity, and desire for public service. It is rather to reflect, in my judgment, an inability on his part to disassociate himself from the self-interests of the General Motors Corporation, a corporation with which he has been associated for nearly 24 years. This inability will, in my judgment, likewise interfere with Mr. Wilson's ability to carry out his duties as Secretary of Defense solely in the public interest.

There is one other reservation that I have with regard to Mr. Wilson's qualifications that I must bring to the attention of the Senate. He is the product and an integral part of a large industrial combine, General Motors Corporation. This corporation is now under indictment in an antitrust suit because of its relationships with the United States Rubber Co. and the Dupont Co. The spirit of American free enterprise is represented by the small-business man in free competition with other small-business men. Monopolies or big business are inimical to the best interest of the capitalist system and free enterprise. The Secretary of Defense will have great powers either to strengthen small business by awarding it contracts or to weaken small business by taking the easy road of giving contracts to big business exclusively. This has been an area which has interested me ever since I have been a member of the Senate Small Business Committee. I fear that Mr. Wilson's background and business experience will run counter to the best interest of the American small-business man.

Now let me say one final word with regard to Mr. Wilson's decision to divest himself of General Motors stock. I want to commend him for that decision because I know it will mean a financial loss to him. It is important that we not lose sight of the fact, however, that in thus satisfying the statute, Mr. Wilson is not doing an act greater in importance or in selflessness than what has been done by many other businessmen when they joined the Government service. Mr. Wilson will pay a high capital gains tax as a result of his decision to sell the General Motors stock, but let us remember that this tax is at the low rate of 26 percent and is applied only to the gain which he will make as a result of the increase in the value of the stock from the time he bought it. If his tax payments are high, it is because the profit he is making out of the transaction is high. He is not being taxed for that profit at the ordinary earned income rate, which for a man in his income bracket would be an extraordinarily high rate. He is being taxed rather at the special 26-percent rate. Thus Mr. Wilson is in a fortunate position of being able to afford to pay his tax because his profit and his income are high.

This is not to belittle Mr. Wilson's act. It is rather to place it in proper perspective. It is an act made necessary by statute. It is an act which many scores of businessmen have performed in the past, including Mr. Lovett, the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Dulles, the new Secretary of State, and Mr. Harriman, the former Director of the Mutual Security Agency. It is, likewise, not an act which compares in any way with the sacrifices that many families and young men and women have made with regard to their participation in the defense effort.

I know that Mr. Wilson will be confirmed by the Senate. I hope that he will perform his responsibilities ably and in the public interest. I believe that he will attempt to do so to the best of his ability.

I want my reservations to be in the RECORD at this time. It was my hope to listen to the debate before voting. I regret that my illness today prevents me from being in the Senate, listening to the debate, and voting on the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bennett	Griswold	Neely
Bricker	Hayden	Pastore
Bridges	Hendrickson	Payne
Bush	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hill	Purtell
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Robertson
Byrd	Holland	Russell
Capehart	Hunt	Saltonstall
Carlson	Ives	Schoeppel
Case	Jackson	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Daniel	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Symington
Duff	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Tobey
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Frear	Martin	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is necessarily absent, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is unavoidably absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken	George	McClellan
Barrett	Gillette	Millikin
Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Bennett	Gore	Pastore
Bricker	Green	Payne
Bridges	Griswold	Potter
Bush	Hayden	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd	Hill	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hoey	Schoeppel
Carlson	Holland	Smathers
Case	Hunt	Smith, Maine
Clements	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Jackson	Sparkman
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Daniel	Kefauver	Symington
Dirksen	Kennedy	Taft
Douglas	Kerr	Thye
Duff	Knowland	Tobey
Dworshak	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Langer	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

NAYS—6

Johnston, S. C.	Lehman	Neely
Kilgore	Morse	Smith, N. C.

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson	Jenner	McCarran
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Fulbright	Long	Murray
Hennings	Magnuson	
Humphrey	Maybank	

So the nomination of Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Stassen to be Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because of the necessary absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I ask that this nomination go over until tomorrow. However, it will definitely come up tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter Williams to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Blaine Murray, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel W. Anderson to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

JOINT MEETING OF TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 24, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, February 2, 1953, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW'S SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when the Senate completes its business today it is my intention to move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at which time there will be taken up a number of additional nominations which have been reported to the Senate today, including the nomination of Mr. Stassen. It is my intention also that the Senate take up tomorrow the bill providing for the appointment of an additional Under Secretary of State. I see no reason why the Senate cannot complete such business tomorrow and then recess until Thursday, at which time I hope there will be before us other nominations that may have been reported by committees.

I should like to say to the Senate that objection was raised when the Committee on Foreign Relations reported the bill to create the position of a new Under Secretary of State.

I have inquired as to savings in that department, of which I believe there will be many. But in particular Mr. Dulles tells me that I may state to the Senate definitely that he is abolishing the position of Ambassador at Large, which has been held by Mr. Jessup, and that therefore there will be a saving of $25,000, as compared with the salary of the new Under Secretary of State of $17,000. Therefore, the net result of the two actions would be a saving of money and not an expenditure of additional money.

HALF A WORLD JOINS IN PRAYER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a recent article by Dorothy Thompson, entitled, "Half a World Joins in Prayer."

This article by Miss Thompson vividly portrays the sincere, fundamental, sound thinking of the President of the United States.

Our Nation is fortunate in having a President at this time who is grounded firm and deep in a sound, fundamental Christian faith and religious principles. As one who has been closely associated with the President, I know of his great reliance on prayer, as he has on many occasions told me of not only his faith in the Supreme Being, but his reliance on His guidance.

St. Paul wrote, "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, in a speech at Denver made the following statement in regard to the need of spiritual revival:

The need is for a spiritual revival, so that our people will demonstrate dramatically their righteous purpose, a purpose which will be universal in its appeal, peaceful in its methods and intense in its dedication. * * *

We are promised that all things can work together for good. But that promise is not made to all, but only to those who are called in accordance with God's purpose. There is no substitute for God's purpose in the hearts of men.

Under the leadership of our President, it is not too much to ask that each and every citizen interested in the future welfare of this great Nation devote some time to prayer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALF A WORLD JOINS IN PRAYER—EISENHOWER'S PLEA TO GOD WAS AN APPEAL FOR LIGHT, FAITH, HOPE, AND CONFIDENCE IN BEHALF OF ALL MEN

(By Dorothy Thompson)

That the whole world and all its means of communication in every continent in every nation focused upon a few minutes of time—while the President made his inaugural address—illustrated more clearly than any claims, the fact of American leadership—for better or worse. The fact—destiny inescapable—is that this Nation is the focus of hope for all civilized men, and of hate by the ruthless and barbarous.

President Eisenhower, with the instinct of a statesman, knew this and addressed his first words as President as much to the world as to America. He did not address Republicans. There was not the hint of a chortle over his late opponents, or of a mess to be cleaned up; there was no mention of taxes or the budget. Instead, in a few sentences, he summed up the condition of the century—"a time of tempest. * * * Masses of Asia have awakened to shake off shackles. * * * Great nations have fought their bloodiest wars. * * * Thrones have toppled and their vast empires have disappeared. * * * New nations have been born."

"How far have we come," he asked, "in man's long pilgrimage from darkness to light? Are we nearing the light—a day of freedom and of peace for all mankind? Or are the shadows of another night closing in upon us?"

These are not the words of a facile optimist, confident that the outcome of history is a mere matter of units of energy, or the size of the national income. They are the words of a man who dares to gaze into the abyss, but a man into whom the abyss cannot glare back, to cause his mind to doubt or heart to falter. For he is upheld by an unshakable faith, impervious to temptation or reverses, the kind of faith that led Job to cry:

"Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

He recognizes a duality in the universe in which forces of good and of evil forever contend.

"Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby"—he prayed in the little private prayer, which he humbly asked permission to utter as his very first words as President.

That prayer is Dwight D. Eisenhower—above everything else, the man of faith. His speech was, from first to last, a declaration of faith, in God and in mankind—in many sorts of men, holding many creeds, living under many systems of government, in many stages of development, infinitely diverse, not to be molded into a single pattern—an American pattern, for instance—but united nevertheless in common needs and common aspirations—the aspiration of every human soul and of every nation on earth to dignity and freedom, and the achievement thereby of peace.

President Eisenhower is not an orator, with a fine gift for the phrase, a sense of cadence, an instinct for the right pause, the technique of eliciting applause. He has not the orator's power of verbal seduction. All the better. Plato, I seem to remember, would have barred orators from his ideal republic.

What cannot be hidden whenever he speaks wholly his own mind is the forthrightness of the man, his transparent sincerity, his steadfast conviction, untroubled by any doubt whatsoever, that democracy, founded in freedom, justice, equality, and charity—whatever outward forms it may take and however it may come short of its ideals—is the only fit government for men, because

it is God's design for men—whom God, nevertheless, inscrutably left free to choose between the ways leading to life, or the ways leading to death.

The address was wholly affirmative. Not once did he mention Stalin. Not once did he speak the word "Communist." What a relief. Can a man build a prosperous business or create a great work of art if he is obsessed by his competitors and rivals? He spoke of "enemies"—the enemies of human dignity, cooperation, and truth. There have been other enemies of these; there may be again; perhaps there will always be. One overcomes them, not by vain argument but by the courage, persistence, endurance, and charity of one's own faith. President Eisenhower has the free world, and the world struggling to be free, on his brain—not communism. That, in itself, is a change.

And the world that looks to us with hope has responded. Faith responds to faith, confidence to confidence—as half the world prays the President's "little private prayer."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received January 26, 1953:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John C. Allen, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

True D. Morse, of Missouri.
J. Earl Coke, of California.
John H. Davis, of Virginia.
Romeo E. Short, of Arkansas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles E. Wilson, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Walter Williams, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Robert Blaine Murray, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Samuel W. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this brief moment of communion with Thy spirit, may we gain some greater fitness for the duties and responsibilities which we know are far beyond all human wisdom.

We acknowledge penitently that at times we are tempted to yield to those enervating and devastating moods which seek to persuade us that our vision of a better world is merely an illusion.

God forbid that we should allow our faith to become extinguished or eclipsed in these days of moral darkness when many nations are still speaking the language of hatred and hostility rather than the language of friendship and love.

Grant that we may go forward with courage, placing our confidence in the glorious triumph of those noble principles which our blessed Lord proclaimed in the long ago but which mankind seems unwilling to try.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 22, 1953, was read and approved.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to announce to the House that on Monday next at 12:30 p. m. the President of the United States will be here to deliver in person a message on the state of the Union. The time was agreed upon at a conference had by the leadership of the House and Senate with the President this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, February 2, 1953, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 111) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 111, Eighty-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois, and Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland.

IDA SERINGER SANFORD

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a resolution (H. Res. 103) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Ida Seringer Sanford, wife of Robert Edgar Sanford, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Robert Edgar Sanford.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE CHARLES A. EATON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, all of us have read of the death of our very beloved former colleague, Mr. Eaton, of New Jersey. It is expected that on Thursday next Members will be afforded an opportunity to speak of him and of his work and life.

THE LATE JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a sense of personal loss that I have the sad mission of announcing to the House the death of our old friend and one of my predecessors, the former Representative of the Thirty-eighth Congressional District of New York, then the Fortieth District, the Honorable Joseph J. O'Brien, of East Rochester, N. Y.

Joe O'Brien was a native-born Rochesterian, where he attended the public schools and was graduated from Saint Peter and Paul's Catholic School, and the Cathedral High School, both in Rochester. After high-school graduation he attended St. Jerome's College in Kitchener, Canada, and McGill University in Montreal.

After leaving school he became connected with the Merchants Dispatch

Transportation Co. in East Rochester, engaged in the manufacture of railroad cars, where he became superintendent of construction.

Like all civic-minded young men, he took an interest in the affairs of his village and served as village treasurer from 1932 to 1935 and later as village assessor from 1935 to 1938.

Joe was a veteran of World War I, serving in the Navy for 2 years. Because of this experience he was ever mindful of the problems of veterans and ever zealous to protect their interests.

Joe was endowed with a robust physique and during his youth was a prominent athlete in his community. After serving in the Navy, he became an amateur and then professional football player and wrestler. Some of his exploits in that field are still legendary among his colleagues who served with him.

His local activities could not contain his great energies and he sought higher office. He was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress and reelected to the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses.

During the succeeding years, although he was not a Member of this body, he never lost his interest in national affairs. He has made frequent trips to Washington where he has always met a cordial and sincere welcome from all those who served with him, regardless of their political affiliation. Harassed as he has recently been by ill health, his active mind and eager spirit never lost their zest for life.

Joe was passionately loyal to his country, faithful to his friends and devoted in his religious faith.

In the words of Shelley:

He has outsoared the shadow of our night;
Envy and calummy and hate and pain,
And that unrest which men miscall delight
Can touch him not and torture not again;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure, and now can never mourn
A heart grown cold, a head grown gray in vain.

We have lost a valued former colleague and I have lost a stanch and loyal friend. His devoted wife, Mildred, has lost a loving husband. May she and his many friends be in part sustained in their sorrow and loss by the tribute which we pay to him today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very grieved when I read in the newspaper of the death of my former colleague and dear friend, Joe O'Brien. Those of us who served with Joe O'Brien remember him well and will always keep him in our memories. He was loyal to our country and to his friends, and as the gentleman from New York said, devoted to his duty; serious, and a very valuable Member; but above all he possessed one of the most striking personalities I have ever known, wholesome and sincere, one that attracted you when you first met him, and the attraction continued and strengthened. One of the finest personalities I have ever known was Joe O'Brien. I join my friend from New York in extending to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-sixth Congress there was an unusually large group of new Members from all over the country, and this class provided some very strong men in the Seventy-sixth Congress. Joe O'Brien was one of the very best in that group. Almost immediately he impressed his personality upon the Members of the House. He was active, he was constructive, he was useful at all times; and in addition, he had the affection of his colleagues. I join with others in expressing my deep sorrow to his bereaved wife.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pained to hear the gentleman's announcement this morning. I considered Joe O'Brien a singularly lovable character. I shall miss him a great deal. I always looked forward to the too rare occasions when he came back to renew his associations in this body. Those who served with him will recall especially his outbursts of Irish eloquence and wit on St. Patrick's Day. He had the warmth and geniality of the Irish and those were the qualities which most endeared him to his colleagues, but he was a conscientious legislator, and an excellent public servant.

I wish to extend my sympathy to his family. May they find comfort in the kindly memories which we all cherish.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened at the news of the death of my good friend, Joe O'Brien. I had lunch with him the first day I served in Congress and valued his friendship a great deal. He was an outstanding American, patriotic, able, and hard working.

He added a great deal of sparkle to the House when he was a Member. His Irish wit and his winning personality was a constant joy to all of us. I will never forget the St. Patrick Day speeches that he made welcoming to the arms of St. Patrick the sons of other nationalities by simply putting an O' in front of their name.

He was kind enough to visit us frequently since he left the House and it was always a joy to welcome him back. We will all miss him and our sympathy goes to his nice wife, Mildred.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I join the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], in expressing my deep feeling of sadness over the news of the sudden passing of our former colleague and my close personal friend, Joe O'Brien. As we speak of him today a flood of happy memories comes to my mind for it was with Joe and his wife, Mildred, that I shared many happy experiences in the earlier years of our service in the Congress. Joe seemed to radiate happiness and friendliness wherever he went and at all times. Never did we hear him speak a sour, surly, or ugly remark about anybody—he was everybody's friend and everybody loved him. Even in the years to follow his service in the House, he continued to keep his contacts with many of his old friends, and especially on St. Patrick's day to regale them with some choice humorous greeting appropriate to the occasion.

I extend to his widow, Mildred, with whom he shared so many years of marital happiness and herself a warm, friendly, and lovable person, my deep personal sympathy in this hour of trial and pray that the treasured memories of their happiness together may help to ease the anguish which is in her heart. All of us who knew him here and who worked with him here are the better because of that association and his jovial personality. May the Almighty Father receive him and make him blessed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman in expressing sorrow at the passing of Joe O'Brien and in praising Joe O'Brien's life and work. There will never be another Joe O'Brien. He was truly a great character, not just another man but a very unusual man. I regret his passing, and extend to his widow and the others close about him my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New York and our colleagues in expressing my great admiration of Joseph J. O'Brien. While he was here in Congress with us he made an unusual record for friendship. He had a great interest in the personal welfare of each and every one of us, his colleagues, and especially those of us who began our congressional service together in the Seventy-sixth Congress. I wish to express my deep affection for him at this time and extend my sympathy and best wishes to his family.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late Joseph J. O'Brien.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today with a heavy heart. Joe O'Brien was my dear friend. He came to Congress at the same time as I. His office was just across the corridor from mine. Joe was a good neighbor, a true friend, and a patriotic American in every sense of the word. We shall all miss his smiling, friendly greeting wherever or whenever we chanced to meet our friend Joe. He was always scattering sunshine and good cheer. Our hearts go out to his good wife, Mildred. God give her strength to bear the great loss she has sustained.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 24, I was saddened to read in the evening papers of the death of my beloved and good friend, Joseph J. O'Brien, who represented the Thirty-eighth District of New

York in Congress commencing with the Seventy-sixth and through the Seventy-eighth Congresses.

To know Joe O'Brien was to love him, and he was during his service in Congress respected and loved by the Members on both sides of the aisle. To those of us who served with him and had the great pleasure of knowing Joe, it does not seem possible that he is gone.

His spirit was irrepressible; there was always humor and wit and comradeship in knowing Joe or being around him. He had advanced by the so-called hard way of life and knew the value of human sympathy, courage, and companionship; he loved people and understood them. His sympathy was as quick as was his scorn of hypocrisy or intolerance. His concern was not from whence you came but what is your goal—what are your ideals—what are your ethics.

He was a great American and as a veteran of World War I he knew so well the virtues of intense patriotism.

I am sure there is not a Member of the House of Representatives who knew and served with Joe O'Brien who did not, each in his own way, say a silent prayer for Joe on hearing of his death.

To his beloved wife, Mildred, of whom he was so proud, I extend my deep personal sympathy in her great bereavement.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I had to be absent from the House floor at the time my colleagues were paying well-deserved tributes to the life and character of my dear friend and colleague, Hon. Joseph O'Brien, of Rochester, N. Y.

Few men who have entered the House of Representatives during my time have established themselves so firmly in the affection of their colleagues as did our departed friend, Joe. His big heart, his winning smile, his wit, and his unfailing good nature endeared him to all who served with him.

I extend to Mrs. O'Brien the heartfelt sympathy of Mrs. Reed and me in this time of great bereavement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by our colleague the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, of the untimely passing of former Congressman Joseph J. O'Brien at his home in East Rochester, N. Y., was a great shock to me and, I know, to all other Members of this honorable body who enjoyed the pleasure and the privilege of knowing Joe O'Brien.

I served but one term in the House with him, but in that short span of time he endeared himself greatly with me and with the entire membership of this House. It has truthfully been said of him that Joe knew more Members by their first names than probably any other Member of this body. To all of us he was "Joe." To all of us he was a friend, and to all of us he was one of the most able men in the Congress.

Joe O'Brien was a deep student of economics and of history. He was a firm supporter of legislation which helped to create the greatest merchant marine in world history. As a member of the Maritime Commission, I always found in Joe O'Brien a man whose judgment on merchant marine matters was outstanding. He was a tireless worker and a wonderful man to know. He was a Christian gentleman of the highest type, a good husband, and fine citizen. I share with his myriad friends and loved ones a profound sorrow in our common loss. Joe O'Brien will be long remembered as a man who made his contribution to his Nation as a statesman, a great athlete, and one who made a most patriotic contribution by his outstanding service in the naval forces of his country during World War I.

This world would be a much happier place in which to live if there were more Joe O'Briens. It is a better world for his having lived in it with us.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 112) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That E. L. BARTLETT, the Delegate from Alaska, is hereby elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and that ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, is hereby elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 23, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are hereby appointed members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT (Michigan), Hon. RALPH A. GAMBLE (New York), Hon. HENRY O. TALLE (Iowa), Hon. PAUL BROWN (Georgia), Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN (Texas).

Sincerely,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on
Banking and Currency.

THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution No. 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; Mr. BOLTON, Ohio; Mr. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts.

INVESTIGATION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. REED, New York; Mr. KEAN, New Jersey; Mr. COOPER, Tennessee; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. TABER, New York; Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; Mr. CANNON, Missouri.

THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as Directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following members on the part of the House: Mr. PHILLIPS, California; Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CRETELLA, Connecticut; Mr. DODD, Connecticut.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House; Mr. BECKER, New York; Mr. KEOGH, New York.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania; Miss THOMPSON, Michigan; Mr. HILLINGS, California; Mr. WALTER, Pennsylvania; Mr. WILSON, Texas.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; Mr. KARSTEN, Missouri.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. D'EWART, Montana; Mr. COLMER, Mississippi.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 224, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the Observance of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. ARENDS, Illinois; Mrs. BOLTON, Ohio; Mr. LANE, Massachusetts; Mr. MORRISON, Louisiana.

FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLER, Maryland; Mr. STAGGERS, West Virginia.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. D'EWART, Montana; Mr. RHODES, Arizona; Mr. MCCARTHY, Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and other improvements to the House Chamber the following Members of the House: Mr. MCGREGOR, Ohio; Mr. GOODWIN, Massachusetts; Mr. BROYHILL, Virginia; Mr. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; Mr. JONES, Alabama.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to the appointees as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality, I ask unanimous consent that the names of appointees announced by the Speaker for members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality be withheld temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already made the appointments. If the gentleman desires to question any of the appointments, this is his opportunity.

Mr. CELLER. No, Mr. Speaker; I do not care to do that, but I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Speaker and minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair is always willing to discuss this committee, as well as any other committee, with the gentleman from New York, but the appointments have already been made.

Mr. CELLER. I speak as ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. For some reason, probably through inadvertence, my name was omitted from the names read by the Chair. The appointees read were Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON, and Mr. HILLINGS on the Republican side. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and I will become members of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary Committee, it seems appropriate that members of that subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee be appointed as members of that joint committee. The names of members of subcommittees will be ratified tomorrow. The name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] was read, and he in all likelihood may not be a member of the subcommittee. Under the practice obtaining on our side the ranking member suggests the various subcommittees. Whoever suggested these names to the Chair did not have that practice in mind when the names were submitted. I suggest that the matter be held over until an opportunity could develop for me to discuss the matter with the minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman is unquestionably talking about members on the Democratic side of the committee. This matter came to the Chair in good faith, in accordance with our past system of appointments. Therefore, the Chair does not think there can be any discussion about the action on appointments already made. The Chair will be happy to talk with the gentleman and the minority leader at any time he so desires.

INAUGURATION DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, from our youth many times comes a great deal of wisdom. I have a letter addressed to me from Muncie, Ind., which is in my district, as follows:

DEAR MR. HARVEY: As I went back to school yesterday afternoon, I got to thinking about the inauguration. I think that this special day should be made a national holiday. Just like any other holiday, the stores should be closed, et cetera, and all the people should not have to work on this special day.

The reason is that the inauguration is a historical event, and takes place every 4 years. Wouldn't you agree with me? If you thought about it you probably would agree with me.

JANE BUTTERFIELD,
Age 15.

P. S.—Please reply as to your opinion.

I would say I think it is certainly a very fine idea.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to amend House rule XXXIV to provide for televising and broadcasting the sessions of the House of Representatives at the discretion of the Speaker, and a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act to provide for televising and broadcasting of public hearings before House committees and their subcommittees in the discretion of the chairman or by a vote of the majority of the committee. My bill also provides for a code of rules with respect to witnesses testifying before committees intended to afford them reasonable safeguards if they consider themselves in danger of being defamed. These rules draw heavily on the work of the committee on the bill of rights of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Government under our constitutional system should operate as far as possible in a fishbowl. President Eisenhower's announcement of his intention to periodically televise and broadcast Presidential news conferences, the beneficial experience of television coverage of the Presidential campaign, the already established radio and television coverage of the United Nations Security Council and Assembly debates all confirm the need for modernizing our congressional procedures to keep abreast of modern technology. The way to get the people interested in government is to let them see and hear it in action. This has been the experience of political campaigns and congressional investigations and is just as true of congressional sessions. My resolution gives complete discretion as to particular debates to be broadcast and televised, order of debate and rules and regulations for broadcasters to the Speaker in the case of House sessions and to the committee concerned or to its chairman in the case of committee hearings. I do not contemplate constant daily coverage of all proceedings but coverage only of those in which there is unusual interest.

The vast coverage of the inauguration proceedings, making them available to half of the population of the United States and especially to millions of school children over a Nation-wide hook-up of 118 stations shows the audience which is practicable. The delivery of the President's state of the Union message to the new Congress on Monday next will be broadcast and televised—what is done

about its important recommendations by the House of Representatives certainly deserves equal treatment.

Clarification of the rules as to broadcasting and televising committee hearings is needed in view of differences on the subject which developed when the Speaker ruled on it early in 1952.

The subject of broadcasting and televising congressional sessions and committee hearings has been much discussed within the last year. The arguments made against it that it would result in theatricalism in debate or in a relatively few Members speaking most of the time, or that it can be distorted for partisan purposes, are all matters that can be dealt with by the rules of the House and the powers of the Speaker and the committee chairmen. Also the discernment of the listening and viewing audience is not to be underestimated. Members inclined to engage in theatricalism will have to account for it to their constituencies. This is likely to be an effective discipline for all.

The profound nature of modern problems and their meaning to the life and future of every individual American dictates that major congressional activities shall be open to the greatest view possible. It is only bringing established newspaper coverage abreast of modern technology.

The major broadcasting systems have stated directly their willingness to give coverage to congressional debates. They have already shown their experience by televising and broadcasting presidential addresses before joint sessions as well as committee hearings. The technical problems involved would therefore seem to have been pretty well ironed out.

It is significant that a great campaign to bring out the vote in the presidential election of 1952, materially increased voting participation from 51.4 percent in the presidential election of 1948 to 62.5 percent in 1952. I believe that television and radio had a lot to do with creating so much interest in the candidates and in voting. But voting in congressional elections is still much below what it ought to be. There is still a long way to go in national elections in comparison with the record of voting participation in Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and other countries which exceeds 80 percent. The stimulation of a direct personal interest in government which can be attained through television and broadcasting can have a material influence in this regard.

I hope very much we will resolve this question in this session, and finally make vital debates and proceedings available to be seen in most American living rooms.

POLICY FOR KOREA

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the honor and privilege of attending the banquet given by the Auxiliary of the American Legion. There I heard read a speech prepared by the national commander. It was read because the flu bug had laid him low and it was impossible for him to be there, but it was delivered in a most impressive fashion.

Because of the impressive nature of this address, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is well worth your reading because it sets forth the situation in Korea and presents a positive, constructive program. I only wish I had had the foresight and the intelligence to have put so able a speech together myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CATTLE SUPPLIES AND PRICES

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, for the past year prices of live cattle have been dropping steadily. The average price for all slaughter steers sold at Chicago in the week ending January 15, 1953, was $26.62 per hundredweight compared to $34.07 a year earlier.

During the same period the prices of beef at wholesale and retail have also declined—although not in direct ratio to cattle prices—so that all beef prices are now and have been for several months well below OPS ceiling prices.

Supplies are ample. In spite of unusually heavy slaughter, cattle on farms increased by an estimated 5,000,000 head during 1952.

The movement of stocker and feeder steers from the ranges to midwestern farms is up about 18 percent over a year ago.

There were 273,753 cattle slaughtered in federally inspected plants in the week ending January 17, 1953, compared to 203,782 in the comparable week in 1952; and beef in storage on December 31, 1952, was 127 percent of a year earlier, and 170 percent of the 5-year average for that date.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that beef production will be even higher in 1953 than it was in 1952.

There is no reason, therefore, to anticipate that beef prices will rise to OPS ceiling levels during the coming year.

Under these circumstances, OPS controls on beef are not needed and are a violation of the general policy of the Defense Production Act, that controls should be removed from individual commodities as soon as they can be dispensed with safely.

More important than the mere waste of funds, both private and public, in maintaining useless and unnecessary regulations, the committee finds from evidence presented to it that the needless continuation of OPS ceilings and controls on grading, cutting, and distribution of beef are impeding normal marketing and price relationships and are costing both producers and consumers millions of dollars.

The mere existence of ceiling prices at the retail level destroys the flexibility of retail merchandising and tends to prevent a drop in retail prices as fast or as far as would be warranted by live cattle prices. Too frequently ceiling prices are regarded by the merchant as "fair" prices below which he will go only reluctantly.

The rigid requirements of OPS compulsory grading, which force all the beef ordinarily sold in retail stores into two arbitrary classes—Choice and Good—are preventing much Good beef of excellent quality and of extremely low relative price from even being offered to consumers by retailers.

OPS regulations requiring retailers to cut and trim their beef in a uniform manner are preventing the close trimming normally practiced by many retail stores and are forcing consumers to buy at the price of good meat as much as 100 pounds of bone and fat on each beef carcass which ordinarily would be trimmed away.

At the producer end, OPS ceilings and controls—particularly compusory grading—are contributing substantially to distorted price relationships that are threatening thousands of beef producers with financial disaster.

Largely because of these controls, the price margin between beef steers grading Good and those grading Prime is almost 100 percent wider today than it was a year ago. In Chicago on January 22, 1952, Prime steers brought $37.13 per hundredweight and Good steers brought $32, a spread of $5.13. On January 21, 1953, the Chicago price for Prime steers was $33.25, but Good steers were only $23, a spread of $10.25 lower than Prime steers sold on that day.

Normally a large percentage of the beef animals which move from the Southwest plains to the Corn Belt for feeding and fattening go to market grading "high good"—on the line between Good and Choice—and will bring a price only three or four dollars below Prime animals. Under OPS grading requirements there is no such thing as a "high good" steer or a "line" between Good and Choice. All animals that do not clearly grade Choice must be graded Good or lower.

This unnatural and unnecessary situation is destroying the investment of time and money that farmers have in their cattle and many are facing the prospect of actual losses up to $100 a head on all the cattle they own.

In the long run, the hope of consumers for plenty of beef at relatively low prices depends upon an ample supply. The surest way to discourage production of an ample beef supply is to subject producers to financial losses such as they are now suffering.

The committee finds: That OPS ceilings and controls over grading, cutting, and distribution of beef are not only unnecessary and a waste of public and private funds, but that these controls are seriously interfering with normal marketing and price relationships; that they are costing both producers and con-

sumers millions of dollars; and that they are discouraging ample beef production.

The committee unanimously recommends, therefore, that OPS controls and regulations on beef be abandoned immediately.

EMERY A. ODELL

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people in my congressional district and especially those who reside in Monroe, Green County, Wis., mourn the passing of a veteran newspaper publisher, Emery A. Odell. He passed to his eternal reward on last Sunday and funeral services were held on Tuesday.

Emery A. Odell lived a full and useful life. At the time of his death, he was 81 years of age. Fifty-five years of that time were devoted to serving the city of Monroe and Green County as the publisher of the Monroe Evening Times. That newspaper was established October 13, 1898.

Mr. Speaker, the life story of Mr. Odell is typical of the American success story, the poor boy of humble parentage and little money, determined to serve his fellow man and in the striving for that objective rose to a position of distinction and honor in his chosen profession.

Mr. Speaker, Emery Odell was the spokesman for the small dairy farmer of southern Wisconsin. He did much to develop the Swiss cheese industry in Green County which today has the reputation of being the Swiss cheese center of the world. The Swiss people in that county by hard work are producing cheese far superior to that of their forebears in Switzerland. It was Mr. Odell who insisted that their product must excel all others. So he has served his county, his State, and his country with distinction and honor.

Mr. Speaker, Emery Odell was my friend. I shall miss him and I join with thousands of his friends and neighbors to mourn his passage. He has left his footprints in the sands of time. May God bless his memory and his soul.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, attended the meeting of the Women's Forum on National Security at the Mayflower Hotel. I have a copy of the national commander's speech, but it has already been introduced in the RECORD.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks in another instance a description of the operation of the so-called Korean GI bill of rights. I am sure the Members will be interested in having the latest information as to how this program is operating. I find there is some confusion in the minds of a great many regarding exactly how that GI bill of rights operates.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I was recently named as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the Ways and Means Committee for its action in naming me to serve on this important committee. I know also that the thousands of veterans who live in the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana and their families are also happy to have representation on this committee.

It will be my pleasure to work with the fine lady from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS, who will serve in this Congress as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Everybody knows of her many years of untiring efforts to gain benefits for the veterans of this country. Many of the laws now on the statute books bore her own name as author when they were presented to this body.

At this time one particular phase of benefits to our severely handicapped veterans has commanded my attention, namely, the acts granting automobiles to those who lost a leg or an arm or their eyesight in combat. I understand the lady from Massachusetts was also the author of the original legislation granting these automobiles. Veterans are now writing me to the effect that some of their automobiles are wearing out. Some have already worn out; some need repairs. I think that the Congress should see that these extremely handicapped veterans continue to have some means of transportation or locomotion. I am therefore introducing a bill today which would grant $50 per month additional compensation to the checks of these veterans after the original automobile has been in service for a period of 4 years. This $50 per month should be ample to repair the old car, or the veteran can trade the old one in and apply the $50 as a monthly payment on a new car, or he may use it to purchase any other contrivance he so desires. This bill would apply to all who are eligible for automobiles under laws now in existence, and would be extended to armless, legless, and blind veterans of World War I as well.

The text of my bill is as follows:

H. R. 2114

A bill to amend the law pertaining to the furnishing of automobiles to certain disabled veterans by extending its provisions to veterans of World War I and by providing $50 per month additional compensation to such veterans

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes," enacted October 20, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 252a–252e), is amended by inserting "World War I or" before "World War II."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 of such act are amended by renumbering them as sections 3, 4, 5, and 7, respectively.

SEC. 3. Such act is amended by inserting after the first section of the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to each veteran for whom he has provided or assisted in providing an automobile under this act or under the provisions of law referred to in section 5, the sum of $50 during each month which begins (1) more than 4 years after the payment is made in connection with providing such veteran with such automobile, or (2) more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, whichever is the later."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The benefits provided in the first section of this act shall not be available to any veteran of World War II or of service on or after June 27, 1950, who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after the effective date of this act, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after said effective date, and such benefits shall not be available to any veteran of World War I who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator before July 1, 1956. No application shall be required from a veteran in order to establish his entitlement to the benefits provided in section 2 of this act."

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this short time today for the purpose of bringing to the attention of this honorable body what I believe to be a desperately critical situation which is endangering proper and orderly development of our highways. The Bureau of Public Roads has before it today claims from the various States for Federal aid matching money due from the Government on completed work aggregating $27,000,000. The Bureau has no funds to meet these claims. The result is that many of the States are in desperate

straits and cannot continue the highway programs to which they are committed.

This situation is brought about by the fact that the appropriation for this year was reduced from $400,000,000 to $325,000,000. In making that reduction the committee reported on page 21 of House Report No. 1665, Eighty-second Congress, and I quote:

> This reduction is made on the premise that shortages of manpower, equipment, and materials, especially steel, would slow down the completion of much of this road work. If these shortages do not materialize and the work is completed the Federal Government is obliged to furnish the necessary funds since the substantive legislation gives the Bureau authority to incur obligations.

The premise upon which this reduction was made has been proved to be wrong. The shortages did not develop. The result is the States have in good faith proceeded with the program and the Federal Government is now in the position of failing to keep faith with the States.

It is my firm conviction that the Congress cannot be a party to this breaking of faith and that immediate action is necessary. The supplemental appropriations asked for this year contain an item of $185,000,000 to correct this deplorable condition and to enable the Bureau of Public Roads to reimburse the States for work already completed and which is scheduled for completion by the end of this fiscal year.

In view of the fact that this item must be considered by the Appropriations Committee along with the numerous other items in the supplemental bill, I urge that this House take appropriate action so that the committee may bring up this item at the earliest possible moment in a special appropriation bill. If this is not done, there will be such a great backlog of unpaid obligations to the States that it is quite probable some of them will be forced to suspend all highway construction operations. This would mean complete disruption of their highway programs. It would mean also that many of the highways now requiring improvement to meet even the minimum standard of safety will have to remain as hazards to life and property. It will mean, undoubtedly, an increase in the enormous death toll that is taken on the highways each year and which now is beyond all reason.

It will be dangerous for us to delay this action at a time when the Nation's highways are overtaxed, due to the drastic curtailment of Federal funds and the diversion by the Federal Government of 75 percent of the income from excise taxes on highway users to other purposes than building and maintenance of highways.

I feel, and I believe the great majority of my colleagues feel, that we have been quite remiss in meeting our obligation by permitting such an enormous diversion of these funds from the purpose for which they rightfully should be used.

In view of the comparative deterioration of our highways in recent years and of the efforts of the various States to correct this condition so that the death and damage toll taken on the highways may be decreased, it would seem to be only right that this House take immediate action to make this supplemental appropriation of $185,000,000 available for reimbursement to the States for the money they have already spent at the earliest possible moment.

I, therefore, respectfully urge that you give this serious matter immediate and favorable consideration.

McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been searching the metropolitan dailies every day in an attempt to find an account of the convention of the International Transportation Workers Union. Because no account of this convention has been reported in the press, I want to read part of a newscast of Howard K. Smith reporting from London in which he said:

> It is no longer news when Europeans attack the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which has been called over here the most offensive piece of legislation ever passed by Congress, but conversely it is news when the main victims of the act the sailors of Europe praise that piece of legislation and that the International Transportation Workers Union representing the seamen of all Western Europe and now meeting here has done this morning. A resolution passed by the body says, "Freedom-loving people should welcome such measures." It adds that the union willingly cooperates with governments which take such screening action. It does add a request that the screening of Europe's seamen arriving in the States be simplified, but that comes as a pretty weak stinger on a resolution in general praiseful of the McCarran-Walter restrictions. Today's resolution will no doubt cause dismay among the governments of Europe almost all of which have bitterly protested against the act and had hoped thereby to see it repealed or greatly amended.

CREATION OF A UNITED STATES ACADEMY OF FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as in the Eighty-second Congress, I have again introduced a bill which would provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Foreign Service. The bill calls for the creation of an academy which would offer a specialized 4-year course, intended to train promising young men and women for a career in the Foreign Service of the United States. The students would be selected on the basis of competitive examinations, appointed on the basis of merit, and would receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point. The graduates of the academy would be available for assignment with the Foreign Service of the United States in the Department of State, with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the Department of Agriculture, and with the Department of the Treasury for service in connection with international finances and related activities.

My experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, as well as the study missions to which I was assigned as a member of that group, have convinced me that our Nation needs a reservoir of able, specially trained, learned men and women, who will give our Government the most capable and satisfactory representation abroad that we have ever had. While a few of our colleges and universities have established limited chairs and departments for this particular training, I do not believe that they adequately meet the urgent need in this field.

I believe that to properly represent the United States, our delegates abroad should not only be thoroughly conversant with the economic and political backgrounds of both our country and a particular foreign nation, but should also be learned in the philosophy, history, language, and culture of the foreign country to which the student may be eventually assigned.

The establishment of the academy envisioned in my bill would, in my estimation, eventually give our Nation better representation abroad on all levels, and foster better understanding, cooperation, and peace among nations.

DECREASE IN FARM PRICES A MAJOR PROBLEM

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the continuing drop in farm prices is a major problem before this Congress and the Nation. To those of us who come from the great agricultural sections of the country, it is the most important domestic problem today. Economists and financial writers recognize that if steps are not taken to check this alarming trend, our whole economy will suffer drastic consequences. Therefore, it is a problem which should concern us all.

ONE-THIRD LESS THAN 1946

No less than the Wall Street Journal, in a very recent issue, recognized the gravity of this problem when it pointed out that the farm price drop poses a knotty problem for the Eisenhower administration. This article cites the alarming fact that at mid-December prices received by farmers averaged 12 percent below a year ago. In other words, in the past year farm prices have dropped on the average of 1 percent a month. And they have gone down 33⅓ percent since 1946. The two major agricultural products of the section which I am privileged to represent, cotton and cattle, have suffered the worst of all.

SAME EARMARKS AS 1929

This situation has many of the earmarks of what happened prior to the terrible depression of the early thirties when farm prices went to the bottom. Just as occurred in the late twenties, farm prices continue to decrease when all other costs, incomes, and prices of stocks and commodities are high.

AFFECTS EVERY SEGMENT OF ECONOMY

In this connection let me call your attention to the front page of the financial section of yesterday's New York Times, where there appears a careful discussion of this alarming trend in agricultural prices. The article is written by J. H. Carmichal, and carries this headline, "New regime faces farm price riddle." In it, he points out what is happening to the farmer as his income for his products decreases and the commodities which he has to buy continue to be high. I quote:

Prices of industrial products and other things that the farmer must buy to produce a crop have held not far from their high level reached after the start of the Korean war.

He then points out:

The price decline in farm products means that the agricultural areas will have fewer dollars with which to buy industrial and other products as compared with last year and 1951. In addition, with higher transportation costs prevailing and processing costs also higher, the farmer is getting a smaller amount of the consumer's dollar.

REDUCTION IN PURCHASING POWER

As most of the economists and financial writers point out, when the purchasing power of a large group of our population is reduced, the purchasing power of other groups is affected, and our whole economy is jeopardized.

ECONOMY OF SOUTH HURT

And the first to suffer from such an economic reverse will be the agricultural sections of our country. Here again the New York Times emphasizes this fact when it points out what the drop in cotton prices is doing to the South. I quote from the article:

An example of how the price decline may influence general business conditions in agricultural areas is furnished by cotton. A year ago the price of the staple at the 10 markets in the South was roughly 42 cents a pound, while at present the average is about 32 cents, a drop of $50 a bale. On a normal crop of around 15,000,000 bales the decline would mean a drop of about $750,000,000 in total income.

FARM LAND PRICES MAY FOLLOW

In one discussion of this problem a fear has been expressed that if this trend in farm prices is not stopped, farm land prices will follow. It goes on to point out that already the small farm family is being attracted to defense and industrial areas by high wages and better economic security, while the large landowner will be further discouraged by his inability to obtain farm workers at a price he can afford to pay in relation to the price he receives for his own products.

TIGHTENING OF BANK LOANS

Another development, the results of which must be closely watched, is the little-noticed action of the Federal Reserve Board taken during the excitement of the inaugural in raising the rediscount rates to member banks. Every financial writer whose views I have read observes that perhaps a year ago or 6 months ago this move might have been anti-inflationary, but that now it can only have the effect of raising interest rates and making it more difficult for local banks to make loans. Whether or not this will add to the already difficult financial problems of the farmer remains to be seen.

PRESENT FARM PRICE LAW SHOULD BE EXTENDED PROMPTLY

In my opinion it is vital that every effort be made promptly to check the lowering of farm prices. I know that from my discussion with the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture that they are making every effort to bring about a solution to this problem. As they make their studies of steps which must be taken over a long period of time to assure the farmer of a fair price for his products, I believe that the Congress should, without delay, extend through 1956 the present price support law, which, unless extended, will expire at the end of next year.

While it is true that this law commits the Government to support only the basic crops at 90 percent of parity, the extension of the present law will, it seems to me, go a long way toward preventing a disastrous wholesale decrease in all farm prices. The extension will give to the farmer some assurance that he can engage in production of the crops needed by this country and the world and receive at least until the end of 1956 a price based on 90 percent of parity. And this step should certainly give reassurances where uneasiness has been permitted to exist because of some indication of opposition to the farm price support law in certain quarters.

FILING OF ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in fulfillment of a pledge by me to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, I am introducing a bill requiring Members of Congress to file annual financial statements.

In the campaign of 1952 I was very actively supported by the independent voters of Illinois, a fine group of patriotic Americans receiving no pay and expecting no political favors, intent only on making their contribution to the successful functioning of our democracy. In literature prepared and distributed by them appeared this paragraph:

BARRATT O'HARA is unalterably opposed to the use of public office for private financial gain. He proposed as early as 1934 that all public officials disclose their total income. He will, if elected, introduce a bill requiring Congressmen to reveal their income.

The bill which I am introducing is short and simple. There are only 183 words. It is unlike other bills on the subject in, first, that it does not in its application go beyond the membership of the bodies—Senate and House—voting upon it; and, second, that it does not require detailed itemization which would provoke controversy and countless amendments reducing to a minimum the chances of enactment.

The simplicity and reasonableness of the bill should recommend its support and passage on a bipartisan basis by a substantial majority of the membership of both bodies. Its passage would amount to a recognition by the Congress of the legitimate right of the public to some knowledge of the finances of Members of the Congress who make the laws of the country. Applying it by voluntary action to themselves it well might come to be the pattern for future legislation affecting others in the governmental service.

The principle involved is that a Member of Congress, or any other person in Government service, should not use the power and prestige of public office for personal enrichment. My bill seeks to make available to the public information upon which it can base judgment, whether the motivation of the Member of Congress is a sincere deep-rooted desire to serve the public interest or to advance his own private fortunes. At the same time it protects the legitimate rights to privacy on intimate and personal matters which the public workers should share in common with the workers in private activities.

I bespeak for this bill the most earnest consideration by my distinguished colleagues. It should have the support of all and the opposition of none.

LIMITING THE SPENDING POWERS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to House Joint Resolution 24 which has been introduced by me. This is a proposed constitutional amendment which would limit the spending powers of Congress and provide for the reduction of the national debt.

Our Constitution should always remain a simple and orderly charter for the Federal Government. Its purpose always has been and always should be to provide a government with limited powers—a government that fully preserves the rights of the citizens. Any proposed amendment should meet these tests.

The last amendment to our Constitution limited the tenure of the President of the United States to two terms. This will forever stand as an added bulwark in preserving sovereignty in the hands of the people.

The Eighty-third Congress can render no greater service to the American people of this and future generations than to submit to the States a constitutional amendment limiting the spending powers of the Federal Government and making it possible to work out an orderly

and systematic payment of the national debt. House Joint Resolution 24 will accomplish these objectives.

My proposal simply provides two things: First, that no expenditure shall be made by the Government which would require an increase in the debt of the United States and that the Congress shall not make any appropriation which would cause a violation of that provision. In other words, the amendment provides for a compulsory pay-as-you-go system. It will end deficit financing, because expenditures could not be made unless there was money in the Treasury. The practical effect of this would be that Congress could not increase spending without at the same time increasing taxes. Likewise, a reduction in taxes would automatically bring about a reduction in expenditures. The people, by demanding a repeal of certain taxes, could reduce Government spending.

This provision of my proposal would automatically be suspended upon a declaration of war by the Congress but could not be suspended for any other emergency except by a three-fourths majority vote of all the Members of both Houses and then only for a period of 1 year at a time.

Secondly, this proposal for a constitutional amendment further provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect a special tax, the proceeds of which would be applied to the payment of the principal amount of our national debt. This is necessary and desirable. It would make it possible for the Congress to levy a particular tax and have the proceeds put in a special fund and used only for debt retirement. Thus we would have a systematic amortization of the national debt. We would serve notice to the bond holders and to the entire world that this Government intends to fulfill its obligations.

At the present time the Congress cannot levy a tax and direct that it go into a special fund for a special purpose. The Constitution provides that all taxes shall go in the general fund of the Treasury, and makes these taxes subject to appropriations of the Congress. It is necessary that we amend the Constitution in order to levy a special debt retirement tax that could not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this Eighty-third Congress will approve House Joint Resolution 24 and give the States of this Union a chance to vote on it. I predict that the required number of States would readily ratify it if given the opportunity.

OPS PERSONNEL

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency and also the Committee on Appropriations to some information I have received from a reliable source with reference to the personnel of the OPS. There is a large staff in the OPS agency here in Washington, and I am informed that a good many of both high and low members of the staff are taking trips over the United States. I know of two of them now who are preparing to spend some time in California. They are two ladies. It is rather cold here. We have 32° temperatures here today, and they are going out to California and get into the nice chamber of commerce climate out there for a few weeks. They also intend to stop over at New Orleans—possibly to check up on the Mardi Gras.

There are also two male officials from the OPS who have been working for the past 3 weeks in New York City investigating feathers. You know what feathers are—chicken feathers and duck feathers. They have spent considerable time there. They live in New York, but their primary investigation is to look into the price of feathers. I do not know of anybody who uses feathers for pillows or other things nowadays, but it seems to me that the tremendous waste in the OPS of the taxpayers' money would warrant immediate action to stop further squandering of public money.

I wish to urge the Banking and Currency Committee and also the Appropriations Committee to take steps that will stop pleasure traveling by employees of the OPS and other agencies. There is no reason in the world why the American taxpayer should be called upon to pay for such trips. I personally feel that the OPS has served its full purpose, and if I am given an opportunity to vote on the question, I will cast my vote for discontinuance of the agency. Such action by Congress will save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and of the Special Committee on Livestock. The Committee on Agriculture this morning recommended unanimously that the OPS strike out all the controls on all cattle prices, and in addition repeal for good and all this compulsory grading of meat. That will get rid of some of these trips. Maybe some of these people can keep warm while they are writing these regulations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman from Colorado will do a thorough job in the investigation.

Mr. HILL. Maybe they would not have to go to California, and they would keep warm while they are writing those regulations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion that I am going to give the names of these persons who are getting ready to travel over the country at the expense of the taxpayers, and I am also going to give the names of the feather experts in New York to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on Appropriations so that they may immediately stop this waste of money.

LT. GEN. LEWIS A. PICK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is something about this great country of ours that instills in men the desire to improve their environments to serve in the true sense of service to their country, and when they retire from fields of active work to leave things better than they have found them. It is that urge which has given us gallant and selfless leaders. It is that kind of service which has kept this Nation free and made it great.

Among such stalwarts of this generation, I give you the name of Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, who this month retires from active service as Chief of Engineers.

His record as a soldier, encompassing more than 35 years and overseas service in two World Wars, is notable. But his record as a great American, in peace as well as in war, ranks him among history's most eminent leaders of this generation. As the editor of a leading North Dakota newspaper once wrote of General Pick in connection with the engineering program which he had devised and initiated for control of the vast untamed Missouri River Basin:

> The school children of North Dakota for generations to come will hail his name.

His program for the control and development of the Missouri River system is today well advanced. To a vast area—one-sixth of the United States—it is bringing relief from long harassment by floods and by drought. The importance of the Pick plan to the entire national economy in years to come is incalculable. Yet that is only one of the many achievements of General Pick's remarkable career.

Just short of 4 years ago he became Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. In the intervening time he has traveled the world over, supervising, directing, and planning the vitally important works of the Corps of Engineers. He has visited every State in the Union, and most of them over and over again. And he has combined his official duties and inspections with appearances before many, many civic groups, anxious and entitled to know about the functions of that great and historic organization which he so ably has headed. On these occasions he has had ample opportunity to extol the corps. He has had ample opportunity to tell of its efficiency, of its noble tradition, of its splendid accomplishments. It was his right and his privilege to do so. But did he exercise that right and that privilege? Rarely.

For nearly 4 years he has gone up and down and across this country like a modern Paul Revere, awakening and enlightening the people to the necessity for conserving our natural resources; pointing out the waste of the past; envisioning the needs of the future; pleading for a new special public concern with measures for protecting the soil and conserving and utilizing our water resources—those two fundamental and self-renew-

able resources on which the greatness of this country was founded and on which the future of a greater America must be built.

No man in Government in our time has done more in so short a space of years to spread the message of resources conservation. We, all of us, owe him a deep debt of gratitude for this service which he is so eminently qualified to render, and to which he has given the indefatigable energy of a splendid physique and a compelling eloquence, the like of which I have seldom encountered.

But General Pick is no podium preacher—no desk soldier. He is a natural front-line leader, to be found always where and when the going is toughest.

There are those who will tell about the tall, white-haired figure in uniform that stalked the mud and water-soaked levees at Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, last spring, through the days and nights when the life of two great cities was at stake, menaced by the record-breaking, relentless floods on the Missouri River; keeping vigil with the thousands of soldiers and more thousands of wearied citizens, cheering them and directing them in a fight which they eventually won.

There are others to tell you of that same figure, who seemed to be everywhere, directing the battle against the ruthless waters of the unprecedented floods at Kansas City, 2 years ago.

And still others who tell of that white-haired, tireless leader emerging through blinding ground blizzards to give personal direction to the relief work in that unprecedented snow disaster which gripped the Midwest in 1949. In that disaster, which found all other agencies helpless to handle the situation, it was General Pick that the Governor of Nebraska asked for to lead the fight against the elements; and the Army, to whom our Government turned for aid in the disaster areas, named him commander of "operation snowbound." They chose the right man. Within 24 hours the greatest mobilization of snow-removal equipment in history was well under way and an effective operation was organized that resulted in freeing 200,000 snowbound people, thousands of them marooned for many weeks; an operation that rescued 4,000,000 head of livestock from starvation, and bulldozed open 115,000 miles of snow-blocked roads.

Then there are the soldiers and the natives who worked with him on the Ledo Road, through the jungles and the mountains of North Burma. To them he was known as "the man with the stick." This name came to him from the long rattan stick, with a hooked end for a handle which he carried out on that job from 12 to 15 hours a day—a stick which, originally taller than his own 6 feet, became worn down to cane length by much prodding up and down the hills and valleys of North Burma, as he drove that job, which others said could not be done, through to completion.

The New York Times of February 11, 1945, described the Ledo Road, then known as Pick's Pike, as "the greatest engineering feat in the annals of the United States Army." Let me quote just a paragraph from that Times story:

It was General Pick who conquered the mountains and jungle, faced down the monsoon, bridged the raging rivers, licked malaria with one hand while conjuring up new miracles of engineering with the other hand; and all the time solving the problems of leadership and of men slaving against time, nature and the Japanese in a strange wilderness thousands of miles from home. * * * He was out on the job from 12 to 15 hours a day, walking, jeeping, inspecting. He knew what was going on everywhere along the way. Often he went up in a small liaison plane, scouting out new trails or travelling from one end of the road to the other.

These things I have mentioned are achievements of his later years, but his entire career has been marked with the unusual, made up of natural daring and intelligent vision.

For example, Lowell Thomas, in his book on the history of the world's great floods, published in 1937, under the title "Hungry Waters" makes especial reference to this amazing officer in connection with the tragic Mississippi River floods of 1927. It was an engineer officer, and a young one at that, wrote Thomas, who first expressed the theory of flood control which has since been accepted by all flood control experts.

In 1927—

Continues Thomas—

Herbert Hoover sat in the rear of an office car while all around them raged a sea composed of the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ouachita Rivers. With him sat Capt. Lewis A. Pick, who advised the then Secretary Hoover: "First find out what Old Man River wants to do, then help him do it."

And Thomas closes his book with this final paragraph:

Slowly and gradually (the country) is beginning to learn the wisdom of what Captain Pick told Herbert Hoover in 1927.

General Pick entered the service of his country on the entrance of the United States into World War I in 1917, and commanded a company of engineers overseas. He has made the Army his career ever since, rising through assignments of ever increasing responsibility, in all of which he has served with distinction.

The national and international recognition which has come to him as a great soldier and a sound engineer have been earned and well earned. His appointment as Chief of Engineers in March 1949 was a natural culmination of his career.

In these last years of his service, he and the great organization which he has headed have been called upon again to perform miracles of defense construction. Billions of dollars of construction funds were entrusted to his direction and supervision. Tasks without precedent in engineering and construction annals were thrust upon him. And, like the Ledo Road, it-can't-be-done-jobs somehow were done and done well under his leadership.

The planning, the organization, and the actual construction of an air base in the frozen north, far within the Polar Circle, became his direct charge. Its accomplishment—the job known as "Operation Blue-Jay" in northern Greenland—is another tribute to his engineering skill and determination. More than that, its greatest significance to all of us here is that American genius and the teamwork of all our armed services and the private construction industry, together have broken the great northern and heretofore icebound frontier. It is with thanks to General Pick that we now have the know-how to go anywhere and build anything in the Far North.

Up in my New England, we have a saying that "the winds whistle loudest around the loftiest peaks." And so it is with this great military figure who, in a few days, leaves the service of his Government, but never—so long as he lives—the service of his country.

The windy whistling of critics have in recent months sought a target in this towering figure. Headline hunters have sought to gain publicity by attacking his works. These unfounded and grossly unwarranted attacks have but served, under scrutiny and analysis, to increase the stature, enhance the reputation, and emphasize the sterling accomplishments of Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, thirty-seventh Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. To him as he enters retirement, far more than to most of us, goes the biblical "well done" of the good and faithful servant.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAWSON of Utah, for an indefinite period on account of illness.

Mr. BARTLETT, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bow in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOLT in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances, one on the subject of Fort Robinson in the State of Nebraska; the other on the use of narcotics in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include a remarkable sermon preached by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris on the Sunday preceding inauguration.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include some statements regarding the State of Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a resolution passed by the American Legion Post No. 16 of Huntington, W. Va., and three reports from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial from the Christian Century dealing with our policy in Europe.

Mr. CELLER in three instances.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE and to include an article.

Mr. EVINS and to include a resolution.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and to include a letter.

Mr. CARNAHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER and to include a brief address.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Catholic Standard and an address delivered by President James B. Conant of Harvard University, and in the other a radio address delivered by him over a radio station in Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an article recently appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 29, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

379. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report on the operations of Budget Circular No. A–45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government, pursuant to section 1413 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

380. A letter from the administrative assistant, Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950, relative to violations of subsection (h) with respect to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice, 1953"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

381. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

382. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C., sec. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

383. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of activities and expenditures of the Office of Civil Defense, District of Columbia, authorized under Public Law 686, approved August 11, 1950, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 686, approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

384. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the civil defense plan for the United States Capitol Building group; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

385. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fifth semiannual report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, Public Law 455, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

386. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

387. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to certain benefits for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat areas"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2062. A bill to permit the coordination of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2063. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2064. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2065. A bill to facilitate wine production, to recodify, modify, and improve present requirements of internal-revenue law with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2066. A bill to facilitate wine production, to recodify, modify, and improve present requirements of internal-revenue law with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2067. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make payments on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain veterans who have suffered permanent loss of vision in one eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes in the case of scoutmasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2069. A bill to provide for the reinterment in a special plot in Arlington National Cemetery of the remains of the last-known survivors of wars and major armed conflicts in which the United States has been or hereafter may be engaged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2070. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2071. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control works on Coal Creek and its tributaries in Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 2072. A bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2073. A bill to establish the Government Service University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 2074. A bill to allow widows and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 2075. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the issuance of 328,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to certain refugees, German expellees, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2077. A bill to amend the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2078. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2079. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2081. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance

benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2082. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2083. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2084. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2085. A bill to require the Attorney General to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2086. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2087. A bill to repeal section 3 (g) of the Social Security Act amendments of 1952, thereby giving permanent effect to those provisions of such amendments which relate to the preservation of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance rights of individuals while they are permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2088. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2089. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2090. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2091. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2092. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2093. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 2094. A bill to provide for an Agricultural Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2095. A bill designating the second Saturday in October in each year as National Farmers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2096. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2097. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the period of presumption of service connection in the case of pulmonary tuberculosis from 3 to 7 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2099. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit, under certain circumstances, the employment of child labor in the harvesting of agricultural commodities during school hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2100. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational-rehabilitation training may be afforded certain hospitalized or otherwise incapacitated veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2101. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2102. A bill to provide that where goods are shipped to consignees inside the State where they are produced, the fact that State lines are crossed in transit shall not result in the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees producing such goods; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2103. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2104. A bill relating to the payment of World War veterans' adjusted compensation in certain cases of the veteran's continued absence from home for a period of 15 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2105. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2106. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2107. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the monthly insurance benefits for spouses and to increase the widow's, widower's, and mother's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 2108. A bill to amend section 902 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, so that the penalties provided therein will apply to violations of Civil Aeronautics safety regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2109. A bill to provide for the televising and broadcasting of and regulations for the conduct of hearings and activities of committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2110. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2111. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2112. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to include claims of certain American citizens who served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II and who were taken prisoner of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2114. A bill to amend the law pertaining to the furnishing of automobiles to certain disabled veterans by extending its provisions to veterans of World War I and by providing $50 per month additional compensation to such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2115. A bill to provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 2116. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of streams in the vicinity of Alice, Tex., with a view to their improvement in the interests of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2117. A bill to provide that members of the bar of the United States district courts shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2118. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain Mexican citizens who serve in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean hostilities beginning June 27, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2119. A bill to amend section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the sale of cattle necessitated by drought conditions shall be deemed an involuntary conversion of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2120. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2121. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Food and Drug district office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2122. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Nebraska of certain real property known as Fort Robinson and situated in Sioux County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2123. A bill to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2124. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2125. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2126. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2127. A bill to pay tribal funds to issue of members of the Ojibway or Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. R. 2128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an income-tax deduction for depreciation of personal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2129. A bill to require Members of Congress to file annual financial statements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2130. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 2131. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2132. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Arizona control over their tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2133. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2134. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2135. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2136. A bill to suspend Federal price support for agricultural commodities during the present emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2137. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2138. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold-coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2139. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2140. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism while serving with the Armed Forces of the United States of America, and for their widows in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 2141. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by widows in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2142. A bill to authorize the General Services Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2143. A bill to increase the level of price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAUFFER:

H. R. 2144. A bill to authorize the conveyance for public-school purposes of certain Federal land in Gettysburg National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2145. A bill to exempt certain nonprofit organizations from the tax imposed on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE (by request):

H. R. 2146. A bill to authorize the issuance of national service life insurance to certain veterans who apply therefor during the calendar year 1954, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2147. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2148. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H. R. 2149. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2150. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any person covered under old-age and survivors insurance shall be entitled to the same primary and survivors benefit rights during a period of disability as he would be entitled to had he attained retirement age on the initial date of such a period of disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2151. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2152. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt certain beneficiary associations from the tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating the third Thursday in October as Agricultural Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution creating a joint congressional committee to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of constructing a new and modern post-office building in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Res. 113. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. Res. 114. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate the administration of national parks and national monuments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. Res. 115. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 116. Resolution providing funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 115; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Res. 117. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 109; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 118. Resolution providing for additional compensation for two messengers for the House Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. Res. 119. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 120. Resolution amending rule XXXIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting of sessions of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2154. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leona Hungry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2155. A bill for the relief of the Wilbraham Academy; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2156. A bill for the relief of the Fredericktown Lead Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2157. A bill for the relief of David Lee Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2159. A bill for the relief of Andrew Trittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2161. A bill for the relief of Sheppard B. Yates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:
H. R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Cyril Claude Andersen, Patricia Andersen Hill, and Thelma Andersen McNeill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:
H. R. 2163. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:
H. R. 2164. A bill for the relief of Foon Tung Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2165. A bill for the relief of Foon Ay Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Naomi Suzanne Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2167. A bill for the relief of Warren Thomas and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:
H. R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Peter Borgesen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:
H. R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Louis A. Schafer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:
H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Kurt William Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Jordan Bros. Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):
H. R. 2172. A bill to equalize certain benefits provided by law in consideration of services rendered the Army in yellow-fever investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 2173. A bill for the relief of Jacob Shwimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Irving Goldberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2175. A bill for the relief of Herman Eidlis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):
H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Norma Jean Whitten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:
H. R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Ludwig, Isabel, and Milly Model; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 2178. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Ida Head; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Tony Ion Bonescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Ursula Thiess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2181. A bill for the relief of Richard Karl Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of Michael Thiess, Manuela Thiess, and Wilhelmina Huth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of John Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 2184. A bill for the relief of Omar Faruk Baturay and wife, Suad Esin Baturay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2185. A bill for the relief of Leopold Katz and his wife, Lydia Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2186. A bill for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 2187. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2188. A bill for the relief of Karoline Diekmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Harilaos Filippos Ikonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:
H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Constantin Michel Zampikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Walenty Bolesław Zaleski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H. R. 2192. A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios, also known as Stephen Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Tselepis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:
H. R. 2194. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Patricelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2195. A bill for the relief of James Watanuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:
H. R. 2196. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks, copartners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2197. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Ira T. Todd and Major C. Todd, copartners, trading as Todd Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:
H. R. 2198. A bill for the relief of Joanna Podberezka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2199. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franziska Hildebrandt Aldinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:
H. R. 2200. A bill for the relief of Judy Shibasaki Hanover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:
H. R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:
H. R. 2202. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grisinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:
H. R. 2203. A bill for the relief of Chor Youl Park Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Taufic Abdallah Joudeh Khalaf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2206. A bill for the relief of Veljko D. Kovacic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:
H. R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Rudolf M. Planert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:
H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecylia Kaminer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAUFFER:
H. R. 2209. A bill for the relief of Heinz Langerhans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:
H. R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Frans Gunnick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Brunhilde Reichert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:
H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Karola Thielebein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:
H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Dane Keith Asmundson (Evans Frank Nabeshima); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:
H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of railroad pensioners requesting a change in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, signed by 15 railroad residents of Tipton, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

25. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Maine State Chamber of Commerce, acting as defenders of our free-enterprise system, urging the Eighty-third Congress of the United States to consider legislation which will insure an efficient, financially sound transportation system with fair and equitable regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

26. By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of Senate and House of Representatives, State of Washington, extending felicitations and best wishes to new national administration under leadership of Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

27. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, Milwaukee, Wis., relative to a new hospital at Wood, Wis.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

28. By the SPEAKER: Petition of president of the board of the Congress of the Peoples for Peace, Sao Paulo, Brazil, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a peaceful solution to the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

29. Also, petition of Camilo Gomez, president of the National Congress of Honduras, wishing the United States prosperity under the Eighty-third Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beset by the perplexities of these calamitous days with all their fury and terror, let not our strength fail nor the vision fade. In these times when searing hate has done its worst upon the earth, we thank Thee for men and women of good will under all skies, the saving salt of a tortured world, upon whose integrity of character and upon whose understanding sympathy with other nations and races the hopes of tomorrow's world rest. Where our deeds can help to make this a fairer world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of a social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, there let us act and speak and pray. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 26, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Thursday and Friday of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Investigation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received the resignation of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to fill the vacancy thereby created.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was ordered to lie on the table:

House Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there was held, on November 4, 1952, a national election for the purpose of electing officers to various national and State offices; and

Whereas as the outcome of said national election, a new administration in the National Government of the United States is assuming office under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, thirty-third President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Washington does hereby extend to the new national administration, under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, its felicitations, and its most earnest and sincere best wishes, that, with God's guidance, it may meet, with wisdom and foresight, the momentous matters which are now, and will in the ensuing years, be placed before it for consideration; be it hereby further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and of the House, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation.

Passed the house January 19, 1953.

R. MORT FRAYN,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 19, 1953.

EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Pierino F. Berta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Nino Sabino Di Michele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 662. A bill for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou;

S. 663. A bill for the relief of Ottavio Saulino and Marcella Saulino; and

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Luxembourg, also known as Henry Luxemburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 665. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 666. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 667. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes;

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Henri Suderman;

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Helene Olga Iwasenko; and

S. 670. A bill for the relief of John Doyle Moclair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 671. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, relating to the exemption of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission from State and local taxation; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Agostino Giusto;

S. 673. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family;

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa; and

S. 675. A bill to amend section 2312 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the punishment of the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to trailers or semitrailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the last two bills mentioned above, which appear under separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Eftychios Mourginakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 677. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 678. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Congressional Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; and

S. 679. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 680. A bill to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin; and

S. 681. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Grace Kills A Boy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 682. A bill for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 683. A bill for the relief of Avak Hagopian;

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders;

S. 685. A bill for the relief of the estate of Esteban Boadilla Dalao;

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Anna I. R. Wells, Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, and W. S. Rosasco, Jr.;

S. 687. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Lincoln Operating Co., Cameo Amusement Co., Biscayne Beach Theater, Inc., and Mitchell Wolfson and others doing business as a partnership under the name of "Wometco Circuit"; and

S. 688. A bill dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

KIKUE TSURUKAWA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa, which is of unusual urgency.

It would enable a young Infantry lieutenant, now stationed in Japan, and his wife to complete the adoption of 3-year-old Kikue Tsurukawa, a pretty little Eurasian girl, and bring her to the United States when his tour of duty ends in July of this year.

Kikue's parents-to-be are Lt. and Mrs. Andrew Dickison, of Baker, Oreg. They are in Japan with their three fine sons, ages 9, 6, and 3. The Dickisons have made this child a member of their family. The family is now together and all are most anxious to return to the United States without being separated.

Lieutenant Dickison has already secured an extension of his assignment in Japan from January to July of this year. That extension takes him to the maximum of the time permitted for such an assignment.

If they are to be able to make plans, this bill must be enacted well in advance of July.

We lawyers know the contract doctrine that "time is of the essence." That is all the more the case in problems of this sort which are concerned with the love of parents for their children and children for one another.

I urge prompt consideration and passage of this bill.

The bill (S. 674) for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF DYER ACT RELATING TO INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF STOLEN TRAILERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Dyer Act so as to provide a remedy for an increasingly troublesome problem.

Under the Dyer Act—title 18, United States Code, section 2311 and the following pages—at present Federal authorities are given jurisdiction in cases where motor vehicles are stolen and brought across State lines. The definition of motor vehicle in the act, however, does not cover trailers and semitrailers, which are not self-propelled. There are cases in which loaded or unloaded trailers and semitrailers, detached from the truck or tractor which hauls them, are picked up and carried off by someone operating another truck or tractor and brought across State lines. In all such cases, however, the FBI and Federal authorities are prevented by the narrowness of definition in the Dyer Act from assuming jurisdiction.

There seems no good reason, however, for maintaining such a vacuum in the Criminal Code—a gap in Federal jurisdiction which is being increasingly exploited by hijackers and thieves operating on an interstate basis.

The bill (S. 675) to amend section 2312 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the punishment of the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to trailers or semitrailers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill regarding a new Federal judicial district in the State of Florida, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 688) dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Today I have introduced a bill which calls for the creation in the State of Florida of a third Federal judicial district. For the past 50 years we have had in our State two districts known as the northern and southern districts of Florida; I need not attempt to prove to anyone the fact that in this half century Florida, as a State, has had a higher percentage of growth than any other State in the Union, with the exception of California. Surely the Judiciary Committee can take judicial note of this fact.

The difficulty about the present judicial districts which we now have is that the so-called southern district of Florida is really more than the southern district. It extends from Duval County, which is the second northernmost county in our State, in a southwest direction and includes the Tampa and St. Petersburg area, which has over a million and a half people in a radius of 100 miles. It includes the rapidly growing city of Orlando and its environs. It also includes the populous and fast-growing south Florida coastal area, Palm Beach southward to Miami, where we find the greatest concentration of our State.

Since the end of World War II, the Miami area has grown faster than any other single area in all of the United States, with the exception of the Los Angeles area.

We find that Miami International Airport is the busiest airport of any in the United States. The month of November revealed that there were more landings and departures than at any other major airport in this country. As a matter of fact, there was more activity at the Miami Airport than at La-Guardia and Idlewild combined. The reason for this is obvious. Florida juts out into the Atlantic and into the Caribbean and is the closest point to South America.

There are many immigration problems which naturally arise because of its location and because of this foreign activity. Much Federal work arises through immigration and foreign trade. Because of these facts, we find in the Federal courts in the southern district of Florida that they are from 1½ to 2 years behind in their work. I had the honor of serving as assistant district attorney in charge of the Miami office just prior to World War II and at that time, according to statistics, it was the eleventh busiest United States district attorney's office in the Nation. Since that time, the number of cases in that office and the workload has increased tremendously.

It has long been an axiom of law that justice delayed is justice denied, a condition which certainly can be charged to this district.

We only have four Federal judges in this so-called southern district, which actually includes 80 percent of the area and population of the State of Florida and extends a distance of over 400 miles.

Not only is there an immediate need for more judicial help and larger staffs in the office of the United States attorney, but there is a desperate and immediate need for the creation of a new judicial district in southern Florida; a district which will include and have as its hub the greater Miami area but will include what is now the southern division of the southern district, i. e., from St. Lucie County on the east coast across to Lee County on the southwest and include Monroe County in the extreme southern end of the State.

By every standard of measurement the need is obvious.

The Federal judicial districts should be renamed, the southern Florida district, the central Florida district, which would include Jacksonville and Orlando and the Tampa and St. Petersburg area, and the old northern district which would maintain its present limits. This would give balance to the judicial districts in the State and would mean that the Federal workload could be more expeditiously handled and result in greater and more prompt justice.

Two years ago, the Judiciary Committee held rather thorough and sympathetic hearings on this proposal. At that time it did not recommend a new judicial district but did recommend an additional Federal judge. The recommendation passed the Senate but got snarled up in some politics in the House of Representatives and did not pass. Since that time the Census Bureau reveals that the State of Florida has increased its population by over 300,000. This is further evidence of the need for not only the authorization of a new Federal judge but the establishment of a new southern district.

The lawyers are unanimously in favor of this proposal, as well as the press, and so is everyone who is familiar with the problem. This problem was recently spotlighted when a Federal grand jury met in Miami and filed a factual and irrefutable report decrying the present archaic setup. The grand jury demanded that Federal authorities immediately take recognition of this problem and do something about the creation of a new Federal district for southern Florida. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will give to this proposal immediate and sympathetic consideration. The facts are indisputable and will prove beyond doubt the desirability of the adoption of this legislation.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 50), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 263, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 28, 1952, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1953," wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "March 17, 1953."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Editorial entitled "Islands in the Wake of War," published in the New York Times of January 25, 1953.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Memorandum entitled "Farm Prices and the Agricultural Outlook," prepared by economists in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the use of members of the Joint Economic Committee.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "McCarran Act Is Helping Reds in Italy, Monsignor O'Grady Says," being an Associated Press dispatch from Rome dated January 24.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Hoey
Anderson	Douglas	Holland
Barrett	Duff	Hunt
Beall	Dworshak	Ives
Bennett	Eastland	Jackson
Bricker	Ellender	Jenner
Bridges	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Bush	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Butler, Md.	Frear	Kefauver
Butler, Nebr.	George	Kennedy
Byrd	Gillette	Kerr
Capehart	Goldwater	Kilgore
Carlson	Gore	Knowland
Case	Green	Kuchel
Chavez	Griswold	Langer
Clements	Hayden	Lehman
Cooper	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Malone
Daniel	Hill	Mansfield

Martin	Potter	Symington
Maybank	Purtell	Taft
McCarthy	Robertson	Thye
McClellan	Russell	Tobey
Millikin	Schoeppel	Watkins
Morse	Smathers	Welker
Mundt	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Murray	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Neely	Smith, N. C.	Young
Pastore	Sparkman	
Payne	Stennis	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF RECESSION IN FARM INCOME AND PURCHASING POWER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement relative to the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. The rapidly declining prices of farm commodities is not only of serious concern to farmers, but should concern every wage earner, housewife, and businessman as well.

The drop in farm income and purchasing power can have serious consequences to the national economy if it continues.

The extent of the decline appears to be unwarranted.

It is true that 1952 was a good crop year. There are surpluses in some commodities, but they should not be burdensome surpluses.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will attempt to determine what factors are contributing to the unwarranted recession in farm income and purchasing power.

The committee will very soon undertake a thorough study of the situation.

Among the questions to which we shall seek answers are the following:

First. To what extent has the importation of poor quality grain, ostensibly imported for feeding purposes, but actually sold for milling and export, contributed to the drop in grain prices?

Second. To what extent has the sale of large quantities of grain by the Commodity Credit Corporation, beginning early last fall and continuing to the present time, affected prices?

Third. To what extent has excessive speculation and the possible failure of commodity exchanges to keep their houses in order added to the economic distress of agriculture?

Fourth. What factors including price controls are responsible for the maintenance of high meat prices to consumers and disastrously low prices for livestock?

Fifth. Is the depreciation of foreign markets for farm commodities, particularly for wheat and cotton, of a temporary nature? Is it necessary to continue huge "give-away" programs in order to maintain foreign markets?

These are some of the questions to which your Committee would like to find the answers.

We may not be 100 percent successful, but it is vitally important that we make the effort to find the answers and find them soon.

On Thursday of this week the General Accounting Office will report to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee the results of its investigation relating to the importation of low-grade grains.

From that beginning, your Committee plans to go into each phase of the whole problem as rapidly as possible.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield if I have the right to do so.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont be permitted to yield to me to answer one question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Would this investigation include the importation of Canadian oats, apparently at a loss, the importer making up his losses through short selling on the Chicago Grain Exchange?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that the scope of the proposal would include the matter to which the Senator from North Dakota refers.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have time to answer a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the statement which he read was his statement, or is it a statement from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. AIKEN. This is a statement which I am making. However, I did read the statement to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning in executive session, and the committee approved it. Eight or nine members of the committee were present.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is the Senator now making it as a committee statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I originally intended to make it as my own statement, but the committee seemed to approve; in fact, it did approve.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The reason I ask is that I was not present at the meeting.

Mr. AIKEN. I so understand. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is just as anxious as are all the other members of the committee to find the answers to these questions if it is possible to do so.

JOSÉ MARTÍ

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, January 28 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of José Martí, Cuban patriot.

José Martí, an advocate of the good-neighbor policy, was born on January 28, 1853, in the Province of Habana, Cuba. He is considered the father of Cuba's freedom because, through his tireless effort and brilliant leadership, he unflaggingly carried a group of hard-pressed patriots to victory.

From the time he became a political prisoner at the age of 16, working in the lime quarries, he carried the torch of freedom. His health ruined, he was allowed to go to Spain to study but was not allowed to return to Cuba. For most of his life he was an exile, living in Mexico, Guatemala, and Venezuela. He moved to New York in 1881 and lived there until the beginning of the Cuban Revolution in 1895.

Martí, as a literary figure, had a great following in Latin America. For many years he wrote for La Nación, of Argentina, and various papers in New York, Venezuela, Costa Rica, and other countries in Latin America. While living in New York, he wrote North American Scenes. He is equally well known as a poet and essayist, and as a dramatist. He was a friend of Walt Whitman, the poet, of Dana, of the New York Sun, and of Domingo Sarmiento, of Argentina, who wrote of him "If one were to pick any one man to represent the spirit of Latin America, it would be Martí."

The North American historian, Willis Fletcher Johnson, author of a history about Cuba, referring to Cuba's struggle for independence, expresses extraordinary admiration for Martí by writing:

> The foremost director of that war, its organizer and inspirer, was José Martí; one of those rare geniuses who have appeared occasionally in the history of the world to be the incarnation of great ideals of justice and human rights. He was indeed many times a genius: Organized economist, historian, poet, statesman, tribune of the people, apostle of freedom, above all, man. In himself he united the virtues, the enthusiasm, and the energizing vitality which his countrymen needed to have aroused in themselves. To his disorganized and disheartened country he brought a magic personality which won all hearts and inspired them with all his own irrepressible and indestructible ideal, national independence.

The thoughts and spiritual inspiration of José Martí have a present-day significance to the Americas and to the democratic nations of the world.

His prolific imagination analyzed with great depth unlimited aspects of human relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a few observations and deductions, taken at random from his writings:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM WRITINGS OF JOSÉ MARTÍ

FREEDOM

He who wants to make nations, let him make man.

The trenches of ideas are worth more than the trenches of stones.

We love liberty because we see truth in it.

AMERICA

America must promote everything that brings its people closer together and should despise all that tends to separate them. In this, like in all human problems, the future is peace.

The problem of the independence of America was not so much the change of forms, but the change of spirit.

RELIGION

The happiness of the people is not conceivable without the separation of the state and the church.

Everyone has the right to his own conscience. Tyrant is the Catholic who places himself above the Hindu and the Methodist who whistles at a Catholic.

RACE

Every race brings to the world its own mission and each one must be given a free way, so as not to hinder the harmony of the universe.

The soul arises equally and eternally from the bodies that differ in form and in color.

He who encourages and promotes opposition and hate among the races, sins against humanity.

ART

Art, like salt in food, preserves the nations.

Art is to avoid the diminutive and to affix oneself to the great.

LITERATURE

How pure are the books when they are written straight from the soul.

MUSIC

Music is man escaped from himself.

ORATORY

A speaker without instruction is like palm trees without breeze.

There is nothing like thinking firmly to speak eloquently. Whatever is definite in judgment, will surely be well expressed by the lips.

JOURNALISM

Journalism is not kind consent nor insulting anger; it is proposition, study, examination and device.

The knowledge of the newspaperman must range from clouds to microbes.

POETRY

Verses are made from greatness but only from feeling come poems.

Everything, including pain itself, must seem like love to the poet.

CHARACTER

The duty that has been accomplished irradiates a light that never appears in the life or the tomb of those that have avoided it.

Not until everything has been done, has anyone the right to sit down and rest.

This knack of being able to see the inside of men is very bitter and not too enviable.

I enjoy the worthiness of others.

LAW

Law assures nations and restrains men.

A just principle even if it comes from the very depth of a cave can accomplish more than a whole army.

The right of labor can never be hate to capital; it should be harmony, conciliation, and the mutual approximation of both.

EDUCATION

He who plants schools will harvest men.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Nothing guarantees so much the peace among peoples than free and natural interests; nothing endangers it more than artificial and forced agreements.

PATRIOTISM

The Republic needs sacrifices. It is an altar not a pedestal. One serves it, but one does not use it to serve oneself.

Only virtues produce constant and serious well-being in the nations.

POLITICS

He that does not have the capacity to convince should not govern.

Haters should be declared traitors to the Republic. Hate is not constructive.

APHORISM

Conscience is the citizenship of the universe.

How great is a man when he knows how to be one.

Enthusiasm has never had gray hairs.

Rights are taken not asked for; they are torn off, not begged for.

All triumphs cost blood. From the veins or from the soul.

When man has emptied his spirit, he can then leave the earth.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, many books have been written on Martí and thousands of articles and essays about his intense and romantic life of patriotic sacrifice. One of the most recent books entitled "Martí: Apostle of Freedom," was written by Jorge Manach. It has been translated into the English language.

He fell wounded on the battlefield while leading and inspiring his compatriots, and did not live to see his beloved Cuba an independent Republic.

There is no doubt that Martí's understanding of human values and his sincere respect and tolerance were incalculable contributions to the solutions of race problems in Cuba and other Latin-American countries. That is why the centennial of his birth is being commemorated this year throughout the Americas with such solemnity and admiration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, José Martí, the great Cuban liberator, a heroic figure in the history of this hemisphere, is being honored today not only in his native land but also in the other 20 American Republics. This is his centenary. He was born January 28, 1853, at Havana. He died only 42 years later, on May 19, 1895, fighting for the independence of Cuba, in the battle of Dos Ríos. It is extraordinary that a life so brief was so varied in achievement, so consistent in purpose, so fruitful in result.

Martí was a statesman. He was a soldier. He was a newspaperman, who, as has been often said, elevated journalism to literature and who never wrote a line which did not have as its intention the freedom of his country. He was eloquent as poet, as prose writer, and as an orator whose words inspired multitudes. His great gifts, and the noble use he made of them, won for him the title Apostle of Freedom, the phrase which Cubans use to describe Martí just as we describe Washington as "first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen." In their respective times and their respective environments, both descriptions apply equally well to both these immortal national heroes.

The main facts of Martí's life can be told in few words, because that life was tragically short. He was only 42 years old when he died in battle in 1895. While hardly more than a boy, he began his lifelong struggle for Cuba's independence. He was a political prisoner at 17. He suffered exile and deportation. He traveled from country to country—Mexico, Central America, Venezuela, Colombia—striving to arouse support for Cubans in their determination to be free. He spent many years in the United States, where he made friends for the Cuban cause among journalists, political leaders, and the general public. From New York, through articles in the press of both the United States and Latin America, he attacked Spanish rule in Cuba and portrayed eloquently the government which Cubans intended to establish for themselves.

He devoted special effort to bringing about better understanding and therefore closer friendship between Cuba and the United States. The most effective help, he realized, would come from those convinced of the justice of Cuba's cause; and the best way to convince was to establish the basis of understanding. Accordingly, his speeches and newspaper articles in the press of this country were a series of interpretations of Cuba and Cubans. In the same way, he strove through articles published in Latin America to make Cubans and other Spanish-speaking peoples understand the United States. In New York, New Orleans, Miami, Tampa, he spoke at educational meetings, commercial clubs, Masonic lodges, labor organizations. He made friends in high places, and struck up acquaintances in restaurants and corner drug stores. And he wrote brilliantly and continuously.

His reports on our country and our people were interesting reading more than a half-century ago and they are interesting reading still. He wrote about the opening of Oklahoma Territory to settlement, about the death of Jesse James, about the first voting by women in Kansas in 1887. He wrote about the unveiling of the Statue of Liberty, the erection of Brooklyn Bridge, the return of the flags of the Confederacy to the South. He wrote about Generals Grant, Sherman, and Logan; about poets Whitman, Longfellow, and Bryant. He wrote about our public schools and our art exhibitions. And somehow he linked up all these things, and the many others attracting his keen and inquiring attention, with the right of Cuba to be free.

Charles A. Dana, editor of the New York Sun, became Martí's friend, and opened the columns of his paper to the Cuban patriot. A street in the city of Camaguey bears Dana's name, in grateful recognition of this aid.

Cuba's freedom, for which Martí strove, has been heroically attained and steadfastly upheld. Long since, his country proudly took her place among the sister republics of this hemisphere, and has helped weld the inter-American solidarity which is one of the surest safeguards of the free world. But it is not only as a great Cuban hero, but as a hero of the Americas and of mankind that I salute the memory of José Martí here today.

I feel it a privilege to recall, in the Senate of the United States, on this centenary of Martí's birth, how greatly he contributed to the collective freedom and security of the American Republics.

We can do no greater honor to his memory than to bear in mind and act upon his mighty precept:

By being men, we are endowed with the principle of freedom; and by being intelligent, we are under obligation to make that principle a reality.

Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on the American Republics, of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have had a special interest, of course, in all the American Republics and their solidarity, but a special interest traditionally in Cuba. So I am very happy to make these remarks today on the centenary of the birth of José Martí.

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 243.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out the word "There" and to insert in lieu thereof "Until December 31, 1956, unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President, there."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Secretary of State, in asking for the creation of this office of Under Secretary of State, specifically stated to the committee, as I recollect, that the work of the new Under Secretary of State would not last longer than 16 or 18 months, or 2 years at most.

In my opinion we should conform to his expressed statement to the committee. Therefore, to the committee amendment, I offer an amendment, in line 6, page 1, of the bill, to strike out "1956" and to insert in lieu thereof "1954."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 1, line 6 of the bill, it is proposed to strike out "1956" and to insert in lieu thereof "1954."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to say that I know of no department of government which needs reorganization more than does the State Department, and I heartily congratulate the Secretary of State on his effort to bring what may be called an efficiency expert into the Department of State for the purpose of reorganizing it, both in Washington and in the field. But since the Secretary has stated to the committee that the work could be accomplished within 16 or 18 months, I believe Congress would do well to limit the term to 2 years. Of course, the term can be extended if for any reason necessity for extending it should become apparent.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I personally can agree to everything the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has said. The committee had before it the request of the Secretary of State, who said, as I recall, that he believed 18 months to 2 years would be ample time; but, after discussing the matter, the committee wrote this amendment.

I have not consulted with the committee about the matter. I think there is much to what the Senator from Georgia has said, and I personally would make no objection. In fact, I personally would accede to his amendment to the committee amendment, although I do not believe I can speak for the committee in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Dulles has approved limiting this measure to 2 years. Although in the committee I voted for a 4-year period, as a member of the committee I am glad to accept the proposed 2-year amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, although I cannot speak for it, I should like to say that I am glad to join in the proposal to limit the term to 2 years, if we may assume that in the future there will be no objection to extending the period if necessity to do so should arise.

Mr. GEORGE. There would be no reason whatsoever for objecting to that, and I would be glad to join in such a proposal if necessity arose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the suggestion of the able Senator from Georgia is timely. We need to conserve in every possible manner. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment would limit the term of office of the proposed new Under Secretary of State to a period of not to exceed 2 years. I am in full accord with that proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in thorough accord with the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment. As a matter of fact, in the committee I offered such an amendment, since the Secretary of State had suggested that he believed the work could be completed within from 18 to 24 months. So in the committee I proposed the amendment to limit the term to December 31, 1954.

Some members of the committee believed it would be better to provide for service beyond that time, with the provision that the President could terminate the position at an earlier date, provided the work were done. On the other hand, I believe the better plan is the one which I suggested in the committee, and which the able senior Senator from Georgia has now suggested in the form of an amendment to the committee amendment, namely, that we limit the term to December 31, 1954; and then, if necessary, we can extend it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the pending bill was reported to the Senate a few days ago, I objected to the proposal on the ground that the creation of such a position was entirely unnecessary. I wish to repeat that objection today, and I should like to explain why in some detail.

It is my judgment that the State Department presently has both sufficient funds and ample authority to do precisely what the bill proposes. Furthermore, the existing organization of the Department of State embodies the position of Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration—a job which bears the very same responsibility as the new Under Secretary, which position the pending bill seeks to create.

Mr. President, there is not one of our Government departments that does not have an official charged with overseeing the administrative organization of that department. In the State Department we have a splendid administrative official in the person of Mr. Humelsine, presently Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. Whether Mr. Humelsine has done a good job in the past or is capable of doing a good job in the future is not the point. The point is that he, as Deputy Under Secretary of State, is now charged with the duty of assuring proper administrative efficiency within the Department of State. Since at present he holds the position of Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, and as such is a member of the State Department's official family, I do not see why this work could not be done by him. His work, as I understand, as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, is for administrative purposes only. That is what he does.

I happen to be a member of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles all the appropriations for the State Department. I have had occasion to question Mr. Humelsine quite often. I believe he is a capable man. He is able to do this work, and has sufficient authority to carry it out.

Now, if Mr. Humelsine is not capable of doing the job, Mr. Dulles has the power to select someone who can and will.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like most respectfully to call to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana that while as a result of the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment the maximum period will be 2 years, unless the position is sooner terminated by the President, the statement was made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that he had been assured by Mr. Dulles that the forthcoming vacancy in the position of Ambassador at Large would not be filled. That office, presently occupied by Mr. Jessup, carries a salary of $25,000, I believe, whereas the salary of the proposed

new Under Secretary would be $17,500. With the new administration coming into office, and with the Secretary of State just having assumed the heavy responsibilities for the reorganization of the State Department, I hope the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will be willing to go along with the unanimous report of the Foreign Relations Committee, in order to give to the Secretary of State the tools he at least believes he needs in order properly to reorganize the State Department.

It might well be that the Secretary of State does not believe that, in the organizational scheme of things in the Department, a Deputy Under Secretary would have sufficient authority or sufficient standing in the Department as a whole, and not the authority or standing that an Under Secretary for Administration would have.

Under those circumstances, and with the 2-year limitation which has been proposed by the Senator from Georgia as an amendment to the committee amendment, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be willing to go along with this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from California, that it is not my purpose to in anywise hinder the operations of the State Department. It is not my intention to slow for one moment any move which might make that Department more efficient and less costly to our people. I am simply trying to lay before the Senate facts as I see them.

And it seems to me that the very salient fact to be considered is that it is poor economy, indeed, to do away with a $25,000 job and immediately create a $17,500 job, when that very same job duplicates work and authority and salary already authorized for the Department. That is false economy. As I have said, I understand that an existing State Department official already has authority to do the very thing this bill proposes. The top officials of that Department can hire or fire, and the present Deputy Under Secretary for Administration can certainly not only suggest reorganization objectives, but can recommend that certain positions and functions be done away with entirely. The creation of this new position means duplication of the rankest kind. I say that because there is no hint that the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration will be abolished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Appropriations for the State Department, let me inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana agrees that there is a necessity for an overhaul of the State Department, and that if we were to spend, instead of $25,000 a year for an Ambassador at Large and $14,500 a year, the salary which Mr. Humelsine now receives, the $17,500 now proposed, we could obtain the services of a man who could save many, many times the difference between those amounts. Certainly that is what should be done, and the evidence before the Appropriations Committee indicates that a reorganization of the State Department should be had.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no doubt of that, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Michigan. However, the point I am making is that it can be done now, under existing authority, within an existing position, without creating another high-paying Government job and the trimmings that go with it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. Mr. President, there is sufficient authority for the Secretary of State to fire and hire. The work of trying to remove superfluous employees from the Government service, as the Senator from Michigan well knows, is very difficult. I care not how much investigating is done, we shall always be met with the statement, "I do not think a cut should be made here nor there; the work is all necessary, and the present force is just about sufficient to carry on." What the Secretary of State will have to do is start swinging the ax. I do not mean the Secretary should fire employees indiscriminately. I do mean that the framework within which a thorough reorganization can be accomplished already exists. What the Secretary should do, in my humble opinion, is to use that framework without adding to it, especially so when the addition is substantial in cost and when it duplicates existing authority. There can certainly be no justification in duplication of jobs to prevent duplication of jobs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator not think it would be a good thing to have someone within the Department who can swing the ax?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. It must be done within the Department. But it is my opinion that there is sufficient personnel—sufficient authority—in existence now. For the life of me, I am unable to see why the Office of Under Secretary of State for Administration should be created in order to bring about economies that can be accomplished with the present staff. I can see no reason on earth why an additional $17,500 a year must be spent, on top of the $15,000 now being paid to Mr. Humelsine, in order to accomplish precisely what Mr. Humelsine is already empowered to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The situation complained of has existed in the State Department since Mr. Byrnes was Secretary of State, since General Marshall was Secretary of State, and while Mr. Acheson was Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, himself, has always wanted to reorganize the department. In effect, he never has been able to pay any personal attention to it, because he is concerned with world affairs. He has an Under Secretary of State, but the Under Secretary of State is also involved necessarily in questions of foreign policy; he has them constantly on his desk, and his attention is constantly devoted to them. His time is engrossed in global thinking; he has no time for the details of administration. So there has been no adequate administration of the State Department.

The purpose of the pending bill is to provide for the appointment of a man with sufficient standing in the department, and with a title which will make him superior to the Assistant Secretaries and all employees of the Department, so that he can tell them where to get off. It is contemplated that he shall devote his entire attention to the organization of the Department—something which has been almost completely neglected because, in the State Department, the men at the top, the Secretary and the Under Secretary, have necessarily above everything else been obliged to devote their attention to questions involving global policy, which are of greater importance than the administrative details of the Department. Until we get a man with the title of Under Secretary for Administration, with authority over everybody else in the Department except the Secretary and the Under Secretary, I do not think we shall obtain the necessary reorganization. That is our reason for wanting a man who will bear the title provided by the bill.

After all, Mr. Jessup was practically appointed as an Under Secretary of State. He was called an Ambassador at Large, but his office was here in Washington. Mr. Acheson appointed him because he wanted an assistant, and he was paid $25,000 a year. He was made an Ambassador at Large, because they thought they could not pay him enough as an Assistant Secretary of State.

It seems to me perfectly obvious that there is sound reason for having an Under Secretary of State at a high level, with full power to reorganize the Department, which everybody in the country admits ought to be reorganized, and to reduce its personnel, not only in Washington but throughout the entire world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me read to my distinguished colleague from Ohio portions of the bills that is before us. This measure provides for the creation in the Department of State of a second Under Secretary of State, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per year, and "shall perform such duties and exercise such administrative powers as the Secretary of State may prescribe." Mr. President, I repeat there is already such a position in the Department. The man who fills the position serves as Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. He is already there, and that Deputy Under Secretary for Administration is, in fact, clothed with the same powers which are sought to be attached to the office that this bill seeks to create. It is my opinion, too, Mr. President, that while the actual reorganization of the Department of State may require a great deal of time, it is certainly no great task to see that the Department is overstaffed in many fields—particularly abroad, due primarily to the fact that much useless work is heaped on our workers abroad by Washington. I will be more specific later on. I believe, too, that whoever holds the position of Deputy Under Secretary for Administration—a position which presently exists—is not only authorized but able to accomplish

a complete reorganization of the Department. Certainly the facts are there to see for whoever wishes to look for them. During my recent trip through South America, Mr. President, I became acquainted with much unnecessary work that had to be done through orders from Washington.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. As many Members of the Senate know, I have not always seen eye to eye with Mr. Dulles, but he is now Secretary of State, which is certainly one of the most important positions in the entire administration and I wish to support him whenever I think he is in the right. My feeling is that he should be given the tools for which he asks, and which he thinks are necessary in order to do the kind of job which we all want him to do. I protested very strongly the placing of road blocks in the way of the previous Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, in the performance of his duties, and I do not believe that at this time the Senate of the United States should place any road block in the way of the new Secretary of State, when he feels that a certain position is necessary to the performance of his duties. Therefore I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to say that Mr. Humelsine's present title is Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. If there ever was a time when we needed a man within the State Department in a position above the assistant secretaries and all employees so that he may be able to carry out plans for a proper reorganization of the Department, it is now. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I feel that, if we desire to obtain results, there should be placed in the Department a new officer, with responsibility only to the Secretary of State, to do the work we have in mind. In that way we can anticipate that he will save the Government many, many thousands of dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I was about to indicate awhile ago, on a recent trip to South America I found that every embassy had an administrative officer along with many others. I was told everywhere that there was no position in the embassy that could be dispensed with; they were all necessary, they were all important. For example, in Venezuela the economic and commercial section had within it 20 employees, the political section numbered 7. Those employees stated that they spent half of their time preparing reports to be sent to Washington. I believe that if the unnecessary reports were eliminated—if requests from Washington for information were kept within reason, many of those jobs could be eliminated.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The very remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana convince me more than ever that the proposed new Under Secretary is needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator be so good as to tell me just what the new Under Secretary is going to do that could not be done by the present Deputy Under Secretary?

Mr. THYE. I am trying to, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be pleased to let the distinguished Senator from Minnesota advise me. Let me repeat my question. Will the Senator tell me what the new Under Secretary is going to do that could not be done by Mr. Humelsine, who has been in charge of that work for the past 4 or 5 years?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit, I would say that, if he has been in charge of that work during the length of time mentioned and the situation exists in South America which the Senator has just described, it should be apparent to all that he has not accomplished what he was supposed to accomplish.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I suggest to my good friend let someone else be named by Mr. Dulles who will do the job.

Mr. THYE. If he will permit, Mr. President, I would say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that what is needed is to permit Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State, to proceed with the consideration of world problems that are so pressing and in such a chaotic condition, and to that end to furnish him with an administrative officer who can undertake to unload the embassies in South America which have excessive personnel. That is going to be a man-sized job in itself, I want to give Mr. Dulles the personnel and the assistants who will be able to reduce the huge number of excessive employees—a subject to which the Senator from Louisiana has so ably referred and which he has described as existing in the countries of South America.

Mr. President, let us give the Secretary of State an administrative assistant who can undertake a study to determine whether there is excessive personnel in our embassies, and, if there is, can proceed to get rid of them. That can be accomplished only by providing for the Secretary of State the necessary personnel who can do the job, because the Secretary will be very busy in the chaotic situation which faces the world today.

I think my friend from Louisiana answered his own question when he referred to the excessive personnel in the embassies of South America.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have never denied that the State Department was overloaded. As a matter of fact, I have gone to considerable effort and personal expense to show many times in the past just what the Senator said. The point I am making is that we do not have to employ additional persons in order to discharge excess employees. Those employees were placed in their jobs by someone. There is full authority now in the State Department to have superfluous employees discharged. We can change the rules and regulations with respect to the reports which are required of our embassies throughout the world, and save probably 20 percent of the manpower abroad. Many of these reports come to Washington, and I doubt if any of them are ever read. They are pigeonholed, and when a special report is asked for, in order to bring out certain facts, what happens? Does anyone go over the reports previously furnished? No, Mr. President. Some clerk in the Secretary of State's office or someone in the Department of Commerce or in the Department of Agriculture sends a telegram to Venezuela, for instance, and, I suppose, signs the name of the Secretary to it, and says, "We want a special report on such and such a problem." The reports which have been previously filed with the various departments, such as the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, might easily answer the question, but, in order to save themselves work, these people write or cable the field for new reports when they themselves, working with existing data, could accomplish what is desired at a great reduction in cost. That is where some of the trouble lies.

We do not need to have an expert to spend 2 years to find that out. It could be done next week.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is too good a businessman to say that we can get rid of surplus personnel next week, with a snap of the fingers, because the Senator knows he would not eliminate the personnel of his committee staff or of his office in that way.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not? The Senator is mistaken. I try to keep abreast of their work from day to day.

Mr. THYE. Secretary Dulles must not be asked to act in that manner as Secretary of State. He must proceed with the consideration of world problems. I think the Senator and I want him to be free to devote his attention to a study of world affairs, and see if he can bring order out of the present chaos, and bring the permanent peace for which all are hoping and praying.

There is no man in the Senate for whom I have a greater admiration than the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, because I have been fortunate enough to serve on two committees with him since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind words.

Mr. THYE. The Senator and I want to reduce the over-all cost of government, do we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I want to help the Senator to do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to help the Republican Party to do it. The Senator and I differ in this respect, that I do not want to create new jobs to get rid of old jobs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when we reduce the number of old jobs I want it to be done in a systematic manner. I do not want to use a meat-axe and discharge good personnel while I am trying to root out unnecessary personnel. I would say to the Secretary of State, "Mr. Secretary, proceed with the world's problems which must be settled if peace is to

come to the world, and we will give you an expert in the field of administration, who will undertake in an orderly, systematic, scientific way to reduce the personnel in the Department of State, and in our embassies throughout the world, so that there can be a reduction in the over-all expenditures of government which are far beyond what the taxpayers should have to pay for today."

I would say to the Secretary of State, "We will give you a man qualified in the administrative field, who will be able scientifically to reduce the personnel of the Department, without discharging good, valuable employees who are legitimately engaged in carrying out the affairs of the State Department and of the Government."

I think the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana would not even go into his own sugarcane field or potato field in his operations in Louisiana and indiscriminately fire men and women without first looking at their record of achievement and saying, "I have had wonderful service from that man or that family, and I shall retain them, but this man has never rendered good service, and, therefore, I shall discharge him."

In that manner, Mr. President, we must go about a thorough study of the personnel of the State Department and reduce the number without injuring, destroying, and losing competent help by discharging persons who should not be discharged.

The Senator from Louisiana says men are already available in the Department who can dispose of surplus employees. The bill provides for giving the Secretary of State an assistant who can do the housekeeping work of the Department, and enable Mr. Dulles to devote himself to world affairs which must be settled, or we can not economize by saving a single dollar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am rather glad that the Senator from Louisiana is making an issue of this matter, because it is a departure from what we have experienced during the past 20 years. I think of the assistants I have helped, in one body or the other, to provide for various Government agencies. Some of them had a great passion for anonymity, and some of them had no passion for anonymity; but whenever the request was made, I rather blithely helped to approve it, with the feeling that the request indicated that they were a necessary nuisance.

The Secretary of State is asking for one person——

Mr. ELLENDER. That is just a beginning. I understand that an effort will be made to provide for two or three Under Secretaries of Agriculture. That proposal is in the offing now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I disagree with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] as to the technique to be employed. Having labored for many years on the Committee on Appropriations, I have become confirmed in the conviction that the way to accomplish our objective is to use a meat-ax. The Government has become so big that it is a citadel of bureaucracy, and we must bring about an excision of personnel whom we do not need. It is a surgical operation, and there has to be an excision, I think, of persons who are not necessary. I hope the process will not take too long, but I do not believe that any Senator on the other side of the aisle should begrudge us a single individual who is to be appointed to perform a very special surgical operation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not begrudge the Senator or the new administration anything. I am trying to help the Republicans carry out their platform pledge with reference to economy. That is one of the main planks upon which General Eisenhower rode to victory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend has a whole sheet with reference to unnecessary reports. He wants to dispense with some of the employees. We need a great dispenser to do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just pointed out, we have, first, the Secretary of State, then the Under Secretary of State, then the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. It should not take too long to determine that many reports which must deluge the various agencies every day are unnecessary and should be curtailed. The moment the reports are curtailed we can eliminate some of the personnel who prepare these reports.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will bet my friend the best hat he can buy in New Orleans that it will not take very long to get this job done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope not. I am for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just give us one man.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have just indicated, in Venezuela, the political section has seven employees. In every embassy I visited I was told that a substantial number of employees could be eliminated if only it were not necessary to prepare a great number of reports now called for by the various agencies here in Washington.

There is another consideration. In each embassy there are Army attachés, Navy attachés, and Air attachés. I do not know what the Secretary of State could do with reference to that situation, but to have air attachés, naval attachés, and military attachés in almost every country of South America seems to me to be utterly useless. To my way of thinking considerable money is being wasted in this field alone.

In one country in South America I found the Army had seven persons assigned just to maintain liaison with military developments. It was necessary to have four automobiles, paid for out of the Federal Treasury. In most of the South American embassies there was one person employed to disburse funds and maintain records for the Army and Air Force attachés, but the naval attaché had to have his own personnel man for this purpose. And this in spite of the fact that we have unification of the armed services. It is certainly not necessary to have an expert naval attaché in a country that has no navy. Let us do away with such positions now. It is not necessary to have an Under Secretary to determine whether such a person is needed. In my humble opinion, naval attachés in one country could do the work of naval intelligence in adjacent countries. Or, as an alternative, why could not one attaché, either Army, Air Force, or Navy, do the work in each country for all three services? I found in two South American countries that an Army attaché is satisfactorily handling the reporting needs of all services. Why cannot this be done in the other countries? Why have all these officers on the payroll—and have each supplied with automobiles and clerical help—one of their functions being to go to parties, where they say they obtain most of their information. That situation is one that I believe can be corrected without the necessity of employing an expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree thoroughly with the Senator. The attachés look very nice in their uniforms. But I found attachés in 15 or 16 countries of South America, and I think a good many of them could be dispensed with. I wish the Senator would go along with us so that we could have a chief dispenser who would do the job.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, take issue with me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no; not on the question of the job to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but does not the Secretary of State now have power to select someone to do this work? I should like to see the law, if there be any, which provides that he does not have such power. He now has the power to direct all who are under him, particularly the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration he now has, to perform duties within the functions that position carries.

It occurs to me that if Mr. Humelsine has rendered poor service in the past—and I certainly do not intimate that such is the case—someone else could be found who would do better, and could do it with the staff the position now possesses and with the money that is now available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the Senator, because it seems to me we ought to take over Mr. Humelsine's job, when the proper time comes, and substitute a chief dispenser, so that we will be sure that, from a fresh viewpoint and with fresh personnel, the work will be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. In Venezuela, the office of military attaché employs 4 persons; the naval attaché, 5; and the air attaché, 6, making a total of 15 who represent the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Venezuela. I dare say that a naval attaahé could do the work of the other attachés, and that probably with a third the number of persons now employed what is necessary could be done.

Let us now consider Brazil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before getting to Brazil, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for one observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment.

The economic section in Brazil employs 33 persons. These people spend their time in preparing and sending reports to the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the

Department of State, and other agencies. I do not suppose that many of the reports ever see the light of day. Notwithstanding the fact that such reports are made weekly or monthly, whenever a special report is called for by any of the departments, instead of the department concerned going through the reports which have been received and then compiling additional reports from those already in their files, requests are sent out into the field to prepare additional reports. That means a duplication of work—a duplication which would be unnecessary should departments utilize the reports already in their hands. It is not necessary to employ an expert to understand that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know what the tenure of Mr. Humelsine is in the State Department at the present time, but certainly it is a fair assumption that over a period of 20 years devotees of the Fair Deal, disciples of the New Deal, and an occasional Democrat have got into the Department of State. We want to smuggle in one Republican, in order to see if we can do the job that needs to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. My guess is that there are more Republicans in the State Department than there are Democrats.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt that very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think the civil service discriminates in its appointments, as the Senator may agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. However, the new, fresh viewpoint has to be expressed in the Department of State. That is the reason for proposing the creation of the new position.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the new administration is making a change-over from the top on down to the lower echelons; that is, I understand it is proposed that various officials—high and low, so to speak, will be replaced. Of course, the Secretary of State has been replaced, and I presume that the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Policy, and the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration will be changed, too. It is in that field that the new administration will need the "new thought" about which the Senator has spoken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will take quite a while to get through the political trenches that have been established during the period of 20 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad that it is proposed to change the tenure of the proposed new Under Secretary to 2 years, instead of 4 years, in the effort to dig down and locate those trenches.

It is not my intention further to burden the RECORD with statistics of the number of employees in our embassies in various countries throughout South America. It is my purpose in due time to make a report to the Committee on Appropriations of my findings on my recent trip through that area, but before yielding the floor, I should like to refer to the little country of Uruguay. One can almost jump across it. In our Embassy in Uruguay 10 persons are employed in the economic section, and 9 in the political section. There are 11 attachés, of whom 3 are in the Army, 3 in the Navy, and 5 in the Air Force. Many of them could be dispensed with. It should not require an expert to come to that conclusion.

In Argentina the economic section has 21 employees, the political section 9, and military attachés 28, the Navy having 7, the Air Force 14, and the Army 7.

As I have said previously, I do not wish to do anything that would hamper the Republicans in attaining the goal of economy, about which they have been preaching so long. My desire is to help them. But we have here an instance in which the party in power could save not only $25,000 by abolishing the position formerly held by Mr. Jessup—the position of Ambassador at Large—but also the $17,500 position which it is proposed to create could be eliminated and that amount saved, too.

Aside from the $17,500 position, I presume there will be a large number of staff officers and clerical assistants required to help the new Under Secretary, and I presume that the operation of such an office will entail a large expenditure of money.

I believe it comes with singular bad grace for the Republican Party to come before the Senate preaching economy but creating more jobs, in order to do away with a few jobs. It does not add up, Mr. President.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee hold any hearing at all on the question of determining whether the Department could accomplish what is here sought without the creation of a new position?

Mr. WILEY. We did not hold any further hearings than those which have already been spoken of on the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee did not have any hearing at all, did it?

Mr. WILEY. That depends on what the Senator calls a hearing. We heard read the letter from the Department, and we discussed it fully. We had the judgment of men like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who said today that he certainly felt the Department of State needed an overhauling, or words to that effect. That is the sum and substance of what took place.

Mr. ELLENDER. But all the committee had before it was the request of Mr. Dulles, asking that the position be created, and then the opinions and the votes of Senators who voted to report the bill.

Mr. WILEY. That is the sum and substance of the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment on page 1, line 6, to strike out "1956" and insert "1954."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee I wish to thank Senators who have participated in this debate and have covered most of the ground which I intended to cover. I thank them for taking that load off my shoulders.

On the other hand, I must say a few words in reply to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I believe that if there ever was a case which was made by an opponent, it is this case. I think he has clearly demonstrated that there is need for a job to be done. The Senator from Louisiana has clearly demonstrated that the job has not been done in the past 20 years by those in power. Moreover, when we take the statement of the distinguished statesman from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who made such an eloquent presentation of the need for this particular job, very little more need be said on the subject.

Mr. President, members of the Senate will recall that when I reported Senate bill 243 for the Committee on Foreign Relations last Thursday, I announced that I would ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The bill is an amendment to Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session, and provides for the creation of a new Under Secretary of State for Administration. The committee voted unanimously to report the measure for favorable action by the Senate.

As has been said by other Senators, a request has been made for a new Under Secretary of State. For what purpose? In order that efficiency may be brought about in the Department of State, in order that expense may be saved, in order that excess material, human and otherwise, may be disposed of so that the Government will benefit.

I need not remind my colleagues of the criticism to which the Department of State has been recently subjected. But I take the judgment of a distinguished Democrat, whose statement was made on the floor today, to the effect that there is an imperative need for this job to be done. When we realize that it has not been done, there seems to be but one answer, and that is to do what the Secretary asks should be done.

In part, the criticism of the State Department has questioned the need for the expansion of the Department in terms of personnel and has also been directed in part against the multiplying activities of the Department. The Hoover Commission made recommendations for a reorganization of the Department and most of these were voted by the Congress. Nevertheless the problems of the Department were not solved, and administrative matters still continue to require attention.

It is not my purpose here to assess the degree to which these criticisms may be justified. I would, however, like to point out that over the past few years the Secretary of State has found it necessary to spend roughly one-half of his time away from Washington at international conferences and that as a result, the Under Secretary of State has been functioning in the capacity of an Acting Secretary of State. The many pressures upon both officers have made it necessary at times for them to give less than full attention to administrative matters because of more critical

and urgent business before them. The administrative problems have multiplied until they have assumed substantial proportions and now require careful attention.

It is the aim of S. 243, which I introduced at the request of Secretary Dulles, to create a temporary office of Under Secretary of State for Administration on a top level. It is the hope of the committee that it will be possible to attract a top-flight executive to this post and that he will make a thorough review of the operations and administration of the State Department and the Foreign Service of the United States. It is also the hope of the committee that the new Under Secretary will initiate changes that will improve the administration of the Department, and promote its efficiency, and that the changes he initiates will result in a simplification of operations and the streamlining of both the organization and the procedures of the Department and the Foreign Service.

The responsibility of this new officer will cover the whole scope of the operation of the Department.

Let us look at the chart of organization, which shows that under the Secretary of State there are the following: Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs; Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs; Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations; Special Assistant on Intelligence Research; Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; certain legal advisers; then the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. The Deputy Under Secretary for Administration is the gentleman who was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. His functions are limited. They embrace the Office of Controls, the Office of Foreign Service, the Office of Budget and Planning, and the Office of Departmental Administration. On the other hand, when we consider the other assistant secretaries, we find that their functions are at least four or five times as great as would be the functions of the proposed new Under Secretary.

Mr. President, the issue is very plain. Secretary Dulles, a man of great experience not only in legal and business affairs, but in the service of this great Nation throughout the years, in this very Department, now says to the Congress, "I wish to do a job of streamlining. I wish to save overhead. I wish to get rid of useless material, so I ask you to give me an opportunity to appoint a man who can do the job. I cannot do it myself because my function is to deal with policy matters. There is one job that I should like to do away with, a $25,000 job, which might be continued for years. I wish to do away with it entirely. Give me an opportunity to appoint a man to a $17,500 job, a man who has not been so close to the trees that he cannot see the forest, or so close to the forest that he cannot see the trees. Give me an opportunity to appoint a man who has had experience in reorganization matters."

When Mr. Dulles makes the request on such a basis, I say that there is ample justification for his request.

As I have said, it is the hope of the committee that it will be possible to appoint a top-flight man to this post. The responsibility of this new officer will cover the whole scope of the operations of the department. Some of the specific major problems with which he will be concerned may be mentioned by way of illustration. It is expected that he will develop sound and efficient personnel policies, and that he will assume responsibility for the loyalty review procedures of the department in order to restore public confidence in the department.

There is much that some of us could tell on that subject, but for the present, at least, our lips are sealed. However, one of the needs is to have a man from outside assume responsibility for the loyalty review procedures of the department in order to restore public confidence in the department.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator wish to expand his statement as to why his lips are sealed?

Mr. WILEY. Not at this time. I have seen the Senator from Oregon in the same situation several times.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know when.

Mr. WILEY. I saw the Senator last night on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator did not see me with my lips sealed.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, yes; they were closed.

This new officer will review the budget to see that it is adequate but not excessive in order to achieve the objectives of the new administration; and that he will make a careful study of the administration of specific operating programs such as the consular service, and the Technical Cooperation Administration.

The Department of State has informed the committee that these objectives can be attained in a period of 18 months or 2 years. In this connection may I call attention to two amendments which the committee recommends in the bill. The first of these aims at removing any possible doubt on the score that the new office is temporary. This is accomplished by adding the following words before "There" on page 1, line 6, "Until December 31, 1956, unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President."

The amendment adopted today changes the period from 4 years to 2 years.

The second amendment recommends striking out the word "administrative" on page 2, line 1. It is the opinion of the committee that the duties of the new Under Secretary on occasion may require him to perform nonadministrative functions. The retention of the word "administrative" in line 1 might operate to prevent the new Under Secretary from rendering the greatest possible service. The committee believes it wise to remove any such obstacle at the outset.

In closing I may say that the bill is in full accord with the Hoover Commission's recommendations and is consistent with sound managerial practices.

Mr. President, when I stood on the floor of the Senate the other day I called attention to what big business does in similar situations. I believe the analogy is an appropriate one and a good one. When a big business corporation or a big institution finds that things are not going as they should, or when profits are not what they should be, or perhaps when the budget will not take care of overhead, or when in general things are not going too well, what does such a corporation or institution do? Does it pick a man from its own office? Does it pick a man from the business which has been manufacturing the same or similar article? No. It picks a man from the outside. It picks a man who has no blinders on his eyes and thus is able to see the true facts.

That is what is needed in this situation. In business such a man is called an efficiency expert, and he is employed to bring the business out of the red and into the black. That is what the Republican Party is trying to do in this instance. It is trying to take government out of the red and put it into the black. It is an attempt to eliminate useless jobs in government and to dismiss excess personnel in government. In other words it is an endeavor to put efficiency into the Government. That is the job which is intended to be done.

Both the President and Secretary of State have recommended the creation of this office and the committee believes their efforts to strengthen the Department should be supported. American foreign relations are steadily increasing in complexity. Their administration and operation present a constant challenge to the best minds in this country. It is the opinion of the Foreign Relations Committee that as far as it is possible for the Congress to do so, it should help the President and the new Secretary of State to secure cooperation of those minds in bringing about greater efficiency in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe there should be no question as to what the Senate should do, and I ask for prompt action on the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to add to the discussion of the pending bill what was to me a very interesting personal experience. I was asked approximately a year ago to address a kind of a study club on State Department propaganda. I went over to the State Department building on Virginia Avenue and walked into a room which was considerably larger than half the size of the Senate Chamber. The room was full of men and women, all of them intelligent looking, and all very keen and very eager.

I inquired of the official in charge of the meeting as to who these people were. He said, "These are the people who are concerned with the various branches of administration—the CIA, the Army intelligence, naval intelligence, and various branches of the State Department concerned with the presentation of our point of view to the rest of the world.

"Here," he said, "is a diagram which shows the organization."

I looked at the diagram and saw a great number of interdepartmental committees, interbureau committees, and interbureau-interbureau committees, with crisscross lines going all over the big chart.

I was sitting beside Mr. Wilson Compton, who I suppose had the primary responsibility for that sort of thing. I hunted all over that chart in an effort to find where he appeared on it, but I could not see his name on the chart. I said to him, "Mr. Compton, where are you on this chart?"

"Oh," he said, "I am outside of that. I am not on this chart. I am over here, and my organization is not represented."

I left the meeting with a strong conviction that our program of presenting our case and helping our case psychologically before the world was in status quo, which, as Senators know, the colored man thought meant "the mess we are in."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, to strike out the word "administrative."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

John C. Allen, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Postmaster General; and

Charles R. Hook, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

J. Earl Coke, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and

True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of Mutual Security.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I discuss the nomination, I wish to make a brief personal comment on another matter. Last night my telephone at home rang for several hours because some of our radio commentators had spread across the airways of the country some remarkable announcements concerning a physical ailment which I suffered yesterday. In fact, one of my friends of the working press on one of the Oregon newspapers telephoned to me and said, "Wayne, the boys have already ordered the liquid refreshments for your political wake." The news seemed to be that I had suffered a very serious heart attack. Of course, all Members of the Senate are well aware of the effects of false rumors on political fences. So I am sure they will permit me to answer the rumor today—I have a very good heart physically—although, in the opinion of some, not sentimentally or politically. All that happened yesterday was that I spoke on the floor of the Senate following a scraping of my jawbone, at the Bethesda Hospital yesterday morning, for a slight infection. The doctor had supplied me with some rather heavy loads of codeine pills, which I took here on the floor of the Senate during the speech in order to relieve the pain. Apparently I thought I was a better doctor than the doctor himself, because I did not quite follow literally his instructions, but took more codeine than I should have. So about an hour and one-half later, after I finished my speech—Fulton Lewis to the contrary notwithstanding—I had what is known as a codeine blackout, out in the lounge. I did not collapse in walking from the floor of the Senate following my speech. I fainted about an hour and a half later while in the Senate lounge after the codeine pills started to take effect.

I wish to say to my friends that I appreciate very much the courtesies they extended to me. I wish also to thank the Vice President for the courtesy he extended to me out in the lounge.

To my political opposition I wish to say, "Boys, you are going to have to wait for the wake, because the time has not arrived."

Now, Mr. President, I proceed to discuss the Stassen nomination. The other day I asked to have it go over, as will be my common practice in asking that all nominations go over until we have had an opportunity to look at the record of the hearings conducted on each nominee.

That is not a new position for me to take. If anyone will check my record over the past 8 years, I believe it will be found that no other Member of the Senate has objected to more unanimous-consent requests for immediate action on matters before the Senate than I have. I simply hold to the view that it is a very good parliamentary practice to take at least enough time so that we can stop, look, and listen to proposals for immediate action in the Senate. That has been my attitude, and will continue to be my attitude so far as unanimous-consent requests are concerned, always reserving the right, when there are special circumstances which I believe justify immediate action, to waive the objection, as I did the other day in the case of the Lodge nomination. As I said then, every Member of the Senate was fully aware of Senator Lodge's record in connection with the United Nations. We had worked with him as his colleagues in the Senate. Furthermore, of course, there is the old, traditional courtesy of the Senate, namely, that in the absence of good cause for objection, as a matter of courtesy we let the nomination of an ex-Senator go through. However, as I said the other day, I would even object in such a case if I thought there was really a need to look into the record of the nominee. On the other hand, I felt no such need in the case of the nomination of Senator Lodge.

I did believe there was such a need in the case of the nomination of Mr. Stassen—and for reasons which I now shall enunciate.

A few days ago I made on the floor of the Senate a speech in which I recapitulated the criteria which in my judgment the Senate historically has always applied in passing on the nominations of Cabinet members. I presented that study for the first time on May 7, 1945, and summarized it again the other day. I mention it now by saying that the criteria applied by the Senate in passing upon Cabinet nominations have always been, I believe:

First, the criterion of character and mental soundness.

Second, the criterion of loyalty to our form of government.

Third, the criterion of a lack of self-interest, direct or indirect, in the job, which would accrue out of selfish motivations to the nominee, should his nomination be confirmed. It was this criterion which served as the basis for my objection yesterday to the nomination of Mr. Wilson. I voted against that nomination because I think he still has both a direct and indirect interest in General Motors.

Last of all, the criterion of competency to carry out the policies of the President. I made the point that, after all, the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, as it relates to Senate action on Cabinet nominations, happens to be words of limitation in relationship to the appointing power in the same section of the Constitution. In other words, the Constitution gives the President the power to appoint, and gives the Senate of the United States the duty to give the President its advice and consent. However, as I have said, in my judgment, at least, that does not place upon the Senate the right to take the position that it should not confirm a nomination unless the nominee is the person whom the individual Senators would appoint if they had the power to appoint. I take that position for the reason that if we ever accepted such a principle as a criterion in regard to nominations, it seems to me that it would be rather difficult for any President to make Cabinet selections which would not result in at least a great division of opinion in the Senate

on the question of whether those particular persons should be appointed.

In the case of Mr. Stassen, after having examined the testimony taken at the hearing, I am satisfied that there would be no ground for objecting to his nomination on the basis of any of the criteria I have mentioned. So I do not intend to object to his nomination or to vote against it.

Certainly, if I were in the position of the appointing authority, I would not appoint Mr. Stassen for this position. However, my personal lack of confidence in his ability should in no way cause me to vote against his nomination if the President has confidence in his ability. It seems to me that I have no right to vote against the nomination because of the fact that I believe Mr. Stassen engages in a great deal of fuzzy and confused thinking on subjects of great public import.

The other day I raised a question concerning Mr. Stassen's attitude in respect to the use of Mutual Security aid as a means or device for interfering with or influencing the internal operations of Allied Governments. I said I should like to take time to look at the record.

That was on Friday. The record of the committee hearings had not even been sent to the Government Printing Office on Friday at the time the nomination was before the Senate. When the session was over—in fact, at 4:15, to be exact—I called the Foreign Relations Committee and officially requested that a copy of the transcript be sent to my office. Within an hour the official copy of the committee transcript, which I hold in my hand, was sent—confidential then; no longer confidential—and I studied that transcript over the week end.

In regard to the discussion as to Mr. Stassen's philosophy in respect to the policies which should govern mutual-security aid, in which I have heard many participate, I note that, beginning at page 39, volume 1, of the stenographic report of proceedings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 21, on the nomination of Mr. Stassen, the following colloquy took place between Mr. Stassen and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]:

Senator HUMPHREY. I have just one or two questions.

In reference to the activity of mutual security, Governor Stassen—let me put it this way: Do you believe the Government of the United States ought to take a direct hand or by indirect action interfere with the composition of and the policy of other independent governments with whom we may be associated, with which we may be associated?

Mr. STASSEN. No; I think the governing policy on that was also included in President Eisenhower's inaugural address. He specifically went into that.

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, you feel that the composition of a government with which we may be associated is the privilege and prerogative of the individuals within that nation or state?

Mr. STASSEN. It was the fourth point in the President's inaugural message, and I think I can never state it any better, and that it is best to refer directly to it. He stated this:

"Honoring the identity and the special heritage of each nation of the world, we shall never use our strength to try to impress upon another people our own cherished political and economic institutions."

Senator HUMPHREY. And you subscribe to that fully?

Mr. STASSEN. Fully.

Senator HUMPHREY. I heard that, and I felt it was very encouraging, a very appropriate statement.

The reason I ask this question is that some time ago you were at least reported to have said that you did not believe economic aid ought to be extended to governments of a Socialist composition. Do you still hold those views?

Mr. STASSEN. The exact statement I said, Senator, was that I did not believe that American aid should be used as a means of increasing the nationalization and socialization of industries in other countries because thereby you would defeat the very objective of the aid itself. In other words, you would not strengthen the other country. The British situation was one that was particularly being discussed at that time.

I think that that address of mine was misinterpreted in part by some, which is, of course, not an unusual thing to have taken place, but I take it that my views have been and are now directly in line with President Eisenhower's express policy in his inaugural of yesterday.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is a good point to clear up, Governor, because there has been some comment about it, I am sure, some intentional distortion by some, and others who are genuinely and seriously concerned.

Mr. STASSEN. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. If we accept the thesis of the Eisenhower statement of principle, which I commend, it appears then that it would be rather difficult to extend aid, let us say, to a country such as Norway, which has a Socialist government and, at the same time, be able to follow the Eisenhower principle if we took any line of action which would deny them the use of that aid for their own purposes; is that correct?

Mr. STASSEN. Of course, I assume the Senator does not mean that we would be unconcerned as to what the country was doing.

Take a very specific field: We have a very direct concern, officially stated by an act of Congress, as to East-West import and export.

Senator HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. STASSEN. Now, that is and can be under some circumstances considered to be the internal economic policy of that given nation; but when we are thinking of American policy in the building up of free nations versus a threat, then we must have a direct relationship in what we do to what they are doing themselves so that it is the Eisenhower principle, stated in the inaugural, that I subscribe to and feel is sound.

Senator HUMPHREY. The Eisenhower principle goes to the basic institutions of their government; is that not right?

Mr. STASSEN. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. And the composition of their government?

Mr. STASSEN. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. My point is you, as Administrator of Mutual Security, will follow that principle and in no way use the Mutual Security for, or funds or materials to in any way adulterate that principle; is that correct?

Mr. STASSEN. I would administer the program under that principle stated in the inaugural, and in accordance with the actions of Congress.

The Senator from Minnesota then proceeded to discuss another subject matter.

I believe Mr. Stassen made his point of view understandable, at least, although I think it is interesting in comparison to read the testimony he gave before the committee a few days ago in the light of a published statement by Mr. Stassen in the May 16, 1952, issue of U. S. News & World Report, page 60. Mr. Stassen was being subjected to a series of questions by the editorial board of the U. S. News & World Report, and I wish to read from what was published:

Question. Do you think that foreign aid is popular with the rank and file of people?

Answer. I am not certain as to that. But I think an increasing percentage of them understand its importance.

Question. Do you think that, if we develop a new and more vigorous foreign policy, it should be a bipartisan foreign policy?

Answer. Definitely. The bipartisan principle is sound, provided there is good participation in the formulation of policy and an understanding of its execution. We veered off a bit on foreign policy. The matter of American economic and cultural policies toward the world then become extremely important. Because you are then engaged in a long-term competition or struggle with communism, which may go on a couple of decades. In other words, if you can prevent them from opening up a world war—you keep very strong in the air and keep a lot of resistance behind the iron curtain—then you are looking forward to years of competition across the face of the earth.

And that's where the economic assistance comes in on a very practical basis to other countries. With this should be an insistence that the empire countries liberalize their own economic and sovereignty policies.

Question. That will take continued aid over many years?

Answer. Oh, yes. I think that America, as the leading Nation in the world, from both a production and credit standpoint, must contemplate a continuing relationship on an economic-aid basis. It has to be fitted into a balanced budget at home. When you think of the long-term struggle, you have to bring the domestic budget down into balance. So, it cannot be excessive. I think it should have conditions on it, very businesslike. It should insist that the aid not be used for socialistic schemes, that it does not get into the black markets, that they develop the raw materials that they have which we need in our own future economic expansion.

Question. In terms of military aid?

Answer. Emphasis on civilian aid.

Question. Would you tie political strings to that, such as the strings that I think you suggested should be attached to the British loan in the case of nationalization of steel?

Answer. Yes, I would.

Question. That is, you would say that unless the country agrees not to nationalize its industry we will not give it economic aid?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Wouldn't that throw such a country into the hands of Communists?

Answer. No. You would have somewhat of a struggle at the time, but England would be stronger today if she had not wasted so much American aid in her socialistic schemes of medicine and coal and so forth. Now, if we had insisted that they could not do those things while they were on American aid, you would have had a hot political argument at the time, you would have had a certain amount of turmoil, but you would also have had England now pulling up into a much stronger position.

As I read Mr. Stassen's testimony given before the committee the other day, and then as I read his interview published in the U. S. News & World Report, I form the opinion that his mind is not very clear, and that clarity of expression is not one of his mental fortes. He leaves the impression of being "on again, off again." He does and he does not, as I interpret his language, believe that we should, or we should not, use economic

aid to influence the internal policies of any country, because he said to the U. S. News:

Now if we had insisted that they could not do those things while they were on American aid, you would have had a hot political argument at the time; you would have had a certain amount of turmoil, but you would also have had England now pulling up into a much stronger position.

I think it is true that there would have been plenty of hot political turmoil in England. But, of course, Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that on May 16, 1952, there was sweeping our country a political reactionary movement of such a nature that his statement was good political opportunism. There were political forces in the country much interested in a presidential political campaign at that time which would welcome the kind of political talk Mr. Stassen engaged in when he was interviewed by the editors of U. S. News.

I thfnk I make my point, Mr. President, that there has been appointed to this position of Mutual Security Director a very able politician. If the President wants a very able politician in the position of Mutual Security Administrator, he is certainly welcome to him. He does meet the criteria I have laid down which I think ought to guide me, at least, in passing judgment upon Cabinet appointments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a letter which I have received and which I understand some other Senators have received from Norman Thomas, putting forth some of his views in regard to the problem of Cabinet appointments. I place it in the RECORD only for informational purposes.

I close by saying that I wish Mr. Stassen well, and I am perfectly willing to vote for him on the basis of the last statement he has made on the subject of the use to which mutual security aid should be put in dealing with our allies, namely, that he will follow the principle Eisenhower laid down in his inaugural speech. If he will do that, then I think his record will be characterized by much more clarity than is the record which he has made to date on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTWAR WORLD COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., January 22, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have just been reading the New York Times' account of your comments on the Wilson appointment and related matters. I agree with all the points you made but wish to suggest another which I have already suggested in a telegram to Senator SALTONSTALL. It is this:

Practically everywhere I went on two trips to Asia, I was told, more or less politely, that all or most of the American interest in the Korean war was because of the profit in it for American capitalists. This I earnestly, and I hope usefully, denied. It isn't an opinion born wholly of Communist propaganda but increased by Communist propaganda. Now, to confirm the Wilson nomination or even to adopt some law or rule which would make it possible for him to evade the spirit of it, would be a free present of invaluable ammunition to our critics, especially our Communist critics in Asia, and probably to some extent in Europe.

This is not the only consideration which the Senate should take into account but it is a consideration which I submit for your attention. I shall probably send a copy of this letter to two or three other Senators, including JIM DUFF whom I used to know in college.

I am not writing this letter because I happen to be a Socialist. I am willing to concede that the American people gave President Eisenhower a mandate to run a business administration, a big business administration, even a General Motors administration. The electorate did not give him a mandate to upset conspicuously the legitimate, well established principle written in law which forbids a high or low official to be financially interested in companies with which the Government does a specific business.

Eisenhower, Wilson, and the Republicans ought to reflect how unnecessarily handicapped Mr. Wilson and the administration would be if any exceptions were made for him. This on the assumption that they want to do the right thing. In a difficult decision, their critics would make capital of the fact that for Mr. Wilson more than mink coats was involved.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to make a few brief remarks concerning the confirmation of the nomination of my friend, Harold E. Stassen, to be Mutual Security Administrator. In age, I am many years senior to Harold Stassen, and it has been my good fortune to observe and appraise him from the time he was a very young man.

As a young man, just out of college, he was elected county attorney in one of the important and large counties of the State of Minnesota. I observed him in the office of county attorney. His administrative ability was not only a compliment to the legal profession but it was such that he was elected president of our Minnesota County Attorneys' Association. He was reelected county attorney with a very substantial majority, and he was also reelected, if my memory serves me correctly, to serve a second time as president of the Minnesota County Attorneys' Association.

As a Republican I had seen the Republican Party go down in defeat in election after election, and I joined with a group of other men in 1937 in sponsoring Harold Stassen, then a very young man, for the governorship of Minnesota. He was nominated and elected, the youngest State executive in the Nation. He served Minnesota as Governor with distinction, and achieved a most commendable record. If we examine the record of the State during the period of his administration it will be found that as an executive he not only brought excellent business administration to the Governor's office, but he introduced and supported legislation which brought about a reorganization of the administrative functions of the government of Minnesota.

He reduced the over-all cost of government. He reduced the number of State employees and prosecuted those who had misused their public trust in various State agencies under the previous administration.

Mr. President, Governor Stassen was reelected overwhelmingly when he came up for reelection for a second term. He was reelected for a third term as governor. At the time he was up for reelection for his third term, he informed the people of Minnesota: "I hold a reserve commission in the Navy. I feel that I have a responsibility in Minnesota to complete the reorganization of the State government which I advocated and for which I have worked during the period I have served as Governor. I should like to continue as Governor until we have enacted legislation which makes possible the completion of reorganization which I and the legislative members who have worked with me have advocated."

He was reelected for a third term, knowing full well that he was going to resign to take up military duty the moment the legislative session had come to a conclusion at the end of the 90-day legislative period. He said, "I feel that it is my responsibility to serve in the Armed Forces with the rest of the young men of this Nation, and that is where I want to be as soon as I have completed my task."

True to the positive statement which Governor Stassen made to the people of Minnesota, the second day following the close of that legislative session Harold Stassen resigned, which was on April 27, 1943. He resigned at 11 o'clock in the morning, and that afternoon, at 4:30 o'clock a delegation, including myself, was at the Union Station in St. Paul bidding good-by to this young man, then in naval uniform and on his way to the naval service. He asked only one thing of this Nation, namely, to give him an assignment on active duty. He did not ask for an assignment in the security of some military office. After several months of intensive training he was sent to Admiral Halsey's staff aboard the flagship in the South Pacific.

Later I had the good fortune to ride with Admiral Halsey. I was then Governor of Minnesota, and Admiral Halsey was in our State on what was termed "Halsey Day." On that occasion, while riding through the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Admiral Halsey told me that he had observed Harold Stassen to be a man of great ability and unquestioned courage, one who had a sense of loyalty to his country. For Mr. Stassen, Admiral Halsey had only the highest admiration.

I cannot repeat verbatim what Admiral Halsey said, but it was something to this effect: "There is nothing that this Nation has to offer that young man for which he is not qualified."

Harold Stassen served well in the naval forces. It is not necessary to take my word for that statement. The naval records themselves bespeak that fact. He served in a most admirable and commendable manner.

As the Senator from Oregon stated, Mr. Stassen has been engaged in the political activities of this Nation, and that is to his credit. Our two-party political system in this country survives, and has survived, because men have made it their business to be engaged in political contests.

I hope and pray that our political parties will always be strong enough so that each will stand as a check and balance against the other. Only in that

manner can we expect to have a survival of this Republic that we hold so dear.

Mr. President, I believe that Harold Stassen will give a good account of himself, and will administer the Mutual Security Administration effectively and efficiently. I believe that not only will he carry out the wishes of the President but he will also carry out the will and wishes of Congress, and will advise with Congress.

Mr. Stassen may differ with some of us at times. That is an indication of his strength of mind. That is a credit to him. He will make known his views. I have observed him in legislative committee work. I presided over the Senate of the Minnesota Legislature when he was Governor. Occasionally he differed with us, but his differences were never argumentative; they were educational. We benefited from the differences that our young Governor oftentimes had with us on legislative policies and questions. He may differ with Congress at times, but we will respect him even though he differ with us. One qualification I have noted in Harold Stassen is that the man has the courage of his convictions and the courage with which to speak his convictions.

I am confident that President Eisenhower will find in Harold Stassen an able administrator, an able executive, a man without question insofar as his loyalty to this country is concerned, one whose courage never will be questioned.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me, representing the State of Minnesota, to know that there is before the Senate for confirmation the nomination of our former Governor. I believe this Nation will receive from Harold Stassen as Mutual Security Administrator, a record of service that will be a credit to his native Minnesota and a credit to all who have enthusiastically supported him in his public service in the past.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Harold E. Stassen is now a Pennsylvanian. About 4 years ago officials of the University of Pennsylvania, the largest institution of learning in the Commonwealth, desired someone to direct its affairs. They made a very careful search throughout the United States, and the committee making the search unanimously recommended Harold E. Stassen for the position.

The University of Pennsylvania is more than 200 years old. It is one of the outstanding institutions of America. Not only has it a college course, but also it has professional schools representing practically every field of endeavor in our country.

Harold E. Stassen has made good as president of the University of Pennsylvania. He has extended its curriculum. He has added to its endowment fund. He has pursued a building program which has been sound and has redounded to the benefit of the university.

I do not desire to take more of the time of the Senate; I wish only to say that Pennsylvania is very proud to support Harold Stassen in this most important appointment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which reported the nomination of Mr. Stassen unanimously, I personally was very happy to make the report. I have known Harold Stassen since 1938. He is a citizen of Minnesota, a neighbor of Wisconsin. Really, the Twin Cities of Minnesota are only about 100 miles from my home town of Chippewa Falls, Wis. I concur in all the fine sentiments that have been expressed today about Mr. Stassen. He is virile, he is honest, he has integrity, he has youth, he has tremendous energy, and, of course, he has ambition—and ambition is a good thing in youth. Harold Stassen will go forward in the postion to which he has been nominated and will do great work for the country.

In view of the remarks the Senate heard this afternoon from the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with relation to certain matters contained in the hearings on the nomination of Harold Stassen, in which certain questions were asked and certain extraneous matter introduced, I feel it is only fair at this time that I ask to have printed in the RECORD the testimony beginning on page 2 of the hearings. Anyone reading that testimony would understand that Harold Stassen has a very fine grasp of the work entailed in the position to which he has been nominated. Furthermore, he is not a person who jumps back and forth or off and on; he stays put. He has remained steady throughout the years. He has stayed with his philosophy. He has stayed with his party. He is a person who can always be located, because of his adherence to his principles.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I ask for the confirmation of the nomination of Harold E. Stassen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin to have certain material printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had an opportunity to study the $7,60,000,000 program which former President Truman has requested for the 1954 fiscal year budget?

Mr. STASSEN. In a preliminary manner, to the degree that one could, not having the authority, of course, to go into it fully. I have studied it within the limitations of time since it has been announced and, at the same time, of course, concluding my own responsibility at the University of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any tentative reactions as to the level of the foreign-aid program?

Mr. STASSEN. It is my view, of course, that it should be at the most limited level that would carry out the objectives of America in the situation. I do not feel that at this time I should give it in terms of precise amounts. We must also have in mind the over-all budget situation of our own country and our own defense program. These matters must be evaluated by both the administration and Congress.

INCORPORATION OF AGENCIES

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any ideas as to whether the Mutual Security Program should be incorporated into the State Department or, as other proposals have suggested, be maintained separately?

Mr. STASSEN. I think that in the final instance it is a matter for Congress and the President to decide. I think it can be administered in a number of different ways, and each has certain assets and certain liabilities related to it.

I do feel that it is important that the leadership of the State Department in foreign-policy formation must be recognized at all times, and the leadership of the Defense Department in defense-policy formation, so that as it is now constituted I feel one of the important aspects of the Director for Mutual Security is to operate a program that is in the maximum degree implementing the established foreign and defense policies of the country in accordance with the actions of Congress, the decisions of the President, and the more direct policy decisions in Defense and State.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

The CHAIRMAN. You pretty well answered the next question I wanted to ask, which was the relation of MSA to other agencies.

Will you be a little more specific as to what role you believe Congress should play in the formulation and implementation of a foreign policy of this character? Will you keep Congress fully informed on matters within your area of responsibility, and consult it in other major problems?

Mr. STASSEN. It is my view, Senator, that Congress and, particularly, the appropriate committees, should be kept fully informed, and that if they are agreeable hdvance consultations are extremely helpful.

It is the manner in which I discharged my administrative responsibility years ago in Minnesota, and it would be the manner I know in which the President would want me to discharge this one. I would wish to do so. If this committee and its appropriate subcommittees, the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House and its appropriate subcommittees were agreeable, I should like to have a consultation relationship along with the more formal reporting which occasionally might arise.

AMOUNT OF AMERICAN PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Governor, I feel that President Eisenhower was elected largely on the theory that there was going to be a reduction in overhead, stoppage of waste, and so forth.

In my travels abroad I have ascertained that—at least I believe that—a quarter of a million Americans are now working overseas. Do you have any plan to cut out what has been called the "fat" in the foreign-aid program?

Mr. STASSEN. I do plan to administer it as economically and as efficiently as it possibly can be done. Of course, there are no numbers, anything like that which you mention, engaged in the Mutual Security Program.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; overseas.

Mr. STASSEN. I believe that figure must also include the Territories and the civilian personnel engaged in defense activities.

There is no question that there is an immediate administrative problem of what numbers should be overseas in the conduct of American affairs.

I intend to, if it is decided that I should be in this position, take very prompt steps to evaluate the personnel and the program toward the objective of keeping the numbers at a minimum, and their conduct in such manner that it will best serve America in its foreign policy overseas.

I do have the impression at this time that it will be possible to make some reduction in the number of personnel who are in the Mutual Security Program.

LOYALTY OF PERSONNEL

The CHAIRMAN. You know that there is considerable talk of late that there are people in the organization who might involve loyalty and security risks. I particularly mean in the foreign establishment. Do you have any plans or any thoughts for assuring the absolute reliability of every single individual in the foreign-aid program?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes, I do. I would anticipate having a very ably staffed division on the matter of personnel security and integrity, and of cooperating with the FBI, the military intelligence agencies, and the over-all policy of the administration and of Congress toward the end of assuring the very maximum of security and integrity in the conduct of this extensive program.

NUMBERS OF AMBASSADORS

The CHAIRMAN. You and Mr. Dulles plan a trip in the near future to Europe. Will you report the findings of your trip to this committee?

Mr. STASSEN. I will be pleased to do so if this committee would permit me to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thought that has occurred to me from talking with some of the Senators, that in Paris right now we have no fewer than four individuals with ambassadorial rank who are administering various phases of the aid program.

Do you have any plans as regards streamlining the organization so that there will be only one individual in a foreign country who will speak for the United States at the highest level?

Mr. STASSEN. That analysis of organization will be one of the objectives of this trip with Mr. Dulles. I will, of course, have an opportunity of conferring extensively with him in the course of the journey as to the best way in which we might work out that administrative relationship.

I should add that this particular matter you referred to does not primarily affect the program in France. Extra individuals with the rank of Ambassador are engaged in the Western European or NATO program, but it does, so far as locale is concerned, bring this point of four individuals of the rank of Ambassador in Paris to the fore. There is no question that that is an important administration consideration.

I would anticipate that it would be the wisest thing for us to carefully analyze that special representation and the special administrative problem represented by Western Europe. We should retain it as it is as we approach the next NATO meeting, which will be in April. Between now and April, with consultations with this committee, we would seek to determine how it might best be administered after that NATO meeting. We can then come out of that meeting with our new administrative structure, with the other countries at that time understanding what we are doing and why we are doing it.

ANTICIPATING ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN-AID REQUESTS

The CHAIRMAN. How soon can we expect the administration's foreign-aid authorization request; do you have any idea?

Mr. STASSEN. I would think it will take a considerable period of time in that it must relate to our over-all policy decisions, Mr. Dulles' trip now, and his own early study of the basic foreign-policy decisions would have to be a prelude to the foreign-aid recommendations.

I would say that if you had a preference we would make a great effort to meet that date, but that it will involve first certain policy decisions on the part of the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the President, the building of the program in relationship to that policy decision, and then bringing it to you here in Congress.

HOW LONG FOREIGN AID WILL CONTINUE

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to tell us your own idea of how long you will have to continue the military and economic aid?

Mr. STASSEN. I think the essential ingredient, in answering that question, is how long will there be a serious threat from the Soviet Union to world peace and to future American security, and I feel that is the basic fact and it is impossible to put on a time limit.

Our objective, of course, should be—and mine would be, and I know it would be in accordance with President Eisenhower's wishes, as in fact he expressed in that eloquent statement at the inaugural of yesterday—that all other free peoples should do the maximum they can do, along with America, in the building of the total strength of the free nations as a whole, versus the threat to their joint and individual security.

REFERRING NOMINATION TO COMMITTEE

Senator TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt, but I have to go briefly to a meeting, and I want to ask Mr. Stassen one question only.

Is your nomination coming up today? Has it been sent up, do you know?

Mr. STASSEN. It is my understanding that it is; yes.

Senator TAFT. So that it will be and can be referred to this committee this afternoon.

Mr. STASSEN. It is my understanding; yes.

AUTHORIZED BUT UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

The CHAIRMAN. You know recently Congressman TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, said something that I think is of considerable importance. He stated that there would be no further mutual aid this year because of the $10,000,000,000 authorized but unexpended appropriations. What is your reaction to Mr. TABER'S comment?

Mr. STASSEN. A very major question which we must move on promptly in the administration is this matter of the large carry-over. I do not have all the essential facts at this time to report conclusions to you.

We are all aware of the fact that when you put in orders for the production of long-lead items in the military, such as airplanes and armaments of that kind, it is a matter of 2 and sometimes 3 years before you actually get the flow of production. Thus the heavy expenditure of money for an original authorization is long delayed and it is unquestionably a large amount in the carry-over that is represented in that form of orders that have been placed for essential military equipment for our Western European friends that has not yet been produced.

Likewise, there has been the development, as you know, of what is called the offshore procurement program, the placing of orders with European firms for military end items.

It takes a considerable period of time for them, as they rebuild from the damage of war and move anew into the production of defense items, to get production under way, but there needs to be a very early commitment.

It is also clear, I think, that the necessary diversion of military equipment to Korea that had not originally been ordered for Korea has caused an additional volume of this mutual-security carry-over.

In my own mind, one of my very early administrative responsibilities is to get a very clear analysis of this carry-over. What does it consist of? What are the obligations that have been made? When were they made, and what is the progress on their production? How should this then fit in with the long-term sound building of a strong position in Western Europe and in the other portions of the free world, for the security of our country and for future peace? I propose to do that, and I will report very frankly to this committee when we are presenting a program, if it becomes my responsibility to do so, as to what that carry-over situation is.

I do not feel at this time I have the facts to be either helpful or categorical in my analysis of what that carry-over will mean.

FORMULATING FOREIGN POLICY

The CHAIRMAN. I think in view of your very important position, particularly because you are so close to the head of the Government, and as a future Mutual Security Administrator, it would be well to get your idea as to the formulation of foreign policy. Although I presume the President yesterday defined pretty well what that was, I would like to get your own personal idea as to the formulation of foreign policy. That is, will you outline to the committee your ideas of what our foreign policy should be in regard to Korea, the Far East, the Technical Assistance Administration, the Soviet Union, Western Europe, the United Nations, and NATO.

Now, that is a pretty big assignment, Governor, but we are now meeting for the first time since the President has been inaugurated with one of the men upon whom he will rely and consult with, and if you want to give us some of your ideas, we would be glad to have them.

Mr. STASSEN. Let me respond to that question in this manner, Senator: I would say unequivocally that I feel that the President's inaugural message of yesterday and, I would add with that the Guildhall speech that he made as he ended his successful commandership in World War II, are two of the most eloquent statements and sound expressions of the position of America in the world relationship to foreign policy, that have ever been made.

So far as giving individual views on the detailed problems, large though each one may be, which you have expressed, it would be my view that in my present position I should look to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, for foreign-policy-formation leadership. I should participate with him as the law provides, and with the Secretary of Defense, in the National Security Council, responding to such inquiry there as the President might make or the others might make as to my views and, of course, responding at any time to any questions this committee or the Congress might have that might be appropriate. But fundamentally my responsibility is to operate and implement under the foreign policies that are decided in their appropriate spheres by the President, the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, this committee, and the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harold E. Stassen to be Director for Mutual Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Carl W. McCardle to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the McCardle nomination, as well as the nomination of Thruston B. Morton to be Assistant Secretary of State, be passed over until Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask that all nominations in the Department of the Treasury be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand that all these nominations were unanimously approved by the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. All these nominations have been unanimously approved by the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the nominations in the Department of the Treasury are confirmed en bloc.

The nominations in the Department of the Treasury which were confirmed en bloc are as follows:

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Elbert P. Tuttle, of Georgia, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

T. Coleman Andrews, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Ivy Baker Priest, of Utah, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Alma K. Schneider, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William P. Rogers to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren E. Burger to be Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Lee Rankin to be Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday, January 29, 1953.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 29, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1953:

DIRECTOR, MUTUAL SECURITY

Harold E. Stassen, of Pennsylvania, to be Director for Mutual Security.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Elbert P. Tuttle, of Georgia, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

T. Coleman Andrews, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Ivy Baker Priest, of Utah, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Alma K. Schneider, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Attorney General.

J. Lee Rankin, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Attorney General.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and blessed God, in the midst of the toiling days when the fever and fret of perilous times take their toll of our spirits, we are grateful for quiet arbors where, at an altar of contrition, we may bow for Thy forgiveness and cleansing. With the refreshing dew of Thy strengthening grace upon us may we go forth, on our way attended by the vision splendid, as we lift up our hearts with the glad Te Deum, "He restoreth my soul."

Give us, we beseech Thee, a part in making the earth's crooked ways straight, when social and industrial relations will lose their hard antagonisms and become the hallowed cooperation of comrades in human service. Toward this high purpose may we labor while our brief day lasts, in quiet confidence that Thou wilt guide our steps and keep our feet from falling. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 27, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the following resolutions:

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 1815, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. HINSHAW of California, Mr. VAN ZANDT of Pennsylvania, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Mr. PATTERSON of Connecticut, Mr. DURHAM of North Carolina, Mr. HOLIFIELD of California, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. KILDAY of Texas.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLCOTT of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TALLE of Iowa, Mr. BENDER of Ohio, Mr. HART of New Jersey, Mr. PATMAN of Texas, and Mr. BOLLING of Missouri.

Resolved, That pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Speaker announced the appointment by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the following Members to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. WEICHEL will serve as ex officio member of the Board, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. SHEEHAN of Illinois, and Mr. HART of New Jersey.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CANFIELD of New Jersey, Mr. GAVIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. SIKES of Florida.

Resolved, That pursuant to Public Law 38, Seventy-fifth Congress, as amended, the Speaker announced the appointment by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the following Members to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Mr. WEICHEL will serve as an ex officio member of the Board, Mr. SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut, Mr. MUMMA of Pennsylvania, Mr. HART of New Jersey.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1038 and 1084, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. JENSEN of Iowa, Mr. SMALL of Maryland, Mr. BAILEY of West Virginia, Mr. YATES of Illinois.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1, 1952 to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no tort claims were paid by the Department of Defense during the year ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SYSTEM OF GRADE DISTRIBUTION UNDER OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue in effect the system of grade distribution provided by the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 31, 1942, RELATING TO ADJUSTMENT OF ROYALTIES

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the provisions of the act of October 31, 1942, as extended, relating to the adjustment of royalties for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AS DEPOSITORY FOR GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make the United States Naval Postgraduate School a depository for Government publications (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT CHERRY POINT, N. C.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CERTIFICATES OF ASCERTAINMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS OF STATES OF NEBRASKA AND VERMONT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of certificates of ascertainment of Presidential electors received from the States of Nebraska and Vermont (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that agency, for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CHOCTAW NATION AND THE SIOUX INDIANS OF THE SANTEE RESERVATION IN NEBRASKA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of the claim of the Choctaw Nation, petitioner, and the Sioux Indians of the Santee Reservation in the State of Nebraska, plaintiffs, against the United States of America (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth semiannual report of that Commission, dated January 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures by that company, for the year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, Washington, D. C., received on January 28, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, dated January 15, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from the Attorney General, State of New Hampshire, Concord, N. H., relating to a civil defense compact entered into by the Governors of the six New England States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit No. 36, of Tampa, Fla., favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend-old-age-pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Washington, extending felicitations to the new Administration under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower; ordered to lie on the table.

(See the above resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on January 17, 1953, page 586 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE MAKING OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Council of Delegates of the Ohio State Bar Association, the Ohio State Bar Association, and the National Association of Attorneys General relating to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, which I introduced on behalf of myself and other Senators on January 7, 1953.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the council of delegates of the Ohio State Bar Association approves for consideration by Congress an amendment or amendments to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty, contract, pact, or executive agreement which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect, and further providing that a treaty, contract, pact, or executive agreement between this Nation or any other nation or nations shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty, contract, pact, or executive agreement.

Resolved, That the Ohio State Bar Association is of the opinion that in order that the principle of representative government may obtain in our foreign affairs as well as our domestic affairs, and that any confusion and ineffectiveness in our foreign policy resulting from unilateral foreign policy decisions by the Executive may be avoided, a procedure should, if possible, be devised and put into effect whereunder policy decisions in the field of foreign affairs should be made by the executive department only after obtaining the consent of Congress, or where this is impracticable, of an adequately informed representative committee or committees thereof established by Congress for such purpose.

THE TREATY POWER AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas article VI of the Constitution of the United States of America provides that all treaties of the National Government shall be the supreme law of the land; and

Whereas this provision of the Constitution, due to a changed concept of international relations and obligations of national states whereby national states now undertake obligations which are designed or interpreted to directly affect the lives and property of individual citizens in time of peace as well as war, which changed concept represents a radical deviation from the historical incidents of treaty making current at the time said article VI was adopted by the founding fathers of the Republic, and for the first century and one-half of our national existence; and

Whereas it now becomes apparent in proposed treaties and conventions under consideration in the United Nations, of which international body the United States of America is a member, and will be asked to ratify said treaties and conventions, that the individual rights and privileges of American citizens as supposedly guaranteed them by the Constitutions of the United States and the several States may be derogated and even destroyed pursuant to possible interpretations of said article VI; and

Whereas adherence to this new concept of international relations and obligations of national states, directly affecting private persons and property even when not expressly required by treaty terms, has reached such a level of judicial acceptance as to be incorporated in a dissenting opinion of the Supreme Court of these United States wherein the general military obligations of the United States under the terms of the United Nations Charter and conventions and the North Atlantic Treaty were advanced as justification for the seizure of private property by the National Government and might equally well be advanced as a justification for invasion of the traditional liberties of our citizenry; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the National Association of Attorneys General that the

rights and privileges of American citizens, most of which have attended our people from the very formation of the Republic, and which formed the very jurisdiction for the American Declaration of Independence and the founding of the Republic, should be forever inviolate from even the risk of derogation by the treaty-making power of their own National Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Attorneys General does herewith recommend that steps should be taken to amend the Constitution of the United States of America so as to subordinate the treaty-making power of the National Government to each and every provision of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States of America, and to each and every similar provision in the constitutions of the several States except as these may be expressly abridged by act or resolution of the Congress of the United States of America.

HOLIDAYS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF MANAGEMENT OF KENTUCKY SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of management of the Kentucky Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Louisville, Ky., relating to holidays.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is at present a movement among certain groups and individuals to place important holidays on the Monday nearest to the exact date—this being done for business reasons and for the purpose of extended week-end holidays; and

Whereas the holidays under such consideration are of historic and patriotic value, and stir such loyal interests as pertain to our great American traditions (holidays so considered for change are President's Day, to the third Monday in February, Memorial Day to the last Monday in May, Independence Day to the first Monday in July, and Thanksgiving Day to the fourth Monday in November); and

Whereas the changed dates would cause a loss of interest in the persons and events that are memorialized by the exact dates of celebration; and

Whereas it is the privilege of the States to have jurisdiction over such holidays: Be it

Resolved, That the members of the board of management of the Kentucky Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, assembled in executive session on January 10, 1953, at the Brown Hotel, Louisville, Ky., protest such change. In protesting, they would call to mind that the signs of the times indicate that it behooves all individuals and organizations to be strengthening and reaffirming allegiance to events and incidents pertaining to the lives of the patriots who have contributed so much to the foundation and growth of the great Republic which is the United States of America.

ORDER OF MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the majority membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be amended so as to make certain changes which have been agreed upon. I ask unanimous consent that the order of membership on the committee read: CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, chairman; HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana; JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio; ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland; DWIGHT GRISWOLD, of Nebraska; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; and CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan.

The proposed new order does not change the membership of the committee. It merely establishes the order of seniority which has been agreed upon by the Republican conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 44. Resolution extending authority for the investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs; without amendment (S. Rept. 24); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. Res. 45. Resolution extending the authority for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and the formulation of a fuel policy for the United States; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably various resolutions, some of which I submit reports thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reports will be received, and the resolutions will be placed on the calendar.

The resolutions reported by Mr. JENNER and placed on the calendar are as follows:

S. Res. 22. Resolution extending the time for study by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 13);

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the time for investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of certain transportation and communications problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 33. Resolution continuing the authority for the temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 17);

S. Res. 37. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; with an amendment (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 40. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to employ temporary personnel and increasing its limit of expenditures; without amendment (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 41. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign Commerce; with amendments (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 42. Resolution to investigate problems relating to economic mobilization and stabilization, banking and housing policies, and certain other matters; with amendments (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 46. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures in connection with the internal security of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 47. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for a review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make certain expenditures and employ temporary personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 21); and

S. Res. 50. Resolution extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 23).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana give me his attention for a moment? As I understand, the Senator from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, has submitted reports on numerous resolutions which his committee has considered. It will be necessary for the Senate to take action on them, or the procedure will become quite involved.

The Senator from Indiana, as chairman, has submitted the reports of the committee. Am I correct in understanding that it is the intention of the Senator from Indiana to call up these resolutions tomorrow?

Mr. JENNER. It is my intention to have them called up tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wish the RECORD to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration has made reports of various and sundry resolutions. I hope Senators will take due notice of the reports and be prepared to act on the resolutions tomorrow.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is about to recognize the Senator from Kansas, unless the Senator from Louisiana wishes to speak upon the matter just discussed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to speak upon the same matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Senator from Indiana if his committee held hearings on any of the various resolutions he has just reported?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; the committee asked the committees affected to submit estimates of amounts that would be needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will all that data presented to the Government Operations Committee be available to the Senate before the resolutions are taken up?

Mr. JENNER. To what data does the Senator refer?

Mr. ELLENDER. To the data upon which his committee based its actions. Specifically, I mean the information presented to the Government Operations Committee to justify the approval of the expenditures.

Mr. JENNER. No; we did not have any public hearings. It has not been the custom of the committee to hold such hearings. As the Senator from Louisiana is probably aware, many of the resolutions come in written form

from the various committees of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Committee on Rules and Administration would be willing to make available to all Senators desiring it such evidence, or such justifications, as were made or presented by those asking for the various amounts involved.

Mr. JENNER. The committee did not have made a transcript or a record of the hearings, but I, or any other member of the committee, will be glad to give the Senator all the information that is available. All members of the committee were present on each occasion, with the exception of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], who was absent yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am particularly anxious to ascertain the justification for the so-called McCarthy resolution, which I understand has been reported this morning.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; it has been reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That calls for an expenditure of about $200,000, does it not?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that another resolution has been reported calling for $150,000, for the purpose of enabling the Committee on the Judiciary to continue its investigation of communism.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. It has been reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand further that the resolution provides for an investigation of communism in schools and colleges, and of other aspects of communism.

Mr. JENNER. It does not cover those phases. It does continue the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any presentation or specific indication made as to the subjects that would be investigated by, for example, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Government Operations Committee of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is chairman?

Mr. JENNER. Yes. The Senator from Wisconsin and the chief clerk of his committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and presented their entire program. At that time several Senators asked questions concerning the program, and the resolution was unanimously reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any evidence in the form of a written record?

Mr. JENNER. No. The committee did not have a transcript made. It has not been customary to have transcripts made of such proceedings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator from Indiana recalls my conversation with him on this subject some time ago.

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I told the Senator that I thought it would be a good idea to have a record made of such hearings, so that all Senators could be informed, when the resolutions came to the floor, as to why the various requests were being made and why they were being approved.

Mr. JENNER. I do not recall the Senator from Louisiana asking that a record be made. I recall the Senator from Louisiana saying that he would look upon such requests with a very jaundiced eye.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said I would like to see something specific in justification of the requests.

Mr. JENNER. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration as long as I have been a Member of the Senate. I have served under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is now on the floor.

There has never been a record made of the hearings. We request Senators to come before the committee with their recommendations for their respective budgets—how much is to be spent for personnel, telegraphic expense, traveling expense, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the committee also require information as to what subjects will be investigated?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can Senators obtain for their own information a résumé of what was stated and the reasons assigned for the various amounts requested? Can the Senator provide that?

Mr. JENNER. As I have said, there is no stenographic record, but I shall be glad to go over these requests with the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is present, as are other members of the committee. I am sure that all of us would be glad to give the Senator the benefit of all the information we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. If possible, I should like to have such information before the resolutions are taken up tomorrow. It may well be that I shall have no objection, but I should like to have the information, so that the resolutions may be presented to the Senate in an orderly way. I just want to have all the information on hand, so that the Senate may make a considered and well-founded decision. I want to be sure that each of these expenditures is needed.

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to give the Senator all the information in my possession.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 689. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 690. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 691. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 692. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 693. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; and

S. 694. A bill to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 695. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; and

S. 696. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit Mrs. Maggie Snowie to occupy and reside on Maggie Fraction Lode Claim; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 697. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Aba Szejnbejm, Mrs. Dvora Szejnbejm, Shlomo Szejnbejm, and Daniel Szejnbejm;

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Anthony Zahareas;

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Joseph Weisz and his family; and

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Maarten Van Der Toorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. NEELY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 703. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 704. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 705. A bill for the relief of Anna Leng; and

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Witzeling Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina):

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Spainhour Furniture Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Ken C. Wu and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 709. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 710. A bill to provide for grants to State unemployment funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 711. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, and under the parkway land along the line of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, and to authorize an exchange of lands with other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 712. A bill for the relief of William R. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 713. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 714. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 715. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 716. A bill to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce;

S. 717. A bill to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event; and

S. 718. A bill to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse or dog racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 719. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Commander John J. O'Connell, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 721. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Spencer C. Clark for extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed between 1929 and 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 722. A bill for the relief of Mary Bethe Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 723. A bill for the relief of Rose L. Kerrigan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 724 (by request). A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Akers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 725. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution making January 30 of each year a legal public holiday in commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a joint statement by me, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 689) to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. MARTIN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDING AND POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the United States is obligated to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River.

The Congress further finds that it is necessary and desirable for the public welfare and for the security of the United States that the share of the waters of the Niagara River made available for power purposes under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, dated February 27, 1950, and ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, be utilized promptly.

The Congress further finds that low-cost power is urgently required to supply, among other purposes, the greatly expanded demands of the Department of Defense upon the electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries and other industries maintained in the vicinity of Niagara Falls.

The Congress further finds that utilization of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River for the production of hydroelectric power is not an incident of the exercise of the public functions of the United States to improve navigation, flood control, reclamation, irrigation, or sanitation.

The Congress further finds that in view of the public burden of the increasing obligations of the United States, it is most desirable that development of hydroelectric projects be made by private enterprise and without recourse to public funds particularly where, as here, private enterprise is able most promptly to commence actual construction of and to put the project, as hereinafter authorized, into operation.

The Congress further finds that the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 838), as amended, provides adequate safeguards deemed essential for the protection of broad local and national interests in navigable waters of the United States, at the same time permitting full development and utilization of water power resources with due regard to the protection of the interests of the United States herein.

The Congress further finds that further development of any hydroelectric project at Niagara Falls requires the enactment of legislation prescribing special conditions to be incorporated in any license issued by the Federal Power Commission for such development as hereinafter provided.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress (1) to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and its environments; (2) to further the national security; and (3) to assure the development of low-cost electric power under the private enterprise system.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission is hereby authorized and directed to issue as soon as practicable to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such citizens,

or to any corporation organized under the laws of any State, a license for the purpose of prosecuting works of improvement for redevelopment of the Niagara River in substantial accordance with the project plans outlined in the report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission dated September 28, 1949, entitled "Possibilities for Redevelopment of Niagara Falls for Power—Niagara River—New York" (such works of improvement being hereinafter referred to as the "project"). The Commission shall have authority to require such modifications of said project, not inconsistent with this act, as it may deem advisable in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Power Act, as amended. In issuing a license under this act, the Commission shall give preference to the applicant most able to commence actual construction of and put the project into operation promptly.

SEC. 3. Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the license to be issued hereunder shall incorporate all of the provisions of the Federal Power Act, as amended, and in addition shall expressly include the following terms and conditions:

(a) Any agency of the United States as may hereafter be created for such purpose or any agency created and designated by the State of New York for such purpose may after March 2, 1971, upon not less than 2 years' written notice, take over and thereafter maintain and operate the project upon the condition that before taking possession such agency of the United States or of the State of New York shall pay to the licensee its net investment, as that term is defined in the Federal Power Act, as amended, in the project. The net investment of the licensee in the project for the purpose of this act shall be determined by the Federal Power Commission after notice and opportunity for hearing.

(b) In contracting for the disposition of project power, preference shall be given to directions from the Department of Defense for supplying power to governmental installations or to industries requiring power to produce materials essential to the national security.

(c) The licensee shall pay to the United States and include in its net investment in the project herein authorized the United States share of the cost of the construction of the remedial works to be undertaken in accordance with article II of the treaty referred to in the first section of this act whenever such remedial works are constructed by the United States.

SEC. 4. Upon the complaint of any interested State, the Federal Power Commission shall have jurisdiction, after due notice to all interested States and to the licensee and opportunity for hearing, to require the licensee to enter into reasonable and practical arrangements whereby project power will be apportioned equitably among States within economic transmission distance, subject, however, at all times to the priority in respect of project power accorded to the Department of Defense as hereinabove provided in section 3 (b).

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting any valid existing rights under licenses heretofore issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 838), as amended, or as now or hereafter affecting the applicability of the provisions of that act in the case of waters of the Niagara River presently authorized to be diverted for power purposes under licenses heretofore issued under that act.

SEC. 6. In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this act and the provisions of the Federal Power Act and of the license to be granted for the project herein authorized, the provisions of this act shall govern in respect of the project herein authorized.

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as the "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1953."

The statement presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATORS CAPEHART AND MARTIN AND REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM E. MILLER, OF NEW YORK

Bills providing for the development by private enterprise of additional hydroelectric power on the Niagara River were introduced simultaneously today in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Coauthors of the Senate bill are Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, and EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania. The House bill was introduced by Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER of New York. All are Republicans.

The bills were identical with those introduced in the Eighty-second Congress by Senator CAPEHART and Congressman MILLER, with Senator MARTIN joining as a new cosponsor. Hearings were conducted during the Eighty-second Congress by the Senate and House Committees on Public Works.

A treaty with Canada, dated February 27, 1950, and ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, requires that the Congress specify the method by which that portion of the United States development is to be accomplished.

The bills would commit Congress to the principle that "in view of the public burden of the increasing obligations of the United States, it is most desirable that development of hydroelectric projects be made by private enterprise and without recourse to public funds particularly where, as here, private enterprise is able most promptly to commence actual construction of and to put the project into operation."

The bills have three stated purposes. They are:

1. To preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and its environments.

2. To further the national security.

3. To assure the development of low-cost electric power under the private enterprise system.

The bills authorize and direct the Federal Power Commission to issue as soon as practicable to private citizens, any association of citizens, or to any corporation organized under the laws of any State a license for the purpose of prosecuting works of improvement "for redevelopment of the Niagara River in substantial accordance with the project plans outlined in the report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission dated September 28, 1949, entitled "Possibilities for Redevelopment of Niagara Falls for Power—Niagara River—New York." The bills require that the Federal Power Commission, in issuing a license, shall give preference to the applicant "most able to commence actual construction of and to put the project into operation promptly."

The bills further provide that after March 2, 1971, any agency of the United States Government created for such purpose or any such agency created by the State of New York may, upon not less than 2 years' written notice, take over and thereafter maintain and operate the project. In that event, the private enterprise operators would receive their net investment as that term is defined in the Federal Power Act. The amount of the net investment would be determined by the Federal Power Commission.

A primary condition incorporated in the bills is that in the disposition of power developed by the project preference must be given to directions from the Department of Defense for supplying power to Government installations or to industries requiring power to produce materials essential to the national security.

Another condition imposed on the distribution of power developed in the project provides that if any State within economic transmission distance complains about its allotment of power, the Federal Power Commission may require the operators to enter into "reasonable and practical arrangements whereby project power will be apportioned equitably among those States."

The bills introduced in the Eighty-second Congress received Nation-wide support from newspapers, many business organizations, civic clubs, and labor organizations.

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill relating to the prohibition of discrimination in employment. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 692) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I are reintroducing the bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origion, or ancestry. This bill, in the Eighty-second Congress, was known as Senate bill 3368. If enacted, it will be entitled "The Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act."

As cosponsors, we emphasize the fact that the bill has bipartisan sponsorship—really tripartisan support—consisting of nine Republicans, nine Democrats, and one Independent, who, aside from ourselves, are as follows: the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The question of civil rights generally, and especially that of discrimination in employment, should never be allowed to become partisan issues.

Just as in the present instance this bill is receiving bipartisan sponsorship, so in the last Congress it received bipartisan sponsorship.

This bill recognizes three factors which we believe to be fundamental in this type of legislation:

First. It provides for the maximum use of educational programs, with emphasis placed largely on the voluntary proc-

esses of conference, conciliation, and persuasion in handling complaints, and concerted effort by citizens' councils consisting of representative citizens in every important community.

Second. It contains a minimum of enforcement provisions; but resort to the use of such provisions should be wholly avoided save in rare instances where there may be open and deliberate defiance on the part of a violator.

Third. Insofar as possible, it authorizes and encourages maximum actual participation by State and local authorities in its administration and enforcement.

Elimination of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is the very heart of the civil-rights program. Such discrimination denies equality of opportunity and constitutes an outright violation of our American creed.

Statements made at one time or another by many of our colleagues in the Senate indicate that they are utterly opposed to discrimination in employment.

In offering this legislation, we who sponsor it believe that it furnishes the most practical and effective medium by which to guarantee to everyone equal opportunity to earn a living according to his ability and regardless of his parentage or religious faith.

By this process we would assist in making our American creed a living reality and in establishing at home the observance of the ideals and principles for which we profess to stand among the nations of the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I do not think I have time; but if I have time, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to know whether or not the Senator is obtaining permission to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. I ask for that permission at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation, the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary for the following purposes:

(1) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

(2) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States.

(3) To advance toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, other than a labor organization.

(c) The term "employment agency" means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(d) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having 50 or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(e) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession but through any point outside thereof.

(f) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry.

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to properly classify or refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual or any employer because of the race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry of any individual;

(2) to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, employment agency or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

THE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, one for a term of 5 years, one for a term of 6 years, and one or a term of 7 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 7 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as

defined in title 28, United States Code, chapter 3, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; attorneys apointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court;

(2) to cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder;

(4) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(6) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens resident of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance; the Commission may, to the extent it deems it necessary, provide by regulation for exemption of such persons from the operation of title 18 United States Code, sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99); such regulation may be issued without prior notice and hearing.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That an agreement between or among an employer or employers and a labor organization or labor organizations pertaining to discrimination in employment shall be enforceable in accordance with applicable law, but nothing contained therein shall be construed or permitted to foreclose the jurisdiction over any practice or occurrence granted the Commission by this act: *Provided further*, That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession or local government, to cede, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, to such agency jurisdiction over any cases or class of cases, if such agency, in the judgment of the Commission, has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in such cases.

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter called the "respondent") a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such complaint. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than 1 year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission and the service of a copy thereof upon the respondent, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the 1-year period.

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

(j) If, upon the preponderance of the evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination), as will effectuate the policies of the act: *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

(e) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

(f) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial

evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(g) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(h) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(i) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(j) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

(k) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

(l) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

(e) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(f) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(g) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least fifty individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or rescission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or rescission, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or rescission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. The provisions of section 11, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. This act shall become effective 60 days after enactment, except that subsections 7 (c) to (l), inclusive, and section 8 shall become effective 6 months after enactment.

NONVOTING DELEGATE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 697) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. NEELY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

When this Congress convened, I outlined a seven-point legislative program for the District of Columbia which I hope to develop during the next 2 years.

On January 21, I introduced the first bill in that program, a proposal to increase the number of District Commissioners from three to five. Today I am offering the second of these measures, a bill to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the House by an elected, nonvoting Delegate, similar to the representation provided for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

This bill was passed by the Senate last year as a part of the so-called Case home-rule bill. The voteless Delegate bill has been introduced this year in the House by Congressman AUCHINCLOSS, who also sponsored it last year.

It provides merely for the election of a Delegate to the House from the District of Columbia with the right to sit on committees, enter into debate, sponsor bills, and participate in the same way that the Alaskan and Hawaiian Delegates do—but without the right to vote.

Since Congress is the "state legislature" for the District, the bill also necessarily sets up the election machinery, consisting of a three-man Board appointed by the President for 3-year staggered terms, to maintain a registry and conduct the elections. In addition, the bill prescribes voters' qualifications, the method of nomination, and other details.

I should like to make clear that I am proposing this measure as a step toward eventual full-fledged emancipation of District citizens. It may interest Members of the Senate to know that the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia pay more Federal income tax than the people of each of 25 States, outnumber the people of 13 States, buy more than the people of 16 States, served in greater numbers in World War II than the people of 14 States. Yet they have not a voice in Congress. They cannot vote for President. And only since 1940 have they had equal access with other Americans to the Federal courts.

Not only are they taxed without representation and governed without their consent nationally, they must obey the laws and pay nine-tenths of the cost of a local government and school system in which they also have no voice whatever.

The District never has had voting representation in Congress, although it has been suggested from the first month that Congress met here in 1800. The last President Washingtonians helped to elect was Thomas Jefferson, shortly before their fledgling, muddy village became the seat of Government. They last elected local officials in 1873, soon after which Congress chose to exercise directly its constitutional power of exclusive legislation for the District, by then a metropolis of 131,000.

The injustice has grown with the city. In 1950 the Nation's ninth largest at 802,000. Nearly 600,000 are potential voters—21 and older, the usual voting age. About 125,000 are Federal employees; more than 200,000 are privately employed.

Many of the Federal workers and a few others retain absentee voting rights in the States from which they came. But upward of half a million Washingtonians—Americans—of voting age never see a ballot. For them, election day is only a biennial reminder of their shadow citizenship.

I hope that the Congress and the States, by due process of legislation and constitutional amendment soon will give the District of Columbia its full local and national voting rights, preserving, of course, proper protection of the Federal interest in the Nation's Capital City. I am confident the objectives are compatible and will be achieved.

But I recognize that legislation, and especially constitutional amendments, for the District necessarily take a back seat in these days of grave State, National, and world problems with which our Federal and State governments are preoccupied. In such circumstances I believe more can be accomplished by taking first steps, where an area of agreement and understanding exists or can be reached soon, by creating machinery and institutions that can grow and mature with increasing experience and understanding in all quarters.

In that spirit, I am introducing today the bill to provide a nonvoting Delegate for the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION AGAINST BODILY ATTACK ON UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard. The bill would extend to members of the Armed Forces the protection of Federal law against unprovoked violence while such personnel are on duty or on account of the performance of their duty. It would amend title 18 of the code and would give members of all the armed services the same protection that is now accorded to a long list of Federal officers and employees, including members of the Coast Guard.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation and support of this proposal be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 703) to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

We have been working on this bill for almost 3 years. I first introduced a similar measure as an amendment to the universal military training bill in the spring of 1951. During the last session of Congress this identical bill was introduced as S. 3481. A similar measure was introduced in 1944, with the active support of the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. At that time the bill in question was favorably reported out of committee but never acted upon. In its present form, this proposal, as introduced, has overcome the technical objections which have been raised in the past.

Last year the Department of Defense formally endorsed this proposal and for the purposes of the RECORD I would like to include at this point the letter which I received setting forth that Department's views.

The simple effect of this bill would be to provide Federal sanctions against unprovoked physical assault on uniformed military personnel if committeed while such personnel are engaged in performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. Persons charged with such assault could be tried in a Federal court.

This law, if enacted, would be especially effective in protecting servicemen belonging to minority groups or who might otherwise be the objects of prejudice in particular localities of our country. This law would make clear that the uniform of our country extends to all its wearers the protection of Federal law in the performance of duty. We already extend such protection to long categories of Federal officers and employees, including members of the Coast Guard. These officers range from marshals and deputy marshals to game wardens and meat inspectors. Certainly we should give our servicemen the same protection we now give food and drug inspectors.

It is common knowledge that in many of our localities where there are large numbers of servicemen in training camps and base installations, the police protection which can be provided by the local enforcement officers is very inadequate.

Many local authorities have neither the personnel nor the resources to provide sufficient protection to our servicemen against violence and bodily attack. A military policeman or other military personnel who is on duty to protect servicemen and maintain order must be given adequate legal protection against bodily harm if he, in turn, is to be an effective instrument of law and order. He must be assured that persons assaulting him or other personnel on duty will be promptly apprehended and prosecuted.

The evidence over the last few years shows that there is often an increase in incidence of attacks on military personnel in areas where local enforcement is lax in apprehending those who provoke the assault.

I have in mind a small town near a large Army camp where, within the last few months, a Federal grand jury has indicted the entire police force for failing to provide protection for the soldiers on leave in the town, and where unprovoked attacks against military police were frequent. According to press reports, the local police force was involved in importing illegal liquor, protecting prostitutes, and maintaining gambling establishments. The military police were seriously hampered in carrying out their mission in this community, and the final result was the closing of the community to all military personnel.

Such cases are not typical, but a law which would extend the protection of the Federal Government to those officers and men who have been assigned the task of protecting

soldiers on leave, seems to us to be only a prerequisite for providing adequate protection to our men and women in the service, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Last year I reported that a study made by the Department of the Army showed that between the period of January 1 and September 1, 1951, listed 111 cases of physical violence against military personnel by civilians which had gone unpunished due to failure of local police officers and courts to apprehend or punish the attackers. I have recently requested the Department of the Army to make a similar determination for the year 1952.

I quote an editorial from the Washington Post which sets forth the need for this simple law, and a letter from Charles A. Coolidge:

"PROTECTING SOLDIERS

"The files of the Army Department show that during the year 1951 there were more than a hundred cases in which assaults were committed against uniformed members of the armed services and no punishment was meted out to those who committed the offenses. Moreover, the Department's files probably reflect no more than a fraction of the cases that occurred during the year. Many instances of this sort of violence are never recorded. The record as it stands, however, is quite black enough to make plain the need for some sort of Federal protection of servicemen. A bill to provide such protection was introduced by Senator LEHMAN on behalf of himself and a bipartisan group of a dozen colleagues at the tail end of the congressional session. It came too late to permit action before the adjournment. But it is useful to have it available for public consideration and for congressional action next year.

"The bill would operate quite simply to penalize physical assault against uniformed military personnel whenever it is committed against individuals engaged in the performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. It would make such an assault a Federal offense subject to trial in a Federal court. The doctrine is scarcely a novel one. As Senator LEHMAN pointed out in introducing his bill, 'the protection of Federal law is already extended—and has been for many years—to a long list of categories of Federal officers ranging all the way from marshals and deputy marshals to game wardens and meat inspectors.' It is already extended, in point of fact, to members of the Coast Guard. The Lehman bill would merely extend the same protection to members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"Negro servicemen have been, of course, the principal victims of the unprovoked violence which the proposed legislation aims to penalize. And the harsh fact is that in some States the local police have lacked either the means or the determination to provide protection or to arrest and punish the attackers. The Army has been seeking protection for servicemen ever since Secretary of War Stimson first recommended it in 1944. There can be no question that, when the Federal Government drafts men into its Armed Forces and sends them to training camps far from their homes, it owes them a guaranty of respect for their uniforms—and for the rights of citizenship which they have been called into uniform to defend."

MAY 28, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Reference is made to your letter requesting the views of the Department of Defense as to the extent which legislation should go in protecting members of the Armed Forces against physical violence, and requesting the Department's definition of the term "on duty."

It is the view of the Department of Defense that the protection afforded officers and employees of the Government by sections 1114 and 111 of title 18, United States Code, should be extended to members of the Armed Forces for periods when they are engaged in the performance of official duties. Such periods may be more precisely defined as being during the execution of duties imposed by statutes, and regulations and directives of the Armed Forces concerned, and during the execution of specific duties imposed by order of competent authority. It would seem that it would be unrealistic to attempt to extend such protection to members of the Armed Forces for periods not involving the performance of official duties, such as periods of leave, liberty, or authorized absence. It is our understanding that the provisions of sections 1114 and 111 have been so construed in the case of the Coast Guard. The draft of bill furnished you by the Department of Defense on July 5, 1951, would accomplish this purpose.

Your letter specifically requested an interpretation of the term "on duty." While that term is generally construed by the Department to mean any time during which a member of the Armed Forces is in receipt of basic pay, it should not be used in this sense in legislation extending protection against physical violence to members of the Armed Forces. Any extension of such protection to members of the Armed Forces should be limited, as in the case of the Coast Guard, to periods when they are performing official duties.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. COOLIDGE.

I would like to point out that this proposal has bipartisan support, and again that it has the approval of the Department of Defense. Let us hope that this year Congress will be able to act swiftly in providing the protection which our military personnel need.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States since the outbreak of the action in Korea. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared concerning the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 704) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am today introducing a bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States since the outbreak of the action in Korea, June 24, 1950. Many of you will recall that a similar bill passed both Houses during the last session of Congress, but died when Congress adjourned and no time remained to work out the differences between the House and Senate versions.

At the time the Senate bill was reported out of committee in the last session, I questioned some of the committee's amendments which would have severely and unfairly restricted the scope of the measure, barring hundreds of deserving veterans of Korea from the benefits of this proposal. These defects are corrected in my proposed bill.

I do not believe that the revision of our present illiberal immigration and naturalization laws can be accomplished by the ineffective process of piecemeal amendment. However, in this case I believe the urgency of the measure warrants immediate action and we cannot await the time when a full revision of our basic laws is placed before the Congress. It is my hope that in the near future a complete rewriting of our basic immigration and naturalization laws will be available in order that we may unwind the maze, and undo the damage of the immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952.

Although this proposal is in the form of an amendment to the McCarran Act, the need for it predates the passage of that act. The bill is meant to include only those who served during the Korean war, and is the same type of special provision passed for members of the Armed Forces who served during World War II.

The main purpose of this bill, which has the support of many, many groups, is to provide that persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and have served in our Armed Forces since June 24, 1950, can attain citizenship without the usual requirement of a residence waiting period.

I feel that it is only proper that we extend the privilege of citizenship to those young men and women who have joined our Armed Forces and served during this time of world crisis. Evidence of a good service record and their willingness to join in the defense of the free world should go far toward cutting the red tape required by our present restrictive and confused naturalization laws. Exceptions should certainly be made in the case of these deserving individuals.

It is my hope that this bill can receive speedy and favorable action of the appropriate committee, and that it will be brought before the Senate at an early date.

TRANSPORTATION OF FLAMMABLE FABRICS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 715) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOBEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

The purpose of the bill is to protect consumers and others from the dangers surrounding the use of flammable textile products of types which have caused either bodily injury or death to numerous individuals. It is limited in general scope to wearing apparel, and fabrics which are intended

or sold for use in wearing apparel. It will outlaw, for example, the sale of highly flammable children's cowboy play suits and the so-called explosive sweaters or jackets which have caused serious injuries and taken a number of lives in recent years.

The bill is identical to S. 2918 of the Eighty-second Congress as reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by unanimous vote. S. 2918 passed the Senate but was caught in adjournment rush and did not get through the House.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING MATERIALS AND INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 716) to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HUNT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

On behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I have introduced a bill which would prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of certain gambling materials, to prohibit the broadcasting of certain gambling information and prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications and further prohibits the transportation of certain gambling devices in interstate commerce. This bill was sponsored by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce in the Eighty-second Congress as a major item in their program of proposed anticrime legislation.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the Eighty-second Congress and with certain clarifying amendments was reported unanimously but died on the calendar. This bill revises the lottery law to include within its prohibitions other gambling enterprises and punchboards and pushboards designed for gambling. Similarly, it extends the present ban on broadcasting lottery information to include information relating to other gambling enterprises, and it imposes a new restriction on the use of interstate communications to transmit bets or wagers and broadens the controlling definition in the Slot Machine Act, Public Law 906, Eighty-first Congress, to tighten the administration of that act.

ILLEGAL TRANSMISSION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 717) to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HUNT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

On behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I have introduced for appropriate reference, a bill which would make it unlawful for any person to transmit in interstate or foreign commerce by means of telephone, telegraph, or radio any gambling information concerning any horse- or dog-racing event or other sporting event when such information has been obtained surreptitiously or through stealth and without the permission of the person conducting such event. This bill is identical with S. 1564 which was sponsored in the Eighty-second Congress by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. S. 1564 was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which, after extensive hearings thereon, reported it favorably. The bill, S. 1564, died on the calendar in the last Congress.

The bill is designed to drive illegal gambling or horse and dog racing out of interstate commerce. It is aimed at the source of the essential gambling information which flows to bookmakers over the so-called wire services. The Special Crime Committee found that the proprietors of almost all legitimate race tracks and sports events and race tracks have sought to restrict the operation of the so-called wire service operators by denying them the right to send out bulletins on betting odds, scratches, times, results, etc., from the track or enclosure where the event takes place. The operators then resorted to elaborate subterfuges, sometimes installing the information from blinds outside the track or enclosure and even using walkie-talkie equipment from inside. This bill would add a Federal sanction to local efforts to curb this flow by making it a misdemeanor to transmit in interstate commerce gambling information obtained surreptitiously or through stealth and without the permission of the proprietor of the event when such information is intended to be used for illegal gambling purposes.

LICENSING OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse- or dog-racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 718) to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse- or dog-racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HUNT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

On behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I have introduced a bill which would make it unlawful for any person to disseminate information concerning horse- and dog-racing events, betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio unless such person has a license issued by the Attorney General of the United States. This bill was recommended in the Eighty-second Congress by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, Senate bill 1563, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for legislative action, since the special committee had no legislative authority. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, after extensive hearings on this bill, reported the bill favorably, with amendments, and the bill being offered at this time is identical with the bill that was reported unanimously by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which died on the calendar.

Under the provisions of this bill the Attorney General is required to grant a license to an applicant who desires to disseminate information concerning horse- and dog-racing events or betting information concerning any other sporting event by means of wire or radio communications if such applicant shows to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the information to be disseminated will not be used primarily to facilitate gambling activities which constitute violations of State laws in the States where the information will be disseminated. The license is to be granted unless the At-

torney General finds that the public interest will not be served by such a grant or unless he finds that the applicant is not of good moral character.

The bill specifically excludes from its operations, by exemptions, newspapers and periodicals of general information, licensed radio stations, and news-gathering agencies engaged exclusively in serving such newspapers, periodicals, and stations.

LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAY IN COMMEMORATION OF BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which would make January 30 a legal holiday in honor of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD together with a statement I have prepared in explanation and support of this proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) making January 30 of each year a legal public holiday in commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 30th day of January in each year is hereby made a legal public holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the first Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the fourth Thursday of November, and Christmas Day are now made by law public holidays.

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Tomorrow is the seventy-first anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is 8 years now since his death. While he was President his birthday was observed by many of his fellow citizens. It came to be a sort of national observance, although without official auspices. By his wish these celebrations became fund-raising events to combat the dread disease of poliomyelitis. The March of Dimes which is currently being conducted in behalf of the fight against polio still remains, for those of us who remember, a memorial to our late great beloved President.

The heat of the passion which Franklin Roosevelt aroused in his lifetime has greatly abated. The vitriolic partisanship which his name aroused for so many years even after his passing is dying down. The party to which he gave renewed life and whose standard bearer he was, the party to which I am proud to belong, has, by the turn of the wheel of fortune, become the minority party. I think all who have witnessed the change-over in administrations will bear witness to the fact that this has been accomplished with good grace. Might this not also be an occasion for this country to pay to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt the tribute it so richly deserves, without regard to partisanship or political bias? He saved this country and he saved the world from the totalitarian threat of his day. He led us to victory over the forces of evil. He presided over the greatest expansion in our productive might this Nation or any nation has ever known. He banished fear from our midst, giving us new hope and confidence in the future of America.

We have need of that high spirit today. We have need of it whether we are Democrats or Republicans.

I might hope that members of the Senate, irrespective of party, will join in paying this richly deserved tribute to this historic man who already has become in the view of history and in the eyes of all mankind the greatest single figure of this generation. I hope that the appropriate committee of the Senate will give this measure early consideration and favorable action.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution concerning the three hundredth anniversary of Westmoreland County, Va., the birthplace of George Washington, James Madison, Richard Henry Lee, Light-Horse Harry Lee, Robert E. Lee, and many others who wrote their names high upon the scroll of fame.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), submitted by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas Westmoreland County, which is in the Commonwealth of Virginia, was created in the year 1653; and

Whereas Westmoreland County has given to the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia an extraordinary number of distinguished citizens and patriots, among them George Washington, the Father of his Country; James Monroe, fifth President of the United States; Robert E. Lee, commander in chief of the Confederate Armies; Bushrod Washington, nephew of General Washington and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; Richard Henry Lee, author of the famous Westmoreland Resolution, protesting the Stamp Act, and signer of the Declaration of Independence; Gen. Thomas Stuart Garnett, of Chancellorsville fame; Gen. R. L. T. Beale, dashing cavalryman of the Confederate Army; Gov. Henry (Light-Horse Harry) Lee, general, United States Army and Member of Congress; Francis Lightfoot Lee, Member of Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence; Col. George Eskridge, Attorney for the King in Westmoreland County, Member of the House of Burgesses, and guardian of George Washington's mother, Mary Ball; Daniel McCarty, Member of the House of Burgesses for many years and Speaker of the House in 1715 and 1718; Willoughby Newton, Member of Congress and founder of the Virginia Agriculture Society; John Critcher, Member of Congress and eminent jurist; and many other illustrious persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress joins the county of Westmoreland in commemorating its tercentennial anniversary, and acknowledges its contribution to the development and progress of the Nation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, shall be transmitted to the clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Westmoreland County.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON POLICY GOVERNING PRIVATE FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution calling for a complete study of existing laws and administrative requirements relating to the potential conflict between the public interest and the private financial interests of officials in the executive departments and agencies.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a temporary Joint Committee on the Policy Governing the Private Financial Interests of Executive Officials. The committee shall be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(a) To make a detailed study of problems arising from the potential conflict between the public interest and the private financial interests of officials in the executive departments and agencies;

(b) To make a detailed study of the existing laws and administrative requirements relating to such conflicts;

(c) To give particular attention in such studies to (1) the circumstances under which, because of their private financial interests, individuals should be disqualified from holding office in the executive departments and agencies; (2) the circumstances under which, because of their private financial interests, individuals should be disqualified from handling certain duties or functions in the executive departments and agencies; (3) the extent to which the private financial interests of members of the immediate family of an individual should be taken into account in policies dealing with potential conflicts of interest; (4) the circumstances under which individuals serving in executive departments and agencies should be allowed to engage in private financial activities of their own or receive outside salaries or other forms of remuneration; (5) the conditions that should govern the employment in the executive departments and agencies on the basis of no compensation or nominal compensation; (6) the prohibitions that should be applied against the subsequent employment by private firms doing business with Government departments or agencies of individuals working for such departments or agencies; and

(d) To file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing the results of its studies and such legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its own members. It is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, and, within the limitation of its appropriations, to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies. The joint committee shall terminate its activities as quickly as possible after the submission of its report and, in

any case, shall not remain in existence after December 31, 1953.

Sec. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $10,000, and such expenses shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for approximately 5 minutes to explain the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I assure my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana, that I shall not object, let me say that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself have been waiting for some time for the close of the morning hour, because we wish to submit a few remarks to the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Then I shall yield.

Mr. HILL. No; I wish the Senator from Montana to proceed, and I shall not object to his doing so. I merely wish to say that after he has concluded his remarks, and following the morning hour, I hope we shall have an opportunity to present the matters we have in mind.

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana to proceed for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I have submitted calls for a complete study of the existing laws and administrative requirements relating to the potential conflict between the public interest and the private financial interests of officials in the executive departments and agencies. This study is proposed to be handled by a temporary joint committee of Congress, which will be expected to present recommendations for improved legislation during the present session of the Eighty-third Congress.

Naturally, this resolution has a direct and important bearing upon the questions raised by the nomination of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the head of General Motors, as Secretary of Defense, and the announced plans concerning the nomination to high posts in the Defense Department of other men from companies with defense contracts. The concurrent resolution, however, is not concerned with whether the President was well advised in nominating Mr. Wilson for this post or whether, once the nomination had been made, Senate confirmation was appropriate. The resolution deals exclusively with the much more important question of what should be the general policy of the United States to protect the public interest from being jeopardized as a result of the private financial interests of Government officials.

There are some who would say that the existing laws on this question are too rigid. For example, the following statement appears in an editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," published in the Washington Post on January 27:

> There ought to be some thought, as a general principle applicable in future cases, to means of making it easier for men of every station in life to answer the call to public service. * * * If it is possible to remove some of the barriers without damaging the conflict of interest safeguards, that ought to be done.

Mr. President, I believe every Member of the Senate can agree with this observation by the editor of the Washington Post. Not only some thought, but also a considerable amount of thought, should be given to this problem.

On the other hand, there are many who will quickly point out that in some respects the present statutes are too loose and too vague. Certainly, it is entirely possible that some of the barriers to which the Washington Post refers cannot be safely removed unless others are erected in their place.

Furthermore, the discussions that have already taken place concerning the nomination of Mr. Wilson and his chosen assistants have vividly raised at least seven important questions of national policy.

What policy should govern the private financial interests of a man's wife and immediate family? Is a man indirectly interested in the profits or contracts of a corporation if his wife owns $75,000 or $100,000 worth of stock in the corporation? Is a man indirectly interested if he transfers 20 percent of his stock to members of his immediate family?

Does a man remain directly interested in the profits or contracts of a corporation if, upon being named to a high post, he announces his unmistakable intention at some later date to dispose of his substantial holdings? Or does he somehow receive, by virtue of his statement of intention or by virtue of confirmation action by the Senate, a temporary dispensation which excludes him from the scope of the provisions of the Criminal Code?

Under what circumstances and to what extent should individuals with private financial interests be disqualified from performing certain duties or functions in the executive agencies?

Under what circumstances should they be prevented from engaging in private activities of their own or receiving outside salaries or other forms of remuneration?

What conditions should govern the employment of individuals in the executive agencies on the basis of no compensation or nominal compensation?

What prohibition should be applied against the subsequent employment of Government officials by private firms doing business with the Government agencies for whom such officials have previously worked?

Should the special provisions of the law affecting the private financial interests of members of various independent boards and commissions be extended to cover the officials of the regular departments of Government also?

Mr. President, the laws on our statute books do not provide a satisfactory answer to these questions. Judicial decisions do not answer them. I doubt whether any Member of the Senate feels qualified at this moment to attempt a definitive answer. I know that all Members of the Senate—and I believe all thoughtful citizens throughout this country—will agree with me in my contention that questions of this type should not be left dangling in the air but should be affirmatively settled by action of the United States Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana now requests unanimous consent that he may proceed for an additional 2 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a great forward step in this direction has been taken by members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has had the Office of the Legislative Counsel prepare a special memorandum concerning existing statutes relating to possible conflicting interests of officers of the Government. This memorandum, in my judgment, fully indicates the vague and incomplete nature of existing statutory requirements in this field.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts has had another memorandum prepared by the Office of the Legislative Counsel concerning judicial interpretations of provisions of these present laws. This memorandum also indicates the existing gaps in our present policy in this field.

These memoranda, together with other important materials on the subject, have been brought together by the Senate Committee on Armed Services in a committee print entitled "Compilation of Certain Legal Materials Prepared by the Office of the Senate Legislative Counsel on Conflict of Interest Statutes." A careful reading of this valuable document will convince anyone that a fresh and intensive study by Congress is needed in this field.

Mr. President, I believe that the most expedient and effective method of making this study would be through a temporary joint committee set up for this specific purpose. It is my hope that the concurrent resolution which I have introduced to authorize such a committee will be supported by members of both parties and will be acted upon promptly by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the Washington Post editorial from which I have quoted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Now that Charles E. Wilson has agreed to dispose of his stock holdings, it is hard to see how anything less can be asked of the nominees for Secretary of the Army and Secretary

of the Air Force. If anything, the relationship of the Secretary of Defense to the various industrial contractors is considerably less direct than that of the service secretaries. The services, as opposed to the Department of Defense as an entity, are actually engaged in procurement, and the service secretaries are responsible for executing contracts. After all the attention focused on the Wilson affair, it would be damaging to permit a half-way arrangement for the service heads, even if they should transfer their stock to nonvoting trusts and disqualify themselves in matters affecting the respective firms.

The degree of sacrifice thus necessitated should not be overlooked. Harold E. Talbott, the prospective Secretary of the Air Force, could no doubt sell his Chrysler Corp. and Auto-Lite stocks with only a capital-gains penalty. But in the case of Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army-designate, sale of his holdings in J. P. Stevens & Co.—which is a large uniform supplier—might result in transfer of control of the firm outside of his family. For Mr. Stevens personally that would be a high price to pay.

There ought to be some thought, as a general principle applicable in future cases, to means of making it easier for men of every station in life to answer the call to public service. Financial sacrifices are, of coarse, not the only question; there is no feasible way, say, to reimburse a man who gives up a high private salary in order to take a Government job, and there are plenty of examples of men who have relinquished fortunes in order to serve the public with no taint of private interest. Nonetheless, if it is possible to remove some of the barriers without damaging the conflict of interest safeguards, that ought to be done.

MEMBERS ON PART OF SENATE ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; and Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut; Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. GILLETTE, of Iowa.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR FRED A. SEATON

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 52), and submitted a report (No. 25) thereon; which resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Fred A. Seaton, who were carried on the Senate pay roll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF MANPOWER STUDIES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53), and submitted a report (No. 26) thereon; which resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 53, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to on February 19, 1951 (providing for a study and investigation of the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government), is hereby continued to February 15, 1953, inclusive.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BLAIR MOODY

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54), and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon; which resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Blair Moody, who were carried on the Senate pay roll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 55), and submitted a report (No. 28) thereon; which resolution was ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas R. Underwood, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 56), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsections (g) (1) (B) and (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 252, Eighty-second Congress, first session, agreed to on January 24, 1952, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That section 1 of rule XIII of the Senate is amended by substituting a period for the comma after the word "Vote" in the eighth line of said section and striking out the remaining words of that section and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "No motion to lay a motion to reconsider on the table shall be in order until after 1 day of actual Senate session following the filing of the motion to reconsider."

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO WEEKLY APPEARANCES OF DEPARTMENTAL AND AGENCY HEADS IN SENATE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS OF SENATORS

Mr. KEFAUVER. On behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend rule X of the standing rules so as to permit weekly appearances of departmental and agency heads in the Senate to answer questions of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule 10 of the standing rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. There shall be held in the Senate on at least 1 day in any one calendar week, a 'question and report period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of executive departments and agencies are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the Senate. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department or agency concerned, with an invitation to appear before the Senate, and one copy to the Committee on Rules with a request for allotment of time in a question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this

paragraph, the Committee on Rules shall determine the date for, and the length of time of, each question period to the head of a department or independent agency who has indicated to the committee his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions propounded in any one question period shall be approved by one committee. The latter half of each question period shall be reserved for oral questions which shall be germane to the subject matter of the written questions by Members of the Senate, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such question period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. The time of each question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the RECORD appearing before the day on which such question period is to be held, and the proceedings during the question period shall be printed in the RECORD for such day."

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

I am today introducing a resolution to set up a report-and-question period on the floor of the Senate at which the heads of executive departments and agencies are requested to appear and answer questions propounded by Members of the Senate.

I should like this opportunity to explain this proposal, so that other Members of the Senate may give it their consideration. It is neither new nor novel. I proposed it for a number of years in the House of Representatives. Senator FULBRIGHT has previously offered similar resolutions in the Senate. The history of similar efforts to ameliorate friction between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, in fact, goes back to the founding fathers.

Mechanically, the resolution calls for such a session at least 1 day in each period of two calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any one calendar week. The length of any one session is limited to 2 hours, so as not to trespass on the time of either the executive officials or the Members of the Senate.

Under the resolution, the first part of the question-and-report period will be confined to written questions, submitted in advance by the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter with which the particular department or agency is concerned.

The committee will submit one copy of these questions to the head of the department or agency concerned, with an invitation to appear before the Senate, and another copy to the Committee on Rules, with a request for allotment of time in a question period to answer such questions.

The written questions, along with an announcement of the time set aside, will be published in at least two daily editions of the RECORD prior to the hearing, so that all Members may have full notice of the session and an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the subject matter.

The latter half of each question period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the Senate. The only restriction is that these questions be germane to the subject matter. One-half of this oral question time will be controlled by the chairman of the committee which prepared the written questions and the other half by the ranking minority member of that committee.

The entire proceedings will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day.

Now the purpose of this plan, I am sure, is self-evident.

It is intended to provide for a mutual canvassing of problems between the executive and legislative branches of Government. It is intended to make for better understanding, between the two, of mutual problems. Since proceedings of the Senate are open to the public and press, it is intended also to make for better public understanding of these problems. Without public understanding and support, no problem in a democracy can be solved satisfactorily.

In short, this plan has as its purpose better, more responsible government, and is intended to be of benefit to the Members of the Senate, to the Executive, and to the public alike. It is in no sense a party measure—it appeals to no partisan interest, it awakens no party spirit.

United States history is rich with precedents for this plan. Our founding fathers never intended that the three divisions of our Government should work in water-tight compartments. Rather, I think our Constitution intended that some consultative custom be worked out. There is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit the method which has been proposed in this resolution from being that custom.

Let us examine some of the historical background for this proposal.

In the law organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, the Secretary of the Treasury was given the duty "to make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature in person or in writing * * *." In the debate on that bill it was expressly objected to on the ground that it might lead to the introduction of all the Secretaries on the floor, but the bill was nevertheless passed, and without so much as a denial that such would be the result.

In the early days of the Government, the Secretaries were repeatedly called to the presence of either House for consultation, advice, and information. There are about 14 instances noted in the annals of the First Congress in which a member of the Cabinet appeared before the Senate during the First Congress. There are eight instances cited of appearances before the House.

As an example there is this notation in Annals of Congress, volume 1, page 51, First Congress:

"Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations."

In the Executive Journal of the Senate, volume 1, page 55, there is the notation that on August 4, 1790, President Washington sent a message to the Senate communicating the draft of a secret article to be incorporated in a treaty with an Indian tribe.

The message closed with these words: "If the Senate should require any further explanation, the Secretary of War will attend them for that purpose."

This, mind you, was a message from the Father of our Country, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention.

A parallel in our history is the practice, usually followed, of the President delivering his state of the Union address in person. It is of historical interest also to note that the Constitution of the Confederate States provided that "Congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either house, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department."

This was in essence the proposal of the Pendleton resolution, introduced in the Forty-sixth Congress. One of the principal objections to the Pendleton plan was that it required constant attendance of the administrators—something which my proposal obviates. However, it is interesting to note that among the prominent Americans who advocated that plan were President William Howard Taft, Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, Elihu Root, John W. Davis, President James A. Garfield, President Woodrow Wilson, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler (then General Eisenhower's predecessor as President of Columbia University), Herbert Hoover (then a Cabinet member), Dr. Charles A. Beard (noted historian), and Justice Story.

In conclusion, let me say that the need of closer collaboration between Congress and the administration has frequently been felt and voiced in the course of our national history, but was never more essential than now, in this confused time which is neither clearly peace nor war.

These are trying times, both domestic and international. It is very necessary that we have the best liaison and understanding possible. While President Eisenhower has announced plans to carry on the White House press conferences, news from the conferences does not fully meet the needs. This proposed question and answer period will give Cabinet members and officials the opportunity to state their plans and policies after mature consideration.

Effective cooperation between the two great political branches of Government is indispensable.

The problems of Government are not going to become easier. They will become more complicated.

If we are to keep pace with them, if we are to legislate intelligently, and if we are to meet the great domestic and international issues coming before us, we must improve our system of securing information and keeping up with the administration of laws.

And we must find a way of having closer teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

REPORTS BY SENATORS ON CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING THEIR EMPLOYEES, AND ITS PUBLICATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would require monthly reports from each Senator showing the names, duties, and salaries of each person employed by him. The resolution would require publication of such reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is a companion to the bill I introduced to require Members of Congress to report their financial and commodity transactions.

There has been increasing public concern over the financial transactions of public servants and the use of public funds.

Passage of this resolution would reassure the public that no Senator has anything to hide. Disclosure would prevent the development of any situation which a Senator would not be willing to defend publicly.

In the Eightieth Congress the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 123 which requires similar reports from Senate committees. I am advised by the disbursement office of the House that Representatives' payrolls are open to public inspection. This has been so since 1932.

There can be no reason for different treatment of Senate payrolls.

The junior Senator from Oregon has always advocated the fishbowl approach to public service. The public has the right to know what is going on where they cannot see. The public has a right to an unobstructed view.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 59), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That every Senator shall report to the Secretary of the Senate, within the first 10 days of each month, the name, duties, and total salary of each person employed by him during the preceding calendar month and such information shall be published in the first issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published after the last day for filing such reports. The name, duties, and total salary of each person employed by each Senator during the 6-month periods ending December 31 and June 30 shall be published in the first issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published after the last day for filing such reports for the last month in each 6-month period.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on January 13, 1953, the bill (S. 394) to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It should have been referred to the Committee on Finance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON MISSOURI RIVER DEVELOPMENT OAHE DAM (S. DOC. NO. 11)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Public Law 870, Eighty-first Congress, second session, directed the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with certain Indian tribes for lands which would be inundated by the Oahe Dam.

It provided in section 5 of the Act that in the event the negotiating parties were unable to agree on any item in the proposed contracts they should report to Congress. I have in my hand a report which has been prepared by one of the negotiating parties, and I submit it herewith to the Senate by way of reporting it to Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a public document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the second biennial dinner of the men's club of the Adas Israel Congregation of Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1953.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him relative to the twentieth anniversary of the Lone Ranger in radio.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the dedication of the headquarters building of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C., August 30, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address entitled "Our Ancestors and Their Contribution," delivered by Dr. Charles M. Steese before the Women's Club of Lewisburg, Pa.

Program of service of prayer on the occasion of the inauguration of a new President, the appointment of a new Cabinet, and the convening of the Eighty-third Congress, held at Washington Cathedral on Sunday, January 25, 1953.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Statement issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority entitled "Taxes and Tax Equivalents Paid by TVA and Power Distributors for the 1952 Fiscal Year."

By Mr. HOEY:

Correspondence between himself and Miss Janette Manring, of Browns Summit, N. C.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Article entitled "The Dulles Speech," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in his syndicated article Today and Tomorrow, in the Washington Post of January 29, 1953.

Editorial entitled "'Never Not' Diplomacy," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 28, 1953, relating to a recent address delivered by Secretary of State Dulles.

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

Article by David Fernaier, regarding the burial of José Martí.

MANHATTAN, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 1 minute. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Manhattan, Kans., has been cited as a 1952 All-American City for its outstanding citizen action in rebuilding the city after the devastating flood in 1951.

The award, sponsored by the National Municipal League with the cooperation of Look magazine, is a well-deserved recognition of this city and its citizens, who suffered one of the most severe disasters that can befall any city.

The all-American cities awards are made annually to 11 United States cities, selected by a 12-man jury of distinguished citizens and experts on Government impaneled by the National Municipal League.

As one who had the opportunity to visit Manhattan shortly after the destructive flood and observe personally the ruin, muck, and mire left following the flood, I can assure you the situation looked practically hopeless, as was well expressed in the article by one of the soldiers who was carrying sandbags, when he said, "Why don't they just move this town some place else and start all over?"

It was only a matter of months later that I had an opportunity to again visit Manhattan and I could hardly believe the rebuilding and restoration that had taken place in a few months. This could only have been accomplished by the indomitable spirit of the citizens of the city.

I salute Manhattan and its citizens on receiving this award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very brief article on the same subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS.

"Why don't they just move this town some place else and start all over?" a soldier carrying sandbags is supposed to have remarked while working to stem the devastating flood that covered half of Manhattan in the summer of 1951.

The soldier's advice could have been taken. Flood damage totaled $22 million, a tremendous sum for a city of 19,000. All of the downtown business district was under water. Certain sections could never be rebuilt.

It took the people of Manhattan the next 18 months to rebuild their city—but rebuild they did. Cooperation was their greatest weapon. Kansas State College, for example, was untouched by the flood water, but teachers and students put in countless hours at hard labor repairing the damage. Civic groups did not wait for the harried city administration to repair the damaged basement of the community building, but did the job themselves.

As the clean-up work progressed, it became apparent that blighted areas remained that were beyond rehabilitation. The civic groups proposed that the areas be cleared. A bond issue was passed enabling the city to buy the properties at preflood prices. This permitted residents of the area to relocate in more desirable neighborhoods. The city promptly annexed 50 acres and extended utilities to an area when low-cost relocation housing was built.

Eighteen months after the flood had receded, Manhattan was indeed a new city.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. If I am permitted to yield during the morning hour, I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish my distinguished colleague to yield in order that he may recognize the fact that on that same all-American team Roanoke, Va., is playing.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

F. A. MILLER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER OF SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment of the Senate's time to pay tribute to a man who is most deserving of far more than a moment of time and attention by this body.

Saturday will mark the eighty-fifth birthday anniversary of Mr. F. A. Miller, editor and publisher of the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind.

Mr. Miller is known, either by reputation or personally, to many Members of the present Senate and to a great number of those who have served before us. Those of us who know him are always eager to tell those who do not know him that Mr. Miller is the finest possible representative of the American press.

I am certain the entire United States Senate will join me in wishing this honest, fair and forthright exponent of American journalism many happy returns of the day and many, many more opportunities to receive the endearing expressions to which he is so richly entitled.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF THE TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GORE] and myself, I wish to call the attention of this body to a resolution of the Tennessee General Assembly, which appears on page A312 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an insertion by Representative JOE EVINS.

This resolution of the Tennessee Assembly calls attention to proposals which have been made to sell the Tennessee Valley Authority to private investors. The resolution concludes that the Tennessee General Assembly urges Congress "to reject any such plan that may be submitted for its consideration and to preserve the ownership of the Tennessee Valley Authority by all the American people, to whom it rightfully belongs and to whose interest it is dedicated."

Mr. President, we of the Valley recall that the Muscle Shoals plant was built during World War I, because of the shortage of power that existed then.

After the war there was the Government with a dam and a power plant on its hands and there were men in the Congress of the United States who said that it would be socialistic for the Government to use that dam for the benefit of all the people. There were proposals in Congress at that time to sell Muscle Shoals. Henry Ford was one of the prospective purchasers. Attempts to sell it were frustrated. But still—it just sat there.

Then, under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, the dream of TVA was born. It seems everlastingly right to me that the waters of the rivers, which belong to all the people, should be harnessed for the benefit of all the people. It seems everlastingly right that electric power, which is a natural monopoly, and which we are all increasingly dependent upon, should be distributed for the benefit of all the people.

The facts prove the wisdom of this conception. Once the South was known as the Nation's economic problem No. 1. We do not talk about any section being economic problem No. 1 any more. Certainly the South is not. And TVA has a lot to do with the fact that it is not.

In helping rebuild the economy of the South, TVA has helped rebuild the economy of every other section. The generators it uses come from Schenectady. The steel from Pittsburgh. Salesmen follow the power lines and sell things manufactured all over the Nation. The entire Nation is the beneficiary.

Yet the old ideas of reaction are reawakening and stirring once more. It has been rather disturbing to me, as it undoubtedly has to the Tennessee General Assembly, to read the editorials in the McCormick press advocating the sale of TVA to private interests just as there were advocates of the sale of Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford after World War I.

Mr. President, as pointed out by the Tennessee General Assembly, TVA has contributed immeasurably to the national defense by providing an abundant supply of low-cost power for atomic energy, plant, air-research facilities, aluminum manufacturing, chemical production, and other mobilization activities which have made the Tennessee Valley the inner citadel of the Nation.

It must be preserved for the benefit of the Nation.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that the Senate will meet tomorrow for the purpose of considering nominations which are reported today, and for the purpose of considering resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration dealing with numerous committees, and granting additional funds to numerous committees. Some of the resolutions must be acted upon before the 1st day of February, which will be Sunday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Could the Senator give us any indication of what he expects to bring before the Senate today, and on what days of next week he expects to have the Senate meet?

Mr. TAFT. So far as I know, except for the consideration of nominations which are being reported, probably there will be nothing before the Senate except possibly the bill extending the Reorganization Act. I hope that it will not be necessary for the Senate to meet except on Monday and Thursday of next week, but we may have to meet more often if there is a tendency to postpone consideration of reports on nominations, because the various departments are very anxious to get under way as quickly as possible. So far as I know, that is all that will be brought before the Senate.

If we can meet on only Monday and Thursday, we shall do so. However, in order to permit the passage of 1 day after a nomination has been reported, it might be necessary to have a session on some day in addition to Monday and Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When does the Senator from Ohio expect that the reorganization bill will be brought before the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. Not until Thursday, anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I correctly understand the distinguished majority leader to state that he intends to have the Senate consider certain so-called "money" resolutions tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, the resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have made a personal examination of some of those resolutions, and I find that the amount we are thereby being asked to approve for expenditure—to be spent in the performance of committee functions—is far in excess of half a million dollars. I have been trying to gather information in regard to these expenditures. I doubt that I can complete that examination by tomorrow, in view of the fact that the resolutions have just been reported today.

Mr. TAFT. I regret very much that we shall have to consider the resolutions tomorrow, in view of the fact that, as the Senator from Alabama has indicated, we must take prompt action in the case of these committees. Some of the resolutions relate to pay for the staffs of committees which otherwise will expire. All these matters have been before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Democratic Members of that committee have attended the meetings and hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is just the point: There were no hearings.

Mr. TAFT. In each case the chairman of the committee involved appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and presented his claim. That is all that has ever been done in these cases, as I understand.

So far as the Senator's questions are concerned, let me say that it seems to me we must proceed tomorrow to act on the resolutions, and it is the intention to have a meeting of the Senate tomorrow for that purpose. At the meeting tomorrow the Senator from Louisiana can object, if he wishes to do so, to having the resolutions considered, and he can present his reasons for making such objection.

However, at this time I am not prepared to say anything except that the resolutions will be on the calendar. The Senate itself can determine whether at that time action on the resolutions should be postponed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. FELISBERTO M. VERANO, MEMBER OF THE PHILIPPINE SENATE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of presenting to Members of the Senate a distinguished and leading member of the Senate of the Republic of the Philippines, Senator Felisberto M. Verano. It is with great pleasure that I now present him to the Members of the Senate. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Tennessee for presenting to the Senate this distinguished visitor from the Republic of the Philippines.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the majority leader whether he can give us some information as to when action will be taken on completing and reappointing the Select Committee on Small Business. One reason for asking that question now is that tomorrow, I believe, or perhaps the next day, is pay day, but the employees of this committee are not able to draw pay, because of the fact

that under the resolution creating the committee it has to be reappointed every 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. I hope we may have the list of our members on that committee ready by tomorrow, so that it can be reported tomorrow.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, upon which he has served so well. I wonder when action will be taken on it.

Mr. TAFT. That also will be no later than tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the majority leader very much.

Mr. TAFT. The selection of members for those two committees has been made, I believe, but has not been finally confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business has now been concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator desire to be recognized?

Mr. TAFT. I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HILL. I yield. My remarks would be quite as appropriate in executive session as in legislative session.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. When will the morning hour be concluded? I have been waiting to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has just announced the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. TAFT. I then move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. The Senator can make a statement in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain;

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the remainder of the term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1953; and

Herman Phleger, of California, to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Warren Olney III, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy; and

H. Brian Holland, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

STEPHEN F. DUNN TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Stephen F. Dunn, of my own State of Michigan, to be general counsel of the Department of Commerce. Mr. Dunn is a noted attorney from Grand Rapids, Mich., and will perform great service for the Department of Commerce. I urge my colleagues to support the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl W. McCardle to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is the understanding of the Senator from Oregon that both these nominations have been on the desk for a number of days.

Is he correct in his understanding?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the nominations went over for 2 days.

Mr. MORSE. Is there a report from the committee on Mr. Morton?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that a number of reports have been submitted today, to be placed upon the Executive Calendar tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not customary to have printed reports on nominations, except in extraordinary cases. Very seldom does a committee submit a printed report in connection with recommendations that the nominations of appointees be confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is quite immaterial to me what is customary and what is not customary. I am simply raising the question as to whether there are any reports on these nominees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed, he will state to the Senator from Oregon, that there are no reports on Mr. McCardle to be Assistant Secretary of State, or upon Mr. Morton to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder whether the chairman of the committee would accommodate the Senator from Oregon by advising us in regard to Mr. Morton's qualifications. I have no report before me. I know nothing about his qualifications. It may be good procedure to confirm nominees without knowing anything about them, but, speaking for myself, I should like to know something about them.

Mr. WILEY. Were the nominations in question confirmed, or were they not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the McCardle nomination was acted upon before the Senator from Oregon arose, but the Morton nomination was not.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to say something about Mr. Morton. I am sorry that we have been so busy in the committee that we have not a detailed report, if that is customary. Mr. Morton is a former Representative in Congress from Kentucky, and recommended very highly by the distinguished Senators from Kentucky. He has been in the armed services of this country. He appeared before the committee. The report of the committee is unanimous that his nomination be confirmed. He is a young man, I should judge between 40 and 50 years of age, a man of fine appearance, a man of good, alert mind. The report which came from the Secretary's office is that there is nothing unfavorable in the record against him, and, as a consequence, the committee reached the unanimous conclusion that his nomination should be confirmed. No objection was raised by anyone. The matter was before the committee, I think, for a week or 10 days. That is as much as I recall about Mr. Morton at this time.

I may say we had a hearing this morning on two other nominations, which we have reported for the calendar. I refer to the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, to be United States Representative on the United Nations Human Rights Commission, and the nomination of Winthrop W. Aldrich, to be Ambassador to Great Britain. If it is going to be insisted that printed reports, in each case, shall accompany the committee's recommendations in relation to nominations as to which there seems to be no dispute, I suppose we shall have to have that done, but I do not think that has been the practice heretofore in connection with the hundreds of cases that have come before the committee. Only in matters of great significance and importance has the question been raised. Are there any further questions?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a comment?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is a strange argument that there would have to be a dispute over some nomination before we could be supplied with the

information that those of us not on the committee ought to have in order to determine whether there is a basis for raising a question as to the nominee. In regard to positions so important as that of Assistant Secretary of State, it seems to me that Members of the Senate who are not on the committees ought to be supplied with an informative report on the background and interests and all the other questions into which one naturally goes when he is passing judgment on a nominee.

Speaking for myself, and within my rights on the floor, I do not propose to pass upon nominees for high posts in the Government under this administration until I know something about them.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to read briefly from the biography of this nominee. I realize that the Senator from Oregon should be on the Foreign Relations Committee and on every other committee of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. I have the floor. I decline to yield.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator has made a personal remark, and I intend to answer him.

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I desire to take the floor in my own right later.

Mr. WILEY. We have a committee system which has existed for 50 or 60 years, but we will not be able to transact business under that system if Senators who are not members of the particular committee and who think that the action of the committee is erroneous and is not, so to speak, according to Hoyle, are to raise objection.

In order that the Senator from Oregon may know something about the nominee, I may say a memorandum has just been handed to me, from which I read:

Born August 19, 1907, Louisville, Ky. Five great grandparents born in Kentucky, two in Virginia, one in Newfoundland. Educated in public schools in Jefferson County, Ky. Graduated from Yale University in 1929 with bachelor of arts degree. Associated with Ballard and Ballard Co., a grain and milling business from 1929 until 1941. Left the company as executive vice president to accept a commission in United States Navy. On active duty with the Navy for 51 months. Commanded three ships in the Pacific. Returned to Ballard and Ballard as president in 1946 and continued in that position until elected to the Eightieth Congress in November of that year. Was reelected to the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congress. While in the Congress served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor. Married in April 1931 and has two children, ages 21 and 17.

As I understand, Mr. President, he did not run for reelection.

That is the biography of the gentleman. The committee unanimously arrived at the conclusion that his nomination should be confirmed.

I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like the floor in my own right.

Mr. WILEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Chair please state the situation as it now exists with respect to the nomination, as to whether the nomination is received, whether it is vulnerable to objection on the part of one Member, whether it requires unanimous consent, or just what the situation is?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination was reported on January 26. The McCardle nomination has been confirmed by the Senate. When the Morton nomination came up, the Senator from Oregon raised his point, and the nomination is under consideration at the moment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is before the Senate, then, on motion? Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was reached in its regular order on the call of the executive calendar.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And it is open to debate, I take it. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

WILLIAM RUFUS KING, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, within the next few weeks a delegation of Alabamians will journey to Cuba to join with the people of Cuba to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the administering of the oath of office to William Rufus King, of Alabama, as Vice President of the United States, at Matanzas, Cuba, on March 24, 1853. Mr. King had gone to Cuba seeking the restoration of his health and was permitted by act of Congress to take the oath there. Mr. King was for many years a distinguished Member of the Senate and served as the President pro tempore of this body from July 1, 1836, to March 11, 1841. The people of Alabama deeply appreciate the honor the people of Cuba are according the memory of William Rufus King. They hold the people of Cuba in warm friendship.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to a great Cuban patriot.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

JOSÉ MARTÍ, FRIEND OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday, January 28, was the centenary of the birth of José Martí, the great Cuban liberator, and I deem it a privilege to pay tribute to him.

The life of José Martí was an exemplification of selfless devotion to a cause. That cause was the freedom of his country. He dreamed of nothing else, worked for nothing else, lived for nothing else. He died for that cause in his very first battle, and the freedom of Cuba was to strike root, and put forth leaf and flower and fruit and to grow strong, nourished by his heroic blood. On horseback, on his way to battle, he had written Cuba's national anthem with words that have proved prophetic of his own undying fame, "To die for the fatherland is to live."

There was no room in Martí's faith for failure or defeat. To such conviction as was his, defeat can be no more than a temporary delay, and failure is impossible.

Martí came to this country, a very young man, to seek the support of our citizens in his country's struggle for independence. He found it in abundant measure. The friendship between Cuba and the United States is deeply rooted in our mutual will for liberty and has been richly nurtured by valiant blood of both nations shed in a common cause. In the great pacific work of friendship as in the great martial work of liberation, Martí was leader and apostle.

It is interesting to recall that the publication of Martí's complete writings, which has been carried on in many different places, in many volumes, was begun here in Washington in 1900, 5 years after his death.

When Martí arrived in New York in January 1880, he wrote exultantly:

At last I am in a country where every man seems to be his own master. One can breathe freely here because freedom is the foundation, shield, and essence of life. Here one can be proud of mankind.

It is needful in our Americas to know the truth about the United States—

He told the Spanish-speaking peoples. He added—

The defects of the United States should not be intentionally exaggerated, because of a desire to deny it all virtues; neither should its defects be concealed nor applauded as if they were virtues.

He brought a friendly but careful spirit of appraisal to his work of interpreting our people to Latin America. His attitude was one of goodwill and moderation, qualities which he esteemed highly; and his philosophy, in his own words, was "constructive Americanism." He found here a nation in which, summoned by freedom, all kinds of men and problems have a forum. And he said of the United States that it is "the only Nation which has the absolute duty of being great. It is natural," he added, speaking of Latin America in general, "for us who inherited storms to live with them. This country—the United States—inherited calmness and grandeur; it should live with these."

Time and again Martí advocated inter-American solidarity as the only sure basis for peace and progress in this hemisphere. "America must encourage every means of bringing the American peoples closer together, and must reject everything that separates them," he declared. "In this, as in all human problems, the future belongs to peace." He was none the less aware that peace must be not merely achieved, but zealously safeguarded.

So it was in 1893 that he said, in words that have a special relevance to world conditions now, 60 years after, "We Americans are one in origin, in hope, and in danger."

We rightly think of Martí as a man of vision, dedicated to an ideal. But like all men who bring vision into objective

reality, he based his ideal on a solid foundation of everyday fact. His writings and speeches were filled with sound common sense. The ownership of their land by small landholders was, he asserted, "the guaranty of the Republic." "An impoverished country will always live in tension and revolt," he pointed out. "To create ownership is to create supporters of personal independence, and the public pride necessary to defend those interests."

He was a strong advocate of the democratic process, expressing his own determination "to have it made self-evident that in public affairs there is no greater will than that of the country; and the country's welfare shall prevail over private interests."

An enlightened patriot, he fully understood the importance of politics in the life of a democracy; and he insisted upon both sagacity and integrity in the political arena. He believed patience to be the greatest of all virtues in politics—so long as patience is not carried to the point of exaggeration. A list of precepts for political life could be compiled from his writings. For instance, "To sic on the dogs is a demagogue's job; the patriot's duty is to be on guard."

He expressed much the same idea in equally forceful words on another occasion: "A country should have one gallows for those who kindle needless hatred, and another for those who do not tell the truth in time."

"That man is a criminal," Martí said, "who promotes an evitable war; and he also is a criminal who avoids an inevitable war."

And, again: "To win a victory is to take on a duty."

These, and all the other luminous phrases of Martí speak as directly to us as they did to his own countrymen, because they voice truths dear to us all, and may well be summarized in one sentence of his: "I cherish only a love for the growth—and a horror for the imprisonment—of the human spirit." Surely in these words we find a noble parallel for the immortal declaration of Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Today all men who love freedom and cherish independence salute the heroic memory of José Martí.

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has agreed to recognize the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who desires to speak on the subject just discussed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a news dispatch from Havana earlier this month reported the death of Maj. Gen. Miguel Varona y del Castillo, a veteran of the Cuban struggle for independence. The death of General Varona, who had taken part in the campaign of 1895 in which José Martí was slain, is a reminder of how close in time we are to that epic chapter in the history of the American Republics. In the early years of the nineteenth century, the heroic figures of Bolivar and San Martin loomed large in the wars of independence which freed South America. Toward the close of the century, Cuba was in the throes of revolution, with Martí, last of the great liberators, as her apostle of freedom.

The bonds between Cuba and Florida go back to the very beginning of our history; back to Ponce de Leon, discoverer of Florida, who, wounded on those fair shores by an Indian arrow, was taken to Havana to die. But of all the many historical and cultural ties uniting Florida and Cuba, none has greater significance than the work of José Martí in his apostolate for Cuban freedom, especially among his follow countrymen who had found refuge in our State.

In common with civic leaders at Tampa, I have been advocating the creation of a shrine in Ybor City, Fla., commemorating José Martí and the issuance by the Post Office Department of a José Martí commemorative stamp. Ybor City contributed in large measure the enthusiasm, the encouragement, the support, which were to lead to the victory for which Martí spent years in preparing.

I have no doubt that that shrine will be created at Ybor City, and will remain for time to come as a memorial to the indomitable force of the human spirit, when armed with the strength of noble purpose and of selfless patriotism.

It was in a speech at Tampa on November 26, 1891, that Martí made the following declarations of democratic principle for the republic which his life, and his death, were to be instrumental in bringing into existence:

> If in things concerning my country I should be given the choice of one good above all others * * * this is the good that I would choose: I would have as the cornerstone of our Republic the devotion of Cubans to the full dignity of man. * * * If the Republic were not to have as its foundation the basic character of every one of her sons, his own handiwork, his own habit of thinking for himself, and his respect, as if it were a matter of family honor, for the unrestricted freedom of others—in short, the fervent recognition of man's essential worth—then the Republic would not be worth a single one of our women's tears, nor a single drop of a brave man's blood.

Martí strove for survival, freedom, peace. Mere survival, lacking freedom, and without peace as its normal condition, did not enter into his considerations. His nature was one incapable of accepting defeat; but the only real victory for him was the victory over injustice, intolerance, and violence; the victory of a peace in which a free people would have opportunity for growth to its highest stature.

The vitality and vigor of man's indomitable will to freedom is a recurrent theme in Martí's writings and his public addresses. I like especially to recall a famous speech he made to the Cuban cigar makers in southern Florida some 64 years ago. He found a symbol of his purpose in the beautiful landscape around Tampa, where gnarled and blackened pine trunks were gloriously surmounted by the sturdy green of fresh growth. He said:

> Suddenly the sun broke through a clearing in the woods and there in the dazzle of unexpected light I saw, rising proudly from amid black trunks of fallen trees, the flourishing branches of new pines. That is what we are: new pines.

It is as a towering pine in the forest of American heroes that Cuba, with the rest of the hemisphere, remembers today the soaring, triumphant spirit of Jose Martí.

WILLIAM RUFUS KING, OF ALABAMA, AND JOSÉ MARTÍ, OF CUBA

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as has been stated by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], it was in 1853, in Havana, Cuba, that William Rufus King, one of Alabama's most illustrious sons, took his oath of office as Vice President of the United States.

King was already a sick man, in the last stages of tuberculosis, when he was elected on the same ticket which carried Franklin Pierce into the Presidency. Although he sought a cure in the balmy climate of Cuba, it soon became plain that his case was fatal. By special legislative enactment, setting a precedent in our national life, the oath of office was administered to him in the Cuban capital; and on that occasion, before he returned home to die, the citizens of that beautiful island showed him friendly care and consideration which we Alabamans still remember gratefully after a hundred years.

In March of this year a number of Alabama citizens will go to Cuba, to be present at the dedication of a plaque that is to be placed at Matanzas, near Havana, by the Cuban people, honoring the memory of William Rufus King. At least two of those whose names will appear will be descendants of William Rufus King. Mr. Henry P. Johnston, of Birmingham, is a collateral descendant, and the same is also true of Mr. De Vance Jones, of Tuscaloosa. One of the principal speakers on that occasion will be Mr. Thomas W. Palmer, an Alabamian now living in Havana. One of the ceremonies will be the laying of a wreath at the tomb of José Martí.

In the year 1853, José Martí was born in the same city of Havana. Alabama, therefore, feels a special bond with Cuba on this centennial of Martí's birth. In the name of my State, I am proud to join in tribute to Martí, whose life story is an inspiration for all who believe in the inherent right of men to be free.

Martí's own impassioned defense of that right awoke widespread response in this country. That was only to be expected. In fact, even before Martí was born, there had been in the United States, and especially in the South, many advocates of Cuban independence. In 1850, three distinguished young southerners, Maj. Robert E. Lee, Senator Jefferson Davis, and Governor Quitman, of Mississippi, had been asked, each in turn, to lead an expeditionary force to free Cuba. It is true that all three declined, though all were favorable to the cause; but many young men from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, and other States, volunteered for the expedition which Narciso López led in 1851.

A generation later, memories of that earlier heroic but unsuccessful attempt to free Cuba reinforced Martí's own persuasiveness in winning friends for his cause. In the United States Senate, one of the most eloquent supporters of the Cuban patriots was to be that noble and high-minded son of Alabama, Senator Edmund Winston Pettus.

Martí was, himself, one of the greatest orators of the hemisphere. It has been justly said that he is a striking exception to the general rule that orators are rarely men of action. In the case of Martí, words should be counted as deeds. Words, for him, were a means toward action, a proved and effective means. He viewed, and used, words as tools for accomplishment of his undeviating purpose—his country's freedom. He said, in 1880:

> I do not come to a literary tournament, I come to revive with good tidings the faith of believers; to exalt with sound reasoning the failing strength of doubters; to rouse with a friendly summons laggards and weary sleepers; and sharply to recall to honor deserters from their banner.

And on another occasion, he declared that—

> Words are superfluous when they do not establish, when they do not clarify, when they do not draw toward something, when they do not create. For what is thinking if not establishing, creating?

For Cuba to take her place among the sisterhood of American Republics was the steadfast purpose of Martí's life. It is due to him, far more than to any other one man, that that purpose was attained. There is an old saying in Cuba, "It does honor to give honor." We do ourselves honor today in giving honor to the unforgotten and unforgettable achievements of Cuba's great apostle of freedom, José Martí.

BANKRUPT FARM PRICES—THE GATEWAY TO A DEPRESSION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the nomination of True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, and the nomination of J. Earl Coke, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. I shall not oppose the confirmation of these nominations. However, I feel that at least a brief statement should be made in the Senate before these nominations are confirmed with reference to the present plight of agriculture in the light of the continued downward trend of agricultural prices. From reading the hearings before the committees one would judge that everyone recognizes the present trend and wishes to do something about it; but no one connected with the administration has yet suggested anything in the form of a definite policy recommended for enactment into law.

Mr. President, the present long continued drastic downward trend in prices for agricultural products which will soon reach the bankrupt level for the farmer is a forerunner of, and is fair warning of what we may expect for our entire economy if the trend is not halted. To meet this question squarely before more harm is done and to remove uncertainty, the Congress should enact within the next 30 days Senate bill 481 introduced by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] extending for at least 3 years beyond 1954 mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic agricultural commodities.

I believe that such supports should be continued as a permanent policy of the Government. The bill to which I have referred provides that they be continued for 3 years under the present law, which would mean 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Mississippi think that if we were to assure the farmers proper support for such a term of years it would lend confidence to buyers and probably affect the market at the present time, thereby allowing farmers to receive better prices for basic commodities?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the answer to the Senator's question is undoubtedly "Yes."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That being true, is it not also true that the trouble with the market today is that those who are on the market purchasing expect the market to go down because there will not be proper price supports under the basic commodities, and that that is affecting the market at the present time?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is eminently correct. That is one of the major contributing factors in the present downward trend of the market. The uncertainty as to the continuation of his program and the prospect of the termination of our present price support law has had the effect of depressing agricultural prices.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Without bringing politics into the discussion, is it not also true that during the Eightieth Congress the supports were reduced and placed upon a sliding scale, and that a great many people think we are going back to that plan?

Mr. STENNIS. When that law was enacted in the Eightieth Congress, before it ever came into effect, prices did go down; but when Congress met again and reenacted definite price supports at mandatory levels, prices went back up, long before the Korean war started.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the law now in existence provides supports only for certain commodities?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And does not cover many of the commodities which are produced by the farmer for the consumers of the Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The 90-percent support price is made mandatory by law only with respect to the so-called basic commodities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator be so kind as to express his views as to whether or not other commodities should be taken care of?

Mr. STENNIS. With respect to the so-called basic commodities, the mandatory price-support level is 90 percent. I believe that the other commodities, the perishables, present a somewhat different question, and would have to be handled on a different basis. They should be considered, and everything possible should be done for them, as circumstances may permit. However, I think they fall within a separate category.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that most people believe that overproduction is probably causing the present effect on prices?

Mr. STENNIS. That is definitely in the thinking of a great many people.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That cannot be true in the case of cotton. Last year we produced 14,500,000 bales, which most people believe will not be sufficient to supply the demand in the United States and take care of our agreements with foreign countries, at the same time leaving a small surplus or carry-over from year to year, which we must have.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator is entirely correct. It is not safe to go along without a surplus of cotton from year to year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The production of cotton last year certainly cannot be affecting the price of cotton at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks.

In advocating such a law as I have referred to I am not asking a favor for agriculture, but I am thinking in terms of our entire economy—the housewife, the wage earner, the banker, the businessman, the shopkeeper, and the farmer.

Such a law extending for the full period of the Eisenhower administration and beyond would certainly be in line with President Eisenhower's statement of last October 4, at Brookings, S. Dak., when he said:

> I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

It seems clear that without any limitation whatsoever the President is pledged to a mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities at least. But neither the President nor anyone speaking for his administration has ever made the flat statement that he favors a mandatory price support of basic commodities at 90 percent of parity as contrasted with the sliding scale price support extending below 90 percent. This has created an uncertainty among the farmers and the trade that is today undermining the strength of the markets, and it precludes definite, long-range planning by the farm producers who supply our food and fiber. Person-

ally, I think that the most critical and crucial decision to be made by the Eisenhower administration is on this basic question of the fate of agriculture.

BALANCE NECESSARY

Our economic problem consists of maintaining a balance between farm prices, wages, and operating margins for industry. If we maintain this balance in the future, then we can move ahead without fear of a depression. But the cold facts of the record prove that no administration can maintain even fair employment and moderate prosperity without a sound foundation for agriculture that will insure a market price somewhere near 100 percent of parity, and to accomplish this a minimum price support of 90 percent of parity for basic agricultural commodities is necessary. Such a program is to be clearly distinguished from a give-away program and from subsidies.

The laborer, the businessman, and the industrialist cannot long prosper with an agriculture that is receiving less than cost of production. Agriculture is a producer of raw materials, as well as one of our primary industries, with a $172,000,000,000 capital investment. The production of farm products is both the source of physical materials necessary in the employment of labor and the primary foundation of income for all wage payments and our total national income.

The effect of farm income on our total national income is clearly illustrated by the fact that for the past 25 years, through depressions and wars alike, each $1 of gross farm production has had the practical effect of creating a total of $7 of national income. From 1929 to 1951, through prosperity years, depression years and war years, gross farm income and nonagricultural income have increased or decreased from year to year in almost exactly the same ratio. The failure of some of our economists, some of our industrial leaders, some of our labor leaders, and some of our political leaders, to recognize and act upon this definite ratio constitutes in my opinion the greatest threat to the future stability of our economy.

COST IS SLIGHT

Sometimes the public is led to believe that the farm support program is a dole. This is not true. When the long-range view of the program is considered and actual figures examined, it is found that the program for the basic commodities has cost the American taxpayer very little money, and, in fact, one of the major items in the price support program, cotton, has actually netted the Government agency which handled the loan more than $250,000,000 of profit. This price support program may be more properly termed an orderly marketing plan whereby the Government furnishes the plan and supervises the machinery to bring about a fair market.

Agriculture is in part a capital industry, and to survive as an industry must have parity prices which in business terms means cost of production plus a normal profit. The term "farm parity prices" might be termed "equality for agriculture" or "justice for agriculture." Any downward sliding scale of price supports will eventually destroy the economy of our agricultural producers and cause a failure in the production of needed farm raw materials, which in turn will cause a failure to create the income necessary to pay the wages of labor and the costs of operating our industrial machinery.

The first effect of a sliding scale support price would be to drive the small producer, the family-size farmer, out of production and destroy him as an economic unit. In my opinion, he is today America's greatest single asset in our social order. If acreage control is a necessary part of the machinery for a 90-percent-parity-support program, as I think it will be during some years, it will be a part of the program that we will have to take and for which we will be amply rewarded.

Farm price supports not only protect the agricultural industry, but in addition, they protect the wage level of every worker and greatly help to supply a market for every industry in the United States. The consuming housewife has been led to believe, and many of them do believe, that the price-support program has increased the cost of the food that goes into their market baskets. Food prices were considered high in 1951, the total food bill being $60,000,000,000, which was exactly 21.5 percent of the national income. It is striking to note that this 21.5 percent of national income was the same as the average percentage of our national income which was spent for food during each of the years from 1929–51. This period of 22 years included prosperous years, depression years, war years, and postwar years. Incidentally, this is the lowest food cost on the basis of percentage of national income of any nation in the world. Let us always remember that when we enact laws for support prices at 90 percent of parity, we are not providing for high prices; we are merely providing for equality of treatment between industry, labor, and agriculture, or, perhaps I should say, approximate equality of treatment.

There is, of course, a strong sentiment to get farm prices down so that our money will buy more. We forget that when the same amount of money puts more food in the basket, there will be less money in the purse. If we went back to 1945 price levels, the consumer would have cheaper food, but he would also have less money with which to buy that food. As heretofore stated, the percentage of national income spent for food was the same in 1951 when we spent $60,000,000,000 for food as it was in 1945 when we spent $36,800,000,000 for food. As a normal pattern, the farmer receives about 45 percent of the consumer's dollar and the other 55 percent is paid out for transportation, processing, and distribution through our wholesale and retail industries. The wages for all these workers have to be met from the mark-up which takes place after the product leaves the farmer. If farm prices should continue to drop, every worker employed in handling the farm product from the farm to the ultimate consumer would have to take a reduction in wages and every business institution a reduction in its operational margins.

VAST RURAL MARKET

Another prime and major reason for the necessity of adequate farm prices is that our rural areas are a major market for industrial products.

I might digress here, Mr. President, to say that one of the reasons for the increase in the so-called prosperity which has been sustained throughout our Nation is the increased buying power of our rural areas throughout the Nation.

Rural territory, which includes all towns of 2,500 or under, contains 41 percent of the population in the United States. Because of the agricultural industry, which is not only a consumer of goods but also an investor in capital equipment, our rural States spend a greater percentage of their income for goods than do those living in metropolitan areas. For example, the State of New York spends about 50 percent of its income for manufactured goods, whereas in Mississippi we spend 70 percent of our State income for manufactured goods. This situation prevails in other farm States. For example, the State of Iowa, one of our leading farm States, also spends about 70 percent of its income for manufactured goods.

From a recent publication of the Bureau of Labor Statistics I find that 60 percent of the manufacturing workers of the Nation are concentrated in 8 States. This contrasts with a total of 11 percent of the manufacturing workers to be found in 25 States. The people of those 25 States, the so-called farm States, constitute the market for the manufactured products of the highly industrialized States. The market thus constituted by the people of the farm States is essential, because the people of the highly industrialized States cannot alone consume the output of the factories in their States. Thus it is obvious that if the buying power of the population of the farm States is curtailed, the wheels of the factories in the eight highly industrialized States will be slowed down or stopped.

Stated simply, our rural territory is the reciprocal market for factory production. Any underpayment to the agricultural industry as a result of too low a price is, in direct ratio, a loss of market to American industry.

The day will come soon enough in America when concern will not be over food prices but over food sufficiencies. The population of our Nation is increasing at the rate of 2,500,000 per year. Today the farmer is required to feed 15 persons; by 1975, at this rate of increase, he will be required to feed 20 people. Unless the incentive for maximum production is maintained in the form of fair prices, how can we expect the agricultural industry to accomplish this enormous task?

There may be years, and doubtless will be, when the surpluses will accumulate under this program. Whatever problems are presented thereby can, and will be, dealt with as they arise, and will doubtless cause from time to time some modification of the program, without an abandonment of the basic principle of adequate price support.

DEPRESSION FORERUNNER

The record shows that the United States has never had a serious or long-lasting depression without having farm prices lead the way downward.

Because of its vast productive resources, the United States cannot go bankrupt from a purely economic standpoint. Our Nation can, however, go into a state of financial national bankruptcy through too low a price level for its production.

Agriculture produces approximately 70 percent, in dollar value, of all raw materials used in the annual operation of our economy. The physical production represents the materials that pass through our economic cycle. Their movement from producer to the processor and back to the consumer is responsible for a large part of available employment for our labor force.

We must stop penalizing the agricultural industry through a drop in farm prices due to increased production. Otherwise society will find itself without the materials or the income with which to operate the economic machine on a basis of full employment and prosperity.

In the future we shall have to decide whether we shall protect our national income and wage levels with a foundation of farm income and farm production as a support for our industrial productive capacity. I have said before, and I repeat, that farm price supports are not a special benefit to agriculture. Farm price supports protect the wages and income of all groups.

TWO ALTERNATIVES

We can accept one of two things: Either we can have a fluctuating price level, with either booms or busts; or we can stabilize enough basic commodities to provide stability of prices and income.

The current spot market and loan support price for certain basic commodities are approximately the following:

Wheat: Price, $2.32—bushel; loan, $2.29—bushel.

Corn: Price, $1.64—bushel; loan, $1.54—bushel.

Cotton: Price, 32.55 cents per pound; loan, 32 cents per pound.

It will be noted that in each case the market price is only slightly above the loan price.

I am not an expert on market prices, of course, and cannot give an expert opinion thereon; but I am firmly convinced that if we had no price-support program, each of the foregoing commodities would already be selling at far below what is the loan-price level, and in many instances far below the cost of production under the present scale of production costs. With the farmer's buying power thus cut off, he would necessarily drag down with him the labor and industrial segments of our economy. That is exactly what happened in years past.

Our friends, the wage earners, can hardly realize the extent of the drop in prices for farm products. I have before me a Comparison of Economic Factors, based on the 1947–49 level as 100. It shows the hourly wage average for all industry, as of December 1952, to be 128.6 of the base period. It also shows the spot market prices for 22 farm commodities to be 90.5 percent of the base period. Thus it is that on the basis of 1947–49 economic factors, wage earners are 28.6 percent above the 100 level, while agricultural prices are 9.5 percent below that level, a spread of 38.1 percent. But as certain as night follows day, and according to all established records, continued low agricultural prices will eventually pull the wage averages down to the already destructive levels of agriculture.

MUST ACT NOW

Mr. President, the time for action is now.

I do not believe that the campaign statements by President Eisenhower were idle gestures or what is loosely called "campaign oratory." They were promises made by a serious and sincere man, and were accepted as such. I do not know how Mr. Benson or his assistants feel on this subject. A great many people believe that Mr. Benson is opposed to mandatory price supports at a fixed level. However that may be, his opinion is not controlling; he and his assistants are administrators. The man to make the decision and to take the lead is the President. I respectfully suggest that the time has already come for him to state his position as President of the United States, so that the Congress can then expeditiously proceed to the enactment of sound legislation on the subject. To this end, I believe that within the next 30 days the Congress should enact Senate bill 481, introduced by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as a minimum program designed as an immediate and necessary step to meet the situation.

DIFFICULTIES IN DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as Senators well know, for some time I have called the attention of the Senate to what I believe to be some of the inherent difficulties in the development of our very important merchant marine. On many occasions in the past 18 months I have said to the Senate that without certain legislation and so-called tax deferments—not tax exemptions, but tax deferments—we would have what we call an emergency block of obsolescence in our entire fleet.

At the present time not one passenger ship is being built in American yards, on American ways, and only about 22 combination freight-passenger ships. Only a few dry-cargo ships have been added to our fleet since World War II. Other countries have added over 2,700 ships.

This matter is very important and very alive in the minds of many of our people—not only the operators of the merchant marine but also others, including labor, who are associated with our merchant marine.

Mr. James A. Farrell, chairman of the Committee of American Shipping Lines Serving Essential Foreign Trade Routes and president of Farrell Lines, Inc., of New York, made a statement on this subject just the other day, on January 23. I ask that excerpts from his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD. In his statement Mr. Farrell most succinctly calls attention to the present serious situation, and reaches some very intelligent conclusions in regard to what should be done.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American shipping faces grave ship replacement problems and needs strengthening of tax incentives to the industry rather than restrictions as proposed to Congress by former President Truman earlier this week, James A. Farrell, chairman of the Committee of American Shipping Lines Serving Essential Foreign Trade Routes, said today. Mr. Farrell, president of Farrell Lines, Inc., of New York, spoke in behalf of 15 American shipping companies that operate under equality-payment agreements with the Government.

As one of the final acts of his outgoing administration former President Truman early this week proposed to Congress that tax deferments provided shipping lines under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act be eliminated. The act provides for a system of tax deferment on reserve funds of essential foreign trade route shipping lines in order to encourage accumulation of reserves for ship replacement.

"Despite generally favorable earnings records of shipping companies since the war," Mr. Farrell said, "few companies today have been able to accumulate sufficient reserves to replace their fleets at very high present-day construction costs. Within the next 8 to 10 years most of these ships will have to be replaced.

"Yet, either because of lack of funds or because of uncertainty in the shipbuilding picture, not one passenger or cargo ship is being built in the United States today for private ownership and operation," he pointed out.

Mr. Farrell said only 18 passenger or combination passenger-cargo ships and only 22 dry-cargo vessels have been built for American shipping lines since the war. Other maritime nations, he emphasized, have added more than 2,700 merchant vessels to their fleets in this period.

"Most people do not realize that shipping's equipment costs are among the highest in American industry," Mr. Farrell said. "When an old World War II Victory ship is replaced with a modern C–3 type freighter the new vessel costs roughly $6,000,000, less any Government construction allowances. Passenger ship construction is even higher. The recently completed *United States* superliner was built at an over-all cost of some $78,000,000, more than one and a half times the original cost of the Empire State Building."

To replace present-day fleets with new, modern vessels, Mr. Farrell said, the United States Maritime Administration estimates shipowners must pay at least $4.50 for every dollar spent in acquiring present vessels. A recent Maritime Administration study showed the lines receiving operating and construction equality payments would need reserves of nearly $400,000,000 to make minimum required down payments for ship-replacement purposes. The study showed that company reserve funds were more than $51,000,000 short of this initial down payment.

Mr. Farrell said tax considerations given shipping companies are in the form of deferments of tax payments, not exemptions, and that taxes are ultimately paid when the funds are withdrawn or through depreciation allowances on vessels. They differ only in form, he said, from tax incentives supplied by Government to other defense industries. Tax deferments are given only on funds placed in reserve for ship replacement, otherwise shipping companies pay Federal, State, and local taxes as do other industries, Mr. Farrell pointed out. Since 1936, he said, the Government-aided shipping lines have paid

more than $146,000,000 in Federal income and profits taxes.

"Tax deferments on reserve funds are simply another way of equalizing United States costs with foreign costs, a principle that Congress has recognized in writing the 1936 Merchant Marine Act," Mr. Farrell said. "Like operating and construction differential payments designed to put United States costs on a par with lower foreign costs, they simply put American operators in position to compete in world trade. Practically every other major maritime nation provides tax incentives to its shipping operators greater than those provided by this country."

Tax benefits for shipping companies since 1937 are estimated by ship operators to be nearer $100,000,000 than the $155,000,000 estimate of the Treasury Department, Mr. Farrell said.

Mr. Farrell proposed that instead of limiting tax incentives the Government should work with shipping leaders in strengthening the program.

He also urged joint Government-industry action in a program to encourage shipping of American exports in Unied States vessels, and in the elimination of discriminatory practices by foreign nations that now hamper American shipping.

On ship replacement he urged immediate clarification of construction differential formulae to eliminate uncertainties that have virtually brought shipbuilding for private ownership and operation to a halt. "If these uncertainties can be resolved," he said, "American shipowners will proceed with the funds at hand to modernize their fleets to the best of their ability."

Shipping companies represented by the Committee of American Shipping Lines Serving Essential Foreign Trade Routes are: American Export Lines, Inc.; American Mail Line, Ltd.; American President Lines, Ltd.; Farrell Lines, Inc.; Grace Line, Inc.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.; Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc.; Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.; Pacific-Agentine-Brazil Line; Pacific Far East Line, Inc.; Pacific Transport Lines, Inc.; Seas Shipping Co., Inc.; the Oceanic Steamship Co.; United States Lines Co.

NOMINATION OF THRUSTON B. MORTON TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the beginning of the executive session today in the Senate, we proceeded to take up the nominations then on the calendar. The first name called was that of Carl W. McCardle, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of State. I then looked around on the top of my desk, in an attempt to find some report from the committee about Mr. McCardle. However, I found none. Meantime Mr. McCardle's nomination was confirmed. Not a word was said by the chairman of the committee by way of informing the Senate about Mr. McCardle's qualifications. It seems to me that the RECORD ought to show some information about Mr. McCardle and at least a summary of the committees favorable conclusions concerning his qualifications. The position of Assistant Secretary of State is no minor position in the executive branch of our Government.

Then the name of Mr. Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, also nominated to be an Assistant Secretary of State, was called. I did not wait then to look to see whether any committee report on the nomination was on my desk. I assumed there probably was not; so I asked if there was any information to be made available to the Senate by the committee about Mr. Morton. The majority leader advised me that it was not customary to file printed reports on nominations of this type; to which I replied it was quite immaterial to me whether it was customary or not, I happened to want to know something about these nominees.

Then the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, proceeded to discuss Mr. Morton, but in the course of his remarks he engaged in the following comment, which in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon, shared by the Parliamentarian, is not in conformity with the spirit and intent of rule XIX. I have never applied rule XIX, and I shall never apply rule XIX, Mr. President. I shall answer its violations when they involve the junior Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Wisconsin said:

> Mr. President, I merely desire to read briefly from the biography of this nominee. I realize that the Senator from Oregon should be on the Foreign Relations Committee and on every other committee of the Senate.

I suggested then that he yield, because I thought that was the time for us to come to an understanding concerning his sarcastic remark. The Senator from Wisconsin replied, so the official transcript shows:

> Just a moment. I have the floor. I decline to yield.

To which I said:

> But the Senator has made a personal remark, and I intend to answer him.
>
> Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin can engage in hit-and-run debating if he wants to, but let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that any time he wants to take me on in a mutual exchange of terms of disrespect for each other, I am ready. I am perfectly aware of the fact that under the operation of the seniority system in the Senate, the Senator from Wisconsin is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Parenthetically and incidentally, I may say, Mr. President, I have always been in favor of abolishing that archaic rule of the Senate and adopting a rule whereby chairmen of committees would be chosen by majority vote of the committees. In previous speeches in the Senate in support of this recommendation of mine over the years, I have expressed the view, which I reiterate today, that the election of chairmen of the committees would give us a greater guaranty of having committee chairmen who, in my opinion, would be best qualified to serve in those capacities.

Now, Mr. President, let me say not only to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee but to the chairman of any other committee of the Senate that the junior Senator from Oregon intends to continue to ask for information about nominations to high posts of Government, made by this administration. If the committees do not want to supply us with reports on the nominees in advance of debating their nominations on the floor of the Senate, the junior Senator from Oregon, in keeping with his rights as an individual Senator, intends to ask for all pertinent information when the nomination comes up for debate. If it is necessary for the junior Senator from Oregon to do such Senate work on the floor of the Senate, that is where he proposes to do it. But let me say that I do not think it comes in very good grace for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to suggest sarcastically that the junior Senator from Oregon should be on the Foreign Relations Committee and on every other committee of the Senate, when it is perfectly obvious that the sarcasm thus indulged is bottomed upon a personal feeling, and especially when the junior Senator from Oregon feels, and as he has expressed the view on the floor of the Senate, that under the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, he is entitled as a matter of right to remain on the committees on which he served in the last session of the Congress.

The Senate has voted me down on that proposition. I have accepted the judgment and the decision of the Senate because I had no other choice. I do not believe the Senate is right, either as a matter of law or as a matter of good policy or as a matter of fair play. It is unfortunate that the Senate has to go back to 1871 to find any precedent for its committee treatment of the junior Senator from Oregon. That precedent, as we all know, was at the beginning of another military administration in our country, headed by General Grant. But be that as it may, let me today serve notice on my colleagues in the Senate that I intend to exercise my rights on the floor of the Senate in the interest of representing the people of my State, and when I want to know something about a nominee to the office of Assistant Secretary of State, I believe I am entitled to the information I ask for, and I am entitled to receive it within the spirit and the meaning and the intent of rule XIX. If, however, any Member of the Senate does not want to extend me that courtesy, then I am ready at any time to take him on in a Donnybrook.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to reply to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I shall first refer to a great Senator who today celebrates the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth—the distinguished Senator from Georgia, WALTER GEORGE, a man of wisdom, a man who sits in committee, listens to the evidence, and then gives the Senate the benefit of mature judgment, a man who in the Senate has always had the respect of every other Senator, because he knows that no one man is big enough to do the job of the whole Senate. He is not one who suggests that a fellow Senator indulges in hit-and-run tactics.

I have always admired my distinguished friend from Oregon. If he will read the RECORD, and read it in full, he will see that he did get the information he requested. I read into the RECORD the record of Mr. Morton. Of course, this gave the distinguished Senator the opportunity again to put himself in the class of the champion filibusterer in this

Congress. He has been regarded as an antifilibusterer, but now, on every occasion when opportunity affords, he rises and speaks, consuming unlimited time. I recognize his rights as a Senator. We have a rule of unlimited debate. I recognize that we can place no limitation on him or on any other Senator, unless we should adopt the antifilibuster rule. But, I say he is again demonstrating that he is the greatest filibusterer of this session.

When he talks about my being sarcastic, and saying something he did not like, when I suggested that he should have been on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I only stated the fact. I remember that my good friend WAYNE MORSE fought in the past for such an assignment, and he thinks he should be on that committee. But I did not say that he did not merit such a position, which is what he said about me, thereby sarcastically inferring that I had no ability; and also inferring that he possesses omniscience. Where does he get the stuff that entitles him to stand on the Senate floor and talk that way about a friend? If I said, more or less facetiously—as I did—that he thought he ought to be on every committee of the Senate, I think the truth of that statement has been demonstrated, because on almost every occasion when any committee makes a report, he rises to oppose it, and, of course, he puts on a show. The galleries hear it, the press writes it. On the day of the President's inauguration, in the press, immediately under "Eisenhower" was "WAYNE MORSE."

We respect the ability of the Senator from Oregon. The Lord has given him a great deal of ability. He is versatile and tireless in speech. The Lord has given him opportunity to perform a great service. But he cannot do it successfully as he thinks he is doing it. He should rise with the occasion, not fall with it.

Mr. President, I rose to speak about a great Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], a man who has performed valuable service, who has brought to the Senate qualities which are much needed, judicial qualities, qualities which enable men clearly to see the issues, to forget self, and to give selfless devotion to the great problems we are facing. There is nothing of the ego in Senator GEORGE.

The Senator from Oregon brought up the fact that he was not assigned to the committees to which he thought he should be assigned, one, of course, being the Foreign Relations Committee, but everyone knows that he "jumped the fence" and would no longer qualify himself as a Republican. No; he is the great Independent. As a result, following precedent, the Republican caucus said, "You are the one who has hit and run. You jumped the fence and ran away." So, Mr. President, the responsibility is his own. But he will not see it that way. He thinks the great group of Republicans are unfair. I am sure that on sober thought, if he uses the same degree of judgment which the Senator from Georgia uses, he will see that all the Republicans cannot be all wrong and he right on every occasion.

I am reminded, Mr. President, of the story of the woman watching a regiment of soldiers going down the street. Her boy, Johnny, was out of step, but she said, "They are all out of step except my boy."

If we use the proper teamwork we believe the team can be in step.

Some of us feel a responsibility to the Nation in this great crisis, and yet a few days ago the Senator from Oregon said that we were not in a crisis, inferring that such a statement by the President was wrong.

Mr. President, this is just another instance of what I am talking about. I say the world situation today is far more serious than it has been for a long time, and that the Senator from Oregon is wrong again in his appraisal. I have heard an analysis of the world situation, and I say the Senator from Oregon is again mistaken.

The issue before us, comes up in relation to the nomination of Mr. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State. His nomination lay over in the committee until we received a certificate from the Secretary of State indicating Mr. Morton's qualifications. We examined him, and today I read his biography. We are now told that every time a nomination comes up for confirmation there must be on the desk of each Senator a report concerning it. The majority leader stated that that had not been the custom. At times there may be submitted to the commitee as many as 100 qr 150 nominations for positions in the Foreign Service. Can we, as legislators, take time to examine into the qualifications and qualities of each one of those persons, or is it the function of the State Department to go into their record? If we were to examine each one of them we would have to enlarge our committee, hold innumerable hearings, and submit reports on each nomination.

I am sorry that this discussion has occurred, if I have said anything unseemly on the floor of the Senate about an associate. I, too, have at times a feeling of righteousness with reference to how we should conduct ourselves and if I have acted in an unseemly way, I apologize.

When it comes to the words "best qualified," everyone is out of step "except my boy, Wayne" The Senator from Oregon inferred that the Senator from Wisconsin is not qualified. That is a fine statement. Talk about a violation of a rule; talk about stabbing a friend in the back. Somewhere it is said "Judge not lest ye be judged."

Mr. President, that is that.

Mr. President, I am happy to have the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on my committee. Always he analyzes; always he stops, looks, and listens, and then gives his judgment. Always he is the helper and the friend. That is why the State of Georgia loves him and all America appreciates his selfless devotion to the Republic.

So I want to conclude, Mr. President, by saying that we wish for him many more years of constructive service.

Good health and prosperity to you, Senator GEORGE.

SENATOR GEORGE'S SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I must be present at a committee meeting at 2 o'clock. The Committee on Armed Services is meeting in an attempt to untangle some of the problems before it. But before I leave the Chamber I desire to wish our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, a very happy birthday.

Today the distinguished Senator from Georgia is 75 years of age. Early this morning I met him at his hotel and attended a very important meeting with him. He is in fine health and has a keen and active mind. It is pretty difficult for some of us who look upon ourselves as youngsters actually to keep up with him.

The senior Senator from Georgia has served in this body longer than has any other Senator who sits here. I doubt that there is a Member of this body for whom any of us has more admiration or greater respect and affection. On any question to which the Senator from Georgia addresses himself he always commands the respect of his colleagues and the respect of a grateful people.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wrote a letter to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] congratulating him upon his birthday anniversary. I did not realize that tributes were going to be paid to him on the floor of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the body of the RECORD, at an appropriate place, in connection with tributes paid him by other Senators, the letter which I wrote to him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1953.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please permit me to add my felicitations to the many I know you have already received upon the occasion of your birthday.

For me this is more than just the ordinary birthday greeting. For many years I have regarded you as one of the great Americans of our time and I feel stronger in that respect after having served with you 2 years in the United States Senate.

I hope and pray that you will have many happy returns of this day, and that the good Lord will permit you many years to serve our country and to guide and counsel your colleagues, and to inspire the youth of our country in our great American tradition.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

GEORGE SMATHERS.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I know it is unnecessary for me on the floor of the Senate to try to tell the Senate anything about the senior Senator from Georgia, WALTER GEORGE, but coming from South Carolina, just across the river from Georgia, it may not be inappropriate for me to say a few words.

I have known Senator GEORGE for a long time, and I am sure I speak for the people of South Carolina, as well as for the people of Georgia, when I say that the large majority of the people of both States believe him to be one of the finest

characters developed in the South in many, many years. We all love him. Even his enemies love and admire him. His enemies, so far as politics is concerned, admire him because they know he is fair always. They know he is always sincere. They know that he is trying to the best of his ability to represent all the people of the United States at all times. So today, on his seventy-fifth birthday, Senator GEORGE is being thought of by many people. It is my earnest hope and wish that the Senate may enjoy the benefit of his services for many, many, more years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in extending to our colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, our congratulations, felicitations, and best wishes on his seventy-fifth birthday anniversary. Senator GEORGE is not only from Georgia but, in the truest sense, he represents the best interests of the United States as a whole. As one of the new Members of this body, I am delighted to have this opportunity to extend to him my best wishes, and to express the fervent hope that he will have many more years of service in the Senate and continue to give me and the other Senators the fruits of his rich experience and wise judgment.

NOMINATION OF THRUSTON B. MORTON TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, without desiring to interrupt the exchange of amenities between my good friends, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I desire to address myself to the matter at hand, namely, the pending nomination, and particularly the request of the Senator from Oregon for more information.

Mr. President, I am glad that the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State. I should like to say to my friend from Oregon that I have known Mr. Morton and his family for more than 30 years. On his paternal side and his maternal side, the Morton and Ballard families are among the most distinguished families of Kentucky.

No families have contributed more to civic, political and philanthropic activities in Kentucky than have those families.

Mr. Morton is a young man, but he has already achieved great success in various fields. Before World War II commenced, he had served as executive vice president of the largest milling company in the South.

I know how the interest of the Senator from Oregon is in matters of labor and management relations. As a business executive Mr. Morton was known for his broad understanding of the problems of labor, and in his company there were enjoyed most amicable relationships between labor and management.

Mr. Morton served in the United States Navy for more than 4 years during World War II. His service was distinguished, and his leadership is attested by the fact that he held command of three different ships.

Upon his return from the service, he was elected in 1946 to the House of Representatives from the third district of Kentucky comprised of Louisville and Jefferson County. It is normally a Democratic district yet he was elected by a very large majority. He was reelected in 1948, and again in 1950, by very large majorities.

He enjoys the respect not only of his own party, but also of the Democratic Party and of the independent voters who live in his district.

I know Mr. Morton well. I know his intellectual ability, his background, and his understanding of international problems.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I believe, because of these qualities, and his integrity, Mr. Morton is eminently fitted for the position to which he has been nominated. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection, so that Mr. Morton's nomination can now be confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I only wish to say that the Senator is quite mistaken if he thinks I have raised any objection to the nomination; I am only seeking information.

Mr. COOPER. I did not know. I only wanted to be certain.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky if he believes any great harm has been done to the nominee from his State by my asking for some information about him?

Mr. COOPER. No; and I have no objection at all. That is the reason why I tried to supply some information about him from my own knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Kentucky agree with the Senator from Oregon that no reflection is cast upon Mr. Morton when a request is made to have information about him spread upon the RECORD?

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator is entitled to any information he desires. I merely wish to make it plain that I am not going to take part in the interchange between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to reply to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] by saying that, in characteristic fashion, he did not have his facts straight in his reply to me. If he knew the position of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the Committee on Foreign Relations matter, he would know that there is, and has been for many weeks past, a letter on file with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees in reply to a letter I received from the Senator from Nebraska, in which I made very clear that I did not wish to be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Wisconsin simply is not up to date with his information.

There was a time, before I had gained the seniority I had on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, when I would have liked to be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, the Republican caucus did not see fit to put a west coast man on the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the result that for several years that committee sat without having a single Senator from the west coast on it. On several occasions in the Republican caucus I raised the issue, and the record is perfectly clear as to my views. I said that if there was any man from the western part of the United States, having greater seniority than I had, who desired assignment to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I was in favor of assigning him to that committee; but that in the absence of such a request from any other western Senator, I thought that one of the criteria that should have been taken into account in filling the committee assignments was geographical distribution. It was my position that in that instance the Senate certainly should have taken into account the tremendous interest of the people of the west coast in Asiatic problems, and that there ought to have been a west coast Senator on the committee.

The Senator from Wisconsin now says—and, I respectfully suggest, it is an afterthought, because not even cold print will sustain him—that he was speaking facetiously. If he was speaking facetiously when he made the sarcastic statement in his earlier remarks, that was the time when he could have very quickly explained it to the junior Senator from Oregon when I asked him to yield, and the personal exchange would not have taken place.

The Senator from Wisconsin is also incorrect in his reference to precedents in connection with the action taken by the Republican caucus this year in the handling of independents or insurgents. In my discussion of the issue when the matter was before the Senate, I cited the one and only precedent for the course of action that was followed, namely, the precedent of 1871, when Sumner, of Massachusetts, was kicked off his committee.

The only precedent the Republican side of the aisle could offer with regard to the action taken was that in some instances insurgents who had held committee chairmanships lost their chairmanships. That is true, but they did not lose their positions on the committees; and in other cases such Senators were dropped to the foot of the list of the committee, so far as seniority within the committee was concerned.

I expected such action as that, and I so stated on the floor. I said I thought that would be a perfectly proper course of action to take. But I repeat that neither this side of the aisle nor the other side of the aisle can justify going all the way back to 1871 for a precedent in order

to deny to a Member of the Senate the 8 years of seniority he has on committees, considering the meaning and importance seniority has in the Senate. However, that has been the will of the Senate. The Senate must live with it unless it sees the light and corrects its mistake, and I am going to live with it, Mr. President. But I am not going to sacrifice any of my rights on the floor of the Senate.

That is why I said to the Senator from Wisconsin, and now say to other committee chairmen, that I shall get the information I need, in order properly to represent the people of my State on issues as they arise here on the floor of the Senate. I expect that there will be used against me, time and time again, all the adjectives which were used against me by the Senator from Wisconsin. As a substitute for argument and facts, I expect to have my critics resort to name calling, to ridicule, and to sarcasm.

I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that two insurgents from his State, the two Senators La Follette, did not always follow the will of the majority of the Republicans in the United States Senate. They formed a third party. However, the Republicans of their time did not deny them the positions which they formerly held on committees.

Likewise, the great Norris, of Nebraska, went even further. He announced that he was an Independent, and stood for election as an Independent. He did not even lose the chairmanship of his committee.

Not many weeks ago former Senator Burton K. Wheeler telephoned me to discuss this matter. He pointed out that in 1924 he ran for Vice President on a third-party ticket against his party, but the Democrats did not see fit to penalize him in any respect for exercising what he considered to be the dictates of his conscience and his honest independence of judgment.

Thus we can go down the list, and demonstrate that the Senator from Wisconsin cannot substantiate his statement that the Republican caucus acted on the basis of precedents, unless he wishes to hold to the precedent of 1871.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin has raised the committee question, let me close my remarks by saying to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the issue which was before them at the time of the committee assignment fight—I set it forth in my speech, but it needs to be repeated—was whether minority rights were to be protected in the United States Senate. What my Democratic friends refuse to recognize is that, whether they like it or not, there are three parties in the United States Senate today. There is a Republican Party, a Democratic Party, and an Independent Party. Suppose my party, instead of having one Member in the Senate had three or four. Does anyone think the action on the committee assignments would have been the same? But the principle would have been the same. The existence of greater political power in the Independent Party would not have changed the principle. If the Independent Party today had three or four Members of the Senate instead of one, does anyone think the Democrats would have voted to deny minority rights to the Independent Party?

What did some of my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle say at the time of the committee assignment fight? Some of them have come to apologize to me. Apologies are a matter of form. It is all right if people want to apologize; but an apology never righted a wrong. An apology is a little conscience salve being used by the apologizer. When the Democrats came to me on the day of the committee assignment fight and said, "Wayne, you have us in a position where we must either vote for you or vote against a Democrat, and that is an awful position to be in," my reply to each of them when they tried to argue that I had been maneuvered into a bad parliamentary position, was that I had not been maneuvered into any bad position. I told each of them, "I am only asking you to follow the Reorganization Act. It is not an issue as to whether you vote for or against a Democrat. It is an issue as to whether you vote for or against a principle."

What was the principle? The principle of protecting minority interests and rights in the Senate.

It is my judgment that there was only one course of action for the Democrats to follow. They certainly could not expect the majority to proceed to protect the minority, because, as was pointed out, there is merit in the position of the majority in wanting to keep at least a majority of one on each committee.

I think that argument has great merit. I said so the day the debate arose. But so far as the Democrats are concerned, it was perfectly obvious, it seemed to me, that it was in the interest of fair play that what should have been done in respect to those two committees was to substitute a member of the other minority party for the lowest ranking Democrat proposed for membership on each of those committees. That is the way minority rights would have been protected.

So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to let the Democrats ignore or forget that principle. The fact is that they have established a precedent whereby they have denied a member of a minority party his 8 years of seniority rights on the floor of the Senate. They also know that if in the years immediately ahead the number of members of the Independent Party increases to three or four and the ratio between the other two parties changes only that much, the junior Senator from Oregon will take the same position then that he took when this issue arose in 1953. If members of the independent party then should raise the cry, "Remember 1953," it will be my position, "But we do not resort to the same tactics that were adopted by the Democrats in 1953. We will protect minorities." We will not ask, if that time should come, that we be permitted to take advantage of the situation merely because we would then have the clear balance of power in the Senate.

Let me say facetiously that if my party had the active membership of all its Members in the Senate who are Members by suppressed desires, I would have quite a party in the Senate. We are going to take the question to the polls in 1954 and 1956. I am inclined to think that after 1954 and 1956 we shall have more independent Senators. Then we shall have an interesting discussion of the rule of precedent which the Republicans and Democrats adopted in 1953 with respect to my committee assignments. When the question of my committee assignments is raised here today by the Senator from Wisconsin, at least this much good comes from his speech; at least he has given me an opportunity to present my point of view once again, as to what I think the Senate should do in the interest of fair play and the right.

The Senate should adopt the motion which I have pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration, that there be added to the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an additional Republican, and that then the member of the minority party, the independent party, have returned to him the position which he held on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That should be done with the understanding, of course, that he be at the foot of the table as far as seniority within the committee is concerned, just as other insurgents before me were treated, at least in some instances, as a result of their insurgency.

Let me say to my Democratic friends—and if I am wrong I hope they will correct me—that it is my understanding that when the Republican leadership suggested to the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle that an increase be made in the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by adding one Republican to each of those committees so that the member of the independent party could be added to them, it was the Democratic leadership which opposed the proposal. I want the country to know it, because I understand now, from some of my mail, that such is not the position which some of the Democrats take in answering their mail on this issue. Some of them are placing the blame on the Republicans and hiding the fact that the Democrats opposed my motion. It seems to me that they have an opportunity to rethink this issue and proceed to do what I believe is clearly right and fair, and bring to an end a very bad precedent, the major responsibility for which, in my opinion, rests upon the Democrats in the Senate. I say that because unless my ears betrayed me, it was the majority leader, on the Republican side of the aisle, who raised the proposal about adding an additional Republican to the Armed Services Committee and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and it was the Democratic leadership which rejected the proposal.

Some good has come out of this discussion, Mr. President. I hope at least it will be accepted as the serving of notice that no kind of intimidation, no kind of name calling, no resort to personalities, will deter the member of the Independent Party in the United States Senate from doing what he thinks ought

to be done in the interest of the people he represents, in carrying out his duty.

I hope this little exchange today will at least have the result of causing Members of the Senate to recognize that if we want rule XIX followed, then he who would throw the first stone had better keep it in mind before he makes his pitch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thruston B. Morton to be Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as is well known, I very seldom speak on the floor of the Senate. I am suffering from a bad head cold, as many others are doing at this moment. Therefore I have been reminiscing in my own mind for the past half hour.

I remember that when I was a youngster in Pike County, Ind., my Scotch grandfather used to raise very fine white sheep. In fact, they were about the finest sheep in the county, and they were all white. They had white faces and white legs. They were beautiful white sheep.

One spring, when I was about 8 or 9 years of age, during lambing time one of the ewes (yoes) had a black lamb. I remember how the white lambs and white ewes (yoes) stood around and looked at that little black lamb. I remember that the neighbors came from all around to see the black lamb. There was a black lamb in the midst of all the beautiful white ewes (yoes) and white lambs. It was the subject of conversation at the little church. It was the subject of conversation at the school. I do not remember, but I presume the local newspaper must have printed an article or story about how Uncle Bill Kelso, as my grandfather was known, who raised fine white sheep, finally saw a black lamb appear among them. The black lamb enjoyed for many weeks the publicity which it received and the conversation about it. I do not know whether lambs can be jealous, but I presume they were jealous, but, in any event, it was not long before that little black lamb had all the other white lambs and ewes (yoes) looking at it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a biblical quotation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I refuse to yield at this time. I am just reminiscing about an experience I had years ago. It was the talk of the community. Everybody talked about it, and speculated whether or not the next year all the lambs would be black. They wondered whether all of Grandfather Kelso's sheep were going to be black sheep from then on. The speculation was that he might have only black sheep next year. However, as I started to say, it was not long until that little black lamb, which had enjoyed all that glory and all that attention from the community, stopped growing. It was not long before it died, and was gone. So far as I can remember, all the succeeding lambs were white lambs. Pretty soon all the people in the community forgot all about the black lamb.

Mr. President, the moral of my little story is that once in a while of course there do develop black sheep among a lot of wonderful white sheep, but the black sheep die off. They get a lot of attention. Eventually, in the case of my grandfather's sheep, the wonderful blood strain of his stock prevailed, and to this day there are only white sheep in this herd. There is not one black sheep among them.

I could not help reminiscing about that experience. I do not know, of course, whether it has any relationship to anything that has happened in the Senate. I remember the experience as though it had happened only yesterday, although it happened 45 or 46 years ago. There are still only white sheep on that farm, and there is not one black sheep among them. That black sheep certainly received a lot of attention. I do not know how it all happened; but such things will happen, I suppose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would suggest a more appropriate statement in the words of the Founder of the Christian religion, who said:

> I send you forth as sheep in the midst of ravening wolves.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Illinois made his statement in good humor. Honestly, I cannot say whether he is a sheep or a ravening wolf. At times I believe he is a sheep, and a very mild one. At other times, I think he is quite a wolf.

I merely wanted to tell the Senate of my experience 45 years ago, because I do not think we need to be too much concerned about these new situations. The world will go on, the Senate will go on, and I think our Government will go on. While it may be nice to sit around and listen to talk, talk, talk, let us not however take ourselves too seriously, because the black sheep do pass from the herds.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have a short statement which I should like to make on another subject. However, if we are ready to proceed to vote on pending nominations, I do not wish to delay such a vote. However, if the display of erudition, the resort to allegory and witticism, and the expounding of parliamentary law for the benefit of the general education of the Senate and the public are to continue for an indefinite period, I believe I should be permitted to make my statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for 1 minute so that I may reply to my good friend from Indiana?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be very glad to yield. I do not like to delay a vote on the nominations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to get the admission of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that at least by analogy he considers Senators on this side of the aisle to be political sheep. I think that is about the way they have been acting in the Senate since inauguration day. They have been following the leader without much thought as to where they are going. I believe it is about time that we changed that course of action in the Senate. I think the Senator from Indiana has done very well, considering he has a cold in his head. Perhaps I should not suspect that it is a somewhat perpetual ailment with him. I should like to suggest in a helpful vein—because I know he, too, along with me, is a farmer—that the pronunciation of the word for a female sheep is ewe—yew.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is not correct in Indiana.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not intend to get into the argument, but I wish to testify that out on the prairies in Iowa 50 years ago when farmers used to come in to talk about sheep I never heard them say ewe (yew) until the very erudite and educated gentlemen started to talk about sheep. The female sheep were always called ewes (yoes) in my section of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Chair is ready to state the question before the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall defer my statement until after a vote is had on the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky to be Assistant Secretary of State. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The next nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of True D. Morse to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if there is to be a discussion of this nomination which will delay its consideration——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have before us the committee reports on both the Morse nomination and the Coke nomination. I wish to commend the committee for making available to the Senate the information which I believe ought to be made available in connection with nominations to such high offices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of True D. Morse to be Under Secretary of Agriculture? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Earl Coke to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Hook, Jr., to be Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would give us a report on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon has requested information with regard to the hearings on the nomination of Charles R. Hook, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

Hearings were held on the nomination, and I have copies of the testimony which

was taken by the committee. The hearings were not ordered to be printed with reference to the three nominees who appeared before the committee at that time. I shall be pleased to give the Senator from Oregon the transcript of the hearings, and I shall also be glad to give any information which appears in the record with respect to Mr. Hook and Mr. Allen.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe that the Senator need to give me the transcript of the testimony. I wonder whether the Senator from Kansas could give us a very brief oral summary of the testimony. I do not know the gentlemen at all. I should like to know something about them.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the Senator from Oregon has made a very fair request. I am very pleased to state, on the basis of the transcript of testimony taken at the hearing on January 27, 1953, that Mr. Charles R. Hook, Jr., lives at Gates Mills, Ohio; that he was born in Middletown, Ohio, on December 22, 1914, and was graduated from Yale University in 1937. He is married to former Louise Morgan, of New York, and they have five children. Mr. Hook has been vice president—personnel—of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway at Cleveland, Ohio, since January 1, 1948. He joined the railway company as assistant to president—personnel—on July 15, 1946.

In 1946 he was appointed a member of a seven-man advisory council to assist the War Department General Staff in personnel phases of the War Department reorganization.

He also served as an industry member of the National War Labor Board and as a management adviser for the Training Within Industry Division of the War Manpower Commission.

In 1944 he coauthored with Lee H. Hill a book entitled "Management at the Bargaining Table."

He is a director of the American Arbitration Association and a former director for two terms of the American Management Association.

As the industry member of the Joint Bolivian-American Labor Commission named by the State Department, he spent several months in Bolivia in 1943, studying the labor-management relations at the tin mines.

Mr. Hook is a member of the personnel advisory council of the American Management Association, and formerly held the same position with the National Industrial Conference Board. He is a trustee of the Musical Arts Association in Cleveland, and a trustee of the Cleveland Mental Health Association.

I believe that concludes most of the statement regarding Mr. Hook.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Was the committee unanimously in support of the nomination?

Mr. CARLSON. The committee was unanimous in voting in favor of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Kansas personally acquainted with Mr. Hook?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I am not. Let me say that we inquired of Mr. Hook about his interests in steamship lines, air lines, and railroads, the groups with which the post office deals. He assured us, as to each of them, that he has only 100 shares of stock in an air-line company, and that he is disposing of that holding.

Mr. MORSE. That is the next point about which I wished to inquire. I now understand the Senator from Kansas to say that Mr. Hook has no financial interest which should be disposed of before he serves in the position to which he has been nominated. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is what we were informed.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to Mr. Hook, whom I happen to know personally. His father is president of the American Rolling Mill Co. Mr. Hook was brought up in Middletown, near Cincinnati, Ohio. He has in no way been involved in politics of any kind. As a matter of fact, he was in no sense a political nominee or recommendation; and he took no part, from any point of view, I believe, in the recent campaign. Mr. Hook was found by Mr. Summerfield in his desire to obtain the services of men with actual business experience, particularly in the field of transportation, to undertake a reorganization of the Post Office Department. I was very glad, indeed, that Mr. Summerfield happened to select Mr. Hook, although he had not been my recommendation. I do not think we could find a better man for the job. He, together with one or two others whom Mr. Summerfield is bringing into the service, will, I am confident, be able to put the Post Office Department on the business basis on which it should be placed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles R. Hook, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

The nomination was confirmed.

JOHN C. ALLEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John C. Allen, of Illinois, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas to give us a similar summary. Let me make clear that it is only in connection with appointments to what all of us recognize are major positions in the Government that I ask for this information, when the committee has not supplied it in printed form.

On the other hand, in the case of the Public Health Service, for example, we usually confirm, en bloc, 50, 60, or 75 nominations of persons who have been closely checked by the committee and by the Public Health Service. In such cases I have no intention of requesting information about the nominees, because the positions to which they are nominated are not policy-making ones.

However, when we are dealing with major posts in the Government service that do have great administrative responsibility and, in many instances, a considerable amount of administrative policy-making responsibility, I believe it to be only proper that the RECORD show the kind of information that I am requesting today.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that I am most pleased to give the information that is contained in the transcript which was taken on Tuesday, January 27, at which time John C. Allen, the nominee to be Assistant Postmaster General, appeared before our committee. More than a quorum of the committee was present at that time. I read the following from the transcript:

Mr. John C. Allen was born in Fairhaven, Mass, on August 23, 1906, and was graduated from Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., in 1928.

Mr. Allen has been general traffic manager of Sears Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill., since April 1946. He joined the company in March 1932, and practically all of his business experience with Sears has been devoted to transportation activities. Previous to that, he was associated with Mandel Bros. department store in Chicago, and at the time he left this company, he was traffic manager.

Mr. Allen is a member of the executive committee of the National Industrial Traffic League and is chairman of the LCL and merchandise committee of that league. He is a member of the transportation committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and he serves on the transportation committee of the National Retail Federation.

Mr. Allen lives in Lombard, Ill. He is married to the former Kathleen Edwards of Chicago, and they have a son, 18, and a daughter, 14.

I wish to say for myself, as chairman of the committee, that Mr. Allen was interrogated by the members of the committee; and he assured us that he had no connections which would in any way violate the conflict-of-interests statute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENTS BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN REGARDING RUSSIAN ATOMIC EXPLOSIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the statement I am about to make on the floor of the Senate is somewhat delayed, for the Senate was not in session yesterday. However, I feel duty-bound to make this statement today, for the public record.

On the morning of January 27, former President Truman was quoted in a news dispatch as saying that he had some doubt as to whether the Russians had

an atomic bomb. He also admitted that he had announced positively on three different occasions, beginning in 1949, that Russia had first released an atomic explosion, and on two different occasions later stated that Russia had exploded atomic bombs. When confronted with that statement later by the press, Mr. Truman is reported to have said something to the effect that he was saying those things at that time in order to make the American people aware of the dangers which might be facing them.

Mr. President, I state to you that if Mr. Truman made positive statements of that nature—which he did, in 1949 and subsequently—and if when he made those statements he had doubts in his own mind that Russia had atomic weapons, and if Mr. Truman made those statements merely to frighten the American people, then it is one of the most reprehensible misrepresentations any man in public life ever made to his people, to whom he owed a responsibility.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. By law, that committee has the right to receive information about the services and all the other operations of the departments and agencies of the Government insofar as atomic developments are concerned. In fact, there is in the law a mandate upon those agencies to inform the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of atomic developments. I say to you, Mr. President, that regardless of whether Mr. Truman, while he was President of the United States, either could understand or was fully aware of the information which should have been given to him, and upon which apparently, he based his three flat statements, that the Russians had released atomic energy, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy did receive full scientific and highly responsible information, based upon all manner of evaluation and all manner of intelligence which thoroughly convinced able and intelligent representatives of this Government that Russia had indeed in 1949, and subsequently, released atomic explosions.

If Mr. Truman, who made those flat, positive statements on his own responsibility, had any doubts about that matter, either then or thereafter, it was his legal duty, under the Atomic Energy Act, immediately to inform the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; but he never at any time so informed the joint committee.

Mr. President, it comes with poor grace for a man who is now a private citizen to comment so glibly and apparently so irresponsibly upon matters of high secrecy and high sensitivity to the security of the United States and the world, based upon information which he solemnly received under his responsibility as the highest executive of this land.

No, Mr. President, there is no question in my mind, although I am not an expert or a scientist, and I must rely upon the reliable persons in our Government who are intelligently capable of evaluating these things. In full reliance upon their positive assurance in the past, I say to you that I am convinced that Russia has released atomic explosions in the past, approximately at the times when they were announced. Yet the fantastic statement is quoted or is alleged to have been made by Mr. Truman, namely, that while he said that the Russians had released an atomic explosion, he did not say the Russians had released an atomic bomb. Mr. President, the record shows that, according to the news story, Mr. Truman said he had a doubt that the Russians could make an atomic bomb. I call attention to the fact that it is less complicated to encase explosive atomic materials in a bomb—that is only a matter of mechanical aptitude—than it is to create the materials which themselves will explode. So if the Russians were able to release an atomic explosion when they wanted to, certainly the competence that enabled them to release such explosion would be fully sufficient for them to place the material inside a case and call it a bomb.

Mr. President, it is a startling thing the former President has done. In some way it smacks of irresponsibility of utterance, which is not without precedent in his history. Just today I am informed that, over the news and ticker services, the former President released another blast at his critics, in which he called them pin heads and squirrel heads. Those appellations find their counterparts in some of the juvenile utterances which have come from the White House in the past when irritation and other causes have brought outbursts from that quarter.

But, Mr. President, on the evening of the 27th, two statements were released. I released one earlier, on my own responsibility, with regard to the statement of the former President. I shall not quote it at this time, but I ask that that statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, today issued the following statement with regard to former President Truman's statement expressing some doubt that the Russians have the A-bomb:

"In the first place, Mr. Truman is a private citizen, and I believe he is entirely out of place in making any such statements as a private citizen, based upon sensitive and classified information which he may have received while he was President.

"He is quoted as saying that his former announcements that the Russians had released an atomic explosion 'had been made to keep the American Nation fully informed of the peril they might face.'

"If Mr. Truman made such ominous statements in 1949, and later, as President, for the purpose of frightening the American people without being convinced that they were factually correct, then it is reprehensible, indeed.

"I am convinced that the Russians did release an atomic explosion on more than one occasion, and certainly if they can release an atomic explosion when they want to, they can make bombs, because the technical skill required in putting together the material for an explosion would not be greater than the mechanics of encasing those materials in a bomb.

"My information on the release of the atomic explosion in Russia comes from responsible officials in government, who have the responsibility of advising accurately on such matters, and I have their assurance that atomic explosions have been released in Russia, and I am further convinced that Russia is going forward with atomic development."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative W. STERLING COLE, the ranking Republican member of the joint committee on the House side, and myself, as the ranking Republican member on the Senate side, joined in a statement which is a little more ample than the short statement I had previously released. That joint statement calls attention, with some shock, to the statement of the former President, and in a very brief way reviews some of the steps to which the joint committee had gone to assure itself from competent authority that atomic explosions had been theretofore released in Russia. It expresses some consternation that former President Truman would make such a statement. I ask, Mr. President, that that joint statement, issued also on January 27, 1953, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CARL DURHAM, DEMOCRAT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, RETIRING CHAIRMAN; SENATOR BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, REPUBLICAN, OF IOWA, RANKING SENATE MAJORITY MEMBER; AND REPRESENTATIVE W. STERLING COLE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, RANKING HOUSE MAJORITY MEMBER, JANUARY 27, 1953

Today former President Truman is quoted as saying, "I am not convinced Russia has the [atomic] bomb * * * I am not convinced the Russians have achieved the know-how to put the complicated mechanism together to make an A-bomb work, I am not convinced they have the bomb."

The purpose of this joint statement is to clarify history and to point out that the ex-President's statement is highly unfortunate in that it contradicts indisputable evidence not only available today but available in 1949.

A report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, dated October 19, 1951, stated as follows:

"In the first months of its existence the committee took two steps, (1) it pressed for a strong United States intelligence effort directed at the atomic energy activities of potential enemies; and (2) it brought unrelenting pressure in behalf of all endeavors to secure information which would enable the United States to know when any atomic test explosion took place on the continents of Eurasia. The intensity of the committee's interest as to both phases has continued at peak level throughout. The active intervention of a handful of individuals, some of whom are committee members, may well have meant the difference between failure and success in becoming aware of the * * * Soviet bomb tests announced by the President. Had these * * * tests passed unnoticed in the United States, the consequences to ourselves could have verged upon the disastrous."

One individual is largely responsible for successful United States detection of the three Soviet atomic bomb test explosions thus far announced from the White House. This individual is former AEC Commissioner Lewis L. Strauss. Mr. Strauss found that inadequate measures were being taken to inform the United States about any successful Russian weapon test. He, therefore,

went to Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Patterson and other high-ranking military and civilian officials and insisted that the necessary measures be undertaken. In this effort he had the powerful backing of Senator HICKENLOOPER, then chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; Representative COLE, ranking majority member on the House side; and Senator McMahon and Representative DURHAM, ranking minority members. It was Mr. Strauss' foresight, relentlessly endorsed by the joint committee—and assisted on the technical side by Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, now director of AEC Reactor Development—that brought into being many of the vital measures which averted the disaster that might have ensued had the United States remained ignorant of Russia's success in achieving the atomic weapon.

In 1949 there began to arrive intelligence data indicating that Russia had tested her first bomb. This intelligence data—like any other similar material—had to be carefully evaluated. Even in the early phases of evaluation, however, it was clear that in all probability the Soviet explosion had been a weapon test and not an accident. Nevertheless, for a few days, it was possible to entertain narrow hopes that the explosion was not an actual test.

During this period of a few days one or two high officials in the executive branch vehemently took the position that the Soviet explosion could not have been a bomb test and that it might have been due to accident. Within a very short time thereafter—before September 23, 1949—the evidence had been fully evaluated and it simply did not admit of doubt.

A special board of the Nation's foremost experts was called in to review the evaluation. The board members—and there are no more technically qualified individuals to be found in the United States—were completely convinced that the Soviets had tested a weapon device and so reported on September 23, 1949, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The evidence was again reviewed during fall 1949 in the interest of supercaution, and once again the evidence was found by the most competent technical authorities to show conclusively that the Soviets had indeed tested a bomb. Probably never in the history of intelligence has such clear-cut evidence been examined so exhaustively so often to arrive at the same simple and unavoidable conclusion.

This whole episode has an ironical aspect in that the executive branch, with the backing of President Truman, determined before September 23, 1949, not to disclose the nature of the evidence to the joint committee—a decision violating the Atomic Energy Act, which requires the joint committee to be informed. We term this decision ironical not only because the joint committee already knew the measures being taken but had been itself highly instrumental in causing those measures to be adopted in the first place. Soon after September 23, 1949, the joint committee did gain access to all details about the first Soviet bomb test.

On October 3, 1951, Mr. Truman, as President, himself publicly stated—and we quote—"another atomic bomb has recently been exploded within the Soviet Union." On October 22, 1951, the White House announced that a third atomic bomb explosion had occurred in Russia. It is interesting to note that yesterday the ex-President referred in his statement to only two Soviet tests, whereas he himself—when President—announced three such tests.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I make one other observation. It has generally been considered by high-ranking officers of the Government, regardless of party, that when they retire from office and return to civilian life, they should exercise the most meticulous care in any statements they may make, based upon classified, confidential, or secret information which they received in their capacity as guardians of the public security. I may say, paraphrasing the words of a famous American patriot a good many years ago, may former President Truman profit by their example in his conduct and in the statements in which he indulges in his private life, as a private citizen.

FINDINGS OF SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA RESULTING FROM HIS TRIP TO EUROPE, NORTH AFRICA, AND THE NEAR EAST

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a report on my findings in Europe, in north Africa, and in the Near East concerning the personnel employed there. This report is based on a personal study of Federal pay and personnel practices in the Near East, Africa, and Europe. A representative cross section of Federal installations in those areas was selected for study with the view to obtaining an intimate understanding of the many complex and pressing problems involved.

As the Senate knows, the Congress has been required, with increasing frequency during recent years, to consider special pay, allowance, leave, and other types of personnel legislation for overseas employees. Action has been taken, frequently, in the face of a wide diversity of views and often without adequate factual information upon which to base decisions. Accordingly, Public Law 201, section 5 (b), enacted October 24, 1951, directed the Bureau of the Budget and Civil Service Commission to report "on pay and personnel practices being followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies, including the Foreign Service of the Department of State." The report was submitted April 1, 1952, and is included herein as appendix A.

That report indicated, and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and departments and agencies with whom portions of it were discussed, agreed that the personnel problems abroad are varied, complex, and not easy of solution. Further, there was ample evidence that prolonged inattention to these problems had impaired the effectiveness of Federal activities, nourished inefficiency, undermined employee morale, and increased administrative and operating expenses beyond reasonable limits.

I respectfully urge the Congress to take the necessary steps to immediately curtail certain useless and valueless activities and to insist on major organizational and managerial reforms in overseas areas. It is my conservative estimate that over 100,000 persons can be removed from United States payrolls within the next 12 months if this is done.

On the basis of additional information and valuable leads received but not contained in this initial report, I am continuing my investigation of certain other aspects of personnel practices in these overseas installations. This will be the subject of a final report at a later date.

A large portion of the information revealed to our party is classified, secret, and confidential, and naturally will not be divulged by me except through proper channels.

It is hoped that this report will be useful to the Congress in the consideration and development of legislation affecting Federal activities and personnel in overseas areas.

REPORT ON OVERSEAS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES

The study, upon which this report is based, covered a representative cross-section of Federal activities and installations in the 10 countries of Europe, the Near East, and northern Africa. Over a thousand Federal employees were interviewed during more than two dozen formal conferences; other hundreds were interviewed at their posts of duty. Employees were selected for interview in a manner to represent all levels of responsibility, types of program and work from the Ambassador, administrator, or commanding officer down through the ranks to the guards and messengers.

Although the primary purpose of this study was to obtain first-hand knowledge of conditions and problems in the field of pay administration and personnel management, significant findings resulted in other areas. Therefore, to the end that this report serve usefully to the greatest extent possible, it goes beyond matters of strictly a personnel nature.

The study group commends the courage and loyalty of some of our employees who have stuck to their jobs in certain areas despite the difficult circumstances and conditions. These circumstances and conditions must be seen to be appreciated. In north Africa, France, and parts of occupied Germany where new construction has been raised from the bombed-out wilderness, there Federal employees, men and women alike, have stood firm in their jobs without even the least semblance of convenience. Their children are going to school in Dallas huts and traveling over 50 miles a day to attend their classes.

While great progress has been made in the execution of our many tremendous projects abroad, frequently under conditions adverse in the extreme, it is time to face up to the fact that the very foundation of our foreign policy is being damaged by an undertow that is steadily increasing its pressure. This undertow derives its strength from streams of indecision, overlapping authority, duplication of effort, wasteful practices, overstaffing, and irresponsible and uncoordinated supervision and direction. Responsibility for the correction of these conditions must be assumed as appropriate by the Congress, the President, the executive departments and agencies, the supervisory and operating officials, and even individual employees, if success is to be realized in our endeavors abroad.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

First. The Civil Service Commission, as the central personnel agency for the Federal Government, should recognize and assume its responsibilities abroad. Complete abdication of its responsibilities in overseas areas has proven costly

in terms of manpower, money, and morale.

Second. Prompt steps should be taken to develop the full framework of a comprehensive and sound overseas personnel program. The system should be designed to provide an extension of the domestic career service to our employees abroad but tailored to meet the unusual problems peculiar to overseas employment. The lack of such a system accounts for many of the problems existing today in the field of personnel administration abroad.

Third. Immediate action should be directed toward removing inequities and bringing about a reasonable degree of uniformity in the administration and operation of such matters as (a) base pay fixing, (b) cost-of-living, rental, hardship and other types of allowances, (c) home leave, (d) medical, educational, and recreational facilities, (e) travel, (f) transportation of household and other personal effects, (g) promotional opportunities, and (h) retirement and separation benefits. It is a situation that has developed since the Second World War. The various agencies have mushroomed in a hodgepodge manner, so to speak. We must assume our responsibility, and correlate them under one head. Then we shall have better morale among our personnel overseas.

Fourth. The variety, scope, and size of our foreign programs and activities should be reduced immediately. Further, appropriate measures should be taken to assure continued curtailment as warranted and to prevent irresponsible growth in the future. When an agency is set up overseas, naturally the desire is to build it up as much as possible. That is only human nature.

Fifth. Responsibility for policy and direction of foreign programs and activities should be placed in or under the regular departments in Washington. From somewhere must come the source of power.

Sixth. Responsibility for the administration of all Federal programs and activities in each country should be vested in our accredited representative to that country. Further, the intermediate levels of responsibility now existing should be abolished.

We should not have in some countries, as is now the case, as many as four ambassadors looking after the interests of America.

Seventh. Appropriations should be consolidated, administrative responsibility defined, and accountability required so that costs can be determined, results measured, needs anticipated, employees utilized, and economies effected.

Eighth. The joint accounting project of the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and Treasury Department should be extended to all overseas areas at once. Adequate accounting systems, comprehensive audits, and systematic reporting minimize the possibility of fraud, spot-light wasteful practices, and promote efficiency.

Ninth. The separate organizational units performing housekeeping functions—personnel, procurement, building maintenance, motor pools, and so forth—within each different agency should be abolished. These services can and should be performed at each location by a common service staff.

Tenth. Immediate steps should be taken to eliminate the costly and unnecessary movement of personnel, equipment and goods from one location to another, due mainly to the absence of over-all planning, direction, and coordination. A great many movements from place to place could and should be eliminated in the future by proper planning.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

First. The Civil Service Commission: It is the role of the Civil Service Commission, as the central personnel office of the executive branch, to preserve and improve the merit system and provide leadership in personnel administration. Conditions found to exist in overseas areas, on the whole, provide the basis for a serious indictment of the Commission for its failure to recognize and measure up to its responsibilities. Among other things it was found:

(a) That except for the Foreign Service of the Department of State the overseas personnel practices of the Federal Government generally are not designed to fit into our concept of a career service. This accounts, to some extent, for the problems of recruitment, transfer, and employee utilization.

(b) That the diversity of statutes and regulations leads to numerous systems of personnel administration. Many of the problems which result are beyond the power of any one agency to resolve and there is no coordinating machinery to bring the several agencies together.

(c) That little has been done, except on an individual agency basis, to develop guides which take into account characteristics essential to successful overseas employment. This accounts, in some measure, for the selection and appointment of many employees who fail to properly adjust themselves to conditions abroad.

Certainly there ought to be someone assigned who knows the conditions of the particular country involved before anyone is sent abroad. If that were the practice, I think we would fare better after our representative arrives there.

(d) That several different performance rating systems are used for evaluating the work of overseas employees. The variety of systems in use destroys the value of an employee's rating, except in his own agency, leads to charges of personal favoritism, and results in more than a normal number of appeals.

(e) That standards and job specifications have not been developed for many positions peculiar to overseas employment. This makes sound pay administration difficult if not impossible.

It is not unusual to find such conditions. I once asked a man who had been in about five or six different agencies, and who had moved from place to place, "Every time you move do you get a pay increase?" He replied, "I do not know whether you ought to ask me that question or not."

(f) That several distinctly different systems are used in the examining, selecting, and appointing of overseas employees. This leads to an inevitable duplication of forms, procedures, and processes, which, of course, results in extra expense.

(g) That no audit has been made of the classification and pay administration programs of the agencies in overseas areas. The variance in rates of pay between agencies for positions of a like nature indicates a serious lack of coordination in the important phase of management.

(h) That the wide diversity of practices many times between agencies in the same country, with respect to pay, allowances, and other benefits for the many thousands of indigenous personnel employed by the United States Government, is costing the taxpayers millions of dollars, and destroying much of the good relations we have sought through our assistance programs. To cite one of the many examples encountered; one agency decided it should give a Christmas bonus to its indigenous personnel without conference or proper advice with other agencies in the same neighborhood. Consequently, the other agencies did not follow the practice, and it caused much disruption of normal activities. Frequently it is the practice in these areas, on the part of local governments and industry, which practice must necessarily be followed by the United States Government, to compensate their personnel according to length of service, number of children to be supported, whether an employee is married or single, and numerous bonus arrangements which, compared with our system, are extremely complicated. Yet in many areas we found no evidence of cooperation between agencies, or attempts to work out a uniform approach to the matter.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The executive branch should develop and present to the Congress appropriate legislation to clarify and extend the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission for leadership in overseas personnel administration. Such legislation should provide for the reorganization and strengthening of the Civil Service Commission, as required, to enable it to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

Some agencies are taking into the service persons from various countries. I warn the Senate that we shall wake up someday to find that some of them have been placed upon our retirement rolls, and are being paid in accordance with the American retirement system. Others will not. We should look into and correct all such conditions before it is too late.

B. The Civil Service Commission should move with force and direction to fulfill its responsibilities in the areas in which its authority is clear.

2. OVERSEAS PERSONNEL PROGRAM

It is readily apparent that the Federal Government does not have an over-all personnel program designed specially for overseas employment. Current policies and practices are an unrelated hodgepodge of laws, regulations, and administrative decisions improvised on a day-to-day basis.

Although the Foreign Service of the State Department has taken important strides in the development of a personnel system tailored for overseas employment, evidence indicates that administration of the system is somewhat

deficient. Apart from the matter of actual administration, the State Department's Foreign Service system has characteristics which are subject to serious question. They involve its isolation from and lack of interchangeability with the rest of the Federal service both abroad and at home and its practices relating to the selection, transfer, and promotion of employees and its pay-fixing program and methods.

The Foreign Service system, while it is adaptable to a small, closely knit group representing this country in diplomatic circles, has serious weaknesses when extended to the thousands of employees now overseas. Working in the same job and in the same area with employees having diplomatic status with its special privileges creates a serious morale problem.

Aside from the foreign service the tendency is to staff overseas activities through contractual employment instead of on a career basis. While this method of staffing is quicker in its initial stages and has certain other advantages it also has some major draw-backs. It results in a higher turn-over rate and denies the Federal service the benefit of continuity of service overseas and in the United States. Further, it does not lend itself to the development and maximum use of employee skills and knowledges acquired in Government service.

Generally, persons appointed to overseas positions are not selected on a competitive basis or required to meet the same standards set up for employment in the States.

Many employees were interviewed who had not been briefed sufficiently on the customs, history, and conditions of the country to which they were assigned. Others stated that while they were given an orientation course before being sent overseas it proved to be of negligible value.

These and many other conditions of a similar nature point to the need for constructive thinking and concerted action in the development of an overseas personnel program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The Civil Service Commission should take the lead in developing the framework of a complete overseas personnel program. While the system should be designed to provide an extension of the domestic career service to employees abroad, it does not follow that status should be conferred on all employees now overseas.

B. Consideration should be given to removing the barriers that exist between the Foreign Service and the rest of the Federal service so that eventually employees overseas will be available for service in any agency either at home or abroad.

C. Adequate entrance standards should be developed and adopted to assure the selection of qualified personnel.

D. Proper orientation courses should be given employees before they are sent overseas.

3. DIFFERENCES IN PERSONNEL AND PAY PRACTICES

Wide differences were found to exist in most of the basic elements of personnel administration in overseas areas. A few examples are as follows:

(a) Position classification: Like positions are allocated to different grade levels in the several agencies. Some evidence was found to indicate that the grades of positions have been raised as a means of providing an extra incentive to overseas employment. Position descriptions often are inaccurate and not up to date. Also, there is a difference in concept of pay administration to further complicate the picture. In the Foreign Service the salary of an individual is based in part on his rank, whereas, in other departments the salary of an individual is based on an evaluation of the duties and responsibilities of his position.

(b) Allowances: Under a wide variety of laws and regulations employees are accorded allowances and differentials to meet special problems and needs while serving abroad. They are designed to equate the net compensation of employees abroad with the compensation of employees in the United States. In general, allowances are authorized to cover, first, the cost of quarters; second, the difference in cost of living between an overseas post and that in Washington; and third, the extraordinary expenses involved in transferring from one post to another. Certain types of personnel, serving at designated hardship posts, receive in addition to other allowances up to as much as 25 percent additional by reason of the assignment to such posts. Employees of the Department of Defense in certain instances are provided educational facilities whereas employees of other agencies are not similarly treated.

(c) Home leave: Employees in the Foreign Service and employees of MSA earn home leave in addition to annual and sick leave, whereas employees of other departments and agencies earn only annual and sick leave. This difference in leave benefits is the cause of considerable concern to the agencies and some dissatisfaction on the part of employees.

(d) Other benefits, and so forth: Wide variances were found to exist between agencies and even within agencies in such matters as medical facilities and charges for medical services, commissary and PX privileges, travel rates and transportation of household effects and automobiles.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The Civil Service Commission should be directed to conduct an immediate study of pay and wage fixing policies and practices in overseas areas with the view to developing a sound system of wage administration. The system should be designed to remove existing inequities and be suitable for use by all agencies on a uniform basis.

B. Either by amendment of Executive Order 10000 or by legislation, responsibility for determining allowances and administration thereof should be vested in one authority. At present the Department of State has jurisdiction in foreign countries and the Civil Service Commission has jurisdiction in the Territories and possessions. Because of the relationship of allowances to pay administration it would appear preferable to centralize responsibility for administration of allowances in the Civil Service Commission.

C. Congress should enact legislation to equalize the home-leave benefits of overseas employees.

I think everyone will agree that it should be done, but we are not doing it.

D. Legislation is required to equalize a number of other matters such as the cost of medical treatment, transportation of household effects and allowances for educational purposes.

4. VARIETY, SCOPE, AND SIZE OF PROGRAMS

It is self-evident that many of our foreign programs have served their purpose and unless curtailed immediately will succeed only in the future in winning us enemies instead of friends. Other programs have been conducted on much too grand a scale. One must meet with the people over there to know just how they feel about Americans in the light of such actions.

Still others have been extended over too large a territory and in too many directions. Some appear designed to impose our social standards upon other peoples even against their will or to deliberately create situations from which we cannot withdraw in good faith in the predictable future.

Our aid has increased employment, helped agriculture and industry, raised the national income and stabilized the economy of Western Europe to a great extent. Yet even in spite of this we are losing the respect and good will of the peoples of these countries for a variety of reasons: Our wasteful practices and apparent disregard for the value of a dollar breeds disgust. The large number of our employees and the extent of our operations creates suspicion. The use of scarce housing and other facilities by our employees encourages contempt.

Those of us who are not confronted with the problem of scarce housing cannot appreciate the plight of those who are pushed out of their homes.

The plush living of our employees on a comparative basis causes jealousy. Disgust, suspicion, contempt, and jealousy are not foods upon which lasting friendships between individuals or nations thrive and grow.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Congress should authorize and direct that an independent firm of accountants conduct an immediate comprehensive audit of each and every appropriation from which funds for foreign programs and activities have been or are available. Among other things the audit report should indicate: (a) Funds spent—by country and by object, (b) funds obligated—by country and by object, (c) funds available—limitations, if any, such as time or object.

B. Congress should call for and direct each department and agency engaged in overseas activities to prepare and submit a current progress report indicating among other things: First, projects completed—location, initial cost and continuing annual cost of operation or maintenance; second, projects started but incomplete—location, cost to date, cost to complete, anticipated completion date, continuing annual cost of operation or maintenance after completion; third, projects committed—location, antici-

pated cost, starting time, time to complete, continuing annual cost of operation or maintenance after completion.

C. Future appropriations should be made only on the basis of an accurate determination of the amount of funds still available, the amount of funds required to complete projects for which we are already obligated, future operating and maintenance costs and an overall appraisal of our total foreign program.

D. Future appropriations should be restricted to and based on sound budget estimates for specific projects and activities.

E. Appropriation language should establish administrative responsibility and accountability and provide for adequate auditing by the General Accounting Office to assure that legislative intent is being fulfilled.

5. RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOREIGN PROGRAMS

There was evidence on every hand of confusion, duplication of effort and overlapping of functions stemming from the lack of central direction and coordination in Washington. This was evident not only with respect to the foreign-aid programs but in connection with and between the MAAG groups and the attaché staffs.

It is obvious that such a situation not only impairs the efficient conduct of our activities and pyramids the cost but weakens our position in dealing with foreign powers and their representatives.

RECOMMENDATION

A. Full responsibility for foreign policy and the administration of foreign-aid programs should be drawn together under the Department of State.

6. ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN PROGRAMS

The organizational structure under which our foreign-aid programs are conducted varies widely in different countries. Generally speaking, lines of authority are not clearly established which leads to indecision and unnecessary delay. For example, in France we have three individuals with the title of Ambassador and three others with the title of Minister. In addition to these six we have a score or more with the title of administrator, director, head of mission, and so forth. In Paris alone, the United States Government has 49 separate agencies, each with separate authority and responsibilities. Perhaps even worse than this is the duplication of staffs down through the ranks even to the mail clerks and messengers.

In view of this it is little wonder that almost every foreign city of any size is "bulging at the seams" with American employees.

RECOMMENDATION

A. Complete responsibility for execution of our foreign policy should be vested in our accredited representative to each country. This individual's authority should not be diminished or diluted by subjecting him to intermediate controls in his contacts with or in receipt of directions from the Department of State in Washington.

7. STATUS OF OBLIGATIONS AND PROGRAMS

It is difficult, if not actually impossible, to ascertain accurately the status of our expenditures and obligations either on a program, activity, project, or country-wide basis. Neither can the number of our employees be determined either in total or on a country-wide or program basis. For example, there is a difference of well over 10,000 in the number of employees reported to be stationed overseas by two official sources on the same date. As a further example, one specific project was reported by one source as costing in excess of $150,000,000 and by another source at less than $90,000,000.

In another instance payment of over $200,000 was made to a contractor on the basis of his personal statement that the contract had been fulfilled. Many months later it was discovered that the contract had not only not been completed, but very little work at all had been started on it.

The reasons for this confused state of affairs are manifold: For one reason, the funds and personnel for any given program, activity, or function may be derived from a variety of appropriations or even by transfer of funds and personnel from one appropriation to another. For a second reason, accountability is neither clearly defined nor effectively executed. For a third reason, administrative responsibility is not positive or coordinated to the extent that systematic and reliable reporting results.

It seems reasonable to assume that consolidation of responsibility for foreign policy and the administration of foreign-aid programs in the Department of State, coupled with the merging of functions under a responsible representative in each country, would provide a businesslike organization within which administrative responsibility and accountability could be effectively established.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. To the greatest extent possible appropriations should be consolidated on a program and object basis.

B. Blanket appropriations, transfers of funds and personnel from one appropriation to another, and the commingling of funds and personnel by administrative action should be held to the absolute minimum.

C. Congress should, through its appropriation processes, require and obtain reliable reports indicating the exact status of past appropriations, the total amount of outstanding obligations, and other data upon which to base an estimate of our future requirements in terms of money and manpower.

8. ACCOUNTABILITY

It was disturbing to observe the loose manner in which large amounts of Federal funds are being handled in overseas areas. In many instances, normally accepted business practices were not in evidence. Records and accounting procedures vary widely and give every indication of being inadequate in many instances. Regular audits have not been made and do not appear to be contemplated.

Testimony was received to the effect that fraud and favoritism have invaded our procurement operations. Some of them now would probably be military secrets. The circumstances surrounding the letter of some large construction contracts are open to question. I believe that some mention of that matter has appeared in newspapers in the United States. That news broke in the field over there while I was making an investigation in that particular place. It was rumored that payrolls are being padded and that incidents of alleged thefts of equipment and materials are in fact sales of such items by Federal employees to outside parties.

Regardless of whether any or all of these allegations are true, there are still other reasons for insisting on the introduction of sound accounting and auditing practices into our overseas operations: First, the American taxpayer is entitled to know that every dollar of public funds is being honestly handled; and, secondly, the introduction and adoption abroad of businesslike accounting procedures will of itself bring about worth-while economies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The joint accounting project of the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and Treasury Department should be extended to overseas operations as quickly as possible.

B. The General Accounting Office should be authorized and directed to extend its audit activities into every phase of our foreign operations and submit periodic reports to the Congress.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND HOUSEKEEPING FUNCTIONS

It was observed that an inordinate proportion of employees abroad is engaged in the performance of administrative and housekeeping functions. This is due in part to the lack of over-all direction, coordination, and planning, but in the main to the fact that each agency, however large or small, has a separate organization to carry out its personnel, procurement, payrolling, building maintenance, motor pool, and other service functions.

In Athens these common services are being performed by one organization known as Joint Administrative Services, and referred to as JAS. However, much of the effectiveness and possibly all of the economy to be expected from such a consolidation has been dissipated because of the overly extensive and plush manner in which JAS is operated. As presently carried on, JAS is a large operation. It has a staff of over 100 local Greek engineers, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, elevator operators, charwomen, and guards who are engaged in the operation and maintenance of buildings occupied by Federal employees. It is responsible for the operation of five hotels and two mess halls. It supervises the operation of a bus system and a far-flung taxi service. Over one million bus passengers and over three-quarters of a million car passengers were given transportation during the last fiscal year. The motor pool consists of 290 vehicles, and has a personnel of 135 chauffeurs, 40 truck drivers, and 70 mechanics. The supply, communications, publications, property maintenance, housing, and other services performed by JAS are correspondingly large.

I must say that that organization is trying to correlate in some way the various agencies in Greece, but it is a costly organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The separate organizational units performing common administrative and housekeeping functions in each agency should be abolished, and their functions absorbed by the staff of our accredited Department of State representative in each country.

B. The Department of State should establish criteria for the selection of staff and the performance of common service functions to assure a minimum operation and maximum efficiency and economy.

10. MOVEMENT OF PERSONNEL, EQUIPMENT, AND GOODS

Evidence was received to the effect that employees, equipment and goods are moved from one location to another with little rhyme or reason. One employee stated that he was assigned to three different locations before turning out a full day's work. Another did no work until his fifth assignment. Several did no work until their second assignment. Others found work on their original assignment, but were moved to posts where no work existed.

At some installations a surplus of heavy equipment was observed. Much of this surplus, now completely unusable, was shipped to the installation just prior to the start of the rainy season, without advance notice, and apparently with full knowledge that adequate storage facilities did not exist at the installation. Other installations did not have similar equipment in sufficient quantity to keep the project moving in an efficient manner. On the other hand, other installations, perhaps close by, did not have sufficient equipment, but probably had more than ample storage facilities. However, much of the equipment was shipped to installations at which adequate storage facilities did not exist.

At one point the demurrage bill alone amounted to over $60,000 a month. In other words, Mr. President, materials and supplies were shipped so rapidly that they could not be unloaded from the railroad cars in an expeditious manner, but remained on the railroad cars for long periods of time, thus subjecting the United States Government to very large bills for demurrage. I do not recall the name of the officer who made the remark to which I now refer; in any event, let me say that when I drove past a man who said, "You know, the goods that were to come in last week haven't arrived yet," the officer to whom he spoke turned around to me and said, "I hope they don't come for 3 months; I have no place to put them."

The reason for this mismanagement is obvious. It is simply a case of there being no coordination and planning at the top in the direction of our multibillion dollar construction projects abroad.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Authority and responsibility should be drawn together under competent management.

B. Business-like accounting systems should be installed, rigidly followed and utilized to improve operating and management practices.

C. Planning should start at the top and be conducted on an over-all basis. The main thing is, we need a proper coordination of all our agencies, which we do not have at the present time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I move that as in legislative session, the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, January 30, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 30, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Robert Ten Broeck Stevens, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Harold E. Talbott, of New York, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1956. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Laurance T. DuBose, United State Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier, and commander, Atlantic Reserve Fleet.

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years; and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Personnel).

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

REAR ADMIRAL, LINE

James H. Thach, Jr.	Aaron P. Storrs 3d
Richard W. Ruble	William K. Mendenhall, Jr.
Stanhope C. Ring	Harry D. Felt
Charles F. Coe	John M. Will
Thomas B. Williamson	Leslie A. Kniskern

REAR ADMIRAL, MEDICAL CORPS

Frederick C. Greaves
John Q. Owsley

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS

Joseph L. Herlihy

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Henry C. Bruton	Edward N. Parker
Joseph M. Carson	Lewis S. Parks
Charles F. Chillingworth, Jr.	Robert B. Pirie
Howard L. Collins	Lester K. Rice
Henry Crommelin	James S. Russell
William L. Erdmann	John H. Sides
Harry H. Henderson	John Sylvester
Ira E. Hobbs	Edmund B. Taylor
Willard K. Goodney	John M. Taylor
Peter W. Haas, Jr.	George C. Towner
Robert S. Hatcher	David M. Tyree
Frederick N. Kivette	Frederick B. Warder
Victor D. Long	Joseph H. Wellings
Redfield Mason	Austin W. Wheelock
Armand M. Morgan	George C. Wright

MEDICAL CORPS

Thomas F. Cooper	French R. Moore
James R. Fulton	Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.
Bartholomew W. Hogan	

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles G. DeKay
Frederick W. Hesser

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Joseph F. Jelley

DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Malone

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Edward B. Harp, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John R. Perry

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade and corps indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Rudolph J. Fabian	Bruce L. Carr
William R. Lefavour	Russell C. Williams
James M. Wood	Charles B. Brooks, Jr.
Frank G. Raysbrook	Victor H. Soucek
Lucian F. Dodson	Peter M. Gaviglio
Oscar E. Hagberg	Theodore A. Torgerson
Elliott M. Brown	Victor A. King
Henry A. Renken	Lowell W. Williams
Freeman Cutter	Robert E. Hudson
George W. Molesworth	Charles C. Kirkpatrick
Lawson P. Ramage	Reid P. Fiala
Henry Mullins, Jr.	Richard H. Crane
Louis F. Volk	Richard C. Steere
John O. Miner	William B. Sieglaff
Bafford E. Lewellen	Donald T. Wilber
Richard R. Hay	Alfred B. Metsger
Byron L. Gurnette	Sinclair B. Wright
James R. Z. Reynolds	Anthony C. Roessler
John B. Fellows, Jr.	John F. Harper, Jr.
Archie D. Fraser	Jay S. Anderson
George E. Peckham	Karl R. Wheland
Morris A. Hirsch	Charles O. Cook, Jr.
Robert A. Theobald, Jr.	Harry M. S. Gimber, Jr.
Edward L. Robertson, Jr.	George B. Madden
	Robert P. Beebe
Claude V. Hawk	John H. Brockway
Darwin M. Wisehaupt	John A. Fitzgerald
George D. Arntz	Sidney J. Lawrence
John G. Lewis	Nelson M. Head
Carl F. Nieberle	John N. Hughes
Schermerhorn Van Mater	Bernard F. McMahon
	Robert A. Fitch
Raymond P. Hunter	Philip W. Mothersill
James M. Peters	John D. Crowley

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Robert B. Brown

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

John F. Castree	John W. Crumpacker
Marshall H. Cox	Paul W. Clarke
Ignatius N. Tripi	Robert M. Bowstrom

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

George A. Rosso

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Wilbur N. Van Zile
Alvin H. Grunewald

COMMANDER, LINE

William N. Thies
Richard B. Laning
Lucian J. Hunt, Jr.
Robert H. Pauli
Arthur H. Berndtson
Russell F. Moon
William J. Caspari
Vincent P. Healey
John D. Howell
Hugh B. Vickery
Arthur L. Maltby, Jr.
George L. Block
Ralph P. Desmond, Jr.
Eugene A. Hemley
Thomas H. Taylor
Robert H. White
Albert W. Newhall, Jr.
Donald M. Kable
William W. Trice
Archibald T. Nicholson, Jr.
Ashley J. Little
Harry P. Fischer, Jr.
James G. Hedrick
Thomas R. Perry, Jr.
John B. Nelson
William W. South
Jacob V. Heimark
Roy C. Smallwood, Jr.
Guy E. Hearn, Jr.
Ernest R. Peterson
Richard H. McElligott
William E. Westhoff
David L. G. King
Ned Garrett
Herschel V. Sellers, Jr.
Allen A. Bergner
Irving J. Davenport
William W. Braley
Robert A. Bogardus
David A. Marks
Charles S. Walline
John A. Whitacre
John H. Caldwell
Fred J. Gorczyk
William J. Keating
Eugene D. Lamiman
Harold W. Biesemeier
Markeson Varland
Robert E. Huddleston
Joseph Demetreo
Andrew H. Reid
Paul M. Paul
Robert N. Miller
Forrest A. Todd
John P. Edwards
Richard W. Parker
Richard M. Niles
William S. Antle, Jr.
Allen P. Cook, Jr.
William H. Mack
James F. McRoberts
Kenneth G. Simmons
Robert L. Kalen
John P. Davis
Edward F. Jacobs
Arthur G. Esch
Harry C. White
John H. Boyum
Rue O'Neill, Jr.
Douglas A. Clark
Carl A. Sander, Jr.
John L. Bishop
Philip F. Eckert
Harvey J. Smith, Jr.
James S. Elkins, Jr.
Wilbur G. Barton
John C. Micheel
Roger F. Smith
Stephen H. MacGregor, Jr.
John E. Plummer
Everett M. Glenn
Louie W. Strum, Jr.
Leigh C. Winters
Jesse D. Worley
Julian T. Burke, Jr.
Nathan R. Lincoln, Jr.
Louis E. Burke, Jr.
Farrell B. McFarland
William F. Laffey
Richard W. Shafer
Robert W. McIntosh
Richard C. Mueller
Stanley E. Wagenhals
John P. Wier, Jr.
Richard E. Brown
John H. Rockwell, Jr.
William A. Walker 3d
Hugh A. Hanna
Demetrius J. Vellis
Tom H. Wells
Robert D. Quinn
Robert G. Bill
George M. Hawes
Stewart W. Swacker
John W. Sullivan

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Grover C. Heffner
Olio V. Wallgren, Jr.
William F. Harvey, Jr.
Robert W. Granston
Earl G. Rice, Jr.
Gordon M. Callison
Arthur E. Desrosier
Kenneth L. Jeffery, Jr.
Russell O. Merrill
William C. Nielsen
Gardiner T. Pollich
James T. Hughes
Joseph H. Batchelder
Fred Coleman
Harold H. Blackman

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Lyman H. Riney
William I. Gullett
Allen L. McInturff

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William E. Norcross
Donald M. Rait

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Adams, Spencer M.
Allen, Russell B.
Anderson, Howard T. E.
Antoniak, Charles
Arnold, Jackson D.
Ashley, James H., Jr.
Babb, James D.
Bailey, Claude F.
Baranowski, Walter E.
Batcheller, Edgar H.
Baumberger, Walter H.
Becker, Albert L.
Bengston, Robert C.
Bentley, James C.
Bertholf, Charles M.
Bienman, Charles, Jr.
Bourke, Robert E.
Boyle, Francis D.
Brockett, William A.
Brooks, William B.
Bromley, John R.
Brown, Samuel R., Jr.
Browne, George H.
Bruchez, Ernest V.
Bullen, George S.
Bullen, Jacob T., Jr.
Cain, James R., Jr.
Chambers, Lester S.
Chandler, Robert A.
Chaney, Wilbur H., Jr.
Christensen, Ernest E.
Chung-Hoon, Gordon P.
Clarey, Bernard A.
Clifford, George M.
Close, Robert H.
Coffin, Albert P.
Cole, Allyn, Jr.
Coleman, Wilson M.
Coley, Charles C.
Collins, William M., Jr.
Compton, James R.
Copeland, Richard G.
Cordiner, Douglas L.
Craft, James P., Jr.
Daunis, Stanley S.
Davis, Eugene W.
Day, Barton E.
Day, Howard E., Jr.
Dean, William A., Jr.
Deragon, William N.
Dickey, Willie M.
Dickinson, Clarence E.
Dissette, Edward F.
Dixon, Duncan P., Jr.
Doss, Clarence T., Jr.
Dry, Melvin H.
DuBois, Thomas H.
Dutton, William T.
Edwards, David S., Jr.
Fahy, Edward J.
Fielder, Charles W.
Fleck, Francis E., Jr.
Fletcher, Francis O., Jr.
Florence, John W.
Foster, John L.
Fulghum, Benjamin C.
Fuller, Harold D.
Fulp, James D., Jr.
Gamon, John A., Jr.
Garth, Craig R.
Gebelin, Albert L.
Gerlach, Charles H.
Gralla, Arthur R.
Grange, Gifford
Greer, Harry H., Jr.
Griffith, Walter T.
Gunn, Frederick A.
Guthrie, William L.
Halligan, James E., Jr.
Hampton, Isaiah M.
Hardy, Robert J.
Harllee, John
Harper, Cecil K.
Hastings, Willard E.
Henderson, Charles M.
Hoffman, George D.
Horton, John A., Jr.
House, Arthur C., Jr.
Howard, John W.
Hutchings, Charles S.
Hutchings, Curtis H.
Hyde, John M.
Hyland, John J.
Ingram, Carlyle
Irvine, Donald G.
Jett, Charles M.
Joachim, Paul L.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Nels C.
Kait, Herman H.
Kane, Richard P.
Keller, William W.
Ketchum, Gerald L.
Kinsella, William T.
Kossler, Herman J.
Krapf, Arthur E.
Latham, Richard C.
Lautrup, George W., Jr.
Lee, Edwin S., Jr.
Leeman, Robert W.
Lefelar, Louis
Lief, Sam Albert
Lord, Edwin E., III
Lowe, John T., Jr.
MacKenzie, Colin J.
MacLeod, Warren S.
Maddox, William S.
Mann, Charles C.
Manning, Arthur R.
Marshall, Frank G., Jr.
Martin, John C.
Martin, William I.
Maynard, Russell H.
Merrill, Grayson
Merrill, Sidney D. B.
Metcalf, Paul T.
Miller, Henry L.
Morgan, John C.
Morland, John B.
Murray, Hugh Q.
McCormick, William M.
McGillis, John F.
McLaren, Earle K.
Nauman, Harley K.
Neville, Lawrence R.
Newell, James H.
Nichols, John C.
Nichols, Richard E.
Nusom, Frank A.
Ogle, John N.
O'Kane, Richard H.
Oliver, Robert J.
Ours, Statton R., Jr.
Ovrom, Robert J.
Owers, James E.
Parsons, George E. T.
Paton, Robert A.
Pfotenhauer, Fred D.
Phelps, John M.
Pinney, Frank L., Jr.
Pittard, George F.
Powell, Edgar S., Jr.
Powers, Robert D., Jr.
Presler, Irving S.
Price, Lowell S.
Rider, Eugene C.
Risser, Robert D.
Rittenhouse, Ellis B.
Robbins, Orme C.
Roenigk, John G.
Rowe, Hilary C.
Rutherford, Reginald
Savidge, Paul S., Jr.
Scanland, Francis W., Jr.
Schantz, Edwin H.
Scherer, Donald A.
Schnable, Allan G.
Schulz, Lester R.
Sellars, Robert P.
Semmes, Benedict J., Jr.
Sheffield, Fletcher L., Jr.
Shepard, Richard D.
Shilson, James S.
Slack, Leslie M.
Smith, Arthur C.
Smith, Bernard A.
Smith, James E.
Smith, John V.
South, Thomas W., II
Spicer, Henry C., Jr.
Staley, Joseph J., Jr.
Stephan, Charles R.
Stirling, Cedric W.
Stone, Lester J.
Strickler, Lyle E.
Sweeney, William E.
Swift, Douglas M.
Taylor, Brown
Taylor, Keith E.
Thompson, Harry L., Jr.
Tibbets, Joseph B.
Tilburne, Edward R.
Townsend, Robert L.
Travis, Charles W.
Upham, Frank K.
VanArsdall, Clyde J.
VanLeunen, Paul, Jr.
Vose, James E., Jr.
Walker, William W.
Walsh, David J.
Wells, George G.
Westholm, Rollin E.
Wheeler, Robert E.
Whitaker, Reuben T.
White, Marshall W.
Williams, Robert R., Jr.
Williams, Vernon
Wright, James M.
Wyckoff, John M.

MEDICAL CORPS

Canty, Thomas J.
Davis, Jefferson
Ede, Shakeeb
Garrity, Richard W.
Gell, Charles F.
Goodwin, Merrill H.
Hanner, Joseph M.
Hogan, Edward E.
Lawler, Arthur L.
McLarney, Edward P.
McNamara, Philip J.
Metcalfe, Earle E.
Miller, Walter R.
Phoebus, Clifford P.
Roudebush, Marion E.
Syslo, Joseph A.
Walker, Russell H.
Wisler, Samuel J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Ambrose, Dennison C.
Cole, Harold E.
Fagan, Edward M.
Klunk, Richard S.
Robbins, William I.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Dickman, Paul W. J.
Howe, Harris W.
Redman, Emil P.
Schwyhart, Robert M.
Twitchell, Martell H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Castelazo, Arthur H.
Church, William C. G.
Coxe, Lewis C.
Daily, Charles S., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Chastain, Roger V.
Curren, Gail T.
Griffin, Mallie A.
Hoffer, Caryl J.
Justice, James R.
Martin, Niels H.
Urban, Kenneth L.
Schlicht, Otto H.
Simpson, Maurice E.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Lul, Edward E.
Rowinski, Nicholas M.
Schatz, Otto C., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Ennes, Ralph M.
Henn, Carl G.

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Allen, Joseph S.
Baker, John R., Jr.
Bayers, Edward H.
Bjornson, Gordon B.
Bode, Elton W.
Boord, Robert F.
Bragg, Frank B.
Brannan, Leonard L.
Brooks, George W.
Brown, Ben T.
Brueggemann, Arthur R.
Burton, Roy E., Jr.
Callan, James E.
Chase, William E.
Clute, George S.
Commons, Norbert A.
Crawford, Adna R.
Crawford, Joseph W., Jr.
Dana, Martin L.
Danielski, Joe M.
Davis, Lewis E., Jr.
Davol, Charles D., Jr.
Decker, Joe B.
Deibler, William D.
Dunston, Charles E.
Emslie, William F.
Esch, Robert R.
Firebaugh, Gordon E.
French, George W.
Gisvold, Paul A.
Gmyr, Walter A.
Griffing, Charles W.
Gross, John W.
Harding, William T.
Harlin, Walter V.
Hawk, Clarence C.
Hawkins, Everett L.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Hughes, James L., Jr.
Isaitt, Donald K.
Jackson, Richard J.
Jones, Charles M.
Kaul, Frederic H.
Keigher, Joseph P., Jr.
Lamka, Raymond W.
Larson, Vernon H.
Lee, Fiorn L.
Lehan, John P.
Leichter, Herbert L., Jr.
LeMote, Norman N.
Lewiston, William A.
Loewer, Leroy
Madrigan, Fred J.
Maurer, Winfield G.
Melusky, Thomas A.
Merritt, Carl R.
Miller, Otto C.
Montfort, Richard A.

McCarthy, John P.
Neely, William E.
Newton, Lewis
Norvell, Forrest H., Jr.
Odiorne, Robert G.
Osegueda, Frank
Paretsky, Jacob S.
Pease, William L.
Randall, Arthur H.
Reid, Robert C.
Rex, Daniel F.
Robertson, Horace L., Jr.
Sanborn, Francis R.
Schultz, Horace D.
Screws, Frank M.
Sibitzky, Martin C.
Smith, Michael P.
Snider, Alfred C.
Stetson, Thomas H.
Sullivan, George A.
Swain, Dean H.
Tenanty, Joseph R.
Terrill, Ralph B.
Thomas, Willis L.
Troemel, Benjamin H.
Violett, Sam O.
Ward, Arvell E.
Watson, George S.
Windley, William D.
Wolfe, Theodore E., Jr.
Wooldridge, Arthur R., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Anderson, Gustave T.
Berry, Richard G.
Bills, Ervine S.
Braff, Andrew F.
Callagan, Dwight A.
Canfield, Earle G.
Cerzosimo, Frank A.
Cheffey, John H.
Clark, Gale G.
Galuszka, Albin A.
Hall, William K.
Jones, Walton L., Jr.
Kaufman, James A.
May, Romulus L.
Maynard, Russell M.
Nadbath, Rudolph P.
Osborne, David P.
Pease, John A.
Pino, Daniel M.
Reist, Vorris M.
Sarkisian, Sarkis S.
Schufeldt, Dean
Smith, James M.
Smith, William L.
Stryker, William S.
Sudduth, Herschel C.
Sussex, James N.
Wagner, Henry G.
Walker, Granville L., Jr.
Weiss, Harry A.
Whoolery, Lawrence A.
Yocum, Thomas D.
Zuska, Albert J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, John P.
Clefton, Claude A.
Harrison, Frederick D.
Kasdorf, Charles A., Jr.
Kirby, Robert W.
Loomis, Floyd, Jr.
Mather, Fred I.
Peterson, George W., Jr.
Peterson, Rudolph M.
Stafford, Harry D.
Stern, Theodore S.
Troth, Philip

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Connolly, Daniel E.
Gill, Samuel C., Jr.
Huey, Arthur S., Jr.
McCaffrey, William T.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Albrecht, Herbert C. W.
Alley, James A.
Beck, Max G.
Best, Cyril
Hester, James D.
Kulinski, Arthur M.
Marks, James R.
McComas, Robert P.
McDonald, Joseph D.
Michaels, Emmett T.
Morton, Paul C.
Read, Alden A.
Reaves, James E.
Ricker, Richard W.
Salyer, Oswald B.
Schnurr, Herman J.
Seymour, Howard A.
Wright, George A.

DENTAL CORPS

Cermak, George L.
Dudley, George E.
Ferris, John B.
Friesz, Raymond H.
Gleisten, Howard P.
Harrison, William J.
Hildreth, Edward R.
Hutson, William E.
Jones, John P.
King, Jan F.
Leonard, Melvin R.
Loring, Arthur J.
Ownby, Thomas J.
Parker, John A.
Robie, John C.
Rogers, James G.
Sample, Theodore C.
Sheppard, Furman L.
Smith, George M.
Stewart, Craig A.
Walker, Rupert S.
Walsh, Eugene A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Glawson, Joseph J.
Goren, Sydney
Holway, Richard T.
Knight, Kenneth L.
Miller, George A.
Taylor, William W., Jr.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Allen, Frederick S.
Anderson, Paul O.
Angstadt, Albert W.
Ash, Lloyd R.
Barclay, Ralph E., Sr.
Bartindale, Richard M.
Bates, Towar B.
Benge, Leroy
Bennett, Howard P.
Bentley, Robert J.
Betak, John P.
Bisbee, Charles L.
Bishop, George W., Jr.
Black, Clifford W.
Blackwell, Raymond E.
Blanchard, Jean J.
Blauvelt, Ralph E.
Boardman, Samuel C.
Brewer, John S.
Briggs, Charles W.
Brown, Lloyd L.
Brownlee, John H.
Brownlee, Marion R.
Carlock, Lacon, H., Jr.
Cash, Mitchell
Chesser, Wendell J.
Clapper, Emory W.
Clark, Terence O.
Clarke, Henry E.
Cleaves, Alfred S.
Cleland, Cook
Clement, Thomas M.
Coleman, Wade H., Jr.
Conrad, Charles A.
Cox, Peter J., Jr.
Creed, James E.
Dean, Frank E.
DeLong, Walter E.
Denham, Dale
DesJardins, Paul B. G.
DeWitt, Bert F.
Donald, Robert G.
Donaldson, James R.
Dubrule, Jean P.
Dustin, Frederick G.
Eickwort, Louis, III
Ellis, Burton T.
Embry, Ashton F., Jr.
Fane, Francis D.
Fenwick, William P.
Fink, Theodore R.
Fisher, Benjamin H.
Fisher, Bernard R.
Fisher, Ferdinand H.
Foltz, Earl M.
Foulger, Frederick B.
Frederick, Joseph L.
Fuller, Frank L.
Fuller, Nathan R.
Fussell, Lucian H.
Garvan, Francis P., Jr.
Gaudreaux, Laurence F.
Gentsch, Frank M.
Gerboth, Harold C.
Gleason, Maynard G.
Gnam, James H.
Goddard, Lawrence J.
Godfrey, Robert B.
Greene, Frederic H.
Gregg, John A.
Griffin, Oliver F.
Grimm, Robert S.
Haatvedt, Rolfe A.
Habermacher, Andrew L.
Hanor, Dorman H.
Harper, Edwin J.
Harper, Russell F.
Hart, John H.
Hatfield, Joseph L.
Henson, Charles A.
Hill, August J. N. H.
Hogan, John H.
Hougland, Clifford P.
Houser, Lyle C.
Hudson, Raymond G.
Hughson, Howard H.
Hutchison, Elmo H.
Ives, George S.
Jackson, William B.
Jarvis, Kenneth L.
Jennings, Hubert E.
Jewell, Richard
Jones, Frederick H., Jr.
Jorgenson, Irving N.
Keirstead, Maurice S.
Kelley, Kenneth K.
Kimmel, Samuel
Kirkham, Harold B.
Kitchell, Francis R., Jr.
Klare, Robert A.
Krisel, Lionel
Kuch, Walter A.
Kyle, Burton T. Jr.
LaMonica, Thomas A.
Lasnibat, John J.
Lazott, Harlow A.
Lilly, McRae A.
Linderman, John A.
Loughborough, William E.
MacDonald, Archibald B.
Macek, Francis J.
MacKinley, Laurence L.
Martin, Daniel A.
Mattlin, Harold C.
Maurer, Robert A., Jr.
Mayer, Robert
Miller, Alfred R., Jr.
Mitchell, James M.
Mitchell, William B.
Moorehead, John P.
Morgan, Thomas J.
Morreale, Joseph H.
Morrison, Claude O.
Mullen, John O.
Mullins, Fred F., Jr.
McGee, George J. M.
McLaughlin, David C.
McReynolds, Robert
Nelson, Richard E.
Newton, Roy M.
Nisbet, Robert A.
Nuelsen, John L., Jr.
O'Leary, Frazier L., Jr.
Orenstein, Samuel
Otteson, Otto P.
Otto, William J.
Paige, Harvey C.
Paxon, Robert J.
Perry, James H.
Pettebone, Edgar R., 2d
Pillsbury, John D.
Pokinski, Joseph N.
Pool, Willard R.
Potts, John L.
Powdrell, Earle C.
Powers, Oscar S.
Prior, Harris K.
Reid, Robert T.
Reymann, Edward K.
Robinson, Seymour J.
Robinson, Virgil N.
Rogers, Dean C.
Rose, Clifford A.
Rowland, Joseph M.
Ryan, Delbert O.
Sabin, Frederick
Sanchez, Alvaro M.
Sewall, Charles H.
Shaul, Donald R.
Shirley, Henry A.
Shyne, John W.
Simonelli, Romeo
Smith, Gordon D.
Smith, James C.
Sommer, Philip L.
Spellman, Joseph E.
Spidell, Emery P.
Stein, Irving
Sternfield, Bertram F.
Stone, Earle F.
Strauss, Stuart M.
Strickler, Charles S.
Strickler, Kenneth H.
Sugden, Greer W.
Sveeggen, Gerald E.
Tacker, Harold L.
Tarleton, Wilson W.
Taylor, Byron M.
Thompson, Laurence
Trapolin, Frank W.
Tully, John M.
Tyler, Sidney F., 2d
Vlachos, William N.
VonMach, George L.
Wall, John C., Jr.
Wallace, Lowell D.
White, James F.
Willoughby, Dike A.
Wilson, Raymond S.
Wimberly, Francis C., Jr.
Wolfe, Daniel D.
Woods, Ruel H.
Woodson, Roland H.
Woodward, Donald P.
Wright, Weldon H.
Zenneck, Ross

MEDICAL CORPS

Curtis, Charles N.
Kenney, John J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Creech, John C., Jr.
Finley, Edley B.
Griggs, Chester H.
Hampton, Deward E.
Hawes, Ernest L.
Howitz, Charles R.
Lenahan, John F.
Locke, Walter R.
McElroy, Benjamin J.
McHugh, Daniel J.
Murdock, Clifford M.
Payne, George W.
Pritchard, William T.
Ryan, John C.
Simpson, Alexander R.
Spalding, Allan R.
Wash, Carroll B.
Weske, Christian A.
Wessling, Frank J.
Wood, George S., Jr.
Young, Albert J.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Black, Franklin C.
Breen, William F.
Burrus, Llewellyn G.
Carter, James L.
Connolly, James C.
Embry, Hugh C.
Galaty, Gordon B.
Hoglan, George W.
Jones, Allen
Kuolt, Milton G.
Lawler, Charles W.
Lynch, Edward M.
Mulligan, Edwin C.
Murray, Alfred L.
McGrath, Timothy J.
Organ, William J.
Shackelford, Clarence H.
Spiegelhalter, George B.
Wallace, Anthony T.
Webster, Giles A.
White, Walter H.
Wiggins, William A., Sr.
Wren, Leonard J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bailey, William D.
Barrett, Carl T.
Barnard, Douglas F.
Bearden, Walter C.
Bliss, Percy H.
Cona, Peter A. C.
Cross, James F.
Dowd, John F.
Drennon, Raleigh E., Jr.
Ehrman, Kent S.
Flynn, William F.
Frisendaux, George M.
Giesen, Francis E.
Gordon, Rob C.
Graham, Theodore R.
Hugill, Harry S.
Libby, Charles P.
Meleski, Stanley F.
Mitchell, Willis H.
Murrell, Drue L.
McAllister, John A.
McBurney, Edward C.
Parker, Frederick S.
Parson, Arvid F.
Polisson, Paul A.
Powell, Fay E.
Powell, Julian G.
Quinn, James B.
Rayner, Oliver G.
Riley, Thomas F.
Robison, Fred A.
Rowan, Everett L.
Sanborn, James W.
Schell, John C.
Sheehy, Patrick J.
Stone, Thomas B.
Storey, Donald G.
Witherell, Roger G.
Zimmerman, Abe

DENTAL CORPS

Bergen, Samuel F.
Gorenberg, Philip
Lane, Creighton L.
Leahy, Paul F.
Lyons, Norwood E.
Payne, Charles E.
Rossina, Wesley R.
Smith, Samuel C.
Tenaglia, Joseph L.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Dougherty, Kathryn
Quick, Winifred R.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abdon, Albert L.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Acosta, William
Adams, Robert C.
Aillaud, Emmett R., Jr.
Ainsworth, Lawson I.
Albright, Donald S., Jr.
Albright, Robert D.
Alcock, Richard D.
Aldred, Eldon D.
Alexander, Robert H.
Allen, Alfred H.
Allen, James A.
Allen, John R.
Allen, Raymond C.
Allen, Richard L.
Alling, Roger D.
Allison, Paul
Anderson, Donald A.
Anderson, Daniel C., Jr.
Anderson, Lyle C.
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, William W., Jr.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack E., Jr.
Anfang, Ralph E.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Apgar, William M.
Appel, John L. Jr.
Arbuckle, Wallace D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Armstrong, Robert J.
Arnold, Henry J.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, Julian M.
Arnold, Richard W., Jr.
Arthur, Paul W.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.

Attardi, Anthony A.
Attwell, Leonard L., Jr.
Augustine, William F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Averitt, Gordon F.
Axe, John R.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayers, Emory D.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Babcock, Robert E.
Babington, Herbert R., Jr.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Badger, Sherwin C., Jr.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Bagley, Ralph F., Jr.
Bailey, Donald J.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, William C.
Baker, Richard L.
Bakula, Joseph S.
Baldwin, Clarence L., Jr.
Ballarian, Richard H.
Barck, Dale E.
Bardecki, Frank J.
Bardes, Charles R.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnhart, Robert W.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Bartram, Francis J., Jr.
Bassett, Harmon B.
Bassett, James C.
Basso, Robert J.
Batchelor, William M.
Bate, Henry C., Jr.
Bates, George M.
Bates, George W., Jr.
Baty, Edward M.
Baumgardner, Max G.
Baumgartner, James V.
Bayreuther, William A., Jr.
Beamer, Clyde R.
Bearer, Gerald L.
Beavers, Robert, A.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Becker, Donald A.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Belew, Chapman H., Jr.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Bellmer, Lee D.
Belter, Robert H.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Bender, Henry J.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Joseph F.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Berg, Robert L.
Bergen, Harold D.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Bergman, Daniel
Bernard, Eugene A.
Biesterveld, Thomas C.
Bigenho, Roy M.
Bigler, Glade S.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, John H.
Billings, Randall K.
Binnion, Robert C., Jr.
Bircher, William B.
Birdwell, Thomas M., Jr.
Birkel, William M.
Bittner, Ralph R.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blair, Eddie R.
Blake, Robert H.
Blanc, William R.
Blanchard, Zane S.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Blonsick, John S., Jr.
Blumenthal, Robert A.
Blyde, Lewis J. N., Jr.
Bockstruck, Arnold H.
Boden, William H., Jr.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Bond, John R.
Bonekamp, Fred H.
Boney, Paisley, III
Booth, Henry O., Jr.
Borgers, Emil R.
Bossert, Richard M.
Boston, Leo
Bottom, George A., 3d
Boulay, Roger J.
Bouquet, Daniel J.
Bowe, Robert E.
Bowen, Donald C.
Bowman, Hamilton B.
Boyce, William R.
Boyd, David S.
Boyd, Llewellyn
Boylan, Bernard R.
Bradberry, Richard F.
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bradley, William B.
Bradshaw, Dwight A.
Brady, Charles E.
Brady, Gene P.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branson, John R., Jr.
Bray, Kenneth W.
Breda, Sante
Brett, Morton
Brey, Elwood E.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brogan, James
Brook, William E.
Brooks, John L.
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Brown, Bonner B., Jr.
Brown, Charles D.
Brown, James W.
Brown, Robert S.
Brown, Theodore L.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Bryant, Wenzell B.
Buck, Roger L.
Buckley, Ellis H.
Burdenski, James
Burnett, Carl J., Jr.
Burnett, Wayne I.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Burton, Harry R.
Burton, James L.
Buseck, Donald C.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Butler, James E.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Byron, Edward W.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Calhoun, William P.
Caliento, Stephen R.
Callahan, Andrew J., Jr.
Cameron, Allen K., Jr.
Cameron, David D. S., Jr.
Cameron, James M.
Cammack, Charles W., III
Campbell, Douglas W.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Norman R.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Capper, Walter E.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carlson, Paul A.
Carlton, George A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carpenter, Alan P.
Carpenter, George C., 3d
Carr, Carrol A.
Carr, Edgar S., Jr.
Carr, Edward W.
Carr, William K.
Carter, Frank R.
Cartmell, William C.
Carver, Ralph W.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Catherwood, Billy R.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Cave, Thomas H.
Ceremsak, Robert J.
Chacho, Victor
Chaitin, Neil D.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chaney, Walter D.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Chapman, John B.
Chapman, Robert W.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Cheek, Eugene E.
Childs, Blair, Jr.
Chipman, Eugene N.
Chisolm, Lawrence W.
Chizinsky, George
Choyce, Charles V.
Christensen, Robert L.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Clewett, Stanley L.
Clough, Robert S.
Cobb, George B., Jr.
Cochran, Donald L.
Cochran, James A.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Cole, Charles F.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerald G.
Colgan, John D.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colton, Dudley T., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Conatore, George E.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Condit, Maurice J.
Congdon, Walter R.
Conlon, Charles M., Jr.
Connelly, Jerald L.
Conrad, Byron W.
Conroy, Thomas P.
Cook, Melvin S.
Cook, Richard M.
Cook, William G.
Cooke, David H.
Cooksey, Edouard V.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Jack E.
Cooper, Martin
Cooper, Warren P.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cortner, Robert S.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Costen, Thomas A.
Coston, Kenneth C.
Cotchen, John J.
Cotsen, Lloyd E.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Covington, Hewitt H.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowles, Clifford M., III
Cowley, Richard T.
Cox, Billy J.
Cox, Richard G., Jr.
Cox, Richard A.
Crajon, Stephen D.
Crambiet, Frank
Cranston, Francis J.
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Dayl E.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Crum, Allen E.
Crump, William A.
Cruse, Donald A.
Crutcher, William C.
Crytser, William B.
Cubbage, Benjamin C., Jr.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Curran, James C.
Cusack, Warren J.
Cushing, Don J.
Custer, James C.
Cuthbert, Thomas R., Jr.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dague, George I.
Damuth, John D.
Dancey, John M.
Dannemiller, Thomas E.
Danziger, Robert F.
Darfus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davids, Mark M.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Jerome R.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
Davison, Orrin H., Jr.
Day, Lawrence C.
De Carlo, Michael A.
de Compiegne, Henri duP., Jr.
De Graff, John T., Jr.
Delanoy, Douglas, Jr.
Delay, Eddie J.
Dellinger, Donald B.
Demers, William H., 2d
Demming, Raymond E., Jr.
De Mott, Donald W.
Denmark, George T.
Denney, Clarke D.
Dennis, James M.
Desmond, Joseph P., Jr.
Dessart, Donald J.
de Victoria, Jose L., Jr.
Dewey, Edward
Dick, Ronald F.
Dickert, Eddie J., Jr.
Diehl, William F.
Dille, Earl K.
Di Stefano, Renato T., Jr.
Dixon, Robert C.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dobbins, David F.
Dolk, Charles S.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Dombrowski, William P.
Donovan, John P.
Donovan, Timothy J.
Dooley, Gerald F.
Dotson, Bennie F.
Dougherty, Robert H.
Downing, Robert A.
Draddy, John M.
Drake, Richard F.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Dresser, Duane W.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, Robert C., II
Duggan, Frederick P., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dukes, Warren C.
Dunaway, Gene T.
Dunn, Charles C., Jr.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Dupnik, Joseph J.
Durrett, Harold W.
Dyer, Martin E.
Dysart, Samuel C., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas B., 2d
East, George W.
Ebelacker, Richard M.
Eck, Robert J. J.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edney, Briggs B., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Egan, David M.
Egan, Laurence D.
Ellena, Eugene D.
Ellington, Edward P.
Elliot, Jared
Elliott, James D.
Elliott, Robert C.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Epeneter, Gus W., Jr.
Erickson, Arthur E., Jr.
Ericson, Stanton D.
Estes, Robert S.
Estes, Windom L.
Etherton, Fred S.
Evans, Hubert T.
Everett, Bernard A.
Everett, Elmer C.
Ewertz, Roy W., Jr.
Eyster, Rodney E.
Fahey, Richard S.
Fahland, Frank R.
Fahs, Raymond Z., Jr.
Fajnor, John P.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Fallandy, Martin A.
Falls, Norton H.
Faris, David W.
Farnsworth, William B., Jr.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
Fassula, Richard F.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Fauver, John K.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Daniel F., Jr.
Featherston, Frank H.
Fendorf, James E.
Fenier, Joseph
Fennell, Robert W.
Ferguson, George D., III
Ferris, Richard W.
Ferrucci, David E.
Ferry, John W.
Fiers, Carlisle W., Jr.
Finke, George A., Jr.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Finstrom, Don A.
Fiske, Timothy
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, James L.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Ford, William W.
Foreman, George E.
Forest, Richard J.
Forster, William G.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foster, Douglas T.
Foster, James R.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fowler, John F., III
Fowler, Robert A.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, Duane C.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Richard T.
Fraasa, Donald G.
Francis, George H.
Frank, Elias C.
Frantz, Robert F.
Franz, Robert G.
Frazier, Montgomery L.
Fredlund, Keith E.
French, Norman M., Jr.
French, Robert D.
Frerichs, John S.
Frey, John M.
Friesen, Edwin J.
Fritsch, Thomas D.
Fritz, William W.
Frizzell, Everett E.
Frohreich, Richard A.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle A.
Gabrielsen, Donlon H.
Gallagher, Thomas E.
Gallagher, Walter J., Jr.
Galles, Thomas E.
Gallion, John H.
Galloway, Charles R., Jr.
Gamble, Francis T.
Gano, Hubert D.
Gardiner, Thomas M., III
Garland, John C.
Garrett, Donald A.
Gay, Thomas D.
Gedney, Kendall C.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gelnaw, Arthur V.
Gentilucci, August T., Jr.
George, Thomas B., Jr.
Gerhardt, Charles J., Jr.
Gerhart, Harold L., Jr.
Gerold, William F.
Giangiobbe, Frank T.
Gibson, Charles L.
Gilbert, Morton
Gildersleeve, Thomas H.
Gillespie, Edward A.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Giorgini, Norman L.
Gire, Larold W.
Glazer, Jack H.
Gobble, George F.
Gochenour, David T.
Goetz, Robert C.
Goffe, William L.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Gormly, Matthew E., Jr.
Gosch, William D.
Gott, Herschel L.
Goyette, Harold L.
Graham, Walter M.
Graham, William H.
Granieri, Alfred G.
Grask, Erwin S., Jr.
Gray, James W. Jr.
Gray, Rockwell M., Jr.
Greeley, William E.
Green, Samuel G., Jr.
Green, Thomas M., III
Greene, Leonard B.
Greenwood, James W., Jr.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Greer, John C.
Greer, Wiley W.
Gregg, William A., IV
Gregory, George T.
Grier, Joseph L., Jr.

Griffin, Ellegood V., Jr.
Griffin, Randolph P.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Grinnell, John R.
Grisewood, Norman C.
Gross, Peter M.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grote, Joseph C.
Grove, Michael M.
Gruner, Otto H., 3d
Grunwald, Edward A.
Gude, Erik A.
Gully, Robert L.
Gutknecht, Lowell E.
Haas, Joseph S.
Hackbart, Robert W.
Hackney, Robert H.
Hadley, Robert L.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hahn, William S.
Hain, Gilbert N.
Hale, George E.
Hall, Donald C.
Hall, Donald P.
Hall, Henry L.
Hall, James W.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamann, Elmer D.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hancock, Virgil R.
Handy, Charles V.
Hanke, Carl C., Jr.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanzo, Walter J., Jr.
Harber, Russell L.
Hardin, David L.
Harding, Price P., Jr.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkin, Edward D.
Harkness, Richard E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harris, Dale B.
Harris, Edgar S., Jr.
Harris, George B., 3d
Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harrison, James R.
Hart, Silas C., Jr.
Hartnett, David H.
Hartwell, Ralf L., Jr.
Hartzell, Thomas H.
Harvey, John W.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hastings, Howard W.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hawley, Frank J. Jr.
Hayes, John L.
Haynes, Richard D.
Haya, Ronald J.
Hayward, Houston C.
Healy, Richard P.
Heerwagen, David D.
Heidelberg, Kenneth E.
Heinecamp, Robert J.
Helman, William W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henderson, Burton
Henderson, William B.
Henning, John C., 3d
Henty, Ralph H., Jr.
Herring, Harold G.
Hershel, John A.
Hesse, Victor L.
Hiatt, Henry G., Jr.
Hickok, James K.
Hicks, Norman W.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hight, Albea D.
Hiles, John G.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Joseph V.
Hills, David K.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hinkle, Ewan M.
Hinton, John W.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hobson, Carroll D.
Hockema, Calvin L.
Hofferth, Delbert D.
Hoffland, Paul
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hoge, Kenneth G., Jr.
Holbert, Richard A.
Holden, Rothschild H.
Hollack, Michael
Holliday, Robert L.
Hollister, Frank M.
Holloman, George H.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Hooper, Charles S., Jr.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, William H. P.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Horton, Edward E.
Hoseman, Leland J.
Hotchkiss, James K.
Hotchkiss, Eugene, III
Hottinger, George W.
Howard, Joseph B.
Howard, Philip B.
Huber, James W.
Hudson, James A.
Hudson, John P., Jr.
Huelsbeck, Gerald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Arter P.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunt, Donald B., Jr.
Hussmann, Harry L., III
Huston, Richard W.
Hutchinson, William R.
Hutchinson, James D.
Hutchison, Stuart M.
Huth, Ralph L.
Ingram, Billy G.
Irish, George E.
Irwin, Wayne R.
Jackson, Robert D.
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jakimier, Beverly G.
Jameson, William M.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jaso, John P., Jr.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, John E.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jessen, George E.
Johns, Ronald L.
Johnson, Arthur L.
Johnson, Bruce M.
Johnson, Clyde L., Jr.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Harvey L.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Lyle K.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard L.
Johnson, Richard D.
Johnson, Roy T.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, Huby A., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Robert L.
Jones, Webster F.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Joslow, Bruce L.
Joyce, Edward R., Jr.
Judy, Edward R.
Jurgielewicz, Edward P.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kangas, Robert T.
Karns, Dane L.
Kaufman, Melvin L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kavanagh, Lloyd R.
Keeler, Donald J.
Keeling, James W.
Keevers, Robert J.
Keith, James N.
Kelley, Robert D., Jr.
Kelley, Sidney B.
Kellogg, Paul L.
Kelly, Edward J.
Kelly, Ellis G.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kent, Paul F.
Kermath, Addison H.
Kerr, Allen S.
Kerr, Thomas J., Jr.
Kersch, Roger N.
Kessel, John H.
Kessler, Lewis H., Jr.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
Kimball, Edwin D.
King, Robert A.
King, Robert M.
King, Thomas R.
King, William R.
Kingery, Samuel G.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kinnear, James W., III
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Charles B.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell P.
Kittler, James P.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Kline, Albert H., Jr.
Klingensmith, Joseph P.
Klippstein, John R.
Klotz, Kenneth E.
Kmak, Walter S.
Knapp, Donald J.
Knight, Jeff P.
Knighten, Charles E.
Knox, Edward P.
Knutson, Creighton R.
Koch, Robert M.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Koth, Quintus J. H.
Krag, Robert L.
Kramer, Kenneth C.
Kramer, Robert P.
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Krefting, James L.
Kremer, John L.
Kresse, Robert A.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kropf, John F.
Kuhlman, Donald A.
Kulsick, Kenneth E.
Kunberger, Albert W.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Kuns, Delmer L.
Kurser, Paul E.
Kurtz, James B.
Kushnerick, John P.
LaBaw, Jerome E.
Lackey, Vaden M., Jr.
Ladner, Ivan M.
Lalicker, Robert C.
Lamoureux, Philip J., Jr.
Lampson, James L.
Landau, Frederick P.
Lang, Samuel C.
Laniado, Howard I.
Laque, Harold A.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassing, James S.
Latimer, Hewlett W.
Lattin, Norman P.
Laube, Robert E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V.
LeDew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lee, Robert M.
Leeman, Donald J.
Lehman, Donald A.
Leinberry, Wilbur S.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leonard, William J.
Leser, John R.
Leslie, Myron E.
Lester, Dick M.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, John T.
Libby, Harold D.
Liebenguth, James F., Jr.
Lilly, Douglas K.
Lind, Donald C.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lindley, Charles E.
Lindquist, Robert H.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Littell, Raymond W.
Little, Frank K.
Little, Harry M., Jr.
Little, James G.
Llewellyn, Theodore C.
Lochridge, Marshall A., Jr.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lodato, Thomas F.
Lohrey, Curt T.
Lonborg, Arthur C.
Long, Charles R.
Long, Donald C.
Long, James D.
Loomer, Richard C.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Losey, Willis M.
Loux, Raymond E.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lueders, Robert E.
Lyles, William D.
Lyman, Jack N.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lynch, Douglas R.
Lynch, Osmar W.
Lynch, Robert M.
Lytle, James H.
Lyttle, James D.
MacDonald, Dewitt K., Jr.
MacDowell, Charles R.
MacFarland, Willard C.
Macfie, Thomas E.
Mackell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Maegli, Richard E.
Maher, James J., Jr.
Mahon, Richard B.
Mahoney, George C.
Maier, William J., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Mapp, Thomas W.
Marangi, Leonard M.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marchant, Richard D.
Marcus, John W.
Maritz, William E.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Marsh, Albert B.
Marshall, Alexander
Marshall, Lonnie A.
Martin, Gene A.
Martin, Richard W.
Martin, Roger T.
Martin, William K.
Martin, William W.
Marting, Fredric W.
Mason, Sidney R.
Massa, Emiddio
Massey, Paul H.
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
May, Daryle C.
May, Harry L.
Maynard, Frank T.
Mayo, Daniel K.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McBroom, William A.
McCaine, George S.
McCarley, William T.
McCarthy, William A., Jr.
McCarty, William D.
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McCormick, Thomas F.
McCoy, Ambrose P., Jr.
McCranor, Craig J.
McCrary, Dewey W.
McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
McCutchen, Samuel P., Jr.
McCutcheon, James N.
McDonnel, Harold A.
McDougal, Alexander M.
McElvery, Richard M.
McFadden, James H.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McGrath, Thomas C., Jr.
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKean, John W., Jr.
McKee, Richard W.
McKinney, Melvin J., Jr.
McKinley, Walker
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McKown, George M.
McLanahan, Duer, Jr.
McLaughlin, Daniel H.
McLeod, William H., Jr.
McMasters, Lewis L., Jr.
McMinn, Earl C.
McNabney, John P.
McNally, John J., Jr.
McNamara, Stuart D.
McPhee, Roy D.
McQueen, Ralph E.
Meade, Carlton J., Jr.
Meek, Donald B.
Meetze, James C.
Melton, Frank D.
Merkle, James C.
Messier, Albert C.
Meyer, Frank G.
Meyer, Paul A.
Michaud, Robert A.
Michell, Robert E.
Miller, Alan H.
Miller, Alfred E.
Miller, Allan S.
Miller, Byron K.
Miller, Charles J., Jr.
Miller, Marvin J.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, Robert D.
Miller, Thomas G., Jr.
Miller, Thomas B.
Miller, William A.
Millpointer, Edward D.
Mills, Beverly T.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Mitchell, Alan R.
Mitchell, Charles J.
Mitchell, John F.
Moberly, Ralph M., Jr.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Moeller, John H.
Moffett, Russell G.
Molling, Carl H.
Molnar, Joseph J.
Monahan, Robert E., Jr.
Monroe, Robert R.
Montague, Edgar B., Jr.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Montgomery, John D.
Moore, James W.
Moore, Thomas L.
Moore, William F.
Morgan, Hugh J., Jr.
Morin, Gene D.
Moritz, Max R.
Morris, Melvyn C., III
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Morton, John W., 2d
Moshier, Richard W.
Moss, Robert
Muck, Floyd R.
Mudrock, John
Muench, Nils L.
Muery, Robert W.
Mull, Charles L., II
Muller, Leonard A.
Mullin, Norman K.
Munsell, John G.
Munson, Floyd N.
Murphy, Frank M., Jr.
Murphy, Garrison E.
Murphy, John A.
Myer, George W.
Myers, Charles B.
Myers, Raymond W.
Myers, Robert G., Jr.
Mylott, Thomas R.
Nall, Delbert L.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neely, Edward R., Jr.
Nehrling, Arno H., Jr.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Neithercott, Robert A.
Neitling, Stanley J.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert H.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, William R.
Netro, Robert J.
Neustel, Arthur D.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, James F.
Newman, Richard T.
Newman William M., Jr.
Newton, John T., Jr.
Nichol, Monte B.
Nichols, Howard F.
Nicklin, John R.
Niesee, John E.
Nigels, Emile W.
Nilon, Thomas M.
Nilsson, Byron A.
Ninnis, Robert V.
Nissen, William C., Jr.
Niver, George E., Jr.
Nix, Henry J.
Noble, James K., Jr.
Noble, Thomas I.
Noonan, John M.
Nordyke, Cutlar J.
North, Thomas G., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nugent, George R.
Nulton, Frank I.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Oakes, Raymond H.
Oberholtzer, James P.
O'Brien, John W.
Ockerlund, Robert C.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donel, James H.
O'Donnell, George J.
O'Donnell, James J.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Oglesby, Micajah L.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.

Ohls, Karl E.
O'Laughlin, Bernard T.
Oliver, Robert M., Jr.
Oliver, Robert P.
Oliver, Thomas N.
Ollendorf, Joel
O'Neill, John T., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
O'Reilly, James P., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Osborne, James C.
Osbourn, James B.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Owen, Charles E.
Owen, Donald F.
Owen, Richard L., Jr.
Owens, Richard J.
Palmatier, Philip P.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parent, Gerald J.
Paris, Ronald E.
Park, Robert M.
Parker, James W.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Parsons, Alan
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Herbert
Patterson, George W., III
Patterson, John R., Jr.
Pauley, Gordon L.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Peake, George W., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
Penny, Stanley D.
Perkins, William L., Jr.
Perry, Frank M., Jr.
Perry, Riddell T.
Perryman, Donald B.
Pester, Fred J.
Peterman, Edward E.
Peters, Lyle R.
Peterson, Gene S.
Peterson, Thomas A.
Petrick, John W.
Petrucci, Joseph W.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Petty, William G.
Pezzel, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Pfister, Robert J.
Phillips, James L., Jr.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pine, Emanuel P.
Plaster, Henry G., Jr.
Platte, William A.
Pleasants, Arthur L., 3d
Pleasants, John B.
Pollak, Stephen J.
Pomeroy, Walter S., Jr.
Porter, George W.
Porter, Thomas
Portnoy, Howard R.
Post, Stephen L.
Potash, Matthew E.
Potter, Hamilton F., Jr.
Powel, Samuel P., III
Powell, James R., Jr.
Powell, Robert M.
Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.
Prescott, Richard J.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Preston, Samuel D., Jr.
Price, Allen B.
Pride, Alfred M.
Prince, Gordon A.
Profilet, Leo T.
Pugliese, Joseph A.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Pulliam, John M.
Purnell, Edward W.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Purvis, John A.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quarles, Charles D., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinlan, Francis B.
Quinlan, Francis X.
Racy, Louis P.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Radtke, Herman J.
Rallis, Chris G.
Ramberg, John C.
Ramsden, John H.
Ramsey, Jack H.
Ramsey, Russell B.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Rauch, Rufus W., Jr.
Reagan, John H.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Gordon A.
Reed, Sherman C.
Reese, Charles L., III
Reese, Warren P.
Reeves, Garrett M.
Regan, Richard M.
Regenauer, Bernard J.
Reichl, Charles J.
Reid, David N.
Reid, Eugene L.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Restuccia, Carmelo C.
Reyn, William P.
Reynolds, Donald H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Reynolds, Richard J.
Ribble, Richard S.
Ricci, William J.
Rice, Minor T.
Richards, Francis J.
Ricker, Stanley S.
Rico, Gustavo V.
Riker, Harland A., Jr.
Rish, Richard H.
Ritchie, George P., Jr.
Ritner, George
Robbins, Donald K.
Robertson, Charles G., Jr.
Robinson, Charles H.
Robinson, James A.
Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.
Rochester, Carl W.
Rodgers, James P.
Roebuck, James W.
Rogers, James H.
Rogers, John T.
Rogers, Nelson K.
Rogers, Norman T., Jr.
Rogers, Palmer
Rogers, Ralph R.
Rogers, Samuel I., Jr.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rogers, Waid
Rogoway, Ned A.
Rooney, Peter W.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Henry L., Jr.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Roth, Gustave A.
Roth, Robert D.
Rowe, Alvah L., Jr.
Rowe, Bruce W.
Rowe, John D.
Rowe, Richard C.
Roy, Kenneth B., Jr.
Royal, Lee R.
Rubin, William
Rubins, Frederick K.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Ruff, James A.
Rule, Adrian O., 3d
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Rush, Homer P., Jr.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, James F.
Ryan, John J., Jr. (403769)
Ryan, John J., Jr. (533158)
Ryan, Philip
Rychlik, Leonard P.
Sailors, Benjamin G.
Salter, Winston W.
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sands, James W.
Sanford, Ronald J.
Sanford, Robert H.
Sant, William W.
Saros, Chris
Sartor, Steven L.
Satre, Robert S.
Sattler, Donald C.
Sauer, John E.
Saulson, Stanley H.
Sax, Joe
Scarborough, Jack C., Jr.
Scarsheim, Hugo V.
Schaber, Rolph E.
Schakel, Raymond A.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schell, James F.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Scherr, Lawrence
Scherrer, Orvil D.
Schettino, Joseph N.
Schiffelbein, Walter L.
Schlei, Norbert A.
Schmidt, Ray A.
Schmitt, Alois E., Jr.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Schrier, Lynn E.
Schultz, George M.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schuster, Robert J.
Schwab, Robert W.
Schweitzer, Lamar T.
Scott, Roger M.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Seawell, Jack W.
Seeley, George H.
Seeman, David B.
Seipp, Russell M.
Sellers, Donald H.
Senior, Bruce M.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shaner, Donald H.
Shank, Edward L.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Shannonhouse, Royal G., III
Sharpe, William K.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shattuck, Benjamin H.
Shaw, Douglas C.
Shea, Paul W.
Shearer, Donald R.
Sheehy, William P.
Sheffield, John A., Jr.
Sheffield, Hughie D.
Sheppard, James D.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherin, Joseph
Sherman, John B.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shick, George B., Jr.
Shimon, Edward J.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shoolman, Alan R.
Shultz, Robert T.
Siegmeister, Robert
Siler, James R.
Simensen, Richard E.
Simison, Charles B.
Simms, Charles H.
Simpson, Kenneth P., Jr.
Singleton, Floyd B.
Sirrine, Jack D.
Sisk, Robert J.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skelton, Homer R.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skorheim, Robert D.
Slankard, Max L.
Sliwinski, Daniel J.
Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
Smith, Edward G.
Smith, Floyd A.
Smith, Frederick M.
Smith, Gerald R.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Leland N.
Smith, Leon W.
Smith, Melbourne L.
Smith, Neale S.
Smith, Philip W.
Smith, Porter J., Jr.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert M., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, Thomas W.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smoot, William N.
Snyder, Collins
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Richard E.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Socas, Roberto E.
Soldan, Harvey M.
Sollinger, David A.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Somogye, Roy S.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Springmier, Robert S.
Sproull, Howard E., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stambaugh, Henry C.
Stapp, Aron L.
Stecker, Albert L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stella, Howard C.
Stephenson, Jack H.
Stephenson, Stuart X., Jr.
Stewart, Zach R.
Stewman, John A., III
Still, Jack H.
Stimler, Richard P.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stockelager, Arthur J.
Stoffer, Maurice H.
Stolle, Victor C.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stone, Bruce G.
Stone, Douglas D., Jr.
Storey, Joseph D.
Stott, David R., Jr.
Stratton, Robert D.
Straube, Gene F.
Straubel, John F.
Strecker, Raymond P.
Streich, Paul R.
Stroupe, Keith K.
Stull, Donald
St. Ville, Edward L.
Subak, John T.
Sullivan, Don M.
Sullivan, Francis W.
Sullivan, Gerald J.
Sullivan, John L., Jr.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundstrom, Alex L.
Suraci, Anthony F.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swalen, Jerome D.
Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
Sweeney, Charles L., Jr.
Sweeney, James R.
Sweet, Philip W. K., Jr.
Swift, Hugh G., Jr.
Swingley, Robert E.
Sybeldon, William
Talbot, Warren C.
Tanc, Charles B.
Tanner, George S.
Taylor, Francis C.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Tennis, William W.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Terrill, William R.
Thibault, Charles H.
Thoen, William L.
Thom, Norman R.
Thomas, Carl H., Jr.
Thomas, Tom D. C.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, John, A. Jr.
Thompson, Raphael P.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, Theodore O.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thornburg, Thomas H.
Thornton, John W.
Thorp, John H.
Thrower, Guy T.
Thurston, Dick W.
Thyberg, Robert C.
Tibbetts, Alan D.
Tinker, Donald C., Jr.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, William E.
Todes, Lew, Jr.
Toland, Owen J., Jr.
Toll, Edwin A., Jr.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Tomlinson, Frank R.
Tostberg, Robert E.
Towles, William T.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trevillyan, Jacques P.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trotter, Robert J.
Troutman, Glean E.
Truax, Charles J.
Truitt, Thomas D.
Trzcinski, Edward E.
Tuck, Edward H
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Ulbert, Eugene T.
Ullman, Earl A.
Upthegrove, William R.
Van Houten, Louis A.
Van Kleeck, Justin L.
Vassalotti, Nichols A.
Vea, David M.
Vejvoda, Charles H.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vincent, George K.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vining, Adrian D.
Vitcenda, John P.
Voda, Eugene M.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseller, James B.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wait, James L., Jr.
Walker, Merle R.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Wallin, Robert A.
Walsh, Edward J.
Ward, Donald S.
Warner, Brooks F.
Warner, Virgil W.
Warwick, William B.
Washington, Max L.
Weatherly, Robert T., Jr.
Webb, Richard C.
Weeks, Grady A.
Wegener, Glenn L.
Weldon, John F.
Wells, Alfred T., Jr.
Wells, John L., Jr.
Welsh, Richard W.
Werner, Richard E.
Werner, Robert V.
West, Ronald B.
Westervelt, John C.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
Whalley, William B.
Whelan, James A.
White, John E.
White, Robert W.
White, Robert J.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitelaw, Robert
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitlock, Robert T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitmer, Don R. R.
Whittle, William B.
Wibbenhorst, William R.
Wick, Ned E.
Wiedmaier, Harry O.
Wiginton, Emmett C., Jr.
Wigmore, John G.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilcox, James G.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Willard, Daniel D. M.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, Franklin E.
Williams, George N.
Williams, Jesse G.
Williams, Lewis L.
Williams, Roy E.
Williams, William A., III
Wilson, Carlton D.
Wilson, Donald R.
Wilson, James I.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Wilson, Keith C.
Wilson, Richard F.
Wilson, Wayne R., Jr.
Wilson, William W.
Wink, Jacob L. H.
Winneg, Richard I.
Winslow, Donald F.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wise, Harold G.
Wise, Robert E.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wiss, Robert E.
Wodjenski, Joseph J.
Wood, Peter W.
Wood, Raymond S., Jr.
Woodall, James F.
Wooddell, Allen C.
Wooden, Neal R.
Woodman, Gordon P.
Woodmansee, Ernest R., Jr.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woodside, John A.
Woodwell, George M.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Wooley, Robert T.
Woolf, John M.
Worcester, Thomas K.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, Russell A.
Wright, William B.

Wuethrich, Don L.
Wulftange, William H.
Wunch, Edward R. P.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wyckoff, Frederic L.
Wylie, Henry K.
Yardley, John L. M., Jr.
Yasaitis, Frank M.
Young, Casanave H., Jr.
Young, Frank J.
Yowell, Grover M.
Zell, Donald D.
Zellmer, George P.
Ziebarth, Thomas A.
Zilis, Milton C.
Zimmerly, Arthur, III
Zimmerman, James A.
Zink, Stewart T.
Zwolinski, Frank J.
Butler, Donald D.
Carnicon, Francis E.
Clymer, Roy E., Jr.
Della Rocco, Peter
Elliott, Chester E.
Engelman, Otis E.
Giddens, Homer A.
Hamilton, George
Huckaby, Donnie W.
Hutton, William L.
Ingram, Jack R.
Ludwig, Helmuth A.
Marcini, Armido E.
Marker, Raymond K.
Moore, Robert L.
Murphy, John L.
Pierce, John F.
Pitcher, Harry B.
Reed, Irvin W.
Sentman, Albert G.
Shafer, Elroy J.
Smith, Jack D.
Valek, John C.
Walden, Walter A.
Wetmore, Richard O.
Agger, Elizabeth J.
Allen, Beverlee J.
Barteau, Celia L.
Bryan, Elizabeth E.
Cady, Joan J.
Caldwell, Margaret
Campbell, Glenna B.
Campbell, Marian A.
Cassidy, Joan K.
Clark, Dorothy L.
Doyle, Mary E.
Elsen, Marie K.
Fisher, Mary C.
Freethy, Lauraine A.
Gray, Norma J.
Harrah, Betty L.
Harrison, Mary L.
Helleberg, Jacqueline
Hills, Mary E.
Hopf, Margaret E.
Kerr, Dorothy C.
Kraff, Lorraine
Lloyd, Rebecca A.
Luddeke, Rhoda N.
Maimone, Genevieve K.
McKee, Fran
Moore, Patricia E. J.
Oliver, Mariella B.
Parlin, Norma F.
Pettit, Mary C.
Ross, Mary L.
Rutherford, Catherine L.
Saunders, Mary F.
Schantz, Patricia J.
Smith, Anne P.
Stallings, Barbara D.
Till, Marilyn J.
Walters, Faith E.
Wilson, Ann P.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Leon M.
Anderson, Harry L.
Angner, Joseph J.
Ansel, Donald R.
Armstrong, George K.
Barber, Ray C.
Barker, Richard T.
Barrow, Spencer A.
Bauer, Robert F.
Baunsgard, Perry E.
Besemann, Wilber C.
Billian, Douglas C.
Bieck, Robert G.
Bohl, Stanley C.
Bown, Walter L.
Burnetta, Thomas E.
Carley, John A.
Carpenter, Normar, E.
Cassell, Lewis D.
Chandler, Hugh R.
Cheatham, Guy C., Jr.
Clark, Charles A., 3d
Cohen, Stanley
Colen, Paul
Connell, James J., Jr.
Cross, Richard J.
Curley, Wilfred B.
Curran, William E., Jr.
Davis, James B.
Dawkins, Samuel D., Jr.
De Laittre, Charles D.
Dewey, Wayne D.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Droge, William B., Jr.
Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Eckfeld, Frederick J.
Ecklund, Alan R.
Eckmann, James L.
Ely, James S.
Ely, William B., Jr.
Fillmore, William C.
Flanagan, Richard M.
Francis, Evans J.
Fulton, Robert C.
Fussell, Theodore J.
Garchow, Alvin R.
Gary, Lewis E.
Geiger, Merrill A.
Gordon, Gilbert H., Jr.
Gove, Jack E.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Hall, Richard A.
Halperin, George B.
Harris, Walter P., Jr.
Harrison, John I.
Hawkinson, Lloyd E.
Henderson, John M.
Hile, Robert H.
Hogan, John E.
Hoggard, William D., 2d
Holcomb, Franklin J.
House, Clyde V.
Howard, Donald S.
Hudson, Richard S.
Huebner, Donald E.
Hughes, Robert L.
Hunter, George M., Jr.
Hurley, Joseph D.
Isaacson, Robert L.
Jolliffe, John D.
Jones, Burton H.
Katz, Samuel
Keeney, Frank W.
Kepple, Philip E.
Kilbourn, Garland R., Jr.
Killebrew, Thomas E.
Kingsberg, William J.
Kirby, Frederick W., Jr.
Knowles, Walter E., 3d
Krone, Frank W.
Krueger, John R.
Lacombe, William G.
Landes, Richard J.
Liedtke, Norman H.
Lindberg, Donald W.
Loetscher, Robert L.
Lynn, James W.
Martin, Charles C.
Martin, Marvin D.
Mason, Philip J.
McAden, Sidney Y., Jr.
McClintock, Harry C.
McCormick, Loyd W.
McCoy, Daniel J.
McGoldrick, Richard D.
McNabb, Thomas R.
Miller, Donald W.
Morrison, Richard W.
Morrison, Walton M.
Mouch, Charles M., Jr.
Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.
Neff, Paul W., Jr.
Newton, Jack R.
Newton, Theodore J., Jr.
Paine, Glenn
Parker, James A.
Peloquin Ferdinand C.
Pratt, James R.
Pravitz, William H.
Reynolds, Eugene E., Jr.
Rice, Robert L.
Richardson, Mortimer, J.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
Roche, Clayton P.
Rudzinski, Anthony W.
Schumann, Merritt, J.
Simons, Thomas C.
Smith, Edward L.
Sowle, Claude R., 3d
Stegner, Ralph W.
Sterner, Francis J.
Strickland, Robert L.
Strobel, John R.
Traskowsky, Richard A.
Tveita, Reynold C.
Van, George E.
Waddell, Herbert L.
Walker, George L.
Walmsley, J. Truman
Webb, Davis L.
Williams, Richard G.
Williams, Ross P., Jr.
Dunnam, Betty Grove, Mary S.
Breeden, Robert L.
Tapp, James G.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Austin, Bruce G.
Chesson, Eugene, Jr.
Forehand, Paul W.
Huffman, James I.
Leonard, Theodore E.
Martin, Hunt V., Jr.
Middleton, William D., Jr.
Phelps, Pharo A.
Pinner, William E., Jr.
Sherman, George E.
Simpson, Sherwood L.
Skinner, Charles E.
Stetson, John B.
Wagner, Walter R.
Wentz, George R.
Whipple, Caryll R.
Larson, Theodore J.
Norman, Calvin C.
Taber, Donald O.
Wilcox, Romeo E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Dwight J.
Barkley, Lucien E.
Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Biggs, Leland M.
Bobek, Francis R.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Boone, George A.
Bowe, Warren C.
Brown, Albert E.
Bryant, Harvey F.
Carr, Charles A., Jr.
Conrad, Ray W.
Courtney, John C.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Denningham, John S.
Devins, Thomas A.
DeWitt, Richard G.
Dinwiddie, Carl F.
Douglas, George F.
Duffey, William S.
Freeman, Noel L.
Gay, LaVerne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Geliman, Martin
Gibbons, Harry C., Jr.
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Green, Barney O.
Grossnickle, Paul D.
Hamrick, David O.
Hanavan, Robert J.
Harvey, Dallas C.
Hiatt, Roger L.
Huber, Godfrey S.
Jensen, Roderick E.
Jones, William H.
Kelly, Daniel L.
Kelly, James D.
Koepke, Milton E.
Kramer, Ernest S.
Kuhl, Peter R.
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Leach, Thomas G., Jr.
Lee, Raymond W.
Levich, Calman
Lind, Vincent E.
Marah, William G., Jr.
McCarthy, Daniel F.
McDonough, William A.
McGuire, Francis E.
McIlraith, James D.
McKerley, Lowell H.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
Merrell, Walter C.
Miller, Edwin B.
Moody, John A.
Morgan, William J., Jr.
Murphree, Henry B., Jr.
Murray, Reid F., Jr.
Newton, Richard R.
Nicholson, Earl M.
Nygren, Raymond A.
Pfau, Bernard J.
Phelps, Donald L.
Pruitt, John D.
Rever, Rodney R.
Ridge, Bradley B.
Sandeen, Garnet G.
Sanders, James M.
Scales, Thomas N., Jr.
Schwab, Albert J.
Sharp, Robert
Stiles, Thomas R.
Stuart, James F.
Swindal, James R.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Thompson, Robert E.
Tober, Theodore W.
Waggoner, Edgar G.
Warner, Albert D.
Wells, William H.
Wheeler, Thomas E.
Wilson, Henry B.
Zaller, Frank A.
Keating, Katherine
Murtagh, Nancy M.

NURSE CORPS

Anderson, June L.
Bach, Lillian M.
Barron, Joan L.
Betzinger, Elizabeth D.
Black, Helen J.
Bower, Joan E.
Boyd, Olivia G.
Brock, Catherine M.
Brown, Eleanor J.
Bruton, Annie R.
Buckingham, Louise A.
Carlson, Doris J.
Carpenter, Lois T.
Cassanova, Audrey M.
Clemens, Rose M.
Cooper, Opal J.
Craig, Florence V.
Crowe, Patricia P.
Damasco, Irene I.
DeMartino, Theodosia
Dennis, Catherine E.
Dial, Thelma P.
Dunn, Kathleen M.
Easter, Mary R.
Eberhardt, Marie
Eldridge, Ruth E.
Elliott, Laura S.
Fitz, Barbara O.
Frame, Ellen B.
Fuller, Doris T.
Gasper, Pearl Y.
Gelbmann, Mary A.
Greer, Goldie D.
Hancock, Joan
Harrigan, Nancy L.
Hedrick, Betty S.
Henkel, Dolores A.
Hinckley, Colleen
Jaeger, Elizabeth L.
Kailan, Addie E.
Kellagher, Violett J.
Kirkland, Mary E.
Krintz, Betty R.
Leutz, Lillian D.
Levin, Mildred R.
MacDonald, Madeline M.
MacDonald, Frances E.
Maguire, Frances P.
Marsch, Doris E.
Martin, Rosalie S.
Melendez, Rose M.
Merrick, Millicent E.
Michael, Thedia A.
Miller, Jean L.
Miller, Joyce L.
Moffitt, Jeanne T.
Moody, Anna E.
Moore, Lucille A.
Moring, Pattie W.
Muhlenfeld, Loretta T.
Nicora, Adeline
Noonen, Barbara A.
Obertance, Helen I.
Odom, Thelma
Patterson, Rita M.
Plosila, Edia M.
Pluke, Virginia M.
Pommier, Angelina T.
Ragland, Wilda R.
Read, Anna C.
Reed, Sylvia P.
Rhodarmer, Joan
Riecken, Margarete
Rock, Josie
Schlachter, Wilma R.
Selic, Luella F.
Severson, Shirley R.
Sganga, Anna
Shafer, Mary H.
Shelton, Waunie L.
Sheridan, Anne M.
Shrout, Rose E.
Simkins, Lois J.
Smith, Donna J.
Smith, Mildred M.
Smith, Vivian E.
Snyder, Mildred I.
Spangler, Elizabeth V.
Sprowles, Elizabeth F.
Stilwell, Adelaide
Struble, Mary R.
Sullivan, Harriet E.
Sullivan, Norma A.
Taylor, Mary E.
Ulrich, Marian J.
Underwood, Wanda D.
Wakeman, Harriette L.
Walbert, Bertha M.
Warren, Ellen G.
Wheeler, Mary B.
Whitfield, Gilda G.
Whitfield, Gloria M.
Williams, Alice K.
Wywiorski, Patricia A.

For permanent appointment as an ensign in the line of the Navy:

Parker, John R.

For permanent promotion to chief radio electrician in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Mandzak, Nicholas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Carl W. McCardle, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

J. Earl Coke, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Charles R. Hook, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

John C. Allen, of Illinois, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and wisdom unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known,

wilt Thou inspire us daily with those longings and hopes which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Help us to believe that no needed blessing wilt Thou withhold from us if we walk uprightly and that Thou canst bring to fulfillment every noble aspiration which stirs our soul.

Grant that we may meet and master all our difficult national and international problems with an assurance of Thy guiding and sustaining presence.

May every thought of our mind be brought into a glad and willing obedience to the mind of our blessed Lord and may His spirit of love touch the life of broken and bleeding humanity with its healing and transforming power.

In His name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 26, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress on February 2, 1953.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 243. An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration).

The message also announced that the Senate had been directed to notify the House of Representatives that the President of the Senate under authority of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, has appointed Mr. CORDON, of Oregon, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. PASTORE, of Rhode Island.

RECESS ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1953

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 2, 1953, the Speaker may declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, February 3, 1953, it be in order to consider the bill (S. 243) to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration; that such bill be considered under the general rules of the House, and that there shall be not to exceed 1 hour debate, to be confined to the bill, and equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit and act during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file their report on the bill (S. 243) to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. JENSEN, Iowa; Mr. SMALL, Maryland; Mr. BAILEY, West Virginia; Mr. YATES, Illinois.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CANFIELD, New Jersey; Mr. GAVIN, Pennsylvania; Mr. BROWN, Georgia; Mr. SIKES, Florida.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 1815, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLE, New York; Mr. HINSHAW, California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania; Mr. JENKINS, Ohio; Mr. PATTERSON, Connecticut; Mr. DURHAM, North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, California; Mr. PRICE, Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, Texas.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLCOTT, Michigan; Mr. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; Mr. TALLE, Iowa; Mr. BENDER, Ohio; Mr. HART, New Jersey, Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. BOLLING, Missouri.

ADMISSION TO HOUSE FLOOR AT JOINT SESSION ON MONDAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Monday next the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED CUMMINGS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1952, there passed away in Fort Collins, Colo., a former Member of this House, the Honorable Fred Cummings. Mr. Cummings was elected to Congress in 1932 and served until January 1941.

Mr. Cummings was a great friend of the farmers of the Second District of Colorado. He battled to save the sugar industry and supported with all the power of his office the approval of the Colorado Big Thompson project.

I insert as part of my remarks his obituary in the Fort Collins Coloradoan and an editorial from the Denver Democrat:

[From the Fort Collins Coloradoan of November 10, 1952]

The honorable Fred Cummings, 88, former Congressman and 46-year resident of Fort Collins, died suddenly about 11:30 a. m. today at the Page Convalescent Home at 211 Canyon Avenue.

Death followed a sudden heart attack. Relatives said he had recovered from a recent operation in a Denver hospital.

Mr. Cummings, a Democrat, was elected to Congress in 1932, the year in which Franklin D. Roosevelt defeated Herbert Hoover for the Presidency. During his four terms as a Representative of the Second Congressional District, Mr. Cummings led in the battle for approval and appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, now scheduled for completion next year.

FOUGHT FOR SUGAR ACT

He also took a leading part in the fight for Federal payments for sugar beet growers, which resulted in the Sugar Act of 1936. Near the close of his congressional service he was third ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Before entering Congress, Mr. Cummings had served successively as president of the Mountain States Sugar Beet Growers Marketing Association and its Fort Collins local, and of the National Sugar Beet Growers Association. In those years he was prominent in the growers' struggle for favorable contracts.

Mr. Cummings was born in New Hampshire September 18, 1864. At the age of 1 year he was taken by his parents to Clinton, Iowa.

FARMED IN NEBRASKA

When he was 12 his family moved by ox wagon to a farm in Jones County, Iowa, and 2 years later to Custer County, Nebr. There they built the first sod house and barn during Nebraska's early homesteading era. In later years the youth hauled wheat 30 miles to market.

He engaged in stock feeding and farming in Nebraska for many years. Before coming to Fort Collins in 1906 he owned one of the largest livestock businesses in northern Nebraska.

While living in Nebraska Mr. Cummings studied for and was admitted to the bar, at the age of 30. Farming and stock feeding became his major interest, however, and he gave up his law practice after a few years.

OWNED SEVERAL FARMS

After coming here, Mr. Cummings owned several farms in Larimer and Weld Counties, feeding livestock and raising sugar beets. He served as a member of the Fort Collins city council before the city charter was adopted in 1913.

His four terms in Congress ended in 1941, following his defeat by the present Congressman, WILLIAM S. HILL, the Republican candidate, in the 1940 election.

He married the former Miss Nancy Jane Sutton in 1889 in Nebraska. Of their five children, three survive: George G. Cummings, of Washington, D. C.; Ralph P. Cummings, of Fort Collins, and Mrs. Raymond West, of Santa Ana, Calif. Two sons, Harry and Hugh, died in 1920 and 1902, respectively.

Mrs. Cummings died in March 1944 at their home at 828 West Olive Street. In October 1947 Mr. Cummings married the former Mrs. Ina Graham of Fairfield, Iowa. Their home here was at 1201 Laporte Avenue. She died here in September 1951. Since then Mr. Cummings had lived at the Page home.

WAS ODD FELLOW

Mr. Cummings was a life member of the Odd Fellows lodge, which he joined in 1888. He filled all the lodge offices, and in 1897 was a past noble grand.

Survivors besides the three children include four grandchildren: Dr. Fred Cummings, of Seattle, Wash.; A. J. Cummings, of Denver; Mrs. Lowell Watts, wife of Captain Watts, serving with the United States Air Force in the Azores Islands; and Harry Cummings, of Denver. There are nine great-grandchildren.

Funeral arrangements, not yet completed, are in charge of the Blythe-Hollowell Mortuary.

[From the Denver Democrat]

Northern Colorado has lost one of the region's great champions with the death of Fred Cummings, former Congressman for the Second District, and the man whose consistent efforts in Congress were largely responsible for securing funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

When his colleagues in Congress were skeptical of the idea of diverting water under the Great Divide, Fred Cummings had a large scale model of the prospect set up just outside the doors of the House of Representatives in Washington and spent hours there showing his fellows in Congress just how the project would work and then explaining its great value to the Nation and to the West.

"It took some time," Fred once told me, "but I finally converted them, they couldn't refuse to vote for this project when they saw its many benefits, and realized that it was not an expenditure but an investment."

A good farmer himself, Cummings was always ready to push legislation that aided agriculture. As one of the original New Deal Congressmen, he fought with Roosevelt and Costigan for sound legislation to stabilize the prices of sugar, for rural electrification benefits, for reclamation expansion and for a sound program of low interest rate farm loans.

Cummings believed in the soundness of the West and fought for project after project that helped bring the Nation from the despair of the late thirties to its present stage.

His almost inevitable rule of thumb for each project he supported was, will it repay itself in greater production for our people, greater income for our farms and a higher standard of living for those who work to produce America's wealth.

Northern Colorado, the State, the West, and the entire Nation lost a real champion in the death of Fred Cummings, a man who gave generously of a dynamic energy that America might be a better place in which to live and in which to make a living.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague from Colorado's Second Congressional District and acknowledge the loss which the people of Colorado and especially those of the Second Congressional District have experienced with the passing of the late Fred Nelson Cummings, former Congressman from that district.

It was my personal privilege to know this capable and unselfish citizen of Colorado in his profession as a lawyer and his career as a public servant. He was industrious, able, loyal to the principles in which he believed, and most successful in protecting and advancing the interests of the people whom he represented. He came to the Congress as a Democrat with the election of former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and remained until the beginning of Roosevelt's third term. He gave unstintingly of his efforts and ability in the interests, particularly of the farmers, and is especially remembered for his activity relating to the sugar-beet industry. His was a long and successful life, during which he endeared himself to countless thousands of his fellow men, who will continue to value his personal accomplishments and good deeds.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy to his loved ones who are left to bereave his passing.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It was with great regret that we in Colorado learned of the passing of Mr. Cummings. As most of you know he served in this House for 8 years. Throughout that time he was a tireless worker in behalf of the farmers, the sugar beet growers, the cattlemen, and irrigation, a subject very dear to our hearts in the State of Colorado. We considered Fred Cummings one man who was very dependable, who advocated the rights of the people at all times. In his passing we in Colorado feel we have lost a friend, a citizen, and a statesman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from Colorado in paying tribute to our former colleague, Fred Cummings. I was indeed saddened last fall when I learned of his passing. It was not my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Mr. Cummings. However, I was aware of the outstanding service he rendered as a Member of this body, and of the esteem in which he was held by the people of his district. I recall that he was very active in promoting the interests of the sugar beet industry and in supporting legislation for the benefit of the farmer. I join my colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1953.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1953: Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., California; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Illinois; Hon. EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Very sincerely yours,

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1953.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public Law 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.) I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1953: Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Connecticut; Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania; Hon. EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Very sincerely yours,

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will at this time recognize Members to extend their remarks or to address the House for 1 minute before the program for today which includes eulogies on William McKinley and our former colleague, the late Dr. Eaton.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the purpose of assisting the Chair in what I believe is in the Chair's mind: The Chair hopes there will be no special orders following the eulogies.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so desires and hopes that requests for extensions of remarks and 1-minute speeches will be made at this time. As far as the Chair knows there are pending no special orders for today.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Chair hopes that none will be asked for today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so hopes.

OPERATION SMACK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include certain editorial material regarding Operation Smack.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everybody has been very much astounded and greatly shocked by the so-called Operation Smack in Korea. The War Department has just sent a general to talk with me regarding it. He states that all the information they have is what the papers have carried, but that they have asked General Collins, the Chief of Staff, who is now in Korea, for a complete report. The whole incident reminds us of the horror and tragedy of war and gives us a new determination to end it. I asked for a general investigation of the whole shocking incident.

I wish to read the following editorial from the Boston Post of January 28:

The following is a letter received by the Post from a Korean veteran:

"It was with actual waves of nausea that I read the article on Operation Smack in the January 26 paper. I wonder if the poor battered guys who staged Operation Smack were issued bound timetables with a pretty three-color decoration on the front as were the invited guests.

"What a lovely memento of a joyous occasion that would have been. After 4 hours of bitter fighting, many of their buddies shot to pieces, I'll bet they would have danced with glee at the sight of such a bright little souvenir.

"I hope the guests enjoyed the thrilling drama. Where, except in the ancient Roman arena, could they witness a life-and-death struggle and get an ornate program card to boot?

"Better still, why doesn't the Army print up more copies and send one to each of the mothers who lost a boy in that engagement? Wouldn't a cardboard-bound timetable with a picture on the front be just the thing to mend a broken heart?

"I'm sick!"

A lot of people are sick at the incredible stupidity that devised that stunt in Korea, and somebody ought to be given a punishment that would fit the crime.

Here is a quotation from the Associated Press report: "The raid, called Operation Smack, was witnessed by invited high officers of the United States Air and Ground Forces and war correspondents. Each held a mimeographed seven-page timetable bound in cardboard with a three-color decoration on the cover."

Operation Smack turned out to be 4½ hours of bitter fighting, in which 35 Chinese were killed and 20 wounded. There was no report of American casualties, but inasmuch as the assault was on a deeply dug-in position heavily fortified during the truce negotiations, it can be assumed that our losses were heavy.

What in the world kind of warfare is this? Is it just an afternoon's entertainment for the brass and invited guests? Why don't they issue engraved invitations? "Please attend our live ammunition military display on the afternoon of January 25. Some of our men will doubtless be killed, and others maimed, but don't let that spoil your afternoon. Programs will explain what is happening, provided the enemy cooperates."

Of course, the enemy didn't cooperate and our men were pushed back with heavy losses.

The whole Korean episode has been marked by the worst kind of folly on the part of United Nations forces, but this stunt caps everything. If this sort of thing had gone on at Anzio or Bastogne there would have been a whole series of courts-martial.

But in Korea we aren't fighting a war to win it. We are carrying on a campaign that is utterly senseless, and sooner or later President Eisenhower will have to make up his mind that the American people won't put up with it much longer.

It is bad enough to be trapped in a difficult situation without pulling such a stunt as Operation Smack. Of all the senseless deaths, none in any war can compare with those that came to the boys who fell during that show.

They died so that a group of invited guests, calmly perusing their gaily decorated programs, could have an afternoon that through some weird reasoning on the part of some commander was supposed to be instructive, but actually was just a show.

What if the Chinese position had been taken? Would it mean anything in the kind of warfare that we are waging? Not a thing, obviously, for we have no intention of pressing on to victory.

Is it any wonder that the Communists are scornful of our military efforts in Korea? They fooled the U. N. forces for months with phony truce negotiations during which they built up their strength. They gained time to build a strong mountain line across the peninsula, against which we throw our troops in broad daylight according to schedule on a fancy three-color program.

The draft goes on and on, and the effort of the military to put over universal military training goes on and on. What are the boys being drafted for? To die on a Korean hillside in the afternoon sun while invited guests stand off and watch? For a stunt?

President Eisenhower should take official cognizance of this appalling stupidity called Operation Smack. Those guilty of the blunder should be called to account and given proper punishment. If those responsible are allowed to go unpunished there will be no morale either in the service or on the home front.

Mr. Eisenhower made Korea an issue in the campaign, and he'd better get to work on it soon before the American people have lost all confidence in the leaders of that dreadful war which is turning out to be a thoroughly disgraceful episode in American history.

I also wish to include as part of my remarks the following article from the Boston Post of January 26:

ALLIES HIT REDS WITH BIG PUNCH—BUT ACTION FAILS TO DISLODGE CHINESE ON SPUD HILL

WESTERN FRONT, KOREA, Monday, January 26.—The Allies threw the biggest coordinated plane-artillery-tank-infantry raid of the new year Sunday against Little Spud Hill, close by T-Bone Hill on the western front.

But it failed to knock out the Chinese Red defenders who poured a withering hail of cross fire and bursting grenades on the American foot soldiers who charged up the steep slope.

"They lobbed hand grenades down on us as we started up the hill," said one of the walking wounded later. "As we got close to the top they caught us in a crossfire. It was pure hell."

The battered infantrymen pulled back to their own lines after 4½ hours of bitter, close-range combat after reaching within 15 yards of the crest.

"We simply could not go any farther," one soldier said.

Before the raid, briefing officers said the coordinated action was to be a raid and that the attack force would pull back after assaulting the knoll, shaped somewhat like an Idaho Russet potato.

The coordinated attack was witnessed by Lt. Gen. Glenn Barcus, commander of the Fifth Air Force; Lt. Gen. Paul Kendall, First Corps commander, and Maj. Gen. Wayne C. Smith, commanding officer of the United States Seventh Infantry Division.

Infantrymen sprung their assault at 1 p. m., after waves of jet fighter bombers hit the entrenched Reds with tons of high explosives and searing napalm (jellied gasoline).

The smashing air attacks were followed by tremendous artillery barrages that turned Spud Hill and Red-held T-Bone just behind it into an inferno.

Then tanks rumbled out into flat ground where two small valleys led to the base of Spud. They fired volley after volley of direct fire into the Red bunkers and trenches. Other tanks, firing from set positions all along the allied line, threw additional hundreds of high-velocity shells at the Reds.

Sabre jets high over northwest Korea continued their deadly patrol of the Manchurian border Sunday and shot down one MIG and damaged another, the Fifth Air Force announced.

Other allied war planes swarmed over North Korea, blasting an estimated 50 Red supply vehicles and hitting hard at Red front-line positions.

OPERATION SMACK

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the incident to which our colleague from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has just referred, the story that was carried in an AP dispatch dated Korea last Monday was followed by editorials in some newspapers. The impression with respect to this incident by many of our folks has been that the lives of our men were needlessly sacrificed in what might be termed a show.

This morning an AP reporter called and said that the revised information indicated that the operation there was a

normal one; that the only difference was in what they called a program, and I assume what that amounts to was that the orders for attack were printed in colors; that the high-ranking officers who in the dispatch were described as invited guests were officials of the Air Corps and other branches of the armed services who were on the scene in order that they might be advised as to the tactical maneuvers and the effect of the operation.

What the facts are I do not know, but that is the information I have received.

I was later advised by a reporter for a Boston paper that he had checked with the Pentagon and was told that the programs—or, if you prefer "orders"—had been printed for 8 days and that nothing similar to this operation had ever before been ordered or carried out.

In the past requests for appropriations running into billions upon billions of dollars made not only by the armed services but by the administration, have either been based upon or followed by statements of dire results as to what would most certainly happen to us if these requests were not granted.

For example, years ago when President Roosevelt wanted billions to carry on his New Deal, he told Congress if it did not give him what he asked, it was more than probable that planes from Germany would be bombing Detroit, Kansas City, and Omaha—in fact, practically all of our big industrial Midwest cities.

The Congress swallowed that hook and the appropriations were made.

Then we had our stories that submarines were operating off the east coast. Still later the Japanese submarines were taking a look at the shorelines of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Oh, there have been a constant stream of scare stories and headlines, all apparently intended to make us believe that if we did not use the last red cent appropriated, we were unpatriotic, no better than traitors to our country.

So, naturally, when last Monday, I read the Associated Press story that in Korea a group of invited guests, and I use that word "guests" advisedly, had witnessed an assault by our men on a strongly fortified position; that there were sound and moving picture recordings; that the guests had been issued invitations and a program in colors of the proposed attack, I, like millions of other Americans, naturally wanted to know whether the armed services were putting on a show which necessarily would result in the wounding and the killing of our men, if the show was advance propaganda for another drive on Congress to induce us to appropriate other billions while the Armed Forces now have more money than they can spend, or whether that attack on Spud Hill was a normal wartime procedure. And I know that officers gain knowledge which later may save lives, if permitted to witness attacks, make moving pictures, learn the results of military assaults just as doctors who do not participate therein, acquire knowledge by witnessing major operations.

So far as I know, no one criticizes that procedure, but if American men are being sent into battle where they are wounded and killed just to make propaganda for increased appropriations for the armed services, that is something else again and our people will never stand for it.

To get the facts back of this Associated Press story, a privileged resolution of inquiry was introduced and the Secretary of Defense was asked to give us the facts.

REPORT OF TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE CHEYENNE RIVER RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing with the Speaker of the House the Report of the Tribal Council of the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota as provided by Public Law 870 of the Eighty-first Congress.

That law provided authority for the Army engineers, jointly with the Secretary of Interior to negotiate with the Sioux Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation, for compensation for their land and improvements taken by the United States Government for inundation back of the Oahe Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota.

The law provides just compensation for such land and improvements and for the cost of relocating and reestablishing the Indian people, their agency buildings, shrines, and improvements. Section 4 of the act includes other provisions beneficial to the Indians who are parties to such contract.

It further provides that in the event of failure of negotiations that such items as have not been agreed upon shall be reported separately to this Congress.

Because of failure to agree upon the principal item of the value of the land and improvements, negotiations broke down and no agreement has been reached.

In behalf of such tribal council I therefore file with the Speaker of the House this report which is today also being made to the other body and is expected to be made a Senate document.

I am today likewise introducing a bill providing for such compensation as is anticipated under this act and which the Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation are willing to stand in their agreement for settlement.

MISSOURI RIVER DEVELOPMENT—OAHE DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT—REPORT TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED ON NEGOTIATIONS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 870, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, BY AND FOR THE SIOUX INDIANS OF CHEYENNE RIVER RESERVATION, S. DAK.

This report to the Congress is made and signed by a majority of the Negotiating Committee of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council under the authority of the act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 870, Eighty-first Congress, second session. The said act of Congress is as follows:

"An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, jointly with the Secretary of the Interior, representing the United States of America, are hereby authorized and directed to negotiate contracts containing the provisions outlined herein separately with the Sioux Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and with the Sioux Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, through representatives of the two tribes appointed for this purpose by their tribal councils.

"SEC. 2. The contracts made pursuant to section 1 of this act shall—

"(a) convey to the United States the title to all tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interests therein belonging to the Indians of each tribe required by the United States for the reservoir to be created by the construction of the dam across the Missouri River in South Dakota, to be known as Oahe Dam, including such lands along the margin of said reservoir as may be required by the Chief Engineers, United States Army, for the protection, development, and use of said reservoir: *Provided*, That the date on which the contract is signed by Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the Secretary of the Interior shall be the date of taking by the United States for purposes of determining the ownership of the Indian tribal, allotted, and assigned lands conveyed thereby to the United States, subject to the determinations and the payments to be made as hereinafter provided for;

"(b) provide for the payment of—

"(1) just compensation for lands and improvements and interests therein, conveyed pursuant to subsection (a);

"(2) costs of relocating and reestablishing the tribe and the members of each tribe who reside upon such lands so that their economic, social, religious, and community life can be reestablished and protected: *Provided*, That such costs of relocating and reestablishing the tribe and the members of each tribe who reside upon such lands shall not result in double compensation for lands and properties to the tribe and members of each tribe, and

"(3) costs of relocating and reestablishing Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines located upon such lands;

"(c) provide that just compensation for the lands of individual members of such tribes, who reject the appraisal covering their individual property, shall be judicially determined in proceedings instituted for such purpose by the Department of the Army in the United States district court for the district in which the lands are situated;

"(d) provide a schedule of dates for the orderly removal of the Indians and their personal property situated within the taking area of the Oahe Reservoir within the respective reservations: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall have primary and final responsibility in negotiating concerning the matters set out in the foregoing paragraphs (a) and (b) hereof;

"(e) provide for the final and complete settlement of all claims by the Indians and tribes described in section 1 of this act against the United States arising because of construction of the Oahe project.

"SEC. 3. To assist the negotiators in arriving at the amount of just compensation as provided herein in section 2 (b) (1), the Secretary of the Interior or his duly author-

ized representative and the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, or his duly authorized representative shall cause to be prepared an appraisal schedule on an individual tract basis of the tribal, allotted, and assigned lands, including heirship interests therein, located within the taking areas of the respective reservations. In the preparation thereof, they shall determine the fair market value of the lands, giving full and proper weight to the following elements of appraisal: Improvements, severance damage, standing timber, mineral rights, and the uses to which the lands are reasonably adapted. They shall transmit the schedules to the representatives of the tribes appointed to negotiate a contract, which schedules shall be used as a basis for determining the amount of just compensation to be included in the contracts for the elements of damages set out in section 2 hereof.

"SEC. 4. The specification in sections 2 and 3 hereof of certain provisions to be included in each contract shall not operate to preclude the inclusion in such contracts of other provisions beneficial to the Indians who are parties to such contracts.

"SEC. 5. (a) The contracts negotiated and approved pursuant to this act shall be submitted to the Congress within 18 months from and after the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) No such contract shall take effect until it shall have been ratified by act of Congress and ratified in writing by three-quarters of the adult members of the two respective tribes designated in section 1 hereof, separately, within 9 months from the date of the act ratifying each said contract: *Provided*, That in the event the negotiating parties designated by section 1 of this act are unable to agree on any item or provision in the proposed contracts, said items or provisions shall be reported separately to the Congress as an appendix to each contract, and shall set out the provisions in dispute as proposed by the advocates thereof for consideration and determination by the Congress.

"SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to restrict the orderly prosecution of the construction or delay the completion of the Oahe Dam to provide protection from floods on the Missouri River.

"Approved September 30, 1950."

Under section 3 of the said act a firm of land appraisers was employed to "prepare an appraisal schedule on an individual tract basis of the tribal, allotted, and assigned lands, including heirship interests therein, located within the taking areas of the respective reservations."

We are not advised as to the date of the contract with the firm of appraisers. We do not at this time wish to comment on the way in which the appraisal was made, but we wish to advise the Congress that a schedule in writing under the subject headings required by section 3 of Public Law 870 was submitted to the tribal council of the Cheyenne River Sioux Indian Reservation on or about November 15, 1951.

Immediately upon receipt of the appraisal schedules the negotiating committee, by its own members, made a complete check of the appraisal schedules which had been submitted against agency and land records. The committee found errors in the original appraisal schedules of omission of tracts of land, omission of improvements, and omission of timber. It also found errors in description and omission of land areas from the schedules entirely.

The negotiating committee, which had been duly appointed by the tribal council, thereupon requested a meeting in Washington, D. C., with the Chief of Engineers, or his representative; with the Secretary of the Interior, or his representative. The meeting was to be held on January 7, 1952. For this purpose the entire negotiating committee came to Washington and went before the Office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the purpose of arranging the proposed conference. It seemed necessary in view of the errors found in the appraisal schedules to ask for such a conference. As a result of this step a conference was arranged with General Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, which conference was held on January 11, 1952, at the general's headquarters.

At this conference there was handed to General Pick an 8-page list of errors, small or large as they happened to be. General Pick stated that the errors must be corrected before he or any of his subordinates would be permitted to proceed further. Whereupon, it was agreed verbally that the matter of further work on the appraisals, the descriptions of the acreage and the value of land, timber, improvements and severance would be reconsidered, checked, and brought into agreement. This agreement is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1952.

Mr. FRANK DUCHENEAUX,
Chairman, Committee of Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council, care of Mr. Ralph H. Case, attorney, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUCHENEAUX: Confirming the discussion with you and the members of your council this morning, in connection with carrying out the provisions of Public Law 870, dated September 30, 1950, I am agreeable to the following:

(a) The date of Tuesday, April 15, 1952, as suggested by you for a meeting at the Cheyenne Agency, in South Dakota, to be attended by your representatives, by representatives of the Department of the Interior, and my representatives, for the purpose of resolving factual matters concerning appraisal of lands, and discussing other subjects as may be required prior to contract negotiations;

(b) Formal contract negotiations to be held in Washington, D. C., and to start not later than September 15, 1952.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

Received and agreed to January 12, 1952:

FRANK DUCHENEAUX
(For Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council).

I concur:

DALE E. DOTY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Due to very inclement weather and flood conditions on the Missouri River, it was impossible to hold a conference at the Cheyenne River Agency on April 15, 1952, as agreed to in the above-quoted memorandum. The date for the conference at the Cheyenne River Agency was necessarily advanced to May 13, 1952. The Secretary of the Interior made available the services of the Missouri River Basin investigation (MRBI) group.

The representatives of the Chief of Engineers and of the Secretary of the Interior, the designated staff of MRBI, and the tribal negotiating committee met at the Cheyenne River Agency, S. Dak., on May 13, 1952. The three parties to the proposed contract were at divergence on the exact descriptions of land, on the values of land improvements, timber, and other items. It was a physical impossibility to adjust the differences existing between the original appraisal schedules and the schedules prepared by the negotiating committee from the land records of the Cheyenne River Agency, and it was an obvious necessity that a reexamination of the entire subject matter must be undertaken. To that end representatives of the three parties to the negotiations agreed to adjourn the meeting and to reassemble at the office of the district engineer at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5, 1952, in order to carry out the proposed reexamination of land descriptions and values as above stated. It was agreed that two representatives of MRBI, two representatives of the district engineer's office at Omaha, and the tribal negotiators should meet at the Cheyenne River Agency and make a reexamination of the entire subject matter as above referred to. The agreement is as follows:

"SUMMARIZATION OF CONFERENCES, MAY 13, 1952, CHEYENNE AGENCY, S. DAK.

"Re negotiations with the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe under Public Law 870, Eighty-first Congress.

"The parties, directed by Public Law 870, Eighty-first Congress, met in conference in accordance with the agreement dated January 11, 1952, signed by Lewis A. Pick, lieutenant general; Frank Ducheneaux, chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council; and Dale E. Doty, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

"In accordance with said agreement, said conference was held at Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak., on May 13, 1952, at 10 a. m., attended by representatives of the Department of the Interior, Corps of Engineers, and the negotiating committee representing the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe.

"Discussion between the conferees continued throughout the day, and in consequence thereof, certain understandings were reached between the parties, of which the following is a summary:

"1. It is the position of the negotiating committee of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council that there are errors in the appraisals prepared by Gerald T. Hart and made under authority of said Public Law 870, in descriptions, areas of land, quality and quantity of timber, extent and value of improvements, and in other matters contained in said appraisal.

"2. By reason of the objections aforesaid by the said negotiating committee of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council, it is the position of the representatives of the Government that proper steps of inspection and correction of any errors, as alleged, should be taken to effect the purpose stated in subparagraph (a) of the agreement of January 11, 1952, i. e., '* * * purpose of resolving factual matters concerning appraisals of land.'

"It was the suggestion, which met with the tentative consent of all parties, that a reexamination by a committee should be made of the Hart appraisal and that the committee should consist of two representatives of the Corps of Engineers, two representatives of the Department of the Interior, and two or more members of the tribal council negotiating committee. This was stated to be subject to approval of the three principal organizations involved. The committee is to be formed as soon as arrangements can be made, and under the supervision of their respective departments to report all factual matters concerning appraisal of lands in the taking area to their respective superiors.

"It was further suggested, and tentatively agreed to, that the report of the committee above-described should contain the correct description of the land in each tract, the correct acreage thereof, the classification and grade of the land, the amount and class of standing timber, the description and the estimated value of the improvements within the taking area.

"If divergencies of opinion develop between the members of the said committee which, for purposes of identification shall hereinafter be designated as the Reviewing Committee, such divergencies may be stated pro and con by the members of the said Reviewing Committee; all such statements of dispute shall be recorded by the committee and submitted by said committee to

the negotiators of the three principal organizations involved.

"Dated: May 14, 1952, at Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak.

"A. B. MELSNER,
"W. R. GOODALL, Jr.,
"FRANK DUCHENEAUX,
"RALPH H. CASE."

Under section 5 (a) it was required that the contracts be negotiated and submitted to the Congress "within 18 months from and after the date of the enactment of this act," September 30, 1951.

Thirteen and a half months had been consumed in making the contract with the appraisers and the work done under said contract on the appraisal. It appeared certain that section 5 (a) of the said act, Public Law 870, did not give sufficient time for negotiations. Therefore, the negotiating committee, now reporting, asked for and the Congress passed an act extending the time for negotiations to January 31, 1953.

At the Omaha conference it was further agreed that the negotiations in Washington should begin November 10, 1952, and continue thereafter for such time as might be necessary to prepare a contract based upon an agreement as to land descriptions and values.

Acting under the Omaha agreement, the reexamination committee of six or more was designated and did assemble and did accomplish very substantial results. No complete agreement, however, was reached.

On November 10, 1952, the negotiating committee met at the office of Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for organization and agreement on procedure for the subsequent meetings. Thereafter the conference was to be held in the hearing room of the Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

The first meeting of the conferees was held on Wednesday, November 12. It developed then that there still were differences in the appraisal schedules, but that the differences had been materially reduced. It was also developed that in preparation for the meeting then being held, a draft of a contract had been prepared and would be ready for presentation at the next meeting on Friday, November 14.

On November 14 we delivered to the representative of the Chief of Engineers; to the representative of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. A. B. Melsner, copies of a proposed contract which in terms and in amounts is the offer made by us, the negotiating committee, and which, if accepted by the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior, would be the settlement contract for all purposes in respect to the construction of the Oahe Dam and the maintenance and operation of the reservoir behind the dam.

We do not present the entire document here nor make it a part of this report for the reason stated hereinafter. We have rewritten the opening sections of the proposed contract, which we handed to the negotiators on November 14, to bring it in line with our present proposal to the Congress. There were no discussions as to the merits or demerits of any matter stated in the proposed contract. Obviously, it was necessary that both the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior should have time to study the matter; therefore, the conference adjourned to meet on Monday, November 17.

On Monday, November 17, the conference reconvened and discussed sections 1 and 2 of the proposed contract. A definite difference appeared to exist between the representatives of the Corps of Engineers, the MRBI, and the tribal negotiators. It was decided to send representatives of the three groups into a committee meeting and, if possible, the three groups were to agree on acreage and on values. Again, the conference was adjourned to Wednesday, November 19.

The conference reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Wednesday, November 19. No agreement had been reached by the representatives of the three parties in the conference. It was stated by the representative of the Chief of Engineers that the Corps would deliver an offer on land, improvements, timber, and severance damages at our next meeting, but the material was not available on that day; therefore, the conference again adjourned to meet on Friday, November 21.

On Friday, November 21, we were advised that the Corps of Engineers would submit their offer in writing on the following Monday, November 24, 1952. On Monday, November 24, the conference met at 1:30 p. m. in the hearing room of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers laid down their offer of $2,000,000 for lands, timber, improvements, and severance damages. We, the negotiating committee, decided to take the matter under consideration and make a counter offer in response thereto. The offer, together with tabulations showing all offers pending at that time, is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS SUBMITTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE TRIBAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE OF THE SIOUX INDIANS OF THE CHEYENNE RIVER RESERVATION AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR AT A MEETING ON NOVEMBER 24, 1952, AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

"At our last meeting on Friday, November 21, 1952, it was brought out that in the various discussions among the negotiators three sets of figures have been presented for consideration in determining the just compensation to be provided for the lands and improvements and interests therein belonging to the Sioux Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation and which will be required for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project. The first set in the amount of $1,605,410 is based on the Hart appraisal, and it was stated that this figure represented the offer of the Chief of Engineers. The second set in the amount of $2,053,117 constitutes an estimate prepared by the MRBI after review of the Hart appraisal. The third set in the amount of $2,614,778.95 is the figure prepared by the tribal negotiators after review of both the Hart appraisal and the MRBI report, discussions with the individual landowners, and inspections of their lands. This third figure, it was stated, represents the offer of the tribal negotiators.

"As the representative of the Chief of Engineers, I then stated that since the Hart appraisal had been made pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 870, approved September 30, 1950, by a recognized expert in the appraisal field who was selected with the approval of the representative of the Secretary of the Interior, and that from our reviews and discussions to date, it appeared to be based on sound principles.

"The representative of the Chief of Engineers recognizes that it is not uncommon in negotiations for the acquisition of land to agree upon a price differing in reasonable degree from the official appraisal figure where such variation is justified. Accordingly, while having in mind that Public Law 870 provides that the official (Hart) appraisal, made in accordance with the terms of that act, shall be used as the basis for determining the amount of just compensation to be included in the contract, we have caused a further analysis of the three reports to be made in an effort to arrive at a possible basis for adjusting the Chief of Engineers' offer. A tabulation showing the results of this analysis is attached.

"In making this review we have accepted the land classifications and acreage compiled by and set forth in MRBI Report No. 132, which data was also adopted by the tribal negotiators, applying average per-acre values derived from the official (Hart) appraisal. In respect to the severance item, realizing that even experts must use professional opinion in determining such damages, we have used the value established by the tribal negotiators. In respect to the improvement item, wherein the official (Hart) appraisal included fences and stock-water ponds in the land value and not as a separate classification, we have nevertheless used the value established by the tribal negotiators. In respect to the timber item, the previous discussions and analysis of the report constrains me to use the MRBI figure. This analysis results in a total figure of $1,725,530.55. Thus it will be seen that the different method of land classification, variance in severance, improvement, and timber valuations, result in raising the official appraisal slightly in excess of $100,000.

"I do not accept the result of this computation as a proper basis for settlement, but it has served to clarify, in my mind, some of the points involved in our negotiations. Considering this computation, the discussions at previous meetings concerning increases in land values, and in an effort to reach an amicable settlement, I have concluded that the maximum figure which the Chief of Engineers could support as just compensation for lands and improvements and interests therein to be conveyed under section 2 (a) of Public Law 870, approved September 30, 1950, would be $2,000,000.

"I, accordingly, offer the sum of $2,000,000 as the final offer of the Chief of Engineers.

"G. J. NOLD,
"Major General, United States Army, Representative of the Chief of Engineers."

Analysis of reports, Cheyenne River taking area

Item	Hart		MRBI		Tribe value	OCE Review	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value		Acres	Value
Cropland	1,133	$22,146	403	$15,730	$13,200.00	403	$7,874.62
Meadow	7,029	121,887	12,360	285,021	325,091.00	12,360	214,322.40
Sheltered pasture	10,732	156,604	12,412	192,802	200,049.76	12,412	181,463.44
Grazing land	82,354	932,880	75,087	1,075,906	1,359,529.65	75,087	852,247.45
River wash	1,599	9,900	3,515	21,093	16,731.12	3,515	21,737.85
River bed		0	643	0		643	0
Irrigation potential					27,622.30		
Total land	102,847.23	1,243,516	104,420	1,590,574	1,940,223.83	104,420	1,277,668.76
Severance		19,974		36,570	40,303.74		40,303.74
Improvements (except hospital)		281,160		342,485	326,073.05		326,073.05
Timber		60,740		81,488	308,178.33		81,488.00
Grand total		1,605,410		2,053,117	2,614,778.95		1,725,530.55

On Wednesday, November 26, the conference reconvened and we, the negotiating committee, submitted an offer in writing in the sum of $2,500,000, covering the same matters and items previously set out in the offer of the Corps of Engineers. We submitted the offer for the tribe with the reservation that, in the event a compromise

should fail, the making of the offer of $2,500,000 shall not prejudice our return to the original figure of $2,614,778.95."

The signed offer which we made is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF THE TRIBAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE OF THE CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL SUBMITTED TO THE NEGOTIATORS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 870 ON NOVEMBER 26, 1952

"We have reference to the statement submitted and signed by Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold on the same matter now presented. We note the offer of $2,000,000 is made by the Chief of Engineers for the values set out in the engineer's statement. In that document the offer by the trial negotiators was stated as $2,614,778.95 for land to be conveyed, for individual severance, for private improvements, and for timber.

"The tribal negotiators have considered the offer made by the Chief of Engineers and cannot agree to the amount offered. As an offer made in compromise, the tribal negotiators now amend their offer and say that for the sum of $2,500,000 for the elements of value above stated they are willing to go on with negotiations concerning the remaining matters set out in the draft of contract heretofore presented under Public Law 870 and as previously presented to the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior. We submit this offer with the understanding that in the event a compromise fails, the making of this offer shall not prejudice our return to the original figure, to wit: $2,614,778.95.

"FRANK DUCHENEAUX,
"Chairman,
"JOHN LITTLE CLOUD,
"Member,
"ALEX CHASING HAWK,
"Member,
"FELIX BENOIST,
"Member,
"SIDNEY CLAYMORE,
"Member,
"EDWARD CLAYMORE,
"Member,
"LLOYD LE BEAU,
"Member, Negotiating Committee,
"Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council.
"Signed: November 26, 1952."

Maj. Gen. George J. Nold stated in response to our offer in compromise of $2,500,000 that the offer made by the Corps of Engineers of $2,000,000 was its final offer and our offer of $2,500,000 would not be considered.

The representative of the Secretary of the Interior did not make an offer and the matter stood in disagreement. General Nold asked the question whether or not we cared to discuss other provisions set out in the draft of contract which we had laid before the conference; whereupon we replied that since no agreement had been reached, and since it was evident no agreement could be reached on values, we regarded as useless a discussion of further legislative provisions in our proposed draft of contract for the Oahe project. Thereupon, on the motion of the representative of the Secretary of the Interior the conference adjourned.

Attention is now directed to the proviso contained in section 5 of Public Law 870, Eighty-second Congress hereinbefore set out. Under that proviso we are reporting to the Congress on the matters which have not been agreed to for consideration and determination by the Congress.

We have rewritten but have not changed materially the opening provisions of our original draft of the contract for the purpose of stating the matter more nearly in legislative language. We have in our draft of the proposed legislation necessarily omitted references to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Interior insofar as negotiations are concerned.

The entire matter is now submitted to the Congress in two items only: (1) this report and (2) the bill which accompanies it, to which we give our assent and to which we have complete confidence that our Sioux people of the Cheyenne River Reservation will agree.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK DUCHENEAUX,
Chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council.
LLOYD LE BEAU,
Member of Tribal Council.
ALEX CHASING HAWK,
Member of Tribal Council.
JOHN LITTLE CLOUD,
Member of Tribal Council.

Dated: January 29, 1953.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after 16 years in this House most of the older Members have come to classify me as one of the conservative Members of the House; but in spite of that fact, I want to on this occasion say a good word for the Townsend plan.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago during the House debate on H. R. 6000, a bill to revamp our unsound social-security system, I said:

When I compare the two programs for social security—the one contained in H. R. 6000 and the one contained in the Townsend plan—I am convinced that the Townsend plan is to be preferred to H. R. 6000. In my opinion, after careful consideration, the Townsend plan is more equitable, more practical, more just, much easier and cheaper to administer, and less costly in the long run.

Today the 3,200 members of the United States Chamber of Commerce by the overwhelming vote of 16 to 1 have endorsed the two principal planks of the Townsend plan, namely:

First. Complete coverage of all aged people.

Second. Pay-as-you-go basis for the social-security system.

Mr. Speaker, when a Nation-wide organization as powerful and important as the United States Chamber of Commerce endorses the main features of the Townsend plan, and at the same time points out how unsound our present system of social security is, that is real progress.

The fact that such action was taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce demonstrates the effectiveness of the campaign that the Townsend Clubs have been carrying on in the face of ridicule, political obstacles, and New Deal propaganda. It should also advance the cause of the worthy old people of the Nation and speed up the time when they will be given just, proper, and adequate support.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

OPERATION SMACK

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made this morning to the so-called Operation Smack in Korea. I knew nothing about this so-called operation until last evening, when a Boston reporter called me. This morning I wish to advise Members of the House that the Committee on Armed Services has contacted the Vice Chief of Staff, General Hull, who is Acting Chief in the absence of General Collins. He has already cabled General Collins twice. General Collins, Chief of Staff, who is in northern Japan now and has been in Korea for the past 2 or 3 days, will return home over this week end. He will be only too glad to give us the full facts about certain allegations and charges that have been made. It is inconceivable to me that our military leaders out there would uselessly sacrifice human life. I cannot believe it. I think when the full facts are known the furor that has been created will silently pass away. We do want to know the full story and get the true picture, which I assure you you will get on General Collins' return.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for price support at 100 percent of parity for the 1953 and 1954 crops to apply to each of the basic agricultural commodities.

This bill is in keeping with our President's commitment and I am sure that it is in keeping with his present wishes. I wish to quote an excerpt from our President's speech at Kasson, Minn. I quote verbatim:

Here and now, without any ifs or buts, I say to you that I stand behind, and the Republican Party stands behind, the amendment to the basic farm act to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income.

A fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since our President has stated that a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity, I hope the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate will report this legislation favorably at the quickest possible date and that the Congress will immediately approve the legislation so that our President's promises to the farmers can be carried out without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the record is crystal clear that the farmers are now getting hit harder than any other segment of our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

great industrial America and by carrying out our President's commitments and wishes farmers will be afforded a fair share of the national income.

PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if the people of Louisana indicated anything in the recent election, it was that they as a whole want tax reduction. I think the best way to begin tax reduction is to increase the personal income-tax exemption, and my bill in the House of Representatives to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 will accomplish this purpose. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to take up this measure and incorporate its provisions in a tax-reduction bill to be presented to the House of Representatives.

Regardless of what may happen to this bill, I stand for reasonable tax reduction. I read in the press that Chairman Reed of the Ways and Means Committee will present a tax reduction measure during the month of February, and I want to say now, if the measure gives hope of any reasonable tax reduction for the average man, I expect to support it or some similar measure which will better accomplish this result.

JOSÉ MARTÍ AND WILLIAM RUFUS KING

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, José Martí, the hero of Cuban independence whose greatness of spirit makes him a heroic figure in the history of freedom throughout the hemisphere, was born 100 years ago, January 28, 1853, in Havana, Cuba.

It is fitting that we should recall his honored name in the Congress of the United States on this centenary day. Martí believed in our democracy, and sought in it a pattern for his own people. He visited many countries, sometimes as a voluntary, sometimes as an involuntary, exile, in his campaign for the freedom of Cuba; but it was in the United States that he launched and carried on his most continuous and most successful labors. His prolonged campaigns in the press and in innumerable public forums were part of a brilliant strategy of informing the United States, and through his contributions to the Latin-American press, the other American Republics, about conditions on the Island. He made friends for his cause; and won support among the people generally, in the Halls of Congress, and in powerful editorial columns. Martí was not to see the final victory—he was, in fact, killed in his first battle, in 1895—but there can be no doubt that victory was largely due to his selfless, tireless zeal.

I firmly believe that no man in history ever asked less of his native country than José Martí, or gave it more. Cuba makes proud testimony of this debt. Everywhere in the Republic of Cuba, in cities, towns, and villages, are statues of José Martí erected by his grateful countrymen. Parks, avenues, and schools bear his name. In both poetry and prose he is quoted, every day of every year, more often than any other Cuban. His wise and enlightened statesmanship is still constantly invoked. He is, in short, a living figure whose force was not extinguished nor even diminished by death.

Time and again Martí gave eloquent expression to his conviction that the rights of a free people are not mere privileges, but civic obligations. The real independence of a people, he held, consists in the respect of the citizen for his government and likewise of the government for the rights of every citizen. He looked with yearning toward the peace for which his struggles were being waged. In war, command means destruction, he said; but in peace, it must mean construction; and he added that no edifice ever had bayonets as its foundation. Nevertheless, for all his love of peace, his way was a hero's way, and his death a hero's death. He might have been describing himself, with prevision of his own fate, when he told his fellow-countrymen that, fortunately for the world, there will always be some men who are willing to lead without any thought of reward, to suffer for the sake of other men, and, if necessary, to give their own lives for the burning in order to light the way for others.

In the centenary of José Martí, Alabama feels a special part. This year is also the centenary of a memorable event in Cuban-United States relations. In March 1853 William Rufus King, of Alabama, was authorized by special legislation of the Congress to take his oath as Vice President of the United States in Cuba. This event preceded his death by a few weeks only. I wish to associate today the memory of these two illustrious Americans; recalling the coincidence of history by which that eminent citizen of Alabama, Vice President King, died in the year which saw the birth of Cuba's apostle of freedom, José Martí.

THE WONDERFUL WORLD OF BOOKS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a book which is so unusual and holds out such great promise for the future that I think it justifies the attention of the House. Its title is "The Wonderful World of Books." Its publication represents a notable cooperative effort among the individuals and organizations of our country which are most concerned with education in its broadest sense.

The Wonderful World of Books has been edited by Alfred Stefferud, editor of the Department of Agriculture Yearbook. It is illustrated by Robert Osborne. The whole text is a guide to the pleasure and profits of reading. There are 72 articles, written by leading authors, legislators, clergymen, educators, librarians, farm leaders, book sellers, and publishers. The introductory article is by our former colleague in this House, T. V. Smith. Another contribution is by that distinguished member of the other legislative body, Senator LISTER HILL.

The Wonderful World of Books will appear simultaneously on February 25 in two editions, a 35-cent paper-bound Mentor book published by the New American Library of World Literature, Inc., and a $2 cloth-bound edition published by Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. The book will be sold at book stores and newsstands in this country and overseas and will undoubtedly reach millions of people.

As Alfred Stefferud, editor, says in his introduction:

> This is a book to encourage people—all of us—to read more and to encourage efforts to make books more easily available to more people.

The articles cover every aspect of books and reading, from instilling a love of reading in children to the resources of libraries from the Library of Congress at one end of the scale to the county bookmobile at the other. An entire section of the book is devoted to organizing reading programs and to using and improving local library facilities.

The Wonderful World of Books was inspired by the Conference on Rural Reading held in Washington, D. C., in September 1951, under the auspices of the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service with the cooperation of the national farm, education, religious and labor organizations, the American Library Association, and the American Book Publishers Council. Many present at the conference urged that the illuminating discussion be made available in greatly expanded and permanent form to a large audience.

The resulting collaboration contains information and inspiration, not only for those interested in rural life, but for all those interested in the expansion of good reading in our country. All of us in this House know that an informed electorate is of the very essence of democracy. I believe that this book can be invaluable in contributing to that great objective.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT WOOD, WIS.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years, various veterans' groups in Milwaukee County, welfare organizations, and individuals such as myself, have been seriously concerned about the condition of facilities at the Veterans' Administration center at Wood, Wis.

Of grave concern to all of us have been the inadequate and outmoded facilities at Wood, Wis., particularly the antiquated, unsafe domiciliary buildings which presently house approximately 1,600 elder and disabled veterans. Many complaints have been received and carefully investigated, and efforts have been exerted to remedy the situation.

One of the most pressing deficiencies of the hospital at Wood, Wis., was, until recently, the lack of facilities for treating psychotic, other psychiatric, and neurological cases. In an effort to change that situation, I had repeatedly conferred with Veterans' Administration officials and with the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, trying to find some way whereby adequate funds could be allocated for the activation of a new psychiatric ward. The community was immensely gratified when such funds were finally allocated, and the annex reactivated.

This temporary relief, however, did in no way diminish the need for reappraising the entire situation at Wood, Wis. The hospital buildings remained outmoded and inconvenient, and the domiciliary facilities as antiquated, deteriorated, and unsafe as before. Despite these severe shortcomings, the authorities at this center have been doing what they could to extend the best possible service to our veterans, and their efforts should be commended.

Bearing the above-mentioned facts in mind, the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, composed of 17 major veterans organizations in Milwaukee County, adopted the following resolution which was transmitted to me together with the letter appearing below:

ALLIED VETERANS
COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE COUNTY,
January 20, 1953.

The Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: The Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, after long and careful study of the matter, passed the enclosed resolution.

The Allied Veterans Council is composed of 17 major veterans organizations in this county. These organizations are in turn broken down into 140 veterans posts or units. Our information, in addition to our own study of this matter, came from the various service officers of these organizations who are in constant contact with the facilities at Wood, Wis. This information convinces us of the necessity of new hospital construction and the early abandonment of many of the old buildings, which, for the most part, are over 70 years old.

We are satisfied that you have the interest of the veterans of Wisconsin at heart and that you will do everything possible to promote legislation directed toward remedying this unfortunate situation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. EOCIAN,
President.
RICHARD D. CAREY,
Chairman, Veterans Affairs.

"Whereas all the member organizations of the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County recognize the very definite need for a new hospital at Wood, Wis.; and

"Whereas the old hospital could be utilized to house domiciliary activities and thus eliminate the present unsafe, untenable, and unsightly domiciliary buildings; and

"Whereas the present hospital has inadequate and outmoded facilities and is highly crowded and inconvenient, awkward to work in, rearranging and remodeling could not correct the errors; and

"Whereas Wood, Wis., because of the proximity of nationally known medical schools and the large number of experts in the medical field located in Milwaukee, would be ideally located for the building of such a hospital; and

"Whereas the present hospital-bed capacity at Wood, Wis., is inadequate to care for American veterans of all wars: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That a new hospital be requested at Wood, Wis., in an area adjacent to the existing hospital building; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of our United States Senators and each of the Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin, and to Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs."

After a careful examination of this situation, and consideration of the facts brought to my attention by the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, as well as by other veterans and welfare organizations, I have prepared, and am introducing today, a bill calling for the construction of a new 1,500-bed general hospital at Wood, Wis., and for the conversion of the present hospital into domiciliary units.

My bill envisions a 203-bed increase in the overtaxed facilities at Wood, Wis. It would make possible substantial improvement in the medical and domiciliary services rendered to our veterans at that center, and it would do away with the necessity of refusing admittance or transfer privileges to those Wisconsin veterans who today have to seek hospitalization in VA hospitals located a considerable distance from their homes and families.

I sincerely hope this legislation will receive early consideration and approval.

REVISION AND EXTENSION OF 1949 REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask for a 30-minute special order today to put into the RECORD some vital information regarding the revision and extension of the 1949 Reorganization Act. But, respecting the leadership of the House, as I do, and also knowing the reason for the program today in memory of my former esteemed colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I refrained from asking for that special order. However, I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a chart of statistics and certain other extraneous material bearing on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we Democrats on the Committee on Government Operations gave President Eisenhower complete support in the bill which he wanted, is that not correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. As the newspapers carry the story, 15 Republicans voted against the act and 14 Democrats voted to give to President Eisenhower the same authority that we gave to President Truman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MANPOWER SITUATION IN AGRICULTURAL AREAS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, 994 central Minnesota farmers attended a meeting at Albany, Minn., on October 13, 1952, to consider the growing seriousness of the manpower situation in the agricultural areas of this country.

These farmers fully realized the hard problem facing their neighbors on local selective-service boards in meeting the need for men in the Armed Services. Recognizing the relationship between military manpower and farm manpower problems, the purpose of the meeting was a constructive one. In the traditional spirit of democracy's town hall, the farmers who gathered at the meeting wanted to call their problem to the attention of the Selective Service System and the Congress.

Today I am presenting the resolution to the House of Representatives in the sincere hope that these constructive suggestions toward the solution of this grave problem will be given every consideration in the formulation of manpower policy. Following are the resolutions adopted at the Albany meeting:

Whereas Stearns County and central Minnesota's main activity is the diversified type of farming in which various technical farm machinery is operated and selective registered livestock are produced;

Whereas the highly technical mechanized equipment now in operation on farms, such as hay balers, combines, etc., requiring skill and experience for its operation which can only be acquired by apprenticeship of 4 or 5 years of operation;

Whereas the young men of central Minnesota, who have such skill and experience acquired same from several years' experience and training, they cannot be replaced by persons from other walks of life until such persons have had several years' experience assuming that they would remain on the farm or in agricultural pursuit long enough to acquire this experience and training;

Whereas a great many of the younger experienced operators, who are being removed from their agricultural connection, fail to return to agriculture, consequently, it is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

apparent that in the near future the fathers and older men cannot be replaced because of the lack of young trained agricultural workers, who are trained to repair and operate technical mechanized equipment and attend to valuable dairy cows, poultry, and other livestock, keeping breeding, production, and registration records.

Whereas in many instances when young men are taken from the agricultural pursuit and placed in the military service upon their return they choose not again to engage in agriculture because of the shorter hours they have experienced and the higher pay they can secure in other fields;

Whereas this large mass meeting is being held on this 13th day of October A. D. 1952, at 8 p. m. at the high-school auditorium at Albany, Stearns County, Minn.:

Resolved—

1. That the local selective-service board's decisions with reference to classification not be interfered with unless in exceptional cases and that in case where an appeal has been made and a classification given to the registrant, in case of a change in status or new evidence, he shall have the right to have same reviewed or reconsidered by the local board.

2. That in determining the classification of agricultural workers that the unit system be put into effect and that if a certain number of units exist that the registrant would be entitled to a certain classification.

3. That provision and consideration be given to hardship cases, such as taking a son into service which will result in liquidating or selling a herd of livestock which has been the result of 30 or 40 years of selective breeding, thereby destroying a valuable farm unit, which it would take years to replace.

We the undersigned having taken part in passing the above resolution do hereby sign our names as evidence of our support and request that said resolution be called to the attention of the proper authorities or the Congress of the United States of America.

Dated at Albany, Minn., this 13th day of October A. D. 1952.

Mr. Speaker, living as I do in a farm community, I am amazed at the shortage of manpower on our farms today. In my own community, manpower was more plentiful during the darkest days of World War II than it is today.

High industrial employment has attracted both boys and girls from our farms. Many returning from military service are unable to enter the field of agriculture because of the high cost of operation. The price of Minnesota farm land is at an all-time high. It is evident in reviewing farm records that the cost of operation continues to rise while income is steadily declining and reducing the narrow profit margin of successful operation. It is impossible for farmers to pay the wages paid in industry today. All of these factors tend to discourage a new operator from starting on a farm venture.

Every local selective-service board deals with many cases of extreme hardship caused by drafting farm workers and they have granted deferments under the law. However, the State appeal board has reclassified men without regard to hardship and has denied registrants the right of appeal which I am sure Congress intended to grant to every man.

American agriculture is a highly complex operation, requiring not only technical knowledge and ability to operate machinery but the great skill required in the care of livestock. Our dairy farms and livestock farms have been hit hardest by the manpower shortage.

Instances have been called to my attention where the only man in the operation who had knowledge of breeding programs was denied deferment. In some instances the only man on the farm with the health, knowledge, and ability to carry on the operation has been denied deferment.

The loss to Minnesota agriculture will be felt for some time. Many farmers have been forced to reduce operations or stop them entirely. This has meant the end of a lifetime's work in building up breeding herds and improving the farm. Oftentimes it has meant forced liquidation at inopportune times. I am sure this was never intended by Congress in passing the Selective Service Act.

A serious misunderstanding has arisen. Altogether too many people working with selective service have said we do not need farmers.

Mr. Speaker, it is often stated on the floor of this House that what our enemies fear most is our production. I submit to you that it is not a wise policy to place our country in jeopardy by curtailment of farm production which will result from our present deferment policy.

We must recognize the need of producing raw materials to keep our industrial output high. This Congress has a responsibility in defining a selective-service policy to be followed in agricultural deferments in order that our production will remain strong. I hope this Congress will take action. It is imperative that we do so.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] will make some remarks today with reference to the birthday anniversary of one of our great Presidents. All of us as Americans revere the memory of the late William McKinley. The remarks that may be made by the gentleman from Ohio will be such that all of us can join with him in them.

However, tomorrow is the birthday anniversary of another great President, the late immortal Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As we are not meeting tomorrow I take the opportunity on this occasion to make reference to this great man. It is most fitting and proper, and I think highly commendable that the House pause on the birthday anniversaries of Presidents who have taken the journey into the Great Beyond, to make reference to their great services. It has a far-reaching effect on our people, particularly those attending our schools and universities.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was one of the strong Presidents of our country. Particularly in times of emergency, the President has got to be firm and strong, because the President of the United States is sitting in the chair of history and of destiny. President Roosevelt will go down in history as a great humanitarian, but he will also occupy prominent pages in history as a strong President and a firm leader of our people. Franklin D. Roosevelt's place in history is important. Countless generations in the future, in all lands, people will talk about him and the great leadership he gave in one of the most trying periods in the history of man.

In joining with my friend in commemorating the birthday anniversary of the late William McKinley I also wanted to make these few remarks about another great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose birthday anniversary is tomorrow.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The lady has already had a 1-minute speech today. That is the number allocated to each Member.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is informational, Mr. Speaker, and I thought possibly I might be allowed to give it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels he must observe the rules laid down by the House.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on H. R. 1979, dealing with the extension of the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to make an announcement regarding the program for next week.

As has been heretofore arranged, we will have a joint session on Monday to hear the President deliver his message on the state of the Union.

As I understand it, the Rules Committee is meeting tomorrow on a resolution before it to continue in operation the House Select Committee on Small Business. If that rule is reported, as I think it will be, I expect to call that matter up on Tuesday next.

Under unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the bill to provide an Under Secretary of State will come up for consideration on Tuesday, with 1 hour of general debate. I do not know whether it will be followed by the Committee on Government Operations. I do not know what may happen with respect to the rule thereon or what may ultimately be determined as to action in the other body or here. There is a possibility that that proposal coming from the Committee on Government Operations, may be called up next week although I am not sure about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The understanding I had in committee—of course, the leadership determines the matter ultimately—there was a hope and intention of bringing up the extension of the Reorganization Act next Tuesday. Would it be possible for the gentleman to give a little more specific information for the benefit of the Members, assuming the rule is reported out? Of course, that bill would go through the House without any controversy if a plain extension of the law can be arranged for. I was wondering if the gentleman could give a more definite idea as to what day it might be called up.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly would yield to my very good friend from Massachusetts the right and the power to determine just what might be controversial, but in specific answer to the question I think probably I could say that if the measure is called next week it would be on Tuesday.

JOHN C. MONTGOMERY

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] to address the House under his special order.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic death of a certain person has created an atmosphere of wonderment over the manner in which official Washington has permitted or not permitted this news to get to the press.

Last Sunday morning, John C. Montgomery, a 42-year-old State Department official, took his own life. His nude body, with fragments of a bathrobe cord and a hemp rope, was found in the home he shared with a Washington attorney, A. Marvin Braverman.

Montgomery was in charge of the Finnish desk in the State Department, a confidential position in which he handled classified documents. It may be no more than a coincidence that he worked in a Government agency where Communists, Communist sympathizers, and poor loyalty risks have plagued our security. In view of the fact that Montgomery brought his own life to an end, we should not assume that he was innocent of such associations. For our own sakes, as well as for his, we should know whether or not he was innocent.

There has been entirely too much secrecy surrounding the death of this State Department official. There are stories being bruited about that police have been told not to talk. There has been protection, it is said, for Montgomery's former associates and their activities. Of course, the innocent should be protected, but protection should not be carried to the point where the public may be injured. If this is a case where a person has destroyed his life for personal reasons, a thorough investigation will establish that fact. If it is not such a case, the public is entitled to know the motive. Mystery and secrecy will not suffice.

It has been hinted that Montgomery was despondent because he was lonely and unmarried. From all appearances, he was very popular and was a bachelor by choice. There are some stories that he was dissatisfied with his pace of promotion in his chosen field; yet it would appear that his promotion was fairly rapid, as he was head of the Finnish desk after about 6 years with the State Department.

We have learned very little about this State Department official from the newspaper accounts of his suicide. As I said before, it was reported that he shared a fashionable Georgetown home with a local attorney. Neither Montgomery nor the Washington attorney had ever married. This is not unusual, but it is not customary. We do know the identity of some of the people with whom these two men spent last Saturday evening, but we do not know who was at their home the evening before.

The name of the Washington attorney had, in times past, been linked romantically with the name of a daughter of a former President, and, on the very evening that tragic death called at his home, he had been escorting the daughter of a governor to a social funotion. When he arrived home, according to his story, he found the body of his friend.

What did he do? There are many questions that remain unanswered. It has been said that this attorney called a district commissioner at 5 a. m., asking what he should do. Does that sound logical? What law school did he attend? As an attorney, or even as an ordinary citizen, he should have known that the proper thing to do was to call the police, and to do that at once. There is reason to believe that some time elapsed between the discovery of Montgomery's body and the call to a district commissioner. What happened during that time? Did Montgomery leave a note, as suicides generally do? Was such a note destroyed to protect the dead, and perhaps some living?

Now is the time to investigate these matters—not 6 months from now when trails are cold and witnesses may not be available. From past experience we cannot expect that the State Department nor the police authorities will be either anxious or willing to make known to the public all the facts surrounding a case of this kind. If this was just an ordinary suicide, then I would take the position that it would be a case for the police authorities. But this is not such a case. Because it is not such a case I am directing the following letter to the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN, chairman of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, asking that a full investigation of this case be made by his committee:

JANUARY 29, 1953.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee,
House of Representatives.

My DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am enclosing a copy of my remarks in the House of Representatives today, and respectfully ask that the Government Operations Committee make a thorough investigation surrounding the death of John C. Montgomery, to the end that the public will be informed as to the facts connected with this case.

Sincerely,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress, Third District, Illinois.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to thank you as our presiding officer for your kindness in yielding to me sufficient time this afternoon to have the Members of our great body pay their respects to one of the greatest of many great men that our country has produced and who have been Members of the House of Representatives.

About 20 years ago, having long since been convinced that William McKinley was one of the greatest of all Congressmen, I thought it would be very fitting and appropriate if the Members of Congress would spend a few minutes on McKinley's birthday to remind the people of this day and generation what a great statesman William McKinley was. We have continued that practice and I hope we will keep it up.

I think that what the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], just said about this custom that we Ohio Congressmen have followed is very appropriate. But I should like to have it understood that those of us who were responsible for asking this privilege with reference to William McKinley did not do so only because we felt he had been a great President. We did it because we felt that the greatest work that William McKinley did for his country was the work that he did on the floor of this House in a very critical period in the history of our country.

When William McKinley was 18 years of age he left the little country school where he was a teacher and went to Columbus, Ohio, where he enlisted in the United States Army in the great War Between the States. There he met Rutherford B. Hayes, who was then a captain in the Army. A warm friendship developed between these two men, a friendship that lasted throughout their lives. When Rutherford B. Hayes became President his warm personal friend became a Member of Congress—that was the time of the reconstruction period and when the very life of the Nation was at stake from a legislative standpoint, Hayes and McKinley working together, did a magnificent job. Although President Hayes declined to run for a second term, Mr. McKinley continued to serve in Congress for many years.

When William McKinley got further along in the war he distinguished himself very conspicuously as a great soldier

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and a great leader of men. But we did not give special consideration to his war career, although it was very outstanding, for many people have done that; but few if any men have been so prominently connected with the Congress of the United States and then gone to the Presidency. So I am glad to see today again how loyally the Members on the other side of the aisle wear the red carnation. The carnation was McKinley's favorite flower and it now is the State flower of Ohio.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] spoke I was reminded of one experience that has come into my life and that is that strong friendships are made here in Congress between men who are nearly always on opposite sides in legislative controversies. For instance, Mr. Nick Longworth and Mr. John Garner waged many a battle on the floor of this House but I never saw a finer friendship develop between any two individuals than developed between Nick Longworth and Jack Garner.

William McKinley sat over here to my left I am told. In those days they had desks. William Tyler Page, who some of you older Members will remember with pride, told me how eloquently Mr. McKinley could present the tariff issues. He told me how on the other side of the aisle there was another man from Texas who did not agree with McKinley and who with great ability presented the other side of the issue. Those two great statesmen, one from Texas and one from Ohio, were the real leaders in their time. There developed a friendship between them which historians say was truly wonderful. I refer to Roger Q. Mills. McKinley fought through the Civil War in the Union Army with great distinction. Mills fought through the War Between the States with great distinction. Both fought each other in Congress with great ability and distinction and each maintained his honor in every conflict.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for this time to consume it all myself. We have in our membership a man who has the honor of representing part of the territory that McKinley represented when he was a Member of Congress. He is Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I now yield to Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON such time as he may desire.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today we memorialize the one hundred and tenth birthday of an Ohio son, the twenty-fourth President of the United States, William McKinley. Through the years the leadership in this House has graciously granted the Ohio delegation the courtesy to say a few words in his memory. I thank my distinguished colleague, the dean of our delegation, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, for giving me the opportunity to add my tribute to those given here today and in the years gone by.

The story of William McKinley's life is known to every schoolboy. His rise from average birth in Niles, Ohio, in 1843, to the Presidency in 1896, his reelection in 1900 and his tragic assassination—these are facts of history well known to all.

In these days of turmoil in the world, however, when once again the threat of total war and of cheap money hangs over our land, let us honor the character of the man who led this Nation out of similar perils, in the hope, perchance, that by considering his strength we may fortify our own.

From even the briefest consideration of his life, certain facets of William McKinley's character stand out as beacons to guide all who would emulate him. In all of his dealings, and in his thinking, he was fair and courteous. His respect for others and for their rights; his sincerity; and his logic based on a knowledge gained from hard work, won him admiration and respect. Never pugnacious, never profane or vulgar, never self-assertive, he put on no airs and refused to indulge in personalities. And yet, he was ardent in his advocacy of his beliefs and skilled in their presentation and their defense. It was his devotion to his principles and adherence to them for which he is perhaps best known.

The persuasive advocate of the protective tariff, McKinley fought for it because he felt it offered benefits for all the people—for the growth of the entire Nation. He did not believe in class legislation or in classes in America. Thus, he believed that political issues should divide the Nation vertically, not horizontally; that rich and poor, high and low, should be found in both political parties; and that if there was anything intrinsically dangerous to our political system, it was the effort to set class against class. Therefore, he believed in the principle of protection, not for a part of but for all the people, and he fought for it all his life.

But let his own words show the depth of his conviction and his devotion to it. Olcott tells us, that during debate in the Forty-eighth Congress, McKinley was speaking of the hardships that result to labor from free trade, saying "I speak for the workingman of my district, the workingman of Ohio, and of the country," when Springer interrupted with the uncalled-for remark:

> They did not speak for you very largely at the last election.

Quickly turning on his opponent, McKinley, with flashing eye, but with no show of anger, replied impressively:

> Ah, my friend, my fidelity to my constituents is not measured by the support they give me. [Great applause.] I have convictions upon this subject which I would not surrender or refrain from advocating if 10,000 majority had been entered against me last October.

No partial recital of McKinley's virtues would be proper, however, without attention being drawn to his intense sense of honor and integrity. Perhaps the best illustration of this can be drawn from his remarks on the floor of the Republican National Convention in 1888. McKinley was there as a delegate from Ohio pledged to his friend, John Sherman. On the fourth ballot, it became clear that a dark horse might win but that Sherman could not. Nonetheless, when his name was pressed, and though he knew he might win the nomination, McKinley rose to say, in part:

> It has pleased certain delegates to cast their votes for me for President. I am not insensible of the honor they would do me, but in the presence of the duty resting upon me I cannot remain silent with honor. I cannot consistently with my own views of personal integrity, consent, or seem to consent, to permit my name to be used as a candidate before this convention. I would not respect myself if I could find it in my heart to do so, or permit to be done that which could even be ground for anyone to suspect that I wavered in my loyalty to Ohio, or my devotion to the chief of her choice and the chief of mine. I do not request—I demand, that no delegate who would not cast reflection upon me shall cast a ballot for me.

This same devotion to principle, integrity, and recognition of the rights of others which were so noticeable during his service in Congress were the guideposts of his life. Along with them was a simple humility arising out of his devotion to a cause and to a Being greater than us all, which lent his life a dignity and greatness for all time.

In his last speech before his death, the fineness and beauty of his character shine through his words, which the world would do well to remember today:

> Let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors and like blessings to all the peoples and the powers of earth.

Mr. Speaker, may I again express my appreciation of the privilege of presenting this view of a great Ohioan, President William McKinley, who made such an outstanding record as a Member of this House as well as a President of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor now to represent in this House the district that was represented by William McKinley. I appreciate the fact that the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], arranges these memorials each year. May I compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] on the fine address he has made today on the life of William McKinley.

The people of the Sixteenth District revere the memory of the great McKinley. They revere him not alone as a great President or a great statesman but as a great friend and neighbor. There are very few there now who still remember him, but the story of William McKinley and his kindness to all of his neighbors and friends will live in the memories of all the people of the Sixteenth District throughout time.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with other Members of the House today in paying tribute to William McKinley, one of this Nation's greatest Presidents, on the occasion of the one hundred and tenth anniversary of his birth.

William McKinley, although he was not born in my Sixteenth Ohio District, did spend most of his life there, and we in the city of Canton, Ohio, and surrounding area are extremely proud of him. We take pride in his record of entering the Union Army as a private and emerging as a major.

We take pride in his service to our community as the prosecuting attorney of Stark County, a position he attained when only 26 years of age. We are

proud of the fact that our forebears had the wisdom to send William McKinley to Congress in 1876, at the age of 33, and to keep him there for seven consecutive terms, for it was in this very House that McKinley laid the ground work for his later elevation to the Presidency.

We take additional pride in the fact that William McKinley's record in the House of Representatives was so outstanding that not only the people of my district but the people of the entire State of Ohio came to recognize him as an exceptionally able leader. For this reason they elected him Governor of Ohio in 1891 for the first of two terms.

While Governor of Ohio, McKinley continued to ably dispatch the duties of office in such a manner as to gain further attention from political leaders throughout the Nation. As a result, when it came time to name a Republican candidate for President in 1896, the name of William McKinley quickly came to the fore.

As every Member of the House will recall from his study of history, McKinley won that election of 1896, and was reelected in 1900. His administrations marked a high tide in the progress of the United States. With the aid of the protective tariffs which had been fostered by McKinley while he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, American industry prospered and expanded, providing employment for an ever-increasing number of people.

The growth of industry brought increased prosperity and a higher standard of living for all Americans. It brought with it more contact with foreign lands, as is always the case with a growing nation. McKinley handled the foreign policy problems which resulted from our expansion with the same capability as that he displayed in solving domestic problems. As a result of the straightforward, Christian, but firm foreign policy which McKinley fostered, the United States of America had by 1900 finally become recognized throughout the world as a mature and highly respected member of the family of nations.

These are the facets of the life of William McKinley which are best known by the average American. His actions as Member of Congress, Governor of Ohio, and President of the United States are detailed fully and favorably in any standard history book. And, as I mentioned earlier, we in McKinley's home town are proud of his accomplishments along this line.

However, it is for reasons entirely aside from his accomplishments in public office that we retain in our hearts a special niche for William McKinley. Nor are we alone in this recognition of the other special qualities which made William McKinley great.

When one hears members of the opposite political party joining in the eulogy of McKinley, as has so often happened here, it is an indication that McKinley was indeed a very special sort of man.

When one realizes that the McKinley monument in Canton, Ohio, was built not by the Government, nor by the contributions of millionaire friends, but through the gift of pennies by thousands of American school children, there is further proof that William McKinley held a special place in the hearts of the American people.

What was this special quality? Was it simply the fact that McKinley died from an assassin's bullet? Hardly—Garfield too was assassinated, yet he never was held in the high esteem of McKinley, and I do not wish to demean President Garfield, of whom we in Ohio are also proud.

No, there was something special in the make-up of William McKinley which caused all who knew him to revere him. That something, I am convinced, was an ample supply of the milk of human kindness.

Nearly every reference to McKinley contains some allusion to his love for his fellow man. All who knew him testify to this great quality. In fact, among those still living who knew William McKinley well, there is usually more reference to McKinley's friendliness, the happiness of his home, and his deep love for his wife, Ida Saxton McKinley, than there is to his achievements in public office.

Note the words which appear on his monument in Canton:

> In memory of William McKinley. A good citizen, a brave soldier, wise executive, helper and leader of men, exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the state, society, and the home.

Note again that final phrase, "exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the state, society, and the home."

That is how the people of William McKinley's home town felt about him. So widespread was this regard and respect for McKinley on the part of his friends and neighbors that today there is hardly a town in our part of Ohio which does not have a McKinley Avenue, a McKinley High School, or some other symbol of the esteem in which he is held. And so it will always be, for William McKinley early in life was marked down as one who loved his fellow men, and who, for that reason, was in turn loved by his fellow men.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the life and services of the late William McKinley at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the last Spanish-American War veteran in this body my comrades of that conflict would not wish me to remain silent when loving tributes are beflowering the memory of William McKinley. On last Memorial Day in a cemetery in Chicago I stood with the members of William McKinley Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans between the rows of gray-white markers over the graves of volunteer soldiers and sailors who in their youth had answered the call of President McKinley. It bespeaks the sentiment of Spanish-American War veterans that one of their largest camps is named in his honor. I have never known a veteran of the war with Spain to mention the name of William McKinley without revealing in the tones of his voice his deep and abiding affection for the Commander in Chief in the White House when the century was near the turning point and America was starting on the road to world destiny. I think it appropriate on this anniversary occasion to remark the sense of warm personal affection which the volunteers of 1898 felt for the President. In unanimity and in sweeping intensity, I venture to say, it has never been surpassed. The affection and reverence of every Spanish War veteran for William McKinley continues unabated until the end beneath the gray-white marker in a cemetery where on Memorial Days other veterans will come with red carnations and the other flowers of the springtime.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES A. EATON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of real sadness and of personal loss that I announce to the House the passing, on January 23, 1953, of a distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Charles A. Eaton. Less than 3 weeks previously, Dr. Eaton had retired from public life after completing 28 years of uninterrupted and outstanding service as a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Before discussing Dr. Eaton's achievements in Congress, I should like to mention his active early years, which laid the foundation for his fruitful political career. Born in Nova Scotia on March 29, 1868, he was graduated from grammar school at the age of 8, and became head of the family when his father died 4 years later.

At the age of 16, while working his way through high school, he decided to become a minister. After graduation from Acadia University in Nova Scotia in 1890, he went to the Newton (Mass.) Theological Institution from which he was graduated in 1893.

For over a quarter of a century, Dr. Eaton followed a full and successful career as a Baptist minister. He met his future wife, Miss Winifred Parlin, during his first pastoral appointment at Natick, Mass., and they were married in 1895. In that same year he became a naturalized citizen of the United States. He served also at the Bloor Street Church in Toronto, Canada, at the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio, and at the Madison Avenue Church in New York City. In 1919 he formally resigned from the ministry, declaring he could do more good writing than preaching.

During World War I, he served as industrial relations consultant for the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and he also headed the National Service Section of the United States Shipping Board. This broadening of his horizons led Dr. Eaton, after the war, to work as an industrial consultant for the General Electric Co., and also to travel in Europe to study industrial conditions there.

During his ministry, and afterward, Dr. Eaton served as a correspondent for several newspapers. He also assumed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the editorship of Leslie's Weekly. These manifold activities, all handled capably and energetically, give some indication of his abilities, his versatility and his tremendous vitality.

In 1924 Dr. Eaton was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress from New Jersey's Fourth District. He served four consecutive terms as representative of that district. When the State was redistricted he was elected as representative from the present fifth district, which he served for 10 additional consecutive terms, until his retirement on January 3 of this year.

In Congress, Dr. Eaton served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, acting as ranking Republican member for many years, and as its chairman during the Eightieth Congress. During World War II, he became a foremost advocate of a bipartisan foreign policy, supplementing the efforts of Senator Arthur Vandenberg. He helped draft the Republican Party's declaration of adherence to the policy of international cooperation enunciated at Mackinac Island in 1943, and was a key figure in the passage of the European recovery legislation enacted in 1948.

In 1945 he served as a United States delegate to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Later that same year, he went to London as delegate to the United Nations Assembly, serving in the same capacity in New York in 1946.

Besides Dr. Eaton's achievements as an able and conscientious Representative, he had other qualities which endeared him to many friends. He was forthright, candid and outspoken, particularly regarding domestic policies of which he did not approve. He was an experienced leader, moreover, tolerant and wise, eloquent in debate and respected by all who knew him.

His personality was warm and outgoing. Although advancing years finally forced his retirement, his interest never lagged in all sorts and conditions of men and his enthusiasm and vitality sustained him to the end. He was witty and good humored, but also kindly, thoughtful and gentle. His life illustrates the truth of a Psalm which says that "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord, and he delighteth in his way."

In his inaugural address, President Eisenhower referred to three qualities which all Americans cherish—love of truth, pride of work, and devotion to country. In his full and varied life, Dr. Eaton provided a vivid demonstration of these basic virtues. At a meeting here in Washington less than a year ago, he confided that the secret force in his life had been service. Strengthened by an unwavering faith in God, and a devotion to certain fundamental ideals, he was truly a public servant of whom the entire country may be proud. His life will be a continuing inspiration to all of us who knew him.

In extending my deepest sympathy to Dr. Eaton's son and to his five daughters, I feel confident I speak also for the thousands of his constituents and his many friends throughout the country who relied on his good judgment, his steadfastness and his unfailing solicitude. I am sure that I can speak also for his many colleagues who were privileged to serve with him in the service of their country.

In conclusion, I should like to say, as the elected successor to Dr. Eaton, that I shall always seek to measure up to the high standards which he has set. As a new Member, almost half a century the junior of my distinguished predecessor, I feel my responsibilities deeply, and I shall be guided by the lofty principles which shaped his career.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber could be more anxious than I to pay full tribute to Charles A. Eaton, Doc Eaton as he was known to all of us.

No one has more reason to mourn the passing of a beloved colleague and friend.

Well do I remember my earliest days in the Congress of the United States. I was a much younger man then, deeply impressed by my surroundings and awed by the magnitude of the responsibilities of office. It is only natural, in such circumstances that one looks to the older and more experienced Members for guidence and counsel. In my eyes Charley Eaton appeared the epitome of the honest, stalwart, and wise public servant.

And may I say in all sincerity that my earliest judgment of his character and ability was to be confirmed, time and again, down through the years.

It has been well said that Doc Eaton was a true friend of his fellowman. I can attest to the justice of that appraisal.

To me he proved everything that one might expect of a good father.

Charles Eaton was under no obligation to spend his time tutoring a freshman Congressman from Indiana in the complexities of service in the House of Representatives. Yet down through the years this kindly man, burdened as he was with his own tremendous responsibilities, went out of his way to give me the benefit of his experience and his wisdom—and to sustain me with encouragement, with tolerance and with understanding.

I have no doubt there are many others who could give similar testimony to his generous and valued help. Tennyson has said, "I am a part of all that I have met."

Certainly, for my part, any success I have achieved, or may achieve in the future, must be shared in great measure with the memory of the beloved friend whose passing we mourn today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our dear friend and former colleague, Dr. Eaton, is a sad loss to all of us and a great one to our country and to me a personal loss. For between us there existed a close and understanding friendship.

Dr. Eaton was a man of outstanding capacity, extraordinary ability, great courage, all of which he used in the service of God and country.

As a human being he emphasized to the fullest extent humanly possible the two great Commandments: "Love of God," and "Love of Neighbor."

It is unnecessary for me to recount in detail his great achievements as a Member of this body. They are and always will be an important part of the history of our country. Dr. Eaton was a truly great American. While we deeply regret his death and shall miss his presence among us, to those of us who were fortunate enough to know our dear friend Doc Eaton, as we called him, his memory will always remain as an inspiration and a guide. He will always remain as one of our treasured memories.

A poet once said:

> Not a soul beneath the sun
> But what is precious unto one.

Dr. Eaton was precious to everyone he met, to the countless thousands of persons whom he served, to tens of thousands of others who never met him but who knew of him. He was one of the finest, one of the most striking personalities I have ever met; a man of deep faith, a man of sincere convictions, who gave to society, gave to his country, gave to everyone, of his great capacities which God gave him, contributing to the fullest extent humanly possible everything that represented goodness, refinement, and progress.

To those of us who were blessed in knowing Doc Eaton, we have a memory that we shall never forget and will always carry with us until the end of our time.

To the loved ones Dr. Eaton has left behind, his children and grandchildren, I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, dean of the New Jersey delegation [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep regret and a sense of real loss that we learn that our former colleague, Charles A. Eaton, has departed this life.

Dr. Eaton served the Fourth which subsequently became the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States faithfully and well for a period of 28 years. He was first elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress and afterward to each succeeding Congress, including the Eighty-second Congress which was concluded on January 3 of this present year. The large majorities that he received in each of his elections, from the beginning to the end of his long and eventful service, is an indication of the high esteem in which he was held by the constituency he so ably served.

Dr. Eaton, or "Doc" as he was more affectionately called, won the hearts and had the respect of all who knew him. His kindly manner and plain, but wise, philosophy of life endeared him to every Member of the House, regardless of political affiliation. His passing leaves each with that sense of loss that follows the departure of a true friend, one who in daily contact showed the spirit of a brother to his fellowman.

His service was one that exhibited outstanding ability and rare devotion to duty. His activity was not limited to promoting the interests of the congressional district that he represented, although he did that in a highly satis-

factory manner; but he also had a part, an important part, in advancing the welfare of our Nation in its international affairs.

In the field of foreign affairs he was privileged, by reason of his long service as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—chairman for a time and ranking Republican member for many years—to exert a great influence in determining the policies of this Nation in relation to the other nations of the world. He was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco in 1945. He was also a member of the American delegation to the United Nations General Assembly at London in 1945, and at New York in 1946. In the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House and in the international organizations to which I have referred, his voice was always raised in behalf of those principles that would strengthen the peace and security of all nations throughout the world. His influence in promoting world peace and advancing the cause of freedom and justice has indeed been great.

Dr. Eaton lived a life of great usefulness both in Congress and out of Congress. Few men have had the opportunity of service to their fellowman in so many and varied activities. In every one of such activities he has made a record of achievement that makes him outstanding. Recognizing his obligation to promote the welfare of his fellowman he labored faithfully and well to accomplish those things that would be of lasting benefit to them. He lived a useful life in the highest and truest sense of the word.

To his family we extend our heartfelt sympathy and pray God that each of them may find comfort in the knowledge that their loved one lived continuously in an endeavor to fulfill that which was expected of him by his Lord and Master whom he loved and served.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, a small group of us made a pilgrimage to Plainfield to pay our last respects to our friend and colleague, the Honorable Charles A. Eaton. We walked the few blocks from the hotel to the Park Baptist Church where the services were to be held. The church was white, a brilliant white, built on very simple lines. Resting at the foot of the chancel steps was the casket covered with a blanket of smilax with white and red carnations. On either side were wreaths on standards straight across the church, triumphant, simple, exquisitely beautiful. No sadness dimmed their message of love and life.

The service was very simple. Bits of the Old Testament were read that I happen to know meant a great deal to him—a little of the New—hymns sung by a soloist with a lovely voice. The two young ministers read with such feeling, with such understanding, with such meaning. They were very unusual in their realization that this was a service of victory, not a service of sorrow. After all, Charles Eaton had lived for many many years; he had served his country well; he had shared many years of that life with an exquisite woman who gave him six children, five lovely daughters who are all playing their part in constructive living, and one son, yet the members of the family who were there numbered 49; all sharing in the heritage left them by this stalwart servant of the Most High.

We had a few minutes in the old homestead that the girls had opened up. For myself I am deeply grateful for the taste it gave me of the background of his living on that farm about which he and I talked many times.

My first knowledge and contacts with Dr. Eaton were when he was Dr. Eaton in the Baptist Church in Cleveland. He left a wonderful influence on all who knew him.

Many years later I had the great privilege of going to Mackinac for a Republican program committee meeting. There I was one of eight who helped draft a foreign-affairs plank for the Republican Party. Dr. Eaton and I represented this House.

To watch him take every word, think it over, give it deeper meaning, was a most marvelous experience. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, too, gave of himself in a most amazing way. And we were all agreed at the end of that long day that something had happened in the chamber where we sat. Something greater than ourselves came there, something that might have been present when the Constitution of this country was written. Such men as Charles Eaton attract such forces.

Every member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on either side of the aisle appreciated greatly his breadth of understanding of human beings, his knowledge of world politics, and, most of all, of world psychology.

Such amazing understanding was his of the human heart and the human mind. Many times a little quip from him would relax the whole committee when we became too tense about something: a little wayward expression, a twinkle in his eye and we were normal again. While he became chairman he handled many of us who were pretty temperamental opera singers with judgment and wisdom and kept us at our task.

I think every member of the committee is grateful that he had those 2 years of authority in the Eightieth Congress. From his example we learned so much of what it means to work with people. And in the years after that when he was ranking minority member of the committee he contributed so much in wisdom and understanding to the conferences that took place at the White House which he attended, as well as those in our own committee and in the conferences with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to have served in the Congress of the United States with a man of such breadth of wisdom, such depth of understanding, such high ideals.

My sympathies go to his family because he is no longer with them. Yet at the same time I do rejoice with them that his spirit, so calm in its simple dignity, has been so long with them. I am just as certain as I know they must be that the veil between is very thin and that we have but to reach out toward him to be aware that his presence is miraculously close and will be so always.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eaton's life was one of devotion to his ideals. He believed thoroughly in the dignity of man and his importance as an individual, and thus opposed domestic legislation which he felt would in any way impair man's right to make the best out of his life in his own chosen way.

He early saw that the conflict between communism and freemen was one which touched on the very foundations of our Christian philosophy and doctrines, and so based his policies on this fundamental belief.

In his earlier years he gave what to most men would be a lifetime of service to his church. In his latter years he gave what to most men would be a lifetime of service to his country. But always through his long life he worked for the benefit of his fellowmen.

Verily here was a man of God.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to do justice to the memory of Doc Eaton because his life was such a full one and he brought so much courage and affection to all who knew him. From his earliest days he was interested in human beings and how they lived materially and spiritually. He wanted desperately to improve the human race and the world in which he lived and, in approaching his objective, he displayed a rugged fearlessness coupled with a rare vision. He was afraid of nothing on this earth and was always prepared to meet his Creator, fearless and with head unbowed.

Doc Eaton was endowed with the spirit of friendship and be made friends wherever he went. People trusted him because he trusted them, and they were charmed by his gallantry and ready wit. He had no patience with the faker or demagogue; he gloried in exposing the false and in supporting the truth. His show of righteous indignation against insincerity was devastating and his support of honesty was heartwarming. He was truly a great man, although he never thought so himself.

His belief in God and in the eternal righteousness of things was founded upon the rock of faith. He never doubted the triumph of right and the eventual restoration of peace in the world. When he rose to speak in the House, it was always a treat to his colleagues, and the echo of his admonition can still be heard that if we "have faith in ourselves, have faith in our country, and have faith in our God" the perplexities of the times would, in due time, be resolved. Such doctrine preached by such a man bred courage and determination and hope.

His many friends mourn his passing, but they rejoice in the memory of his friendship and in the knowledge that he

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

was one of God's noblemen on earth who made the world a better place. The strength and beauty of this gallant soul will linger long to uplift us when we are beset with doubts and fears, and to brighten our path when "the shadows lengthen and our work is done."

Spun like a thread that feeds a weaver's loom,
Until at last the toiler's task is done,
So was his life a splendid tapestry
Of priceless faith and friendship he had won.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr Speaker, I did not realize this morning that we were going to pay tribute to Dr. Eaton or I would have prepared a paper.

I knew Dr. Eaton back in my home town of Cleveland. He was pastor of John D. Rockefeller's church, the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, one of the great churches of our community. For 20 years he worked with my father at the General Electric Co. He was a friend of my family and my father's best friend.

The thing I admired most about Dr. Eaton was his keen sense of humor. You were never sad when you were around Doc Eaton, because he always had some choice story to tell.

I recall two or three instances in the life of Dr. Eaton. On one occasion when in his church on a Sunday morning there were about as many parishioners present as there are Members in the hall here today, Dr. Eaton moved his church service down to the public square, and of course there he had a vast congregation. From that time on there was not an empty pew in the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church.

On another occasion I said, "Doc, why did you leave the Christian ministry?" Dr. Eaton said to me, "My boy, I got tired of preaching to a lot of sleeping Christians." Of course, we know Dr. Eaton never left the Christian ministry, because he occupied a greater place in the affairs of men and was always a Christian minister wherever he was.

On another occasion a man in his congregation who loved to tell stories, and whom everybody knew as the best story teller in town, had died. Everybody who knew him turned out for the funeral service for their friend. Instead of Dr. Eaton's reading words of scripture or singing hymns, he spent an hour retelling the stories this man had told, and he had the congregation in stitches, including the close members of this man's family. Everybody loved it. That was Dr. Eaton.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I recall so well the day on which Dr. Eaton was 76 years of age. As I was walking over to the House floor I determined I would make some remarks about that anniversary. Before I did so, I called him on the phone. First I asked him if he was coming to the floor. He said, "No." I said, "Doctor, you are 76 today, and I want to say something about you. Perhaps you can give me a punch line." He thought a moment and said, "All right, Gordon, I will give you a punch line. You can tell my colleagues in the House that the spirit of '76 is invincible."

Mr. BENDER. There was another fellow in his congregation who loved to sing. He was always singing hymns. They had the funeral of this man, whom they all loved. So Dr. Eaton brought out all the hymn books and they had a regular, old-fashioned hymn sing instead of preaching a tear-jerking sermon. Dr. Eaton had a keen sense of humor. Dr. Eaton was loved by all of us because of his optimism and because of his forthrightness. I am happy to say a word here because if ever there was a man that everybody loved, it was "Doc" Eaton. If the Lord will forgive me for all of my shortcomings and I am permitted to enter the heavenly gates, I hope I am assigned to the precinct over which "Doc" Eaton presides.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Dr. Eaton very closely for every year of his 28 years of service on Capitol Hill. In fact, my service on the Hill antedated his service by 1 year. When my beloved chief and predecessor, Mr. Seger, was called away in 1940, and I was privileged to succeed him in office, Dr. Eaton then put his arm around me and became sort of a congressional father. He counseled me. At times he admonished me. During congressional recesses he wrote me lengthy letters in longhand. Oh, what precious treasure those letters are today. I am so glad that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] has referred to the simple funeral services held for Dr. Eaton in Plainfield, N. J., on last Monday. I was among the Members of Congress who attended those services, and I believe I know what was meant by the pastor in his eulogy when he said, "A saint of God has returned to his heavenly home."

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out today to members of Dr. Eaton's family and my heart also goes out today to a little self-effacing lady who is listening to our words in the gallery. She was Dr. Eaton's faithful and efficient secretary on Capitol Hill for all but 1 of the 28 years of his service here—Miss Marie A. Texier.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask to have inserted in the RECORD some remarks I made on the floor of the House on July 5, 1952, when I addressed myself to Dr. Eaton's announced retirement:

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I was visiting the Marines in Tientsin, China, in January 1946 a young snappy marine came up to me, saluted and said: "Congressman CANFIELD, I am Charles A. Eaton III. I think you know my grandfather."

That grandfather, who is about to leave the House on the completion of 28 years of faithful and effective service has been a congressional father to me during my many years of service on Capitol Hill. When I needed sound advice, he gave it to me; when I was sick he called on me; and when I needed encouragement, he was always close by to accord such. I can hardly remember a legislative day during my membership in this body that he has not put his arm around me in a friendly greeting.

It has been truly stated that Dr. Eaton, as we affectionately call him, is one of the most important and least publicized men in public life.

Beverly Smith, Washington editor of the Saturday Evening Post, wrote in 1948:

"Dr. Eaton is a character from way back. He has crowded half a dozen lives into one. Forty-five years ago he was a nationally known pulpit orator, and the friend and spiritual adviser of John D. Rockefeller, the elder. Thirty years ago he played a leading role in America's feverish World War I shipbuilding effort. In his frail and bookish childhood he was regarded as a prodigy. In youth he was a husky farm hand and star football player. He preached his way through college. He has been a reporter, a labor-relations expert, a prosperous dairy farmer and the editor of a national magazine. He is a patriarch with 21 living descendants. He sees his time on earth as a marvelous adventure, and marvels seek him out."

It is Doc Eaton's philosophy that he must take time off in life to ponder the higher strategy. He says: "If a man lets his vision become blurred with minutiae, he gets to playing the flyspecks instead of the notes."

Those who will recall his famous speech on the Marshall plan in which he declared that freedom was the distinctive glory of man will be interested to know that in 1901, when he was 33 years of age he wrote a book and in the first chapter he said:

"The earth has shrunk to a neighborhood * * *. No country or civilization is any longer isolated. * * * The mighty hand of God is pressing the nations together. Henceforth no man can live or die unto himself. * * * Into the political and commercial impulse which has dwarfed the globe * * * we must breathe the spiritual impulse of Christian debtorship, Christian love and brotherhood; else the new propinquity will mean anarchy."

The record will show that it was Doc Eaton who months before Pearl Harbor warned that men's basic freedoms would soon be challenged by war which would appear first in the Pacific. And long before the Western World came to realize the menace of Godless communism, he was warning our people of its dangerous portents. With all our woes, however, he believes that this is still God's world and he says: "My faith is unshaken and undimmed. The human race was not intended by the Divine Creator simply to make its starless and hopeless way from one oblivion to another."

It is my prediction that when the history of these troublesome years is written, the contribution of the distinguished dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation will make up one of its most wholesome chapters.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few Members who were here when Charlie Eaton came to the Congress. He impressed everyone here then as always as a man of real and rare courage. He never had the slightest hesitancy to stand up and take it even if he stood alone. He was one of the ablest speakers we have ever had in the House of Representatives. Although he did not on every occasion take advantage of the opportunity to speak upon questions before us, he did on very many occasions come out on the floor of the House and make an outstanding contribution to the deliberations of this body. Seldom have I seen one who could do so well. Seldom have I seen one who was as devoted as he was to the responsibilities which he assumed in this body. I am sure that people throughout the country who had the pleasure of knowing him will appreciate the long and faithful life of real

service to the people that Charlie Eaton gave them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our former colleague, Dr. Charles A. Eaton, of New Jersey, the Nation has sustained a heavy loss. Dr. Eaton was a leader of great stature and during his 28 years of service in this House he demonstrated again and again his farsightendess as one of our leading statesmen.

I first met Dr. Eaton when I came to Congress in 1943. For 8 years it was my privilege to serve with him on the Foreign Affairs Committee. From our earliest acquaintance he was always a stanch friend. His wise counsel and advice based on many years of fruitful experience was most helpful.

During his tenure in the House of Representatives Dr. Eaton made a valuable and an imperishable contribution to the formulation of our foreign policy. His service spanned some of the most trying years in the history of the Republic. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress he played a major role in drafting and in putting through many pieces of constructive legislation. Under his leadership the European Recovery Program was enacted.

Dr. Eaton possessed a most unusual grasp and a keen understanding of international affairs. His inimitable and eloquent manner of stating the issues before the country always made a profound impression upon his listeners. He was an accomplished leader, an eloquent orator and a statesman of marked ability.

On innumerable occasions in addressing this House he demonstrated his thorough knowledge of world affairs. He always made an outstanding contribution to the passage of the legislation under consideration.

Dr. Eaton will be greatly missed by all who knew him. His many friends throughout the country will long cherish his memory. I deem it a privilege and an honor to have worked and served with him. We have lost a great and good friend. The Republic in his passing has lost an outstanding statesman.

I join with my colleagues in extending profound sympathy to his beloved ones.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the body of a great warrior for the Lord has been laid away, but his spirit is still with us. Dr. Eaton's snowy mane, his big strong body, developed as an ox-driver in Nova Scotia, his genial smile, his friendly but piercing brown eyes, will be seen no more. We will never again hear his rich voice, uttering great and noble thoughts, spiced with incisive wit, and humble, gentle humor. But his memory lingers on.

He had a great career, farmer, preacher, business leader, statesman. I served under him for 14 years in the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was never one to become enmeshed in the details of legislation, but he often said he had psychic power to sense the broad, deep, moving currents in the turbulent affairs of life, and he demonstrated this power again and again.

We think today of our loss in his passing, but we should also be thinking of the great gain to us, and to our country, in his life.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, like so many of us, I was distressed to learn of the death of our former colleague, Dr. Charles A. Eaton. It was only a short time ago that he walked among us, greeting us with that mischievous smile and twinkle under his shock of white hair, that he firmly clasped our hand and encouraged us with cheerful words. These gestures, however small or brief, gave each of us a great sense of comfort.

Few men have had the versatile public life that Dr. Eaton had. He was at various times a minister of the gospel, a newspaperman, a magazine editor, a labor-relations expert, a statesman, and orator. In each of these callings he brought an intellect that was incisive and penetrating. No mark of pettiness or intolerance invaded his mind to blur his vision or dim his judgment.

From the beginning of my membership in this body I was privileged to serve with Dr. Eaton on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Members of both parties recognized his capacity for constructive thinking and sound decision. In the Eightieth Congress he reached new heights of leadership as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He guided through the committee and the House measures that stand as landmarks in postwar foreign policy. When the full history of that period is written, I am convinced that he will be recognized as the real father of a nonpartisan foreign policy.

I shall always count among the privileges of service in this House the friendship Dr. Eaton gave me, the counsel he imparted, and the understanding and courage he showed. The Nation has lost an irreplaceable figure in these trying days.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of our beloved former colleague, Dr. Charles A. Eaton, our Nation has lost one of its greatest statesmen. Charlie Eaton was first elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress and, after 28 years of outstanding and unselfish devotion to his country's service, retired at the end of the Eighty-second Congress.

One of the great experiences of my career in the Congress has been to serve under Dr. Eaton when he was chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during the Eightieth Congress. The fairness with which he conducted committee meetings, his strong desire to take as little credit for himself as possible and to give credit to others of the committee, were typical of the man. His vast and varied experience in human affairs, combined with his superb intellect and understanding heart, helped immeasurably in preparing Dr. Eaton to establish with the late Senator Vandenberg the bipartisan approach to foreign affairs. I believe that this contribution to our Nation's progress entitles our beloved Charlie Eaton to a high place among our Nation's leaders.

His was a rich life—a life of devotion, a life of supreme loyalty to his ideals and his country; a life free of prejudice and petty ideas, a life of understanding, a life of accomplishment rarely equaled in the annals of our country. I shall always consider myself privileged to have served under Dr. Eaton and with him on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Truly his goodness will always be remembered and his service can only be an inspiration to others.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the House 10 years ago, one of the first Members who sought me out was Congressman Eaton whose passing we mourn and whose memory we honor today. He was the beloved friend of all of us. He had been for many years a prominent Baptist minister. Apparently he heard that this young fellow coming down from Minnesota had been for some years a medical missionary of a sister denomination in China. Naturally he was interested. He was the only preacher in the Congress and I the only missionary. He took me under his wing from the very beginning. He called me, as he did many of you, "My boy." I can say truthfully that I have never known a man of nobler and kindlier spirit.

He had the great essentials for extraordinary success in any field. First, spotless character; courageous, strong, unwavering in his convictions; stern with himself, but always gentle, tolerant, and forgiving with others, perfectly aware of the weakness of most human beings, though he seemed not to have them himself. It was the character of the man that gave content and force to whatever he did.

Second, a fine intellect. He had a mind that went quickly to the heart of things. I never knew him to become confused by the trees. He saw them but he was able to see also the forest. He thought primarily in broad terms. First the principles, then the details. He saw the long-range issues in proper perspective. He never allowed his thinking to get bogged down in immediate difficulties so that he lost sight of the ultimate objectives and the main measures by which they could be achieved.

Third, a winsome and contagious personality, he had the capacity to communicate his ideas to stimulate and inspire; you could not talk with him without being more alert and alive—a better person. I remember a story he once told me about Pearl Harbor one afternoon. He, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was called with other congressional leaders down to the White House. There also were Cabinet members, military Chiefs of Staff, and key advisers. Understandably, there was considerable tension, a tendency by some to blame and sharply criticize those who had not foreseen this or prevented that. There was some backbiting, some bitterness, and recrimination over the mistakes that had led to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the awful disaster. Finally, Dr. Eaton stood up and said, in substance—and everyone who knew him will understand why he had to say it: "This is not the moment to argue about how we got here and who may have been responsible. The one fact is that here we are. This is our country; we are at war; our fleet lies at the bottom of Pearl Harbor; hundreds of Americans are dead. What are we going to do now to retrieve the situation?" All of you can see and hear him as he called to higher levels of thinking and resolve. One other who was there has said that his pulling of the threads together was what lifted up their hearts and did more to develop real unity on that tragic afternoon than any other thing. I am sure Dr. Eaton would never have said this in public, but he told me, with a warm glow in his eyes, that when the meeting was ended and the men were to hasten to their posts of duty, President Roosevelt held him back. He pulled the shaggy head of our dear friend down beside his own face, and said: "Thanks, Doc."

That is the sentiment, I am sure, that is in the heart of everyone of us who have been privileged to know and serve with this great, noble servant of God and of our Republic: Thanks, Doc.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of Dr. Eaton at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Charles A. Eaton there passed from this earthly scene one of God's noble men. A man of brilliant intellect and a fine sense of humor, he won the stout friendship of all with whom he came in contact.

It was my privilege to become intimately associated with him during his 28 years of service in the House of Representatives. We entered Congress together and had many things in common. His first pastorate was in Natick, one of the towns in my district; and several of his relatives and school boy friends were my intimate friends in my native town of North Attleboro. Through the years his warm friendship was to me a great pleasure.

Dr. Eaton shone brilliantly wherever he served: As a preacher of the gospel; as an industrial relations adviser, and as a Member of Congress.

His service in Congress was outstanding. A brilliant speaker with a sparkling wit, his addresses were closely listened to. Attached to the Foreign Affairs Committee, he became a student of our international affairs. As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the Eightieth Congress, he won high honor through his brilliant service.

He lived a rich, full life and left the world better for his having lived. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am including as part of my remarks a resolution unanimously adopted by our committee out of respect for our late departed colleague, Hon. Charles Aubrey Eaton, who served in this House for 28 years.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie, as he was affectionately called by all of us on our committee, has made an outstanding contribution to the development of foreign policy in the many years that he has been a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was his great honor to serve as chairman of that committee in the Eightieth Congress. He was always ready to help his colleagues, and his ready wit, warm handshake, and genial smile will linger with us as we contemplate the work he did here.

RESOLUTION OF RESPECT AND GRIEF FOR THE HONORABLE CHARLES AUBREY EATON, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS DEATH JANUARY 23, 1953

Whereas the death of our beloved colleague of many years, the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton, leaves us with a profound sense of loss;

Whereas the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton's 28 years in the Congress, as a Representative of the Fifth District of New Jersey and as a member and former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, were characterized by a deep devotion to his country and to the cause of peace and understanding between nations;

Whereas under his kindly and wise guidance as chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress he stimulated the analysis of international problems on a nonpartisan basis as the result of which there were enacted into law programs of profound significance for the security and welfare of the United States and the peoples of the free world;

Whereas all who knew the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton loved him for the tolerance he showed his fellowmen, his sweetness of disposition and the unfailing enthusiasm and devotion he brought to his many public services;

Whereas the passing of the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton brings to a close a distinguished career marked by statesmanship and patriotism of the highest order: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs hereby record their respect for, and tribute to, the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton as a spiritual leader, wise counselor, public servant, and statesman and their grief on the occasion of the passing of a beloved colleague; and

Resolved further, That his resolution of respect, tribute, and grief be conveyed to the family of the Honorable Charles Aubrey Eaton and be spread upon the RECORD of the House of Representatives.

Robert B. Chiperfield, Chairman; John M. Vorys; Frances P. Bolton; Lawrence H. Smith; Chester E. Merrow; Walter H. Judd; James G. Fulton; Jacob K. Javits; Donald L. Jackson; Karl M. LeCompte; Edmund P. Radwan; Albert P. Morano; Marguerite Stitt Church; E. Ross Adair; Winston L. Prouty; Alvin M. Bentley; James P. Richards; Thomas S. Gordon; Thomas E. Morgan; Laurie C. Battle; A. S. J. Carnahan; Thurmond Chatham; Clement J. Zablocki; Omar Burleson; Brooks Hays; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Edna F. Kelly; Henderson L. Lanham; Burr P. Harrison; Boyd Crawford, Staff Administrator.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we have all been saddened by the news of the passing of our distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. Charles A. Eaton, of New Jersey. I wish to join with other Members of the House in paying a tribute to him and extending an expression of my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Judge Eaton, as he was known to all of us, was a Member of this body for more than a quarter of a century. The years of his service covered a period of the utmost gravity in our Nation's history. His service to our country and the Congress in this critical period was devoted, untiring, and brilliant. He rose to the high position of chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and was one of the architects of the United Nations. Our Nation was fortunate in having him present at San Francisco and subsequent meetings of this great organization for international peace—his life was devoted to the service of his fellowman and dedicated to the cause of peace.

Judge Eaton went about his great work in a quiet, modest, and unassuming manner. He was an inspiration to me as I know that he has been an inspiration to other Members of the House. He was always kindly and especially helpful to the younger Members of this body. His good will and great heart knew no boundary of aisle, but embraced the entire body of the House. He will be greatly missed.

My sincerest sympathy is extended to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the kindness which Dr. Eaton showed to me when I became a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was ever helpful, and his wise counsel was above the line of duty. He was a true Christian, a man beloved by all who knew him, and I revere his memory. I pray that God will comfort and bless his family.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of personal appreciation, and with sincere admiration of Dr. Charles Aubrey Eaton, I add my tribute with those of his many friends to one of the finest men I have ever known.

Dr. Eaton just about fully exemplified what to me a Member of Congress should be. When I first came to Congress 8 years ago he was one of the first Members to attract my admiration. Serving on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with him, I soon found myself looking to his grasp of world affairs, and to his diligent search for the correct answer to problems of world peace, for my own guidance when difficult decisions were in the process of being made.

The present generation is always prone to look in the past for men of great stature and even our short national life reveals many outstanding examples. However, Dr. Eaton's friends recognize in him one of the most able, dependable, and devoted patriots of the Republic.

While I am sure Dr. Eaton was loyal to a two-party system of government, I am also sure that no other Member of Congress surpassed him in placing devotion to that which is right above partisan expediency.

In Dr. Eaton's passing, the cause of free men has lost a powerful friend; but he has left a worthy contribution, and

death to such a man is merely a benediction to a good life and an invocation to immortality.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Charlie Eaton was respected and loved by all his colleagues in this House.

I deeply regret his passing, terminating, as it does, an abiding friendship of more than 24 years.

A minister of the Gospel, an expert in the field of industrial relations, an editor and special correspondent, Charlie Eaton became a Member of the Sixty-ninth Congress in 1925, and served in every succeeding Congress for a period of 28 years, his death occurring only a few days after his retirement.

For many years he was a leading member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. During the Eightieth Congress he served as its chairman.

He was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco in 1945, and to the United Nations General Assembly in London in 1945, and in New York in 1946.

During his later years he became widely known, both at home and abroad, because of the part which he played in the field of cooperation in the Western World. He was a firm believer in the doctrine "In unity there is strength," and he carried conviction because of his sincerity and strength of character.

In his long and distinguished career he made a great contribution to his State and to the Nation.

He will be greatly missed by all who served with him here. They will remember him for his understanding, for his willingness to lend a hand, for his never-failing sense of humor, and for the courage of his convictions.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Dr. Eaton, which came so swiftly after his retirement from Congress, our Nation has suffered a serious loss.

Dr. Eaton will long be remembered by those of us who have been privileged to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Through the years filled with some of the most complex and critical problems that mankind had ever faced, Dr. Eaton had rendered distinguished service in shaping our Nation's foreign policy legislative program. His profound knowledge and understanding gave him a seldom-encountered insight into the problems confronting our Nation and the world, which was reflected in his imposing contributions to our legislative acts dealing with our foreign affairs.

Dr. Eaton has always been kind, generous, and sincere, and has given unsparingly of himself to those who called upon him for assistance and service. He will be sorely missed in these Halls.

I want to convey my deep sympathy to the members of his family, and to express my prayer that the good Lord may grant him eternal rest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feeling that I speak of our beloved former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. Charles A. Eaton. His qualities of heart and mind were well known and highly respected here in the House for many years. But I had personal experience with him as a member of the committee to which it is a privilege to testify on this occasion.

I first came to Congress in the Eightieth Congress when Dr. Eaton was, after many years, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was assigned to that committee. Dr. Eaton immediately took me in hand as a freshman Member, urged me to participate actively, recognized me in committee on every suitable occasion and even entrusted me with the sponsorship of committee bills. He gave a magnificent example of how a chairman and a wise elder statesman can bring along and encourage new men to do their best work.

Dr. Eaton was eternally young in his outlook, always modern in his conception of events. I will not soon forget either his warm grasp on my arm or his thundering reminder to us all that in the great debates on foreign policy in the House of Representatives we were debating not a bill but the future of mankind and of freedom. His leadership in the writing of the Economic Cooperation Act alone entitles him to a high place in American history. Dr. Eaton leaves us as well as his family a great heritage. He was truly a lion among men, and I for one shall remember him and be influenced by his personality all my life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. NEAL and to include a resolution forwarded by Rev. Norman I. Bromley, Huntington, W. Va., relative to social security for clergymen.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON).

Mr. FINO (at the request of Mr. DORN of New York) and to include an article from Il Progresso entitled "Our National Shame."

Mr. BENDER in five instances.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. BETTS) and to include an article by Louis Bromfield.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. BELCHER and to include a letter from Mr. Arthur C. Butler, secretary of the National PAR Committee.

Mr. WITHROW and to include a letter written to President Dwight D. Eisenhower by Mr. GROSS, of Iowa, and to include also a brief report to which the letter refers.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF and to include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous matter, one of the inclusions to be a radio address delivered by the new Secretary of State expounding his views on what American foreign policy should be.

Mr. ANGELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN in two instances and to include a newspaper article and a magazine article.

Mr. HAGEN of California and to include an editorial from the Fresno Bee of January 18, 1953.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. WIER in two instances and to include two articles from Minneapolis newspapers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include two resolutions adopted by the International Transport Workers Federation.

Mr. DOLLINGER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FORAND and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include an address delivered by Gordon R. Clapp, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two and one-half pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. THOMAS and to include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Texas commending the President on the appointment of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. BATTLE.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. CARNAHAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a very fine address made by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a letter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter written to him by former Representative Rich, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RIVERS and to include an article written by him with regard to America's oldest daily newspaper, the Charleston News and Courier, which on the tenth of this month celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary.

Mr. LOVRE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 243. An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

388. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

389. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to continue in effect the system of grade distribution provided by the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

390. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the report made to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia pursuant to paragraph 14 of the act of March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

391. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the report of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1952, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress, 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

392. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953, approved July 10, 1952; to the Committee on Government Operations.

393. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to make the United States Naval Postgraduate School a depository for Government publications"; to the Committee on House Administration.

394. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting additional copies of certificates of ascertainment of presidential electors, pursuant to section 6 of title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

395. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

396. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of conclusion of proceedings with respect to the claim of *The Choctaw Nation, Petitioner*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 51), and *the Sioux Indians of the Santee Reservation in the State of Nebraska, Plaintiffs*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 104), pursuant to provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

397. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report of Operations for the Fiscal Year Ended May 31, 1952, under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

398. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report and findings on the Sacramento Canals unit of the Central Valley project, California, pursuant to section 5 of the act of September 26, 1950 (H. Doc. 73); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

399. A letter from the Secretary, the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting the Annual Report of the American National Theater and Academy for 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

400. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Thirteenth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

401. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, for the period January 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

402. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the provisions of the act of October 31, 1942, as extended, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

403. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2673, that no amounts were paid from the appropriation "Claims, Office of the Secretary of Defense" for tort claims arising from the acts or omissions of employees of the Department of Defense, excluding the military departments, during the year ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

404. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 371, 372, and 373 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the resignation and retirement of judges and the appointment of additional judges when permanently disabled judges fail to retire"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

405. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

406. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

407. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to Public Law 539, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session (56 Stat. 267), as amended by Public Law 721, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 19, 1950; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

408. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 31, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Mobile Harbor and River, Ala., with a view to determining if the existing project should be modified in any way at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on September 27, 1951 (H. Doc. 74); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

409. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 7, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Tampa Harbor, Fla., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time to meet changes in navigation requirements, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on July 22, 1950, and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on August 16, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the Thirty-fourth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in New York, N. Y., August 1952, pursuant to Public Law 249, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 243. An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2215. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expan-

sion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2216. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 2217. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2218. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2219. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2220. A bill to provide for closer supervision of the costs of constructing irrigation and reclamation projects, and projects in the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2221. A bill to provide for closer supervision of the costs of constructing irrigation and reclamation projects, and projects in the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2222. A bill to increase the level of price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2223. A bill to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 2224. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2225. A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2226. A bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2227. A bill to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2228. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2229. A bill to increase the maximum amount of Federal funds which may be expended for any one water-facilities project in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2230. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitation on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2231. A bill to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development; and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2232. A bill to authorize the issuance of trust patents in lieu of land-use-exchange assignments issued on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation and the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation prior to January 1, 1951; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2233. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and other related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2234. A bill to amend the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2236. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Area Problems of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2237. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2238. A bill to implement article I, section 7, of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2239. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the establishment of the Smithsonian Gallery of Art as a part of a national war memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2240. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2241. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make uniform the tax on the liquidation and sale of corporate properties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2242. A bill to amend section 1962 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2243. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 2244. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by providing for the regulation of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2245. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by providing for the regulation of chemical additives in foods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2246. A bill to provide for an increase in the strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia and to increase the pay, retirement benefits, and death benefits of the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 2247. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2248. A bill to restore directory service for letters and parcels sent through the mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2249. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that ministers may elect to receive old-age and survivors insurance coverage by treating service performed in the exercise of their ministry as self-employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2250. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2251. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2252. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2253. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2254. A bill to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2255. A bill to allow a widow or widower to deduct, for income-tax purposes,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2256. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2257. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American school teacher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2258. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2259. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2260. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2261. A bill to provide for payments to State unemployment funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 2262. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project, California, to the State of California or an agency thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2263. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2264. A bill to provide automatic annual pay increases for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2266. A bill to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Willwood, and Belle Fourche irrigation districts shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2267. A bill to provide for exemption from the land-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to supplemental water projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2268. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas," approved August 28, 1951, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2269. A bill to provide that Government procurement contracts shall be awarded, wherever practicable, so as to increase employment in areas suffering from unemployment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2270. A bill to establish an Office of Government Investigation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2271. A bill to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2272. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2273. A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2274. A bill to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2275. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2276. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the earning of $1,200 in wages in a year without loss of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to increase from $900 to $1,200 the amount of net earnings from self-employment which may be received in a year without loss of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2278. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2279. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2280. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $200 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of old-age or survivors benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2281. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions, including the additional exemption for old age or blindness from $600 to $750, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2282. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of the city of Hawthorne, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2284. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2285. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the definitions of wholesale and retail dealers in liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 2287. A bill to make uniform the law of reciprocal enforcement of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2288. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to exemptions from the tax on admission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2289. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes, and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2290. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute for Poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project, California, to the State of California or an agency thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 2292. A bill to provide for price support at 100 percent of parity for the 1953 and 1954 crops of each basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2293. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to increase by 10 percent the disability retirement pay paid under section 402 (d) of that act, and to extend the period during which persons retired before the effective date of that act may elect to qualify for pay under that section; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of the County of Riverside, Calif., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2295. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2296. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2297. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2299. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to farmers and to broaden the coverage of such system in the case of agricultural laborers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2300. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2301. A bill to repeal the $75 work clause that applies to old-age and survivors

insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2302. A bill to create an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2303. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations, shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2304. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 2305. A bill to extend to certain naturalized citizens of the United States the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2306. A bill to assist States and cities in fostering civil peace through public agencies set up to improve group relations, to provide for the training of State and local law-enforcement officers in the prevention and control of intergroup conflicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2307. A bill to amend section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2308. A bill to amend section 7 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 2309. A bill to provide for the extension of terms of patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2310. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2311. A bill to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2312. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 1098), an act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2313. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County water control and improvement district No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2315. A bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2316. A bill to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2318. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize civil defense aid between the United States and neighboring countries; to modify the loyalty oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2319. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2320. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska communication system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2321. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2322. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2323. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2324. A bill to provide for the interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2325. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, to remove the limitation upon the rank of the director of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2326. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2327. A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2328. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2329. A bill to authorize the Army Medical Service Graduate School to award master of science and doctor of science degrees in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and in the biological sciences involved in health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2330. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2331. A bill to repeal section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2332. A bill to require an annual review of military personnel requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2333. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2334. A bill to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2335. A bill to increase to five the number of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2336. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for certain widows who were married at least 50 years to employees to whom such act applied; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2337. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2338. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2339. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted United States Government life (converted) insurance or national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2340. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIER (by request):

H. R. 2341. A bill to protect the public health from the dangers of fluorination of water; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2342. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 2343. A bill to repeal section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2344. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2345. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1951, Public Law 233 (82d Cong.), to provide a method of computing annual and sick leave for regular and substitute employees in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2346. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 2347. A bill to permit continued exercise, until 6 months after termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1950, of certain powers, relating to preferences or priorities in the transportation of traffic, under sections 1 (15) and 420 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 2348. A bill to authorize the construction of a new general medical-surgical hospital at the Veterans' Administration Center, Wood, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution abrogating Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, relating to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the first uniformed civilian police department on or about June 19, 1828; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the first trial run of a steam locomotive, the Stourbridge Lion, in the Western Hemisphere on August 8, 1829, at Honesdale, Pa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution amending the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., at Lake Wallula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the selection of the successors of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress who become unable to perform their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution amending section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the admission of new members to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution commemorating the three-hundredth anniversary of the formation of Westmoreland County, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 121. Resolution inquiring as to whether the Korean "Operation Smack" was a military attack or publicity or cold-war operation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. Res. 122. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of Communist activities among merchant seamen and their unions and Communist infiltrations into transportation industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Res. 123. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 91; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 124. Resolution providing for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 125. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 126. Resolution directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 127. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 128. Resolution providing funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to House Resolution 127; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Luis De La Vega Villarruel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Leopoldo Gonzalez-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Sam Rosenblat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Rita (Keskula) Vigla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Evoggelos Mpompotsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Emilie Pingerlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Kim Ull Sunnie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Vitus Johannes De Vries and his wife, Antonie Paula Else De Vries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2359. A bill for the relief of Joseph Velch, also known as Guiseppe Velc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Lenda Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2364. A bill to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of Dwejra Shaffer and daughter, Haya Shaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2367. A bill for the relief of Aoun Louis Rachid Habib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 2368. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Rughaase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Mary Muraki, the adopted daughter of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Vernon Cornett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2370. A bill for the relief of Jan Brodulski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria M. Broix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of Leib Chaim Perl (Leb Chaim Perl); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Joseph Feldinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2374. A bill for the relief of Casimir Krzysanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2375. A bill for the relief of You Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2376. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Hagishima Satchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 2377. A bill for the relief of Aba Szejnbejm, Mrs. Dvora Szejnbejm, Shlomo Szejnbejm, and Daniel Szejnbejm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2378. A bill for the relief of John H. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2379. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert J. Needham, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2380. A bill for the relief of Remus Tzincoca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2381. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2382. A bill for the relief of Panagoitis Demetrios Zeras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2383. A bill for the relief of Michio Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Angelo Spinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Fruscione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:
H. R. 2386. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:
H. R. 2387. A bill for the relief of William M. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 2388. A bill for the relief of Kazmirz Budzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 2389. A bill for the relief of Martha Starke and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2390. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ventimiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2391. A bill for the relief of John Gieraga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H. R. 2392. A bill for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H. R. 2393. A bill for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumeriato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2394. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko (Clara) Oe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 2395. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2396. A bill for the relief of Harry Clay Maull, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2397. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRILL:
H. R. 2398. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Cecil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:
H. R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Fidel A. Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 2400. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2401. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2402. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2403. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2404. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2405. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2406. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2407. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2408. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2409. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2410. A bill to restore and continue in full force and effect patents Nos. 4,750, 16,436, 21,258, 17,679, and 23,984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:
H. R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Rogers Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2412. A bill for the relief of Josefina V. Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:
H. R. 2413. A bill for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 2414. A bill for the relief of Andrew Vasilatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:
H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:
H. R. 2416. A bill to permit Haruko (Yamamoto) Iki to remain and reside permanently in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. R. 2417. A bill for the relief of Hiromi Kashiwagi Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2418. A bill for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:
H. R. 2419. A bill for the relief of Robert J. McGarry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:
H. R. 2420. A bill for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:
H. R. 2421. A bill for the relief of Frank L. McCartha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:
H. R. 2422. A bill for the relief of the Coosa River Newsprint Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 2423. A bill for the relief of Jaakko Olavi Hursti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:
H. R. 2424. A bill for the relief of Johann August Josefsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 2425. A bill for the relief of Paul Okon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2426. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Stutzer and Haiya Stutzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Annie Litke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2428. A bill for the relief of Nader Taghinia-Milani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2429. A bill for the relief of Adolf Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Ehstathios Aristidou Spathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Renato Ugo Raffaelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Li Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:
H. R. 2433. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:
H. R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Sally Kitterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:
H. R. 2435. A bill for the relief of the Starr Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 2436. A bill for the relief of Anesti N. Balcousheff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:
H. R. 2437. A bill for the relief of Jean Mae Hopkins (nee Schnurer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:
H. R. 2439. A bill for the relief of Joe G. Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Lidija Cimse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:
H. R. 2442. A bill for the relief of Domenico Basilisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2443. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Savvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2444. A bill for the relief of Koccimides Nicolas Katsibris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. R. 2445. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Vina Coulter Wakan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:
H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

30. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions concerning the extension of social security, Federal payments in lieu of taxes, and Federal tax on municipal-bond income adopted at the Thirty-seventh Annual Conference of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

31. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the Department of Rhode Island, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., urging revision of the Servicemens' Indemnity Act of 1951, to permit veterans of World Wars I and II to reinstate their national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance which may have lapsed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

32. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of O. J. Kaschmitter, Paynesville, Minn., and others urging revision of selective-service agricultural-deferment policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 9, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel (P)	$5,823.00
Altavene Clark	Executive officer (P)	5,823.00
Mabel C. Downey	Clerk (C)	5,823.00
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant (C)	3,224.94
Alice Baker	do	2,890.32
Lorraine Greenbaum	do	2,428.32
Betty Pretioso	do	2,428.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	18,801.73
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	10,153.13
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	28,954.86
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	21,045.14

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	Clerk and staff director	$5,823.00
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,823.00
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	5,823.00
Corbal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,823.00
Paul M. Wilson	do	5,642.52
Ross P. Pope	do	5,642.52
Jay B. Howe	do	5,642.52
Arthur Orr	do	5,296.92
Robert P. Williams	do	5,158.68
Frank Sanders	do	4,605.06
Carson W. Culp	do	4,605.66
Robert M. Moyer	do	4,398.06
Robert L. Michaels	do	3,663.06
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk	3,145.26
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,826.60
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,826.60
Francis G. Merrill	Clerk-stenographer	2,189.34
Samuel R. Preston	do	2,189.34
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,854.78
Willie Tarrant	Janitor-messenger	1,451.70
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,216.14
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the majority	4,951.26
Robert E. Lee	Clerk to the minority	5,823.00
Ross D. Frith	Clerk-stenographer to the chairman	1,053.78
Lawrence A. Dicenzo	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member	2,189.34
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	2,189.34
William J. Neary	do	2,189.34
Norajean Ray	do	2,189.34
Terence J. McGrath	do	2,189.34
Elizabeth H. Pascual	do	2,189.34
Theodora M. Grant	do	2,189.34
Lena M. Adams	do	729.78
Dorothy M. Vitale	do	2,189.34
Ethel M. Scholl	do	2,189.34
Ann M. Woodward	do	1,909.58
Harve W. Mobley	do	1,459.56
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		$302,215.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		127,101.38
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		127,101.38
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		175,113.62

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTION

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Donnelly	Director of studies and investigations	$5,823.00
James E. Nugent	Chief investigator	4,712.70
Robert E. Rightmyer	Investigator	4,501.98
Charles G. Haynes	do	4,501.98
John F. Doyle	do	2,800.24
Victor J. Orsinger	do	2,473.54
S. Churchill Elmore	do	2,100.18
Darrell D. Donovan	do	841.10
M. Phyllis Monaghan	Clerk-stenographer	2,141.52
Helen Terry	do	2,009.82

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture:		
John J. Mallen	Investigator	$1,531.53
Edlow G. Parker	do	1,119.53
Department of the Air Force: Rowland W. Fixel	do	1,843.71
Department of the Army: Charles W. Hart	do	2,826.00
Department of Commerce:		
Bureau of Standards:		
Chester H. Page	do	5,276.32
Lauriston S. Taylor	do	1,786.00
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Clifford C. Hulse	do	1,766.67
Defense Transport Administration: Henry R. Pellegrino	do	2,076.90
District of Columbia: Office of Corporation Counsel:		
John F. Doyle	do	800.80
Oliver Gasch	do	1,118.98
Economic Stabilization Agency: Office of Price Stabilization: Alexis P. Bukovsky	do	4,244.88
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
William M. Alexander	do	2,903.37
Robert G. Aulenbacher	do	1,999.77
Carl L. Bennett	do	3,870.74
William W. Colby	do	3,830.59
Robert J. Deueen	do	1,616.18
Arthur W. Hagstrom	do	3,308.13
Erwin P. Hair	do	861.55
Harold H. Hair	do	3,266.19
Marguerite A. Hansen	Clerk-stenographer	123.75
Albert T. Healy	Investigator	3,148.91
John P. Kochenderfer	do	3,215.40
Paul H. Lewis	do	2,872.15
Albert G. Macdonald	Investigator	$3,199.41
Margaret E. McDermott	Clerk-stenographer	350.53
Richard A. Miller	Investigator	3,300.32
Thomas M. Mulherin	do	4,016.36
Peter G. Roth, Jr	do	1,221.85
John A. Ruhl	do	3,215.40
Melvin E. Singleton	do	1,588.62
Richard B. Smith	do	1,382.04
Henry J. Somers	do	1,993.55
Edward T. Steele	do	12.08
Samuel I. Virden	do	12.08
Marcus S. Wallace	do	3,182.58
Federal Civil Defense Administration:		
Stephen J. Grillo	do	4,632.65
Carlton H. Jencks	do	2,242.87
Federal Security Agency: Public Health Service: John H. Scruggs	do	1,625.96
General Services Administration:		
Addison S. Bomberger	do	1,349.84
John H. Holmead, Jr	do	3,503.97
Roland R. Pyne	do	1,476.00
George B. Sheldon, Jr	do	2,789.30
Allan Stewart Thorn	do	3,145.00
Fred W. Young	do	4,444.56
Department of Justice:		
Francis X. Daly	do	1,699.22
James F. Harahan	do	2,834.60
Department of the Navy:		
Albert W. Buckmaster	do	3,021.56
Ellis M. Kline	do	1,003.44
Richard C. Paul	do	1,636.37
James E. Thomas	Clerk-stenographer	573.87
Office of Defense Mobilization:		
Grace DuPree	do	528.45
John D. Young	Investigator	2,492.34
Securities and Exchange Commission: H. Don Cummings	do	2,186.52
Department of State: Psychological Strategy Board: Wayne G. Althaus	do	4,153.80
Tennessee Valley Authority: James E. Goddard	do	3,284.56
Treasury Department: Bryant D. Hiers	do	1,462.16
Veterans' Administration:		
Sam J. Clark	do	2,013.80
Wilton B. Gundlach	do	1,919.93
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		None
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952		216,685.07
Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1952		216,685.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952		283,314.93
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period		5,485.39

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 2, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$8,823.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	5,823.00
Philip W. Kelleher	do	5,823.00
Janice Angell	Clerical staff	2,810.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,810.70
Elizabeth Gilmore	do	2,810.70
Olga K. Greene	do	2,810.70
Agnes H. Johnston	do	3,065.58
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,810.70
John J. Courtney	Special counsel (July 1, 1952, through Jan. 3, 1953).	5,920.05
Paul L. Monahan	Assistant to special counsel (July 1, 1952, through Jan. 3, 1953).	4,851.08
Robert N. Tyler	do	3,116.61
Richard W. Webb	do	4,752.69
Roemer Kiess	Clerk (Aug. 1, 1952, through Jan. 3, 1953).	1,960.48
Mary E. Morrill	Secretary to special counsel (July 1, 1952, through Jan. 3, 1953) (Office of Special Counsel operating under H. Res. 38, H. Res. 114, and H. Res. 557).	2,857.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	57,979.95
Amount expended from July 1, 1952 to Jan. 3, 1953	24,962.04
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to Jan. 3, 1953	82,941.99
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1953	67,058.01

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 10, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff	$5,380.12
John E. Barriere	do	4,063.20
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,823.00
Elsie L. Gould	Assistant clerk	4,065.92
Helen E. Long	do	2,858.46
Jeannette M. Devlin	Stenographer	869.05
W. Kenneth Watkins	Consulting architect	[1] 1,000.00
Mildred Childers	Stenographer	[1] 413.05
Oliver E. Meadows	Investigator	[1] 2,548.03
Helen A. Wright	Assistant clerk	[1] 1,698.85

[1] Amounts paid to employees of Subcommittee on Housing pursuant to H. Res. 436 and H. Res. 437.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$70,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	28,717.70
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	18,929.44
Total amount expended from Oct. 17, 1951 to Dec. 31, 1952	47,647.14
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	22,352.86

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 26, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,822.28
Wendell E. Cable	Minority clerk	4,605.66
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
George R. Stewart	Counsel	5,642.52
Marie E. Hurda	Assistant clerk	2,667.30
Barbara A. Schwartz	Stenographer (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1952).	1,054.83

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	922.67
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	3.10
Total amount expended from Feb. 20, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	925.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	1,074.23

JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 13, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
John S. Forsythe	General counsel	5,823.00
David N. Henderson	Assistant general counsel.	5,823.00
Russell C. Derrickson	Investigator	5,823.00
John O. Graham	Minority clerk	5,823.00
Mary Pauline Smith	Assistant clerk	3,001.66
Barbara Ann Stent	do	3,001.66
Kathryn Kivett	do	3,001.66
Frances N. Roberts	do	3,001.66
Myrtle Locher	Assistant clerk (minority).	3,001.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
	687.80
	30,687.80
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,838.30
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1952	2,075.53
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	10,913.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	19,774.06

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 6, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Roy J. Bullock	do	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	5,823.00
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,384.24
Helen C. Mattas	do	3,145.25
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	3,065.35
Helen L. Hashagen	do	3,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	17,281.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	3,464.56
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	20,746.32
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	54,253.68

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 7, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to January 3, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Unexpended balance, July 1, 1952	$148,291.72
Expenses from July 1, 1952, to Jan. 3, 1953:	
Full committee	2,125.23
Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman	13,435.65
Special Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	2,412.32
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman	40,844.86
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	15,027.34
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman	6,914.08
Total spent from July 1, 1952, to Jan. 3, 1953	80,759.48
Total unexpended Jan. 3, 1953	67,532.24

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas A. Kennedy	General counsel	$5,823.00
William A. Young	Staff director	5,823.00
Christine Ray Davis	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Martha C. Roland	Assistant chief clerk	5,296.92
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	4,605.66

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Florence Hoffman	Staff member to minority, July 1 to Sept. 10, 1952.	$1,651.22
Annabell Zuo	Minority clerk	4,836.06
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	3,463.92
Alice Cravetts	do	2,667.30

Expenses of full committee:	
Stationery supplies for full committee and subcommittees	$367.61
Periodicals for use of committee	11.55
Mimeographing	5.50
Telephone	96.35
Taxi fares, official business	18.50
Postage and stationery supplies, not available in stationery room	24.26
Plane transportation, full committee and subcommittees	1,422.46
Hotel, mileage, meals, per diem	179.00
Total	2,125.23
Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman:	
John H. W. Small, counsel	2,203.04
Cora Louise Harris, clerk-stenographer	2,424.33
Lillian E. Gray, clerk-stenographer	863.86
Bureau of the Budget, reimbursement for personal services of Ray Ward	6,062.80
Hotel, mileage, meals, per diem	1,656.09
Plane transportation	95.68
Reporter	118.75
Mimeographing	9.00
Stamps	2.40
Total	13,435.65
Special Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into the Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Hyman I. Fischbach, reimbursement for hotel, transportation, meals, cab fares, telephone	2,413.32
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:	
Michael P. Balwan, staff director	4,893.23
William A. Brewer, counsel	4,541.87
Eugene F. Sullivan, legal assistant, July 1 to Sept. 20, 1952	1,114.63
Thomas G. Fleming, administrative assistant	4,893.23
Lewis J. Lapham, administrative assistant	3,945.56
H. Sander Bell, administrative assistant	2,290.52
John C. Vick, administrative analyst	2,954.51
James R. Morgan, administrative analyst	890.74
Frances G. Hardy, research clerk	3,693.60
Sylvia L. Swartzel, clerk	2,549.74
Mildred Deen, clerk-stenographer	2,387.75
Garnette S. Benton, stenographer	609.96
Gordon P. Peyton, special counsel	1,965.00
Stephen D. Carnes, Jr., special adviser into various activities of VA	672.00
Railroad transportation	25.96
Stamps	4.92
Plane transportation	248.55
Photostating	21.97
Telephone	271.55
Witness expenses	43.60
Expenses, conducting investigations away from Washington, D. C	3,235.92
Total	40,844.86
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff director	5,920.05
Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk	3,521.65
Olive M. Willeroy, assistant clerk	3,521.65
Telephone	123.25
Expenses, conducting investigations away from Washington, D. C	1,940.74
Total	15,027.34
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:	
Franklin D. Rogers, Jr., clerk	4,316.78
John J. McElwee, administrative assistant	2,544.78
Transportation	52.52
Total	6,914.08

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lea Booth	Clerk	$4,951.26
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	4,813.02
Jack Watson	do	4,674.78
Lura Cannon	do	3,304.56
Ruth Bradley	do	2,348.64

THOS. B. STANLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Preston E. Peden	Committee counsel	$5,823.00
James K. Carr	Technical consultant (Irrigation and Reclamation).	5,823.00
James R. Queen	Consultant (Mines and Mining).	5,373.40
William H. Hackett	Consultant (Territories and Insular Affairs).	5,615.00
Clerical staff:		
Virginia McMichael	Assistant to the chairman.	5,823.00
Claude E. Ragan	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Nancy J. Arnold	Minority clerk	4,606.66
Geraldine Eaker	Clerk	3,145.26
Ruth I Timmony	do	3,065.58
Elizabeth L. Angus	do	2,866.44

NOTES

(1) Timothy V. A. Dillon employed as chief counsel on Seaward Boundaries, chargeable special fund. Gross salary $1,500.

(2) George H. Soule employed as consultant on mining and minerals, salary chargeable to special fund. Gross salary during 6-month period, $5,823.

(3) Jacob N. Wasserman, chief counsel, Bureau of Land Management, on loan from Department of the Interior to aid in the study on revision of public land laws. Salary chargeable to special fund during 6-month period, $3,315.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	47,961.49
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	25,901.02
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	73,862.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	26,137.49

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,823.00
Harold W. Lincoln	Assistant clerk	3,065.58
Kenneth J. Painter	do	3,065.58
Georgia G. Glasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,826.60
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,731.02
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,189.34
Camille O'R. Agnew	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516).	2,428.32
Melba J. Contsonikas	do	2,707.14
Louis Rosenman	Research assistant (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516).	2,375.21
Margaret P. Hogan	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516).	2,203.90
Professional staff:		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,823.00
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,823.00
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant	5,823.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 123 and H. Res. 516)	$80,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	35,326.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	20,362.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	55,688.94
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	24,311.06

ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dick, Bess Effrat	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Besterman, Walter M.	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Brickfield, Cyril F.	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Foley, William R.	do	5,823.00
Lee, Walter R.	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Smedley, Velma	Assistant chief clerk	5,823.00
Benn, Violet T	Clerical assistant	3,583.26
Goldsmith, Helen	do	3,862.20
Berger, Anne J.	Clerk-stenographer	3,424.08
Christy, Frances	do	3,025.74
Coble, Jeannine S.	do	3,025.74
Cram, Jane H.	do	3,025.74
Kaslow, Berta	do	4,246.02

1. Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws.

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1952	$38,913.00
Appropriated—Legislative Appropriation Act 1953	100,000.00
	138,913.90
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1952	11,866.56
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1952	147,047.34

B. (1) Revision of the Laws 1952:

Unexpended balance June 30, 1952	163.05
Expended	41.30
Balance (to be returned to Treasury)	121.75

(2) Revision of the Laws 1953:

Appropriated—Legislative Appropriation Act 1953	13,700.00
Expended	6,193.64
Balance Dec. 31, 1952	7,506.36

C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1952	25,437.72
Expended	11,870.68
Balance Dec. 31, 1952	13,567.04

Pursuant to House Resolution 95 (H. Res. 54, H. Res. 467, and H. Res. 628) employees were paid as follows during the period July 1 through December 31, 1952:

Antitrust subcommittee:

Mary Ahern, clerk-stenographer	$1,950.36
Eileen R. Browne, clerk	3,463.92
E. Ernest Goldstein, general counsel	3,752.50
J. Bruce Hannaford, clerk-typist	935.34
Virginia North, clerk-stenographer	2,029.98
Veronica Strosak, clerk-stenographer	2,436.32
Jerrold L. Walden, assistant counsel	4,432.86
John F. Woog, assistant counsel	3,463.92
Total	22,457.20

Subcommittee To Investigate the Justice Department:

Stephen A. Mitchell, chief counsel to Aug. 10, 1952	$1,575.00
Daniel G. Kennedy, associate counsel	2,976.19
Robert A. Collier, chief counsel	9,319.00
Arthur H. Crowl, investigator	3,346.92
Morris Best, investigator	3,751.65
Thomas J. Connor, investigator-accountant	4,501.98
John C. Weigel, research analyst	837.03
Kathryn Healey, staff assistant	375.50
Lois Sanders, staff assistant	1,485.21
Della L. Sayre, staff assistant	563.27
Robert Willett, legal clerk	670.02
John X. Ward, chief file clerk	2,105.70
Elizabeth Jean Morgan, secretary	1,852.10
Orville Stewart, messenger	1,257.66
Leo N. Nulty, investigator	750.33
Mrs. Judith A. Smith, stenographer	1,041.08
Carl W. Belcher, legal clerk	813.85
Nancy L. O'Rourke	1,964.53
Thomas L. Howe, special counsel	2,888.23
Jean M. Greene, staff assistant	630.77
Bette B. Welch, staff assistant	876.16
Charles J. Myrtle, investigator	650.28
Murray B. York, investigator	4,086.37
Ralph J. Culver, investigator	1,771.31
Milton R. Morgan, special consultant	2,836.46
Alice L. Kupferman, attorney	951.27
Rufus G. King, special counsel	1,449.24
FBI reimbursable	2,189.83
Total	57,516.94

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	General counsel	$5,823.00
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.	Assistant counsel	4,951.26
Reginald S. Losee	Chief investigator	4,882.14
Gus S. Caras	Investigator to the minority.	1,627.38
Frances Still	Chief clerk	5,124.00
Madonna Haworth	Assistant clerk	3,304.56
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk to the minority.	3,304.56
Lucile P. Lamon	Secretary	2,667.30
Total		31,684.20

EDWARD J. HART,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 2, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	5,435.16
John B. Price	Staff assistant	3,463.92
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	3,224.94
Lillian Hopkins	Secretary	2,826.60
Ann Hayden	Stenographer	2,667.30
Donna J. Bramock	Stenographer (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1952).	1,014.99

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 2, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Tierney	Counsel, professional staff.	$5,823.00
Robert F. McConnell	Professional staff assistant.	5,823.00
S. Philip Cohen	Professional staff	5,823.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Mrs. Margaret R. Belter.	Clerk	4,054.11
Mrs. Alice B. Norton	Assistant clerk	4,054.11
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	do	4,054.11
Mrs. Helen Dooley	do	4,054.11
Mrs. Florence Palmer	do	3,802.20

EMPLOYEES UNDER AUTHORITY OF H. RES. 415

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles D. Curran	Staff director	$5,642.52
Charles F. Keyser	Research assistant	1,462.01
Feral Davis	Secretary	2,348.64
Mary Luschyk	do	1,733.65
James R. Christiansen	Research assistant	751.09
Bailey F. Mason	do	507.44
James W. Hudson	do	722.57
Dewitt C. Black, Jr.	do	494.38
Paul E. Zahn	do	1,140.92
Total		14,803.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$95,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	36,050.45
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	19,387.15
Total amount expended from May 31, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	55,437.60
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	39,562.40

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey S. Shaw	Clerk	$5,822.28
T. Howard Dolan	Assistant clerk	4,536.54
Frank Klepal	Assistant to clerk	4,398.06
Elliodor M. Libonati	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
Jane Snader	Minority clerk	3,463.92

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Ranking Majority Member.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	$5,573.40
C. E. Owens	do	5,298.92
C. E. McKillips	do	4,674.78
James A. Andrews	do	4,674.78
W. Jackson Jones	do	4,743.90
Alvin W. Stokes	do	4,467.42
Robert W. Barker	do	4,882.14
Frank Bonora	do	3,264.72
Fuoss, Earl L.	do	4,743.90

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Raphael I. Nixon	Director of research	$5,306.04
Lillian E. Howard	Research clerk	3,065.58
Helen I. Mattson	do	3,224.94
Aselia Poore	Editor	3,304.56
Pearle Gay	Clerk-stenographer	2,746.98
Jane Collins	do	2,667.30
Barbara Jean O'Neal	do	2,348.64
Marie Shults	Clerk-stenographer (terminated services Nov. 1, 1952).	1,957.20
Rose Sanko	Clerk-stenographer	2,746.98
Kathryn Zimmerman	do	2,746.98
Josephine Sheets	Telephone operator	1,759.08
Riley Smith	Stock clerk	1,004.40
Lorraine Nichols	Secretary to director of research.	2,786.76
Alice Walker	Information analyst	2,746.98
Gladys Slack	do	2,587.62
Alyce Gartrell	do	2,667.30
Anniel Cunningham	do	1,671.96
Ruth Tansill	do	2,746.98
Grace O. Hall	Chief file clerk	2,348.64
Virginia Truax	Assistant file clerk	2,348.64
Lena W. Adams	Liaison clerk	1,565.76
Merle Holton	Index clerk	2,348.64
House payroll:		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to committee counsel.	4,098.92
Thomas W. Beale	Assistant counsel	5,099.56
John W. Carrington	Clerk of committee	5,642.52
Juliette Joray	Secretary to clerk	3,105.42
Louis J. Russell	Chief investigator	5,823.00
Thelma W. Scearce	Secretary to chief investigator.	4,017.90
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	5,711.70
Ann Turner	Chief of files	4,467.42
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant chief of files.	3,304.56

Balance Jan. 1, 1952, $75,494.20.
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported 128,611.78
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952 136,229.49
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952 10,653.02

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Chief clerk [1]	$5,823.00
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide	5,823.00
Harold A. L. Lawrence.	do.[2]	970.50
Edwin B. Patterson	do	5,823.00
Ida Rowan	do.[3]	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	2,826.60
Frances Montanye	do	2,826.60
Basil C. Rankin	Assistant clerk [4]	2,309.28
George J. Turner	do	2,746.98

[1] Effective Dec. 1, 1952.
[2] Appointed Dec. 1, 1952.
[3] Effective Dec. 1, 1952.
[4] Appointed Sept. 1, 1952.

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Minority adviser (P).	$5,642.52
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P).	3,530.17
Leo H. Irwin	Clerk (C)	5,823.00
Susan Alice Taylor	Minority stenographer (C).	2,615.52
Frances C. Russell	Staff assistant (C)	2,428.32
Anne Gorden	Clerk-stenographer (C).	2,332.74
Betty R. Hill	Clerk-stenographer (C) (July 1952).	378.16
Virginia M. Butler	Staff assistant (C) (July 7, 1952, to Dec. 31, 1952).	2,039.32
June A. Kendall	Staff assistant (C) (Aug. 15, 1952, to Dec. 31, 1952).	1,714.32
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	1,575.42
Walter B. Little	do	1,499.80

JERE COOPER,
Acting Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 12, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Florence Botta	Typist	$930.00
Bertha A. Brito	Court reporter	2,149.80
Robert E. Conn	Attorney (Sept. 22 to Oct. 31).	457.00
Beatrice B. Daly	Staff assistant (to July 31).	434.63
Barbara A. Davis	Secretary (to Oct. 3).	1,110.57
Bess J. D'Onofrio	Staff assistant (from Dec. 1).	241.95
James P. Donovan	Chief investigator	5,435.16
Grace Good	Staff assistant	2,396.46
Lola M. Hanson	Staff assistant (from Oct. 3).	928.19
Barbara Z. Heslowits	Court reporter	2,149.80
William P. Hindman, Jr.	Attorney (from Oct. 27).	1,196.19
Thomas L. Howe	Assistant counsel (to July 15).	401.06
Sadye B. Jacobs	Staff assistant (to Sept. 30).	1,252.30
M. William Krasilovsky.	Attorney (from Sept. 8).	1,574.42
Howard D. Levine	Legal clerk (to July 15).	169.15
Charles S. Lyon	Chief counsel (to Sept. 15).	3,125.00
Carl M. Mazzocone	Staff assistant (Oct. 15 to Dec. 7).	188.26
Jack C. Pepper	Investigator (July 16 to Aug. 15)	335.00
James Q. Riordan	Assistant counsel (to Nov. 2).	2,423.32
James M. F. Ryan, Jr.	Attorney (from Aug. 25).	2,111.68
Arthur J. Schissel	Attorney (from Dec. 1).	351.61
William A. Silk	Attorney (to July 15).	185.76
Joseph Stein	Attorney (from Aug. 27).	$1,455.31
Lillian Stillman	Staff assistant	2,035.32
Herbert Stoller	Investigator (Aug. 6 to Sept. 30).	614.18
Walter C. Taylor	Assistant counsel (to Aug. 19).	1,225.52
John E. Tobin	Assistant counsel (to Sept. 15), chief counsel (from Sept. 16).	5,864.76
Paul J. Yesawich	Attorney (from Dec. 1).	560.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (represents $184,283.16 minus refund of $158.58) 184,124.58
Amount expended from July 1, 1952, to Dec. 31, 1952 60,242.32
Total amount expended from Apr. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952 244,366.90
Refunds 2,485.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952 8,118.93

CECIL R. KING,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS, EVIDENCE, AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

JANUARY 15, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Mitchell	Chief counsel, Katyn Massacre Committee (select).	$5,823.00
Roman C. Pucinski	Investigator, Katyn Massacre Committee (select).	4,501.98
Barbara R. Booke	Secretary, Katyn Massacre Committee, (select) (resigned Sept. 30, 1952).	1,333.65
Lucile S. Bieblhausof.	Secretary, Katyn Massacre Committee (select).	2,347.36
Wiley T. Swearingen	Clerk-typist, Katyn Massacre Committee (select).	560.03

TRUE FIGURES ACCORDING TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:
Authorized September 1951 $20,000.00
Authorized March 1952 65,000.00
Total 85,000.00
Amount of expenditures from Sept. 27 to Dec. 31, 1951 2,522.29
Amount of expenditures from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952 19,629.83
Total 22,152.12
Less credits from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952 166.04
Total amount expended from Sept. 27, 1951, to June 30, 1952 21,986.08

Amount of expenditures or obligated from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	$41,959.85
Total amount expended from Sept. 27, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	63,945.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	[1] 21,054.07

[1] The following items represent the only obligations which will be incurred in 1953. These should be subtracted from the total unexpended balance and will represent the final financial statement of the committee:
John J. Mitchell, chief counsel, salary, $97.05.
Wiley T. Swearingen, clerk-typist, salary, $41.

RAY J. MADDEN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS UNDER THE GI BILL

JANUARY 3, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oliver E. Meadows	Clerk	$1,583.92
Helen A. Wright	Stenographer	1,056.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	71,014.20
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1952	3,835.49
Total amount expended	74,849.69
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	150.31

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOODS AND COSMETICS

DECEMBER 31, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to January 3, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mildred C. Darrow	Secretary	$2,225.83
Vincent A. Kleinfeld	Chief counsel	697.44
Franklin Bing	Technical consultant.	64.69
Alvin L. Gottlieb	Associate counsel	2,411.57
Total		5,369.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount expenditures previously reported	66,431.38
Amount expended from July 1, 1952, to Jan. 3, 1953	5,424.10
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1951, to Jan. 3, 1953	51,915.48
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1953	23,084.52

JAMES J. DELANEY,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 1, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jean C. Curtis	Clerk	$1,512.87
Victor P. Dalmas	Executive director	5,823.00
Jane M. Deem	Clerk	3,025.74
Elizabeth H. Feltman	Secretary	2,504.29
W. G. Gibson	Special investigator	3,850.53
Charles A. Grefe	Research analyst	1,500.93
Katherine M. Greene	Stenographer	153.52
Marion E. Harrison II	Investigator	1,107.94
James E. Hay	do	2,428.32
Louise Kauffman	Stenographer	2,276.94
Arthur F. Lucas	Economist	3,066.33
Edith Marsh	Administrative assistant.	2,918.22
L. V. Monzel	Research analyst	3,204.56
Jeremiah T. Riley	Assistant counsel	3,702.90
Mary Shaw	Stenographer	2,276.94
Ernest L. Stockton	Research analyst	4,951.26
Betty R. Thomson	Stenographer	1,093.08
Mary D. Ward	do	2,276.94
David E. White	Chief investigator	3,623.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$260,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	160,282.63
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1952	61,521.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1952	221,804.03
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	38,195.97

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CURRENT PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS

JANUARY 14, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1952, to January 3, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
H. Ralph Burton	General counsel	$4,573.46
Clifford Davis, Jr.	Assistant general counsel.	3,322.82
Marcos E. Hoverson	Clerk	1,558.90
Leo Cullinane	Special investigator, public fee basis (per diem only).	240.00
John A. Kendrick	do	59.15
J. Alvin Kugelmass	do	658.49
Joseph B. McFeely	do	551.84
Charles O. Pratt	do	2,195.71
Walter K. Van Olinda	do	1,920.00
Florence O. Binion	Typist, public fee basis (per diem only).	200.00
Lucile E. Brooks	do	20.00
Hope Daigneault	do	40.00
Helen W. Gillian	do	240.00
George A. Martin	do	100.00
Virginia L. Noah	do	20.00
Jewell Y. Sealy	do	80.00
Charlotte S. Croson	Stenographer-typist, public fee basis (per diem only).	$450.00
Ramel V. Payne	do	1,620.00
Freda H. Spencer	do	90.00
Total		17,960.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1952 to Jan. 3, 1953	20,266.74
Total amount expended from July 1952 to Jan. 3, 1953	20,266.74
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 15, 1953	4,733.26

E. C. GATHINGS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

JANUARY 8, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold M. Keele	General counsel	$11,220.00
Thomas J. Feeney	Staff director	5,032.14
Edward C. Kennelly	Attorney	3,514.25
Joseph C. Kiger	Director of research	4,091.84
Mary E. Searight	Clerk	3,184.61
Edith M. Knight	Administrative assistant.	2,527.61
Russell M. McFarland	Investigator	3,468.48
George B. de Huszar	Research analyst	3,300.84
Roger H. Mudd	do	914.18
William H. Snape, Jr.	do	1,495.88
Sarah G. Billingsley	Clerical assistant	910.24
Mary L. Taylor	do	855.84
Clarence A. McGillen, Jr.	do	772.26
Lucye L. Summers	Secretary	1,044.97
Marie A. Morris	Stenographer	449.50
Total		42,822.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Total amount expended from July1 to Dec. 31	48,269.89
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1952	26,730.11

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES

Payroll:	
July 1952	$3,068.99
August 1952	5,181.56
September 1952	7,425.78
October 1952	8,351.02
November 1952	9,158.99
December 1952	9,606.29
Total	42,822.64
Office supplies and equipment	610.65
Telephone	494.45
Witness expense	251.01
Transportation:	
Airline	819.81
Railroad	349.32
Expense accounts of members and staff:	
Per diem allowance or subsistence	1,339.66
Transportation	1,233.92
Miscellaneous (telephone, postage, etc.)	220.06
Printing	28.37
Total	48,269.89

BROOKS HAYS,
Acting Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose approval we seek above the hollow applause of men, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and demanding issues that Thou might lift upon us the light of Thy countenance. We come with grateful hearts for the gift of another day. May its hours be made luminous by Thy presence, who art the light of all our seeing. May we work with full purpose of heart while it is called day, knowing that the night cometh.

In all our dealing with others grant us the spirit of kindliness, of thoughtfulness, and of fair play. Deliver us from all malice and contempt lest we hurt others and sour our own souls. May the tyranny of expediency never bend our conscience to low aims which betray high principles. Hear Thou our prayer, as out of the depths we cry, bowing at the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 29, 1953, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAYBANK was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday, February 2, 1953.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF APPLICATIONS AND HEARINGS CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearings cases in the Federal Communications Commission, as of December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the year ended April 1, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Townsend Club 22, Miami, Fla., favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 3

"Whereas building of roads and highways since the inception of our Government has been primarily a State responsibility; and

"Whereas every State of the Union has tremendous problems in maintaining, extending, and building highways and bridges due to the lack of building program during the war-years period; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has always collected much more than they have sent back to the States for road-building purposes; and

"Whereas the costs of building and maintaining roads and highways have increased tremendously; and

"Whereas States have demonstrated they are willing, have, and do cooperate in building the federally designated highways; and

"Whereas the States sensed the responsibility of an integrated highway system as it relates to the national welfare; and

"Whereas the States have demonstrated that they can build adequate highways; and

"Whereas in many instances, many economies can be effected through sole State responsibility of building highways; and

"Whereas because of the foregoing facts and after due consideration, the Council of State Governments in the national meeting December 7 in Chicago passed a resolution supporting this proposition, and the governors' conference in the national meeting in July 1952 unanimously passed a resolution supporting this proposition: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the Eighty-third session of Congress give serious consideration to the question of eliminating the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; be it further

"Resolved, That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Iowa delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the legislature of Iowa, be sent to each house of the legislatures of the States of the United States."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 242. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 29).

INTERIM REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES (S. REPT. NO. 30)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last year, the Senate approved Senate Resolution 74, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations or a subcommittee thereof to conduct a full and complete investigation of the overseas information programs of the United States. The resolution called for the committee to report to the Senate prior to January 31, 1953.

The subcommittee has made a preliminary investigation under the terms of Senate Resolution 74, and has prepared an interim report recommending that it be continued until June 30, 1953. The subcommittee did not feel that it had sufficient time to make the full and complete study and investigation required by Senate Resolution 74 and present recommendations for necessary appropriations or legislation.

I ask that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to submit the interim report of the Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs of the United States before midnight tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Subsequently,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the above-mentioned report, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 726. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 727. A bill to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Willwood, and Belle Fourche irrigation districts shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 728. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of the national service life insurance granted the late Lester T. Brown to his widow, Mrs. Gay Dobler Brown; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 729. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Christ Lagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 730. A bill for the relief of Winfried Kohls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CALLING OF A SENATOR TO ORDER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution for a change in the rules to provide a reasonable manner for the application of rule XIX, in regard to the calling of a Member of the Senate to order. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, explaining the purpose of the resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) submitted by Mr. LEHMAN was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 4 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the calling of a Senator to order in debate, is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a) If a Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order. When a Senator is called to order by another Senator, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, immediately decide whether the Senator who has been called to order has violated a Senate rule. The decision shall be subject to an appeal to the Senate which shall, without debate, be decided at once. When the Presiding Officer calls a Senator to order, an appeal shall lie from such action to the Senate and it shall be decided at once, without debate.

"(b) When it is determined under this rule that a Senator is not in order, he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate. If such leave is granted, it shall be upon motion that the speaker be allowed to proceed in order. This motion shall be decided without debate."

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

My proposal to amend rule XIX is intended to restore to this rule the meaning which analogous rules have in all parliamentary bodies, and to remove the possibility of capricious assault upon the right of every Member of this great body to participate in the debates and deliberations which are the hallmark of the United States Senate.

I am a great admirer of the high traditions of the Senate and agree that every Member of the Senate should conduct himself in debate and otherwise in such a manner as to avoid casting any reflection on the honor or motives of another Senator, except perhaps in such instances when the Senate is, in fact, sitting in judgment upon the qualifications of its own Members—an obligation imposed upon the Senate by the Constitution. In all other situations our debate should, of course, be conducted upon a high and impersonal plane. It was in order to set this standard that rule XIX was included in the Standing Rules of the Senate.

However, as rule XIX is now written and interpreted, any Member of the Senate can take any other Senator off his feet and thus deprive him of the floor by the simple act of invoking rule XIX. Under existing interpretation it does not matter whether the Senator invoking rule XIX has any justification or not. Every Member of the Senate becomes an omnipotent judge and Presiding Officer to decide whether or not the Senator speaking has imputed to another Senator conduct or motives unworthy or unbecoming a United States Senator. The question of whether the Senator speaking has, in fact, cast any reflection upon the honor or motives of another Senator can never be brought to issue. Rule XIX as now written and enforced permits any Senator to invoke it without proof or showing of just cause.

This seems to me a complete negation of the spirit of the Senate and a complete negation of the intent and purpose of all the other rules of the Senate which are designed to give each Member of the Senate, as a representative of his State, the fullest possible latitude in advocating the interests of his State and of the Nation. I know of no other parliamentary body in the world where such a practice is followed. Yet I can see where a literal interpretation of rule XIX as it is now written leads us to the present practice.

I am, therefore, proposing an amendment to correct this intolerable situation.

I would propose that if a Senator is called to order by another Senator, the Presiding Officer shall immediately decide whether the Senator has violated the Senate rule of conduct and propriety. The decision of the Presiding Officer shall be subject to appeal of the Senate without debate.

In the case where the Presiding Officer on his own initiative calls a Senator to order, an appeal from his action can be taken by the Senate immediately without debate.

These are the major changes which my resolution would effect. It seems inconceivable to me that the framers of rule XIX intended that a single Member of the Senate should be able to take another Senator off his feet and deprive him of the right to debate.

The essence of my proposal is to give the entire Senate through its Presiding Officer—with right of appeal from his ruling—the right to judge the propriety of a Senator's remarks. This right should not be vested in every individual Senator. That is the denial of democratic procedure. It opens the way—and it has been so used—to arbitrary interference with the right of each Senator to debate. It is, in my judgment, a most autocratic rule. It could be misused to destroy and paralyze the Senate.

I hope that my resolution will receive early and favorable consideration.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have printed for its use 1,500 copies of Public Law 414, Comparative Print of the Texts of the Immigration and Nationality Act and Immigration and Nationality Laws Existing Prior to Enactment of Public Law 414.

PAY OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF NAVY DEPARTMENT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on January 9, among the official referrals from the Vice President to the committee was a communication from the Department of Defense requesting introduction of a bill regarding the pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska. This is identical with S. 1829 of the Eighty-second Congress, which was handled by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

In view of the above, I request that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the letter from the general counsel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska, and that the letter and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him before United Nations General Assembly, December 18, 1952, answering certain charges made against the United States by the Soviet Union.

By Mr. MORSE:

Letter entitled "Complaint," written by George E. Foote, and published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard of recent date.

Letter entitled "Lesson of the Morse Affair," written by Soren A. Toroian, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, January 18, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "Jacob Brown Goes to War," written by Jerome Kearful, and published in the National Guardsman of February 1953.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT T. STEVENS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has stated that he does not intend to bring up the nomination of Robert T. Stevens, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may be permitted to speak out of order on this nomination for just a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I look at the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. BRIDGES] I am reminded that he is the only Senator now on the Committee on Armed Services, as I recall, who was a member of the old Committee on Military Affairs during the last war. I had the pleasure of serving on the committee with the distinguished Senator. During the period of my service I was a member of several subcommittees and also a member of the Joint Subcommittee on Deferment, at which time there were many occasions when I had to contact Colonel Stevens, who was always cooperative and helpful in looking after the interests of the War Department. I also talked to him after his many trips. He served well and faithfully in the Quartermaster Corps for 4 years.

I never knew a man who performed his duties in a more perfect way than did Colonel Stevens. During my entire experience with him while I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and of the various subcommittees, I was greatly impressed by his honesty, his ability, his integrity, and his devotion to duty.

I understand that when his nomination was considered it was approved unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. The services of Colonel Stevens will be of the greatest benefit to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the country and the people. I am happy to have the opportunity to make this statement for the RECORD in behalf of his nomination.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 27, 1953, in a coast-to-coast broadcast over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System and CBS television, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles delivered an address on the subject of the foreign policy of the United States. The address, made just prior to a trip abroad which Mr. Dulles is beginning today, has been the subject of criticism, both pro and con, in various newspapers.

It is of such great importance that I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the body of the RECORD in order that it may be brought to the attention of all Senators at the time when Mr. Dulles is beginning his important trip.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been now just 6 days that I have been Secretary of State and I can assure you that they have been very, very busy days. They have been a perfect mass of accumulated problems, but I hope never to be too busy to talk with the Congress and with the people of the United States so that they will know what it is we're thinking about and what our purposes and intentions are.

I've already met with two congressional committees that deal primarily with foreign affairs and now I want to have a chance to talk with you. Of course it's obvious that after 6 days I haven't got the answers to all the problems. It would be ridiculous if I pretended that I did have but I do think it's worth while to tell you what our position in the world is and the spirit with which we approach the solution of these problems.

Now the first thing that I want to make clear and I want to make it abundantly clear is that I consider that it is my job to work for the people of the United States. I am part of your Government; it's you that have hired me and pay me and you're entitled to have me do the best that I can for you. And that is going to be the spirit of the State Department and of our Ambassadors. You needn't be afraid that we're working against you and for others.

President Eisenhower has often used a phrase—it's the phrase "enlightened self-interest"—that is going to be the guide as we go on to make our foreign policy. Now in our own interest, our enlightened self-interest, we have to pay close attention to what is going on in the rest of the world. And the reason for that is that we have enemies who are plotting our destruction. These enemies are the Russian Communists and their allies in other countries.

Now you may ask, how do we know that they are really trying to destroy us? Well the answer to that one is that their leaders teach it openly and have been teaching it for many years, and everything that they do fits into that teaching. And in this country our courts have had to look into the question and they've found most recently, only last week, that the Communist Party in this country is part of a gigantic conspiracy designed to overthrow our Government by violence.

Well you may say, do we need to take this threat seriously, and the answer to that is that the threat is a deadly serious one. President Eisenhower recently said that the Nation stands in greater peril than at any time in our history. Any American who isn't awake to that fact is like a soldier who's asleep at his post. We must be awake, all of us awake, to that danger.

Now already our proclaimed enemies control one-third of all the people of the world. I've here behind me a map which shows the vast area which stretches from Kamchatka near Alaska, the northern islands of Japan and right on to Germany in the center of Europe. That's an area which the Russian Communists completely dominate. In that area are 800,000,000 people and they are being forged into a vast weapon of fighting power backed by industrial production and modern weapons that include atomic bombs. If this block of 800,000,000 people is compared with our population, about 150,000,000 people, it means that if we were alone against them, the population odds against us and in their favor would be 7 to 1. Now in the case of the First World War and the Second World War there was a big coalition on our side against the despots so that the manpower ratio then was about 7 to 1 in our favor. It wouldn't be pleasant to have a war in which the odds against us were 7 to 1.

And another important fact is that this vast area of Asia-Europe, which our enemies control, has within it all of the natural resources which they need. On the other hand, we are largely dependent on overseas goods. For example, our steel industry which is of course basic, in peace production and war production, depends very largely upon importations of manganese from overseas. So, if we were alone, not only would the manpower odds be terrifically against us, but we would be at a great disadvantage in the production of the weapons that we needed.

These are some of the reasons why the enlightened self-interest of the United States compels that we should have friends and allies in the world. At the present time, the Soviet Communists are carrying out a policy which they call encirclement. That means they want to get control of the different areas around them and around us so they will keep growing in strength and we're more and more cut off and isolated. They said they don't want to start an open war against us until they have got such overwhelming power that the result would not be in doubt. So that strategy has been to pick up one country after another by getting control of its government, by political warfare, and indirect aggression. And they have been making very great progress.

At the end of the Second World War, only a little over 7 years ago, they only controlled about 200,000,000 people, and today, as I say, they control 800,000,000 people, and they're hard at work to get control of other parts of the world.

Let me now, with a map before me, pick out some of the high spots of trouble. Let's start with Korea, which naturally comes first to our minds because of the cruel and bloody war going on there. What's that all about? Well, one thing that it's about is Japan. You see the Soviet Union has already moved into the northern islands which are very close to Japan, in fact they are within 2 miles of northern Japan, and their planes are reported daily almost as flying across the northern part of Japan. And you can see from this map that if they had not only this area up to the north of Japan, but also had all of Korea, then Japan would be within the Communist pincers. And if the Russians or Chinese Communists got control of Japan with its great industrial power, then they could use that to process the raw materials which come from Asia, from Manchuria, and from China, and to process them into arms and weapons for the vast manpower of China. And that, if it happened, would be a very unfortunate thing for us. It was hard enough for us to win the war against Japan in the Pacific when Japan was alone, when China was our ally and the Soviet Union was neutral. If Russia, China, and Japan all combined, it would be pretty tough going for us in the Pacific. Stalin has boasted that with Japan the Soviet Union would be invincible. We don't need to believe that but at least we can see that it would be pretty tough going.

Now the Soviet Russians are making a drive to get Japan, not only through what they are doing in northern areas of the islands and in Korea, but also through what they are doing in Indochina. If they could get this peninsula of Indochina, Siam, Burma, Malaya, they would have what is called the rice bowl of Asia. That is the area from which the great peoples of Asia, great countries of Asia, such as Japan and India, get in large measure their food. And you can see that if the Soviet Union had control of the rice bowl of Asia that would be another weapon which would tend to expand their control into Japan and into India. That is a growing danger and it is not only a bad situation because of the threat in the Asian countries that I refer to, but also because the French who are doing much of the fighting there are making great effort and that effort subtracts just that much from the capacity of their building a European army and making the contribution which otherwise they could be expected to make. I'll touch on that problem later on when we get to Europe.

Now then, we can go on to the next area which is the Arab world. And in the Middle East we find that the Communists are trying to inspire the Arabs with a fanatical hatred of the British and ourselves. Now that area contains the greatest known oil reserves that there are in the world, and the Soviet interest is shown by the fact that Stalin when he was negotiating with Hitler in 1940 said that that area must be looked upon as the center of Soviet aspirations. If all of that passed into the hands of our potential enemies that would make a tremendous shift in the balance of economic power. And furthermore, this area also has control of the Suez Canal and that is the portion of the world and the seaways of the world which has long been guarded and called the life line which made it possible for Europe to be in communication with Asia. Then, there are difficulties at the present time between the British Government and the Government of Egypt which relate to the question of the defense and control of the Suez Canal.

Then if we move on further, we can go to Africa. And throughout Africa the Communists are trying to arouse the native people into revolt against the western Europeans who still have political control of most of Africa. If there should be trouble there, that would break the contact between Europe and Africa, Africa being a large source of raw materials for Europe.

And then we come now, as we go around the globe, to Western Europe itself. And in Western Europe we find that there is in existence there one of our major foreign policies, the foreign policy that is called by the word "NATO"—NATO standing for North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The purpose there was to tie the Western European countries together with association from United States and from Canada so as to create there a community which would be strong enough to deter any attack on Western Europe by the Red armies. This area of Western Europe has always been historically an area which was strong in the military sense. And the countries have quite a considerable military tradition. The trouble has been that in the past these Western European countries have used their military strength with which to fight each other and to bleed each other. Particularly France and Germany, as you know, have been fighting each other about once in every generation for quite a long time. The present hope is that Germany

and France will join in a single European defense community, and then we would have a situation where they could not fight each other and where their combined strength with that of their other allies would make it unlikely that the Red armies would attempt to invade Western Europe. That's a good idea, and it has had in this country bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the plan now seems to be somewhat stalled. And it seems as though some of the French people and some of the German people want again to go in their separate ways. That's one of the reasons why President Eisenhower asked me and Mr. Stassen, who directs the mutual assistance program, to go to Europe this week. We want to look the situation over at firsthand and see whether this trend to unity is on the upgrade or is on the downgrade.

Let me say to you first of all that in this trip we are taking we are not going to make any commitments of any kind, sort, or description. The problem of making commitments is for the Congress of the United States, working in cooperation with the executive departments of the Government. We shall be there to observe and to listen, but not to make any commitments.

The United States has made a big investment in Western Europe on the theory that there could be unity there. Of the $40,000,000,000 which we have sent abroad since the end of the second World War, almost $30,000,000,000 have gone into Western Europe. If however there were no chance, and that I just refuse to believe, but if it appeared there were no chance of getting effective unity, and if in particular France, Germany and England should go their separate ways, then certainly it would be necessary to give a little rethinking to America's own foreign policy in relation to Western Europe. So you see that as we look around the world so far we've looked at Asia and we've looked at Europe, and we've looked at Africa, but then also we've got this hemisphere to look at. And we have to look at South America. Sometimes we're inclined to take South America for granted. But the reality is that there are strong Communist movements in South America and Fascist influences in some quarters which are working away, largely underground so far, and they're trying to destroy the traditional friendship between the people of the American republics. The past administration has been so preoccupied with some of these problems of Europe and Asia and Africa that I referred to, that I fear it may have somewhat neglected South America and taken it for granted that we could forget about South America for a time and then go back again and find everything the same as it was before. But actually any such policy of neglect would lead to growing danger.

Well you can see that there is plenty of trouble around the world; I've pointed out some of the high spots of trouble but there are many more. There are plenty of areas which are vulnerable to the political warfare which the Russians are waging and if these areas were lost then the Russian Communists would have largely completed their encirclement of the United States and be ready for what Stalin has called the decisive blow against us with the odds overwhelmingly in their favor. That's a gloomy picture but it need not and it must not discourage us. These Russian Communists are not supermen and their strategy is not irresistible. I feel absolutely confident that we can make it fail. Now as I said I'm not going to attempt to tell you tonight in any detail what will be the foreign policies of President Eisenhower's Administration. It would be foolish to attempt to do that so quickly—it's only a week ago today that President Eisenhower was inaugurated—but I think I can on the basis of what I know about him give you two indications as to the outline of our foreign policy, one negative and the other positive.

Now, first, the negative one. We will not try to meet the Soviet strategy of encirclement by ourselves starting a war. Take that for certain. A few people here and there in private life have suggested that a war with Soviet Russia was inevitable, and that we'd better have it soon rather than later because they said time is running against us. President Eisenhower is absolutely opposed to any such policy and so, of course, am I and all of my associates in the State Department and the Foreign Service. We shall never choose a war as the instrument of our policy.

It says in the Bible, you recall, that all they that take the sword perish with the sword. And even people who do not accept that as a doctrine of faith, they should at least remember that twice within our generation great and powerful despots have taken the sword. Germany and Japan, for example, have taken the sword with seemingly overwhelming power only in the end to perish miserably. Now, of course, we know that our enemies do not have moral scruples, in fact they deny that there is such a thing as a moral law. They preach violence. Stalin has said and it is taught to every one of his Communist followers that the world transformation which they seek cannot, they say, be achieved without violence. And Stalin went on to say that any who thought that their goals could be achieved peacefully have either gone out of their minds or are traitors to the Communist cause. We know that they've used violence, at least on a local scale in several countries of the world including Korea and Indochina. They're building up a vast military machine; they've rejected United Nations proposals for an armistice in Korea; and they've rejected United Nations proposals for effective limitation of armament. Therefore we ourselves must have a strong Military Establishment and we should encourage the creation of military strength among our friends but the purpose is never to wage war but only to deter war. Not only shall we never invoke war to achieve our purposes but we shall try to the best of our ability to stop the wars that are now going on in the world, notably these wars in Korea and Indochina. Today these wars go on because the enemy thinks he's getting an advantage by continuing the war. I believe that General Eisenhower will find the ways to make the enemy change his mind in that respect so that they too will want peace.

Now the other purpose of our foreign policy, and this is the positive aspect, must be to create in other peoples such a love and respect for freedom that they can never really be absorbed by the despotism, the totalitarian dictatorship of the Communist world. The Russian Communists, as I've pointed out, have swallowed a great many people to date, approximately 800,000,000, but you know there is such a thing as indigestion. People don't always get stronger by eating more; sometimes they eat more than they can digest and then they get weaker instead of getting stronger. And already there are signs of indigestion within the Russian Communist world. The purges and the trials that are going on in Eastern Europe, the wholesale executions that are going on in Communist China, all these things show the people are restive and are unhappy. The fact that the Communist rulers feel that they have to resort to these tactics of terrorism in order to make the people do their will, that fact is a sign of weakness, not a sign of strength. And a great deal can be done to make these peoples, these captive peoples, retain such a love of freedom and independence and to bring such a love and determination to keep independence on the part of these peoples that I've talked about who are menaced that they can't be swallowed and digested by Soviet communism. And perhaps in time the indigestion will become so acute that it might be fatal.

Now what's our job and our task in that respect? Our job is to serve our own enlightened self-interest by demonstrating by our own performance, by our own examples, how good freedom is and how much better it is than despotism is. Now who can put on that performance, that demonstration to show that example? The only people in the world that can do it are you, the people of the United States of America. And it means that each of you has a task in foreign policy. Foreign policy isn't just something that's conducted by secretaries of state and by ambassadors in different parts of the world; everyone of you has got a part in making a successful foreign policy for the United States, because whether or not we peacefully succeed will largely depend upon the demonstration you make as to the value and productivity of liberty. You must work hard enough at whatever your task is to show that freedom is more productive than slavery. You must be resourceful and inventive enough so that our instruments of peace and if need be war are better than any that can be invented by the despots and their captives. And we must be compassionate and friendly and good neighbors because people who are wholly selfish are never an attractive people. If each of you will recognize that you have a part to play in making freedom seem desirable, then all of us together will make freedom so sought after throughout the world that the Russian Communists will be bound to fail in their strategy of encircling us by swallowing up the rest of the world.

The point I want to emphasize is that the heart of a successful foreign policy is our national conduct and example and that is a matter for every individual and not just the diplomats. So far as your Government is concerned you may be sure that it will not be intimidated, subverted, or conquered. Our Nation must stand as a solid rock in a storm-tossed world. To all those suffering under Communist slavery, to the timid and the intimidated peoples of the world, let us say this, you can count upon us. Together with the other free peoples of the world we can, I am confident, peacefully achieve an honorable peace.

Now I suppose some of you are wondering whether the State Department can really be trusted to take a strong lead against Russian communism. There have been some shocking revelations which showed that some Communists and sympathizers have found their way into high places and betrayed secrets—even that of the atomic bomb. I can assure you that all of the resources of Government, and that includes the FBI, are going to be employed to be sure that any such people are detected and cleaned out. I can promise you that our foreign policies, our new policies, will never to the slightest degree reflect any lack of faith in the ideals and the principles on which this Nation was founded. And let me now in conclusion say that I believe that our foreign policies should be open so that you can know what they are and they should be sufficiently simple so that you can understand them and judge them and they should be sufficiently decent and moral so that they will fit into your idea of what you think is right. These principles of openness, simplicity, and righteousness—those principles are those which are in accord with what used to be the great American traditional foreign policy—that has been our great tradition and I am proud that we here in the State Department and in our Foreign Service will have a chance to carry on that great tradition and to live up to it. And in that way we shall, I think, deserve and I hope we shall receive the support, the confidence and the cooperation of the American people.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar under rule VIII is in order. The clerk will state the first business on the calendar.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF MANPOWER STUDIES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The resolution (S. Res. 53) extending the time for completion of the manpower studies in the executive departments by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution would continue until February 15, 1953, inclusive, the present staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service investigating the manpower policy and the general civil-service policy of the executive branch of the Government. The authority for such investigation will end on January 31, 1953, unless otherwise extended. This investigation was given funds by the Senate in the amount of $50,000 during 1952. Of that total approximately $10,000 remains, of which it is expected that this resolution would expend not more than $8,000. Only about 15 days remain for the completion of the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it true that this resolution does not entail any new funds?

Mr. JENNER. It involves no new funds.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was just about to propound the question which the Senator from Louisiana has asked. This resolution will not even use up all the funds the committee has. The purpose is to enable the committee to complete its report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 53) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 53, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to on February 19, 1951 (providing for a study and investigation of the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government), is hereby continued to February 15, 1953, inclusive.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BLAIR MOODY

The resolution (S. Res. 54) to pay compensation for a certain period to the employees of former Senator Blair Moody was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Blair Moody, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

The resolution (S. Res. 55) to pay compensation for a certain period to the employees of former Senator Thomas R. Underwood was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas R. Underwood, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 33) continuing the authority for the temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 3, after "August" to strike out "1" and insert "6", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951, and Senate Resolution 249, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants, is hereby continued until January 31, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have for the record an explanation of the resolution from the chairman of the committee?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to attempt to explain the purpose and need of the resolution. Personally, I must say that, in my humble opinion, while many of the executive departments are overstaffed, a great many of the legislative agencies of Government are understaffed. Personally, for a long time I have felt that there should be a permanent joint committee which could sit, as an overall budget committee, as it were, checking the requests which we receive from downtown, the requirements, and the cost of government. That is where money can be saved.

Be that as it may, that is not the subject I wish to discuss today. All I am asking now is that the Senate continue the situation which has been in effect under the Democratic administration for a number of years.

The workload of the Foreign Relations Committee is as heavy as that of any committee in the Senate, with the possible exceptions of Appropriations and Judiciary, each of which has a much larger staff. The Foreign Relations Committee has a staff of only 12, including the 2 positions which it is sought to continue.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the Foreign Relations Committee and its legislative subcommittees met 175 times. In the Eighty-second Congress, there were 251 meetings. In the Eighty-third Congress, the committee has already met many times.

Many of these meetings are necessarily in executive session, but frequently the transcripts are later edited for security and published. This procedure has been adopted in an effort to make sure that the public has every bit of information that can properly be made public, while at the same time information affecting our national security is kept secret. The process, however, inevitably involves additional clerical work. During the Eighty-second Congress, the committee spent 123 days in hearings which filled 10,010 pages.

The two positions which we are asking to have continued do not represent additional help. They will merely prevent a reduction in staff.

Aside from the full committee and its legislative subcommittees, there are eight consultative subcommittees which do not handle legislation but which are designed for consultation with appropriate responsible officials of the Department of State so that committee members can be kept fully and currently informed on foreign-policy developments in all parts of the world. Each of these subcommittees requires staff work in arranging meetings, sending out notices, keeping records, and so forth.

The day-to-day mail received by the Foreign Relations Committee is heavy, and there are no indications that it will get any lighter in the months to come. On an issue of major public interest, the committee has received as many as 3,000 communications a week.

Except for the addition of the two clerical assistants covered by this resolution, the staff of the committee has been kept within the limits prescribed by the Legislative Reorganization Act. We do not believe in payroll padding or in excess staffing. As an example, when the Senate last summer in Senate Resolution 74 directed a special investigation of overseas information programs and appropriated $50,000 for that purpose, much of the work was done by the committee's regular staff while Congress was in adjournment, and at a great saving of money.

The membership of the committee has recently been enlarged from 13 to 15 members, and that increase will entail additional clerical work on the part of the staff if all members of the committee are to receive the service they are entitled to.

Within the last 4 years, the committee has handled such very important items as the North Atlantic Treaty, the big programs of military, economic, and technical assistance—now consolidated in the Mutual Security Program—the question of sending troops to Europe, the Japanese Peace Treaty and related se-

curity pacts in the Pacific, and the contractual conventions with Germany.

Let me say parenthetically that from information which has been brought to our attention it is very clear that there will be many more problems presented to the committee because of the present critical situation of the world.

The question of staffing was discussed by the Foreign Relations Committee at its first meeting of the year, and I was unanimously directed to submit this resolution which will maintain our staff at the same level it has been for the last 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator anticipate that the committee will have as many problems to consider as it had during the past 2 years, when it was necessary to employ two additional clerks?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. I just made the statement that in my humble opinion the committee will have many problems to consider.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator anticipate? I can well understand that in past years the committee had the Atlantic Pact and various other proposals to consider. But will the Senator be a little more specific and state what new problems he anticipates?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I should be very happy if additional time could be granted. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed 3 minutes additional.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Wisconsin may answer the question in my time.

Mr. WILEY. I can be specific only in part, for the simple reason that in my judgment the problems will be multifarious. A statement given to us yesterday indicates that Secretary Dulles leaves for Europe today. Why does he leave? The answer is that the European situation is very critical and complicated.

I am also concerned with the situation in the Far East. I should not be in the least surprised if, before many months have passed, we shall have placed in our lap the equivalent of NATO for the Far East. We shall undoubtedly have to consider the question of extension of mutual aid. We shall have before us the question of extension of military aid. If we do not succeed in obtaining an overall understanding with the European nations, we may have to have bilateral understandings. While I am an optimist, I can conceive of the work being a great deal heavier than it has been in the past, and that we may have to request additional help. However, at this time, we are not asking for it.

I may say also that we already have in our lap something which we did not have last year or 2 years ago. It has been indicated that 120 nominations will be received to fill positions from which our Democratic friends have resigned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the able Senator from Wisconsin to say that during the past 4 years the heavy work of the Committee on Foreign Relations has been conducted with a minimum of staffing and with no excess payroll?

Mr. WILEY. With these same two assistants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the committee had a large volume of work which it did with a saving, and the new committee which now comes along feels that it is necessary to continue the staff and that it will not be possible to effect any economy.

Mr. WILEY. My answer is that the place to effect economy is in procurement in the Military Establishment and in the executive and administrative branches of the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, so far as the Committee on Foreign Relations is concerned, the previous chairman of the committee, who happened to be a Democrat from Texas, administered the committee with efficiency and economy?

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Illinois talk to me instead of to the wall on the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon. Did I understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that the previous chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally, conducted the work of that committee with efficiency and economy?

Mr. WILEY. I believe I can say the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very gracious of the Senator from Wisconsin to say it, and I am delighted that it has been made a matter of record.

Mr. WILEY. Is that what the Senator from Illinois was fishing for?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted one more minute in order to reply to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the record is very clear as to my opinion of my former distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally. I have expressed my sentiments on the floor of the Senate, and I was one of the first to pay my compliments to him, which I wish to restate. Compounded throughout the years, my impression of the distinguished former Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally, is that he has been an efficient servant of his country, one whom we all learned to love. He was a character, if you please, Mr. President, who cannot be replaced in the Senate, because when Tom Connally came here the mold was broken. He was an outstanding citizen and an outstanding Senator, whom we all love, and there is no question about the fact that he did his work well as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to make brief reference to the subject before us by way of supplementing the statement of our distinguished chairman. We have a staff which is very well trained. It is capable and willing. I doubt if any committee of the Senate has a staff which is better qualified to do its work than the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, there have been times when the staff has been overworked. I do not know how the committee can possibly do its work in the coming year with a staff less in number or quality.

I sincerely hope that the staff of the committee will not be reduced at this critical time in our history.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 33), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 42) to investigate problems relating to economic mobilization and stabilization, banking and housing policies, and certain other matters, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "authorized", to strike out "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-third Congress,", and in line 8, after the word "the", to insert "reimbursable", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1953, to January 31, 1954, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic mobilization and stabilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities in the present national emergency; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) war disaster insurance.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1954, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $23,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 248, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to on January 24, 1952.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 37) authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 2, after the word "until", to strike out "otherwise provided by law" and insert "January 31, 1954", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, until January 31, 1954, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I am glad to respond to the request of the Senator from Louisiana. Last year the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was organized on a different business than this year. Last year the committee had several subcommittees, and this year the committee will have the same subcommittees. However, last year the subcommittees had individual staffs, whereas this year we decided to start our operations without separate subcommittee staffs. The subcommittees as such will have no separate staffs. In that way we have been able to reduce the budget of last year by approximately $260,000. Therefore we are merely asking that we be given more clerical help for the regular staff of the committee, which is allowed by the Reorganization Act, and that we may use the staff to assist the subcommittees. The committee has five subcommittees, which are the subcommittees on civil rights, education, health, labor, and veterans' affairs. Each of the subcommittees is organized, and consists of a chairman and four members. They will all try to do their work with the aid of the regular staff. In the event that the pressure of work becomes too heavy we may ask for additional help, but we are starting our work without asking for such additional help. All we are asking for is additional clerical help so that we may handle the work efficiently.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much additional clerical assistance would be authorized by the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Two clerical assistants and two clerk-stenographers, or a total of four. The total amount of the request is $21,529.46.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated, however, that if the Senate should adopt the resolution, a gross saving of some $200,000 would be realized over the expense of the committee last year.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Two hundred and sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make it clear that the $260,000 would be the saving for the entire Congress. It is a saving of $130,000 a year. Last year the expense was $150,000, and the resolution asks for $20,000 for the first year. Therefore, the actual saving would be $130,000 this year. Presumably the saving would be the same next year, unless a special investigation should be held.

I may say, too, Mr. President, that I hope we may make a similar cut in funds for the Committee on the Economic Report. I do not believe that committees of Congress should be research organizations. I do not believe that they should be engaged in large research projects, when there are so many other Government agencies which conduct research and whose reports are available to the committees of Congress.

The work done by the committee in question was important work, but most of it was done by the staff and submitted to the committee in the form of staff reports. The Members of the Senate who served on the committees themselves have never had the time to consider the reports which were submitted. The hearings were conducted largely by the staff.

I do not believe that kind of work should be done by committees of Congress. Unless members of the committees themselves care to spend the time to conduct such investigations, consider the staff reports, and give enough time to the task, I do not believe that kind of work should be done. I do not believe it falls within the proper scope of committee staff work.

That is very different from a situation in which members of committees themselves are actually interested in investigations and where investigations ought to be made only by Members of Congress in public hearings. In such a case it is a very proper function for committees to conduct such investigations and hearings, which finally lead up to action by Congress. I believe this committee is one of the committees which went rather wild in that respect, making merely research investigations which could be made as well by executive agencies. That is why we are asking for a reduction in the committee's funds. On the other hand, we shall ask for increases in funds to be granted to other committees whose members are undertaking active investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that when the Taft-Hartley law was passed the act provided for a committee to continue a study of labor-management relations?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that the same work was continued by subcommittees thereafter.

Mr. TAFT. The work continued through the Eightieth Congress. We were responsible for starting an outlay of a considerable extra amount of funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Then the life of the committee was extended for another year. After that I believe the work of the committee was completed, and we should have stopped it, but we did not stop it. In fact, we expanded the committee into a still larger study group, so to speak, whose activities no longer commanded the interest of the members of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I wanted to make is that the subcommittee had its origin in the Taft-Hartley Act itself; later the subcommittee was extended for a year, and thereafter continued in another—and larger—form. Congress renewed the committee once, and that committee established a subcommittee which did more work than the previously authorized committee did.

Mr. TAFT. At least, it spent more money; I do not know about the work it did.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Ohio for expanding the discussion of this point, and I think it will be helpful to us and to the committee.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the membership of the standing subcommittees of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Ives (chairman), Mr. Aiken, Mr. Griswold, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Lehman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. Aiken (chairman), Mr. Taft, Mr. Purtell, Mr. Hill, Mr. Murray.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Mr. Purtell (chairman), Mr. Griswold, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hill, Mr. Lehman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. Taft (chairman), Mr. Ives, Mr. Purtell, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Neely, Mr. Kennedy.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Griswold (chairman), Mr. Aiken, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Murray, Mr. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPEHART in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 37, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The resolution (S. Res. 23) extending the time for investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of certain transportation and communications problems was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this resolution merely provides for extension to June 30, 1953, of the power and authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress. The committee is in process of the work at the present time. The resolution, if agreed to, will not require the appropriation or expenditure of additional funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the resolution does not entail the appropriation or expenditure of additional funds or new money?

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 23) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, Senate Resolution 55, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951, Senate Resolution 154, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, and Senate Resolution 258, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952, hereby is extended to June 30, 1953.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 41) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "authorized", to strike out "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-third Congress," and insert "until January 31, 1954"; in line 17, after the word "the", to insert "reimbursable", and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$75,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(2) civil aeronautics;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) maritime matters generally, and particularly port security and conditions at harbors, ports, and other waterfront facilities which may affect the national health, safety, and interest; and

(5) the duties and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce in the field of foreign commerce and international trade, including a reappraisal of the effectiveness of measures and efforts instituted by Government agencies to control the shipment or transshipment of exported materials to foreign countries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, until January 31, 1954, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this resolution from the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire? As I understand the resolution, it entails the appropriation of $75,000 in new funds.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct, and it is cheap at the price, let me tell the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning that.

Mr. TOBEY. I wanted to reassure the Senator from Louisiana; that is all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Will the Senator from New Hampshire tell the Senate whether the subject matter of this resolution is covered by the resolution adopted a moment ago, Senate Resolution No. 23, which appears on page 6 of the calendar?

Mr. TOBEY. There is no duplication at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. No duplication?

Mr. TOBEY. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no connection between the two?

Mr. TOBEY. No; not at all.

Mr. President, I may say, for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana, that Senate Resolution No. 41 relates to the following areas of investigation:

Communications: Color television and educational television are both new developments in the communications field. The committee should give these developments especially close attention due to their great impact on the American people. The best possible service must be provided from these and other new developments in the communications field, and it should be this committee's job to see that the industry and the Federal Communications Commission are ever watchful of the public's interest in these developments.

Civil aeronautics: With Great Britain considerably ahead of the United States in the development of commercial jet air transport facilities, it behooves our committee to study the problem intensively with the purpose in mind of stimulating our own development of this bold new field. Also, in a related field, the Interstate Commerce Committee should do a particularly careful job in the field of prototype-aircraft development. The principal policy question here is who is going to finance the work—private industry or the Government. We must search out the answers to such questions as: How vital is prototype development to our military-defense program; how extensive must the program be; how have similar programs been handled in other countries?

Surface transportation: The principal problem facing the committee in this field—that of rail transportation, in particular—is an overall examination of the so-called Mahaffie Act, which provides for voluntary reorganizations of railroad financial structures. Since the act was passed as section 20 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, a number of reorganizations have been carried out under its provisions. In some of these, considerable public dissatisfaction has been manifested with the methods and results of the reorganizations. The committee proposes to do an intensive case study of at least one such reorganization—the Boston and Maine Railroad—about which many charges of irregularities have been leveled.

Maritime affairs: The disclosures currently being made about crime and corruption on the New York-New Jersey waterfront make it obvious that the Congress should explore the situation in order to determine what legislative corrections are called for. In this greatest of our ports, our foreign trade is being directly hampered by these criminal activities. Somehow the bottlenecks here must be unplugged.

New England economy: Several major studies of the New England economy have recently been completed, and this committee feels the time is ripe for the Congress to pay some attention to this region. Almost no Federal aid of any kind has gone to New England. Its problems are those of the oldest economic region in the country. They deserve attention on their own merits, but have the additional value of serving as prototypes of problems facing regional economies as they grow older.

So these matters are on our agenda, and they constitute the scope of Senate Resolution No. 41, which involves $75,000.

I may say for the benefit of the Senate that under authority of Senate Resolution No. 332, of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has just issued a report, called the Wolf Report; and in that connection I should like to take time at this point to make a comment of approval of my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have requested the printing of a report on the operations and organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, prepared by the Wolf Management Engineering Co., of Chicago. This study was authorized by Senate Resolution 332 of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, under which the committee employed the independent Wolf Co. firm.

The completion of the Wolf report should mark an important milestone in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the life of one of the Nation's most important governmental agencies, the Interstate Commerce Commission. With some of our economy's most crucial industries and semipublic utilities as its jurisdiction, the Commission has suffered under the twin burdens of a rapidly increasing workload and steadily diminishing work force—the result of inadequate appropriations.

Aware of the handicaps which have been bogging down the Commission's work, my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], last year urged that a management study of the Commission be made by our committee. As a close and careful student of the ICC, the Senator from Colorado has been convinced that the agency needed more funds, more personnel and better administrative methods—under the direction of an administrative manager. I believe the present study fully bears out his contentions. It is a monument to his tireless work as chairman of this committee.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I commend the Wolf report to the Interstate Commerce Commission as a thorough analysis of its administrative problems. Adoption of its recommendations should do much to promote more efficient and more effective performance of its many and varied duties. I can assure the Commission that in its implementation of the proposed administrative changes it will receive the sympathetic cooperation of this committee.

I also call the attention of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the two appropriations committees of the Congress to the recommendations embodied in the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of recommendations of this report, which I have had prepared, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN WOLF REPORT, SURVEY OF ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

1. Our first recommendation, therefore, is that the performance of all administrative functions of the ICC shall be delegated by the Commission to a managing director who shall be selected and appointed by and be responsible to the Commission, and who shall have full authority over all civil service rated personnel of the Commission.

2. Our second recommendation, therefore, is that the present 15 bureaus be consolidated into three general staff offices: administration, law, secretary; and 6 specialized administrative bureaus: certificates and finance, traffic, hearings, transport services, safety inspection, accounts and statistics.

3. Our third recommendation, therefore, is that the field operations be organized under six geographic regions. The internal, administrative services to all regional activities (office arrangements, hearing rooms, clerical aids, supplies, deportment of field staffs, etc.) should be made the responsibility of a regional manager, one for each region, who at the same time would act as a supervisory executive for one of the specialized field services in such region.

4. Our fourth recommendation, therefore, is that the Commission, under section 17 (2) of the act, delegate more regulatory authorities to additional qualified boards of employees, subject to specific reservations of the Commission, with the Commission, or any of its divisions, serving as the appellate jurisdiction.

5. Our fifth recommendation, therefore, is that a Section for Management Procedures and Controls under the Office of Administration shall be established and organized. The specialized professional personnel for this section involves, at the outset, eight new positions: One chief management specialist with five assistants trained in methods, procedures, and control techniques and two steno-clerks.

6. Our sixth recommendation, therefore, is that the Managing Director, as an aid to his office, shall form an Operations Staff Council, holding regular meetings with agenda prepared in advance. Members of such Council shall be the Managers of Staff Offices, the Directors of Bureaus, and the Secretary of the Commission.

7. Our seventh recommendation, therefore, is that the policy of appointing specialized technical review committees to review and guide the work of administrative bureaus shall be extended; that their meetings and agenda shall become regular functions of the bureaus; and that the members of such committees shall consist of Commission staff members, of accredited independent engineers and specialized technicians representing management, labor, and other interests according to the specialized objectives of each particular bureau.

8. Our eighth recommendation, therefore, is that the financial realinement of the budgetary account classifications shall be made simultaneously and shall correspond with the alinement of activities under the proposed organization structure.

9. Our ninth recommendation, therefore, is that personnel management in the Commission receive increased recognition; that plans be made for recruiting and training personnel to replace the large segment of key persons ready to retire; and that essential personnel programs be developed and carried out.

10. Our tenth recommendation, therefore, is that specialized transportation consultants shall be employed by the Commission, on a w. a. e. basis, for the initiation and development of policies and programs which may influence the regulatory and administrative activities of the Commission, but shall be primarily to "foster sound economic conditions in transportation * * * to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense."

11. Our eleventh recommendation, therefore, is that a staff increase of 30 examiners and approximately 15 steno-clerks shall be immediately authorized, and that this personnel increase may be reduced during the following 2 years, as older persons retire from service. This recommendation is dependent upon the proposed organizational structure being made effective while the older staffs are still available before their retirement to train the new employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the Senator's committee contemplates investigation relating to crime on the New York waterfront.

Mr. TOBEY. It has not been carried on, but it is coming in the near future.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will this committee conduct it?

Mr. TOBEY. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will conduct the investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

On page 2 of the report on Senate Resolution 41, I notice the following:

(4) Maritime matters: The shocking revelations of crime and political corruption on the New York water front which have come to light through the investigations of the New York State Crime Commission indicate dramatically the need for a major study of this and similar situations in port areas on both coasts of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say that our investigation will include New Orleans, also.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; in other words, the committee will proceed to do what now is being done by the New York Port Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. No; the Senator from Louisiana is completely in error. Let me explain to him, in all kindness——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am seeking information.

Mr. TOBEY. That is what I wish to give. The point is that the New York Crime Commission's jurisdiction stops at the confines of New York State. On the other hand, we are going to New Jersey, where a great deal of rottenness and crookedness exists. We are also going to New Orleans, to California, and to any other place under our flag where graft and corruption and crime exist in connection with transportation matters and where interstate or foreign commerce is hampered by crooks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was there evidence of such corruption?

Mr. TOBEY. I have enough in my pocket now to blow this Capitol sky high.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean evidence about activities in New York and New Jersey?

Mr. TOBEY. Throughout the Nation as a whole.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see.

I read further from the report:

Such a study should emphasize the interstate nature of this criminal activity and should be directed toward protecting the security of our national interests as they are manifested in the crucial port areas of the country. It should be noted that a study of this magnitude may become complex and involved, thus requiring more time and money than can be foreseen at present.

Mr. TOBEY. No doubt before the year is over we shall need more funds. We are going to do a complete and thorough job; we are going to clean these rats out of the country, before we get through.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 41), as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 50) reported by Mr. BRIDGES from the Committee on Armed Services on January 27, 1953, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that this resolution merely extends the life of the subcommittee until March. I assume it is the intention of my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to continue the subcommittee after March.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what the Senator from Louisiana has said is true. Because of the various hearings on nominations before our committee, we have not had time to hear the final report of the Senator from Texas, and to decide just how to continue the subcommittee. The committee has voted to continue the subcommittee, and has left it to the chairman to work out the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 50) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 283, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 28, 1952, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1953," wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "March 17, 1953."

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 46) increasing the limit of expenditures in connection with the internal security of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, in line 5, after the word "unexpended", to strike out "balances"; in line 6, after the word "resolution", to insert "and Senate Resolution 314, agreed to May 29, 1952, and Senate Resolution 198, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, agreed to January 29, 1951", and in line 11, after the word "such", to strike out "resolution" and insert "resolutions", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $150,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 314, agreed to May 29, 1952, and Senate Resolution 198, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, agreed to January 29, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1954.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has requested that Senate Resolution 46 go over.

The next resolution on the calendar will be stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what will be the effect of having Senate Resolution 46 go over?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out that Calendar No. 12, which is Senate Resolution 46, is the resolution which I wish to have go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana mean that the resolution can be taken up later today?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know; I understood that could not be decided today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that further proceedings in connection with Senate Resolution 46 now go over? The resolution has already gone over once, under the rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is objection to having the resolution go over.

I rise now for parliamentary information: Is a motion in order to proceed with the further consideration of the resolution at this time, or are we simply to complete the calendar now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion is now in order to have the Senate proceed at this time with the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the chairman of the particular committee affected is not presently on the floor.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was leaving for New York, and he stated to me he would like to have me represent him in this matter, since I am to be chairman of the subcommittee concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 12, Senate Resolution 46.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute? I desire to join with the Senator from Ohio in his motion, because I think that every dollar that is needed for an investigation of subversive activities should be granted by the Congress. Let us find out what the facts are. I certainly strongly urge the adoption of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 46).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator from Indiana be good enough to explain the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to explain it. It is to provide for the continuance of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, known generally as the McCarran subcommittee. It provides $150,000 in new money, and would pick up a balance of $72,000 unexpended from previous appropriations.

Following the policy of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the expenditures are limited to January 31 of next year. I have before me a statement of the work of this committee and a list of the printed hearings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate. I do not think I need belabor the Senate regarding the valuable work which this subcommittee has done. I am to be the chairman of the subcommittee in this Congress and I hope to maintain the high standards of work done by it in the past.

For the information of Members of the Senate it may be in order to give a brief résumé of the work of the subcommittee, in order that Senators may realize what it has done. In the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, 69 witnesses were heard in open session, 99 in executive session. Five hundred witnesses and informants were heard at staff conferences. The staff examined 22,000 documents, about 2,000 of which were placed in the record as exhibits. Five thousand nine hundred and sixty-four pages were printed and published by the subcommittee, and the final report was a 234-page report.

The conclusions and recommendations of this investigation were fully set forth in Senate Report No. 2050. I refer to the report on the Institute of Pacific Relations.

On the subject of communism, 41 witnesses were heard in open session, 59 in executive session. One hundred prospective witnesses and informants were interviewed by the staff. The printed hearings consisted of 412 pages. A 13-page interim report was published by the subcommittee. These hearings had to do with the problem of active Communists in teaching positions, who and what they were—not what they taught.

On the subject of the loyalty of United States nationals on the United Nations staff, 38 witnesses were heard in open session, 49 witnesses testified in executive session, and 150 staff interviews were held. The hearings totaled 434 printed pages, and an 18-page interim report was published by the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I could continue, but I think Senators may be interested in a summary. For the 2-year period, this subcommittee has had available $366,000. The subcommittee, in this 2-year period, has spent $297,000. There is left approximately $69,000. We are requesting $150,000 with which to carry on the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

work of the subcommittee. I am unable to make it public, but for the benefit of Senators, I hold in my hand the tentative agenda of the Internal Security Subcommittee, showing what it proposes to do in the coming year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is what I wanted to ask the Senator; I am anxious to ascertain the need for continuing the committee, if the Senator can tell us. So far as I personally am concerned, let me say that I do not at all oppose legitimate investigations. What I propose to say in a few minutes to the Senate will be for the purpose of calling attention to the vast amount of money which has been spent by the Senate within the past 7 or 8 years on investigations—many of which were duplications of activities of other committees. It occurs to me that when we are demanding economy in other departments of the Government, we should be able to set the proper example. We ourselves should practice economy. If the Senator from Indiana will, I should like him to tell us what prompts the request for additional funds. What are they to be used for in the way of conducting an investigation that has not already been accomplished?

Mr. JENNER. I may say to the Senator that, naturally, I do not want to announce publicly what we propose to investigate that has not been investigated heretofore, but I do hold in my hand a list of the subjects the committee has proposed to investigate.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom was the list prepared?

Mr. JENNER. It was prepared by the committee and its staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was it prepared by the professional staff of the committee?

Mr. JENNER. It was prepared by members of the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the list to which the Senator referred was prepared by persons who are to be continued in the service of this committee. That is the way these investigations are usually begun, and the way they are expanded. On Capitol Hill we have quite a few professional job holders who get around and convince some Senators of the necessity of continuing investigations, not on the former scale, but upon an increased scale, as has just been demonstrated by my good friend from New Jersey. As I mentioned just a short time ago, the Taft-Hartley Act provided for a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to study labor-management relations for 1 year following enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. Instead of winding up in 1 year, it was continued for a second year. Then instead of the subcommittee being discontinued, what happened? As was just stated by my good friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that same work was carried on in another form, in a bigger way, by the same persons who had previously been employed on the labor-management subcommittee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the work of this committee indicates what its duties are. I refer to the Internal Security Committee of the United States Senate. At this juncture in our history I can think of no place where we could spend money to protect the internal security of this Nation to better advantage than in the manner proposed. I have recently read from some of the investigations in which this committee of the Senate has been engaged. A most recent example is the investigation of Communists in the United Nations. I observe that our new representative in the United Nations, our former colleague, Senator Lodge, has requested that security provisions be included for checks on employees of the United Nations. That is the type of work this committee has done.

Mr. President, at this juncture in our history, we cannot do without the services of a committee of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit, I should like to propound a series of questions dealing with the resolution. I may say at the outset, the questions are aimed to bring out the position of the junior Senator from Oregon, that the appropriation requested by the committee should be granted.

My first question is this: Does the Senator from Indiana agree with me that there is in the body politic of our country among our people, a great deal of concern over the question as to whether there exist in our country subversive elements which, in case of an all-out war with Russia, would work to the detriment of our security?

Mr. JENNER. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if, as a result of the work of the committee, one such element should be detected and his or its activities prevented, the relatively small amount we are asking to have appropriated for the committee would be repaid to our people many times over in the benefits derived?

Mr. JENNER. I certainly do.

Mr. MORSE. Let us be frank, as I know the Senator from Indiana always is. I am referring to no Member of the Senate, but does the Senator agree with me that there are those in this country who seem to be in opposition to the granting of any increase in funds for the investigation of subversive activities to which the Senator has referred, because, for their own reasons, none of which is good, they do not want the Congress to put itself in a position where it will have the funds to detect subversive activities in this country?

Mr. JENNER. How is Congress going to be able to discharge its duty to the people unless it has the funds necessary properly and intelligently to represent the people of the country?

Mr. MORSE. That goes to my next question. Does the Senator agree with me that in spite of the fact that there is much criticism today about the investigatory activities of the Congress, it nevertheless happens to be one of the great functions of the Congress in protecting the country from fraud, corruption, subversive activities, and wrongdoing against the public interest?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the investigative power of the Congress of the United States being one of the great bulwarks of a free people against oppression and wrongdoing. Is not that correct?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Indiana agree with me that there are those who are apparently in opposition to the granting of the funds which the committee is asking for because they claim they do not like the methods or the techniques of the investigations of this and some other committees of the Congress?

Mr. JENNER. I presume that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. But is not the answer to that not only a refusal to deny the funds necessary for conducting fair investigations, but also an effort on the part of the Members of the Congress, in keeping faith with their duties, to see to it that congressional investigations are fair, if it is alleged and proved and shown that they are not fair?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will yield further for a brief comment, I think the last question I have put goes to the kernel of the problem before us today. As my colleagues know, I put my cards on top of the table, and in recent days, since the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Wisconsin have been quoted in the newspapers to the effect that more funds were needed for their committee work representations have been made to me that I ought to do what I can to try to block the granting of those funds.

My response has been that I not only will not be a party to an attempt to block them, but that I even have doubts as to whether the committees are asking for sufficient funds properly to conduct the investigations. I intend to accept the figure for which they have asked. I serve notice on the floor of the Senate today that I am going to be no party to any organized drive in this country, I care not how sincere the intentions of those conducting it may be, to prevent the Senate from doing the investigative job which needs to be done. The members of the committee sit here under a great public trust, and I am not going to assume or presume that they will not live up to that trust merely because some persons do not like some of the committee members personally.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am not going to indulge in a presumption of guilt against anyone, including any colleague in the Senate of the United States. I am going to hold fast and true to a great principle of American justice, namely the presumption of innocence, and the assumption that trials, investigations, and hearings are going to be fair and in keeping with American principles of justice, until someone shows me that such an assumption is not justified. If that is demonstrated, then I will deal with the issue

when it arises. But I here and now disassociate myself from any movement which seeks to prevent the granting of funds necessary to enable the Senate to conduct an efficient and thorough investigation of subversive activities.

To the Senator from Indiana, I say I wish him well in the investigation. I think the attitude of the Members of the Senate should be to judge the Senator on the basis of the results and on the basis of the procedures which he follows. I have no reason to believe that those procedures and the conduct of the committee will not be in keeping with the high standards of American justice and fair play.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee during the past 2 years I have observed its activities and its method of conducting investigations, and I challenge anyone to go into the records and examine the conduct of the committee and find anything it has done that was improper. I think the committee has been very objective. It has considered the rights of witnesses, and others whose names have been mentioned, to appear and have a full opportunity to state their case. It has not been a publicity stunt in any degree. No televising was permitted, and, with few exceptions, no newsreel or other cameras were permitted to be used during the period of the hearings. In cases when pictures were taken the witnesses were consulted whether they were willing to have their pictures taken. I have been a member of many committees but have served on none that has been more fair than has the Internal Security Subcommittee.

There are many questions still under investigation. Some hearings have been started already. It is dangerous to the country to stop the investigations. We cannot announce just what we are going to investigate, because we are investigating subversives, and they would be glad to know just what we are investigating in that field. It is one of those cases in which the Senate should take a full-faith statement from the chairman of the committee, and grant the amount now requested, which is necessary. Every dollar will be honestly accounted for in connection with the defense of this country in the future.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make a suggestion to the prospective new chairman of the subcommittee with reference to some justifiable criticism which has occurred within the past 2 years. I was a member of the full Committee on the Judiciary during that period, but not a member of the subcommittee. Many of us found that because of the great volume of testimony there was sometimes a delay in getting the testimony printed, and because of the fact that some of us were not in attendance at the hearings of the subcommittee, when the matters came up before the full committee there was little or no opportunity for the other members of the Judiciary Committee to know exactly what the testimony was, because of its great volume. There was also, I think, justifiable criticism that when a preliminary report or a full report was made, it was not brought before the full Judiciary Committee. Some of us, who were not sitting in on the hearings, but who knew the vast and complex details that made up the testimony in the reports, although the reports may have been all right, refrained from signing them, but only because we did not know what was in them; they were too detailed and too voluminous.

I think it would strengthen the work of the committee if some administrative procedure could be worked out whereby the members of the full committee could know a little more about what is going on in the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

I think that is a justifiable criticism, and I believe it will be borne out by other members of the committee. Toward the end of the session we were busy with other matters. As I have said, I am of the opinion that the work of the committee will be strengthened if the other members of the Judiciary Committee may have an opportunity to know a little more about the agenda, the procedure, and so forth. I do not know of any time during the life of the subcommittee when there was full knowledge of its activities. I do not criticize anyone for that; perhaps it is all right, because sometimes it is not desirable to have too many persons know what is transpiring. There were times when some Senators did not know quite exactly what some of the objectives were. I think it developed that the objectives were commendable, but there would have been a great deal more support in the full committee if a plan could have been devised to enable all Senators to feel that they had a part in the investigation.

Mr. JENNER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hold in my hand excerpts from various newspapers in Washington, to the effect that the committee which is to be headed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will take over the role of probing communism and subversive influences in this country. Have the differences that formerly existed between the Subcommittee on Internal Security and the so-called McCarthy committee been ironed out, so that there will not be any duplication?

Mr. JENNER. First, I may answer the Senator from Louisiana by saying that there never have been any differences that I know of. I do not know to what articles the Senator refers. However, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I have talked on many occasions to the Senator from Wisconsin with regard to overlapping and duplication of work. The Senator from Wisconsin came before our committee, and the members of our committee asked him the very same question, namely, as to the field of activities the Senator from Wisconsin proposed to investigate.

Of course, investigation in the field of communism is handled by the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Wisconsin is present, and he can verify my statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hold in my hand an article published in the Washington Post, from which I read:

> McCARTHY said he thought the Government has just "scratched the surface" in attempting to rid itself of subversive influences and that his committee will continue—"very definitely"—efforts to root Communists from the Government.

Not long ago the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin took part in a Meet the Press program. At that time I think he again indicated that he was going to keep a close watch on the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is a member, on the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House, and on all other committees, and that if they did not do a good job of rooting out communism, he proposed to take action through his committee.

Mr. JENNER. In the first place, I hope we will maintain the fine record established by our subcommittee during the past 2 years, when it has been engaged in the field of investigation of communism and subversive activities, and has achieved excellent results. Therefore I see no reason for duplication by any other committee.

As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government. That is the view which our subcommittee intends to take of the situation. It is our understanding with the Senator from Wisconsin that such an arrangement applies to similar activities on the part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was that understanding reached?

Mr. JENNER. I have talked with the Senator from Wisconsin on many occasions. He came before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I think on January 22, requesting an appropriation for his committee. At that time various members of the Committee on Rules and Administration asked him the specific questions which the Senator from Louisiana has raised.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is no possibility of any duplication of the work of the Committee on Government Operations, the work of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is to be chairman, and the committee headed by Representative VELDE in the other House. I have instructed the staff of my committee to work with the staffs of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

committee of which the Senator from Indiana is a member and with the House committee, and I feel certain there is no question that that will be done.

I do not attempt at this time to divest my committee of any jurisdiction which it has, but I can assure the Senate that we will not duplicate the work of any other committee.

I may say that I have been very much concerned about subversive activities within the Government, and I still am. Whenever I find such activities I intend to take them up with the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is to be chairman.

I can also assure Senators that I am not forgetting the issue of communism. However, I understand that while under the Reorganization Act there is unlimited jurisdiction so far as investigations are concerned, there is no question that the Senator from Indiana and I desire to avoid duplication of work.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I happen to be the only member of the Subcommittee on Internal Security from this side of the aisle who is now on the floor. I have been a member of that subcommittee from the beginning of my service in the Senate. I do not know how any committee's proceedings could have been conducted more expeditiously, efficiently, or economically than have been those of that subcommittee.

The fact that it has reported unspent $69,000 of the money appropriated for it which it could have spent, is a good indication of the integrity of the committee.

With respect to employing personnel for the subcommittee, I know that a very high-class group of men are working for the subcommittee. Many of them could command much higher salaries in other employment if they wished to do so.

I believe the subcommittee has been conducted according to the very best and highest standards of judicial and ethical conduct.

Some of my colleagues may recall that about a year or more ago there was some criticism of the subcommittee because of something said by a distinguished journalist and a distinguished former high official of the Government. I happened to have heard of those two gentlemen and, when the investigation was concluded, I was advised by them that the method of examination was quite correct. There had been some suspicion about secret hearings, but they then understood that the hearings were held in the way they were for the purpose of protecting the names and reputations of good men whose names might have been used inadvertently until sufficient facts had been ascertained to justify making the facts public.

There was also another element involved. I recall that there were some writers—script writers and others—who had been proscribed by Communists, who had done some talking, and they had been kept out of their work by different schemes hatched against them. Of course, it was necessary to examine them in executive session in order to get the evidence against them, and they willingly and gladly cooperated with the subcommittee. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the work done by the subcommittee has been on the very highest plane, and without the waste of any money whatsoever.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the figures "$150,000" and insert, in lieu thereof, the figures "$100,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to reduce by $50,000 the amount asked. As I indicated a while ago, it is not my purpose to oppose any legitimate investigation. I think that the Subcommittee on Internal Security has functioned well in the past.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] indicated that the amount spent during the last 2 years totaled about $300,000, which would mean $150,000 per year. As was stated by my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the subcommittee has at present an unexpended balance of more than $69,000.

The effect of my amendment would be to allow the subcommittee for this year the same amount of money that was spent last year, that is, $150,000, plus about $20,000.

Mr. President, I am asking that this be done because it is my belief that with a committee doing similar work on the House side, and with other committees in the Senate delving into the same subject matter, this work could be easily done with the sum which would be provided if my amendment were adopted.

It strikes me that the Senate must show the way not only in appropriating less money but in actually demonstrating to other departments of Government that a good job can be done with less money. There is no doubt that a good job was done by this committee, as my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] stated, with the money at hand. The committee did not spend all the money which was appropriated last year. If my amendment is adopted, it will give the committee, as I have just indicated, $20,000 more to spend than it had last year.

I should like to indicate to the Senate and to the country the increases in expenditures which have occurred in the operations of the Senate. First, I have before me a table showing the expenditures made by the Senate from the contingent fund during the fiscal years 1940 through 1952, for investigations by the standing committees, special committees, select committees, and joint committees. I shall not go into detail to show what each of the committees has spent, but I will ask that the table be placed in the RECORD. I merely point out to my colleagues the totals which have been spent for the purposes I have just indicated, beginning with the year 1940 and including 1952. As I just stated, these amounts were for special investigations similar to the one we are now considering.

For the year 1940 the entire amount spent by the Senate for all investigations was $170,268.04; for 1941, the same amount; for 1942, $210,000 plus; for 1943, $381,000; for 1946, the last year of operation before the Reorganization Act became effective, the amount spent was $588,000. During the past year we spent $1,727,600. In other words, last year the Senate spent for special investigations 10 times as much money as was spent for that purpose in 1940 and more than double the amount of money which was spent for investigations in the last year before the Reorganization Act became effective.

Mr President, it strikes me that the Senate is going somewhat haywire on some of these investigations. We are spending too much money. There is too much duplication. I am satisfied that before the year is out we shall see a little tug-of-war between some of the committees as to who should investigate what. Some of these investigating committees are going to run out of material, and they will be encroaching upon one another's territory, as has occurred in the past.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a member of the committee, I hope we do run out of material. I hope we run out of reasons for investigating. So far as I am concerned, as a member of that committee I would be willing to stop the investigation the first day we find that we have run out of subversives.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not anticipate that the committee will expire. As I indicated a while ago, there are professional investigators who live on Capitol Hill, and who keep these committees alive. They will always find some way to continue their jobs. I have no doubt that is the way a great many investigations are started. They are started by some professional investigator, or someone who comes to us and sells us an idea. Immediately a special subcommittee is created to look into it. As I stated a while ago, once a subcommittee is established, it is never terminated. I shall demonstrate that later in connection with another resolution which is coming up, dealing with the so-called McCarthy subcommittee. The forerunner of the McCarthy subcommittee was the Truman committee, which rendered its final report in 1948. Nevertheless, it was continued—to do the same work—in another form, but on a larger scale.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the table from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures paid by the Senate from the contingent fund during the fiscal years shown for investigations by the standing committees (including subcommittees), special committees, select committees, and joint committees

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
COMMITTEES (INCLUDING SUBCOMMITTEES)													
Agriculture and Forestry	$2,255.40	$1,763.64	$2,435.20	$8,110.37	$12,524.24	$10,311.40	$5,318.85	$2,778.43	$11,024.15	$3,632.30	$26,982.54	$21,576.51	$37,121.96
Appropriations	5,168.58	3,955.88	9,352.50	9,336.57	10,179.20	6,645.35	27,059.49	41,056.73	48,863.79	15,282.44	30,863.42	86,820.70	88,136.45
Armed Services								2,599.48	9,351.93	11,029.19	6,845.00	79,322.13	174,930.69
Audit and Control, Contingent Expenses of the Senate	38.50			62.37		82.69	71.75						
Banking and Currency	14,699.93	14,106.72	11,118.56	8,479.81	10,712.30	9,939.19	11,517.64	4,997.85	29,180.20	6,106.16	71,960.72	131,214.21	42,266.27
Civil Service			141.12	296.00	412.04	400.25	431.02						
Claims	204.75		271.73	37.80		42.00	76.12	41.55					
Commerce	897.71	2,650.21	4,818.11	4,310.73	9,399.50	7,417.29	1,819.68	1,571.04					
District of Columbia	885.57	197.68	1,849.30	4,858.81	2,663.50	635.99	4,137.16	2,419.97	2,188.50	1,708.08	1,789.89	3,338.49	68,928.65
Education and Labor	48,543.39	11,890.99	3,352.75	7,295.07	2,754.29	8,901.75	19,018.18	6,404.21					
Expenditures in the Executive Departments		34.50			223.30	35.00		19,674.26	93,857.16	131,556.70	126,532.99	118,789.44	[1]106,325.71
Finance	5,886.15	1,892.49	3,771.31	4,438.47	2,916.47	363.12	2,873.20	4,919.01	30,409.20	25,115.96	6,735.85	5,088.38	5,675.00
Foreign Relations	876.12	4,221.97	1,101.25	1,926.79	318.15	8,104.75	8,426.71	3,299.77	13,818.14	8,075.60	27,689.82	16,954.35	13,273.71
Immigration	159.14	15.62	571.57	39.69	199.51	106.75	82.25	49.87					
Indian Affairs	1,162.54	2,113.09	1,583.28	744.48	2,698.11	877.63	441.87	137.19					
Interoceanic Canals	106.93												
Interstate Commerce	14,593.64	19,500.48	9,481.05	4,336.16	7,199.83	8,043.81	10,463.56	3,662.92					
Interstate and Foreign Commerce								5,312.44	12,007.07	53,903.28	135,823.48	77,942.82	34,638.89
Interior and Insular Affairs								2,448.50	24,918.88	16,467.00	12,265.96	22,877.72	25,905.70
Irrigation and Reclamation	1,190.73	73.09	75.28	122.43	332.43	2,791.53	1,116.39	233.44					
Judiciary	2,924.96	5,383.32	2,147.49	2,055.50	9,276.66	5,182.85	5,409.95	9,069.06	51,878.82	105,174.63	141,580.75	134,217.17	271,839.89
Library	8.70												
Labor and Public Welfare									14,534.08	7,433.64	64,692.24	159,166.25	144,733.39
Military Affairs	1,986.89	2,131.40	4,581.82	23,131.70	18,461.42	10,698.47	15,360.09	28,265.22					
Mines and Mining	231.21	79.20		34.12	337.41								
Naval Affairs	1,386.66	1,696.56	1,927.15	5,168.55	961.22	1,139.47	7,882.88	2,170.59					
Patents	183.52		6,036.75	5,449.20		270.90							
Pensions			48.60			46.37	23.50						
Post Office and Civil Service								4,429.81	34,009.99	11,522.16	10,810.12	19,280.97	129,528.81
Post Office and Post Roads	206.92	197.85	296.10		1,341.73	505.25	555.45	112.00					
Printing	38.22			81.24									
Privileges and Elections		1,108.39	18,070.26	24,046.37	1,100.21	40.50	45.50						
Public Buildings and Grounds	4.92	470.80	103.25	30.31	218.93	35.00	81.12	252.00					
Public Lands								2,899.63					
Public Lands and Surveys	6,089.48	4,070.46	15,924.25	7,556.68	7,841.45	5,109.70	6,338.25	2,974.47					
Public Works								1,708.98	3,881.06	1,726.73	11,640.50	11,951.48	3,858.72
Rules			74.40		19.25								
Rules and Administration								42,983.60	154,542.67	90,241.84	64,637.75	64,543.91	46,443.74
Senatorial Campaign Expenditures for 1942				9,606.00									
Territories and Insular Affairs	622.00		501.25	6,955.54	15,651.84	6,303.46	599.99						
SPECIAL COMMITTEES													
Atomic Energy							38,767.97	43,646.44					
American Merchant Marine	6,193.77	1,879.05	5,857.17	402.00									
Aquatic Life	25.00												
Campaign Expenditures for 1940	8,606.08	44,595.16											
Campaign Expenditures for 1944					953.08	42,528.76							
Campaign Expenditures for 1946							456.40	38,170.03					
Civil Service Laws	717.85					162.08							
Executive Departments and Agencies	3,600.00	2,400.00											
Fiscal Affairs of the Government		32.27											
Fuels in the Midwest, Production of				4,219.25	2,340.86	667.33	437.65						
Gasoline, Shortage of			9,158.32	5,584.50	4,093.07	1,439.95							
Centralization of Industry					1,256.20	3,721.71	.72	2,374.07					
Reorganization of Courts	1,593.20												
National Defense		1,789.06	46,500.00	137,543.84	150,280.12	126,311.20	143,074.51	162,360.31	153,169.11				
Operations of the Old Age Pension System			3,419.89	498.87									
Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce											7,637.12	290,310.34	63,274.41
Postwar Economic Policy and Planning					17,942.38	20,864.09	7,408.38						
Effects of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934	392.00		823.99	1,578.49	28.87								
Small Business		6,233.05	12,309.05	51,310.74	38,441.17	66,394.97	134,825.68	119,792.14	112,710.76	85,347.64	1,777.22	50,597.98	61,382.85
Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries	1,575.00	450.00											
Unemployment and Relief	1,570.03	691.33											
Conservation of Wildlife Resources		4,536.76	3,228.25	6,034.43	6,616.08	6,102.31							
Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool	392.10		24.00	321.30	182.50	111.30	2,309.93	132.12					
SELECT COMMITTEES													
Governmental Organizations	287.22												
SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEES													
Claims (Mediterranean Fruitfly in Florida)		1,712.37											
JOINT COMMITTEES													
Atomic Energy								28,154.08	116,354.84	112,048.01	145,306.79	146,357.24	180,604.39
Organization of Congress						2,085.79	4,988.24	427.97					
Economic Report								8,600.59	77,764.19	59,498.79	167,918.62	109,573.97	121,113.64
Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures			2,749.79	6,091.69	8,615.09	11,432.45	24,304.38	22,571.94	2,854.11	1,401.92	16,865.19	15,915.83	19,062.06
Foreign Economic Cooperation									12,339.42	179,036.14	[2]176,076.14	27,088.19	
Forestry													
Housing	5,000.49	702.00							85,893.27	730.30			

[1] Redesignated the Committee on Government Operations by S. Res. 280, 82d Cong., 2d sess.
[2] Of which amount, $23,469.01 was paid as reimbursement to appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Expenditures paid by the Senate from the contingent fund during the fiscal years shown for investigations by the standing committees (including subcommittees), special committees, select committees, and joint committees—Continued

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
JOINT COMMITTEES—con.													
Internal Revenue Taxation	$27,527.53	$28,342.87	$26,873.28	$29,282.01	$33,931.09	$36,850.30	$45,572.75	$50,428.06					
Island Possessions and Trust Territories in the Pacific										$2,906.19			
Labor-Management Relations									$62,562.77	60,361.73			
Military Affairs			120.75										
Samuel F. B. Morse Memorial					10.25	1,707.40							
Pearl Harbor Attack							48,376.46	13,033.51					
Petroleum Resources					3,599.53	13,026.04	7,450.06	6,431.40					
Tennessee Valley Authority	2,435.21												
National Memorial Stadium Commission							1,183.47						
Congressional Aviation Policy Board									49,125.64	868.97			
Total	170,208.04	170,619.16	210,574.02	381,381.89	385,983.52	427,574.15	588,507.15	692,003.65	1,207,299.65	1,000,195.66	$1,196,433.12	$1,502,928.08	$1,639,024.88
Democratic Policy Committee									39,439.56	31,784.83	37,318.86	39,207.00	21,082.71
Republican Policy Committee									22,863.81	36,480.96	43,342.41	42,368.70	59,545.85
Total	170,208.04	170,619.16	210,574.02	381,381.89	385,983.52	427,574.15	588,507.15	692,003.65	1,269,603.02	1,068,461.45	1,277,094.39	1,674,503.78	1,719,653.44
Joint Committee on Defense Production													6,546.14
Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation													1,401.69
Grand total													1,727,600.67

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have before me a table showing the salaries paid to employees of standing committees of the Senate. Remember, these employees are separate and apart from those I have just mentioned, who are employed in connection with special investigations. These employees that I now refer to do the regular work of the Senate, as employees of the various standing committees of the Senate.

In 1940 the amount of money which we spent to pay all such expenses was $474,829; in 1946, the last year before the Reorganization Act, we spent $948,819; for 1952 the amount spent was $1,213,699. So it will be seen that the expenses of operating our regular committees have also been increasing from year to year.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table to which I am referring printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Salaries paid to employees of standing committees of the Senate

Committee	Fiscal year 1940	Fiscal year 1941	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1944	Fiscal year 1945	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948	Fiscal year 1949	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951	Fiscal year 1952
Agriculture and Forestry	$15,780.00	$15,780.00	$19,380.00	$20,620.31	$21,472.67	$23,605.01	$26,734.30	$24,528.67	$16,657.14	$14,007.72	$18,064.92	$16,618.26	$34,086.40
Appropriations	32,069.94	31,940.00	35,540.00	34,941.30	40,800.66	44,311.84	56,712.12	74,312.78	131,205.91	133,923.35	131,154.35	126,554.96	156,240.02
Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate	13,200.00	13,152.00	17,210.17	22,638.85	24,358.00	27,237.14	33,838.23	27,676.44					
Banking and Currency	11,400.00	11,400.00	16,192.51	21,618.05	22,417.85	25,383.58	36,700.50	40,889.30	46,191.59	73,700.06	81,655.78	83,774.80	92,481.48
Civil Service	10,320.00	10,320.00	12,295.84	16,682.27	21,069.15	23,615.96	33,371.32	54,268.03	30,085.04				
Claims	16,467.00	17,245.83	21,886.68	23,794.11	20,782.42	20,737.30	21,742.23	17,580.09					
Commerce	16,175.33	16,200.00	21,295.00	21,705.13	22,666.87	24,148.02	29,248.82	21,850.33					
District of Columbia	13,680.00	14,856.00	23,280.00	24,197.70	26,216.42	27,195.97	35,218.33	35,682.61	27,229.32	39,167.80	51,573.87	49,363.15	41,043.75
Education and Labor	12,500.00	12,875.11	16,980.00	19,982.98	21,415.32	23,308.91	28,690.88	21,064.31					
Enrolled Bills	11,025.00	12,120.00	15,720.00	16,686.31	17,988.00	10,435.69							
Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Government Operations)	10,500.00	10,416.99	14,065.00	15,143.43	21,749.17	21,029.90	27,751.41	40,347.41	60,087.17	63,500.08	66,479.73	73,335.55	81,975.20
Finance	28,820.00	29,970.00	33,178.33	32,829.87	36,013.02	32,347.38	41,028.87	38,267.32	27,617.91	27,715.04	41,738.79	46,551.23	48,004.91
Foreign Relations	15,680.00	15,482.78	21,913.94	25,431.95	28,709.79	28,676.76	35,341.09	32,554.65	45,445.91	52,477.80	56,306.03	67,077.93	84,648.90
Immigration	12,900.00	12,873.33	17,825.00	20,809.29	21,954.81	23,427.90	28,013.73	21,993.15					
Indian Affairs	18,200.00	18,200.00	21,800.00	20,810.96	24,659.92	23,864.56	20,694.11	23,871.53					
Interoceanic Canals	12,500.00	12,500.00	17,600.00	18,722.08	20,224.60	17,910.71	26,151.30	18,352.32					
Interstate Commerce	17,760.00	17,760.00	20,836.00	18,408.33	21,044.20	20,394.53	28,779.79	24,323.66					
Irrigation and Reclamation	12,300.00	12,300.00	15,900.00	16,860.62	18,083.26	19,432.17	24,061.75	22,129.43					
Judiciary	16,725.00	14,304.47	17,902.49	19,854.70	22,073.53	22,148.00	28,561.02	48,676.63	63,676.01	77,128.65	109,582.27	122,352.67	130,422.47
Library			2,035.00	2,452.00	9,145.50	12,867.37	12,822.96	8,708.26					
Manufactures	12,320.00	12,320.00	15,854.99	15,940.08	17,952.00	19,861.11	26,026.14						
Military Affairs	16,200.00	16,427.66	24,180.00	26,083.65	27,750.88	29,284.40	35,542.29	20,999.41					
Naval Affairs	13,620.00	13,720.00	18,720.00	19,923.81	21,462.00	22,649.24	29,381.25	22,472.11					
Patents	12,520.00	8,718.89	16,320.00	17,497.35	18,521.69	19,465.38	27,578.41	21,459.29					
Pensions	15,360.00	14,899.66	18,520.00	19,757.26	20,079.15	19,931.06	20,358.38	15,678.58					
Post Offices and Post Roads	17,460.00	17,760.00	21,360.00	22,568.48	25,176.47	25,450.67	26,734.20	25,024.62					
Printing	10,500.00	10,500.00	14,040.00	14,515.81	15,978.92	18,305.33	24,378.77	19,651.62					
Privileges and Elections	10,320.00	11,274.34	16,103.00	17,010.06	18,468.00	18,236.00	22,772.33	15,786.74					
Public Buildings and Grounds	12,487.00	11,756.67	16,796.67	18,149.61	17,440.94	21,289.68	27,985.83	22,509.31					
Public Lands and Surveys	13,800.00	13,793.83	17,547.50	20,679.24	22,836.45	23,359.98	30,748.85	22,782.06					
Rules	13,580.00	9,436.11	15,040.11	15,630.70	17,382.91	18,639.74	25,391.23	18,638.21					
Territories and Insular Affairs	14,720.00	14,720.00	20,320.00	21,643.91	23,502.96	24,633.44	31,720.60	22,272.87					
Armed Services								19,127.08	57,623.23	60,619.34	61,957.12	64,392.51	62,121.28
Interior and Insular Affairs									22,996.03	89,793.55	60,683.07	67,423.80	87,349.09
Interstate and Foreign Commerce								14,909.47	45,983.69	60,634.82	74,837.92	77,478.05	86,025.35
Labor and Public Welfare								24,128.13	43,166.44	59,469.57	87,918.38	97,087.56	106,524.22
Post Office and Civil Service									27,838.40	53,221.02	56,239.14	55,577.60	59,053.27
Public Lands								13,205.03	19,458.78				
Public Works								13,135.51	55,470.87	70,007.10	70,957.59	67,576.27	82,103.45
Rules and Administration								12,348.59	37,160.13	36,894.84	47,144.97	46,503.97	70,619.98
Mines and Mining	13,920.00	15,300.00	20,820.00	24,915.63	27,197.94	28,799.99	35,538.37	26,242.20					
Total	474,829.27						948,819.41						1,213,699.77

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us now consider the expenditures for all Senate employees to see how much more is now being spent than has been spent in the past.

The last full year prior to the Reorganization Act the Senate had 1,369 employees. That was as of June 30, 1946. The amount of money spent during fiscal year 1946 was $5,936,521.

As of June 30, 1951—and that is for the fiscal year 1951, nearly 5 years after the Legislative Reorganization Act became operative—the number of employees had increased from 1,369 to 1,808, which cost the Government $10,871,432, as compared with $5,963,521 for the fiscal year 1946.

The percentage increase for 1951 over 1946 was 32 percent in employees and 82 percent in amount of money.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Did the Senator from Louisiana compare the percentages with the budget amounts now and in the days which the Senator used as a basis of comparison?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that the budget has anything to do with it.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I think the percentage does have a great deal to do with it. Does not the Senator from Louisiana agree that today the Government is engaging in many activities in which it did not engage during 1946?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. And that the more activities the Government engages in the greater the need for investigations. Is that not correct? Would not the Senator from Louisiana say that the more activities the Government engages in the more activities there are to be watched and investigated by Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but it is not in direct proportion.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I do not know whether it is. I asked the Senator whether he has compared the figures he used with the present budget, showing the amount of money being spent by the Government. I think that should be the test.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt it. If the Navy spends $10,000,000 more this year than it spent last year the work entailed in looking into it is almost the same. I serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and I know that to be the fact. We must go into practically the same detail, and it merely means that the Navy has a few more ships; but insofar as investigations are concerned it does not entail very much additional work.

Mr. President, in 1952 Senate employees increased from 1,808 on June 30, 1951, to 1,950, as of June 30, 1952. That is in the space of 1 year. Senate expenses increased in fiscal year 1952 from $10,871,432 to $11,354,594.

To put it another way, the percentage increase of 1952 over 1951 in the case of employees is 7.7 percent, and the increase in expenditures is 4.5 percent. The increase of 1952 over 1946, when the Reorganization Act came into being, was 42.4 percent for employees, and 89 percent in the cost of operating the Senate.

Mr. President, I have before me a document which shows all Senate expenses, including salaries of Senators. The figures which I will read include the expenses of regular operation of the standing committees of the Senate and for the work these committees perform ordinarily. Included also are special investigations.

In 1940 the total amount of Senate expenditures, including the salaries of Senators, was $3,936,986.

In 1952 that amount was $12,850,183. Expenses, including the salaries of Senators, have jumped during a period of 12 years from $3,936,986 to $12,850,183.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. I do not believe—in the face of these tremendous increases—that the Senate can, in good conscience, ask for reductions in agencies of the executive branch unless we show the way, and unless we, ourselves, are willing to make cuts.

The purpose of the amendment which I have sent to the desk is not to do away with the committee. I do not wish to reflect upon the committee's record. I do believe, however, it should try to live within the same amount of money that was provided for it last year. That is all I am asking, Mr. President. I believe all Senators will readily admit that a good job was done last year by the committee, but the great difficulty is that it wants to expand its work and to continue to expand its work and to create more jobs. That is the ultimate result, Mr. President.

What I am trying to do is to save a few dollars, that is all. I am trying to help the Republican Party carry out the economy plank in its platform. All of us heard last year the campaign cry that the Democrats were spending the country out of existence. What I am trying to do, as a Democrat, on this side of the aisle, is to help the Republicans carry out their economy pledge. I do not see why there should be any opposition to this effort on my part. What all of us ought to do, and what I am trying to do, is to permit the committee to continue in operation and to perform its work along the same line as last year, by giving it the same amount of money it spent last year, plus approximately $19,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks at this point, the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate employees and expenditures

	Senate employees	Senate expenditures [1]
June 30, 1946 (last full fiscal year before Legislative Reorganization Act)	1,369	$5,963,521.51
June 30, 1951 (fiscal year 1951)	1,808	$10,871,432.40
Percent increase 1951 over 1946	32	82
June 30, 1952	1,950	$11,354,594.93
Percent increase 1952 over 1951	7.7	4.5
Percent increase 1952 over 1946	42.4	89.0

[1] These figures include all moneys paid out by the Senate Disbursing Office except salaries, expense allowances and mileage of Members of the Senate, and the expense allowance and mileage of the Vice President. Included in the figures is the salary of the Vice President. If Senators' salaries, etc., are added to the 1952 fiscal year figure, the total rises to $12,850,183.06.

Senate appropriations by fiscal years, including salaries of Senators

1940	$3,936,986
1941	4,128,884
1942	4,153,374
1943	4,400,585
1944	4,605,005
1945	4,882,103
1946	6,360,365
1947	8,443,002
1948	11,218,625
1949	11,895,698
1950	11,507,772
1951	12,424,781
1952	12,850,183

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. As I recall, the Senator from Louisiana said that the expenses in 1940 were $3,000,000 as against $12,000,000 in 1952. In other words, they increased considerably over a period of 13 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Is it not correct to say that the expenses of government generally increased five times during that period of time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not able to say whether that is correct. If the Senator from North Carolina has the figure I shall be glad to accept his word for it.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. No; I was merely asking a question. I think the expenses increased many times.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know they increased considerably.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The other question I had in mind is this: Is it not a fact that the Internal Security Subcommittee is going to ferret out Communists in Government and in America generally?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. It is in the nature of treatment which an individual may get from a doctor, clinic, or hospital. In other words, the fact that a man may not need any medical or hospital attention one year does not set any criterion as to the nature of the expenses he will have to meet when he does need such attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there was a great cry for the investigation, and quite a number of Communists were discovered throughout the country, or so we have been told. I am not opposed to getting Communists out of government, if there are any in it. Certainly, they should be thrown out. All that I am trying to do, since the committee has done an excellent job with the money we gave it last year, is to have it continue its investigations, using the same amount of money.

It should be remembered that we do not have the same condition now that we had last year. According to my good friends across the aisle, we have had, or are going to have, a complete change in the heads of all departments. We have had loyalty boards established, which no doubt will be revamped, and all branches of government, from Cabinet positions on down, have new blood in them, and I am sure that they will do a good job in weeding out Communists, if there are any in government.

As I have said, with the new administration coming in, and with new heads for each department, it strikes me that they will do the job that should be done. They have said that the reason it could not be done by the Democrats was that the Democrats had been too long in office. Now the Republicans have control, and can make a clean start. I say to you, Mr. President, that I honestly believe that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the work of this committee should be less this year than in the past.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to permit me to make a brief comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Louisiana has been discussing generally a matter that is of outstanding importance to the Senate. I compliment him for his statement. I do not wish to discuss this specific measure; but the criticism he has directed toward the immense increase of expenditures charged to the contingent fund is wholly justified, and the tremendous increase in those expenditures is wholly inexcusable.

Let me ask the Senator whether, instead of attacking one of these measures as it comes to the floor, it would be more salutary to attack the cause of the situation he has been discussing, as that situation has developed over the past few years, and particularly since the adoption of the Reorganization Act.

I call the Senator's attention to the practice we have been following under the Reorganization Act, which provides, with respect to the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the first matters coming under its jurisdiction are:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that under that practice and under the system which has grown up under it, when a resolution calling for a special investigation is submitted, it is referred to the committee in interest, the committee which has a vital interest in the particular resolution and its purposes. The resolution does not come to the Committee on Rules and Administration until after the committee particularly concerned with the resolution and its purposes has reported the resolution, usually unanimously, to the Senate; and the Senate has no opportunity to discuss in any way the merits of the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that is done without hearings.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct. Immediately after the resolution has been reported to the Senate, it is referred as a matter of course to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That committee has insisted that a proposed budget be filed in connection with the resolution. The only appearance before the Committee on Rules and Administration is that by the party in interest, namely, one or more representative of the committee which is particularly concerned with the resolution. Their testimony to the Committee on Rules and Administration is, "We have discussed the wisdom of making this investigation, and we have unanimously agreed that the investigation should be made. You on the Committee on Rules and Administration have no jurisdiction of this matter except to consider how much money you will make available to us. We are ordering the investigation. All you have to do is determine the amount of money. We have submitted to you our budget. You can approve it or reduce it."

So there develops the situation which the Senator from Louisiana is trying to meet now, in connection with the pending resolution. In other words, the resolution comes to the Senate from the Committee on Rules and Administration on the basis of the representations made in that committee by the parties in interest. So we have presented to us a proposed charge to be made upon the contingent fund. The Senate has no opportunity, on the basis of any proceedings, to pass on the wisdom or merits of the proposed investigation or to debate it upon its merits.

After making that comment, with the kind permission of the Senator from Louisiana, I now wish to ask him the following question: Would it not be more effective to arrive at the ends the Senator from Louisiana has in mind—and I am with him 100 percent—to correct the rule under which we are operating, so that the substantive consideration, namely, the wisdom of ordering the investigation, could be considered and discussed here on the floor of the Senate before the investigation is ordered?

Mr. ELLENDER. In answer to my good friend, the Senator from Iowa, let me say that I believe the matter could be handled under the present rule.

As a matter of fact, before these resolutions were considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I suggested to my good friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who now is chairman of that committee, that I should like to know whether there would be hearings on these resolutions which call for such expenditures. I think it is incumbent upon those who seek such funds to show that there is a necessity for expending them. That is what prompted me yesterday to ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the majority leader, to postpone the calling up of these resolutions until next week, so that we could look into them. I have done the best I could in the period of 24 hours. I am sure that if I had more time I would be able to look further into them and probably would be able to give more information on them to my colleagues.

This morning I made every effort to obtain information as to the amount of money spent on the so-called Internal Security Subcommittee. I telephoned the financial clerk of the Senate, but was told by him that he could not give me the information because he had received instructions that it could be given only to the chairman and to the clerk of the committee. I do not see why that information should be secret. I did not ask about the matters which would be examined or investigated by the subcommittee. All I requested was information as to the amount of money which had been spent.

I could not get the information so I did the best I could with the data I had at hand. Why such instructions had been given by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and by the clerk of that committee, namely, that the financial clerk of the Senate was not to give out that information to anyone, is beyond my comprehension. What is so secret about the matter?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Is the Senator from Louisiana referring to the former chairman of the subcomittee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I am referring to the new chairman.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I had never heard of any idea of secrecy about such matters.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had not either.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I believe that everything the subcommittee has done has been open to any Senator. Certainly that has been the case up to now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was trying to find out, in the short time available, how much money was spent last year and the year before and the year before that by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. I was told by the financial clerk of the Senate that he had been instructed by the chairman of the committee, as well as by the clerk of the committee, not to divulge any information of that sort to anyone. So I had to contend myself with information I was able to obtain in other ways. I had to assemble information in the best way possible.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are not these committees required to make reports at the end of each year as to the amounts of expenditures and the persons to whom the money is paid? I know that is true in regard to the committe on which I have served as chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. Why the instructions to which I have referred were issued, I do not know.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe such instructions would be valid, even if they had been issued; that is my point.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was told that I could not obtain the information, that the information was not to be released to anyone.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Did the Senator from Louisiana call the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and ask him for that information?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I did not.

Mr. WELKER. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think he should do that, rather than take hearsay evidence on that matter?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not hearsay evidence.

Mr. WELKER. Certainly it is hearsay, because the Senator from Louisiana did not ask the chairman of the committee. I myself shall be glad to call him.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose the Senator from Idaho knows how to conduct his own business; and I will conduct mine in the way I wish.

Mr. WELKER. That may be very true; but I think it is unfair to the

chairman of the Judiciary Committee, when he is not on the floor and will not have an opportunity to reply. I shall be glad to contact him and ask him whether he did give such an order.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no reason to doubt that he did give it. If I had any doubt that he had given such an order, I would not have mentioned it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Why did not the Senator from Louisiana telephone the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. As a matter of fact, there cannot be anything secret about this because all matters involving the expenditure of such funds are legally handled by way of resolution. I hold in my hand all the resolutions, which are matters of public record. They are as follows: Senate Resolution 366, $10,000; Senate Resolution 7, $75,000; Senate Resolution 198, $117,000; Senate Resolution 314, $163,800.

Then the statement shows the expenditures to October 31, 1952. I have all that information, and I gave it to the Senate earlier today. For instance, for the 2 years our committee has received $366,000, and the committee has spent $297,000, leaving an unexpended balance of $69,000.

In this resolution the committee is requesting $150,000 of new funds, to be added to the unexpended balance of $69,000.

This situation has developed because this particular committee, like all other committees, began slowly, with a small staff, but has picked up momentum. Now we are considering the result of a part of the committee's work, as I tried to show earlier today.

Last year this committee spent in excess of $200,000.

Mr. President, I am now chairman of the committee. We are concerned with 10 different areas of subversive activity and of Communist activity in our Government. I am asking for only the amount of money which was used last year to do that job. I do not know how many areas we shall investigate; I do not wish to take that responsibility as chairman of the committee. However, I know that we are not spending one-tenth of the money the Mutual Security Administration is spending in France today for investigators.

We have now—and I did not want to expose this—a project concerning Communists in our Army. Would the Senator wish to deprive us of the funds necessary in order to go into that legitimate field of investigation, upon which the peace and security of our own Nation might rest? Mr. President, I cannot assume such a responsibility.

I am only requesting what the committee had last year, and what it spent last year. I know that the costs of Government have not diminished to any extent. We are concerned now with 10 areas. I do not want the responsibility of having to pick and choose the areas to be included as those which we are to investigate. I say they should all be investigated. So far as the money is concerned, the only way by which any committee can obtain funds is through a resolution. Such a resolution is before the Senate. It is a matter of public record.

Mr. ELLENDER. All I sought this morning in the short period of time I had available was information as to how much the subcommittee spent last year and the year before.

Mr. JENNER. I supplied the Senator with that information.

Mr. ELLENDER. This afternoon, certainly. But what I wanted this morning was to be certain that my amendment would provide the subcommittee with the same amount of money during the year ahead as it spent last year. I have indicated the information that I received, namely, that the data was denied me—and anyone—upon order of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, in addition to the various expenses of the Senate that I have previously cited—that is, maintaining various committees of the Senate, providing employees of the Senate who serve Senators, defraying costs of special investigations—there is a sum, not included in the resolutions, authorizing these investigations but which is inherent in these costs. I refer to the amount of money necessary to print reports made and hearings held by any committee. I could not obtain the amount spent last year by the House and Senate respectively within the short time I had. I compiled this data rather hurriedly, so I must use total congressional costs. For instance, the cost of printing hearings held by committees of both Houses of Congress last year was $2,035,000. The cost of printing reports, such as we have attached to these resolutions or to any bill that comes from a committee, was $400,000. Those amounts represent an increase of approximately two and one-half times the amount spent in 1946 when the Legislative Reorganization Act was placed on the statute books. During that year, for hearings that were printed, and for reports that were made as a result of those hearings, the Congress spent $808,991. During the past year that amount increased to $2,435,000.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment. I should like to be somewhat specific. I want to complete my statement on this point.

Mr. WELKER. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. To be specific, $219,269.61 was spent merely to print the hearings that were conducted in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation. Of course these were hearings that occupied a great deal of time. But I cite that figure just to indicate to the Senate that the black and white cost of salaries and incidental expenses does not tell the whole story of how much these investigations cost. Another investigation in which I participated last year, was the investigation of storage and processing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate Agriculture Committee spent almost 3 months investigating the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The entire expense entailed in the employment of investigators, stenographic reporters, and our special staff was $37,121.96. But in addition to that, the cost of printing of hearings held by the committee—which expense was not included in the resolution authorizing that investigation—was $25,053.14. I think it becomes obvious, then, that when any Senator comes before the Senate requesting $150,000 or $180,000 for the purpose of conducting an investigation, the amount requested does not represent the entire cost. That particular amount of money would be spent merely to pay the employees necessary to conduct the investigation, to pay expense of the stenographic reports, and to defray miscellaneous costs such as telephone and telegraph bills, stationery, and so forth. The printing of a report and any hearings held during that investigation is a separate cost, and is included in a separate appropriation.

Let me refer for a moment to the now defunct Special Committee to Investigate Crime, which was headed by my good friend from Tennessee. The sum expended for hearings, for the salaries of staff members, and for the stenographic notes taken in the course of the hearings was $350,921. To print the hearings required an additional sum of $134,450. So that when the Senate appropriates, as I have just indicated, certain sums with which to conduct hearings or investigations, there are additional sums which must be provided.

Mr. President, I repeat, I am not trying to do away with the Internal Security Subcommittee. All I am trying to do is provide the same amount of money that the subcommittee was authorized last year, in the hope that $50,000 can be saved. I believe that the work can be easily continued, especially in view of the change in administration. It is my considered judgment that as fine a job can be done by this subcommittee during the months ahead as was done last year, with the same amount of money—the amount that would be provided if my amendment is adopted.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Louisiana for yielding. With respect to our little colloquy a moment ago, I called the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I am sure the Senator will be glad to know that he stated to me that the Senator from Louisiana had been totally and completely misinformed, that he had never instructed anyone to deny the Senator access to the figures he requested, and that as a matter of law they were open to any citizen and particularly to any Senator who desired them. I feel sure the Senator will be glad to know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I am glad to know that, but someone is in error. I made the request on two occasions. I do not recall the name of the man with whom I talked, but I shall check further into it.

Mr. WELKER. I should be glad if the Senator would call the chairman, as I did.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I shall be glad to do that.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. What I am trying to do, as I have previously stated, is to save the taxpayers of this country a few dollars. I am satisfied that with $50,000 less the Internal Security Subcommittee can do as fine a job as was done last year.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two statements to which I made reference in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressional printing costs—Government Printing Office

Item	1946	1950	1951	1952	1953 (estimate)
Hearings	$634,075	$1,744,083	$1,972,629	$1,975,000	$2,035,000
Reports	174,916	334,475	441,220	360,000	400,000
Total	808,991	2,078,558	2,391,849	2,335,000	2,435,000

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1953.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As requested in your letter of January 21, I am sending you the estimated cost of printing and binding a number of the more voluminous hearings produced for the Senate, including the hearings on Pearl Harbor and those of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerning storage and processing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The charges or estimates are as follows:

GPO Jacket No.	Title	Committee	Cost
79716	Attack on Pearl Harbor (39 parts)	Special Committee Investigating Pearl Harbor.	$219,209.61
20554	Investigation Storage and Processing Activities of Commodity Credit Corporation (2 parts).	Agriculture and Forestry	25,053.14
68958	Interstate Communications Facilities (14 parts)	Special Committee to Investigate Crime.	106,154.62
80513	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary (2 parts)	Appropriations	28,873.91
83686	Interior Department Appropriation Bill (2 parts)	do	28,701.87
83762	Defense Production Act Amendments (3 parts)	Banking and Currency	50,060.17
83797	Military Situation in the Far East (5 parts)	Armed Services	38,235.32
85277	Investigation of Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce (7 parts).	Special Committee to Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce.	28,295.33
95515	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary (1 part)	Appropriations	24,220.16
96315	Defense Production Act of 1952 (5 parts)	Banking and Currency	41,826.00
98400	Interior Department Appropriation, 1953 (1 part)	Appropriations	19,598.65

I trust the foregoing provides the information you desire.

Very truly yours,
JOHN J. DEVINY,
Public Printer.
By JAMES W. BRODERICK,
Planning Manager.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the statement about a possible misunderstanding in my committee as to the Jenner subcommittee, I should like to make it clear that I wholeheartedly favor the appropriation of the amount of money requested by the Jenner subcommittee. I think the McCarran committee did one of the most outstanding jobs that has ever been done in the Senate by any investigating committee. I strongly feel that if that committee had been in existence and doing that type of work over the past 20 years, we would have saved billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives. I think the committee should be given all the money it needs.

Mr. President, lest there be any misunderstanding about the position of my committee, and speaking for myself, I take the position that the permanent subcommittee on investigations, under the Reorganization Act, has almost complete unlimited jurisdiction to investigate the executive branch of the Government. We have jurisdiction to investigate subversion, graft, and corruption, and so forth, but it is my thought that we should under no circumstances exercise that jurisdiction over a subject which is being investigated by the Jenner subcommittee. We may run into subversive activities as we have already, and if we find that the Jenner subcommittee is not investigating that particular matter and does not intend to go into it and if we feel it is within our jurisdiction, in my opinion we should investigate such subversive activity.

I am not attempting to divest our committee of any jurisdiction in regard to whether it involves graft, corruption, subversion, or anything else.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I take it from the Senator's statement that it will not be the primary purpose or objective of the permanent investigating subcommittee to conduct investigations from their very incipiency if it should appear that they would overlap the functions of the special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, but that if in the course of investigating matters there should come into it some subversive activity, it should be further pursued. What I understand the Senator to mean is that under such circumstances, if the other committee is not investigating the same action, his committee would pursue it to its logical conclusion.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There could be, if I may say to the Senator, a circumstance in which the whole matter could be turned over to the committee, but there could also be circumstances which would indicate that it would be necessary to pursue it to the final objective through the Senator's committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has stated the situation very well, and I agree with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hendrickson	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bricker	Hill	Potter
Bush	Hoey	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Smathers
Case	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Cooper	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kerr	Stennis
Daniel	Kilgore	Symington
Douglas	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Tobey
Ferguson	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Welker
George	Maybank	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Goldwater	McClellan	Young
Gore	Millikin	
Green	Morse	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the rule the morning hour is automatically terminated.

The Chair desires to ask the majority leader if he wishes to ask that the call of the calendar be continued after 2 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be continued after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the call of the calendar be continued after 2 o'clock? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Vermont would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from North Dakota would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who is absent by leave of the Senate, would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—73

Aiken	Griswold	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hendrickson	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bricker	Hill	Potter
Bush	Hoey	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Smathers
Case	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Cooper	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kerr	Stennis
Daniel	Kilgore	Symington
Douglas	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Tobey
Ferguson	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Welker
George	Maybank	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Goldwater	McClellan	Young
Gore	Millikin	
Green	Morse	

NOT VOTING—23

Bennett	Frear	Lehman
Bridges	Hennings	Long
Byrd	Humphrey	McCarran
Carlson	Jackson	Monroney
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Duff	Kennedy	Robertson
Eastland	Knowland	Schoeppel
Flanders	Langer	

So the resolution (S. Res. 46), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $150,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 314, agreed to May 29, 1952, and Senate Resolution 198, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, agreed to January 29, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1954.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 22) extending the time for study by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not this resolution entails the authorization of any new money.

Mr. TOBEY. It involves no new money. There is a hangover of $16,000 to clean up the job.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 332, agreed to June 26, 1952, hereby is extended to June 30, 1953.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 47) increasing the limit of expenditures for a review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 245, Eighty-second Congress, relating to an examination and review of the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, agreed to March 24, 1952, is hereby increased by $50,000, and such sums together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before June 30, 1953.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may the Senate have an explanation of this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves an appropriation of $50,000. The cut-off date is June 30, 1953. Last year the committee was given $100,000, but it expended only $47,860. So actually this resolution will provide the committee $97,860 with which to complete the work.

As I understand from the hearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration, this investigation started in a small way. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has been chairman of the subcommittee. I note that he is present in the Chamber, so I defer to the Senator from North Carolina, who, I am sure, can answer all questions on this subject.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to tell the Senate what I know about the subject.

The amount involved is comparatively small in the light of the tremendous task which the committee had. When this investigation was authorized last spring it required some time for the subcommittee to organize. We found a great many people who wanted to see certain properties sold. There were so many claims that we had to be very careful in the selection of the counsel and the staff. Personally I had to go through large lists of applications. Here and there I discovered someone who was in a business similar to one of those which was held by the Alien Property Custodian, or had some connection with such business. Finally, after much difficulty, I obtained a lawyer of very great ability from my own State to head the staff. The committee members were very particular about obtaining a man who was reliable and well qualified.

We went into the subject, and we found that there were 60,000 claims filed with respect to the property held by the Alien Property Custodian. In addition to the claims for specific property, we found that there were 45,000 accounts dealing with vested property, which was claimed by former owners. That made a total of 105,000 items. We found that of the claims which had been presented about 15 percent had been liquidated or processed. We found also that the Alien

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Property Custodian's Office was organized in such a way that it was quite difficult to get the facts.

One hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for this work. We began our work, and found that before we could deal with the details of various claims and cases we first had to establish certain records in order to be able to refer to the various cases which had been called to our attention initially, and others which would later be called to our attention.

We found some $60,000,000 referred to as assets from World War I. It was very difficult for some of us to believe that there were any assets left from World War I yet to be administered.

The situation was not quite so bad as some of the reports set forth because a part of the difficulty was due to the fact that German bonds which had been deposited with the Alien Property Custodian shortly after World War I were in default. However, we found that there were items yet to be attended to and processed or liquidated. Many of the claimants had died.

But that was not the big job. The big job was in connection with World War II assets. As most Senators will recall, I am sure, there was a provision in the Trading With the Enemy Act to the effect that the net proceeds after all liquidations should be held for the benefit of the veterans' war fund.

We found also that a great deal of money had been turned over to the War Claims Commission before there had been any real solution of the problem or before there was any real evidence that there was going to be any net amount. We found that many things had to be investigated. We have issued an interim report, which is being printed. I have before me a copy of it. In the report we have set forth some of the things we have come in contact with. We saw at once that there was no need to engage a large staff and spend the $100,000 in 6 months, merely because we had the money. Therefore we were very careful in choosing staff members and accountants and others. The whole committee worked together on it, and we had many conferences. Up to now we have spent approximately $55,000. I believe that is the correct figure.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was the author of the resolution and he sat with us, and he has been very attentive in the handling of these matters. We have remaining approximately $40,000 or $45,000 of the original $100,000. However, we are just beginning to scratch the surface so far as getting to the bottom and so far as getting to the problem of handling alien property is concerned. Under the plan which had been suggested by some persons the Alien Property Custodian's Office would go on for probably another 30 or 40 years, unless something were done to work out a program to settle the claims, distribute the assets properly, and arrive at a fair distribution of them.

There are many lawsuits involved, and many of them are still pending. Some of the lawsuits have gone to the Supreme Court, and there are many other cases pending. Some cases involve dual nationality claims. There are the claims of the Swiss people. There are the claims of people who are accused of being Germans and of owning property, and who are trying to hide behind some kind of dual nationality scheme.

All these questions are very complicated and will take a considerable length of time to straighten out. Therefore the committee felt that to start with, it would ask for an additional $50,000, which, added to the $40,000 or $45,000 unexpended, would at least carry the committee over until it got to the point where it was in a position to tell the Senate how much additional money it would need to complete its work.

The interim report which I have before me will be available in printed form in the next day or two, and any Senator who wishes to obtain a copy of it may do so. Every member of the committee has a copy of the interim report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the first report of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes; it is the interim report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee find any evidence of irregularity in the handling of the claims?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Evidence of irregularity?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I would not wish to accuse anyone of anything at this time. At least, we did find what appeared to be very poor practices in business management, but we would not wish to make any charges at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has no doubt that much good will come from the completion of the investigation?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I think a great deal of good will come from it, because I believe we will get at the truth of what has been going on. Secondly, we will formulate a plan by which war assets and the various claims can be disposed of, instead of letting the process continue for 30 or 40 years.

Thirdly, I believe we will be able to formulate a plan for the proper consideration of the claims.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's judgment that the amount of money being asked for is sufficient to complete the investigation?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I would not wish to make that statement definitely at this time, because we are still in the process of trying to run down all the ramifications. Let me illustrate it in this way: A company, which is supposed to be a German company, may be claimed by the Swiss. It has millions of dollars in assets. It has many subsidiaries, and those subsidiaries own real property. In some cases it has been charged that some of the real property owned by the second or third subsidiary removed from the parent company has been disposed of. There may be no record of the names of the parties involved, except those that come to us in one way or another. We must ascertain whether $100,000 worth of property that may have been sold for $5,000 is property that should have gone into the Custodian's funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the situation be corrected? Would it not be necessary to go to court in order to determine the final result?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. There may be cases which will require court action. There are some court cases pending now, and some of them have been pending for many years.

Mr. ELLENDER. What can the committee do to correct the situation?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The committee can get at the facts and determine what process of liquidation should be followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means by way of recommendation?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes; and by congressional enactment. For instance, there are two or three big cases before the Custodian with respect to which I am told by the lawyers representing the Custodian and the Department of Justice, as well as by the lawyers working for the committee, that will require legislative enactments to authorize certain things to be done so as to get the assets in such a position that they can be liquidated. It is quite a monumental task. The Senator from Wisconsin is quite familiar with the situation, as are several other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the Senator will agree that the committee has done a splendid job up to date, but that it has only touched the surface, because it has been investigative work rather than what might be called regular committee work. Therefore, unless the work of the committee is continued the work that has been done up to date will represent practically an entire loss, because the committee has not completed its work. Therefore it would not be fair to the Senate or to the public to allow it to cease its work at this point, because the work of the committee has not been completed. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from North Carolina feels that it is of such importance that it would be well worth while, even though its costs some money, to actually complete the investigation.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Quite so, when one realizes that the Office involved $500,000,000 in properties to start with.

Mr. FERGUSON. Some of the cases involve property of citizens, as well as property of aliens. In other words, it is not always a matter of alien property.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. It may be either. There may be disputes between an alien and a citizen, and the administration of the funds is as important as some of the judicial decisions.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Quite so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Like my colleague from Michigan, I, too, wish to commend the distinguished chairman's fine job on the subcommittee. I merely want to say to the Senator from Louisiana that if the committee does not do anything else——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not opposing the work of the committee. I am asking for information, that is all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand. If the committee does nothing else but formulate some kind of orderly process of liquidation it will have saved a thousand times the amount of money that it has cost, because the Office of the Alien Property has been going on and on and on, and we have World War I cases still pending. The hope is that we will get an orderly process of liquidation. In that way we will save more than 100 times over what it has cost so far.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state to my good friend from North Carolina that in asking these questions I am not opposing the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] stated a while ago that if hearings were held on these resolutions before they were presented to the Senate, and in that way give the Senate the benefit of what is being done, we could save some time. I am hopeful that in the future, before any request is made of the character that we are discussing today, full information will be furnished to the Senate, so that Senators may make up their minds.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I may say that, acting in accord with what I believed to be the proprieties of the situation, I tendered my resignation as chairman of the subcommittee. Therefore, from now on the ball will be carried by someone else. I am sure that those now in the majority on this committee, who were once in the minority, will do a good job, because we have had perfect unanimity—if that is the correct expression—in the work of this committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word or two with relation to the matter which has been under discussion today. I am very well acquainted with the whole proceeding. I agree fully with the remarks which were made relative to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I realize, and I am sure every other Senator understands, that, as stated by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], this is a tremendous undertaking. It involves, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, half a billion dollars, with transactions running back to immediately after the First World War. The purpose of the investigation was not particularly to smell out anything against individuals.

The purpose was probably threefold: First, to ascertain whether in the future we shall face situations in which we think the proper method of procedure in relation to property of this kind is to pay for it in the way that has been done under the present practice. I was glad to hear the chairman of the committee say that the committee would make a recommendation, and perhaps would suggest the enactment of legislation.

Second, to see that there is greater opportunity for those who have private interests to obtain justice, rather than to have to wait 20 or 30 years and even then not obtain justice.

Third, as has been suggested so well by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, in regard to some of the officials or employees of the Senate to whom he has referred, to see whether we have in the legislative branch of the Government persons who wish to perpetuate themselves in office. I think there is every evidence that there are such persons in the Government.

Fourth, to see that the Government itself obtains justice. As was so well stated by the chairman of the committee, funds have been transferred when they should have remained as they were. I believe some $150,000,000 was transferred.

Incidentally, of course, there is the question of whether in this way a gravy train has been provided for favorite sons and whether there has been efficiency by the Government in the operation of the industries which are subject to the Alien Property Custodian, and, again, whether such operations have interfered with private industry. Some of these institutions now are in direct competition with private enterprise.

All those questions have to be more or less answered by means of subsequent investigations.

Up to date a considerable analysis has been accomplished by a subcommittee headed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; and sufficient facts are available at this time to enable us to determine how these operations have been conducted and whether there has been maladministration.

So I am very happy to say a word on behalf of the subcommittee and particularly on behalf of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 47.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 245, Eighty-second Congress, relating to an examination and review of the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, agreed to March 24, 1952, is hereby increased by $50,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before June 30, 1953.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MR. LIANG CHAYAKON, MEMBER OF THE SIAMESE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have pleasure this afternoon, at the instance of the Department of State, to present to the Senate a member of a sister parliament. We have a rule of the Senate which accords to members of other parliaments of the earth the privilege of the floor.

Mr. President, there are other governments which do not grant that privilege. I have had experience with certain of the great governments of the earth which do not reciprocate in this regard, but we in this country, being the great leader among the democracies of earth, observe that rule. Today, I am privileged to present a representative from what was formerly the Government of Siam, now known as Thailand. He is a member of the parliament, as is his wife, also, elected by the people. His name is Liang Chayakon. I am very happy to present him to the Senate. [Applause.]

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY IN CONNECTION WITH IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 48) making an additional authorization for the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with immigration and naturalization, which had been reported by Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, on January 23, 1953, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may the Senate have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in reply to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, I shall be glad to give an explanation.

This resolution will permit the expenditure of the amount of money that has been spent year after year, I believe, by the Subcommittee on Immigration. In other words, certain laws which have been enacted have placed certain duties upon the committee. Last year the Committee on the Judiciary disposed of 1,263 bills, of which 33 were general bills and 1,230 were private immigration bills. Each of the latter must have an individual report, as required by law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any evidence adduced to show why the number of immigration bills has increased to such an extent?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; that has occurred because the immigration quotas are oversubscribed. So private immigration

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

bills are introduced, in order to have certain special exceptions made. Moreover, certain laws throw additional burdens upon the Congress in connection with the introduction of other immigration bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. The effect of the private bills is to permit the entry of more persons than now provided for under existing law; is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. That is true. In fact, it is estimated that between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 persons are illegally in the United States at the present time. I am not an authority on the subject, but I understand that these bills are primarily in the interest of persons of that class.

Mr. ELLENDER. That also means that those who are thus attempting to become citizens cannot qualify under existing laws, and therefore their cases are presented by means of special bills. Does not the Senator from Indiana think that if this process is continued, the present numbers are small indeed in comparison with what they will become within the next 4 or 5 years, if we continue to offer inducements for such persons to enter the United States, although they are not entitled to entry under our existing laws?

Mr. JENNER. I think the Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. In fact, the subject has been discussed many times in our committee. Such measures throw a tremendous burden upon the Judiciary Committee. Nevertheless, the provisions of the law must be followed. It is not the fault of the committee that the law reads as it does.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, that is not the law which the Judiciary Committee is attempting to follow in connection with these matters. Such special bills are introduced for the purpose of permitting the entry of persons who otherwise would not be entitled to enter the United States.

Mr. JENNER. As I have said, it is estimated that between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 persons are illegally in the United States at this time. The persons covered by such private immigration bills would otherwise be subject to deportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; except for these special laws, such persons would be returned to the country of their origin, would they not?

Mr. JENNER. So far as that is concerned, the law is already about as tight as it can be made.

Let me say that 821 private immigration bills were reported to the Senate, and a written report was submitted on each one.

Special cases of deportation by the Attorney General and matters relating to the status of aliens under the Displaced Persons Act require individual examination and appraisal. Nine thousand seven hundred and thirteen cases were handled, of which 7,145 were approved, and 2,568 were held for further investigation.

The following was the backlog at the end of the Eighty-second Congress: 3,496 cases were in preliminary process; 2,568 were being held for further investigation.

They constitute a total of 6,064.

It is anticipated that upward of 15,000 cases will come before this Congress.

One of the requirements is to try to screen out the subversives, Communists, and criminals. Under the law, for example, if the Attorney General wishes to deport a person who may have been a Communist at some time in the past—and in some cases such a person may have resided for many years in the United States and may have 10 children living in the United States at this time—it is the responsibility of Congress to investigate that case and act upon it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the record should be clear that any person who is allowed to enter the United States as the result of the enactment of a private immigration bill is charged to the quota of the country of his origin. In other words, his entry does not result in increasing that quota.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; that is true, of course; all such persons are charged to the quotas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the fact, is it not?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; that is correct. That is in accordance with one of the policies of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Such persons, when allowed to enter the United States, are charged to the quota of the country of their origin; is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my colleagues that today we are making available to one of our standing committees almost half a million dollars. The Judiciary Committee is entitled, under the Reorganization Act, to spend a maximum of between $95,000 and $96,000. By special resolutions adopted in the past we have provided for two extra specialists and three extra clerks for the committee, so that the committee can handle the private claims which are filed with it. The amount of money we are spending at this time on private claims is approximately 50 times more than the amount so spent when we had the former Claims Committee. The resolution permitting the employment of the two additional experts and the three extra clerks was adopted because of the great amount of work placed on the committee because of the extra private claims bills. That work had nothing to do with immigration, which is treated separately.

I happened to be chairman of the Committee on Claims before passage of the Reorganization Act. The record can be examined, and it will be found that the Claims Committee handled over 50 percent of the total number of bills which were passed in any Congress. We operated then by having each Senator who served on the committee handle a certain number of bills, which were assigned to him to examine. Each Senator reported on the bills assigned to him, after studying them. As a result, we were able to do our work with only one clerk, whose salary was $3,600.

Today this committee has six attorneys. Of course, I must admit that the committee now does work other than that handled by the old Claims Committee. However, claims still constitute the major part of the committee's work.

In addition to the amount of money spent by the Judiciary Committee on these claims, we are providing about $100,000 for the Justice Department. This was not the case prior to enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Today, as I understand—and I should like to be corrected if I am in error—these claims are serviced and handled, not by Senators but by clerks. The clerks report on them to Senators, but the Senators do not investigate them personally. Am I correct in that statement, or am I incorrect?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee for a long time. The Senator from Wisconsin was chairman of the commitee. I repeat, there is not a Senator on that committee who does not have to study three or four hundred private claim bills during a session of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to bills reported by the staff?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The procedure is for the staff to examine them first. The Senator from Louisiana will remember, of course, that when he was on the Claims Subcommittee, there were times when that constituted the entire work of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. No——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Judiciary Committee has an Immigration Subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was a great deal of work put upon that committee, so that it was literally impossible for Senators even to read all the bills and reports.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I shall come to that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we all passed upon them individually—and there was no partisanship—when the Senator from Wisconsin was chairman, as well as when the Senator from Nevada was chairman. We would pass out these bills as well as we could to so-called subcommittees, usually composed of but one Senator, who would examine the claims and the testimony. We had to rely on the staffs.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to be a little more specific with reference to this particular committee than I was in my general statement a while ago. The Judiciary Committee is entitled, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to some $95,000 or $96,000, with which to perform the duties charged to it under the act.

But what we are doing today will bring the cost of the committee to nearly a half million dollars. This includes the $219,000 for the Internal Security Subcommittee, and $97,000 for extra work in connection with immigration. In addition, there is $50,000, which was referred to a while ago by my good friend from North Carolina, plus the cost of extra clerical and professional help, provided for by resolution, authorizing the

employment of two extra attorneys and three extra clerks. This makes a total of $496,000 that we are providing for the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, to conclude, I wish to point out again that this is a committee which obtains not only $95,000 for professional and clerical help as do all other standing committees, but which, in addition to that has been provided some $227,000 merely for the purpose of performing the ordinary functioning of the committee, exclusive of special investigations. It occurs to me that that is a little too much money. I shall not attempt to amend this resolution because of previous experience today. But it seems to me that there must be a less expensive way by which these private bills could be handled. Last year, during hearings before the Appropriations Committee, I attempted to have the Department of Justice determine the amount of money spent to process private claims, in excess of what was spent prior to reorganization. My recollection is that we have to appropriate, for the Justice Department, in the neighborhood of $100,000 more than was required in 1946. Having the claims come to the Judiciary Committee necessitates the committee hiring all this extra help, amounting to perhaps half or even more than half of the $130,000 expended each year in order to operate the committee. I would say that the staff probably spends more than half its time examining these private claims bills. The measure now under consideration, however, does not deal with private claims, but deals solely and entirely with immigration cases.

If we continue the present practice, instead of having 1,800, the number of private immigration bills now being considered, we shall have 10,000. I think something ought to be done to stop that in some way. I pointed out in the course of my previous remarks that it costs $400,000 to print the reports to accompany the bills in the Senate. There ought to be some way to limit that expense. Since private bills, as well as immigration bills, are the subject of 50 percent of the reports made to the Senate, there should be some way in which a saving could be effected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I agree with the Senator as to the amount of money involved. But the immigration laws have been changed. The Senator will recall that the Department of Justice now sends claims to the Senate en bloc. We have a right to veto them if we think it proper to do so. We sometimes have a list of perhaps 150. Those cannot be examind by individual Senators, but must be examined by the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a moment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to answer the Senator on that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a moment. The Senator will have ample time for reply. Secondly, in the handling of private claims, the Senator is an expert. He handled the old Claims Committee well when he was its chairman. When we enacted the Federal courts law, we thought we would get rid of these claims, but, as it has turned out, more claims bills are introduced now than ever before. I have tried ever since becoming a member of the Judiciary Committee to point out the fact that most of those who come to us with claims do so because of the slowness of the Court of Claims in passing upon claims. A case may have been pending for years, and the cost to a man living in Louisiana of coming to Washington to see his Senator regarding what he considers to be a just claim is prohibitive. He thinks something ought to be done. The Senator is quite correct, because this committee is flooded with private claims and immigration bills which it would be impossible for any one Senator to examine, assuming the claims were divided up among Senators and that they spent some time on them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator inform me whether, before a private claim is considered by the committee, it is investigated by the Justice Department?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom is it investigated?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not investigated by anyone. A bill is introduced and referred to the committee. We have a staff——

Mr. ELLENDER. The staff itself does not conduct the investigation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sometimes we direct the staff to investigate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not referring to private claims; I am speaking of immigration cases.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is a liaison with the Justice Department, and advantage is taken of all the information the Department has concerning a given case. Or, if further information is required, we ask the Department to get it. The Department is contacted before the case is brought to us. I venture to say that 50 percent of the private claims are claims involving Army trucks which perhaps hit an old lady on the street. After the war there was a flood of such claims. We would contact the Army and the Judge Advocate General would give us a report. That was the nature of the liaison, back and forth.

I hope something can be done, because the Judiciary Committee is flooded with those two categories of bills. We tried to get the Defense Department to settle claims up to $5,000. That would relieve Congress of a great many tort claims, usually automobile accidents occurring during and following the war. The Army can now settle claims up to $5,000; the Navy cannot. The Air Force can settle claims only up to $500. We should make it uniform. If that can be done, it will relieve Congress of approximately 30 percent of the bills referred to the Judiciary Committee, together with the cost of making reports and hiring personnel. The Senator knows that on a calendar day 60 percent or 70 percent of the bills on the calendar are private bills.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If we establish an agency to take care of the situation, it would cost the Government approximately four times as much as it is now costing. I think Congress ought to get rid of the burden, but I think that so far as the cost is concerned, it would be four times as much as it is now.

Mr. ELLENDER. The way it now operates, a great deal of the work on private claims is done by the Department of Justice. I just pointed out that it was necessary to increase the Department of Justice appropriation in order to provide them more lawyers. The appropriation was increased by more than $100,000. By the same token, we must do the same thing with respect to immigration bills. The amount of $97,000 is but a pittance compared to what is spent by the immigration authorities in running down the claims.

It strikes me that some new method must be evolved so as to reduce expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my understanding is that two kinds of cases come from the Department of Justice; one is with reference to the admission of displaced persons and the other is in reference to persons deported. The information I have is that during the past year, between 9,000 and 10,000 deportation cases were examined and that only approximately 200 persons were ordered deported.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that such cases should be handled by the Justice Department itself.

Mr. JENNER. That is what the Judiciary Committee felt when it wrote the new bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the Senator satisfied that it takes care of the situation completely?

Mr. JENNER. It still leaves criminal and subversive cases to be referred to the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that burden can be lifted from the Judiciary Committee, it will save approximately $25,000 or $30,000 a year, and the saving will be the same in the House with respect to other classifications.

If the Senator is satisfied that the law as it is now written will take care of the situation, I am content. If not, I should be glad to join with the Senator in the introduction of a bill which would make certain that a great deal of the burden would be lifted.

Mr. JENNER. I think the new law will take care of it. If not, I shall certainly be happy to join with other Senators in introducing a bill which will take care of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was agreed to.

The resolution as agreed to is as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 40) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to employ temporary personnel and increasing its limit of expenditures, was announced as next in order.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $189,000 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 251, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to January 24, 1952, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are we proceeding under the 5-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, would the Senator mind telling me his reasons for wanting the resolution to go over?

Mr. ELLENDER. Because I shall need more than 5 minutes in which to discuss it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator be able to state approximately the length of time he would like to consume in discussing it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should prefer that the resolution go over, if possible, because I should like to get a little more information regarding it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator prefer to have it taken up after a quorum call, or would he prefer to let it go over to another day?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have it go over until Monday. As I pointed out, there were no hearings on any of these resolutions, and most of us have had only 48 hours in which to examine this mass of resolutions. I was in hopes that we might have a little more time in which to discuss them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, it is important that we proceed at once, because if the resolution is agreed to, the employees will continue in their employment. If not, there will be a lapse of employment, and the question of rehiring them, and so forth, will be involved.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Morse
Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Griswold	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bricker	Hendrickson	Payne
Bush	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hill	Purtell
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Russell
Byrd	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hunt	Smathers
Carlson	Ives	Smith, Maine
Case	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cooper	Kefauver	Stennis
Cordon	Kerr	Symington
Daniel	Kilgore	Taft
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Tobey
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Welker
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	
Goldwater	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 40, notwithstanding the objection, which motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may I request that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration or the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] make an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should perhaps make a preliminary statement and then defer to the Senator from Wisconsin.

This resolution came from the Committee on Government Operations, formerly headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The subcommittee under the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] has done fine work. The Committee on Rules and Administration unanimously decided to approve the request for these funds. The Committee on Rules and Administration heard the evidence, heard the proposed program, examined the budget, and examined the Senator from Wisconsin as to the fields of activity which the committee intended to enter. The Committee on Rules and Administration unanimously approved the resolution.

The Senator from Wisconsin is present in the Chamber at this time, and I think he can give a more detailed explanation than I can. He can give the same detailed explanation which he gave to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee have any information at all other than what was presented by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in support of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. No; the committee did not.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the committee permitted the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to make his own case, and relied entirely on what he had to say?

Mr. JENNER. Just as the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] explained, that has been the procedure and method of the Senate for many years. It may be that it is wrong, but that is the way we proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated to my good friend a couple of weeks ago, I was hopeful that the procedure would be changed; I hoped that the committee would try to obtain from those who propose various resolutions the full facts and the reasons for requesting such appropriations.

Mr. JENNER. I may explain to the Senator that we require budgets, and detailed explanations of what it is proposed to do with the money. We require information as to what it is proposed to spend, how much is desired for telegraphic expense, how much for travel, how much for investigators, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the budgets are prepared by employees of the various committees.

Mr. JENNER. I do not know by whom the budgets are made. They come to us with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Government Operations. Our committee has nothing to say about that, except that we require those who request such appropriations to be specific as to what the money is to be used for, and how much they want. The only jurisdiction we have is to see that the resolutions conform to the policies of the Committee on Rules and Administration. For example, one of our policies is that we will not let a committee ask for an appropriation for a 2-year period, or for the entire Congress. We amended most of the resolutions. I think this was one of the resolutions amended. It was limited to January 31, 1954. We also require a complete, itemized budget showing what the money is wanted for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee approve the entire amount requested by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JENNER. In this case we did. We do not in all cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much effort was made by the Rules Committee to determine whether or not this committee could do with less than $200,000?

Mr. JENNER. Various members of the Committee on Rules and Administration asked questions on that subject. I think the chief clerk of the committee was present to help answer the questions.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was present. He is now in the Chamber, and I think he can give an explanation to the whole body as he gave it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] on the outstanding job which he did as chairman of the subcommittee of which I am now chairman. He operated on a rather meager budget. He saved the Government a tremendous amount of money. For example, in the tanker cases, the cases initiated under the Senator from North Carolina and turned over to the Department of Justice, the Justice Department has begun to libel the ships concerned. One of the cases is now in the lower court. It appears that the possibility of winning in the higher court is excellent. If that case is won in the higher court, it will ultimately mean a recovery by the Government in the neighborhood of $50,000,000, I am informed. The results of the investigative work under the man who was the head of the staff at that time have been excellent. Mr. Francis D. Flanagan is still staff director under the present chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The budget of the permanent investigating subcommittee has ranged from $100,000 to a quarter of a million dollars. We are asking for $200,000. That will enable us to increase our staff of investigators from 7 to 14 or 16. We feel that that is absolutely necessary if we are to do the job we should do. We feel that if the committee does the kind of job we hope it will do, we can save many millions of dollars. I assume that the Senate and the country are not too familiar with the so-called functional investigations conducted by the committee. They are, of course, aware of the investigations covering graft and fraud. Some of the functional investigations are much more important. For example, at the present time the joint staff of the Committee on Government Operations and the investigating subcommittee are conducting an investigation into the Federal Security Agency. That investigation was ordered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The staff has now submitted to me a report which indicates a very alarming and wasteful situation in the Federal Security Agency, a situation which has resulted in unnecessary costs to an extent far greater than the entire budget we are requesting. It will be necessary to hold hearings on this subject.

We are now looking into the rather unusual procurement practices indulged in in some instance in connection with stockpiling. On the surface the practices appear to be very wasteful. We have been holding hearings on that subject in executive session. We expect to hold open hearings on that subject.

All in all, I think that the $200,000 here requested will be very well spent, and will result in savings far beyond the budget for this committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. In further answer to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I believe that when the subject was before the Rules and Administration Committee for consideration we went quite extensively into the question of the number of investigators the committee had been using, and the reasons why more were needed. One specific example which was brought out before our committee was in connection with the tanker deal. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] was chairman of the full committee, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] was chairman of the subcommittee. I believe it was brought out that four investigators were tied up for almost a year investigating the tanker deal alone.

In further substantiation of the request, our committee asked the Senator from Wisconsin questions concerning his duties and activities, and the reasons for the additional investigators.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that connection, let me say that the four men who worked almost a year under the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Arkansas cost the Government only a few thousand dollars, whereas the ultimate recovery by the United States Government because of their activities will amount to $50,000,000, $60,000,000, or $70,000,000. So the committee has served as a good watchdog, and has made tremendous savings to the country.

I do not think there is any investigative agency in the executive branch which will have a smaller staff of investigators than we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator can indicate to the Senate what it is proposed to investigate which cannot be investigated, let us say, by the so-called Jenner committee, the Internal Security Subcommittee, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, or the watchdog subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with which I am sure Senators are all familiar, to investigate all of our foreign expenditures. As I understand, an effort will soon be made to enlarge this committee so that proposed appropriations will be looked into and studied before they are actually made.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand, the question is what we shall be investigating which is not being investigated by the Jenner committee and by——

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not say "which is not being investigated," but "which cannot be investigated" by that committee. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say some time ago that he was against duplication.

What I should like to have the Senator tell us is what——

Mr. McCARTHY. I have the Senator's question. The Senate Appropriations Committee the other day voted to do away with the so-called watchdog committee. That action, as I recall, was rescinded because the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], was not present. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was not present either, I understand. That question is coming up again next week. It is the question of whether or not the watchdog committee will be done away with.

However, answering the Senator's question further, one of the subjects that we are now investigating, which would not come within the jurisdiction of any of the committees which the Senator has mentioned, is a matter which has been brought to us by the House Judiciary Committee, the old Chelf committee, now the Keating committee. It has to do with certain irregularities in the Justice Department. This is how our committee got into the case. They had been working on it for 6 months when they discovered that there were elements in the case which did not come within their jurisdiction, such as influence peddling and fraud. They contacted our committee and we have been working on it with them. Four of the members of our staff are tied up in the investigation with four members of their staff.

We are also conducting the so-called functional investigation. One is of the FSA, which was started under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The staff is doing an excellent job. They have submitted to me a preliminary report on their work. I do not believe that subject would come within the jurisdiction of any of the committees mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. At the present time we are investigating wasteful and improper practices in purchases for the stockpile—practices which on the surface would appear to cost the taxpayer many millions of dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin believe that the Armed Services Committee could look into that subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. It possibly could, but the point is, it has not done so. If the members of that committee care to take it over we shall be very glad to have them do so. The Armed Services Committee has not been investigating the matter. While under our gentleman's agreement we do not like to discuss matters considered in executive session, let me give briefly one example of a situation which has existed during the past few years. We find, for example, that one of the purchasing agents has a cost-plus contract with a corporation located in Europe. That corporation also has a branch in China, and it has a branch in New York. The cost-plus contract is with the European branch. The European branch of the corporation has been buying from the China branch at prices about double what its New York branch was quoting for the same product. We found that the product was shipped from China, to Europe, processed, and shipped to New York and laid down at about 150 percent above the ceiling price. There are many other items such as that, and one investigation would pay the cost of the committee for years and years to come.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I submit that ample funds should be provided for the work of the Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on Government Operations. The chairman of the committee has already made reference to the fact that an investigation probably will be made of the stockpiling program. All of us recall that Congress, in the enactment of the Defense Production Act, laid down principles and mandates for the stock piling of strategic and scarce materials, particularly minerals which are to be used in case of global war. I happen to come from a State which is one of the leaders in the production of minerals, and during the past several weeks I have made a study and an investigation to determine the status of the stockpiling program.

I have a great deal of information and material which was furnished to me by the General Services Administration and by the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, but all of it is marked "restricted," which means that it would not be wise or ethical for any Member of this body to publicly use the information in support of a certain viewpoint or contention.

However, I am sure that it will be entirely proper for the Committee on Government Operations through its staff to investigate the stockpiling program and the operations under the Defense Production Act, because some shocking disclosures may be made.

I have in my hand one of the documents which is marked "Restricted." Without mentioning any specific information I should like to point out that at a time when the OPS ceiling price for domestic copper was 24½ cents and for foreign copper 36½ cents there were many instances in which the Defense Materials Procurement Agency entered into purchase contracts, not for a year or 2 years, but for as long a period as 8 or 10 years. Many of these purchase contracts run for 10 years. What do we find? We find that the Federal Government is not obligating itself to pay 24½ cents or 36½ cents a pound for copper. In one instance nearly 15,000,000 pounds are being purchased over a 17-month period at prices involving subsidies.

We can go down this list and we will not find any ceiling prices. Here is an instance where 91 cents a pound was paid. A few are near the ceiling prices, but in many instances one finds that twice or three times the ceiling price is being paid in the purchase contracts negotiated by the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, talk about economy. I share the concern of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in his anxiety to cut expenses. How can any Senator dare to stand on this floor and say it is wise to save a few thousand dollars in order to block an investigation of the expenditure of many millions of dollars? Who is responsible? Congress laid down the mandate and it is the responsibility of Congress to check on abuses and waste and extravagance in the negotiation of purchase contracts for strategic materials, which are so essential to our national preparedness program.

Members of this body will recall that last summer one of the President's special commissions made a report. It was called the Paley Commission. I hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or another standing committee of the Senate will investigate the report. This report substantially recommmended that, since the time had come when the United States was a have-not nation insofar as minerals were concerned, it was no longer profitable or feasible to develop and explore and mine our vast deposits of minerals, and that the Federal agencies in charge of the stockpiling program should go into foreign countries and negotiate purchase contracts so as to bring about an expansion of mineral production abroad, even though it would make the United States more dependent upon foreign production of minerals and would be a serious threat and menace in case of global war.

Mr. President, I do not like to be personal, but I am constrained to point out that one of the members of the Paley Commission was a man by the name of Arthur Bunker. There were five members of the Commission. The record shows that Mr. Bunker, who was one of the five members of the Paley Commission, is the president of the Climax Molybdenum Co. Most of the molybdenum is produced in six or seven Rocky Mountain States. Very little is produced abroad.

I said that the material before me is marked "restricted." However, I am sure that the Committee on Government Operations will be under a mandate to investigate the stock-piling program, to determine whether in the name of economy it is wise to save a few thousand dollars now, or to disclose expenditures of many millions of dollars, probably in many cases unwisely and in a manner which is detrimental to the defense of our country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. On the question of classification, the Senator from Idaho might be interested to know that we were investigating the purchase of material from Red China; but that information was classified as secret, apparently on the theory that if we brought out in the hearing the fact that we were making purchases from Red China, Red China would then learn that we were buying from Red China.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for that contribution.

Mr. President, to return to molybdenum, I find that the General Services Administration negotiated a contract to purchase 85,000,000 pounds of molybdenum from the Climax Molybdenum Co., to be produced in Colorado over a period of 5 years, at a price of 90 cents a pound.

I find another contract for 50,000,000 pounds, with the same company, over a period of 10 years, to be purchased at a price of $1.24 a pound.

Mr. President, anyone who knows anything about mineral prices knows that currently, today, and for many months, molybdenum concentrates have been selling at 60 cents a pound f. o. b. the mines.

On the other hand, one contract amounting to $76,500,000 obligates the United States Government to pay 90 cents a pound for molybdenum concentrates; and another contract, amounting to $62,000,000, obligates the United States Government to pay $1.24 a pound for these molybdenum concentrates.

I know there may be some details which are not readily apparent from the statement I am making, and I realize that the possibility that low-grade ores involving molybdenum may be involved in this case may justify to some extent a price of 90 cents or a price of $1.24 cents a pound for a mineral which currently is selling at 60 cents a pound f. o. b. the mines. Nevertheless, I wish to mention that matter.

Perhaps I had better refer to another matter. We know that in the past year the prices of lead and zinc have been depressed. The OPS ceiling price for lead was 19½ cents a pound, and for zinc was 19 cents a pound. However, because a large amount of dumping of those minerals has occurred, in the case of United States markets, the prices of those minerals have declined. In one specific instance Great Britain dumped 30,000 tons of lead, last summer, and demoralized the United States market and also the world market. As a result, the prices of lead and zinc dropped from the OPS ceiling prices of 19½ cents a pound and 19 cents a pound, respectively, to the current price of 14 cents a pound for lead and 12 cents a pound for zinc.

In this instance I shall not mention the name of the company concerned; but I do point out that this case involves a contract which covers 33,000,000 pounds of zinc to be produced over a 3-year period. The date of the contract is December 29, 1951; and the unit price for zinc, under the contract, is 17 cents a pound, although today throughout the United States zinc producers are selling their product for 12 cents a pound. I do not know why this large operator was able to negotiate a purchase contract, over a 3-year period, with Mr. Jess Larson of the General Services Administration, for 33,000,000 pounds of zinc at 17 cents a pound; but I wish my friend, the Senator from Illinois, would point out the economy in a contract which commits the Government of the United States to spend 17 cents a pound for zinc which currently is selling for 12 cents a pound.

I shall not take more of the time of the Senate at this time to deal with that aspect of this economy problem in connection with the stockpiling program.

I have before me some documents which are restricted. I do not wish my colleagues in the Senate to read these documents; but I do wish to have the Government Operations Investigating Committee stage an all-out hearing, when the officials who have been spending these millions and millions of dollars for the purchase of stockpiled strategic materials may come before the committee and present the facts. Then we shall know what is being done in the way of national defense, involving the expenditure of much of this money.

I think I should be specific in another instance; so I shall point out that in the restricted information which I have before me, I now turn to antimony. It

so happens that in north-central Idaho—at Stibnite—we have the Bradley Mining Co. operation which produces 90 percent of all the antimony produced in the United States. I find that contracts for the purchase of antimony have been negotiated with mining companies in Mexico, Bolivia, South Africa, and other places.

What do I find has occurred in the case of the Stibnite operations of the Bradley Co.? We find that that company shut down its operations last August, and 320 persons were taken off the payroll; and a smelter costing $2,000,000—although it did not involve a nickel of expenditure in the way of assistance from the Federal Government—has been closed. It is difficult for me to rationalize when I see all these millions of dollars being spent at prices much higher than the current world prices or the domestic prices. It is difficult to justify the closing of the principal antimony smelter and mining operations in the United States, thus subjecting our country to monopolistic prices and controls by producers of antimony in Mexico, Bolivia, and South Africa.

It so happens that in 1951 some rich deposits of antimony were uncovered in South Africa. The result was to double the South African production of antimony. Of course, it was inevitable and natural that those operators would dump the additional production of antimony in the United States, thus depressing the price of antimony and eliminating competition in this country, principally in the State of Idaho. Thereafter, when the South African producers had almost complete control of the production of antimony, it would be very easy for them to inflate the price and exact a monopolistic payment from the United States. This would be entirely aside from any consideration of the hazard of having the United States be dependent upon antimony produced in South Africa, with which a transportation problem might arise in the case of global war, thus making it extremely difficult for us to have available an adequate supply of antimony.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to express to my senior colleague my appreciation for his very learned discourse on the matter now being presented to the Senate. I should like to ask him if it is a fact that in the event of a global war, and if at that time the shipping lanes were interfered with by the enemy, we would have very definitely to rely upon the Bradley Mining Co., of Stibnite, Idaho, which has produced 90 percent of the domestic supply of antimony. Where would we be in the event of an interruption of our shipping lanes, and if at that time the operations at Stibnite, Idado, were closed, with the result that not one pound of antimony was being produced from the domestic supply in Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The problem confronting us at that particular point would be that it would require not less than 6 months to reopen the mining operations, and probably just a few months to reactivate the smelter and make it possible for us to produce antimony in the United States and not be dependent upon a foreign supply.

But apparently the General Services Administration—which, according to the record, has been paying 100 percent or 200 percent, and in many cases more than that, in excess of the current prices for coopper, lead, zinc, tungsten, manganese, and other minerals, refuses to take any steps to safeguard the production of antimony in the United States.

Mr. President, I contend that that is not in the interest of our national defense.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. While we are referring to antimony, let me ask my distinguished colleague if it is not a fact that the Bradley Mining Co. was one of our great producers of tungsten during World War II; and by virtue of the closing of their antimony-processing plant that company has closed its explorations for tungsten in the north-central section of Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator is correct. That particular Stibnite operation, conducted by the Bradley Mining Co., produced during World War II approximately 50 percent of the tungsten which was produced in the United States. However, because of the forced closing of that operation, at this time it is impossible to obtain either tungsten or antimony from that particular section.

Mr. President, I should like to stress another point in connection with antimony. This information should be had by the Members of the Senate, because it is our responsibility to see that the national defense is not placed in a hazardous condition. What do we find? I hold in my hand information which is not restricted. It shows United States imports of primary antimony during the first 10 months of 1952, stated in short tons. The first column lists the countries, and the following columns are headed "ores and concentrates, metal, oxide, sulfide;" and then the totals are given.

What do we find from this table, Mr. President? The countries listed are Belgium, Luxemburg, Bolivia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Italy, Mexico, The Netherlands, Peru, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia. We find that in the first 10 months of 1952 those countries produced a total of 10,576 short tons of contained antimony. Czechoslovakia, a country behind the iron curtain, produced and sold to the United States 328 tons of metal. I wonder who is so naive as to think that the Congress passed bills, now enacted into law, restricting the exchange of minerals and war potential products with the countries behind the iron curtain. But instead of producing antimony in a domestic mine in this country, the General Services Administration is willing to agree to buy 328 tons of antimony from Czechoslovakia. We find Yugoslavia selling 704 tons also. That all adds up to the fact that during those first 10 months of 1952, 86 percent of our antimony imports can be traced back to Bolivia, Mexico, and the Union of South Africa, as well as to those countries behind the iron curtain.

I hesitate to take much time on this subject, but I think it is tied in with the proposal of the Government Operations Committee to make a full investigation of our stockpiling program. A few weeks ago, after studying this problem, I issued a release, and I am going to read certain parts of it at this time:

> The new Congress should carefully reexamine policies recently established by the Truman administration which have given preferential treatment to foreign mining at a time when mineral prices are depressed in this country and many of our own domestic mines are being forced to shut down.

There are literally hundreds of small mines, lead, zinc, antimony, and other mines, being forced to close down because of renewed competition with foreign countries and the purchase-contract program initiated and followed by the General Services Administration. Quoting further from that statement:

> Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, total loans and grants amounting to $245,500,000 have been made available through Federal agencies and the Export-Import Bank to expand foreign-mineral production.

Did Senators get that figure? Approximately a quarter of a billion dollars of the taxpayers' funds, in loans and grants and gratuities expended by the Truman administration within 2½ years following the Korean outbreak, to expand the production of foreign minerals.

To quote further:

> These funds have been expended in Europe, Africa, South America, Canada, Australia and Mexico and cover manganese, copper, cobalt, nickel, zinc, uranium, sulfur, and tungsten. The following shows the individual items.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief table showing the details of the nearly $1,250,000,000 of funds which have been expended in foreign countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certified loans (sec. 302 of DPA):	
Manganese	$15,000,000
Copper-cobalt	7,500,000
Do	21,000,000
Processing zinc	337,500
Export-Import Bank, own funds:	
Manganese	52,500,000
Nickel and cobalt	5,000,000
Loans for uranium	42,400,000
Increase of previous loan	100,000
Sulfur	3,620,000
Tungsten	580,000
1950	20,800,000
1951	76,725,000
Total loans and grants	245,562,500

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table entitled "United States Imports of Primary Antimony, First 10 Months, 1952."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States imports of primary antimony, first 10 months, 1952

[Short tons contained antimony]

Country	Ore and concentrate	Metal	Oxide	Sulfide	Total
Belgium-Luxemburg	.....	483	146	.....	629
Bolivia	3,730	.....	.....	.....	3,730
Canada	86	.....	.....	.....	86
Czechoslovakia	.....	328	.....	.....	328
France	2	6	.....	.....	8
Greece	15	.....	.....	.....	15
Italy	.....	11	.....	.....	11
Mexico	2,080	980	.....	.....	3,060
Netherlands	.....	76	.....	.....	76
Peru	280	25	.....	.....	255
Turkey	.....	133	.....	.....	133
Union of South Africa	348	.....	.....	.....	348
United Kingdom	2	239	927	.....	1,168
Yugoslavia	.....	704	.....	16	720
Total	6,502	2,985	1,073	16	10,576

NOTES.—Source of information: U. S. Bureau of Mines. Main source of ore for Belgium-Luxemburg smelters: Bolivia. Main source of ore for United Kingdom smelters: Union of South Africa.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I quote further:

In addition to these grants, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency has utilized counterpart funds and other credits in excess of $100,000,000 to stimulate foreign mineral production.

It is significant that while the Truman administration has been encouraging foreign production of materials, it has been extremely difficult for the domestic mining industry, with high operating expenses, to cope with low-cost foreign production. In case of global war it would also be most difficult to accelerate domestic production if and when mineral imports are disrupted. It is also apparent that if foreign mineral monopolies are permitted to develop and domestic production here is materially reduced, prices of imports may be greatly increased.

During the past year the Federal Government has set two standards of prices—

I have already referred to that in the case of copper, where, notwithstanding the 24½ cents OPS ceiling prices for domestically produced copper, the OPS has permitted processors in this country to pay an additional 12 cents, or a price of 36½ cents for South American copper, and the restricted information shows that General Services Administration has been paying as high as 80 and 90 cents a pound for millions of pounds of copper.

I continue:

The New Deal financing of foreign mineral production involves credits which have been made to the same cartels which have established international price levels, resulting at present in the closing of antimony mines in the United States and forcing lead and zinc mines to accept depressed prices largely the result of dumping of foreign lead in this country. Many American mining concerns have developed subsidiary mining activities abroad obviously to take advantage of the low-cost production as well as be beneficiaries of credits and grants out of the Federal Treasury which are not available for domestic production.

I think in all fairness I should point out at this time that in the expenditure of this quarter of a billion dollars abroad to expand foreign mineral production, the record will show that many of the large mining operators in this country, the large corporations, have established subsidiaries abroad, so that they could qualify for preferential treatment which they would not receive so long as they remained in the status of a domestic producer. I continue:

Although these policies have been formulated largely through administrative agencies, Congress can no longer ignore its own responsibility in reexamining these trends. It may be desirable for the United States to have available strategic minerals produced abroad, but it is far more important to our national security to give equitable treatment to our domestic mining industry. In case of global war we would find it hazardous to rely upon imports while our own domestic mines are restricted and hampered by policies which cannot be defended. This problem should be one of the first to be considered by the Eighty-third Congress.

I think the Government Operations Committee would be the proper group to undertake this extensive study to determine to what extent these millions of dollars are being expended for an alleged stockpile, in the building of which preferential treatment has been given to these countries abroad. I have confidence in the investigating committee—and I am sure that the chairman and his group will undertake that study. I think that the American people who are interested in national defense and national preparedness and the mining industry in this country, are interested not solely on a personal, selfish basis, but because, in case of global war, our domestic mining industry would be called upon to furnish these essential and strategic materials, without which a war could not be successfully prosecuted. So I stress that, while we are spending this money under the stockpiling act, under sections 301 and 302 of the Defense Production Act, mandates laid down by the legislative branch to expand the domestic production of mineral, the record shows that every consideration and preferential treatment has been given to foreign mineral producers. And I, for one, cannot justify that kind of program. Nor do I believe that it was the original intent of the Congress to discourage the production of these minerals at home and place our complete reliance upon foreign production of these essential minerals.

I have already pointed out that in case of global war the transportation of these minerals might be seriously impaired or interfered with, placing this country in a very serious situation. Just as important as that, is to remember that following the Korean outbreak the price of wool in the South Pacific, in Australia primarily, and in some of the South American countries, doubled in price within a short time. We remember the treatment we have received from our so-called allies in the procurement of rubber and tin and certain of the other materials which we consider so vital. More important than that, I want to stress that because of this inconsistent policy, the lack of a sound constructive program, we shall probably face, according to the authorities in the mining industry, a situation not later than 1955 whereby we shall have encouraged, both abroad and at home, through these purchase contracts and in many other ways, that overexpansion of our mining industry; and then what shall we do? Unless someone is willing to go out and create several more cold wars such as the Korean war, we may find ourselves facing a very gigantic overproduction, a surplus of copper, lead, and zinc.

Then we shall probably be faced in the legislative branch with a request to take some steps to relieve the distress and to make it possible for our domestic mining industry to operate in the interest of the national defense.

I have pointed out these matters, Mr. President, because I believe that every Member of the Senate agrees with me that it is our responsibility, after mandates are issued such as are contained in the Stockpiling Act and the Defense Production Act, sections 301 and 302. It is the responsibility of someone—the individual Members of the Senate do not have the facilities or the time to carry through and see that the mandates of Congress are scrupulously complied with—I believe it should be properly the function of the Committee on Government Operations to hold an investigation. If the hearing should disclose that there has been no waste or inefficiency and no abuse in preferential treatment for foreign producers, no harm will be done. If, on the other hand, it is disclosed that we on Capitol Hill have been lulled into a sense of false security because we have been under the impression that the General Services Administration, the Defense Materials Procurement Administration, and other agencies have been doing an efficient job, that fact can be determined. If I were connected with any of those agencies I would be glad to appear in a hearing before the Committee on Government Operations and submit a full report on what has been done in the matter of stockpiling and in the expansion of domestic mining which we deem to be essential in promoting the national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] regarding the pending resolutions are pertinent and proper and entirely worthy of consideration by the Senate. I should like to state the position of members of the Committee on Rules and Administration which favorably reported the resolutions and what we are faced with when resolutions of investigation come before us for action.

It must be remembered that each and every resolution providing for an investigation now on the calendar came to our committee with the unanimous endorsement of a standing committee. Were we to assume they were sending us padded budgets? Were we to assume that the resolutions were drafted with the idea that the sums requested would be reduced? Like the estimates submitted by all departments of the Government, we must assume that they are clear and proper budgets fully justifying the action sought to be taken. There is much loose talk about padded budgets coming to Congress from the departments, but my experience has been that meat-ax cuts made by the Congress are a mistake and that the efficiency of many agencies has been materially injured by such arbitrary reductions. An investi-

gating committee should either be allowed to function, or it should be abolished. If a certain activity is not worth while it should be abandoned, but if it is to be carried on, it should be properly supported.

Some question has been raised about duplication of effort. That subject was very carefully looked into by the Committee on Rules and Administration when these several resolutions were under consideration before it.

It has happened in my time that both the House of Representatives and the Senate were investigating the same subject matter, sometimes seeking the same witness on the same day. That is a duplication of effort which should, if possible, be avoided. I cannot suggest any better agency to take care of such a situation than the majority policy committee of the Senate. I am sure that if a situation of that kind should arise, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would be only too glad to confer with the House majority policy committee, and if any investigation has been initiated and is being handled by a proper committee of the House, it should not be taken up by a Senate investigating committee.

The Congress has a perfect right to follow up any appropriated dollar to its final use and to determine whether it has been expended not only according to law but according to the intent of Congress. In the exercise of that right, Congress, through its investigating committees, can go into any department or agency to see whether the business assigned to them is being handled in a manner satisfactory to the Congress. If investigations are conducted along such lines, it is possible to save the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

It is well known that many of the investigating committees to which the Senate has given money have not spent all of it. It is not necessary to assume that if a certain amount of money is appropriated for a committee it will all be expended. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has returned money, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] has returned money which was not used by the investigating committees over which they had supervision.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that I appeared before the committee and suggested that the money which was allocated to run the committee generally be used for that purpose, but I was told that could not be done. I wish to say that I, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, had the privilege of spending $95,000 in fiscal 1952 for salaries of employees of the Standing Committee, and the record will show that I spent only $37,000.

The Senator from Arizona will remember that instead of asking for $50,000 to institute a special committee, I desired to finance the investigation out of the $95,000. I do not see why some of the money which is appropriated to operate the ordinary functions of the committee could not be used for that purpose.

Let us consider for a moment the Committee on Government Operations. It can expend up to $95,000 in salaries for committee employees. Why the regular staff could not be used to do the very things now being considered without creating a special subcommittee with a special staff is beyond me.

Mr. HAYDEN. An investigating committee by a special resolution is granted certain authority by the Senate which is not inherent in the parent committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are not creating a special committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Senate is imposing additional duties on a committee beyond its normal functions by way of a special investigation, and thereby making it possible for the committee not only to employ necessary personnel, but to pay other expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not like to differ with my good friend, but the authority for the investigation stems from the Reorganization Act. The resolution we are considering provides for the committee carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV, which charges the Committee on Government Operations with studying "the operation of government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Since the Reorganization Act, and not a special resolution, provides that it shall be within the purview of the committee to do that, I do not see why the funds allocated for the committee generally cannot be spent for this purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Be that as it may, the Senator from Louisiana found it could not be done, and the Committee on Rules and Administration had to provide his committee with additional money. The Senator made a corresponding saving from his regular committee funds. The Senator did not employ extra professional assistants to which he was entitled, but used in other ways the money which had been allotted to his committee. His committee did a very commendable job for less than the amount which had been estimated.

The same situation is true with respect to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The Committee on Rules and Administration granted his standing subcommittee more funds than were actually expended.

So it must not be assumed that when a committee asks for money that it is presenting a padded budget or that it will necessarily spend all the money allowed to it.

Senators should appreciate what a good investigator or a good member of a permanent professional staff can do.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and I are both members of the Joint Committee on Printing. We have found in times past that there has been a vast waste and extravagance in Government printing. The largest printing plant in the world, with more than 7,000 employees, is in Washington, and it is required to do whatever work is sent to it by the various departments of the Government. It has no choice in the matter so long as an appropriation is available to a department to have its printing done at the Government Printing Office. But the Joint Committee on Printing by use of a qualified investigator from its staff has stopped the printing of a great deal of material going from the departments to the Government Printing Office. I am sure the Senator from Indiana will join with me in the statement that James Harrison, the man whom we employed, on the recommendation of Mrs. Mary Norton, of the House Committee on Expenditures, has earned his pay many hundred times over by reason of the savings he has caused to be made, not only in the Government Printing Office, but also in other printing plants throughout the United States, and in Europe and the Orient, which need to be checked and examined. Such savings can be accomplished only by the use of qualified personnel.

The success of congressional investigations depends upon the type of investigators who are employed. With trained investigators, there is no trouble in obtaining good results.

Such a position is no place for a political hack and no place to put a friend. Only when men of talent and ability are obtained can substantial savings be effected.

I wish to make perfectly clear to the Senate that so far as the Committee on Rules and Administration is concerned, it has acted with respect to the pending resolutions just as we have acted heretofore under my chairmanship. That is, we have assumed that committees which send us unanimous requests for funds know what they are doing, that the budgets submitted are not padded, and that we are justified, under the circumstances, in granting the money to them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to observe that according to the Reorganization Act, the work of the committee on Government Operations must be evaluated with respect to the general charge of jurisdiction and responsibility, and the obligation to study the activities of government at all levels, with a view to determining their relationship to efficiency and economy.

Having served on the investigating subcommittee, and also having served as chairman of the full committee, I have had an opportunity to observe the tremendous benefits which have resulted from the responsibility and authority vested in the committee. Millions of dollars have been saved the Government as a result of investigations the committee has made under that responsibility. Many of the savings and corrections made in administrative procedure, and so forth, in different agencies of Government have never hit the headlines. Public hearings have never been held. When the committee began its investigations, either through its investigators or by hearings in executive session, and the facts were revealed, the heads of agencies were called in, the unsatisfactory conditions were pointed out to them, and administrative action was then taken to correct such conditions.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was a matter about which I desired to ask the Senator a question. Has he not found that it is not by the spectacular investigations, which get into the newspapers, that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

money is saved, but rather by contacting the department or agency of government whose head desires that it function in the best possible manner and who is only too glad to obtain and accept the advice of a committee of this kind? In this way adjustments and corrections are made, and very considerable sums are saved without any fanfare?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. It does not necessarily mean that the head of an agency has willfully permitted undesirable conditions to develop, or condones them. Sometimes such conditions are unknown to him.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who has been the chairman of the subcommittee, and who has worked so assiduously and effectively, can cite instances—and I believe reports have been submitted citing instances—of the kind we are discussing, involving deficiencies or inefficiencies which, when the head of the agency was called in, were corrected by administrative order. There never was any publicity, and no public hearings were held.

There is an almost unlimited amount of work a committee of this type can do. It can render effective and economical service. Whether $100,000 or $200,000 a year is necessary depends upon the circumstances which arise each year.

I was not present at the full committee meeting. I had to be absent from the Senate on the day the committee was organized and this matter was presented to the full committee. However, had I been there, I probably would have gone along with some increase in amount for the work of the committee, keeping in mind that, as has been the case heretofore—and I have served heretofore on the subcommittee—if it was not necessary to spend the money, it would not be spent. But there are presently being conducted investigations, action on which is imminent before the committee, one of which alone, in my judgment, so far as the case has been developed up to now, will bring about savings that will probably be equal to the amount asked for, or greater.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was called into the Chamber because of the discussion with respect to stockpiling. The Johnson subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services made some very fine reports on the stockpiling of tin, lead, and manganese last year.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I do not believe there is any question of jurisdiction. I know I shall not raise it. I shall vote for this appropriation for his committee this afternoon. I know that when the two committees are set up, we can work out any questions of jurisdiction with respect to stockpiling. There is plenty of room for action in the future. There is plenty of opportunity for his committee to look into questions as to what is going on behind the iron curtain, or wherever the material is coming from. But the work of the Committee on Armed Services is to see that this country has the material needed. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I think so. I feel sure that my committee will never duplicate the work of the Senator's committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$189,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$89,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, again I wish to assure Senators that I am not opposed to a continuance of the subcommittee; I am only trying to help the Republicans carry out their economy pledge. It seems to me that I am not succeeding so well. It may be recalled that the first bill passed by the Senate a few days ago created a new position in the State Department which will cost $17,500, without the trimmings, the object being to do away with jobs. When the bill was before us I pointed out to the Senate that under existing law the Secretary of State has ample authority, as well as sufficient funds, to achieve the very objective that is sought by the creation of the new position.

A while ago I offered an amendment to reduce another appropriation which was quite a few thousand dollars in excess of what had been spent by the same subcommitee last year. In this case I am trying to make a similar effort. So far we have heard very little about the fine work which was done by this subcommittee when it was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I think he did an excellent job. Last year we provided $100,000 with which to pay the expenses of the subcommittee. Notwithstanding the fact that a good job was done, it did not require the expenditure by the Senator from North Carolina and his subcommittee of all the $100,000. It required only $89,000. What I am trying to do is to provide additional money for the subcommittee, amounting to $89,000 plus $11,000 which the committee now has as a carryover. In other words, this committee would have the same amount of money it had last year. My friend from Wisconsin desires to double the amount. He proposes to televise and to broadcast all the hearings. He is actually proposing to double the staff. According to the report which is attached to the resolution, he expects to hire the following:

Legal and investigative:	
General counsel and staff director	$11,646.00
Chief counsel	11,646.00
Chief assistant counsel	10,068.45
Assistant counsel	9,570.74
Do	9,570.74
Do	9,570.74
Do	8,005.36
Do	8,005.36
Chief investigator	10,068.45
Investigators	8,005.36
Do	8,005.36
Do	8,005.36
Do	7,533.19
Do	6,577.27
Research director	10,068.45
Accountants (contracted on per diem basis)	10,000.00
Total	146,346.83

The clerical staff will consist of the following:

Clerical:	
Chief clerk	$5,525.75
Assistant clerk (secretary to general counsel)	5,525.75
Assistant clerk (record clerk)	4,845.61
Assistant clerk (file clerk)	4,537.96
Assistant clerk (stenographer)	4,537.96
Do	4,537.96
Do	4,537.96
Total	34,153.17
Grand total, salaries	180,500.00

Mr. President, it strikes me that my good friend from Wisconsin is trying to overdo this matter, especially in view of the fact that we now have in the Armed Services Committee a Preparedness Subcommittee, under the able direction of my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sure that he will do a good job. We have in the Senate Appropriations Committee the so-called watchdog subcommittee. It will be remembered that last year my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] submitted a resolution providing for a watchdog subcommittee to examine appropriation requests before they are granted and to follow them through. I am sure that a good deal of the work contemplated by the Senator from Wisconsin will be done by the Preparedness Subcommittee, by the watchdog subcommittee, and by various other committees of the Senate.

No doubt there will be a great deal of duplication. I am not asking that the subcommittee be done away with, but am simply trying to save some of the taxpayers' money. Here we have an opportunity to save $100,000.

What does that mean, when we consider who will have to pay these expenses? I have before me a statement prepared by my staff. To provide salaries for these 12 additional helpers will require the total income tax to be paid by 333 soft-coal miners, whose salaries average $4,562. It will require the total income tax to be paid by 602 steelworkers, whose average salary is $3,720. It will require the total income tax to be paid by 363 auto workers, whose salaries average $4,622, or 322 oil-refinery workers, whose salaries average $4,615. It will require the total income tax to be paid by 6,666 textile workers to pay the 12 additional helpers who are proposed to be placed on the staff of the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. Unless we can reduce the expenditures of Government, and unless we succeed in eliminating waste from government expenditures, the amounts referred to by the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana in terms of taxes imposed upon textile workers and other workers will be continued to the extent of the excess amounts of taxes which we are now extracting from them. When we talk about spending more than $70,000,000,000 in Federal taxes, think what burdens we are going to impose upon the taxpayers. Unless we can eliminate some of the waste, graft, and

extravagance in government, there is no hope that in the future the taxpayer will have his taxes reduced. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana can read all the comparisons he likes, but unless we can reduce the tax burden upon the taxpayer, he will continue to pay $70,000,000,000 a year, as he has been doing in past years.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that 15 years ago the United States Government was spending only a few billion dollars annually. Today our appropriations are running more than $70,000,000,000 a year. If we continue such expenditures the textile workers and other workers will continue to pay taxes in large amounts, which will destroy everything they hold dear. Such payments will destroy, as well, opportunities for obtaining venture capital, representing the beginning of new businesses and the creation of jobs for workers. So I say, Mr. President, that while the Senator can make out an excellent case for economy by reducing the investigational expense to the extent of $100,000, unless we get some of the waste and some of the extravagance out of the Government the taxpayer is not going to get any relief. Most of us campaigned last year for economy in government, and the votes of the American people indicated that they wanted it. We cannot bring about economy in government unless we can get the facts. We cannot get the facts unless we scientifically find out where the waste is. We are not going to get economy by reducing an appropriation such as this. We must find out where the actual expenditures are being made.

I have found time after time cases such as that of an aged man, for example, who, after operating an elevator in the General Services Administration for many years, was discharged, and within a few weeks, when he was hungry and did not know where else to turn, was taken on as a new employee. He lost his seniority and he lost the top wages that he was earning when he was discharged. In other words he was started again as a beginner. If that is economy, I do not want any part of it.

But I hope the investigation subcommittee will be able to find out just where the waste is. The committee can find it out with the assistance of a good staff. We do not want to use an axe on poor elevator operators, as was done in the past few years. If any Senator wants me to give names I shall be very glad to show them several cases like that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think increasing the amount we are spending is a poor way to obtain economy. That is what we are proposing to do today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. As I pointed out before the Senator came into the Chamber, we must consider for example, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. It is doing the same kind of work. There are committees in the House which are doing the same kind of work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. The Senator from Minnesota was the author of a resolution which was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, to create a watchdog committee which would investigate appropriation requests before appropriations were made, and then follow through on the appropriations. How many committees does the Senator wish to create?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana referred to a statement he made before I came into the Chamber. I wish to correct that statement. I want to state to the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I have been on the floor all afternoon and I have heard all the colloquy between Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I withdraw the statement.

Mr. THYE. I heard all the colloquy. I was the author of the resolution which sought to create a watchdog committee within the Committee on Appropriations. I will say to my good friend from Louisiana that one of the reasons why I proposed such a watchdog committee was that I sat on a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and listened to military budget requests being made, and I know that neither I nor any other member of the subcommittee could possibly grasp and understand all that was involved in the budget requests within the limited time we had to study the requests. Therefore I wanted to establish a watchdog committee which could work in the interim, as well as go out and get the facts for the committee.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that had such a watchdog committee been functioning we would never have had the waste of taxpayers' money in Africa on the construction of runways and landing strips on which we were spending millions of dollars.

Therefore, I will say to my good friend from Louisiana—and he is to be commended for trying to economize—that it is imposible to economize in the spending of millions and millions of dollars, if we are not certain whether it is a good expenditure, and that cannot be determined by curtailing an appropriation of $100,000 for investigative purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot quite agree with my good friend from Minnesota that it is possible to economize by spending more money. That is exactly what we are asked to do.

Mr. THYE. I may say to my good friend, if he will be good enough to yield to me——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I will ask the question. Would we not have been better off if we had used all the investigational funds appropriated to the Committee on Agriculture and made a complete and thorough investigation, rather than now to be uncovering the scandalous conditions in the movement of grain which came in from Canada as feed grain and inedible wheat and is now finding its way into our edible wheat supply and being milled for consumption by our soldiers? I think that we would have been much better off had we spent more of the unused funds for investigational purposes rather than to now have the scandalous conditions uncovered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we did a good job.

Mr. THYE. We should have been at it when it was being done.

Mr. ELLENDER. The report was unanimous, as I remember.

Mr. THYE. We should have been at it when it was being done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that it could have been done under the resolution, because the resolution limited the investigation to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and this subject involves another department of the Government.

Mr. THYE. I will say to my good friend from Louisiana that unless we ascertain the facts and get the Government operations on rock bottom instead of on a bog we will not have any economy in government.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are not going to get economy by spending more money.

Mr. THYE. We can get it by finding out what the facts are. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would not now be uncovering a situation which developed in the past year if we had spent the money to get at the facts while the wrongdoing was taking place. That is what we should have been doing, instead of looking under the rug now, after it has been done.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Minnesota will be fair to me, he will admit that the matter was never brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. THYE. A good investigator would have found it and brought it out to the attention of the committee.

Mr. WELKER. It was disclosed in 1951.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is that not the whole purpose of investigators, namely, to call matters to the attention of the proper committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, we could have a few snoopers go out into government and find out a few little things here and there in government. That is what will be done in this case. That is my guess. It has not yet been disclosed what the committee would do. I remember hearing the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] on a Meet-the-Press program the other day. I believe he said that he had 10 or 11 subjects that he wanted to investigate, but that he was not permitted to disclose them. I do not know why there should be any secret about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana has referred to investigators as snoopers. Whatever name one may wish to apply to investigators, the fact remains that even though we expect the executive branch of the Government to discipline itself and to bring these

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

matters to the attention of the public—and I am hoping that that will be done—the fact remains that if Congress is to pass legislation and establish policy, we must get the facts, and we must have men who will go forth and dig out the facts. We should not expect too much of human nature by looking to Government employees to bring to our attention facts which are adverse to them. I believe we should spend a little money on this job.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we should spend a little money, too. But I want to save $100,000, which has been requested to carry on work which, as I indicated a while ago, will largely be a duplication.

Here is what will happen, Mr. President. That $100,000 will mean a lot of fat jobs to a few attorneys on Capitol Hill. That is how it is going to end up. We have, as previously indicated, various committees of the Senate as well as of the House which are going to duplicate their work. It is mighty poor economy to spend more money in order to economize. I repeat that all I am trying to do is to assist my good friends across the aisle, all of whom I love dearly, to carry out the platform of President Eisenhower.

As I indicated earlier in this discussion of the whole subject, once a committee is established it is very hard to do away with it. The committee we are discussing is a continuation of the War Investigating Committee headed by former Senator Truman. There is no doubt in my mind that the committee gave the country President Truman. Whether the same path will be followed by my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, with the result of perhaps giving us the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] 4 years after President Eisenhower, remains to be seen.

The Truman committee was begun during the Seventy-seventh Congress. All of us know that it did a very good job. During the Seventy-seventh Congress the investigating committee spent $265,000. During the Seventy-eighth Congress it spent $200,000. During the Seventy-ninth Congress it spent $250,000. During the Eightieth Congress it spent $175,000.

Now it is proposed that we appropriate, for 1 year, almost as much money as was spent by the Truman committee during any 2-year period when it was in existence. I am confident that if the staff of the standing committee were utilized, and if additional staff members were provided with the $89,000 which I propose to make available, there would be ample funds available to employ a sufficient number of investigators to do this work.

Mr. President, much has been said by my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, to the effect that a good investigator can do a great deal of good for a committee. According to the brochure which has been submitted to us in this case, this particular subcommittee is requesting 15 investigators and about eight lawyers. I plead with the Senate to try to save this $100,000. I am sure that $89,000 is enough, especially in view of the fact, as I repeat, that the Senate has so many other committees, in addition to the House committees, doing similar work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, following my remarks, two tables from which I have read.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Per family taxes required to provide $100,000 (head of household and 3 dependents), selected income groups

Industry [1]	Annual gross [2]	Tax	Number
Soft coal miners	$4,562	$299	333
Steelworkers	3,730	166	602
Auto workers	4,422	275	363
Oil refinery workers	4,615	307	322
Textile workers	2,758	15	6,666

[1] Index of weekly earnings:

Soft coal miners (Dec. 1952)	$91.25
Steel workers (Sept. 1952)	74.61
Auto workers (Sept. 1952)	88.49
Refinery workers (Sept. 1952)	92.30
Textile workers (Sept. 1952)	55.16

[2] Basis of 50 employed weeks per year.

War Investigating Committee

Senate resolution	Congress	Session	Authorized	Total per Congress
71	77th	1st	$15,000	
146	77th	1st	50,000	
218	77th	2d	100,000	
288	77th	2d	100,000	
				$265,000
6	78th	1st	(1)	
146	78th	1st	100,000	
235	78th	2d	100,000	
				200,000
55	79th	1st	(1)	
147	79th	1st	100,000	
247	79th	2d	85,000	
309	79th	2d	65,000	
				250,000
46	80th	1st	(1)	
89	80th	1st	150,000	
145	80th	1st	25,000	
				175,000
Grand total				890,000

[1] Continued committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution (S. Res. 40) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to employ temporary personnel and increasing its limit of expenditures.

The resolution (S. Res. 40) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $189,000 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 251, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to January 24, 1952, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

COMPENSATION OF THE EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR FRED A. SEATON

The resolution (S. Res. 52) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Fred A. Seaton, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 4, 1952, salary for services in his office for the period November 5, 1952, through December 4, 1952, or for so much of that time through December 4, 1952, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 4, 1952.

MEMBERS ON PART OF SENATE ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY

The resolution (S. Res. 51) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; and Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut; Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. GILLETTE, of Iowa.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is an ex-officio member of the Board.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] members of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is an ex officio member of the Board.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. To fill the two vacancies on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert Ten Broeck Stevens, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Army;

Harold E. Talbott, of New York, to be Secretary of the Air Force; and

Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1956 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for the remainder of the term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the President for the appointment of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to this position.

I have known Mrs. Lord for several years. I know about her excellent record of public service. I know about her abiding interest in humanitarian causes. I know about the work she has done in the Department of Defense in times gone by, in connection with the problems of women in the armed services. I know her to be a great humanitarian, in my judgment one of the great women of America; and I am very pleased to make these favorable comments this afternoon about the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a word about Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, nominated to be a representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, has unanimously approved the nomination and recommends that it be confirmed by the Senate.

Mrs. Lord's nomination is for the remainder of the 3-year term expiring December 31, 1953. She will succeed Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as the American representative on the Human Rights Commission.

The nomination was referred to the committee on January 23, 1953, and Mrs. Lord testified at a hearing January 29.

Mrs. Lord, who is the former Mary Pillsbury of Minneapolis, is the mother of two children and has long been active in civic affairs. She was assistant regional director of the Office of Civilian Defense, 1940–43, and chairman of the National Civilian Advisory Commission for the Women's Army Corps, 1944–47. In 1946 she was a member of the Civilian Advisory Commission to the Personnel and Administration Division of the Department of the Army. She was a member of the board and executive committee of the National War Fund, 1943–45, and was chairman of the Women's Division in 1943.

From 1949 to 1951, Mrs. Lord was adviser to the Department of Defense Housing Commission, and since 1948 she has been Chairman of the United States Committee for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

Mrs. Lord was one of the incorporators of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, and at various times she has been secretary and member of the board of the Community Chest and Councils of America, member of the New York State Women's Council, member of the board of trustees of Smith College, and vice chairman of the National Health Council.

The committee believes that Mrs. Lord's varied experience makes her particularly well qualified for the difficult task of representing the United States on the U. N. Human Rights Commission. It was impressed with her understanding of the work of the Commission and of the problems involved in it, particularly so far as the United States is concerned. It unreservedly recommends prompt Senate confirmation of her nomination.

Mr. President, I ask that, following my remarks, a short biographical sketch of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MRS. OSWALD B. (MARY PILLSBURY) LORD

Born: Minneapolis, Minn., November 14, 1904.

Family background: Daughter of Charles Stinson and Nelle Pendleton (Winston) Pillsbury.

Education: Graduate of Smith College, cum laude; bachelor of arts, 1927.

Marital status: Married Oswald Bates Lord, December 7, 1929. Children: Charles Pillsbury and Winston.

Experience: Junior League of New York, 1936–38.

Member, board of directors and chairman, National Advisory Commission on Woman's Participation, New York World's Fair, 1939–40.

Assistant director, Office of Civilian Defense for region II, 1940–43.

Member board and executive committee, National War Fund, 1943–45, chairman, woman's division (1943).

Chairman, National Civilian Advisory Commission for Women's Army Corps, 1944–47.

Chairman, United States Committee for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, 1948– —.

Secretary and member of board, Community Chest and Councils of America, 1949–51.

Adviser to the Department of Defense, Housing Commission, 1949–51.

Member, New York State Woman's Council, 1949– —.

Member, Board of Directors, Women's City Club (N. Y.), 1940– —.

Member, Board of Trustees, Smith College, 1949– —.

Member, Board of Trustees, Community Service (N. Y.), 1940– —.

Member, Civilian Advisory Commission to Personnel and Administration Division, Department of the Army, 1946– —.

Vice Chairman, National Health Council, 1950– —.

Citizen's Committee for Hoover Report (one of the incorporators and member), 1919– —.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herman Phleger, of California, to be Legal Adviser, Department of State.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in relation to the nomination of Herman Phleger to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State, I ask that the statement I have before me be incorporated in the RECORD, together with a copy of a biographical sketch.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the nomination of Herman Phleger, of California, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State, has unanimously approved the nomination and recommends that it be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Phleger's nomination was referred to the committee January 22, 1953, and a hearing was held January 26 at which Mr. Phleger testified.

The nominee was born in Sacramento, Calif., in 1890. He attended the University of California and Harvard Law School and has been in the private practice of law in San Francisco nearly all his adult life. Since 1925, he has been a partner in the firm of Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison.

In World War I, Mr. Pheleger served on a destroyer in European waters, and after World War II, he served for a time as associate director of the Legal Division of the Office of Military Government in Germany.

Mr. Phleger's law practice has been general in character and has involved business transactions in foreign countries and foreign territories. He is a member of the International Law Association.

He retired from his law firm on December 31, 1952, and has resigned as a director of the Union Oil Company of California and the California-Oregon Power Co. He has likewise disposed of some stock which he owned in the Standard Oil Co. of California.

The committee questioned Mr. Phleger about his conception of the duties of the legal adviser of the Department of State and was favorably impressed with his approach to the problems which he will encounter in this important office. It unanimously recommends that the Senate promptly confirm his nomination.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HERMAN PHLEGER

Home: Woodside, Redwood City, Calif.

Office: 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Born: Sacramento, Calif., September 5, 1890, son of Charles W. and Mrs. Mary (McCrory) Phleger.

Education: Bachelor of science, University of California, 1912; student Harvard Law School, 1913–14; doctor of laws, Mills College, 1935.

Married: Mary Elena Macondray, April 2, 1921. Children—Mary Elena, Atherton Macondray, Anne.

Experience: Admitted to California bar, 1914; clerk, later partner, Morrison, Dunne & Brobeck, San Francisco 1914–25; partner Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison, San Francisco, since 1925.

Director: American Trust Co.; Union Oil Co.; Pabco Products, Inc.; Fibreboard Products, Inc.; Moore Drydock Co.; Matson Navigation Co.

Military: Served as lieutenant, United States Navy, 1917–18; associate director, Legal Division, Office of Military Government (Germany) 1945.

Other: Trustee, Stanford University; president, board of trustees, Children's Hospital, San Francisco; trustee, Wm. G. Irwin Charity Foundation, San Francisco.

Clubs: Pacific Union, Bohemian (San Francisco), Burlingame Country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the committee, if it sees fit to do so, spread on the record some of the reasons in support of this nomination.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Mr. Aldrich be passed over. I promised the Senator from North Dakota, who wishes to speak briefly on the nomination, and who is absent today, that I would have the nomination passed over until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Brian Holland, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Judiciary Committee for making available to us a report on this nomination and the one following it, that of Mr. Warren Olney III, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

I have read the reports. Certainly in my judgment no cause is set forth in the reports to justify a refusal to confirm these nominations.

I must say that in the case of Mr. Holland, I was a little surprised that he showed so little knowledge about the "blue ribbon" jury problem. I read now from page 18 of the transcript of the hearing, at a point where the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stated to the nominee:

I would like to know what your opinion is on these "blue ribbon" juries?

Mr. HOLLAND. I don't think I have given it very much consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Judge Knox, who was here before this committee a year or two ago, and he had the endorsement of Harry Chandler, the Administrative Assistant, you know—they wanted to adopt federally the New York scheme that Dewey inaugurated up there, where they picked a jury out of graduates of colleges and out of the Social Register, and out of the directors of corporations, and barred anybody who was ever on relief, and apparently it was an attempt to keep off the jury the poor people. Opposition to that was had from Judge Allen of Cincinnati, who came in and protested valiantly against it, and some other people. But they seem to be pretty well organized to get this "blue ribbon" jury system into effect federally.

Do you not believe that under our Constitution, a man is entitled to be tried by his peers, by the rank and file of the people?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Constitution is quite clear on that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think that these jurors ought to be professional jurors or ought to be chosen from the so-called higher strata?

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, that is a question with which I am not too familiar in its practical operation, Senator, and I think I ought to give it more consideration before I expressed an opinion on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

That will be all, Mr. Holland.

I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that I believe anyone appointed to the position of Assistant Attorney General should be a little more familiar than Mr. Holland showed he was with a very important question in the administration of justice and in guaranteeing to the American people that they shall be judged by their peers, and not by a special class of persons to be selected for jury service.

I may be wrong in my suspicion, Mr. President; but I am inclined to believe that Mr. Holland knew much more about the subject than he testified to, and that he simply did not wish to discuss it—which, of course, leaves me with some doubt as to what his attitude about it is.

Mr. Olney was a little more communicative on the same subject, but not much more. Mr. President, it is not my intention to vote against these nominations, but I do want to say in closing that I think we had better be vigilant in our efforts to protect the jury system, and should see to it that it remains the jury system that our forefathers had in mind. I quite agree that we ought to have tests for jury service, in that people lacking in mental competence and who are illiterate should not serve on juries, but, on the other hand, I think what has become known as the "blue ribbon" jury system entails a great many dangers so far as concerns the preservation of a system of justice whereby all citizens are judged by their peers and not by stacked juries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Warren Olney III, to be Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen F. Dunn to be general counsel, Department of Commerce.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in support of the nomination of Mr. Stephen Dunn, of Grand Rapids, whose nomination to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce is now before the Senate for its advice and consent.

I have known Mr. Dunn for years as an able and outstanding attorney in Grand Rapids, Mich., and am familiar with his work as counsel for the Furniture Manufacturers Association of Grand Rapids, Mich., and as an authority on workmen's compensation and unfair trade laws.

Mr. Dunn is widely known in his home State as a man of outstanding character and ability. His loyalty to our form of government has never been questioned in the slightest degree and that loyalty is fully demonstrated by his contributions to our Government as a member of the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission, as well as his contribution to the government of Michigan.

I am certain that he has no direct monetary interest in any phase of his work as Solicitor for the Department of Commerce, but it is my belief that he has, nevertheless, a direct interest in his position—the direct interest of every citizen who is vitally concerned in the need for good government and in his $1,800 share of our national debt.

Mr. Dunn, I am sure, will be a real asset to the new administration in the Department of Commerce, and I urge the confirmation of his nomination by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stephen F. Dunn to be general counsel, Department of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that there is one more nomination?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The clerk will state the next nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roger M. Kyes to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the nomination of Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. The Armed Services Committee, after full hearings, has unanimously approved the nomination.

The vital area of national security, the effect on the lives and future of our youth we are calling from every community and section of the Nation, and the sheer magnitude of our defense program make it imperative that it be ably,

effectively, economically and efficiently administered.

Since the Deputy Secretary of Defense is actually the alter ego of the Secretary, he must have the capacity and the qualifications required of the Secretary.

Roger M. Kyes' accomplishments, capacity and qualifications are known personally to me, and I want to tell the Senate about him so that Senators will share the great confidence I hold in the man.

Mr. Kyes is a young man, 46 years of age, full of drive and energy, capable of carrying the heavy load of the office. Before he came to General Motors, only 4 years ago, he already had experience such as few men can encompass in a lifetime.

Before he joined General Motors, he already had been a top executive. He had demonstrated such capacity and ability that General Motors reached out for him. He was given what is known as a tough assignment. During a period of critical material shortages, he so effectively secured and coordinated materials that General Motors achieved a record production. To accomplish this, he not only drew on supplies from all over the world, but, with Mr. Wilson, established new facilities in both the ferrous and nonferrous fields. He knows the production capacity of individual steel mills, as to amount and type of product. In the field of copper mining and fabrication, and also in other nonferrous metals, he knows how and where these can be secured and how much should be used in the manufacture of a given product.

Fortunately, because of his long experience in the fields of design, tooling, and production, he is equally well informed as to the various techniques and processes necessary for the fabrication of these materials into a finshed product.

Within 2 years General Motors recognized his capacity and achievement by making him a vice president and a member of the administration committee—the top operating committee of General Motors. His ability to make a substantial contribution to a large organization was thus recognized.

Mr. Kyes had to survive another selective process when Mr. Wilson, as Secretary of Defense-designate, and with a broad knowledge of the talent in American industry, faced the problem of picking his alter ego, the Deputy Secretary of Defense. He asked only one man, and that man was Roger Kyes, who patriotically responded to his request.

While Mr. Kyes has been with General Motors only a relatively short time, he has spent most of his business career with diversified industries. He has been connected with small, medium-size, and large organizations. He knows what it means for a small-business man to meet a payroll, and he knows the problems of a vast enterprise.

When Henry Ford ventured into the farm-equipment field in 1940, Roger Kyes organized, directed, and coordinated all tractor and implement activities of the Ford Tractor-Ferguson system as active head of Harry Ferguson, Inc., in which company he was part owner. This operation he built into one of the leading tractor and farm-equipment organizations in the United States.

I may say, Mr. President, that I have not had any acquaintance with Harry Ferguson, nor is he in any way related to or connected with the Senator from Michigan.

As we can read in the January 15, 1946, issue of Modern Industry, Kyes developed a practical and sound technique for the decentralization of industry.

Taking 110 diversified manufacturing organizations, each independently owned and operated, he created a production mechanism from coast to coast which competed successfully with the best of mass producers.

His organization was a super management team which had final responsibility for the design of the product, the supervision of tooling for production, production control, and the distribution of the product.

In this activity, he showed great capacity as an organizer, as an administrator, and as a coordinator of complicated organizations. His relationship with suppliers was based upon contracting and subcontracting, which developed a keen sense of what is involved as to contractual relations. He also gained considerable knowledge of the cost of accomplishing a production effort in various parts of the country.

He has also had substantial experience in the European theater, having organized Harry Ferguson, Ltd., in England and having established business relationships throughout the sterling area, together with Continental Europe and Africa.

He is also familiar with the countries in the Pacific as a result of his travel there.

His background has been in aviation, farm tractors and equipment, highway equipment, the electrical industry, and the broad group of products produced by General Motors.

Mr. Wilson and he have worked together. They are a great team. The Nation is indeed fortunate that this relatively young man is willing, in the middle of his career, to interrupt it and serve his country.

In addition to his industrial experience, executive ability, and his organizing and coordinating capacity, Mr. Kyes has another side. Born in a small town in Ohio, he has never lost touch with rural America or his contact with people.

He is well known in farm circles for his contributions to the betterment of agriculture.

His activities in the defense program will be in good perspective because of his role of leadership in youth activities. The youth of the land will be in his heart when he goes forward with the defense program.

Let me read a portion of the acknowledgment of his resignation as chairman of the Sponsoring Committee of the Future Farmers of America Foundation:

> Your long experience as a pioneer leader in developing better mutual understanding and closer cooperative working relationships between agriculture and industry has been reflected favorably in the attitude of the general public toward the Future Farmer organization. Your untiring and sincere efforts will long be remembered and have won for you the respect and friendship of over 400,000 farm boys throughout rural America.

He has contributed much to junior achievement, 4-H Clubs, and the Future Farmers of America.

With these facts before the Senate, I know Senators will share the confidence that we are placing our trust in good hands as we confirm the nomination of this great young American, Roger M. Kyes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to speak just a few minutes in opposition to this nomination, because I think a record should be made against it. I am fully aware of the fact that the sentiment of the Senate is overwhelmingly in support of the confirmation of the nomination. Therefore, I shall not call for a yea-and-nay vote on the question. I do want to say that everything I said in my speech against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson, insofar as what I conclude to be the retention of an indirect interest in the General Motors Corp. is concerned, applies equally to Mr. Kyes.

So, Mr. President, for the purposes of the record and in order to save the time of the Senate, I incorporate by reference everything said in my speech against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson concerning the retention of an indirect interest in the General Motors Corp., what I said is as equally applicable to Mr. Kyes.

In addition, I point out, Mr. President, that Mr. Kyes, on his second appearance before the committee, agreed to sell or give to charity all his stock, including approximately 3,000 shares of General Motors stock, and excepting shares in a bank and an insurance company. He told the committee that he hoped to finish with the disposal by April 1, and would try to do it immediately.

His case is different from the Wilson case in this particular, in that members of his family do not have General Motors stock. However, Mr. President, I was shocked in reading the record when I realized that we had before us another nominee who apparently felt that there was involved no ethical principle in his retaining stock and, at the same time, serving in a high position in the Defense Establishment, even though that stock was in a company that has billions of dollars worth of defense contracts, as General Motors has with the Defense Establishment. Others need not agree with me, but, so far as I am concerned, that is a shocking indication of what I consider to be a lack of sensitivity on the part of Mr. Kyes to ethical standards. I think one can take judicial notice of the fact that when one sits in a position of policy making, such as the one Mr. Kyes will occupy, he ought to know that while he retains those stocks a great many people will hold him suspect, so far as his value judgments are concerned, in carrying out the duties of his office. The fact is that if it had not been for the insistence of the committee, neither he nor Mr. Wilson would have got rid of their stock.

The next point I wish to make, the point I made in my discussion of the Wilson case, is that Mr. Kyes can divest himself of the stock, but he is not going to divest himself of a feeling of affinity for General Motors. There are many

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

other positions in Government in which Kyes and Wilson could be used, without placing them in the one department which has supervision over the defense contracts with General Motors, of which concern Mr. Kyes has been a vice president and Mr. Wilson has been the president.

I think it is asking too much and expecting too much of human nature to think that in their positions as Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense they are going to be unaware of their past connections, and that they are going to function as Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense without any influence whatsoever being brought to bear upon their judgments because of their past connections with General Motors.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I recall that on a recent day, in discussing the Wilson case, the Senator from Oregon suggested that one of the great men of America who might have been nominated as Secretary of Defense was Mr. Hoffman. Is my memory correct about that?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that is my position.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator have expected Mr. Hoffman to forget his connections with the Studebaker Corp., for example?

Mr. MORSE. No.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It seems to me that the two situations are analogous.

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator from New Jersey thinks so, but I do not believe they are analogous. Would the Senator like me to tell him why?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to have an explanation from the Senator, please.

Mr. MORSE. In the first place, there is a record on the part of Mr. Hoffman in public service, in connection with our whole foreign aid program, and in a field in which I think he was highly qualified to perform his work, which in my opinion, clearly demonstrates the impartiality of the man.

Second, his connection with Studebaker was at a time long since past and, in my judgment, there would not have been the slightest cause-to-effect relationship which would affect his judgment as Secretary of Defense by reason of his past connections with Studebaker.

In the third place, it happens that Studebaker does not have contracts in any such amount as General Motors has and Hoffman has had no connection with negotiating them.

We are here dealing with the one company in America that has, far in excess of those of any other company, tremendous contracts with the defense establishment, and Studebaker is not even in that class. There has been a long break of association between Hoffman and Studebaker, whereas in this case Wilson is stepping out from behind his desk in General Motors to behind a desk in the Defense Establishment, dealing with the very contracts which, a few weeks ago, he himself helped negotiate. Hoffman is completely clear of any such negotiations whatsoever.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The principle is quite the same.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator mean when he says the principle is quite the same? One cannot separate the application of negotiations for contracts from the principle I am talking about.

I say to my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that I think it is highly unethical for Wilson now to be administering, as Secretary of Defense, defense contracts which he himself helped negotiate. Paul Hoffman has never been a party to any such negotiations.

I took the position the other day, and I adhere to it, that it is desirable to have men of wealth in Government, and Hoffman is a man of wealth. But I say that men of wealth in Government, like anyone else, should have no connection whatsoever with the duties they are performing in the Defense Establishment, in relation to defense contracts, to the negotiation of which they have been a party. I say to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that in my opinion, the difference between the Hoffman case and the Wilson case is as great in principle as is high noon from the blackness of midnight.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator said it was in his opinion.

Mr. MORSE. I may say I would never speak for the Senator from New Jersey, but I will speak for myself.

In my judgment, we cannot escape the fact that Kyes, a vice president of General Motors, in his own testimony—and I shall read it in a moment—proves my point as to his feeling of affinity for General Motors, which he is going to carry over into his work as Deputy Secretary of Defense.

On page 50 of the first hearing, on January 16, Kyes saw no reason why he should not hold his approximately 3,000 shares of General Motors stock, of $120,000 in value, and to act on contracts with General Motors. He said he could make decisions adverse to General Motors. I do not believe he ought to be placed in the position of doing so. I think that would be similar to the case of the juror I spoke about recently. One reason for the rule excusing from jury service a person who has a financial interest in the case, or who has had a past connection that indicates such an indirect interest as to involve a possibility of prejudice in his mind, is that in the administration of justice, human behavior, human nature, and human temptation are taken into account.

Seating on a jury a person who has a basis for prejudicial action in the case is not allowed, not only because it is desired to protect the litigant from such a possibility of prejudice, but, interestingly enough, because it is desired to protect the juror and our system of justice from the danger or possibility that the juror will lean over backward against his own interest and, thereby defeat the proper administration of justice.

Let me state the situation in this way: Mr. X is called for jury service. The fact that Mr. X has a connection with the case which might create an atmosphere of prejudice, so far as his connection is concerned, does not mean that necessarily he will manifest prejudice. Mr. President, you and I know many persons who, when placed in that position, would lean over backward against their own interests. As jurors they might render a decision in such a case in favor of the litigant, or one of the litigants, which would not be in keeping with a fair and impartial administration of justice, but would be in favor of the litigant because such a juror, being a person of great conscience, would say to himself, "I am going to lean over backward in this case, against my own interests."

Mr. Kyes thinks he can make decisions adverse to General Motors. I seriously doubt if he should be put in that position, because I think Mr. Kyes, as a human being, is going to be confronted many times with a situation in which he will have to render judgments, and I do not want him in a position where he will be leaning over backward against General Motors, or leaning over forward in favor of General Motors. I am not sure that he will be leaning at all, or that he will be sitting in the middle impartially. I think it is asking too much. But the important thing is that we owe it to the administration of our Government to keep men out of positions such as this, where there is danger that they may not be impartial because of an indirect interest which they have in their former associations.

Listen to Mr. Kyes. I read from pages 51 and 52 of the hearings:

Mr. KYES. Well, I imagine after I am through with my tour I would go back to industry, because that is all I know, as you can see from my record.

Senator STENNIS. I think you would have every right to.

Mr. KYES. But I think I am beyond the point where I would be down here on the basis of representation. I have gotten to be an officer of a corporation of a substantial size, and I do not think I would take a job down here on a different basis than that.

Senator STENNIS. What I was getting at——

Mr. KYES. As I said to you very frankly, I said my relationship is excellent with General Motors, and I like my association.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. KYES. While there are absolutely no commitments at all, it would be a rather normal thing for me to go back if things had not changed. I might add another thing, and that is that a man has been picked to take my place, and that slot is closed. You know how life is in a corporation; they say absence makes the heart grow fonder, but it is not so in business.

I now read from page 49 of the hearings:

Senator JOHNSTON. Have you any plans or any agreements or agreement to return to General Motors following your Government service?

Mr. KYES. General Motors has told me, because of my record, they would be very happy to have me come back at any time. I enjoyed my association with General Motors, but there is absolutely no commitment on the part of either party with respect to the future.

I say that by his own language he indicates a feeling of affinity for General Motors. There is no signed contract with respect to his going back to General

Motors, but it is my interpretation that, as of now, depending, of course, upon future events—and all of us must depend upon future events as to what we shall do next month, next year, or the year thereafter—by his own testimony there is a very strong indication that he expects to go back to General Motors.

There was not even that element in the Wilson case. There is nothing in the transcript of Mr. Wilson's testimony which indicates that when he gets through with the Department of Defense job he intends to go back to General Motors. But I say that there is a pretty strong indication, as of now, of a feeling of affinity on the part of Mr. Kyes for General Motors, and that the feeling is such that he intends to return to that corporation in some responsible position. I say that such an affinity is an indirect interest, and that it is rather questionable whether we ought to place a person in a position of policy making and judgment when it is clear that his feeling of affinity for this company is such that there is the probability, and certainly the expressed intention on his part, qualified as his testimony qualifies it, that eventually he will go back to the corporation which has billions of dollars of defense contracts over which, in part, he will have administrative supervision.

I repeat what I said the other day in connection with the Wilson case, that I do not believe that is good Government policy. I do not believe that it is a risk we ought to run. I think it is a mistake to put both the president and the vice president of General Motors in the two top positions in the Defense Establishment, with jurisdiction over billions of dollars worth of contracts with General Motors with respect to which they themselves, as former officers of the company, must be considered to have been participants in the negotiation and consummation.

What about the bonus problem? It is the same as in the Wilson case. Although counsel for the bonus and salary committee, and Mr. Sloan, as chairman, have said that cash will be given in lieu of stock bonuses to be received over the next 4 years, the fact remains that the question has not yet been settled. The matter has not yet been concluded. At least there is nothing in the printed record which shows any finality of action. It is true that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] have no question about the outcome, but I point out the fact that the transaction has not yet been concluded as far as we have been informed to date. So as of this moment there is a direct interest. I am not going to vote for confirmation so long as that direct interest exists. I would not vote for confirmation for the other reasons, anyway; but I think a cash payment is not going to weaken the feeling of affinity which Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kyes have for General Motors.

There is one other part of the transcript which I wish to read. At the last hearing, on page 3——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the question of bonuses?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. In order that the chairman of the committee may clear up that matter and disclose what the record now shows?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I have received two letters from Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., one addressed to Mr. Kyes and one addressed to Mr. Wilson, which I should like to place in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. Do they show that the cash settlement has been made?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will read one of the letters. They are identical:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
New York, N. Y., January 29, 1953.

Mr. R. M. KYES,
The Westchester Apartments,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KYES: With respect to the undelivered installments of your bonus awards which, if earned out in accordance with the provisions of the General Motors bonus plan and action of the bonus and salary committee previously reported to you, will be delivered to you in January 1954, January 1955, January 1956, and January 1957, I have polled the individual members of the bonus and salary committee and it is unanimously agreed that, in accordance with your request, cash payments will be substituted for the shares of General Motors common stock which would otherwise be delivered to you on the aforesaid dates.

In accordance with the foregoing, no further payments will be made to you of dividend equivalents which would otherwise be payable under the provisions of paragraph 7 (c) of the bonus plan.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED P. SLOAN, JR.,
Chairman, Bonus and Salary Committee.

This letter is identical with the letter addressed to Mr. Wilson. Both are dated January 29, 1953.

Mr. MORSE. I think that information is very helpful and very fine. The bonus matter has been cleared up in a very profitable way for Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kyes, but in a way which, in my judgment, will only strengthen the feeling of affinity they have for General Motors. In my judgment, it will have a very definite psychological effect on them so far as the question of partiality is concerned. I think it only bears out my point that we are putting men in the position of judgment over General Motors contracts, through their positions in the Defense Department, a position which in my opinion will make it impossible for them to avoid the suspicion that they are acting with bias and prejudice in favor of General Motors.

Why not put them in some other governmental job, where they would not be passing judgment on General Motors contracts, and put somebody in the Defense Establishment who has not been a party to negotiating defense contracts with the Defense Establishment, over which they will have jurisdiction?

I wish to say kindly that few things have shocked me as much as has Eisenhower's appointment of the president and vice president of General Motors to be in charge of the Defense Establishment. If I ever saw an example of big business stepping in and proceeding, as big business too frequently likes to do, to be both the judge and the advocate in the administration of the Government over its own affairs, the appointment of Wilson and Kyes prove my point.

My colleagues are welcome, if they wish to do so, to vest that kind of arbitrary power in big business, but I do not think it is in the interest of the American people. That is why I oppose this nomination, as I opposed the Wilson nomination.

Mr. President, let us go back to the colloquy between Mr. Kyes and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Senator HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I haven't any questions. I intend to vote with the committee with reference to Mr. Kyes' nomination.

He is in exactly the same position; I see no difference at all between his situation and Mr. Wilson's, but I do have, Mr. Chairman, some hesitancy in giving my full approval to both the president and vice president of the largest corporation that we do business with moving in on one establishment of Government, the Defense Establishment.

Now these men are absolutely honest. I think they will bend backward to see that General Motors doesn't get favors, but it just doesn't seem to me good public relations or good policy, and that is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

I wish to say to my good friend from Wyoming that I agree with his observations about these men being honest. I think they are honest. I also agree with his observation that it is not good public policy to appoint both the president and the vice president of General Motors to these top defense positions. My only difference with the Senator from Wyoming with respect to the cogent observation he made during the hearings is that I think the objection is so valid that I cannot vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or two to set forth some historical facts in regard to the question of the confirmation of nominees, because I have said all that I intend to say about the Kyes appointment. If the reader will keep in mind the fact that I have incorporated by reference all my objections to Wilson as applicable to Kyes, saving and except my comments in the Wilson case to the family holdings he will then know my full case against Kyes.

I wish the record to show some historical facts with respect to the question of nominations in our history and of Senate action with reference to them. I am no little amused by the number of people I have talked to who have not checked the history very well.

Under Zachary Taylor's administration the following experience was recorded:

Mr. Seward's first speech in the Senate was to secure the confirmation of the Postmaster General, which was threatened by an attempt to refer the nomination to a committee, Mr. Collamer being singled out from all the others for opposition, because of his abolition sentiments (pp. 140–141, Hinsdale).

Under President Andrew Jackson's administration:

Inasmuch as the unsettled condition of the Senate made doubtful the confirmation of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the incoming Cabinet with different principles than the outgoing one, the precaution was taken of having Eaton, Branch, and Berrien hold their seats, until the Secretaries of the State and Treasury Departments had been confirmed. Accordingly, the appointments were not complete until March 9 (Hinsdale, pp. 83–84).

Under President Jefferson's administration:

The Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, assumed office by vacation commission, May 14, 1801, a precaution which he himself urged, and which sprung greatly out of the dislike he had invited from the Federalists by the surveillance over Treasury operations that he had assumed in the House of Representatives (Hinsdale, pp. 41–42).

The following Senate rejections of nominations for Cabinet positions are compiled from Haynes Commentaries, pages 761–762, volume II:

Nominee	Position	President	Date	Vote
Roger B. Taney	Secretary of the Treasury	Jackson	June 23, 1834	18–28
Caleb Cushing	do	Tyler	Mar. 3, 1843	19–27
Do	do	do	do	10–27
Do	do	do	do	2–29
David Henshaw	Secretary of the Navy	do	Jan. 15, 1844	6–34
James M. Porter	Secretary of War	do	Jan. 30, 1844	3–38
James S. Green	Secretary of the Treasury	do	June 15, 1844	(1)
Henry Stanbery	Attorney General	Johnson	June 2, 1868	11–29
Charles B. Warren	do	Coolidge	Mar. 10, 1925	39–41
Do	do	do	Mar. 16, 1925	39–46

[1] Not recorded.

In 1946 President Truman was compelled by Senate opposition to withdraw Edwin W. Pauley's nomination to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

In the Washington Star for January 22, 1953, we find this statement:

Wilson isn't the first to be challenged. President Grant had his trouble over a nomination for the Treasury. He named a wealthy New York philanthropist and merchant, Alexander Stewart, and the Senate confirmed Stewart as Secretary but he never took office because someone dug up a 1789 statute forbidding anyone to be Secretary of the Treasury who has a direct or indirect interest in commerce. Stewart offered in vain to let trustees run his business while he was in office. Grant, after a futile attempt to have the law changed, appointed another man.

The 1789 statute which applies only to the Secretaries of the Treasury was resurrected in 1924 and cited against Andrew W. Mellon who was confirmed—opposition stemming from Senator McKellar.

Mr. President, I have inserted the historical information in the RECORD because some persons who have written and telegraphed to me seem to think that the position which I have taken on these nominations is unheard of in the history of the Senate. Of course, history does not bear them out. I have followed no course of action different from what others in times gone by, who have felt as I have felt about these nominations, followed in respect to nominations which they believed to be equally unwise in their time. I have put this historical information into the RECORD also to point out that the Senate has a glorious record of functioning under our constitutional system as a check upon the Chief Executive.

I have placed it in the RECORD for the further reason that the wisdom of our predecessors in the Senate was so farsighted that they recognized the importance of preserving for the exercise of any single one of the Members of the Senate the procedural prerogative which I have exercised since the beginning of this session of the Congress in regard to these nominations. As I said in my first speech on the subject, it is a very important check, vesting in each Member of this body the right to run up a warning flag of caution, in calling for fuller consideration and greater deliberation upon nominations, as they come before the Senate.

I am fully appreciative that the fact that I have been the one to hoist that warning sign is bound to heap upon me the kind of criticism I have been receiving; but let me say, by way of thanks to the many hundreds of persons who have sent telegrams and letters to me in the days immediately past, that I appreciate their confidence and their words of encouragement, as I have seen fit to put into operation the principle of checks and balances.

On the Wilson case, the latest count in my office shows that the telegrams and letters have been running at a ratio of about 15 to 1 in support of the position I have taken. The count in my office shows that the communications on the position I am taking on the entire Cabinet fight are running at a ratio of better than 9 to 1 in support of the position I have taken. I do not draw any strong generality or conclusion from those facts; I simply cite them as some evidence that in the United States not all our citizens are accepting the claim that if any Member of the Senate raises a question about any recommendation made to the Senate by President Dwight Eisenhower, that Senator is not a good American in these times.

Let me say then that, as I said over the radio the other evening, that I am going to fight political goose-stepping in the United States. Of course the hour is a critical one, and it is so critical that every American citizen should contemplate his duties of citizenship and statesmanship, and should recognize that, after all, even though he may disagree with the action of a Senator on the floor of the Senate, that Senator has the duty, so long as he remains in this body, of following a course of action which will check the administration if he believes more time is necessary for consideration of nominations sent to the Senate by the President, regardless of whether that President is a Republican or a Democrat.

Only in keeping with that principle have I followed the course of action I have followed in the Senate; and I intend to continue to follow it whenever I believe a check by way of an objection, as guaranteed to me as a Senator, as a right under the rules of the Senate, should be exercised in what I believe to be the best interests of my country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the nomination of Roger M. Kyes to be Deputy Secretary of Defense was submitted by the President of the United States; and thereafter the Committee on Armed Services heard Mr. Kyes, and subsequently was unanimous in reporting the nomination favorably. The Senator from Michigan has gone into considerable detail in discussing the life history of Mr. Kyes.

As chairman of the committee, I simply call attention to the printed hearings in connection with the nomination of Mr. Kyes; in particular, I call attention to page 47 of the hearings of January 15, where Mr. Kyes' life history is set forth in some detail; and also to the statement appearing on page 2 of the hearings of January 28, in which Mr. Kyes stated he has divorced himself completely from General Motors Corp.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for making available to me, even in advance of the printing of the hearings on these nominations, the committee transcript.

I also wish to thank the gentleman who sits at the right of the Senator from Massachusetts, General Mudge, of the professional staff of the committee, for the many courtesies he has extended to me in our discussion of the nominations, in carrying out the chairman's instructions that the information be made available to me.

It has been exceedingly helpful; and, incidentally, it has saved a great deal of time on the floor of the Senate, because without that information to study in advance, undoubtedly I would have found it necessary to take several times the amount of time I have felt it necessary to take this afternoon in discussing these matters on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Oregon has made. I believe every Senator is entitled to the fullest possible information; and certainly the Senator from Oregon will receive it when, as, and if it is available from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, I hope the nomination of Mr. Kyes will be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations which have been confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate adjourn; but before doing so, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

MAYME R. L. CRESSE

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the granting of the franchise to the women of America—giving them the right to vote—was one of the great advancements in our free way of life.

I shall ever remember that event which occurred when I was a very young member of the district board of elections in my own district. At that time I had just returned from World War I.

Among the women in my State who fought valiantly for the cause of equal suffrage was a great lady from a neighboring community, a community of my own county. Her name will ever be hallowed in Gloucester County history.

I refer, Mr. President, to the Honorable Mayme R. L. Cresse.

On Tuesday of this week she passed into the Great Beyond. Her passing is a great loss to the county, to our State, and to the Nation to which her heart and soul were ever devoted.

Sometimes, Mr. President, we are given to long memorial tributes to men and women whose names are known throughout the world, and on such occasions I often wonder whether we overlook the more humble souls who serve without reward to keep our country strong and virile here at home.

Mayme Cresse was one of these many unsung heroes. She was a good wife, a good mother, a good citizen. I use the word "good" because the word "great" is so much overused in such circumstances. But Mayme Cresse was truly a great citizen of our Republic.

Mrs. Cresse was the wife of a distinguished banker of New Jersey, Wadsworth Cresse. Her only son, Wadsworth Cresse, Jr., was a distinguished soldier of World War II, and now is practicing law in the city of Woodbury, N. J., where I live.

This great lady of New Jersey began her long political career as an active suffragist, serving as Gloucester County chairman and a member of the State board at that time.

When women's suffrage became law in New Jersey, she was appointed a member of the Republican State committee, a post which she has held continuously since 1920.

Mrs. Cresse was an alternate-at-large to the Republican National Convention in Kansas City in 1928.

Mrs. Cresse was also one of the organizers of, and for 7 years served as president of, the Gloucester County Health Association.

She was also a past president of the Gloucester County Women's Republican Club, the Woman's Club of Woodbury, and the Woodbury Rotary Anns.

She was a member of the National Republican Club; the State Women's Republican Club of New Jersey; the Academy of Natural Science, in Philadelphia; the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society; and the Chester County (Pennsylvania) Historical Society.

Mr. President, save only our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I know of no woman in public life who has served her party with the same devotion and loyalty as has Mayme Cresse, unless it might be the wives of those who have made possible our success as United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I regret that my duties as a member of the Armed Services Committee at a very important hour of the Nation's history made it impossible for me to attend the last rites of this great lady.

Mayme Cresse helped give this Nation the kind of representation it will ever so desperately need.

I bow my head as I pay her memory the respect which her services to her community, State, and Nation so justly deserve.

PRAGUE NEWS LETTERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] found it necessary to leave during the debate on another matter. He gave me the following statement, which I desire to read into the RECORD at this point:

Ever so often our faith in our free institutions is reemphasized by some meaningful incident. A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Harold Hutcheson, superintendent of schools, Atkinson, Nebr., giving me his views regarding a so-called news letter which is apparently being mailed to many of our schools by one of the satellite embassies of the Communist empire. Mr. Hutcheson's highly commendable reaction to this propaganda technique demonstrates again the stability of our educational institutions in America. I am certain his letter will be of interest to all Members of this body. Therefore, I request that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

For Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska and in his name, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Harold Hutcheson be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATKINSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Atkinson, Nebr., January 20, 1953.

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I received six Prague News Letters from the Czechoslovakian Embassy addressed to the Superintendent of Schools, Atkinson, Nebr.

These papers are filled with the Communist propaganda line and full of vilification of the United States.

The manner of addressing the package leads me to believe that similar papers have been mailed to most of the schools in the United States.

I don't believe this type of propaganda can have any effect upon the superintendents of schools of the United States but the attempt to do so irks me.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD HUTCHESON,
Superintndent of Schools.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for the remainder of the term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1953.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Herman Phleger, of California, to be Legal Adviser, Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Roger M. Kyes, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

H. Brian Holland, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Warren Olney III, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Stephen P. Dunn, of Michigan, to be general counsel, Department of Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, lead us who seek Thy face, to still waters and green pastures where, in some quiet shrine of the spirit, we may be reassured of those values which are excellent and permanent, and which assert their sovereignty in all life's changing scenes.

As we bow at this altar of prayer, with poignant sympathy we lift our supplications for those who are in great lamentation today because of the devastations of tempest and of sea in the terrifying catastrophe which has swept the shores of ancient lands, our partners in the free world. While today with the Nation's Chief Executive we come to a place in these solemn times when the state of the Union is examined, may we carefully examine the state of our own hearts, our ideals, our motives, our ruling passions, knowing that out of men's hearts are the issues of life. And so, near the forum with its clash and din of human interest, may we ever raise an altar where a constant sense of the eternal may save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 30, 1953, was dispensed with.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. WILEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REQUIREMENT OF MERCHANT SEAMEN TO UNDERSTAND ORDERS GIVEN IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require that merchant seamen be able to understand orders given in the English language, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Interior on synthetic liquid fuels, for the calendar year 1952, together with parts I and II, entitled "Oil From Coal" and "Oil From Oil Shale," respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN A CERTAIN INVENTION TO FREDERICK W. LEE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Public Roads, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-sixth annual report of that Commission, dated November 1, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN INTERSTATE CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INFORMATION AND CIVILIAN EDUCATION FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the general counsel, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas vesicular exanthema, hog cholera, trichinosis, and other diseases of swine are, or may be, transmitted by the feeding of raw garbage; and

"Whereas these diseases cause heavy losses to the swine industry of the Nation; and

"Whereas Nebraska and some of her sister States have enacted laws designed to prevent the spread of these diseases by prohibiting the feeding of raw garbage, but other States have not done so; and

"Whereas a part of the problem is interstate in character, hence not amenable to effective control by the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-fifth session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation forbidding the shipment of raw garbage across State lines for feeding purposes.

"2. That the Congress of the United States be further urged to enact legislation forbidding the shipment of swine across State lines if such swine have been fed on raw garbage.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its thirty-second session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho produces better than 750,000 pounds of trout annually for food; and

"Whereas the production of trout for commercial purposes is one of the main industries in Idaho; and

"Whereas the trout produced in Idaho is of superior quality; and

"Whereas Idaho trout men, licensed in the State of Idaho, in cooperation with trout men from adjoining States, have gone to considerable expense in order to advertise their product; and

"Whereas foreign nations can and do import trout of an inferior quality at greatly reduced prices; and

"Whereas foreign trout are being sold as Idaho trout, or Rocky Mountain trout: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the thirty-second session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass an act requiring that all imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to its origin and the date of processing and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail handler removing said label; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho, be and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to the use of the word 'California' on labels of garments manufactured by out-of-State garment manufacturers

"Whereas for several years the apparel industry in California has been concerned over injuries to it suffered as a result of the practice by some out-of-State firms of labeling their apparel in such manner as to lead the public to assume that such goods are manufactured in California; and

"Whereas by the use by out-of-State firms of the word 'California,' or other similar devices, such firms are attempting to capitalize on the sales value of said word in connection with the apparel industry, which word the public has learned to associate with superior styling of certain apparel manufactured in California; and

"Whereas such practice has been sufficiently widespread to be of a major concern to the apparel industry of California and is injurious to other California industries which use the name 'California' on their labels; and

"Whereas under the Federal law (15 U. S. C. A., sec. 1125) any person who affixes or uses in connection with any goods or services a false designation of origin and with knowledge of such falsity causes or procures the same to be transported or used in commerce is liable to a civil action by any person doing business in the locality falsely indicated as that of origin or by any person who believes that he is or is likely to be damaged by the use of such false description or representation; and

"Whereas lawsuits instituted for the purpose of enjoining such activities and for the collection of damages suffered thereby are costly, lengthy, and in many cases unsuccessful due to the difficulty of proof required; and

"Whereas the Federal Trade Commission has in some instances, under its power to prohibit unfair methods of competition, investigated such activities; and

"Whereas it is felt by the Legislature of the State of California that this is the most proper and efficient method of controlling such unfair activities and that the Federal Trade Commission should, with renewed

vigor, continue its patrol of such offenses and in proper cases issue cease-and-desist orders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Federal Trade Commission be respectfully requested to henceforth investigate all instances of the use of the word 'California' on labels by firms in the apparel industry other than those who actually manufacture such apparel in California and, in the proper cases, issue cease-and-desist orders; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from California."

A resolution adopted by the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing two additional Federal judgeships for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the elimination of the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa printed in full when presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER on January 30, 1953, p. 674, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower is about to embark on a most perilous journey, and the way ahead is beset with soul-testing trials that might cause others to question the course to be taken by our leader: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives: That we go on record as endorsing the hopes and visions of our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who, on January 20, 1953, became our thirty-fourth President; and

"That we express our confidence in his leadership and join with him in pledging our lives and fortunes in the fight against totalitarian powers who are seeking to destroy our democratic form of government; and

"That we express to him and his administration our confidence in his expressed desire to bring light to the people in the world who are in darkness; and

"That we want him to know his hopes are our hopes and we pledge to him and his administration all that is ours in his effort 'to build and unify the strength of the free peoples of the world for peace'; and

"That we are ready to make 'whatever sacrifices may be required to us' to accomplish this purpose; and

"That we pray his hopes and visions for all mankind will receive the support of all free thinking people; and

"That by the wisdom of his policies, with the aid of the American people, we pray that his course shall be guided toward peace, progress and prosperity at home and abroad and that by his actions he shall keep and maintain the highest and truest traditions in our Government that will give to the world a true picture of our country; and

"That we extend to him and his aides our heartfelt wishes for good health and a long life with abundant happiness for all; and

"That his uttered prayer, is our prayer; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to forward a certified copy of these resolutions to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, and Hon. Winston L. Prouty.

"CONSUELO N. BAILEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved January 27, 1953.

"LEE E. EMERSON,
"Governor."

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; to take action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed and other pertinent matters in relation thereto

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring therein):

"Whereas the Missouri River development program will permanently inundate thousands of acres of hay meadow, pasture, timber, and farm land; and

"Whereas many farm families of long established residence will be dispossessed; and

"Whereas many other farm acreages will be reduced so greatly that their operation would not be economically sound; and

"Whereas the land involved in this development program is adapted to livestock raising; and

"Whereas livestock raising requires programs extending over a long term of years to provide sufficient feed and equipment for this type of agriculture; and

"Whereas the families affected are required to dispose of their property on a closed or forced market and are required to secure replacements on an open market at a time when it is recognized that farm lands are selling at inflated values: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the thirty-third session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to require that in all land appraisals that these facts, including the good will of the people involved, be considered and that the appraised value of the land be known by both parties making the transaction; and be it further

"Resolved, That the requirement that the money received from the sale of dispossessed land be reinvested in land within 1 year or requiring the payment of income tax be extended so that parties involved will not be required to purchase land during the period of inflated values; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress, to United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH IN KENTUCKY—PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I have just received from Mrs. W. H. Noel, of Harlan, Ky., State chairman of the Americanism committee of the Kentucky Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, a copy of a proclamation issued by the Honorable Lawrence W. Wetherby, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, on January 9, 1953, designating the month of February 1953 as American History Month in Kentucky. It is my understanding that this proclamation was issued at the request of the Kentucky Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and certainly in view of the need at all times, particularly in these days of international strife and oppression, to keep alive the great principles and goals emphasized in the pages of our glorious American history, I am indeed glad to send this proclamation to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the proclamation was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come:

Whereas the strength of our Nation depends upon the great principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all people; and

Whereas such goals can only be achieved if the youth of our Nation is educated and indoctrinated in these principles; and

Whereas such education is now imperative because of the growing force of communism with its oppression of small nations which look to us for help and inspiration;

Now, therefore, I, Lawrence W. Wetherby, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1953 as American History Month in Kentucky and urge all homes, schools, colleges, and universities, and the people of Kentucky generally to especially emphasize American history during the month and to impart knowledge of the pledge of allegiance to the flag, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

Done at Frankfort, Ky., this the 9th day of January in the year of our Lord, 1953, and in the year of the Commonwealth, the one hundred and sixty-first.

LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY,
Governor.
CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.
SUSAN B. RUTHERFORD,
Assistant.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN SWISS AND LIMBURGER CHEESE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION, MONROE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to receive from Al Stoldt, president of the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, a series of three resolutions which had been adopted by that fine organization at its fourteenth annual meeting. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING, WISCONSIN SWISS AND LIMBURGER CHEESE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION, MONROE, WIS.

PRICE EQUALIZATION

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association recommend to Federal and State lawmakers that they keep in mind the necessity of uniformity of the prices of farm products and the prices of the things the farmer must buy; that if farm prices go down, other prices must go down in proportion; that we also advise that farm groups in other States make similar recommendations to their representatives.

SUPPORT OF FARM PRICES

Whereas the economic welfare of the Nation is inseparable from protection against unreasonable declines in farm prices.

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association recommends continued farm-price supports as price floors, along with intelligent research designed to achieve improvement in the realistic determination and administration of such farm-price supports.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

We recognize the importance of international trade not only upon our own economy, but also upon that of those nations friendly to us in our struggle to retain freedom as a part of our lives and of their lives.

It is our conviction, however, that reciprocal trade agreements must be balanced in their application to all parts of our economy, and we disapprove trade policies which unduly curtail imports of industrial commodities while liberalizing imports of agricultural products.

Resolved, That we urge corrective measures under appropriate legislation to assure agriculture relief from excessive imports.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (by request):

S. 731. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 732. A bill to create an additional district judgeship for the eastern district of Texas, and to make permanent the district judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by the act of August 3, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 733. A bill to provide that the Federal Board of Parole shall consist of five members not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 734. A bill to amend paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to include survivors of deceased veterans who at the time of death are totally disabled and whose disabilities were service connected; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 736. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. McPhail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 737. A bill for the relief of Elias Miltiades Iordanopoulos;

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Maria Busa;

S. 739. A bill for the relief of Guntram Weissenberger;

S. 740. A bill for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita);

S. 741. A bill for the relief of Henryk S. Ryniewicz-Wisniewski;

S. 742. A bill for the relief of Manuel Sequeira;

S. 743. A bill for the relief of George P. Khouri;

S. 744. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Spinosa;

S. 745. A bill for the relief of Jose Do Rego Dias Pereira;

S. 746. A bill for the relief of Kerop Nahabedian and Ardemis Nahabedian; and

S. 747. A bill for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 748. A bill for the relief of William Clark Vyse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 749. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Ira T. Todd and Major C. Todd, copartners, trading as Todd Bros.; and

S. 750. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks, copartners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 751. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of the national service life insurance granted the late Lester T. Brown to his widow, Mrs. Gay Dobler Brown Choquette; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 752. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 753. A bill to provide stand-by economic controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 755. A bill to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate 1953 as the fiftieth anniversary year of farm demonstration work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact or agreement providing for joint planning in the building and improvement of roads leading in and out of the National Capital and in the beautification of roadsides and public parks within the metropolitan area of the National Capital, and joint execution of such plans; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMBERSHIP OF FEDERAL BOARD OF PAROLE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that the Federal Board of Parole shall consist of five members not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party. I ask unanimous consent that a very brief statement prepared by me in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 733) to provide that the Federal Board of Parole shall consist of five members not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I have introduced a bill relating to the Board of Parole in the Department of Justice. The bill would amend Public Law 865, Eighty-first Congress. These amendments have a twofold purpose: First, to emphasize a small element of economy by reducing the Board of Parole from eight to five members; and, secondly, to provide in the law for fair representation of each party in the membership of the Board.

Reorganization of the Board of Parole, as affected by Public Law 865, increased the number of members from five to eight, but experience has shown that five members are entirely adequate to conduct the important functions of the Board. In fact, no effort has been made since the law was passed in 1950 to implement the new provisions of the law, and five members are carrying the work now.

It seems to me that if five members of the Federal Board of Parole can adequately and efficiently do the job, as they have been doing, there is no need of providing for a Board of eight members. Furthermore, there is no indication that a larger Board will be needed in the near future.

As to the second point, with reference to representation on the Board, I wish to draw attention to the fact that this is now one of the few important boards and agencies of the Federal Government where the law does not require division of representation.

Consequently, I am proposing an amendment to provide that on the five-member Board of Parole not more than three members shall be from the same political party, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at dinner honoring J. Francis Cardinal McIntyre in Los Angeles, Calif., January 28, 1953.

Address delivered by him before California Motor Transport Association at Coronado, Calif., on January 30, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Student Exchange Program," written by Donald Michael Rauh, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 1, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "Art of Being Happy," written by Norman Vincent Peale, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer magazine of February 1, 1953.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is the intention to have the Senate meet, after today, Wednesday and Friday, unless it becomes necessary to change the schedule. Probably the sessions will not be very long, because I know of no legislative business that is likely to come before the Senate, although the Reorganization Act may be considered at the end of the week.

However, there will be nominations to be considered, and it is important that they be confirmed as rapidly as possible. I urge Senators to return to the Chamber after the joint session is concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is it the intention of the Senator from Ohio to have the Senate proceed this afternoon with the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I shall propose that the Senate proceed this afternoon to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, namely, the nominations of Winthrop W. Aldrich, Robert Ten Broeck Stevens, Robert B. Anderson, Harold E. Talbott, and Francis A. O'Neill, Jr.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 24, I move that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing an address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

(Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the Senate preceded by its Secretary (J. Mark Trice), its Sergeant at Arms (Forest A. Harness), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.)

(For the address delivered today by the President at the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, see pp. 748–753 of the House proceedings of today.)

The joint session having been dissolved, the Senate, at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m., returned to its Chamber, and was called to order by the Vice President.

EMERGENCY STABILIZATION ACT OF 1953

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry out the recommendations of President Eisenhower in respect to price, wage, and rent controls and other features of the present Defense Production Act.

It also covers some features not contained in the President's recommendations of a few minutes ago, most important being the subject of stand-by controls, Small Defense Plants Administration, and other matters.

Introduction of this bill will enable the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings and accept testimony from all classes of our people covering all viewpoints of this complex and controversial subject.

This is my chief purpose in introducing the omnibus bill.

It certainly is not perfect and some will disagree with some of its features, but the best way to bring out the bad as well as the good in any proposed legislation is an open discussion in open hearings and that is what your Senate Banking and Currency Committee will make every effort to do.

To this end, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will begin open hearings on this bill, and any others pertaining to controls, starting at 10:00 a. m., on Monday morning, February 16.

The first witnesses will be the heads of those departments of our Government in the executive branch vitally concerned with these problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement which I have prepared, and a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 753) to provide stand-by economic controls, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Stabilization Act of 1953."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In spite of substantial increases which have occurred since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, prices are now generally in normal relationship and the economy as a whole is relatively stable. It is the sense of the Congress that this stability can be maintained by the full and effective use of indirect controls barring unanticipated and adverse international developments. There is, however, the ever present possibility of further Communist aggression which may seriously jeopardize the American economic system unless proper legislative and organizational safeguards exist for the immediate imposition of economic controls. The necessity for such safeguards is emphasized by the speedy destructive force of modern warfare which allows no delay in the taking of Executive action to insure preservation of the well-being of the economy. The purpose of this act is to provide the basis for such action in the event serious economic dislocations threatening the national security or welfare develop.

It is the sense of the Congress that direct economic controls are incompatible with the American free enterprise system and should be invoked only if an emergency arises serious enough to threaten the economic well-being or national security of the United States and within the framework as far as practicable of the American system of competitive enterprise. But if such an emergency should develop, the President must have full powers to employ immediate economic controls to the extent necessary to meet the needs of the national security and welfare.

In order that this Nation be prepared, it is the policy of the Congress that agencies be provided on a limited stand-by basis, to be ready at all times to take appropriate action in the event of such an emergency. It is the further sense of the Congress that all other agencies of Government shall cooperate to the fullest extent in assisting these agencies in carrying out the purposes of this act.

It is the sense of the Congress that a stand-by program of the kind here authorized will provide for the national security, the general welfare, and implement the foreign policy of the United States in the event of serious economic dislocations and that the powers granted herein shall be used for those purposes. This program may require diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes, and may require expansion and maintenance of productive facilities beyond levels needed to meet civilian demand. Such a program should insure against the ravages of inflation. Such a program should operate to assure against dissipation of defense appropriations in an economic emergency; to stabilize the cost of living for workers and other consumers and the costs of production for farmers and businessmen during such an emergency. Such a program should prohibit profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities if a crisis develops. It should protect consumers, wage earners, investors, and persons with relatively fixed or limited incomes from undue impairment of their living standards in an emergency. It should safeguard against economic disturbances, labor disputes, interferences with the effective mobilization of national resources and impairment of national unity and morale. It should also protect the national economy in a time of crisis against future loss of needed purchasing power by the dissipation of individual savings.

TITLE I—PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) The President is hereby authorized (1) to require that performance under contracts or orders (other than contracts of employment) which he deems necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense shall take priority over performance under any other contract or order, and, for the purpose of assuring such priority, to require acceptance and performance of such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders by any person he finds to be capable of their performance, and (2) to allocate materials and facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate to promote the national defense. No restriction, quota, or other limitation shall be placed upon the quantity of livestock which may be slaughtered or handled by any processor. Nor shall any restriction or other limitation be established or maintained upon the species, type, or grade of livestock killed by any slaughterer, nor upon the types of slaughtering operations, including religious rituals, employed by any slaughterer; nor shall any requirements or regulations be established or maintained relating to the allocation or distribution of meat or meat products unless, and for the period for which, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have determined and certified to the President that the overall supply of meat and meat products is inadequate to meet the civilian or military needs therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products.

(b) When all requirements for the national security, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials, and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and minimizing inflationary pressures. No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption of any material unless such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference and not used by any such participating country. Nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials (both domestically produced and imported) and facilities through the controlled materials plan or other methods of allocation.

SEC. 102. In order to prevent hoarding no person shall accumulate (1) in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption, or (2) for the purpose of resale at prices in excess of prevailing market prices, materials which have been designated by the President as scarce materials or materials the supply of which would be threatened by such accumulation. The President shall order published in the Federal Register, and in such other manner as he may deem appropriate, every designation of materials the accumulation of which is unlawful and any withdrawal of such designation. In making such designations the President may prescribe such conditions with respect to the accumulation of materials in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption as he deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this act. This section shall not be construed to limit the authority contained in sections 101 and 706 of this act.

SEC. 103. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by the provisions of this title or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products may be necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below current production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.

SEC. 105. Before initially invoking any authority granted by this title, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council, by Executive order shall find and declare that the exercise of any power conferred by this title is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability.

TITLE II—AUTHORITY TO REQUISITION AND CONDEMN

SEC. 201. (a) Whenever the President determines (1) that the use of any equipment, supplies, or component parts thereof, or materials or facilities necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or component parts, is needed for the national defense, (2) that such need is immediate and impending and such as will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply, and (3) that all other means of obtaining the use of such property for the defense of the United States upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted, he is authorized to requisition such property or the use thereof for the defense of the United States upon the payment of just compensation for such property or the use thereof to be determined as hereinafter provided. The President shall promptly determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any property or the use thereof requisitioned pursuant to this title but each such determination shall be made as of the time it is requisitioned in accordance with the provision for just compensation in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If the person entitled to receive the amount so determined by the President as just compensation is unwilling to accept the same as full and complete compensation for such property or the use thereof, he shall be paid promptly 75 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to recover from the United States, in an action brought in the Court of Claims or, without regard to whether the amount involved exceeds $10,000, in any district court of the United States, within 3 years after the date of the President's award, an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid to him, shall be just compensation. No real property (other than equipment and facilities, and buildings and other structures, to be demolished and used as scrap or second-hand materials) shall be acquired under this subsection.

(b) Whenever the President deems it necessary in the interest of national defense, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings to acquire by condemnation, any real property, including facilities, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, together with any personal property located thereon or used therewith, that he deems necessary for the national defense, such proceedings to be in accordance with the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before condemnation proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation unless, because of reasonable doubt as to the identity of the owner or owners, because of the large number of persons with whom it would be necessary to negotiate, or for other reasons, the effort to acquire by negotiation would involve, in the judgment of the President, such delay in acquiring the property as to be contrary to the interest of national defense. In any condemnation proceeding instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

(c) Whenever the President determines that any real property acquired under this title and retained is no longer needed for the defense of the United States, he shall, if the original owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, return such property to the owner. In the event the President and the original owner do not agree as to the fair value of the property, the fair value shall be determined by three appraisers, one of whom shall be chosen by the President, one by the original owner, and the third by the first two appraisers; the expenses of such determination shall be paid in equal shares by the Government and the original owner.

(d) Whenever the need for the national defense of any personal property acquired under this title shall terminate, the President may dispose of such property on such terms and conditions as he shall deem appropriate, but to the extent feasible and practicable he shall give the owner of any property so disposed of an opportunity to reacquire it (1) at its then fair value as determined by the President, or (2) if it is to be disposed of (otherwise than at a public sale of which he is given reasonable notice) at less than such value, at the highest price any other person is willing to pay therefor: *Provided,* That this opportunity to reacquire need not be given in the case of fungibles or items having a fair value of less than $1,000.

SEC. 202. Before initially invoking any authority granted by this title, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council, by Executive order shall find and declare that the exercise of any power conferred by this title is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability.

TITLE III—EXPANSION OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY AND SUPPLY

SEC. 301. (a) In order to expedite production and deliveries or services under Government contracts, the President may authorize, subject to such regulations as he may prescribe, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Commerce, and such other agencies of the United States engaged in procurement for the national defense as he may designate (hereinafter referred to as "guaranteeing agencies"), without regard to provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, to guarantee in whole or in part any public or private financing institution (including any Federal Reserve bank), by commitment to purchase, agreement to share losses, or otherwise, against loss of principal or interest on any loan, discount, or advance, or on any commitment in connection therewith, which may be made by such financing institution for the purpose of financing any contractor, subcontractor, or other person in connection with the performance, or in connection with or in contemplation of the termination, of any contract or other operation deemed to the guaranteeing agency to be necessary to expedite production and deliveries or services under Government contracts for the procurement of materials or the performance of services for the national defense.

(b) Any Federal agency or any Federal Reserve bank, when designated by the President, is hereby authorized to act, on behalf of any guaranteeing agency, as fiscal agent of the United States in the making of such contracts of guarantee and in otherwise carrying out the purposes of this section. All such funds as may be necessary to enable any such fiscal agent to carry out any guarantee made by it on behalf of any guaranteeing agency shall be supplied and disbursed by or under authority from such guaranteeing agency. No such fiscal agent shall have any responsibility or accountability except as agent in taking any action pursuant to or under authority of the provisions of this section. Each such fiscal agent shall be reimbursed by each guaranteeing agency for all expenses and losses

incurred by such fiscal agent in acting as agent on behalf of such guaranteeing agency, including among such expenses, notwithstanding any other provision of law, attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation.

(c) All actions and operations of such fiscal agents under authority of our pursuant to this section shall be subject to the supervision of the President, and to such regulations as he may prescribe; and the President is authorized to prescribe, either specifically or by maximum limits or otherwise, rates of interest, guaranty and commitment fees, and other charges which may be made in connection with loans, discounts, advances, or commitments guranteed by the guaranteeing agencies through such fiscal agents, and to prescribe regulations governing the forms and procedures (which shall be uniform to the extent practicable) to be utilized in connection with such guaranties.

(d) Each guaranteeing agency is hereby authorized to use for the purposes of this section any funds which have heretofore been appropriated or allocated or which hereafter may be appropriated or allocated to it, or which are or may become available to it, for such purposes or for the purpose of meeting the necessities of the national defense.

SEC. 302. To expedite production and deliveries or services to aid in carrying out Government contracts for the procurement of materials or the performance of services for the national defense, the President may make provision for loans (including participations in, or guaranties of, loans) to private business enterprises (including research corporations not organized for profit) for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials, including the exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical metals and minerals, and manufacture of newsprint. Such loans may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law and on such terms and conditions as the President deems necessary, except that financial assistance may be extended only to the extent that it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 303. (a) To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provision (1) for purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale; and (2) for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals: *Provided, however,* That purchases for resale under this subsection shall not include that part of the supply of an agricultural commodity which is domestically produced except insofar as such domestically produced supply may be purchased for resale for industrial uses or stockpiling, and no commodity purchased under this subsection shall be sold at less than the established ceiling price for such commodity (except that minerals and metals shall not be sold at less than the established ceiling price, or the current domestic market price, whichever is lower), or, if no ceiling price has been established, the higher of the following: (i) The current domestic market price for such commodity, or (ii) the minimum sale price established for agricultural commodities owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided in section 407 of Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress: *And provided further,* That no purchase or commitment to purchase any imported agricultural commodity shall be made calling for delivery more than 1 year after the expiration of this act.

(b) Subject to the limitations in subsection (a), purchases and commitments to purchase and sales under such subsection may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law, for such quantities, and on such terms and conditions, including advance payments, and for such periods, but not extending beyond , as the President deems necessary, except that purchases or commitments to purchase involving higher than established ceiling prices (or if there be no established ceiling prices, currently prevailing market prices) or anticipated loss on resale shall not be made unless it is determined that supply of the materials could not be effectively increased at lower prices or on terms more favorable to the Government, or that such purchases are necessary to assure the availability to the United States of overseas supplies.

(c) If the President finds—

(1) that under generally fair and equitable ceiling prices for any raw or nonprocessed material, there will result a decrease in supplies from high-cost sources of such material, and that the continuation of such supplies is necessary to carry out the objectives of the act; or

(2) that an increase in cost of transportation is temporary in character and threatens to impair maximum production or supply in any area at stable prices of any materials, he may make provision for subsidy payments on any such domestically produced material other than an agricultural commodity in such amounts and in such manner (including purchases of such material and its resale at a loss without regard to the limitations of existing law), and on such terms and conditions, as he determines to be necessary to insure that supplies from such high-cost sources are continued, or that maximum production or supply in such area at stable prices of such materials is maintained, as the case may be.

(d) The procurement power granted to the President by this section shall include the power to transport and store, and have processed and refined, any materials procured under this section.

(e) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, the President is authorized to install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.

SEC. 304. (a) For the purposes of sections 302 and 303, the President is hereby authorized to utilize such existing departments, agencies, officials, or corporations of the Government as he may deem appropriate, or to create new agencies.

(b) Any agency created under this section, and any department, agency, official, or corporation utilized pursuant to this section is authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out its functions under sections 302 and 303: *Provided,* That the amount borrowed under the provisions of this section by all such borrowers shall not exceed an aggregate of $ outstanding at any one time: *Provided further,* That when any contract, agreement, loan, or other transaction heretofore or hereafter entered into pursuant to section 302 or 303 imposes contingent liability upon the United States, such liability shall be considered for the purposes of sections 3679 and 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, as an obligation only to the extent of the probable ultimate net cost to the United States under such transaction; and the President shall submit a report to the Congress not less often than once each quarter setting forth the gross amount of each such transaction entered into by any agency of the United States Government under this authority and the basis for determining the probable ultimate net cost to the United States thereunder. For the purpose of borrowing as authorized by this subsection, the borrower may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to be redeemable at its option before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase such obligations and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of obligations hereunder.

SEC. 305. (a) (1) It is the sense of the Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act. In order to carry out this policy there is hereby continued the Small Defense Plants Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administration), created under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The Administration shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government. The principal office of the Administration shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Administration may establish such branch offices in other places in the United States as may be determined by the Administrator of the Administration. For the purposes of this section, a small-business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation. The Administration, in making a detailed definition, may use these criteria, among others: Independency of ownership and operation, number of employees, dollar volume of business, and nondominance in its field.

(2) The Administration is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $50,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the Administration from the revolving fund when requested by the Administration. This revolving fund shall be used for the purposes enumerated subsequently in subsection (b) (1) (B), (C), and (D). Reimbursements made to the Administration under these operations shall revert to the revolving fund for use for the same purposes.

(3) The management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be a person of outstanding qualifications known to be familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Administrator shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to appoint two Deputy Administrators to assist in the execution of the functions vested in the Administration. Deputy Administrators shall be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(4) The Administration shall not have succession, beyond June 30, 1954, except for purposes of liquidation. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to select and employ such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of business of the Administration; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and fix the penalties thereof. The Administration, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, including any field service thereof, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this section.

(5) All moneys of the Administration not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Administration or in any Federal Reserve bank. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Administration in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act. All insured banks, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as custodians, and financial agents for the Administration.

(b) (1) Without regard to any other provision of law except the regulations prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, the Administration is empowered—

(A) to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturity as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may determine on its own discretion, to enable small-business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, including the acquisition of land; or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials; or to finance research, development, and experimental work on new or improved products or processes; or to supply such concerns with capital to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for defense or essential civilian purposes; or to establish and operate technical laboratories to serve small-business concerns; such loans or advances to be made or effected either directly by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate in insurance of loans, or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise;

(B) to enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers obligating the Administration to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government;

(C) to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small-business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or parts thereof, or servicing or processing in connection therewith, or such management services as may be necessary to enable the Administration to perform such contracts; and

(D) to provide technical and managerial aids to small-business concerns, by maintaining a clearinghouse for technical information, by cooperating with other Government agencies, by disseminating information, and by such other activities as are deemed appropriate by the Administration.

(2) In any case in which the Administration certifies to any officer of the Government having procurement powers that the Administration is competent to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officers, such officer shall be authorized to let such procurement contract to the Administration upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Administration and the procurement officer.

(c) (1) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administration, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this section, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(2) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administration (A) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it, or (B) with intent to defraud the Administration or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administration makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administration, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (C) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administration, or (D) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administration which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administration shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(d) (1) It shall be the duty of the Administration and it is hereby empowered, to coordinate and to ascertain the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Administration and it is hereby empowered, to consult and cooperate with appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting or expanding production by, or in the formulation of policy in granting priorities to, business concerns. All such governmental agencies are required, before issuing such orders or announcing such priority policies, to consult with the Administration in order that small-business concerns will be most effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for national defense and essential civilian purposes.

(e) The Administration shall have power, and it is hereby directed, whenever it determines such action is necessary—

(1) to make a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production or to arrange for such inventory to be made by any other governmental agency which has the facilities. In making any such inventory, the appropriate agencies in the several States shall be requested to furnish an inventory of the productive facilities of small-business concerns in each respective State if such an inventory is available or in prospect;

(2) to consult and cooperate with officers of the Government having procurement powers, in order to utilize the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small-business concerns;

(3) to obtain information as to methods and practices which Government prime contractors utilize in letting subcontracts and to take action to encourage the letting of subcontracts by prime contractors to small-business concerns at prices and on conditions and terms which are fair and equitable;

(4) to take such action, authorized under this section, as is necessary to provide small-business concerns with an adequate incentive, excluding subsidies, to engage in defense and essential civilian production and to facilitate the conversion and equipping of plants of small-business concerns for such production;

(5) to determine within any industry the concerns, firms, persons, corporations, partnerships, cooperatives, or other business enterprises, which are to be designated "small-business concerns" for the purpose of effectuating the provision of this section;

(6) to certify to Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, as to capacity and credit, of any small-business concern or group of such concerns to perform a specific Government procurement contract;

(7) to obtain from any Federal department, establishment, or agency, engaged in defense procurement or in the financing of defense procurement or production such reports concerning the letting of contracts and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as it may deem pertinent in carrying out its functions under this act;

(8) to obtain from suppliers of materials information pertaining to the method of filling orders and the bases for allocating their supply, whenever it appears that any small business is unable to obtain materials for defense or essential civilian production from its normal sources;

(9) to make studies and recommendations to the appropriate Federal agencies to insure a fair and equitable share of materials, supplies, and equipment to small-business concerns to effectuate the defense program of for essential civilian purposes;

(10) to consult and cooperate with all Government agencies for the purpose of insuring that small-business concerns shall receive fair and reasonable treatment from said agencies; and

(11) to establish such advisory boards and committees wholly representative of small business as may be found necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

(f) (1) In any case in which a small-business concern or group of such concerns has been certified by or under the authority of the Administration to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit as to a specific Government procurement contract, the officers of the Government having procurement powers are directed to accept such certifications as conclusive, and are authorized to let such Government procurement contract to such concern or group of concerns without requiring it to meet any other requirement with respect to capacity and credit.

(2) The Congress has as its policy that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small-business concerns. To effectuate such policy, small business concerns within the meaning of this section shall receive any award or contract or any part thereof as to which it is determined by the Administration and the contracting procurement agencies (A) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (B) to be in the interest of the national defense program, to make such award or let such contract to a small-business concern.

(3) Whenever materials or supplies are allocated by law, a fair and equitable percentage thereof shall be allocated to small plants unable to obtain the necessary materials or supplies from usual sources. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of the lawful allocating authority after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the Administration.

(g) The Administration shall make a report every 90 days of operations under this title to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let, and for whom financing is arranged, by the Administration, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information, and such comments and recommendations, with

respect to the relation of small-business concerns to the defense effort, as the Administration may deem appropriate.

(h) The Administration is hereby empowered to make studies of the effect of price, credit, and other controls imposed under the defense program and whenever it finds that these controls discriminate against or impose undue hardship upon small business, to make recommendations to the appropriate Federal agency for the adjustment of controls to the needs of small business.

(i) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans and advances upon the recommendation of the Small Defense Plants Administration as provided in (b) (1) (A) of this section not to exceed an aggregate of $100,000,000 outstanding at any one time, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may determine.

(j) The President may transfer to the Administration any functions, powers, and duties of any department or agency which relates primarily to small-business problems.

(k) No loan shall be recommended or equipment, facilities, or services furnished by the Administration under this section to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administration the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Administration for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such persons; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of 2 years after any assistance is rendered by the Administration to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within 1 year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent or employee of the Administration occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Administration shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this section.

(l) To the fullest extent the Administration deems practicable, it shall make a fair charge for the use of Government-owned property and make and let contracts on a basis that will result in a recovery of the direct costs incurred by the Administration.

(m) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this section.

SEC. 306. This title shall be deemed a continuation of the authority contained in title III and section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and all assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records primarily related to the exercise of functions under title III and section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 are hereby continued in the administration of this title.

TITLE IV—PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

SEC. 401. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, the Office of Price Stabilization and the Wage Stabilization Board as hereinafter constituted are hereby continued and any activation of ceilings on prices or the stabilization of wages, salaries, or other compensation shall be exercised through these agencies or such other agencies as the President may designate.

(b) The Office of Price Stabilization shall be directed by an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and he shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,000 per annum. The principal office of the Administrator shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place. The President is authorized to transfer to the Office of Price Stabilization any of the powers relating to allocations and rationing conferred by law upon any other department or agency with respect to any particular material or materials.

(c) (1) The Wage Stabilization Board shall be composed of 15 members representative of the general public, labor, and business and industry. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but the functions of the Board may be performed by duly authorized regional boards.

(2) The members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

(3) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(4) Except insofar as stabilization of wages, salaries or other compensation is involved, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of wage stabilization regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress.

(5) The President may, notwithstanding any other provision of this title, authorize the continuation of the Salary Stabilization Board, the Railroad and Airline Wage Board, and the Construction Industry Stabilization Commission, and delegate such functions to them as he deems advisable. The members of these Boards shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(d) Upon the activation of ceilings on prices and the stabilization of wages, salaries, or other compensation the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, the Wage Stabilization Board, and any other agencies the President may create under this title, shall be under the supervision and control of an official appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of such official to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages.

SEC. 402. In the absence of the activation of ceilings on prices or the stabilization of wages, salaries, or other compensation it shall be the continuing function of the Office of Price Stabilization and the Wage Stabilization Board to establish and maintain procedures for the study and evaluation of price and wage trends; to make monthly reports to the Congress with respect to these and related matters, and any special reports that bear upon the proper administration of this title; to formulate and recommend to the President general policies and regulations relating to controls on prices and on wages, salaries, and other compensation; to consult with advisory committees with respect to price trends and the improvement of pricing techniques which may be employed in future regulations; to draft for possible future use new and simplified regulations incorporating improved techniques suggested by such committees and prior experience in the administration of controls; to conduct such protest and review proceedings as may be appropriate under sections 407 and 408 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to complete promptly investigations of violations of regulations or orders relating to prices or to wages; salaries and other compensation arising under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to assist the Attorney General in the prosecution of any suits or actions based upon such violations; to furnish information and special reports at the request of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Justice; to advise and consult with other governmental agencies concerning the pricing of materials required in the defense mobilization program; to maintain current rosters of qualified persons who would be available in the event of the activation of controls to agencies controlling prices and wages; and to devise and perfect the appropriate pattern of organization and procedures which would be required in the event it should become necessary to impose selective or general controls.

SEC. 403. (a) (1) The President may issue regulations and orders establishing a ceiling or ceilings on the price, rental, commission, margin, rate, fee, charge, or allowance paid or received on the sale or delivery, or the purchase or receipt, by or to any person, of any material or service; and the President shall at the same time issue regulations and orders stabilizing wages, salaries, and other compensation in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(2) Action under this section may be taken either with respect to individual materials and services and to individual types of employment, or with respect to materials, services, and types of employment generally. Whenever any action is taken with respect to any particular material, service, or type of employment or with respect to materials, services or types of employment generally, ceiling prices shall be fixed and the wages, salaries, and other compensation shall be stabilized at the level prevailing as of the close of business on the business day next preceding the day on which the action is taken. As soon thereafter as practicable (within a period of 90 days after the taking of such action, if possible, and within a period of 6 months after the taking of such action in any event) the President shall adjust such ceiling prices and such wages, salaries, and other compensation in the manner provided in subsection (c) of this section.

(3) Whenever a ceiling has been imposed with respect to a particular material or service, the President shall stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation in the industry or business producing the material or performing the service.

(4) Whenever ceilings on prices have been established on materials and services comprising a substantial part of all sales at retail and materially affecting the cost of living, the President (i) shall impose ceilings on prices and services generally, and (ii) shall stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation generally.

(b) In stabilizing wages under this section, the President shall issue regulations prohibiting increases in wages, salaries, and other compensation which he deems would require an increase in price ceilings or impose hardships or inequities on sellers operating under price ceilings.

(c) So far as practicable, in exercising the authority conferred in this section, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

President shall ascertain and give due consideration to comparable prices, rentals, commissions, margins, rates, fees, charges, and allowances, and to comparable salaries, wages, or other compensation, which he finds to be representative of those prevailing during the period from , to , inclusive, or, in case none prevailed during this period or if those prevailing during this period were not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then those prevailing on the nearest date on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representative. The President shall also give due consideration to the national effort to achieve maximum production in furtherance of the objectives of this act. In determining and adjusting ceilings on prices with respect to materials and services, he shall give due consideration to such relevant factors as he may determine to be of general applicability in respect of such material or service, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in cost of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the material or by persons performing the service, subsequent to ; but no such ceilings shall be established for the purpose of controlling profits. In stabilizing and adjusting wages, salaries, or other compensation, the President shall give due consideration to such relevant factors as he may determine to be of general applicability in respect of such wages, salaries, or other compensation. Any regulation or order under this title shall be such as in the judgment of the President will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this title, and shall be accompanied by a statement of considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order. The President, in establishing and adjusting ceilings with respect to materials and services, and in stabilizing and adjusting wages, salaries, and other compensation, shall make such adjustments as he deems necessary to prevent or correct hardships or inequities.

(d) (1) Regulations and orders issued under this title shall apply regardless of any obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred, except as provided in this subsection; but the President shall make appropriate provision to prevent hardships and inequities to sellers who have bona fide contracts in effect on the date of issuance of any such regulation or order for future delivery of materials in which seasonal demands or normal business practices require contracts for future delivery.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no wage, salary, or other compensation shall be stabilized at less than that paid during the period from , to , inclusive; no regulation or order shall be issued or remain in effect under this title which prohibits the payment or receipt of hourly wages at a rate of $1 per hour or less; and no action shall be taken under authority of this title with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, or any other law of the United States.

(e) In order to carry out the objectives of this title, the President may encourage and promote voluntary action by business, agriculture, labor, and consumers. In proceeding under this subsection the President may exercise the authority to approve voluntary programs and agreements conferred on him under section 707, and may utilize the services of persons and agencies as provided in section 712.

SEC. 404. Except as otherwise provided in section 403—

(a) No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the highest of the following prices:

(1) The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials, or (2) the highest price received by producers during the period from , to , inclusive, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials, or (3) in the case of any commodity for which the market was not active during the period , to , inclusive, the average price received by producers during the most recent representative period prior to , in which the market for such commodity was active as determined and adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture to a level in line with the level of prices received by producers for agricultural commodities generally during the period , to , inclusive, and adjusted by the Secretary for grade, location, and seasonal differentials, or (4) in the case of fire-cured tobacco a price (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted for grade differentials) equal to 75 percent of the parity price of Burley tobacco or the corresponding crop, and in the case of dark air-cured tobacco and Virginia sun-cured tobacco, respectively, a price (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted for grade differentials) equal to 66⅔ percent of the parity price of Burley tobacco of the corresponding crop.

(b) No ceilings shall be established or maintained hereunder for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to producers of such agricultural commodity a price for such agricultural commodity equal to the highest price therefor specified in this subsection: *Provided*, That in establishing and maintaining ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing; and equitable treatment shall be accorded to all such processors.

(c) Whenever a ceiling has been established under this title with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part therefrom, the President from time to time shall adjust such ceiling in order to make appropriate allowance for substantial reduction in merchantable crop yields, unusual increases in costs of production, and other factors which result from hazards occurring in connection with the production and marketing of such agricultural commodity; and in establishing the ceiling (1) for any agricultural commodity for which the 1953 marketing season commenced prior to the enactment of this act and for which different areas have different periods of marketing during such season, or (2) for any agricultural commodity produced for the same general use as a commodity described in (1), the President shall give due consideration to affording equitable treatment to all producers of the commodity for which the ceiling is being established.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of either (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, or (2) the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

(e) Ceiling prices to producers for milk used for distribution as fluid milk in any marketing area not under a marketing agreement, license, or order issued under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (hereinafter referred to as a non-Federal marketing area), shall not be less than (1) parity prices for such milk, or (2) prices which in any such area will bear the same ratio to the simple average of the prices payable to producers for milk used for distribution as fluid milk in all Federal marketing areas as the prices for fluid milk in the non-Federal marketing area bore to the average of the prices for such milk in all Federal marketing areas on .

(f) For the purposes of this section, the parity price of any agricultural commodity as of any date shall be the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the then current marketing year or season for the commodity, except that, in the event that the marketing year or season then current commenced prior to May 1, 1953, such parity price as of any date during such year or season shall be the parity price for the commodity published by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 29, 1953. The marketing year or season for a commodity shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and, in the case of a commodity which the Secretary determines is not marketed on a marketing year or season basis, shall be the calendar year.

SEC. 405. (a) The authority conferred by this title shall not be exercised with respect to the following:

(1) Prices or rentals for real property;

(2) Rates or fees charged for professional services; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to physicians employed in a professional capacity by licensed hospitals, clinics, and like medical institutions for the care of the sick or disabled; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to attorneys licensed to practice law employed in a professional capacity by an attorney or firm of attorneys engaged in the practice of his or their profession; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession;

(3) Prices or rentals for (A) materials furnished for publication by any press association or feature service, or (B) books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals, or newspapers, other than as waste or scrap; or rates charged by any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting or television station, a motion-picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities;

(4) Rates charged by any person in the business of selling or underwriting insurance;

(5) (A) Rates and charges by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended, and including compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, and charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others; charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common-carrier operations; and (B) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pickup and delivery and local transfer services: *Provided*, That no common carrier or

other public utility shall at any time after the President shall have issued any stabilization regulations and orders under subsection (a) of section 403 make any increase in its charges for property or services sold by it for resale to the public, for which application is filed after the date of issuance of such stabilization regulations and orders, before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase: *And provided further*, That the Office of Price Stabilization or its successor shall not intervene in any case involving increases in rates or charges proposed by any common carrier or other public utility except as provided in the preceding proviso;

(6) Margin requirements on any commodity exchange;

(7) Prices charged and wages paid for services performed by barbers and beauticians;

(8) Rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing;

(9) Wages, salaries, or other compensation of persons employed in small-business enterprises as defined in this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That the President may from time to time exclude from this exemption such enterprises on the basis of industries, types of business, occupations, or areas, if their exemption would be unstabilizing with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation, prices, or manpower, or would otherwise be contrary to the purposes of this act. A small-business enterprise, for the purpose of this paragraph, is any enterprise in which a total of eight or less persons are employed in all its establishments, branches, units, or affiliates;

(10) Prices charged and wages paid by bowling alleys;

(11) Wages paid for agricultural labor.

(b) The President, in or by any regulation or order, may provide exemptions for any materials or services, or transactions therein, or types of employment, with respect to which he finds that (1) such exemption is necessary to promote the national defense; or (2) it is unnecessary that ceilings be applicable to such materials or services, or transactions therein, or that compensation for such types of employment be stabilized, in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

(c) The powers granted in this title shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except where such action is affirmatively found by the President to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, or requirement under this title.

(d) Nothing in this title shall be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination or any restriction of the use of trade and brand names; (2) as authorizing the President to require the grade labeling of any materials; (3) as authorizing the President to standardize any materials or services, unless the President shall determine, with respect to such standardization, that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such materials or services; or (4) as authorizing any order of the President establishing price ceilings for different kinds, classes, or types of material or service, which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency.

(e) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall require any seller of materials at retail to limit his sales with reference to any highest price line offered for sale by him at any prior time.

(f) Where the sale or delivery of a material or service makes the person selling or delivering it liable for a State or local gross receipts tax or gross income tax, he may receive for the material or service involved, in addition to the ceiling price, (1) an amount equal to the amount of all such State and local taxes for which the transaction makes him liable, or (2) 1 cent, whichever is greater. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of tax liability shall be computed on shipping units at the ceiling price, and a fractional part of a cent in the amount of tax liability shall be disregarded unless it amounts to one-half cent or more, in which case it shall be increased to 1 cent.

(g) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by the State law (other than any so-called fair trade law) now in effect, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law.

SEC. 406. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with, and establish and utilize committees of, representatives of persons substantially affected by regulations or orders issued hereunder.

SEC. 407. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to sell or deliver, or in the regular course of business or trade to buy or receive, any commodity or service, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this title or of any regulation, order, or requirement issued thereunder, or to offer, solicit, attempt or agree to do any of the foregoing. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any payment made, either in money or property, by any person in violation of any such regulation, order, or requirement shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any such person for the purposes of any other law or regulation, including bases in determining gain for tax purposes.

(b) No employer shall pay, and no employee shall receive, any wage, salary, or other compensation in contravention of any regulation or order promulgated under this title. The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any wage, salary, or compensation payment made in contravention of any such regulation or order shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

SEC. 408. Nothing in this title shall be construed to require any person to sell any material or service, or to perform personal services.

SEC. 409. (a) At any time within 6 months after the effective date of any regulation or order relating to price controls under this title, or, in the case of new grounds arising after the effective date of any such regulation or order, within 6 months after such new grounds arise, any person subject to any provision of such regulation or order may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the President. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this section, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing, the President shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith. In the event that the President denies any such protest in whole or in part, he shall inform the protestant of the grounds upon which such decision is based, and of any economic data and other facts of which the President has taken official notice.

(b) In the administration of this title, the President may take official notice of economic data and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under section 708 of this act.

(c) Any proceedings under this section may be limited by the President to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs: *Provided, however*, That upon the request of the protestant, any protest filed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section shall, before denial in whole or in part, be considered by a board of review consisting of one or more officers or employees of the United States designated by the President in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by him. Such regulations shall provide that the board of review may conduct hearings and hold sessions in the District of Columbia or in any other place, as a board, or by subcommittees thereof, and shall provide that, upon the request of the protestants and upon a showing that material facts would be adduced thereby, subpenas shall issue to procure the evidence of persons, or the production of documents, or both. The President shall cause to be presented to the board such evidence, including economic data, in the form of affidavits or otherwise, as he deems appropriate in support of the provision against which the protest is filed. The protestant shall be accorded an opportunity to present rebuttal evidence in writing and oral argument before the board and the board shall make written recommendations to the President. The protestant shall be informed of the recommendations of the board and, in the event that the President rejects such recommendations in whole or in part, shall be informed of the reasons for such rejection.

(d) Any protest filed under this section shall be granted or denied by the President, or granted in part and the remainder of it denied within a reasonable time after it is filed. Any protestant who is aggrieved by undue delay on the part of the President in disposing of his protest may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the President to dispose of such protest within such time as may be fixed by the court. If the President does not act finally within the time fixed by the court, the protest shall be deemed to be denied at the expiration of that period.

SEC. 410. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the President, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the President has taken official notice. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of all questions determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper; to permanently enjoin or set aside,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in whole or in part, the regulation or order or the amendment of or supplement to the regulation or order protested; to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the President; to dismiss the petition; or to remand the proceeding to the President for further action in accordance with the court's decree: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the President at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. The findings of the President with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the President and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the President or included by the President in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the President. The President shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the President, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

(b) The Emergency Court of Appeals is hereby continued for the purpose of the exercise of the jurisdiction granted by this title, with the powers herein specified, together with the powers heretofore granted by law to such court which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this title. So far as necessary to decision, the court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and interpret the meaning or applicability of the terms of any official action under this title or under this act, as amended, of which this title is a part and with respect to this title. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this title.

(c) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a United States court of appeals as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any such regulation or order issued under this title. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

(d) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 411 or 709 of this act, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the President setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with section 409 of this title. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the President or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

(e) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 411 or 709 of this act, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

(1) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under subsection (d) of this section with respect to such provision;

(2) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under section 409 of this title prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 411 or 709 or this act, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, setting forth objections to the validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

(3) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under subsection (d) of this section with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, in the case of a proceeding under section 411 or 709 of this act, the court granting a stay under this subsection shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective, any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under section 409 of this title, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 411 or 709 of this act, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code; nor, except as provided in this section, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under this act.

SEC. 411. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the President any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 407 of this title, he may make application to any district court of the United States or any United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the President that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, with or without such injunction or restraining order, shall be granted without bond.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 407 of this title shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. Whenever the President has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

(c) If any person selling any material or service violates a regulation or order prescribing a ceiling or ceilings, the person who buys such material or service for use or consumption other than in the course of trade or business may, within 1 year from the date of the occurrence of the violation, except as hereinafter provided, bring an action against the seller on account of the overcharge. In any action under this subsection the seller shall be liable for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus whichever of the following sums is greater: (1) Such amount not more than three times the amount of the overcharge, or the overcharges, upon which the action is based as the court in its discretion may determine, or (2) an amount not less than $25 nor more than $50 as the court in its discretion may determine: *Provided, however*, That such amount shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation or order in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. For the purposes of this section the word "overcharge" shall mean the amount by which the consideration exceeds the applicable ceiling. If any person selling any material or service violates a regulation or order prescribing a ceiling or ceilings and the buyer either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the President may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period, or compromise with the seller the liability which might be assessed against the seller in such an action. If such action is instituted, or such liability is compromised by the President, the buyer shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations.

(d) Any action under subsection (c) by either the buyer or the President, as the case may be, may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction. A judgment in an action for damages, or a compromise, under subsection (c) shall be a bar to the recovery under that subsection of any damages in any other action against the same seller on account of sales made to the same purchaser prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered, or prior to such compromise. The President may not

institute any action under subsection (c) on behalf of the United States—

(1) if the violation arose because the person selling the material or service acted upon and in accordance with the written advice and instructions of the President or any official authorized to act for him; or

(2) if the violation arose out of the sale of any material or service to any agency of the Government, and such sale was made pursuant to the lowest bid made in response to an invitation for competitive bids.

(e) The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any payment made by way of fine pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, or any payment made to the United States or to any buyer in compromise or satisfaction of any liability or of any right of action, suit, or judgment, authorized pursuant to subsection (c) of this section for selling any material or service, in violation of a regulation or order providing a ceiling or ceilings, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any such person for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

(f) The term "court of competent jurisdiction" as used in this section shall mean any Federal court of competent jurisdiction regardless of the amount in controversy and any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 412. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with, and establish and authorize committees of, representatives of persons substantially affected by regulations or orders issued hereunder.

SEC. 413. Before initially issuing any regulation or order controlling prices or wages, salaries or other compensation authorized by this title, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council, by Executive order shall find and declare that the exercise of any such authority is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability; and in any event before imposing controls generally under this title, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council with respect thereto, shall by Executive order make a similar finding and declaration.

SEC. 414. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that price and wage controls, if activated, shall be terminated as soon thereafter as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that the President shall suspend price and wage controls in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relationship to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension.

SEC. 415. In the administration of this title, the President may suspend any requirements with respect to the furnishing of reports or other information relating to sales of materials or services at prices which are below ceiling, if such person certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices.

TITLE V—RENT CONTROL

SEC. 501. Subsection (c) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "at the close of April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "upon the expiration of title V of the Emergency Stabilization Act of 1953."

SEC. 502. Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) (A) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall remain in force after April 30, 1953, on a stand-by basis for the fixing of maximum rents—

"(i) in the areas described in subparagraph (1) (B) and (C) of this subsection in which maximum rents were in effect on April 30, 1953, and

"(ii) in any area which prior to or subsequent to April 30, 1953, is certified under subsection (l) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area;

but before initially invoking any authority granted by this title II as to areas in (i) or (ii), or both, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council, by Executive order shall find and declare that the exercise of any power conferred in this title II is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability.

"(B) In the case of housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established or reestablished pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the maximum rent shall be the maximum rent in effect on April 30, 1953, for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control plus or minus applicable adjustments; or if no maximum rent was in effect for such housing accommodations on such date, the maximum rent shall be the rent generally prevailing for comparable controlled housing accommodations within such area, plus or minus applicable adjustments."

SEC. 503. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(r) Regulations or orders under this title II shall be subject to the same proceedings for protest and review as are provided for regulations or orders relating to price controls by sections 409 and 410 of the Emergency Stabilization Act of 1953."

TITLE VI—CONTROL OF CONSUMER AND REAL ESTATE CREDIT

THIS TITLE AUTHORIZES THE REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT AND REAL ESTATE CONSTRUCTION CREDIT ONLY

SEC. 601. To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 386, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 921), to exercise consumer credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 8843 (August 9, 1941) until such time as the President determines that the exercise of such controls is no longer necessary, but in no event beyond the date on which this section terminates.

SEC. 602. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, the President is authorized from time to time to prescribe regulations with respect to such kind or kinds of real estate construction credit which thereafter may be extended as, in his judgment, it is necessary to regulate in order to prevent or reduce excessive or untimely use of or fluctuations in such credit. Such regulations may, among other things, prescribe maximum loan or credit values, minimum down payments in cash or property, trade-in or exchange values, maximum maturities, maximum amounts of credit, rules regarding the amount, form, and time of various payments, rules against any credit in specified circumstances, rules regarding consolidations, renewals, revisions, transfers, or assignments of credit, and rules regarding other similar or related matters. Such regulations may classify persons and transactions and may apply different requirements thereto, and may include such administrative provisions as in the judgment of the President are reasonably necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this section or to prevent evasions thereof.

In prescribing and suspending such regulations, including changes from time to time to take account of changing conditions, the President shall consider, among other factors, (1) the level and trend of real estate construction credit and the various kinds thereof, (2) the effect of the use of such credit upon (i) purchasing power and (ii) demand for real property and improvements thereon and for other goods and services, (3) the need in the national economy for the maintenance of sound credit conditions, and (4) the needs for increased defense production.

(b) No person shall extend or maintain any real estate construction credit, or renew, revise, consolidate, refinance, purchase, sell, discount, or lend or borrow on, any obligation arising out of any such credit, or arrange for any of the foregoing, in contravention of any regulation prescribed by the President pursuant to this section. Any person who extends or maintains any such credit, or renews, revises, consolidates, refinances, purchases, sells, discounts, or lends or borrows on, any obligation arising out of any such credit, or arranges for any of the foregoing, shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accountr, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records, and make such reports, under oath or otherwise, as the President may by regulation require as necessary or appropriate in order to effectuate the purposes of this section; and such accounts, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records shall be subject at any time to such reasonable periodic, special, or other examinations by examiners or other representatives of the President as the President may deem necessary or appropriate. The requirements of this section apply whether a person is acting as principal, agent, broker, vendor, or otherwise.

(c) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this section, the President by regulation may require transactions or persons or classes thereof subject to this section to be registered; and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the President by order may suspend any such registration for violation of this section or any regulation prescribed by the President pursuant to this section. The provisions of section 25 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, shall apply in the case of any such order of the President in the same manner that such provisions apply in the case of orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission under that act. In carrying out this section, the President may act through and may utilize the services of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Reserve banks, and any other agencies, Federal or State, which are available and appropriate.

(d) For the purposes of this section, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the following meanings, but the President may in his regulations further define such terms and, in addition, may define technical, trade, accounting, and other terms, insofar as any such definitions are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section.

(1) "Real estate construction credit" means any credit which (i) is wholly or partly secured by, (ii) is for the purpose of purchasing or carrying, (iii) is for the purpose of financing, or (iv) involves a right to acquire or use, new construction on real property or real property on which there is new construction. As used in this paragraph the term "new construction" means any structure, or any major addition or major improvement to a structure, which has not been begun before . As used in this paragraph the term "real property" includes leasehold and other interests therein. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the term "real estate construction

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

credit" shall not include any loan or loans made, insured, or guaranteed by any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the United States, or by any wholly owned Government corporation, or by any mixed ownership Government corporation as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended.

(2) "Credit" means any loan, mortgage, deed of trust, advance, or discount; any conditional sale contract; any contract to sell or sale or contract of sale, of property or services, either for present or future delivery, under which part or all of the price is payable subsequent to the making of such sale or contract; any rental-purchase contract, or any contract for the bailment, leasing, or other use of property under which the bailee, lessee, or user has the option of becoming the owner thereof, obligates himself to pay as compensation a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of the value thereof, or has the right to have all or part of the payments required by such contract applied to the purchase price of such property or similar property; any option, demand, lien, pledge, or similar claim against, or for the delivery of property or money; any purchase, discount, or other acquisition of, or any credit under the security of, any obligation or claim arising out of any of the foregoing; and any transaction or series of transactions having a similar purpose or effect.

SEC. 603. Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 601, 602, or 605 or any regulation or order issued thereunder, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 604. All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of credit controls under section 601 as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections 21 and 27.

SEC. 605. To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act the President may at any time or times, notwithstanding any other provision of law, reduce, for such period as he shall specify, the maximum authorized principal amounts, ratios of loan to value or cost, or maximum maturities of any type or types of loans on real estate which thereafter may be made, insured, or guaranteed by any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the United States Government, or by any wholly owned Government corporation or by any mixed-ownership Government corporation as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, or reduce or suspend any such authorized loan program, upon a determination, after taking into consideration the effect thereof upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy and the needs for increased defense production, that such action is necessary in the public interest: *Provided*, That in the exercise of these powers, the President shall preserve the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law. Subject to the provision of this section with respect to preserving the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law, the President may require lenders or borrowers and their successors and assigns to comply with reasonable conditions and requirements, in addition to those provided by other laws, in connection with any loan of a type which has been the subject of action by the President under this section. Such conditions and requirements may vary for classifications of persons or transactions as the President may prescribe, and failure to comply therewith shall constitute a violation of this section.

SEC. 606. Before any authority granted by this title may be initially invoked with respect to either consumer credit controls or real estate construction credit controls, the President, after consulting the National Advisory Council, by Executive order shall find and declare that the exercise of power to invoke consumer credit controls or real estate construction credit controls, or both, as the case may be, is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. As used in this act—

(a) The word "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or government agency.

(b) The word "materials" shall include raw materials, articles, commodities, products, supplies, components, technical information, and processes.

(c) The word "facilities" shall not include farms, churches, or other places of worship, or private dwelling houses.

(d) The term "national defense" means the operations and activities of the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other Government department or agency directly or indirectly and substantially concerned with the national defense, or operations or activities in connection with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The words "wages, salaries, and other compensation" shall include all forms of remuneration to employees by their employers for personal services, including, but not limited to, vacation and holiday payments, night shift and other bonuses, incentive payments, year-end bonuses, employer contributions to or payments of insurance or welfare benefits, employer contributions to a pension fund or annuity, payments in kind, and premium overtime payments.

SEC. 702. There is hereby established a National Advisory Council composed of members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The membership shall be representative of business and industry, agriculture, labor, the military, and consumers. The President shall designate a Chairman from among the members. Such Council shall, upon request, advise the President on general policies relating to economic mobilization, in addition to performing the functions prescribed elsewhere in this act. Each member may receive compensation not in excess of $50 per diem for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member, and, while away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while so employed. The members shall, in respect to their functions on the Council, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

SEC. 703. Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President may exercise any authority granted to him by this act without prior consultation with the National Advisory Council in the event of state of war exists.

SEC. 704. (a) In order to carry out the policy of the Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act—

(1) the President shall provide small-business concerns with full information concerning the provisions of this act relating to, or of benefit to, such concerns and concerning the activities of the various departments and agencies under this act;

(2) such business advisory committees shall be appointed as shall be appropriate for purposes of consultation during the period prior to activation of controls authorized by this act and in the formulation of rules, regulations, or orders, or amendments thereto issued under authority of this act, and in their formation there shall be fair representation for independent small, for medium, and for large business enterprises, for different geographical areas, for trade association members and nonmembers, and for different segments of the industry;

(3) in administering this act, such exemptions shall be provided for small-business concerns as may be feasible without impeding the accomplishment of the objectives of this act; and

(4) in administering this act, special provision shall be made for the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from small-business concerns.

(b) Whenever the President invokes the powers given him in this act to allocate, or approve agreements allocating, any material, to an extent which the President finds will result in a significant dislocation of the normal distribution in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as to make available, so far as practicable, for business and various segments thereof in the normal channel of distribution of such material, a fair share of the available civilian supply based, so far as practicable, on the share received by such business under normal conditions during a representative period preceding , and having due regard to the current competitive position of established business: *Provided*, That the limitations and restrictions imposed on the production of specific items shall not exclude new concerns from a fair and reasonable share of total authorized production.

SEC. 705. (a) The President may delegate any power or authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or agency of the Government, including any new agency or agencies, and he may authorize such redelegations by that officer or agency as the President may deem appropriate; except that he may not delegate the function of consulting with the National Advisory Council as required by this act. The President is authorized to create such new agencies, and to continue such existing agencies established under the Defense Production Act of 1950 or the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and any such agency may be placed on a standby basis prior to the activation of any title contained in this act, to perform such functions as the President may delegate to it. The President is authorized to appoint heads and assistant heads of any such new agencies, and other officials therein of comparable status, and to fix their compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the head of one such agency to be paid at a rate comparable to the compensation paid to the heads of executive departments of the Government, and other such heads, assistant heads, and officials at rates comparable to the compensation paid to the heads and assistant heads of independent agencies of the Government. Any officer or agency may employ civilian personnel for duty in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, as the President deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The head and assistant heads of any independent agency created to administer the authority conferred by title IV of this act shall be appointed by the President, by

and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall be included among the policy-making officers of each regional office administering the authority conferred by title IV of this act a resident of each State served by such office whose governor requests such representation.

SEC. 706. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act. Any regulation or order under this act may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the President are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this act, or to prevent circumvention or evasion, or to facilitate enforcement of this act, or any rule, regulation, or order issued under this act. No rule, regulation, or order issued under this act which restricts the use of natural gas (either directly, or by restricting the use of facilities for the consumption of natural gas, or in any other manner) shall apply in any State in which a public regulatory agency has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of this act.

SEC. 707. (a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of industry, business, financing, agriculture, labor, and other interests, with a view to encouraging the making by such persons with the approval by the President of voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of this act.

(b) No act or omission to act pursuant to this act which occurs while this act is in effect, if requested by the President pursuant to a voluntary agreement or program approved under subsection (a) and found by the President to be in the public interest as contributing to the national defense, shall be construed to be within the prohibition of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States. A copy of each such request intended to be within the coverage of this section, and any modification or withdrawal thereof, shall be furnished to the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission when made, and it shall be published in the Federal Register unless publication thereof would, in the opinion of the President, endanger the national security.

(c) The authority granted in subsection (b) shall be delegated only (1) to officials who shall for the purpose of such delegation be required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, unless otherwise required to be so appointed, and (2) upon the condition that such officials consult with the Attorney General and with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission not less than 10 days before making any request or finding thereunder, and (3) upon the condition that such officials obtain the approval of the Attorney General to any requests thereunder before making the request. For the purpose of carrying out the objectives of title I of this act, the authority granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be delegated except to a single official of the Government.

(d) Upon withdrawal of any request or finding made hereunder the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission to act by reason of such finding or request.

(e) The Attorney General is authorized to make, or request the Federal Trade Commission to make for him, surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of the administration of this act; and the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and the President at such times as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of any such surveys, including such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

(f) No voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section.

SEC. 708. (a) The President shall be entitled, while this act is in effect and for a period of 2 years thereafter, by regulation, subpena, or otherwise, to obtain such information from, require such reports and the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, and administer oaths and affirmations to, any person as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or the administration of this act and the regulations or orders issued thereunder. The President shall issue regulations insuring that the authority of this subsection will be utilized only after the scope and purpose of the investigation, inspection, or inquiry to be made have been defined by competent authority, and it is assured that no adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal or other responsible agency. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the President, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirement under this section or from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, documents, and other evidence in obedience to a subpena before any grand jury or in any court or administrative proceeding based upon or growing out of any alleged violation of this act on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to penalty or forfeiture; but no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture in any court, for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is so compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that such natural person so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying: *Provided*, That the immunity granted herein from prosecution and punishment and from any penalty or forfeiture shall not be construed to vest in any individual any right to priorities assistance, to the allocation of materials, or to any other benefit which is within the power of the President to grant under any provision of this act.

(c) The production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person usually keeps them, if, prior to the return date specified in the regulations, subpena, or other document issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the President with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into a stipulation with the President as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(d) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited or willfully fails to perform any act required by the above provisions of this section, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(e) Information obtained under this section which the President deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information shall not be published or disclosed unless the President determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the interest of the national defense, and any person willfully violating this provision shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(f) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.

SEC. 709. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the President any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the President that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, with or without such injunction or restraining order, shall be granted without bond.

(b) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction of violations of this act or any rule, regulation, order, or subpena thereunder, and of all civil actions under this act to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, this act or any rule, regulation, order, or subpena thereunder. Any criminal proceeding on account of any such violation may be brought in any district in which any act, failure to act, or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Any such civil action may be brought in any such district or in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business. Process in such cases, criminal or civil, may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found; to subpena for witnesses who are required to attend a court in any district in such case may run into any other district. The termination of the authority granted in any title or section of this act, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, shall not operate to defeat any suit, action, or prosecution, whether therefore or thereafter commenced, with respect to any right, liability, or offense incurred or committed prior to the termination date of such title or of such rule, regulation, or order. No costs shall be assessed against the United States in any proceeding under this act. All litigation arising under this act or the regulations promulgated thereunder shall be under the supervision and control of the Attorney General.

SEC. 710. No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any act or failure to act resulting directly or indirectly from compliance with a rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this act, notwithstanding that any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid. No person shall discriminate against orders or contracts to which priority is assigned or for which materials or facilities are allocated under title I of this act or under any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, by charging higher prices or by imposing different terms and conditions for such orders or contracts than for other generally comparable orders or contracts, or in any other manner.

SEC. 711. The functions exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of section 3 thereof. Any rule, regulation, or order, or amendment thereto, issued under authority of this act shall be accompanied by a statement that in the formulation thereof there has been consultation with industry representatives, including trade-association representatives, and that consideration has been given to their recommendations, or that special circumstances have rendered such consultation impracticable or contrary to the interest of the national defense, but no such rule, regulation, or order shall be invalid by reason of any subsequent finding by judicial or other authority that such a statement is inaccurate.

SEC. 712. (a) The President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, is authorized to place positions and employ persons temporarily in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act.

(b) The President is further authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, and subject to such regulations as he may issue, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation; and he is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99). Persons appointed under the authority of this subsection may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business pursuant to such appointment.

(c) The President is authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, to employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 55a of title 5 of the United States Code. Individuals so employed may be compensated at not in excess of $50 per diem and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while so employed. The President is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(d) The President may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize and establish such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed; and he is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of persons whose services are utilized under this subsection from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(e) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United states or any department or agency thereof (including any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives), receives, by virtue of his office or employment, confidential information, and (1) uses such information in speculating directly or indirectly on any commodity exchange, or (2) discloses such information for the purpose of aiding any other person so to speculate, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. As used in this section, the term "speculate" shall not include a legitimate hedging transaction, or a purchase or sale which is accompanied by actual delivery of the commodity.

(f) The President, when he deems such action necessary, may make provision for the printing and distribution of reports, in such number and in such manner as he deems appropriate, concerning the actions taken to carry out the objectives of this act.

SEC. 713. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this act by the President and such agencies as he may designate or create. Funds made available for the purposes of this act may be allocated or transferred for any of the purposes of this act, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any agency designated to assist in carrying out this act. Funds so allocated or transferred shall remain available for such period as may be specified in the acts making such funds available.

SEC. 714. (a) The Joint Committee on Defense Production (hereinafter referred to as the committee) created by the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby continued and shall continue to be composed of 10 members as follows:

(1) Five members who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, three from the majority and two from the minority party, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; and

(2) Five members who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, three from the majority and two from the minority party, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee.

A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and the other a Member of the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs authorized by this act, both before and during activation of controls, and all problems affecting consumer interest, giving special attention to prices charged the ultimate consumer for food, fuel, and clothing and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of this act. Upon request, the committee shall aid the standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of the programs authorized by this act; and it shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. Any department, official, or agency administering any of such programs shall, at the request of the committee, consult with the committee, from time to time, with respect to their activities under this act.

(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena (to be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee) or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the revised statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(e) The expenses of the committee under this section, which shall not exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made without regard to any other provision of law.

SEC. 715. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 716. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 717. No person may be employed under this act who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 718. (a) Title VII of this act shall become effective upon the date of enactment of this act.

(b) Titles IV and V of this act shall become effective on May 1, 1953.

(c) Titles I, II, III, and VI of this act shall become effective on July 1, 1953.

SEC. 719. (a) (1) Except as otherwise in this act provided, this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the expiration of 90 days after the President proclaims that the existing international emergency requiring the involvement of Armed Forces of the United States in actual hostilities in the Korean conflict has ended.

(2) Title III of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1954.

(3) Title VII of this act shall terminate at the time provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or at the close of June 30, 1954, whichever is later.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing—

(1) The Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may terminate this act prior to the termination otherwise provided therefor.

(2) The Congress may also provide by concurrent resolution that any section of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate prior to the termination otherwise provided therefor.

(3) Any agency created under this act may, in the discretion of the President, be continued in existence for purposes of liquidation for not to exceed 6 months after the termination of the provision authorizing the creation of such agency.

(c) The termination of any section of this act, or of any agency or corporation utilized under this act, shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, guarantee, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this act.

The statement and summary presented by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I have just introduced a bill, the Economic Stabilization Act of 1953—which proposes, among other things, a stand-by system of economic controls.

As Members of this body well know, and as does anybody who is at all acquainted with my record on various economic and social questions, I have always been prominently identified with those who believe and strongly advocate that the less Government control and the less Government interference in our economic and social life, the better. I have been nourished on freedom.

To me free competitive enterprise is not a glib phrase or some loose or abstract terminology. To me it has been, truly, a way of life. It is a way of life that has profound meaning for me and which I have done everything in my power to preserve, strengthen, and develop and to which I shall continue to dedicate my life.

It is exactly because our system of free competitive enterprise means too much to me, and because I believe American enterprise unfettered by controls and Government regulation functions at its optimum that I am introducing the Economic Stabilization Act of 1953 today.

No doubt, this sounds somewhat strange and paradoxical. But I have only decided to introduce the bill after a great deal of thoughtful deliberation based on long experience working on the subject of economic controls as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and as one who had personal experience with controls as an industrialist during World War II.

You will recall when I first came to the Senate in 1945 I fought hard along with other Senators to amend the price-control bill so that it would operate more equitably, efficiently, and without unnecessary interference with our production machinery. You will remember, also, when it appeared to many of us that the price-control program was doing more harm than good to our production and distribution machinery that I with others sought to abolish it.

More recently you will recall my efforts in attempting to amend the Defense Production Act so that it would be administered more fairly and so as to insure that production would not be discouraged.

No one who understands and appreciates our American economic system, no Member of this illustrous body—all good independent and free Americans—likes or prefers a system of price and production controls operating over our economy. A great majority of us will be glad to see the end of all price controls on April 30. Not one Member of this body, I am confident, wants to see controls continued one day longer than they think they are necessary. No one, least of all I, want to see controls ever reimposed once they are removed.

Certainly this is our feeling now after 2 years of economic controls. It was our feeling in 1946 after 4 years of controls.

Yet, just as surely as Congress voted for the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 after the Japanese invaded Pearl Harbor, and again in 1950 after the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, just as surely shall we, much as we detest controls over our economic life, do the very same thing again.

It is my considered judgment that it is out of the haste with which Congress and the administration has had to act in enacting the legislation and in getting the program into operation that a very large number of our difficulties and problems with the operation of a control program arises. When you stop to consider the difficulties of trying artificially to control and direct an economy as large, varied, and as complicated and dynamic as ours, you wonder how anyone would be so bold as to attempt it. Yet, attempt it we did, and on balance, it seems to me, it was better for America and the world that we did. Naturally any system of controls will give rise to some problems and will result in a certain amount of inequities and unfairness. The problem is how to minimize them. To a large extent this is a problem which takes time, hard study, experience, and continuous cooperation between business, labor, Congress, and the administration.

It is the height of impracticability to expect that Congress can do a proper job of legislating a good controls law into effect in a period of less than 3 months, and for such a law to begin properly functioning within 7 months from the incidence of the request for the legislation. To expect Congress to act within a few days or a few weeks, or for an agency to begin a reasonably adequate administration of such an act earlier than 4 months from the date it is enacted is to ignore valuable experience. But even 3 months is not enough time in which to frame a good, workable, and fair law, especially in a time of high tension, emotion, and accelerated economic change.

But what happens in a period of 3 months or 7 or 8 months after the incidence of an economic emergency? The very evil which we try to control or stop makes its greatest headway. People become panicky and in an effort to avoid the higher prices which they expect, rush out and clean off the shelves, hoard for anticipated needs; savings are converted into goods, and the stream of spending expands in an accelerated and explosive fashion.

Business does likewise. It expands greatly its buying, accumulates excessive inventories and sells them at higher and higher prices. The price mechanism almost ceases to function for consumers and businessmen alike. Prices become a secondary consideration and the inflationary spiral is already viciously destroying our purchasing power and increasing the cost of our defense production and our cost of Government.

In June 1950, when the Korean conflict began, industry was producing at very high levels and consumer demand was being fairly well satisfied. There were no backlogs of demand like there were after World War II and no cut-backs were called for in the production of consumer durables. Yet the vicious inflationary process took place pretty much in the manner I just described. From June 1950 to January 1951 when price controls were finally imposed, the cost of living had increased by 7 percent. It is estimated that this increase cost the American citizens approximately $18,000,000,000.

More important than the money it cost is the human suffering which is unnecessarily created and the strain and stresses it puts on our economic system. It creates all sorts of dislocations, inequities, disequilibriums, friction, and disruptions in our personal lives and in our productive system which take years to rectify, and in many cases are never corrected. Most important, it delays and hinders our chief objective at such times—organizing and increasing our production potential for our national defense.

Now, I am not so naive as to think an economy like ours can shift from a peacetime economy to wartime economy, without some inflationary effects. But the effects need not be so great, nor must they take place before the shifts or changes in production actually occur.

Members of this body will recall how in June 1950 I urged an across-the-board freeze on all prices, wages, and salaries. If we had been able to do that when the Korean conflict began and adjusted the inequities later, we would have avoided a large part of the inflation we experienced in the 8 months before the freeze was finally imposed.

The bill which I have introduced would permit the President, after certain findings have been made, or in the event a state of war should come to pass, God forbid, to freeze all prices, wages, and salaries as of the business day preceding the date of the imposition of the freeze. He would then have 3 months, but in no event more than 6 months, to make adjustments in such prices, wages, and salaries, the adjustments to be made in accordance with fair and equitable standards known and clearly set forth in the bill. Imagine how fortunate we would have been to have such a law on the books on June 24, 1950. Or, think of how foolish it is not to be prepared for such an eventuality—especially when we know there is an enemy increasingly arming itself for the purpose of destroying us.

We are not a militaristic nation. Yet we prepare for war. We are not a nation of soldiers, yet we have a selective service and a military reserve system in peacetime. The fact is that we do prepare for war and have such a system ready to operate effectively and efficiently to help mobilize our military might. This is an important reason why we have been able to do that part of our job with relative smoothness, speed, and with a minimum amount of dislocation. There is no question, if we were similarly prepared for economic mobilization, we would be able to do that part of our job more efficiently, effectively, and with considerably less dislocation.

At the present time our economy is in fairly good economic shape. Prices are in fairly normal relationship. We are close enough in tune to controls to know a good deal about them and their administration—in the Congress, in the Executive Offices, and throughout industry. We are not being moved by emotion or fearing imminent changes in our economy, or in our consumer needs, or do we expect radical changes in our industrial outlook. We have a law that is operating and being tested daily. We know its faults and its good points, if anyone will agree such a law can have good points. It seems to me, therefore, that this is the ideal time for Congress to legislate on the subject of controls, free as it is from the stress, strain, and tensions of a great national emergency.

Moreover, as I indicated before, 3 months is hardly enough time in which to write an economic controls law from scratch. Even starting, as I do, pretty much from our present law, and with all the advantages the present time offers in writing such a law, the existence of such a law on a standby basis would give those who would be administering it, and those business and labor advisory groups who would be constantly meeting and working together with them, time and opportunity to perfect recommendations for changes in the law or in regulations which might be issued if such a law

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ever were invoked. Congress would receive monthly reports on the agency's operations and would continuously be kept informed and educated with respect to the various problems that arise or might develop if the controls were invoked. In my conception such a standby agency's important functions and that of the advisory committees would be constantly to study and agree on ways and means of perfecting the basic statute and develop efficient, effective, and fair means of administering it.

It seems to me that industry and agriculture, most of all, would benefit from such a standby program. During previous times industry and agriculture had no such opportunity to help in framing the law or to assist to any great extent in helping to develop and formulate the regulations. Under the pressure of time, it was almost impossible, even if the administration had desired it, for business and agricultural groups to play such an important and constructive a part in the controls program. Speed was of the very essence. A standby type of organization and a standby type of law will afford the time and the opportunity for business to share its know-how with the administration and the Congress in the formulation, revision, administration, and operation of such a law, should it ever be invoked. Without such a law, this is for all practical purposes impossible.

In addition to this, industry and agriculture and labor representatives can become acquainted with the key staff that will operate the program, if such a time should ever arrive; and they can be familiar with the organizational structure and the full meaning of the law and the regulations issued under it. In a word, millions of man-days of study, frustrating search for information, advice, and decision would be spared, not to mention the millions of man-days saved business, the administration, and the Congress in attempting to straighten out and revise what had already been done improperly or unfairly.

Also, industry, in the process of working with such a standby agency, in constantly thinking about such problems that might arise, would keep itself educated with respect to the law and its operation and would, therefore, be able to adjust itself to its requirements more efficiently and with less cost in time and money. Personnel who, because of their knowledge of the law and of the standby agency, would not only be valuable to the industry involved, but such personnel would also be listed in the roster of qualified persons available in the event of activation of controls as provided in the bill.

With industry being forced, as it were, to meet with those studying price, wage, and salary trends and other conditions in the various industries and in the economy generally, it is quite conceivable that many of the problems that might arise and eventually lead to the imposition of controls could be foreseen and adjusted, or taken care of volur tarily without the need for invoking the law.

With the bill providing, as it does, a National Advisory Council composed of distinguished representatives of business, industry, agriculture, labor, the military, and the consumers, all of whom are subject to Senate confirmation, to advise the President on the imposition of each of the controls in the different titles of the bill and to advise the President generally on policies relating to general mobilization, I am sure you will agree that we have provided sufficient opportunity for the President to secure the best advice available before taking any action. I am satisfied that such a council will prevent any hasty or unwise decisions in the use of any of the authority granted in the bill.

The most important functions price, wage, and salary controls can perform, in my opinion, is to give assurance to the consumers that prices will remain relatively stable. Once the freeze took effect in January 1951, the average citizen seemed satisfied that prices were not going up very much more, and immediately the enormous pressure on consumer durables began to drop off. With the outlook for prices fairly stable, the average consumer purchased only what he needed, and again he began to save rather than spend his surplus. It is this psychological effect that price control has on the consumer that encourages him to save rather than spend. This in turn reduces the flow of income into consumer-goods industries and relieves the marginal pressures on prices for these goods. At the same time the increased savings serve as a source of investment capital for defense industries. All this makes price controls an effective instrument of economic stability in periods of emergency.

A stand-by law would cause consumers and businessmen to have that same sense of assurance that prices would not be allowed to spiral upward, and as a result they would not rush out with the first sign of an emergency in panic to stock up on all they could get their hands on. Thus prices would tend to remain more stable, as would savings, and the very need for invoking a control program might be avoided by the very confidence it would engender. If controls finally had to be invoked, fear of price increases would be considerably lessened and so to would the problem of controlling such prices.

I have devoted most of my remarks, thus far, to my philosophy and approach to the problem of price, wage, and salary control, and the need for and the good practical sense of a stand-by system of such controls. The reason I have done so is because this is the more controversial part of my proposal and, if I may say, the side which I have heard very little argument for, and which, it seems to me, ought to get some very serious consideration. It should be given especially serious consideration by those who have been most unsatisfied with controls. I think a stand-by control law offers the best means that I know of by which the most irritating and unsatisfactory effects of controls can be eliminated or considerably lessened.

Very briefly, the bill would continue until June 30, 1954, the various loan, purchase, loan-guaranty, and development programs of financial aid to business and would likewise extend the Small Defense Plants Administration.

It would continue the priority and allocations programs of title I, and the power of condemnation and requisition in title II, of the Defense Production Act, on a stand-by basis. The authority in these titles could only be invoked after consultation with the National Advisory Council, except in the case of war, in which event the President may act immediately in respect to all titles.

Similarly, rent control would be continued on a stand-by basis with the National Advisory Council advice necessary to invoke it initially on critical defense areas. Its advice would also be necessary when rent controls are initially invoked on defense rental areas.

Credit control would likewise be on a stand-by basis and could be invoked initially on consumer goods (regulation W) only after consulting the National Advisory Council. A similar procedure would be required for the activation of real-estate credit control (regulation X).

Price and wage controls would be continued on a stand-by basis and the necessity of advising with the National Advisory Council would be required before invoking initially either selective or general controls. With a few exceptions the price and wage provisions are similar to those in the present act. It is left to Congress to decide on the representative base period for adjusting ceiling prices after the freeze which would be imposed on prices and wages on the business day preceding the imposition of the control or controls.

The necessity for a stand-by bill will expire with our present emergency and therefore titles I, II, IV, V, VI expire 90 days after the end of hostilities in Korea. Title III is extended for a definite period of 1 year and expires June 30, 1954. Title VII which contains general provisions and is needed when any other titles of the act are in effect expires at the end of hostilities in Korea or June 30, 1954, whichever event occurs last.

In introducing this bill, I am aware that there are many who have long shared my point of view on most economic and social problems who may disagree with me at this point. To those, all I can say is that my views have not changed. My experience and my study of this subject have increased my knowledge about it. In sponsoring this legislation, it is my most profound and considered opinion that I am laying the best groundwork I know of to further promote and facilitate the system of free competitive enterprise, which has been the basis of my whole economic philosophy. It would take a great deal less courage and would result in a great deal less criticism, no doubt, if I chose not to introduce such a bill. But I believe it is my responsibility and my duty as a Senator and one who is privileged to serve as the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to bring this bill before you for your thoughtful deliberation and action.

The bill does not contain all the provisions that I would prefer it to have, nor does it exclude many of the provisions that I would prefer to see out of the bill. It probably can be improved in many, many respects; but I believe it does offer a reasonable and satisfactory basis upon which you can begin thinking and acting. It is modeled after the most recent bill Congress enacted last session.

If all my efforts but result in greater knowledge, if not action, my purpose will have been served.

Summary of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1953

The bill permits price, wage, and rent controls to expire April 30, 1953, and allocation and other controls to expire June 30, 1953, as provided in the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952. The loan, loan guaranty, purchase, and development programs providing financial aid to defense industries, authorized in title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Small Defense Plants Administration, authorized in section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, are continued until June 30, 1954.

The bill continues on a stand-by basis until 90 days after the termination of hostilities in the Korean conflict power to establish priorities and make allocations, to requisition and condemn, to control prices, rents, consumer and real estate credit, and to stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation.

The bill recognizes in the declaration of policy that direct controls are incompatible with the American free enterprise system and that, since prices are now generally in normal relationship, direct controls are no longer necessary to maintain economic stability. But it further recognizes that the ever-present threat of further Communist aggression and that the speedy destructive nature of war requires swift Executive action. Controls should only be invoked if an emergency develops involving serious economic dislocations threatening the national security and welfare.

A National Advisory Council composed of members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, who are representative of business and industry, agriculture, labor, the military, and consumers, is established by the bill.

Before the President can initially invoke any controls under any title of the bill he is required to consult with this council. The

council is also authorized to advise the President on general policies relating to economic mobilization.

The President is required to consult with the National Advisory Council before he can initially impose selective controls on prices and wages and again before he can impose general controls on prices and wages. Likewise, the President is required to consult with the National Advisory Council before he can initially impose rent controls in an area declared to be a critical defense area and again before he can initially impose rent controls in a rental area that had taken affirmative action in requesting that the area remain under Federal rent control prior to September 30, 1952. He would, similarly, have to consult with the Council before he can impose either regulation X or regulation W. Only in the event that a state of war exists can the President invoke any of the controls without consulting the National Advisory Council.

The priorities and allocations title (I), and the requisitioning and condemnation power title (II), except for the trigger device of consulting with the National Advisory Council, are the same as in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The credit control title (VI) is substantially the same as title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as originally enacted, except for the trigger device. Title III (expansion of productive capacity and supply) is the same as title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, but it also contains provisions relating to the Small Defense Plants Administration which are identical with the provisions of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This title is operative after June 30, 1953, without use of the trigger device. It expires on June 30, 1954. The protest, court review, appeal, and penalty provisions are substantially the same as in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The price and wage stabilization title (IV), except for the added trigger device, follows in general the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The special provisions for agricultural commodities are the same except for certain provisions in connection with milk ceiling prices. The bill does not contain the 1952 amendment excluding fresh and processed fruits and vegetables from controls.

As stand-by agencies the OPS and WSB would be required constantly to study and evaluate wage and price trends, to formulate and improve general regulation techniques of controls, patterns of organization and procedure in case of future use, to maintain a roster of qualified persons who would be available in the event of the activation of controls, to advise the President generally with respect to the proper administration of the act, and to make monthly and special reports to Congress on its activities and its recommendations. The President is given the power, after affirmative action on his part, to continue any existing control agencies and also to create any new agencies he deems necessary during the period when controls are in a stand-by status.

Whenever the President takes any price or wage action, selectively or generally, he is required to freeze, either selectively or generally as the case may be, prices and wages at the levels prevailing on the business day preceding the day on which the action was taken. He is then required within 90 days, if possible, but in any event within 6 months, to adjust such price ceiling or ceilings and wages.

In adjusting such price ceiling or ceilings and wages the President is authorized in accordance with the same general requirements of the Defense Production Act to take into consideration comparable prices, rentals, commissions, margins, rates, fees, charges and allowances, and comparable salaries, wages, and other compensation which he finds to be representative of those prevailing in a base period, the dates of which are left blank. The bill provides that no such ceilings shall be established for the purpose of controlling profits.

A number of the technical and administrative provisions which were added to the Defense Production Act in 1951 and 1952 to correct what the Congress believed were inequities resulting from the administration of the act or were caused by particular situations or circumstances which existed at the time were not included in the provisions of this bill. Accordingly, the Capehart, Herlong, and Fugate amendments and certain minor administrative and technical amendments were not included in this bill.

The Wage Stabilization Board authorized by the bill has substantially the same powers as in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The bill provides that the 15 members shall be representative of the general public, labor, business, and industry, leaving the exact composition of the Board for the President to determine.

This bill authorizes the President to encourage and promote voluntary action by business, agriculture, labor, and the consumer, but he is not required to utilize the voluntary procedure before invoking the control provisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Indiana whether the bill which he is introducing contains in it a provision for stand-by legislation on price-and-wage controls in the event of a national emergency?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly what it does contain. It does contain such a provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With respect to prices and wages?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and also with respect to rents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does that not differ somewhat from the message on the state of the Union which the President has delivered today?

Mr. CAPEHART. It certainly does to that extent.

THE CALENDAR—BILL PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under Senate rule VIII, a call of the calendar is mandatory on Monday, unless suspended by unanimous consent. There is one bill on the calendar, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 242, to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the bill go over. I do not think any notice was given of it. It is no doubt a meritorious bill, but I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Robert W. Burgess, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Winthrop W. Aldrich to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I anticipate that there will be a voice vote on this nomination, and I should like the record to show that the senior Senator from North Dakota voted against it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations give us a statement regarding Mr. Aldrich, setting forth why, in the opinion of the committee, Mr. Aldrich is qualified to serve as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to address myself to the request made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the nomination of Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain, has approved the nomination and recommends that it be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich is a son of former Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island. He is a graduate of Harvard University, from which he received the degree of bachelor of arts in 1907 and the degree of bachelor of laws in 1910. He received the degree of doctor of laws from Colgate University in 1937; from Northeastern University, in 1938; from Washington and Jefferson College in 1939; from Brown University in 1944; from Columbia University in 1946; from New York University in 1950, and from Georgetown University in 1952.

Mr. Aldrich's nomination was referred to the committee on January 23, 1953. He appeared at a hearing held on January 29, at which time he very frankly discussed his affairs and his point of view with the committee. The vote of the committee recommending confirmation of his nomination was unanimous, with the exception of one vote, that of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

As I said, Mr. Aldrich is a son of former Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island. He became president, and later chairman of the board, of Chase National Bank of New York. Mr. Aldrich has had extensive experience in international affairs generally, and in Great Britain in particular, which the committee believes

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

makes him well qualified to represent the United States in London.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator mind being interrupted, or would he prefer to finish his statement before yielding for a question? I will follow the Senator's pleasure.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator tell the Senate anything in regard to any international holdings on the part of the bank of which Mr. Aldrich has been president?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. That was gone into very thoroughly. As I recall, the testimony shows that the bank has no international holdings, and that all it does in its London office is limited to dealings back and forth, as it were, over the counter.

Mr. MORSE. Did the committee go into the question of the holdings of some of the major clients of the bank in international cartels?

Mr. WILEY. I recall no questions relative thereto, but as Mr. Aldrich has sold his interest, and, as I recall, has no further interest in the bank except his interest in a fund from which he derives a pension, that matter, as I understand, would not have any bearing at this time.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator expresses the view of the committee that, insofar as no present holdings on the part of Mr. Aldrich himself are found to exist, the fact that he has been president of the bank, advising with clients, as bankers do, in regard to their great economic empires that spread around the world in no way creates any problem as to the wisdom of this appointment. It creates no affinity of interest on the part of Mr. Aldrich in the perpetuation of a system of international cartels, which in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon perhaps are a very serious threat to the preservation of peace in the world.

Mr. WILEY. I am not informed as to the existence of what the Senator claims to be facts. I may say that Mr. Aldrich, contrary to the accepted opinion, is a relatively poor man. His total estate, I understand, is worth about $300,000, as I think the testimony shows. That does not include the pension fund.

As to the bank's having dealings with international concerns, an institution such as the Chase National Bank undoubtedly does have. But what surprised me was that the testimony shows that it had very few foreign offices. I think it has an office in Canada and an office in London. There were inquiries as to other places, where it had no offices. The Senator from North Dakota corrects me as to the office in Canada. It had no offices in Canada. I stand corrected as to that.

Mr. Aldrich was admitted to the New York bar in 1912. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of positions or offices formerly held by Mr. Aldrich.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Formerly member of law firms Byrne, Cutcheon & Taylor and Murray, Aldrich & Webb; president, Equitable Trust Co. of New York; director, Federal Reserve Bank of New York; trustee, Rockefeller Foundation; trustee, General Education Board; overseer, Harvard College; founder and president, British War Relief Society, during World War II; president, National War Fund, World War II; chairman, President Truman's Committee on Financing Foreign Trade, from its foundation until it was disbanded (1945–50); president, International Chamber of Commerce, 1945–47.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Aldrich resigned from those various positions. His only present connections are as trustee of the Riverside Presbyterian Church, trustee of Presbyterian Hospital, president of the visiting committee of Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and as a member of the Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Aldrich occupied all of the following positions or offices until the time of his nomination to be Ambassador to Great Britain, from which positions or offices he has now resigned. He was chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, a director of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., director of the International Paper Co., director of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., director of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., director of the New York Central Railroad Co., president and director of the Chase Safe Deposit Co., director of the Discount Corp., trustee of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, treasurer and member of the executive committee of the Welfare Council of New York, vice president of the National Institute of Social Sciences, director of the American Cancer Society, director of the Nassau Hospital Association, trustee of Barnard College, and president of the board of managers of the Home for Incurables.

He has had military service, and has been a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve from 1930 to date.

I might state further, Mr. President, that he was president of the National Chamber of Commerce from 1945 to 1947. He resigned from the positions which I have just enumerated when he was nominated to be Ambassador to Great Britain.

The committee discussed with Mr. Aldrich some of the problems, particularly economic problems, which will confront him in London, and was favorably impressed with his grasp of world monetary and economic affairs. The committee believes Mr. Aldrich is well qualified to make an outstanding contribution to Anglo-American relations, and it recommends that the Senate confirm his nomination promptly.

Mr. President, it has been stated that Mr. Aldrich was the head of the Chase National Bank. In this world where problems are so complex, as has just been outlined by the President of the United States in his speech before the joint session of the Congress, it is well that America should have the best brains in key positions. Through the years Mr. Aldrich has been privileged to serve in various positions, and the fact that he has accumulated merely $300,000 indicates that he is the type of man we need in positions of trust and of leadership.

I believe he is a man who can go to London—and, after all, London is still very important—and serve the best interests of his country.

I particularly inquired of Mr. Aldrich in relation to a statement made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that many of our posts are over-staffed, and he stated that that was one of the things which he would look into. He said that he himself felt that we should not apply meat-ax methods, but that if there is excess overhead he will see to it that the situation is properly corrected.

I have personally known the distinguished gentleman only 2 or 3 weeks. I met him when I was at the United Nations. That was my first acquaintance with him. I met him again when he was a guest at the home of Mr. Dulles, where I happened to be at the time. I saw him the third time in Washington. My impression of him is that in him we have a man who is competent and able and who has a selfless desire to serve the Republic in this period. I wish we had more of that type of person in positions of trust.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator also tell us that Mr. Aldrich has been decorated by the British Government?

Mr. WILEY. There was evidence of a certain type of humanitarian service he had rendered. As I recall, there was a joint relief society, in which France and England participated, and of which he was the founder and president. Then the society was divided, and he engaged in the selfless work of war relief during World War II, and for that service he was given some decoration. I have forgotten just what it was.

I again say, Mr. President, that, in my humble opinion, he is the type of man who undertakes to fill a position not for what he can get out of it, but for what he can give. We need more and more of that type of person.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my dissent will be very brief.

I think it is most unfortunate, in fact, I think it is very undiplomatic of the Eisenhower administration, to nominate for the Ambassador's post in London the head of a great financial institution, the Chase National Bank, which, rightly or wrongly, has come to symbolize in many areas of the world American dollar diplomacy. I think it is very unfortunate and is anything but diplomatic to appoint to the ambassadorship to the British Empire a man who in the minds of many Englishmen, and particularly those who are to be found in the party affiliations of the Laborites, is looked upon as a symbol of economic exploitation of peoples in the backward areas of the world. I think it is most unfortunate to appoint to this particular position, when we are trying to develop the unity we need in Western Europe to meet the great threat of Russian communism, a man who personifies, rightly or wrongly, in the eyes of many Europeans, the American dollar sign.

Because I think it is an undiplomatic appointment I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination. I think Aldrich has too much self-interest in the appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and con-

sent to the nomination of Winthrop W. Aldrich to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, may I inquire if I correctly understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say that Mr. Aldrich is worth only $300,000?

Mr. WILEY. That is my recollection. He estimated that his capital investment was approximately $300,000.

Mr. MURRAY. At one time he was reputed to be a very wealthy man.

Mr. WILEY. I know nothing about that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator from Montana is mistaken. The wife of Mr. Aldrich is very wealthy.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that Mr. Aldrich also is very wealthy. He appeared before a committee of the Senate in 1938——

Mr. WILEY. Much water has gone over the dam since that time.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that, but at that time he took a very strong position against the economic reforms which had taken place in this country. He said he was opposed to the Federal deposit insurance system which we have adopted in this country, and he also criticized very severely the Securities and Exchange Commission which undertook to regulate the New York Stock Exchange. At that time I asked him what his objection was, and he said it went too far. I said, "Do you not think the reform should go far enough to prevent Wall Street from cheating the American people out of hundreds of millions of dollars by manipulations of stocks?"

He seemed to think that the stock exchanges of the country should not be regulated.

It seems to me we are selecting a man who represents great wealth, and I am sure he must have great wealth himself. I know the Chase National Bank, because of many of its manipulations, came into very serious criticism following the crash in Wall Street in 1929. It sold people its own stock across the country and many American people were influenced into buying it at that time. The stock was manipulated in such a manner that people were induced to buy it, thinking they were investing their money in sound and safe stock, but very soon the stock began to go down.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate examined into the operations of those in control of the Chase National Bank and found many instances of manipulations.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if Mr. Aldrich has only $300,000, he will not be able to represent very well the position of Ambassador to Great Britain, because it will probably require a little more money than that if he is going to represent the conservative, reactionary interests.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Montana has filled the RECORD with the statements he has just made. First, his attitude implies that because a man represents wealth, he is a crook; second, that if he represents wealth, but does not have wealth of his own, he is a crook. I do not like to hear that kind of talk on the floor of the Senate.

I feel that if there is anything that should be said about the nomination of Mr. Aldrich, it is that the great President of the United States has seen fit to send his nomination to the Senate for confirmation. We have listened to the President today, and we must say that he showed a pretty thorough grasp of the issues before the American people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. In a moment. Let me carry through with my thought.

I say that the President showed a good grasp of the issues now confronting this country. Among other things, he said he wanted to get rid of the crookedness and the graft that have come to light, and he is choosing people whom he will hold accountable to see that the house is cleaned.

The President chose Mr. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense. As the evidence shows, Mr. Wilson was a rich man, yet he set an example before the country by offering to take a loss of $600,000. I wonder how many of us, faced with a similar situation, would be able to meet the issue squarely, as did Mr. Wilson. He is the type of man we want to have in public office. Furthermore we want men who can create wealth, who can create jobs, who can bring about harmony.

Such a man is found in the person who has had the experience Mr. Aldrich has had in various organizations, a man who has engaged in eleemosynary activities, for which he was decorated, a man who now says that, outside of his pension fund, he estimates the total market value of his assets to be $300,000, a man who has lived a long life, and who now desires to render public service in one of the key positions of our Government.

There was no claim by anyone that Mr. Aldrich was dishonest, that he did not have competency, that he was not efficient. There is nothing to that effect in the testimony. To the contrary, it was demonstrated by the Republicans and the Democrats, including every member of the committee, that he was an ideal man for the position to which he had been appointed, because all members of the committee voted to confirm the nomination, except the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who said he would not support confirmation of the nomination. That is the situation as it stands.

I am now very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a moment in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I had not intended to say anything, but the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], by his comments, has moved me to make a few remarks.

I am perfectly happy to have the Senator from Wisconsin express his views as to the address just delivered by the President, but I do not wish to be included in the Senator's use of the plural "we," because I do not think the address by the President showed any such thing as the Senator from Wisconsin has indicated. So far as my judgment is concerned, the address was full of some interesting preachments, and some sound principles. I only pray that it will not take us down toward the goal of war, which I say because I think the President's discussion of Formosa was most unfortunate. I would have been very happy to have the President of the United States discuss the Formosa issue after he had given us evidence that there also had been discussion with our allies about it.

We cannot avoid the fact that at the time the United States became embroiled in the Korean war, we moved very quickly to make it a United Nations war. Although the order of the then President of the United States in regard to the use of the Seventh Fleet was in a very real sense a unilateral order, it was, nevertheless, an order upon which our allies have come to rely.

So far as the major premise is concerned, let me make very clear that I am anxious to have us take the steps necessary to guarantee the security of my country at all times. I recognize that the greatest threat to my country is Russia, and, further, I do not have any doubt about what her intentions will be if Russia ever catches us off guard and finds us weak enough. In that event, she will probably try to destroy us. That is why I think it is so important that we move shoulder to shoulder with our allies on the whole international front. I do not see any escape from the fact that our allies have come to accept the program in Asia as an allied program. A part of that program has been the position we have taken in connection with the use of the Seventh Fleet.

What concerns me in following the recommendation of the President today is what is going to happen if Nationalist China should decide that it wants to fight, and then moves on to the mainland of China, is driven off, let us assume hypothetically for a moment, and then goes back to Formosa. Are we going then to give the Nationalists our protection? Could not such an incident be used as a basis for the claim on the part of some that we are now expanding the war to all of Asia, and be recognized as the spark that ignites the third world war? I am still not willing to accept the view that we cannot avoid such a war and nevertheless defeat communism, but I think we shall have to do it with our allies, and not unilaterally.

I thought we had bottled up pretty well for determination some time in the future the question of who has title to Formosa; whose territory it is. I am very much concerned about the fact that in the course of history—I do not know whether it will be 50, 75, or 100 years hence, or, as I hope, sooner than that—there will be established a universal system of international justice through law, such as the great late Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, used to plead for on the floor of the Senate, and which those of us who were his disciples and sat at his feet agreed was right in principle. He contended that we must stand together with the free nations of the world and keep ourselves so strong that Russia would not dare to attack us. We must

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stand together until Russia begins to disintegrate and dissolution begins within her, and wedges of dissension can be driven between her and her satellites. Eventually the jurisdiction over Formosa should go to the World Court for final settlement. However, that is probably years away.

What bothers me is the kind of recommendation the President of the United States made to the joint session of Congress today. His address may play into the hands of Russia, in that it may be the source of a wedge being driven among our allies over the Formosa issue. I think we should stand united and not act unilaterally on Asiatic problems. We should not proceed unilaterally, although it is true that our action in regard to Formosa always has been our own action, separate and distinct from United Nations action. However, I believe it is also true that some of our allies in the United Nations have come to consider the policy of the United States in regard to Formosa as a status quo situation on which they could rely without consultation and joint decision. So I am concerned about that point in the President's address.

Of course, I have always said I am concerned about Yalta and about the serious mistakes which were made at Yalta. But I think the cause of the mistakes made at Yalta, was, after all, illness. More than anything else, I think it was illness that caused us to make many mistakes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at present.

Be that as it may, we made grave mistakes at Yalta. I think the whole matter in regard to the handling of China was one of the mistakes that goes back to Yalta.

My point is that, sooner or later, the world is going to have to decide what is to be done with Formosa. Certainly it is not American territory, and we do not want it as American territory. However, I think it is sound foreign policy to take the position that, for the time being, in the interest of peace and the preservation of peace, we are not going to let Formosa become the cause of war.

As I understood it, that was the position we had taken in regard to Formosa. We were not going to let the Red Chinese take it to be used as a bastion for a possible attack on our Pacific holdings and our Pacific friends. The President's proposal may be the course of action we should take now, but I say that I am worried. I am worried about the Nationalist Chinese and what they may do. I am worried as to the effect of what they do may have upon us, and the effect of what they may do may have upon the peace of the world.

So I hope that at least concurrently with the President's decision to follow this course of action in Formosa he will at least discuss it with our allies, because I cannot think of anything worse than to allow divisions of opinion to develop between ourselves and our allies.

In the main, Mr. President, in my opinion, there is not the unity of action among the allies in Asia that there ought to be. I think there is need of conducting negotiations with our allies to see if we cannot get together on a common program for action in connection with the Korean war.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Not just now.

I believe we need a common program of action in respect to the Korean war, such as, for example, an agreement on all sides to stop the shipment of any economic goods into China. I think we ought to sit down with our allies and see how far we can get, if we can get anywhere at all, on a common agreement as to the kind of blockade we are going to carry on against the coast of China.

In my judgment, we cannot afford to run the risk of unilateral action. What worries me is that the kind of proposal the President makes today may result in more and more unilateral action by us. I do not believe we can do this job alone. I think we have the right to call upon our allies to help us more than they are helping us, and that we have the right to call upon our allies to stop shipping into Red China goods which can be used directly or indirectly to kill American boys in Korea. It is difficult, in my judgment, to name any economic goods that are not of great assistance to Red China now, whether they be domestic goods which help the domestic economy, or war munitions.

Stopping their shipment is what is necessary by way of negotiation. Yet when we pick up the New York Times this morning we see, even before the views expressed by the President in the joint session this afternoon became official, disagreements among our allies in regard to this subject. I think the problem should have been settled in advance.

So far as I am concerned—and I know it is true of every other Member of the Senate—once we mark out a course of action, once we have had full discussion and the decision has been made, then it is the duty of each of us in the Congress to help execute the program, no matter what the consequences may be. But in these critical days, when it comes to the formation of policies, we all find ourselves in a delicate position in the carrying out of our legislative responsibilities. Here in the Congress we have the duty, it seems to me, to raise questions and suggest weaknesses which we may see in the program. I wish greater opportunity could be provided us to do these things in advance of the decisions. I have been heard to say before, under other administrations, that it seems to me that in the field of foreign policy too frequently decisions are made and we in the Legislature are confronted with an accomplished fact. Then when one criticizes, when he suggests that perhaps the decision is not so sound as some think, he opens himself to the danger of being charged with not cooperating with his Government.

I have made these remarks because some of the things which the Senator from Wisconsin said justfy them, in my judgment, at least so far as concerns separating myself from the general conclusions which he has reached concerning the Eisenhower speech.

But if this is to be the policy, we must get behind the policy and give the President the support he must have. However, that does not mean that we should be silenced. Nor does it mean that we should hesitate to suggest that he may be moving too fast, or that we should not suggest that in the matter of Asiatic policy he ought to confer with our allies before the fact rather than after the fact.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator knows whether or not the President consulted with our allies, and whether or not they were informed of the statement which he was about to make to us. Does the Senator know whether or not the President had an agreement with our allies that he would follow the course of action which he followed today? I do not know. I am asking if the Senator knows.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know; but I certainly think that if he did he owed it to us to tell us. What a great strength that would have given to his recommendation. If the American people could be told, at the same time, "This action is going to be a united action on the part of the free nations of the world in Asia," that would be one thing. But if he did not see fit to tell us, in my judgment, until he does tell us to the contrary, I think it is fair to assume that there has been no meeting of the minds on the part of our associates within the United Nations concerning this subject. If there had been such a meeting of the minds, probably the press would have carried something about it. I know of no formal representations which have been made in this matter in any discussions in the United Nations.

Let me make one further observation with regard to the Aldrich appointment. I join with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in my opposition to the Aldrich appointment for the reasons heretofore expressed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I cannot remain in my seat and hear a personal friend of mine maligned undeservedly. I realize that the attacks which have been made against Mr. Aldrich have not been direct attacks, but by indirection they amount to almost the same thing.

I have known Mr. Aldrich for many years. The people of New York City and of New York State know Mr. Aldrich. I refer to my colleague across the aisle [Mr. LEHMAN] for correction, but never in my life have I heard the slightest criticism of him with respect to his integrity or his honor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I certainly do.

Mr. LEHMAN. The senior Senator from New York is entirely correct. I have known Mr. Aldrich for a great many years, and I consider him a man of very high character in every way and of great ability. I do not believe that the objection which has been raised against him on the ground that he has received a decoration from Great Britain should serve as a basis for criticism. That decoration was awarded to him because of unusual service. In 1939 and 1940 the British people were fighting our battles. Mr. Aldrich was the head of what was then known as British War Relief. My wife and the wife of the senior Senator

from New York [Mr. IVES] were very active in the Albany chapter of that organization. They were in complete sympathy with its efforts as was I. So I do not think the circumstance of the decoration should give any justification for criticism. It was evidence of the appreciation and regard of the people of Great Britain.

Mr. Aldrich has long been a great friend of Great Britain and he has tried to serve and strengthen the cause of democracy in the west during the years when it was under very great stress from the Nazi hordes under the leadership of Hitler.

I will be glad to vote for the confirmation of Winthrop Aldrich as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. IVES. I thank my distinguished colleague for that splendid contribution to this discussion.

To continue, for my own part, I point out that the question which seems to have been raised in connection with the confirmation of Mr. Aldrich's nomination is a question which seems, by indirection, to have been raised also in connection with the confirmation of other nominations which have come before the Senate. I refer to the question of the material wealth of the nominee.

I raise that point. Everybody knows that I am a person of very moderate circumstances. The point I raise is: Have we in this Government of ours come to the condition where we must recognize for appointment to public service—and, of course, eventually it will also come to apply to recognition in the matter of election—only persons who are, in effect, paupers? That is what it amounts to. Is the person who has been successful in business or finance, and has accumulated some wealth in the process, to be condemned and not be permitted to hold public office on that ground? I disagree wholeheartedly with that kind of philosophy, and I know that the country as a whole disagrees with it.

I went into this question during the last campaign because I was faced with it, at least by indirection, and I handled it in a straightforward manner directly with my audiences. Everywhere I went I found a favorable response to the position I took then and have taken since. Likewise, in this instance, I think we had better forget all about any financial connection or any financial prosperity or well-being of the individual with respect to the office to which he has been nominated by the President, provided the function of that office in no way is connected with any financial interest he may have.

As I understand, the appointment of an Ambassador to the Court of St. James's involves nothing which in any way should interfere with Mr. Aldrich's qualification to serve in that capacity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. In my judgment he will serve our country there with distinction. The very fact that he appears not to have accumulated much wealth himself should in no way condemn him, and the fact that he has been honest all his life should be a factor strongly supporting his appointment. Therefore, I wholeheartedly endorse the nomination and I shall vote for confirmation.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Was the Senator from New York a delegate to the Republican Convention in Chicago last year?

Mr. IVES. I was.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from New York must be familiar with the fact that the Chicago Tribune, on its front page, not once but several times, published items to the effect that Mr. Aldrich's crowd—not he personally but apparently with his consent—offered $10,000 to a delegate, to another delegate $3,000, and so on, naming the delegates.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from North Dakota believe everything he reads in the newspapers?

Mr. LANGER. That is not all. As a member of the committee I voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Aldrich. I voted against confirmation because when I asked about that published statement, he said, "I saw it, but I did not want to bring a libel suit." Mr. President, when is a libel suit justified if it is not justified when a statement such as that is made about a man by a newspaper which is financially responsible?

Mr. IVES. My answer is that the Chicago Tribune has printed at one time or another editorially enough against me to justify my suing it for libel at any time that I might want to do so. I would not stoop to such a level. I am sure that Mr. Aldrich has shown that he is the kind of man who also would not stoop to it.

Mr. LANGER. Of course if he is willing to have a newspaper lie about him and libel him without bringing suit against the newspaper he is not the kind of individual the senior Senator from North Dakota is.

Mr. IVES. I base my position entirely on the kind of newspaper involved.

Mr. LANGER. On three different occasions I filed libel suits and in every case I received a verdict, the last one being for $25,000 in settlement against a Boston newspaper. The time has not come when a man in public life must stand silent while being maligned and lied about. I was particularly interested when the nominee said that, although he considered doing so, he had not brought a libel suit against the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. IVES. I have answered that matter from my own standpoint. I do not expect to bring a libel suit against the Chicago Tribune or any similar newspapers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not want time to pass, in view of some discussion which has taken place on the floor, without making a few observations.

First of all, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I agree that it would be a very sad situation in this country if an otherwise qualified person were to be foreclosed from representing his Government or serving in his Government, either at home or abroad, merely because he had been successful in a business or profession.

I also was rather surprised at what I at least interpreted to be the argument of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that, because the former Labor Government of Great Britain, or some of its members, might object to a man of Mr. Aldrich's standing, he should not be accredited to the Court of St. James's. Mr. President, since when are we selecting our Ambassadors to represent the Socialist form of government of Great Britain. Our Ambassadors are sent abroad to represent the people of the United States. They are sent abroad to represent the American constitutional economic system. They are not sent abroad to please the former Labor Government of Great Britain.

Secondly, I was somewhat disturbed by the remark of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in which he indicated on the floor of the Senate that Mr. Aldrich's appointment represented a point of view which favored the exploitation, presumably, of the people in more backward countries. I do not believe that such a suggestion represents the thinking of Mr. Aldrich in any sense of the word, and I do not know of anyone who will get any satisfaction out of a statement of that kind, unless it be the men in the Kremlin, for use over their equivalent of the Voice of America, which might be the voice of the Soviet Union wherever that voice is being broadcast.

I also wish to discuss the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I think a careful examination of the hearings will show that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, specifically asked Mr. Aldrich whether there was any basis in fact for the newspaper article to which reference has been made. I think the record will show that he clearly indicated that there was no basis in fact for it, regardless of his own personal idea as to whether he should or should not file a libel suit.

So much for the Aldrich nomination, for the confirmation of which I shall vote. I believe that the President of the United States has a right to designate his Ambassadors, who represent abroad the Chief Executive.

At this time I wish to discuss very briefly a statement made by the Senator from Oregon in regard to the message delivered today by the President of the United States. I have particular reference to action concerning the neutralization of Formosa. I differ quite considerably with the Senator from Oregon, because it seems to me that since June 25, 1950, our Nation and all the American people have been bearing the overwhelming brunt of the fighting in Korea, insofar as United Nations' members are concerned. Of course, the little Republic of Korea has borne grievous wounds and has suffered heavy casualties, far more than we have; but I am sure the Senate will recall that the Republic of Korea is not a member of the United Nations, having been kept out of that body by the veto of the Soviet Union. So, Mr. President, as we meet here in the Senate, more than 2½ years after the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

outbreak of hostilities in Korea, it is correct to say that, insofar as the members of the United Nations are concerned, up to today the United States of America alone has supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower of the United Nations members used in Korea and has suffered more than 95 percent of the casualties in Korea among forces of members of the United Nations.

Therefore it seems to me there is an obligation upon the Government of the United States to change some of the policies which have led to the present stalemate condition in Korea. Certainly, as the President very correctly pointed out, regardless of the extent to which the unilateral action we took in Korea on the 25th, 26th, and 27th days of July, 1950, may have justified President Truman's action in neutralizing the island of Formosa or in preventing attacks from the mainland of China upon the island, such neutralizing action in relation to Formosa lost its validity when the Communist forces in China joined the forces in North Korea in the attack upon the Republic of Korea and upon the United Nations forces then in Korea, where those United Nations forces were active in resisting the aggression from North Korea.

As the President quite correctly pointed out, the action at that point was tantamount to the use of the United States Navy to defend a part of Communist China at a time when Communist China was attempting to destroy our own forces and was inflicting heavy casualties upon our forces in Korea. I believe that quite generally the American people will applaud this forthright action on the part of the President of the United States in at least not using the American Navy as an adjunct to the Communist forces in Korea, for even if the Republic of China does not move a single soldier across the Formosa Straits, the Communists will never know when and under what circumstances the Republic of China will move soldiers there.

Therefore, instead of making it possible for the Chinese Communists to concentrate their forces in Korea, as they have been able to do, for the purpose of inflicting casualties upon our forces there and for the purpose of attempting to destroy our forces there or to drive them into the sea, if they can, the Chinese Communists will have to begin to move their forces along the long coast line of China, some several thousand miles in length, never knowing at what point a commando raid may become a full-scale invasion and never knowing when, under those circumstances, they will have to move some of their troops and some of the matériel in order to oppose such an attack. Thus the Chinese Communists will have to bear a great economic strain in order to build coastal fortifications and new supply depots, for they will never know when or where their lines of communications may be cut. As a result, it will become more difficult for the Chinese Communists to concentrate their forces for the purpose of destroying our forces in Korea.

I am also a little disturbed by the statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he thought the Formosa question had been "put on ice" for a while. Although he conceded that perhaps we would not let the Chinese Communists take Formosa by force, at least he implied that perhaps by a far-eastern Munich we would be willing to hand over Formosa to the Chinese Communists if they would be good boys and would agree to an armistice in Korea.

Mr. President, I believe the American people have determined once and for all that we are not going to barter away the rights and freedoms of human beings at another Yalta or another Munich. I do not believe that any administration worthy of the respect of the American people or of the free world could even consider entering into a negotiation with the Chinese Communists or the Russian Communists with the result of bartering away the rights of the 8,000,000 human beings on the Island of Formosa, who represent the free people of China. Mr. President, if China is ever to be free, those 8,000,000 human beings are the seed corn for a free China which some day may exist on the mainland of China.

Those who hold to the old ideas of Yaltas and Munichs, the idea that one can barter away the freedom of human beings, may have gotten some satisfaction under past administrations; but I do not believe such persons will get any satisfaction under the administration of President Eisenhower. I do not believe the American people would countenance for a moment the surrender of the lives and liberties of human beings by any such future Yaltas and Munichs. Furthermore, I believe that the President of the United States made that point very clear in his message to the American people and to the Congress, when he said that even insofar as such past secret executive agreements are concerned, he would suggest to the Congress the passage of a joint resolution which would make very clear that anything which would result in a permanent surrender, into the hands of a godless Communist tyranny, of the lives and liberties of our fellow human beings would not be binding upon the American people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and thereafter I shall return to a consideration of the Aldrich nomination and shall make some comments on the statement made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Of course, Mr. President, language forms are always very interesting devices for leaving impressions or imputing motives or even implying accusations pertaining to others, even though without relationship in fact to the views such persons entertain or to the statements they have made. I am perfectly willing to let the official transcript of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of my earlier remarks answer the Senator from California in connection with the assertion I now make, namely, that not a word in that transcript will support, even by the most elastic stretching of anyone's imagination, an interpretation to the effect that I favor or propose a Munich in Asia. Let me assure my friend, the Senator from California, that he is no more opposed than I am to Munichs in Asia or anywhere else; nor is the Senator from California, in my opinion, any more cognizant than I am of the great danger to freedom which Russian communism presents to the world.

What I did plead for earlier this afternoon was a recognition of the importance of our taking steps in our Asiatic policy so as to make clear to our allies that we want more, not less, support from them in Asia. If I correctly interpret the remarks of the Senator from California, that is a part of his thesis, too, and has been for several years, as we may judge by his statements on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from California and I have more than once stood together in demanding greater aid in Asia from our allies. That was the thesis of the argument I tried to impress upon the Senate today.

I said that in my judgment the first negotiation that is needed in connection with the foreign-policy problems which confront our country is a negotiation with our allies, for I believe we must bring to an end the statistics which have been most correctly stated by the distinguished Senator from California, namely, that approximately 95 percent of the United Nations' costs and casualties connected with the Korean war have been American costs and casualties. I cannot reconcile that situation with really unified allied action in Asia.

That is why I said earlier this afternoon, Mr. President, that I believe the so-called unity among our allies in Asia is pretty much in name only; and that is why I believe we should take our steps in Asia very carefully until we can ascertain whether our United Nations' allies have any intention of going along with us or whether we are going to have to handle the entire Korean matter on a unilateral basis. Believe me, Mr. President, if it ever becomes clear that the latter is all that is open to us in our endeavor to end the sacrifice of precious American lives in Korea, then I will be found arguing for unilateral action.

All I tried to do was to express my concern and some of my worries as to whether the action now proposed in connection with Formosa is such an action as should be undertaken before we at least have with our allies the kind of negotiations to which I referred, and which I have in mind in connection with the whole Korean war. I said in my earlier remarks that I thought we ought to find out from our allies what help we can get from them in unity of action, in ending the shipment into Red China of economic goods of any kind that will be of assistance to Red China in the war now being carried on against us in Korea. Such traffic ought to stop. It ought to be stopped by our allies who may indulge in it, and likewise we should see to it that an end is brought to the activities of any economic or business group in our country that uses any neutral flag to transship to Red China from neutral ports goods manufactured in America and shipped in the first instance to such neutral ports. That ought to stop, because such traffic results in killing American boys in Korea.

I do not yield to the Senator from California; I do not yield to any other Senator in my patriotic desire to take

the steps necessary to bring the Korean war to a successful conclusion. It cannot go on in the way it has been proceeding. All I tried to point out was that I thought we ought to try to bring about this result through negotiations with our allies first. I therefore expressed worry and concern as to how the action recommended by the President today is going to be interpreted in certain of the capitals of the world among our allied nations.

The New York Times this morning gave us a little forerunner of the reaction. I did not think it was very good, nor that it was indicative of increasing unity. I thought the dispatches in the Times were written in terms of disunity, dissent, puzzlement, disagreement, and doubt, rather than unity. That is the way I judged their tenor.

Now let us take the reference of the Senator from California to Munich and his intimation that apparently I thought Formosa was "on ice." I want to be fair with him, but he used language that meant to me, at least, that he was seeking to give the impression that I was favoring or advocating some kind of Munich procedure with Red China and Red Russia over Formosa. Not at all, Mr. President. What I did say—and let the RECORD speak for itself—and what I did point out was that I thought a great many serious mistakes had been made at Yalta, and I said I thought the chief cause of them was illness. I said, furthermore, that I thought one of the great mistakes made at Yalta was in regard to China policy. In fact, I am a little surprised that the Senator from California did not recall our joint action—his and mine—on the floor of the Senate, since Yalta, when, as Senators from the west coast, we both expressed our concern in regard to Asiatic policy, and why we thought our country ought to adopt a stronger policy looking to the saving of China rather than losing it. I am surprised that he did not recall some of the criticisms I have made on the floor of the Senate in the past few years against the State Department for what I considered to have been a whole series and chain of very bad judgments on the part of that Department in connection with China policy.

What I tried to point out this afternoon, Mr. President, was that at some time in the future—and I said I did not know when; 50, 75, 100 years from now; perhaps sooner—the Formosa issue will have to come before a great international tribunal, in keeping with the great principle for which former Senator Vandenberg fought on the floor of the Senate, namely, a system of international justice through law. That is what I alluded to. I had reference to no proposal for any armistice talks with Red China or with Red Russia over Formosa. That would be furthest from my intention.

What I am trying to say, Mr. President, is that until such time as the Formosa issue comes before an international court of justice for final disposition in keeping with principles of international law, I think it sound policy for the United States to say we are not going to let Formosa fall into Communist hands, to become a threat to American possessions and interests in the Pacific. That is what I said, and that is what the RECORD will show when it is read tomorrow. Not a word or phrase did I use which justifies, by the most elastic stretch of the imagination, the implication that I am proposing a Munich with Red China or with Red Russia.

What I am proposing, Mr. President, is that we get together with our allies and say to them, "Now, we are either going to fish or cut bait; we are going to find out what our unity of program is going to be." But I say again, Mr. President, that in my judgment the kind of action proposed by the President today would have been better undertaken after consultation with our allies in advance. I repeat my assumption that there had been no consultation, or at least agreement on such action, because, had there been, I cannot imagine the President of the United States failing to say that he had taken it up "with the foreign ministers of the following countries, and we are in agreement."

I said also earlier this afternoon that our original action was unilateral, not United Nations action, and we have the legal right to act unilaterally now, if we want to. The old question arises as to whether the exercise of one's technical legal right is the best way to settle a lawsuit or whether to propose negotiations with one's allies might not be the better way.

So, Mr. President, in order to clinch the point I was making in regard to which I think the Senator from California completely misunderstood my intentions and my motives, I said earlier this afternoon that Senator Vandenberg's point was, that we have got to hold fast with our allies and have got to maintain a strong mutual military, economic security program with our allies for as many years as necessary, until division starts to break up the Russian empire. I think that time will come. Vandenberg very often said to us in conversation he did not see how they could hold together for 25 years. I do not either, Mr. President, unless we let them reverse the tables on us and drive wedges between and among the allies.

That is my position on that issue, and I close that part of my remarks by saying to the Senator from California that, as I have for the past several years, so now do I stand with him and every other Senator on this floor, in following whatever course of action the facts show to be necessary to best protect the security of my country. But I think, Mr. President, we need to watch and to be on guard against a tactic which I notice is developing in debate in the Senate, namely, that if we suggest disagreement with a proposal of the administration, if we utter a criticism of the new President, it is said that our words will be pleasing to the men in the Kremlin.

Mr. President, in keeping with our system of government, if we are going to carry out our legislative functions, expressions of disagreement must be made from time to time, and if we feel that criticisms of the administration are due, we owe it to the country to make them.

When men of good faith stand up and express their honest judgment and conclusions about an issue, even though their conclusions differ from the conclusions of other Members of the Senate, or from the President or other officers of the executive branch, I hope, Mr. President, for the last time we have heard on the floor of the Senate the comment that the mere expression of such views or criticisms will be interpreted as music to the ears of the Kremlin. That is not in keeping with fair debate; it is not in keeping, in my judgment, with our system of republican government. Tactics of that type are aimed at silencing and muzzling speech, and there is no place in the Senate of the United States for such tactics.

As for me, Mr. President—and I think it is true of my colleagues in the Senate—I will have to answer for myself when I think a comment of disagreement with policy should be made, and I intend to continue, unless attacked personally, to make my comments above the level of personal debate.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that I quite agree with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that in appointing an ambassador to the Court of St. James's we are appointing someone to represent the American people. There is no question about that. I suppose that almost everyone agrees that when it comes to the appointment of an ambassador we should take into account the reaction to the appointment in foreign capitals. Although that is only one of the factors involved, and I am not saying it should be the controlling factor, it certainly should be considered when we are appointing someone who, to a large segment of the population, might be persona non grata. That is not improving relations between this country and another country. One of the functions of an ambassador is to try to improve understandings and relationships between this country and the nation to which he is assigned.

I quite agree with the Senator from California that we should not refuse to appoint Mr. Aldrich to the Court of St. James's even if the Labor Party—and it has not—by formal resolution had said, "We do not want him." In fact, that kind of action would cause me, at least, to entertain to some extent the feeling, "We will appoint whom we want to, and if that is the way you feel about him, you will get him any way." That is a normal reaction.

But all I said, Mr. President, was that there was a certain segment of the British population, and I think it is best represented by members of the Labor Party, who look upon Mr. Aldrich as a personification of the dollar sign or dollar diplomacy, rightly or wrongly. I think that is true. If we check the British press, we will find that sentiment is expressed by many persons. It is one of the factors that should be taken into account. That is all I said.

We do not know when political changes may take place in Great Britain, so I do not think we in the Senate of the United States should be too sure that we can follow the course of action proposed in regard to our relations with Great Britain without giving at least some consideration to the attitude of the other major

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

political party in Great Britain. We should consider it as one of the factors.

A word, Mr. President, in regard to what my good friend from New York [Mr. IVES] has said. I apparently cannot correctly use the English language; apparently I am failing to make clear my meaning, but in all the comments I have made during the past few days I have tried to make clear, and once again I shall try, that I am not objecting to any of these nominees on the ground that they are wealthy men. I shall go along with any Member of the Senate to fight for and to protect the right of the wealthy to participate in public service, as well as the right of those who are not wealthy. There is not a sentence in any of my utterances in the past few days that would justify anyone in reaching the conclusion that I am against X, Y, or Z because of the fact that he is a wealthy person. The tenor of my remarks, the major thesis which I have sought to develop, is that we have had throughout our history the long-established policy that we do not confirm the nominations of men for high, responsible Government positions if we can find direct or indirect economic interests which will accrue or may accrue to them, or which might prejudice their minds in performing the functions of the position to which they are appointed.

Men of equal sincerity, and certainly with faith as good as mine, have disagreed with my conclusions in regard to the existence of an indirect interest on the part of Wilson and Kyes. That is an honest difference of opinion. I have studied the record; I have taken my work in connection with these nominations just as seriously and just as conscientiously as has any other Member of the Senate, and my conclusions in regard to Wilson and Kyes have nothing to do with their wealth. I came to the conclusion that because of the positions which they have held in General Motors as President and Vice President, respectively, because of the fact that they have been parties to negotiating, in round numbers, approximately $5,000,000,000 worth of defense contracts with our Government, they had an indirect interest, which we would have to concede, and that therefore, there is at least a danger, which we ought to avert, that unconsciously, if not consciously, unintentionally, if not intentionally, they will be influenced by their feeling of affinity for General Motors.

That was the burden of my argument, Mr. President. I stated in my first speech on the subject, "It makes no difference to me what the situation is in regard to their stocks; it is their connections that give me concern." I said, "I think there are positions to which these men can be appointed without placing them in these particular posts."

I was asked on a radio program yesterday afternoon this question: "Where would you put Wilson?"

It is not for me to say where he should have been put, but I do not hesitate to say where I think we could have put him, with a great responsibility involved. There is a good man there now. He could have been made Secretary of Commerce, and there would not be involved the problem of the relations of General Motors to the Defense Establishment.

That is the burden of my argument, Mr. President.

I have no objection to Mr. Aldrich because of any wealth he may have or may not have. That is not the burden of my objection to the confirmation of his nomination. The burden of my objection is that he has been the head of a great financial international empire—the Chase National Bank, with far-flung holdings.

The Chase National Bank is both praised and criticized in many parts of the world—and I have been in many parts of the world. I have listened to members of foreign governments discuss their economic problems. What we have talked about in terms of diplomacy, I have heard them discuss in terms of the exploitation of their natural resources by great American financial interests, some of them the clients of this bank.

When we are discussing the building up of diplomatic relations, I merely wish to express my concern about appointing the president of the Chase National Bank to a position so important as the one to which he has been nominated, considering the vital economic problems we shall have to work out with our allies, including Great Britain, in the years immediately ahead.

That is why I said it was my judgment that the nomination of Mr. Aldrich was a bad one, not because he was a man of wealth, but because of his past activities as the president of the Chase National Bank, and because of that bank's activities in international economics. That is my position, and I stand on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Winthrop W. Aldrich to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Aldrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT TEN BROECK STEVENS TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Ten Broeck Stevens to be Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week, on January 26, when the nomination of Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense was before the Senate, I voted against the confirmation of his nomination. I did so reluctantly, because I believe that the President of the United States should have broad latitude in selecting his immediate advisers, and that a vote of confirmation should not seek to pass judgment on the abstract views or political philosophy of the individual named by the President to serve as a member of his Cabinet. My vote of opposition was cast reluctantly, too, since I did not wish to express any doubt—because I had none—as to Mr. Wilson's high character or his determination to serve his country with complete loyalty and integrity. My vote against the confirmation of Mr. Wilson's nomination was cast, Mr. President, after deep reflection, during which I arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Wilson's designation and confirmation were inconsistent with both the spirit and the letter of the law now on our statute books forbidding the service of any official of the Government in a capacity in which there would be a conflict of interest, direct or indirect, with his own personal interest. Mr. Wilson has such a conflict.

Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Stevens to be Secretary of the Army is now before the Senate. I have carefully read the record of testimony before the Armed Services Committee, and have studied all the available facts, based largely on Mr. Stevens' own statements before the committee. I have looked again at the law. I arrive at the same conclusion as in the case of Mr. Charles E. Wilson. I cannot vote for the confirmation of Mr. Stevens' nomination. I shall vote against it, again with a deep reluctance, especially because I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Stevens personally. Over the years I have met him on a number of occasions. I know him to be a fine gentleman, of complete integrity, loyalty, and good purpose. As an old textile man I have had personal knowledge, for more than 50 years, of the fine textile firm of which Mr. Stevens has been head for many years. The Stevens Co. has long been one of the most responsible firms in the field of textiles.

But I shall vote against the confirmation of Mr. Stevens' nomination because I feel that his appointment is inconsistent with, indeed is contrary to, the spirit and letter of the law governing conflicts of interest. The pertinent section of the law has been referred to. It is in the record of the hearings. Let me read it. It says:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

The facts are clear and simple. By the candid admission of Mr. Stevens himself, he has 43,000 shares in the J. P. Stevens Co., almost one-third of whose business last year was with the Defense Department of the Government. Mr. Stevens, himself, has been chairman of the board of this company, which is largely a family owned concern. Mr. Stevens has agreed to divest himself of his personal holdings. This willingness we must applaud, because it will involve a considerable financial sacrifice. But

even after Mr. Stevens has divorced himself from his own stockholdings, his immediate family, according to the record of the hearings, will retain about 30,000 shares. Even more significant is the fact that, in addition to these family holdings, there is held in trust, under the terms of his father's will, approximately 206,000 shares in this company, of which nearly 70,000 shares will revert to Mr. Stevens on the death of his mother. Of this interest Mr. Stevens cannot legally divest himself. The trust, created by his father's will, cannot be set aside, nor can Mr. Stevens' interest in it be ceded or eliminated. This large block of stock represents, in my reluctant judgment, a very direct interest, on Mr. Stevens' part, in the Stevens Co.

Indeed, the opinion of Mr. John W. Davis, a great lawyer, whose counsel Mr. Stevens solicited and whose opinion was entered into the record by Mr. Stevens, makes it very clear that the disposal by Mr. Stevens of his personal holdings of the stock will not divest Mr. Stevens of an undeniable and inalienable interest in a company with which the Army Department must and will do substantial business. Mr. Davis points out that Mr. Stevens must retain that interest under the terms of his father's will.

But Mr. Davis goes on to say that the letter of the law can still be satisfied if Mr. Stevens will disqualify himself from participating in decisions involving Army contracts with the Stevens Co. I am not a lawyer, and I have a great respect for the legal talents of Mr. John W. Davis. But I have been in public life for a great many years, and have held some positions of executive responsibility. I cannot see how the head of a department, any more than the governor of a State, can disqualify himself or otherwise divest himself of a responsibility for performing functions imposed upon him by law. That responsibility is his. He may delegate it to others, to his subordinates, or even to his superior, but that delegation does not divest him of his own ultimate responsibility. The law gives it to him. He cannot escape it. The conflict of interest, forbidden by law, is present, even though in the present instance Mr. Stevens might not personally take part in the award of contracts to the Stevens Co. He would have the responsibility for the awarding of contracts. No Executive order could change that. A way may have been found technically to get around the letter of the law, although I do not think the way wholly satisfies the law. But the spirit of the law would be clearly violated.

Under these conditions I cannot vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Stevens.

I wish again to emphasize that my decision to vote against Mr. Stevens involves no doubt of his high character, integrity, loyalty, and good will. I have a high personal regard for the man, and a great respect for his achievements and talents. But to confirm him would be further to undermine and virtually to destroy a vital principle of government—a principle upon which rests that delicate and precious structure, the public faith. Destroy that and we destroy all. We cannot venture even to endanger it, however meritorius the exception we seek to make from the impersonal and general rule.

It is bad government to destroy the letter or spirit of a law merely to fit a particular situation. I predict that the confirmation of the nominations of Mr. Stevens and Mr. Wilson will in the future be advanced as precedents to justify the confirmation of the nominations of other less worthy men. In good conscience I must, therefore, vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Stevens.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the nomination of Robert Ten Broeck Stevens to be Secretary of the Army should be confirmed. This nomination is one of the most noteworthy made by President Eisenhower.

I do not say this merely because Mr. Stevens happens to come from my State of New Jersey, but knowing him as I do, I would be remiss, Mr. President if I left unsaid that which I now say.

Mr. Stevens is in the prime of life, just a little younger than I am. He is full of energy, has outstanding qualities of leadership, and possesses the necessary administrative ability which can be acquired only through long experience.

The Secretaryship of the Army is essentially an administrative position, requiring executive talents of the highest order, including the knack of getting things done quickly and right, and the ability to cause persons of divergent views and opinions to work together as a team.

This is the kind of work which Mr. Stevens has been doing for more than 30 years in industry and in government, in the Army and in private enterprise, through two World Wars and in the quasi peace between and since.

To be specific, Mr. President, Mr. Stevens, educated at the Phillips Andover Academy and Yale University, entered the employ of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., in 1921 and has been chairman of the board since 1945.

This is one of the largest textile firms in the United States, and from its founding 140 years ago, during the War of 1812, it has been connected with the Stevens family.

He is a director of many other successful business enterprises, greatly diversified as to type and scattered geographically over a large part of the United States.

Among these organizations which have profited by his genius are the General Electric Co., General Foods Corp., Jackson Mills, Wellford, S. C., the Marion N. C., Manufacturing Co., New York Telephone Co., Alexander Smith & Sons Carpet Co., Whitney Chair Co., Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Stevens is also a trustee of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, and a director of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

For almost 20 years Mr. Stevens has been a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and he has been Chairman of the Board since 1948.

For more than 10 years Mr. Stevens has been a valued member of the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce and for the years 1951 and 1952 was its chairman.

In addition to all this very successful large-scale administrative experience, Mr. Stevens has served in the Army in two World Wars.

In the First World War he was a second lieutenant of Field Artillery, and in the Second World War, having graduated from the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, became a colonel in the office of the Quartermaster General.

He was awarded the Legion of Merit Medal and the Distinguished Service Medal.

His patriotism is unquestioned. His work for his country during World War II, and before, during the depression years, was arduous and voluntary, and was undertaken at real sacrifice in order to be helpful in time of need.

He is too modest to say much about these sacrifices, and we must gather some of this information as best we may from brief published biographical sketches and personal knowledge.

Now, Mr. President, as he approaches this new and greater task, involving new and greater sacrifices, he will be disentangling himself from the burdens of industry which he has borne so long and so well to answer his country's call.

He has assured the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, that he will divest himself of all stock holdings in various companies and corporations doing business with the Department of the Army, including his interest in the J. P. Stevens & Co.

What more could be asked?

Furthermore, Mr. President, Mr. Stevens' fine family should be considered an asset and a recommendation for this work. In ancient times were not family men preferred in the Roman Senate and the Jewish Sanhedrin?

Mr. Stevens' four sons—one of whom, casting aside service deferment as a student, is now serving as a private overseas—and one daughter should certainly be a powerful personal incentive for the Secretary of the Army to do all within the power of his high office in order to bring to a quick and successful conclusion the present war in Korea as well as any future conflict which may be forced upon us.

Certainly then this nomination should be confirmed.

By training and experience Mr. Stevens is the man for this vital task.

His work in World War II in the office of the Quartermaster General was just the training designed to enable him to solve the great problems of logistics with which the Secretary of the Army has to deal, and which at this very moment are awaiting the touch of executive genius.

We need this tower of strength at this critical hour. One of the ancients said:

> Not stones, nor timber, nor the art of building constitute a state; but wherever men are who know how to defend themselves, there is a city and a fortress.

I shall sleep better at night with Robert Ten Broeck Stevens as Secretary of the Army.

The nomination of Robert Stevens should be confirmed. I am confident, Mr. President, that it will be.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I seek only information. The Senator said that Mr. Stevens agreed to sell all his stock. I have been trying to check the record hurriedly. Will the Senator point that out to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have not the notation. I heard him agree to it. It is in the record, if the Senator will look.

Mr. MORSE. I have been looking, and I have not been able to find it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I did not mark the record.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if he can answer the question?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Mr. Stevens and Mr. Talbott agreed to give up their stock in an afternoon session in executive session, when no stenographer was present, so I do not think there is any record of his statement that he agreed to give up the stock.

Mr. MORSE. I could not find it. It is one of the points which I intend to make in my argument when I take the floor in my own right. I find nothing in the record which supports the statement.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to disagree with the chairman of the committee, but I think Mr. Stevens agreed in open session to divest himself of his stock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Jersey to page 39 of the second volume of the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. What is the date?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The dates are January 28 and 29.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. January 28 and 29.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When Mr. Stevens was before the committee he said—and this part of the testimony appears at page 39 of the hearings:

> Mr. STEVENS. If the committee feels that I should dispose of my stock, I am prepared to dispose of it, but I hope that the committee will not take quick action on this and underestimate the seriousness of the precedent and the principle that I in my heart deeply believe is facing us and is going to do harm to the best interests of the United States. Now, I plead with you to do that before you reach a decision on what you think I should do.

That is on page 39. Later he came before the committee and the members of the committee said that they did believe he should dispose of his stock, and he promptly agreed to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield for me to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the committee?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know of course that Mr. Stevens has divested himself of his personal holdings of 43,000 shares, or has agreed to do so. I may say parenthetically that the Senator from New Jersey has stated nothing which is any more complimentary to the character and ability of Mr. Stevens than was stated by me in my remarks. However, I am deeply concerned with the question of direct or indirect conflict of interest. I think it is very clear that in this case such a conflict does exist. While I know, as I have stated, that Mr. Stevens has promised to divest himself of his personal holdings of 43,000 shares, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services whether any steps have been taken or could be taken by which Mr. Stevens would divest himself of the reversionary interest in the trust fund set up for Mr. Stevens' benefit in his father's will, under which he will receive, on the death of his mother, approximately 70,000 shares of stock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee discussed that point very briefly, and the members of the committee did not feel that they should go that far. They felt it was something that would come up in the future. The committee felt that if and when the event actually took place, it could be guided by the circumstances then existing, or ask Mr. Stevens to be guided by them. We felt that it would be looking too far into the future, that it would not be fair to his mother or to his family, and that it was not a question with which the committee should immediately concern itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] yield so that I may ask another question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand of course that the chairman of the committee has stated that Mr. Stevens still holds the reversionary interest in the trust fund set up by his father. I should like to quote a very small part of the letter written by the Honorable John W. Davis to Mr. Stevens in reply to a request from him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At what page of the hearing does the letter appear?

Mr. LEHMAN. Page 14, in the hearings of January 28 and 29. Mr. Davis writes:

> You have for some years been chairman of the board of directors of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., a manufacturer of textiles. You have recently resigned that position, but you still hold approximately 42,486 shares of the common stock of the company, constituting a little over 1 percent of the approximate 4,000,000 shares now outstanding. The present market value of the stock is about $34 a share. Other holdings by your wife and children bring the total shares owned by your immediate family to approximately 75,000. In addition, approximately 206,000 shares of such stock are held in trust under a trust instrument which provides that the income therefrom is payable to your mother during her life, with provision that after her death one-third of said 206,000 shares of stock are to be delivered to you, the other two-thirds going equally to your two brothers.

I am skipping part of the next few lines. Then I read at the beginning of the third paragraph of the letter, on page 14:

> You are of course no longer an officer or agent of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. However, I believe that you would be held under the above statute to be "directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits of contracts" of that company. It is not necessary to go into the question of how large a man's stock interest must be to bring him within this language, as yours is sufficiently substantial to make it applicable.

Mr. President, that is a very definite statement, and that is what I am concerned about. I want to emphasize with all the force at my command that my unwillingness to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Stevens' nomination is in no way an indication of any reservation on my part with regard to the ability or character of Mr. Stevens, of both of which I have the highest opinion.

The fact is we have a law on the books which covers the situation. It was drafted as a matter of wisdom and necessity. I do not believe anyone will quarrel with the wisdom or necessity of that kind of law. We are not proposing to amend or repeal the law. We are merely closing our eyes to the fact that the law is being disobeyed, disregarded, and repudiated if we confirm the nominations of men like Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stevens. I believe it is an extremely dangerous precedent to establish.

I do not agree at all with Mr. Davis that a man by his own act or by the act of his superior can disqualify himself from duties imposed upon him by law, any more than I could disqualify myself when I was Governor of my State from the performance of duties which were assigned to me by law.

I merely wish to draw the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to what is proposed to be done and to express my very sincere and deep fear that we are letting ourselves in for precedents which will plague us and which may lead to the nomination of men who may be unworthy and to the lowering of the standards of our Government.

We have heard a great deal said about ethics, and that it is even sinister to accept a dinner from another person; yet we close our eyes to a matter which I believe will deal a serious blow to the maintenance of ethics in government and in the procurement of supplies for the Government. We are being asked to do it merely to meet the need of one man or two men. I am against it for that reason, not because I have any question about the ability or character of the men who have come before us.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to my colleague from New York that I disagree most heartily with him when he states that the committee has disregarded the law. If the Senator had sat, as I did, through at least 7 or 8 hours of the hearings he would be convinced that it was our determination to have the law obeyed. Certainly there were Members on both sides of the table who felt strongly that we should make sure that the law was obeyed.

Furthermore, when we considered a strict legal interpretation of the law and considered Mr. Stevens' personality, and

knew that while he served in the Quartermaster Corps of the Army for 4 years during the war he never allowed the Stevens Co's. business to come to his desk, the committee felt that there would be no conflict of interest. Everyone agrees with what the Senator from New York has stated, that Mr. Stevens' personality and patriotism are of the highest. Mr. Stevens has four sons in the Armed Forces of his country and he himself served in the Armed Forces during World War II. In view of the fine spirit he showed before the committee as I think the Senator would agree if he sat on the committee, Mr. Stevens, under all the circumstances, is entitled to be confirmed as Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Davis' opinion was written on the premise that Mr. Stevens would not dispose of his stock. He has disposed of his stock. Therefore he has no stock or other interest of any kind in the company today.

Secondly, he has stated unequivocally that he himself will not do any business in a situation involving the Stevens company. In the third place he must comply with a specific order from Mr. Wilson, directed to all the departments, stating that any man in Mr. Stevens' position cannot, whether he wishes to or not, do any business with a company with which he was formerly connected.

It seemed to the committee that there was compliance with the law and that in the Stevens case there was no conflict of interest. The committee felt that Mr. Stevens' interest in his father's estate and the interest of his wife or children in Mr. Stevens' father's estate were so remote as not to raise any question concerning the observance of the law.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have concluded.

Mr. LEHMAN. I simply wish to say that I believe that the principle here involved far transcends in importance the qualifications of any one man.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course we must see that the law is obeyed; but I believe that the Senator from Georgia, who was a judge, and the Senator from Oregon, and all other Senators will agree with me that every criminal statute must be strictly construed in relation to the facts and the character of the person involved, before determining that any person has engaged in criminal action in violation of the statute.

Mr. LEHMAN. In reply, let me say that we are not here in a court of law; we are in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, but we are construing a law.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senate has the responsibility of confirming or not confirming presidential nominations. In this case the situation is absolutely clear to me, because the nominee cannot divest himself of a reversionary interest. In that case the Senate by confirming the nomination, will be completely nullifying the law which the Senate itself passed only 3 or 4 years ago. That is what I object to; and that is why I warn that, in my opinion, confirmation of this nomination will lead to many difficulties in the future. By confirming this nomination we shall be setting a precedent which I am convinced will rise up to plague us many times in the years ahead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have the utmost respect for the opinions and judgment of the Senator from New York, but I say most respectfully that I simply disagree with him on his statement of this question. As I view this matter, the statute is a criminal statute which must be interpreted before it is applied to any individual case; and in this case our committee has interpreted the statute as it may apply to the present nominee. The committee believes that this nominee has placed himself beyond the possibility of a conflict of interest, and has done so sufficiently to justify Senate confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the nomination of Mr. Stevens, because I have known him for a long number of years and I know him to be a man of exceptionally high character and great ability and very great patriotism.

If the nominations of men such as Bob Stevens cannot be confirmed by the Senate because of a contingent interest which may fall to them later, then I believe the Government of the United States is in a poor way in respect to getting the very best talent which can be obtained in the handling of its affairs.

In the first place, Mr. President, I wish to make my own position clear. Section 434 and all the other sections which have been called to the attention of the Senate are not sections prescribing the qualifications of a public officer. They are not that at all, but we have treated them as if they were. As a matter of fact, they are sections of the code which provide that if one who becomes an officer of the Government, does a certain act, he then is subject to a very severe penalty.

Mr. President, when a judge goes on the bench, he recuses himself in every case in which he or his family has a direct pecuniary interest. He should do that; it is the ethics of the profession, and has become statutory in most of our States. Section 434 and all the other sections merely provide that when a person becomes an officer of the Government or an agent of the Government, if he then transacts business with a firm or corporation or co-partnership in which he is interested, and so forth, or makes a contract with such a firm, he is subject to a penalty. The statute is undoubtedly a very wise one; it is undoubtedly founded upon sound public policy. I am not quarreling with it at all. It has become statutory in the case of Federal officers. After all, it lays down broadly the ethics which should govern every person in public office.

In other words, Mr. President, here is a statute which prohibits the doing of certain things by a person who has become an officer or agent of the Government, with power to bind the Government. Mr. Stevens has said that he would not make any contracts with the J. P. Stevens Co. or have anything to do with any business with the J. P. Stevens Co. So far as I am concerned, knowing Bob Stevens as I do know him, I would accept his word. Of course, that is not a wholly satisfactory way of doing business, because others might not know Mr. Stevens so well. But, Mr. President, he came into the Government service as an officer of the Army, when his country called him, back in 1942. He entered the Quartermaster Corps of the Army. At that time not a single patriot raised his voice against Bob Stevens, although he went into the Quartermaster Corps which has directly to do with purchases. At that time he said, be it said to his honor, that he would have nothing to do with the Stevens Co. business. Those of us who know him know that he lived up to his statement. In fact, he leaned backward. He had nothing whatever to do with it. One of the first things he did after he entered the Quartermaster Corps was to say that nothing affecting his company or any other company in which he had any interest should come over his desk in any way at all.

Mr. President, there is another reason why such a contingent interest, until it accrues, should have nothing whatever to do with the question of confirmation of this nomination. That reason is that none of these statutes are qualifying statutes. I am not merely making a technical point in order to be technical, but there is a good reason for this point. These statutes prescribe a code of ethics—in this case a code of ethics which has been enacted by Congress in statutory form. That is sound and proper. However, it is not the taking of the office that subjects the person to a penalty, although he may own stock in any or in every company on the face of the globe; it is the doing of something after he has become a Government officer.

In the present case it is said by my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], that because Mr. Stevens has a reversionary interest in some stock—an interest which may not be in existence at all when the trust matures, or it may; I make no point of that; or the stock may have been disposed of, anyway—his nomination should not be confirmed. At any rate, Mr. Stevens does not have that stock now. When he gets it, of course he should disqualify himself. On the other hand, he has done that in advance; he has said to the chairman of the committee that he would have nothing whatever to do with the Stevens Co. stock.

In this case there is an additional reason why we should not hesitate to confirm the nomination of Mr. Stevens. That is that—as opposed to the case of Mr. Wilson, who could not divest himself of his responsibility—Mr. Stevens, as of the service Secretaries, can divest himself of the responsibility. Indeed, a careful reading of the entire Unification Act indicates strongly that Mr. Stevens will not have to do directly with procurement, but will deal with it only as a sort of housekeeping matter.

On the other hand, he can divest himself of that responsibility; he can say to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Secretary of Defense, "Mr. Secretary, I am disqualified with respect to every contract that is to be made by companies A, B, and C, or partnerships X, Y, and Z, and therefore I will have nothing to do with them."

Mr. Stevens has done that; he has expressly said it. He can divest himself of that authority. Not only can he divest himself of that authority, but the Secretary of Defense himself can and must take away that authority. The Secretary of Defense is given the broadest power, in my judgment, of any single head of a Federal agency or department of Government known to our law. The Secretary of Defense is given extremely broad powers.

On the 28th of January he issued an order, directed to all the service Secretaries, expressly disqualifying them in any case and in all cases which may come to their desks in which they have any pecuniary interest. Undoubtedly the reversionary stock will be received, although it certainly could not be held to be disqualifying until the trust actually matures and until there is a distribution of the stock. But, since Mr. Stevens has a remote contingent interest in it, he has properly disqualified himself with respect to all matters in which the Stevens Co. has any interest whatever; and the Secretary of Defense, exercising his broad authority and power, has expressly taken away from Mr. Stevens any authority whatever to make any contracts with J. P. Stevens & Co., or with any other company in which he has an interest, direct or indirect. There ought to be no quarrel with the ethics, there ought to be no quarrel with the statute, which is a statutory requirement of a sound principle of ethics; but until the occasion arises, or until Mr. Stevens actually is in a position to do something which would constitute a breach of that law or that code of ethics, we should not withhold confirmation. That is the situation before us as I see it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator has brought this out, but I should like to have him make it absolutely clear. It is his opinion, is it not, that, if and when Mr. Stevens is confirmed as Secretary of the Army, he will be required to take some affirmative step before he may involve himself under section 434, which is the conflict-of-interest statute, a penal statute? In other words, the mere fact that he is Secretary of the Army and takes no steps does not bring him ipso facto into conflict.

Mr. GEORGE. That is undoubtedly so. I said it was not a qualification for office. It is not intended to be a qualification for office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Nor is it a disqualification.

Mr. GEORGE. Nor is it a disqualification. He can own stock in anything and everything on the face of the earth. But in the case of Mr. Wilson, I think the committee very properly said, "Since you cannot divest yourself of this authority"—and the act expressly says so—"and since you must exercise this authority or bear this responsibility, if we confirm your nomination, we know that you cannot function as Secretary of Defense until you have gotten rid of this stock." That is an altogether different case.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then there is another point which runs through the Senator's statement and my own feeling, namely, that all the business with Stevens & Co. is a competitive business—99 percent of it is competitive.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, that is actually true. I do not want to make any personal statement, but when Mr. Stevens was asked to come here and to enter the Quartermaster Corps, he read every one of these statutes. He consulted his counsel, among whom was none other than the former Governor of North Carolina, Hon. O. Max Gardner, who was en route to the Court of St. James's when he was stricken in New York, where he passed away. As I have said, Mr. Stevens himself read these statutes, and he requested an interpretation of them. When he was assigned to the Quartermaster Corps, he said, "I can have nothing to do with any company in which I am interested, although my company, by and large, is selling standard merchandise, and must sell on a competitive-bid basis. But I do not want to have anything to do with it in any event." So, at his instance, that became the order in the Quartermaster Corps, and there was express direction that certain officers above him should handle anything in which his company might be remotely interested or concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The question is this: In determining whether to confirm the nomination of a man for this position, the Senate is entitled to consider, first, the man's personality and character, and, second, his knowledge of this criminal statute. If he states that he knows it, it will then make it less likely that he will get into trouble. So our main job is to make sure that he has a high-class personality and also a full understanding of the law.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true. In Mr. Stevens' case, I do not believe anyone questions his high character. I am certain that even the distinguished Senator from New York does not question it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly, not for a moment.

Mr. GEORGE. Nor is his ability questioned. Mr. Stevens is in all respects qualified. His company must sell its merchandise on an open, competitive basis. But that is not the controlling point. He himself, though he is the holder of but a mere contingent-remainder interest, is disqualifying himself, and the Secretary of Defense has already issued an order, dated January 28, which is in the RECORD, divesting all the service Secretaries of any power or authority to deal with matters in which they have a pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, within the meaning of the statute. So I can see no reason why the nomination of Mr. Stevens should not be confirmed, and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I support confirmation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator will remember that in referring to the steps taken in order to make Mr. Stevens eligible to the office to which he has been nominated, I made the statement that I did not think the divesting of holdings, which had been invoked by the Secretary of Defense, wholly cared for this situation. It might be that it would be a technical cure for a breach of the letter of the law, though I did not for a moment believe that would effect a cure of a breach in the spirit of the law. The section to which reference has been made provides:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits—

I emphasize the words "directly or indirectly interested." I doubt very much whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia, or anyone else, would claim that the large reversionary interest belonging to Mr. Stevens through the trust set up in his father's estate does not constitute an indirect interest, at best.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, not at all. It does constitute an indirect interest. There is no question about that in my mind. It is true he could not divest himself of it. He might disclaim his right to take under the trust, but presumably he could not do that in this particular case. But he has disclaimed any intention to pass upon any contract or anything which affects the Stevens company. The Secretary himself has issued the order which is in the form of a directive, which, I take it, is binding. I assume that no one would accuse Mr. Wilson of playing fast and loose with the Senate, and that when he issues an order he will not revoke it. But whether he permits it to stand or not, when Mr. Stevens gives his word that he is not going to exercise any power he may have, however remote the possibility of the exercise of the power may be, he is a man of such character that his word can be relied upon.

If this reversionary interest, however, stands in Mr. Stevens, and if he does undertake to do anything which is forbidden by a sound code of ethics which has now statutory approval, of course he would be subject to the severe penalties of the law. He says himself that he understands it. He says himself that he will not do anything against it.

I think, Mr. President, it is as much as could be asked of anyone, that when he parts with all his own personal holdings and is merely a contingent beneficiary under a will executed by his father, that ought not to stand as a disqualifying factor, because the statute is not a disqualifying one. But if there should be any violation of the statute by Mr. Stevens he should be subjected to the penalties of the law.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator again, that I have no doubt whatsoever of the high character or the good purpose of Mr. Stevens. We have a law on the books which reflects the point of view of the Congress with regard to ethics which should be followed by

agents who are concerned in any way with the procurement of supplies for the Government. I think that when we try to make the law fit the case of one man—and I think we may all agree that no one man is indispensable—it is unwise, and that we may live to regret the action in many cases in the future. I do not believe that a man who is appointed the head of a department can completely divest himself of direct or indirect interests, and that is why I raised the question. I have no illusions; I know that Mr. Stevens' nomination will be confirmed; but I feel that I would not be true to my own conscience if I did not bring these issues to the attention of the Senate and did not give evidence of my disagreement with what appears to be the majority sentiment of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has very sincerely and very clearly stated his belief; but, as one who heard all the testimony, who had several conversations with Mr. Stevens, and who listened to him when he finally decided to dispose of all his stock, looking at the man and hearing the evidence, in this instance, as one juror versus another juror, I would respectfully disagree with the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to join with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and I do so on the major premise that I think there is involved a matter of law in this appointment.

I was very much interested in the comment of the Senator from Massachusetts, which I think was a very novel one, because, if I correctly understood him, he argued that if we find that a man knows of the existence of a criminal statute, the fact that he has knowledge should be an argument in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. We are not interested in whether he has knowledge of it; we are interested in the statute.

I was very much interested in the very able argument——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, in making that statement, that if an honest man, a man of the quality and character of Mr. Stevens, says he knows of the existence of the statute, at least he is not willingly or intentionally going to disregard the statute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I still say it is a very novel argument. The existence of the statute and his knowledge of it does not have anything to do with his fitness for the position. We should look at the contents of the statute in relation to the nominee's direct and indirect interests in the job.

We have the duty, as guardians of public policy, not to confirm the nomination of a man for a high office whose holdings place him in a position where he can even be suspect. We have the duty of following very carefully a well-established, sound public policy which is very clearly expressed in the statute which I am going to read in its entirety in a moment, by not placing in positions of public trust men who have holdings or interests, direct or indirect, which may create temptations either for themselves or for others. The confirmation of the nomination of such a man will become a precedent.

The Senator from New York is quite correct in saying that in confirming a whole series of such nominations we are establishing a very bad precedent. We are not going to find that all nominees possess the personal qualifications these men possess, and we cannot rise here and testify in such laudatory terms of others what has been testified in connection with Wilson, Kyes, and Stevens. We are establishing a precedent, and I think it is a very bad one.

Let us take a look at the statute, Mr. President. It provides:

> Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits of contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. President, the restriction is on the employment. The restriction is very clear that men with such direct or indirect interests should not be employed in the first place. Certainly, technically it can be said that this is not a qualification statute under any heading of the code that deals with the subject of confirmation, but it is a clear criminal statute that makes very plain that persons with these qualifications or interests should not be employed, because if they are employed in the Defense Establishment they are employed for the transaction of business.

They are not employed to sit down and do nothing—or they should not be. I cannot read the law in any other way, or find any other legal meaning in the statute, than that there is a prohibition against employing a person who has a direct or an indirect financial or economic interest which could affect the position to which he is appointed. That is the first premise.

The second premise is that, in my judgment, we are not here dealing with a case even as strong as the Wilson and Kyes cases, which, I believe, were bottomed entirely upon indirect interests. I think that, within the meaning of the statute, there is in this case a direct interest to the tune of about $2,100,000. It is in a trust fund, but it is a true remainder, and the beneficiary of it, of course, has a deep interest in it.

I shall come to the Davis opinion in a moment, because even Stevens' own attorney was concerned about the trust fund. Not even Stevens' own attorney gave him a clean bill of health on this point. He recognized that the matter was still problematical and questionable. I shall come to his language in a moment. First I wish to drive home the point that we are dealing with a true remainder in a trust fund.

I have not seen the trust language, and what I now say may not be correct; but as a lawyer I know that trusts of this nature are of a stereotyped pattern, and I shall be very much surprised if the trust in this case does not provide an even more direct interest than I have already mentioned, in that if Mr. Stevens should not outlive his mother, his family will benefit from the trust as a part of his estate, when it comes to settlement of his estate.

So there is involved a direct financial interest. Certainly Mr. Stevens did not create it of his own volition, and his attorney may be right when he says it may be difficult for Stevens to do much about it. But I cannot help that, and neither can you, Mr. President. It merely happens to be one of the operative facts in the picture. Stevens has a true remainder in a trust fund in this company, and the company will be doing business with the Defense Establishment. At least, we should not close the doors and prevent the company from doing business with the Defense Establishment.

As I argued last week in connection with the nominations of Wilson and Kyes, I certainly think it is bad public policy for the Senate to confirm the nominations of men who have been officials in great corporations in the United States, on the basis of a premise that those companies will not be allowed to do any bidding on defense contracts. We need the production of all companies qualified to provide the defense production that is needed. I do not think the interests of individual persons should be placed above the welfare of the Defense Establishment, so that it would not be possible for it to go into the open market and get bids from any company in the country to help manufacture needed sinews of defense, merely because an officer of the company held a position in the Defense Establishment. If the idea is that in order to have the nomination of Mr. Stevens confirmed, the Stevens Co. will agree that it will not make any bids; I think that is bad public policy.

Let us move to the next premise. I also think it is bad public policy to engage in what I believe to be pretty much of a fiction, namely, that Mr. Stevens will disqualify himself in the case of Stevens Co. contracts, and that Mr. Kyes will disqualify himself in the case of General Motors contracts—if you get my meaning, Mr. President. I cast no reflection on the individual men concerned, but we ought to be realistic, and recognize that it is not good public policy to confirm such nominations for top jobs in the Defense Establishment. Because I am making no personal attack, I shall use references to the alphabet.

It is not good public policy to confirm Mr. A, from Y corporation, on the basis of an assumption that when Y corporation matters come before the Defense Department, Mr. A will not act on them; and to confirm the nomination of Mr. B, from X corporation, on the assumption that he will not act on any matters coming from X corporation; but that he will act on Y corporation matters, and Mr. A will act on X corporation matters. It is just not realistic. That is the way abuse develops.

The situation is similar to that involving interlocking directorates in respect to which opportunities for collusion are developed. It seems to me that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the answer is obvious. Under such circumstances, we should not confirm such nominations. Some other positions should be found for them. Before we move the defense establishment from Washington, D. C., to Detroit, Mich., or elsewhere, an effort should be made to bring to Washington persons from throughout the United States who are not connected with corporations that are doing business with the defense establishment.

Mr. President, this question will not be tested on the floor of the Senate as the final step in this argument. I understand that steps will be taken to test it in the court of the United States, because I believe the precedents that are being established, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], are so serious in these cases that it will be necessary to refer them to the courts for a decision on the interests, direct and indirect, of the men whose nominations are sought to be confirmed for the defense establishment. There is a law covering the situation, and I think that now it will have to be interpreted by the courts.

Irrespective of what the courts may find, there is involved an even greater question of public policy. I say it is a dangerous public policy to confirm the nominations of men who in their official capacities within the defense establishment have feelings of affinity, which I think are the real indirect interests that are alarming in these cases, with companies which will be doing business with the defense establishment, even though the judgments or decisions may be made by their associates in the defense establishment who are from other corporations.

Let me point out that in 1952 the Stevens company did business with the defense establishment in the amount of $125,000,000. Stevens had 42,486 shares, at a value of $34 a share, or a total of about $1,450,000. That is a nice sum of money. I think there will be a continuation of a feeling of affinity on the part of Stevens, even after he sells the shares. I certainly think he is going to be very much interested in the success of the Stevens company, in view of the trust fund of about $2,000,000. The yearly dividend has been approximately $84,000.

It is true that all the business of the Stevens company with the Government has been on a competitive-bid basis. But who knows when a situation will again develop, as it did during World War II, when very often it became the policy not to take bids, but to enter into contracts on a negotiated basis?

In this debate, reference has been made to competitive bidding. There seems to have been an assumption that competitive bidding is bound to be the practice. Not at all. That policy can be changed by the executive branch. It can be changed by the legislative branch. It was not a uniform policy during the war. So I say that even the argument or the rationalization that in some way the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Stevens can be justified on the basis of the fact that there will be competitive bidding does not hold up. Even in the case of competitive bidding someone must decide who the lowest bidder is. The lowest bidder is not necessarily the bidder who submits the lowest figure. Other criteria are taken into account besides the lowest figure. Under the competitive bidding system if A makes one bid, we will say, of $1,000,000, and B makes a bid of $1,100,000, it does not necessarily follow that A will get the contract. If the brochures of the two companies show, for example, that from the standpoint of facilities, financial responsibility, and ability to deliver quickly, B can get the goods out quicker, there is nothing to prevent awarding the contract to B. I presume there is hardly a Senator who has served here for any substantial period of time who has not received complaints from constituents representing companies in their own States, on the ground that they failed to receive contracts when they were the lowest bidders. But in many instances when we examined such cases we found that there were very good reasons why the lowest bidder did not receive the contract. So even that argument needs qualification.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] was very much disturbed in the first hearing, as I recall. I have gone through these records. On page 79 of the first hearing the Senator from Wyoming said:

> Senator HUNT. Mr. Stevens, I am wondering if you will not find yourself in a position where you will need to divest yourself and shut yourself out of many, many decisions which should go to you for top-level findings.
>
> The companies here in which you are interested and own stock in, there are so many of them and they are so diversified, and they affect practically all of our manufacturing and our lives in the United States, I just do not see how you can effectively get out from constantly having to face up to certain problems that would come to you with reference to those companions.
>
> Mr. STEVENS. Well, Senator HUNT, I had not given that point a great deal of thought, but in respect to the companies in which I own a limited number of shares, if I should, by any chance, find that that was a problem, I would dispose of those shares.
>
> The great hardship in my case, as in other similar cases, would be a requirement by the committee or by the court or whatever higher authority, that I must divest myself of my Stevens' stock in order to serve; the impact of that would be very severe.

I think it would be very inconvenient, Mr. President. But there constantly creeps into this debate, as there did earlier this afternoon, the argument that these men are making great sacrifices. That simply is not so. If the argument is made on the basis of financial sacrifice, all these men are doing is selling their stock, and at a good profit; and they are paying taxes on the profits. One would think we were taking money away from them. We are not. I am sure that any comment I might make would have no effect on the stock market, so I feel very free to say that I am not so sure that Mr. Wilson will not discover in time that he made the greatest possible profit out of the sale of his General Motors stock which he will be able to make for some time to come. I am not so sure that we are not near the top of the peak so far as profits on that stock are concerned. So he may discover that selling his General Motors stock now would net him a very much greater profit than selling it at a later date. But be that as it may, the only point I wish to make is that these men are paying taxes on profits. There is no confiscation involved here, and no great sacrifice.

When we look at the second hearing, the second time Mr. Stevens was before the committee, we see that he continued to be very reluctant about selling his Stevens company stock. On page 11 of the second hearing Mr. Stevens twice stated his reluctance to part with his Stevens' company stock, and stated that it would create a bad precedent for other businessmen entering public service.

That is a novel argument, too. It is a bad precedent for other businessmen to conform to a statute which, I think, is a clear, mandatory prohibition upon their owning stock in companies having contracts with the Government. I have not heard anyone propose the repeal of the statute. If we are not going to repeal it we ought to follow it. So I say that Mr. Stevens showed a remarkable reluctance about getting rid of his stock so as to conform to the statute. He argued that it would be a bad precedent.

Reference has been made to the John W. Davis opinion, to which I shall come in a moment. But, first, let us call attention to page 16 of the second hearings, where the chairman of the committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL] said:

> Chairman SALTONSTALL. And, secondly, if the committee should decide, in spite of your statement, that it believes you should sell this stock, what position do you take?
>
> Mr. STEVENS. Well, I think on the basis of the opinion of Mr. Davis, coupled with the statement of the facts in the case that I placed before you, and having in mind the precedent and the principle with which I am deeply concerned, I should be most reluctant to do so, but I am perfectly willing, not only perfectly willing but I would like very much to receive the advice of this committee as to what you think I should do.

On pages 27 and 28 of the transcript we find the following:

> Senator SMITH. Mr. Stevens, if I understand the law correctly, in our consideration of your appointment as Secretary of Defense we are concerned with your contracts with the Department of the Army, not with the Navy and the Air Force. Did I understand you to say to Senator BYRD that you would provide us with a breakdown?
>
> Mr. STEVENS. I will, Senator SMITH.
>
> Senator SMITH. Based on the past?
>
> Mr. STEVENS. That's right, and I would estimate that it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of two-thirds for Army use.
>
> Senator SMITH. Mr. Stevens, if the committee, when we get to the point of a decision on your confirmation, decides that it is necessary in keeping with the existing law to ask you to divest yourself of your stock in the J. P. Stevens Co., did I understand you to say you would do so?
>
> Mr. STEVENS. No; I didn't say that, Senator SMITH. I think that is a very good, fair, and appropriate question.
>
> I think what I said was—it is the way I feel now, anyhow—I am trying to weigh, if that occasion arises, I will try to weigh what I consider to be the public interests of the precedent and the principle which I have enunciated here on the one hand, and my possible service as Secretary of the Army on the other hand.
>
> I feel very deeply about this principle and precedent, and I have not yet made a conclusion on that because, as I said to the

chairman, I need the help of this committee. I welcome it. I want it, because I am so anxious to do the right thing by the United States of America.

Senator SMITH. I personally feel that if you divest yourself of your stock you still can't help being interested in the company that you have come up with through the years, but as a member of the committee I also must remember that there is a law that we must think about.

I think the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] was quite right in her observation. It is very difficult for us to divest ourselves of the conviction that he will continue to have quite a feeling of affinity for the Stevens Co.

Coming back to the transcript:

Mr. STEVENS. That is right.

Senator SMITH. And I would like your answer "yes" or "no" as to whether you will, if we consider it necessary, divest yourself of the stock?

Mr. STEVENS. May I think about that as the discussion goes along, Senator SMITH?

She could not get a yes or no answer from him.

Senator SMITH. Yes. Thank you.

On page 33 of the second hearing we find the following:

Senator HUNT. Now one more question, if I may. I am sorry that I had to leave the hearing and didn't get all of your statement. am I correctly informed that you will divest yourself of all of your stocks, excepting the one owned by your family?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct, sir.

So even that late in the hearing he still was holding out with respect to the Stevens Co. stock.

On page 39 of the second hearing we find the following:

Senator SMITH. Mr. Stevens, do I understand that your answer to my question is "Yes," if the committee feels that we must vote in accordance with the law as we understand it?

Mr. STEVENS. If the committee feels that I should dispose of my stock, I am prepared to dispose of it, but I hope that the committee will not take quick action on this and underestimate the seriousness of the precedent and the principle that I in my heart deeply believe is facing us and is going to do harm to the best interests of the United States. Now, I plead with you to do that before you reach a decision on what you think I should do.

He still does not want to give it up. He still thinks it would be a bad precedent. Apparently he thinks the committee should not take the position which it was indicating it was going to take, as a matter of law. Many times during the hearing Mr. Stevens was presented with the question with respect to his direct and indirect interest in this company through his holding of stock. He showed great reluctance to say, simply, "I will follow the law. If the law says to get rid of the stock, I will get rid of it." They had to drag it out of him. Of course, that gives me some insight into his mental operations.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that we are dealing here with a man who is going to go only so far as he thinks the technicalities of the law require him to go, whereas the great issue before us is that of public policy underlying the whole question which gives, or should give, assurance to the American people that defense contracts which are costing the Nation millions and millions of dollars will be negotiated by men who not by the slightest connection have any interest in such contracts, and whose judgments cannot possibly be prejudiced or influenced by past association as officers of companies bidding on or holding contracts with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sure that the Senator from Oregon was on the floor of the Senate this afternoon when a number of Senators who engaged in colloquy with me said they realized that both the personal holdings of Mr. Stevens and the remaining interest which he had in a trust fund set up by his father's will constituted an interest in the company as defined by law. They made no distinction between the remainder interest and Mr. Stevens' personal holdings.

Mr. MORSE. It was created by a trust.

Mr. LEHMAN. Can the Senator understand, any more than I can understand, why they were so insistent on his divesting himself of only one part of his interest, namely, his personal holdings? They acknowledged that all of his holdings constituted an interest in the company, but they claimed to believe that, as suggested by Mr. Davis, Mr. Stevens could disqualify himself. If that is the case, I do not understand why they were so insistent on his divesting himself of the 43,000 shares, which really have no different status from his other holdings.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from New York. I completely agree with him. I think their argument on the disqualification is their own rebuttal. They rebut themselves when they take the position that it is necessary for him to divest himself of a part of his holdings. When they make that admission they admit that he has an interest. If he has an interest his nomination should not be confirmed. However, the Senator from New York and I are in the minority. Other Senators will have to refer to the record in the future, mark my word, and I believe many Senators will rue the day that the precedent was established.

Going back to the point I was making with reference to the millions of dollars of defense contracts and the relationship of such contracts to the national debt, about which we heard so much today in the President's State of the Union message, I suggest that we had better keep the cost of the contracts down and we had better keep the profits on them down if we want to keep the national debt down, and we had better assure the American people that the individuals who are passing on the defense contracts have no affinity of interest with the companies which are manufacturing the defense goods.

I cannot make it any more simple. The question gets down to whether or not an individual in his own conscience believes there is involved a question of political ethics. I think such a question is involved.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I do not think Mr. Stevens' own attorney was of any great help to him in the final position which Mr. Stevens took, as is apparent from his attorney's own opinion. I read from page 14 of the first hearings. It is Mr. Davis' opinion to his client, to which the Senator from New York referred. I read:

You are of course no longer an officer or agent of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. However, I believe that you would be held under the above statute to be "directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits of contracts" of that company. It is not necessary to go into the question of how large a man's stock interest must be to bring him within this language, as yours is sufficiently substantial to make it applicable.

It follows that if you assume the position of Secretary of the Army, the section I have quoted will be violated if, while your stock interest continues, you act for the United States in connection with the transaction of business with J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.

Later, speaking about the trust fund, Mr. Davis said:

However, it does not provide a complete solution in the case of your connection with J. P. Stevens & Company, Inc. Even if you sold the 42,486 shares which you own outright, your remaining interest in the stock now held in trust, over which you do not have control, might be sufficient to present a question.

His own attorney had the same doubts the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon have expressed this afternoon. They are not doubts about any indirect interest, either.

Therefore I close by summarizing my opinion on the Stevens case:

First. The same question of public policy which was involved in the Wilson and Kyes cases is involved in the Stevens case, and I incorporate by reference every argument I made against those two nominations.

Second. In connection with the Stevens case we have a new feature. There is involved in round figures $2,000,000 in a remainder interest, a valuable interest which he automatically gets. At least the committee has not shown us that he will not get it. I believe it to be a direct interest in the company, not an indirect interest.

Lastly, Mr. President, we are considering a man who dragged his feet all the way through the hearings. It was not until the very last—and then we are told that the statement was made in executive session, and we really do not have the full statement about it—it was not until the last, as the chairman of the committee now tells us, that Mr. Stevens finally agreed, in the last executive session, to divest himself of any and all stock, save of course the stock of which he could not divest himself, and that is his interest in the trust estate.

Mr. President, the administration ought to find some other position for him. They ought to keep him out of an office that is going to have so much to do with defense contracts. He should not be put in a position where he must disqualify himself to pass on some contracts, because that is an admission of his lack of qualification for the job. It is a rebuttal of the very arguments that have been made in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. It is a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

rebuttal of the argument that he does not violate the statute. If he must disqualify himself, it is because he can not meet the statute.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the reasons I have given, I believe the nomination should not be confirmed, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not believe I can add anything to the discussion of the nomination, but I should like to put my own position on record with regard to it.

I fully agree with Mr. Stevens in his dragging of his feet. I think the committee made a mistake when it required him to sell his stock. I think that if that policy is pursued we will disqualify hundreds of able men from assuming Government positions. It seems to me perfectly clear, from a reading of the statute, that there is no violation of it unless a man really acts in a case involving a company in which he has an interest. It seems to me to be perfectly clear that in all subordinate positions a man who is forced into the position of acting in cases which concern his company can be relieved of that responsibility; and that can apply to the Secretary of the Army, as well as to anyone else. I think the present case is distinguished very clearly from the Wilson case, because I do not believe the Secretary of Defense can relieve himself of that responsibility without an additional statute. Under the statute relating to the Department of Defense it is stated very clearly that:

> Under the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Defense shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense. The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries, under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

The Secretary of the Army is merely a subordinate, similar to any other subordinate in the Department of Defense. If in any case the Secretary of the Army is presented with the duty of dealing with his own company, the Secretary of Defense can order him to have nothing to do with that matter, and can assign it to someone else, and should necessarily assign it to someone who is not a subordinate of the man he is relieving. In that way the Secretary of the Army can be ordered not to deal with his own company, and can be prevented from doing so. If that policy is pursued, it is very clear that there will not be a violation of the law.

I can conceive of a case in which an appointee's Government job might be such that if he were disqualified from dealing with his own company, that might amount to such a substantial interference with his duties in his Government job that he could not properly perform them. That is largely the case of Mr. Wilson, and that is another reason why it was necessary to require Mr. Wilson to sell his stock in General Motors Corp. The business done by General Motors Corp. relates in so many ways to the activities of the Department of Defense that if we were to say that the present Secretary of Defense must be disqualified from dealing with General Motors Corp., he could scarcely serve as Secretary of Defense.

On the other hand, if we take the view that any person who has an interest of any kind in a company which deals with the Government, which perhaps sells the Government one out of the many hundreds of thousands of products the Government purchases, must sell his stock in that company before he can accept a position in the Government service, we shall encounter great difficulties in obtaining the services of desirable men, for many men in such circumstances will refuse to sell their stock. They may own stock in a family business to which they look for support in their old age, or to which they look for the support of their children. So it seems to me that the application of such a policy will simply make it impossible to employ hundreds and hundreds of capable men in the service of the United States.

Incidentally, Mr. President, such situations arise as a rule in the case of men with connections with smaller businesses, rather than with large ones—men who have small family businesses, men who have not been connected with big business. The small-business men will be the ones to be disqualified under such a policy.

I realize the law and the circumstances which relate to the case now before us, and I certainly am not disposed to criticize the action taken by the committee in this case. However, I think the principle the committee has established—a principle against which Mr. Stevens protested by the "dragging of his feet," as mentioned by the Senator from Oregon—is a wrong principle. If it is not reversed, I think the Congress should proceed, with due consideration after proper hearings, to amend the law, so as to make it perfectly clear that in such a case a man can be relieved of responsibility, so long as the particular matter concerned is only an occasional part of his entire service in the Government agency, a matter which may come before him perhaps only once or twice a year, among many thousands of other transactions. It seems to me that we should amend the law so as to make it perfectly clear that such men can be made eligible to serve the Government of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been very much interested in hearing the distinguished majority leader say that scores of desirable persons would be disqualified. Of course, I do not believe that anyone is indispensable to the Government service.

As I look back, I can mention a great many persons who have had no conflict of interest such as we have been discussing here, and yet have made very excellent public officials. Among the many, I can mention to my colleagues Secretary of Defense Forrestal; Secretary of Defense Lovett; Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, under whom I served for a time; Secretary of the Navy Jonathan Daniels, under whom I served for a time; Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox; Secretary of War Stimson——

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator from New York that all those men and also former President Truman bitterly protested the fact that they had great difficulty in obtaining the services of qualified men in subordinate positions in the Government of the United States.

Once in a while it is possible to obtain the services of a man who happens to have no connection with a firm doing business with the Government, and sometimes it is possible to find a man who is willing to sacrifice all the personal position he has acquired. But that does not change the general fact, which has been called to our attention by all those who have just been mentioned by the Senator from New York, because of their difficulty in obtaining competent assistants to serve the Government in positions which require business experience. It seems to me that the need I am stating has been admitted to exist in the last administration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say that the positions to which we now have reference are not at all subordinate positions. One of them is Secretary of Defense, one of the highest positions in the Government. The other position is that of Secretary of the Army, certainly an extremely high position. I doubt that many persons would reject an offer to serve in either of those positions.

Mr. TAFT. I say to the Senator from New York that Mr. Stevens would have refused, I believe, if he had known what was coming; in that event I do not think he would have considered for a moment taking this position. At least, that is my impression.

I know of another gentleman—a very close friend of mine—who declined to accept a position in the Government service because he has a company which has war contracts.

So I think there is a real danger in adopting the policy which the committee has pursued.

My remarks do not apply to Mr. Wilson, for two reasons: First, I do not think Mr. Wilson can disqualify himself, because he is Secretary of Defense, and I do not believe the Secretary of Defense can disqualify himself unless a new statute to that effect is enacted. In the second place, Mr. Wilson as Secretary of Defense will necessarily deal with General Motors Corp., which has $6,000,000,000 of contracts with the Government. As a result, General Motors Corp. is affected by almost every policy established by the Department of Defense. So it seems to me that if Secretary of Defense Wilson were deprived of any duties in connection with Government business with General Motors Corp., he would become a rather ineffective Secretary of Defense, and for that reason would be disqualified from serving as Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert Ten Broeck Stevens, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Army?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in urging confirmation of the nomination of my good friend and fellow Texan, Robert B. Anderson, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Bob Anderson is one of the best known and most highly respected citizens of my State. He has a reputation for outstanding integrity and ability. I do not believe there is a single Texan who would not take Bob Anderson's word as his bond.

For a number of years Bob Anderson has been the manager of one of the largest and most far-flung business enterprises in our State. In that capacity he has exhibited executive and administrative talents that can be matched by few persons.

But it is not in the field of business enterprise alone that Bob Anderson has distinguished himself. He is a former law professor at the University of Texas. From a sense of public spirit he has served as chairman of the Texas State Board of Education.

All his friends know Bob Anderson to be a man who would resolve any conflict between national and personal interest in favor of the United States. He has already shown his complete willingness to enter his new office without any ties that might prove to be embarrassing.

Mr. President, as Secretary of the Navy, Bob Anderson will make a fine contribution to the Nation's defense. I hope his nomination will be unanimously and promptly confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to say that I believe this nominee is highly qualified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the committee was unanimously agreed about this nomination. The nominee is a fine person, as the Senator from Texas has said, and has no conflicting holdings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am told that, at the request of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the committee is holding some further hearings. I ask that this nomination be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. O'Neill has been a member of the Board for some time. His term expired yesterday, and he has been reappointed for a period of 3 years. There has been no objection to his nomination, so far as I know. Mr. O'Neill is a citizen of New York, and his work on the National Mediation Board has been highly spoken of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Robert Ten Broeck Stevens, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Robert B. Anderson, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Navy.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou supreme source of life and light of wisdom and truth, wilt Thou inspire us during this day with a reassuring sense of Thy companionship and the conquering power of Thy divine spirit.

Grant that the moral and spiritual forces may be greatly strengthened as we seek to establish the kingdom of universal peace and brotherhood.

May our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of leadership and authority in our Republic be animated by sincere and lofty ambitions.

Help us to walk circumspectly and with dignity and humility as we meet the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 29, 1953, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 50, Rept. No. 7), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, effective as of January 3, 1953, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (l) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "under," insert the words "clause 12 of."

Page 1, line 5, after "XI", strike "(1) (l)."

Page 1, line 9, after "States", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

Page 1, line 10, after "tories", strike out ", and possessions."

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 22, Rept. No. 8), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1953, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 11 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government, or Government-owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the solution of the problems of small business during the continuance of the existing national emergency.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 129, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24, TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12:30 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Eighty-third Congress, for the warmth of your reception my deep and grateful thanks.

I welcome the honor of appearing before you to deliver my first message to the Congress.

It is manifestly the joint purpose of the congressional leadership and of this administration to justify the summons to governmental responsibility issued last November by the American people. [Applause.]

The grand labors of this leadership will involve:

Application of America's influence in world affairs with such fortitude and such foresight that it will deter aggression and eventually secure peace [applause];

Establishment of a national administration of such integrity and such efficiency that its honor at home will insure respect abroad [applause];

Encouragement of those incentives that inspire creative initiative in our economy, so that its productivity may fortify freedom everywhere; and

Dedication to the well-being of all our citizens and to the attainment of equality of opportunity for all, so that our Nation will ever act with the strength of unity in every task to which it is called.

The purpose of this message is to suggest certain lines along which our joint efforts may immediately be directed toward realization of these four ruling purposes.

The time that this administration has been in office has been too brief to permit preparation of a detailed and comprehensive program of recommended action to cover all phases of the responsibilities that devolve upon our country's new leaders. Such a program will be filled out in the weeks ahead of us as, after appropriate study, I shall submit additional recommendations for your consideration. Today can provide only a sure and substantial beginning.

II

Our country has come through a painful period of trial and disillusionment since the victory of 1945. We anticipated a world of peace and cooperation. The calculated pressures of aggressive communism have forced us, instead, to live in a world of turmoil.

From this costly experience we have learned one clear lesson. We have learned that the free world cannot indefinitely remain in a posture of paralyzed tension. [Applause.] To do so leaves forever to the aggressor the choice of time and place and means to cause greatest hurt to us at least cost to himself.

This administration has, therefore, begun the definition of a new, positive foreign policy. [Applause.] This policy will be governed by certain basic ideas. They are these:

First. Our foreign policy must be clear, consistent, and confident. This means that it must be the product of genuine, continuous cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of this Government. [Applause.] It must be developed and directed in the spirit of true bipartisanship. And I assure you Members of this Congress I mean that fully, earnestly, and sincerely.

Second. The policy we embrace must be a coherent global policy. The freedom we cherish and defend in Europe and in the Americas is no different from the freedom that is imperiled in Asia.

Third. Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices—except breaking faith with our friends. [Applause.] We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. [Applause.] I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement. [Applause.]

Fourth. The policy we pursue will recognize the truth that no single country, even one so powerful as ours, can alone defend the liberty of all nations threatened by Communist aggression from without or subversion within. Mutual security means effective mutual cooperation. For the United States, this means that, as a matter of common sense and national interest, we shall give help to other nations in the measure that they strive earnestly to do their full share of the common task. [Applause.] No wealth of aid could compensate for poverty of spirit. The heart of every free

nation must be honestly dedicated to the preserving of its own independence and security.

Fifth. Our policy will be designed to foster the advent of practical unity in Western Europe. The nations of that region have contributed notably to the effort of sustaining the security of the free world. From the jungles of Indochina and Malaya to the northern shores of Europe, they have vastly improved their defensive strength. Where called upon to do so, they have made costly and bitter sacrifices to hold the line of freedom.

But the problem of security demands closer cooperation among the nations of Europe than has been known to date. Only a more closely integrated economic and political system can provide the greatly increased economic strength needed to maintain both necessary military readiness and respectable living standards.

Europe's enlightened leaders have long been aware of these facts. All the devoted work that has gone into the Schuman plan, the European army, and the Strasbourg Conference has testified to their vision and determination. These achievements are the more remarkable when we realize that each of them has marked a victory—for France and Germany alike—over the divisions that in the past have brought tragedy to these two great nations and to the world.

The needed unity of Western Europe manifestly cannot be manufactured from without; it can only be created from within. But it is right and necessary that we encourage Europe's leaders by informing them of the high value we place upon the earnestness of their efforts toward this goal. Real progress will be conclusive evidence to the American people that our material sacrifices in the cause of collective security are matched by essential political, economic, and military accomplishments in Western Europe.

Sixth. Our foreign policy will recognize the importance of profitable and equitable world trade.

A substantial beginning can and should be made by our friends themselves. Europe, for example, is now marked by checkered areas of labor surplus and labor shortage, of agricultural areas needing machines and industrial areas needing food. Here and elsewhere we can hope that our friends will take the initiative in creating broader markets and more dependable currencies, to allow greater exchange of goods and services among themselves.

Action along these lines can create an economic environment that will invite vital help from us.

Such help includes:

First. Revising our customs regulations to remove procedural obstacles to profitable trade. I further recommend that the Congress take the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under immediate study and extend it by appropriate legislation. [Applause.] This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards. [Applause.] In all Executive study and recommendations on this problem, labor and management and farmers alike will be earnestly consulted.

Second. Doing whatever our Government can properly do to encourage the flow of private American investment abroad. This involves, as a serious and explicit purpose of our foreign policy, the encouragement of a hospitable climate for such investment in foreign nations.

Third. Availing ourselves of facilities overseas for the economical production of manufactured articles which are needed for mutual defense and which are not seriously competitive with our own normal peacetime production.

Fourth. Receiving from the rest of the world, in equitable exchange for what we supply, greater amounts of important raw materials which we do not ourselves possess in adequate quantities.

III

In this general discussion of our foreign policy, I must make special mention of the war in Korea.

This war is, for Americans, the most painful phase of Communist aggression throughout the world. It is clearly a part of the same calculated assault that the aggressor is simultaneously pressing in Indochina and in Malaya, and of the strategic situation that manifestly embraces the island of Formosa and the Chinese Nationalist forces there. The working out of any military solution to the Korean war will inevitably affect all these areas.

The administration is giving immediate increased attention to the development of additional Republic of Korea forces. The citizens of that country have proved their capacity as fighting men and their eagerness to take a greater share in the defense of their homeland. Organization, equipment, and training will allow them to do so. Increased assistance to Korea for this purpose conforms fully to our global policies. [Applause.]

In June 1950, following the aggressive attack on the Republic of Korea, the United States Seventh Fleet was instructed both to prevent attack upon Formosa and also to insure that Formosa should not be used as a base of operations against the Chinese Communist mainland.

This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. Regardless of the situation in 1950, since the date of that order the Chinese Communists have invaded Korea to attack the United Nations forces there. They have consistently rejected the proposals of the United Nations command for an armistice. They recently joined with Soviet Russia in rejecting the armistice proposal sponsored in the United Nations by the Government of India. This proposal had been accepted by the United States and 53 other nations.

Consequently there is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. [Applause.] This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies, in Korea.

I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. [Applause.] Permit me to make crystal clear, this order implies no aggressive intent on our part. But we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea. [Applause.]

IV

Our labor for peace in Korea and in the world imperatively demands the maintenance by the United States of a strong fighting service ready for any contingency.

Our problem is to achieve adequate military strength within the limits of endurable strain upon our economy. To amass military power without regard to our economic capacity would be to defend ourselves against one kind of disaster by inviting another.

Both military and economic objectives demand a single national military policy, proper coordination of our armed services, and effective consolidation of certain logistics functions.

We must eliminate waste and duplication of effort in the armed services. [Applause.]

We must realize clearly that size alone is not sufficient. The biggest force is not necessarily the best force—we want the best.

We must not let traditions or habits of the past stand in the way of developing an efficient military force. All members of our forces must be ever mindful that they serve under a single flag and for a single cause. [Applause.]

We must effectively integrate our armament programs and plan them in such careful relation to our industrial facilities that we assure the best use of our manpower and our materials.

Because of the complex technical nature of our military organization and because of the security reasons involved, the Secretary of Defense must take the initiative and assume the responsibility for developing plans to give our Nation maximum safety at minimum cost. Accordingly the new Secretary of Defense and his civilian and military associates will in the future recommend such changes in present laws affecting our defense activities as may be necessary in order to clarify responsibility and improve the total effectiveness of our defense effort. [Applause.]

This effort must always conform to policies laid down in the National Security Council.

The statutory function of the National Security Council is to assist the President in the formulation and coordination of significant domestic, foreign, and military policies required for the security of this Nation. In these days of tension, it is essential that this central body have the vitality to perform effectively its statutory role. I propose to see that it does so.

Careful formulation of policies must be followed by clear understanding of them by all peoples. A related need, therefore, is to make more effective all activities of the Government related to international information.

I have recently appointed a committee of representative and informed citizens to survey this subject and to make

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

recommendations in the near future for legislative, administrative, or any other action.

A unified and dynamic effort in this whole field is essential to the security of the United States and of the other peoples in the community of free nations. There is but one sure way to avoid global war—and that is to win the cold war. [Applause.]

While retaliatory power is one strong deterrent to a would-be aggressor, another powerful deterrent is defensive power. No enemy is likely to attempt an attack foredoomed to failure.

Because the building of a completely impenetrable defense against attack is still not possible, total defensive strength must include civil defense preparedness. Because we have incontrovertible evidence that Soviet Russia possesses atomic weapons, this kind of protection becomes sheer necessity. [Applause.]

Civil defense responsibilities primarily belong to the State and local governments, including recruiting, training, and organizing volunteers to meet any emergency. The immediate job of the Federal Government is to provide leadership, to supply technical guidance, and to continue to strengthen its civil defense stockpile of medical, engineering, and related supplies and equipment. This work must go forward without lag.

V

I have referred to the inescapable need for economic health and strength if we are to maintain adequate military power and exert influential leadership for peace in the world.

Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can:

First. Reduce the planned deficits and then balance the budget, which means, among other things, reducing Federal expenditures to the safe minimum [applause];

Second. Meet the huge costs of our defense;

Third. Properly handle the burden of our inheritance of debt and obligations;

Fourth. Check the menace of inflation;

Fifth. Work toward the earliest possible reduction of the tax burden;

Sixth. Make constructive plans to encourage the initiative of our citizens.

It is important that all of us understand that this administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate. Much already has been written on the record, beyond our power quickly to erase or to amend. This record includes our inherited burden of indebtedness and obligations and deficits.

The current year's budget, as you know, carries a 5.9 billion dollar deficit, and the budget which was presented to you before this administration took office, indicates a budgetary deficit of 9.9 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The national debt is now more than 265 billion dollars. In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payment totals over 80 billion dollars. Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities, so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description.

The bills for the payment of nearly all of the 80 billion dollars of obligations will be presented during the next 4 years. These bills, added to the current costs of government we must meet, make a formidable burden.

The present authorized Government debt limit is 275 billion dollars. The forecast presented by the outgoing administration with the fiscal year 1954 budget indicates that—before the end of the fiscal year and at the peak of demand for payments during that year—the total Government debt may approach and even exceed that limit. Unless budgeted deficits are checked, the momentum of past programs will force an increase of the statutory debt limit.

Permit me this one understatement: To meet and correct this situation will not be easy. [Laughter and applause.]

Permit me this one assurance: Every Department head and I are determined to do everything we can to resolve it. [Applause.]

The first order of business is the elimination of the annual deficit. This cannot be achieved merely by exhortation. It demands the concerted action of all those in responsible positions in the Government and the earnest cooperation of the Congress.

Already, we have begun an examination of the appropriations and expenditures of all departments in an effort to find significant items that may be decreased or canceled without damage to our essential requirements.

Getting control of the budget requires also that State and local governments and interested groups of citizens restrain themselves in their demands upon the Congress. [Applause.]

A balanced budget is an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar. This is one of the critical steps to be taken to bring an end to planned inflation. Our purpose is to manage the Government's finances so as to help and not hinder each family in balancing its own budget. [Applause.]

Reduction of taxes will be justified only as we show we can succeed in bringing the budget under control. [Applause.] As the budget is balanced and inflation checked, the tax burden that today stifles initiative can and must be eased.

Until we can determine the extent to which expenditures can be reduced, it would not be wise to reduce our revenues. [Applause.]

Meanwhile, the tax structure as a whole demands review. The Secretary of the Treasury is undertaking this study immediately. We must develop a system of taxation which will impose the least possible obstacle to the dynamic growth of the country. This includes particularly real opportunity for the growth of small businesses. Many readjustments in existing taxes will be necessary to serve these objectives and also to remove existing inequities. Clarification and simplification in the tax laws as well as the regulations will be undertaken.

In the entire area of fiscal policy—which must, in its various aspects, be treated in recommendations to the Congress in coming weeks—there can now be stated certain basic facts and principles.

First. It is axiomatic that our economy is a highly complex and sensitive mechanism. Hasty and ill-considered action of any kind could seriously upset the subtle equation that encompasses debts, obligations, expenditures, defense demands, deficits, taxes, and the general economic health of the Nation. Our goals can be clear, our start toward them can be immediate—but action must be gradual.

Second. It is clear that too great a part of the national debt comes due in too short a time. The Department of the Treasury will undertake—indeed has undertaken—at suitable times a program of extending part of the debt over longer periods and gradually placing greater amounts in the hands of longer-term investors.

Third. Past differences in policy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have helped to encourage inflation. Henceforth, I expect that their single purpose shall be to serve the whole Nation by policies designed to stabilize the economy and encourage the free play of our people's genius for individual initiative. [Applause.]

In encouraging this initiative, no single item in our current problems has received more thoughtful consideration by my associates, and by the many individuals called into our counsels, than the matter of price and wage control by law.

The great economic strength of our democracy has developed in an atmosphere of freedom. The character of our people resists artificial and arbitrary controls of any kind. Direct controls, except those on credit, deal not with the real causes of inflation but only with its symptoms. In times of national emergency, this kind of control has a role to play. Our whole system, however, is based upon the assumption that, normally, we should combat wide fluctuations in our price structure by relying largely on the effective use of sound fiscal and monetary policy, and upon the natural workings of economic law.

Moreover, American labor and American business can best resolve their wage problems across the bargaining table. [Applause.] Government should refrain from sitting in with them unless, in extreme cases, the public welfare requires protection.

We are, of course, living in an international situation that is neither an emergency demanding full mobilization, nor is it peace. No one can know how long this condition will persist. Consequently, we are forced to learn many new things as we go along—clinging to what works, discarding what does not.

In all our current discussions on these and related facts, the weight of evidence is clearly against the use of controls in their present forms. [Applause.] They have proved largely unsatisfactory or unworkable. They have not prevented inflation; they have not kept down the cost of living. [Applause.] Dissatisfaction with them is wholly justified. I am convinced that now—as well as in the long run—free and competitive prices will best serve the interests of all the people, and best meet the changing, growing needs of our economy. [Applause.]

Accordingly, I do not intend to ask for a renewal of the present wage and price controls on April 30, 1953. [Applause.] In the meantime, steps will be taken to eliminate controls in an orderly manner, and to terminate special agencies no longer needed for this purpose. [Applause.] It is obviously to be expected that the removal of these controls will result in individual price changes—some will move up, some down. But a maximum of freedom in market prices as well as in collective bargaining is characteristic of a truly free people.

I believe also that material and product controls should be ended, except with respect to defense priorities and scarce and critical items essential for our defense. I shall recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted to continue authority for such remaining controls of this type as will be necessary after the expiration of the existing statute on June 30, 1953.

I recommend the continuance of the authority for Federal control over rents in those communities in which serious housing shortages exist. These are chiefly the so-called defense areas. In these and all areas, the Federal Government should withdraw from the control of rents as soon as practicable. But before they are removed entirely, each legislature should have full opportunity to take over, within its own State, responsibility for this function. [Applause.]

It would be idle to pretend that all our problems in this whole field of prices will solve themselves by mere Federal withdrawal from direct controls.

We shall have to watch trends closely. If the freer functioning of our economic system, as well as the indirect controls which can be appropriately employed, prove insufficient during this period of strain and tension, I shall promptly ask this Congress to enact such legislation as may be required.

In facing all these problems—wages, prices, production, tax rates, fiscal policy, deficits—everywhere we remain constantly mindful that the time for sacrifice has not ended. But we are concerned with the encouragement of competitive enterprise and individual initiative precisely because we know them to be our Nation's abiding sources of strength.

VI

Our vast world responsibility accents with urgency our people's elemental right to a Government whose clear qualities are: loyalty, security, efficiency, economy, and integrity.

The safety of America and the trust of the people alike demand that the personnel of the Federal Government be loyal in their motives and reliable in the discharge of their duties. Only a combination of both loyalty and reliability promises genuine security.

To state this principle is easy: to apply it can be difficult. But this security we must and we shall have. By way of example, all principal new appointees to departments and agencies have been investigated at their own request by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Confident of your understanding and cooperation, I know that the primary responsibility for keeping out the disloyal and the dangerous rests squarely upon the executive branch. When this branch so conducts itself as to require policing by another branch of the Government, it invites its own disorder and confusion. [Applause.]

I am determined to meet this responsibility of the Executive. The heads of all executive departments and agencies have been instructed to initiate at once effective programs of security with respect to their personnel. The Attorney General will advise and guide the departments and agencies in the shaping of these programs, designed at once to govern the employment of new personnel and to review speedily any derogatory information concerning incumbent personnel.

To carry out these programs, I believe that the powers of the executive branch under existing law are sufficient. If they should prove inadequate, the necessary legislation will be requested.

These programs will be both fair to the rights of the individual and effective for the safety of the Nation. They will, with care and justice, apply the basic principle that public employment is not a right but a privilege. [Applause.]

All these measures have two clear purposes. Their first purpose is to make certain that this Nation's security is not jeopardized by false servants. Their second purpose is to clear the atmosphere of that unreasoned suspicion that accepts rumor and gossip as substitutes for evidence.

Our people, of course, deserve and demand of their Federal Government more than security of personnel. They demand, also, efficient and logical organization, true to constitutional principles.

I have already established a Committee on Government Organization. The Committee is using as its point of departure the reports of the Hoover Commission and subsequent studies by several independent agencies. To achieve the greater efficiency and economy which the Committee analyses show to be possible, I ask the Congress to extend the present Government Reorganization Act for a period of 18 months or 2 years beyond its expiration date of April 1, 1953.

There is more involved here than realining the wheels and smoothing the gears of administrative machinery. The Congress rightfully expects the Executive to take the initiative in discovering and removing outmoded functions and eliminating duplication. [Applause.]

One agency, for example, whose head has promised early and vigorous action to provide greater efficiency is the Post Office. One of the oldest institutions of our Federal Government, its service should be the best. [Applause.] Its employees should merit and receive the high regard and esteem of the citizens of the Nation. There are, today, in some areas of the postal service, both waste and incompetence to be corrected. With cooperation of the Congress, and taking advantage of its accumulated experience in postal affairs, the Postmaster General will institute a program directed at improving service while at the same time reducing costs and decreasing deficits. [Applause.]

In all departments, dedication to these basic precepts of security and efficiency, integrity and economy can and will produce an administration deserving of the trust the people have placed in it.

Our people have demanded nothing less than good, efficient government. They shall get nothing less. [Applause.]

VII

Vitally important are the water and minerals, public lands and standing timber, forage and wildlife of this country. A fast-growing population will have vast future needs in these resources. We must more than match the substantial achievements in the half century since President Theodore Roosevelt awakened the Nation to the problem of conservation.

This calls for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development. Its major projects should be timed, wherever possible, to assist in leveling off peaks and valleys in our economic life. Soundly planned projects already initiated should be carried out. New ones will be planned for the future.

The best natural resources program for America will not result from exclusive dependence on Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens, and the Federal Government, all working together. This combined effort will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power that they can generate. [Applause.] Likewise, such a partnership can be effective in the expansion throughout the Nation of upstream storage; the sound use of public lands; the wise conservation of minerals; and the sustained yield of our forests.

There has been much criticism, some of it apparently justified, of the confusion resulting from overlapping Federal activities in this entire field of resource conservation. This matter is being exhaustively studied and appropriate reorganization plans will be developed.

Most of these particular resource problems pertain to the Department of the Interior. Another of its major concerns is our country's island possessions. Here, one matter deserves attention. The platforms of both political parties promised immediate statehood to Hawaii. The people of that Territory have earned that status. Statehood should be granted promptly with the first election scheduled for 1954. [Applause.]

VIII

One of the difficult problems which faces the new administration is that of the slow, irregular decline of farm prices. This decline, which has been going on for almost 2 years, has occurred at a time when most nonfarm prices and farm costs of production are extraordinarily high.

Present agricultural legislation provides for the mandatory support of the prices of basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates will, of course, execute the present act faithfully

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and thereby seek to mitigate the consequences of the downturn in farm income. [Applause.]

This price-support legislation will expire at the end of 1954.

So we should begin now to consider what farm legislation we should develop for 1955 and beyond. Our aim should be economic stability and full parity of income for American farmers. [Applause.] But we must seek this goal in ways that minimize governmental interference in the farmers' affairs, that permit desirable shifts in production, and that encourage farmers themselves to use initiative in meeting changing economic conditions.

A continuing study reveals nothing more emphatic than the complicated nature of this subject. Among other things, it shows that the prosperity of our agriculture depends directly upon the prosperity of the whole country—upon the purchasing power of American consumers. It depends upon the opportunity to ship abroad large surpluses of particular commodities, and therefore upon sound economic relationships between the United States and many foreign countries. It involves research and scientific investigation, conducted on an extensive scale. It involves special credit mechanisms and marketing, rural electrification, soil conservation, and other programs.

The whole complex of agricultural programs and policies will be studied by a Special Agricultural Advisory Commission, as I know it will be by appropriate committees of the Congress. A nonpartisan group of respected authorities in the field of agriculture has already been appointed as an interim advisory group.

The immediate changes needed in agricultural programs are largely budgetary and administrative in nature. New policies and new programs must await the completion of the far-reaching studies which have already been launched.

IX

The determination of labor policy must be governed not by the vagaries of political expediency but by the firmest principles and convictions. Slanted partisan appeals to American workers, spoken as if they were a group apart, necessitating a special language and treatment, are an affront to the fullness of their dignity as American citizens. [Applause.]

The truth in matters of labor policy has become obscured in controversy. The very meaning of economic freedom as it affects labor has become confused. This misunderstanding has provided a climate of opinion favoring the growth of governmental paternalism in labor relations. This tendency, if left uncorrected, could end only by producing a bureaucratic despotism. Economic freedom is, in fact, the requisite of greater prosperity for every American who earns his own living.

In the field of labor legislation, only a law that merits the respect and support of both labor and management can help reduce the loss of wages and of production through strikes and stoppages, and thus add to the total economic strength of the Nation.

We have now had 5 years' experience with the Labor Management Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law. That experience has shown the need for some corrective action, and we should promptly proceed to amend that act.

I know that the Congress is already proceeding with renewed studies of this subject. Meanwhile, the Department of Labor is at once beginning work to devise further specific recommendations for your consideration.

In the careful working out of legislation, I know you will give thoughtful consideration—as will we in the executive branch—to the views of labor, of management, and of the general public. In this process, it is only human that each of us should bring forward the argument of self-interest. But if all conduct their arguments in the overpowering light of national interest—which is enlightened self-interest—we shall get the right answers. [Applause.] I profoundly hope that every citizen of our country will follow with understanding your progress in this work. The welfare of us all is involved.

Especially must we remember that the institutions of trade unionism and collective bargaining are monuments to the freedom that must prevail in our industrial life. They have a century of honorable achievement behind them. Our faith in them is proven, firm, and final.

Government can do a great deal to aid the settlement of labor disputes without allowing itself to be employed as an ally of either side. Its proper role in industrial strife is to encourage the processes of mediation and conciliation. These processes can successfully be directed only by a government free from the taint of any suspicion that it is partial or punitive. [Applause.]

The administration intends to strengthen and to improve the services which the Department of Labor can render to the worker and to the whole national community. This Department was created—just 40 years ago—to serve the entire Nation. It must aid, for example, employers and employees alike in improving training programs that will develop skilled and competent workers. It must enjoy the confidence and respect of labor and industry in order to play a significant role in the planning of America's economic future. To that end, I am authorizing the Department of Labor to establish promptly a tripartite advisory committee consisting of representatives of employers, labor, and the public.

X

Our civil and social rights form a central part of the heritage we are striving to defend on all fronts and with all our strength.

I believe with all my heart that our vigilant guarding of these rights is a sacred obligation binding upon every citizen. To be true to one's own freedom is, in essence, to honor and respect the freedom of all others.

A cardinal ideal in this heritage we cherish is the equality of rights of all citizens of every race and color and creed.

We know that discrimination against minorities persists despite our allegiance to this ideal. Such discrimination—confined to no one section of the Nation—is but the outward testimony to the persistence of distrust and of fear in the hearts of men.

This fact makes all the more vital the fighting of these wrongs by each individual, in every station of life, in his every deed.

Much of the answer lies in the power of fact, fully publicized; of persuasion, honestly pressed; and of conscience, justly aroused. These are methods familiar to our way of life, tested and proven wise.

I propose to use whatever authority exists in the office of the President to end segregation in the District of Columbia, including the Federal Government, and any segregation in the Armed Forces. [Applause.]

Here in the District of Columbia, serious attention should be given to the proposal to develop and to authorize, through legislation, a system to provide an effective voice in local self-government. While consideration of this proceeds, I recommend an immediate increase of two in the number of District Commissioners to broaden representation of all elements in our local population. This will be a first step toward insuring that this Capital provide an honored example to all communities of our Nation.

In this manner, and by the leadership of the office of the President exercised through friendly conferences with those in authority in our States and cities, we expect to make true and rapid progress in civil rights and equality of employment opportunity.

There is one sphere in which civil rights are inevitably involved in Federal legislation. This is the sphere of immigration.

It is a manifest right of our Government to limit the number of immigrants our Nation can absorb. It is also a manifest right of our Government to set reasonable requirements on the character and the numbers of the people who come to share our land and our freedom.

It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact: We are—one and all—immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants. [Applause.]

Existing legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate. I am informed by Members of the Congress that it was realized at the time of its enactment that future study of the proper basis of determining quotas would be necessary.

I am therefore requesting the Congress to review this legislation and to enact a statute which will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all.

In another but related area—that of social rights—we see most clearly the new application of old ideas of freedom.

This administration is profoundly aware of two great needs born of our living in a complex industrial economy. First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control. Second, the welfare of the people de-

mands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services.

In the light of this responsibility certain general purposes and certain concrete measures are plainly indicated now.

There is urgent need for greater effectiveness in our programs, both public and private, offering safeguards against the privations that too often come with unemployment, old age, illness, and accident. The provisions of the old-age and survivors' insurance law should promptly be extended to cover millions of citizens who have been left out of the social security system. No less important is the encouragement of privately sponsored pension plans. Most important of all, of course, is renewed effort to check the inflation which destroys so much of the value of all social-security payments.

Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action. I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Public interest similarly demands one prompt specific action in protection of the general consumer. The Food and Drug Administration should be authorized to continue its established and necessary program of factory inspections. The invalidation of these inspections by the Supreme Court of December 8, 1952, was based solely on the fact that the present law contains inconsistent and unclear provisions. These should be promptly corrected.

I am well aware that beyond these few immediate measures there remains much to be done. The health and housing needs of our people call for intelligently planned programs. Involved are the solvency of the whole security system; and its guarding against exploitation by the irresponsible.

To bring clear purpose and orderly procedure into this field, I anticipate a thorough study of the proper relationship among Federal, State, and local programs. I shall shortly send you specific recommendations for establishing an appropriate commission; together with a reorganization plan defining new administrative status for all Federal activities in health, education, and social security.

I repeat that there are many important subjects of which I make no mention today. Among these is our great and growing body of veterans. America has traditionally been generous in caring for the disabled—and the widow and the orphan of the fallen. These millions remain close to all our hearts. Proper care of our uniformed citizens and appreciation of the past service of our veterans are part of our accepted governmental responsibilities.

XI

We have surveyed briefly some problems of our people and a portion of the tasks before us.

The hope of freedom itself depends, in real measure, upon our strength, our heart, and our wisdom.

We must be strong in arms. We must be strong in the source of all our armament—our productivity. We all—workers and farmers, foremen and financiers, technicians and builders—all must produce, produce more, and produce yet more.

We must be strong, above all, in the spiritual resources upon which all else depends. We must be devoted with all our heart to the values we defend. We must know that each of these values and virtues applies with equal force at the ends of the earth and in our relations with our neighbor next door. We must know that freedom expresses itself with equal eloquence in the right of workers to strike in the nearby factory—and in the yearnings and sufferings of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

As our heart summons our strength, our wisdom must direct it.

There is—in world affairs—a steady course to be followed between an assertion of strength that is truculent and a confession of helplessness that is cowardly.

There is—in our affairs at home—a middle way between untrammeled freedom of the individual and the demands for the welfare of the whole Nation. This way must avoid government by bureaucracy as carefully as it avoids neglect of the helpless.

In every area of political action, free men must think before they can expect to win.

In this spirit must we live and labor: Confident of our strength, compassionate in our heart, clear in our mind.

In this spirit, let us together turn to the great tasks before us.

Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT SESSION ORDERED PRINTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

TERCENTENARY OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, today is the tercentenary of the establishment of the city of New York on February 2, 1653. It is a good day to speak some truths about my native city. Too often here and elsewhere the significance of this greatest of our own and the world's cities has been written down as some province fenced off from the rest of our country by a different way of life and point of view, peopled by citizens not quite American by reason of background and ideology and living in a stew of municipal corruption. We have our share of troubles but these are careless thoughts irreverent of the majesty of New York and of the 8,000,000 patriotic and essentially religious Americans who are the New Yorkers. For this mighty and magnificent city is not alone unparalleled in the physical aspects of its gleaming man-made pinnacles but is the very expression of the modernity, the drive, the creativeness, and the adventure of our country. More people live in New York than in all of Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. New York City gave 1,000,000 young men and women to our Armed Forces in World War II. New York City is a vital element in what makes our country strong in body, mind, and spirit. Let us make a resolve on this tercentenary day to learn to know New York and to be proud of her as our queen of cities and a national treasure. And I predict that to learn to know her with sympathy and pride will be to learn to love her.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I am today inserting in the Appendix from a special issue of the New York Times magazine, published Sunday, February 1, an article on the history of New York City since its founding 300 years ago by Meyer Berger; an article on New York as it compares with other cities, entitled "Rivals: A Vote for New York" by R. L. Duffus; and finally an article on the staggering statistics about New York by Gilbert Millstein.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

SECRET YALTA PACT AND THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include a resolution pertaining to Yalta introduced by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's state of the Union message rings with long overdue confidence in the natural strength of America.

It puts faith in the people and not in the planners. It is a challenge to all citizens of good will to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our forefathers.

The President's speech will give the Kremlin gang deep dismay. From it they know that their dream that the American economy will sink into the slough of socialism will simply not come true. It lets them know that we do not acquiesce in the Communist conquest of China and Eastern Europe which, if they can consolidate, would give them a pool of manpower and natural resources to carry out their plan of world-wide domination. It denounces the secret Yalta agreement which was never ratified by Congress or the American people and which gave Stalin a seemingly legal strangle hold on his criminal gains.

The Yalta agreement violated the sovereign rights of Poland and China without the knowledge or consent of the Polish or Chinese people. It gave Stalin a strategic hold on Asia and Eastern Europe that has enabled him to keep the initiative in the cold war. By reversing the process of the Yalta agreement and by permitting the forces of freedom of Poland and China to be reborn, we will seize the initiative from the Communists and win the cold war. The Communist conspiracy cannot be contained, it cannot be negotiated with. No sound agreement can ever be entered into with it. The Communist conspiracy must ultimately be defeated. This is the surest road to permanent peace.

For this reason, I have introduced today a resolution declaring the Yalta agreement null and void and not binding on the United States. I wish to include with my remarks the text of the resolution as follows:

House Joint Resolution 162

Joint resolution declaring the Yalta agreement null and void and not binding on the United States

Whereas the private agreement signed at Yalta, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on February 11, 1945, by J. Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill, represents a denial of the principles of national freedom and self-government, as expressed in the North Atlantic Charter and our own Declaration of Independence, which principles have always been cherished by the American people and for which millions fought in World War II; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement was not legal or binding on the United States since it was signed by Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt as an individual and was not signed by him in his official capacity as President of the United States; nor was the agreement approved by the Senate of the United States as is required of any political agreement under section 2 of article II of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas under the Yalta agreement, Mr. Roosevelt attempted to commit the United States to an infringement of the sovereign rights of Poland and of the Republic of China by attempting to make concessions to the Soviets at their expense, in violation of treaties and of the natural law itself; and

Whereas, specifically, the Yalta agreement attempted to sanction Soviet domination of eastern Europe and east Asia, the betrayal of Poland and the mutilation of its natural boundaries, the transfer of the national allegiance of millions of persons without plebiscite or other recognition of their rights to self-determination, and the uprooting of other millions of persons; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement violated the national sovereign rights of the Republic of China by attempting to grant territorial concessions to the Soviets and a preferred position in Manchuria, the richest and most industrialized area of China, in violation of the Nine-Power Treaty of February 6, 1922, and the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1924; and

Whereas under the Yalta agreement Mr. Roosevelt agreed to take measures on the advice of Marshal Stalin, a foreign despot, to obtain the concurrence in the agreement of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, an obligation beyond his power or right as President of the United States or as a private individual to perform; and

Whereas J. Stalin, a party to the Yalta agreement, has consistently disregarded the provisions of the agreement which he has found inconvenient to honor, including the provision for free and unfettered elections in dismembered Poland and the provisions for treating Germany as an economic unit and for encouraging free political parties in Germany; and

Whereas the Soviets under the direction of J. Stalin, has also forcibly interfered in the internal affairs of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, thus making it impossible for the respective peoples of such nations to hold free elections to form governments of their own choice; and

Whereas the denial by the United States of the validity of the Yalta agreement for the above reasons will reemphasize to the peoples of the world the adherence of the United States to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and our own Delcaration of Independence, and will serve to give hope to the subjugated peoples of the world through the knowledge that the United States is mindful of their desire to achieve independence and self-government: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the private agreement signed at Yalta, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in February, 1945, is hereby declared to be null and void and of no binding force whatsoever on the United States.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower measured up today. He was at his best. In my 29 years on Capitol Hill I have never heard a more dynamic and forthright address on the state of the Union.

When I was in Korea last April I was appalled at what I saw. Most of the fighting and dying on our side was by American boys and ROK troops. Later I saw on Formosa the Nationalist Chinese soldiers making up the largest Asiatic anti-Communist army in the world. While we had a mission of 400 American officers training them they had been neutralized as combatants by our Government. They were anxious to regain their mainland where so many of their loved ones were active in the underground. I wondered how long these good-looking, healthy men could be held together. Why, I asked publicly, could they not help relieve the pressure on our men in the heartbreak ridges of Korea?

I am glad the President has instituted positive action to remedy the stalemate.

For years I have urged governmental action to repudiate the infamous Yalta agreements selling the liberty-loving people of Poland down the river, and I am prepared to vote now on a proper resolution to this end.

Since President Truman reported to the Congress the first atomic explosions in the Soviet Union I have insisted that we in Washington have been most remiss in our appraisal of civil defense needs. There are too many among us who hold "it just cannot happen here" or, if it could, "there is nothing that can be done about it." I am pleased that President Eisenhower senses the danger and means to do something about it.

For some time I have known that better mail service to the people of the United States was close to the hearts of our new President and his Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield. I have contended that the Post Office Department has become outmoded and archaic. It was only yesterday that an irate patron wrote me that to him at least an improved mail service meant more than a moderate reduction in taxes. He said he was the father of a lad fighting in Korea.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FORRESTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and to include an article prepared by William C. McCollom, sheriff of Suffolk County.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois and to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

Mr. PELLY and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include a letter.

Mr. D'EWART in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include three resolutions and a letter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. GORDON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN in three instances and to include articles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POAGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOLLOHAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. FINE.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 3, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

412. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1952, as required by an act of Congress, approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

413. A letter from the General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education personnel for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

414. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605, and act of June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

415. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1952, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 10 of an act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, and paragraph 14 of section 8 of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

416. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report with reference to illegal expenditures made by the Department of the Navy in connection with the suit brought by the United States against Fallbrook public utility district, and others, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division; to the Committee on Government Operations.

417. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a letter relative to the advisability of making a special audit of the corporations and lending agencies of the Department of Agriculture as of the close of business January 31, 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the synthetic liquid fuels for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

419. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-sixth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

420. A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission for the year 1952, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 232, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

421. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require that merchant seamen be able to understand orders given in the English language, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

422. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a statement of business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to chapter 2510 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1133); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

423. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the administration of functions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 212 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

424. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of certain final valuations of properties of carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

425. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended, July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

426. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 1979. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955; with an amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 129. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1979, a bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2446. A bill Pay-as-you-go Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2447. A bill Pay-as-you-go Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2448. A bill making an appropriation for the construction of a building for the Bureau of Mines, authorized under section 101 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, on a site in Mount Hope, W. Va., which has been donated to the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2449. A bill to establish a Bureau of Clinics for the treatment of chronic alcoholics and narcotics addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2450. A bill to credit the Oglala Sioux Tribe with the proceeds of Oglala Sioux tribal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2451. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2452. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2453. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2454. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2455. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2456. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2457. A bill for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2458. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2459. A bill to reduce the rate of postage on third-class matter consisting of sample ballots and other official election material mailed by States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2460. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2461. A bill to regulate the subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2462. A bill to waive, in the case of certain veterans of World War I over 70 years of age, the income limitation restricting their right to receive non-service-connected disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2463. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2464. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act so as to permit the charging of tolls, under certain conditions, on federally aided highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2467. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2468. A bill to promote equal treatment for disabled veterans by providing that the increase in compensation granted by the first section of the act of May 23, 1952, shall be 15 percent in all cases, without regard to degree of disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST (by request):

H. R. 2469. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to dependents' parents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2470. A bill to provide for the issuing of policies of national service life insurance to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2471. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2472. A bill to channel into Government hands excess production of basic commodities needed for defense purposes and to prevent the price depressive effects of such production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2473. A bill to provide for dissolution of interstate bank holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2474. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2475. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2476. A bill to regulate subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 2477. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2478. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate 1953 as the fiftieth anniversary year of farm demonstration work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution declaring the Yalta agreement null and void and not binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 130. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study regarding the reestablishment of cartels, resumption of power by former Nazis, and resurgence of fascism and anti-Semitism in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to passing legislation to incorporate Franco-American War Veterans, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to their senate joint resolution No. 9, relative to the shortage of hospital beds for California veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to requesting the enactment of such remedial legislation as may be necessary to permit the deduction from income taxes of expenses incurred for travel to and from work, expenses incurred by working mothers and fathers for the care and maintenance of minor children, and to exempt from income taxes remuneration received by coal miners in the form of miner's pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to requesting certain changes in the field of taxation so as to give several States of the Union an increased opportunity to levy additional taxes without increasing the burden of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to requesting the enactment of legislation forbidding the shipment of raw garbage across State lines for feeding purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to requesting taking action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed and other pertinent matters in relation thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Washington, extending its felicitations, and its earnest and sincere best wishes to the new national administration, under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Spainhour Furniture Co., Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Dulin G. Westfall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jeanne Kane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2484. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Oliver P. Livermont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Libera Andreuzzi Popovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Maria (Henriette) Zagrabowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Robert Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Paul, Zelma, and Ivan Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spytihnev Karlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2491. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Panayotis Koutsoyannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Poulicos S. Loucacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Antonia Majer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Jozica Zorman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2496. A bill for the relief of John Jacob Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Mary Catherine Flowers, widow of John Edward Flowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2498. A bill for the relief of William B. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Adolfo L. Kalb, and his wife, Mrs. Eugenia G. Kalb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Majzner (alias Stanley Maisner); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Mahmud Ali Mahmud Areiquat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Hasan Areiquat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Christian Schmidt-Courvoisier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Lajos Schmidt and his wife, Magda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of certain members of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Gatti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2508. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla., by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Maltese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution adopted by the New Haven Jewish Community Council, New Haven, Conn., protesting and condemning the anti-Jewish campaign conducted in Eastern Europe in the guise of anti-Zionist charges of international Jewish conspiracies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

34. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to requesting the enactment of legislation and to make an investigation into the alarming curtailment of hospital beds and other medical-care programs for veterans in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

35. Also petition of chief of police, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting the establishment of an agency on the national level to aid local law enforcement in combating organized crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

36. Also petition of Gerassimos Tsetoulis, Montreal, Canada, relative to stating a grievance in regard to the Greek immigration quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Abraham Shusterman, rabbi, Har Sinai Congregation, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in whose hands are our lives and destinies, we lift our hearts unto Thee in thanksgiving and praise. We render thanks unto Thee for our country and for those brave men, the quick and the dead, who have preserved its integrity as a land of justice and freedom. May our devotion to the ideals for which they lived and died ever bear witness to our gratitude and our faith. Enlighten with Thy wisdom and uphold with Thy strength all who guide our free institutions. Bless those who serve within the several branches of our Government; grant them the courage and faith to lead our Nation and all who look to it for guidance toward that goal of peace and security which Thou hast ordained for all Thy children. Uphold the arms of the Members of this House; set their minds and hearts on Thee. Speed the day when, united in loving service, we may establish Thy kingdom. Establish Thou also upon us the work of our hands; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 51):

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; and Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut; Mr. JENNER, of Indiana; and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; and Mr. GILLETTE, of Iowa.

The message also announced that Mr. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, had appointed Mr. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, and Mr. MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, were appointed as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. STENNIS, of Mississippi, a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission in lieu of Mr. GEORGE, of Georgia, resigned.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. CORDON, of Oregon, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in lieu of Mr. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, resigned.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, of Georgia; Mr. DWORSHAK, of Idaho; and Mr. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy. Mr. SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, is an ex officio member of the Board.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

COMMUNISM

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, with our recent change in national administration there are positive evidences that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

there will be no change in our domestic, nor in our international, firm stand against communism. We are, under the Eisenhower administration, uncompromisingly determined to defend and to perpetuate the democratic way of life.

However, the godless, militant, adroit, and powerful force driving toward world-wide dictatorship, under the Russian banner of so-called international communism, is still very much on their job. Their self-assigned task is to dominate all the world, and to rule by brute force by enslaving individual human beings everywhere.

By force, using their well-known tactics of slave-labor camps, extortion, persecution, and murder, they claim to be bringing relief and peace to those they enslave. They parade under a banner of peace. We must be very sure that we are not deceived and fooled by this clever Communist hoax which they say is peace.

Peace to the Communist dictators means something radically different from what peace means to freemen. To the Communist masters, peace means merely submission without resistance to the ruling Communist clique. Its inevitable result to individual human beings is poverty, disease, misery, and slavery, in a life of fear. Peace to freemen means abundance, happiness, security, and freedom, in a life of opportunity. Thus, until we positively know the Communist meaning of peace has completely changed, we should not be deceived by any Communist peace movement.

I am sure that no man living today is more determined than President Eisenhower to effectively, successfully, and as quickly as possible, turn back these Communist dictators—destroyers of peace—and make secure this free way of life we know and love.

Our recent transition of the reins of government from one of our major political parties to the other, a normal process for a free, democratic people, gives little hope to those who would destroy our form of Government. The retiring President riding with the new President to the inauguration, and the two sharing mutual loyalties and mutual determinations, must have been perplexing and discouraging to those who claim that democracy and private enterprise will not work.

While we believe in, are devoted to, and operate under a two-party system of government, this does not mean that party loyalty overshadows the basic principles of free government. Both Democrats and Republicans equally value American citizenship and know that no privilege is afforded to human beings which means more to an individual than being a citizen of the United States of America.

This rich heritage carries sobering obligations and responsibilities. We must defend and expand what we have if we hope to perpetuate it. We can remain free only by encouraging others to embrace and develop for themselves, in their own way, a free pattern of life which will bring to them abundance, happiness, security, and peace. The United Nations is an organization conceived and designed to build and expand this democratic concept of world peace. It deserves our support. It also demands constant vigilance to see that none of its groups hinder our cause rather than help. Devotion to the cause of freemen everywhere is, and must continue to be, our compelling aim.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have been working on a program designed to bring about a more realistic approach to our trade agreements program—one which would provide needed protection to American interests and also allow for reasonable trade relations with other countries.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 with amendments which will make the act more practical.

The President has advocated an extension of the present act, but in so doing pointed out the necessity of providing legitimate safeguards to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor standards.

The Reciprocal Trade Act as applied during the past 20 years, has come to be a one-way street. Industries of the United States, in many instances, have been sold down the river through the granting of inequitable tariff concessions.

Some people, and certain countries, imply that the United States has been obstructing world trade.

This is far from being factual. The complaining countries have restrictive barriers between themselves and against us, their trade has diminished from loss of possessions and colonies and now they demand that the United States become the dumping grounds for their excess production.

An article in the January 24, 1953, issue of the California Farmer points out this fact. Reference is made therein to a statement by "Casey" J. M. Jones, executive secretary of the National Wool Growers Association, when, in appearing before the United States Tariff Commission, he said:

> We are one of the lowest, if not the lowest, tariff country in the world. The average rate applying to tariffs collected on all imports coming into the United States is about 5½ percent; into Canada, 10.2 percent; Italy, 11 percent; United Kingdom, 11 percent; France, 11.2 percent; Australia, 17.1 percent; Mexico, 22.5 percent; and India, 25.3 percent. These figures do not tell the entire story. On top of the big tariffs these countries also pile import licenses, embargoes, and currency manipulations.

Many American industries and workers will continue to suffer unless the reciprocity feature of the Reciprocal Trade Act is brought into a more equitable balance. I believe that domestic standards may be provided adequate protection while at the same time avoiding the impeding of world trade.

In introducing my bill to extend the present act for a period of 2 years, I have given this phase of the legislation particular attention. As the act now stands, the Tariff Commission conducts hearings and reports the peril point on all articles which will come up for discussion at trade meetings. That report goes to the President and is then placed in the hands of the Trade Agreements Committee, but there is nothing which prohibits this group from negotiating below the predetermined peril point.

My bill would reverse this procedure. The President could not authorize a concession on any article in violation of the peril point without first submitting his proposal to Congress and obtaining affirmative action by the Congress to circumvent the provisions of the peril point.

In other words, the responsibility of placing a domestic industry in a position of possible danger through tariff concessions would be placed in the hands of Congress, where it rightfully belongs.

THE PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUND HOG

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was unable to call to the attention of the Congress yesterday the prediction of that great prognosticator of the weather, the Punxsutawney ground hog. President Eisenhower delivered his state of the Union message and I therefore was unable to present the prediction of that great prophet for the coming 6 weeks.

Well, the ground hog saw his shadow at 7:38 a. m. on Gobbler's Knob at Punxsutawney, in the hills of Pennsylvania, and announced to his millions of followers that severe winter weather would continue until mid-March. And, as usual, there were the regular opportunists, quacks, fakes, interlopers, and nature-fakers of low degree who again intruded on the sacred tradition of the Punxsutawney ground hog in the same obnoxious manner as they have interjected themselves in the past.

Whenever I hear of these synthetic ground hogs and alley cats impinging on the one and only official forecaster—the Punxsutawney ground hog—it is my intention to expose them; quacks such as the one from Quarryville, Pa., Sun Prairie, Wis., West Virginia, Arkansas, and other points.

It might be said that yesterday the chuck's shadow, as usual, was duly recorded by the official shadowgraphers of the Punxsutawney Ground Hog Club.

After making his prediction of 6 weeks more of winter weather, he was asked if there was anything in particular he wanted to get off his chest. He paused momentarily, then launched into a scathing tirade against those fakers who have attempted to discredit him as the top weather prophet of the world. "Why," he said, "I've been forecasting the weather—and accurately—before some of those guys were out of knee pants, and they had better leave the job of forecasting the weather to an ex-

perienced head who has been giving out the right dope for more than 50 years." This was a fine, forthright statement from the seer of seers.

I might say, my colleagues, that I am proud and honored to represent Jefferson County and Punxsutawney—the home of the Punxsutawney ground hog—and I want to serve notice at this time that I will continue to defend this great meteorologist to the best of my ability from these periodic attacks upon the one and only forecaster who has accurately predicted the weather for nearly a century from his home on Gobbler's Knob in Pennsylvania's hills.

I shall continue to ignore and disregard the petulant predictions of those pestiferous piggeries parading under the guise of and basking in the glory of Punxsutawney's peerless prophet.

AMENDING REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and at this time yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 129 makes in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 1979), as amended, which is a bill to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949. The bill as it is presented to the House carries two provisions; one, the provision contained in the original bill, as I personally introduced it, to change the expiration date of the Reorganization Act of 1949 from April 1, 1953, to April 1, 1955. It also contains an amendment submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] which would change the vote necessary for the rejection of a Presidential organization plan in either House from a constitutional majority, or 218 in the House or 49 in the Senate, to a simple majority of those present.

Before discussing the merits of this bill, as they will be discussed fully, I am sure, in general debate, I should point out that this rule not only makes H. R. 1979 in order but provides 2 hours of general debate, following which the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole where amendments may be offered and considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I should give to the House some explanation of the situation which confronts us.

The Reorganization Act of 1949, which would be extended by this bill, was adopted in the Eighty-first Congress and conferred upon President Truman the power and authority to submit organization plans to the Congress, with the understanding that if these organization plans were not rejected by one body or the other by a constitutional majority they would become effective within 60 days after submission.

At the time we had the Reorganization Act of 1949 before this body we voted, by not a too heavy majority, to require that both bodies of the Congress reject the reorganization plan or plans by a majority vote of both bodies. The bill was sent to the other body and there they wrote into the bill the simple majority provision or that the reorganization plan could be rejected by a simple majority of a single House. The measure then went to conference and was in conference for from 4 to 6 weeks. There was considerable discussion of the constitutional question as to whether or not Congress could give to the President greater legislative power than they themselves had. Finally, as a matter of compromise, the 1949 Reorganization Act, as we now know it, was accepted by both Houses, following the submission of the conference report that a reorganization plan can be rejected by a constitutional majority of either House.

As I submitted and introduced this bill, H. R. 1979, and as it was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations, it carried a very, very simple amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1949, which simply changed the expiration date from April 1, 1953, to April 1, 1955. The bill was written to accomplish one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to extend the 1949 Reorganization Act for 2 years, or until April 1, 1955. This was believed necessary in order to give to the President power and authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress during the next 2 years, and to permit their consideration by Congress.

I think I should be frank enough to say to the House that I had a rather lengthy and a very fine discussion with General Eisenhower in New York some time before he assumed the Presidency. I found him to be very much interested and very much concerned about the proper reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. We did not discuss details as to how this should be done, but at that time he expressed the feeling that the Reorganization Act should be extended, and I agreed with him in that position. Later on those who represent him in the executive branch in connection with reorganization matters came to see me and to discuss rather thoroughly and fully the different methods by which reorganization plans could be submitted and considered by the Congress. At that time the question came up as to whether or not any bill had been introduced in either branch to extend the reorganization authority contained in the 1949 Reorganization Act. Upon investigation it was found such a bill had not been introduced. Thereupon I introduced this measure, H. R. 1979.

We asked for early consideration, by the House Committee on Government Operations, so as to give sufficient time for the consideration of the bill and also so the President might promptly know the length of time he would have in which to submit reorganization plans. Later advice was brought to me and to some of the other members of the committee that the other body, which had been so insistent when the original 1949 act was before us, that a reorganization plan could be vetoed by a simple majority of either House, that the other body was ready to report a bill which contained a provision so as to require only a simple majority to reject a reorganization plan, rather than a constitutional majority as now provided in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Then a discussion was held as to whether or not, in order to avoid any long-drawn-out conflict between the two Houses, the House committee should accept an amendment to the bill which I had introduced so as to make it carry the same wording as the bills before the Senate.

I agreed that if this action was desired, it would be satisfactory with me. While I had the feeling there was a constitutional question involved, I was not in position to pass upon it, and was therefore perfectly willing to give to the President the same power President Truman had during the past 2½ or 3 years. I then stated that if the amendment to put the House bill in line with the proposed Senate bill was desired, the amendment should be prepared and submitted to me.

That amendment was prepared, and it was not prepared on Capitol Hill. It was later submitted to the chairman of the House committee, who had at previous times expressed his belief that a simple majority of one House was all that should be required to veto or reject a Presidential reorganization plan. The amendment was introduced by him in very good faith, with the understanding that the simple majority arrangement was entirely satisfactory to those representing the President in reorganization matters. The amendment was adopted by a majority vote of the Committee on Government Operations.

Let me say frankly that our minority members of the committee expressed a desire to give the new President the same or even greater powers than the 1949 act gave to President Truman.

I was very much touched by the great sympathy expressed by my Democratic colleagues on the committee for our President. I am very grateful to them. I am sure they will continue to cooperate with the President on the adoption of all his reorganization plans in the future. We look forward to their assistance and their aid in all these matters.

May I say that some of the minority members of our committee, and I am saying this seriously and very frankly, have been very helpful in the enactment of reorganization legislation in the past. However, I am sure that at that time

they did not have the same understanding of the situation as the majority members of the committee.

As evidence that the Republican members of the Committee on Government Operations acted fairly, and did only that which they believed was right, I point to the official press statement released later at the White House, in which it was stated there had been some sort of an agreement made to accept the simple majority provision contained in the bill reported in the other body. That press statement made it clear, of course, why the Republicans on the House committee went along with the Senate provision.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to trust the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States with the simple majority provision. I am convinced the President of the United States will send to this Congress reorganization plans so sound that they will only have the support of my Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Reorganization, but will also have the support of the entire Congress, with but few exceptions.

I think this whole matter has been magnified by the press and by others attempting to make it appear there was a conflict developing between the Republicans on Capitol Hill and the Republicans in the White House. Of course, I do not blame my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for attempting—well, let me put it the other way—at least they did not do anything to dampen those wild news reports or to quiet them down. It has really been quite a tempest and teapot, may I say.

While the President has said through his official statements that he did not seek any more power than contained in the bills reported by the other body, the Republicans in the Congress and on our committee, with few exceptions, are perfectly willing and ready to give the President all the reorganization power he can use constitutionally. We certainly are ready to give him as much authority as President Truman was given, especially in view of the fact——

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I please complete my thought, and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Would the gentleman yield for a slight observation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I may please complete my thought, then I will be glad to yield for the gentleman's observation.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is apropos of what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. I just want to say to the gentleman that, of course, the minority—the temporary minority—believes in really sound organization, and we want to go along with sound policies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is very gracious of you.

Mr. RAYBURN. We would like to know what the majority is going to stand for so far as reorganization is concerned from one week to the next. That has been bothering us during the last 10 days.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure there have been a great many things bothering the minority recently.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman has been so lucid in his explanation of the statements made at the White House, and the action of the committees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us not make a speech, Mr. Speaker, please.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is my first opportunity to speak in this session.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield me time from his side if I yield to him until my time expires?

Mr. RAYBURN. I just want to say we would like to know what the program is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We shall certainly look forward to having the gentleman's cooperation. I can understand that the leadership on the Democratic side has been somewhat confused about what to expect, and I know you are greatly concerned about some of these situations, especially as to the future, as well as the present. But, we are looking forward to having your cooperation. We are very happy that you have gone on record, as minority leader, in support of these Presidential papers. We look forward to your aid in putting the President's reorganization plans through the Congress, and we are very, very appreciative.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may answer the gentleman, it will be a whole lot better than what we have had in the last 10 years. He need not worry about that. He can rest assured of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very proud of the fact that we can say to the former Speaker that President Eisenhower is perfectly willing to trust the Congress of the United States, and so has expressed himself through his official press releases.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude, if I may, quickly, pointing out that this bill will, of course, be brought up under the 5-minute rule in Committee of the Whole, where amendments may be offered, and at which time, of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the chairman of the committee, will move to adopt the committee amendment contained in the bill. Upon amendment each of you may vote as you decide is in the best interest of the Government, and as to whether you want to change from the constitutional majority requirement to a simple majority provision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state what his position is today?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. My position, as the gentleman well knows—and the gentleman, of course, cannot misrepresent me on the floor, and I do not think he would desire to do so—was to give the President the exact power contained in the 1949 act. Then, in view of the situation which developed in the other body, which indicated this bill might be sent to conference and develop into the same situation which endangered the 1949 act under the gentleman's able leadership, where it was tied up for 6 weeks between the two Houses, I agreed to accept the Senate amendment. I also took this position in view of the fact that I was given to understand the amendment was entirely satisfactory to the President, as was later made clear by the statement issued by the official press secretary to the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield too long. My time is short.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am anxious to know what the gentleman's position is today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have said I was perfectly willing to give the President the powers contained in the bill as I introduced it, even though he did not request them.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, you are going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, since there has been an understanding reached with the other body eliminating the need for such an amendment, and I hope you will also.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not know of any understanding.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course you do not. That is the trouble. Like some of the rest of us, you are perhaps rather uninformed, may I add, on all matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this matter is quite as controversial as it might appear to be. In its final analysis it is rather simple. During the Democratic administration we passed a Reorganization Act, in which the President could make proposals for reorganization, which would become effective unless a constitutional majority of one House voted against it. I think it has been clearly demonstrated in the committee, and here this morning, that the minority party, the Democratic Party, is anxious, as well as willing, to cooperate with the President in giving him an opportunity to carry out sound policies. Therefore, the Democratic side has proposed, and I understand will vote, and did vote in the committee, to give to President Eisenhower just as much power and authority in reorganization matters as we gave to the Democratic President. As a practical matter, that is about the only way you are going to bring about effective reorganization. We are anxious to cooperate to that end, but let me for the moment explain what the parliamentary situation is today.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] introduced a simple bill which amended existing law on reorganization, by simply extending the date—changing the date so that it would expire 2 years from now instead of this year. In the committee, by a vote of the majority party that power of the President was limited by this amendment which will be proposed as a committee amendment. That limitation provided that any reorganization plan proposed by the President could be defeated by a simple vote of a majority of the Members who might be sitting on the floor at the time the bill came up, rather than a constitutional majority; that is, a majority of the whole elected membership of the House or of

the Senate, as the case might be. So that when this bill comes to the floor you will be presented with a committee amendment which restricts the President in his power to reorganize, so that a simple majority of the House could vote it down.

If you believe in giving the President more extended power, if you believe in giving him the same power the Democrats gave a Democratic President, then you will vote with us to defeat that amendment so that the law may be continued just as the original bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio provided, namely, merely changing the date of expiration.

I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have only one more speaker; so if the gentleman will use all but one speaker on his side I will then yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has explained the parliamentary situation; therefore, what I am about to say will not add much of anything new, because I agree that the Congress is the final judge as to the powers to be given to the executive department in a matter of this kind.

The executive department has certainly indicated that it will be satisfied with whatever action is taken by the legislative department, that it does not press for any specific or particular action by this body. It does seem to me, however, that the powers which were given to previous Presidents could, with propriety, be given to the new President. This view is supported by the letter, appearing in the committee report, of former President Hoover who indicated his favorable attitude toward the continuance of the act for a 2-year period without change and under the same powers which were given President Truman. Those who feel as President Hoover feels and as President Truman felt need only vote down the committee amendment and we will have a simple extension of the act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think the statements made by my friend from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] present the legislative situation: That those Members on both sides of the aisle who want to give President Eisenhower at least the same authority that was given to former President Truman can do so by voting down the committee amendment when it comes up in the Committee of the Whole. There will be no necessity, as I understand, for a motion to move the amendment or strike it out, because it is an amendment to a bill reported out of a committee and will come before the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule as an amendment.

Without regard to the confusion of the last week, and I am not going to enter into that too extensively, because I want to be considerate of the disturbed views and mental state of my friends on the Republican side where they find themselves on the first important measure of this administration following the leadership of the Democratic Party, I call attention to the fact that only yesterday the President in his message said:

> I have already established a Committee on Government Organization. The Committee is using as its point of departure the reports of the Hoover Commission and subsequent studies by several independent agencies.

I also call your attention to what President Eisenhower then further said only yesterday:

> To achieve the greater efficiency and economy which the Committee analysis showed to be possible I ask the Congress to extend the present Government Reorganization Act for a period of 18 months or 2 years beyond its expiration date of April 1, 1953.

We all know that President Eisenhower's press secretary last Thursday did say that the simple-majority amendment adopted by a majority of the committee was acceptable to President Eisenhower. We also know that the leader in the other body next day said he did not think it was agreeable. We all know that our own distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], according to a newspaper statement that I read Saturday, as a result of the conference held with representatives of the White House, decided to go through with the existing law.

Without regard to the statements that have been made within the past 10 days, the President himself stated clearly yesterday that he wants extended the present law and not the bill as reported out of the committee. I am not going to make any further comment because I have too deep a personal respect and official respect also for my distinguished friends on the Republican side; but the fact remains that the 14 Democratic members of the Committee on Government Operations voted against the amendment. We voted to give to President Eisenhower the same authority that was given by the Congress to ex-President Truman a little over 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, may I make this further observation on the merits of the legislation. I recognize there are some who feel that there is a constitutional question involved, and I respect their views. I recognize that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] strongly feels that way, and I deeply respect his views. I recognize also there are some who favor a simple majority as against a constitutional majority, and I respect their views. But, having lived with this question as some of us have for years, we realize, first, that the Congress in its entire history has never made a reorganization of the executive branch of Government. In order to do so there must be some practical action taken to accomplish that end. We realize that we have to delegate administrative authority—not legislative authority but administrative authority—to the President of the United States who is charged with the responsibility to submit to the Congress his plans.

Under the law that was passed 3 years ago and previously there were particular legislative standards prescribed that the President must comply with. So it is not a blanket delegation of legislative authority. If we were to pass a law just delegating it without general standards, I would agree that there is a constitutional question involved and, frankly, I agree that we have no constitutional authority to do so. But that is not what we have done.

We have laid out broad legislative standards. There is legislative criteria contained in the present law and will be in the law if extended that the President of the United States must comply with. Then we have the rejection which exists in the legislative branch, reserving to us the power of rejecting any plan submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has made a very fair statement. I wonder if he will permit me in turn to ask a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understood the gentleman's position correctly, both in committee recently and in 1949 when we had the original 1949 Reorganization Act before us, it was his position that there should be given to the President the power to put into effect a reorganization plan unless a constitutional majority of both Houses rejected it. Was that the position of the gentleman?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; that was not my position.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Was that not the gentleman's position?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. My position was that unless there was a concurrent resolution introduced, which meant that both bodies had to reject it by a simple majority.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the gentleman stood for rejection by both bodies?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In 1949?

Mr. McCORMACK. We passed it through this branch.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that was the follow-up of the two previous laws.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That was in 1949?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That was the gentleman's position. The gentleman served on the conference committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman brought in, did he not——

Mr. McCORMACK. A constitutional majority, exactly; reluctantly so, yes; reluctantly so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted the two-body rejection. Yes, I reluctantly agreed to it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All right. Let us go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us be logical.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would admit that my friend is always logical, and I shall try to respond.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All right. Thank you. Now the gentleman in 1949 was faced with a practical situation as the result of the position taken by another body of this Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but when we went into the conference we had something to compromise on. We did not compromise before we went there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All right. Just a moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Go ahead.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman was practical enough that he accepted a situation, reluctantly, as he pointed out, which confronted him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, that is a fair statement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You have no criticism of anyone for reluctantly accepting some sort of a situation when the other body has reported the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think I criticized anybody. I am going along with a very understanding mind and a mind of generosity. For whatever value my opinion might be worth, I think the President ought to be given authority to do the job. We can talk back and forth, but we want results. We are coming now to a vote on this bill. No matter what somebody might have said about the position here in the past 5 days, in the final result we want legislation that is in the best interest of our country. Without regard to party, I think it is for the best interest of the country to give to President Eisenhower the authority contained in the present law. I would go further, I will be frank, I would go for a two-House veto; I believe in it, but that question is not before the House today. The question before the House is whether you are going to give the President, when he submits a plan, a constitutional majority to reject it or a simple majority. I think it is in the best interest of the people and of our Government to give to President Eisenhower the same authority we gave to President Truman. I hope when that vote comes that you Republicans, or enough of you Republicans, will join with us Democrats to give the leadership to the country that will bring about a strong bill and to give to President Eisenhower the power to efficiently and effectively make reorganizations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN].

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram received from Charles B. Coates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the present effort to reduce the powers of the President of the United States, with respect to reorganization of the executive branch of Government, constitutes in my opinion a direct repudiation of one of the most solemn promises made by the Republican Party, in the course of the recent election campaign.

In support of my thesis that the American people want and expect the new administration to reorganize and streamline the Federal Government, let me quote briefly from the Republican platform of 1952.

Said the platform:

> We pledge a thorough reorganization of the Federal Government in accordance with the principles set forth in the report of the Hoover Commission, which was established by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Nothing could be clearer than that, Mr. Speaker. Republican leaders made a definite promise. The voters took that promise into consideration when they gave President Eisenhower the biggest vote ever given to an American President.

Now we are presented with our first major opportunity to support the President in his effort to make good on the campaign promises which enabled him to lead his party back into control of both legislative and executive branches of the Government.

This promise to reorganize and streamline the Government in accordance with the principles set forth in the Hoover report is no less important to the welfare of the American people than is that other promise to seek an honorable and victorious end to the war in Korea.

We cannot—we must not—fail to support the President now. We must retain to him those adequate powers to reorganize the executive branch of Government which were possessed by his predecessor in office. In my own opinion, we would do well if we should strengthen rather than weaken those powers.

Originally the Hoover Commission recommended to the Congress that both Houses should have to veto a reorganization plan proposed by the President in order to set it aside. The final decision to permit a veto by either or both Houses was a compromise.

That there may have been reason for the compromise, at the time it was made, is more than possible in the light of another paragraph in the Republican platform.

Said the platform:

> We denounce the duplicity in submitting to Congress for approval, reorganization plans which were represented as being in accordance with the principles of the Hoover Commission recommendations, but which in fact were actually intended to further partisan political purposes of the administration in power.

The compromise was made before my time on this floor, and so I know little of the specific considerations on which it was based. But I do know, Mr. Speaker, that 46 public laws have been passed, implementing the Hoover report, and 30 or more proposals by the Democratic administration were approved.

This means that approximately 50 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations today are in effect. Government operational savings, as a result, are estimated at $2,000,000,000 annually. That the Democratic administration more than offset these savings by expenditures elsewhere, is beside the point at this time.

In any event, political scientists and other students of government know that because of failure to complete properly the job of reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal establishment, it is not the President, not the Congress, not the American people, but the bureaucrats who have been running the people's business—the Federal Government—for too long.

Because of these things, it is quite understandable that some Members of this honorable body should entertain lively fears as to the possibility of further misuse of the reorganizing power. No doubt they recognize, as we all must, that even Presidents and their advisers are human, and that power tends to corrupt.

But in view of the accomplishments of the new administration in the first 2 weeks of its existence, and in view of the program laid down by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union, I think we can rest assured that any new reorganization plans presented to the Congress will be such as the Hoover Commission, in its wisdom, really intended.

Still further, it seems to me, we can be sure that the new President and his advisers will take a good look at the reorganization plans already approved and in effect, with a view toward making them conform more closely with the intent of the Hoover Commission, and hence with the intent of Congress.

It may be argued that Congress is the real governing body of the Federal Union, and that it is the duty of Congress itself to handle the reorganization in all its details. These arguments are not to be controverted.

From the theoretical standpoint, they are good arguments. They are quite unanswerable. But we are faced here, Mr. Speaker, with a condition and not a theory. Experience has shown that the Congress, by reason of so many conflicting interests and ideas, cannot effectively reorganize the executive branch of Government.

Past efforts by Congress to legislate reorganization of the various agencies of Government, I believe, too often have resulted in compromise, when compromise served only to render the reorganization futile. The sole cure for this condition, I submit, is to continue the reorganization power in the hands of the President, and to give him authority consonant with his responsibility.

If the President of the United States must tailor each reorganization proposal to meet the possibility of veto by a simple majority of either House of Congress, then he may find it necessary to compromise with the facts, if not with his own conscience.

On the other hand, if he feels confident that his proposals will not be defeated by a minority, he can be expected to make them such as may redound to Government economy and efficiency, and to honesty in the conduct of public affairs.

The Government of the United States, may I say, constitutes the largest and most powerful corporation on the face of the globe. As such, and within the framework of constitutional law and the facts of political life, it must be transformed into the ultimate exemplar of corporate efficiency.

Now we have a President who can be trusted, on his record, to use the reorganizing power to good and honorable ad-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

vantage. We know, in any event, that powers which Congress confers, Congress can take away.

Then let us give to the President the reorganizing power, subject to veto only by a constitutional majority of either House of Congress. I do not believe that one House or the other, in the unlikely event a proposal should be foolish or wrongful, would fail to veto it by such a majority.

On this basis, is there any reason why we should load the dice against a full and effective reorganization of the executive branch? On the contrary, there is every reason why we should not.

As for myself, I would paraphrase the statement of a former Secretary of State; but please note, in a different context and with implications quite to the contrary.

I would say: "I shall not be one to turn my back on the President of the United States."

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 2, 1953.*

Hon. CHARLES G. OAKMAN,
House Office Building:

We share your concern over the proposed amendment to the bill extending the Reorganization Act of 1949. In our view the substitution of an ordinary majority for a constitutional majority in either House greatly endangers the outlook for any substantial action on reorganization. In effect it means that 25 Members of a Legislature of 531 can negate the President's proposals, even though these may fully express the best thinking of the administration of the Congress as a whole and the public. This amendment represents a long step backward at the very time when the Nation should be moving forward to insure a well-organized compact responsive executive branch so gravely needed in a time of crisis. I am sure that Dr. Pollock and the other members of the Hoover Commission share this view. In the absence of Chairman Sidney A. Mitchell please accept the assurance that the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report strongly urges renewal of the Organization Act of 1949 without amendment.

CHARLES B. COATES,
Vice Chairman and General Manager, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 3, 1953.*

Hon. CHARLES G. OAKMAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,

DEAR MR. OAKMAN: Thank you for your telegram of February 2 regarding the reorganization bills reported by the House and Senate committees permitting veto of presidential plans by a simple majority of either Chamber. I share your concern about this proposed curtailment of the President's powers. It would seem to me that President Eisenhower should have at least as much authority with respect to reorganization as was enjoyed by the outgoing administration.

Obviously if the proposal to permit veto by a simple majority goes through, little, if any, reorganization of an effective nature can be obtained. We are working very hard to provide the special committee with worthwhile recommendations to the end of insuring the soundest possible management of the executive branch. I hope that Congress will support us in our efforts by granting the President the kind of reorganization powers which he needs to do his job.

My friend, Jim Pollock, as a former Hoover Commissioner, undoubtedly thoroughly understands the seriousness of the proposed curtailment of the President's powers. I very much appreciate your getting in touch with me, and I wish you the best of success in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. JOHNSON,
Director, Temple University Survey of Federal Reorganization.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious we are getting away to a good start in this Congress. We have Democrats in the leadership, including my very estimable friends, ex-Speaker RAYBURN and ex-Majority Leader McCORMACK, who want to go along with the administration. For that I am very happy. I do not know how long that will last. Maybe a little later on we will be dividing up the men from the boys, I do not know, but we hope it will last for a long time, because Mr. RAYBURN has spoken a time or two of the temporary minority in which he presently finds himself. May I say that I can understand his disappointment at being in the minority, but he can probably look forward to a very considerable service in that capacity.

I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who has made such an able statement here. May I call the attention of those of you who may have forgotten it, and maybe some who are newcomers here who never did know about it, to the fact that it was he who back in the Republican Eightieth Congress initiated the action that created the Hoover Commission. Insofar as the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government is concerned, that was the starting point for about everything that has been accomplished that has been worth while.

There is more work to be done and we hope to get it done, but let us not forget as we talk about who is going to carry on the processes of reorganization, and there certainly is much room for reorganization, that it was the Republican Party and the majority leadership of the Eightieth Congress that started the show.

The Commission operated under the leadership of ex-President Hoover and did a good job, everything considered. As I say, many of their recommendations are yet to be acted upon.

There is another thing that has come out of all this. I realize with many that there has been something of a tempest in a teapot, because I do not think there is anything to be too much concerned about. But one thing is crystal clear and that is that we have in the White House today a President of the United States who by his every act and word convinces me, as he must convince you, that he wants to cooperate with the Congress of the United States, that he wants to grant and yield to the Congress of the United States its rightful position as the legislative branch of the Government under our time-honored, constitutional tripartite system.

I know there are some people present who do not think much of the method of reorganization that is here proposed. They did not like it when it started. I can remember those early days when we had some bitter battles here under Democratic leadership, when the right was sought to interfere with the Comptroller General who is an officer of the Congress of the United States alone, and when the right was sought to destroy the great quasi-legislative agencies of the Government. Those proposals were turned back. But finally in 1949, after the creation of the Hoover Commission, I think it was generally recognized that this sort of arrangement was desirable in the public interest.

It does do some violence to the concept of legislative authority under which we initiate legislation in the Congress of the United States, because what we really do is transfer to the executive branch of the Government the power to initiate the legislation, reserving to ourselves the right of veto. However, as has been pointed out so well by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I think experience has demonstrated that it is necessary on occasion that we have that device in order to bring about effective reorganization.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not an unlimited delegation, but it is a broad, general delegation.

Mr. HALLECK. That is true.

In order that my position may be made perfectly clear, I am going to support this bill, I am going to vote against the amendment, if it is offered, and I am going to vote for the bill on passage. I think that is the attitude that most of us are going to take.

There has been talk about a simple majority and a constitutional majority. The matter was discussed at the White House when we were down there. The fact of the matter is that a great many people in this body and the other body, Democrats and Republicans, have firmly believed for years that the simple majority route is the best route. They believe that they can sustain it with good argument.

We all realize that earlier when this matter was before the other body there was insistence on the simple majority. It has been pointed out by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the matter was long in conference. It became something of a crisis before the matter was brought out of conference. So I can understand the things that were in the minds of our people on the committee.

Let me make this further point—that I know of my own knowledge that our people on that committee acted the other day upon information which under the circumstances, would be considered reliable. They had every reason to believe that the simple majority route was perhaps not desired by certain people at the White House but, at least, in the attitude they have taken of cooperation and absence of dictation and domination, maybe it would be agreeable.

But since that time it is now evident and apparent to all of us that what is really desired, and what we ought to give to the President is the power contained in the bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. And certainly the fact that he introduced that bill in that form is evidence

of his good faith, and evidence of the good faith on the part of everyone who undertook to deal with this matter.

I do not know how much difference the matter of the simple majority and the matter of the constitutional majority would make in practice. I understand that in this body there was only one occasion when a plan would have been defeated under the simple majority operation, but it did carry and was not vetoed here because of the requirement for the constitutional majority. Now, certainly if the experience in the other body were the same as that, then it would be tweedledee and tweedledum as to which plan we adopted.

But in any event the President of the United States through his campaign expressed himself as being highly desirous of bringing about much needed reorganization in the executive branch of the Government. I think everyone who heard him here yesterday is impressed with his sincerity and with his devotion to the accomplishment of the objectives which he outlined. I, for one, want to give him the right and the power and the opportunity as far as I can do so under the Constitution, and in accordance with the dictates of my conscience, to make it possible for him to accomplish those objectives and do the job that I know needs to be done in the matter of streamlining the executive branch of the Government for more efficiency and economy in our whole operation.

So thanks again to all of you people for just going along with us. We are glad to have you, and as the gentleman from Ohio said, we hope it will last a long time, because although we might be able to do it by ourselves, if it is possible that you go along with us, and we need not do it by ourselves, it will be just that much better.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak in Committee of the Whole may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include certain other matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1979, with Mr. JENKINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, the persistent attempts of the minority to suggest that utter confusion exists in the ranks of the Republican Party are obviously moves to stress partisan politics at a time when the citizens are much more interested in action toward sound, economical, efficient Government.

What are the facts? Simply these. There were several conferences and conversations last week between the President and his advisers and representatives of the leadership of Congress. Instead of recognizing these conferences as worthwhile meetings of able leaders in search of a solution to the problem of reorganization, the opposition chooses, quite arbitrarily, to condemn them as confusion.

After discussing this legislation with my colleagues, I find that I am one of the many of the majority side of the aisle who are not disturbed by these frank discussions between the executive branch and the representatives of our legislative bodies. Attempts to adjust the delicate balance between the power of the Executive and the power of Congress are normal to our form of Government. Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, director, legislative reference service, in his valuable study, Congress: Its Contemporary Role, discusses the problem of executive-legislative relations at great length in chapter 4, using as his lead paragraph the following thought which seems particularly applicable to the informal maneuvering of the past week:

> Far more attention has been paid to the clashes, rivalries, and differences between the executive in general, and the President in particular, on the one hand and Congress on the other than to their cooperation. We must grant that it is sociologically inherent that two coordinate centers of power operating in a common area will be jealous of each other and will each strive to gain the ascendancy. But it is also psychologically true that there will be accommodation when the shared end is great enough to command a common loyalty or urgent enough to force a solution. If the persons involved are public-spirited, naturally friendly, and broad-gaged—and more often than not the President, the department heads, and the Congressmen are all three—the Government becomes workable. Their mutually independent positions also have this advantage, that each usually is required to convince the other—always a humbling and wholesome experience—before effective action can be taken.

To me, and to the American people, it is refreshing to have a President in the White House who will discuss these important reorganization proposals in a series of meetings with the leaders of Congress. It is reassuring to have a Chief Executive who does not make demands on Congress; who does not send down directives to a rubber-stamp House. It is certainly different to have a President with whom it is possible for the leaders of Congress to exchange ideas in deliberative discussions, calculated to produce the best posible reorganization legislation.

Already in this debate the argument has been frequently advanced that President Eisenhower should be granted at least as much authority as former President Truman was given by the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. While I appreciate the desire of those who advance this theory to cooperate fully with the President, I do not find this reason a valid argument in favor of the legislation which we are considering today.

It does seem to me, however, that there exists a most valid reason for extending to President Eisenhower, at this time, the full authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government, which has been enjoyed by other Presidents. This reason, which transcends the fields of personalities and politics is based on the fact that many of the Hoover Commission proposals, published in 1949, have not yet been given serious consideration by the legislative committees of the Congress and have not yet been reported out for action on the floor of the House either as a Presidential reorganization plan or in the form of congressionally drafted legislation. This reason is entirely beyond the argument that this power was previously given to President Truman. It is a line of reasoning based entirely on the enormity of the job that is still ahead.

The best estimates that I have been able to get from political scientists and other observers of this area of reorganization, indicate that only approximately 50 or 55 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been adopted. That leaves an all-important area of 45 to 50 percent of the Commission's recommendations yet ahead of us.

Members of the House far more experienced that I am in the passage of legislation tell me that the 45 to 50 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations which have not yet been considered, represent the really difficult achievements in reorganization. The road ahead is difficult to travel into areas where reorganization will be difficult—areas where pressures from the agencies and pressures from interest groups will be heaviest. With the difficult problems attendant upon reorganizing the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department, the Veterans' Administration, and social security facing President Eisenhower, I maintain that it is essential that we continue the reorganization authority as it exists.

While I realize that at most, the reports of the Hoover Commission were intended to serve only as a guide to Congress and were never considered at any time to constitute a mandate either to the Executive or to Congress, I do believe that the 18 areas of reorganization covered by the Commission represent fields in which some action should be taken. If we are to assume that reorganization of one type or another is desirable in these 18 areas, let us look for a moment at the reorganization box score approximately as it appears today. Obviously, it is unlikely that any two authorities would agree exactly on the per-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cent of reorganization achieved in any given field.

However, the percentages I shall quote indicate approximately the current box score on Hoover Commission reorganization.

In the area of general management there has been an estimated 80 percent of the reorganization accomplished and legislation enacted, with 20 percent to go.

The field of personnel management does not look quite so good, with only 35 percent enacted and 65 percent to go.

As far as the office of General Services and Supply Activities is concerned, we find 95 percent enacted; 5 percent to go.

Post Office Department, 30 percent enacted; 70 percent to go.

Area of foreign affairs, 80 percent enacted and 20 percent to go.

Department of Agriculture, zero percent enacted; 100 percent to go.

Area of budgeting and accounting, 85 percent enacted; 15 percent to go.

National-security organizations, 95 percent enacted; 5 percent to go.

Veterans' affairs, 5 percent enacted; 95 percent to go.

Department of Commerce, 70 percent enacted; 30 percent to go.

Treasury Department, 40 percent enacted; 60 percent to go.

Regulatory agencies, 66 percent enacted; 34 percent to go.

Department of Labor, 80 percent enacted; 20 percent to go.

Department of Interior, 20 percent enacted; 80 percent to go.

Social Security and Indian Affairs, 5 percent enacted; 95 percent to go.

Medical activities, 10 percent enacted; 90 percent to go.

Federal business enterprises, 25 percent enacted; 75 percent to go.

Overseas organizations, Federal and State Relations and Federal Research, 50 percent enacted; 50 percent to go.

General Management, 80 percent enacted; 20 percent to go.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to take the position that this House may at some time reach a point where it is unnecessary to delegate reorganization authority; a point where it will be possible for all reorganization legislation to come through committee as any other legislation would come, so that the will of the House may be worked upon this legislation in committee, and so that the amendments of the House might be accepted in the Committee of the Whole.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that time has yet come. I am hopeful that with the vigorous attention to the field of reorganization which President Eisenhower pledged to us yesterday in his state of the Union message, this is the last time it will be necessary for us to meet here in this House of Representatives and delegate some of our legislative power to the Executive. However, I feel that with the area of accomplishments that still lie ahead of us, with the way progress has been delayed—and I make no charges of a partisan nature in marking that delay, we must continue the full reorganization authority of the President. In 3 years we have considered only 55 percent of the total Hoover Commission program. On that basis I say that this authority is needed, and it is needed without amendment, if we are going to proceed on toward a real solution to the reorganization problems of the Federal Government and make it practical for President Eisenhower and for all of us in Congress to bring about a realization of the campaign promises on which we were elected in this last election; promises of efficiency, economy, and common sense in Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman made a most instructive statement when he told us the various percentages of the Hoover recommendations which have been effectuated. The gentleman recalls, of course, that Republicans introduced bills to implement every one of the Hoover Commission's recommendations way back when the opposition was in full control. If there is anything to be said about their not being effectuated it rests not with the present majority, but with the minority on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. BROWNSON. I certainly agree with my distinguished chairman, for I well remember the great difficulty I had trying to get some of the Hoover Commission legislation considered in the last session of Congress when the Democratic Party controlled our subcommittees and our committee.

Since our distinguished committee chairman commented on the percentage of achievement figures, it may be of interest to suggest what these uncompleted areas might be expected to mean in dollar economies. The Hoover Commission task force on personnel estimated a savings of between $256,000,000 and $600,000,000 when its recommendations were enacted and personnel reorganization was completed. Since we still have 65 percent of the way to go in this field, it may be possible to predict savings of between $166,000,000 and $390,000,000 if this reorganization is productive of the economy its planners predict.

In the field of veterans affairs possible savings of $71,000,000 might result if the other 95 percent of reorganization could be completed in such a manner that benefits to the veteran would not suffer.

In the area of revolving funds and business enterprises with 75 percent of the way yet to go, toward the task force estimate of $30,000,000 in savings, it appears that $22,500,000 may be saved by completing reorganization. Add to these an estimated savings of $44,000,000 in agriculture activities, in which area no reorganization progress has been reported and a possible $98,000,000 saving in the completion of reorganization of the Post Office Department and you have between $400,000,000 and $620,000,000 which may be saved annually if President Eisenhower is given the authority to complete the reorganization program started in 1949 on the basis of legislation passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The stakes are high; the need is desperate. The responsibility is ours. Once the controversial portions of the Hoover Commission recommendations have received a fair hearing, I can see no need for further delegation of legislative authority; a delegation which I know is distasteful to many thoughtful students of government in this House.

As for myself, I shall vote against the amendment and in favor of the bill in order that the desire of the voters for efficiency and economy in Government, through reorganization, will not be frustrating in this Republican administration as it has been for the past 2 years.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with pardonable pride that I rise to address you at this time; I am proud of the fact that the committee of which I was the chairman was responsible for the Reorganization Act of 1949 under which 65 percent—and I have the authority of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report for that figure—65 percent of the recommendations were effectuated either by legislation or by planning. I am proud also of the fact that I belong to the party that gives reorganization not a mouth service but a real service. We believe that the people of these United States are entitled to reorganization in the executive department. We know that the executive department has grown through the years, because of war and because of the necessity of rapidly meeting emergencies that have arisen, that many, many agencies came into being until now the executive department is a sprawling, loosely arranged organization and badly needs reorganizing. We also know something of the difficulties of reorganization, because every head of every department, bureau, or commission wants reorganization, but not of his own agency; consequently, when legislation was sought from the Congress the head of any department to be reorganized was found not only objecting himself but going throughout the country and raising a lobby that would bring pressure upon different Congressmen against reorganizing that department. So that when Congress, in its judgment, turned over to the head of the executive department, the President, the duty of submitting reorganization plans, it took the opportunity out of the hands of the heads of bureaus and commissions and relieved them of the task of lobbying against the bill, because I do not believe that the head of any bureau, department, or commission in the Federal Government would come up here and lobby against a plan that had been submitted to us by the President; so it was absolutely necessary in order to reorganize the executive department that we put the responsibility in the hands of the Chief Executive.

Experience has shown that we still ought to give him sufficient power and authority that any upsetting of the plan could come about only after due deliberation and due debate in this Congress. That was shown because the Reorganization Act, known as the Economy Act of 1932, which was the same act that this law as amended would be, the simple one-House veto, President Hoover sent up many plans, but not a single plan sent up by him under that law was ever enacted into law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I will always yield gladly to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And they were rejected by a Democratic Congress, were they not?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. And it looks like President Eisenhower's requests are going to be turned down by a Republican majority, does it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait and see.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. No, we will not wait and see, because in my judgment you now know it is not a good thing to tie President Eisenhower's hands by such a law. I am proud that in the committee the Democratic members of the committee, who had given so much time and attention to the subject of reorganization, were willing not to tie the hands of the President but were willing to give him sufficient authority to enable him to do a good job of reorganization. We were willing not only to go beyond the constitutional majority of either House but to require a majority of both Houses in order to defeat a Presidential plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I yield once again to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not propose and never did propose to tie the hands of the President.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will make his statement in his own time I would appreciate it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want the constitutional authority vested in the Congress of the United States to remain there.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. The gentleman talks about constitutional authority. That is not a new question, because Congress after Congress has given the President the power to reorganize, beginning with President Hoover on down, and not once has it been attacked and found unconstitutional as far as the delegation of power was concerned. So the gentleman lives in a yesteryear, the gentleman will not recognize what is happening every day; the real fact is that the gentleman does not believe in any type of reorganization. That is why he was for the simple majority of either House, which is shown both by his words and by his vote in the committee.

In giving due deference to the Democrats on that committee, I could not be fair if I did not state that the vote in committee was 15 to 14. There are 30 members of that committee. One Republican voted "present." I could not be fair unless I paid deference to that one Republican who because he believed that the President ought to be given adequate power, because he knows the difficulty of getting reorganization through this Congress, would not vote with us but would not vote with them. So the vote stood 14 to 15 in committee with one voting "present."

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that when this amendment comes before the House the House, as well as the other body, will support the hand of our new President and that the Congress will give at least the power that was given to former President Harry S. Truman. And while I am standing here as a Member of the House, I want to say once again that I am proud to be a Member of this body when I see what the House has always done about reorganization.

Out of all of the plans submitted by the President there was only one plan defeated in this House. That was the plan to give to FSA cabinet status and, in my opinion, that was rather a personal matter than one aimed against the plan itself. So we have the situation where every plan submitted by the past President except one was accepted by this House. Any plans that were defeated was done over in the other body.

So, as we stand here talking about reorganization, I am hopeful that the Republicans will, as a matter of pride, abandon that stand and I am hoping they will agree with the Democratic minority that does not play politics with matters of interest to our country.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I always yield to one whom I regard so highly, a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his regard which he knows I share in equal measure for him. But does the gentleman think that either Republicans or Democrats sought to abandon what they regard as important principles, just because the President is of their party?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I think the Republicans ought to learn the difference between principles and good judgment.

Mr. JUDD. Some of us have crusaded all these years for principles. We think they are more important than men—any men. I am sure the gentleman would not ask us to abandon what we believe to be constitutional principles just because it might be more expedient and might be better politics and perhaps might be portrayed as better judgment.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. The gentleman does not understand anything I said if he puts that construction on my language. I thought I had the powers of expression. None of us would abandon principles, and it is good principle of government administration to give the President of the United States power to reorganize the executive department. If Congress holds to its right to initiate all legislation on reorganizing the executive department, why has it not done so? Why did it not do it throughout all these years? In all these years Congress has not, on its own motion, taken the time to go into extensive reorganizations of the executive department. Let us do it. And, when they start it, they will find pressure will be brought on them that cannot be brought on the President of the United States, because he is the head of the executive department, and those who would bring pressure on Congress would not bring it on him.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry if I misunderstood. The gentleman knows that both he and I have favored reorganization powers and plans, but it is the method and the final authority on which we disagree.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. That is why I am wondering why you are abandoning your President.

Mr. JUDD. We are not abandoning our President. We are refusing to abandon our conviction that on every matter of legislative responsibility the final say must be in the Congress. It is not that we love our President less, but that we love our Constitution, as we understand it, more.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. We love our Nation more than that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I also agree in the statement that was recently made that we are getting off to a very good start. We get a great deal of sympathy, solicitude, and humor from our friends on the other side of the aisle, and we also get rapped on the knuckles by them quite frequently. But may I say that this whole matter has been made rather larger and more important than it should be. It is merely a question of perhaps a slight misunderstanding. Certainly, the Republicans on the committee as far as I know were in favor of reorganization. There has never been any question of that in anyone's mind. There may have been, indeed, and quite properly so, a question as to method, a question as to the constitutionality, a question of what kind of majority would be preferred: constitutional or a straight majority. On the other hand, we were assured that this amendment as it was offered and passed by the committee was written downtown and was entirely acceptable. This was verified when Mr. Hagerty made a statement to the press that the President had no objection to the amendment. Now in the course of time it appears that it is not so desirable; that it would impair the powers of the President and that his thought has been changed. I am not one who objects to people changing their minds; in fact, I belong to a sex that has always upheld that prerogative. Not only that, I am also a great believer, and I recommend it to a great many of my colleagues, that consistency is the vice of little minds. It is a good thing to be able to learn, it is a good thing to be able to change, and I for one propose to change, because I told my people before the election that one of the things I would do in this Congress would be to support President Eisenhower; that if at any time or on any occasion his judgment and mine should clash, I would submit my judgment to his, because I feel that he has proved in the past and will prove in the future that his judgment is far better than mine. Therefore this change will not upset me in the least and I do not believe it is going to upset many people on the committee. I have no doubt that our friends, the press, who still hold consistency as the greatest virtue, will make the most of it, and my reply to them is, go ahead and try to do it. As long as the people understand the situation we do not have to worry about a few smart remarks and a few humorous quips, which we are glad to accept at any time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, during the recent campaign, President Eisenhower made a promise to the American people that when he was elected he would initiate plans to reorganize and streamline the administrative and executive branch of Government. In his speech at St. Louis, Mo., on October 20, 1952, he spoke on this subject in some detail. That our President was sincere in this pledge is evidenced by his request that Congress extend the Reorganization Act of 1949, in order that he might have the authority to present to the Congress, under special conditions, certain plans to reorganize the executive departments of Government.

Further evidence of his sincerity is given in the fact that his first request for legislation from Congress was the particular request to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949. Additional evidence is furnished by the fact that Mr. Dodge, the new Director of the Budget, appeared before the House Committee on Government Operations on January 27, 1953, and conveyed to us the wishes of the President.

In not less than eight instances, Mr. Dodge made quite clear that the administration wanted the Reorganization Act of 1949 extended without change, modification or amendment.

If the Members will consult pages 9 and 10 of the report they may read the exact words Mr. Dodge used before the Government Operations Committee. I notice that the majority report of our committee also quotes the Honorable Joseph M. Dodge's endorsement of H. R. 1979.

Let me pause at this point to emphasize the fact that Mr. Dodge's testimony in favor of H. R. 1979 pertained to the bill as originally introduced in the House by the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, and as originally introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. Dodge's endorsement did not pertain to the bill as amended by the Hoffman amendment. This is brought out clearly by his answers to questions on the possible effect of this type of amendment. You will find those answers on pages 9 and 10 of the report.

Mr. Dodge was the only witness before our committee on this bill, with the exception of the sponsor of the bill, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, who is a member of the committee. No testimony was received from witnesses on behalf of the Hoffman amendment. At the conclusion of the testimony of Mr. Dodge, and the statement made by Mr. BROWN on behalf of his bill, the Hoffman amendment was offered and was adopted by a vote of 15 Republicans in the affirmative, one Republican voting present, and 14 Democrats voting against the amendment to substitute a simple majority for the constitutional majority required in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Up to this point, the record on handling this legislation was fairly clear, but from this time forward the guidance of the legislation becomes somewhat confused.

There was an immediate outcry from responsible newspapers, such as the New York Times, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Post, not to mention others, condemning this particular nullification of the powers of the President to reorganize the Government in line with his campaign promises. The press pointed out that this was a denial of power and a demonstration of a lack of confidence in our new President. It was also pointed out that the Congress was refusing the President's first legislative request and was not giving to the new President the same powers which we gave to President Truman.

Democratic Members who are, and have been, exponents of reorganization of Government in order to eliminate waste and inefficiency took exactly this position. From long experience we knew that unless the President was granted an extraordinary arrangement, reorganization plans which he might send to the Congress would be defeated.

As pointed out in our report, pages 8 and 9, an attempt to reorganize the executive departments under this method of simple majority rejection failed completely in 1932. President Hoover sent 11 plans to the Congress in that year and they were all rejected by a simple majority in the House of Representatives.

On the other hand, under the Reorganization Act of 1949, which required a constitutional majority to reject, 41 plans were presented, 29 became effective, 11 were rejected, and one was superseded by law.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly at this point?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. I think the record should show that that was the Democratic Congress in 1932 which defeated those reorganization plans.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true; that is true, it was a Democratic Congress, but I point out that the method used is the thing that is important, in my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am very glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean by that last statement to say that we must have a law in order to make the Democrats behave and go along with what is good for the country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My chairman may put any construction he wishes to on my remark; that is his privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was asking you. I was asking you.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On the other hand, under the Reorganization Act of 1949, which required a constitutional majority, as I said before, 41 plans were presented and 29 became effective.

The proponents of this weakening amendment may tell you that President Eisenhower will send to the Congress only plans which the Congress will be glad to approve. May I suggest that this flies in the face of experience and this condition has never existed under any former President.

The present honeymoon between President Eisenhower and the Congress may be of short or long duration, but that the honeymoon will end is a certainty as proven by the records of past honeymoons.

On January 29, 1953, beginning on page A343 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a chart showing the 21 recorded votes on reorganization plans sent to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949.

As you may remember, these plans were sent to the Congress in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. A study of that chart reveals an amazing and possibly significant record of the attitude of the Republican Party toward reorganization. It points out that in 17 cases out of the 21, a majority of the Republicans voting voted against reorganization. This causes the thoughtful to ask "Is the Republican Party really in favor of reorganization of the executive departments?"

The record seems to indicate otherwise in the compilation of votes during the years 1949 to 1952, inclusive.

Their unanimous passage of the Hoffman amendment which weakens the chance of reorganization plans being accepted by the Congress, is consistent with their past record of antagonism to reorganization.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In 1945, 168 Republicans voted for this same amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. The Republicans voted for the simple majority amendment, and that proves my point, that they want a simple majority amendment in order to be able to defeat reorganization plans because we all admit under the simple majority plan, it is easier to defeat a plan than under the constitutional majority system.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman will also recall that 2 years ago when the Emergency Reorganization Act was before us, the simple majority was adopted by this House under Democratic control by a vote of 158 to 61.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I remember it very well. I remember that the gentleman who addressed me presented the amendment, and he specifically stated that it applied only to emergency reorganization plans and did not apply to permanent reorganization plans, and to follow up the gentleman's comment, I will point out that after his amendment was adopted, in the Committee of the Whole House, the bill was defeated later in the House because of that amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think that any plan sent down by any President, that accomplishes real efficiency and economy, will be rejected by a simple majority of this House?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I can only go by the record. I know that the pressure on the Members of Congress from different bureaus and agencies and their friends back home is tremendous. I know that over a period of the last 30 years it has

been impossible for the Congress to enact any reorganization unless they had the benefit of a special arrangement as contemplated in the plan.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know of any reorganization plan that was turned down by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, that should have gone into effect, as you look back over it today?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I can remember several. I can go back over the record.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think any plan ought to go into effect if a majority of either House of the Congress disapproves. Nothing else becomes law unless it is approved by both branches of the Congress. Why should a reorganization plan?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not going to quarrel with the gentleman in his position on a constitutional question. I recognize he has a right to his opinion on that question. However, I disagree with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If you take the stand that reorganization is unconstitutional, I think you are in a consistent position to vote for a simple majority amendment, because it weakens the ability to reorganize. You are also consistent if you vote against the Reorganization Act. I respect you for taking that position but I do not agree with you.

Mr. JUDD. I have never voted against a Reorganization Act. I have not been against reorganization. I am in favor of the delegation to the President of the authority to prepare plans. He is in a better position than we to prepare plans and he has got to take the lead, but I cannot abdicate my responsibilities under the Constitution to have the final say on each plan. It is not because I do not want reorganization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I accept the gentleman's statement of his position, but I will ask him to obtain his own time to explain his position more fully.

Mr. JUDD. I simply wanted to get that position clear in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We members of the Democratic Party, who have proven over the years by our actions that we do desire reorganization, are ready and willing to give to President Eisenhower the same powers of reorganization that we gave to President Truman. But, in view of the history of the bill now before us and the attitude of the Republican leadership toward reorganization, we must pause and consider the situation.

That there has been confusion both at the White House and on Capitol Hill no one can deny. First we have Mr. Dodge, director of the budget, asking for a simple extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949 without amendment. Then we have the action of the two Republican controlled committees of Congress rejecting Mr. Dodge's request and drastically curtailing the power of the President to reorganize. Following an outcry in the press at the amazing action, the President's press secretary issues a very confusing and unclear statement in which he somehow conveys the impression that President Eisenhower had been consulted and had agreed to the proposal that his hands be tied in this matter.

Two days later, we have another press report apparently quoting the Republican policy leader in the other body in which he changes the signals again and states that they are perfectly willing to give President Eisenhower a simple extension of the act as originally requested by Mr. Dodge.

Then, yesterday, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower says as follows:

> To achieve the greater efficiency and economy which the committee analyses show to be possible, I ask the Congress to extend the present Government Reorganization Act for a period of 18 months or 2 years beyond its expiration date of April 1, 1953.

In view of all of these suggestions or opinions and switches of signals and confusion on the part of the Republican leadership, I want to ask this question:

Can it be that the responsibilities of leadership are more difficult than was foreseen during the November campaign? Can it be that there is a division of opinion in the Republican Party as to the reorganization of the executive departments? Can it be that there is a desire to control in fewer hands on Capitol Hill the destiny of legislation suggested by President Eisenhower and his businessmen-Cabinet?

I confess that I am somewhat confused by the record which has been made by the new majority party on this first legislative matter. As a believer in executive reorganization, I personally would like to see President Eisenhower have the same trust and confidence of the Congress as was evidenced toward Mr. Truman. In my own mind, I had planned to vote to strike out the Hoffman amendment, thereby assuring the President the same authority which we gave Mr. Truman.

Under the confusing circumstances created by the administration and the majority, however, I am confronted with a dilemma.

If President Eisenhower really wants the power to reorganize, as his representative Mr. Dodge requested, and as contained in his speech yesterday, I am anxious to give it to him. But if President Eisenhower does not realize the important difference between a simple majority and a constitutional majority approving reorganization plans, and is willing, as Mr. Haggerty's statements seem to indicate, to accept the simple majority provision which spells disaster for reorganization, then I must consider carefully how I shall vote on this matter.

As the debate unfolds, we on the Democratic side trust that we will have a clarification of leadership: That those in charge of this bill on the Republican side will give to the Democrats a clear cut expression of their attitude toward effective reorganization. We Democrats can assure you Republicans that we are in favor of eliminating waste and duplication in government. We are in favor of streamlining our departments to make them more efficient. We have proven this by our record of accomplishment in the field of reorganization and we would like to cooperate with our new President in completing this work of reorganization, so much of which was accomplished during the Democratic administration.

As heretofore stated, over 65 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations were effected under the Democratic administration. As a member of this committee who has studied for some years this matter, I challenge the majority members of the committee and the majority Members of the Congress to effect in the next 2 years the balance of these recommendations and put them into operation. Now that the responsibility for effecting these recommendations is in your hands let us see what you will do with the responsibility of effecting the balance of the Hoover Commission recommendations, and I assure you that you will have a great deal of support from the Democratic side on plans to reorganize which are proven to be effective and efficient. We, of course, always reserve the privilege of opposing plans which, in our opinion, are not based on merit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to speak at some time during this debate in favor of H. R. 1979 and particularly in favor of striking out the committee amendment, since there has been no time during my experience on the committee or as a Member of the House that I have not taken the following viewpoint: First, that reorganization is desperately necessary; and, second, that if we give the Executive the power to reorganize it is neither wise nor necessary to curb that power. May I say incidentally that I think any question of constitutionality lies in whether the Congress has a right to bestow the power rather than in the amount that we bestow. I personally favor the extension; and am against the committee amendment requiring a simple majority rather than a constitutional majority for veto.

I did not mean to bring up what happened in executive session of the Committee on Government Operations. I rather think that executive sessions should remain executive, however much has been reported by others of action taken. However, the former chairman of the committee has today kindly referred to my vote when this bill was under consideration, and undertaken to interpret to the committee by reasons for voting "Present." I am sure that he meant well, but he misinterpreted my reason for so voting. The fact is that, believing as I do in the necessity for reorganization, I could not bring myself to vote to curb the power of the President by not requiring a constitutional majority; nor could I bring myself to offer a rebuff to the President by voting "No" on what had been reported to us as his request. I voted "Present" rather than "No" because I really looked upon that request for a simple majority as did the other Republican members of the committee, as the first request I had had from President Eisenhower; and my decision to vote "No" was not because I would not desert my fellow Republicans—I am afraid that I would do so anytime in the interest of my convictions—but because, I repeat, I could not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

quite bear to refuse the first request that had come from the President.

Returning to the more important subject, the bill itself, I favor the right of rejection only by a constitutional majority. But I particularly welcome this opportunity to follow my former subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, who just shed such crocodile tears over the Republican Party. I am sure that he will soon realize that his interest and his sympathy should be for his own party.

In the remaining minutes at my disposal, I would most respectfully urge my former chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, on which I had the privilege of serving for 2 years, to consider and regret not only the deplorable record of his own party as regards reorganization in the Eighty-second Congress. As has been said, Republicans, as well as Democrats in that Congress, offered identical bills calling for enactment of the 19 remaining Hoover provisions. I had the privilege myself of introducing H. R. 3406, to create a commission to investigate the administration of our overseas spending. I do not believe that there is even one Democrat who would not think that such an investigation would produce desirable results. That bill, nevertheless, never even came out of the Democratic-controlled subcommittee. As regards the other Hoover Commission proposals, before we adjourned in October 1951 I personally wrote to the chairman of the committee, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, my good colleague from Chicago, reminding him that in our section of the country there was great interest in enactment of the Hoover Commission plans, and begging him as gently, as politely but as strongly as I could, to look over the plans which he had held in committee during the 9 months that he had been in control, to see if perhaps there were not at least 1 or 2 of the 19 proposals that he thought sufficiently meritorious to bring up for committee consideration. That letter still remains the only letter that I have sent to a Congressman which is as yet unanswered, nor was action taken.

In addition to that, to me it was travesty as well as tragedy for the Democratic-controlled Subcommittee on Executive and Legislation Reorganization, and for the whole Committee on Expenditures in the Executive departments, in the Eighty-second Congress finally to hold hearing on these reorganization bills last June when there was not a chance in the world for enactment and when the only object was for the Democrats to be able to say when they went home that these bills had been considered.

For the same Democrats now to come, claiming a greater interest in reorganization and shedding, as I said, crocodile tears over the Republican Party, to me expresses the paucity of their honesty and probably also their regret that they can no longer block the very necessary reorganization of executive departments. I think that if anything healthy has come out of this whole discussion, it is the fact that at long last there is a President in the White House who does not want dictatorial powers, but who has freely said that he will take what power the Congress gives him. As far as I am concerned, I want to give him more power than he has asked for. I am sure that power will be wisely used.

There has been aroused strong public opinion demanding reorganization and full extension of reorganizing power. The American people are demanding not only integrity but efficiency and economy. The same American people recognized last November that under the Democratic Party they could not obtain it; they turned over the leadership to the Republicans; and I assure my former subcommittee chairman, the Republican Party, in assuming that responsibility, needs no sympathy. The Republican Party feels no confusion. We recognize the mandate that was given us and have a magnificent leader to help us carry out that mandate. No amount of political sophistry can delude the American people into believing that the Republicans are not for reorganization. The record of the Republican members of the Committee on Government Operations in subcommittee and in the full committee for years—and in the House—has proven their stand. Let me repeat to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]: shed no more tears for us. We need no sympathy. We are on our way.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what the distinguished majority leader said with reference to his thanking the Democratic Members for going along with him, I would like to thank the distinguished majority leader for going along with the minority members of the Government Operations Committee in opposing the adoption of the so-called Hoffman amendment. All we have to do when we analyze the issue before us today is to turn to the comments on the Hoffman amendment recently submitted to the committee and to the minority leader of our committee by the Citizens Committee for Adoption of the Hoover Report. The obvious purpose of this reorganization bill is to enable this Congress to carry out some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and those presented to us for streamlining Government operations by our new President. Here is the comment of the Citizens Committee for the Adoption of the Hoover Commission Report on the Hoffman amendment which we will have before us shortly to vote on:

> H. R. 1979, as approved by the House Committee on Government Operations, contains an amendment whereby an ordinary majority of either House may disapprove a Presidential reorganization plan. If the Reorganization Act of 1949 fell short of the Hoover Commission's expectations, then surely this bill as amended represents a step backward from the best principles of reorganization at the very time when the Nation expects both the Congress and the administration to step forward.

That sums up the issue in a nutshell. If you want to take a step backward at a time when the people of this country have just put into the White House a man who has pledged himself to reorganize the executive branch of this Government in the hopes of achieving further economies, then you will vote for the Hoffman amendment. If you want to go forward in the hope of adopting the balance of the Hoover Commission recommendations and in support of our new President in his effort to achieve efficiency and economy, then you should vote against the Hoffman amendment and give President Eisenhower the same power that we extended to President Truman.

Let me call your attention to one further point. Before this committee there was not one single bit of testimony in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and adopted by the majority members of this committee. Former President Truman, former President Hoover, the Citizens Committee for the Adoption of the Hoover Commission Report, the new Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, and the United States Chamber of Commerce have all urged this House not to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan and approved by the Republican members of this committee. So rather than our joining with you, as expressed by the distinguished majority leader, I urge the Members of this House to join with the minority members of this committee, to join with the citizens committee for the adoption of the Hoover Commission Report, to join with Mr. Dodge, Director of the Budget, to join with the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to join with two past Presidents, to join with the United States Chamber of Commerce in passage of this bill without amendment extending the power to reorganize the executive branch requested yesterday by President Eisenhower.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN].

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I am happy to give President Eisenhower the best possible law under which to reorganize the executive branch of our Government. The committee action apparently resulted from a misunderstanding of the President's wishes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. For the past 20 years we have had nothing but confusion here. I am sure it was not the Republicans who were confused. I am sure the country voted last November for the Republicans not because of the confusion on our side but because of the confusion everywhere created by the New Deal.

This is my thirteenth year as a member of the Committee on Government Operations. It has been perfectly amazing how little has happened in that committee when the Democrats were in control. Most of the time it was the burying ground of every investigation. Every legitimate investigation that was brought before that committee was buried in committee. The only time the committee was really active was in the Eightieth

Congress, when real Government reorganization became effective. Thus far in this Republican Congress we have shown some real activity.

As for the statement that the Republican members of this committee have a desire to embarrass President Eisenhower, of course such a charge is absurd. Certain newspaper editorials have been referred to. They say that some of the Taft people, commenting about the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], coming from Taft territory, and some of the rest of us as having been original supporters of ROBERT TAFT, were trying to embarrass the President. Is not that an absurd charge, because the people coming from that part of the country where they were strongest for TAFT voted the largest majorities for President Eisenhower. Ohio went for Eisenhower by over a half million votes. The big city counties in all this Taft territory were carried with substantial majorities by President Eisenhower.

We, of course, are supporting Eisenhower. We loved him yesterday when he appeared before us and made the fine statement he did. We appreciate his sincerity. We in this committee have differences. We have our own ideas. We are not abdicating our opinions, because we were elected by our constituents to represent them and to do our own thinking. We were not elected as rubber stamps.

We propose to give the administration the kind of support the country expects us to provide the new President. He is a sincere man. He is a good man. This Republican majority will do a real job of delivering on our campaign pledges made last fall.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, those of us who are interested in reorganization are anxious to see a bill passed which will enable the President to carry out an effective program. It is our desire to try to cooperate, rather than to obstruct, but I feel I must bring to the attention of the House the serious weakness in the legislation which is now before us. Over the last 20 years we have developed a system for governmental reorganization under which great accomplishments have been made. This system is the reverse of the usual procedure in the passage of bills and resolutions. Simply stated, the system has enabled the President to recommend plans to the Congress which have become effective unless either House rejected them by a constitutional majority.

The new administration requested an extension of the law under which we have been operating. Such an extension amounts to nothing more than changing the date in the present act to 1955, and the bill as originally presented by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] provides for that. However, during the hearings an amendment was offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee which would repeal the constitutional majority provisions of the law and would provide that any plan could be rejected by a simple majority of either House. Such an amendment appears to be only minor, but when this is translated into actual practice it means theoretically that 110 Members of the House would be sufficient to defeat a reorganization plan, or 25 Members of the other body could effectively block any program.

During the committee hearings it was disclosed that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget preferred an extension of the law without weakening amendments, and his position was supported by not only the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report but also former President Hoover and former President Truman.

There was practically no debate on the merits of the Hoffman amendment and the majority report is silent on this point. The report simply states that the amendment was offered and adopted, which perhaps is not the whole story, but that is what happened in the committee.

Perhaps we do not know the real reasons for the amendment, but I am glad a member of the minority did not sponsor it, for that would have been classified as legislative sabotage. Instead, the minority is trying to cooperate in order to give the President the authority he will need if he is going to crusade in the field of reorganization.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE].

Mr. FINE. Mr. Chairman, I wanted first to take this opportunity to remind my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that the people did not give the Republican Party its full support, but actually elected President Eisenhower as an individual. And remember this, too, that the President of the United States, President Truman, built up President Eisenhower by making him the great general that he became, and made it possible for him to come before the American people as a great hero. You can look at the record and see just as well as I can that every time a President is elected overwhelmingly, he carries with him an overwhelming majority of his party to the Congress. But, this time if you look at the number of Republicans, you find that there are approximately 221, and we have approximately 212 Democrats. Two have died since so that it would have been 221 to 214. I think that that does not show that the American people have supported the Republican Party. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] think so?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not listening very carefully to the gentleman. I was so intent on the question I want to ask him, or rather in order to correct the gentleman. In my own district, the general did get more votes than I did, but in the adjoining district of my colleague, the gentleman from Grand Rapids [Mr. FORD], he led the President there by something like 8,000 votes, and way up in the northern end of the State, my distinguished colleague [Mr. BENNETT] carried every county in his district, while the candidate for President lost at least one, and I think two counties and fell way below.

Mr. FINE. Of course, I do not know what happened out in those territories that you are referring to, but I will tell you this. Back in New York City, which is predominantly a Democratic city, they gave the President of the United States Eisenhower a very big vote, and at the same time they came back and voted for Congressmen on the Democratic ticket. So we found out that what they were doing was voting for Eisenhower.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINE. I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean that you Democrats in New York rode in on Ike's coattails?

Mr. FINE. Mr. HOFFMAN, even your agile mind should not have come to that conclusion because you know very well that my name appeared on the Democratic line and Mr. Eisenhower's on the Republican line, and what I am telling you now is that the people who wanted to vote for Eisenhower voted for him and not the Republican Party, and then they came back and voted for the Democrats.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Since this matter has risen as to who is responsible for this Congress being pretty evenly divided, I would like to put in my nickel's worth.

Mr. FINE. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I merely want to point this out to the gentleman. You see, I have my own thoughts on this subject.

Mr. JENSEN. And so have I.

Mr. FINE. Of course, so does the gentleman. I have a pretty deep conviction that it was not what you fellows did in Congress the last 2 years that made the difference, but perhaps one or two statements which President Eisenhower made during the campaign which might have influenced a lot of the people. Just for instance, this price control that he was going to continue; and yesterday he made the statement that he is now going to do away with it—or rent control—those things can make a lot of difference—or even Korea—can make a lot of difference to women and housewives. Will you agree to that?

Mr. JENSEN. We will grant that—all right. But the American people discovered also that there had been a great deal of misinformation about the Eightieth Congress through the press and by the then President of the United States. There was no particular fight on Congress as a Congress. In fact, the people were saying, "Thank God for Congress." They said, "Congress stopped Mr. Truman and the New Deal-Fair Deal from putting in their Socialist program." So there was no fight on Congress as a Congress. In fact, the fight was on Trumanism. I can name possibly 40 or 50 Members of Congress on your side who voted with Mr. Truman every time, most every time, some of them every time, voted for everything he wanted, and the people were not looking into that matter. They said, "Thank God for Congress." So, as I say, there was no fight on Congress. Hence, you fellows who had supported Mr. Truman and the New Deal-Fair Deal program had no particular fight on you by the American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

people. The only fight on you was from your opponent, generally speaking. So you slid through, even though you had supported everything Mr. Truman had asked for.

Mr. FINE. Let me tell you this, in all candor: I think that what the American people found out in this campaign is that they had a national hero, Eisenhower, and they wanted to give him an opportunity to run this country. Then when he made several emotional statements which permitted him to influence a lot of the women and housewives, that also made a difference. I think Eisenhower as a candidate overshadowed what we in the Congress did.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, the people in my part of the United States know what we did.

Mr. FINE. I might say this to you: that if the President of the United States had made the same speech he made yesterday, just prior to election he would still be general of the armies.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FINE. I do not mean from my point of view. I mean from the point of view of you fellows on that side who did not go along with him entirely.

Mr. JENSEN. President Eisenhower yesterday simply reiterated his campaign pledges, and he is a great man and will make a great President, and we are going to support him, but we are going to see to it that the Congress of the United States brings back to the Congress the prerogatives which are ours under the Constitution. That is all we are doing today.

Mr. FINE. I want you to know, and I am speaking for the Democratic Party when I tell you now, that we hope he makes a good President. We hope he does well. Whenever he submits a progressive program, we will go along with him, but I am not so sure that all of you fellows on that side will. That is when the country will feel it.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to note in this morning's New York Times that the Republican leadership yesterday pledged to President Eisenhower precisely the reorganization authority he wanted. This, of course, overrules action taken the other day by the Republican-controlled House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. For a while it seemed to me that the Republican Party had forgotten its campaign promises to streamline our Government in the interests of economy, and had confirmed statements made by me during the recent campaign that the GOP talked of economy, but that was all—just talk.

Actually, the reorganization bill presents a simple issue—whether or not you believe the President ought to be empowered to reorganize the executive branch of Government. If you feel as I do that the Congress is not geared to do the job as a practical matter, why then you ought to give the President an effective law, to the end that reorganization of the executive department might increase efficiency, reduce expenditures, and result in economy in government.

The President came close to losing the opportunity to make good on his own campaign promises. However, please note that the Democrats voted unanimously in committee to uphold the President for the best interests of the country. Let us review the record of what has happened to date on this problem. The Eighty-third Congress convened on January 3, 1953. Before the month was out, the very first important bill, H. R. 1979, granting reorganization powers to the President, was considered in the Republican-controlled House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. It was the first important measure which the President considered as must legislation. The President's new Director of the Budget, Joseph M. Dodge, appeared before the committees and voiced the President's and his own unequivocal support of the bill. There were, in addition, the supporting testimony of two former Presidents, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman, and letters from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. The unanimous approval of those who have either had the responsibility for executive reorganization or have made an intensive study of this important problem clearly demonstrates the wisdom of and the need for effective reorganization legislation.

In urging the House committee to extend reorganization authority, Mr. Dodge testified that President Eisenhower wanted the same powers President Truman enjoyed because he considered it "a vital and necessary measure for the promotion of improved organization and businesslike management of the executive branch of the Government." The President apparently wants to complete the reorganization job. He appointed an able three member advisory committee, headed by Nelson Rockefeller, to aid him in formulating a number of plans.

With this array of support there should have been no doubt of the final action to be taken by the Members of the Republican controlled committees for the first Republican President in 20 years. The President had the right to expect at least the same treatment which a Democratic Congress accorded President Truman during the last 3 years. Unless the President is given adequate basic reorganization authority and support, the Republican Party undoubtedly will fail in its campaign promises.

The President did not get what he wanted last week. The two Republican controlled committees voted out a bill with limitations on the President which would result, for all practical purposes, in the defeat of most of his reorganization plans. The vote to deprive the President of full powers of reorganization came from the Republicans. House Democrats voted solidly with the President. This action has caused quite a stir in governmental circles because the President's Budget Director had vigorously opposed any change and had urged that nothing be done to make it more difficult for President Eisenhower to reorganize effectively the executive branch of the Government. Now the President himself, in his first State of the Union message, has requested full reorganization powers.

Effective reorganization can save billions of dollars annually. The estimated saving of former President Truman's reorganization plans would come to approximately four billion dollars annually. Many billions more are in sight—an economy undoubtedly worth striving for.

I am happy that the Democrats in Congress kept the Republicans from going off the track before their administration was a month old. I am sure that the Democrats will continue to support President Eisenhower on any progressive programs.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote to extend for 2 years the President's power to present reorganization plans. I also intend to vote for the committee amendment which will permit either House of the Congress to reject such plans by a majority of those present voting, which is the usual method of taking legislative action.

In this position I am supporting President Eisenhower in carrying out the program he has promised the American people.

In public life we must constantly confront positions fallaciously presented. The situation we face today is an interesting study in the technique of clever propaganda calculated to make black seem white.

Candidate Eisenhower, in the campaign, promised a change. He promised to respect the Congress and its prerogatives. He affirmed the constitutional separation of governmental powers and disavowed any intention to invade the legislative field. He condemned the past usurpation of policy-making power by New Deal and Fair Deal Presidents. He asserted his faith in democratic processes, his confidence in the individuals elected by the people to their Congress, and his belief that a popular Executive and the people's representatives, in an atmosphere of mutual respect, could work together for the welfare of our country.

President Eisenhower, in his only public statement on the subject, has reaffirmed his campaign statements to the electorate. He has asked for power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government: to clean out the mess, to establish common sense and business principles, to weed out waste and cancerous growths in the executive bureaucracy. But he has also reasserted his belief that this job can be done in cooperation with the Congress of the United States. I believe he is right.

There are those, many of whom pose as liberals, who hold that the elected Members of the Congress are incompetent to pass judgment on national affairs. Some, including a former Member, have called us squirrelheads. They say we are irresponsible, subject to pressures, and indifferent to the public good. They say we are not capable of deciding upon national policy. They go further. They say we are not even competent to prevent a program propagated by the bureaucrats, in whom, by

implication, resides all wisdom and devotion to American ideals.

What is this trick?

It is simple. It is so simple as to approach inspired ingenuity.

They argue: Congress gave Truman and Roosevelt power to reorganize which Congress could check only by heroic effort. If you do not give equal power to President Eisenhower, you are rebuffing a great man, a crusader, a popular hero, the only man who has been able to carry the Republicans to victory in two decades.

With this trick the bureaucrats hope to consolidate their gains over supine Congresses. They hope to forestall any trend toward the restoration of that marvelous equilibrium in governmental forces devised by our founding fathers to protect us and our posterity from the blight of tyranny. They hope to continue the gravitation of public power from the Congress to the Executive, and away from the people.

Shall we be deceived? I fear we shall.

Yet President Eisenhower was not deceived. He asserted, in effect, that if he presented a plan which could not muster the support of a majority of the Members of either House of the Congress present and voting, that plan should not take effect.

Let us support President Eisenhower in his statesmanlike regard for the duties and responsibilities of a coordinate branch of the Government. Let us agree with him that we are responsible public officials, whose familiarity with national affairs and whose judgment are entitled to weight.

Let us not abjectly admit with our detractors that we do not possess the capacity to determine national policy, which our friends who sent us here believed we had.

Now let us take this propostion apart. Let us use our minds, not our emotions. Let us assume we are reasonable men and forget the tricks, the generalities, the headlines and the possible political repercussions of our decision.

The subject matter is the set-up in the departments and agencies, boards and commissions of the Federal Government. All of these exist only because of statutes passed by the Congress. Only the President himself owes his origin to the Constitution.

These executive agencies were created by the legislative, policy-making branch of our Government to meet a public need, to carry out a public purpose. Their authority and the limits thereon were prescribed by statute. Except for the Reorganization Act, their reconstitution can occur only by congressional enactment.

With the advent of the New Deal in 1932 Congress granted a popular President power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government by submitting plans. But the Congress retained the right to veto those plans. Such reorganizations as did not infringe upon statutory structure could always be made. They can now. Agriculture Secretary Benson has already effected such a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture.

In 1932 our national annual budget was $3,925,000,000. Employees in the executive branch totaled 583,196. Today, after 20 years of elimination of waste and duplication through well-heralded Presidential reorganizations, we have an annual budget of $78,587,000,000 and 2,500,000 employees.

Let us not kid ourselves. The President has no more hours in his day than you and I have. These plans are not originated by him. They are not even originated by the men he appointed to the Cabinet. They originate in the second, the fifth, the twelfth, or the lower echelons of the huge bureaucracy the Democratic Congresses have built up downtown. Neither we nor the public are unaware of the empire-building proclivities of this bureaucratic monster we have permitted to grow to astonishing proportions.

The proponents of the constitutional majority argue: You gave Truman this power. Why deny it to President Eisenhower?

Who gave Truman such power?

Certainly I did not.

I have consistently advocated with all the force at my command that the Congress recapture the legislative authority the strong Executives of the New Deal have usurped from weak New Deal Congresses in the past two decades.

Did Republicans give Truman such power?

A few of them did. A few Republican Members of Congress, as we all know, vote consistently with the New Deal Democrats.

But the vast majority of Republicans resisted and opposed this transfer of legislative authority. In this stand they were joined by many Democrats who were unwilling to press their party loyalty to the point of being mere rubber stamps.

Even the Democratic Eighty-second Congress went on record clearly and officially as being overwhelmingly opposed to the principle of the constitutional majority for rejecting reorganization plans.

March 13, 1951, this House had before it the emergency reorganization bill of 1951. That was the quickie reorganization bill. That day I proposed an amendment, the purpose of which was to provide that emergency reorganization plans could be rejected by either House by a simple majority rather than a constitutional majority. The amendment was debated heatedly and extensively. On a teller vote, the Committee of the Whole adopted the simple majority rule by 158 to 61, a vote of better than 2½ to 1—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 2, pages 2329–2334.

Now it is suggested that a Republican Congress should do exactly what a Democratic Congress expressly and overwhelmingly refused to do less than 2 years ago.

Do you see how fallacious the argument of the New Dealers is?

I believe the American people are opposed to the further surrender of legislative power to the Executive. I believe they made that opinion crystal clear last November 4.

President Eisenhower in a speech at St. Louis, Mo., September 20, 1952, said:

> This same unity requires a new era of cooperation between the Executive and Congress. The Constitution of the United States does not place the President above Congress; nor does it put Congress above the President. In the business of Government, Congress and the President are coequal partners. We will make it a working partnership.

Again President Eisenhower at Des Moines, Iowa, on September 18, 1952, said:

> I will, with the cooperation of Congress, strive to turn this tide. I shall seek and need the cooperation of Congress—always the cooperation of Congress. The next administration will not be a one-man show.

To me, the question here involved is not one of personalities, but one of fundamental principle.

If you put the question: "Would you trust Eisenhower further than you would Truman?" My answer would of course be an unqualified "Yes."

But if you ask me: "Will you pass over to the Executive the power and the responsibility the Constitution, which you swore to uphold, vests in you and your colleagues?" My answer has been and must be an unqualified "No." That answer must be the same even though the present occupant of the Presidency is of my own party and a leader in whom I have supreme confidence.

It may seem to some that I have been arguing against granting the President any reorganizing power at all. Let me make my position on that principle clear beyond any question.

It is true that presidential reorganization with the congressional veto is legislation in reverse. However, the subject matter is at least theoretically the management of the executive branch of the Government, and the executive power of the Government is vested by the Constitution in the President. Of all of the fields of national policy the area of executive management is one peculiarly appropriate for the exercise of Presidential discretion.

The difficulty is that it seems to be impossible to separate and distinguish matters of pure administrative structure and procedures from matters of substantive national policy. If such a separation could be made, it would be appropriate and constitutional, in my opinion, to give the President complete and permanent authority to make administrative realinements. In fact, where statutory safeguards, checks, and limitations are not infringed, the President, without any legislation already possesses reorganizing powers.

Not being able to separate the purely administrative from the purely policy making, it is, in my opinion appropriate, and constitutional, to authorize the President to present reorganization plans, for a limited time and under special circumstances—such as the present change in administration. But this device, which admittedly is a legislative short-cut or makeshift, should be employed only where the Congress retains a real, not an illusory, power to reject plans which, in the judgment of the Congress, are contrary to national policy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This is why the simple or constitutional majority issue becomes so important. How difficult should it be for Congress to veto reorganization plans? That is the basic issue.

We must all admit that the Congress has failed to keep pace with the rapid growth of the country. It is attempting to deal with 1953 problems and issues with an 1875 legislative machine.

I have consistently urged that the Congress modernize and strengthen itself. I have suggested that this can be done by acquiring sizable, competent, and loyal investigative staffs for its committees—the instrument through which the Congress can train the spotlight and the microscope on areas of national interest. When we have developed fact-finding techniques we will be able to act on knowledge rather than ignorance, on facts and logic rather than emotions and generalities. We will then be able to demonstrate the workability of the processes of self-government in modern complex society. Then, and then only, will we be able to write laws which are clear and specific, delegating no more authority to executive agencies than is necessary to accomplish the public purpose.

Lacking the ability to write the people's will in clear and unambiguous terms, the Congress will presumably continue to legislate by announcing broad objectives and then creating a board or commission, vested with legislative, administrative, and judicial powers, to accomplish them. Since this necessarily entails a delegation of an excess of public power, I hope we will continue to impose standards for its exercise and checks and limitations calculated to prevent abusive and tyrannical exercise of that power.

For two decades in a period of great national stress, the Congress has been pouring national power into an executive bureaucracy which has swollen to monstrous proportions. Yet, Congress has sought to put curbs and checks on that power to keep empire-building bureaucrats from running wild. Such checks have not been completely and universally effective. Nevertheless, they have been the best the Congress could do under the circumstances. And, they have unquestionably prevented abuses of authority. If such checks and restraints are now removed, the result will be the vesting of far greater authority in the executive branch of the Government than the Congress intended to grant. This would unquestionably be a matter of national policy—not mere administrative realinement.

The Congress must retain a practical and workable means of preventing such Executive policymaking.

It is always helpful in understanding and appreciating the force of general principles to talk about specific cases.

A good example of policy-making through reorganization plans is Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, abolishing the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and vesting the broad lending authority of that corporation in a single Administrator. Congress had sought to prevent partisanship, sectionalism, and graft in the exercise of this vast power over public funds by providing that not more than three of the five directors of RFC should be of the same political party, that not more than one director should come from any Federal reserve district, and that the directors' terms were limited to 2 years. The reorganization, by vesting powers of the board of directors in a single Administrator with no fixed term, removed these checks against abuse of authority. Two hundred Representatives thought the plan was bad and voted against it, while only 197 voted for it. Yet the plan became effective for lack of the constitutional majority of 218.

I believe the press, the public, and even Members of the Congress do not fully appreciate the difficulty in obtaining a constitutional majority to override a Presidential reorganization plan.

Half of the authorized membership sounds relatively innocuous. It does not seem to approach in difficulty the two-thirds of those present and voting necessary to override a Presidential veto of legislation.

A brief review of the roll-call votes of the last Congress, however, will quickly convince the dispassionate observer that the requirement of a constitutional majority is a formidable obstacle to the expression of congressional will.

I requested the Congressional Quarterly to make an analysis of the roll-call votes in the two sessions of the Eighty-second Congress. That analysis is set forth in the tables which I include at this point in my remarks:

ROLL CALLS, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION (109)

Number voting on the following roll calls:

1: 423, Wednesday
2: 426, Wednesday
3: 423, Wednesday
4: 365, Wednesday
5: 377, Tuesday
6: 390, Wednesday
7: 393, Wednesday
8: 386, Wednesday
9: 396, Tuesday
10: 398, Wednesday
11: 390, Wednesday
12: 274, Wednesday
13: 394, Tuesday
14: 409, Tuesday
15: 417, Friday
16: 416, Friday
17: 353, Wednesday
18: 397, Wednesday
19: 395, Wednesday
20: 399, Wednesday
21: 392, Wednesday
22: 397, Wednesday
23: 397, Wednesday
24: 391, Wednesday
25: 393, Wednesday
26: 378, Thursday
27: 294, Friday
28: 289, Friday
29: 375, Wednesday
30: 380, Thursday
31: 368, Thursday
32: 387, Thursday
33: 233, Monday
34: 234, Monday
35: 338, Tuesday
36: 340, Wednesday
37: 380, Thursday
38: 335, Wednesday
39: 236, Friday
40: 284, Monday
41: 391, Friday
42: 393, Friday
43: 291, Monday
44: 357, Tuesday
45: 379, Wednesday
46: 388, Thursday
47: 387, Thursday
48: 390, Thursday
49: 382, Friday
50: 391, Friday
51: 368, Friday
52: 268, Saturday
53: 393, Thursday
54: 413, Friday
55: 415, Friday
56: 416, Friday
57: 416, Friday
58: 417, Friday
59: 417, Friday
60: 415, Friday
61: 415, Friday
62: 414, Friday
63: 416, Friday
64: 415, Friday
65: 414, Friday
66: 416, Friday
67: 415, Friday
68: 374, Wednesday
69: 387, Thursday
70: 380, Friday
71: 363, Friday
72: 374, Monday
73: 374, Monday
74: 359, Tuesday
75: 350, Thursday
76: 358, Tuesday
77: 364, Tuesday
78: 375, Wednesday
79: 372, Wednesday
80: 372, Wednesday
81: 374, Wednesday
82: 363, Monday
83: 360, Monday
84: 363, Monday
85: 361, Monday
86: 251, Friday
87: 291, Monday
88: 328, Tuesday
89: 323, Tuesday
90: 342, Wednesday
91: 345, Thursday
92: 337, Thursday
93: 333, Friday
94: 299, Monday
95: 326, Tuesday
96: 325, Tuesday
97: 310, Thursday
98: 320, Thursday
99: 326, Thursday
100: 321, Thursday
101: 312, Monday
102: 361, Tuesday
103: 328, Thursday
104: 313, Thursday
105: 346, Thursday
106: 344, Thursday
107: 345, Thursday
108: 340, Thursday
109: 276, Saturday

SECOND SESSION (72)

110: 359, Tuesday
111: 316, Friday
112: 342, Tuesday
113: 334, Wednesday
114: 332, Wednesday
115: 320, Monday
116: 390, Tuesday
117: 398, Tuesday
118: 288, Monday
119: 320, Tuesday
120: 321, Tuesday
121: 319, Tuesday
122: 331, Tuesday
123: 327, Tuesday
124: 361, Wednesday
125: 349, Thursday
126: 360, Friday
127: 358, Friday
128: 356, Thursday
129: 305, Friday
130: 325, Monday
131: 322, Monday
132: 374, Wednesday
133: 352, Friday
134: 329, Friday
135: 322, Friday
136: 255, Friday
137: 334, Wednesday
138: 351, Wednesday
139: 315, Wednesday
140: 343, Thursday
141: 343, Wednesday
142: 336, Thursday
143: 333, Thursday
144: 335, Thursday
145: 324, Thursday
146: 284, Friday
147: 292, Monday
148: 358, Friday
149: 357, Friday
150: 355, Friday
151: 264, Monday
152: 362, Thursday
153: 345, Thursday
154: 253, Monday
155: 354, Wednesday
156: 339, Thursday
157: 383, Tuesday
158: 392, Thursday
159: 396, Thursday
160: 394, Thursday
161: 392, Thursday
162: 395, Thursday
163: 395, Thursday
164: 396, Thursday
165: 391, Thursday
166: 376, Thursday
167: 340, Saturday
168: 336, Saturday
169: 348, Monday
170: 349, Monday
171: 328, Monday
172: 346, Wednesday
173: 253, Wednesday
174: 348, Thursday
175: 347, Thursday
176: 341, Thursday
177: 327, Thursday
178: 328, Thursday
179: 318, Friday
180: 323, Friday
181: 300, Friday

(Prepared by Congressional Quarterly for Representative MEADER.)

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS—ROLL CALL VOTES ARRANGED ACCORDING TO NUMBER VOTING

1: 426	38: 393	75: 365	112: 344
2: 423	39: 392	76: 364	113: 343
3: 423	40: 392	77: 363	114: 343
4: 417	41: 392	78: 363	115: 342
5: 417	42: 391	79: 363	116: 342
6: 417	43: 391	80: 362	117: 341
7: 416	44: 391	81: 361	118: 340
8: 416	45: 391	82: 361	119: 340
9: 416	46: 390	83: 361	120: 340
10: 416	47: 390	84: 360	121: 339
11: 416	48: 390	85: 360	122: 338
12: 415	49: 390	86: 359	123: 337
13: 415	50: 388	87: 359	124: 336
14: 415	51: 387	88: 358	125: 336
15: 415	52: 387	89: 358	126: 335
16: 415	53: 387	90: 358	127: 335
17: 414	54: 386	91: 357	128: 334
18: 414	55: 383	92: 357	129: 334
19: 413	56: 382	93: 356	130: 333
20: 409	57: 380	94: 355	131: 333
21: 399	58: 380	95: 354	132: 332
22: 398	59: 380	96: 353	133: 331
23: 398	60: 379	97: 353	134: 329
24: 397	61: 378	98: 353	135: 328
25: 397	62: 377	99: 362	136: 328
26: 397	63: 376	100: 351	137: 328
27: 396	64: 375	101: 350	138: 328
28: 396	65: 375	102: 349	139: 327
29: 396	66: 374	103: 349	140: 327
30: 395	67: 374	104: 348	141: 326
31: 395	68: 374	105: 348	142: 326
32: 395	69: 374	106: 347	143: 325
33: 394	70: 374	107: 346	144: 325
34: 394	71: 372	108: 346	145: 324
35: 393	72: 372	109: 345	146: 323
36: 393	73: 368	110: 345	147: 323
37: 393	74: 368	111: 345	148: 322

149: 322	158: 313	167: 291	176: 255
150: 321	159: 312	168: 289	177: 255
151: 321	160: 310	169: 288	178: 251
152: 320	161: 305	17 : 284	179: 236
153: 320	162: 300	171: 284	180: 234
154: 320	163: 299	172: 276	181: 233
155: 319	164: 294	173: 274	
156: 318	165: 292	174: 268	
157: 316	166: 291	175: 264	

(Prepared by Congressional Quarterly for Representative MEADER.)

There were 181 roll calls in the Eighty-second Congress. The highest number of Members ever present in the House of Representatives on those roll calls was 426. The lowest number present was 233. The average was about 357.

There were only 20 roll calls on which more than 400 were present. There were almost 20 roll calls on which less than 300 Members were present. If a reorganization plan came up when there were only 233 Members present in the House of Representatives, although all of the Members opposed the plan except 16 of them, the plan would still go into effect. This requires an almost unanimous vote.

On 42 roll calls, a little less than one-fourth of the total, there were 327 or fewer Representatives present. A constitutional majority on those occasions would have been the equivalent of two-thirds of those present and voting.

Aside from the difficulty of obtaining a constitutional majority there are other features of the present Reorganization Act which are given too little notice.

First, a reorganization plan may not be amended. Clarification or even the elimination of typographical errors is impossible. There is an insurmountable gag rule on reorganization plans. Many of us have tried to see if this phase of reorganization legislation could not be improved. There seems to be no feasible method of permitting amendment in this novel device of legislation in reverse.

Second, committee study of a plan is limited to 10 days. It should not be necessary to point out that this much time does not permit adequate study. Our pitifully deficient committee staffs could not begin to cope with complex and far-reaching plans in this period. There would not be time to sift opinions and consider the ramifications of a plan and give sound advice to committee members. Committee hearings must be short, hasty, and ill-prepared, as must be the committee's report to the House.

Consider the possibility that a far-reaching reorganization of the Department of Defense and related agencies, such as the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and the Central Intelligence Agency, may be presented. Such a plan would be the equivalent of amending the National Security Act of 1947. Does anyone believe that decent and worthwhile study by a committee of such a plan could be completed in 10 days?

Third, although plans are submitted in the name of the President, we all know that as a practical matter they are prepared in the first instance by anonymous authors in the lower echelons of departments and bureaus. The screening processes of the President may or may not purify and improve the programs of bureaucrats not famous for their reticence in asking for more authority, more employees, more money, and more freedom from congressional control.

Fourth, and most important, the reorganization plan device is the means whereby a ruthless and dictatorial President may, for all practical purposes, siphon off the legislative authority of the Congress. This is the channel through which a totalitarian system could be established. This, the Congress must be alert to prevent.

I cannot agree that you, my colleagues, are pin-heads or squirrel-heads. I cannot agree that the bureaucratic monster which has risen up in the past two decades is the fount of all wisdom and goodness. I do agree that the Congress is weak and inadequate. I emphatically assert that the crying need of our day is the strengthening and the improvement of the Congress. The way to do this is not to detract still further from the powers and responsibilities of the Congress.

Let us give the new President a new broom to sweep away the trash and debris accumulated in 20 years of misrule, but let the Congress at least hold the dustpan.

Let us demonstrate to the people that we know they voted for a change—not just a change in faces—but a change in philosophy of government—a restoration of the constitutional equilibrium of a Government of limited powers.

Let us not imitate supine New Deal Congresses and in our first major act give impetus to the 20-year trend away from self-government.

Let us for once stand courageously fast in the face of fallacious propaganda unafraid of the threats of distorted appeals to public emotion. Let us redeem our oaths and preserve, protect, and defend the integrity of the Congress of which we are a part.

I include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of January 30, 1953:

REGAINING LOST POWER

Somehow we can't get excited—as have some political bigwigs and analysts—over the action of the House Government Operations Committee in trimming the reorganization powers of President Eisenhower.

Of course, it would have been very convenient for the new administration to have an unabridged extension of the law which requires a veto by a full majority of the House or Senate to kill an administration reorganization measure.

The bill, as revised by Representative HOFFMAN'S committee, would permit a congressional veto of a reorganization plan by a simple majority of those present and voting. If finally adopted, this bill will result in the death of some needed reorganization plans. Congressmen who love the smell of pork won't have much trouble in drumming up a simple majority on reorganization plans that interfere with their own little empires.

At the same time the Hoffman amendment is a move to recapture some of the legislative powers that have been delegated to the administration and to a mass of commissions and agencies. The powers of these agencies to make rules and, in effect, write laws, brought on the conditions that caused the people to vote for a change.

The original reorganization bill delegated a great deal of power to the White House. We don't doubt that President Eisenhower would use this power wisely if it were granted to him, but we keep remembering the words of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the early days of the New Deal, when Congress literally was abdicating in favor of a strong executive branch, F. D. R. frankly stated that the powers he sought might be dangerous in other hands. President Eisenhower's calm acceptance of the Hoffman amendment shows that he does not thirst for legislative powers.

The American system of Government provides for the protection of freedom with a system of checks and balances, with the power to legislate placed exclusively in the hands of Congress. Any time that balance is destroyed the opportunity for restricting freedom grows larger.

The Republican Congress faces a challenge after 20 years of criticism of Democratic methods. It must legislate wisely and well. It cannot meet the challenge unless it recovers some of the powers its predecessors gave away.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my remarks have more importance in view of the statements made by the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] that the constitutional question is moot because for 20 years Congress after Congress may have acted unconstitutionally. If there is any basis to this request it becomes even more important that this Congress reassert the significance of its aim to defend and support the Constitution.

I do not rise to participate in this debate with any pleasure. The position I am forced to take on this important piece of legislation probably has litle support in this body if I am to judge by the consideration given by the Committee on Governmental Operations and the debate which has gone on here in the Committee of the Whole. However, I shall not belabor the point which has been so well and ably expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Governmental Operations, Mr. HOFFMAN, in the report of the committee, accompanying the bill.

I am opposed to the bill, basically; whether it is amended or not amended makes no difference. It is unconstitutional. The Constitution prescribes that the Congress shall legislate and that the President may veto; not that the Executive Branch of Government shall legislate and the Legislative Branch veto. These basic powers cannot be granted away except if the people of this country in their wisdom and in accordance with the methods prescribed by the Constitution for amendment, decided to do so.

My colleagues, we have no power to change the Constitution by simple legislation. Do not misunderstand me. I am well aware, all too aware, of the fact that the Constitution has been disregarded by Congresses which have preceded us. When I speak of power I mean legal power, power granted to us by the Constitution, and we do not have the legal power to grant to the executive branch of Government the power to legislate.

That we have it in our actual power without check from the judicial branch of Government to do many unconstitutional things is a matter of history. Many persons do not understand this. They are of the erroneous belief that the judicial branch of Government stands as a check over the actions of the Congress and the President when these two

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

branches of Government pass legislation which is contrary to the Constitution. The truth is that the judicial branch of Government only stands as a possible check when the property rights or individual civil rights of citizens have been affected by a certain piece of legislation and the matter of controversy between legal parties is presented to the courts for decision.

Legislation such as this and legislation such as that which the Eighty-second Congress passed in its first session to create an executive commission to write the legislation establishing universal military training have as their only check the oaths of office which we as Congressmen and the Executive as the President take to uphold and support the Constitution.

Only your and my consciences stand between the enactment of unconstitutional legislation of this nature.

There may be some who sincerely believe that this Reorganization Act is constitutional. If so, for the sake of this debate, I believe it is important that they present the reasons behind such a belief. For I know there are many Members who have made up their minds to vote for this legislation because of expediency.

The first argument of expediency is that if the past President was granted the power to write legislation streamlining the executive department then the new President should have this power. This is a forceful argument. I want to grant to the new President all the powers he feels he needs to carry out his ideas of how to meet the momentous problems that confront our beloved country, if those powers are within our power to grant.

The second argument of expediency is that Congress would be under too much pressure to enact legislation which would streamline the executive departments. Specifically it is argued the Congress could never reorganize the Veterans' Administration or the Department of Agriculture under the pressures that would be exerted against it.

Yes; it will be a tough job. In fact, it is a tough job to legislate on any controversial matter. Perhaps, though, it will be a less tough job if the executive branch of the Government would change the policy of its predecessor and crack the whip to prevent its various departments, bureaus, authorities, boards, commands, corporations, divisions, groups, commissions, administrations, and so forth, from lobbying with Federal funds to prevent these reorganizations from coming about. It is not pressure from the people the Congress needs to worry about on these matters but it is the executive agents fighting for their empires with the illegal use of vast sums of Federal money that are our concern. Cracking the whip would mean no more than having the Justice Department prosecute a few executive agents for engaging in this illegal lobbying.

I think this Congress is ready to step up to the job it has to do. I see no reason why this new administration cannot determine what reorganization bills it would like to see passed and present them to the Congress in an orderly manner. There is no reason why the executive branch should not make the original draft of the proposed legislation. Drawing the original draft is not the art of legislation. It is the consideration from there on where the art lies: the hearing and questioning of interested and informed witnesses, the weighing of word and sentence meanings, the changes and the amendments, the deletions and addenda, under the heat of controversial committee debate and, finally, on the floor of the House, the hammering out of the product by the party in power upon the sturdy anvil of the opposition.

Under the reorganization bill the Congress cannot amend the draft. It cannot really study it. It must accept or reject. It must veto or approve. This is not legislating.

The Speaker stated in his acceptance address to this body that he was anxious to see the Congress regain the authorities it had lost. The President has stated in his speeches that he believed in the separation of powers provided for in the Constitution. These are fine generalities; we are now in the process of considering the details which alone can give them real meaning.

The issue is simple. Either this act is constitutional or it is not. Those who believe it is unconstitutional, as I do, must vote against it.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I listened with great interest to the testimony of Mr. Dodge in support of H. R. 1979 and in opposition to the Hoffman amendment which would make possible the disapproval of a presidential reorganization plan by a simple majority of either the House or the Senate, conceivably by as few as 25 Members of the Senate or 110 Members of the House.

I also paid close attention to the arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and others in the committee in support of the Hoffman amendment. I have read Mr. HOFFMAN'S views as expressed in the report of the House Committee on Government Operations. As a new Member of Congress, in the short time permitted, I have endeavored to familiarize myself with previous reorganization plans and the contentions of both proponents and opponents of reorganization of the executive department by the President, pursuant to authority delegated by Congress. I am frank to say that I made this study, not as a Democrat, but as a citizen and a Member of Congress interested, as all of us are, in doing that which I think is for the best interest of America. Incidentally, in this fast moving world, and particularly in the field of government, we are seldom certain that what we do is best for all concerned.

I supported H. R. 1979 and opposed the Hoffman amendment in our committee for a number of reasons. While I have no great enthusiasm for this type of legislation wherein Congress delegates its authority and responsibility to others, I do believe that the passage of H. R. 1979 is, contrary to the contention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in his views expressed in the committee report, necessary. I do not believe it is an unconstitutional grant of legislative power, and I do believe reorganization of the executive departments can result in more honesty and integrity, and more economy and efficiency in government, especially in the executive departments. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that a grant of such legislative power does not insure either. The result depends upon the motives, the determination, the fearlessness, and the devotion to service of the one or ones who initiate the plans and the ones who put them into effect.

As a member of the State Legislature of North Carolina, wherein this question of the constitutionality of the delegation of legislative authority to various administrative agencies has been debated for years, I have long since satisfied myself that if a State legislature, or if Congress is unwilling or is not equipped, because of circumstances beyond the control of either to do a certain job, then when either delegates its authority, that in effect is the passing of legislation, both presently and in advance. These matters bothered me for a long time because of my knowledge of constitutional provisions, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and others have already pointed out, placing legislative responsibility upon the legislative branch of government.

I have long since concluded, as I have concluded in this instance, that there are certain administrative functions—especially in view of the growth of government and governmental responsibilities—which no legislative branch can adequately, properly, and efficiently dispose of. There are many instances, I believe, where legislative branches of government have shirked their responsibilities by delegating to administrative agencies the authority to make law and to make a violation of this administrative law a criminal offense.

Then, too, in this particular instance, while we are delegating some of our responsibilities and our power, there is an opportunity to check upon the work of our agents. Under H. R. 1979, either House of Congress, by a majority of its Members, may reject any proposals submitted by the President. I agree that in most instances a simple majority of either House would be the preferable method of passing upon the acts of our agents. However, in recent years, with the advent of one emergency after another and of wars, Government has become so big, and in many ways so cumbersome, that Congress needs, and does have, the help of experience and of experts to assist it in performing its duties. After we pass this legislation by a simple majority, I see no reason why we should not require a constitutional majority of either House to reject or disapprove any reorganization plans submitted. After the President has done his job in preparing plans, pursuant to authority given him by what legally could be a simple majority of both Houses, I doubt the wisdom of permitting ourselves later

on to destroy all of his labors by that same majority in either House. The reasons are obvious.

The President of the United States is elected by a vote of all the people of America, and is primarily obligated or committed to no congressional district or State in the Union. It is a matter of common knowledge that he owes no allegiance to any particular section of the country because he is elected by all of the people. I, therefore, think it is good judgment for Congress to delegate this authority to the President.

As a matter of fact, the President of the United States committed himself to the American people to reorganize and to streamline our Federal Government, particularly the executive branch, in accordance with the principles outlined in the report of the Hoover Commission. As a matter of fact, that was a pledge in the Republican platform; and, personally, in my own campaign for Congress, I committed myself to support such legislation as could result in the elimination of unnecessary and burdensome agencies and departments, in a reduction of the expenses of Government, and in the elimination of such waste and extravagance as is discovered in our governmental operations. The people of my district, and I believe a great majority of the people of America, are now thinking in terms of more economy in Government, greater efficiency, and a reduction in the tax burden as soon as is practicable.

We have a new President who has requested that we delegate to him the necessary authority to continue a job—already begun—in compliance with his commitment to the American people, and I might say a most praiseworthy commitment. In his inaugural address to the joint session of Congress, he very vigorously and unhesitatingly obligated himself to exercise wisely and discreetly the powers contained in H. R. 1979. I believe it would be unwise and impracticable in this particular instance to make the President our agent in the doing of a job and then say to him a bare majority of either House may disapprove the action which he takes pursuant to legislative authority granted, not by a constitutional majority, but by a simple majority as is true in the case of all legislation passed by Congress. Then, too, I believe it might be considered a reflection upon our President to give him less authority along these lines than was given to our former President. Having been elected, he becomes the President of all of the people of America, regardless of their party affiliations. I repeat: I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that reorganization does not necessarily insure either economy or efficiency, but I believe presidential reorganization, fearlessly, honestly, and intelligently done, will result in substantial financial savings to our people and in greater efficiency of operations. A great job still lies ahead in this field.

While I am a Democrat from head to foot, in every bone, muscle, and nerve of my body, I am not blinded to the fact that mistakes, as well as war and emergencies, and additional responsibilities have resulted in a tremendous increase in the agencies of the executive department, many of which are loosely put together and are badly in need of being straightened out or, even in many cases, eliminated. Our people are fed up with so much red tape and so many rules and regulations which somehow seem to have taken from them some of the freedom which they have so long cherished. Congress has not heretofore assumed its full share of the responsibility of reorganizing the executive branch of government. It is obvious that Congress never will. Who then is better equipped? Who has at his beck and call, training, experience, and expert advice? To whom are the people looking primarily for the fulfillment of the innumerable obligations and responsibilities of the executive branch of government, If there is failure in a job of reorganization, whom will the people look upon as responsible? The answer is: The President of the United States. Should there be any division of responsibility in keeping the executive branch of government clean, honest, economically and efficiently operated? The answer is "No."

May I inject here this thought—and I do it sincerely—I do not believe that big government, too far removed from the people, is the responsibility or the work of any particular political party. It is, in my humble opinion, the result of a number of factors, among which have been war—actual and cold, emergency and world-wide responsibilities, and at times the indifference of the American people, and the unwillingness of local and State governments to assume their full share of responsibility for services to their respective peoples.

I think it is unfortunate that the President, his subordinates, and the leaders in Congress got their wires crossed about this resolution. I was impressed by Mr. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. When he testified before our Committee on Government Operations, he spoke with apparent authority. Here are some of his statements:

> I think a simple majority would make it almost impossible for the President to act in the manner in which you expect him to.
>
> If there ever was a time when the President should be given adequate powers, it is the leader of the incoming administration. His powers certainly should not be weakened.
>
> The President has very determined ideas of what he would like to accomplish, what he believes the people expect of this administration; and I think he is entitled, under all these circumstances, to have his hand strengthened as much as possible, and certainly not weakened.
>
> The public record shows this has been discussed with leaders of the Congress. I am testifying as to the act presented here. We would prefer an extension without modification or weakening of the present act.

And, then, in answer to questions of Mr. RIEHLMAN and of Mrs. ST. GEORGE, he made the following statements:

> Mr. RIEHLMAN. I am sorry I was not here to hear your opening remarks. However, I am of the opinion that you are wholeheartedly in accord with the extension of the present act as it is, without any modification whatsoever?
>
> Mr. DODGE. That is right.
>
> I believe that the President should be given an effective tool for carrying out his responsibilities within such limits as are reasonable, and those established now appear to be reasonable.
>
> * * * I think practice has shown that the decision under the 1949 act was adequate, and we prefer that this be continued as is and not weakened in any way nor modified by exceptions.
>
> Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Dodge, am I correct in assuming that this bill that we have before us has been cleared by the present administration, that it is regarded as the minimum on which they can work?
>
> Mr. DODGE. That is correct.

I am delighted to know now that the Republican leadership in Congress condescended to yield to the wishes of the President and the views of Mr. Dodge, who minced no words in his opposition to the Hoffman amendment. It is consoling to know that the experience and the expert advice of so many individuals and groups have finally made an impression upon the Republican leadership in Congress. The oldest living former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, expressed himself in support of H. R. 1979 without amendment. He is the last person any Democrat would expect to see asking for a grant of authority not justified by the facts. The studies and recommendations made by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, and by other interested and experienced individuals and groups of Americans, deserve our most careful nonpartisan consideration.

The only difficulty I can foresee from the passage of this legislation lies in the fact that the President's reorganization plan must be rejected or accepted in its entirety, if I am correctly informed. I do believe that Congress should give serious consideration to some kind of legislation which will either permit an amendment to the plans submitted—and this could be dangerous—or a means of coordination between responsible leaders in Congress and the President so that the President, himself, may amend his own plans, in keeping with constructive suggestions from Congress, before they are acted upon.

By way of summarization of what I have said, I repeat in another way: Reorganization is necessary. It can result in a substantial reduction of expenditures and of our tax burden. It can result in more efficiency in Government. Should it be undertaken by the President because of a desire to make provision for patronage for an untold number of supporters, then it is doomed to failure and it could be a crime against the American people. If, however, reorganization is attempted by the President in a nonpartisan way, without thought of his party affiliation, without fear of political repercussions if certain supporters of his, or friends of his supporters, lose their jobs or places of trust; if it is attempted by him vigorously and honestly, as I believe it will be attempted, it can well result in substantial improvement and efficiency of the executive arm of Government and in substantial reduction of our expenditures, both at home and abroad.

He has requested that we appoint him our agent to do this job. He has committed himself to do it thoroughly, honestly, and well. I have confidence in his integrity and his sincerity of purpose and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

his willingness to carry out essential orders to his subordinates. I likewise have sufficient confidence in the Members of Congress to believe that, regardless of party affiliation, a substantial majority of the membership of one House or the other will, first, reject any plan that is not right and, secondly, in the future, refuse to extend any authority not properly put into execution. In this program of contemplated action, and in all other programs affecting the welfare of all our people, let us stand shoulder to shoulder, without thought of party affiliation, and do those things which we sincerely believe are for the best interest of our country. As we take these periodic inventories of the needs and responsibilities of Government, I suggest it is both fitting and appropriate that we take a spiritual inventory of our own lives, both as private citizens and public servants.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I rise here briefly not only as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, but as well as one who has been chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Adoption of the Hoover Report in my own State of Connecticut. I suggest to my colleagues at this time that we of the Citizens Committee, which I may say was made up of members of both political parties, have approached this problem of support for the Hoover Commission, in a bipartisan, indeed, in a nonpartisan manner. We have been for and are now for a continuation of this reorganization program. I voted in committee against what is called the Hoffman amendment, because I thought it would be a restriction on the new President which was not imposed on his predecessor and because we of the Citizens Committee feel and have felt that the job of reorganization is difficult enough and that it is in the best interest of the country that a constitutional majority be required in order to further this reorganization program. I am aware that there are those both on my side of the aisle and on the other side who have grave concern about the constitutional question of the delegation of authority by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a telegram from Mr. Charles B. Coates, vice chairman and general manager of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, which reads as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily urge you to oppose amendment substitution simple majority for constitutional majority in H. R. 1979 for Reorganization Act extension. This amendment would seriously damage chances for much needed continuation of Federal reorganization so well begun by bipartisan Hoover Commission. As amended this bill makes it possible for 25 out of the total of 531 Members of Congress to defeat any Presidential reorganization plan in practice. I fear that this would work out so that almost any worth while reorganization could easily be killed without "the Congress even half thinking about it," as the saying goes. Remembering your sterling work as voluntary chairman of the Connecticut Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, I feel sure you will agree that this amendment not only represents a dangerous set-back in the reorganization process but a bitter disappointment to the thousands of public-spirited citizens of both parties who stand ready to support the Congress and the administration in the vital task for making our Government stronger, more efficient, and more effective in this time of crisis.

CHARLES B. COATES,
Vice Chairman and General Manager, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

I understand their concern. I lean toward that side myself. I want the Congress to retain its constitutional authority. I feel that the problem which confronts us today is of such a peculiar nature, and the difficulties which attend reorganization are so great, that it is fair and not unreasonable to suggest that we do pass this bill and continue this act as it has been written heretofore and as it is written today.

May I remind my colleagues, the five of them from Connecticut who are on the other side, I being the only Democratic Member from my State, that I do believe it is accurate to say that the overwhelming majority of the people not only of my own district but of our entire State are very much in favor of the continuation of this plan and are in favor as well of the continuation of the constitutional majority provision.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am under no illusions about what will happen to this committee amendment, which, by the way, was offered by me after I was assured that it met with the approval of the administration.

But to be frank, let me say that regardless of what the administration wanted I would have offered the same amendment. It is in the bill that was reported out without objection in the other body previous to the time our committee meeting was held. That amendment but expresses the opinion which I have held ever since I came here in 1935.

I might add that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS on the table back there, which I did not bring down to the well with me, contain the record showing that previously when there was a record vote on reorganization plans practically the same amendment which I offered to the committee and which is in the bill today was offered, and was supported on one occasion by 168 Republicans. I will not now embarrass my colleagues by reciting that roll call. We have now a President upon whom we can rely. That amendment received the support of the Republican leadership, including my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Massachusetts, our present able Speaker, my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and many others, not only on that occasion but on every other occasion when it was offered.

Later on we were told by the administration advisers that the committee amendment was not wanted. That put 14 committee members on the spot. That change in orders left 14 members of the committee out on a limb—which later was sawed off behind them. Being loyal Republicans, being liberal-minded, and, I assume this is the reason, willing to go along with the first Republican President in 20 years—one in whom they have confidence—they are now voting against the amendment which they voted for in committee, after they were advised that the amendment would meet the approval of the administration.

I have no fault to find with that. The administration just got its signals crossed—only temporarily. I have not yet, in all the years I have been here, criticized any Member of this House, because of his or her vote, and I never intend to do so.

One serious constitutional objection is met by the committee amendment. The unamended act requires that a majority of the authorized membership of each House is necessary to reject a reorganization plan. The amendment would restore the historic constitutional test for effective action of the Houses of Congress.

Those who feel that 218 affirmative votes—a majority of the authorized membership—should be necessary for effective legislative action in the House, or 49 affirmative votes in the Senate, should address themselves to a constitutional amendment.

To call such a requirement a "constitutional majority" is a farce. It is an innovation of the New Deal, repugnant to and designed to frustrate the Constitution.

No such test for legislative action is recognized by the Constitution. None can be imposed by legislation short of an amendment to the Constitution.

Figures which show the number of recommendations of the past two administrations that were turned down are irrelevant. Congress now has faith and confidence in our President. President Eisenhower does not need unconstitutional devices.

The bill without the amendment permits a plan sent down by the President's advisers—for presumably he knows nothing about it—to become the law of the land if 217 Members—one less than a majority of the House—vote against a resolution rejecting the plan or are not present. While those who oppose a simple majority rejecting a plan, they swallow without a quiver to their Adam's apple legislation which has never received the sanction of a majority; the same result would obtain in the other body. That position is absurd for while they insist that only a majority of those elected can reject a plan they accept the passage of legislation by less than that number—they accept legislation adopted by a majority of those present when the vote is taken—even when on one occasion as in the Senate the President and only one Member was present.

Now why do I oppose this reorganization bill with or without the amendment, if you please? Because I do not believe that Congress should delegate its legislative power to the executive branch of the Government.

A COMPARISON OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT WITH OUR CONSTITUTION

Most school children know that we get our laws by the concurrent action of the Houses of Congress, followed by the approval of the President or the overriding

of the President's veto by a two-thirds vote of each House.

The Reorganization Act tries to prescribe another method for making laws.

Section 1 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The Reorganization Act vests in the President the power to originate a "reorganization plan" which unless rejected by a House of Congress, becomes the law of the land.

Section 7 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads in part:

> Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

The Reorganization Act provides that the plans originated by the President shall be filed with each House of Congress and, unless rejected by the affirmative vote of more than half the authorized membership of either House, shall become law. Under the proposed amendment, a plan would become law if not rejected by a majority of either House.

The constitutional powers of Congress are specified in section 8 of article I—see also section 3 of article III, sections 1 and 3 of article IV, and article V. The last clause of section 8 of article I reads:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The Reorganization Act attempts to place in the Executive power and authority, not only to abolish agencies, except departments, but even to abolish any function of the Government, except that he must leave each department with one function.

The first sentence of section 1 of article II of the Constitution is:

> The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

The Reorganization Act makes it possible for either House of Congress to veto a Presidential reorganization.

The constitutional issue: Having in mind these provisions of our Constitution, Attorney General Mitchell—Thirty-seventh Opinions of the Attorney General, pages 56, 63—analyzed the constitutional question presented to him on the basis that, unless the function were executive, the delegation would be unconstitutional, and if the function were executive, the setting up of a method whereby one House of Congress could disapprove executive action violated article II, section 1. With all due respect for the statement of Tom Clark—then Mr. Truman's Attorney General—that Attorney General Mitchell based his opinion on an unsound premise, Mr. Mitchell's analysis seems determinative to me.

The Constitution is violated when Congress attempts to transfer legislative powers to the President—*Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 495); *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388); *Yakus* v. *U. S.* (321 U. S. 414).

The Supreme Court distinguishes an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power by Congress from "a mere exercise—by the Executive—of administrative discretion under valid legislative authority"—*Lichter* v. *U. S.* (334 U. S. 742, 775).

Generally, Supreme Court cases discuss whether Congress has sufficiently laid down "its policies and standards in order that the administrative authority granted may not be an unconstitutional delegation of its own legislative power," acknowledging that this test is a matter of degree "not capable of precise definition" (id. at 779).

The draftsmen of the Reorganization Act of 1949 made a studious effort to comply superficially with these tests of constitutionality—see sections 2 and 3 of the act. But on amount of careful draftsmanship can conceal the basic difficulty presented by the very scope of the delegation in the reorganization act.

Except for its immediate predecessors, I know of no attempted delegation by Congress in any way comparable in breadth with the authority attempted to be delegated in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Under that act, any function of any agency can be abolished by the Executive. The Marine Corps, and its roles and missions could be abolished.

All veterans' benefits can be invalidated by a ukase. The FBI could be put out of business. All farm price supports can be eliminated.

There is hardly an activity of the Government that a President could not eliminate, except that he must leave the nine major departments with at least one function each.

That act tries to give away the power and duty of Congress to make laws regarding the Government of the United States. It is silly to compare that kind of a delegation with the Renegotiation Act, or any other type of statute.

The standards and limitations set forth in the Reorganization Act would be adequate for a delegation of power to reorganize the Fish and Wildlife Service; possibly they would be adequate for a delegation of power to reorganize or even abolish the Department of Commerce, though that I doubt. But, a delegation of the scope of the Reorganization Act of 1949 cannot be validated by a legislative preface of generalities as to permissible aims—see *A. L. A. Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States*, supra, and compare *Fahey* v. *Mallonee* (332 U. S. 245), in which the Court slides over the practical absence of standards because it is dealing with a narrow and customary field of delegation.

We have confidence in the President of the United States. He now has the power to, and I believe he will, clean up the "mess" in the executive department. But we have a Government of laws. A decision that this act is constitutional cannot rest in the fact, which I proclaim, that we have a good and competent President. And there is nothing else on which it can rest.

Carved into stone over the door of the Supreme Court is the legend "Equal justice under law." That is the foundation upon which our Government rests. Constitutional Government is the basic reason we here have a greater degree of freedom, prosperity, and security than in any other country. The constitutional system of checks and balances, which has served us individually and as a Nation so well, will ultimately be destroyed if, little by little, first one constitutional provision and then another is either ignored or overridden. That we are on the way toward dictatorship is shown by the willingness of the Congress to surrender the legislative authority granted to it by the Constitution.

The Congress, of course, can delegate to the Executive administrative functions. But under the Constitution the Congress cannot veto any executive action, the power to perform which is given to the President by the Constitution. And yet in this bill what do we do? We grant legislative power to the President and then we violate another provision of the Constitution by writing in and claiming the right to veto that executive action. Twice in the same bill we violate the Constitution.

Now why? Why should we do it? In addition to my contention that this legislation is unconstitutional, I say it is unnecessary. It comes to me with a feeling of gratification to have our Democratic friends come up here after 20 years, with the exception of 2 years, of absolute control over every branch of this Government—and I speak advisedly and with all due respect because our judges are Democratic appointees—they come to us now and say in effect that this country is in a mess and the people in November agreed with them that the country will be ruined unless we grant legislative powers to the President. Have they so misconducted themselves over these 20 years that they have this Government in this kind of a situation where the Congress itself must abdicate and give to the President the powers which the people have reposed in us? Surely, Eisenhower is my President and I expect to go along with him. I expect to strain my conscience a little here and there on occasion, if I must, to go along—that is, just strain, not disregard it. But, after all, the people in my district are my bosses and I follow their orders after I have strained them through my conscience and used my good judgment to test them by constitutional standards. That is all I can do, and that is just what I have always done, just what I intend to keep on doing, so long as I am here.

But this is only the latest of the futile efforts to find a panacea for waste by reorganizing. Way back in 1888 the Cochrell Commission reported its findings. Then the Dockery-Cochrell Commission was established in 1893. Both were legislative creations, but the Keep Committee was established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905, and functioned until 1909.

In 1910, Congress appropriated $100,000, and in the following 3 years an additional $160,000, which provided for the establishment and operation of the Pres-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ident's Commission on Economy and Efficiency. Although the Commission made numerous recommendations, no legislative action was taken.

The Division of Efficiency, created in 1913, was later given reorganization functions, and the President was authorized to abolish duplications of service which it found to exist.

Vast war reorganization power, during World War I, was given President Wilson by the Overman Act.

After the war the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 created the Bureau of the Budget and established the General Accounting Office as an independent agency.

In the Sixty-sixth Congress, in 1919, a Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Administrative Branch of the Government was established.

In 1921 the President was authorized to appoint a representative to cooperate with this committee. Among the recommendations of the committee in 1924 were: First, the coordination of the Military and Naval Establishments under a single Cabinet officer, as the Department of National Defense—a proposal which was adopted some 25 years later; second, transfer of all nonmilitary functions from the War and Navy Departments to civilian departments—chiefly Interior and Commerce; third, elimination of all nonfiscal functions from the Treasury Department; fourth, establishment of a new Department of Education and Welfare; fifth, change the name of the Post Office Department to Department of Communications; and, sixth, the attachment to the several departments of all independent establishments except those which perform quasi-judicial functions or act as service agencies for all departments.

There was some coordination of units of the Veterans' Administration by President Hoover under act of July 3, 1930.

Authority very similar to that contained in the Reorganization Act of 1949, if committee amendments are adopted, but not as complete, was contained in the Legislative Appropriations Act of 1933.

No plans proposed by President Hoover under this authority became law, and Attorney General Mitchell found the act, so far as it attempted to provide for reorganizations, to be unconstitutional—Thirty-seventh Opinions of the Attorney General, pages 56, 63.

The Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act of 1934 gave President Roosevelt power to issue Executive orders subject to congressional disapproval within 60 days for the purpose of governmental reorganization. The President submitted six Executive orders during 1933 and 1934 in accordance with this grant of power. All the orders became effective, and are known as the first Roosevelt reorganization plan.

On February 25, 1936, the Senate passed a resolution establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government. Composed of five members, headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the committee was appointed by the President of the Senate and drew its funds from the contingent funds of the Senate. The committee was responsible for a series of 14 reports prepared by the Brookings Institution and published as Senate committee prints.

In March 1936, President Roosevelt advised the Congress that he was going to appoint a committee to formulate a plan for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and asked the cooperation of the Senate select committee in that project. The President then appointed Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam—who died in January 1953—and Luther Gulick as the President's Committee on Administrative Management. The committee submitted its report in 1937 with the following main recommendations: First, expansion of the White House staff; second, strengthening and developing the managerial agencies of the Government, such as those dealing with the budget and personnel; third, extension of the merit system; fourth, grouping of independent agencies and units in 12 major executive departments; and, fifth, establishment of accountability of the Executive to the Congress by providing an independent post audit of all fiscal transactions.

The Reorganization Act of April 3, 1939—Public Law 19, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, Fifty-third Statutes, page 561—gave President Roosevelt power to reorganize through the device of reorganization plans which were to be submitted to the Congress. Disapproval by both Houses within 60 days was required to defeat plans and a time limit for submission of plans—January 21, 1941—was included. Under the authority given him, the President submitted five extensive plans of reorganization, all of which were approved.

The next major action relative to reorganization came in 1945, although the President had been given wartime powers of great scope. The Reorganization Act of 1945—Public Law 263, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, Fifty-ninth Statutes, page 613—gave the President authority again to submit reorganization plans subject to the disapproval of both Houses of Congress. Seven plans were submitted under the authority of this act; two were rejected by both Houses; two were disapproved by one House but went into effect; and three were approved without serious objection.

In July 1947 Congress established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the Hoover Commission. After 2 years of extensive study and the expenditure of a little less than $2,000,000 the Commission in 1949 issued a series of reports on various phases or units of the Federal Government. Nineteen reports were submitted to Congress along with accompanying task force reports and other supporting data. It has been estimated that over half of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission have been adopted. The Congress might well adopt the remaining Hoover Commission's recommendations before it seeks others.

In 1949 Congress passed the present Reorganization Act authorizing the President to submit reorganization plans. This time, however, the disapproval of a constitutional majority of only one House of Congress was sufficient to reject a plan. So far, 41 reorganization plans have been submitted under this authority; 29 have gone into effect; 11 were rejected by Congress; and 1 was superseded by law. The authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1949 would expire, except for the now-proposed amendment, on April 1, 1953.

Under the personal direction of its president, Robert L. Johnson, former chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Temple University is now making a survey.

In November last then President-elect Eisenhower wrote Dr. Johnson, as follows:

DEAR DR. JOHNSON: Thank you for your letter of November 14, in which you advise me of the nonpartisan review and study of Government reorganization which has been undertaken by Temple University. It is my understanding that this will integrate and bring up to date existing studies and recommendations, including the report of the Hoover Commission. This undertaking is most timely and should be very helpful to the prospective members of the new administration.

I am appointing a committee composed of Nelson A. Rockefeller, Arthur S. Flemming, and Milton Eisenhower to represent me and work with my assistant, Gov. Sherman Adams, and the Budget Director in connection with this study. In view of the fact that the appointment of the new Cabinet will soon be complete, I would like to make available to the Cabinet designees the experience and findings of the experts who are now conducting the review.

With lasting appreciation of your initiative and selfless devotion in this matter,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

To the average taxpaying citizen who has knowledge of the President's desire to streamline our Government, of his authority, there would seem to be little need for further research. Present conditions are obvious. The cure—Executive action is available. Why spend further time in diagnosis?

Does the President need the unconstitutional power of this Reorganization Act? I say "No." Has reorganization been effective in years gone by? I say "No." We have had reorganization plan after reorganization plan, and what is the situation? There have been more employees, with one exception, in each of the 3 years after every reorganization act was adopted than there were before, and we have spent more dollars by the billions after the adoption of reorganization plans than we did before.

Here is a list of civilian employees of the executive departments for each of the 3 years immediately following the adoption of enabling reorganization legislation:

1934	714,657
1935	830,122
1936	846,316
1940	1,183,344
1941	1,670,922
1942	2,810,871
1946	2,277,078
1947	1,999,431
1948	2,075,559
1950	2,181,217
1951	2,518,137
1952	2,562,792

The same conclusion is demonstrated by the civilian payroll of the executive branch of the Government for each of the 3 years immediately following the

adoption of enabling reorganization legislation:

1933 Reorganization Act	
1934	$1,151,547,000
1935	1,398,383,000
1936	1,584,485,000
1939 Reorganization Act	
1940	$1,955,068,000
1941	2,501,105,000
1942	4,406,373,000
1945 Reorganization Act	
1946	$6,717,837,000
1947	5,722,339,000
1948	6,176,414,000
1949 Reorganization Act	
1950	$6,969,504,000
1951	8,934,726,000
1952 estimate	9,833,613,000

So, is authority to submit reorganization plans the remedy? Look at these books on this table in the well of the House. Do you know what these are? The Veterans' Administration paid $605,000 for that study of how to reorganize the Veterans' Administration, which was completed last year. Then they did not use the plans. Then the VA came out with this other book, beautiful maps and tables, telling why they did not use the $605,000 plan. If you will read it, you will learn that they did not adopt it because of convention resolutions and protests that came to the head of the Veterans' Administration from several groups. Six hundred and five thousand dollars down the drain. Why argue in support of things like that? An Executive order from the President to put it into effect would have done the job.

Then you say, "Why don't you go along with this?" I do not believe the President needs this bill. Why? Because he is the head of this Government. The President appoints the heads of these departments—all of them. He is a military man. He is a man of experience in administrative lines. He has absolute charge. He can call for their resignation any time he wants to. He has the power. He is accustomed to giving orders—let him give a few. Did not the Secretary of Defense give up $2,500,000 in stock just to get a job that he does not need just to serve his country? That is some power, is it not, to make you let go of that much money? The President of the United States, being a man of integrity, being a man of determination, accustomed to giving orders, what does he need to do to get efficiency and economy? Certainly not to send down plans. Oh, let him crack the whip a bit over his own appointees and their deputies. He can do it. Administration officials are dependent upon him. We are not. We are dependent upon our people for our jobs, for our continuation here; to them we report; for them we serve. So all the President needs to do, having a desire to economize, and knowing how, as he does, is to give orders. It is an insult to the intelligence of this Congress, it is a slur, you might say, on our faithfulness to our constituents to argue here that if your President sends down a sound reorganization proposal we will not go along. Of course we will. Have we not had the most sound pledges from the minority that they would go along? They have given us their word that they would go along. Do you know how long they will go along? Until the President sends down the first bill which will kick out of office some of the incompetents that came in during the last administration. Then we will see them all going toward the rear in jet planes. They will not be with us. Do not be deceived with that foolishness. They will desert before the day is over. But we on this side will stand by the President.

How do you legislate? Do any of you know a school boy or girl who will not tell you when you ask that question as to who makes the laws, that Congress makes them with the approval or over the veto of the President?

Would you favor permanent legislation which takes away this power that the Constitution puts in Congress? If we pass a bill which gives a President permanent authority to send down these plans, the plans would become law if neither House takes any action, or even if majorities of both Houses disapprove the plans. That is not the way the Constitution is written.

I will tell you why they do not want to give to the executive branch that legislative power permanently; they just want to let go of it for a little while. But if Congress lets go of its constitutional powers for a little while now, the loss may later be permanent. Any bill repealing a reorganization act must have a majority vote of both Houses, and if the President vetoes it, it takes two-thirds of each House to override the veto. Do you see where we are getting?

Some may say they have no objection to giving a President temporary powers, but power granted to a benign President, to a Republican President in whom we have faith and confidence, might, as they have told us over here, after the expiration of his term vest in the hands of another Truman, and then where would we be? We could not get rid of it. There is the danger. Some are not opposed to a little unconstitutionality, but they do not want too much of it. They do not want it to become a settled policy, or so they say. I cannot go along with that. We have heard an eloquent plea today from our majority leader who sits here, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I recall distinctly that he made some eloquent and forceful arguments here when we exempted 21 agencies from reorganization. On another occasion I think it was 7 or 8, and now we do not exempt any. Where are we going? Little by little the Executive is encroaching upon the power of the Congress; and while I will go along with the President on any proposed economy or efficiency legislation which he may send down here, and as I said a moment ago, while I will strain my conscience just a little to do that, I will never go along with the grant of a constitutional power to anyone in the executive department.

I cannot vote for this bill, because today's grant of unconstitutional power to a liberty-loving President may be tomorrow's weapon in the hands of a now unknown tyrant.

CONFERRING LEGISLATIVE POWER UPON A PRESIDENT TO REORGANIZE THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS IS UNNECESSARY

(a) Because a President now has the authority to appoint the heads of the executive departments and to force them to adopt practices which will bring about both economy and efficiency of administrative functions;

(b) Because a willing Congress, knowing the urgent need for both economy and efficiency in the operation of the executive departments, will enact any and all necessary, constructive legislation which he may send to it by either bill or resolution; and

(c) Because we now have a President who has the administrative ability, the courage, the desire, and the determination to, by Executive order, or the approval of bills or recommendations submitted to Congress, "clean up the mess" which was so large a factor in his election.

Now, it is quite true that obviously, in a business as large and as sprawling as is the Federal Government, there must be over-all plans. No one contends that this Government of ours or any one branch of it can be successfully operated without plans and organization.

Equally true is it that no legislation, no organizational set-up, will either operate itself or can be made foolproof. Inefficient administration will wreck the most perfect organization.

The President is aware of the danger to our economic structure; he is undoubtedly determined that, in the executive departments, we shall have both efficiency and economy; he is, as the people decided in November, a superlative administrator, a man accustomed to command the obedience of those under him. I can see no reason why our President cannot, why he will not, attain the long-sought objective of an economic, efficient administration in the executive departments.

For myself, I prefer to retain our constitutional government, rely for the needed reforms upon the unquestioned ability, integrity, courage, and determination of our President.

That I am justified in this belief is evidenced by order No. 1 of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., which demands that the employees under him give the service to which the Government has so long been entitled, to which the people have been looking forward—see exhibit A.

There is also proof, in a release by Secretary Benson, that, in the Agriculture Department, a similar drive is on—see exhibit B.

Just 10 days ago, President Eisenhower took over, and, within that 10-day period, we have not only these two, but several other orders which, if followed throughout the executive departments, will give us the needed cure.

What more evidence does the most skeptical New Dealer want to convince him that we are on the road toward a more economical, a more efficient executive department, a balanced budget, a lower tax rate?

What this country needs is not an unconstitutional grant of legislative power to the executive department, but faith in the Chief Executive, an opportunity given him to, may I state, crack the whip, let the subordinates know that he means business.

If the President finds that he cannot bring about necessary and desirable

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reforms under the power he now has, or through resolutions sent to a more-than-willing Congress, the Congress can easily and quickly change its procedure to insure immediate consideration of new legislation.

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

ORDER NO. 1

To All Officials and Employees of the Department of Justice:

The business hours of the Department for all offices, including the field, are hereby established as 9 a. m. to 5:30 p. m., Monday through Friday, inclusive. Variations in the established workweek or irregular tours of duty may be fixed to meet the requirements of law or the needs of the service. The hours of duty must be strictly observed.

A schedule for lunch periods will be established in each office on a staggered basis so that someone will be present at all times to answer inquiries or handle routine business. Any abuses of the time allotted for lunch should be corrected by administrative action either as a charge against annual leave or appropriate disciplinary measures.

Unavoidable or necessary absence from duty not in excess of 30 minutes and tardiness may be excused by the supervisor. The time must be made up either by charge against overtime previously worked or subsequent overtime. Habitual tardiness will not be excused and will be charged against annual leave or corrected through disciplinary action. The minimum charge for annual leave regardless of the period of tardiness is 1 hour.

Complete records must be maintained by the time and attendance clerk on all periods of overtime. All paid overtime must be ordered by the head of the division or office and approved in advance by the Deputy Attorney General or the Administrative Assistant Attorney General.

This order becomes effective immediately.

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 22, 1953.

SECRETARY BENSON MOVES TO OVERHAUL DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The United States Department of Agriculture, largest of all the Nation's civilian agencies, swollen into a huge bureaucracy of 20 agencies and bureaus in the last 20 years, is getting a major overhauling.

Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary, announced today that he is regrouping the Department's services into four divisions for administrative purposes. Another division, that of the Solicitor's office, will remain as presently constituted.

"This action," stated Benson, "will make possible a closer coordination of related activities. All the regrouped agencies retain their present structure with the exception of the agricultural conservation program. This will be transferred from the Production and Marketing Administration and placed with the Research, Extension, and Land-Use group.

"What we intend is a gradual streamlining of the Department's services in the interest of economy and greater efficiency. The action is taken after weeks of study and conferences with congressional leaders, the members of the President's Committee on Reorganization, our own Interim Agricultural Advisory Committee, and members of the Hoover Commission."

* * * * *

In a memorandum to agency heads and employees, announcing the new grouping and outlining the new lines of authority in his Administration, Secretary Benson had this to say about policy:

"As public servants, we must recognize the duty and responsibility we have to serve the public efficiently and well. The people of this country have a right to expect that every one of us will give a full day's work for a day's pay. They have a right to expect that we will find more effective and economical ways of doing our job. In these times of unprecedented public debt and continued high Federal expenditures, the public rightfully expects us to put forth even greater effort to effect savings in Government operations and to reduce public expenses. Fulfillment of this responsibility will require the undivided loyalty and support of every agency head and employee in the Department. We must work as a team if we are to meet the problems that lie ahead and render the greatest possible service to the farmers of America, the entire agricultural industry, and to this great and good country we love so much."

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of granting President Eisenhower the necessary powers to reorganize our governmental system so that it may continue to function smoothly and efficiently.

The bill, which came to us from the Committee on Government Operations calling for amendment of the Reorganization Act of 1949, actually seeks to shear the President of effective power and authority to undertake such reorganization plans of our Government departments, agencies, and bureaus as the times and circumstances would require. The committee's formula to substitute so-called simple majority of those present and voting instead of a constitutional majority of all Members of Congress, in my opinion, constitutes a weakening of Presidential power.

At a time such as this, when we are beleaguered with so many problems at home and abroad, we should utilize every opportunity to strengthen the hand of our Government and its responsible leaders so that this country can continue to exert its influence for the good of all.

I am heartily in agreement that Congress should grant a 2-year extension of the same reorganization powers to President Eisenhower as that held by his predecessor, Harry S. Truman. I feel he deserves every opportunity and support to carry out the pledge he has made to the American people to effect economies in Government. Whether we be Democrat or Republican, in a matter such as this we should not take a strictly partisan approach. We must adapt ourselves to new situations and meet the challenge of the times as statesmen and leaders of a great Nation.

Let us not hesitate to give President Eisenhower the encouragement he needs and the power to act when the time for action is at hand. The welfare of the country demands it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C., sec. 133z-3 (b)) is hereby amended by striking out "April 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1955."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan.'"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I shall not prolong the discussion. You all know where I stand on this matter. I merely want to say that from the practical standpoint, and I do not know what action the other body has taken or will take on this, the same amendment is in a bill reported out by the corresponding committee of the other body without objection. If that body takes the bill its committee has reported we will go to conference. In any event, by insisting on striking this amendment which is not necessary to the adoption of effective reorganization plans the administration may lose some support in the other body by those who wish to adhere to constitutional procedure which it otherwise might have. Why does the leadership fight for something it does not need when by so doing it opens the way for a future President to take over our duty to legislate?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time to state my position against the Hoffman amendment and to again reaffirm the position that has been consistent on the Democratic side. If we are going to have effective reorganization, we must give to the President peculiar powers in a special arrangement whereby plans he has drafted can be considered by the Congress in such a way they will actually receive the consideration of the Congress and not be rejected by a small minority of the membership. I therefore ask, when the vote occurs on the Hoffman amendment, that it be voted down.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

(At the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, and by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. JUDD was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that my position on this amendment is a very difficult one to discuss and that whatever one says on that position will be misinterprted by some as lack of confidence in our President or opposition to him. But I think I probably am as good a person to contend for it as anyone because I do not think anybody can rightly say that I do not have confidence in President Eisenhower. No one tried harder than I did for a whole year in almost every State of the Union to get him nominated and elected; nobody has been prouder of the way he is conducting

himself and the responsibilities of his office. Every prediction and every assurance that I gave to voters when urging them to support his candidacy has been fulfilled in fullest measure. I am stronger for him today than I ever was before. Nevertheless, if this amendment is adopted, it will be portrayed that our approval of it means that Republicans are not supporting their own Republican President. It will be said Republicans are not willing to give Eisenhower what the Democrats gave Roosevelt and Truman. That is true, but not for the reason implied. We did not want to give such power to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, not because we had lack of confidence in them but because we believed there were certain constitutional principles and responsibilities it is our obligation to uphold, just as the President has certain principles and responsibilities it is his obligation to fulfill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which is being offered now, is the very same amendment I offered in October 1945. It came within 14 votes of being adopted. I offered it again in 1949 and it almost carried. Practically all the Republicans voted for it and a good many Democrats voted for it. It is the same amendment. If I believed it was sound principle when we were in the minority, it is still sound principle when we are in the majority.

In discussion of the amendment on October 4, 1945, I said in part:

> The people of this country are crying out against overgrowth, overlapping, duplication, and waste in Government. They are crying out against centralization of power. Yet in this very bill, in which we provide for reorganization with the idea of achieving economy and more efficiency and eliminating duplication, we are making a vast grant of power to the President, without reserving for ourselves the right to pass on whether or not he uses that power wisely.
>
> I am not afraid of granting him that power if we have a chance to review it. I want him to have the power. I know he is in a better position to provide a good reorganization plan than any of us here is, but I cannot believe that it is a wise or sound legislative policy, for us to make a delegation of power to the President to prepare a reorganization plan and then allow the plan to go into effect—even though one House disapproves it.
>
> To do that is to abdicate our responsibility for making sure that the power which we have properly delegated, is wisely used, in accordance with the objectives we have laid down in section 2 of the bill. I am not suggesting any lack of confidence in the present President of the United States—

Who at that time was President Truman only a few months after he became President—

> because I personally have great confidence in his integrity and the soundness of his judgment; but no President or his advisers can be all-wise. That is why we have division of responsibilities under our Constitution. We in Congress have certain responsibilities we cannot escape. One of them is for the form, character, and functions of executive agencies.

I believed that then, I believe it now. Having crusaded up and down this country for many years for principles—for government by law, not by men—I cannot do other than continue to take that position. It is not against anybody in the exective branch now as it was not then. When we had the 1949 bill up I said on that very point:

> If I felt sure the President would always send what I personally would regard as the best reorganization plan ever devised, I still would be opposed to a system whereby the House could not hold that plan up if a majority should think it unwise.

That is the system by which we legislate. It is the method established under the Constitution. Action in the Houses of Congress is decided by a simple majority, except in one case, that of an amendment to the Constitution. Such an amendment has to have a two-thirds majority of all of the actual Members of the House. Except that single case, a simple majority determines the will of this House. Therefore, reluctantly, and recognizing that doubtless some will misunderstand or misrepresent, I still have to take the position that I think is my duty and responsibility to take—just as I totally respect the President as he carries out his duty and responsibilities as he sees them.

There is only one thing in this whole episode that has given me a little disappointment. Some Republicans who applauded our sticking to constitutional principles when the President of the United States was Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman, now ask us to abandon those same principles just because the President now is Dwight Eisenhower. I believed them before; I believe them now. It was not against President Roosevelt or President Truman then; it is not against President Eisenhower now. It is for the Constitution of the United States, as many of us see it, and I respect totally those of you who do not agree with my position. If the amendment is voted down, I shall vote for the passage of the bill, as I did in 1945 and 1949.

That brings me to the other point. In addition to the principle involved, there is a practical matter involved. Some have said that if we adopt this amendment it will prevent reorganization. I do not think as a practical matter it would prevent any effective reorganization. The fact is, it was easier to get a constitutional majority against any plan sent down by President Truman, because the House did not have confidence in those around him, than it will be to get a simple majority against a plan sent down by General Eisenhower, because there is confidence in him. This amendment would not block effective reorganization. Anything that comes down here that is sound and ought to be passed will be passed. You cannot possibly get a majority of this House to oppose any plan that gives real economy and real efficiency; whether it is a constitutional or a simple majority, I think, is relatively insignificant when we have an administration in which a majority of the Congress, both parties, has confidence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman says, and I think with some force, whether the amendment is adopted or not it might not have any substantial practical effect on reorganization. If that is true, then why not go along with us who think, when this authority was granted to the preceding President, it might well be granted to this President? If any reorganization plan is presented that is thoroughly bad and the Congress feels it is bad, I think we will be able to muster a constitutional majority. The point I am making is, as I said earlier, much ado has been made of this whole proposition. I think, in the light of history and the experience we have had, it just has not been worthy of that sort of emphasis. However, there are a great many people who have worked diligently for reorganization, have spent a lot of time on it, have been trying to build up sentiment, have figured out the plans, who are very much concerned; they are afraid if we go to the simple majority there might be a very definite road block in the way of effective reorganization. In view of that, does not the gentleman agree with me that we had better go along with the bill as originally introduced?

Mr. JUDD. No; I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman. I do not think it will make much, if any, difference in actual reorganization achieved. But the principle involved is of the greatest importance. So I think that from the standpoint of both principle and practicality the thing to do is adopt this amendment and preserve the basic system under which our Government has operated until recent years, when too often grants were given to Presidents just because somebody asked for them and a majority of the Members went along.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman was campaigning for the President long, long before the convention, before many others who came in later were saying a word in his behalf. Does not the gentleman think the President should trust the Congress a little bit to go along with him, instead of asking us to do something which we think is unconstitutional?

Mr. JUDD. I do not blame General Eisenhower for this request for power.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not blaming him.

Mr. JUDD. I think it was inevitable and natural, and I would have been surprised if he and those around him had not asked to have extended to him the same powers previous Presidents were given. That is perfectly normal, and I have no criticism of it whatsoever. He probably has not gone into our side of it as you and I need to. His obligation is to the executive branch and our obligation is here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would agree with me that the President has been most magnanimous in his attitude toward this whole matter.

Mr. JUDD. That is certainly true.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HALLECK. As I said earlier, there has been no effort at dictation, there has been no effort at domination. On the contrary, every evidence points to the fact that he wants to cooperate with the Congress and is going to cooperate with the Congress. That is the reason I feel strongly about the adoption of this measure.

Mr. JUDD. As I said at the outset, it is mighty hard in my first statement in this new Congress to oppose what looks like an extremely important matter from the standpoint of the executive branch. I do not like to do it. On the other hand, I know the President will respect me for sticking by my convictions as I respect him for sticking by his.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(On request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JUDD was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It seems to me no resolution to reorganize that is sent up that cannot muster the approval of a simple majority has any right to become law.

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly right. But actually the bill makes it even harder to defeat a plan. It goes into effect unless we muster a majority to disapprove it. Believe me, something has to be awfully bad before a majority of this House will rise up and publicly disapprove a plan sent down by the President of the United States. I am not in the least alarmed about the results from the standpoint of reorganization. I want that as badly as the gentleman does.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Is not that the only proposal that is consistent with the theory of legislation by the Congress rather than legislation by the Executive?

Mr. JUDD. That is the way I regard it, entirely.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe one of the reasons the gentleman is known for his forthrightness and for principle in this House is because of stands such as the one he has taken today. I find myself in very much the same position as the gentleman. I congratulate him upon his stand upon principle, and I associate myself with it.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. Nobody who knows me, I think, will imagine I would get up here and say what I have said today without a considerable wrestling within my soul. But I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution. I have to interpret it as I see it to the best of my ability. I respect fully those who do not see it that way. It may be that this kind of start is the best way to have the best relations between the Executive branch and the Legislative branch through this new administration, which for my country's sake I hope and pray is going to do all the things you and I want it to do.

Mr. Chairman, we are always talking about principles. Now is the time to stick to principles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 2, add a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and substituting for said period the following: ': or'; and by adding a new paragraph (7) thereto as follows:

"'(7) minimizing or transferring from or consolidating with any other agency the roles, missions or functions of, or abolishing the United States Marine Corps.'"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, at a previous session of the Congress, 50 Members I think from both sides of the aisle offered identical bills which had for their purpose increasing the size and insuring the roles and missions of the Marine Corps. As I recall it, such legislation was enacted. When we were rewriting the reorganization bill in January of 1947, both General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz were witnesses. Testimony was taken, and a quote from Admiral Nimitz, who was one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, referring to the issues which were carried on in JCS 1478/10 and JCS 1478/11, was read into the record of the hearings on H. R. 2319 at page 640. This statement was as to what the Army was proposing to do to the Marines. I quote:

The basic and major issues considered in JCS 1478/10 and JCS 1478/11 comprise a proposal on the part of the Army (a) to eliminate the Marine Corps as an effective combat element, reducing it to the status of a naval police unit with possibly certain ancillary service functions in respect to amphibious operations, and (b) to abolish an essential component of naval aviation which operates from coastal and island shore bases. To those ends these papers propose to discard agreements on these matters which have been arrived at between the Army and the Navy from time to time over a period of more than 20 years, and which have resulted in a responsibility for functions proven highly effective in World War II.

That was Admiral Nimitz's statement as to what the Army Chief then represented by our President proposed to do to the Marines. Now, I am not out of order in proposing that following our previous efforts, we protect the Marine Corps from any reorganization plan which anyone may have in mind, either now or at some subsequent date.

I want to repeat what I said before once on the floor of this House—our distinguished majority leader advocated that 21 agencies be exempted. Some agencies were at one time exempted. So now I claim the same right to suggest we here and now try to ensure that the Marine Corps will be protected in any reorganization plan that may come down. There was a determined effort at one time to minimize the functions of the Marine Corps, and this amendment would give it protection against such move.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 6 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) If at any time within the said 60-day period, a resolution of either House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall be defeated, after a resolution of the other House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall also have been defeated, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect immediately'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to making a statement about this amendment, because, and only because, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated a while ago that he thought the President had been very magnanimous in dealing with the Congress, let me say this: I do not consider it any great generosity for anyone to recognize my constitutional right to do what I think should be done with reference to legislation. The desire for "rubber-stamp Congressmen" for "yes men" went out several years ago. The Members of Congress are entitled to vote as judgment may dictate. The President himself should and I think would be the last man in the world to try to dictate to us what we should do, even though all of his life he has been a military man and most of that time subject to and the giver of orders. I do not have any idea that he intends to attempt to tell Congresswomen and Congressmen what to do.

Now, let us just see whether an amendment will be defeated even when the purpose is to make this legislation more effective. I do not like this bill—I will not vote for it for the reasons I have given but as it will become the law of the land I want to make it as effective as possible. What will this amendment do? Over the years in discussion on reorganization legislation Members have complained that there might be a situation late in a session where a proposed plan came down, came down too late to be made effective, or where effectiveness might be unduly delayed, and it was discussed—and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will agree with me—it was discussed in committee and with administration leaders as to how that situation could be remedied. So this amendment provides that in certain contingencies, if certain events happen; that is, a rejection of a resolution disapproving a plan by either House; that is, a rejection of a disapproving resolution by both House and Senate, then on adoption of a resolution, the act would become effective immediately. How does that strike my friends on the minority side for cooperating with the President?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment would simply accelerate the effective date of a reorganization plan, upon determination

that neither House was willing to override.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Has the gentleman given thought to the legality of that operation as against a resolution that might be affirmatively adopted for a plan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I have considered both and I thought this was the quicker way. This would do the job now. I have made some study of this and have consulted legal experts, and I was assured it was constitutional.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot quite fix the occasion in my mind, but it seems to me there was an occasion where the question was raised as to the legality of this approach. That is the only reason I inquired of the gentleman, because, as I say, somewhere in my recollection—I am not able to say just where—there was some such question raised.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not exactly on this particular amendment but on this very point, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] raised a similar question whether both Houses could, by affirmative resolution, put a plan into immediate effect. This is just a little bit quicker, as it is a part of the Reorganization Act itself—and if adopted will make unnecessary additional legislation to bring the same result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may we please have the Clerk again report the amendment?

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. From the standpoint of clarification of the amendment, I would direct this question to the chairman of the committee. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the only thing this amendment does is speed up the effective date, in case there has been action on the part of one House disapproving the resolution, or if it makes contingent upon that action the fact that both Houses must have taken that action? In other words, the gentleman by his amendment is requiring both Houses to take action to reject a plan, is he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Only the legislative procedure prescribed in the Reorganization Act which is that if within 60 days either House adopts a disapproving resolution—the gentleman knows the way we do that: The resolution comes from the committee stating that the House disapproves; if that resolution is voted down here and over there then, of course, the plan becomes effective and that takes care of the objection which the gentleman and others raise about plans coming down late in the 60-day period.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But, of course, the gentleman takes away from the other body the right to take opposite action from the action taken by the first body.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no; no.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My understanding of the gentleman's amendment is that if one House takes action disapproving a resolution of disapproval, then the other House takes action approving the disapproval resolution, then it must necessarily take a concurrent resolution in order to make the plan effective.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no, no; it just accelerates it. I call on the gentleman now to give us that support in behalf of the President on reorganization which he pledged a little while ago.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It merely provides that if a resolution which is brought in here to disapprove a plan is defeated and a resolution is brought up in the other body and that resolution is defeated, then the plan goes into effect immediately instead of waiting 60 days; that is all.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. Just one observation: If the disapproving resolution is adopted by a majority of the House then action by a majority can disapprove a reorganization plan, and this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is merely a device to have a majority approve a disapproving resolution which would in effect put the House right back in the position of adopting the original Hoffman amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The observation of the gentleman from Florida is not accurate; it is not a device to do by another method the same thing as the former amendment. If a resolution disapproving a plan passed in one House by a simple majority, it would not kill the plan, but the plan would not go into effect until the full 60 days; that is all. If, however, the plan were disapproved by a constitutional majority that, of course, would kill the plan, just as under the present provisions of the act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the confusion attendant upon the interpretation of this amendment which has not been presented to the committee, has not been given consideration by the committee, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

If action of that type on a reorganization plan is desired it can always be taken by concurrent resolution after action on the part of each House on the same subject matter. Therefore I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us but one question: The President of the United States has asked us to extend the present law under which he can send up reorganization plans to accomplish the balance of the Hoover Commission recommendations and to achieve the efficiency and economy he pledged during the campaign. The House has clearly indicated its desire to give the President that power. But now the distinguished chairman of our committee is offering us another amendment, a double negative, if you please, under which he seeks to introduce a new procedure. A resolution disapproving a plan could be adopted by a simple majority thus thwarting President Eisenhower's wishes on the first thing he has asked us to accomplish. We must beware, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] put it so well the other day, of Greeks bearing gifts. The proponents of this amendment are the same Members who would deny the powers sought by the President. Let us vote down this amendment and support Mr. Eisenhower in the first thing he has asked for—merely an extension of the power of reorganization.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call the attention of the membership on both sides to the language of this amendment:

> If at any time within the said 60-day period a resolution stating in substance.

Now, that is rather strange language.

Mr. JUDD. That is the very language in the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the amendment clearly undertakes to accomplish what the gentleman from Michigan says it will accomplish, that is one thing; but it seems to me that this amendment is capable of two constructions. It has never been presented to or considered by a committee of the Congress. I am accepting the gentleman's word that it means what he said it means and I am accepting the word of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. But this particular amendment has never been considered by any committee. It seems to me it would be unwise to adopt the amendment at the present time without further study of its implications. While I shall vote against the amendment my vote will not be any indication as to my state of mind on the amendment if I had an opportunity to study it and understand what its significance is and what it means.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan, it should be pointed out that the Reorganization Act itself uses these words:

> A resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan.

So the language incorporated in the amendment is in line with the language in the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. May I just make this one other statement. The gentleman from Michigan did not indicate to me he was going to offer this amendment. Probably there is no reason why he should. But as far as having the opportunity to look into it and to see what its effect might be, I have not had that opportunity. From what I can understand of the amendment, and I want this in the RECORD in the event it is adopted, the only effect of the amendment that could possibly be found in the language would be to accelerate the effective date

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the reorganization plan. This acceleration would come about by action of both the House and the Senate in refusing to adopt a disapproving resolution on a reorganization plan.

I have no great feeling about the amendment. It may be that it is perfectly all right and would work to the best interest of reorganization, but, as I say, I do not know. Maybe I ought to have a definite opinion about it, but I do not. As it appears on its face I do not see where it could be destructive of what we are trying to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, I want to beg his pardon for not submitting it. We have been present here, we have been busy in committee, and it was only late yesterday that I whipped the amendment into shape after discussion of the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my position is pretty much the same as that stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. If appropriate language was considered by a committee that would accelerate the going into effect of a reorganization plan after the terms of the reorganization law had been complied with by both branches, a disapproving resolution, that would be one thing and, as far as I am concerned, I think I would approve it. But, on the other hand, I am not so sure this amendment accomplishes that purpose.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. It seems to me that the amendment accomplishes this: Under the present law, a matter comes up in the House when a disapproving resolution is filed in that House, and if no disapproving resolution is filed in the House then the plan will become a law, but under this amendment it compels two shots at turning it down. If it is brought up in one House, then by virtue of having been brought up in that House it is thereby brought up in the other, though that House has not filed a disapproving resolution. So we see once more those who are against the bill are trying to kill the President's plan as sent down.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to point out that this matter was discussed in the committee, if the gentleman will recall. The discussion appears on page 22 of the printed hearings. The question before the committee there was, How could this be done? It seems to me there was agreement that there ought to be a way of accelerating the effective date of the reorganization plan, and it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan clearly accomplishes the purpose and nothing else.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always glad to yield to my friend. By the way, in all fairness, I want to make this observation. Anyone who should place any construction on the position of the gentleman from Minnesota as being opposed to the effect of this bill would be doing not only the gentleman from Minnesota an injustice but doing himself an injustice, because the gentleman from Minnesota is taking a position in accordance with his judgment and his conscience. While a Democrat, I respect the gentleman from Minnesota, and I know that the remarks that he made today and the position he takes are actuated by the exercise of his judgment and his conscience.

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate deeply the confidence of the gentleman, and he knows it is reciprocated. I agree that, with so much confusion regarding this amendment, perhaps it ought not to be passed today. I do not want it to go through if anybody thinks it is a trick to defeat reorganization. All it could do would be to speed it up a few days, and I do not think the Republic is going to stand or fall on whether a plan goes into effect a few days earlier or at the end of the 60 days' period.

I think I can testify as to the good faith of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I would rather have the amendment fail than to have anybody thinking or saying that it is an attempt to play an underhanded trick to defeat reorganization. That is not its objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my state of mind and I have no such opinion as that. I do not think that is anyone else's position. However, I think the observation that this amendment comes from a source that is opposed to any reorganization is a proper argument to make and proper for us to consider, not on the question of a trick but on the question of consideration of the amendment itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think this way. I will have to take this bill and as that is the situation I would like to make it as effective as possible. I would like to see the President in a position to do a good job and do it quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no doubt as to the gentleman's intention and I am not arguing with the gentleman as to his purpose, but I do say that I have grave uncertainty as to whether or not this amendment will accomplish this purpose. It has never been considered by the committee. I have never considered it and I certainly have been on the Committee on Government Operations for some few years now in the consideration of the present bill and the one in 1949 and I am acquainted with the history of past handling, and I think that it would be unwise to adopt this amendment because of the uncertainty and the confusion that exists in relation to its meaning and its effect; not its intent, but its effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1979 has my full support. I think it should be passed unanimously. There should be no difference between Republicans and Democrats on a question of the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government to improve the administration of the Government, save taxpayers' dollars in its costs, and eliminate red tape, overlapping, and duplication.

In order to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, President Eisenhower should have the same powers we gave President Truman under similar circumstances. I therefore feel that the limitations placed on the power of the Chief Executive by the amendment which Republican members of the House Committee on Government Operations grafted on to this bill should be removed. The amendment should be defeated. I trust that by action of this body this afternoon it will be defeated.

I am anxious to see our new President go forward with his announced intention of reorganizing the executive branch of the Government to cut costs and increase efficiency. I shall cooperate with him in this endeavor in every way I can. The plans submitted by the President should become law unless rejected by a constitutional majority of one House of the Congress. During the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses some 30 reorganization plans became law. Billions of dollars have been saved in the fields of military and civilian buying by our Government as a result of these reorganization plans which became the law governing operations of various Government departments and agencies.

Let us not only give President Eisenhower the same reorganization powers President Truman had, but let us help President Eisenhower achieve the same record of accomplishment in this field President Truman did. If we do that, and if the President follows through by submitting to us wise and needed plans, the job of reorganization will virtually be complete.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955, pursuant to House Resolution 129, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 5, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—389

Abernethy	Dempsey	Judd
Adair	Derounian	Karsten, Mo.
Addonizio	Devereux	Kean
Albert	D'Ewart	Kearney
Alexander	Dies	Kearns
Allen, Calif.	Dingell	Keating
Allen, Ill.	Dodd	Kelley, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Dollinger	Kelly, N. Y.
	Dolliver	Keogh
Andresen, August H.	Donovan	Kersten, Wis.
	Dorn, N. Y.	Kilburn
Andrews	Dorn, S. C.	Kilday
Angell	Dowdy	King, Calif.
Arends	Doyle	King, Pa.
Aspinall	Eberharter	Kirwan
Auchincloss	Edmondson	Klein
Ayres	Elliott	Kluczynski
Bailey	Engle	Knox
Baker	Evins	Krueger
Bates	Fallon	Laird
Battle	Feighan	Landrum
Beamer	Fenton	Lane
Becker	Fine	Lanham
Belcher	Fino	Lantaff
Bender	Fisher	Latham
Bennett, Fla.	Forand	LeCompte
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	Lesinski
Bentley	Forrester	Long
Bentsen	Fountain	Lovre
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Betts	Friedel	Lyle
Bishop	Fulton	McCarthy
Blatnik	Frazier	McConnell
Boggs	Gamble	McCormack
Boland	Garmatz	McCulloch
Bolling	Gary	McDonough
Bolton, Frances P.	Gathings	McIntire
	Gavin	McMillan
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gentry	McVey
	George	Machrowicz
Bonin	Golden	Mack, Ill.
Bosch	Goodwin	Mack, Wash.
Bow	Gordon	Madden
Bramblett	Graham	Magnuson
Bray	Granahan	Mahon
Brooks, La.	Grant	Maillliard
Brooks, Tex.	Gregory	Marshall
Brown, Ga.	Gross	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Matthews
Brownson	Gwinn	Meader
Broyhill	Hagen, Calif.	Merrill
Bryson	Hagen, Minn.	Merrow
Buchanan	Hale	Metcalf
Budge	Haley	Miller, Calif.
Burdick	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Burleson	Hand	Miller, Nebr.
Busbey	Harden	Miller, N. Y.
Bush	Hardy	Mollohan
Byrd	Harris	Morano
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison, Nebr.	Morgan
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Va.	Morrison
Camp	Hart	Moss
Campbell	Harvey	Multer
Canfield	Hays, Ark.	Mumma
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Neal
Carlyle	Heller	Nelson
Carnahan	Herlong	Nicholson
Carrigg	Heselton	Norblad
Case	Hess	Oakman
Cederberg	Hiestand	O'Brien, Ill.
Celler	Hill	O'Hara, Ill.
Chatham	Hillelson	O'Hara, Minn.
Chenoweth	Hillings	O'Neill
Chudoff	Hinshaw	Osmers
Church	Hoeven	Ostertag
Ciardy	Hoffman, Ill.	Passman
Clevenger	Holifield	Patman
Cole, Mo.	Holmes	Patten
Cole, N. Y.	Holt	Patterson
Colmer	Holtzman	Pelly
Condon	Hope	Perkins
Coon	Horan	Pfost
Cooper	Hosmer	Philbin
Corbett	Howell	Phillips
Cotton	Hruska	Pillion
Coudert	Hull	Poage
Cretella	Hunter	Poff
Crosser	Hyde	Polk
Crumpacker	Ikard	Poulson
Cunningham	Jackson	Powell
Curtis, Mass.	James	Preston
Curtis, Nebr.	Jarman	Price
Dague	Javits	Priest
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins	Prouty
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Radwan
Davis, Wis.	Johnson	Rains
Dawson, Ill.	Jonas, Ill.	Ray
Dawson, Utah	Jonas, N. C.	Rayburn
Deane	Jones, Mo.	Reams
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.	Shuford	Van Zandt
Rees, Kans.	Sieminski	Velde
Regan	Sikes	Vinson
Rhodes, Ariz.	Simpson, Ill.	Wainwright
Rhodes, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.	Walter
Richards	Small	Wampler
Riehlman	Smith, Kans.	Warburton
Rivers	Smith, Miss.	Watts
Roberts	Smith, Va.	Weichel
Robeson, Va.	Smith, Wis.	Westland
Robsion, Ky.	Spence	Wharton
Rodino	Springer	Wheeler
Rogers, Colo.	Staggers	Whitten
Rogers, Fla.	Stanley	Wickersham
Rogers, Mass.	Steed	Widnall
Rogers, Tex.	Stringfellow	Wier
Rooney	Sullivan	Wigglesworth
Roosevelt	Sutton	Williams, N. Y.
Sadlak	Taber	Willis
St. George	Talle	Wilson, Calif.
Saylor	Taylor	Wilson, Ind.
Schenck	Teague	Wilson, Tex.
Scherer	Thomas	Winstead
Scott	Thompson, La.	Withers
Scrivner	Thompson, Mich.	Withrow
Scudder		Wolverton
Secrest	Thompson, Tex.	Yorty
Seely-Brown	Thornberry	Young
Selden	Tollefson	Younger
Shafer	Trimble	Zablocki
Sheppard	Utt	
Short	Van Pelt	

NAYS—5

Curtis, Mo.	Hoffman, Mich.	Williams, Miss.
Hébert	Mason	

NOT VOTING—38

Abbitt	Fernandez	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barden	Fogarty	O'Konski
Barrett	Green	Rabaut
Bonner	Harrison, Wyo.	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Buckley	Kee	Sheehan
Chelf	McGregor	Shelley
Chiperfield	Miller, Kans.	Stauffer
Cooley	Mills	Vorys
Dondero	Moulder	Vursell
Donohue	Murray	Wolcott
Durham	Norrell	Yates
Ellsworth	O'Brien, Mich.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Green.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Moulder.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Stauffer with Mr. Fogarty.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 22, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1953, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 11 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government, or Government-owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the solution of the problems of small business during the continuance of the existing national emergency.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this resolution requires any extended debate or discussion. It is merely an extension of the Small Business Select Committee of the House. The provisions are exactly the same as those that were written into the law last year. I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York has so aptly said, this resolution merely extends the Small Business Committee that has been in operation in the last several Congresses.

I have no requests for time over here. I think the House is unanimously in favor of this committee. If the gentleman from New York desires to move the previous question, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to add my voice in support of House Resolution 22 reestablishing the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. This committee, in my opinion, has performed outstanding service for the small businessmen of the United States. The work of the Small Business Committee on the materials problem alone would warrant its reestablishment by this House. In fact, the committee has not only rendered yeoman service in the solution of the problems of small business in the field of materials but has performed equal service in practically every phase of business activity. Whether the problem be one of securing

a fair share of Government contracts, or whether it be financing, or whether it be an effort to secure equality of opportunity and basic justice in the problems of small business, the Small Business Committee has never faltered in its objective to render maximum service.

I would like to call the attention of this House to the work of the Small Business Committee in the field of economic controls set up under the Defense Production Act. The field hearings of the committee provided a forum for small-business men when no other competent forum was available. The Small Business Committee, I believe, held some thirty-odd hearings in every geographical section of our country. The hearings were informal and provided an atmosphere of friendliness and cooperation which the small-business man welcomed enthusiastically. Here he was able to tell of his problems in connection with price controls, wage controls, salary controls, materials controls, credit controls, or any other problem which impeded his progress in the business world. These hearings were not empty gestures. The committee came back to Washington and started to work on the problems presented at the hearings. I know first-hand that the record was carefully analyzed and that the problems were taken up with the appropriate agencies and that recommendations were made to the Congress, many of which were enacted into law. I know of this first-hand because of my many, many contacts with the committee, and I have been greatly pleased with the thorough and businesslike manner in which the committee tackled the problems of small business.

Now, may I inject a more personal equation into this statement. I have, as I know a majority of the Members of this House have also done, called upon the Small Business Committee for help on the individual problems of many of my small-business constituents. It has been a source of gratification to me to find that these individual problems received immediate and intelligent attention. In every instance when I have called upon the committee for assistance, it has been rendered cheerfully and with a degree of promptness that was most commendable. Moreover, in practically every instance a solution for the individual problem was found.

As I stated in the beginning of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to add my voice in support of House Resolution 22. I wish the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives in the Eighty-third Congress every success. Many problems of small business are continuing ones and need the ever-watchful eye of this committee to secure the proper treatment for the small-business man everywhere. I have every confidence that the committee will accept its responsibilities and perform its duties in a manner which will reflect credit upon the entire membership of this House.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Small Business is primarily a service committee which cooperates with Members of Congress in solving individual problems of small business firms arising in the various districts. This program not only assists the members but enables the committee to secure a cross-section picture of the problems which affect all small business.

The Select Committee on Small Business, in its final report in the Eighty-second Congress, has stated the concept of small business and many of the problems confronting persons engaging in small business today. From that report I have extracted the following remarks—I am sure the membership of the House will find them interesting:

The great majority of American business firms are small. Excluding agriculture, the Bureau of Census estimated that there were at the close of 1951 a total of 3,991,200 business firms in operation in the United States. Of these, approximately 1,686,000 were in retail trade; 855,000 were in service industries; 366,000 were in construction; 349,000 were in finance, insurance, and real estate; 303,000 were in manufacturing; 204,000 were in wholesale trade; and the remainder were in mining, transportation, communications, and miscellaneous industries.

On the basis of 1939 figures, only 3.5 percent of the retail stores had annual sales in excess of $100,000. More than half had sales below $10,000. Over 1,600,000 units, 91 percent of the total, employed fewer than 100 persons. Only about 100,000 of these firms were incorporated.

In manufacturing, the distribution in 1947 of 240,881 firms according to number of employees was as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Size of firms according to number of employees (1947)*

Number of employees	Actual number		Percent of total	
	Number of establishments	Number of employees (000)	Number of establishments	Number of employees
1 to 4	70,384	161.0	29.2	1.1
5 to 9	46,622	310.9	19.4	2.2
10 to 19	40,645	561.9	16.9	3.9
20 to 49	40,016	1,243.8	16.6	8.7
50 to 99	18,672	1,300.8	7.8	9.1
100 to 249	14,323	2,228.7	5.9	15.6
250 to 499	5,555	1,929.9	2.3	13.5
500 to 999	2,729	1,869.4	1.1	13.1
1,000 to 2,499	1,431	2,146.1	.6	15.0
2,500 and over	504	2,541.8	.2	17.8
Total	240,881	14,294.3	100.0	100.0

NOTE.—The number of employees shown is an average for the year.

Sources: Bureau of the Census; computations by the Conference Board.

It thus appears that only about 500 firms, two-tenths of 1 percent of the total, employ 2,500 or more persons. Only about 4,200 firms employ 500 or more. These constitute only about 2 percent of the total.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

There is a strong tendency in a period of industrial mobilization for Government procurement to favor the large firm over the small. During World War II, 51 percent of all prime contracts went to 33 corporations, each of which received $1,000,000,000 or more. The need for large physical resources, engineering skill, ability to experiment, and overall productive capacity encourages the utilization of the larger firms. Procurement officials follow the line of least resistance and concentrate the placing of contracts with a few large producers and allow the prime contractors to deal with the smaller concerns on a subcontracting basis. The larger concern is in addition much better equipped to handle negotiations with the Government than the small enterprise.

This tendency to utilize the large concern has many indirect effects that work to the hardship of small business. New plants are built and existing facilities expanded under especially favorable circumstances, frequently at Government expense. In World War II the 250 largest corporations operated 79 percent of all new plant facilities built with Federal funds and operated by private industry. The prime contractor is given first claim to scarce materials which he doles out to his subcontractors. Acquisition of new capital is facilitated by Government loans. Virtually every aspect of Government procurement during periods of defense mobilization imposes undue hardships on small business.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

The controls necessary to mobilize industry effectively also frequently place small business at a competitive disadvantage. It is very difficult to avoid leaving scars on our economy, the deepest of which appear on small business. Regulations such as those controlling prices, wages, and the utilization of scarce materials are themselves violative of the principles of free enterprise. The fact must never be forgotten that although they may be necessary for the safety of the country, they do mean a definite even though temporary departure from free competition. Unless great care is exercised in framing regulations, therefore, serious damage may be done to small business. Many instances can be cited to illustrate this. Numerous price regulations, for instance, have continued unfair trade practices in determining prices. The danger here is in perpetuating what can become a serious threat to competition. Again, several price regulations have endorsed follow-the-leader practices. In fact, the general ceiling price regulation ties the price of a seller of new commodities to those of the most closely competitive seller. Several regulations have established ceilings on the basis of maintained resale prices. Unless price relationships are carefully adjusted, price squeezes appear at various stages of the productive process.

SCARCE MATERIALS

Likewise in the area of control of materials, the small firm is placed in jeopardy. The basic fact is that a free market in these materials ceases to exist once an elaborate scheme of control such as the Controlled Materials Plan is instituted. Furthermore, the practice of channeling many materials to subcontractors through prime contractors gives the latter the power of life or death over the small-business man who becomes dependent on his large prime contractor for the materials necessary to remain in operation. Unless checked, material controls generally encourage integrated operation, affiliations with large concerns, and favoritism in the placement of orders. All of these enhance the power of the large suppliers.

TAXATION

In normal times the typical small firm depends upon the savings of the owner for its inception and upon the earnings of the company for future development of the business. The impact of high tax rates on current business earnings has not only affected the operating position of the small concern with regard to the defense period, but may impair its future status. The high surtax on low levels of corporate earnings and the excess profits tax have hindered small concerns in their accumulation of sufficient funds from profits to finance working capital and investment requirements. In many ways the small business bears a greater tax burden than the large concern. While some recognition has been made in the tax laws of the financial difficulties of small business, additional revisions are needed to erase tax inequities and to remove the relatively large tax burden imposed on small enterprises.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through competition can a free market, free investment opportunity, free entry into industry—in a word, free enterprise—survive. This has long been the basic principle of American governmental policy toward industry and was stated succinctly in a recent Supreme Court opinion, which said, "The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition." Competition is the basic regulator of economic activity and the only device that enables us to avoid complete governmental regimentation.

Small-business enterprise provides the most fertile soil in which healthy competition may flourish. Small and independent business supplies the strength and vigor so necessary to the growth of our competitive forces. There is no better assurance of our ability to maintain competition than a flourishing community of small and independent business enterprises. Any development which makes it more difficult for efficient small firms to survive strikes a blow at competition.

Just as small business provides a favorable economic climate for the development of healthy competition, so competition is the greatest safeguard for small business. Small business needs freedom of entry into new industries and occupations. It demands freedom to start and freedom to grow. It is dependent on personal initiative and the individual judgment of its owner. It must be free of controlled prices and restrictive practices of all kinds.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING SMALL BUSINESS

As the role of Government becomes more and more intimately connected with the operation of American business, the importance of Federal agencies concerned with small business has proportionately increased. Today the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Small Defense Plants Administration, the National Production Authority, the Economic Stabilization Agency (OPS, WSB, SSB), the Defense Production Administration and the Munitions Board, among others, are affecting the operation of every small business, and especially so if a particular business deals with the Government in its tremendous procurement program.

Through the years the Congress has taken a direct and specific interest in small business and its problems, dating back to the earliest tariff laws and to such fundamental antitrust legislation as the Sherman Act of 1890. Over 80 bills were introduced in the Eighty-second Congress having a direct bearing on antitrust, monopoly, or small business. That this Congress saw fit to consider very few of the proposals presented to it, and to actually enact even fewer, does not necessarily indicate a disinterestedness on the part of Congress nor a lack of importance of the measures themselves. But it does indicate that many problems worthy of solution remain unsolved.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the resolution continuing the Select Committee on Small Business. I feel that this committee in past years has done a good job and there is a definite need for its activities at the present time.

I am happy and proud to note that my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is to be the new chairman of this important committee. Mr. HILL has served on this committee for many years and has been a most active and prominent member. I am sure that under his able direction this committee will be of even more service to the small-business man of the country.

It should be obvious to everyone that the small-business man is in need of all of the assistance we can give him. During a period like this, when huge purchases are being made for our military services, it is natural that most of these purchases are made from large companies. It is much easier for a procurement officer to make a purchase from one company than it is to buy the same amount from 10 small companies. However, in the interest of protecting the economy of our Nation, I feel that more attention should be given to the small concern so that it may participate in this program. I am hoping that the committee will give more study to this problem in the coming months, to the end that the smaller contractors and industrial plants may receive a greater share of the defense purchases.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

According to latest official figures, 100 large, favored corporations have cornered 62 percent of the dollar value of all military contracts let in the continental United States.

At the tail end of this situation, small business is receiving only 19 to 24 percent of the dollar value of such military contracts.

These official figures document the virtual freeze-out of small business in recent years, and make clear the need for a watchdog committee in the interest not only of small business but of the taxpayers.

Look at Munitions Board Report 3–A. Here we see that an astounding average of about 80 percent of the dollar value of all military contracts are negotiated or cost-plus instead of let on a competitive basis. As I have said before in this House, how can the taxpayers obtain dollar-for-dollar value, much less any bargains, without competitive bidding?

If the House Select Committee on Small Business can channel into competitive bidding even one fair-sized contract, slated to be dished out on a juicy negotiated or cost-plus basis, it will save so much, over and above the cost of its existence under this resolution, that it will amount to a gilt-edge investment for the taxpayers.

Let us keep this committee in business, and, in so doing, provide at least an opportunity to derail some of these negotiated, cost-plus gravy trains which make hamburger out of small business and the taxpayers.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 22, Eighty-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. HILL, Colorado, chairman; Mr. RIEHLMAN, New York; Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Connecticut; Mr. MCCULLOCH, Ohio; Mr. SHEEHAN, Illinois; Mr. HOSMER, California; Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. EVINS, Tennessee; Mr. MULTER, New York; Mr. YATES, Illinois; Mr. STEED, Oklahoma.

PROVIDING FOR AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (FOR ADMINISTRATION)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the matter that is before us is here under a unanimous-consent agreement entered into the other day for the consideration of the measure under the ordinary rules of the House. Unless there are Members who desire to make some remarks in respect to this bill, it occurs to me that, since the bill, as I understand, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it could be passed under a unanimous-consent request for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have no objection to that procedure. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It relates to the authorization of the appointment of an Under Secretary of State.

Mr. HALLECK. I see here the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who I know is interested in the matter. He is the ranking Democrat of the committee. I wonder if he would express his wishes in respect to the matter. I would assume, of course, Mr. Speaker, that anyone desiring to extend his remarks in connection with this measure could extend them at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have no disposition to object to such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why does not the gentleman from Indiana make a unanimous-consent request that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. That would obviate the rule matter, and anyone who desires to offer an amendment by way of striking out the last word would be able to do so in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and it would obviate general debate also.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman from Texas, if we adopted that procedure, although I take it there would be no objection if someone would object, then we would be faced with the necessity of keeping 218 Members here in order to maintain a quorum. If I put the unani-

mous-consent request, I take it that under a reservation of objection with respect thereto brief remarks might be made and extensions of remarks might be made if that be deemed desirable.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that there is no disposition on my part as ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to oppose this bill, but I do feel that the House should know what it is doing. I feel that the House should be informed as to the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and why our committee took that action because this is a pretty important matter. If there is any way under regular parliamentary procedure that I can call a few matters to the attention of the House without prolonging debate, I will certainly be willing to cooperate.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration), with Mr. KEATING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up much of the time of the Committee except to explain the bill briefly. This matter is before us in the form of a bill passed by the other body. It was passed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs with an amendment. This bill amends Public Law 73 of the Eighty-first Congress to authorize the appointment by the Secretary of State of an Under Secretary of State for Administration. There would be the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary, and then this additional Under Secretary. His responsibility would be comparable to a general manager of the Department. In other words, he would have jurisdiction over the personnel, and over the internal operations of the Department. The request for this additional Under Secretary comes as a result of a condition which has been recognized by the public over the years, namely, that there is need for a close look at the organization and operation of the State Department.

What the committee amendment does is merely to determine the line of succession. Policy matters will be handled by the Under Secretary—not the individual who will occupy this new position of Under Secretary for Administration.

Among the responsibilities of the new Under Secretary will be the review, evaluation, and operation of the loyalty and security programs. He will make a careful examination of the budget to assure that it is adequate but not excessive. He will assure the coordination of the Technical Cooperation Administration and the International Information Administration with related programs of the Department and with other agencies. The committee was unanimous in feeling that the Secretary of State ought to have this additional office. In these critical days it is necessary for the Secretary to be away about 50 percent of the time. In his absence the Under Secretary is called upon to act in his place. This second Under Secretary would not deal in matters of policy. His will be a purely administrative job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean now that there are only two Under Secretaries of State?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is only one.

Mr. GROSS. And there would be one additional?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There would be one additional.

Mr. GROSS. How many Assistant Secretaries of State?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There are 10.

Mr. GROSS. It is here proposed to create another Under Secretary of State, to be paid $17,500. How much more in clerical help will be asked to support this office?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No more. As a matter of fact, the office of Ambassador at Large which Mr. Jessup held has been abolished. That was a $25,000 job. This position pays $17,500, so that from a monetary standpoint we are saving money on this operation.

Mr. GROSS. So that by the creation of this job and by the elimination of the other job we would be saving the magnificent sum of $5,000, approximately?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is a saving.

Mr. GROSS. A very small saving.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think this is a position that should be created to insure more efficient administration.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I thought the Republican Party was out to eliminate a lot of jobs instead of creating jobs. As far as I am concerned, I am opposed to it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I remind the gentleman that the office is for 2 years, unless the Secretary determines that the job has been done before that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not this new employee at $17,500 a year is to have a secretary or is he to work without one?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I suppose he is to have one.

Mr. ROONEY. How many?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not know.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman realize that under the provisions of this pending legislation you are setting up a whole new echelon in the State Department, to do work that was formerly done by one man?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Unfortunately it was never done.

Mr. ROONEY. What was never done?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The Department is in a mess. We have heard all about this mess.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, the Department is now in the hands of the gentleman's party. We shall see what mess there is. But we are talking about setting up an entirely new echelon in the State Department. May I ask the gentleman whether or not this is pursuant to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, or whether or not it is contrary to the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I cannot answer that question because the matter was not discussed, but this does not call for more money. It is within the appropriations as they exist today.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman says the job does not call for more money? You are not setting up a new job for $17,500 a year without setting up a whole new echelon. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The testimony we have had does not indicate that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Was not the testimony before our committee that the new Secretary said that the Secretaries were so harassed by administrative matters that they did not get a chance to study matters of organization, which is the first job we want to think about for efficiency. He asked for this man temporarily to go in there and take a fresh look at the Department. He was convinced that if this were done, we could reduce many operations of the Department. If personnel in the Department is to be reduced, an expert should be brought in to make a careful study, rather than depend on people who are involved in it to clean up themselves.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is exactly right. Testimony before our committee showed that the Secretary was so absorbed in policy questions that he could not study administrative programs. That is the testimony on the part of the men who are presently in the Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Who is the expert who is supposed to be hired to fill this job?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can only repeat from hearsay: A gentleman by the name of Lourie.

Mr. JUDD. Donold Lourie, president of the Quaker Oats Co., in the gentleman's own district.

Mr. GROSS. It is not in my district. Does being president of the Quaker Oats Co. qualify him to be Under Secretary of State?

Mr. JUDD. No; but he has demonstrated the qualities to be a successful administrator of a large establishment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman assure the House that the filling of this new position by an officer from Quaker

Oats is not going to require the employment of additional personnel in the Department of State to work under him?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am going to leave that to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. But the gentleman wants to authorize this man to have a desk at $17,500 a year to do work that has been carried on by one man.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. He will have the desk that Mr. Jessup had.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the benefit of the committee that I intend to support this bill. I think the committee knows what it is doing. I have an idea that if this bill had come up last year you would have really heard something in this House. As a matter of fact, this bill does something for the new President and the new Secretary of State, both fine, patriotic Americans, and both, I am sure, intend to do what they think is best for this country. They are coming here and asking this Congress right off to create a new Under Secretary. I think they have pretty good grounds for this action.

As things stand now, we have a Secretary of State and an Under Secretary of State, and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State. I think the new administration should justify a request for the creation of an additional high-level job when they make it, and I think they have justified this request. As a matter of fact, as has just been said, everybody knows the Secretary of State now cannot do the job that is sought to be done here; in the first place, he is out of the country half the time dealing with United States responsibility in world affairs. When he goes out of the country the Under Secretary of State takes his place and has all policy matters under his control. What time is he going to get to attend to the administrative details of the Department and to clean out anything down there that is wrong?

Mr. Acheson, the former Secretary of State, whom I think will go down in history as one of the greatest Secretaries of State this country has ever had, had a hard time because he did not have time to devote his attention to administrative details in the Department; and neither did his Under Secretary of State have time.

I think Mr. Dulles is on the right track when he says he wants a man who can do the jobs that he is going to be unable to do in view of his duties as Secretary of State.

As far as saving money is concerned, that is a horse of another color. Even if this bill does not save money, I think it would still be a good thing. This new Under Secretary of State will be paid $17,500 a year. Each one of the Assistant Secretaries of State is now paid $15,000. They have been operating down there with two Deputy Under Secretaries of State whom I think receive $15,000.

It was said that we would save money because Mr. Jessup, Mr. Truman's roving Ambassador, has been let go. I do not know about that; all I know is that we are providing in this bill $17,500 for a new Under Secretary of State, and I do not know that President Eisenhower is not going to appoint him a roving Ambassador and pay him $25,000, which he can do under existing legislation. I am not basing my support on the claim that this is in the interest of economy; I am basing it on the claim that it is in the interest of orderly government and orderly procedure in the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I would suggest to the gentleman that if these Secretaries of State would stay home and attend to the business of this country there would be more money in the United States Treasury.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, maybe so. May I say that they have had John Peurifoy down there trying to do the job, and he did a wonderful job before he left to become our Ambassador to Greece. They have had Carlisle Humelsine as Deputy Secretary of State. He has done a fine job and has made a lot of progress. They have had Mr. Webb, who had to get into policy matters while Secretary Acheson was away, and, therefore, did not have time to go into the field of administration to the extent he would have liked to. Mr. Bruce has been a particularly able Under Secretary, and I am sure he wanted to do more than he was able to improve the organization and operation of the Department. All these men have made good records for themselves. I believe Mr. Dulles, if given a fair chance, will make a great record for himself. I believe it is in the interest of the United States to provide this Under Secretary; but let us not do it in the guise of economy, because you are not economizing. That is all there is to it. If you pass this bill you are going to do it because you feel it is a good investment. It is entirely possible that it will cost $25,000 more than you are paying now for the same kind of service. I do not know that the President will not exercise the right that he has to appoint somebody in Mr. Jessup's place.

I hope every Member of the House will vote for this bill, but I want you to do it with your eyes open.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the gentleman, is there also to be set up a position to be known as Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Administration?

Mr. BENTLEY. No.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that contemplated?

Mr. BENTLEY. No.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you mean to say that this man is not to have an assistant, the man who is going to fill this job?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I believe the testimony before the committee was that Mr. Humelsine, who is technically an Assistant Secretary today, holding the title of Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, would resume his title as Assistant Secretary for Administration under the new Under Secretary for Administration.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. So that you will have an Under Secretary for Administration, you will have an Assistant Secretary for Administration, and you will have, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said earlier, an entirely new echelon to be administered by a new Deputy Under Secretary.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is possibly so.

Mr. Chairman, as a freshman Member of the House, I certainly intend to be as brief as possible in my remarks on the consideration of S. 243 which creates the post of an Under Secretary of State for Administration. I would not even presume upon the time of my colleague were it not for the fact that I consider that more than 8 years of service with the State Department and the Foreign Service enable me to speak with at least a relative amount of experience in this field.

On the basis of these 8 years' service, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a tremendous job of reorganization is badly needed within the Department of State, the Foreign Service, and related special programs. Such a task cannot and should not be the direct responsibility of the Secretary nor even of the permanent Under Secretary. If we want Mr. Dulles and General Smith free to perform their most urgent responsibilities and duties, they should and must be permitted to formulate and execute over-all foreign policy without being burdened by the details of organization and administration.

However, these details are too weighty and the job to be done is too important for 1 of the 10 Assistant Secretaries. The job will require the full time of a top-level man who is free to devote his entire energy to the important task of pruning, cutting, and reorganizing where such functions have to be performed.

S. 243 provides for an initial 2-year tenure of office for the position we are presently considering. I believe this time to be sufficient to organize our foreign-relations activities in a satisfactory manner. I certainly do not want this to be considered a permanent State Department job.

My own service in the State Department convinced me of the urgent need for reorganization in the name of economy and improved service. I am equally convinced that such reorganization can only be accomplished by the creation of this temporary position. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of S. 243 as amended in our committee to establish the order of precedence in the State Department.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a reasonable argument in favor of this legislation.

Although I do think that I am accurate when I say that there was no great enthusiasm in the Committee on Foreign Affairs for this proposal, we unanimously went along with it because it was the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

considered judgment of all members of the committee to give the new administration at its inception the tools it thinks it needs. The most important argument that was presented to us, and which has not yet been mentioned by my colleagues, was that the job of reorganizing and of pruning within the Department of State and of cutting down on the requests for reports by other Departments cannot be handled by a Deputy Under Secretary or by an Assistant Secretary, because they lack the prestige. If you will remember, throughout our hearings, the word prestige came up frequently. Mr. Dulles and Mr. Humelsine in their testimony stated that the Under Secretary would have sufficient prestige.

I personally do not think that the creation of an Under Secretary is the only way and certainly not the most economical way of reorganizing the Department of State. But I am going along although reluctantly, because of this question of prestige that they consider so important. In other words, Mr. Lourie must be able to have that prestige of a title when he goes over to talk to Mr. Wilson of the Defense Department.

For these reasons, I will support this legislation very reluctantly. But I do not think this is a measure of economy.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a case very much like the Hoover Commission case where money had to be invested in order to save money. Now if we are spending $17,500 or even $25,000, and it will cut down an enormous amount of waste in the State Department, which every foreign traveler on both sides of the aisle has reported, that is not only a good investment but it is what we did with the Hoover Commission. If that is the preferable way, we are putting a man in charge who has had great experience in business, and thereby cut out waste and, further, it will bolster the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of reading into the RECORD a statement by Mr. Humelsine, who was Deputy Undersecretary of State, which you will find on page 2 of the hearings:

There has been continual need for better organization in the Department of State—better organization than it has today. I believe that there could be economies practiced in the Department of State beyond those that we have been able to put into effect in the past years. This would create an Under Secretary who would spend his whole time looking at the problems of the Department of State and trying to see that it was organized properly. He would try to carry out reorganizations where they were necessary, and he would have the authority to see that point 4 was properly managed and operated; to see that the information program was properly managed and operated.

In a nutshell, that is the desire of the administration—to have a man that can do that job.

There is no position in the Department of State at the present time that will allow that sort of a job to be performed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most interesting things I have seen in the House of Representatives in the 4 years I have been a Member. Here today are the Democrats on the Committee on Foreign Affairs gaily going along with the creation of a new job in the State Department at $17,500 a year, plus a staff, to take out of the State Department the lard they put in.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this to the Members of the House. The kind of man you get for this job is far more important than the question of creating the job. The kind of man this administration needs, if it will take my humble advice, is not a man who has made $5,000,000 from the invention of a rat trap or something like that and shown his ability only in that field. It should not be some academician or someone already in the Department. You need a double-barrelled man, a man who has proven his business ability, a man that knows something about the State Department and the Foreign Service, so he will not find himself in a dead-end street down there as have a good many of his predecessors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U. S. C. 151a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Until December 31, 1954, unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President, there shall be in the Department of State a second Under Secretary of State (for Administration) who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary of State (for Administration) shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, and shall perform such duties and exercise such administrative powers as the Secretary of State may prescribe."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 5, strike out the remainder of the page and all of page 2 down to and including line 4, and insert the following:

"Until December 31, 1954, unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President, there shall be in the Department of State an Under Secretary of State for Administration who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall take precedence in the Department of State next after the Secretary and the Under Secretary. The Under Secretary of State for Administration shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, and shall perform such duties and exercise such administrative powers as the Secretary of State may prescribe."

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIES to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 13, after "rate of", strike out "$17,500" and insert "$12,500."

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because for a long time Congress has been creating jobs and paying salaries that are considerably higher than the salaries received by Members of the House and of the Senate.

When I came to Congress in 1931 a Congressman or a Senator got $10,000 a year and paid $250, approximately, in income tax. The purchasing power of his $9,750 would buy in Washington more than $20,000 will buy now. I bought a 3-story brick house near Sixteenth Street for $8,800, $1,250 down and $40 a month.

Coming back to Washington after 8 years, I find that Members of the House and of the Senate are underpaid or else the bureaucrats are overpaid. I cannot understand why they want to create jobs and pay $17,500 to men in the departments when we pay ourselves $12,500. I do not think there ought to be anybody in the Government outside of the President, and possibly the Vice President, who should receive more than Members of the House and of the Senate.

As a matter of fact, most of the stupid errors that have occurred have been the result of executive mismanagement. In my judgment, the composite judgment of this House is superior to the judgment of the executive branch of our Government.

As a result of my own service here, and the fact that my father was a Member of Congress for many years, I found out that the average Congressman who serves on a committee and the average committee is far better informed on any economic or political question than the average man who is imported to the executive department and heralded as a brain truster. I think we ought to restore the dignity and prerogatives of the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, if we had asserted our prerogatives and our independence 15 years ago, we would have spared this country some of the tragic errors that have occurred. So I think it is a good beginning to establish a precedent. If you are going to create executive officers, then they ought not to receive any more money than the Senators and the Representatives. Let us put a ceiling on it. A ceiling that will require them to live on the same salary and the same income as Members of the Congress of the United States. We have a responsible job. Our cost of living is just as high as the cost of living of the average bureau chief. I never could understand why we have an inferiority complex about our service here. We have literally wasted billions of dollars all over the earth, and we have never been reluctant to vote billions of dollars for appropriations. We have people traveling all over the earth, enjoying almost unlimited expense accounts. We have not been economical in our dealings with the executive department. We gave the President $50,000 tax exemption which was equivalent to almost one-half million dollars of income. It would seem to me, therefore, that we have a splendid opportunity this afternoon to establish a precedent, which we ought to follow from now on, and that is to limit the salary and the income of every agent or every officer that we create to the sum of $12,500. I offer this amendment in good faith, and with the earnest hope that it will be adopted.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman has done us a great service in calling our attention to some of these matters, but I trust that his amendment does not prevail because it may be that he has the cart before the horse. However, I do want to commend the gentleman for calling these matters to the attention of the Congress and the country.

Mr. DIES. I appreciate the commendation, but still the logic of the situation is with me. If we serve here as Members of the Congress and of the other body for $12,500, and if we are adequately paid, and our jobs are as responsible as they are, then it seems to me the Under Secretary of State ought to serve for the same money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIES), there were—ayes 55, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while he is not of the same political party as I am, he is a personal friend of mine. Friendship to me transcends the middle aisle, as it does with all of us. Certainly I try to follow that policy. My friends are my friends, without regard to their political affiliations, racial origin, or religion, or anything else.

I was very pleased to note recently that one of our former colleagues who served in this House with ability, distinction, and courage was appointed to the responsible position of Assistant Secretary of State for liaison with Congress. I refer to our good friend Thruston Morton from Kentucky. That brought great pleasure to me. My years of association with him, I think he was here 6 years, were most pleasant. He was a valued Member of this House. He did not seek reelection. He gave to this House the benefit of his knowledge and experience. He gained in this House experience which he will carry with him into his new position of responsibility. I congratulate President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in appointing Thruston Morton. I sincerely hope that in his new position he will have every happiness and success.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111) to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration), had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 342, nays 18, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—342

Adair	Busbey	Elliott
Addonizio	Bush	Engle
Allen, Calif.	Byrne, Pa.	Feighan
Allen, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Fenton
Andersen, H. Carl	Campbell	Fino
	Canfield	Fisher
Andresen, August H.	Carlyle	Forand
	Carnahan	Ford
Andrews	Carrigg	Forrester
Angell	Cederberg	Frazier
Arends	Celler	Frelinghuysen
Aspinall	Chatham	Fulton
Auchincloss	Chenoweth	Gamble
Ayres	Chudoff	Gary
Bailey	Church	Gathings
Baker	Clevenger	Gavin
Bates	Cole, Mo.	Gentry
Battle	Cole, N. Y.	George
Beamer	Colmer	Goodwin
Becker	Condon	Gordon
Belcher	Coon	Granahan
Bender	Cooper	Grant
Bennett, Fla.	Corbett	Gregory
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Gubser
Bentley	Coudert	Gwinn
Bentsen	Cretella	Hagen, Calif.
Berry	Crosser	Hagen, Minn.
Betts	Crumpacker	Hale
Bishop	Cunningham	Haley
Blatnik	Curtis, Mass.	Halleck
Boggs	Curtis, Mo.	Hand
Boland	Curtis, Nebr.	Harden
Bolling	Dague	Hardy
Bolton, Frances P.	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Nebr.
	Davis, Tenn.	Harrison, Va.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Davis, Wis.	Hart
	Dawson, Utah	Hays, Ark.
Bonin	Deane	Hébert
Bosch	Delaney	Heller
Bow	Dempsey	Herlong
Bramblett	Derounian	Heselton
Bray	Devereux	Hess
Brooks, La.	D'Ewart	Hiestand
Brooks, Tex.	Dies	Hill
Brown, Ga.	Dodd	Hillelson
Brown, Ohio	Dolliver	Hillings
Brownson	Donovan	Hinshaw
Broyhill	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoeven
Bryson	Dorn, S. C.	Hoffman, Ill.
Buchanan	Doyle	Hoffman, Mich.
Budge	Eberharter	Holmes
Burleson	Edmondson	Holt
Holtzman	Merrow	Schenck
Hope	Metcalf	Scherer
Horan	Miller, Calif.	Scott
Hosmer	Miller, Md.	Scrivner
Howell	Miller, Nebr.	Scudder
Hruska	Miller, N. Y.	Secrest
Hunter	Mollohan	Seely-Brown
Hyde	Morrison	Selden
Ikard	Moss	Shafer
Jackson	Multer	Sheppard
James	Mumma	Short
Jarman	Neal	Sieminski
Jensen	Nelson	Sikes
Johnson	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
Jonas, Ill.	Norblad	Smith, Kans.
Jonas, N. C.	Norrell	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Mo.	Oakman	Smith, Va.
Judd	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Karsten, Mo.	O'Hara, Minn.	Spence
Kean	O'Neill	Staggers
Kearney	Osmers	Stanley
Kearns	Ostertag	Steed
Keating	Passman	Stringfellow
Kelley, Pa.	Patman	Sullivan
Kelly, N. Y.	Patten	Sutton
Keogh	Patterson	Taber
Kersten, Wis.	Pelly	Talle
Kilburn	Pfost	Taylor
Kilday	Philbin	Teague
King, Calif.	Phillips	Thompson, La.
King, Pa.	Pillion	Thompson, Mich.
Kirwan	Poage	
Kluczynski	Poff	Thornberry
Knox	Polk	Tollefson
Krueger	Poulson	Trimble
Laird	Preston	Utt
Landrum	Price	Van Pelt
Lane	Priest	Van Zandt
Lanham	Prouty	Velde
Lantaff	Radwan	Wainwright
Latham	Rains	Walter
LeCompte	Ray	Wampler
Lesinski	Rayburn	Warburton
Long	Reams	Watts
Lovre	Reed, Ill.	Weichel
Lyle	Reed, N. Y.	Westland
McCarthy	Rees, Kans.	Wharton
McConnell	Regan	Whitten
McCormack	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wickersham
McCulloch	Rhodes, Pa.	Widnall
McDonough	Richards	Wigglesworth
McIntire	Riehlman	Williams, Miss.
McMillan	Rivers	Willis
McVey	Roberts	Wilson, Calif.
Mack, Ill.	Robeson, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Mack, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.	Winstead
Madden	Rodino	Withers
Magnuson	Rogers, Colo.	Withrow
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Wolverton
Mailliard	Rogers, Mass.	Yorty
Martin, Iowa	Roosevelt	Young
Matthews	Sadlak	Younger
Meader	St. George	Zablocki
Merrill	Saylor	

NAYS—18

Abernethy	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Alexander	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Tex.
Burdick	Hull	Rooney
Byrd	Jones, N. C.	Shuford
Dowdy	Lucas	Wheeler
Fountain	Marshall	Wier

NOT VOTING—72

Abbitt	Fine	Murray
Albert	Fogarty	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Friedel	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Garmatz	O'Konski
Bonner	Golden	Perkins
Boykin	Graham	Powell
Buckley	Green	Rabaut
Camp	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon	Harrison, Wyo.	Riley
Case	Harvey	Sheehan
Cheif	Holifield	Shelley
Chiperfield	Javits	Simpson, Pa.
Clardy	Jenkins	Small
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Springer
Dawson, Ill.	Kee	Stauffer
Dingell	Klein	Thomas
Dollinger	McGregor	Thompson, Tex.
Dondero	Machrowicz	Vinson
Donohue	Mason	Vorys
Durham	Miller, Kans.	Vursell
Ellsworth	Mills	Williams, N. Y.
Evins	Morano	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Morgan	Wolcott
Fernandes	Moulder	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Graham with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Case with Mr. Green.
Mr. Jenkins with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Carnais.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Friedel.
Mr. Elsworth with Mr. Fine.
Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Dollinger.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Williams of New York with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Morano with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Harvey with Mr. Moulder.
Mr. Stauffer with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. Machrowicz.
Mr. Golden with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Small with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for recognition at this time in order that I might regretfully announce the retirement from Congress of my distinguished colleague from the Fifth District of Virginia, Hon. THOMAS B. STANLEY.

Mr. STANLEY has served in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, Eighty-first, Eighty-second, and Eighty-third Congresses. Since he has been here he has endeared himself to the Members of the House, to his friends on both sides of the aisle, and I am sure you all join with me in regretting that he is leaving this body.

During the last Congress he was chairman of the important Committee on House Administration where he served as he did on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with great distinction.

Mr. STANLEY has a long public career: He was first a businessman, a farmer, then he engaged extensively in the furniture manufacturing business. But there never was a time in the life of this busy man when he was not willing to lay aside his own fortunes and affairs in order to serve his county, his State, and his Nation.

He was for six terms a member of the House of Delegates of the State of Virginia where he served with great distinction, and owing to his ability, his popularity with his colleagues, became and remained for three terms in the legislature, Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia.

He became known here for his courage, his conservatism, and his allegiance to conservative and sane measures that were presented to this House.

I shall feel a sense of personal loss when Mr. STANLEY retires from the Congress, and I am sure our State and the Nation will suffer a loss. I regret to see him go.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in regretting that Mr. STANLEY has made up his mind to work in another field of endeavor and leave us where he has been such a great joy to many of us with his fine personality and his splendid legislative experience that he brought here from the House of Delegates of Virginia.

Further than that, I feel almost a kinship with Mr. STANLEY because in his county in the State of Virginia my ancestors are buried, in Henry County. I went down there and had a delightful visit with him and his charming lady. A great improvement was going on there and my ancestors had to be moved out of the old family grave and brought over to another cemetery and I was down there at the dedication.

I enjoyed my visit in that fine part of old Virginia, for it brought back things that my mother had told me about her grandfather and grandmother who lived in that neighborhood and who are now buried there.

It is with regret that I lose the association of this fine friend, this fine legislator. I wish him well in any field of endeavor he desires to enter or into which his ambition may lead him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the minority leader and yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, today marks a milestone in an outstanding legislative career which has spanned nearly a quarter century. Twenty-three years ago THOMAS B. STANLEY became a member of the House of Delegates of Virginia. It was my privilege to serve with him in that body for two terms, during which I formed a very strong attachment for him. His ability, sound judgment, and qualities of leadership were soon recognized, and in 1942 he was elevated to the office of speaker of the oldest law-making body on the American continent, in which capacity he served for three terms.

In 1946, when the beloved Representative of the Fifth Congressional District, the Honorable Thomas Burch, retired from this House, TOM STANLEY was elected to succeed him. Here he has displayed the same quality of service and leadership as in the Virginia Assembly. His broad and varied experience as a businessman, farmer, and statesman have enabled him to establish an enviable record. He has served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on House Administration and as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His Virginia colleagues are loath to see him leave the House of Representatives, but their feelings are assuaged by the fact that he is resigning today in order that he may offer his services to the Old Dominion in an even more important capacity.

There is one thing about TOM STANLEY particularly that we all admire extravagantly, and that is his lovely wife. She is one of the most charming ladies I have ever known. Throughout his entire career she has been ever by his side furnishing the encouragement and inspiration for his accomplishments. No wife has ever been more faithful. No wife has ever been more helpful. Our love and best wishes go with both Tom and Ann Stanley as he leaves the halls of Congress to seek greater opportunities for service.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to contribute a few comments from this side of the aisle to the send-off we are giving one of our distinguished colleagues today. I have known TOM STANLEY best as chairman of a committee on which we served together for several years—the House Administration Committee. The committee is perhaps a mild enigma to some of our Members who are not familiar with its myriad functions. We usually take for granted the fact that someone, somewhere, is bearing the multiple administrative burdens that go into the operation of a very complex legislative body, but we do not often stop to ponder his problems unless we disagree with some policy that affects our own offices. The committee is not well known to the ladies and gentlemen in the press gallery because it has seldom been a wellspring of exciting headlines.

We can call it our housekeeping committee because its activities include even the most petty housekeeping and personnel problems, as well as some rather weighty ones. But whatever we call it, its chairmanship requires a solid, stable person with a back broad enough to carry 435 trunks around on it. TOM STANLEY has borne these trunks—sometimes bloody but always unbowed. One of the chairman's chief functions is to serve as watchdog over the multi-million-dollar contingent fund of the House. As you know, being a watchdog and being popular are generally mutually exclusive conditions. But I think that TOM STANLEY has shown us that there is such a legislative species as the popular watchdog.

To TOM STANLEY something is "good business" or it is something to be rejected. We who have been trying through all these years of free-wheeling

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

spending sprees to attain fiscal integrity in Government and who have sought some reasonable economy wherever it could be applied are going to miss the sound business sense of TOM STANLEY. He has been a stalwart warrior in our battle for economy.

Today the House loses a grand fellow and an able business executive. I know of no higher tribute to TOM STANLEY's faithful service in this Congress than to say that his service has been altogether true to what Virginians like to call the good old tradition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and a happy opportunity to be associated with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As chairman of that committee I regret exceedingly that he has removed himself, by resignation from Congress, from the councils of our committee. We shall miss him greatly. During the years that he has served on that committee he has shown a sincerity of purpose that was striking, indeed. Likewise his ability was outstanding. He was faithful and extremely conscientious in the performance of all his duties. His sound judgment and great experience made him a valuable Member. When it came to the attention of our committee a few days ago that he was about to leave Congress in order to be a candidate for Governor of his native State, I took occasion to speak of the service he had rendered as a member of the committee and as a Member of Congress, which was so outstanding and worth while. I had been rather fulsome in my praise of the gentleman on that occasion, and when I had finished my remarks a member of his own party remarked to me, "You better be careful of what you say, he may use it in his campaign." I replied, "I have said nothing but what came from my heart, and whatever I have said that will prove beneficial to him he certainly is entitled to use it." I have a high regard and great respect as everyone else has, for Mr. STANLEY and the service that he has rendered in this Congress. He is the type that his district may well be proud of, and certainly the State of Virginia would do itself a great service if it elevated him to the high office to which he aspires. He has my best wishes and I will follow his future with a great deal of interest and proud of the fact that I had the opportunity to be associated with him in the work of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone in this House will miss our colleague, TOM STANLEY, as I will, because I have been associated with him very closely in the House Administration Committee. I succeeded him as chairman of that committee. Mr. STANLEY is one of the most careful legislators that I have ever met, one of the most conscientious men, and with his fine feeling of the eternal fitness of things he is retiring from the House so that he will not by any stretch of imagination neglect any of the duties in the House while he is engaged in the campaign for a higher office. He has always been for economy and for efficiency, and he has brought about a considerable measure of both while he has been at the head of the administration committee. If the people of Virginia in their wisdom decide to elevate Congressman TOM STANLEY to the position of chief executive of the Old Dominion State, he will indeed add one more star to the fine galaxy of statesmen who have come from that State down through the years since colonial days. I regard his departure as a distinct loss to the House, but we are happy to have him make his own decision and I wish for him many good things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not exactly like the tone the way things are going. I want to say something nice about TOM STANLEY, but after what was said by the two gentlemen from Virginia, and the distinguished majority leader, and the minority leader, and the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from Iowa, I do not know just exactly what is left for me to say. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] stole my thunder when he proceeded to make such a nice statement about Tom's wife who, as everybody in Virginia knows, is one of the loveliest women in Virginia and who, incidentally, looks like Tom's daughter. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I claim I have not reached the age in life where time passes so fast that 6 years seems like yesterday. It is true that Tom and I came into this body the same day to fill a vacancy in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was more than 6 years ago. But, as I look back on that exceedingly, friendly association, it seems to me that time has gone only too fast. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] is a man of outstanding character, and ability, and integrity. Above all he is a man of lovable nature, and those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him here during the years are going to miss him a great deal in the years to come.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], only I think I am approaching this particular situation in a slightly different light in that I have a feeling of mixed emotions. One is a feeling of personal loss that Tom has seen fit to separate himself from us. Another is maybe just a little bit of hurt feeling that he should aspire to be associated with people in Richmond rather than those who have been associated with him here. I suppose it might be natural, however, that anyone who is dedicated to a life of public service would aspire to broader fields, so I shall not hold that against him.

During the 6 years I have been in Congress Tom and I have occupied offices pretty close to each other on the third floor of the Old Building. For that reason I have had a chance to see him perhaps more often than a good many other Members except those who have served on committees with him.

I think one of the finest things about TOM STANLEY is the warmth of personality he possesses and the feeling of friendship that develops so easily. But way beyond that I would have to emphasize just a little what my good friends, BURR HARRISON and VAUGHAN GARY, have said that the best thing about Tom is that charming wife of his. To know her is to love her. The people of Virginia, I know, feel about her just about as I do.

Others who have preceded me have spoken aptly of Tom's experience and splendid personal qualities. In his voluntary separation he takes these same qualities with him, and in addition to his record of achievement he leaves here a host of friends. I think we in the Virginia delegation will feel most keenly the absence of his friendship which has been warm and steadfast.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years it has been my privilege and pleasure to have had a rather close and intimate association with our esteemed colleague from Virginia, TOM STANLEY.

During a part of this period, he has chairmanned the Committee on House Administration of which I am a member. In these years I have learned to appreciate him and the qualities which we all admire in any man.

During this time I have come to respect him as a man deeply devoted to his duties and responsibilities.

As chairman of the committee, TOM STANLEY's basic concept of operations has derived from a store of old and tested Jeffersonian principles that he had packed away during 17 years in the Virginia General Assembly—and that service, I might add, included 6 years as speaker of the house. TOM STANLEY's idea of good legislation is never based on who is right but what is right.

The great State of Virginia holds a unique place in the Union of States. The statesmen it has produced have left their indelible mark of leadership upon the pages of history of this Nation. Many bright stars shine in the firmament of its political history, and among those today reposes the star of TOM STANLEY. Certainly the good people of Virginia need not be told how to vote by an outsider, and no such intent is conveyed in these remarks, but I hope the citizens of Virginia, for the good of the State and of the Nation, will elevate this quiet, modest, and able leader to the highest office within their gift.

If this modest, self-effacing Virginia gentleman prefers to transfer his business acumen to the administration of his native Commonwealth, then he richly deserves the opportunity. If we are losing a good business head, Virginia is gaining one. No matter where he goes, TOM STANLEY will find peace in the power of his own principles.

Your good friends, Tom, will be watching with the greatest of interest the developments as they occur, and I join with many others in wishing for you and your lovely wife the best of all good things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON].

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my happy association with our distinguished colleague, THOMAS B. STANLEY, who has so capably represented the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia, has not been confined to service in the Congress. Our friendship and my high personal regard for him developed because of his fine service to our people in the Virginia Assembly and his leadership as a successful industrialist, farmer, and citizen.

Like many of our Virginia citizens, I will be proud to have TOM STANLEY as the next Governor of Virginia, but I also recognize that our delegation loses a most useful Member whom we love and respect.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay my tribute to this splendid gentleman from Virginia. He is a man of great executive ability, a man of honor and of faith. It is quite certain that our Nation needs strength in the State governments. During the past few years our State governments have degenerated and our Federal Government has become more powerful and more oppressive. We need an actual rejuvenation of strength and vigor in our State governments, and I am certain, Tom, that your people will permit you to give them the benefit of your wisdom, your executive ability, your courage, and your faith to help carry on the traditions of your great State. It has been a great privilege to have served with TOM STANLEY, and I am very pleased that I shall continue to have him as our neighbor, and that I shall continue to enjoy his friendship.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as with our distinguished former Speaker, my colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], my own family sprang from Virginia, and the congressional district of the able TOM STANLEY. I have visited many times in Wytheville, where my kinspeople have resided since the founding of the town, and I was delighted to learn that those people think as affectionately of TOM STANLEY as I have felt since first coming to know him.

TOM STANLEY has earned the respect and admiration of every Member of this House by his earnest attention to his duties. His good judgment stands out among his many other virtues and I am not ashamed to confess that, in the press of legislative matters when I have not had time to examine thoroughly the question before us, I have relied upon his leadership unquestioningly.

I know that whatever he may choose to do, wherever he may choose to apply his talents, the best wishes of all of us here in the House go with him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never been made to feel so humble, so grateful, and so appreciative for the most generous things that have been said about me here this afternoon. I am most grateful to our beloved dean of the Virginia delegation and to all of you who have spoken so nicely of me, and I am especially glad to have a record of what my colleagues from Virginia, whom I have learned to love so dearly, have said. I hope, and I am sure, that it is going to be a very great help to me in realizing my ambition. This was a hard decision for me to make, but I felt compelled to make it at this time for two reasons: First, I wanted my successor to come here to the Congress and begin serving the people from the district that I now have the honor to represent. I want to say that I do not know who this person will be, but the district that I now represent will send someone that you will be pleased to have here. He will ably, and with great honor, to himself and to his district, to the State and to the Nation, represent the Fifth District of Virginia in Congress.

The second reason for my resigning from Congress today is the pressing demand upon my time in planning and conducting my campaign for the Democratic nomination for Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, to be held on July 14, 1953.

I was first elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress but I never sat in that body because it had adjourned at the time I was elected. So I first came here when the Eightieth Congress was being organized. At that time I was with the minority party and this House elected the present distinguished Speaker of the House as their presiding officer. It also elected as majority leader the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. They were indeed patient and kind to me, as well as to all other Members of this House. I want to pay tribute to them for the fine way in which they presided and managed the operation of this body.

Two years later, the majority of the House shifted to this side of the aisle. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was elected Speaker and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was elected majority leader. They, too, were patient and kind through the two Congresses that I had the pleasure to serve under them. I want to take this opportunity to express to the presiding officers, and to the majority leaders who have been so kind to me all the time I have been here, my deep appreciation. I do not want to stop here, however for it has been a real privilege to serve with the members of the committees that I have been connected with since I came here. I have learned to know those gentleman better than any of the others. My first committee assignment was with the Committee on House Administration, under the leadership of my good friend KARL LECOMPTE. We have served together on that committee until this date. Again I congratulate this House on having him as chairman of that splendid group.

I also had the privilege of serving during the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, first under the chairmanship of the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and at the present time under the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. With those gentlemen, as well as the other fine distinguished members of that committee, it has been my very great privilege to have served with them.

My service here has taught me, among other things, some measure of tolerance. I find that this is a great body in which to serve, and if you stay here long enough you will learn to respect the other person's view. I feel that my life has been improved, and I hope that I am a better man for having had the great opportunity of serving with you in this the greatest legislative body in the whole world.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have an opportunity to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing and being associated with THOMAS B. STANLEY for a number of years. I have, of course, been intimately associated with him since I became a Member of this body early in 1948.

TOM STANLEY is one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever had the privilege to be associated with. He is kind, considerate, courageous, gentle, but firm and stanch in his belief.

I admire Tom highly. He is an able legislator who is familiar with the most intricate problems of government and one of the best informed Members of this body. I am proud to call him my friend.

This body will miss his wise, able, and inspiring leadership, but I am proud to know that our colleague is not retiring from public duty but is aspiring to be of greater service to the people of the great State of Virginia, and I am proud to do what little I can to be of assistance to him in this undertaking.

Wherever Tom shall go, our best wishes and hopes for success will follow him. His life and service as we know it and as it is known by the good people of Virginia speaks for itself. He and his wife Ann are good examples of the kind of leaders we in our country need today. We shall miss them, and our hope is that the future will reward them generously.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at this very minute a ship is tied up at an east coast dock carrying disaster to a segment of our national economy in much the same way as rat-infested vessels brought disease into our port cities in years gone by.

That ship is unloading foreign residual oil into an electric-utility plant or other industrial facility that has traditionally depended upon coal for its heat and power. And back in the coal-producing areas—in my home district and elsewhere in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and other coal States—many miners are at home today because there is no work for them.

There is no work for them because of that ship and other ships that bring the left-overs from foreign refineries into this country at the rate that reached an average of 607,200 barrels a day during one week of January.

Last year those ships unloaded 128,000,000 barrels of this alien residual oil on our shores. That is enough to displace 31,000,000 tons of coal and to throw 32,256 miners out of work for a full year.

It also creates heavy unemployment for railroaders in my district and in other shipping centers.

In addition, this flood of foreign oil that displaces domestic fuels weakens national security to a highly perilous level.

Rear Adm. D. V. Gallery, United States Navy, declares in last week's Saturday Evening Post that today Russia has more than 300 submarines, as compared with Germany's fleet of only 60 at the beginning of World War II.

Now please think back to 1942 when tankers carrying oil from our own ports on the Gulf of Mexico were torpedoed right in our own coastal waters.

I ask this legislative body whether we can afford to permit the weakening of the coal industry when, in the event of a national emergency, it would naturally have to carry a tremendously greater energy load.

Let us not delay in acting immediately to correct a situation in which a foreign import is gnawing away at the vitality of the coal industry and the life line of our national security.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to transfer the special order of 1 hour which I had for today to Friday, February 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour, I think the subject on which I shall speak justifies the use of 5 minutes' time of the House and I beg of you to remain long enough to listen to the few words I have prepared concerning a subject which I think comprises the greatest danger which faces America domestically, and I am speaking of the question of industry-wide bargaining.

The wage disputes in the steel and coal industries during the year just passed should have illustrated clearly for the Members of this House the evils of a continuing pattern in industrial relations which has come to be generally known as industry-wide bargaining. These disputes also underscore the rise of big government to handle such matters, for it was only because of intervention by the White House, at the expense of further inflation, that these disputes were finally brought to an end.

The steel strike ran for 55 days during which time we saw every legal measure, except use of the Taft-Hartley Act, resorted to by the Government in addition to the illegal seizure of this industry. It can be said without refutation that no one won this battle. The steel workers lost $390,000,000; the Nation lost 16,300,000 tons of steel, 25,000,000 tons of iron ore, and hundreds of millions of dollars in both civilian and defense products that could have been produced during this period if it were not for the strike. It would appear that the only possible victors were the heads of the steel union who, with the connivance of the Federal Government, strengthened their strangle-hold on the rank-and-file steel workers, and the entire industry.

The coal wage dispute later in the year further illustrates the evil effects of gigantic labor monopoly. A strike was avoided in this instance, but at the expense of total wrecking of what remained of the stabilization program. Nonetheless, the situation in the coal industry represents a primary example of what can happen if labor monopoly is allowed to run riot.

This situation is one that has occupied the attention of the Congress on many occasions.

In 1949, after John L. Lewis forced his 3-day work week and other contractual provisions on this industry, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on the economic power of labor organizations. The committee report reached the following conclusion:

> If this usurpation and abuse of the power to control production and price is tolerated by the Congress, its unbridled use will quickly spread from union to union, from industry to industry, and the Congress will never regain its narrowly circumscribed power to control the economy of the Nation consistently with the Constitution of the United States.

Since that time I have seen nothing in the field of industrial relations which leads me to believe that the trend which the Senate committee warned about has been reversed.

It should be clear by this time that the practice of so-called industry-wide bargaining is a basic cause of continuing labor-management unrest. I say "so-called" industry-wide bargaining because admittedly, industry-wide bargaining exists only in a handful of industries of which coal is the notable example. However, under this general heading there are other types of bargaining including association bargaining, regional bargaining, pattern bargaining and union-wide bargaining, which further weaken the power of the local union. I like to characterize all of these methods as monopoly bargaining.

Past legislative efforts to deal with this relatively new type of monopoly have not been successful. During the original Taft-Hartley debate, the House passed a provision banning this type of bargaining and it failed in the Senate by only one vote. With the 1947 action of this House in mind, I am reintroducing a bill to curtail all types of monopoly bargaining. The bill would not disturb bargaining on a company-wide basis for multiplant companies. It consists of the provisions of the old Hartley bill dealing with this problem. It would:

First. Prevent the NLRB from certifying a common bargaining representative for the employees of competing employers, with a special exemption for small businesses in the same metropolitan area.

Second. Make it an unfair labor practice for employers to engage in monopolistic lock-outs or for labor to engage in monopolistic strikes. Both are defined similarly as concerted interference with employment, or an employer's operation in accordance with a common plan of action by two or more competing employers, or by the employees of two or more competing employers, unless there is a certified common bargaining agent.

Third. Enforcement would be left to the NLRB subject to the procedures now in the Taft-Hartley Act for dealing with secondary boycotts.

Fourth. A grace period is provided for both management and labor to adapt themselves to the new law.

Opponents of this course of action will say that to restore the rights of local and independent unions in the manner set forth in my bill would be disruptive of long established industrial relations patterns. To them, I say that monopoly bargaining is a relatively new arrival dating its beginnings back only to the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932.

I should also like to point out to the Members of this House that my bill may not receive unanimous support from the ranks of industry. While major industrial organizations are on record as being opposed to industry-wide bargaining, there are spokesmen for some industries who have been captured by industry-wide bargaining, and whose jobs depend, to a large extent, on its continuation. For this reason, we can expect opposition from the shipping, pulp and paper, glass, vitreous china, stove, wallpaper, baking, and parts of the coal industries. In addition, local employer groups, particularly on the west coast, are committed to the practice known as group bargaining, with which my bill will interfere to some extent, so we can expect to hear from them.

In a recent speech, I said:

> Whatever form of collective bargaining which may be carried on in any industry and which results in collective bargaining decisions by competing employers is monopolistic. Conversely, collective bargaining on behalf of employees of competing employers is equally monopolistic. Both should be prohibited.

It is the purpose of my bill to accomplish just this result which I believe would establish equality of economic power between labor and management and restore bargaining rights to those most concerned, that is, the officers and membership of local unions.

Recent surveys have shown that workers generally believe that their union leaders are losing touch with the rank and file. The McGraw-Hill research department's twelfth survey of workers' opinion showed that 52 percent of the workers believe that local bargaining would mean shorter strikes and 46 percent feel that they would get better breaks from local bargaining, while only 14 percent believed that they would be worse off if bargaining were returned to their own hands. One local union officer put it this way:

Now that everything is decided at a bargaining table located maybe a thousand or two miles away, we guys here in the town and the plant are nothing but reporters and small-time policemen. The closer our big boys get to company and industry top brass—and to Washington—the further away they move from us and the members we have to answer to—that is, if we're going to hold our union jobs.

When I introduced this legislation last year, I was told that my proposal would destroy the international union. This is simply not true. Have trade associations been destroyed because they cannot regulate their members' prices? Of course not. Similarly, international unions can exercise their power and management for good purposes without possessing monopoly control over the wage rates of their locals and rights of their members to work.

I do not say that my proposal is the ultimate answer to this vital problem, but I believe that by adopting it—whether in this form, or some other—the Congress will have moved one long step toward more democratic practices in labor-management relations and will have provided the protection our society needs against monopoly bargaining and its attendant evils.

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against you or against the help here in the House of Representatives. I see only three Congressmen here and the only reason they are here is because they want to speak.

I had something to say and I expected to say it this afternoon, but I think I can say it to the country without harming anyone here or wearing out your patience. The subject I was going to speak on and now do speak on is: "What can this country, the United States, do to prevent the United Nations from destroying the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitution and laws of the various States of the Union?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I stayed because I wanted to hear the distinguished gentleman, not because I wanted to make a speech. He does bring to mind one thing the people of the United States could do; they could urge their Congressmen to pass these various resolutions, one of which I introduced which would amend the Constitution and provide that no treaties entered into would become internal law until overtly made so by direct action of the House and the Senate of the United States. That would be one safeguard.

Mr. BURDICK. That would be one way to do it, and I am glad the gentleman contributed that suggestion. But if you are interested in how to do it you are not going to find out from me this afternoon; you will have to read this speech.

Mr. LYLE. I will be delighted to.

Mr. BURDICK. And there you will find out how you can do it by legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken many times on the question of what a treaty is; with whom a treaty can be made; and the effect of a treaty on the Constitution and laws of this country.

One of the early cases involving this matter was the *Head Money case*—One Hundred and Twelfth United States Reports, page 190—of *Edye et al.* v. *Robertson*, collector at the port of New York. In this case the collector went on board a foreign vessel having on board a great number of immigrants and, under an act of Congress, collected 50 cents per head for all aliens seeking entry into the United States. This money was paid to the collector under protest, and the action was brought to recover the amount paid. The defense was that the collector had proceeded in the matter as provided by an act of Congress regulating immigration. The plaintiff, however, asserted, and presented provisions of treaties with foreign nations in regard to immigrants coming from foreign countries, that the act of Congress regulating immigration was passed after the said treaties had been made.

On this subject Justice Miller, who delivered the opinion of the Court, said:

A treaty is primarily a compact between independent nations. It depends for the enforcement of its provisions on the interest and honor of the governments which are parties to it.

The Constitution gives it (a treaty) no superiority over an act of Congress, which may be repealed or modified by an act of a later date.

In short, we are of the opinion that, so far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such act of Congress as it may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal.

The action against the collector was dismissed.

In the case of *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190) where the United States imposed a tariff on products from the Dominican Republic, the matter of treaties was fully discussed by Justice Field. In that case the Dominican Republic relied on a treaty which we had made with the King of Hawaii, in which similar products were admitted free of duty, and that our treaty with the Dominican Republic recited that in trade with this country we would place no higher duty on the importation of products from the Dominican Republic than imposed against like products from any other country.

Since the act of Congress providing for a duty on the imports of products from the Dominican Republic was passed after the treaty with the same republic was made, the matter of the importance of a treaty came directly up for a decision.

On the matter Justice Field said:

By the Constitution of the United States a treaty and a statute are placed on the same footing, and if the two are inconsistent, the one last in date will control.

Justice Field cited and approved the decision in the case I have first cited, *Head Money cases* (112 U. S. 580).

In the case of *Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* reported in One Hundred and Thirtieth United States Reports, page 581, Justice Field again presented the opinion of the Court. In this case the plaintiff, who had resided in this country for several years, visited China and on his return was denied entry in the United States because of an act of Congress passed in his absence. Being held in custody, he applied for a writ of habeas corpus, and the matter came before the Court on that issue.

Justice Field, after citing his opinion in the Head Money cases, said:

The power of the Legislative Department of the Government to exclude aliens from the United States is an instance of sovereignty, which cannot be surrendered by the treaty-making power.

The act excluding Chinese laborers from the United States was a constitutional exercise of legislative power and, insofar as it conflicted with existing treaties between the United States and China, it operated to that extent to abrogate them as a part of the municipal law of the United States.

In the case of *Horner* v. *United States* (143 U. S. 570), where a treaty with Austria was pled in defense of the action of the plaintiff in violating the postal laws of the United States, Justice Blachford, in rendering the opinion, said:

The proposition that that section (of the postal laws) is void if it contravenes a treaty between the United States and Austria is not tenable.

The statute is a law equally with the treaty and, if subsequent and conflicting with the treaty, supersedes the latter.

Judge Harlan, in the case of *Sanchez* v. *United States* (216 U. S. 167), said in the majority opinion:

It is true that Congress did not, we assume, intend by the Foraker Act to modify the treaty with Spain, but if that act were deemed inconsistent with the treaty, the act would prevail; for, an act of Congress, passed after a treaty takes place, must be respected and enforced, despite any provisions or existing treaty provision on the same subject.

TREATIES

With regard to the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations by the Senate of the United States, the question naturally arises:

Did the Senate have any authority to ratify that document?

In regard to this power of ratification of treaties by the United States Senate, the Constitution provides:

Article VI: This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If any ratification of the United Nations' Charter was validly made at all, it would have to be made under the authority of the United States. In other words, there must have been authority on the part of the Senate to make a valid ratification.

This treaty was not ratified by an act of Congress, but the document came before the Senate as a treaty. The ratification could not have been made by the Senate alone, unless it was a treaty.

The courts from time immemorial, with respect to treaties, have held that a treaty is a contract between this Nation and some other nation. No individual nation ever offered that treaty for our ratification. It was offered by no nation or more than one nation; it was offered by the United Nations and no one else. It, therefore, seems important to determine what was the United Nations at the time this Charter was offered. Was it a nation? Did it have standing as a nation capable of offering a matter for ratification?

At the time this Charter was offered, the United Nations was the agency of several nations pledged to work for the peace of the world. It was an agent of all nations who had joined the United Nations, but did not then or now exist as an entity entitling it to be ranked as a nation with whom we could make a treaty. The very purpose was for this agency to work for the peace of the world as agents of the several nations who were members. The question now arises, can the United States make treaties with agents of foreign governments?

It is clear, from a digest of the foregoing cases that—

First, a treaty is a compact between independent nations.

Second, since the approval of the Charter of the United Nations was not a compact between the United States and any independent nation, the approval was void.

Third, that a treaty cannot in any case abrogate the sovereign power of the United States or any State in the Union.

Fourth, that an existing treaty may be amended, modified, or repealed by any act of Congress.

Fifth, that where a treaty conflicts with a law passed by Congress subsequent to the ratification of the treaty, that the act of Congress prevails.

Applying these legal principles to the Charter of the United Nations, we find first, that the ratification of any agreement made with agents of several governments does not establish such body as an independent nation with whom we could make a treaty.

Assuming that the United States had the power to make a treaty with this body of agents of independent nations, such ratification could not contain any language or agreement that would abrogate the sovereign power of the United States or of any State in the Union. The decision—the very first decision coming up under the Charter of the United Nations—was in the Fujii case in California, where the court held that since the laws of the State of California in reference to the ownership of land by certain nationals were antagonistic to the United Nations Charter and Declaration of Human Rights, that the law of California must give way to the supreme law of the land doctrine contained in the Constitution of the United States. This decision was clearly erroneous, because it is within the sovereign power of the State of California to make any law it may think proper to regulate aliens in that State.

One of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations reads:

All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it may take in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

This means that whatever measures the Security Council takes, whether in violation of our sovereignty or not, we agree to comply.

This provision, though, must be meaningless, for Russia has violated this principle with impunity in giving assistance to the Red Koreans and the Red Chinese.

Article 6 reads:

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon recommendations of the Security Council.

No action has been taken against Russia although the evidence before the Security Council is overwhelming that through the aid by Russia given to the aggressor in Korea the war there is continuing.

Article 21 provides:

The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present charter.

Article 43 provides:

All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with agreement or agreements, Armed Forces, assistance and facilities, including the right of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Under this provision the Korean war was started, and the United States found itself at war in a foreign country without a declaration of war. The Constitution of the United States had clothed Congress, and no other body, with power and responsibility to declare war. This section of the Charter of the United Nations violates the Constitution, as it takes the power to declare war away from Congress and places it in the power of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Article 55, subdivision (a), says:

The United Nations shall promote (in every country) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

This section opens the doors to the promotion of all sorts of social experiments in the attempt to build an Utopian state. We have seen some of these experiments tried in this country by the New Deal, and this provision of the Charter authorizes it specifically. The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee all these Utopian desires of its citizens, but it does guarantee that every citizen shall be entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that he shall have an equal opportunity to pursue his way of life the same as another citizen. This means that our Constitution confers upon no one a special privilege which cannot be enjoyed by all. That is all any government can promise and, clothed with these opportunities, it is up to the individual, through his own efforts, to realize his ambition. The Constitution does not guarantee every person employment any time he wants it, but it does guarantee him an equal opportunity for employment.

This section makes it possible to set up a communistic state, and since Communists were the chief authors of this whole Charter, it is not accidental at all that the provisions I mention here were inserted in that Charter.

Under the miscellaneous provisions of the Charter relating to the International Court of Justice, set up by the United Nations, the powers of this country over our own treaties have, by this Charter, been transferred to this International Court.

Article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice of the United Nations provides as to the jurisdiction of this court:

The jurisdiction of the court comprises all cases which the parties may refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or to treaties and conventions in force.

The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory, ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the court in all legal disputes concerning: (a) the interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation.

In the event of a dispute as to whether the court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by a decision of a court.

Nothing could be more simple.

The effect of these statutes passed by the United Nations is to take from the courts of this country their power to construe treaties made by the United States and violate the provisions of the Constitution of the United States as to treaties.

The Constitution of the United States, section 2 of article III, provides:

The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, or treaties made or which shall be made, under their authority.

In spite of these provisions there are many advocates of the United Nations who claim no attempt is being made to undermine the Constitution of the United States.

When we find that UNESCO, a subsidiary of the United Nations, is engaged in a wholesale campaign of propaganda, week after week on the radio, at the taxpayers' expense, training teachers to teach, and teaching that love of country—this country—by reference to our great leaders like Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln, creates a strong nationality, we wonder at what place the United Nations will stop in its efforts to destroy the American system of Government. This organization wants no strong national spirit of the United

States, but loyalty to a world government. This is an alarming situation and yet the people, generally, are not aroused. They have been told so many times that the United Nations is the only instrument of peace we have; that peace is what the United Nations is trying to obtain, the people believe in it, and believing it, they are lulled to sleep while the United Nations, conceived and inspired by Communists, seeks to destroy the Government we have.

If the past decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are to be followed, there is no danger that a treaty can disturb the Constitution of the Nation or interfere with the sovereign rights of States, and no constitutional amendment is necessary.

If these decisions are to be followed, Congress has the power by a congressional act to revise, amend or abrogate a treaty entirely. This being true, many amendments will be offered repealing various parts of the Charter, especially that provision which gives the Security Council power to start a war and ignore the powers and responsibilities of Congress.

Of course, we are never sure what the Supreme Court of the United States will hold. In the steel seizure case the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in his dissenting opinion, held the President had the power to seize the steel industry, and based his arguments on the fact that we had assumed a new responsibility when the Senate adopted the Charter of the United Nations, and that here in this document is found the power and authority of the President to seize the steel industry, although elsewhere in the Constitution no such specific authority could be found. This opinion reaffirms the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations and makes this document superior to our own Constitution and, in effect, amends our own Constitution without resorting to the constitutional process by which our Constitution is amended. It is a shortcut, entirely ignoring the Congress and the people, and promulgated by a body representing 64 foreign nations and the United States.

This is an amazing doctrine, and if the majority of the Court were of the same opinion as the Chief Justice, the Constitution of the United States would have been scrapped and, in its place, the Charter of the United Nations would be in full control of our liberties.

I cite this dissenting opinion, not for the purpose of excoriating the Chief Justice, but to point out the danger our Constitution is in since the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations. Fortunately for the people of the United States, the majority of the Court could not entertain any such doctrine, and the Constitution of this country was preserved.

It is most likely that no Senator who voted for the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations had the least idea that the Charter went further than to provide the organization with all proper tools to bring about world peace; it is also likely that no Senator who voted for the ratification saw in the wording of the document the hidden purpose of changing the Constitution of the United States or of any State or any law of the United States, or any law of one of the States of this Union. But the purpose to do so is now obvious. The exclusion laws of the State of California did not suit the majority of the members of the United Nations' representatives, and they implanted in this Charter the intended power to change our laws. When the Fujii case in California reached the court of appeals, the learned judge said:

> The Charter as ratified by the Senate has become the supreme law of the land, and hence the provisions of the California Exclusion Act conflict with the Charter of the United Nations, and hence the California law must be set aside.

It was.

It is likely that no Senator ever dreamed that the United Nations would ever attempt, either through the Charter or by any subsequent convention, to change the Constitution of the United States. But that has already happened, insofar as showing an attempt on the part of the United Nations to change our Constitution.

One of these conventions will come before the Senate of the United States shortly. It attempts to write a new definition of free speech, free religion, and a free press. Copies of this intended move have been circulated and can be found. The very cornerstones of our liberty are free speech, free religion, and a free press, and before the United Nations made this attempt, no one in this country who is familiar with our history ever thought for a minute that these cornerstones could be removed without constitutional amendments in which all the people, through their duly elected representatives, would have a voice. Now read this intended new definition of these cornerstones.

In regard to these cornerstones of our liberty, the Constitution of the United States provides:

> Amendment No. 1: Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or permitting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peacefully assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The provisions of the Covenant of Human Rights, proposed and to be submitted to the Senate for ratification, in respect to the above quotation from the Constitution of the United States, are:

> Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of choice * * * but this right is subject to certain restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law or are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms, and reputation of others.
>
> Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect the public safety, order, health or morals or the fundamental rights of others.

The most ardent and unreasonable supporter of the United Nations must admit that here in these sections proposed by the United Nations the proposal to amend our Federal Constitution is clearly obvious. Loaded down with all these restrictions and conditions—to be interpreted by the United Nations—it must be clear to all that the attempt is being made to destroy these fundamental freedoms as expressed in our Constitution.

The United Nations, created as its sponsors said, to preserve the peace of the world, evidently has found out that it cannot accomplish its original purpose when its own members are at war against each other, and have now started out on a broad grandiose policy of changing the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I should not be doing my full duty to this House or to the people of the United States if I did not, in the light of these decisions, present the quickest possible way in which the Congress of the United States can remove the dangers to our Government in the language contained in the Charter and covenants of the United Nations.

I propose and have introduced today, acts providing:

First. That no treaty, now existing or to be hereafter negotiated, shall in any way abridge the sovereign power of the United States or of any State, nor shall such treaty change, amend, or abridge any law of the United States or of any State in the United States.

Second. That in cases where the interpretation of the provisions of any treaty is at issue and to which the United States is a party, the question shall be submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States for adjudication, notwithstanding any provision in any treaty to the contrary.

Third. That neither the Security Council nor any other agency of the United Nations shall have any power to call on this country for armed troops to serve in any foreign country, without first obtaining the consent of Congress therefor, notwithstanding the provisions of any treaty to the contrary.

There are other provisions of the Charter of the United Nations that should be amended or entirely repealed, but the three changes set forth herewith are imperative.

I am in favor of constitutional amendments such as limiting what may be contained within a treaty, as proposed by Senator BRICKER, and the one making Congress, and not the Senate alone, responsible for approving treaties, as I have proposed in a Constitutional amendment; but since this Congress has the power now to pass acts limiting the extent of treaties, this power should be exercised without delay. The Fujii case in California, and the dissenting opinion of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case, is warning enough that it is directly up to this Congress right now to preserve the Constitution and laws of this country, regardless of any insidious attempt, from any quarter, to destroy them.

OLD-AGE PENSION FOR ALL OVER 65

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, everybody is talking about national security these days.

Most of the money taken from us in taxes is being spent to provide us with defenses against outside foes.

But what is being done to protect our own people against hunger, want, and fear—the age-old enemies of human beings before we ever heard of fascism, communism, or any other "ism" that may arise to plague the world?

The answer is: Not enough.

Apologists of the go-slow school point, by way of defense, to our old-age and survivors insurance program and to the old-age assistance program.

Taken together, they only provide a skeleton of social security.

All people over 65 are not covered, and benefits are paid in dollars that—in number and in content—are suffering from malnutrition.

To make the United States secure at home, we must protect our old people from privation and worry, and the most efficient way of doing it is to provide a $100-a-month pension to all citizens 65 years of age and older, based on qualifying age and citizenship, and without any further red tape, so that administrative costs will be held to a minimum.

Social-security taxes are going up anyway by fractions. A slight increase would finance a complete coverage and eliminate the confusion and humiliation that attend our present piecemeal program.

The need for a national pension is evident to those who are not afraid to face the facts, here they are—not pulled from a hat, but based on actuarial findings by our life-insurance companies.

Take 100 men at the age of 25 and then follow their journey up to the age of 65. How many are left, and what is their fate?

Thirty-six will be dead, and "economisers" will not be troubled by them.

Five will be self-supporting.

Four will be well-to-do.

One will be wealthy.

Fifty-four will be broke or dependent.

That last figure is the shocker.

Over one-half of the original hundred will be stripped of their human dignity, forced to beg from public welfare, or to accept charity from the very children they brought into the world.

Wait a minute. You cannot dismiss their plight by saying "It's their own fault. They should have thought of themselves alone and should have saved up for a rainy day."

Remember that we had four depressions between 1900 and 1942 that wiped out the savings of workers.

Within less than 25 years depression, unemployment, and war have cost us close to a trillion dollars—one thousand billion.

One cannot blame the average American worker for the blunders and the delays and the greed that failed to prevent depression and wars. Today we are engaged in two more wars—a hot one and a cold one.

But when, like Oliver Twist, we ask for a little more for our own people, there are those in high places who complain about the cost.

Our modern industrial economy is a great one, but it cannot survive if it is wrecked in every generation by short-sighted leaders who fail to learn the lesson of the century—that we cannot have either peace or prosperity without first insuring sustained production and purchasing power first of all in the United States. The number of our people over 65 is increasing. Many of them, by that fact alone, are excluded from employment. What are they going to do for purchasing power?

I do not plead on humanitarian grounds, for there are many ears that are closed to such an appeal.

But on the basis of economics, which affect the financially secure as well as the insecure, I say that we should legislate a national pension voluntarily before we are compelled to do it by the revolutionary forces at work in human society.

Those who resist change endanger all.

The principle of pensions is firmly established.

But we have not developed it to its logical conclusion.

Whether it is called disability compensation or retirement or by any other name, it is still a pension.

Veterans of the armed services receive pension, and rightly so, even though they have completed but 20 years of service, have not yet reached the age of 40, and are able to handle a full-time job after retirement.

They gave service to the country, and so have those who have worked in a civilian capacity and for a much longer period.

Now at an age where they cannot do as much physical work, or are excluded from many types of employment, our older citizens deserve first consideration because the concept of a pension was originally intended for them.

H. R. 1041, which I am proud to bring to your attention, would establish this right as a matter of national policy.

It would be a blessing to our millions of old folks and would attract confidence in our leadership throughout the world.

One hundred dollars a month for all citizens over 65 will be the sign that the United States stands for human as well as material security.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, on account of death in family.

Mr. STAUFFER (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and to include an article appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. PATTERSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BOGGS and include extraneous material.

Mr. COLMER and include an editorial.

Mr. POAGE and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in two separate instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE in four separate instances in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. DOWDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD to revise and extend his remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. KEOGH and to include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial appearing in The Commonweal.

Mr. DELANEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an address.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an editorial.

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. RODINO and to include an article.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, February 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

427. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the requirements of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

428. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Disposal of Navy Excess Property in Foreign Areas for the Calendar Year 1952, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

429. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Twenty-first Quarterly Report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

430. A letter from the Administrator of Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

431. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning the progress made in the improvement of Federal-aid highways and other information for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 10 of the act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2510. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2511. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2512. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2513. A bill to provide income tax relief for parents of minor children under age of 18; to reduce the percentage depletion deductions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2514. A bill to provide for payment of death gratuity to beneficiaries of certain members of the United States Naval Reserve and United States Marine Corps Reserve who suffer death from disease contracted while on active naval or military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2515. A bill providing that in the interpretation of any treaty made between the United States and any other independent state, the Supreme Court of the United States shall be the sole judge hereof, notwithstanding the provision of any treaty now existing or hereafter to be made, to the contrary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2516. A bill providing that no treaty now existing or hereafter to be created shall contain any provision abridging the sovereign power of the United States, nor of any State thereof, nor shall any treaty amend or abridge any law of the United States or of any State thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2517. A bill limiting the power of the Security Council of the United Nations or any other agency created by treaty to call for troops of the United States to serve in foreign countries, without the consent of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2518. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2519. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2520. A bill to provide for a physical assay and inventory of all gold owned by the United States, and to provide that the results of such assay and inventory shall be reported to the Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2521. A bill to permit members of the Armed Forces to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2522. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the annuities of certain retired employees who served in Alaska and on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2523. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France by President Jefferson in 1803; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2524. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2525. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2526. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the basis of certification of certificates of necessity and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2528. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2529. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2530. A bill to extend the period within which courses of instruction may be initiated pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by certain veterans unable to avail themselves of such educational benefits because of illness or physical disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2531. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2532. A bill to provide for an additional United States Military Academy to be located in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2533. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2534. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2535. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2536. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2537. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2538. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1950, to provide an equitable readjustment of benefits for certain annuitants and survivors of annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2539. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2540. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klickitat unit of the Wapato project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2541. A bill authorizing flood-control works on the Yakima River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2542. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2543. A bill to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of dependents, while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2544. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 2545. A bill to diminish the harmful effects of labor disputes upon the general public and the national defense by encouraging collective bargaining between employers and their own employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 2546. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to make husbands eligible for survivor benefits under sections 5 and 6, regardless of status or dependency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2547. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2548. A bill to provide that equipment for use in the third- and fourth-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2549. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2550. A bill to provide that the Postmaster General shall furnish flat-top stools for post-office clerks who perform the duty of distributing mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2551. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to officers and employees of the Public Health Service assigned to duty requiring contact with persons afflicted with leprosy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2552. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2553. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for employees engaged in law-enforcement work who, because of disability or other reasons, are unable to complete 20 years of service in such work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2554. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2555. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2556. A bill to amend section 3185 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2557. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2558. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2559. A bill to amend sections 371, 372, and 373 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the resignation and retirement of judges and the appointment of additional judges when permanently disabled judges fail to retire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2560. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the provisions of the act of October 31, 1942, as extended, relating to the adjustment of royalties, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2561. To further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment or personal property occurring incident to their service" by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2562. A bill to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2563. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2151, 2153, 2154, and 2388 as extended to continue in effect the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2564. A bill to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2565. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2566. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2568. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2569. A bill to reclassify supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into step rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services and to adjust inequities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2570. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2571. A bill to regulate subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2572. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon, acquired for military purposes, or for housing projects, national parks, or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2573. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of emergency hospital care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2574. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to certain widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2575. A bill to increase the monthly rates of disability compensation payable to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2576. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2577. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2578. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer certain counties from the eastern district of Michigan to the western district of Michigan, to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the judicial districts of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2579. A bill to authorize the furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2580. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2581. A bill to provide that each personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) for any taxable year shall be increased above $600 in the same ratio as the Consumers' Price Index for such year is above the index for the period 1935 through 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2582. A bill to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled, "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 2583. A bill to amend section 1020c, title 12, Banks and Banking, United States Code, and to provide for payment by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2584. A bill to clarify the copyright laws with respect to the renewal of copyrights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2585. A bill to reclassify supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into step rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services, and to adjust inequities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 2586. A bill to exempt the field service of the Post Office Department from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2587. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 18, 1953, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on Retirement of the National Debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Science; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to provide for the creation of a joint committee to study and investigate all matters pertaining to the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 131. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation to incorporate Franco-American War

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Veterans, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States, and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to take action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed, and other pertinent matters in relation thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2588. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mascitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francis McDowall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2590. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kocsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2592. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Grace Cheng and Philip Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Rath Rahneberg and Erich Rahneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of Jalal Rashtian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Colleen Gloria Chen See; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Jasper Gladstone Chen See; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Hollweg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Francesco Masciotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Elzbieta Grzymkowska Jarosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Lauri Allan Torni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gianna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Dalmazio De Dominicis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Clifford Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2608. A bill for the relief of Erna Zenau and her minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Fleischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2610. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of Commander Buell F. Brandt, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 2611. A bill for the relief of Gerrit Been; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2612. A bill for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 2613. A bill for the relief of Charles Melvin Weisbeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2614. A bill for the relief of James Harry Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 2615. A bill for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2616. A bill for the relief of Generosa Bonet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2617. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2619. A bill for the relief of Sister Aurelia Yanguas Teres and Sister Matilde Cuevas San Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Zamorano-Estape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Maria Rozas Espineira de Colchero Arrubarrena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Ungaro Dell'Oglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2626. A bill for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Lucy Boyack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Yuichi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2629. A bill for the relief of Emanuel and Maria Puleio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2631. A bill for the relief of Marie Jeanne Lapierre O'Donnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 2632. A bill for the relief of George Huppert and Marta Huppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2633. A bill for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Douds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2635. A bill for the relief of Olga Abitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2636. A bill for the relief of George Japhet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Albert Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2638. A bill for the relief of Henry Sauber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of George Lahood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2640. A bill for the relief of Wadih Bakhos Boula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2641. A bill for the relief of Theresia Hotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Morgan M. Whiters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2643. A bill for the relief of William E. Ackerknecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Parrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2645. A bill for the relief of Donald James Darmody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2647. A bill for the relief of Angelita Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2648. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2649. A bill for the relief of Orham Ali Erensel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2650. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Ettl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2651. A bill for the relief of Elie Joseph Hakim and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2653. A bill for the relief of Michael Clive Ossorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2654. A bill for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antonietta Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scariato, Iolanda Gaglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Francescaina Conterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2655. A bill for the relief of Constantinos G. Samonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2656. A bill for the relief of Markos M. Perivolaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2657. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eirini Basili Pagonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2658. A bill for the relief of Aigie Yuasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2659. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Kikta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Josef Aszer Grosman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2662. A bill for the relief of Isaac Brecher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2663. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Haidostian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2664. A bill for the relief of Sonia Sookhdeo Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lampaces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2668. A bill for the relief of Anastasios John Kouvaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Gualtiero Galdinazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2670. A bill for the relief of Pietro Di Filippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 2671. A bill for the relief of Jozef Podlacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2672. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Janus Plucinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 2673. A bill for the relief of John N. Wilson and Hamilton M. Webb; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Keuk Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2675. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alkos Giagtzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (by request):

H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Valentin Finkler Romanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2677. A bill for the relief of Mary Sing-Gieu Carleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

37. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, New Jersey State Department, West New York, N. J., calling for immediate appropriation of adequate funds to continue the hospital and medical programs of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

38. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Petition of Dr. R. J. Brennan and 120 other farmers of Livingston County, Mo., asking Congress to amend the present FHA title I program or enact new legislation similar to FHA title I so that they can obtain insured loans for financing of soil fertility and conservation on their farms; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, before the white splendor of whose purity every vileness shrinks away: Lift us, we beseech Thee, above the immediate and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities; strengthen our inner resources that we may go forth against unnumbered foes with the whole armor of faith and righteousness, pledging our loyalty to Thy kingdom of love, never letting our confidence in it, nor our devotion to it, fail because of the fury of the wicked when they boast themselves in the day of their pride. As Thy servants and the people's, in this temple of democracy, save us from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. In this day of destiny for us and for the world, make us worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 2, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration), with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. WILEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of certain claims relating to correction of military records, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AVERAGE MONTHLY FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the average monthly flight pay paid to certain officers of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL, NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess property disposal by the Navy Department, for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-first quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT RELATING TO ILLEGAL EXPENDITURES BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report with reference to illegal expenditures made by the Department of the Navy in connection with the suit brought by the United States against Fallbrook Public Utility District, and others, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

FACTORY INSPECTIONS UNDER FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to the shortage of hospital beds for California veterans

"Whereas there is an alarming shortage of hospital beds available in California for California veterans provided by the Veterans' Administration, and the number has been decreased by 2,000 beds since June 1950; and

"Whereas there are approximately 4,600 veterans in California State mental institu-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tions of which approximately 1,500 have service-connected disabilities entitling them to hospitalization and care by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas in October of 1946 the Federal Government approved the building of a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital in San Francisco, which hospital has never been built due to the failure of the Federal Government to appropriate funds to build this hospital; and

"Whereas a 200-bed general, medical, and surgical hospital in San Diego was approved but has never been built due to the failure of the Federal Government to appropriate the necessary funds therefor; and

"Whereas the standard of medical care for California veterans in the existing hospitals has been adversely affected by reductions in the budget of the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas it is a well known fact that hundreds of thousands of veterans have been migrating to the State of California from every State of the Union since the close of World War I and the veteran population of California will continue to increase by reason of the Korean emergency, and for that reason applications by veterans for hospitalization have shown a steady increase; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has not only caused a cutback in the number of operating beds, but it has also reduced the standard of medical care, the amount of out-patient treatment for veterans, the amount of medical research, and a shortage in the medical supplies in these veterans' hospitals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to appropriate moneys necessary to bring the Veterans' Administration hospital program to the needed standards to meet the needs of the veteran population of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Whereas the working man and woman of America, is being burdened by high taxation, and that to alleviate some of this burden, the Congress of the United States should enact remedial legislation; and

"Whereas the expenses incurred by workers, are not now exempt or deductible as expenses from income taxes; and

"Whereas expenses incurred by parents for the care of minor children, while said parents are employed, are not deductible from income taxes; and

"Whereas coal miners now receiving pensions from the welfare fund of the United Mine Workers of America are taxed on moneys received as pensions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such remedial legislation as may be necessary to permit the deduction from income taxes of expenses incurred for travel to and from work, expenses incurred by working mothers and fathers for the care and maintenance of minor children, and to exempt from income taxes remuneration received by coal miners in the form of miner's pension; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be furnished to each of our Members in the Congress of the United States and to the appropriate officer in each House of Congress.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. TRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there was held, on November 4, 1952, a national election for the purpose of electing officers to various national and State offices; and

"Whereas, as the outcome of said national election, a new administration in the National Government of the United States is assuming office under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, thirty-third President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Washington does hereby extend to the new national administration, under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, its felicitations, and its most earnest and sincere best wishes that, with God's guidance, it may meet, with wisdom and foresight, the momentous matters which are now, and will in the ensuing years, be placed before it for consideration; be it hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and of the House, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation.

"Passed the house January 19, 1953.
"R. MORT FRAYN,
"Speaker of the House.
"Passed the senate January 19, 1953.
"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit, No. 52, Jacksonville, Fla., favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend plan for old-age assistance for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A statement in the nature of a memorial, adopted by the council of the American Physical Society, at St. Louis, Mo., relating to visa and passport restrictions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring an investigation by the Congress of the continued curtailment of hospital beds and other medical-care programs for veterans within the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PASS LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS, INC.

"Whereas Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., whose membership and officers consist solely of honorably discharged American war veterans who have rendered service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Air Force, is desirous of being officially recognized as a veterans' organization by the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas such incorporation would benefit a large number of Massachusetts citizens who are already included in the membership of this patriotic society: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation to incorporate Franco-American War Veterans, Inc.; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States.

'In senate, adopted, January 15, 1953.
"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, January 21, 1953.
"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PASS A FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation creating a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act with enforcement provisions adequate to insure compliance by employers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted January 15, 1953.
"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, January 22, 1953.
"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Legislative Resolution 4

"Whereas vesicular exanthema, hog cholera, trichinosis, and other diseases of swine are, or may be, transmitted by the feeding of raw garbage; and

"Whereas these diseases cause heavy losses to the swine industry of the Nation; and

"Whereas Nebraska and some of her sister States have enacted laws designed to prevent the spread of these diseases by prohibiting the feeding of raw garbage, but other States have not done so; and

"Whereas a part of the problem is interstate in character, hence not amenable to effective control by the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska legislature in sixty-fifth session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation forbidding the shipment of raw garbage across State lines for feeding purposes.

"2. That the Congress of the United States be further urged to enact legislation forbidding the shipment of swine across State lines if such swine have been fed on raw garbage.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States."

ELIMINATION OF FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES OF JOHN DAY DAM—RESOLUTION OF IRRIGON GRANGE, IRRIGON, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Irrigon Grange, at Irrigon, Oreg., favoring the elimination of flood control features of the John Day Dam.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO ELIMINATE FLOOD-CONTROL FEATURES OF JOHN DAY DAM

Whereas in May 1950 the Congress of the United States passed a law providing for a 40-foot flood-control feature to be constructed above the 255-foot pool of the authorized John Day Dam; and

Whereas such a flood control dam would drown out Arlington, Boardman, Irrigon, and the north part of Umatilla in Oregon, and Roosevelt, Patterson, and Plymouth in Washington, and other valuable acreage on both sides of the Columbia River; and

Whereas the said flood control dam will eliminate the construction of the much needed industrial plants on the 255-foot level of the John Day Dam pool, as it is impossible to build industrial plants where the water level would have a 40-foot variation; and

Whereas the proper location for all flood control dams are in the upper reaches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers where the Army engineers 308 plan had them all located originally; and

Whereas the flood-control dams in the upper reaches of the rivers would firm up the power of 8 or 10 big dams below them instead of only 2 like the 2 aided by the John Day Dam; and

Whereas the 61,500 acres proposed to be flooded by the proposed John Day flood-control dam would destroy the earliest crops of fruit and vegetables in the Columbia Basin area, said damage being far in excess of any possible protection that might be rendered to the lower sections of the Columbia River in case of an occasional flood; and

Whereas the flooding of this area will cause enormous sand blows worse than those of 1894, which took years to get rid of after that flood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Irrigon Grange asks Congress through our congressional delegation to have the Army engineers review the proposed John Day Dam with the idea of eliminating the flood control feature of said dam.

M. A. BIRPIK,
Master.
BESSIE HOBBS,
Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NORTH PACIFIC GRAIN GROWERS, INC., PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., at a meeting on January 16 and 17, at Portland, Oreg., in which they recommend the renewal of the principles of the present International Wheat Agreement.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of directors of North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., at a meeting held in Portland on January 16 and 17, unanimously adopted a resolution strongly recommending the renewal of the principles of the present International Wheat Agreement.

Farmers of the Pacific Northwest are greatly concerned with the marketing problems confronting the Nation, and especially the Pacific Northwest, and are anxious to assist in formulating a sound agricultural program that will be most helpful to not only the farmers, but to the national economy. Our board, represents 12,000 grain growers in the three Pacific Northwest States.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE, PENDLETON, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Oregon Wheat Growers League, at its twenty-fifth annual meeting on December 6, 1952, at Pendleton, Oreg., relating to the renewal of the International Wheat Agreement, the development of a long range farm program for wheat, and freight rates on wheat.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT MEETING OF THE WHEAT DISPOSAL AND TRANSPORTATION AND FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS COMMITTEES

The Oregon Wheat Growers League endorses an active program for the export of wheat and wheat products from the United States. For the promotion of exports, we recommend that—

(a) Recognizing the importance of the International Wheat Agreement in furthering friendly international relations; and recognizing the urgent need to maintain every possible outlet for wheat, the Oregon Wheat Growers League strongly urges the continuation and renewal of the International Wheat Agreement with all terms as favorable to the United States as is possible to secure;

(b) If the International Wheat Agreement is not renewed, an alternative program be developed to facilitate the export of wheat and wheat products in competition with other exporting countries; and

(c) Immediate steps be taken, either inside or outside of IWA to enable the exports of wheat and flour from the United States to rice-deficient areas of the Far East.

2. The Oregon Wheat Growers League recognizes the necessity of building a sound long-range farm program and shall diligently seek the cooperation of all farm groups and organizations in so doing. The Oregon Wheat Growers League believes the proper function of a Federal farm program is to avert disaster rather than to guarantee farmers a profit at the expense of our national economy. Farmers desire to pay their own way. In line with this policy we shall work for the following principles in a long-range farm program:

(a) Least possible cost to the Government.

(b) Least possible Government control on how you operate your farm.

(c) Parity only on wheat used for food in the United States.

(d) Floor under wheat prices in cases of emergencies.

(e) Maintain the productivity of the soil for future generations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE, DECEMBER 6, 1952

Whereas the matter of reasonable transportation rates are of paramount importance to producers of wheat located in Oregon as well as in other States of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the markets, other than local, for wheat and flour produced in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest are in the export trade, California and in States east of the Rocky Mountains, particularly the territory east of the Mississippi River where the heavy centers of population are located; and

Whereas there have been numerous percentage freight-rate increases authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the past 6 years, such increases being added to the existing grain rates thereby discriminating against the long haul shipper, as such increases disturb preexisting market relationships; and

Whereas it is estimated that there will be a large carry-over of wheat on July 1, 1953, amounting to over 550,000,000 bushels or more than double the 254,000,000 bushels for the crop year ending July 1, 1952; that it appears that exports of Pacific Northwest wheat will be reduced thereby producing large surpluses which cannot be disposed of in former domestic markets account of adverse freight rates restricting the movement to local and nearby points; and

Whereas this section is a producer of surplus agricultural products and the restriction of the market where such products may be sold or disposed of may well affect the economy of the entire area; and

Whereas efforts to secure a modification in the freight rates upon wheat and wheat products have been unavailing; and

Whereas the matter of equitable freight rates upon products of agriculture is of vital concern to the welfare of the people of the Pacific Northwest, and the cooperation of State agencies in obtaining freight-rate adjustments that will permit the free movement of agricultural products to deficit consuming markets is desirable and necessary in such an undertaking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Wheat Growers League in meeting in Portland, Oreg., does hereby direct to the attention of the executive heads and the public service commissions of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho the serious nature of this problem and urge their cooperation and assistance in its solution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the governors, United States Senators and Representatives and to the public service commissions of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 10. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 31); and

S. 24. A bill to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged; with amendments (Rept. No. 32).

By Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 34).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 756. A bill for the relief of James Piedrafite; and

S. 757. A bill for the relief of Frank Bastinelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 758. A bill for the relief of Andrew Friedmann and Vera Friedmann, nee Gorog; and

S. 759. A bill for the relief of Chenoch Lieberman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 760. A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 761. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; and

S. 762. A bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis, the psychoses, and multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 763. A bill to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 764. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for expansion of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 766. A bill to amend the existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, to provide additional punishment for violations of such laws, and to permit the United States, as well as private persons, to commence treble-damage actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Monson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 768. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of trucks and trailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 769. A bill for the relief of Maria E. Laedel; and

S. 770. A bill for the relief of H. O. Schundler and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 771. A bill for the relief of Anni Wolf and her minor son; and

S. 772. A bill for the relief of Dimitri N. Berkoff (Berkov), his wife, Lydie M. Berkoff, and his sons, Michael Berkoff and Nicholas D. Berkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 773. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 774. A bill for the relief of Eugene Kahan, Gizella Kahan, and Kathleen Judith Kahan; and

S. 775. A bill for the relief of certain Greek aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 776. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 777. A bill to require that merchant seamen be able to understand orders given in the English language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. 778. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Goirrigaicarri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 779. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 780. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to construct and operate the De Luz Dam and Reservoir on Santa Margarita River, Calif., to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic uses from said reservoir, and to provide for the joint utilization of the reservoir and other waterworks facilities by the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 781. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 782. A bill to grant an exemption from the admissions tax to certain national folk festivals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 783. A bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 784. A bill to prohibit the blending of wheat imported as unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 785. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians asserted in Court of Claims case No. 47568 and to provide for the administration of the lands and moneys paid or to be paid Indians in settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 786. A bill for the relief of John N. Wilson and Hamilton M. Webb; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 787. A bill to provide for the extension of terms of patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 788. A bill establishing a general policy and procedures with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to authorize the erection of a memorial to Sara Louisa Rittenhouse in Montrose Park, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROTECTION OF SURFACE VALUES OF LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forest and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the bill and a statement I have prepared explaining the bill and a letter addressed to me dated January 19, 1953, signed by Hugh B. Woodward, president, New Mexico Game Protective Association, expressing the feeling of that association with regard to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 783) to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter mining locations made under the mining laws of the United States upon lands within the national forests shall confer on the locator the right to occupy and use so much of the surface of the land covered by the location as may be reasonably necessary to carry on prospecting and mining, including the taking of mineral deposits, and no permit shall be required or charge made for such use or occupancy: *Provided*, That any person entering said lands shall not acquire title, possessory or otherwise, to the timber, now or hereafter growing thereon, which timber may be managed and disposed of by the United States as is or may be provided by law, except that such person shall have the right to use so much of the timber thereon as may be necessary in the development and operation of his mine until such time as such timber is disposed of by the United States, but timber cutting by the locator shall be conducted in accordance with sound principles of forest management as defined by the national forest rules and regulations except where clearing is necessary in connection with mining operations or to provide space for buildings or structures used in connection with mining operations: *Provided further*, That no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except under the national forest rules and regulations, nor shall the locator prevent or obstruct other occupancy or use of the surface under authority of national forest regulations, or permits issued thereunder, if such occupancy or use is not in conflict with mineral development: *And provided further*, That placer mining operations shall be conducted under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of

Agriculture may adopt for the minimizing of soil erosion, pollution of the water resources, and damage to watersheds, and for restoration of the surface.

SEC. 2. All patents issued under the mining laws of the United States on locations hereafter made on lands within the national forests shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, subject to the provisions of section 1 of this act relative to timber cutting and other occupancy of the surface resources and to the conduct of placer mining operations, and each patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be made by the holder of such claim.

SEC. 3. Valid mining claims existing on the date of this act and thereafter maintained in compliance with the law under which they were initiated may be perfected under the law under which they were initiated: *Provided*, That all such claims must be recorded in the United States district land office of the land district in which the claim is situated within 3 years from the date of this act, such recording to describe the claim in sufficient detail to locate it definitely with respect to legal survey corners, or, in unsurveyed areas with recognizable landmarks, and failure to record the claim within this period shall constitute abandonment of the claim: *Provided further*, That if patent shall not have been applied for within 5 years from the date hereof the location shall become null and void unless the claim is relocated under the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That development work done on claims located prior to the enactment of this act, if relocated, shall be applicable to patents issued under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That not more than 2 years shall be allowed after application for patent for the correction of defects in the submission of proof.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein or in the mining laws of the United States shall interfere with or abrogate the right of the United States to use the surface of any location made or patented under this act for national forest purposes, including the harvesting of timber, so long as such occupancy or use does not unreasonably interfere with the claimant in the development of the claim or in the extraction or removal of the mineral deposits.

SEC. 5. No mining locations hereafter made on lands within the national forests shall be valid until filed for record in the United States district land office of the land district in which the claim is situated. The recording must describe the claim in sufficient detail to locate it definitely with respect to legal survey corners or, in unsurveyed areas, with recognizable landmarks.

SEC. 6. A mining claim on the national forests may be determined to be invalid for failure to comply with the provisions of this act or other laws applicable thereto, including but not limited to a showing that (1) the deposits discovered are insufficient to justify further development of a claim as a mining property or (2) that assessment requirements have not been met.

SEC. 7. A claim on the national forests shall automatically become invalid if no application for patent is made within 10 years after establishment of the claim. After application for patent has been made, not more than 2 years shall be allowed for correction of defect in the submission of proof.

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

The principal purpose of this bill is to permit the United States to retain title to the surface of mining claims within the national forests with the right to use and manage the surface and the right to dispose of the timber insofar as such would not interfere with the rights granted to the mining claimant or the patentee.

The United States mining laws under which mining claims are located and entered are administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management work in close cooperation in examining mining claims within the national forest. In accordance with regulations relating to claims procedure, the Bureau of Land Management refers all patent applications for claims on the national forest to the Forest Service for recommendations.

The mining examiners of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service frequently collaborate in examining mining claims to determine whether the claims are in accordance with law. The mining laws do not require the locator of the claim to file notice of his location with the Bureau of Land Management and for that reason it is not possible to obtain the exact figures on the number of locations made or the status of all of them.

I have had the Forest Service prepare a summary of mining claims on national forests in the Western States. The following table gives this information:

Estimated number of unpatented mining claims on the national forests (as of Jan. 1, 1952)

State	Number of claims	Acres	Estimated percentage which are producing minerals in commercial quantities	Estimated percentage considered valid under the mining laws	Timber on claims	
					Volume, thousand feet board measure	1951 value
Arizona	5,000	95,400	9.0	22	70,000	$700,000
California	19,640	582,700	.8	30	3,400,000	50,177,000
Colorado	9,450	256,000	1.0	37	80,000	308,000
Idaho	15,840	355,100	4.3	42	1,170,000	8,425,000
Montana	6,860	132,000	1.7	46	85,000	440,000
Nevada	2,640	50,700	2.0	60		
New Mexico	2,350	81,700	3.0	24	225,000	2,000,000
Oregon	7,780	267,300	1.8	55	2,301,000	36,307,000
South Dakota	2,000	52,500	4.5	30	81,000	542,000
Utah	7,810	185,300	2.0	50	7,000	40,000
Washington	2,020	71,700	2.2	52	751,000	4,111,000
Wyoming	800	32,000	.6	55	36,000	417,000
Total	84,030	2,163,000	2.0	40	8,266,000	103,527,000

It is interesting to note that only about 2 percent of the mining claims are currently producing minerals in commercial quantities. In view of this, consideration should be given to the question of whether or not actual production of minerals in commercial quantities ought to be a requirement for a patent rather than a mere discovery of mineral which shows promise. I believe that this situation is taken care of by this bill.

The situation with regard to timber on mining claims is also of interest. It is estimated that the average claim has over $600 worth of merchantable timber. According to the Forest Service it is easy to locate claims in the Douglas Fir Region of Washington or the Sugar Pine Forest of California with $20,000 to $30,000 worth of merchantable timber on a claim. Such claims with a valid mineral discovery can be patented provided the claimant does $500 worth of development work and pays about $500 for survey and the sum of $105 to the United States. It is easy to see, therefore, that by paying about $1,100, a person might obtain $20,000 to $30,000 worth of timber on a mining claim. This is a real temptation for unscrupulous persons attempting to get title to Government land and timber under the guise of the mining law.

I am informed that not long ago a large number of pumice claims totaling something like 60,000 acres were located in the heavy Douglas Fir stands of timber in Washington and Oregon and that these locations will seriously impede timber sale operations. In my own State of New Mexico on the Santa Fe National Forest we have been experiencing some difficulty with rather large pumice operations in the Santa Fe National Forest. In these operations the trees are all cut and the surface cleared and a type of strip mining is carried on leaving the land subject to erosion and subjecting the streams to pollution and the carrying of large amounts of silt into reservoirs below. Under the present mining laws there is not much the Forest Service can do about this type of operation.

The locator of a valid mining claim has surface rights to the claim and a possessory interest in the timber. The United States cannot sell the timber on a valid claim except by obtaining a waiver from the claimant. Mining claims often interfere with the orderly harvesting of mature timber. It is frequently necessary to leave sizable blocks of unmature timber uncut. The Forest Service also advises me that it has difficulty in locating timber access roads around mining claims and must spend a great deal of time in investigating location monuments and old corners to be sure of where active claims are located.

Mining claims also interfere with recreation to some extent. Many presumably invalid claims have been located along important scenic highways on which the United States has spent millions of dollars so that vacationists and local residents could enjoy driving through the National forest to enjoy the scenic beauty and to camp and picnic in the forest. A few invalid claims can ruin the whole recreation program along important parts of a highway or a stream.

These are only some of the possible abuses of the mining laws and interference with the management of the National forest. There is another side which needs consideration.

A commercially successful mine may or may not represent the highest use of a particular tract of forest land. In any event the other public values should be protected. There should be some provisions which could permit the consideration of relative values in arriving at a decision as to whether a given tract should be devoted to mining or to production of timber or some other purpose. The only solution to this problem would be to modify the mining laws so that a mining claimant would get title only to the minerals and the right to the use of the surface for mining purposes.

That is what I hope this bill will accomplish. The Congress has already passed several acts applicable to small areas of National forest land on which mining claimants are limited to mineral development. Two examples are the act of June 11, 1946, affecting the Catalina recreation area on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona, and a bill which I sponsored and which was passed June 10, 1949, becoming Public Law 94 of the Eighty-first Congress affecting the Aspen Basin in the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The bill which has been introduced today, would if passed, do much to discontinue location of fraudulent mining claims. There would be no incentive to locate lands except for the mineral values. I believe this legislation would save the United States much expense in investigating invalid mining claims and would prevent a great deal of damage to resources and interference with orderly management of national forest lands. Moreover this legislation should benefit the legitimate miner and stimulate mining development by preventing the promiscuous filing of claims for other purposes which often impede the honest prospector and miner as well as the Forest Service. This legislation would not interfere with prospecting for minerals or the development of minerals, and the legitimate miner would have all the rights reasonably necessary to develop mineral resources in the national forest.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

NEW MEXICO GAME
PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., January 19, 1953.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senator From New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLINT: Thank you so much for sending me a copy of the act you are planning to introduce with reference to mining claims on the national forests. I have looked it over carefully and, to use a T. R. expression, I think it is "Bully."

By reason of my past experience I have considerable knowledge concerning some of these problems. When I was district attorney of the Eighth District, which embodied Taos County, for a period of 4 years I had many contacts with the United States Forest Service and their problems, particularly where they had occasion to resort to State laws in the matter of protecting United States forest lands.

From 1929 to 1933, when I was United States attorney, I had many, many problems of the Forest Service come to my office, and to my desk.

In both official positions I gave special attention to all Forest Service matters because of my personal interest in the United States forest program. As a kid in Penn State when education in forestry was just beginning, I took 2 years of college work in forestry—in fact, at that time I seriously considered majoring in forestry and following that as a life work. Since then I have a background which has always challenged my interest in Forest Service problems.

In the United States attorney's office I became acutely aware of the practice of filing on United States forest lands under some of the old mineral acts and securing a patent to desirable lands under color of mineral claims when as a matter of fact the locator never dreamed of actually attempting to develop any bona fide mining operations.

I vividly recall one case. You probably remember Mr. Stromquist, who was a plumber, and his wife, Anna Stromquist, who was the "burning bush" in the WCTU for many years. They filed a stone claim on lands within the Cibola Forest adjacent to the State Highway 66 on the north side, just west of the juncture of the State road that leads to Forest Park and the ski run. The land, as I recall, had living water on it, and had potential value for summer home sites. I was consulted in an official capacity, as it was entirely apparent that there was no commercial quarry or potential quarry on the land. We resisted the claim on that ground, but lost out and the patents were issued to the Stromquists. They built a beautiful summer home overlooking the valley on the land. To this good day not a pound of stone has ever been removed from the entire area for commercial purposes.

We had other mineral claims filed on other Forest Service lands where there were traces of minerals sufficient to make a colorable claim, and which, despite resistance to the claims, were patented and have been utilized for summer home sites and recreation purposes, the mineral values being utterly insufficient to ever justify development.

You are, of course, familiar with the many thousands of acres which have been located as pumice claims upon the Santa Fe National Forest and of the utter destruction of timber and surface values in exploration and development. Not 5 percent of these pumice claims will ever be commercially utilized within any foreseeable future.

In making a trip to Lake Mead last spring my attention was called to the filing of mineral claims covering United States Forest lands at the place where the Arizona State highway to the Grand Canyon leaves 66. These claims were so spotted as to control the area adjacent to this intersection, which has great value for the development of service stations, cabins, and other commercial development.

I know that it is the policy of the United States Forest Service to exchange such lands for other lands where the commercial value is greatly in excess of values of timber and other forest values. However, it seems to me a crime that under a specious mineral claim a locator with no thought of ever commercially developing the located area for mineral purposes can, under such color of claim, proceed to patent. In my judgment the statute which you have proposed is very necessary to abate this unfortunate and unfair practice. Such a statute will work no undue hardship upon bona fide mining interests and will certainly serve to eliminate the acquisition of valuable tracts of forest lands under color of claims located under the mining laws.

You are performing a valuable service in directing the attention of the Congress of the United States to this situation. Your action in so doing will, I know, receive the commendation of everyone who becomes familiar with the unfair practices which the statute is designed to eliminate.

I hope that your office will have the AP correspondent in Washington give a news release which can be carried in all of the western papers where many people who are aware of the unfortunate situation can learn of your efforts in trying to correct it.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. WOODWARD,
President, New Mexico Game Protective Association.

PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to State and local governments on Federal real estate now exempt from local property taxes. This proposal was originally submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and is similar to legislation which I introduced last year.

The bill would authorize five types of payments to State and local governments:

First. Regular ad valorem taxes on properties owned by the Federal Government but leased to private users or sold to them under conditional sales contracts.

Second. Annual payments determined by each Federal property-owning agency on the basis of an application from the affected State or local government and in conformity with Government-wide standards and procedure for properties in each class. This would be the most common type of payment under the bill.

Third. Transition payments on a declining basis over a 10-year period.

Fourth. Special payments in unusual situations where a taxing jurisdiction can demonstrate that Federal activities are imposing a local hardship for which no other aid is available from the Federal Government.

Fifth. Special assessment for local improvements, substantially the same as for private property.

The bill would repeal more than 20 statutory provisions authorizing special types of payments and would substitute general provisions applying to specified properties of all Federal agencies. Rules and regulations to guide the property-owning agencies would be issued by a commission consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill would not apply within the District of Columbia and the island possessions, which usually have been the subject of special arrangements adapted to their special relationships to the Federal Government. Likewise, the bill does not cover public-domain lands which have never been on the tax rolls; most of these lands are subject to present revenue-sharing arrangements which would not be disturbed by the new bill.

My own experience as mayor of Minneapolis and as chairman during the Eighty-first Congress of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has persuaded me that this problem is vital and should be acted upon as soon as possible. Local governments have lost a great deal of tax revenue as a result of Federal Government defense activities since 1939. In addition, because of the Federal activities, many communities have had to build schools, hospitals, houses, and otherwise provide for the influx of new population.

I am presenting this bill in the hope that it will provide a basis for further hearings and intelligent action so as to solve the problems today facing local and State governments. The adoption of a reasonable solution will spread Government costs more equitably and will, in my judgment, strengthen our Federal-State system of government. The integrity and independence of the local government is at stake.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 13, addressed to me by former Bureau of the Budget Director Lawton, and a letter addressed to Senator MCCLELLAN from Director Lawton dated November 14, 1951, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 788) establishing a general policy and procedures with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and

referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letters presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In accordance with the request in your letter of August 14, 1952, staff of this Bureau has conferred from time to time with Mr. H. C. Loeffler of the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations regarding the status of S. 2268, a bill drafted and submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget, which you introduced in the Eighty-second Congress. This is the bill to establish a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real estate and certain other property.

The Bureau of the Budget made a report to the committee on this bill on November 14, 1951. I enclose a copy of that report. Recently Mr. Loeffler asked that we give you the comments of this Bureau on the views which various agencies of the executive branch have expressed in reports to the committee on the bill, most of them submitted since our earlier letter was written. This letter is in response to that request.

The bill which became S. 2268 was drafted by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with an agreement reached at a conference on intergovernmental fiscal relations conducted in April 1949, by officials representing the Federal, State, and local governments. In the preparation of the draft bill, the Bureau consulted with the interested Federal departments and agencies and, to a lesser extent, with representatives of the major organizations of State and local government officials who attended the 1949 conference. The objectives of the bill were in accord with the program of the President and were broadly endorsed by most of the executive-branch agencies submitting comments to your committee. However, as I explained in submitting the bill, there has been considerable diversity of opinion about the detailed provisions, so that the specific provisions are those which Bureau staff concluded would be generally practical, equitable, and most likely to be acceptable to the various groups concerned.

The following comments are based on copies of reports submitted to the Senate committee during 1952 by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and State, the Post Office Department, the Federal Security Agency, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Veterans' Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Atomic Energy Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We have had before us, also, the report submitted by the Treasury Department, January 7, 1953.

The views which have been expressed by agencies of the executive branch fall into two main categories. Several agencies question the handling in S. 2268 of certain major procedural or policy points. Practically every agency makes suggestions for technical corrections or revisions. I should like to comment on each of these categories.

The major procedural or policy points mentioned in the agency letters are as follows:

(a) The Bureau proposed January 1, 1946, as a cut-off date for identifying those acquired Federal properties on which payments may be made, but pointed out that an earlier or later date might be justified, and that the choice of an appropriate date is largely a matter of comparing the cost to the Federal Government with the current burdens which Federal property ownership may create for local taxpayers. Several agencies would prefer a later date; one favor a date before World War II.

(b) The Bureau recommended that the day-to-day administration of the payments be delegated to the property-owning agencies and that they be required to make the payments to State and local governments from appropriations or other funds available to them to finance the Federal programs for which the property is held. Several agencies express a strong preference for central, integrated administration and, especially, for central appropriations for these payments apart from the appropriations for financing the program operations.

(c) The Bureau recommended that "indirect benefits" should not be considered an offset to the administratively determined payments authorized under title I of the bill, although they might properly be taken into account in the special cases coming under title IV. Some agencies contend that the Federal Government should be allowed credit under title I for these "indirect benefits."

(d) Several agencies mention problems related to Federal property ownership that will not be solved or will be only partly remedied by this bill. Among these are the provision of aid for building or operating schools in communities especially affected by the defense effort or other Federal activities, for which existing legislation has made broader provision than S. 2268, though on a temporary basis; and the problem of gradually transferring to the States and local governments responsibility for providing health, welfare, and education services to Indians as to other members of the population.

All these major points were before this Bureau at the time the draft bill was prepared. The reasons for our recommendations are indicated, in most instances, in the explanatory statement which accompanied my letter of August 16, 1951, transmitting the bill to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. As I stated at that time, these and many other issues involved in the bill are controversial and complicated. I believe the proposals in the draft bill provide the most equitable and practical solutions consistent with the general objectives of the legislation, and that the alternative provisions which have been suggested would open up other issues or be less equitable.

As to the suggestions for various technical corrections or revisions, most of them are aimed at more precise specification of properties on which payments may be made, the conditions or procedures for payments, and similar provisions. However, our experience in preparing the original bill demonstrated the extreme interdependence of all the various provisions, so that each change must be carefully examined to avoid inadvertent effects on other provisions. To date, our work on the 1954 Budget has prevented us from making an extensive examination of all the suggested changes. On the basis of our general review, however, we find that a few suggestions are based on misunderstandings, and some are proposals which this Bureau had previously considered and either rejected or modified, often in the light of advice from other affected agencies. In several instances, the criticism appears to be valid but the specific proposal for change needs revision to avoid creating new problems. In summary, it appears that in all probability the bill would be improved by incorporating some of these amendments or modifications of them.

If you decide to revise the bill for introduction in the Eighty-third Congress, we shall be glad to give whatever assistance we can in evaluating the specific revisions that have been suggested in the agencies' letters and in working out necessary revisions of language.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, *Director.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1951.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is in response to your letter of October 20, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 2268, a bill "Establishing a general policy and procedures with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property, and for other purposes."

As you know, S. 2268 is practically identical with a draft of legislation prepared by staff of the Bureau of the Budget in fulfillment of an assignment, accepted at a conference on intergovernmental relations in April 1949, to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations dealing with this long-standing problem. The draft legislation was submitted by me to the President of the Senate on August 16, 1951, with a recommendation that full opportunity be given all interested agencies and groups to present their views, since many controversial issues are involved in this proposal.

The objectives of S. 2268 are in accord with the program of the President. The detailed provisions of the bill are those which Bureau staff concluded, after extended consultations with the interested Federal departments and agencies and some discussion with representatives of State and local government organizations, would be generally practical, equitable, and most likely to be acceptable to the various groups concerned.

In view of the many diverse suggestions which your committee undoubtedly will receive from Federal agencies, State and local governments, and other interested groups, we should like to withhold our detailed comments until there has been an opportunity to evaluate their views and suggestions. Many of the suggestions that will be made were, of course, considered and modified or rejected while the draft of legislation was in preparation. We may, however, wish to recommend some changes in the light of new suggestions or new information, and we may also be able to assist your committee by indicating why we did not incorporate in our draft some of the changes that will again be suggested.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, *Director.*

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution, together with an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), submitted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-third Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of —— (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

"(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

"(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the over-all Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Nearly half of the Senate membership today joined in submitting a concurrent resolution to establish procedures by which Congress could regain control of annual obligations for Federal expenditure.

This approach to the recapture of fiscal control would be accomplished by provisions in the bill under which Congress annually would fix limitations on "obligations for expenditure by Federal agencies from balances they have built up in appropriations previously enacted for them, as well as obligations against new authorizations in current appropriation bills."

The importance of expenditures from balances in old appropriations, over which Congress has been exercising virtually no control, is emphasized by the following facts to be found in the Truman budget document of January 9:

1. He estimated expenditures in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, at $78,600,000,000.

2. He estimated revenue at $68,700,000,000.

3. He estimated the deficit at $9,900,000,000.

4. He estimated that, of the $78,600,000,000 total expenditures, only $41,100,000,000 will be from the $72,900,000,000 he requested in new appropriations to be enacted this year.

5. He estimated that $37,500,000,000 of the total expenditures will be from the $102,300,000,000 in balances of old appropriations and other authorizations, enacted in previous years, which are to be carried over into the new year.

6. He estimated that if his deficit calculations are accurate the Federal debt will be within $1,200,000,000 of the $275,000,000,000 statutory debt limit this time next year.

Under present practices, Congress ordinarily acts only on new appropriations requested, without exercising control over expenditures from balances in old appropriations which are to be carried over.

To attempt to balance the budget by action only on that part of new appropriations for expenditure in the coming year would require excessively heavy reductions on half of the expenditure budget, while that half to be spent from old appropriations would be exempt even from review for reduction.

Sponsors of this concurrent resolution do not claim it is the complete solution to the tail-wagging-the-dog situation created by uncontrolled expenditure from tremendous carry-over balances but, among other reforms in fiscal legislative procedure, it is largely directed at this problem.

Provisions of the concurrent resolution may be divided generally into three parts:

1. They would provide that Congress consider all appropriations in one package, instead of a dozen scattered, unrelated bills as at present, so Members and the public can see the whole picture as the spending side of the budget is enacted.

The so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 merely collected all of the regular appropriations between two covers of the bill, and that was as far as its similarity to this proposal went.

2. They would provide that Congress shall write into the appropriation bill, against all items involved, limitations on annual obligations for expenditure from all appropriations—those previously enacted as well as those currently under consideration.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The importance of provisions in this category may be seen from the fact that as of next June 30 the build-up of unexpended balances in old appropriations and authorizations will exceed $100,000,000,000. While a large part of this total will be called obligated, the validity of some of the so-called obligations should be subject to scrutiny in review.

It should be noted also that it is annual expenditures—not annual appropriations—against annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses; and that it is annual deficits which pile up public debt.

3. They would provide also that committee reports on appropriation bills shall show annual expenditure estimates which could be compared with revenue estimates, and that revised revenue estimates shall be requested from the Treasury from time to time during consideration of the bill, so that the budget may be kept in balance during the process of appropriation bill enactment.

The language of this concurrent resolution is practically identical with that of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 of the past session of Congress, frequently referred to as the single-appropriation bill.

This concurrent resolution originally was drafted in 1947 when it first became evident that, even under peacetime conditions Congress was losing annual control over Federal expenditures.

The concurrent resolution is designed to recapture a measure of that control, through its obligation-limitation features, and at the same time provision would be made for necessary long-term contracts such as those required for heavy and intricate military equipment.

The language of the concurrent resolution has been carefully worked over by fiscal experts and drafting technicians, and it has been approved three times by the Senate Rules Committee; once with a Republican majority, and twice with Democratic majorities. It has been passed once by the Senate as a whole.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 62), and submitted a report (No. 33) thereon; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) (6) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend the standing rule of the Senate relating to cloture. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to explain the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 63), submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is amended to read as follows:

"2. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

(b) Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture, is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the fourteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"During the period intervening between the statement of the motion to bring debate to a close and the taking of the vote thereon, the time for general debate on such motion shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents thereof, and shall be controlled by one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the proponents and one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the opponents. Time available to, but not used by, either such side shall be yielded to the other side.

"If the question so submitted on the motion to bring debate to a close shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my views on the subject of cloture in the United States Senate are well known. I am interested in providing a reasonable and effective method by which the basic right of the Senate to vote and the basic right of the Senate to debate can be protected. I believe the Senate must have effective rules which protect not only the minority's right to full and free debate, but also protect the majority in its right to vote on matters which affect the welfare of our country and the world.

This resolution which we are submitting today provides for cloture after 2 days of debate, if, when the cloture petition is brought to a vote, two-thirds of the Senators vote to end the debate. This type of cloture is intended to be invoked in case of national-emergency legislation. Another section of the rule permits cloture by majority vote but only after 15 days of preliminary debate. Even after cloture is invoked, each Member of the Senate is permitted 1 hour of debate on the pending proposal before a final vote is in order.

Section 3 of the present rule XXII is eliminated, thus ridding the Senate of the present impassable roadblock to future rules changes by permitting cloture to be invoked on motions to change the rules:

During the debate at the opening of the Senate of this Congress, we heard promises from the majority leadership that the entire subject of cloture would be fully considered by the Rules Committee and that during this session we would have an opportunity to vote on an effective cloture measure. It is my hope that hearings can be started in the near future, and we will have this resolution, or a comparable resolution, reported to the Senate early in this session.

EXTENSION OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 597) to amend and extend the Reorganization Act of 1949. The amendment provides for striking out all of section 2.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and myself in support of this amendment. At the meeting of the Committee on Government Operations on January 27, 1953, I reserved the right to offer an amendment to the bill (S. 597) which was ordered reported by the committee. The purpose of my amendment was to restore the provision in the present law under which no fewer than a constitutional majority of either House could upset reorganization plans submitted by the President. The Senators from Minnesota and Washington have joined me in a statement of individual views which we intended to be printed in the committee report on S. 597. I now understand that the committee report may be held up indefinitely and consequently I ask that our statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the New York Times of January 29, 1953.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and will be printed, and, without objection, the statement and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement and editorial are as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATORS HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, AND JACKSON

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Government Operations, find ourselves unable to agree with the views of the committee as expressed in the foregoing report. Although we strongly support section 1, which would extend the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to the Congress for 2 more years, we cannot agree to section 2, which would limit the President's exercise of this authority by amending the existing law so as to enable disapproval of any reorganization plan which he might submit to the Congress, by a simple majority vote of either House of Congress. This amendment would, in our judgment, drastically weaken the President's reorganization power.

Experience has demonstrated, beyond any question, that the reorganization plan device is the best method for achieving efficiency and economy in government. Our Government has grown into a large and unwieldy apparatus which is urgently in need of streamlining, if we are to accomplish our objectives in an efficient and effective manner. It is our desire, therefore, to afford the new Chief Executive an opportunity, free of as much restraint as possible consistent with congressional responsibility, to carry on his responsibilities. The inclusion of section 2 of S. 597, as reported by the committee, would in our opinion have the opposite effect.

An examination of reorganization experience during the past 4 years amply supports our position. President Truman submitted to the Congress, under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949, a total of 41 reorganization plans, of which 11 were rejected and 30 became effective. An examination of the voting record will show that two other plans, No. 9 of 1950, providing for the reorganization of the Federal Power Commission, and No. 1 of 1951, reorganizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, would have also been rejected had the simple majority provision been in effect. It may also be fairly assumed that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, placing officials of the Internal Revenue under the classified civil service, might have also been rejected. In the latter case, although there was a substantial majority against the resolution of disapproval, it is generally accepted that the vote would have been entirely different had the rejecting resolution required only a simple majority of those present and voting.

Under existing law, the President can, until April 1, 1953, submit reorganization plans subject only to disapproval by a constitutional majority of either House. But if S. 597 in the form reported by committee were now enacted into law all reorganization plans would be immediately subject to disapproval by a simple majority vote by either House, thereby making it more difficult for the President to accomplish his reorganization program.

Under section 2 of S. 597 as reported by the committee, conceivably as few as 25 Senators or 110 Congressmen could kill any reorganization plan. Under our amendment, as under existing law, reorganization plans of the President could not be killed by fewer than 49 Senators or 218 Congressmen.

Accordingly, we are offering an amendment to S. 597, which retains the provisions of existing law whereby a resolution of disapproval must be adopted by a majority of the authorized membership of either House, rather than by a simple majority, as proposed in S. 597.

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1953]

SHAM "REORGANIZATION"

In their first important legislative action under the new administration, Republican-dominated committees of both House and Senate have delivered a severe blow to President Eisenhower on one of the key points of the program that helped elect him (and them) to office.

The President had urgently requested extension of the authority Mr. Truman had had to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government. Under existing law, which expires March 31, it requires a constitutional majority (more than half of all the Members) of either branch of Congress to overturn a presidential reorganization plan. But now, under the bill approved on Tuesday by House and Senate committees, reorganization proposals can be killed by simple majority (one more than half a quorum) of either branch.

It will literally be just about twice as easy to wreck any given reorganization plan under the new arrangement as under the old, and the brutal fact is that if the present proposal is enacted it will be almost impossible for any really controversial reorganization plan to become effective. Since some of the most important ones yet to come are also among the most controversial because they step on the toes of special-interest groups, the prospects of further genuine advance in governmental reorganization are not particularly hopeful—unless, of course, the committee recommendations are overturned, as we hope they will be, on the floor of Congress.

Inasmuch as one of the major themes of the Republican campaign was that the GOP would bring greater efficiency into government, it is a reflection on the Republican Party that in the House committee the bill was brought down to its present feeble state by a solid Republican vote. If Senator TAFT is serious about his own bill (ignored by the committee), which would give President Eisenhower as much power as President Truman had in this field, he had better start working on some of his colleagues at both ends of the Capitol at the earliest possible moment. Otherwise the Republicans will have to bear the major responsibility for passing a reorganization bill that to all intents and purposes is a phony, a sham, and a delusion.

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill from the Senate (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration), which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive, and on page 2 to strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert:

Until December 31, 1954, unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President, there shall be in the Department of State an Under Secretary of State for Administration who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall take precedence in the Department of State next after the Secretary and the Under Secretary. The Under Secretary of State for Administration shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, and shall perform such duties and exercise such administrative powers as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration."

Mr. WILEY. The bill passed the Senate on January 29, 1953, and the House amended the bill to include the following language: "and who shall take precedence in the Department of State next after the Secretary and Under Secretary."

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Senate bill 243 provides for the new position of Under Secretary of State for Administration. After consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the bill was unanimously reported to the Senate on January 23. On January 27 the Senate passed the bill adopting the committee amendments.

Aware of the urgency of the matter, the House of Representatives yesterday passed S. 243, with an amendment, by a vote of 341 to 18.

The House version is to all intents and purposes the same as that of the Senate. The House has provided by amendment that the Under Secretary for Administration shall take precedence in the Department of State

next after the Secretary and the Under Secretary of State. This appears to be a wise amendment entirely consistent with the action taken in the Senate.

In recommending Senate consent to the House amendments I should like to make three points.

First, one of the campaign hopes of the new President, and a subject which he mentioned in his state of the Union message on Monday, was to bring greater efficiency to the Government. It is expected that S. 243 will be a long step in this direction. It creates a new Under Secretary who will devote his entire attention to the vast problem of the operation and administration of the Department and the Foreign Service. Senators will recall that it is hoped that the needed reorganization can be accomplished in 18 months to 2 years, and that this position is a temporary one, to be terminated on December 31, 1954, "unless the office shall be abolished sooner by the President."

Second, as the committee reported to the Senate, for many years it has been necessary for the Secretary of State to be out of the city, or even out of the country for a great deal of the time. Indeed, he is away at present. During his absence, the Under Secretary acts in his place, and as a consequence administrative matters have not been given the attention they have needed. The new Under Secretary for Administration is needed now to bring about efficiency in the Department.

Third, the new administration has taken a judicious and speedy initiative in facing the administrative problem in the State Department. I feel that we in the Senate should do our part in assisting the Executive in his vigorous start.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN OF 1949

The bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be given permission to report the bill (H. R. 1979) just laid before the Senate up to midnight tonight, and to submit a report thereon, or on any other bill dealing with a similar subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I shall go along with this unanimous consent request, because all this is is a formality of filing a report by midnight tonight which could not be filed during the session of the Senate this afternoon. If objection were made to this request, the Senate undoubtedly would meet tomorrow. I think that would be an unnecessary inconvenience to the Senate. The main thing is that this bill will be available to us tomorrow for our study when Senators come to their offices; and, therefore, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Ohio. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Subsequently,

On request of Mr. McCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate, for the purpose of holding hearings on the reorganization bill (H. R. 1979).

Subsequently,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 36) thereon.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance has ordered that the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, be reported favorably. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to report the bill and to submit its report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that all committees have until midnight tonight to file reports?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that specific authorization from the Senate is required for each committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, there are now two committees that have such authorization, the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Finance, in behalf of which the Senator from Colorado has just obtained permission to submit a report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Committee on Government Operations has received such permission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Chair.

Subsequently,

Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 35) thereon.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Statement made by him before House Appropriations Committee today with respect to supplemental funds for VA hospitalization in Philadelphia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "National Defense in Our Soil," delivered by Senator MORSE at a banquet of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., on January 21, 1953.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement prepared by him regarding an award made by the National Municipal League to the village of Brookfield, Ill.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. McCARRAN):

Address delivered by Dr. W. R. Stovall, Chief, Medical Division, Office of Aviation Safety, Civil Aeronautics Administration, at luncheon meeting of Institute of Aeronautical Sciences on January 29, 1953, together with introductory statement of Senator McCARRAN.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article entitled "India's Ties to United States Sharply Impaired," published in the New York Times of Sunday, January 25, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "Signposts Are Not Very Clear Along the Great Middle Way," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 3, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Nonsense About Chiang," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and published in the Washington Post of February 4, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "H-Bomb Outlook," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of February 4, 1953.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article on the subject of excessive allowances for armed services personnel abroad, entitled "G. I. Joe: Europe's New Royalty," written by Edward Boyd, and published in the February 1953 issue of American magazine.

By Mr. HUNT:

Letter, dated January 26, 1953, regarding formulation of policies of the United States Department of Agriculture, written by A. M. Downey.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Editorial entitled "The Baltimore Plan Is Ready for Appraisal," published in the Baltimore Sun of Saturday, January 31, 1953.

LETTER OF CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures for some time has been studying the subject of unexpended balances in Federal appropriations and other authorizations for expenditure.

At present the committee is in the process of publishing a series of reports on this subject. The first of these reports was a compilation of these balances, by the Bureau of the Budget, as estimated for June 30, 1953. The second of these reports was based on actual figures as shown in its October trial balance by the Treasury Department.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks the text of a letter dated January 28, 1953, which covered the first of these reports to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Truman budget of January 9 requested new appropriations totaling $73,000,000,000, of which $41,000,000,000 was for expenditure in fiscal year 1954, beginning July 1; the remainder was for expenditure in some future year.

Expenditures for the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, were estimated in the January 9 document at $79,000,000,000, $41,000,000,000 out of appropriations to be enacted this year, as noted above, and $38,000,000,000 from appropriations and other authorizations enacted in prior years.

The deficit at the end of fiscal year 1954, 1 year from June 30, was estimated at $10,-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

000,000,000. On the basis of this deficit estimate the January budget document forecast the Federal debt a year from now at within $1,250,000,000 of the $275,000,000,000 statutory limit.

The $41,700,000,000 of new appropriations requested for expenditure in the coming year includes $6,400,000,000 for interest on the debt, $4,500,000,000 in statutory program payments, more than $10,000,000,000 in troop pay and sustenance, and $600,000,000 in postal deficit—all of which are difficult to reduce. This would leave less than $20,000,000,000 in appropriations ordinarily before Congress at this session to which reductions could be applied in an effort to overcome a $10,000,000,000 deficit and balance the expenditure budget with estimated revenue.

It is obvious that expenditures from unexpended balances in prior appropriations must be limited and controlled either by legislative action or Executive order.

In addition to appropriations to be enacted in the current session, these unexpended balances, as of next June 30, are estimated at more than $100,000,000,000. More than $60,000,000,000 is in military accounts; more than $10,000,000,000 is in foreign aid accounts, and the remainder is scattered throughout the Government. To conform with budget figures the total includes some Government corporation capital, revolving funds, and reserves, such as those of the FDIC, but the aggregate of these is relatively small.

The enclosed Committee Print No. 1 is the first of a series on this subject. In it the Bureau of the Budget has compiled agency reports as to that part of these balances which is obligated. But it should be noted that experience indicates the firmness of some of the so-called obligations may be subject to review.

(Signed by the chairman.)

FEDERAL BUILDING AT TWO HARBORS, MINN.—ARTICLE FROM TWO HARBORS CHRONICLE AND TIMES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the January 8 issue of the Two Harbors Chronicle and Times, Two Harbors, Minn., be printed in the body of the RECORD. This article cites a resolution adopted by the members of Agate Bay Post, No. 4454, Veterans of Foreign Wars, requesting the Federal Government to appropriate necessary funds for the building of a Federal building to house the post office and other Federal subdivisions.

I also ask that there be included in the RECORD, portions of a letter received by me from members of the Agate Bay Post, No. 4454, signed by Adjutant Octave Desilet, explaining the reason for the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

There being no objection, the article and portions of a letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VFW FAVORS NEW FEDERAL BUILDING HERE

Members of Agate Bay Post, No. 4454, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at their regular meeting held last Monday, approved and passed a resolution requesting the United States Government to make the necessary appropriations and plans for the building of a greatly needed Federal building to house the post office and other Federal subdivisions operating through and from this community.

The post plans to appeal to the Congressmen in this district and Minnesota for action in appropriating funds for this building. They also made a special appeal to all organizations to support and take part in this request.

This course was taken, according to members, because no action has ever been taken by the Government to erect a building on land that was purchased by the Government from the Salvation Army in June 1940. The property discussed is directly south of the Army citadel, in lot 9, block 6.

The portions of the letter presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am enclosing a newspaper clipping from the Two Harbors Chronicle and Times of January 2, as regards action taken by Agate Bay Post, No. 4454, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at its meeting of January 5.

During the Christmas rush of business, the employees of the post office rendered the best service they could under the limited and congested space they had to work in. But, as for the people waiting in line for long, that was not very pleasant.

PROSECUTION OF SUIT AGAINST FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some correspondence I have had with the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to the action of the former administration, particularly of the Department of Justice and the Navy Department, relative to their ignoring the mandate of Congress and the law in the so-called Santa Margarita controversy. The correspondence I now submit includes a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress, a memorandum, a resolution adopted by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, and correspondence relative to this matter with the Comptroller General, which I had over a period of several months.

There being no objection, the correspondence and attached matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I am enclosing for your information a copy of the Comptroller General's report to the Congress of today, with enclosures therein referred to, relative to the legality of expenditures by the Department of the Navy in connection with the prosecution of the suit entitled *"United States of America v. Fallbrook Public Utility District et al.,"* which was the subject of prior communication between you and this office.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January, 30, 1953.

The Congress:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 26), directing the Comptroller General to specifically report to the Congress every expenditure made by any department in any year in violation of law, the following report is submitted relative to payments deliberately made, and apparently being made, by the Department of the Navy in direct contravention of law after being authoritatively informed that such a course of action would be a violation of law.

Section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 560), provides as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others."

The lawsuit referred to in the section was instituted by the Department of Justice at the request of the Navy Department. By reason of the prohibition against the use of Department of Justice appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the preparation or prosecution of the said suit, the former Secretary of the Navy requested in letter dated August 18, 1952, that the Comptroller General render a decision as to whether the appropriations available to that Department are affected in any way by the provisions of the above-quoted section. By decision of August 29, 1952, B–110945, the Secretary of the Navy was informed that the employment or retention and payment from the funds available to the Navy Department of counsel directly to represent the United States in the preparation, prosecution, or defense of the lawsuit would be in direct contravention of law and was not authorized.

The decisions of the Comptroller General respecting the availability and use of public funds appropriated by the Congress are by statute made final and conclusive upon the executive branch of the Government. Section 8 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 208), as amended by section 304 of the act of June 10, 1921 (42 Stat. 24, 31 U. S. C. 74). (See 5 Comp. Gen. 822, 824; 14 id. 648, 650; 33 Op. Atty. Gen. 265; 26 id. 609; 23 id. 468; 22 id. 581.) Thus, upon the rendition of the decision of August 29, 1952, it was the plain duty of the Secretary of the Navy under the law to accept as final, and properly apply, such decision. Nevertheless, the Secretary deliberately chose to violate the law and the Department of the Navy continued and apparently is continuing the unlawful payment of salaries and other expenses incident to the prosecution of the Fallbrook suit. This was not a passive or inactive disregard of the law; it was an active violation with full knowledge thereof. In an impossible effort to support such action the former Secretary of the Navy contended that he is required to protect the interests of the United States and that his legal advisers informed him that the actions taken in the matter are lawful.

When the Secretary of the Navy requested and obtained a decision of the Comptroller General it was not left to the Secretary's legal advisers to inform him one way or the other on the subject matter. The decision of the Comptroller General concluded the matter—it was final upon the executive branch. That is the simple truth of the matter and that was well known by the Secretary's legal advisers.

Furthermore, it was not left to the Secretary of the Navy to decide whether prosecution of the suit was necesary to protect the interests of the United States. That matter was decided by the Congress through enactment of the provision under discussion. It is fundamental in our Government that it is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions the public moneys shall be spent; and it is not the province of the executive or accounting officers to question the wisdom of legislative enactments upon the use of the public moneys no matter how much a different result at times might seem desirable.

For use by the Congress in the consideration of this report there is attached a memorandum setting forth the material facts and circumstances in this matter, together with a copy of the decision to the Secretary of the Navy dated August 29, 1952.

In conclusion, I repeat, the action of the Department of the Navy in this matter was,

and apparently continues to be, a willful and deliberate violation of the law. Therefore, to the extent that the General Accounting Office is empowered to do so it will hold responsible officials, and their sureties, financially liable for all expenditures of public funds determined to be illegal.

Respectfully submitted.

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MEMORANDUM REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO THE CONGRESS RELATIVE TO ILLEGAL EXPENDITURES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY IN CONNECTION WITH PROSECUTION OF THE SUIT ENTITLED "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, ET AL."

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 30, 1953.

Section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 560), provides as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others."

The referred-to suit was instituted by the Department of Justice on or about January 25, 1951, at the request of the Department of the Navy. It appears that the United States owns approximately 135,000 acres of land on the Santa Margarita River, Calif., presently utilized for the Marine Corps training base at Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, the United States Naval Depot at Fallbrook, Calif., and the United States Naval Hospital at Camp Pendleton. The purpose of the said suit, as appears from the complaint filed therein, was to have the rights of the United States to the use of the waters of the Santa Margarita River declared and the title to those rights quieted against the defendants named therein. The suit was prepared, filed, and conducted on behalf of the United States to a certain point by one William H. Veeder, then employed by the Department of Justice as a special assistant to the Attorney General.

The prosecution of the suit by the Government, beyond the effective date of the referred-to statutory prohibition, July 10, 1952, was first brought to my attention in communications from various Members of the Congress. As a result thereof, under date of July 30, 1952, I addressed a letter to the Attorney General calling attention to the restrictive provisions of section 208 (d) and to the congressional inquiries concerning the expenditure of public funds in contravention thereof. A report was requested as to the steps taken in the preparation or prosecution of the suit after July 10, 1952, together with a statement as to the appropriations or funds used for such purposes, and a reference to the statutory or other authority therefor. By reply of August 7, the Attorney General stated that there was no record of any expenditures from the Department's appropriations in connection with the suit since the approval of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, July 10, 1952; and that the Department had advised the Navy Department it intended to abide by the will of the Congress in the matter.

In that connection there is on file in the General Accounting Office a copy of letter from the Attorney General to the Secretary of the Navy, dated August 11, 1952, which referred to the restrictive provisions of said section 208 (d), and stated that the Department of Justice could not continue to prepare for or proceed to trial in the involved suit. The letter further stated that the Department was advised of the desire on the part of the Navy Department and the Marine Corps that the case should proceed because of its great importance; that in recognition of that urgent necessity the Department was willing that the case go forward and would be glad to qualify Navy Department attorneys as special assistants to the Attorney General; but that in order to comply with the will of the Congress, the Navy Department must bear all of the costs in connection with the preparation and prosecution of the suit.

On the afternoon of August 12, 1952, the then Secretary of the Navy met with me in my office for the purpose of discussing the matter of the suit in question. In that meeting the Secretary of the Navy stated that he had been advised by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, who was also present, that appropriations made to his Department for the fiscal year 1953 are available for the prosecution of the suit, notwithstanding the statutory prohibition in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, and that in reliance on such authority he had proposed and obtained the agreement of the Attorney General for Navy Department lawyers to continue with the suit. I advised the Secretary that the General Accounting Office was aware of the situation, had not taken any position as to the propriety of the suggested action, but that the matter was such as to require a formal decision. By letter dated August 18, 1952, the Secretary of the Navy wrote to me requesting a decision in the matter.

In compliance with the Secretary's request, a decision was rendered to him under date of August 29, 1952, B–110945. In the said decision it was stated that the important question involved in the case was whether the law and appropriations made available to the Navy Department expressly authorize or require that Department directly to institute, prosecute, and defend action on behalf of the United States in matters involving court proceedings. In connection therewith the decision quoted pertinent provisions of the Revised Statutes codified as Fifth United States Code 49, 306, 307, 309, 312, 314, and 316, and section 5 of Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933, issued in pursuance of section 16 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517), which plainly vested in the Department of Justice the power and authority to represent the United States in the courts. Thus, it was stated that by reason of the plain and unambiguous terms of such provisions of law and in the light of decisions by the courts, the decisions of the accounting officers have long recognized the rule that, in the absence of specific authority by the Congress for departments and establishments of the Government to resort to litigation in the courts, in connection with the performance of the duties and responsibilities with which they are charged, it is the duty of the Attorney General, as chief law officer of the Government, to institute, prosecute, and defend action on behalf of the United States in matters involving court proceedings, and to defray the necessary expenses incident thereto from funds expressly provided therefor to the Department of Justice. It was pointed out that no specific authority was contained in title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 523), making appropriations for the Department of the Navy, or other law, which would authorize the Department of the Navy to represent the United States in matters involving court proceedings, or incur expenditures directly connected therewith. The decision applied the rule to the present case and concluded that the funds appropriated to the Department of the Navy were not available for the purpose desired.

With respect to the Secretary's contention that the duty of the executive branch of the Government to safeguard the property of the United States requires that every legal means be employed to secure a judicial determination of the Government's right here involved, the decision cited the case of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 27–28), wherein the Court said that article 4, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in the Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and that, in the exercise of such power, the Congress may limit the power of the Attorney General to prosecute claims for the United States. Of course the primary duty of the executive branch is to see that the laws are faithfully executed—not violated.

Returning to the specific question presented for decision, namely whether appropriated funds available to the Navy Department are affected in any way by the provisions of section 208 (d), it was said in the decision that—

"I fully appreciate the deep concern which you and others feel in this matter. However, the matter has received careful consideration, and in answer to the specific question presented in your letter it must be held that the employment or retention by you and payment from the funds available to the Navy Department of counsel directly to represent the United States in the preparation, prosecution, or defense of the suit in question, and the defrayment therefrom of expenses connected with such litigation, would be in direct contravention of law and is not authorized. Such being the rule, the answer is obvious as to why it was unnecessary for the Congress to apply the prohibition to other than the Department of Justice appropriations. If the rule were otherwise, the evident purpose of the Congress in approving the provision in question seems so clear that I could not approve procedural or mechanical devices designed to overcome a technicality in order to circumvent that purpose."

Shortly before the decision of August 29, to the Secretary of the Navy, my attention was called to the continued prosecution of the suit by Mr. William H. Veeder, special assistant to the Attorney General, and to the conflicting information furnished by the Justice and Navy Departments concerning Mr. Veeder's employment status, the Department of Justice stating that Mr. Veeder was transferred to the Navy Department as of August 4, while the Navy Department denied that he was on its payroll. Under date of August 20, I addressed a letter to the Attorney General requesting a copy of Mr. Veeder's notification of personnel action or other pertinent papers showing the nature of the action, if any, which resulted in his separation from the Department of Justice. By reply of August 25, the Attorney General stated that Mr. Veeder's appointment in his Department was terminated at the close of business August 1, due to his transfer to the Navy Department on August 4, and furnished a copy of the requested notification of personnel action which confirmed said statement.

Representatives of the General Accounting Office interviewed Mr. Veeder on September 9, concerning his activities in the Fallbrook suit in relation to the provisions of section 208 (d). He stated that he departed California by plane on July 12, 1952, returned to Washington, D. C., on the same date, and performed no work on the Fallbrook suit until August 5; that it was his understanding an agreement was reached between the Justice and Navy Departments, concurred in by the heads thereof, that he would be transferred on that date to the Navy Department on a contract basis to continue the suit, and that all expenses incident thereto would be defrayed by the Navy so that the Department of Justice would not be violating the prohibition of section 208 (d); that it was recognized by all concerned that the arrangement merely was a method that would enable him to continue with the Fallbrook suit as a special assistant to the Attorney General; that he left Washington for California on August 6 in a Marine Corps plane, accompanied by Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

David W. Agnew, attorney in the Navy Department, and Lt. Col. E. B. Robertson, USMC, for the purpose of drafting the pretrial order in the Fallbrook suit; that he remained in California until August 25, when the pretrial order was approved by the court; that he left California by Marine Corps plane on August 26, accompanied by Mr. Agnew and Lieutenant Colonel Robertson, and arrived in Washington on August 27; and that since the latter date he has worked in his office in the Department of Justice on cases other than the Fallbrook suit. Mr. Veeder apparently was reinstated on the rolls of the Department of Justice effective September 2.

Concerning his employment and payroll status during the period he was in California for the Navy Department, namely, August 3 to 27, Mr. Veeder stated that while in California he read in the newspapers that the Department of Justice and the Navy Department had both issued press releases denying that he was on their payrolls, but that there never was any question in his mind but that the agreement for his transfer to the Navy Department was in effect; that he was going to be paid by that agency; and that during his infrequent telephone conversations with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy no question as to his status ever was raised. Mr. Veeder further stated that on August 29, he was informed by the Deputy Attorney General, that the Secretary of the Navy had stated he could not pay him (Veeder) for the period in August during which he worked on the Fallbrook suit, but that he would take care of his expenses—as distinguished from his salary—the amount of which should be communicated to Mr. John H. Dillon, administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Veeder went on to state that he telephoned Mr. Dillon and informed him that he had been in California on Fallbrook business 21 days, which at the established per diem rate of $9 per day, would be $189, but that during such period he had spent a total amount of $358 of his own funds for living expenses. Mr. Veeder stated that shortly thereafter a messenger arrived and gave him $350 in cash and being surprised as to such method of payment he immediately telephoned Mr. Dillon who assured him that the payment represented Federal funds which had been made available by the Secretary of the Navy.

Confining consideration at this point to the source of funds used for the payment of $350 to Mr. Veeder, I am informed that such payment was charged to the so-called contingency fund of the Secretary of the Navy. That fund is included under the appropriation "Service-wide operations" contained in title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 527, 528), in pertinent part as follows: "Not to exceed $9,132,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government."

In the light of Mr. Veeder's statements set forth above, and the source and nature of the funds used by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse him for the expenses incurred in connection with the Fallbrook suit during August, the mystery as to his employment status and authority to participate in the suit, in the face of denials by the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy that he was on their payrolls during that period, now is all too clear. Apparently the transfer of Mr. Veeder to the Navy Department effective August 4 never was taken up by that agency so that the Secretary of the Navy technically could state that he was not on the payroll of his Department. But nevertheless it appears that the Secretary of the Navy sought and agreed to utilize Mr. Veeder in the prosecution of the suit; that Mr. Veeder proceeded to California by Marine Corps plane pursuant to the Secretary's directions without intention of rendering services gratis; and that while there he carried out his instructions, used Navy facilities, and otherwise was under the Secretary's jurisdiction and control. Such facts appear conclusive by virtue of the Secretary's action in charging the payment made by him to Mr. Veeder to the so-called contingency fund, the express provisions of which make his determinations with regard to expenditures therefrom final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government. Under such circumstances, who is to question the Secretary's determination to use the fund?

Notwithstanding the adverse decision of August 29, concerning the availability of Navy appropriations for preparation or prosecution of the Fallbrook suit, the Secretary did not discontinue unlawful activities and expenditures with respect to the suit, but, on the contrary, continued prosecution thereof. In that connection, the Attorney General on September 9, at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, qualified Mr. David W. Agnew of the Navy Department as a special assistant to the Attorney General for the express purpose of handling the Fallbrook suit. It is understood that Raymond de S. Shryock, commander, United States Navy, is associated with Mr. Agnew in the conduct of the suit. In an interview with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy on October 3, that official stated that the Navy Department disagreed with the decision of August 29, and that the Department was going ahead with suit even though certain expenditures might be disallowed by the General Accounting Office.

Under date of November 28, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Navy again calling attention to the prosecution of the Fallbrook suit and to my decision in the matter. There was requested a complete explanation as to the action taken by the Department in the suit since the date of my decision, namely August 29, and the legal basis, if any, therefor; for a complete citation to all vouchers, showing the appropriation charged, on which salary and expenses connected with the preparation and prosecution of the suit have been paid by the Department since July 10, 1952; and for a statement as to what action the Department proposed to take in the future with a view to complying with the intent of the Congress in enacting the subject provision of law and the decision construing the same. By letter of the same date, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense transmitting a copy of my letter to the Secretary of the Navy, and requested his comment on the matter and a report as to the action taken in connection therewith.

By reply of December 22 the Secretary of the Navy stated that he had circularized the appropriate agencies of his Department for the purpose of preparing a complete citation to all vouchers evidencing expenditures connected with the Fallbrook suit, and that he would render a complete reply in connection therewith at a later date when the necessary information is available. The reply related the activity of the Navy Department in the prosecution of the suit and the court status thereof. It pointed out therein that trial of the suit commenced on October 29 before Judge Leon R. Yankwich in the United States District Court, Southern District of California, Central Division; that an order by the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, served on Judge Yankwich on that date stayed further proceedings in the district court against the Fallbrook Public Utility District; that the trial proceeded with the Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co., the State of California, and the United States as parties; and that the trial was terminated on November 28, with the Government prevailing in the matter of the suit. With respect to the Fallbrook Public Utility District, the reply points out that the order of the court of appeals on the district court staying proceedings against the said company was granted pursuant to a petition by the company for a writ of mandate or a writ of prohibition alleging, among other things, that—

"Trial proceedings should be suspended by reason of section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953."

The reply further states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"You will note that your letter to me of August 29, 1952, is among the authorities cited by Fallbrook to sustain its position that section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act requires the suspension of the trial proceedings.

"Thus, it is that the issue of the legality of the action I have taken in this matter is squarely before the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, for decision. The court of appeals has not rendered a decision nor has it set a date for a hearing on the Fallbrook petition. Meanwhile, action in the district court involving Fallbrook is stayed.

"I know you are aware of my position that my statutory duty and my oath of office require that I take all legal means available to protect the Government property entrusted to my care. I have been advised, and I believe, that my actions are within the sanction of law. In this, of course, you and I are in disagreement, a situation which I regret.

"Since, however, the very issue upon which we differ is pending before the court of appeals, since a decision favorable to my point of view was rendered by Judge Yankwich on August 28 in denying a motion for a continuance, and since the merits of the Government's cause of action have been blessed by a favorable decision in the district court, I venture to express the hope that you will see fit to rest the controversy in the courts. Should the decision of the courts go against me, I will, of course, retire completely from pressing the suit further."

The reply of the Secretary of Defense dated January 2, 1953, referred to the reply of the Secretary of the Navy of December 22, and stated that his egal advisers informed him that, in their opinion, the actions described in the latter letter and taken by the Secretary of the Navy to protect the interests of the Government are lawful. Also, the reply stated that the matter of the propriety of the use of Navy funds in connection with the suit is now before the court, and, under such circumstances, corrective action by him at this time hardly is in order.

It will be seen from these replies that nothing is contained therein other than to confirm a deliberate and flagrant disregard for statutory law and the plain intent of the Congress. It is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions the public moneys shall be spent, and when the Congress has so expressed itself, as it did in the enactment of section 208 (d), it is not given to the administrative or to the accounting officers of the Government to question its wisdom or substitute their judgment for that of the Congress. The General Accounting Office, as the agent of the Congress, is responsible for seeing that the appropriations made by the Congress to carry out the provisions of law are disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the laws relating thereto. In the exercise of its authority to decide upon the construction of law involving the legal availability of an appropriation for a proposed use its decision in the matter is final and not subject to the review of any administrative official.

The General Accounting Office, therefore, will take appropriate action to disallow in the accounts of accountable officers the illegal payments of expenses incurred by the Navy Department in the preparation or prosecution of the Fallbrook suit.

[From the Fallbrook Enterprise of January 23, 1953]

STATE ASSIGNS FUNDS TO FIGHT WATER SUIT—RESOLUTION PASSED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY

(Following is a copy of California Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 sent to the Enterprise by Senator Nelson S. Dilworth and adopted in the senate and in the assembly on January 17, 1953:)

Whereas on the 25th day of January 1951 the Attorney General of the United States acting at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, commenced an action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, southern division, being civil action No. 1247—SD against the Fallbrook Public Utility District and numerous other defendants within the watershed of the Santa Margarita River; and

Whereas in its complaint the United States claimed that all of the defendants, whether riparian, overlying landowners, or appropriators, were by their diversions, "encroaching" upon "the paramount rights" of the United States and asked the court to "forever enjoin these defendants from encroaching or infringing upon * * * the rights of the United States" as in its complaint set forth; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California in its Assembly Joint Resolution 8 of the 1952 regular session, denounced the action brought by the United States as an unwarranted and unnecessary threat to the water laws of the State of California, and the water rights of its citizens; and

Whereas, to assist the harassed defendants and to better prepare a defense against the threatened assault upon the State's property and the State's rights to control, regulate, and dispose of the use of the waters of the Santa Margarita River, the legislature appropriated in the budget act of 1952 $150,000 to be expended by the division of water resources of the department of public works for surveys and investigation of the water resources of the Santa Margarita River watershed and for the use and distribution of the waters thereof for beneficial purposes; and

Whereas a substantial portion of the money so appropriated by the legislature remains unexpended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California (the Assembly thereof concurring), That the State engineer and the division of water resources are requested to render to the Fallbrook Public Utility District and to the other public agencies defendants in the action and in the case of *United States v. Fallbrook Public Utility District* all such engineering and legal assistance as may be possible within the limits of the appropriation made by item 262.5 of the Budget Act of 1952, to the end that justice may be done and the laws of the State of California upheld and the jurisdiction of the division of water resources of the State be recognized and established and the proper administration of our water laws by State officials be freed from threats of Federal interference; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to submit a copy of this resolution to the State engineer and the Fallbrook public utility district.

JULY 15, 1952.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: My attention has been drawn to a recent article which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of July 8. This article would indicate that the Justice Department plans to go ahead with the prosecution of the case against the Fallbrook Public Utility District et al.

Recently the Senate and House agreed on an amendment which I proposed to the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, H. R. 7289, which states that "none of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California et al." This bill was signed into law by the President on July 10, 1952.

Will you kindly check into the expenditures that are now being made in the Department of Justice for the preparation or prosecution of the above-mentioned case and kindly inform me what funds have been expended since July 1, 1952, and from what sources they were derived.

With kind regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.
Washington, July 30, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of July 15, 1952, enclosing a news item, which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of July 8, which you state would indicate that the Department of Justice plans to go ahead with the prosecution of the case against the Fallbrook Public Utility District in contravention of the provisions of section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 556, 560), which expressly prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department in that act for such purposes. You request that this office check into the expenditures that are now being made in the Department of Justice for the preparation or prosecution of the above-referred-to case, and inform you with respect to the funds that have been expended since July 1, 1952, and the source thereof.

By letter of today, the Attorney General is being requested to furnish a report in the matter. Upon receipt thereof, the matter will receive further consideration and I shall be pleased to advise you further with respect thereto at a later date.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

AUGUST 13, 1952.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: Today I have been advised by Mr. Mullin, public information officer of the Department of Justice, that Mr. William H. Veeder is no longer with the Department of Justice and has not been since the 4th of August and that he has been transferred to the Navy as of that date.

As you know, Mr. Veeder has been working for the Department of Justice in their prosecution of the suit against the Fallbrook Public Utility District et al., in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of California. Section 208-d of the appropriations bill for the Department of Justice prohibits the use of funds of the Department of Justice for the prosecution of this suit.

I have taken this matter up with the Secretary of the Navy and have been informed by his office that Mr. Veeder is not now, and has never been employed by the Department of the Navy. Nevertheless, it is my information that the case against the Fallbrook Public Utility District continues and that Mr. Veeder is representing the United States Government.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could look into this matter and inform me what the source of Mr. Veeder's compensation from the United States Government has been since August 4.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 20, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of August 13, 1952, with further reference to the suit by the United States against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, which was the subject of your letter dated July 15, 1952, and office reply thereto of July 30.

You state in your letter that it is your information the suit in question continues, and that Mr. William H. Veeder, the attorney who has been conducting the suit for the Department of Justice, is representing the United States in the matter. You further state that you have been advised by Mr. Mullin, public information officer of the Department of Justice, that Mr. Veeder is no longer with that Department, having been transferred to the Department of the Navy as of August 4, and that you have been informed by the Office of the Secretary of the Navy that Mr. Veeder is not now, and has never been, employed by the Department of the Navy. You request that this office look into the matter and inform you with respect to the source of Mr. Veeder's compensation from the United States since August 4.

By letter of today, the Attorney General is being requested to furnish a report in the matter. Upon receipt thereof, the matter will receive further consideration and I shall be pleased to advise you further with respect thereto, including the matter referred to in your letter of July 15.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 21, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Further reference is made to your letters of July 15 and August 13, 1952, acknowledged on July 30 and August 20, 1952, respectively, concerning the suit brought by the United States against Fallbrook Public Utility District, and others, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division.

As Mr. Keller, assistant to the Comptroller General, informed your administrative assistant, Mr. Wilson, by telephone today, the Department of Justice notified this office by letter, dated August 7, 1952, that the Department had advised the Navy Department of the prohibition in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, and that it intended to abide by the will of the Congress in the matter. The Department also stated that there is no record of any funds having been expended from the Department's appropriations in connection with the lawsuit since the approval of the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1953, namely, July 10, 1953. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from the Department on the subject. However, after receiving your letter of August 13, 1952, as I advised you by letter of August 20, 1952, I requested the Attorney General to furnish me further information concerning Mr. Veeder's employment by the Department of Justice. When reply is received from the Attorney General, I shall be glad to advise you further with respect to this phase of the matter.

Also, for your information, there has been received here a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, dated August 18, 1952, asking for an opinion as to whether or not appropriated funds available to the Navy Department are affected in any way by the prohibition against preparation or prosecution of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

suit by the United States in the Department of Justice appropriation act. The question presented by the Secretary of the Navy is now under consideration and I shall be glad to advise you of the decision reached.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

AUGUST 28, 1952.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: With further reference to the suit brought by the United States against the Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al., and especially to my letter of August 13 concerning the person of Mr. William H. Veeder, I would like to call your attention to a telegram from the Attorney General to Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON, of the Sixteenth Congressional District for California. Enclosed is a copy of the telegram.

According to the Attorney General's telegram, Mr. Veeder is a special assistant to the Attorney General assigned to the Department of the Navy for the handling of the Fallbrook case and that all compensation and expenses are being paid by the Navy. The date of the telegram should be noted, August 22.

On August 13, I informed you that I had been advised by Mr. Mullin, Public Information Officer of the Department of Justice, that Mr. William H. Veeder had not been with the Department since August 4 and that as of that date he had been transferred to the Department of Navy. The matter was taken up with the Secretary of the Navy and I was told by his office that Mr. Veeder had not been employed by the Navy.

After being informed of the contents of the telegram of August 22 to Congressman JACKSON, a member of my staff again contacted a responsible officer of the Department of Navy. The Navy reiterated its previous statement that Mr. Veeder was not on the Department's payroll. At this point, it seems that both Departments contend that Mr. Veeder is not a compensated representative of either Department, in that both Departments allege that Mr. William Veeder's name does not appear on their payrolls.

Due to the discrepancy in the two reports, the Department of Justice declaring that Mr. Veeder is no longer with them and that he had been transferred to the Department of the Navy, and the latter denying the allegation that Mr. Veeder is employed by them, I would like to ask two questions:

1. How can Mr. Veeder, apparently not on any Government payroll, be assigned as special assistant to the Attorney General for the handling of the Fallbrook case to the Department of the Navy?

2. If not on the official payroll of any Government department, how is it that Mr. Veeder was furnished with Government transportation, as he was, to California, and be provided with personnel assistance from Navy resources?

It would be greatly appreciated if you would look into these two questions and inform me of their answers.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 29, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Further reference is made to your letters of July 15 and August 13, 1952, acknowledged on July 30 and August 20, respectively, and referred to in office letter of August 21 to you, concerning the suit brought by the United States against Fallbrook Public Utility District and others in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division.

As stated in office letters of August 20 and 21, the Attorney General was requested to furnish a further report with respect to Mr. Veeder's employment by the Department of Justice since August 4. There has now been received from the Attorney General a letter dated August 25, 1952, copy enclosed, which states that Mr. Veeder's appointment in that Department was terminated at the close of business August 1, 1952, due to his transfer to the Navy Department on August 4, 1952. However, this Office has been informally advised by the Department of the Navy that Mr. Veeder is not now and has never been employed by that Department. However, in view of your letter of August 28, the matter is being investigated further, and you will be advised with regard thereto at a later date. In that connection, and as stated in office letter of August 21, I am enclosing also for your information a copy of decision of today, B-110945, to the Secretary of the Navy, in which it is held that appropriations available to that Department may not be used in the prosecution or defense of the Fallbrook suit.

I trust that the foregoing furnishes the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 29, 1952.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to your letter of August 18, 1952, stating that a matter of gravest importance to the Navy Department has recently arisen as a result of the enactment of section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 560), as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others."

You state that the lawsuit, entitled "United States of America v. Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al.," referred to in the quoted legislative provision, was instituted by the Department of Justice, at the instance of your Department, for the purpose of quieting the title of the United States to its vested rights in the Santa Margarita River, Calif.; that the litigation involves the primary water supply for Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif., a major Marine Corps installation; that if the said litigation is not successfully prosecuted, the utility of the military installation will be most seriously impaired; and that it is the view of the Navy Department that the provisions of the above-quoted section 208 (d), making unavailable appropriations for the Department of Justice for the preparation or prosecution of the suit in question are limited to the Department of Justice and do not extend to all appropriations or operate to destroy whatever claim or cause of action the United States may have in this suit.

It is stated further that the duty of the executive branch of the Government to safeguard the property of the United States, requires that every legal means be employed to secure a determination of the rights here involved by the judicial processes provided by law, and that the Navy Department, because of its vital interest in the matter, with the concurrence of the Department of Justice, contemplates providing the necessary personnel for the conduct of the suit on behalf of the United States, and to assume such other obligations as may be required and for which appropriated funds are available to your department.

You request a decision before taking such action as to whether or not appropriated funds available to the Navy Department are affected in any way by the provisions of section 208 (d), supra. For consideration by this office in reaching a conclusion in the matter your letter cites various current appropriation acts, which contain legislative prohibitions limiting or restricting the expenditure availability of funds provided for therein, and certain published and unpublished office decisions, which enunciate the statutory principle that legislative restrictions placed upon the expenditure of funds appropriated for a department or agency of the Government do not, as a matter of law, apply to similar expenditures otherwise properly incurred under appropriations of other departments and agencies, and that where the Congress intends a complete prohibition against the use of appropriated funds for a particular purpose it has invariably used the words "in this or any other act" or words of similar import, to describe the funds intended to be encompassed by a particular prohibition.

This office extends full recognition to such well-established principles of statutory construction, but submits that in each of the cited cases, the interpretation there given has been based upon the context of the law being construed together with a consideration of the particular facts and circumstances involved. And in none of those cases was the rule applied so as to completely dissipate the effectiveness of, and make meaningless, the provision in the appropriation act to which applied. That would be the result where such rule applied here. In that connection, it is worthy of note that the decision (30 Comp. Gen. 516), cited and partially quoted in your letter, after holding that the Economic Stabilization Agency was not subject to the expenditure restrictions contained in section 1212 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 768), by reason of the fact that funds for the Agency were not contained in the said act, went on to state "However, having in mind that, by the enactment of said provision [section 1212], the purpose of the Congress was to restrict generally payment to Government employees for any annual leave earned during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1951, it would appear to be in keeping with the spirit of the act if you recommended to employees of your agency that their 1950 annual leave be used by June 30, 1951." But however that may be, the more important question presented in this case is whether the law and appropriations made available to the Navy Department in pursuance thereof expressly authorize or require that department directly to institute, prosecute, and defend action on behalf of the United States in matters involving court proceedings.

Consideration of that question necessarily involves the provisions of sections 189, 357, 359, 361, 363, 365, and 367, of the Revised Statutes, codified as 5 U. S. C., 49, 306, 307, 309, 312, 314, and 316, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 49. No head of a department shall employ attorneys or counsel at the expense of the United States; but when in need of counsel or advice, shall call upon the Department of Justice, the officers of which shall attend to the same.

* * * * *

"SEC. 306. The officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, shall give all opinions and render all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law necessary to enable the President and heads of departments, and the heads of bureaus and other officers in the departments, to discharge their respective duties; and shall, on behalf of the United States, procure the proper evidence for, and conduct, prosecute, or defend all suits and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

proceedings in the Supreme Court and in the Court of Claims, in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested; and no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 312 of this title.

"SEC. 307. Whenever a question of law arises in the administration of the Department of War or the Department of the Navy, the cognizance of which is not given by statute to some other officer from whom the head of the Department may require advice, it shall be sent to the Attorney General, to be by him referred to the proper officer in his department, or otherwise disposed of as he may deem proper.

* * * * *

"SEC. 309. Except when the Attorney General in particular cases otherwise directs, the Attorney General and Solicitor General shall conduct and argue suits and appeals in the Supreme Court and suits in the Court of Claims in which the United States is interested, and the Attorney General may, whenever he deems it for the interest of the United States, either in person conduct and argue any case in any court of the United States in which the United States is interested, or may direct the Solicitor General or any officer of the Department of Justice to do so.

* * * * *

"SEC. 312. The Attorney General shall, whenever in his opinion the public interest requires it, employ and retain, in the name of the United States, such attorneys and counselors at law as he may think necessary to assist the district attorneys in the discharge of their duties, and shall stipulate with such assistant attorneys and counsel the amount of compensation, and shall have supervision of their conduct and proceedings.

* * * * *

"SEC. 314. No compensation shall be allowed to any person, besides the respective district attorneys and assistant district attorneys for services as an attorney or counselor to the United States, or to any branch or department of the Government thereof, except in cases specially authorized by law, and then only on the certificate of the Attorney General that such services were actually rendered, and that the same could not be performed by the Attorney General, or Solicitor General, or the officers of the Department of Justice, or by the district attorneys.

* * * * *

"SEC. 316. The Solicitor General, or any officer of the Department of Justice, may be sent by the Attorney General to any State or district in the United States to attend to the interests of the United States in any suit pending in any of the courts of the United States, or in the courts of any State, or to attend to any other interest of the United States."

Section 5 of Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933, issued in pursuance of section 16 of the act of March 3, 1933, 47 Stat. 1517, provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The functions of prosecuting in the courts of the United States claims and demands by, and offenses against, the Government of the United States, and of defending claims and demands against the Government, and of supervising the work of United States attorneys, marshals, and clerks in connection therewith, now exercised by any agency or officer, are transferred to the Department of Justice.

"As to any case referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense in the courts, the function of decision whether and in what manner to prosecute, or to defend, or to compromise, or to appeal, or to abandon prosecution or defense, now exercised by any agency or officer, is transferred to the Department of Justice."

By reason of the plain and unambiguous terms of these provisions of the law and in the light of decisions by the courts, the decisions of the accounting officers have long recognized the rule that, in the absence of specific authority by the Congress for departments and establishments of the Government to resort to litigation in the courts, in connection with the performance of the duties and responsibilities with which they are charged it is the duty of the Attorney General, as chief law officer of the Government, to institute, prosecute, and defend action on behalf of the United States in matters involving court proceedings, and to defray the necessary expenses incident thereto from funds expressly provided therefor. See *Causey* v. *United States* (240 U. S. 399, 402) and cases cited therein; *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 27–28); *United States* v. *Hall* (145 Fed. (2d) 781); *Booth et al.* v. *Fletcher* (101 Fed. (2d) 676, 681); *Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian,* v. *International Insurance Co. of New York* (43 Fed. (2d) 909, certiorari denied (282 U. S. 890); 12 Comp. Dec. 742; 22 id. 230; 4 Comp. Gen. 386; 6 id. 517; 15 id. 5; 17 id. 58; 24 id. 216 Cf. A–7650, April 24, 1925; A–27566, June 29, 1929; B–34946, June 9, 1943; 15 id. 81; 19 id. 551. Such rule has also been recognized by the Attorney General. See 21 Op. Atty. Gen. 195.

I am aware of no specific authority in title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 523, making appropriations for the Department of the Navy, or other law, which would authorize the Department of the Navy to represent the United States in matters involving court proceedings, or incur expenditures directly connected therewith. Accordingly, no reasonable basis appears for not applying the cited rule to the instant case. With respect to your contention that the duty of the executive branch of the Government to safeguard the property of the United States requires that every legal means be employed to secure a judicial determination of the Government's right here involved, in the case of *United States* v. *California*, supra, the court said that article 4, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in the Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and, that in the exercise of such power, the Congress may limit the power of the Attorney General to prosecute claims for the United States.

I fully appreciate the deep concern which you and others feel in this matter. However, the matter has received careful consideration, and in answer to the specific question presented in your letter it must be held that the employment or retention by you and payment from the funds available to the Navy Department of counsel directly to represent the United States in the preparation, prosecution, or defense of the suit in question, and the defrayment therefrom of expenses connected with such litigation, would be in direct contravention of law and is not authorized. Such being the rule, the answer is obvious as to why it was unnecessary for the Congress to apply the prohibition to other than the Department of Justice appropriations. If the rule were otherwise, the evident purpose of the Congress in approving the provision in question seems so clear that I could not approve procedural or mechanical devices designed to overcome a technicality in order to circumvent that purpose.

There has also been received a letter dated August 21, 1952, with enclosures, from the Judge Advocate General of the Navy to Mr. E. L. Fisher of this office. One of the enclosures is in the form of a copy of a cross-complaint filed in the suit in question on July 14, 1952, by attorneys for defendants Max M. Henderson and Aurelie S. Henderson.

It is stated that the cross-complaint was filed under authority of section 208 (a) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, supra, which gives statutory consent to join the United States as a defendant in a suit such as the Fallbrook case. It is suggested that such cross-complaint makes the United States a defendant in the suit and imposes upon the Attorney General a duty to defend the rights of the United States, pointing out that the prohibition of section 208 (d), supra, against the use of funds appropriated for the Department of Justice in the preparation or prosecution of the Fallbrook suit, contains no restriction upon the use of such funds by that Department in defense of the said suit.

The Judge Advocate General of the Navy further states that it is his information that the court in which the Fallbrook suit is pending will incorporate in the pretrial order a stipulation substantially as follows:

"The Court finds that it is in the best interests of the parties and in the public interest that all rights to the use of water in the Santa Margarita River of all parties to this action be determined as against all others and that the filing of cross-complaints is unnecessarily burdensome and expensive, provided that the order setting this cause for separate action is not affected."

and that it appears, therefore, the United States must defend against the asserted claims of all other parties to the suit, and that the adjudication will quiet and fix not only the rights of the United States but the rights of all other parties thereto.

It is manifest that it is not a function of this office to concern itself in procedural matters in the court. Furthermore, whether or not it is a duty of the Department of Justice to defend the rights of the United States by reason of the counter claim asserted against it by the defendants Max M. Henderson and Aurelie S. Henderson and similar claims which might be considered by the court during the proceedings, and whether or not such action is without the purview of the prohibition of section 208 (d), supra, are matters primarily for consideration by that Department.

Under section 8 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 207, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 74), the authority of the Comptroller General to render decisions to the heads of departments or establishments encompasses only questions involving payments "to be made by them or under them." (See 18 Comp. Gen. 217, 220.) Hence, I do not have jurisdiction and shall not attempt to decide on the basis of the present letters that part of the contention which concerns the availability of funds appropriated to the Department of Justice for use in the defense of actions arising from the Fallbrook case.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

NOVEMBER 7, 1952.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General
of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: On August 29, 1952, in your opinion B110945, you advised the Secretary of the Navy that, in the case entitled "United States of America v. Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al.," "it must be held that the employment or retention by you and payment from the funds available to the Navy Department of Counsel directly to represent the United States in the preparation, prosecution, or defense of the suit in question, and the defrayment therefrom of expenses connected with such litigation, would be in direct contravention of law and is not authorized. Such being the rule, the answer is obvious as to why it was unnecessary for the Congress to apply the prohibition to other than the Department of Jus-

tice appropriations. If the rule were otherwise, the evident purpose of the Congress in approving the provision in question seems so clear that I could not approve procedural or mechanical devices designed to overcome a technicality in order to circumvent that purpose."

Your opinion was delivered in conjunction with section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act of 1953, approved by the President on July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 560), which said: "None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others." For your information, I am enclosing an article which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of November 1 and I call your attention to the paragraph marked in red which says, "Hall was called to the stand by Comdr. Raymond Shryock, counsel for the Navy. He is associated with David W. Agnew as Government counsel in the suit."

In view of the above statement, it would seem that the Department of Navy has appeared in court on behalf of the Government in the case entitled, "United States of America v. Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al." Considering the law quoted above and your opinion B110945, I would greatly appreciate being advised as to what action can be taken to insure that the Executive Agency of the Government complies with the law and with your opinion.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 28, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of November 7, 1952, with enclosure, with further reference to the suit by the United States against Fallbrook Public Utility District, and others, which was the subject of prior communications between you and this office.

You enclose in your letter a news item, which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of November 1, which would seem to indicate that the Department of the Navy has appeared in court on behalf of the Government in the suit, and quote the provisions of section 208 (d) of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act 1953, approved July 10, 1952, 66 Statute 560, which prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Justice for such purposes as well as a portion of office decision of August 29, 1952, B-110945, to the Secretary of the Navy, in connection therewith. You request to be advised as to what action can be taken to insure that the executive agency of the Government complies with the law and the cited office decision.

I am today requesting a complete explanation from the Secretary of the Navy as to what action has been taken by the Department of the Navy in the suit since the date of my decision of August 29, 1952, to him and the legal basis, if any, therefor; for a complete citation to all vouchers showing the appropriation charged on which salary and expenses connected with preparation and prosecution of the suit have been paid by the Department of the Navy since July 10, 1952, the date of approval of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act 1953; and for a statement as to what action the Department proposes to take in the future with a view to complying with the apparent intent of the Congress in enacting the said provision of law and the office decision construing the same. Also, since the Navy Department under section 4 of the act of August 10, 1949, 5 United States Code 171, is a military department within the Department of Defense, a copy of the letter has been transmitted to the Secretary of Defense for his consideration and such action as he deems advisable with a report to this office thereon.

Upon receipt of the said reports, the matter will be given further consideration and I shall be pleased to advise you further with respect thereto. Also, while this office has completed a preliminary investigation of Mr. William H. Veeder's connection with the suit pursuant to your letter of August 28, 1952, which was acknowledged August 29, since the reports of the Secretaries of the Navy and of Defense may shed additional light thereon, further reply to the questions raised in that letter, if agreeable to you, will be deferred until such reports are received and considered.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE SITUATION IN FORMOSA—ARTICLE BY HAROLD LAVINE AND INTERVIEW WITH MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. CHASE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks two very interesting articles which will appear in the magazine Newsweek for February 9. The magazine is not released until Thursday, but special permission has been given by the publishers to make these two articles available.

One of them is an article by Mr. Harold Lavine, Newsweek associate editor, who has just returned from Formosa. It gives his report on the condition of the Chinese Nationalist forces. I call this article particularly to the attention of the Senate because there has been a great deal of comment, both in some Government quarters and in some editorial offices, by persons who have had no first-hand information as to conditions in that area of the world. I think this article, by a competent magazine editor, should be of interest.

The second article appears on page 34 of the same publication. It is an interview with Maj. Gen. William C. Chase. As I am sure Senators know, Major General Chase is the man who is heading our mission to the government of the Republic of China. This is an interview which Mr. Lavine had with General Chase relative to the present condition, the morale, training, and equipment of the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa. I think Members of the Senate and the public generally will find the articles of interest. While I would not, of course, personally underwrite everything which Mr. Lavine has said in the article, representing his own personal observations, having been in Formosa on several occasions I believe that he is substantially accurate in his report. I think it contains information which the Senate and the country are entitled to have.

There being no objection, the article and interview were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG'S TROOPS: THEY ARE RARIN' TO FIGHT BACK

(By Harold Lavine)

There are more than half a million soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines on the island of Formosa who don't think Mao Tse-tung is here to stay. They could be wrong, but the United States is now betting about $300,000,000 a year on them, and so far the bet has paid off. They are the men who refused to surrender when Mao's Red army swept Chiang Kai-shek from the mainland of China. They came to Formosa in rafts and sampans and junks. Now they're living only for the day when they can go back. They're certain that if they ever get on the mainland they can overthrow the Reds. The United States is betting only money on them. They are betting their lives.

These Chinese Nationalists are realists. They know the odds are against them. Mao's army outnumbers them eight or nine to one. And they know that Mao defeated them on the mainland only because they first defeated themselves. They make no bones about it. They were rotten with corruption. They didn't know how to fight, and they hadn't the will to fight. All right, they say; that was on the mainland; things are different now. And they are quite justified in saying so.

Formosa is not Utopia. And the Nationalist army, as Maj. Gen. William C. Chase, commander of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group in Formosa, puts it, still isn't capable of "playing in the big leagues." Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Nationalist Government and army have changed greatly in the past 3 years.

The United States wrote off Chiang when he fled the mainland. It even played with the idea of recognizing Mao and, had it done so, Chiang would have been through. Actually, it was the Korean war that saved Chiang. When the North Korean Reds crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, the United States Government had some sober second thoughts. If the North Korean Reds took South Korea and, at the same time, Mao took Formosa, the problem of defending Japan would become immensely more complicated. So, when Harry S. Truman made his decision to send United States troops into Korea, he also decided to "neutralize Formosa."

ARMS AND KNOW-HOW

Once that policy was adopted, the subsequent developments became inevitable. It obviously made no sense to rely on United States forces to protect Formosa if the Nationalists could be trained and equipped to protect themselves. In 1951, therefore, the United States resumed sending arms to Chiang, as well as officers and NCO's to show Chiang's men how to use those arms. In addition, it started helping to build up Formosa's economy so that it could eventually support the Nationalist Army. The United States help so strengthened the Nationalists that soon they were able to raid the mainland. In 1952, they succeeded in launching 380 raids. Although the United States Government didn't sponsor them officially, it was the United States policy of sending aid to Chiang that made them possible.

Chiang has 10 armies, each consisting of 2 divisions, plus an independent division. They are somewhat smaller than United States divisions but bigger than Mao's. He also has an organized guerrilla force, which holds 31 islands off the mainland and stages the raids. In one hit-and-run operation last year, Chiang was able to put a full division on the mainland and keep it there for 3 days. His men took 800 prisoners.

Chiang has a marine corps consisting of two brigades plus smaller elements. His navy has 80 ships, including a destroyer, 6 destroyer escorts, 10 LST's, 7 mine sweepers, 6 LCI's, and 6 LSM's. His air force consists of four groups of fighter-bombers, a group of what the Chinese call medium bombers (they would be light bombers in the United States Air Force), a group of supply craft, and three photo-reconnaissance squadrons. At present, Chiang's planes are propeller-driven, but the United States plans to send him jets.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

On the mainland, the Nationalist Army was little better than a rabble. Men weren't drafted into the army, they were shanghaied. They were clothed in rags. They never were given enough to eat and therefore had to live off the country, which is one reason why China's peasantry turned against them. The Nationalist Army had no finance office. Generals were given the money to pay their men, but frequently they simply pocketed it. The army also lacked a real supply service, and it wasn't unusual for high-ranking officers to sell what equipment they received on the black market. The men were treated like animals. They had no reason for fighting, and, in plain fact, most of them surrendered at the first opportunity.

That was on the mainland. It's quite a different army that Chiang now has on Formosa. Now Chiang's men are well clothed. And by Chinese standards they are well fed. (United States nutritionists would throw up their hands in horror at the food they get, but they seem to find it ample.) They aren't paid much (a private gets $15 Taiwan a month, which is less than $1, United States, at the official rate), but at least they are paid. And they are treated with respect. A soldier has rights, which no officer can lightly disregard, and the army has a system very much like the Inspector-General's Office in the United States Army to see that he doesn't.

SELF-RELIANCE

One of the most striking things about the new Nationalist Army is the way the men are encouraged to speak up. Soldiers are expected to obey orders, of course—but not blindly. A soldier is entitled to ask his officer why he issued a certain order, and he may argue with the officer about it. He not only may, the chances are he will.

The army now has a kind of G–5, called the political department, which is run by Chiang's elder son, Lt. Gen. Chiang Ching-kuo. The political department has a variety of jobs. It acts as a USO, and otherwise attempts to bolster morale. It educates the men, and already has almost succeeded in wiping out illiteracy. It indoctrinates the soldiers with anti-Communist pro-Nationalist ideas. And it acts as a thought police.

When General Chase and the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group first arrived in Formosa, 25 percent of every soldier's time was devoted to indoctrination and education. At United States insistence, this was cut in half. Many United States officers feel the political department still is taking up too much time. The Chinese disagree. They say that one reason they lost on the mainland was Communist propaganda, which inspired disaffection among their men. They're determined to insulate the men against such propaganda now.

The men in the armed forces average 26 years of age. With few exceptions, they all have seen at least 3 years of service. Nine-tenths of them are combat veterans. By American standards, about a tenth of them would be 4–F's; there is a great deal of tuberculosis in the army, for example. However, they don't look sick. On the contrary, they are the very picture of health. They are muscular, spectacularly agile, and have far more endurance than American troops.

The enlisted men are well trained; in fact, Maj. Robert B. Carney, the senior United States marine officer on Formosa and son of the admiral, believes "they are probably the best-drilled soldiers in the world." He says, "I'd have no hesitation about going into combat with them."

The morale of the men is high. They obviously enjoy even the most arduous training. They train with live ammunition and show complete scorn for the danger. United States officers, who can understand Chinese, say their chief topic of conversation is going back to the mainland. They're busting to fight.

Most of the men are married. All have families on the mainland. They consider Formosa an alien land. The people speak a southern Chinese dialect which few of them can understand. They're homesick, and they know they can't ever get home unless they first overthrow the Reds.

CLASS SYSTEM

Whether the officers are as good as the enlisted men and have equally high morale no one can say for certain. They can prove themselves only in combat. A good many are United States trained and seem efficient. Many, however, owe their rank to politics. Moreover, the system of promotion in the Nationalist army militates against efficiency. The Nationalists have what they call "the class system." A man who didn't graduate from a proper military academy has a hard time getting ahead. Only rarely is a man who graduated in one year promoted ahead of one who graduated the year before. This practice exists to some extent in all armies, including the United States Army, of course, but the Nationalists follow it with amazing rigidity.

The army has other deficiencies. On the mainland, it was so decentralized it actually became disorganized. Now it seems overcentralized. There are rules and regulations covering even the most minor matters, which must be obeyed religiously. There is a rule, for example, that a battery or a tire cannot be changed unless it has gone 18 months or 18,000 miles. If a battery goes dead after say 15 months and 16,000 miles, the car will be immobilized for 3 months.

"I know, it sounds silly," a high Nationalist officer explained. "However, you have to view the rule in the light of our history. On the mainland, it was standard operating procedure for officers to sell a car's battery or tires on the black market and then they often dismantled the car and sold the parts. We can't let that sort of thing happen again, and this is the only way we've figured out to prevent it."

Another obvious deficiency of the Nationalists is their lack of understanding of the importance of maintaining equipment. They're great at repairing equipment, but they also have a talent for wrecking it. At the Pingtung air base is a hangar full of airplane engines, 101 of them at last count. They haven't run a mile, and they are rotten with rust.

TURN-ABOUT

The Nationalists expect to defeat the Communists in precisely the way the Communists defeated them. They believe the peasantry is fed up with the Communists. They say the police force is ripe with disaffection. And they say that even rank-and-file party members are turning against Mao, especially because of his subservience to Joseph Stalin and the Kremlin.

They believe that if they can establish a beachhead and hold it for a while, the countryside will rise against the Communists and that Mao's army will desert him, as the Nationalists deserted Chiang when he was on the mainland. Meanwhile, they'll be helping to create an uprising by chopping up the Communist communications system and thereby wrecking the economy.

The Nationalists are aware that it would be impossible for them to establish a beachhead without the help of United States naval and possibly air power. They argue that it would be very much in the United States interest to supply it. A landing some place in South China, they say, would at once make a solution of Asia's problems possible. It would cut the Communist communications lines to southeast Asia and thereby help to end the Red revolutions there. And it would force Mao to switch men and equipment from Korea.

Meanwhile, there has been a great deal of discussion among the Nationalists about the possibility of a trial invasion—on Hainan Island. That also would force Mao to divert men and equipment south. It would wrest from the Communists—and gain for the West—an important source of iron ore. And, say the Nationalists, it would prove to a world which saw them collapse on the mainland how much they have changed. It would prove they are now a good investment.

CHIANG ALMOST READY

(By Maj. Gen. William C. Chase)

"What are the present capabilities of Chiang's forces?"

Chiang's troops have doubled their combat efficiency in the past year. They have been training like hell, and they are finally beginning to get the hardware the United States promised them after the Korean war broke out. They are not yet yeady to play in the big leagues, but they will be soon.

"How soon?"

It all depends on the United States Government, on how quickly the new administration sends more hardware and on how many more military advisers it sends. Good as these men are, they still need more equipment and they could do with more training. My military mission is supposed to have about 800 officers and NCO's. We actually have about 700, and we could use 1,600. If the administration is willing to make the effort, these men could be ready to play in the big leagues by the end of this year.

"On the mainland, the Nationalist Army was notoriously corrupt and inefficient. Whole divisions surrendered without fighting. Why do you have faith in the Nationalists now?"

It is true: On the mainland, the Nationalists had a record for doing everything wrong. They themselves are the first to admit it. They suffered one of the most disastrous defeats in history, and they know they have no one to blame but themselves. However, let's stop dragging up bygones. These are the Nationalists who did not surrender. They've analyzed the reasons for their defeat, and they're doing their darndest to eradicate them. They haven't entirely succeeded. After all, the build-up of the Nationalist Army started only in 1951. There's still a considerable amount of inefficiency in Chiang's forces, but there's damned little corruption. Morale is high. Every man in the army dreams of nothing but going home. He knows he can get home only by destroying the Reds.

"Chiang has about half a million men in uniform, the Reds between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000. What makes you think 500,000 men can lick millions?"

I'd say the Reds probably have 5,000,000 men, and I can tell you what the Nationalists think. They believe that if only they can get on the mainland and hold a beachhead long enough—6 or 7 months, say—the country will rally around them. Unless all the Nationalist intelligence is wrong, the people on the mainland are fed up with the Communists, and that goes for much of the Red army.

After all, when Mao Tse-tung started out, he didn't have as many men as Chiang has now, and Chiang then had 5,000,000. Or put it another way, at least 1,500,000 of the men in the Red army are former Nationalist soldiers, who surrendered to Mao. Isn't there a good chance they'll switch sides again if the country really is sick of the Communists?

"Could the Nationalists invade the mainland and hold a beachhead without outside help?"

No. They haven't the ships. They're capable of putting a division on the mainland and keeping it there for 3 days. They've done it. And they're capable of conducting a fairly effective blockade. They're doing it now, although, of course, they don't call it a blockade. However, for a real offensive they'd need the United States Navy. They'd need it for any preparatory bombardment,

and they'd need it for logistical support. If our present expansion plans are carried out, they'll have enough air force to give the invading troops close ground support, but for strategic bombing they'd probably need help, too.

"Up to now, United States policy hasn't called for helping Chiang invade the mainland. Unless it is changed—and a real invasion carries the risk of world war—aren't we wasting money?"

On the contrary, the build-up of Chiang has already helped the United States and the United Nations immeasurably. The mere existence of the Nationalist forces, the raids which they're constantly conducting, and the possibility that some day they may attempt an invasion have forced the Communists to keep troops and arms in south China which they otherwise would have been able to send to Korea and Indochina. Moreover, take a look at the map. Just think of what would happen to our far-eastern defenses if Formosa fell into Communist hands; just think of what would happen to Japan's defenses. And consider this: Supposing there's another big show; think of how valuable Formosa could be offensively.

It's not my job to worry about long-range policy. That's Washington's job. I'm here just to carry the policy out. Until now, I've been concerned only with helping to build up Chiang's forces to defend Formosa. And I say that every nickel the United States is spending for that helps the United States. If the United States wants to help the Nationalists invade the mainland, I'm convinced they will give a good account of themselves. And if a third world war breaks out—well, Formosa is a fine naval base; it's an unsinkable aircraft carrier; and 500,000 troops, equipped with United States arms and United States-trained, would be damned valuable to have fighting on our side.

GRAVE AMERICAN DAIRY PROBLEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the farm situation in our Nation has been growing increasingly serious as farm prices have nose-dived further and further down, while surpluses have soared further and further up.

This is not merely a matter of deep concern to the agricultural segment of our economy, but rather to the American people as a whole.

Statisticians have proved conclusively that every major American depression has begun with the falling of farm prices. When the farmer is unable to buy commodities produced in the cities, the impact of his reduced purchasing power spreads throughout the entire economy.

I have prepared a brief statement on the dairy situation in particular.

I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

DAIRY PRICE DECLINE THREATENS WISCONSIN, MIDWEST, AND THE NATION

A grave series of danger signals have begun to appear in the entire dairy economy of our Nation.

Wisconsin, America's dairyland, has been increasingly hard hit. A huge dairy surplus is building up, particularly because milk production this past fall and present winter soared to tremendous heights. Under these circumstances, the level of dairy price supports becomes a crucial factor in the welfare of the dairyman and all who depend upon the dairyman.

As yet, Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, has not announced his final over-all position on future parity levels, and so, it is most important that an announcement be made at the earliest possible date in order to clarify the situation.

A number of factors have contributed to the present dairy problem, such as—

1. For several years, the shift from dairy to beef has been reversed and dairy herds have been built up.

2. Comparatively low prices received for cull cows have caused farmers to retain many head that they would have sold had a favorable beef price continued.

3. At the end of 1952, milk prices were comparatively favorable and this served to stimulate production.

4. We fortunately had fine weather for 1952 production and this gave us high quantity roughage and a good grain and corn crop.

DAIRY SUBSTITUTES POSE DIFFICULT PROBLEM

5. Still another problem is provided by the increasing competition of dairy substitutes which I for one had predicted when the Wiley amendment to the oleomargarine law was taken up on the Senate floor and unfortunately defeated.

I had warned when the Wiley amendment was up for debate exactly what has since come to pass, namely, that natural dairy products would be hard-hit and that, as a result American health, American agriculture, American soil conservation would feel an increasingly harmful impact. In 1953, the sale of oleomargarine will far exceed the sale of butter, and other synthetic sales are also rising.

Of course, we have always recognized the right of individual consumers to choose what they please, as regards a table spread and other items in their food budget. But we want to point out that giving to a synthetic product—oleo—complete legal leeway to imitate a natural product—butter—can cause, and has caused, exceedingly harmful repercussions.

FARM MANPOWER HAS DECLINED

Throughout our entire country, there has been a population drift away from agriculture. More and more farms have been auctioned off. Elderly farmers have retired and young farmers have not replaced them. The drafting of farm manpower has seriously depleted the availability of skilled hands to run the modern dairy farm.

FOREIGN FARM IMPORTS POSE A DILEMMA

Against the background of this increasingly difficult situation we view the problem of competitive imports from abroad.

This is a difficult problem, indeed, and it is made even more so by America's pre-eminent position in the world.

UNITED STATES MUST BUY IF IT IS TO SELL

We recognize, of course, that in this contracted world of the atomic age, the United States must buy if it expects to sell. Trade must be a two-way street. There must be reciprocity, real reciprocity in spirit and in letter.

President Eisenhower recognized all of these facts in his reference to this over-all problem in his state of the Union message where he urged extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program with careful regard, however, for the needs of the American market.

My own view has always been that the American market is the greatest in the world and it must be protected primarily for American producers.

We have already tremendously reduced our United States tariffs. Thousands of items are on the free list entirely. We have thus more than signified our awareness of Europe's economic dilemma.

FREE TRADE IS NOT THE ANSWER

But we know that the answer to that dilemma is not in a policy of virtually free trade. That could be disastrous, and the American people definitely oppose it. Even if there were such free trade, there would still be a grave dollar gap, and Europe's problems would persist and would ever be magnified manyfold, by the resultant economic havoc—closed factories and unemployment which would occur in America.

I have had a good deal of discussion and correspondence on this over-all issue, particularly on its dairy phases which especially concern my own State—Wisconsin.

But I am mindful of the problems of all 48 States, mindful of the millions of jobs which depend on United States exports and the millions of jobs which are affected by imports.

Much has been written about this problem—its pros and cons. To hear some people talk, one would think that folks in the Midwest, or in the dairy heartland in particular, were completely oblivious of the need for world commerce and trade.

On the contrary, I don't believe that I have ever spoken to a leader of the dairy industry who has not evidenced his awareness of the fact that nations must increasingly trade with one another if there is to be economic health in the world. At the same time, we note a tremendous demand abroad for foreign products, including dairy items, to pour into the American market, while the European market is almost ignored.

The American dollar is still just about the most prized currency in the world, and it is little wonder that foreign lands desire to trade for our dollars rather than for less valuable currencies.

EUROPE SHOULD SEE ITS OWN OPPORTUNITIES

I have urged the European nations, however, to recognize the great opportunities in the European market itself if the nations there were to cut down on customs barriers and other restrictions.

I have pointed out that the American dairyman, like the American manufacturer, welcomes fair competition. But he knows that in a great many respects, competition from abroad has often not been fair. It has often been heavily subsidized. Rates paid to dairy hands abroad are so much lower than for farm labor in the United States as to make it extremely difficult for the American dairyman to compete with the foreign import.

I ask very definitely: How can we help Europe's economy if we wreck the American dairyman—dairying which provides the backbone for American farming—dairying which is the greatest single source of cash income for the farmer, dairying which is indispensable in the Nation's health and to the welfare of the Nation's soil?

I repeat; although I have focused on dairying in particular, it is but one phase of this over-all import-export problem. It is a particularly acute phase, however, because of the recent decline in farm prices.

MIDDLEMEN RECEIVE MAJOR SHARE OF DAIRY DOLLAR

Unfortunately, one of the paradoxes of the dairy situation is that when farm prices fall, consumers rarely receive the benefit of the decline, because the dairy product goes through so many hands between farmer and consumer.

As a matter of fact, no matter whether dairy prices rise or fall, the plain fact is that the farmer receives only a small fraction of the total return, considering his tremendous labors. A farmer in Wisconsin may get around 7 cents for his quart of milk, whereas a consumer will pay around three times that total, meaning that two-thirds of the cost has gone to middlemen in the complicated distribution process.

The farmer does the work. He has the tremendous investment. He bears the greatest risk from weather, from livestock diseases and insect ravages, from a surplus glut; but he gets what often amounts to a pitifully small return.

On the other hand, when he goes to the city having had to sell his milk at wholesale, he must thereafter buy his own goods at retail. This is his perennial problem. Yet the farmer provides the greatest single source of purchasing power of any group in America, and once that purchasing power begins to skid, the rest of the economy will soon start down the toboggan.

GOVERNMENT OFTEN FOLLOWS CONTRADICTORY POLICIES

Obviously, there must be careful consideration given to the relation between farm parity supports and the level of tariffs. It is ridiculous for the Federal Government to spend considerable sums of money to support farm prices, and at the same time to follow the contradictory policy of permitting the pouring into the American market of such vast quantities of farm items as to force farm prices still lower and thereby increase the Government's costs of the farm price support program.

MANY GROUPS MUST WORK ON SOLUTION

What is the solution?

To help find a solution, I have talked and corresponded with a great many dairy organizations, with the Dairy Industry Committee, the National Creameries Association, the American Butter Institute, the National Cheese Institute, the Evaporated Milk Association, the American Dry Milk Institute, and with many dairy groups, particularly at the State level.

I have discussed this problem also, however, with representatives of interested foreign governments, with representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, because I recognize that we must bear in mind the whole picture, not just one phase of it.

I am indeed hopeful that the Eighty-third Congress will help to provide a solution for the problem; that the 14-man Agriculture Committee appointed by President Eisenhower will, in cooperation with the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, with the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, the United States Tariff Commission, the State Department, and Commerce Department work out what we hope will be an equitable answer to this problem.

We want European countries to be self-sustaining. We want their peoples to enjoy an ever higher standard of living, but we always want to be mindful of our paramount responsibilities to our own people and of the fact that Europe must not become so exclusively preoccupied with the American market that it forgets its own opportunities at home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROCEDURE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may state that when the Senate concludes its business today, I intend to move a recess until Friday; and, on Friday we shall take up the bill dealing with the reorganization powers of the President.

COMPLETION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the able and distinguished majority leader. Last week, before the end of the week, I said:

I should like to ask the majority leader whether he can give us some information as to when action will be taken on completing and reappointing the Select Committee on Small Business. One reason for asking that question now is that tomorrow, I believe, or perhaps the next day, is pay day, but the employees of this committee are not able to draw pay, because of the fact that under the resolution creating the committee it has to be reappointed every 2 years.

The majority leader replied:

I hope we may have the list of our members on that committee ready by tomorrow, so that it can be reported tomorrow.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that these employees are still without pay, and, furthermore, that the work cannot be planned. The committee is simply at a standstill. I am receiving a great deal of mail, and I am certain that other members of that committee are receiving a great deal of mail. I now ask the question again of the majority leader, and, in so doing, urge very strongly that action be taken at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. TAFT. I think I can promise the Senator this time. I only expressed the hope before, but I can promise the Senator that on Friday the committee will be appointed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object. I think we ought to have a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Kerr
Anderson	Frear	Kilgore
Barrett	Fulbright	Knowland
Beall	George	Kuchel
Bennett	Gillette	Langer
Bricker	Goldwater	Lehman
Bridges	Gore	Long
Bush	Green	Magnuson
Butler, Md.	Griswold	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hayden	Mansfield
Byrd	Hendrickson	Martin
Capehart	Hennings	Maybank
Carlson	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Case	Hill	McClellan
Chavez	Hoey	Millikin
Clements	Holland	Monroney
Cooper	Humphrey	Morse
Cordon	Hunt	Mundt
Daniel	Ives	Murray
Dirksen	Jackson	Neely
Douglas	Jenner	Pastore
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Ellender	Kefauver	Robertson
Ferguson	Kennedy	Russell
Saltonstall	Stennis	Welker
Schoeppel	Symington	Wiley
Smathers	Taft	Williams
Smith, Maine	Thye	Young
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	
Sparkman	Watkins	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees; and withdrawing the nominations of Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army, Seymour J. Rubin, of Illinois, to be Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, and Francis Shackelford, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, which were sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Frank C. Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense;

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense;

Charles S. Thomas, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy; and

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

John H. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Romeo E. Short, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

J. Earl Coke, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter B. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State; and

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission, class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD E. TALBOTT TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold E. Talbott, of New York, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to be heard briefly on the nomination. At my request the Committee on Armed Services, through its able chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], called Mr. Harold E. Talbott back before the committee for further examination last Monday.

I have in my hand the printed transcript of those hearings. I feel sure that it has been available to all Senators who wished to study the hearings.

I should like to state my own attitude in asking the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct these further hearings and my attitude now that they have been completed.

When I read the record of the earlier hearings at which Mr. Talbott testified—hearings from which I was absent, unfortunately, because of an attack of influenza—I was disturbed to see that he had passed over the Hughes investigation with a reference to the effect that the company with which he was associated had done no wrong.

Mr. President, I do not like to censure any man for what happened more than 30 years ago. What happened then was not and is not the main point in considering the nomination of Mr. Talbott. Certainly a man is entitled to be forgiven for some impropriety after so long a time. However, I did regard his present attitude toward an occurrence which clearly showed the exercise of improper influence in connection with Government contracts to be an important consideration in connection with his nomination to be Secretary of the Air Force. The same or a similar situation might arise again, and I felt that in the public interest it would be well to know how the new Secretary of the Air Force would meet it.

To me, Mr. President, the actions of Colonel Deeds, and the relationship he continued with certain officials of the Dayton-Wright Corp., after he became head of the Procurement Division of the Signal Corps, which secured airplanes, was indefensible and against the public interest, and I believe the recommendations of that distinguished jurist and citizen, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, to the effect that Colonel Deeds be court-martialed, were fully and entirely justified. Therefore I asked that Mr. Talbott be recalled for further questioning on this subject. The fiasco of our airplane production and Colonel Deeds' performance at that time have been generally known and discussed for many years.

The other subject I wanted to inquire into was Mr. Talbott's attitude toward pricing practices in the automobile industry with regard to spare parts. These practices, involving two companies with which he had been associated, were brought out in House Report No. 1811—the so-called Hardy report—which was dated April 25, 1952.

I may say that I found Mr. Talbott's attitude thoroughly satisfactory as to these pricing policies. For the benefit of those who may not have read the report, the Hardy investigation showed that on bids for spare parts the basic manufacturers were bidding a higher price to the Government than they were to assemblers, and assemblers were bidding a much higher price than they paid.

A specific example concerned 1,000 generators which were manufactured by Electric Auto-Lite. It sold the generators to Chrysler for $52. The Government asked for bids. Electric Auto-Lite bid $87; Chrysler bid $77.20. Of course, Chrysler was awarded the contract and then the generators actually were shipped from Electric Auto-Lite to Rossville Arsenal, a distance of 10 miles, without even passing through Chrysler, but Chrysler got a profit of $25.20 on each generator.

I wanted to ask Mr. Talbott about this matter because he was a director in both companies and was chairman of the finance committee of the Electric Autolite Co. I thought it would be a good occasion to bring out this practice, which had cost the Government untold millions of dollars, and it seemed to me that, being a director in both companies, he might know something about it.

His attitude was thoroughly satisfactory. While he denied knowing anything about the pricing policies of the companies, he stated unequivocally that as Secretary of the Air Force he would take steps toward preventing such manipulations. If he is successful, of course, he would save the Government millions of dollars a year. The House committee estimated that the loss to the Government through that kind of practice over a period of 3 years was about $305,000,000.

I was not satisfied with Mr. Talbott's attitude toward the revelations of the Hughes investigation. I felt that Mr. Talbott was equivocal and protested too much by saying that what the company with which he was associated had done was not wrong.

The Hughes report—and I do not wish to go into a detailed discussion of it, because the testimony is available—showed that Colonel Deeds, who had been associated as one of the officers of the company, succeeded to a controlling position on the Aircraft Production Board and had charge of procuring aircraft for the Signal Corps.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's intention to have the Hughes report printed in the RECORD as a part of his speech?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Hughes report is a public document. It is also attached to the House committee report which investigated the same matter in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. MORSE. It is not a very long report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had not expected to ask that it be made a part of the RECORD. The Senator from Oregon may make that request.

Mr. MORSE. I shall ask that it be made a part of the Senator's remarks, because I believe it ought to be in the RECORD, so that people referring to the discussion on the nomination may turn immediately to the Hughes report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Hughes report—and it is a very well documented report in connection with which a great deal of testimony had been taken—showed that while Colonel Deeds was head of the aircraft procurement division, he conducted improper communications with his former associates at the Dayton-Wright Corp., thus giving them an advantage over other companies. These communications made available to his associates confidential information, and they were very severely criticized by Mr. Hughes. As I said before, it was upon that basis that Mr. Hughes recommended that Colonel Deeds be court-martialed.

The Attorney General of the United States approved that request. The Judge Advocate General of the United States approved it. Colonel Deeds was later released from court-martial by the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, under circumstances which are discussed at length and bitterly condemned by the House committee.

When Mr. Talbott was first before the Armed Services Committee, he was interrogated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], about the Hughes report. Mr. Talbott said, in substance, that the only thing wrong with the telegrams which had been sent was that they were marked "confidential," and that he did not think anything wrong had been done by his company.

On page 97 of the hearings we find this statement by Mr. Talbott:

> There never was any improper action of any kind.

Unfortunately, at that first hearing Mr. Talbott testified that the Hughes investigation and report brought about a lawsuit between the Dayton-Wright Co. and the Government; and that after a long litigation, the company won. The attitude then in the Senate Armed Services Committee seemed to be—although the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is not in the Chamber at this time, and of course I cannot speak for him—that since the controversy had developed

into a lawsuit and since the company had won the lawsuit, that settled the matter.

Unfortunately, Mr. Talbott was wrong in testifying that the Hughes investigation and report had resulted in a lawsuit. Later he sent to the chairman of the committee a letter, which was placed in the record when Mr. Wilson was testifying, pointing out that they were two entirely separate and distinct matters.

The fact is that the Hughes report was made to the President on October 25, 1918; and the lawsuit in which the Government sued the Dayton-Wright Co. was not filed until 1922. At the first hearing the question of Mr. Talbott's present attitude about the transactions between his company and Colonel Deeds was not gone into fully, and that is why I felt Mr. Talbott should be called back for further hearings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the lawsuit had nothing to do with the subject matter of the Hughes investigation? Is it not true that the lawsuit had to do with a tax matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The lawsuit had nothing whatsoever to do with the Hughes investigation or with the investigation by a select committee of the House which went fully into the matter and sustained the Hughes report all the way through. The lawsuit came some 4 or 5 years later. The complaint in the lawsuit is set forth in the hearings which Members of the Senate now have before them, beginning on page 24.

The substance of the lawsuit was that Dayton-Wright Co. falsely and fraudulently charged against the Government certain items amounting to approximately $3,000,000, whereas the Government contended that those items should not have been charged against it. I put in the RECORD the answer of the company, which I believe follows.

In fairness, let me say that the case was tried at Cincinnati before Federal District Judge Hickenlooper, a kinsman of our colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. Judge Hickenlooper found substantially for the Government. His finding was appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which remanded the case, and a finding was made in favor of the Dayton-Wright Co. The opinion of the circuit court of appeals is also to be found in the hearings which Members of the Senate have before them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear on this point. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me that the decision of the court in that case had nothing whatsoever to do with the charges which were made against the company in the Deeds matter by Charles Evans Hughes or by the House committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, that is entirely correct; they are separate, and have no relationship one to the other.

Mr. MORSE. Do I also correctly understand that the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me, therefore, that anyone who cites the court decision by way of any basis for an exoneration of the company in connection with the Charles Evans Hughes investigation is citing an authority which is not at all relevant to the Hughes investigation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is correct. They are separate and distinct matters, as was testified to by Mr. Talbott himself, after he had apparently refreshed his memory.

Mr. Talbott was inclined to defend the activity when he was again before the Armed Services Committee last Monday. Although he defended the action, he later said, when he was pressed on the point, that he did not approve of such action as a matter of public policy; that he would not allow such a thing to happen while he was Secretary of the Air Force; that he would take action against an officer who did what Colonel Deeds did—although at other points in the hearing Mr. Talbott said he did not think Colonel Deeds did anything wrong.

I read now from page 10 of the later hearings.

Senator KEFAUVER. To answer that, some were before and some were after the signing of the contract. They are all set out in this report. Let's get this straight. Do you think the telegrams are all right, the exchange of telegrams?

Mr. TALBOTT. Senator, I think they were perfectly proper. Unfortunate in their implication, but perfectly proper.

Later, as appears on page 11, when Mr. Talbott was asked again about the telegrams, and was asked whether they were perfectly proper, he replied:

No, from the public implication. I think they were perfectly honest in their intent, but they were unfortunate and they should not have been sent.

Mr. President, in my opinion that is an equivocal attitude toward an occurrence which I believe constitutes one of the dark spots in the history of aircraft procurement for this Nation. This is a matter about which there should be no equivocation. It was highly improper to give one company an advantage over another—as Mr. Hughes found had been done—and to continue a confidential relationship with officials of the company with whom Colonel Deeds had been associated.

I agree with the finding of the House committee which investigated the matter, namely, that Mr. Charles Evans Hughes' condemnation was fully justified, and that his recommendation that Colonel Deeds be court-martialed was fully sustained by the facts. Colonel Deeds' action was condemned in very strong language in the report by Charles Evans Hughes, and also in the House committee report.

So I do not see how anyone could properly have an equivocal attitude about the matter, or how anyone could properly feel that it was perfectly proper, but unfortunate, for such action simply should not be tolerated in Government procurement agencies, which should be governed by proper procurement policies fair to all companies and fair to the United States itself. So that this situation persuades me that I must cast my vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Talbott. I regret this. I had planned to vote for all of those nominated by President Eisenhower, in order that he might get his new administration under way. I have heretofore voted to confirm every nomination sent to the Senate by the new President and considered on the floor of the Senate. But there are such serious doubts in my mind, not arising from an occurrence which happened a long time ago, but because of a present attitude, that I cannot in conscience vote for the confirmation of Mr. Talbott's nomination. I hope that I may be shown to be wrong in this matter.

Mr. Talbott is undoubtedly a man of ability and of much experience. He has had many business connections. He knows a great deal about the airplane industry. I hope that Mr. Talbott will prove a success as Secretary of Air, and that his conduct of the department will be without question. But, Mr. President, that is a hope for the future. This is a vote today, and today I cannot assent to the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the confirmation of the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. Talbott appeared before the Committee on Armed Services on three separate occasions. He testified at length, and the record of the hearings is on the desk of each Senator. No question was raised at any time regarding Mr. Talbott's personal qualifications for the position. His character, his integrity, his personality were not questioned. There was a very great question at one time, under the conflict-of-interests statute, as to whether certain stocks which he held in various companies doing business with the Department of Air would interfere with the performance of his duties. On his second appearance, Mr. Talbott agreed to sell all those stocks. I name them: The Chrysler Corp., stock which he held in his own name, the Electric Auto-lite Co., which he held in his own name, and Standard Packaging Corp. stock, which, from the first time he appeared before us, he had always agreed to sell. In addition to these stocks, there was a holding by him of a 6½ percent interest in the so-called Talbott Holding Co., a family concern. That concern held 2,000 shares of Chrysler stock.

Mr. Talbott agreed with the committee that either the Talbott holding company would dispose of that stock, or else he would get out of the Talbott holding company. He has agreed, therefore, to dispose of all stock that might interfere with his duties as Secretary, and thus avoid the so-called conflict-of-interests statute.

During the hearing, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked some questions concerning the Charles Evans

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Hughes report in 1918. That was a report which was made to the House investigating committee at that time, relative to aircraft procurement——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be correct, I understood the Senator to say that the Hughes report was made to the House investigating committee. I understand that that is not a fact. President Wilson, as I think the record will show, appointed Mr. Charles Evans Hughes as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and the report was made in that capacity. The House report was made by a select committee which had made an investigation entirely separate from the Hughes investigation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is entirely correct, and I thank him for the correction of my statement. There was a House investigating committee. Charles Evans Hughes was appointed by the President to be Assistant Attorney General to investigate the questions also. The important report was that of Charles Evans Hughes, which recommended that a Colonel Deeds be court-martialed. The report was sent to the Secretary of War, Mr. Newton D. Baker. On page 15 of the record of the hearings of February 2, 1953, there is a copy of Mr. Baker's letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. That letter is printed in full in the report of the hearing. One brief paragraph of the letter is as follows:

> The unanimous report of this board of review, approved by the Acting Judge Advocate General, recommends that Colonel Deeds be not tried by court-martial on any of the grounds suggested, and this recommendation has been approved by me.

The final paragraph of Mr. Baker's letter reads as follows:

> Inasmuch as the purpose of Judge Hughes' suggestion has been accomplished, I have directed that all the records in this case be filed in the War Department and that this matter be considered as closed.

That letter is dated January 16, 1919, and signed "Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War."

So, Mr. President, it was recommended by the Army Board that no action be taken against Colonel Deeds, and Newton D. Baker, a highly respected public official, agreed with that recommendation, and ordered the report of Mr. Hughes in the Colonel Deeds case to be filed.

Mr. President, who was Colonel Deeds?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in order to have the whole story in proper sequence, will the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that on page 13 of the printed hearings there appears the condemnation by the House Select Committee of Secretary Baker's action in exonerating Colonel Deeds? It is found on pages 13 and 14 of the hearing.

In that report the House committee said:

> This action—
>
> Referring to the action of Secretary Baker—
>
> your committee is informed, is unprecedented.
>
> Colonel Deeds' attorney and two business associates, connected with these same Government contracts, were thereupon heard and a new report rendered exonerating Deeds. Secretary Baker's activities in protecting Deeds against Justice Hughes' finding is at once astonishing and significant. With a record that affected lives of men and charges of inordinate selfishness reported by specific facts, Deeds should have been placed on trial, to be convicted if guilty, to be vindicated if innocent. According to the testimony, Secretary Baker prevented such action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I read the record, the House committee disagreed with the action of Mr. Baker, a very highly respected Secretary of War, in permitting further witnesses to appear before the military board which was established. The sum and substance of it is that they did not agree with Mr. Baker's action.

But, Mr. President, the final conclusion of the matter was that while Mr. Baker did consider a court-martial, as recommended by Mr. Hughes, a board of review decided against it, and Mr. Baker approved the findings of that board.

Mr. President, who was Colonel Deeds? According to the record, he was a successful businessman in 1917, who later became the head of the National Cash Register Co., a very successful company, and was called to Washington in connection with aircraft procurement. At that time we had no aircraft industry. We had no concerns that built aircraft or knew how to build them. Colonel Deeds was called to Washington to stimulate the building of aircraft for our military forces.

He was a successful financier. He had interests in various companies, one of which was the Dayton-Wright Co., in Dayton, Ohio. The chairman of the board of the Dayton-Wright Co. was Mr. Talbott's father. Mr. Talbott himself was listed as the president of the company, but actually was the operating manager in the shop. Colonel Deeds had a financial interest in that company. Various telegrams were sent by Colonel Deeds to Mr. Talbott, Sr., which Mr. Talbott, Jr., the nominee, never saw and knew nothing about. This event occurred 35 years ago, Mr. President.

Mr. Talbott was questioned by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and, at one time, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as to an event which occurred 35 years ago when he was 30 years of age. Most of the things which occurred at that time in connection with Colonel Deeds he knew nothing about, as he was on the floor of the factory, and they were over his head, so to speak, in the top office.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee brings these matters up to show that there may be a wrong attitude of mind on the part of Mr. Talbott with relation to his duties as a public official. As I say, Mr. President, these things occurred 35 years ago, and about most of them he knew nothing.

In answer to straightforward questions by the Senator from Tennessee he stated that if and when he should become Secretary he would not approve the sending of telegrams of the kind which passed between Colonel Deeds and Mr. Talbott's father, and that he believed that was not the type of operation a wise, honest, and public-minded official in the Air Force should carry on. In effect, he was asked, in a way, to criticize the action of his father 35 years ago, his father being now dead and Colonel Deeds being dead. Mr. Talbott stated very frankly that he would not permit such things to take place in his department.

The other matters which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] brought up had to do with things that occurred a few years ago. Mr. Talbott stated that he was chairman of the finance committee of another concern, but that he knew nothing about its pricing policy. He expressed his own attitude of mind which the Senator from Tennessee stated frankly was satisfactory to him. Therefore, there is no question of conflict of interests under the statute. No question, as I have said, has been raised or asked regarding the personality, integrity of character, or present business activities of Mr. Talbott. The only question is as to his attitude of mind when as a 30-year-old man he worked on the floor of a factory in the First World War. In that connection it would be well to bear in mind that at that time there was no aircraft industry, no production line for the building of airplanes, and no greatly advanced knowledge of how to build airplanes.

As I understand, the exchange of telegrams came about in this way: One DeHavilland plane had been shipped from England to the United States, to be used as a model. It was perfectly clear that in using the model, the guns and gasoline tanks had to be changed, and various other experiments had to be conducted. The plane was shipped very secretly to the Dayton-Wright Co. Why should the Dayton-Wright Co. have been chosen? No one can say. No one else had any knowledge of the shipment. Colonel Deeds, as a public-spirited citizen, but perhaps unwisely, because he had a financial interest in the company, had the plane shipped to the Dayton-Wright Co. He sent telegrams stating that he wanted the company to be very careful not to permit any of the information to be disclosed in any way, or there would be a great deal of trouble. Those are the circumstances that happened 35 years ago.

As I have said, Colonel Deeds was ultimately cleared by Secretary Baker, and continued throughout his life to become an even more successful businessman, a man of recognized character, if you will, because he held important positions in concerns like the National Cash Register Co.

Mr. Talbott had no personal relations with Colonel Deeds. It was his father, the elder Talbott, with whom Colonel Deeds communicated. Mr. Talbott, Jr., was brave enough, or frank enough, if we wish to use those terms, to say that

undoubtedly mistakes had been made, but nothing was presented to show his connection with those occurrences.

Under all the circumstances, your committee, by a voice vote, but, to the best of my knowledge by an actual vote of 14 to 1, recommended to the Senate that the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force be confirmed. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will soon approve his nomination to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts is somewhat mistaken in placing all the burden for the receipt of the telegrams on Mr. Talbott's father. Unquestionably the evidence shows that telegrams had been sent to the company itself, because in one telegram, Mr. Kettering suggested that all confidential telegrams be sent to Mr. Talbott, Sr., or to Mr. Smith, who was the confidential man for Deeds.

It will be found also that many telegrams were sent to Mr. Kettering. The telegrams speak for themselves, but they cover a great variety of matters, not only the one DeHavilland-4 plane. For example, they cover matters pertaining to the acquisition of land.

One telegram began by stating:

For your personal, confidential information, as coming from your attorney.

Colonel Deeds then advised what sort of procedure would be followed in the Department with respect to information he had obtained confidentially.

So I do not believe Mr. Talbott's son should share the whole responsibility. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, I think it is true that Mr. Talbott, Jr., was second in command. Undoubtedly his father was the dominating influence. But, after all, Mr. Talbott, Jr., was president of the Dayton Metals Co., which owned the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., and he was general manager of Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. From both positions he received a salary of $46,000 a year, so he was not an insignificant person in connection with the operation of the company. However, in fairness, I think he knew less about what was happening in connection with the exchange of telegrams than did his father.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is my understanding that the telegrams came to the Dayton-Wright shop, or the central office, and that Mr. Talbott, Sr., felt that there might be leaks in that office, so he asked that all future telegrams be sent to the office in town, addressed to Mr. Talbott, Sr., personally, or to Mr. Smith, his general man of affairs.

Thereafter I believe that was done. I think the evidence is clear that the younger Talbott, being an appointee, and the factory manager, did not have anything to do with the office in town, and had no connection with the top management, except as factory producer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, on the question of the confirmation of this nomination, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in opposition to the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force. I have tried to think of a more appropriate term for describing properly my feelings in connection with this particular nomination.

I am opposed to this nomination, because I think it stinks, and the terrific odors emanating from it are sufficient to give warning of the great danger of the decay of the whole pattern of ethical standards of government.

If the Senate does not stop confirming for high office the nominations of men who I think are involved, as the nominee under consideration is involved, in a background of relationship with the Defense Establishment, the men thus nominated will be suspect from the moment they are confirmed.

To my way of thinking, it is incumbent upon the Senate to lean over backward to keep out of office men whom a large segment of our population view with suspicion and distrust. I do not know what character of mail other Senators are receiving, but I know the kind of mail I am getting. I need only to read my own mail to know that there is anything but unanimity on the part of the American people with regard to the nominations to the Defense Establishment. I believe we are going to discover that millions of American people are going to be shocked by this nomination, as, indeed, I think they ought to be shocked by it.

Let us take a look at the record. Last Thursday, January 29, the committee recommended the confirmation of the nomination of Talbott, with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] dissenting.

Over the week-end the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] agreed that further hearings would be held on Talbott's World War I connections with two aircraft companies whose dealings were highly suspect and were criticized by Charles Evans Hughes after he conducted hearings on their operations.

The Talbott company was criticized by a man who was appointed as a special investigator by the President of the United States; criticized by a man who became Chief Justice of the United States; criticized by a man who made a great record as an investigator of fraud and corruption in connection with the administration of government; criticized by a man whose report was joined in, so far as approval was concerned, by the House committee; criticized by a man whose report was not set aside until what? Until we saw in operation what we see so frequently. Throughout our history, whenever the Defense Establishment has gotten into trouble, we have found that there were those in our Government who tried to gloss it over and excuse it. Mr. President, the final dropping of the proceedings against Deeds by the then Secretary of War does not change a word nor answer an accusation or charge made in the Charles Evans Hughes investigation or in the House committee report.

So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied as to what happened. It was decided that there had been enough pointing out of how bad it was, and that steps should be taken to correct the situation in order that some faces might be saved. That is what happened as a result of the action of the Secretary of War. But the wrong was not righted. Nor was the basis for the Hughes charges changed. They rested on facts. So, Mr. President, unless it is necessary for me to read them in totality, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the report of the House committee and the report of Charles Evans Hughes in connection with the Deeds and Talbott matter.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 637, 66th Cong., 2d sess.]

EXPENDITURES IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT: AVIATION—REPORT SUBMITTED BY MR. GRAHAM OF ILLINOIS, FROM THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Subcommittee No. 1, on Aviation, of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and composed of Hon. James A. Frear, chairman, and Hon. Walter W. Magee and Hon. Clarence F. Lea, were given the following jurisdiction by said select committee:

"This subcommitee will have jurisdiction over all expenditures and contracts of the Signal Corps and for aviation generally, whether such supplies were purchased or contracts made by the Signal Corps or by any other subsequently organized bureau or division of the Army. This will include all aviation expenditures in the United States and until the supplies for which such expenditures are made are landed in foreign countries. By arrangement between Subcommittees No. 1 and No. 3 this subcommittee may make investigations in its work as to activities in foreign countries.

"Included in the work of this subcommittee will be the Spruce Production Division and all aviation fields of the Military Establishment of every kind, with their supplies and equipment."

Since its appointment, on June 17, 1919, the subcommittee has been investigating the various matters submitted to it and has taken a very great volume of testimony, which will be found in the printed hearings of the committee, pages 1 to 3880, serial 2.

On February 9, 1920, the said subcommittee presented its report to said select committee, which, on motion, has been adopted as the report of said committee and is as follows, to wit:

The Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department was directed by House resolution of June 4, 1919, to investigate all contracts and expenditures made by the War Department, or under its direction, during the war. Pursuant to such resolution the committee of 15 members therein provided divided the work among five subcommittees, of which "Subcommittee No. 1 (Aviation)," consisting of James A. Frear, chairman, Walter W. Magee, and Clarance F. Lea, were given jurisdiction over all expenditures and contracts of the Signal Corps and of aviation.

The following summary includes a review of the investigation hearings, which comprise about 3,900 printed pages:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

During our 19 months of war with Germany the American Congress appropriated for Signal Corps and aviation purposes as follows:

Appropriations	$1,692,336,424
Revocation of excess after the war (Feb. 5, 1919)	487,000,000
Balance available for use	1,205,336,424
Expended or obligated to June 30, 1919	1,051,511,988

The above statement is approximately correct. (Exhibit 9, p. 2856.)

During this period expenditures or commitments of over $1,000,000,000 produced the following machines used by American aviators on the French fighting front:

American-built pursuit or combat planes	None.
American-built bombing planes	None.
American-built observation planes (DH-4's)	213
Machines bought from our Allies	527
Total planes on French front Nov. 11, 1918	740

(Pp. 178, 179, 180, 185.)

These facts confronted the committee at the outset of this investigation and whatever explanations or excuses may be offered of prospective quantity production, the fact remains that while the American Congress and the people gave ungrudgingly and were beguiled by responsible officials with promises of 20,000 American airplanes that were to precede our American armies to France, when the armistice was signed over 2,000,000 American soldiers had reached France and turned defeat into victory, while America's fighting airplane expectations and promises existed only on paper.

Three thousand American aviators available for flying were in readiness on the front in August 1918, but fighting planes were not to be had, according to testimony of General Kenly, Director of Aviation and an experienced aviator (p. 3494).

The number of American flyers on November 11, 1918, was 11,425, of whom 4,307 were in Europe and 7,118 in the United States (p. 284).

Testimony October 31, 1919, before the Joint Military Committee briefly gives the story of America's aviation record from a witness of acknowledged authority:

"Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Did you at any time have enough planes of any make of American or foreign to train that body [aviators then in France]?

"General PERSHING. No; we were always short.

"Senator CHAMBERLAIN. In other words, we had a body of young men over there to be trained that could not be trained because we did not have the facilities to train them.

"General PERSHING. Yes, sir. That is true (p. 1693, joint military hearings).

* * * * *

"Mr. JAMES. How many American fighting planes were there in France at the signing of the armistice?

"General PERSHING. None. We had the De Havilland 4's.

* * * * *

"Mr. MILLER. I mean combat planes.

"General PERSHING. No combat planes.

* * * * *

"Mr. KEARNS. Do you know the reason why there were no other American-made planes over there?

"General PERSHING. I know very little of the construction program in America nor the reasons why we had no further planes. The only reason that I can give is that there were no planes ready to ship (p. 1611, joint military hearings)."

Bearing on the same question Colonel Patrick, Chief of Air Service, AEF, in August 1918 testified:

"Mr. FREAR. Two thousand seven hundred and twenty machines were necessary for 1,000,000 men (or 3,400 machines for American forces at the front)?

"Colonel PATRICK. That would be it, approximately.

* * * * *

"Mr. FREAR. So we were woefully weak in our own air service, both in machines and men?

"Colonel PATRICK. Yes, sir" (p. 187).

Our utter failure to produce fighting planes after 19 months of war is disclosed by one question:

"Mr. MAGEE. As far as the manufacture of pursuit planes or bombing planes in the United States is concerned, we are practically in the same position (August 1919) we were in when we entered the World War?

"Colonel PATRICK. Quite true" (p. 232).

That, in brief, is the story of America's aircraft production failure, occasioned by a record of stupidity and stubbornness that involved inexcusable waste of men and money and invited military disaster.

The details would fill volumes, but this committee can only point out briefly recognized causes, as set forth in this and previous investigations, and, so far as possible, fix responsibility for the record made.

War means waste and extravagance, and, unless expenditures are of a questionable character, criticism does not ordinarily follow. Where incompetence, inexperience, blundering, or personal interests were permitted to delay or thwart aviation production and thereby jeopardize the winning of the war with attendant unnecessary loss of lives, responsibility should be placed upon those in actual authority. Your committee presents what are believed to be the facts in the firm hope that the Government may profit from errors of the past. Apologists can offer their own explanations.

The members of this committee were appointed without solicitation, but influenced by a unanimous vote of the House they accepted the assignment from a sense of public duty. Notwithstanding propaganda of a political character designed to discredit and interfere, begun before a single witness had been called, the hearings covering testimony of over 100 witnesses tell the story, and this brief report is offered without conscious prejudice, political or personal.

SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

Several years' time and an expensive audit would be necessary to complete an investigation of all aircraft expenditures and commitments. About 700 contracts of over $100,000 each for aviation are set forth from pages 286 to 336 of the record. Some of these contracts severally involve millions of dollars and numerous contracts were canceled before completion. Thousands of small contracts also were made for aviation purposes during the war, so that a mere statement of the situation will indicate the narrow scope necessarily followed in any practical investigation directed by the House.

Numerous business and military organizations connected with aircraft production were found broken up and scattered many months before this committee was appointed, thereby preventing the location of certain disinterested witnesses on important matters. It was, therefore, deemed the proper function of this committee to ascertain, if possible, what aircraft was secured after an expenditure of more than $1,000,000,000. If failure to produce results occurred, then to learn why and who were responsible. If undue waste or specific fraud was discovered, to fix responsibility so far as possible, leaving to the proper legal branch of the Government the decision as to the character and weight of evidence produced affecting civil liability and fraud.

TYPES OF PLANES IN USE AFTER TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS OF EUROPEAN WAR

England, France, Italy, and Germany produced many thousands of combat planes of numerous types prior to our entry into the war, including the English De Havilland, the Spad, the Caproni, the Albatross, and German Fokker.

Improvements in planes were continual, but at the end of the war the above types, including the Spad and Caproni, were as valuable as at the beginning of the war, while 2½ years of world war, prior to our entry, had emphasized the fact that speed in production of planes then in use was of supreme importance. Perfection in airplanes, battleships, machine guns, or rifles was impossible, and if conditions and weapons were nearly equal, victory followed those who got there first and in sufficient numbers.

This truism of war is mentioned because no excuse can be offered for our pitiful failure to prepare prior to our entry into the war.

THE UTTERLY UNSAFE DE HAVILLAND 4 PLANE, KNOWN AS THE FLAMING COFFIN

The only American plane that ever was used at the front—the De Haviland 4—was not a combat plane and was exceptionally dangerous to pilots and observers because of its defective construction. This fact and the general estimate of the De Havilland 4 is set forth in the testimony of General Mitchell, in command of American aviation in France (pp. 2823, 2845), Major Muhlenberg (pp. 194–195), Colonel Clark (p. 191), Rickenbacker (pp. 197–198), Eastman (p. 2391), Archibald, of the Suicide Club (pp. 1177–1179), Major LaGuardia (pp. 144–146), Major Meissner (p. 3629), Major Foulois (p. 368), Captain Dissette (p. 2724), Captain Heisen (pp. 2449–2452), and other reputable flyers or experts, including also many who appeared before the Thomas Senate committee (p. 34), and corroborated by General Pershing's cablegram (p. 203).

A specific indictment against the De Haviland 4, that speaks for itself, was presented by the recent transcontinental race (October 1919). General Mitchell reported (pt. 31—concluded, p. 148, committee hearings) that 73 airplanes of different types were in that race and that 10 aviators were killed. The following table is self-explanatory:

October 1919 military transcontinental airplane race

	Number of planes	Men killed
Unconverted De Havilland 4's	39	9
Converted De Havilland 4's and miscellaneous planes	34	1
Total	73	10

Nine expert aviators in 39 unconverted DH-4's were killed during less than 60 hours of flying. This tragic record in time of peace does not tell the whole story, because many of the 39 unconverted DH-4's, apart from those in which the 9 aviators were killed, were wrecked or disabled and would have been captured if in enemy country.

A bullet penetrating the unprotected gas tank of a DH-4 plane would set the plane on fire, leaving slight chance for any pilot or observers, but that kind of plane was the only one of American make that we gave our aviators with which to fight the Germans.

On page 556b of the hearings a statement submitted by General Menoher, present

Chief of Air Service, shows that the battle fatalities, for hours flown, of American aviators were three times as great as either the British or Belgian. The statement follows:

Battle fatalities, pilots only

Nationality	Period	Hours flown	Fatalities	Average percent of fatalities to pilots in the field
British	July–October 1918	255,842	248	3.2
Belgian	1914–18	40,000	43	(1)
American Expeditionary Forces	March–November 1918	35,747	106	7.74

[1] No data.

American aviation statistics also disclose that in proportion to the number engaged five times as many American fliers were killed, compared with officers of all other branches of the service, and accidents to aviation officers, in round numbers, were 50 times as great. At the signing of the armistice 740 planes were in use on the front by American aviators and 236 officers had been killed in battle, or more than double the number given by General Mencher in preceding table and a large proportionate increase in fatalities compared with above-named countries.

[From Air Service News Letter No. 7, p. 12]

Officers	Overseas	Deaths by battle	Deaths by accident	Deaths by battle and accident	Death rate per 1,000 who served overseas		
					Battle	Accident	Total
Flying	4,318	236	296	532	54.6	68.5	123.1
All others	96,484	2,001	139	2,140	20.7	1.4	22.1
Total	100,802	2,237	435	2,672	22.2	4.3	26.5

FINDINGS OF OTHER INVESTIGATORS

After several months of indecision, confusion, and failure to get results in aviation, following our entry into the war, Gutzon J. de la M. Borglum made public certain specific charges of incompetence or worse against responsible aviation officials and he was given letters of authority from President Wilson to fully investigate conditions. H. Snowden Marshall, of New York, also made a report that in substance agreed with Borglum's charges, and the Providence Journal, which made many independent and valuable investigations during the war, disclosed waste, inefficiency, and indefensible delay in aircraft production that challenged public attention and compelled official notice.

Early in 1918 Justice Charles E. Hughes was commissioned to make a thorough investigation of the entire subject at the personal request of President Wilson. Seventeen thousand pages of typewritten testimony were taken by Justice Hughes and Attorney Meier Steinbrink, who were engaged 5 months in the probe, acting with the cooperation and constant attendance of the Attorney General or his assistant. The Hughes report made in October 1918, of nearly 200 printed pages, was confirmed in all essential particulars by the Attorney General. The Hughes hearings reached every phase of aircraft management and production and it is worthy of note that neither Justice Hughes nor Mr. Steinbrink would accept any remuneration from the Government for their extended service to the country.

Many evidences of incompetence and worse disclosed by the Hughes report are summed up in Justice Hughes' statement:

"The defective organization of the work of aircraft production and the serious lack of competent direction of that work by the responsible officers of the Signal Corps to which the delays and waste were chiefly due, were matters for administrative correction through unification of effort under competent control. The provisions of the criminal statutes do not reach inefficiency" (p. 3806).

Justice Hughes was primarily investigating charges of alleged criminality against responsible officials and neither his jurisdiction nor that of Congress could reach inefficiency which occurred through administrative laxity.

FINDINGS OF JUSTICE HUGHES AND ATTORNEY GENERAL GREGORY

No unprejudiced man will question the judgment of President Wilson in appointing Justice Hughes to investigate and report why our aviation branch of the service has been a failure. No intelligent man will question Justice Hughes' ability, thoroughness, and fairness as disclosed by his voluminous report found on pages 3712 to 3806 of the record. With his conclusions of incompetence and inefficiency in American aircraft production there can be no reasonable difference of opinion, and this committee recommends a careful reading of that exhaustive report to anyone who desires to know the appalling record of orders and counter orders, ignorance and bickerings, waste and extravagance, evidences of self-interest, and of improper practices disclosed. A condensed statement of certain important findings in that report is attached, as addenda A, to this report.

Justice Hughes' conclusions were agreed to by the chief legal adviser of the Government when, on October 31, 1918, or 12 days before the signing of the Armistice, Attorney General G. W. Gregory supported the Hughes report (p. 3706). No higher authority need be offered by any committee to support findings and conclusions of incompetence and inefficiency than the reports of Justice Hughes and of the Attorney General of the United States.

FINDINGS OF THE THOMAS SENATE COMMITTEE

The Hughes hearings were conducted behind closed doors, so that in May 1918, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, acting on evidence of gross inefficiency and failure to get results in aviation, appointed a subcommittee—over a year after America's entry into the war—to investigate the aircraft situation. That committee consisted of Senators Thomas of Colorado, Reed of Missouri, and Hoke Smith of Georgia, Democrats, and New of Indiana, and Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Republicans. It held exhaustive hearings for several months, covering over 1,200 printed pages in extent.

Unwarranted political charges of partisanship or of prejudice may have been made against this committee, against Justice Hughes, or against Attorney General Gregory, but if so no intelligent man will question the ability and absolute fairness of the strong Senate subcommittee, a majority of whose members were Democratic Senators of national reputation, and who were demanding air protection for our country and for our forces overseas.

AN UNANSWERABLE INDICTMENT OF AMERICA'S AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION RECORD

The Senate committee's report, made to the Senate late in August 1918, is found on pages 3693 to 3706 of the RECORD and, like the Hughes report, is there printed in full because of its definite criticisms as to inefficiency at a time when our country was engaged in the mightiest struggle of all history. In view of the necessity for careful statement, plain speaking, and unquestioned authority during times of war, the Thomas Senate subcommittee report is astounding in character and certain in its conclusions. Quoting an extract from that report, we find stated (p. 3693):

"On April 6, 1917, the United States entered the war. On June 8, 1917, public announcement was made that a great fleet of 25,000 airplanes was about to be created and would be decisive of the war months before an effective Army could be put in Europe.

"July 24, 1917, Congress appropriated $640,000,000 to carry out the aircraft program. The fund has been either by actual expenditure or by commitments exhausted. A further appropriation of $884,304,758 has been found necessary.

"In the opinion of the committee a substantial part of the first appropriation was practically wasted; while an Army of 3,500,000 men has been raised, the aircraft situation is as follows:

"(a) Six hundred and one De Havilland 4's have been embarked for France up to August 1, 1918. Of these, 67 reached the front by July 1.

"(b) We have not a single American-made Chasse or bombing plane upon the battle front.

"(c) We have not a single American-made heavy bombing plane upon the battle front.

"(d) We have not developed or put in quantity production a successful Chasse or fighting plane.

"(e) Our attempt to create a fighting plane was centered in an attempt to adopt the Bristol fighter and De Havilland to the Liberty motor. The Bristol was, without sufficient tests, put in quantity production, over $6,500,000 expended, and the lives of several gallant men sacrificed, when the machine was condemned and its manufacture discontinued.

"(f) The Standard J training machine was equipped with the Hall-Scott engine and put in quantity production. After more than 1,200 had been manufactured at a cost of $6,000,000 the machine thus equipped was condemned as dangerous and placed in storage.

"(g) The Spad is a Chasse or fighting plane of the highest type. Early in September an oral order was given to the Curtiss Aircraft Corp. for the manufacture of 3,000 of these machines. Work was at once begun and drawings practically completed. October 8 the contract was canceled, the reason given being that the single-seat fighter was regarded as obsolete. But the fact is that on April 23, 1918, a contract was let to the Curtiss Co. to build 1,000 single-seat fighters known as the SE 5, which is the English equivalent of the French Spad.

"(i) The cancellation of the Spad contract and the failure of the Bristol left us without either a single or two seated fighter. * * *

"(k) As early as the month of October 1917 we were in possession of the necessary facilities to construct the Caproni, a powerful and successful heavy bombing plane, approved both by Italian and English aeronautical engineers. Expert Italian engineers have been upon the ground since the month of January, yet the fact remains that we have up to date constructed only one experimental

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

machine, which is equipped with Liberty motors.

"(1) The Handley-Page heavy bombing machine furnishes another example of delay. Plans were furnished the Signal Corps in the summer of 1917, but were not availed of. * * * A sample plane ordered in March 1918 was flown last July. Tests are not yet complete."

The foregoing record of our tragic failure in aircraft production, as determined by a Senate committee late in August 1918, shortly before the end of the war, is here submitted, together with the caustic report of Justice Hughes and Attorney General Gregory made late in October 1918. These nonpartisan, impartial, and vigorous reports show the deplorable conditions existing in our aircraft program just prior to the armistice and after an expenditure or commitment on contract at that time of a large part of the $1,000,000,000 eventually spent.

AMERICA'S HUMILIATING AIRPLANE-PRODUCTION RECORD

Undisputed facts found by the Thomas Senate committee disclose that on August 1, 1918, about 16 months after the declaration of war, 67 DH–4 observation planes—America's only contribution—had reached the fighting front. On November 11, 1918, 3 months thereafter, when the war ended, the 67 DH–4 observation planes in operation on the front had increased to 213 (p. 190). Apart from 527 foreign machines begged, bought, or borrowed from our Allies, whether up to date, obsolescent, or obsolete, it is conceded America only had 213 observation planes of American make on the front November 11, 1918 (p. 178), with which to supply 1,250,000 American soldiers, then on the battle line (p. 186). The French, after many losses in battle, had 3,321 planes for their 1,500,000 French soldiers then on the line, an insufficient number, but 15 times as many, proportionately, as those of American make.

The British had 1,758 planes for their 900,000 men, or a slightly less proportion (p. 170). The Germans, though hard pressed toward the end, with many destroyed machines, still had 2,730 planes on the line (p. 170). The 527 foreign machines used by American aviators at the front, whether obsolete planes or otherwise, were borrowed or bought from our sorely pressed Allies, who needed them, if serviceable, for their own use.

In response to the contention of apologists that Allied planes were used to protect American soldiers, the patent fact remains that the Allies were short of planes, and if the planes which we received from them were of any value, then, in helping America, they necessarily weakened themselves.

TESTIMONY FROM AMERICA'S GREATEST AVIATOR

The following from America's greatest aviator, Eddie Rickenbacker, tells the actual situation at the front during the momentous summer of 1918. Rickenbacker's book was recommended to the committee by Secretary of War Baker. Rickenbacker and Meissner, two of America's best fighters and best judges of fighting planes, both testified before the committee confirming conditions graphically contained in the book, and Rickenbacker said that statements set forth in his book were absolutely true and based on accurate data made by him at the time.

On page 14 he says (p. 196 of the record):

"The Germans * * * had seen the spring months pass, and instead of viewing with alarm the huge fleet of 20,000 aeroplanes sweeping the skies clear of German Fokkers they had complacently witnessed the Fokkers occupying the air back of our lines whenever they desired it with never an American plane to oppose them."

Of equally thrilling interest are his vivid descriptions of our air helplessness on pages 197 and 198 of the record.

Again he says (p. 119 of his book):

"From the frequency of accidents to our Nieuport it may be wondered why we continued to use them. The answer is simple; we had no others we could use. The American Air Forces were in dire need of machines of all kinds. We were thankful to get any kind that would fly. The French had already discarded the Nieuport for the steadier, stronger Spad, and thus our Government was able to buy from the French a certain number of these out-of-date Nieuport machines for American pilots—or go without. Consequently, our American pilots in France were compelled to venture out in Nieuports against more experienced pilots in more modern machines. None of us in France could understand what prevented our great country from furnishing machines equal to the best in the world.

"Many a gallant life was lost to American aviation during those early months of 1918, the responsibility for which must lie heavily upon some guilty conscience."

The German Fokker, Rickenbacker said, was superior to any fighting plane possessed by the Allies and far excelled the discarded French Nieuport or even the French Spad (pp. 3649–3650).

Colonel Patrick, when before our committee, speaking of Rickenbacker, says (p. 197):

"He had 26 victories, I think. I decorated him. I gave him the Distinguished Service Cross."

Disclosing our complete helplessness in the face of the enemy, Rickenbacker again says:

"The truth is that not one American-made fighting machine came to the front until the war was ended" (p. 197).

RECKLESS BLUNDERING OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

Responsible American officials who refused to have manufactured recognized types of fighting machines then in service; who recklessly blundered with attempted quantity production of the worthless Bristol that could not carry the Liberty motor; who canceled the 3,000 Spad order given our factories in September 1917; who ignored General Foulois' request from France early in July 1917, for 800 SE–5's, 800 Spads, 800 Sopwiths, and 8,000 specifically named fighting machines like planes then in use (p. 360–670); who ignored the request of General Mitchell and the French Government (p. 2614–2617) for planes and aviators, have not suffered from "guilty conscience," but have sought to justify their record of mistakes and their appalling inefficiency with flimsy excuses.

Swivel-chair experts have declared to our committee that American aviators were furnished similar machines to those used by our allies and that the 213 DH–4's eventually furnished by America's expert designers on the front were the equal of machines possessed by the allies or by the enemy. Chief Ace Rickenbacker, Meissner, Archibald, General Mitchell, General Kenly (p. 3496), and many others have nailed such untrue statements in their testimony (pp. 2623, 3498), while many other authorities have shown the uselessness of the DH–4 in any real fighting.

Like the promised 20,000 to 25,000 American planes, fabrications regarding production were used to deceive the American people; but that those at the front in France, who were meeting great odds, knew the truth. A billion dollars for aircraft, a large part of which the Thomas committee found to have been wasted, was a miserable record, but of little importance compared to Rickenbacker's brief comment, "Many a gallant life was lost to American aviation * * * the responsibility for which must lie heavily upon some guilty conscience." The Hughes and Thomas investigations have placed the facts before the country for consideration of those who ungrudgingly raised a billion dollars that our troops might be protected with aircraft. Congress appropriated every dollar asked for, according to General Squier (p. 3590), and with this record of failure, Colonel Deeds, Director of Aircraft, who had been removed and who had been recommended for court martial by Justice Hughes, was banqueted in Washington by Chief Signal Officer Squier and other admirers for the kind of record he had made (p. 59).

Rickenbacker repeatedly describes the helplessness of the DH–4 on pages 197 and 198 of the committee record.

"FLAMING COFFINS" FURNISHED AMERICAN AVIATORS

What more fearful arraignment can be offered than the following description by Rickenbacker of their helplessness in action (p. 198 of record):

"From every side Fokkers were picking upon the clumsy Liberty machines (DH–4's) which, with their criminally constructed fuel tanks, offered so easy a target to the incendiary bullets of the enemy that their unfortunate pilots called this boasted achievement of our Aviation Department their 'flaming coffins.' During that one brief flight over Grand Pre I saw three of these crude machines go down in flames, an American pilot and an American gunner in each 'flaming coffin,' dying this frightful and needless death."

Equally vivid is the following brief, bitter experience that needs no additional explanation. Captain Sweeney, an American engineer, testified before our committee as follows (p. 1354):

"On the 22d of August 1918, in Clarmont, France, about 16 men (American aviators) were lined up that had been ordered to the front. I think there were about four or six DH–4 machines, and the rest were French machines * * *. They were second-grade machines. The French did not give the first-class machines to the Americans * * *. They shook hands with everybody and said, 'Well, this is not au revoir; this is goodby.' Captain Williams (in charge of the aviation group) and I were standing opposite, and I asked him why all this gloom * * *. He said, 'Well, those American machines have no protection. As soon as a bullet hits that gasoline tank it is certain it will take fire immediately, and the men—the pilot and observer—have no chance to get away.' He said the boys called those 'flaming coffins.'

"Mr. MAGEE. Sure death?

"Captain SWEENEY. I presume so. I did not ride in any of them.

"Mr. MAGEE. What did he say about that—the captain in charge?

"Captain SWEENEY. He said they would not come back; that when one of the machines was struck it was the finish. The French machines were old and not up to date. They were not as fast as the German machines and, therefore, they did not figure they had much chance in these machines, either. I saw Captain Williams about a month afterward and asked him particularly if those fellows came back. He said he had never heard of any of them. He said they had fallen inside the German lines and had been captured or killed."

Captain Sweeney's statement and Rickenbacker's vivid description can be fully understood when 9 men where killed in 39 unconverted DH–4's in the recent October transcontinental races and many other DH–4 machines like those we sent to France were wrecked or damaged, which in battle would have meant certain death or capture to the fliers engaged.

RESPONSIBILITY FIXED FOR USE OF "UTTERLY UNSAFE" PLANES

In spite of wanton waste of lives, these DH–4's, the only American-made planes that reached the front, were kept in production after their dangerous and clumsy construction was a matter of common knowledge. The last Director of Aircraft, Mr. John D. Ryan, just prior to his long European trip with Secretary Baker in August 1918, testified before the Thomas Senate subcommittee a few weeks after he had canceled the order for

the utterly useless Bristol that could not carry the Liberty motor. The following testimony is from Director Ryan on the DH-4. His responsibility for aviation and needless waste of life was then being weighed by that committee:

"Senator REED. You know that the best and most experienced fliers, a number of them in this country, have testified before this committee that they regard the De Havilland machine as utterly unsafe and that they would refuse to go up in it or send subordinates up in it?

"Mr. RYAN. I understand that some have testified that they have refused to go up in it or let subordinates go up in it.

"Senator REED. You propose to go on making the De Havilland-4 machines?

"Mr. RYAN. Until we can put the De Havilland-9 in production.

"Senator REED. Do you intend to do that regardless of any testimony that may be given by experienced fliers that the machine is utterly unsafe?

"Mr. RYAN. I am not convinced that the burden of testimony of the fliers throughout the country is that the De Havilland-4 is an unsafe machine" (p. 42).

This testimony is taken from the official record of the Thomas Senate committee hearings to show the purpose of responsible American aircraft production officials from Squier and Deeds, at the beginning, and down to Ryan at the finish, to keep manufacturing for use of American aviators the "utterly unsafe" DH-4. Equal responsibility rests with the head of the War Department who was informed of the facts—for Secretary Baker, who approved the Squier program at the outset, was before the Thomas committee in August 1918, when the following startling statement was made to him by a Senator of that committee:

"Senator NEW. It is a fact that every flyer that we have had before this committee as a witness, including several who have seen long service abroad, both in our own forces, the British forces, and the French forces, have testified that the De Havilland-4 machine, with the defects appearing in it as it has been produced at the Dayton-Wright factory, is highly dangerous and ought not under any circumstances be used; and at least one officer has testified that he would no longer send men up from his field in a machine of that type until after these defects had been remedied. In view of that condition, as it has been expressed and recorded by the men who are best qualified to pass upon the conditions and quality of that machine, I at least think that it was a very great error of policy and judgment to have sent them forward before these mistakes were corrected, and I wanted to know whether or not you agreed with that view.

"Mr. BAKER. The subcommittee, of course, has a great advantage over me in that I have not been permitted to see any of the testimony the committee has taken, so that I do not know anything about this concurrence of opinion to which you refer.

"Senator NEW. I am telling you now what that opinion is" (p. 34).

More specifically, Secretary Baker testified before our own committee, July 31, 1919, as follows (p. 42):

"Secretary BAKER. Mr. Ryan and I talked over the general question * * * and I approved that we should not suspend making any machine we were then making, but we should go on and make it and get ready to make others."

This was Mr. Baker's judgment when the only machine apart from training planes then or thereafter produced by the United States was the utterly unsafe DH-4 plane.

Secretary Baker and Mr. Ryan, his appointee, were both faced by the Senate committee with these facts, which were pressed upon them when they sailed together for Europe in August 1918, at which time Mr. Ryan declared to Senator Reed that he proposed to go on making the dangerous DH-4's.

THOUSANDS OF UNSAFE PLANES BUILT WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR DEFECTS

Many combat flyers testified before the Hughes investigation, the Thomas committee, and this committee regarding the unsafe and clumsy DH-4 planes, but not 1 witness out of the 740 American flyers at the front has been found to defend its use for fighting purposes in battle.

One thousand and ninety-seven of these DH-4 machines, which Rickenbacker called criminally constructed, were produced in October 1918 alone at a cost of $10,000,000 to $15,000,000, and they were kept in production up to the end of the war. A certainty exists that fatalities among American aviators would have largely increased but for the failure of General Pershing to receive more than 213 of these DH-4's with which to face the enemy.

Good judgment was displayed when over 1,000 DH-4's were scrapped and burned in France after the armistice, whereas we brought back 1,000 used and unused foreign planes, including about 300 obsolete Nieuports and Sopwiths, discarded by the Allies long before the end of the war (p. 3317).

Very few of these were new, and yet were sent here in preference to the utterly unsafe DH-4's (pp. 3317-20).

General Pershing's cablegram (p. 203), showing over 50 defects in DH-4 planes received by him in Europe, specifically indicated the clumsy, dangerous machine, and apart from the 213 used at the front, the remainder of the DH-4's were put to better use by being kept boxed and stored in this country as coffin-shaped monuments to official stupidity and criminal stubbornness.

Sending American aviators into action with these DH-4's was more wasteful of human life, even in the hands of the best-trained aviators, than it would have been to equip shock troops with wooden guns. American aviators made a name for American valor, courage, and skill, although equipped with second- or third-rate machines, as described by the different witnesses. Individual aviators stood out brilliantly, but with all their bravery, which was emulated by their comrades on the ground when going over the top, the fact remains that nothing injured the morale of flyers, or of the soldiers whom they were protecting, more than knowledge that their machines in use were discarded French Nieuports or unsafe American planes far inferior to machines then in use by the enemy (pp. 3649-52).

MISLEADING PRODUCTION FIGURES

Testimony was placed before the committee relating to production figures, actual and prospective. Estimates were frequently measured by the imagination of witnesses, while grossly misleading evidence, confusing to the average mind, shows that anything may be proved by figures.

As stated, Secretary Baker testified in effect before our committee that at the end of the war we had not a single American-built fighting or bombing plane at the battle front, and Colonel Patrick stated that the only machines in use at the front by Americans were 527 foreign bought or borrowed planes, supplemented by 213 observation DH-4's (p. 178).

General Pershing testified before the Joint Military Committee that we never had any American-built fighting plane at the front, yet we find Assistant Secretary of War Crowell, in a report on American munitions (p. 243 of report), giving figures that carry a wealth of misinformation characteristic of similar testimony placed before the committee and before the country. He says:

"On the day the armistice was signed we had received from all sources 16,952 planes. Of these, 5,198 had been produced for us by the Allies."

Of 11,754 planes claimed to have been built in America, according to this same authority, we had produced 3,328 fighting planes. That is his statement.

DRAWING ON OUR EXHAUSTED ALLIES

Mr. Crowell includes Penguin wooden grasshoppers in his list of planes and also scores of worthless Bristols and 1,660 condemned Standard J training planes (p. 3769), together with other similar disastrous experiments, including 4,000 utterly unsafe DH-4's, in order to reach the figures contained in his remarkable statement; but when he states that "3,328 fighting planes" were produced in America, the astonishing error is manifest.

Rickenbacker's brief statement is undenied (p. 197): "The truth is that not one American-made fighting machine came to the front until the war was ended." Secretary Baker, Mr. Ryan, General Pershing, and all other witnesses before all the committees agreed to this proposition. Neither 3,328 nor any American-made fighting machines were produced for use before the end of the war, but Mr. Crowell's statement calls to mind a most pitiful picture of our own inefficiency during the war when he says that 5,000 planes of various types, largely training, including over 2,000 obsolete Nieuports and Sopwiths, were purchased from the Allies during the war, equal in number to the total real fighting planes on the front owned by France and England combined. Bleeding France and exhausted England, with their backs against the wall, with reserves strained to the utmost limit, were called on to furnish planes to the opulent, prosperous United States that had raised a billion dollars for planes and then had to depend on the Allies for 527 fighting planes, including Nieuports and Sopwiths—all that we could get—because of our own failure to produce. General Pershing testified that we were short of both fighting planes and training planes. Criminally short, he might truthfully have added.

The picture is humiliating when we contemplate the efforts of our Allies to provide planes for their own protection, as disclosed by the testimony, and by their payment to us per thousand feet, on a 10-percent salvage basis, of $802.20, $287.20, and $895.20, for spruce, fir, and cedar, respectively, which was used by them in building planes for our mutual defense (p. 2304), while many of our own factories were standing idle, according to the Hughes report.

We had the factories, men, and money, and might have turned out planes at a wholesale rate, when the uselessness of DH-4's in battle was demonstrated at the outset, but that was the only American machine ever produced for use at the front.

So much for the record of American aircraft production during 19 months of war. If the war had lasted 2 or 3 years longer and until responsible American officials decided to build Spads, Capronis, and real fighting machines, without constantly canceling orders, we might have shown results. Production of all Army planes, apart from DH-4's, in January 1918 reached 744. Seven months afterward, during strenuous war needs, American production reached 489 planes in August 1918, or a loss of about 35 percent compared with the month of January.

American airplane production, 1918 (p. 518)

January	744
February	725
March	934
April	728
May	598
June	448
July	666
August	489
September	450
October	554

The foregoing does not include the "quantity production" of DH-4's, but it does include all training planes, sea sleds, and several hundred Penguins, or what are known as wooden grasshoppers. It also includes 1,660 discarded worthless Standard J planes, described in the Thomas committee report,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and scores of Bristols, also discarded. About 4,500 useless DH-4's were paid for by the United States at a cost of over $50,000,000.

The following statement gives comparative production of airplanes in Italy, France, England, and the United States by months from January 1 to September 30, 1918, according to testimony of General Menoher, Chief of Air Service:

Total production of airplanes in Italy, France, England, and United States, by months, from Jan. 1 to Sept. 30, 1918

	Italy	France	England	United States [1]
1918—January	305	1,484	2,347	729
February	349	1,615	2,288	734
March	189	1,609	2,587	938
April	161	2,150	2,107	743
May	291	2,023	3,051	751
June	435	2,262	2,650	784
July	469	2,595	3,474	1,150
August	365	2,857	2,279	713
September	374	2,298	2,726	1,207
Total	2,938	18,833	23,509	7,749

[1] The apparent discrepancy in American airplane production shown by the 2 tables is due to the DH-4's, which are included in the second table.

WASTED 3 TO 5 MONTHS

March 13, 1918, Gen. Pershing cabled Gen. Squier:

"Approximately 700 cadets in Europe awaiting flying training. These cadets have already wasted from 3 to 5 months for training and it is estimated some of them will have to waste at least 4 months before their training can be commenced. * * * These conditions have produced profound discouragement among cadets" (p. 3751).

The whole country was becoming discouraged with Squier, Deeds, et al., and no relief ever in sight.

Vice President Keys, of the Curtiss Co., sets forth some of the contradictory orders received (pp. 3481-3483) while 789 changes were made under orders of the War Department in the attempted production of the discarded Bristol. The following testimony is illuminating regarding this one firm manufacturing planes:

"Mr. FREAR. How many men were you employing?

"Mr. KEYS. 18,700.

"Mr. FREAR. What was your possible production capacity?

"Mr. KEYS. Our plant was designed for a maximum of 100 machines a day of any type small machines. * * * We contracted in September, 1918, to deliver 100 machines (fighting planes) a day" (pp. 3456-3457).

The Curtiss firm received an order for 3,000 fighting "Spads" on September 19, 1917. The order was canceled November 7, 1917. (P. 3755.) But this one factory could have produced 30,000 fighting planes a year, according to Keyes, if given a free hand.

Borglum stated several months before the Hughes investigation was started that at the Curtiss plant 13,000 or 14,000 people were on the payrolls (cost plus) and "it has been suffering from 60 to 70 percent idleness. Very much the same conditions prevail at the Standard Co." (p. 27). All were waiting for orders from the experimenting experts.

General Squier, before the Senate Military Committee, January 30, 1918, explained his own state of mind at that early date when he said:

"I think we shipped no training planes to France at all. It is looming on the horizon that we may be producing more than we can get across and thereby be upsetting industry" (p. 24).

UPSETTING INDUSTRY

General Squier's statement before the Senate Military Committee was made shortly before General Pershing cabled to him that 700 flying cadets had been from 3 to 5 months delayed in their training because of absence of planes.

While General Pershing, General Mitchell, Major Foulois, and others in France were frantically calling for planes with which to train and fight, General Squire was calmly studying the horizon to discover whether we should upset industry.

Upsetting industry has been a besetting fear with the War Department, which made 8 hours a day's work for soldiers on the coast. It has salvaged airplanes, copper, trucks, and all other properties, including foodstuffs in a manner not to upset industry. It has frequently sold back for a song articles produced under Government contract, to the original producers in order not to upset industry. Airplanes costing the Government $20,000,000 were resold to the Curtiss factory for $2,700,000, or about 13 percent of cost. Thousands of American aviators were compelled to buy at full price from the Curtiss Co. if they wanted these machines.

In his final report to the Secretary of War, evidencing the failure to receive American planes, General Pershing says (p. 76 of report):

"In aviation we were entirely dependent upon our allies. * * * Without going into a complete discussion of aviation material, it will be sufficient to state that it was with great difficulty that we obtained equipment even for training."

Nothing need be added to this significant statement of failure of responsible officials in this country to provide airplanes.

America's aviators, with all their handicaps through poor planes, are described as follows by the same high authority:

"As to our aviators, many of whom trained with our allies, it can be said that they had no superiors in daring and in fighting ability. During the battles of St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne our aviators excelled all others. They have left a record of courageous deeds that will ever remain a brilliant page in the annals of our Army."

HUGHES AND THOMAS COMMITTEE REPORTS

This committee has embodied in its hearings as exhibits, the hearings and reports of Justice Hughes and of the Senate subcommittee, because early in the investigation it was determined to avoid duplicating hearings and overlapping of investigations so far as possible. With that purpose in view, your committee has accepted the conclusions based on specific facts of the two other investigations with a belief that the desire of the House is to have facts brought down to date, together with an investigation of the spruce situation, which was suggested in the Hughes report. The Major Ray spruce investigation, and various hearings in other investigations, are also herein referred to.

The Hughes report fixed responsibility on certain officials, from General Squier and Deeds down to subordinate officers, and recited failures in measuring up to requirements. The Thomas Senate committee report devoted brief consideration to individual inefficiency, but pointed out the disastrous policy pursued in sacrificing everything and subordinating all energies to perfecting the Liberty motor.

In the judgment of this committee both the Hughes report and the Thomas report reached correct conclusions, and it is not necessary to reiterate those conclusions; but responsibility for failures should be chargeable to those at the top who permitted inefficiency and stupidity to govern what ought to have been a vigorous branch of our military program. Addenda A in part 2 of this report gives an extended summary by Justice Hughes of production figures and other data down to October 1918.

OFFICIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR AVIATION FAILURES

A sufficient warning was given the Department by General Squier before the Senate Military Committee, January 30, 1918, when he said:

"We had to make a momentous decision back in April 1917, when we decided to make the Liberty motor. * * * We had to throw the die. I think we did right. We had to decide whether we would go over to England and get those planes and engines and try to produce them or try to pool everything we had. That decision was taken boldly, and I think it was a very wise one" (p. 23).

Justice Hughes' report says of General Squier (p. 3773):

"The duty of providing an adequate organization for aircraft production was left to the Signal Corps. It is quite clear that this undertaking was beyond the competency of the Chief Signal Officer."

This reckless, foolish policy threw aside every tried life preserver, every efficient air weapon used by all other countries after 30 months of war, and resulted in disastrous blunders and inexcusable delays, when delays meant unnecessary loss of life and possible loss of battles. General Squier threw the die in April 1917, and pooled everything for the Liberty motor experiment, which was used in the hopeless DH-4's ignoring all other weapons.

Secretary of War Baker, while before our committee, said he approved General Squier's course when he responded, "That was my judgment at the time and still is my judgment" (p. 23).

On Secretary Baker's shoulders must rest equal responsibility for failure to procure other engines and other planes when pooling all energies in the Liberty motor. Thousands of workmen were idle in airplane factories waiting for work, while Europe shouted for planes. General Squier was finally relieved from active production about the time he testified before the Senate committee after 9 months of valuable time had been wasted. All energies continued to be bent in building the useless DH-4, as shown by Director Ryan's testimony previously cited, and the same disastrous policy was thereafter pursued to the end of the war and approved by Secretary Baker (p. 42).

It is not the province of this committee to declare the measure of responsibility of any official, but we would be derelict in duty if we failed to present to the House what we believe to be the causes for America's aviation failure and the resulting lack of confidence in any present War Department aviation plans.

Official responsibility reaches back prior to the war when Congress created a Council of National Defense, August 29, 1916. An active, virile organization, that would insure ample protection to the country in time of peace and full preparation if our country became involved in war, was needed. Over 6 months elapsed, "while Rome was burning," before the council was finally organized on March 3, 1917, with Secretary of War Baker as chairman. General Squier, then Chief Signal Officer, was in control of aircraft matters. Nothing had been done in aviation—nothing was likely to be done. He pooled everything on the Liberty motor when he did start, after the war was on, and put all the Nation's aviation program eggs in one basket.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEEDS

Col. Edward A. Deeds, of Dayton, Ohio, was placed in charge of the Equipment Division of Aviation under General Squier in August, 1917, 4 months after our entry into the war. Nothing appears in any of the hearings of any investigation to show why Deeds was appointed. Deeds knew nothing of aircraft. Deeds had never been connected with any Government activity. Secretary Baker says he never saw Deeds until after his appointment, although Deeds and Secretary Baker were both from Ohio.

Justice Hughes' report found that Deeds began his activities by centering aircraft operations at Dayton, Ohio; that he gave large contracts to his business associates—Kettering, Talbott, and others in that city, although they had no previous experience in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

such matters; that he located several aviation fields around Dayton in improper locations, and also located fields in Florida without authority or explanation; that Deeds was largely interested in corporations controlling the Delco ignition system used in the projected Liberty motor, whereas prior to its use on the Liberty, the magneto system had been used on all airplane engines (p. 58).

The following is from the Hughes report (p. 57 of record):

"At the inception of the Government's aviation activity in connection with the war and within the sphere of Colonel Deeds' important if not commanding influence, his former business associates were placed at once, through Government contracts, in a position where they had assurance of very large profits upon a comparatively small investment of their own money, and in addition were able to secure generous salaries which they charged against the Government as part of the cost of manufacture."

After reciting evidence in support of his conclusions, Justice Hughes finds:

"The evidence with respect to Col. Edward A. Deeds should be presented to the Secretary of War, to the end that Colonel Deeds may be tried by court-martial under articles 95 and 96 of the Articles of War."

Justice Hughes' report in part 2 of this report includes a detailed statement of testimony on which the finding was based.

In the Attorney General's report (p. 58 of the record) this finding appears:

"I acquiesce in the recommendations of Judge Hughes that the facts be submitted to the Secretary of War."

Because of these findings and recommendation for court-martial it is proper to say that about 4 years before his appointment to produce aircraft, Deeds achieved considerable notoriety in Ohio, where he was prosecuted in the Federal court for alleged bribery and criminal methods in driving his competitors out of the cash-register business, and was convicted by a jury after a trial lasting over a month and sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year.

An appeal was taken, with 50 assignments of error, and the case was reversed and no retrial was ever had (p. 50–52). Deeds' innocence may be conceded, for the sake of argument, though no second trial occurred, but the charge, conviction, and court record were enough to put any responsible official on inquiry before giving Deeds a place of transcendent importance in charge of matters about which he knew nothing.

WHY WAS DEEDS' COURT-MARTIAL PREVENTED?

For Deeds' alleged efforts to place large Government contracts with his business associates in Dayton, under questionable arrangements, and for other reasons stated in his report, Justice Hughes recommended Deeds for court-martial (p. 57–58), and Attorney General Gregory joined in the report to the extent of declaring Colonel Deeds' conduct inexcusable, reprehensible, and censurable, and recommended that all the facts be submitted to the Secretary of War (p. 58).

Based on the Hughes record, the Judge Advocate General's office on November 11, 1918, submitted its report approving the Hughes recommendations and holding, in addition, that if Colonel Deeds was under oath when testifying before the Senate committee he should be court-martialed for perjury, if false statements were shown to have been made (p. 2652).

Subsequently, Secretary of War Baker sent word to the Judge Advocate General's office requesting that other witnesses be heard on behalf of Deeds and that the report be reconsidered (p. 2653). This action, your committee is informed, was unprecedented. Colonel Deeds' attorney and two business associates, connected with these same Government contracts, were thereupon heard and a new report rendered exonerating Deeds (p. 2687). Secretary Baker's activity in protecting Deeds against Justice Hughes' finding is at once astonishing and significant. With a record that affected lives of men and charges of inordinate selfishness supported by specific facts, Deeds should have been placed on trial to be convicted if guilty, to be vindicated if innocent. According to the testimony, Secretary Baker prevented such action.

Colonel Deeds was thereafter banqueted in Washington (p. 59) and praised by General Squier for his record in aircraft production.

The approval of Deeds by Squier and the saving of Deeds from court martial by Secretary Baker require no further discussion to reveal disheartening conditions surrounding American aircraft production in 1917. Whether conditions ever improved is a matter of grave doubt. General Squier is still Chief Signal Officer and General Menoher is now in charge of aviation—an Artillery officer, courteous and obliging, but without aviation training or experience. Secretary Baker's judgment is a matter of record.

Deeds, after filling many positions in the aircraft-production branch of the Signal Corps, was finally sidetracked about January 1918, and Col. Robert L. Montgomery, a bond dealer, was placed at the head of the equipment division, but despite the change in technical relation it is apparent that Colonel Deeds remained in practical charge, under the Chief Signal Officer, of production. (Hughes' report.)

POTTER AND RYAN, DIRECTORS

In February 1918, William C. Potter became the head of the equipment division and remained in this position until May 20, 1918, when General Squier was removed from aviation duties and John D. Ryan, who had been acting since April, was appointed Director of Aircraft Production, with Potter as Assistant Director.

Apart from the responsible officers named a number of advisory boards existed—of doubtful value, and with no powers of responsibilities. They included an Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, a Joint Army and Navy Technical Aircraft Board, an Aircraft Production Board, and an Aircraft Board. These Boards were in existence at different times but could only advise and recommend. To what extent their advice was followed or ignored does not appear, other than as it may have been adopted by Deeds, Potter, or Ryan, who were the responsible aviation officers during practically all the time from August 1917 to the end of the war.

In an official War Department publication, published by Major Mixter, on Aircraft Production Facts, appears the following:

"In January 1918, W. C. Potter, of the Guggenheim interests, became Chief of the Equipment Division. When the Air Service was separated from the Signal Corps in May 1918, John D. Ryan, of the Anaconda Copper Co., was appointed Director of Aircraft Production and later an Assistant Secretary of War and Director of Air Service. Mr. Potter continued as First Assistant Director of the Bureau of Aircraft Production" (p. 61 of the record).

This statement, presented under military authority, proudly sets forth the great copper interests of Mr. Potter and Mr. Ryan, of which they were the respective heads. It is no part of this report to recite the enormous increase in profits of these copper interests during the war, as shown by the hearings (pp. 73, 86), nor of their dealings with the Government, as disclosed at pages 63, 64, 73, 74, 75, 84, 85, and 86 of the hearings. These controlling copper interests of which Ryan and Potter were the heads are alleged to have added $50,000,000 more to their coffers since the war, according to statements heretofore presented to the House by another subcommittee of the Select Committee of Fifteen appointed to investigate the expenditures of the War Department. The intimate connection of these powerful interests and of Mr. Potter and Mr. Ryan with Secretary Baker, representing the Government, has never been explained.

DEEDS, POTTER, AND RYAN WITHOUT ANY KNOWLEDGE OF AIRCRAFT

Deeds had no knowledge of aircraft nor have any known reasons ever been given for his appointment. Equally inscrutable are reasons for appointment by Secretary Baker of either Potter or Ryan to their positions of great aircraft responsibility. Testifying before the Thomas Senate Committee, Director Ryan was asked:

"Senator REED. What was Mr. Potter's occupation or business before he came in?

"Mr. RYAN. He was in the mining and metallurgical business and connected with the Guggenheims.

"Senator REED. And never had anything to do with aircraft?

"Mr. RYAN. I think not" (p. 65).

That briefly presents Potter's aircraft qualifications.

Testifying before the same Thomas Senate Committee, Director Ryan was asked regarding Potter, Kellogg, Wolff, Brown, Fletcher, Downey, Lockhart, Mixter, and Leadbetter, all of whom were his assistants in aircraft production:

"Senator REED. There was not a single one of these men who had had experience so far as you know in aircraft production?

"Mr. RYAN. Not so far as I know.

"Senator REED. They were men that you think had the final say in regard to contracts before you took charge?

"Mr. RYAN. Subject, of course, to General Squier, who was Chief of the Signal Corps. They were under him" (p. 70).

These men had charge of aircraft production during the most critical months of the war with Germany. Mr. Ryan was appointed director May 20, 1918. In July he went to Portland, Oreg., and other places, as will later appear, returning from his 6,000-mile trip in August and, after a few days spent in the East, sailed for Europe in August in company with Secretary of War Baker, who had made Mr. Ryan also an Assistant Secretary of War a day or so before they sailed. Both remained away until October 13, or shortly before the end of the war. Apart from the two trips that took him away from aircraft duties in Washington for several months, Mr. Ryan had large private business interests and other duties to care for. His absence was commented upon by Henry Ford, who was complaining about delayed production in aircraft during those critical times of war and gave his reasons to the Thomas committee. Mr. Ford, of Detroit, was probably the largest producer of aircraft engines in the country during the war.

MR. FORD'S CRITICISMS "OBVIOUSLY TRUE"—BAKER

In July 1918 he said (p. 38 of the record):

"I do not know how you can have the head of the Aircraft Division around New York sitting down there and have him do very much. This is the first time I have said anything about Mr. Ryan and I do not know anything about him. I think they ought to be on the job no matter who they may be * * *. It is necessary to have somebody who is broad and knows what he is talking about to go around to the different factories and tell them what to do."

To this common-sense view Secretary Baker responded to our committee (p. 38):

"Well, his (Mr. Ford's) observations are not only those of a very great expert, but they are obviously true."

Mr. Ford's testimony before the Senate committee was given several weeks prior to the extended trip to Europe, taken by Assistant Secretary of War and Aircraft Director Ryan with Secretary Baker.

No higher authority in administration circles need be quoted than Mr. Ford, yet so far as appears from testimony before the committee, none of the various officials in charge of aircraft production from Director

Ryan down had any particular knowledge of the subject, nor did they go around to the different factories and tell them what to do for obvious reasons.

RESPONSIBILITY OF ARMY OFFICIALS

Responsibility for failure of our aircraft program rested upon those in authority, who have been named, and with equal force responsibility rested on Army officers in this country whose duty it was to provide an efficient aircraft force. Officers of the Army, who for many years have been subject to strict Army discipline, generally are loath to express themselves freely when their associates or superiors are concerned. Testimony from three responsible aviation officials, two of whom were in France charged with work on the front, is self-explanatory. All these officers were old experienced flyers of undoubted ability.

General Foulois, early in 1917, shortly after the declaration of war, testified that he prepared for the General Staff and Congress an aircraft program covering 22,625 planes of specified types; 5,000 pilots, and 50,000 mechanics, at an estimated expense of $640,000,000, which amount Congress immediately appropriated (p. 367).

General Foulois further testified:

"I was the responsible officer (in France) under the commander in chief. * * * Certain members of the General Staff were willing to be educated, but that was a very small minority. Other members were more or less disinterested and a certain proportion opposed to aviation.

"Mr. FREAR. What was that opposition grounded on?

"General FOULOIS. * * * We could hear constant complaint about these young aviators running wild all the time, and too much rank and a great many features of that kind. * * * In my 21 years of service I have never seen it (jealousy in the Army) more prevalent than it is today. * * * General Pershing, in my opinion, is the best friend aviation has in the Army. If it had not been for him, on a great many occasions we would not have had any Air Service."

General Mitchell was commander of Air Service for a long period in France and was in the American Expeditionary Forces from the beginning to the end of the war and an experienced aviator.

General Mitchell, with Ambassador Sharp, sent a cablegram April 16, 1918, to General Squier strenuously urging 20,000 fighting planes for control of the air as described in program submitted (p. 2615). Again in May 1918, a strong cablegram was sent General Squier (p. 2618). These telegrams were never acknowledged. "They did not know in this country whether we knew anything about it. There were no dealings with the Signal Office. We could get absolutely nothing out of them" (p. 2638).

General Kenly was Chief of Air Service from May 1918 to practically the end of the war. He testified before the committee to the following effect: That appointments to the Air Service, as well as to the command of the Air Service, were not made because of any experience of the one appointed, and that such condition exists today. It may be due to favoritism or due to relationship, but it affects the morale of the Department. General Kenly advised that the Air Service should be put into the hands of a man conversant with the work and thoroughly in earnest about it (p. 3497).

THE DH-4 AND ITS 3,600 CHANGES

Testimony before the committee showed that 789 changes were ordered in the construction of the Bristol, which was a reckless attempt to fit a foreign machine to the heavy Liberty motor in which all our interests were pooled (p. 3450). After wasting $6,000,000, according to the Thomas Senate committee report, the Bristol was discarded early in 1918. According to the Hughes report, subject to salvage, $17,500,000 was wasted on 1,600 S. J.-1 training planes. About $50,000,000 was spent for 4,000 utterly dangerous DH-4's during the war. This accounts for nearly $75,000,000 largely wasted on three useless experimental planes.

No question exists but that the Liberty motor, when finally developed in 1918, could be used for bombing and observation planes, but for fighting planes it was entirely unfitted.

The claim that approximately 3,600 changes were made in the DH-4 observation plane during its development and that engine experimental development was equally difficult and involved, gives full significance to the danger of pooling all interests in experimenting on one air machine or on one engine for all air machines.

Apart from DH-4's, the record of airplane production, good, bad, and indifferent, none of which were fighting planes, reached a total of 6,342 during the 10 months of 1918, when the country supposed production was five times that number of fighting machines. What is more remarkable, the first 5 months' total of 3,729 dropped to 2,613, or about a 30-percent loss during the last 5 months of war (p. 518).

WASTED PUBLIC FUNDS

A brief examination of the Hughes and Thomas hearings, covering an aggregate of probably 20,000 typewritten pages of testimony, discloses great waste of time and money accompanying many activities of aircraft production. Evidence of waste and of glaring mismanagement and inefficiency set forth in the Hughes and Thomas reports are found in this committee's hearings, but will not again be recited at length. Although reckless expenditures reached a large part of the great total appropriation made for aircraft by Congress, it is wasted time to mourn for water that has gone over the wheel.

Fabulous amounts were expended or contracted for castor oil, used as a lubricant, acetone used for dope, spruce used for wing beams, and for various other things that went into airplane construction.

A statement covering the operations of either branch of production necessarily reaches beyond the limits of any report that will be read or digested by the House. Justice Hughes, however, said in his report:

"In particular it is recommended that the activities in relation to spruce production, which being largely centered on the Pacific coast, it was impracticable to embrace in the present inquiry, should be carefully scrutinized" (p. 3806).

SPRUCE PRODUCTION RECORD

The Committee of Fifteen, of which the aviation subcommittee is a part, by unanimous vote directed that the spruce production investigation be undertaken and, pursuant to that vote, hearings were held by us on the Pacific coast where spruce activities were centered. Several investigations had previously occurred and reports rendered to the War Department, including the Stansbury report and Major Howes' report, the latter being based on extended examination covering 40 pages of committee hearings, which investigation was conducted by Lieutenant Kerrigan and a number of military operators in the employ of the Inspector General's Department (pp. 2342-2384). Kerrigan, a former member of the San Francisco Police Department, seemed to be fearless and thorough in his work.

Major Howes sent a telegram dated November 23, 1918, to the Intelligence Department, Washington (p. 97). A brief extract is submitted:

"Lumbermen of the Northwest unanimous in demanding Federal investigation of lumber situation. Their principal contentions are: That John D. Ryan was director Milwaukee Railroad; that he was instrumental in giving cost-plus contracts Siems-Carey-Kerbaugh Corp. for building railroad across Washington Peninsula which tapped holdings of the Lacey interest and the Milwaukee Land Co.; that Sawyer, former chief engineer of the Milwaukee Railroad, was made major in spruce production division and is building the road which joins the Milwaukee at Joyce, Wash.

"Ryan approved the lending of $6,000,000 to the Siems-Carey-Kerbaugh Corp., and the copy of the mortgage is on file in Clallam County, Wash., approved by Assistant Secretary of War Crowell. This road, according to Kerbaugh, has cost about $12,000,000 and taps no spruce until it travels over 40 miles, which brings it into the holdings of Lacey's and the Milwaukee Land Co."

SECRETARY BAKER'S REPRESENTATIVE INVESTIGATES

Captain Gund, an attorney, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Maj. Martin Ray, of the Inspector General's Department, were sent by Secretary Baker to investigate the charges of Major Howes.

On December 28, 1918, after a personal investigation, Gund sent the following telegram to the War Department, Washington (p. 3445):

"Have unearthed evidence indicating enormous graft, but do not consider case as yet ready for submission to legal prosecution. I deem it absolutely essential in obtaining connecting evidence to unearth contents of private offices. Doubt any present authority to act. I am proceeding with investigation as rapidly as possible pending your explicit confirmation, which I again repeat is absolutely essential.

"GUND."

Lieutenant Kerrigan's supplemental report (pp. 3444-3448) states that on December 18, 10 days prior to Gund's telegram, he was called before Major Ray and "placed under oath, warned that anything I might say could be used against me." Kerrigan says he was not further consulted, although he had accumulated much data, and in view of Ray's attitude he did not offer further information (pp. 2342-2384). Gund, on his own initiative, learned of matters on which his telegram was based. Gund suddenly left for San Francisco and did not return, and Major Ray, who is alleged to have announced on December 18 that Kerrigan had nothing but "the statements of a few Seattle lumbermen," was left in charge to conduct the investigation (p. 3444).

* * * * *

SECRETARY OF WAR BAKER

Secretary Baker is properly chargeable with any success or failure of America's aircraft program. His selection at a critical time for the important department of governmental war activities by President Wilson promised official capacity.

Whether Mr. Baker was equal to the demands of war must be determined from the record. Men accepting public obligations are measured by that standard, and your committee has presented a brief review of aircraft activities.

Prior to our entry into the war the world had been on fire for 2½ years. Aircraft had become a recognized important arm of the military service. It was a time when any responsible official primarily charged with public safety and with war preparation should have provided the country with the best available war equipment, or should have placed definite plans before Congress to that end. It was a time when a man of capacity and force should have been selected and placed in charge of aircraft, prepared for any reasonable war emergency.

As a Government we were permitted to drift without rudder or sail in our aircraft program from the time Secretary Baker assumed charge of the War Department down to the end of the war.

Mr. Baker's appointment of General Squier, in charge of aviation, and his agreement with the foolhardy April 1917 aviation program (p. 23); his appointment of Colonel Deeds and unprecedented act in preventing Deeds'

court martial, which was recommended by Judge Hughes (p. 2655); his appointment of Mr. Potter as aircraft director; a man without knowledge of aviation (p. 65) and interested in enormous copper contracts with the Government; his appointment of Mr. Ryan as aircraft director, also without knowledge of aviation (p. 68) and president of the Anaconda Copper Co. that, through the United Metals Selling Co., controlled all copper contracts made with the Government; his appointment of Colonel Disque, who was equally without knowledge of the business, and his directions to limit to 8 hours per day all work, civilian or military, in Oregon and Washington during times of war and to pay the soldiers the prevailing civilian wages; his approval before the Thomas Senate committee of Mr. Ryan's determination to continue all efforts in the production of the extremely dangerous DH-4 (p. 42); his extended European trip in company with Aircraft Director Ryan in the midst of America's aircraft failure and during the most critical hours of national defense activities—these were matters presented to your committee in the hearings and speak for themselves.

WASTEFUL METHODS

We feel that it is our duty to call the attention of the House and the country to the large amount of spruce going to waste in Washington and Oregon as a result of the riving and cutting operations of the Spruce Production Corp. in the forests of those States. Newspaper publishers throughout the United States are so hard pressed to get sufficient newsprint paper to meet their requirements that some steps should be taken to utilize this available spruce. Trees have been cut from 6 to 8 feet and more above the surface of the ground. The reason given was that the butt of the tree was not straight grained and unsuitable for aircraft lumber. When we consider that the trees averaged several feet in diameter, it becomes apparent how great the wastage has been. Evidence taken at the hearings shows that the spruce trees cut in France for aircraft purposes were cut as near to the surface of the ground as the saw could be operated. The trees thus cut were planted by the thrifty French several centuries ago. Besides, riving operations were extremely wasteful of the spruce timber. In this connection we do not speak in any spirit of criticism, but because we feel that enough spruce is going to waste in those forests to furnish sufficient newsprint paper to meet the requirements of American newspapers for some time to come.

It will be apparent to any fair-minded person who will carefully read the evidence that the stake being played for, in the abortive attempt to produce spruce lumber in Washington and Oregon, was for the control of the lumber interests in the Northwest after the war. In exposing this scheme the patriotic loggers and lumbermen on the coast and the Providence Journal have rendered a great public service.

It should be a perpetual warning to men holding high official positions that they must not use their official power, particularly in time of war, to advance commercial interests at governmental expense.

OUR AVIATION PRODUCTION WAR PROGRAM

Briefly stated, the American Congress during the war appropriated over $1,000,000,000 that was expended for aircraft activities.

Apart from training planes practically nothing but a handful of DH-4 "flaming coffins" was produced. The sorely pressed Allies were persuaded to sell us a few largely obsolescent planes, with which we equipped our aviators. In all lines of aircraft production we subordinated speed, immediate needs, and experience to be gained from other nations to "quantity production." Instead of inviting all agencies to aid, the War Department engineering "experts" jealously refused intelligent and experienced help. These experts during the war tried to develop an automobile engine and fit it into all types of aircraft. The result was an impossible program that for a year and a half awaited the experiments of military engineering experts. Battle or pursuit planes would not have reached quantity production in 1919, judging from past experience in 1917 and 1918 and with a scarcity of planes possessed by our allies every gift or sale by them was at a tremendous military and national sacrifice. Inexperience, ignorance of the business, and inefficiency from beginning to end marked our aircraft-production program during the war. Our strongest asset was the airplane production of our allies, the splendid fighting spirit of American aviators, and the weakness of the enemy toward the end, for all of which our aircraft-production program was in no way responsible.

Waste of the larger part of $1,000,000,000 will not be entirely lost if we have learned a lesson from the past.

Lack of public confidence in War Department aviation plans appears well grounded. America should keep abreast of modern aircraft thought, and invention must not be permitted to lag behind; but the great stumbling block today lies in a knowledge by Congress and to a large extent by the country that the War Department has made a mess of America's aircraft program and has not developed any competent head to inspire public confidence.

A SEPARATE AIR SERVICE INDISPENSABLE

Any investigation to be of permanent value should offer a solution for the problem of intelligent aircraft advancement.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, the striking failure of the War Department to rise to the aircraft emergency, either in peace or in war, has made necessary the creation of a separate bureau or department of aeronautics. Therein all governmental activities should be centered with a capable, progressive official at the head.

Practically every witness examined on the subject of future American air service united in a plea for separate independent control.

From generals to lieutenants, from private citizens, familiar with the subject, and from every experienced aviator appearing before our committee, including Generals Mitchell, Kenly, and Foulois, military aircraft authorities, and LaGuardia, Meissner, Kindley, and, last but not least, Rickenbacker—men who upheld American air laurels at the front, all unanimously urge a separate air service that will work and cooperate with the Army, Navy, Post Office, and Interior Departments in the development of aviation. We feel that real progress in aviation must depend in a material degree upon encouragement given to civil and commercial aviation.

Adequate appropriations, wisely expended, are necessary to put America to the front where she belongs. The imperative necessity for this policy must be apparent to all who have studied the constantly increasing scope of aeronautics. Cooperation with and encouragement to inventors and manufacturers and a broad, intelligent policy is demanded. Practically all other countries have adopted that course, and ours must not fail at this crucial period, to do so.

The future of aviation is beyond our present dreams or understanding, and our Government must do her full part in leading in its development.

EXPENSES OF THIS CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Your committee has worked hard and faithfully for over 6 months and submits the record, without apologies, for whatever its value may be.

The committee of 15 selected to investigate War Department expenditures possesses no member, Republican or Democrat, who desired the thankless task that entailed hard work without reward. Once appointed, however, it became a public duty that could not be avoided.

This comment is offered in conclusion because the committee of 15 was brought into being by a unanimously adopted resolution of the House and every Member has direct responsibility for its existence. Members of Congress get their commission direct from the people, and in any painstaking congressional investigation of public expenditures the facts are sought and given to those who ultimately pay the bills. Critics who question the expense of investigations are often influenced by motives other than public-money expenditures, but they are here reminded that directions to incur such expense came from a unanimous vote of the House, and, as we understand, all expenditures of the five subcommittees combined will not equal much more than the cost to the Government of 1 mile of the Lake Crescent Railroad, or 1 mile of the Newport Railroad, or of the Alsea Railroad. All the combined five subcommittee expenditures presumably will not equal 5 percent of the cost to the Government of the Siems-Carey sawmill folly, or 2 percent of public money wasted on the worthless Bristol plane. Your subcommittee on aviation has tried to perform its duty and offers the record as an evidence of how little was realized by the Government from $1,000,000,000 ostensibly expended for aircraft.

The committee has endeavored to present a temperate, unbiased report devoid of sensationalism, which is sustained in important essentials by the reports of Justice Hughes and the Thomas Senate subcommittee. The facts have been presented squarely without inuendo and responsibility has been lodged against those in positions of authority. Pages of record on which such testimony appears has been cited with names of witnesses. This was our commission from the House, and it has been faithfully performed.

Experience in prior investigations has disclosed whitewash reports and efforts to smother or discredit anything reflecting upon the War Department. In an effort to distract public attention from the findings of fact reached by Justice Hughes and the Thomas committee, as stated at the outset of this report, apologists for indefensible inefficiency and extravagance may seek to mislead public opinion and endeavor to confuse the situation by reflections upon the committee which was unanimously selected by the House to get the facts. Such methods, if pursued, strikingly illustrate a course of procedure adopted in responsible quarters of trying to minimize anything affecting the air service, War Department, or administration. No honest or reputable Member of Congress can afford to take the position and your committee presents the hearings, testimony, and report as conclusive evidence in support of the findings submitted.

If from the record we may find helpful suggestions regarding pitfalls to be avoided and a solution for the permanent advancement of aeronautics, then the money, time, and labor expended by your committee will not have been in vain.

ADDENDA A

This is an extract from the report of Hon. Charles E. Hughes. Wherever any substance is omitted that omission will be indicated by asterisks.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 25, 1918.*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL:

I have the honor to submit the following report of the aircraft inquiry:

The investigation has been concerned with aircraft production. Other activities relating to aviation, but not to production, have been touched only incidentally. Thus, upward of thirty training or flying fields with numerous structures have been provided, and to meet other aviation needs a great variety of construction has been required, here and abroad. These enterprises, being aside from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

aircraft production itself, have not been the subject of this inquiry, save as transactions relating to Wilbur Wright Field and McCook Field have invited scrutiny by reason of the aircraft enterprises centered at Dayton, Ohio, and the activities of Edward A. Deeds and his former business associates.

Another governmental activity which does relate to aircraft production, but is conducted separately from the orders for airplanes and engines, is known as the Sales Department. The Government itself purchases large quantities of lumber, fabric, chemicals, etc., which it resells. When these commodities are supplied by the Government to contractors, the Sales Department is credited and the items are transferred to the other appropriate accounts. The largest item of this sort is for spruce. The account of the Sales Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shows that spruce orders amounted to $76,211,360.35 on which there had been deliveries and payments aggregating $6,357,853.83, leaving unfilled orders of $69,853,506.52; and of the spruce delivered the Government had resold to the extent of $3,679,155.95. It appears that the Government had also (to June 30, 1918) invested in its cut-up plant at Vancouver, Wash., the sum of $1,487,237.81. While to some extent testimony has been taken bearing on the spruce contracts, it became evident as the inquiry proceeded that it would be impossible to reach any satisfactory conclusion with respect to the transactions of the Spruce Production Division without a special inquiry on the Pacific coast, which in view of the extent and character of the activities involved would probably take several months. It has not been practicable to undertake this as yet, in view of the magnitude of the work involved in other branches of the investigation, and accordingly it has been left to be undertaken hereafter by the Department of Justice as it may be advised. For this reason, a report on the operations of the Spruce Production Division or of the Sales Department will not now be attempted. Also, in view of the importance of the present inquiry in its special relation to airplanes and airplane engines, transactions of the Balloon Division have not been examined.

Aside from these limitations, the inquiry has taken a wide range. It has been prosecuted without pause since it was begun in the latter part of May last. About 280 witnesses have been examined and over 17,000 pages of testimony have been taken. The more important plants have been visited, and a large part of the testimony has been taken at these plants where books, records, employees, and Government representatives have been available. To compass all the activities involved in aircraft production, reaching into a great variety of contracts and operations involving numerous plants and the expenditure of many millions of dollars, would require the constant efforts of a force of investigators for a year or more longer and also the services of an army of accountants charged with the responsibility of checking and auditing the work of the hundreds of Government representatives now supervising the contractors' accounts. It is impossible, of course, to say what irregularities or offenses such a protracted inquiry would bring to light, but the investigation has been sufficiently comprehensive to give, it is believed, a survey of the field as a whole and to disclose the facts bearing upon the serious charges which have been made.

In addition, and as a result of information received through this inquiry, there have been special proceedings before grand juries. Thus, on information of violations of the sabotage act at the Hammondsport (N. Y.) plant of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., the matter was examined by the grand jury and indictments were returned in the western district of New York, and there have also been indictments in the same district for violations of this act at the North Elmwood plant, Buffalo, of the same corporation. There also has been a special investigation by the grand jury at Sacramento, with respect to conditions at the Liberty Iron Works.

It is manifestly impracticable to state the details of even the more important evidence, but the salient and controlling facts which have been elicited will be set forth, so far as this is deemed to be compatible with military exigency.

I. APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

* * * * *

STATEMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR JUNE 30, 1917, TO JUNE 30, 1918

* * * * *

OBLIGATIONS OTHER THAN FOR AIRPLANES AND ENGINES

* * * * *

OBLIGATIONS FOR AIRPLANES AND ENGINES

The amount of the estimated obligations for airplanes and engines, and spare parts of both (including experimental and development work) charged, to June 30, 1918, against the aeronautical appropriations for the fiscal year 1917–18 was as follows:

Charged to the $640,000,000 appropriation	$457,379,122.15
Charged to other appropriations	17,531,584.40
Total	474,910,706.55

ACTUAL DISBURSEMENTS FOR ALL AERONAUTICAL PURPOSES

* * * * *

ACTUAL DISBURSEMENTS FOR AIRPLANES AND ENGINES

The actual payments for the fiscal year 1917–18 against the estimated obligations for airplanes and engines, and spare parts of both (including payments for experimental and development work), are reported by the Finance Division of the Bureau of Aircraft Production as amounting to $155,535,946.41 as follows:

Disbursed from the $640,000,000 appropriation	$142,908,398.95
Disbursed from other appropriations	12,627,547.46
Total	155,535,946.41

These disbursements included not only payments to contractors for articles delivered or on account of work and materials, but also advances in the nature of loans to contractors, upon security, made by the War Credits Board, and, in addition, the payments which had been made for the manufacture of planes and engines overseas.

The payments for manufacture overseas amounted to $25,605,074.31, as follows:

Cash remittances to overseas disbursing officers for payment on overseas contracts for airplanes and engines	$16,600,000.00
Paid on purchase of materials, supplies, etc., purchased by United States for shipment abroad to be used in overseas manufacture of airplanes and engines	[1] 9,005,074.31
Total	25,605,074.31

[1] This includes the compensation of the purchasing agent, the J. G. White Engineering Corp., amounting to 3 percent of the purchases, or $262,662.02.

The unpaid balances of advances to contractors (whose contracts are embraced in the obligations for airplanes and engines above described), these advances being repayable to the Government, amounted on June 30, 1918 (exclusive of interest) to $21,491,551.14. The principal contractors who have received these advances are specified below:

Contractor	Advances authorized	Advances made	Balance unpaid June 30, 1918 (without interest)
Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp	$8,000,000	$8,000,000	$5,561,645.94
Dayton Wright Airplane Co	2,500,000	2,000,000	1,405,222.57
Duesenberg Motors Corp	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,632,447.97
Fisher Body Corp	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,944,933.33
Lincoln Motor Co	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,255,392.00
Nordyke & Marmon Co	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000.00
Packard Motor Car Co	5,000,000	5,000,000	1,731,232.00
Trego Motors Corp	315,000	285,000	281,695.70
Willys-Overland Co	2,500,000	2,500,000	451,861.25
Various other contractors			227,120.38
Total			21,491,551.14

The amounts paid, to June 30, 1918, on account of experimental and development work on airplanes and engines amounted to $1,697,830.19, of which the principal items are these:

Expenditures of experimental station at McCook Field	$974,300.20
Director, Bureau of Standards	64,077.33
Department of Agriculture	34,540.82
Packard Motor Car Co	249,159.10
Dayton Wright Airplane Co.[1]	48,120.39
Dayton Metal Products Co	66,097.14
Miscellaneous payments	261,535.21
Total	1,697,830.19

[1] Other vouchers allowed before June 30, 1918, but not paid until later, $89,630.52.

Deducting these advances, and the payments of experimental and development work, the disbursements to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1918, for airplanes and engines, and their parts, manufactured or in process of manufacture in the United States amounted to $106,741,490.77, as follows:

Total disbursed for airplanes and engines		$155,535,946.41
Less—		
For overseas manufacture	25,605,074.31	
For advances to contractors	21,491,551.14	
For experimental and development work	1,697,830.19	
	48,794,455.64	
Disbursed on account of production in United States	106,741,490.77	

AIRPLANES AND ENGINES DELIVERED DURING FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1918

The reported deliveries of airplanes and engines made prior to June 30, 1918, are as follows:

Airplanes

Elementary training planes:	
JN4–D	2,972
SJ–1	1,600
Total	4,572
Advanced training planes:	
JN4–H—	
Training	402
Gunnery	321
JN6–HB	100
S4–B	100
S4–C	73
Penguin	50
Total	1,046

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Airplanes—Continued

Combat and bombing planes:	
DeH–4	529
Bristol Fighter	24
Total	553
Total planes	6,171

Engines

Elementary training:	
OX–5	5,474
A7a	2,188
Total	7,662
Advanced training:	
Hispano, 150-horsepower	2,188
Gnome, 100-horsepower	209
Le Rhone, 80-horsepower	68
Lawrence, 26-horsepower	114
Total	2,579
Combat and bombing:	
United States 12-cylinder—	
Army type	1,615
Naval type	775
Hispano, 300-horsepower	2
Total	2,392
Total engines	12,633

For some of the units thus delivered payments had not yet been made at the close of the fiscal year. The payments to June 30, 1918, covered about 5,530 of the airplanes delivered and about 9,750 of the engines delivered. In addition, there had been deliveries of various planes and engine parts, and the greater part of these were also covered by the payments above mentioned. And there were also large payments to contractors under cost-plus contracts for labor, materials, and overhead charges in connection with work in process.

ALLOCATION OF PAYMENTS TO JUNE 30, 1918

* * * * *

FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS

* * * * *

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS

* * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR JUNE 30, 1918, TO JUNE 30, 1919

Continuance of prior appropriations

The act of July 9, 1918, making appropriations for the fiscal year 1918–19, continued the prior appropriations of $640,000,000, and other aeronautical appropriations, thus making them available for the present fiscal year and for the payment of obligations incurred prior to the passage of the act. Under this provision the production orders given in the last fiscal year, which remain uncanceled, will be continued and payments will be made in accordance with the terms of the existing contracts as production progresses.

New appropriations

The act of July 9, 1918, also made a new appropriation for the Air Service of $884,304,758. This appropriation is available for the purchase, manufacture, maintenance, repair, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, with equipment, aviation stations, schools, and fields; for the expenses of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees; and also for training, experimental work, creation, expansion, acquisition, and development of plants, etc. Of this amount there has been apportioned for Air Service production the sum of $760,000,000, of which $200,000,000 has been set aside for airplanes, their spare parts, instruments and accessories, $250,000,000 for engines, their repair parts, instruments and accessories, and $200,000,000 for foreign expenditures. Various items for balloons, oils, gases, and chemicals, transportation, plants, miscellaneous equipment and supplies, experimentation, and pay of Reserve Corps and civilians make up the remainder.

Against this new appropriation thus apportioned the obligations incurred to September 30, 1918 (exclusive of the sales department), amounted to $151,580,503.35, of which $21,603,470.90 is for airplanes, their spare parts, etc., and $102,746,372.91 is for engines, their repair parts, etc. The total payments against the new obligations amounted, to September 30, 1918, to $3,670,707.66 (exclusive of foreign expenditures and transfers to other departments), leaving then unexpended of the new appropriation of $760,000,000, apportioned to Air Service production, the sum of $756,329,292.34.

Payments since June 30, 1918, and total payments to date

The last financial reports available are of September 30, 1918. The disbursements to that date which were made after June 30, 1918, for all aeronautical purposes and were chargeable to the appropriations for the prior fiscal year (continued as above stated) are as follows:

Disbursed from the $640,000,000 appropriation (act of June 24, 1917)	$128,265,038.31
Disbursed from other aeronautical appropriations	7,250,915.36
Total disbursed since June 30, 1918, under prior appropriations for aeronautical purposes	135,515,953.67

The total disbursements for aeronautical purposes from June 30, 1918, to September 30, 1918, are in the aggregate:

Under appropriations prior to June 30, 1918	$135,515,953.67
Under appropriations after that date, as above	3,670,707.66
Total	139,186,661.33

These disbursements for all aeronautical purposes cannot at present be apportioned so as to show separately the amounts disbursed since June 30, 1918, for airplanes and engines, and parts.

Deliveries to October 11, 1918[1]

The total deliveries of airplanes and engines (exclusive of spare parts) to October 11, 1918, appear, by the Government's reports, to be as follows:

Training planes

	Since June 30, 1918	Total to Oct. 11, 1918
JN–4D	615	3,587
SJ–1		1,600
JN–4H and JN–6H	609	1,432
84–B		100
84–C	225	298
Penguin	245	295
E–1	12	12
	1,706	7,324

ADDENDA X

Training planes

	Since June 30, 1918	Total to Dec. 1, 1918
JN–4D	918	3,890
SJ–1		1,600
JN–4H and JN–6H	950	1,773
84–B		100
84–C	357	430
Penguin	250	300
E–1	47	47
Total	2,522	8,140

ENGINES FOR TRAINING PLANES

OX–5	2,084	8,458
A–7a (Hall-Scott)	62	2,250
Gnome 100 horsepower	71	280
LeRhone 80 horsepower	1,245	1,313
Hispano 150 horsepower	1,389	3,577
Lawrence	337	451
	6,088	16,329

SERVICE PLANES

De Haviland 4's	3,622	4,151
Handley-Page (parts 85 percent complete)	[1] 102	102
Le Pere	7	7
SE–5	6	6
Total	3,737	4,266

[1] See addenda X for deliveries to December 1, 1918.

ENGINES FOR SERVICE PLANES

	Since June 30, 1918	Total to Dec. 1, 1918
Liberty (United States)—12's	13,348	15,738
Hispano 180 horsepower	568	568
Hispano 300 horsepower	6	8
Bugatti	11	11
	13,933	16,325

[1] 25 sets of wooden parts and no metal parts delivered to June 30, 1918.

Engines for training planes

	Since June 30, 1918	Total to Oct. 11, 1918
OX–5	2,532	8,006
A–7a (Hall-Scott)	62	2,250
Gnome, 100 horsepower	69	278
LeRhone, 80 horsepower	679	747
Hispano, 150 horsepower	824	3,012
Lawrence	328	442
	4,494	14,735

SERVICE PLANES

De Haviland-4's	1,821	[1] 2,350
Handley-Page (parts 85 percent complete)	[2] 100	100
Le Pere	5	5
SE–5	2	2
Total	1,928	2,457

ENGINES FOR SERVICE PLANES

Liberty (U. S.) 12's	7,299	[1] 9,689
Hispano, 180 horsepower	242	242
Hispano, 300 horsepower	3	5
Bugatti	1	1
Total	7,545	9,937

[1] Since the above was prepared information has been received that to Oct. 18, 1918, 2,556 DeHaviland-4's and 10,568 Liberty (U. S.) 12's have been delivered.

[2] 25 sets of wooden parts and no metal parts delivered to June 30, 1918.

PAYMENTS FOR AIRPLANES CONDEMNED

Standard J–1 training planes

This type of plane was condemned as dangerous in June 1918, because of the unsuitability of the motor (Hall-Scott, A7a) used with it. There were 1,600 of these SJ–1 planes ordered and delivered, and all deliveries had been made prior to June 30, 1918. The entire amount disbursed for these planes and their spare parts to September 30, 1918, the date of the last financial statement, is $11,027,733.61, of which $8,593,576.11 was under cost-plus contracts.

There were 2,250 A7a engines ordered for these planes, all of which, with parts, have been delivered. The amount disbursed for these engines and parts (exclusively under

fixed-price contracts) to September 30, 1918, amounted to $6,487,134.75.

The aggregate cost of the SJ–1 planes with A7a engines, with spare parts, to September 30, 1918, amounted to $17,514,868.36.

There appears to have been no defect in the SJ–1 plane itself, and there is an expectation that it may be utilized by the installation of another engine. The cost of adapting these planes to such an installation may amount to $2,000 a plane.

What salvage may ultimately be gained in this way or on the A7a engines cannot now be determined.

Bristol fighters

The Bristol Fighter was condemned as unsafe in July 1918. A contract for 2,000 of these planes and for 1,200 sets of spare parts had been placed with the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. on a cost-plus basis at an estimated cost of $19,190,100. Orders were also given to the Hayes-Ionia Co. and to the Lewis Spring & Axle Co., each for 400 sets of spare parts, at the estimated cost of $1,890,000, or $3,780,000 in all. The estimated cost of the Bristol planes and spares was thus $22,970,100.

Only 27 had been delivered prior to cancellation, but there was a large amount of work in process. The amount shown by the accounts of the Bureau of Aircraft Production to have been paid on these contracts to September 30, 1918 (exclusive of increased facilities owned by the Government), is about $2,350,000. Taking the materials purchased for the Bristols, the labor, and estimated overhead charges, it would appear that the total amount expended by the Curtiss Co. in the course of the production of the Bristols was about $3,000,000. This does not include any claim for damages for the cancellation of the contract. The Finance Division of the Bureau of Aircraft Production makes a general estimate (which includes unpaid vouchers and possible claims for damages growing out of the cancellation of contracts) that the aggregate cost of the Bristol will amount to about $6,500,000. What salvage there may be on the materials cannot now be determined.

The Liberty engines intended to be used in the Bristols can be utilized in other planes.

On this estimate, the cost to the Government of the SJ–1 planes (with engines), and on the Bristol planes, subject to reduction by whatever salvage there may be, amounts to $24,000,000.[2]

2. RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS AND ADVISORY BOARDS

By the act of July 24, 1917, full authority was given to the President to provide, through the War Department, for the purchase, manufacture, maintenance, and operation of all types of aircraft, with all necessary equipment.

Signal Corps

Under the Secretary of War, the authority to establish the aircraft program and the control and administration of matters relating to aircraft production for the Army were vested in the Chief Signal Officer, Brig. Gen. George O. Squier. It was under his direction that the organization of the aviation section of the Signal Corps, with its various departments of production, supply, inspection, and accounting, was effected. The matter of aircraft production was entrusted to the Equipment Division, which was organized on August 2, 1917. Edward A. Deeds was made Chief of this Division, with Sydney D. Waldon as his assistant. At the same time Robert L. Montgomery was made Chief of the Finance and Supply Division. There was a reorganization on August 29, 1917, by which these two Divisions were abolished and the functions of both were transferred to a new Equipment Division, with Edward A. Deeds in charge. Robert L. Montgomery was made the head of the Finance Department of the Equipment Division. Deeds, Montgomery, and Waldon had been members of the Aircraft Production Board and in or about August 1917 they were commissioned with the rank of colonel. Thus Colonel Deeds, as the head of the Equipment Division, had direct charge, under the Chief Signal Officer, of all matters relating to aircraft production. On January 14, 1918, Colonel Deeds became industrial executive in the Executive Division of the Signal Corps, and was succeeded by Colonel Montgomery as head of the Equipment Division; but, despite the change in technical relation, it is apparent that Colonel Deeds remained in practical charge, under the Chief Signal Officer, of production. In February 1918 William C. Potter became the head of the Equipment Division and remained in this position until the passage of the act of May 20, 1918.

Bureau of Aircraft Production

By order of the President, dated May 20, 1918 (promulgated May 24, 1918), the Chief Signal Officer was put in charge of military signal duties, not connected with the Aviation Section; Gen. W. L. Kenly was appointed Director of Military Aeronautics and charged with the duties which had formerly pertained to the Aviation Section, except so far as they related to aircraft production, and for the latter purpose the executive agency known as the Bureau of Aircraft Production was established. Mr. John D. Ryan was appointed head of this Bureau and thus became Director of Aircraft Production, Mr. Potter taking the post of Assistant Director.

ADVISORY BODIES

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

* * * * *

Joint Army and Navy Technical Aircraft Board

* * * * *

Aircraft Production Board

* * * * *

Aircraft Board

* * * * *

3. PERSONAL INTERESTS

There are no common-law offenses against the United States, and a charge of crime under Federal law must rest exclusively upon the violation of a Federal criminal statute (*United States* v. *Eaton* (144 U. S. 677, 687), *United States* v. *George* (228 U. S. 422)).

The applicable statutes of the United States dealing with the question of personal interest of officers and agents of the Government in Government contracts are the following:

1. Section 41 of the Criminal Code of the United States, formerly section 1783 of the Revised Statutes, provides:

"SEC. 41. No officer or agent of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, and no member or agent of any firm, or person directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of such corporation, joint-stock company, association, or firm, shall be employed or shall act as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such corporation, joint-stock company, association, or firm. Whoever shall violate the provision of this section shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years."

Under this statute it is not enough that an interested person merely recommends or advises transactions with the Government. To constitute a violation of the statute, the interested person must "be employed" or "act as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such corporation," etc.

2. Section 3 of the act of August 10, 1917 (food and fuel control act) provides:

"SEC. 3. That no person acting either as a voluntary or paid agent or employee of the United States in any capacity, including an advisory capacity, shall solicit, induce, or attempt to induce any person or officer authorized to execute or to direct the execution of contracts on behalf of the United States to make any contract or give any order for the furnishing to the United States of work, labor, or services, or of materials, supplies, or other property of any kind or character, if such agent or employee has any pecuniary interest in such contract or order, or if he or any firm of which he is a member, or corporation, joint-stock company, or association of which he is an officer or stockholder, or in the pecuniary profits of which he is directly or indirectly interested, shall be a party thereto. Nor shall any agent or employee make, or permit any committee or other body of which he is a member to make, or participate in making, any recommendation concerning such contract or order to any council, board, or commission of the United States, or any member or subordinate thereof, without making to the best of his knowledge and belief a full and complete disclosure in writing to such council, commission, or subordinate of any and every pecuniary interest which may have in such contract or order and of his interest in any firm, corporation, company, or association being a party thereto. Nor shall he participate in the awarding of such contract or giving such order. Any willful violation of any of the provisions of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not change, alter, or repeal section 41 of chapter 321, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large."

This section covers those who act in an advisory capacity. It has no application to transactons occurring before its passage.

It is apparent that the section was guardedly drawn and its limitations should be noted. The first sentence of the section applies to interested persons only where they "solicit, induce, or attempt to induce" any person or officer, who is "authorized to execute, or to direct the execution of contracts," to make any contract or give any order for labor, services, materials, etc. The use of different expressions in the different clauses of the section suggests possible shades of meaning. The act of recommending does not come within the first sentence unless it is found to amount to "soliciting," "inducing," or "attempting to induce," nor does the first sentence cover solicitations addressed to others than the persons or officers duly authorized to make the contracts or give the orders.

The second sentence relates to "recommendations" by interested persons, but it is limited to recommendations made "to any council, board, or commission of the United States, or any member or subordinate thereof" in the absence of the disclosure described. Apparently this sentence does not cover recommendations made to individual officers acting under the authority conferred upon them by law, who are not members or subordinates of a "council, board, or commission."

The third sentence provides that the interested person shall not "participate in the awarding of such contract or giving such order." This would seem to relate to those who take part in the actual awarding of the contract or giving of the order and not to those who act in an advisory capacity only.

The section concludes with the proviso that its provisions shall not alter or repeal section 41 of the Criminal Code above quoted.

[2] Further information has been received that a contract is contemplated under which about $3,500,000 of Bristol parts may be used in a new type of plane which, if successful, would reduce the estimated loss on the Bristols to $3,000,000 and the total loss on SJ–1's and Bristols, subject to salvage on the SJ–1's, to $20,500,000.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

To come within these statutes an interested person must either (1) act as an officer or agent of the Government for the transaction of business with the concern in which he is interested, or (2) solicit, induce, or attempt to induce, the person or officer who is authorized to execute or direct the execution of contracts, to make a contract with, or give an order to, the concern to which the interest relates, or (3) take part in a recommendation to a "council, board, or commission" or subordinate or members thereof, without the disclosure stated, or (4) participate in the award of the contract or giving of the order.

In connection with these statutes attention may be called to the following provision, which appears as a rider in the appropriation act of March 3, 1917, immediately following an appropriation for the distribution of documents (39 Stat., p. 1106):

"*Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1919, no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine."

It will be noted that this provision, enacted in March 1917, is not to be operative until July 1, 1919. It may be contended with force that this constitutes a legislative declaration, by implication, that the action described by the provision—that is, the mere supplementing of the pay of Government officials by private contributions—should not be deemed contrary to law prior to the date fixed.

INDIVIDUAL RELATIONS OF OFFICIALS

* * * * *

OFFICERS OF THE SIGNAL CORPS FORMERLY IN CONTROL OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

1. The Chief Signal Officer: It does not appear that General Squier had any interest in any corporations or concerns transacting business with the Signal Corps. The defects in the organization, which was created under his direction for the purpose of aircraft production, are matters distinct from any question of personal interest and will be considered in another division of this report.

2. Col. Edward A. Deeds: The charges pertaining to personal interest in Government contracts relate particularly to Col. Edward A. Deeds and grow out of the highly suggestive transactions with his former business associates at Dayton. These transactions have been subjected to careful scrutiny.

Colonel Deeds was born near Granville, Ohio, on March 12, 1874. There is testimony that he once said that his name originally was Dietz. No public record has been found to this effect. Colonel Deeds denies making the remark attributed to him and states that his family has borne the name of Deeds for at least four generations—his great-grandfather of that name coming from Pennsylvania. For many years Colonel Deeds was an officer of the National Cash Register Co., and was one of several connected with that organization who were indicted in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, in 1912, for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Upon the trial Deeds, with other defendants, was convicted, but this conviction was set aside by the Circuit Court of Appeals (*Patterson* v. *United States*, 222 Fed., 599), and the prosecution went no further.

At the time of our entry into the war, Mr. Deeds had large business interests at Dayton. His intimate business associates were Charles F. Kettering and H. E. Talbott. Mr. Deeds and Mr. Kettering (an inventor and engineer of ability) have been jointly associated in many enterprises with equal shares, it being their policy to organize corporations and to take their respective interests in stocks. Mr. Deeds has supplied the financial talent and Mr. Kettering, who is without any aptitude for business details, the engineering skill. They have had, and still have, a common agent of a highly confidential sort, George B. Smith, of Dayton, who holds the power of attorney of each, keeps their respective books, has charge of their bank accounts, signs their checks, and generally looks after their financial affairs. They are still associated in various undertakings and their relations are of the most intimate character.

In 1904 Kettering was employed in the National Cash Register Co. as a designer in the engineering department, and later he became associated with Deeds in the development of what is known as the Delco ignition system for automobiles. In the course of this development Deeds and Kettering organized the Dayton Engineering Laboratories Co., known as the Delco Co. The enterprise was successful and the common stock was sold by Deeds and Kettering in 1916 to the United Motors Corporation for several million dollars in cash and certain shares of stock. Deeds and Kettering each retained a few shares of preferred stock; Deeds continued as president of the corporation, with a salary of $60,000 a year, and Kettering as vice president, with a salary of $50,000.

In April 1915, Deeds, Kettering, H. E. Talbott, Sr., and his son H. E. Talbott, Jr., organized the Dayton Metal Products Co. with a capital stock of $200,000. The stock was held as follows: Talbott, Sr., 900 shares; Deeds, 500 shares; Kettering, 499 shares; Talbott, Jr., 99 shares; Charles H. Mead, 1 share; and George B. McCann, 1 share. Prior to our entry into the war this company had profitable fuse contracts with the British Government and had accumulated a considerable surplus. It appears that in the spring of 1917 both Deeds and Talbott were appointed on the subcommittee on fuses and detonators of the Munitions Standards Board. In 1916, the company had a contract with the Navy Department for fuses, and it received other fuse contracts from the Navy and the Ordnance Department of the Army in 1917. As vice president of this company, Deeds had a salary of $25,000 a year. The relation of the Dayton Metal Products Co. to aircraft production is that this company, in the latter part of the year 1917, acquired all the stock (save four qualifying shares) of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. and also has subcontracts for metal parts with contractors making airplanes and engines. The Dayton Metal Products Co. also subscribed and paid for 1,000 shares (par value $100,000) of the stock of the Lincoln Motor Co. which was organized to build Liberty engines and has a paid-up capital stock of $850,000.

In September 1916, Deeds and Kettering organized the Domestic Building Co., of Dayton, for the purpose of erecting and financing plants for the use of various companies. The capital stock is now $1,000,000 of which all but four qualifying shares are held by Deeds and Kettering in equal parts. This company owned the land and erected the building acquired by the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. for its principal airplane plant.

On April 9, 1917, the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. was incorporated with a capital stock of $500,000 by Deeds, Kettering, H. E. Talbott, and H. E. Talbott, Jr., in conjunction with Orville Wright. They had taken over the former Wright organization and thus had started an airplane enterprise at Dayton in a small way in the summer of 1916. The larger enterprise of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. was launched about the time of our entry into the war, manifestly with the expectation of obtaining Government contracts. While Deeds was one of the incorporators, he did not become a stockholder, the subscriptions for the first 5,000 shares being as follows: H. E. Talbott, 1,990 shares; C. F. Kettering, 2,000 shares; H. E. Talbott, Jr., 990 shares; George H. Mead, 10 shares; and C. A. Craighead, 10 shares. In August 1917 the capital stock was increased to $1,000,000 ($600,000 common and $400,000 preferred). The new common stock was taken by the Messrs. Talbott and Kettering in the proportion of two-fifths, two-fifths, and one-fifth. There were early negotiations for a Government contract, and as early as June 12, 1917, a contract with the company was recommended by the Aircraft Production Board. The contract was executed on August 17, 1917 (under date of August 1, 1917), and was for 40 Standard J–1 training planes at the fixed price of $6,500 each. For this, there was substituted the contract dated September 7, 1917, which was also recommended by the Aircraft Production Board and was approved by General Squier. This contract was for 400 Standard-J airplanes, 2,000 De Havilland 9's, and 1,500 Martinsydes with spare parts. By later modifications the Martinsydes and De Havilland 9's were omitted and provision was made for 4,000 De Havilland 4's. These contracts were on a cost-plus basis, the estimated amount involved being upward of $30,000,000. There was to be a fixed profit of $620 on each Standard-J plane and $875 on each De Havilland, making a total fixed profit of about $3,750,000, exclusive of fixed profit on spare parts covered by the contract, thus expected to be earned, according to the contemplated deliveries before the end of 1918. The contract also provided for additional profits to the extent of 25 percent of the saving under the bogey or estimated cost of the planes ($7,000 on the De Havillands), and it is estimated that the additional profit on this basis would have amounted to over $2,600,000. When the bogey cost of $7,000 was fixed, letters were obtained from the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. and from Fisher Body Corp. (which also had a contract for De Havillands), that after 250 machines had been produced there would be an equitable adjustment if the bogey cost was found to be materially wrong. Accordingly, a contract is now about to be signed reducing the bogey cost to $5,000 and the fixed profit to $625 per plane.

Even at this rate, the fixed profit on the 4,000 De Havillands will be $2,500,000, and it is believed that there will be an additional profit through saving under the bogey cost and on spare parts of not less than $1,000,000. In August and September 1917, when the first Government contracts were awarded, the capital stock of the company ($1,000,000) had not been paid in. It was not paid in until December 1, 1917, when, in one transaction, the stock was paid for and all the shares, preferred and common, save five qualifying shares, were transferred to the Dayton Metal Products Co., which thus became and still remains the owner of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. As the latter company practically received nothing on the issue of its capital stock save the fixed property represented by its plants, it was lacking in working capital, and this at the outset was supplied by various loans and advances of the interested parties. In December the Government agreed to advance the company $2,500,000, of which $1,500,000 was advanced at once.

The name of Orville Wright was used in this enterprise, but his chief activity has been as a consulting engineer in connection with experimental work. He has not been responsible for production. Mr. Kettering is an engineer of ability, but his work also has been that of experimental engineering; he is not a manufacturing or production expert. Much emphasis is placed by the parties concerned upon the fact that they were able to avail themselves of the old Wright organ-

ization which had been continued as already stated. But this was a very slender basis for the prompt selection of this newly organized company, which had not even completed its financial arrangements, as one of the few companies immediately admitted to the advantages of large and highly profitable Government contracts. The promoters of this enterprise, not content with these profits which were to accrue to them, either directly or through their ownership of the Dayton Metal Products Co., at once took advantage of the opportunity to increase their gains by salaries as executive officers of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. Dating from August 1, 1917, the salaries thus allowed were as follows: H. E. Talbott, Sr., $35,000; C. F. Kettering, $35,000; and H. E. Talbott, Jr. (30 years old, who was made president of the company), $30,000. Talbott, Sr., was at the time receiving, and continued to receive, $60,000 a year as president of the Dayton Metal Products Co.; Kettering received a salary of $15,000 from the Dayton Metal Products Co. and $50,000 from the Delco Co.; and Talbott, Jr., was also receiving a salary of $18,000 from the Dayton Metal Products Co.

There would seem to be no question but that the members of the Aircraft Production Board in recommending contracts had confidence in the capacity of those undertaking the venture, and the previous success of this group while Mr. Deeds had been associated with them was well known. But the fact remains that practically at the inception of the Government's aviation activity in connection with the war, and within the sphere of Colonel Deeds' important, if not commanding, influence, his former business associates were placed at once through Government contracts in a position where they had the assurance of very large profits upon a relatively small investment of their own money, and in addition were able to secure generous salaries, which they charged against the Government as part of the cost of manufacture.

That Deeds, Kettering, and Talbott continued to be on the most intimate and confidential footing in connection with the prosecution of the Government work by the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. is apparent from their correspondence, of which the following are excerpts:

[Letter Deeds to Kettering, June 13, 1917]

WASHINGTON, *June 13, 1917.*

Mr. C. F. KETTERING,
City National Bank Building,
Dayton, Ohio.

MY DEAR C. F.: You will be interested to know that the standard training machine is going to be called the United States primary training, and will not be called the Curtiss J. N. This was decided last week, and I forgot to tell you when in Dayton.

Provision will be made for either Mr. Coffin or myself to appear before the S. A. E.[1] and as I am one of the committee on arrangements, will see that the plans of the Aircraft Production Board get properly before the association.

Relative to the design of planes, I do not care to write what is being done, but will discuss it with you when I get home and you will see that we have already gone away down the pike in this matter. Everything is lining up now in pretty good shape.

Yours, very truly,

E. A.

[Telegram Deeds to Talbott, July 3, 1917]

JULY 3, 1917.

Mr. H. E. TALBOTT,
Dayton, Ohio:

General Squier went direct to Detroit. Will probably spend Fourth at his old home in Michigan. May be in Dayton Thursday or Friday, arriving there from Detroit or from Champaign, Ill. Harold, Kettering, and Wright can take care of him. He will be interested in the Dayton Wright factory and laboratory, Orville Wright laboratory, and especially Mr. Kettering's views on scientific subjects. In general he is highly technical.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram Kettering to Deeds, August 4, 1917]

DAYTON, OHIO, *August 4, 1917.*

E. A. DEEDS,
Room 527, Munsey Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe all confidential telegrams should be sent to Mr. H. E. Talbott, Sr., City National Bank Building, or George B. Smith, instead of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co.

C. F. KETTERING.

[Telegram Deeds to Kettering, August 4, 1917]

AUGUST 4, 1917.

Mr. C. F. KETTERING,
City National Bank Building,
Dayton, Ohio:

Hereafter all confidential telegrams will be sent to H. E. Talbott, Sr., instead of to the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram Deeds to Talbott, September 16, 1917]

OLD POINT, VA., *September 16, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
Dayton, Ohio:

For your personal information as coming from your local attorney. Judge Advocate General has ruled it legal for Government to select one, contractor one, and the two a third, as appraisers of market value of plant at expiration of contract. If you care to raise the question the above will be found to be the final ruling.

E. A. DEEDS.

When this last telegram, which puts in a stronger light the relations of the parties, was sent, Deeds was an officer in the Army. This highly improper conduct in holding communication in this manner with his former business associate in a transaction pending between the Dayton-Wright Co. and the Government department in Colonel Deeds' charge demands the attention of the military authorities.

But evidence of favoritism, influence, or confidential communications of this sort, however otherwise reprehensible, do not make out criminal liability under the statutes above quoted, unless it appears that the representative of the Government has a pecuniary interest in the Government contract or order, or is an officer or stockholder of, or has a pecuniary interest in, a corporation, firm, or association which is a party to the Government contract or order. And the question is whether Colonel Deeds had such an interest. His statement is that he had no such interest, but, on the contrary, had given up large salaries to devote himself to the Government service.

The facts with respect to the disposition of Colonel Deeds' interests (so far as pertinent to this inquiry) and the method of disposition are as follows:

UNITED MOTORS CORP., DAYTON ENGINEERING LABORATORIES CO.

The only transfer made by him of any of his shares in that company was by gift to his wife. He endorsed, for transfer, the certificates for 17,500 shares on October 13, 1917, and they were transferred to Mrs. Deeds' name on October 17, 1917. * * *

If there were evidence that Colonel Deeds had acted as officer or agent of the Government in the transactions with the Delco Co., or with the United Motors Corp., prior to October 13, 1917, there would be ground by reason of his interest for charging a violation of the statute, and it may be doubted whether there was then or thereafter such a transfer as would avail to take the case out of the statutory prohibition. But there is no evidence that Deeds acted for the Government in any transaction with either of these corporations. So far as appears, the Government made no contracts for Delco ignition either with the Delco Co. or with the United Motors Corp. The contracts for the Delco system were made by the contractors who were manufacturing the engines under contracts with the Government, and the dealings with the Delco Co. or with the United Motors Corp. in relation to the Delco system were had by these contractors. * * *

His statement to the Aircraft Production Board on August 28, 1917, that he had made a bona fide transfer of all his stock in the United Motors Corp., when the stock had not in fact been transferred, and at most he contemplated a gift of the stock to his wife, was neither candid nor truthful, and is certainly not to be regarded as a "full and complete disclosure." But in the absence of proof of solicitation, inducement, or recommendation by him, or action on his part as an officer or agent of the Government in transactions with the United Motors Corp. or the Delco Co., there are no facts bringing the case within the statutory prohibition.

DOMESTIC BUILDING CO.

In his letter of August 28, 1917, to the Aircraft Production Board, Colonel Deeds stated that he had made a bona fide transfer of his stock in this company. This was not true. It appears that on that date he resigned the office of president of the company, but he did not dispose of his stock. The stock of that company is still held in equal portions by Deeds and Kettering.

Colonel Deeds was plainly led to make the statement in his letter by the fact that the Domestic Building Co. had acquired the land and had erected the building which was in course of completion and was then occupied and intended to be used as the principal plant of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. for the manufacture of airplanes. It is said that in anticipation of a lease of the property to the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., it had been agreed prior to August 28, 1917, that Deeds' stock in the Domestic Building Co. should be sold to Kettering. But there is not sufficient evidence of a definite and binding agreement to that effect, or of anything more than a loose understanding between intimates, whose arrangements could at any time be adjusted to suit their mutual convenience. Certainly there had been no transfer of the stock. It was not until November that there was an adjustment of accounts with this company, and then, instead of a sale of his stock by Deeds, he retained his stock in the Domestic Building Co., and the plant erected by that company was purchased by Talbott, Sr., Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., who at once transferred it to the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co.

DAYTON-WRIGHT AIRPLANE CO.

Colonel Deeds' statement in his letter of August 28, 1917, that he had never been a stockholder in this company was true. The stock is owned by the Dayton Metal Products Co., and if Colonel Deeds had or has any interest through stock ownership in the profits on its contracts with the Government this interest must be derived from an interest in the stock of the Dayton Metal Products Co.

His relation to the organization of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. is this: He was an incorporator, and while he did not subscribe for stock and none was issued in his name, the payment of the stock of the company to the extent of upward of four-fifths of its par value was made, in substance, by the transfer to the company of the plant built by the Domestic Building Co., owned by Deeds and Kettering, and this company received therefor unsecured notes of Talbott, Sr., Mr. Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., only a small part of which has been paid.

[1] Society of Automotive Engineers.

Thus, Deeds and Kettering, through the Domestic Building Co., virtually furnished the main plant of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. on a credit to the Talbotts and Kettering. The transaction was as follows:

The airplane factory was erected on a tract which the Domestic Building Co. had acquired from the Moraine Development Co. (a corporation in which Deeds and Kettering were largely interested) at a price a little over $753 an acre. The building was intended for the use of the Domestic Engineering Co., another concern owned by Deeds and Kettering, which was engaged in the business of supplying Delco lights for general illuminating purposes. It was later decided that it should be used by the Dayton Wright Airplane Co., which entered into possession.

Still later, it was arranged that the syndicate composed of Talbott, Sr., Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., should purchase the plant from the Domestic Building Co. and convey it to the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. In November 1917 (while the building was still incomplete), Mr. Allan R. Smart, a public accountant (of Barrow, Wade, Guthrie & Co.), made an adjustment of the accounts of Deeds, Kettering, Talbott, Sr., and Talbott, Jr., for various advances, and a balance was struck of $683,732.16 as owing to the Domestic Building Co. In this adjustment the land (25.55 acres) was taken at $1,200 an acre, and the building at the amount of the expenditures upon it, making the price of the plant (called the Moraine plant) $836,401.08. The balance of $683,732.16 was covered by three individual notes of Talbott, Sr., Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., in the proportion of two-fifths, two-fifths, and one-fifth, as follows: H. E. Talbott, $273,492.87; C. F. Kettering, $273,492.87; and H. E. Talbott, Jr., $136,746.43. All of the notes were dated November 4, 1917, and were payable to the Domestic Building Co. 1 year after date with 6-percent interest. The notes are unsecured. The makers of the notes have paid interest quarterly; and, in addition, Talbott, Sr., has paid $3,492.87 on the principal of his note, reducing it to $270,000, and Talbott, Jr., has paid $26,746.43 on the principal of his note, reducing it to $110,000. It appears that Mr. Kettering has made payments of $6,000. This transaction left the Talbotts and Kettering as the owners of the Moraine plant, which the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. was operating, and the stock of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. for which they had subscribed had not been paid in.

The payment of the subscriptions for the stock of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co., the concurrent payment by that company for two plants (the Moraine plant already mentioned and another at Miamisburg), and the transfer of its stock, thus paid for, to the Dayton Metal Products Co., were effected by an exchange of checks on December 1, 1917. Shortly before, the Miamisburg plant had been acquired by Talbott, Sr. (for the syndicate) for the sum of $60,000 and was turned over to the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. at $127,202, the profit being divided between himself, Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., according to their respective interests in the syndicate.

To accomplish the desired result, the following procedure was adopted:

The Dayton Wright Airplane Co. gave to the syndicate its check for the sum of $955,071.25 made up of the purchase price of the Moraine and Miamisburg plants ($836,401.08 less an item of interest ($8,531.83) for the Moraine, or main plant, and $127,202 for the Miamisburg plant). The Dayton Metal Products Co. gave its checks to the syndicate for $183,459.55 for various balances of accounts, and for $999,500, the purchase price at par of the stock of Dayton Wright Airplane Co. (less five shares retained). The syndicate thus received checks to the aggregate amount of $2,138,030.80. The syndicate gave their check to the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. in payment of the capital stock of $1,000,000 and another check to the Dayton Metal Products Co. for $1,136,537.20 as the purchase price of certain securities which the Dayton Metal Products Co. sold to the syndicate, making the total of the syndicate's checks $2,136,537.20. The Dayton Wright Airplane Co. gave its check to the Dayton Metal Products Co. in repayment of advances for $44,928.75, the difference between the sum of $955,071.25 paid by the company for the plants and the sum of $1,000,000 received for its stock. The transaction was accomplished with a minimum use of cash (less than $1,500), and as a result the Dayton Metal Products Co. had all the stock (save five shares) of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co.; the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. had the Moraine and the Miamisburg plants; Messrs. Talbotts and Kettering had the securities which they had purchased from the Dayton Metal Products Co.; and the Domestic Building Co. (owned by Deeds and Kettering) continued to hold the notes which the Talbotts and Kettering had given to that company on the settlement in November.

* * * * *

DAYTON METAL PRODUCTS CO.

Colonel Deeds originally held one-fourth of the stock of this company or 500 shares. It appears from the minutes of the board of directors that at a meeting of the board in Dayton on May 21, 1917, President Talbott stated that the company had been advised by the Ordnance Department of the Army "that in all probability, the entire facilities of the company would be utilized for munition work, and, in all probability, contracts would be given to the company as soon as appropriations were made by the Government." It is further set forth "that Mr. E. A. Deeds explained that he had been called to Washington and requested to take place on some of the committees of the Council of National Defense; that he had been to Washington and that he had accepted the call; and he therefore desired it that he might act as unintereated, directly or indirectly, in any manufacturing plant which was contemplating business with the Government, and that he desired to offer his resignation as vice president and as director of the company." The minutes show the acceptance of this resignation and that Mr. Kettering was elected vice president. The minutes of the meeting of May 21, 1917, conclude with the following statement:

"At this meeting Mr. Deeds offered for sale and discussed probable purchasers for his stock in the Dayton Metal Products Co., and Mr. Deeds offered to the directors his entire holdings of stock at its book value less 15 percent to cover costs and probable losses in view of the possibility of no future Government contracts being secured and the business of the company would have to be readjusted into lines being developed by the experimental department."

Some time subsequently—in the early part of the year 1918—the accountant drew a line across the last-mentioned statement in the minutes. He explains that he did not consider it a corporate record, but a matter between the stockholders.

The testimony of the parties concerned is that Talbott, Sr., Kettering, and Talbott, Jr., purchased all Deeds' shares in the Dayton Metal Products Co. at their book value as of May 1, 1917, less 15 percent, and gave in settlement of the purchase price their notes, as follows:

H. E. Talbott, 200 shares	$207,706
C. F. Kettering, 200 shares	207,706
H. E. Talbott, Jr., 100 shares	103,853

The notes were dated May 22, 1917, were payable to Deeds' order 1 year after date, with interest at 4½ percent, and were placed in the hands of George B. Smith, the confidential agent of Deeds and Kettering. The notes were wholly unsecured. According to the stock certificate book the old certificates were canceled and new certificates issued to the Talbotts and Kettering under date of May 22, 1917.

It is not only open to doubt whether the transaction described in the minute book took place on May 21, 1917, but on all the evidence it is reasonably clear that it did not take place on that date. The minutes are typewritten and pasted in the minute book. No one of the parties is willing to testify positively that the proceedings described in the minutes took place on that day. Mr. S. S. King, of the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co., has testified that he and Deeds went to Washington on the same train on May 18, 1917, and that they were in communication every day in Washington, from May 19 to 23. Furthermore, it appears that on May 21, 1917, when Mr. Deeds is represented as making his statement at the meeting of directors in Dayton, he was making his first appearance, according to the minutes of the Aircraft Production Board, at a meeting held by that board on that day in Washington. He himself testifies that he was in Washington on that day. While Mr. Deeds is represented as resigning his office as vice president of the Dayton Metal Products Co. in May 1917, he continued to draw his salary until the end of June 1917. The notes were placed in the custody of the confidential agent Smith, but he made no entry in Deeds' bills receivable book of these notes until September. It does not satisfactorily appear, in view of the nature of some of the items, that the adjustment of accounts in fixing the book value and the determination of the amounts of the notes could have been made before June 30, 1917. There are stock certificates bearing the date of May 22, 1917, and purporting to have been issued after the issue of the new certificates to the Talbotts and Kettering for the Deeds' shares, but these certificates were issued to members of the Talbott family dividing the shares he had formerly held.

Upon all the evidence it is not established that the stock was purchased as early as May 22, 1917, and there are many indications that the transaction was dated back to that date.

However, Colonel Deeds' stock was actually transferred on the books of the company, and the notes dated May 22, 1917, were given apparently not later than September 1917.

On December 31, 1917, interest was paid by the makers on their respective notes to that date; and interest was paid quarterly thereafter. On January 18, 1918, Talbott, Sr., paid $7,706 on account of the principal, reducing his note to $200,000; in February 1918, Talbott, Jr., paid $3,853 on account of the principal, reducing his note to $100,000, and on September 11, 1918, Kettering paid, on account of his note, the sum of $10,000.

If the transaction was a bona fide sale of the stock, Colonel Deeds thereby parted with all his stock interest in the Dayton Metal Products Co., and thus did not have, by virtue of an interest in that stock, an interest in the profits of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. The parties all deny that there is any secret agreement or option or understanding of any sort for a retransfer of the shares to Colonel Deeds, or for a sharing of profits with him.

To conclude: The fact is that the transfer of the shares in the Dayton Metal Products Co., which owns the stock of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., was made to Colonel Deeds' intimate business associates on their unsecured notes, which are overdue and unpaid save to a small extent. But there is no proof upon which it can be charged that Colonel Deeds retained an interest in the Dayton Metal Products Co., and thereby in the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

OTHER AVIATION ACTIVITIES CENTERED AT DAYTON

The Wilbur Wright Field

This is a tract of about 2,245 acres leased to the Government by the Miami Conservancy District, of which Mr. Deeds was the head. It was a portion of the area selected by the Miami Conservancy District for the impounding of waters in the event of a serious flood. The property was acquired by the Government for a flying field and was developed by the erection of hangars, barracks, a storehouse, and other structures. Upward of $3,000,000 has been expended by the Government in this development.

* * * * *

It appears from the testimony of Ezra M. Kuhns, the secretary of the Miami Conservancy District, that at the time of our entry into the war the district had been able to secure options on only about 300 acres of the tract in question, but when negotiations with the Government began there was swift action. Mr. Deeds had brought the matter to the attention of Mr. Waldon as early as April 24, 1917, and had sent to him one of the district's engineers with maps. The following telegrams show the activity of Deeds and Talbott:

[Telegram, Deeds to Kuhns, April 30, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 30, 1917.*

EZRA M. KUHNS,
Miami Conservancy District,
Dayton, Ohio:

Subject of our trip yesterday moving very rapidly and very satisfactorily. There is no doubt in my mind but what we will be successful. Avoidance of publicity very essential. Inspection will be made end of this week or first of next. You and Morgan[1] must plan now as though it was decided.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Deeds to Kuhns, April 30, 1917.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 30, 1917.*

EZRA M. KUHNS,
Miami Conservancy District,
Dayton, Ohio:

Options should be rushed in the vicinity of Fairfield, raising the price if necessary.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Deeds to Kuhns, April 20, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 30, 1917.*

EZRA M. KUHNS,
Miami Conservancy District,
Dayton, Ohio:

Ohio State University is ordered today to cooperate with the Dayton school, and Magruder, Lord, and Knight instructed to report at Camp Borden, Canada, Monday to learn course of instruction. Publicity will follow these instructions, and no one outside of Signal Corps officers know of our plan for the larger school, and, so far as everyone is concerned, Dayton school is the Wright Field civilian school. Think you should advise Wright, Morgan, Harold Talbott, and Kettering so that they will not disclose anything inadvertently. The civilian school will continue, regardless of what is done with the other plan, and Ohio State will give the preliminary instruction in military tactics and all classroom work, while the Wright Field Co. will give the instruction in aviation. Harold Talbott should be the channel through which publicity is given out, and there is no objection using the last statement, if called upon.

E. A. D.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 11, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 11, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT, *Dayton, Ohio:*

Think your whole plan ideal.

E. A. DEEDS.

---

[1]Morgan was the engineer of the Miami Conservancy District.

[Telegram, Talbott to Deeds, May 11, 1917]

MAY 11, 1917.

E. A. DEEDS,
Care New Willard, Washington, D. C.:

Contracts remaining secured to cover 2,500 acres will be closed by tomorrow evening. Will start Monday on immediate possession of land so the fields will be ready when buildings are finished. This applies to central 1,000 acres in front of building. Builders may retain use of buildings and barns for a few months, and in some cases until winter, but main fields must be prepared without delay if they are to be used this fall. Think best to give no reason for immediate possession, and feel sure we can arrange it. We can arrange financial matters as suggested. Wire if you approve.

H. E. TALBOTT.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 11, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 11, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
City National Bank Building, Dayton, Ohio:

With few exceptions owners can, if necessary, continue to live in their houses for a year, thus avoiding necessity of moving this summer. Their teams will be employed, giving revenue to them. District wants to try out flying on a large scale, and wants to try experiment at once. This is only a suggestion. You doubtless may have a better one. May be necessary to exercise option at once, and if so I will gladly go on district's note for full amount.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 12, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 12, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
City National Bank Building, Dayton, Ohio:

Suggest Kuhns, Emmett, Grant, and Brown be here Monday morning for conference on conservancy bringing description of entire 2,500. Tax value and tax rate of property under discussion. Will be helpful. Publicity can be delayed at this end without difficulty. Everything moving nicely.

E. A. DEEDS.

The partiality for this site does not appear to have been warranted by any advantages it can be said to possess. Indeed, no satisfactory reason appears for the securing of so large a tract, as apparently, 1,400 or 1,500 acres would have answered the purpose.

Fields of about 650 acres were selected at Rantoul and Detroit for two-squadron fields and the field at Dayton was for four squadrons. Both the lease-hold interest and the option to purchase are subject to a flood easement. The evidence is that in case of a flood, such as that of the year 1913, the impounded water—that is, after the completion of the dam which it is understood will be completed in 2 or 3 years—would cover the lowlands to a depth of about 40 feet; the lowest hangar would have 24 feet of water—that is, over the eaves—and the highest hangar would have 13 feet of water. The barracks and various buildings which stand on higher ground would not be seriously affected. The warehouse itself—a large structure—is in a dry place; and the suggestion that some of the property stored there during the past year has suffered from moisture is not supported. Aside from the consequences of flood in the Miami Valley and the use of the area as a detention basin, it should be added that a considerable part of the tract consists of swamp land which is unsuitable for the use for which it was leased.

* * * * *

THE CONTRACT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WILBUR WRIGHT FIELD

The next step was the placing of the contract for development. The contract was signed by Captain Edgar under the direction of the Chief Signal Officer, and its terms were not unreasonable. It was on a cost-plus basis with a sliding scale, which as applied to the amount actually expended gives the contractor a commission of 7 percent with a maximum limit of $140,000. The contractor, the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co., was recommended by Deeds. This company had done nothing in an extensive way for several years, having been engaged since the year 1908 in selling material, and in operating a planing mill and a lumber yard. Its capital stock was $75,000. Prior to April 1917, one S. S. King had owned 117 of the 750 shares. King's holdings were then increased to 417 shares, and in acquiring these 300 shares King was backed by H. E. Talbott, who as president of the City National Bank of Dayton arranged for a loan of $60,000 for the purpose. King wrote Talbott on April 25, 1917: "As to the ownership of the stock, if you see fit to back me up in it this can be determined in any manner that you see fit." It was not long after the control of the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. was thus acquired that the arrangement was made for giving to this company the contract to develop Wilbur Wright Field. King's narrative of the circumstances in which this contract was obtained is very illuminating, and affords a notable contrast to the difficulties of many who unavailingly sought contracts with the Government.

King was sent for by Talbott and informed that he (King) had been recommended down at Washington to assume the responsibility of putting up some buildings for Wilbur Wright field, and suggested that he immediately set about effecting an organization for the purpose. This was on Saturday, May 17, 1917, and on Sunday Talbott telephoned to King, asking him to leave immediately for Washington. Accordingly King went to Washington on Sunday afternoon, taking the same train with Deeds. It was arranged that King should call the next day at Deeds' office, which he was informed was on the same floor with that of the contracting officer, Captain Edgar. Accordingly on the following day, May 19, Deeds introduced King to Captain Edgar and in 2 or 3 days, on May 23, the contract was signed. As Colonel Edgar testifies: "King was brought down here by Colonel Deeds and recommended to us as a proper contractor, the most available in Dayton for the work."

The following is a portion of the correspondence between Deeds and Talbott relating to this contract:

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 23, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
City National Bank Building,
Dayton, Ohio:

King probably returns to Dayton this evening. He is undertaking something which he alone is unable to get through with. It will be important that you give him a vision of this job and some very definite suggestions how to hit it in a big way. This is the biggest undertaking that has ever been put across in Dayton.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 23, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
Dayton, Ohio:

Suggest you personally direct publicity regarding contract to be given soon, so that it will avoid criticism and at the same time tell the story. This is particularly vital because of Captain Waring to start work Friday and the visitors whom I am bringing, who may read the papers. Your good judgment is needed on this.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 24, 1917]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1917.*

H. E. TALBOTT,
City National Bank Building,
Dayton, Ohio:

In arranging for contract do not overlook a local contractor and lumberman in Osborne. Ezra Kuhns knows his name. He has been friendly to us and I promised him something to do on this job.

E. A. DEEDS.

[Telegram, Talbott to Deeds, May 28, 1917]

MAY 28, 1917.

E. A. DEEDS,
Care New Willard, Washington, D. C.:

Just to remind you charted accountants of Government selection, expense to be paid by contractor and charged to cost of work. Piecework for labor only on various unit sections in various classifications of work will do much toward speed and economy. Each individual transaction to have the approval of officer in charge before it is effected.

H. E. TALBOTT.

[Telegram, Deeds to Talbott, May 31, 1917]

MAY 31, 1917.

H. E. TALBOTT, Sr.,
Dayton, Ohio:

Wire what progress has been made on Dayton field. This is for our report to the council. If foundations have been started, for instance, and how many men on the job. This only needs to be a rough estimate.

DEEDS,
Aircraft Production Board.

[Telegram, Talbott to Deeds, June 1, 1917]

JUNE 1, 1917.

DEEDS,
Aircraft Production Board,
United States War Department,
Washington, D. C.:

Steam shovel and large trench digging machine now in place. Three cutting gangs at work. Teams and tractors on ground. Carpenters finishing sheds and office for construction purposes. Foundation excavations in progress. Have plant and equipment for six concrete gangs which will be at work early in the week. Sidewalks progressing. Repairing highways to facilitate trucking operations from Dayton. Purchased five new Packerd trucks to augment transportation over the existing available trucks. Next week will see everything booming along. All material, lumber, cement, planks, board roofing located and on the way. Wish you would think over method of authority which can be given me to rush transportation of railway cars. This looks like the main point of congestion. All departments of construction now organized with experienced and competent supervisors and foremen. All this in spite of the fact that it has rained every day since Waring has been here.

H. E. TALBOTT.

Despite the indications of these messages, and of his transactions with King, Mr. Talbott testifies positively that he had no interest in the enterprise, except as a citizen of Dayton, and got nothing out of it beyond 6-percent interest received by the Dayton Metal Products Co. on money loaned.

King had no capital available for the enterprise, nor had the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. King's testimony is:

"Q. Did you have the capital to swing that?—A. Not without assistance.

"Q. Where did you expect to get the assistance?—A. When I talked to Mr. Talbott he told me on the Saturday afternoon, I said, 'Well, this will take a good deal of money.' He said, 'Yes, but,' he said, 'you need not worry about that. We will work out some way for that.' He said, 'I do not know how we will work it out, but we will work out some way for that.' "

The financial assistance that King needed was obtained upon the credit of the Dayton Metal Products Co., supported by the personal guaranties of H. E. Talbott and C. F. Kettering. Notes of the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. to the extent of $400,000 were discounted by the Dayton Metal Products Co. with the American Exchange National Bank of New York. It was originally contemplated that these notes should be endorsed by Deeds and Talbott, as is shown by the following extract of a letter to Mr. Talbott from W. H. Bennett, vice president of the American Exchange National Bank, under date of June 25, 1917:

"Referring to the conversation which the writer had with you on Thursday, I have conferred with Mr. Kenzel, assistant cashier of the Federal Reserve Bank, and upon your statement that the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. is under contract with the United States Government for the preparation of the aviation field at Dayton, and that said company is to receive payments on the 10th of each month on the presentation of receipted vouchers for work completed in the previous month; and that it is the intention of the Dayton Metal Products Co. to make advances to said Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. of amounts necessary to carry on the work, he ruled that the paper executed by the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. and endorsed by the Dayton Metal Products Co. to cover said funds so advanced will be eligible for rediscount with the Federal Reserve Bank.

"Therefore, we feel that it will probably be of mutual advantage to provide for the advance of $400,000 requested from us by a 3-months' note executed by the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. to the order of the Dayton Metal Products Co. and endorsed by Mr. H. E. Talbott and Mr. E. A. Deeds. If you so desire, the endorsement of the individuals can be secured by an assignment from the Dayton Metal Products Co. of certain securities now in safe-keeping with us to the individuals referred to."

It was subsequently arranged that the endorsements should be those of Talbott and Kettering, who also gave their separate agreement of guaranty. The avails of discounted paper were passed by the American Exchange Bank to the credit of the Dayton Metal Products Co. It appears from the accounts between the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. and the Dayton Metal Products Co. that, while the latter company ultimately paid the notes, their proceeds were used in large part from time to time for the benefit of the Dayton Metal Products Co.

The credit to the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co., thus extended to it upon its notes, was furnished without security, or, as Mr. Talbott put it, with "no further security except in the man (King). I trusted the man; I knew his contract." After the contract had been obtained, King increased his stockholdings in the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. by the purchase of 104 additional shares, borrowing for the purpose $20,000 from the Dayton National Bank.

It appears that the total amount paid by the Government under the contract with the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. to August 14, 1918, amounted to $3,115,161.94. This represents the amount paid for the cost of the work—that is, for lumber, material, etc. The commission or profits of the contractor, which had been paid to that date, amounted to $102,436.04. There has been considerable trouble in connection with the contract, and the accounts are far from being in satisfactory shape. An audit of the books of the company was made by Barrow, Wade, Guthrie & Co. to November 30, 1917. They reported that they found "the payrolls very incomplete, full of errors, corrections, and erasures," and that there was "abundant evidence that great laxity and carelessness has been exhibited by the employees of the company, especially those in the paymaster's department." These statements are amply confirmed by the evidence in this investigation, and the accounts are in course of being reaudited by Government accountants. The consideration of the various irregularities in the accounts and of the questions to which they give rise must await the result of this examination. It will be observed that the Government has withheld a large part of the compensation of the contractor until a satisfactory adjustment has been made. Of the profits received from the Government, it would appear that the moneys have been retained in the business of the company, except to the extent of a dividend of $37,500—that is, 50 percent on the capital stock. Of this dividend, King was entitled, on the 521 shares acquired in his name, to $26,050, and of this amount it appears that he had received 70 percent, or $18,235, to July 1, 1918. He had paid $11,000 on account of his loan ($21,000) to the Dayton National Bank. He had paid nothing on the $60,000 loan from the City National Bank. No agreement has been proved for a division of profits on this contract, and there is no proof that Colonel Deeds has had an interest in the contract or in the Dayton Lumber & Manufacturing Co. Even if it appeared that the Dayton Metal Products Co. was interested in the contract (which would explain transactions otherwise difficult to understand), this fact would not affect Colonel Deeds unless he were found to be interested in that company. The question would thus come back to the transfer of his stock in the Dayton Metal Products Co., which has already been considered.

M'COOK FIELD (FORMERLY KNOWN AS NORTH FIELD)

This is a field of approximately 200 acres in and adjacent to Dayton, which was leased by the Government from the Dayton Metal Products Co. and has been used for the purpose of making various tests. Lieutenant Colonel Vincent first suggested another field (South Field, or Moraine Field) and brought the matter to the attention of Colonel Deeds, by whom that field was principally owned. On September 27, 1917, Colonel Deeds sent the following telegram to Mr. Talbott:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 27, 1917.*

Mr. H. E. TALBOTT,
City National Bank Building,
Dayton, Ohio:

Colonel Clark takes letter regarding Moraine flying field with him to Dayton tonight. George McCann has another letter for Mr. Kettering. Government will lease land, put up buildings, and operate experimental field. Lease will be for 3 years without privilege of purchase, as that is not necessary. Have complete description of property prepared; also statement of cost of buildings already erected and suggested monthly rent arrangement, and have George McCann bring them to Washington to complete lease. Have him prepare deed for this property to Mr. Kettering, who, in turn, will lease it to the Government.

DEEDS, *Equipment Division.*

* * * * *

SOUTH FIELD, OR MORAINE FIELD

* * * * *

ACCEPTANCE FIELD

* * * * *

OTHER OFFICIALS

Lt. Col. Jesse G. Vincent

* * * * *

Both before and after Major Vincent received his commission in the Army, he had transactions with the Packard Motor Co., in which he acted on behalf of the Government.

* * * * *

The irregularity of proceeding in this manner without a contract or proper order in writing is apparent. No price had been fixed for the work or materials; if only outlays were to be reimbursed, it was necessary that outlays should be approximately proved before payment was made, and this had not been done in the case of the first three payments. Nor does it appear that at the time

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the first voucher for $104,500 was passed, on or about August 11, 1917, Mr. Deeds had any authority in the absence of a written contract or a proper written order to give the certificate. The chief signal officer testifies that he did not have such authority. Nor was his certificate itself accurate in its terms, as there was no agreement for a price, and if there was an agreement for the reimbursement of actual outlays, the voucher, being a mere estimate, was not in accordance therewith.

It should be said, however, that the evidence does not afford ground for the conclusion that the Government was defrauded or that there was any intent to defraud the Government on the part of any of the parties concerned.

* * * * *

A distinct question, however, is presented as to Lieutenant Colonel Vincent. Section 41 of the Criminal Code explicitly prohibits any person who is directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of a corporation from acting as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such corporation. It is manifest that Lieutenant Colonel Vincent acted as an officer and agent of the Government for the transaction of business with the Packard Motor Car Co. in which he was a stockholder, and that this was in violation of the statute.

Lt. Col. George W. Mixter

Lieutenant Colonel Mixter, formerly vice president of Deere & Co., of Moline, Ill., manufacturers of agricultural machinery, came to Washington in July 1917 to undertake the organization of the inspection department of the Aircraft Engineering Division of the Signal Corps. He was later chief of the Inspection Department of the Equipment Division of the Signal Corps. He was commissioned as an officer in the Signal Corps, with the rank of major, about August 15, 1917. The work of the inspection department covered the inspection or acceptance of material and manufactured articles furnished to the Signal Corps, including the inspection of airplanes and engines manufactured under contracts with the Government. As chief of the department, Major Mixter dealt with matters of organization and personnel and exercised a general supervision over the department in matters of administrative policy. In May 1918 Major Mixter was made production manager and on the reorganization which resulted in the establishment of the Bureau of Aircraft Production he continued to carry the title of production manager, being directly under Archer A. Landon, who is Director of the Production Division, which is broadly charged with the actual execution of the aircraft program after the receipt of engineering data.

Prior to his connection with the Government, Mr. Mixter held 25 shares (par value, $2,500) of the preferred stock of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. He has not disposed of this stock. He testifies that he had sold his common stock in the company about 2 years ago, and that he had not given thought to the retention of the few preferred shares; that his personal accounts are kept at his office in Moline, and are in charge of his secretary. The Curtiss company had important contracts with the Government for the production of airplanes, and Lieutenant Colonel Mixter was in charge of the organization of the inspection of materials and products at its plant as well as at other plants, and he visited the Curtiss plant from time to time in the exercise of his authority as head of the inspection department and as production manager, and as an officer of the Government he dealt with such questions at this plant as required attention.

The statutory phrase "transaction of business" is broad enough to embrace the activity of officers or agents of the United States who are heads of divisions having charge of the inspection of products under contracts requiring the action of Government inspectors in course of performance. It would be a narrow construction to hold that the statute (Crim. Code, sec. 41) is limited to the making of contracts or the placing of orders or transactions relating to payment or discharge. It would seem to be quite as important that the chief of a department of inspection, selecting the inspectors who act under his instructions at the plants of contractors, should be free from interest in the corporation whose work is inspected as the inspectors themselves, and both the chief of an inspection department and the inspectors may properly be regarded as agents of the Government for the transaction of business with the corporation. The same would be true of the production manager having supervision of production under contracts with the Government. No ruling in the Federal courts with respect to the applicability of the statute to such an officer or agent of the Government has been found. In the view that the statute has the scope suggested, Lieutenant Colonel Mixter acted as an officer or agent of the United States contrary to the prohibition, for the transaction of business with the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., in which he was a stockholder. His holdings were small, but it cannot be said that for that reason the statute is inapplicable.

Maj. Howard C. Marmon

* * * * *

Second Lt. Samuel B. Vrooman, Jr.

* * * * *

In a subsequent portion of this report, reference is made to the Mahogany Manufacturers & Importers Association, a voluntary association of the leading mahogany manufacturers of the United States, which was formed last January in connection with negotiations for the purchase by the Government of mahogany for airplane propellers. One of the members of the association is the S. B. Vrooman Co., of Philadelphia. Second Lieutenant Vrooman is the son of Samuel B. Vrooman, who was the head of this company until his death a short time ago. Second Lieutenant Vrooman is 31 years of age and for upward of 9 years was at work in his father's company handling lumber, inspecting, and selling. On his marriage in June 1917, his father gave him $10,000 in par value of the company's stock, which for some years has paid 20 percent dividends annually. This stock he still holds. In addition to the dividends on his stock, the S. B. Vrooman Co. has continued to pay him, since he entered the service of the Government, the sum of $50 a week, which is the equivalent of the compensation he previously received for his services to the company.

In December 1917, S. B. Vrooman, Jr., became identified with the Equipment Division of the Signal Corps as a civilian and was made an inspector of mahogany purchased by the Government. In February 1918 he was put in charge of the inspection of all propeller lumber. He selected the district officers, who in turn selected the inspectors. Mr. Vrooman issued instructions to the district officers, visited the plants to see that the inspectors were doing their duty, and passed on disputed points. He has continued in this service and in July 1918 received a commission as second lieutenant. Among the plants subject to his jurisdiction as head of inspection of propeller lumber is that of the S. B. Vrooman Co., which has had contracts with the Government and is within the territory assigned to the district office at New York. S. B. Vrooman, Jr., selected the head of this office, Mr. McCullough, who was responsible to him for the efficiency of the inspection and for the carrying out of his instructions, which related to the inspection at the Vrooman plant as well as others. The conclusion is not to be escaped that S. B. Vrooman, Jr., was the agent of the Government directly responsible for the proper inspection of the mahogany delivered by the S. B. Vrooman Co. to the Government under its contracts, and that his acting as such agent for the transaction of business with the corporation in which he was a stockholder was in violation of the statute.

4. THE AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

At the time of our entry into the war we had no combat planes, and only a few planes for training and scouting purposes. Approximately 100 airplanes had been delivered to the Army up to the year 1917. There were few fliers and still fewer who had any acquaintance with aviation engineering. The airplane manufacturing industry was in its infancy in this country. But these difficulties were not concealed. The necessity of prompt endeavor to surmount them and of securing at once the full benefit of foreign experience was obvious.

* * * * *

REPORT OF AERONAUTICAL COMMISSION

Two months after we had entered the war an aeronautical commision was sent to Europe. This commission, which sailed on June 17, 1917, in charge of Maj. (afterward Col.) R. C. Bolling, was composed of Army and Navy experts and civilians. Capt. Virginius E. Clark and Capt. Edgar S. Gorrell represented the Army, and Navy Constructor G. C. Westervelt and Lt. Warren G. Child represented the Navy.

Major Bolling's report was sent from Paris on August 15, 1917. The governing principle for the American production program was stated by Major Bolling to be:

"First. The United States must first provide itself with all airplanes and engines required for training purposes in America.

"Second. The United States must next provide the airplanes and engines necessary for use strictly in connection with the operation of American forces in the field. It is best known in Washington what will be the size and composition of the American forces in the field at any given dates in the future. You have the information as to the number of types of airplanes required in direct connection with military operations of these forces. We have learned nothing to change the views on that matter which were held by Major Foulois when we left Washington.

"Third. After these first two considerations comes the American program of putting into the field next year air forces in excess of the tactical requirements of its Army in France. It is generally desired that the United States shall do this. Such air forces should consist of fighting airplanes and bombers." (Then follows a statement of the proportions deemed advisable.)

* * * * *

PLIGHT OF OUR CADETS ABROAD

There may also be noted at this point the serious delays which occurred in securing adequate provision for the training of American cadets abroad. Hundreds of these cadets were held at concentration camps and other places for several months without suitable training. This was the more regrettable because these students embraced a large number who were exceptionally proficient and who had gone abroad early on the assumption that they would have important and superior advantages in training. It is said that their numbers were larger than the capacity of the French and British schools which it was expected would receive them.

In his cable of March 13 General Pershing speaks of the plight of these cadets as follows (p. 726, par. 1):

Dated MARCH 13, 1918.

For Chief Signal Officer. Approximately 700 cadets are now under flying training in Europe. These cadets had to wait an average time of 3 months before commencing flying training. Approximately 700 cadets in Europe awaiting flying training. These cadets have already waited from 3 to 5 months for training, and it is estimated that some of them will have to wait at least 4 months

before their training can be commenced. All of those cadets would have been commissioned prior to this date if training facilities could have been provided. These conditions have produced profound discouragement among cadets. In order to remedy injustice and to relieve cadets in Europe on equitable basis of rank with cadets trained in the United States, request approval of plan to immediately issue to all cadets now in Europe temporary or Reserve commissions in Aviation Section, Signal Corps, subject to revocation in all cases where on completion of training cadets so commissioned are found not to have requisite qualifications for officers in the Air Service. If plan approved will recommend cadets by groups according to seniority. Strongly recommend approval.

PERSHING.

The Secretary of War observed this condition during his visit to France in the spring and cabled that these cadets should at once receive their commissions, which were to be held subject to revocation if later they were not found to be qualified. General Pershing stated in his cable of March 30, 1918, that this relieved the principal difficulty so far as training was concerned and the situation as it then existed was "difficult because of lack of machines for front and not because of lack of training facilities."

LACK OF INFORMATION HERE AS TO EXACT STATUS OF FOREIGN ORDERS

Despite constant exchange of cables, information was lacking here as to the exact status of the foreign orders. While cable inquiries had been made from time to time, it appears from a letter written by Lieutenant Colonel Horner for the Chief Signal Officer to Colonel Bolling, as late as March 12, 1918, that the desired information had not been obtained. There had been apparently an utter lack of an adequate system of communication by which proper records could be kept here of the transactions abroad. Tables and charts of the foreign orders and deliveries were finally received here, but it seems that there still was considerable uncertainty as to the extent of the foreign obligations, and at the beginning of this investigation the extraordinary statement was made by Lt. Col. S. S. Wolff, then head of the finance division, that notwithstanding repeated inquiries, extending over many weeks, he had been unable to ascertain within $100,000,000 what obligations had been incurred abroad.

AGREEMENT WITH FRENCH GOVERNMENT OF MAY 3, 1918

* * * * *

It would seem that by May 23, 1918, there had been delivered by foreign governments for our use abroad about 1,400 training planes and about 350 service planes. Since that time there have been additional deliveries, and according to a list obtained by General Kenly, the approximate number of airplanes received by our forces from European sources to July 31, 1918, were as follows:

School or training planes	1,617
Service or combat planes	1,512

PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES—RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOLLING COMMISSION

While Major Bolling's commission, in anticipation of delays here, placed large orders abroad, it is evident that the speediest production in this country that was possible, of a variety of airplanes and engines, was contemplated.

* * * * *

PROGRAM AS ADOPTED—ELEMENTARY TRAINING PLANES

There were selected for production to be used as elementary training planes the Curtiss type known as the JN4–D, with the OX–5 engine, and the standard type known as SJ–1, with the Hall-Scott or A–7a engine. The program called for 4,800 JN4–D's (later reduced to 3,700, and this number was somewhat increased after May 1918); for 1,600 SJ–1's; for 7,950 OX–5 engines and 2,750 Hall-Scott or A–7a engines (reduced to 2,250).

ADVANCED TRAINING PLANES

For advanced training it appears that there were originally chosen the Bristol Scout with the Le Rhone 80-horsepower engine, the Thomas Morse S–4 with Gnome 100 horsepower, and the United States Training with the Hispano (150 horsepower). There were modifications which resulted in the adoption of the types known as S4–B (with Gnome 100 horsepower), the S4–C (with the Le Rhone 80 horsepower), the JN4–H and JN6–H (with the Hispano 150 horsepower), and the Penguin (with the Lawrence 28 horsepower).

SERVICE OR COMBAT AND BOMBING PLANES

The types first selected for production were the Spad (single-seater pursuit) with the 200-horsepower Hispano Suiza engine; the Spad using the U. S.–8 engine; the Spad Monocoque using 150-horsepower Gnome engine; the Martinsyde; the DH–9, the Caproni, and the Handley-Page, with the Liberty engine (U. S.–12). Subsequently the Martinsyde and the Spads were rejected, the production of the DH–9 was first limited and then postponed, the Caproni and the Handley-Page were not treated as a part of the immediate program, and the plans for production were centered on the DH–4 and the Bristol Fighter with the 12-cylinder Liberty engine (U. S.–12).

The program charts which were prepared show extraordinary variations with respect to quantities and surprising expectations as to deliveries. Thus the program for DH–4's shows a total program on August 2, 1917, of 8,000; August 16, of 7,500; August 22, of 5,000; August 24, of 6,000; August 25, of 15,000; August 31, of 6,000; September 4, 15,000; October 17, of 250; October 29, of 1,000, at which number it appears to have been continued until January 18, 1918, from which time it was increased until 4,500 appear in the program of February 11, 1918, and 8,000 in that of February 19 and thereafter.

According to this program or schedule, it seems to have been anticipated on August 2, 1917, that 25 DH–4's would be delivered in October, 100 in November, 425 in December, 750 in January, and 1,000 in February, and more in each of the succeeding months. Even as late as September 4, 1917, the schedule shows expected deliveries of 62 in October 1917; 250 in November; 1,063 in December; and in the program of November 5, 50 were scheduled for delivery in December, 100 for January, etc.

The program of September 5, 1917, for the DH–9's calls for 2,000 of this type; that of October 9, for 4,000; October 17, 6,750; October 25, 7,750; October 29, 7,000, at which it continued until January 18, 1918, when it became 7,500, to be reduced on February 1 to 5,400; and on February 12 the DH–9 schedule was canceled.

On September 5, 1917, according to this schedule, deliveries of DH–9's were expected as follows: November 1917, 50; December, 200; January, 250; and 300 in February, March, April, May, and June. On November 5, 1917, 50 seem to have been expected in January, and 300 in February, 1,050 in March, 1,500 in April, 1,900 in May, and 2,200 in June. As late as January 18, 1918, 40 are scheduled for March and 500 for April.

The program for the Bristol Fighters started on August 2, 1917, with 1,000. It appears to have been raised to 3,000 on August 16, 1917; within one week it was dropped again to 1,000, and on November 26 the program was finally raised to 2,000. It seems that on August 2, 1917, deliveries of 25 were scheduled for October, 50 for November, 100 for December, 125 for January, etc. On November 5, 1917, the schedule calls for 50 in January, 150 in February, 200 in March, etc.

On August 9, 1917, the Caproni program called for 500; on August 16, for 9,000; on August 22, for 2,000; on August 24, for 500, and there were other variations until the program appears to have settled down after September 28, 1917, to 1,000. On February 19, 1918, the program dropped to 50; it called for 250 on May 3, 1918, and was afterwards increased to 1,000.

On August 9, 1917, when the program for Capronis called for 500, monthly deliveries of 100 were scheduled to begin in February 1918. A week later, on August 16, 1917, when the program was increased to 9,000, deliveries of 900 were scheduled for December, 1,350 for January and each month thereafter. When the schedule was dropped to 1,000, deliveries appear to have been expected of 100 in February; and in February deliveries of 100 seem to have been looked for in May.

The Handley-Page program shows on September 5, 1917, a total of 1,500, with anticipated deliveries of 100 in December, 300 in January, 400 in February, etc. As late as January 8, 1918, deliveries were scheduled for February of 110, 190 for March, 200 for April, etc. On March 18, 1918, the program had dropped to a total of 50.

These programs, with their variations and schedules of deliveries, appear to be grotesque in the light of the actual facts, but they bear the imprimatur of the planning department of the equipment division with the countersign (except in the case of the DH–9's) of official approval.

SUSPENSION OF THE PROGRAM FOR SINGLE-SEATER PURSUIT PLANES

On October 5, 1917, in reporting the failure of the Spad Monocoque, the cablegram from our representatives overseas also contained the following advice as to single-seater pursuit planes with rotary engines:

"Recommend you build no rotary engine single-seater pursuit airplanes to be sent to Europe. Existing machines this type will be outclassed by changing time yours arrive. Build only what you need for use in United States training purposes."

This, however, did not touch the Spad intended to be used with the fixed engine; that is, with the Hispano Suiza engine. That machine was not experimental. As early as July 15, 1917, there was official advice that "200-horsepower Hispano Suiza (is) now fighting on front in Spad aeroplanes." Colonel Bolling reported in his cablegram of August 1, 1917, that the Spad with that engine is "the best fixed engine fighter now in service." There is no reason why this fighting plane should not have been produced here in quantity many months ago. The failure to do so was not due to lack of facilities, but simply to a change of opinion at a critical time as to what was advisable.

Responding to repeated and urgent recommendations for production of Spads in this country, an order for 3,000 Spads was placed with the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. under date of September 19, 1917. But this order had barely been placed when doubt was cast upon the enterprise, and after preparation for production was well under way the order was canceled on November 7, 1917. This is the date of the cancellation, as testified by Mr. Morgan, then vice president of the Curtiss Co. It was nearly 6 months later that the production of a single-seater pursuit plane (the SE–5) was undertaken, and thus there was a serious loss of time through a reversal of judgment, which was in turn reversed.

It should be noted that virtually all the cables of advice sent by our military representatives abroad are signed "Pershing," but doubtless they most frequently come from subordinate officers, and with respect to the subject under consideration, from those in charge of the Air Service overseas. In a cablegram received here on October 5, 1917, the following appears:

"If USA 8 cylinder heavier than Hispano Suiza pounds per horsepower, build no monoplace pursuit airplanes with USA 8-cylinder engines. Machine will be useless by time it arrives here. Increase number DH–4's or

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DH-9's by number monoplace pursuit airplanes. This is necessary provided USA 12 is success. Useful loads increasing so rapidly here that engines now in United States are not considered powerful enough meet requirements. Two-place pursuit airplanes considered most urgently needed airplanes next year."

The view thus set forth found support in influential quarters here. On October 27, 1917, Lieutenant Colonel Clarke in a memorandum sent to Mr. Coffin expressed the opinion that "all fighting and bombing by day will be done in two-seaters flying in regular formation." And he added, "The single-seater will be eliminated." A few days later the following cablegram was received:

November 8, 1917. No. 252 (S. D. 2709), paragraph 1.

"Your 359, paragraph 7, and other cables concerning American engine program. Situation here has changed much during 3 months since original recommendations and continues changing constantly. Following general principles appear clear to us. First. Single-seater fighter will probably become obsolete general use next year, although small numbers will always be used special purposes. Recommend you produce number already actually under contract and started. Believe we can obtain here all this type required future above number actually under contract here and America. This applies both single-seater fighter airplanes and engines. Second. Two-seater fighter airplane with stationary engine will supersede single-seater; 400 horsepower probably sufficient next 6 months, after that 500 horsepower necessary. This summarizes cables already sent you."

It will be observed that while this message recommended against further production, it distinctly stated that the number already under contract and started should be produced. But this was not done.

On November 30, 1917, Colonel Deeds cabled:

"Curtiss Co. has completed drawings and ordered material for Spad for 220-horsepower geared Hispanos. We have canceled that order. Tulasne suggests possibility of helping the French program by building Spad planes here to be equipped with 220-horsepower geared Hispano engines built in France. We could get production in February without materially affecting output of two-place fighters. We are not urging this because of the fact that we have ordered material which can be utilized in other machines, but if it would help your program, here is a quick source for these machines."

To this there was a reply (from London) on December 14, 1917, as follows:

"* * * With reference to paragraph 1 your cablegram 461 do not recommend unionized production Spad airplanes for France. No such request received from French here. Believe they can produce all these airplanes they need. Think our only efforts should be applied airplanes and engines already on our program. United States should leave production single-place fighter to Europe."

The Spad contract having been canceled and preparations for the production of single seaters in this country abandoned, in less than 2 months there was an urgent request from our military representatives abroad that Spads be produced here. As early as February 10, 1918, it was recommended that steps be taken to "put into production 1,000 Spads one-place with 220-horsepower Hispano Suiza engines for earliest possible delivery in France." It was said that "French delivery of one-place Spads very uncertain and cannot be depended upon. Should have more definite information next 2 weeks as to whether your production Spad one-place fighter should be further increased." While this new proposal was evidently the result of the breakdown in the French deliveries, it seems that a closer inquiry into the progress of our deliveries of raw material abroad and the conditions of French manufacture would have revealed the serious importance of continuing the production of single seaters in this country in accordance with the original program.

However, the authorities here were not then ready to follow the new recommendation, and 2 weeks later, on February 25, 1918, they cabled the following reply:

"Production of Spads with 220-horsepower Hispano Suiza engines does not fit well into our program, because engines cannot be put in production without material delay. Probably first deliveries in France in December. We could somewhat more easily produce the 300-horsepower Hispano Suiza engine. We are now producing large number of 150-horsepower engines for training planes, and could even increase production. We believe with this information you will probably decide not to request production of Spads here. Please give us your full advice."

It was not until March 9, 1918, that this cablegram was answered, with the statement that "question being considered. Will advise you soon." On April 6, 1918, Mr. Potter cabled that the British air board had advised that they could supply at once 200 SE-5 planes without engines. He added, "We can arrange production for 180-horsepower Hispano Suiza engines for same at rate of five per day within 30 to 60 days. Shall we arrange engine supply? If so, will you arrange contract for planes?" On the same day Colonel Deeds cabled:

"We could within 4 weeks begin to supply 180-horsepower high-compression direct-drive Hispano Suiza engines to be shipped to England to be installed in the planes by the plane manufacturer. Would this type of fighting machine be of value to you, and if so, shall we proceed to provide them for you? We are advised that this type is in successful use by the British on the front."

On April 19, 1918, the following urgent message was received from our representatives abroad:

"The United States should make immediate preparations for the production of single-seater machines to supplement those we may receive from France and England."

But on April 21, 1918, there was a further cablegram (referring to Mr. Potter's cable of April 6, 1918), stating that the whole subject was still under consideration. This message was (in part) as follows:

"Will the production of 180-horsepower Hispano Suiza engines be interfered with by contracts placed by French or English? If not, we strongly recommend production of this motor for our needs this year on following basis." (Giving delivery dates.) * * *

"The situation with reference to single-seater fighters for remainder of 1918 is as follows: Both France and England have a plane production in excess of their engine production, and as the 180-horsepower Hispano Suiza is already in production in the United States in small quantity, our only practical means of securing the necessary number of single-seater fighters will be for the production of this engine for overseas duty to be increased, so as to provide the number indicated and for us to distribute these engines here, month by month, as conditions require. The entire question of the provision of single-seater airplanes for 1918 and 1919 is being thoroughly investigated and a comprehensive report with all data necessary will be forwarded by an officer familiar with the entire situation."

On April 24, 1918, Mr. Potter cabled that contract could be made with the British Government for SE-5's at the rate of 30 per week beginning July 1; that 180-horsepower, high-compression Hispano Suiza motors could be supplied from here for those planes at the same rate, and that the same machine could be put into production here and shipments begun in September. He asked quick advice if arrangements were desired which would permit of "quickest possible delivery of single-seater fighting planes on the front," and he added "SE-5 equipped with 180 Hispano is the only machine we can produce quickly."

To this an answer was received on May 4, 1918, disapproving the production of SE-5's, as follows:

"Production of SE-5 for 180 Hispano in America disapproved, since it appears that necessary planes for this engine can be obtained in Europe, either SE-5, Spad, or both."

This was followed on May 12, 1918, however, by a cablegram stating that the question was still open pending final report of board of Air Service officers and that final recommendation would be cabled in about 10 days.

On May 15, 1918, Mr. Potter cabled referring to the message from overseas of April 19, 1918, urging immediate preparation for production of single-seater fighters and calling attention to the fact that the cablegram of May 4, 1918, was an exact reversal of the former recommendation. He said:

"We took immediate action on this recommendation and have given orders for 1,000 SE-5's. Your 1052, paragraph 2-A exactly reverses these recommendations. In view of this inconsistent information and also due to requests for production of SE-5 from Air Division for training purposes, we have decided not to change our orders for production on these machines, and request that samples be sent promptly in accordance with our London 81, paragraph 3."

The final result is that there has been no renewed order for the production of Spads, and that the order for SE-5's is being proceeded with, but that the American machine of this type is still in an experimental stage. It is understood that the machines are being tested, and that the questions which have arisen and have been brought to the attention of the authorities are receiving their consideration. We have not as yet sent from this country to the battle front a single pursuit or combat plane, as distinguished from the heavy observation or bombing planes, and, after giving due weight to all explanations, the fact remains that such pursuit planes could have been produced in large quantities many months ago had there been decision and consistent purpose.

DELAYED PROGRAM FOR THE HANDLEY-PAGE AND CAPRONI BOMBING PLANES

* * * * *

HANDLEY-PAGE PLANES

* * * * *

CAPRONI PLANES

* * * * *

POSTPONEMENT OF THE DE HAVILLAND 9

In his recommendation, on his return from Europe in September 1917, the De Havilland 9's was preferred by Captain Clark, as the DH-4 appeared to him to be obsolescent at the time the Bolling Commission was in England and the DH-9 was designed along the same general lines as the DH-4, but with its weaknesses, from a military standpoint, corrected. In other words, he regarded the DH-9 as far better suited for bombing than the DH-4. The principal distinction is that on the DH-9 the rear man—the gun fighter—is moved back about 20 inches from his position on the DH-4; the pilot is moved back so that he is placed immediately in front of the gun fighter; the fuel is moved forward so that it is near the engine, and between the fuel tank and the pilot is a bomb compartment.

The contracts with the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., the Fisher Body Co., and the Standard Aircraft Corp. originally called for DH-9's. When, on September 22, 1917, the program, as it then stood, was submitted to Colonel Bolling on behalf of the Chief Signal Officer, it called for 2,000 DH-9's and the reply was that the number was not sufficient and should be doubled. It may also be noted that in the same cablegram (September 22) from the office of the Chief Signal Officer it was stated that the first deliveries of the DH-9 with the Liberty 12 and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

synchronized Marlin piston-type airplane gun would be made in November 1917.

The sample machine, however, which was first received from England was the DH–4. The DH–9 had not yet been put into service at the front. Apparently there was no sample DH–9 available here until at the end of February 1918, and it seems to have been thought that progress had been made to such a degree in the developing of the design of the DH–4 for production that it was advisable to concentrate upon the production of the DH–4 to the virtual exclusion of the DH–9. Consequently, in the substitution of contracts, the DH–4 took the place of the DH–9 and it appears that in February 1918, directions were received from Colonel Deeds and Colonel Montgomery that orders for DH–9's were to be canceled for the present, pending information from abroad.

It seems that with an adequate production program, this improved type, or its American equivalent, could have been produced here sometime ago, but it has not yet been put into quantity production. It is said, however, that the DH–9 is now "being put out of production abroad" because of the "coming in" of the DH–9A which is a further improvement.

RESULT

For obvious reasons, it is not deemed advisable to make public the details of the present aircraft program. That can be stated by the military authorities whenever they think it wise to do so. For the present purpose it may be said that the abandonment of the program for the Spads left us, until recently, without any program for single-seater pursuit planes, and that also, until recently, so far as service planes were concerned, there remained a program for immediate production which was virtually limited to De Havilland–4's and Bristol fighters.

The Bristol fighter as redesigned to take the Liberty motor proved to be a failure, and after a series of fatal accidents was discarded. The Bristol was so far removed from a machine that could carry an engine of that power that it has been admitted by high authority that it was "a very foolish thing to put the two together."

Thus, nothing is left of last fall's program for service planes save the De Havilland–4's. The course of production of these planes is hereafter stated. It appears that after the remedying of various defects, they are being successfully used as observation and bombing planes. There are certain limitations, which it is not necessary to describe, of their military effectiveness for this purpose, and machines of the later and improved type are to be provided. By reason of a lack of maneuverability the De. Havilland–4 cannot serve the purpose of a pursuit plane.

ENGINES FOR SERVICE AIRPLANES

* * * * *

ROLLS-ROYCE AND SUNBEAM ENGINES—BRITISH EXPERIENCE

* * * * *

THE HISPANO SUIZA ENGINE

* * * * *

There is ample basis for the conclusion that had there been a sustained effort to produce single-seater pursuit planes, and with this definite purpose adequate orders had promptly been given so as to justify the provision of additional facilities by this company and the speedy utilization of its highest capacity, engines for these pursuit planes could have been delivered in quantity through the winter and spring and large numbers of these engines would have been available by July 1, 1918, in addition to the production needed for advanced training planes and without interfering with the development of the high-power Liberty motor. This is aside from what could have been accomplished through timely arrangements made for production by other companies.

ROTARY ENGINES

* * * * *

THE LIBERTY ENGINE

In the latter part of the year 1914 the Packard Motor Car Co. decided to go extensively into the development of air motors. It had received one of the Mercedes motors, used by the Germans in their airplanes, which had been imported in a racing chassis. Taking certain features from that motor and from other motors, an engine was designed in 1915, a duplicate of which was used in a racing car. This engine developed 140 horsepower at 3,600 revolutions per minute. Another model, with greater power, was completed in December 1916, and was also used in a racing car; this was rated at 200 horsepower at 2,180 revolutions per minute. It was described in a pamphlet exhibited at the Aeronautical Show in New York in January 1917, as "The Packard Aircraft Engine," exhibited "as a stimulant to the new aviation industry." The work of developing these motors had been under the direction of J. G. Vincent, then vice president of the Packard Motor Car Co. in charge of engineering. In the latter part of May 1917, Mr. Vincent took his drawings to Washington for the purpose of laying before the Government the plan of the Packard Co. to manufacture these engines in large quantities through enlisting the aid of other automobile manufacturers who had experience in high-grade motor work. Mr. Vincent met Mr. Deeds, Mr. Waldon, and others. The design was not deemed to be adequate for the needs on the western front and it was necessary to increase the horsepower of the motor with lighter weight per horsepower. Mr. Vincent worked in Washington in conjunction with Mr. E. J. Hall, of the Hall-Scott Co., making sketches for the purpose of improving the motor and in a few days a new motor was designed embodying to a considerable extent the engineering features which had been developed during the past 2 years of experimental work. The first efforts were directed to the development of an 8-cylinder motor, and in a few days Mr. Vincent returned to Detroit, taking the Washington sketches for the purpose of having a wooden model made by the Packard Co., and this was done. At the request of the authorities, Mr. Vincent was loaned by the Packard Co. in order that he might take charge of the Engineering Division of the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps. The Packard Co. made a full-sized operating model, which was sent to the Bureau of Standards on July 3. Later, about August 1917, the production of an 8-cylinder engine was postponed and the immediate production of a 12-cylinder engine of the same type was decided upon.

In developing the design for the purpose of quantity production, various difficulties were encountered. Aside from minor changes found to be necessary in the course of production, the crank shafts, connecting rods, and bearings in the first 1,000 engines were too light, creating a dangerous condition. The crank shafts, connecting rods, and bearings had to be redesigned. It was also found to be advisable to change the system of lubrication and, again, it was difficult to obtain a development of radiators that were suitable for a motor of this size. As late as June 25 of this year General Pershing's cable described a series of defects in the motors which had been shipped abroad and these, it is understood, were speedily remedied.

It now appears to be conclusively established that the Liberty engine is a great success for observation and bombing planes, and for this purpose it has found high favor with the Allies. It is too heavy for the lighter pursuit planes.

5. SELECTION OF CONTRACTORS AND DISTRIBUTION OF WORK

For engines to be used in training planes there were orders (to June 30, 1918) for 7,950 OX–5's distributed among the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., the Willys-Morrow and Willys-Overland Cos. Orders for the Hall-Scott engines (2,250) were placed with the Nordyke & Marmon Co., and the Hall-Scott Motor Co. The General Vehicle Co. received an order for 111 Gnome engines (100 horsepower), and the unfilled portion of this order was taken over by the Aeronautical Engine Co., which also received certain additional orders for engines of the same type when the latter corporation was organized to conduct operations at the plant of the General Vehicle Co. after its purchase by the Government. The Union Switch & Signal Co. had orders for 2,500 LeRhone engines (80 horsepower). The orders for the Hispano Suiza engines, placed with the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corp., have already been sufficiently detailed. In addition, orders for 450 of the Lawrence engine (28 horsepower) were placed with the Excelsior Motor Manufacturing Co., and an order for 2,000 Bugattis was given to the Duesenberg Motor Corp.

In the summer and fall of 1917 contracts were entered into for the manufacture of 22,500 Liberty motors, as follows:

Aug. 31, 1917, Lincoln Motor Co	6,000
Sept. 4, 1917, Packard Motor Car Co	6,000
Sept. 7, 1917, Nordyke & Marmon Co	3,000
Sept. 11, 1917, Trego Motor Corp	500
Nov. 22, 1917, Ford Motor Co	5,000
Dec. 11, 1917, General Motors Corp	2,000
Total	22,500

The contract with the Trego Motor Corp. was subsequently canceled,[5] only one engine being delivered.

For the production of elementary training planes of the type known as the JN4–D, reliance was placed chiefly upon the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., which had already made planes for the British Government. Substantial orders were also given to the Springfield Aircraft Co. and the Canadian Airplane Co. (Ltd.), of Toronto. A number of small orders were placed from time to time with various concerns. The total orders to June 30, 1918, were for 3,975 of the JN4–D type.

The orders for the Standard–J training planes were distributed among the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., the Fisher Body Corp., and the Standard corporations (Standard Aero Corp. and Standard Aircraft Corp.). The total orders were for 1,600 of this type.

For advanced training planes there were orders given to the Curtiss Aeroplane and Motor Corp. (to June 30, 1918) for 919 JN4–H and 479 JN6–H; to the Thomas Morse Aircraft Corp. (for 100 S4–B and 400 S4–C); and to the Breese Aircraft Corp. (for 300 Penguins).

With respect to both elementary and advanced training planes there were also various orders for spare parts.

In service planes, the production of the De Havilland–4's was pivoted upon the work of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. in connection with the designing of the plane for American production, as hereafter explained. There were contracts for 8,500 of the DH–4's as follows:

Dayton-Wright Airplane Co	4,000
Fisher Body Corp	4,000
Standard Aircraft Corp	500
Total	8,500

The contract for the Bristol Fighters (2,000) was given to the Curtiss Aeroplane and Motor Corp.

In view of the exigency, it was inevitable that the responsible officials of the Signal Corps entrusted with the duty of aircraft production should exercise a broad author-

[5] It is understood that it has been taken over by the Ordnance Department, for tanks. It is canceled so far as its relation to aircraft is concerned.

ity, virtually unhampered by restrictions, in the selection of contractors. The Aircraft Board, in which the responsible Army officers sat as members, afforded a useful opportunity for the comparison of views, but not a legal and only a limited extent a practical check. There have been numerous complaints from individuals and corporations who sought contracts unsuccessfully. The extent to which activities were centered at Dayton, the profitable contract promptly given to Colonel Deeds' former business associates, and the preference of a small group of manufacturers in the allotment of the large contracts, created a feeling of distrust which finds frequent expression in the record of this inquiry.

There could be no well-founded objection to a well-directed effort to standardize products for production in large quantities under conditions favoring the most economical and efficient work. So far as orders for production of planes in small quantities and various spare parts are concerned, to give an adequate statement of the facts with respect to the companies who received, or which asked and were refused, contracts would require a great variety of detail which it is impracticable to set forth. It does not appear that in the award of these contracts there was adherence to any clearly defined principle. It is sufficient to say that in many instances the parties complaining have no ground for their complaints, save that others in no better situation obtained what the complainants were denied. For while offers or requests of some manufacturers went unheeded because of alleged lack of proper facilities or of assured financial ability, in other cases, contracts were made with parties equally destitute of adequate resources. Among those whose facilities were apparently adequate, some were taken and others were left.

But aside from any question of discrimination between manufacturers, it is obvious that the exigency demanded that important and needed sources of supply should not be neglected, and in this connection, without attempting to make a comprehensive statement of other available resources, the case of the Singer Manufacturing Co. deserves special attention.

SINGER MANUFACTURING CO.

* * * * *

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK

Quite as important as the selection of contractors and the development of adequate sources of supply, was the distribution of work so as to insure prompt and efficient production. Each type of plane requires special preparation, and the demands of varied sorts of work may easily be mutually restrictive and demoralizing. A conspicuous instance of this is furnished in the case of the Standard Aircraft Corp. This company, with its predecessor (the Standard Aero Corp.), had the unusual features of being a manufacturing corporation under the direction of two lawyers, Harry Bowers Mingle and Max J. Finklestein, of the firm of Mingle & Finklestein, of New York City. It is unnecessary to review the financial history of the two Standard corporations, with their plants at Elizabeth and Plainfield, N. J. It is sufficient for the present purpose to say that from the time of the organization of the Standard Aircraft Corp. in November 1917, it has been the operating company, except that recently the Standard Aero Corp. has been availed of, and it has taken the plant at Plainfield for the purpose of handling fixed-price orders, the cost-plus contracts being in course of performance at the large plant at Elizabeth. Both these corporations are controlled by Mitsui & Co., a leading Japanese firm, which holds all the preferred stock and a majority of the common stock of each company. The orders which have been given by our Government to one or the other of these Standard companies exhibit an extraordinary range of types embracing training planes of the Standard-J type, six machines and spares of the JR-1B type for the Post Office, advanced training planes of the M-Defense type, four Capronis, the assembly of Handley-Page planes, 500 De Havilland 4's, as well as flying boats for the Navy and various orders for small parts. The effect was to put in this plant almost every variety of airplane work, a proceeding which has no justification from a production standpoint. Mr. Charles H. Day, the chief engineer of the Standard companies, whose ability is generally recognized, frankly admits the serious disadvantage of this multiplicity of orders. He says:

"There is a natural amount of confusion in having a multiplicity of those parts. * * * The engineering personnel is limited by the number of different machines you have to produce, and the executive force is limited by the same amount. The physical layout of the factory itself is very seriously affected. * * * We have on the HS boat job made entirely our own drawings. It was out of the question to work to the drawings which were supplied us, and we therefore redrew the entire job. That occupied a great amount of time of the drafting room and the engineering departments of the Standard Aircraft. Then a great amount of drawing has been necessary on the De Havilland-4's, it being impossible to get Vandyke drawings from the Signal Corps, and we have attempted to draw up a great deal of that machine, and we have redrawn in its entirety the Handley-Page machine. That involves the engineering department and the drafting department and the bill of materials department, sometimes known as the specification department, which is one of the most important we have, inasmuch as under the present regulations we are not allowed to purchase material except we bill the material. The approvals officer will not approve the materiels except on the basis of a bill of materials supplied, and making the bills of materials and completing the drawings on all these different machines has been extremely difficult.

"Question. Have you had in your drawing department the HS boats for the Navy—that is, the seaplane—the Handley-Page planes, and the De Havilland planes, all being worked out at the same time?

"Answer. Yes, sir."

On the same point, Mr. Day again testified:

"The order for the De Havilland-4's is a very small order comparatively. * * * If we were to turn over our plant entirely into building the 500 De Havilland-4's and had to go ahead on 500 De Havilland-4's, it would not last very long. We expected early in this year and were preparing to take over a large order for Papronis. That was before we had the De Havilland machines, and it was supposedly to be a thousand Capronis. That was a fair-sized order, and we expected we would have that alone and nothing else. But that was withdrawn, and the order for 700 sets of spare parts for the Bristol and 1,500 sets of spare parts for the De Havilland-9 was given us, and that was a pretty fair-sized order. That, in itself, would have been sufficient for some length of time, but both of those orders were recalled. The interference, so far as spare parts of machines is concerned, would have been less than the interference caused by two orders for complete machines. It has been impossible for us to obtain a large enough continued order to actually know what we were going to do and to prepare for doing it."

Criticisms upon the management of the corporation do not excuse such a state of affairs. If a manufacturing corporation is to be intrusted with work, it is manifest that it should be given the work it can handle efficiently; and if its efficiency is distrusted, there is still less reason for embarrassing it with confusing orders. On the other hand, if it is deemed capable of successful production it should have a suitable opportunity to develop it. The effect of placing such an assortment of orders, coupled with the difficulties besetting production in this new industry, has not only interfered with production, but has promoted waste, made it exceedingly difficult to maintain proper cost accounts, and has confused responsibility for delays.

Other illustrations of a poor distribution of work might easily be given; the result of it is that one part of the Government's program has stood in the way of another.

6. THE COURSE OF PRODUCTION—DELAYS—MISLEADING PUBLIC STATEMENTS

* * * * *

The De Havillands

The contracts for these planes, after the substitution of DH-4's for DH-9's, called for 8,500 DH-4's, viz: Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., 4,000; Fisher Body Corp., 4,000; Standard Aircraft Corp., 500.

Under the first contract with the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. (dated September 7, 1917), deliveries of the DH-9's then provided for were to begin in November, and the entire 2,000 were to be delivered by the end of June 1918. Under the modified contract (January 17, 1918), for 1,000 DH-4's and 3,000 DH-9's, deliveries were to begin in January and to be completed by the end of July 1918. Under the final contract (April 1, 1918), substituting 4,000 DH-4's, the latter were divided into two lots of 2,000 each, the first lot for immediate production to be delivered by August 1, 1918, and the remainder to be delivered as ordered.

The first DH-4 was shipped from the plant of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. on February 5, 1918. It was intended for the American Expeditionary Forces in France, but it was not completely equipped; it did not have any bomb gear that would work. On February 14, 1918, the following telegram was addressed by Mr. Talbott to Colonel Deeds:

"Wire received reference Secretary Redfield and Dr. Stratton. Major Shepler advised first 100 De Havillands to remain in this country. If so, will you recall plane shipped for foreign shipment, allowing us to substitute plane completely equipped. Progress here encouraging."

However, the plane already shipped was not recalled. The transport containing it sailed on March 22, and on account of engine trouble in the Azores it did not reach Europe until May 4.

Nine additional DH-4's were shipped by the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. in February for the use of various fields; two on the 15th, one on the 16th, and two on the 17th, intended for Gerstner Field, in Louisiana; one on the 21st for McCook Field (which was sent to South Field); one on the 22d for the Fisher Body Corp.; one on the 23d for the Standard Aircraft Corp.; and one on the 25th for McCook Field. Four were shipped in March, two for Gerstner Field on the 5th and 12th, one for McCook Field on the 10th, and one on the 21st was delivered to the property officer at the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co.

There were no shipments for the American Expeditionary Forces between February 5 and April 3, 1918, when four were shipped; four more were shipped on April 14 and four on April 22, and there were no more shipped for use abroad until May 2, 1918. That is to say, up to May 2 there had been 13 DeH-4's shipped for our forces abroad. It was in May 1918 that what may properly be called quantity production of DH-4's began. By the end of that month 193 DH-4's, and by the end of June 529 DH-4's had been delivered by the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. Of these 529, it appears 381 had gone to ports of embarkation, 116 to the Navy, and 32 to various destinations in this country, including training fields.

On June 25 advices were received that there were serious defects in the planes which had been received abroad. At the meeting of the Aircraft Board on July 31, Colonel Arnold stated that all planes shipped to Europe by the Army which were found on arrival to have weaknesses were rebuilt at the aircraft production centers. At the same meeting Mr. Potter stated that the De Havilland planes for the Navy, which had been shipped from the factory but were not yet floated, should be sent back to the Dayton-Wright Co. to be rebuilt.

From June 30 to October 11, 1918, the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. delivered 1,320 DH–4's, making 1,849 in all to the latter date.[1]

In the contract with the Fisher Body Corp. (November 6, 1917) provision was originally made for 3,000 DH–9's, the deliveries to be completed before July 1, 1918. For these there were subsequently substituted 4,000 DH–4's, of which 2,000 were to be delivered by September 1, 1918—afterward extended to November 1, 1918—and 2,000 more at dates to be fixed. Up to June 30, 1918, no deliveries of DH–4's had been made by the Fisher Body Corp. This company got into quantity production in August and had delivered 452 up to October 11, 1918.[2]

For the order of 500 DH–9's placed with the Standard Aircraft Corp. (January 26, 1918) there were eventually substituted 500 DH–4's by the contract of March 28, 1918. No deliveries had been made up to June 30, 1918, and only 49 had been delivered up to October 11, 1918.[1]

The total deliveries of DH–4's, to October 11, 1918, amounted to 2,350. Of these, 1,617 had been floated, 388 were at ports or in transit, 177 had been shipped to camps and training fields, and 168 are described as being for "manufacturers and miscellaneous."

Bristol fighters

The contract with the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. called for 2,000 Bristols to be delivered by August 31, 1918.

There was no definite release for production until February and then only to the extent of 25 machines; 400 were released for production in the latter part of March and 400 more on April 24. As already stated, only 27 were delivered in all, and the order was canceled in July.

Liberty engines

The deliveries were to be completed as follows:

	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.
Lincoln Motor Co	5	80	160	275	700	1,400	1,900	1,480	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Packard Motor Car Co	50	200	500	800	1,000	1,200	1,200	1,050	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nordyke & Marmon Co	.....	.....	25	125	550	700	800	800	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ford Motor Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	800	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
General Motors Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	25	125	250	300	400	500	400

These were the actual deliveries[1]

	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept. to Oct. 11	Total
Lincoln Motor Co	.....	.....	.....	7	24	134	106	309	484	701	1,022	2,787
Packard Motor Car Co	1	25	43	96	153	314	439	556	724	543	970	3,864
Nordyke & Marmon Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	16	24	117	157
Ford Motor Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	53	197	459	1,212	1,868
General Motors Co	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	130	244	398	371	1,013
Total	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,689

[1] There are slight discrepancies between the factory records and the Government reports, and the latter apparently based on actual receipts are used in this tabulation.

Addenda Y—Deliveries of Liberty engines to Dec. 1, 1918

	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Total
Lincoln Motor Co	687	1,050	818	4,380
Packard Motor Car Co	627	903	636	5,124
Nordyke & Marmon Co	59	308	143	568
Ford Motor Co	812	1,059	1,201	3,826
General Motors Co	177	558	424	1,840
Total	.....	.....	.....	15,738

The total deliveries of Liberty motors (U. S. 12's) to October 11, 1918, amounted to 9,689, of which 6,895 were for the Army and 2,794 for the Navy. Of those for the Army, 3,555 had been floated, 456 were at ports or in transit; and there had been delivered 990 to Allied Governments, 260 to flying fields, 1,429 to manufacturers, etc., the remainder, or 205, being turned over to the Navy.

Contracts have recently been made for the production of the Liberty 8 (U. S. 8), but no deliveries had been made on October 11, 1918.

* * * * *

MISLEADING PUBLIC STATEMENTS

In the face of the delays in production a series of misleading public statements were made with official authority. While these statements were authorized by the Secretary of War, he states that they were issued in reliance upon information furnished by the Chief Signal Officer, General Squier, and by Colonel Deeds, who were acquainted with the actual conditions. It is unnecessary to review the delusive predictions and exaggerations contained in these utterances.

But particular attention should be directed to the official statement released for publication in the papers of February 21, 1918, which contained the following:

"The first American-built battle planes are today en route to the front in France. This first shipment, though in itself not large, marks the final overcoming of many difficulties met in building up this new and intricate industry."

This statement had its origin in a conversation between Colonel Deeds and a representative of the Committee on Public Information a week or two before the completed statement was issued. A draft was first prepared and submitted to Colonel Deeds, who examined it and made some corrections. The statement contained in the paragraph above quoted was not only left unchanged but was the subject of special inquiry. Colonel Deeds was asked what was meant by the "first shipment," and he replied, "They are on the water now, on the way to France." He was then asked, "How many?" and he answered, "I do not know, but I do not think more than 10." The statement in its final form was then presented to the Secretary of War, who permitted it to be issued upon the understanding that it had been verified by General Squier and Colonel Deeds.

At the time this statement was issued (Feb. 20) only one plane had been delivered for shipment to the American Expeditionary Forces, and while this had been shipped from the factory on February 5, it did not leave the United States until March 22. The only other service planes which had been delivered were five DH–4's, which had been shipped for use at Gerstner Field, La. No additional shipments of airplanes for the use of our forces abroad were made until April 3. Actual production in quantity did not really begin until May.

Colonel Deeds admits that this statement was brought to him before its publication, and that he went through it. He examined it minutely enough to correct with his own hand one of the paragraphs following that above quoted, which gave the number of men required on the ground for every plane in the air, his correction making it 46 instead of 45. Colonel Deeds denies, however, that he said in response to the inquiry upon the point that the battle planes were "on the water now, on the way to France." That he did make this statement is testified to directly and unequivocally by John W. McConaughy and Marlen E. Pew, representing the Committee on Public Information.

When Colonel Deeds was examined as a witness before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate on April 2, 1918, he was asked this question and gave this answer:

"Senator WADSWORTH. Did you see, or do you know whether any other responsible officers in your aviation section of the Signal Corps saw, the statement given out by Secretary Baker on February 21 before it was published?

"Colonel DEEDS. No sir; I did not see it. I do not know of anybody seeing it."

Colonel Deeds admits giving this testimony. He testified that he did not then recall the paper in question.

Colonel Deeds further testified, in explanation that when the paper was before him, his information was that four planes were on the cars en route to France, and that it later developed that only one was sent and the others were diverted to Lake Charles, that is, to Gerstner Field, for tests on radiators. The shipments to Gerstner Field, however, had been made directly from the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. on February 15, 16, and 17, and these planes had not been shipped from the factory for the American Expeditionary Forces. There is evidence, also (ante, p. 113), that on February 14, Mr. Talbott had telegraphed to Colonel Deeds that Major Shepler advised that the first 100 De Havillands should remain in this country and asking on this assumption for the recall of the one plane shipped for foreign shipment, so that another could be substituted completely equipped.

There is no question but that this grossly misleading statement was published on the authority of Colonel Deeds and that the Secretary of War relied upon the fact that it had Colonel Deed's approval in giving it his official sanction. While this conduct of Colonel Deeds does not come within the scope of the criminal code, it deserves the prompt attention of the military authorities.

General Squier testifies that he had nothing to do with the statement that was is-

[1] Addenda Z:

Deliveries of DH–4's to Dec. 1, 1918

Dayton-Wright Airplane Co	2,609
Fisher Body Corp	1,372
Standard Aero Corp	80
Total to Dec. 1, 1918	4,151

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sued for publication on February 21 and that he did not know of it before it was published. He testified that when it was brought to his attention, he did not regard it as a proper statement to have been sent out, but that he did not institute an inquiry to ascertain who was responsible for it. It is evident that the matter called for immediate investigation and for suitable disciplinary measures, but no steps were taken either for correction or punishment.

The Secretary of War states that the responsibility for the statement clearly rested with General Squier and Colonel Deeds, and that he did not learn of the inaccuracies of the statement until his return from Europe in the latter part of April.

There were earlier statements of a delusive character as to the progress of aircraft production, but the particular statement to which attention has been called was inaccurate in its specific statement of facts, and its misleading character was obvious to anyone having knowledge of the actual conditions.

7. CAUSES OF DELAY IN PRODUCTION

First. Lack of knowledge and experience

* * * * *

Second. Defective organization in the Signal Corps

The duty of providing an adequate organization for aircraft production was left to the Signal Corps. It is quite clear that this undertaking was beyond the competency of the Chief Signal Officer, who had neither training nor experience for such a large industrial enterprise, and those who were brought to the task in his department failed to produce an organization which was adapted to meet the exigency.

* * * * *

The situation as it appeared to Archer A. Landon (Mr. Coffin's assistant) more than 6 months after we had entered the war is strikingly shown in his letter to Mr. Coffin dated October 16, 1917, in the course of which Mr. Landon said:

"The lack of organization and continuity of responsibility is so apparent that success will be a miracle. * * * If we are to be successful, there must be fixed, from the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy down almost to the office boy, a direct line of responsibility that will make every individual assume the absolute responsibility for the work he is undertaking, and under no circumstances should any conflict of authority or responsibility occur. Industrial men of known responsibility and capacity for the particular work undertaken must be selected. They should be peculiarly fitted for the positions they occupy and should be responsible for their work as in civil life. * * *

"We men who have come here in an effort to assist you find ourselves very seriously embarrassed, and justly so. We are started off to do what seems to be an important piece of work only to find that this work has been delegated to somebody else in some other department, and that we are treading on other people's toes. The result is that we do not get the information we want and do not get anywhere. They do not throw us out, but they are all adept at pulling the latest Washington game of 'passing the buck' or else frankly resenting our appearance in the matter.

"Take the spruce situation as an example of dillydallying through a lack of organization. The first I knew of the spruce situation was around the latter part of July or the 1st of August. At that time it was one of your great worries. The entire aircraft program was and is now endangered by the lack of ability to get spruce; and yet from that time until now, notwithstanding repeated conferences, there was nothing done on the spruce situation, either toward closing contracts or increasing production, until October 13, when Colonel Disque was sent west on the situation—a loss of time of practically 3 months. If this had been your own business, the men would have been on their way west the day after the matter was first brought up. The only reason that there was no action in July was because we do not possess an organization of direct responsibility, and on that account these inefficiencies are possible, and they will continue to occur until such time as somebody wakes up and thoroughly organizes the work."

After giving a further illustration Mr. Landon continued:

"This is not intended as a criticism of General Squier or the other officers, but it is intended to be a very vigorous criticism of methods of organization that make such a condition possible; and I submit to you, sir, that if this same condition exists in all departments and continues to exist we might as well submit to the Germans now, because the one way you can beat efficiency is to match it with efficiency, and efficiency can only be obtained by a thorough organizing of our responsibilities and following them through to a definite conclusion, which conclusion should be the winning of the war."

Mr. Landon, leaving the aircraft work in October 1917, returned to it in June 1918, then becoming chief of the production of aircraft in the Bureau of Aircraft Production. Up to that time the policy he had recommended had not been carried out. He testifies that he "could see practically no change in the organization in 6 months"; that is, prior to the new organization through the Bureau of Aircraft Production, which had just been instituted.

It should be understood, of course, that the complaint so emphatically voiced was not directed at the Aircraft Board, as this, as Mr. Landon stated in his letter, was "merely an executive advisory board." The responsibility lay with the officers entrusted with the duty of effecting an adequate organization for aircraft production.

* * * * *

Third. Lack of information as to the equipment required for service plans

* * * * *

Fourth. Changes in design and equipment of service planes

* * * * *

The delays at the plant of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., due to these changes in design, also caused delay in the other plants which were to produce De Havilland 4's, for both the Fisher Body Corp. and the Standard Aircraft Corp. were awaiting a definite design and a determination of equipment and proper drawings before proceeding to production. The Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. was in advance simply because it had the advantage of the possession of the model and it was working out the necessary drawings.

It will be observed that these changes were required in the course of production. That is, instead of proceeding with production on the basis of a given equipment where changes in equipment would cause serious delay, and introducing different equipment in the planes subsequently produced, virtually the entire production was held up to accommodate the new demands. As Lieutenant Colonel Horner testifies, "We would go on changing this way and that way and let that change go through production, when it could be done without interfering with production, and if we had done it we would have had a thousand more planes on the French front today than we now have without any question."

It is unnecessary to review the changes in the ill-fated Bristol. They were numerous, and related to the structure of the plane itself. Production was, of course, impossible while these changes were in progress. The real effect of the changes, however, in view of the result, was not to retard the production of a useful plane, but to cause an unnecessary expenditure.

* * * * *

Fifth. Conditions in manufacturing plants

* * * * *

There have not been lacking indications of sinister influences at various plants. The opportunities of workmen at aircraft plants to retard production or to injure material and products are quite obvious, and the necessity of keeping the plants free of enemy influences is emphasized in another part of this report. But, so far as the delays in production of service planes are concerned, it is impossible in view of interrupted work and changing plans to attribute the delays in any definite measure to such a cause.

Sixth. Changes in the Liberty engine

In any proper estimate of what should have been accomplished in carrying out the aircraft program it is necessary that regard should be had to the development of the Liberty motor. The airplane must have its motor, and it was inevitable that in the development of a new high-power airplane engine, with the object of securing higher power with a lower weight per unit of power, that changes would be found necessary. Needed improvements were constantly suggested by experimentation, and the number of changes looms very large in the testimony of the experienced engineers who were endeavoring to get into quantity production. It is unnecessary to attempt a review of these numerous changes, for whether time could have been saved by greater expertness is a matter of opinion, and in view of the time that has frequently been spent in the development of new types of motors, there is slight ground for criticism by reason of loss of time in perfecting the Liberty motor. The difficulties were inherent in the task, and the task itself was worth while. As has been said, there was no reason why the development of the Liberty motor should have stood in the way of the production of other motors, such as the Hispano Suiza for use in single-seater pursuit planes to which the Liberty engine was not adapted. But, so far as the heavier observation and bombing planes are concerned, the weight of opinion is that it would have taken about as long to put any other high-power motor into successful quantity production in this country, according to our methods of manufacture, as it has taken to develop the Liberty motor. The attempt to secure planes and motors through foreign production for service pending this development has already been reviewed. By pursuing different methods it is possible, as testified by Lieutenant Colonel Hall, that there might have been a small preliminary production of Liberty motors 2 or 3 months earlier, but, making due allowances for the inevitable course of experimentation, the Liberty motor could not have been put into large production much earlier than it was.

What has been called the "immaturity" of the Liberty motor placed a time limitation upon the program for the planes that were made to take this motor, but it may be observed that by May 4, 1918, 778 Liberty motors (U. S. 12's) had been made, of which 390 were taken by the Army, and only 36 DH-4's had at that time been delivered, and no other Army planes to take this motor were available. It can hardly be said that unnecessary delays in service-plane production, caused by bad organization and lack of a settled design, were excused by unforeseen difficulties in the development of the Liberty engine; and it should also be observed that if, in the light of general experience in motor building, delay in the development of the Liberty engine was to be feared, there was the greater reason for making sure, to the full extent of ability, of the immediate production of single-seater pursuit planes for which other engines could be provided.

8. CONTRACTOR'S PROFITS

Under the various fixed-price contracts, it is probable that large profits have been gained, but definite information as to their

extent would not be available without a survey in detail of manufacturing conditions and costs in a considerable number of plants, an undertaking which would have been wholly impracticable in this inquiry. The profits allowed by the cost-plus contracts present a distinct question.

The justification for cost-plus contracts was found in the fact that the undertakings were novel and that the mainufacturers did not have accurate data upon which to make a satisfactory estimate of the cost of production. This was conspicuously true in the case of airplanes of types with which manufacturers in this country had been unacquainted previously. For production in large quantity either new plants or greatly enlarged facilities of existing plants as well as special tools, would be required to meet an exigency of uncertain duration, and it would also be necessary to procure the requisite labor and materials for the new undertakings in a rising market and to provide working capital for long periods. And while motors had been manufactured here upon a large scale, the newly designed engines for the service airplanes required such a reduced weight per horsepower and such delicacy of construction, that it was felt that the enterprise had many elements of uncertainty. In these circumstances, it was not an unreasonable conclusion that if contracts for the new types of airplanes and for the new engine were offered solely on a fixed-price basis, either manufacturers would not undertake the work or would insist upon high prices as a safeguard against the chances of ultimate loss. It was deemed inexpedient for the Government to undertake the manufacture directly, and it was decided to adopt the alternative of an assumption by the Government of the cost of manufacture through contracts upon a cost-plus basis. This practice, however, could not properly outlast the reasons which may have justified it at the outset. Contracts of this sort lead to waste, foster abuses, and impose an almost intolerable burden of cost accounting, in itself a hindrance to rapid production. Early in this inquiry it was abundantly shown that it was highly important to establish reasonable fixed prices whenever experience afforded a fair basis for estimates.

* * * * *

The fact, however, that a cost-plus system is deemed advisable for a time does not justify an exorbitant fixed profit. It has already been pointed out in the case of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. that the contract for De Havilland-4's originally called for a fixed profit of $875 per plane. This was arrived at on the basis of 12½ percent of the bogey cost of $7,000. This, however, was not an actual cost and, as the event has shown, was very far above the actual cost. If it had been thought fair that there should be a profit of 12½ percent per unit produced, it would have been a simple matter to have given this percentage of the actual cost, as the actual cost was to be ascertained in the course of the accounting, and provide for payments from time to time on account. There is no conceivable reason for giving a percentage of the bogey cost, if the object were merely to assure the contractor a profit equivalent to a given percentage of cost. The actual cost of the De Havilland-4's at the plant of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., despite all the difficulties of production and the enhanced cost of the first lot of machines produced during a period of many changes in design, is understood to be under $4,400. A fixed profit of 12½ percent on the actual cost of each machine would have been about $550, instead of the $875 which was fixed by making the calculation on the bogey cost.

Again, in a contract for manufacturing articles at the contractor's plant, the agreed profit upon a cost-plus basis should have a proper relation to the contractor's actual investment and risk. The contractor is not only reimbursed for his outlays for labor and material but for expenses of management included in overhead charges—including such reasonable salaries of officers, managers, etc., as may properly be allocated to the Government work. There is no sacred formula by which the Government is bound to pay a profit per unit of production regardless of the time in which capital is turned over. The extent to which the Government supplies the needed working capital, either by payments on account of work and materials supplied or through advances, should also be considered. A percentage of outlays, or of a bogey cost, although small in itself, may give an exorbitant profit as applied to each unit of a large production.

SERVICE AIRPLANE CONTRACTS

In the case of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. the paid-in capital was $1,000,000, invested in plant. Advances by the Government to the extent of $2,500,000 were authorized and in December and January last advances of $1,000,000 were actually made. These were followed by additional advances, and the balance of total advances on June 30, 1918, was $1,405,222.57. Approximately $750,000 of the money thus borrowed from the Government at interest is represented by investment in fixed assets. The plant is exclusively devoted to Government work and outlays for labor, materials, and overhead, as provided in the contract, are met by the Government.

The operation of this company relating to production may be said to have begun August 1, 1917. The total fixed profit on the 400 Standard-J planes was $620 per plane and the fixed profit on the 4,000 De Havilland-4's was $875 per plane, making a total of $3,748,000. With the saving as now estimated of approximately $2,600 under the original bogey cost of $7,000, the additional profit of 25 percent of this saving would amount to $650 per plane, making the total profits on the De Havilland contract about $1,525 per plane. At the present rate of deliveries the contract for 4,000 DH-4's will be completed before March 1 next. The total profits on the 4,000 DH-4's would have amounted to upward of $6,100,000, and it is safe to say that, including the profit of the Standard-J planes, the company would have earned a profit of more than $6,350,000 under the original contract. This does not include whatever profits would have been made on its experimental contract or on the spares for DH-4's. It should be added that under its contract it was provided, in substance, that at the completion or cancellation of its contract the Government should pay the difference between the cost of its plant, including real estate, building, machinery, and appliances built or otherwise acquired for the performance of the contract, less what was found to be the fair market value at the time when the contract was completed or canceled, and that in determining (through a board of appraisers) this fair market value, the need or requirement of such a plant in the neighborhood and the probability of securing a tenant promptly, or having an established business available, should be considered as one of the important factors.

In the case of the Fisher Body Corp., which had the other large order for De Havilland-4's (4,000), as well as an order for 400 Standard Js, the profits would certainly not have been less. Instead of establishing a new plant, as did the Dayton-Wright Co., the Fisher Body Corp. had already effected a highly efficient organization and had an established plant which required, however, a considerable expansion of plant facilities and special equipment. The net investment in fixed assets, including building land, and machinery, which was made by the Fisher Body Corp. for the Government work amounted, to May 31, 1918, to $860,849.05. The corporation was aided by an advance through the War Credits Board of $2,000,000, made last December. Waiting for the necessary drawings, it got into production later than the Dayton-Wright Co. and up to October 11, 1918, had only delivered 452 planes. But it should complete its production of the entire 4,000 within the next 6 months.

As already stated, in accordance with letters obtained at the time the contracts were made with the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. and the Fisher Body Corp., which promised an equitable readjustment if it was found that the bogey cost was too high, it appears that contracts are now being negotiated for the reduction of the bogey cost of the DH-4s to $5,000 and the fixed profit to $625 per plane. The total profit per plane with the percentage of saving (exclusive of profit on spare parts) under the new contract would amount to about $775 per plane, or $3,100,000 in all, which with the profit on spare parts would make the total profit on the De Havillands not less than $3,500,000.

LIBERTY ENGINE CONTRACTS

The bogey cost, as first fixed in the contracts for Liberty engines was $6,087. This was approved by Mr. R. H. White, of Cleveland, and Mr. Henry May, of Buffalo, to whom the propriety of the estimate had been submitted by the Secretary of War. The fixed profit as originally stipulated was 15 percent of this bogey cost, or $913.05 per engine. Lieut. Col. Hall (who had had large experience in engine manufacture) testifies that he made an estimate about the time that contracts were being let and told Colonel Deeds that $2,400 would cover the cost of labor and materials for the Liberty engine without overhead charges.

In December 1917, the bogey or estimated cost was reduced to $5,000 and the fixed profit put at 12½ percent of this sum, or $625 per engine, and the contracts with the Packard, Lincoln, and Nordyke & Marmon Cos. were modified accordingly. This was in consideration of further allowances for depreciation and provision for advances by the Government. In last May, the contract with the Ford Motor Co. was modified by the same reduction of the bogey cost and fixed profit. The contracts with the General Motors Co. were put upon the same basis.

Even at this reduced bogey and percentage, the profits allowed were very large.

By September 6, 1918, that is, within a year from the date of the contract, the Packard Co. had delivered (according to the Government's report) 3,100 Liberty 12's, and the agreed fixed profit on these amounted to $1,937,500. In the following month it produced 560, and it should complete its deliveries of the 6,000 first contracted for not later than January 1919, and on these 6,000 engines the agreed fixed profits would be $3,750,000. This profit it would earn within 17 months after it received the contract, and if it could have completed the deliveries as contemplated when the contract was made—that is, according to contract schedule—the profit would have been earned in 1: months. Only the fixed profit has been mentioned, as this was definitely guaranteed, but in addition to this the company was entitled to 25 percent of its saving under the bogey of $5,000. The Government's estimate is that the actual cost of the first 600 Liberty engines produced at the Packard plant was $3,873 per engine, and that the average cost of the first 1,200 motors was thus $3,442 per engine. It would seem that the actual cost of the entire 6,000 is likely to be somewhat under $3,200 per engine. But on the basis of $3,200 there would be an additional profit, through the contractor's percentage of saving, of $450 an engine, which would make $2,700,000 additional profit, or with the fixed profit of $3,750,000, a total profit of approximately $6,450,000 earned on the 6,000 engines within a year and 5 months despite delays in production.

To this there should still be added a considerable amount for profits on spare parts on the 6,000 engines which may be estimated at upwards of $1,500,000, and thus the aggre-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

gate profits on the Liberty engine (exclusive of the original development work) would reach about $8,000,000. The Packard Co. estimated that on May 31, 1918, from the standpoint of plant values, the total investment exclusively for aircraft-motor work was $11,808,404.47. This included, however, advances by the Government for working capital amounting to $2,145,568, and inventory and other items which would be represented in the cost of labor and material ultimately defrayed by the Government. The proportion of its plant, less depreciation, employed on aircraft work was estimated by the company at $5,500,000. It should also be noted that in the contract reducing the bogey cost and fixed profit, it was provided that on the termination of the contract the Government should pay for depreciation upon the heat-treating building and equipment erected by the contractor for the purpose of carrying out the contract, the difference between their cost and "the value thereof to the contractor for use in its business," as determined by a board of appraisers; and that in determining this value the appraisers should be guided by the use the contractor "shall have for said building and equipment at the termination of said contract, in the ordinary operation of its business of manufacturing motor cars and trucks, and shall not include the value, if any, which the same may have to the contractor in the manufacture of further aviation motors." The Government was also to pay the full cost of facilities for testing and inspecting the engines, including the building and equipment erected by the contractor therefor, and should also reimburse the contractor for the machine tools purchased especially for the construction of aviation engines, to be used by the contractor without rental but to remain the property of the Government.

The contract with the Ford Motor Co. was for 5,000 Liberty engines. The company did not begin its deliveries until the 14th of June. It was estimated by its officers that deliveries would reach 1,500 in October, and that the entire contract would be completed by the 1st of December. It is behind its schedule, but between September 6 and October 4 it delivered, according to the Government's records, 768, and it may be expected that it will complete its contract for 5,000 by the end of January 1919. Under the original contract it would then be entitled to fixed profits on the 5,000 engines of $3,125,000 and the additional percentage of the saving under the bogey cost of $5,000. With its well-known efficiency and in view of the fact that by beginning later it did not have as much difficulty as the Packard Co. had experienced, it may be assumed that the actual cost of the 5,000 engines at the plant of the Ford Co. will be less than $3,200 per engine, and at the rate of $450 an engine—that is, 25 percent of the difference between $3,200 and $5,000—its additional profits would amount to $2,250,000, or its aggregate profits on the 5,000 engines would be $5,375,000, earned by January 1919. The plant investment required for this production certainly cannot be regarded as any greater than that on the part of the Packard Co. The Ford Co. has not received advances from the Government. The Ford Co. also has a contract for 400,000 cylinder forgings for the Liberty engine on a fixed price basis of $8.25 each; these are supplied to the other manufacturers. The contract with the Ford Co. for the Liberty engines provides that there shall be allowed for depreciation on the machinery and buildings especially acquired for the performance of the contract, in addition to the facilities already owned by the contractor, the difference between the fair cost and the fair market value as determined by appraisers at the time of the completion or cancellation of the contract.

The Lincoln Motor Co. has its special feature in that it was a new organization and established a new plant which is devoted exclusively to the manufacture of Liberty engines for the Government. It has a highly expert organization, with Mr. Henry M. Leland at the head. When the bogey or estimated cost was reduced from $6,087 per engine, with a fixed profit of 15 percent, to $5,000 per engine, with a fixed profit of 12½ percent, the Government made a special agreement with reference to depreciation, which is thus summarized in a resolution of the Aircraft Board:

"That the Government make an allowance for depreciation of the company's heat-treating plant equal to the difference between the cost thereof and the value to the company of the business at the termination of the contract; further, that the cost of the company's testing plant be allowed as a part of the production cost of the engines to be manufactured; further, that the machinery and equipment used by the company in the performance of the contract be depreciated 40 percent over the term of the contract."

The Government made advances during the last fiscal year to the extent of $6,500,000; additional advances were made in July and August of $4,300,000, in order to discharge obligations and maintain a capacity of 1,500 engines a month, making the total sum advanced by the Government of $10,800,000.

The Lincoln Motor Co. had delivered, according to the Government's reports, only 580 motors by the end of June, but it had reached a production of over 600 per month by October 4, and doubtless will soon be at full capacity, so that the first 6,000 motors will probably be delivered before the end of January. For the first 600 motors the cost of production at the plant of the Lincoln Motor Co. was $3,583, which was nearly $300 per motor less than that of the Packard Motor Car Co., and it may be assumed that its average cost for the entire 6,000 will be not much, if any, more than $3,000. That is the figure which appears in the company's estimate of profit. But on the basis of an actual cost of $3,200 per motor the Lincoln Motor Co. would have earned by January 1919, through fixed profits and percentage of saving), on the delivery of the 6,000 motors, about $6,450,000. There would also be profits on spare parts, which are estimated at upward of $1,500,000 more, making an aggregate profit of about $8,000,000. This would be exclusive of allowances by way of depreciation. The investment in real estate, buildings, machinery, and equipment (exclusive of the special tools to be paid for by the Government and the cost of testing and inspection facilities on which there is to be a depreciation allowance of 100 percent) amounts to approximately $7,150,000, of which about $3,460,000 is the cost of machinery, tools, and equipment (to July 31, 1918) on which the Government is to pay a depreciation allowance of 40 percent, in addition to profits. The entire paid-in capital of the company amounts to $850,000.

At the outset, the company obtained on the credit of its officers about $2,000,000, which served its purposes until it obtained the amounts needed for its plant, equipment, and working capital, through advances by the Government. It is pointed out very clearly that the company has provided an excellent plant for the manufacture of Liberty engines and that ultimately its profit, after paying taxes, will represent only an equity in its plant without any assured business, as it has been devoted exclusively to Government work. On the other hand, it may be said that there is a very liberal flat depreciation allowance on machinery, tools, and equipment; that the plant is a permanent one, admirably designed for commercial work, and not merely for a temporary exigency, and that there is every prospect that it can be successfully utilized. It should also be said that from the standpoint of the Government it was free to make arrangements with existing plants, and the amount of the profits it should allow should be determined accordingly.

It is unnecessary to review the original contracts with the Nordyke & Marmon Co., which is very far behind in its deliveries, and with the General Motors Co. (Cadillac and Buick plants). The profit allowed per engine was the same as in the other contracts, but the contracts were for fewer engines—3,000 in the case of the Nordyke & Marmon Co. and 2,000 in that of the General Motors Co. The Nordyke & Marmon Co. received advances of $2,000,000. There were no advances to the General Motors Co.

The large percentage of the contractors' profits which will be taken by the Government in taxation is strongly emphasized, and, of course, what the Government takes back through taxation should fairly be taken into account. But the contemplated tax does not justify an extravagant scale of profits, which, even after payment of taxes, would permit an excessive return upon the capital invested, in view of the greatly reduced risks of the contractor under the cost-plus contracts.

REVISED CONTRACTS FOR LIBERTY ENGINES

What has been said above relates to the original contracts for Liberty engines. During a recent period the contracts with the Lincoln Motor Co., the Packard Motor Car Co., and the Nordyke & Marmon Co. have been revised and put upon a fixed-price basis of $4,000 an engine.

The revised contract with the Lincoln Motor Co. is dated July 31, 1918. The former contract for 6,000 engines is canceled and superseded, and the new contract provides for 9,000 United States 12's and necessary spare parts, with an option to the Government to require the production of 8,000 additional engines and spare parts. The schedule of deliveries provided for in the new contract is as follows:

Previous to Aug. 1, 1918	1,000
August	750
September	1,000
October	1,500
November	1,500
December	1,500
January 1919	1,500
February	250

The price is $4,000 an engine. The spare parts are to be delivered on a schedule basis corresponding to a total price of $4,000 for a completed engine. The contract provides for payments by the Government by way of amortization upon a basis of 100 percent of the actual cost of all testing and inspecting facilities provided by the contractor with the approval of the Government; for payment by the Government by way of amortization upon a basis of 40 percent of the actual cost of the heat-treating building and equipment theretofore provided by the contractor; and payment by the Government by way of amortization upon a basis of 40 percent of the actual cost of all machinery, tools, and other items furnished by the contractor. It is further agreed that in case the Government shall not order from the contractor the 8,000 additional engines for which it has an option, or the contractor is prevented by termination of the contract from manufacturing and delivering the 9,000 engines contracted for and the 8,000 additional engines, the Government shall pay to the contractor a sum equal to 40 percent of the difference between the actual cost of its plant, including real estate, buildings, machinery, and equipment built or otherwise acquired by it for the purpose of performing the contract (exclusive of any allowance of interest), and any and all payments previously made by the Government on account of depreciation or amortization. While the new contract is on a fixed price basis, provision is made for payments by the Government within 10 days of the determination of the various items on account of the cost of direct materials, supplies, and labor, and also for the payment

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

monthly of amounts equal to proper ordinary depreciation and other proper items of overhead expense not previously paid by the Government. It is also provided that in case the actual cost of manufacture shall be increased or decreased by reason of any changes in specifications or in the rates of labor, material, supplies, or equipment, varying from the rates in force at the date of the revised contract, upon satisfactory proof the contractor shall be paid the total amount of such increases, in addition to the fixed prices, or in case of a decrease the fixed price shall be reduced accordingly.

Up to October 4 the Lincoln Co. had delivered, according to the Government's report, 2,566 engines, instead of the 2,750 required by the schedule to October 1, and it is likely to be somewhat behind its schedule in the total deliveries, but its deliveries of 9,000 should be completed by March next. It may be assumed, as the company assumes in its own estimate, that the 9,000 motors can be produced on an average cost of $3,000 each, which would leave $1,000 profit per engine, exclusive of the spare parts, making a profit on the engines of $9,000,000 earned, it may be expected, by April 1; and assuming that the profit on spare parts will be 25 percent of the profit on the motors, there would be an additional profit of $2,250,000. On this basis the entire profits earned by the company on the Liberty-engine contract would be $11,250,000.

The new contract with the Nordyke & Marmon Co. was made under date of August 31, 1918. The former contract for 3,000 Liberty engines is canceled, and the substituted contract calls for 5,000 U. S. 12's and spare parts, with the option of the Government to order 2,000 additional.

* * * * *

The contract is on the basis of a fixed price of $4,000 per engine, with a provision for increase or decrease in case of a change in the actual cost of manufacture, similar to that contained in the revised contract with the Lincoln Co. The contract also contains a provision for special depreciation, which is somewhat involved and need not be set forth.

The revised contract with the Packard Motor Car Co. was made under date of September 2, 1918. It supersedes the original contract and provides for 12,000 U. S.-12s, at a fixed price of $4,000 per engine, and spare parts on the basis of this price for a completed engine. It contains provision as to an increase or decrease of price in case of a change of the cost of manufacture similar to that found in the other revised contracts above mentioned. The Packard Co. agrees to deliver the articles at the rate of 600 engines a month, beginning with September 2, 1918. As the Packard Co. had delivered 3,660 engines up to October 4, 1918, the entire 12,000 will be delivered approximately by December 1919. It is likely that the cost, distributed over the 12,000 engines, will not be more than $3,000 an engine, and at this rate the profit on the 12,000 engines will amount to $12,000,000, with probably $3,000,000 more as the profit on spares, making about $15,000,000 in all.

Under the original cost-plus contracts for the Liberty engines—that is, with the bogey cost of $5,000, a fixed profit of 12½ percent thereon, and an additional profit of 25 percent of the savings under the bogey cost, the total profits per engine would amount to $1,075 on the basis of an actual average cost of $3,200 per engine, or to $1,125 on the basis of an actual average cost of $3,000 an engine. It will thus be seen that the change from the cost-plus contracts to the fixed-price contracts saves the Government from about $75 to $125 (or possibly a little more) per engine on the fixed-profit allowance, and also whatever expense may be saved by the reduced requirements of cost supervision and accounting and in connection with material. Upon the new fixed-price contracts the contractor's profits, though reduced, still remain very liberal.

It is understood that it has been arranged that similar revised contracts on a fixed-price basis will be made with the Ford Motor Co. and the General Motors Co., but these had not yet been executed according to the latest information received.

9. SUPERVISION OF PRODUCTION—WASTE

* * * * *

Labor

* * * * *

Labor cost

To establish the labor cost under cost-plus contracts it was necessary that there should be proper time records and suitable provision for the identification and check of employees as they entered and left the factory. The opportunities for irregular payrolls, through laxity or connivance, are obvious. The conditions in this respect at the North Elmwood (Buffalo) plant of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. were especially bad. It was at this plant (completed last fall) that the cost-plus work was done on the Bristol Fighter for the Army and the HS-1 seaplane for the Navy.[6] There is abundant testimony with the picturesque detail which cannot be given here, to the effect that at the North Elmwood plant large numbers of employees were kept on the payrolls when they were not needed; through an utter lack of a decent system men and women were paid when they did not work; employees were able to leave the factory without being detected and remain absent for hours while recorded as on duty; employees would ring another's time cards; men who were without work enough to keep them busy during the day were employed overtime at increased rates; men were brought to the plant on Sundays when there was virtually nothing to do; and for many months there was such demoralization at this plant that it became the subject of contemptuous gossip among the employees and in the community. One of the inspectors for the Navy testifies that as late as July, he with others, went through the plant at night on a tour of inspection, and not only were they able to go from one end of the plant to another without being asked for their passes, but they found absurd conditions of idleness. In one room, the foreman and three men were sprawled out on the floor, and, as he put it, there were slackers from one end of the plant to another.

Employment of alien enemies

* * * * *

German sympathizers

The serious risk that is taken in permitting men of known pro-German sympathies, whatever their citizenship, to work in aircraft plants in any important capacity is generally recognized. The opportunities are abundant for delays and interferences in production through the action or inaction of those controlling the progress of production. It is the assumed sympathy with his nation which makes the employment of the German subject dangerous, and the danger may be quite as great in the case of one who, although not an enemy alien, is more friendly to Germany than to the United States.

* * * * *

In the case of the Ford Motor Co., one of the company's employees (who formerly had been in the educational department and had represented the American Protective League) testified as to his inquiry into cases of disloyalty. The reports obtained by him exhibit utterances of employees in antagonism to the Government, insulting references to the President, and praise of the Kaiser. In an extreme case, in which the employee reviled and even threatened the President, there was a prosecution and a plea of guilty. The man was fined $300, was released, and the testimony is that he resumed work in the Ford plant. The reports were numerous, and the employee who obtained them testified that there were about 200 employees whose loyalty was seriously open to question, but how many of these were employed in Government work he could not say. So far as the Liberty engine was concerned, his investigation related to half a dozen cases in the drafting department in the Ford Co. In this department there was a serious situation which engaged the attention of the management. Its importance was manifest from the fact that the drafting department embraces the tool design and drafting room in which the drafting work upon the Liberty engine is done, and it is possible for one in that department to bring about delays, the causes of which, in view of the multiplicity of drawings involved, it would be difficult satisfactorily to trace. This department was in charge of Carl Emde.

There were repeated reports of pronounced pro-German utterances by Emde. A former employee, who had left the plant voluntarily and had later been found with plans and photographs of the plant, was a close friend of Emde's and had been employed in his department. This man, it is understood, has been interned. While nothing conclusive could be established against Emde in relation to his work, the advisability of removing him from a position of such strategic importance was clear to some of the most important men in the management. A conference was held on the subject at which Mr. Ford and the factory managers were present. According to the minutes of this conference reports were read "from various members of the drafting department who were in touch with the situation, and who felt that the department was practically a pro-German institution." Several conferees expressed the opinion that Emde should be removed, and one said that in his opinion "in the very nature of things Mr. Emde could not give us everything required to assist the Government of the United States." Mr. Ford, however, was opposed to that course and overruled his associates. Mr. Ford's position and his reasons are thus set forth in the minutes:

"Mr. Ford deliberated and stated that he had heard numerous rumors but in speaking of all he had heard there had not been one thing shown him which would make him change the present head of the drafting department. He felt that it was a time of sacrifice—that in the next few years every man would be called upon to make some sort of sacrifice, and that possibly Mr. Emde, German born, was making his sacrifice now when making drawings for the Liberty motor to be used ultimately against Germany."

This statement of attitude is sufficiently expressive and requires no comment. The proposed removal did not take place. There has been a laxity at the Ford plant with respect to those of German sympathies which is not at all compatible with the interests of the Government. In deference to Mr. Ford's view, those in direct charge of production, who were alive to the situation, have had to pursue a policy of constant watchfulness and supervision instead of being free to take the precautions which the exigency demanded.

Materials

* * * * *

Overhead charges

* * * * *

[6] The Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. has seven distinct plants: At Buffalo, the Churchill Street group (including the Churchill Street plant where training planes are made, and the plants at Niagara Street, Bradley Street, and South Elmwood, making parts for Churchill Street); the Austin Street plant, doing Navy work, including contracts for the British Government; and the North Elmwood Avenue plant. At Hammondsport, N. Y., motors are manufactured exclusively. The work, except at the North Elmwood plant, is on a flat-price basis.

10. SPECIAL MATTERS

(1) Purchase of the plant of the General Vehicle Co.

* * * * *

(2) Mahogany Manufacturers and Importers' Association

* * * * *

African Mahogany

* * * * *

(3) Sabotage Act—grand jury proceedings

There have been occurrences in various plants indicating efforts to injure war material, or to make it defective, or to conceal defects, but on investigation it has generally been very difficult to find sufficient basis for criminal prosecution, either for lack of evidence as to the particular individual who had committed the act, or because on close examination it appeared that the condition of the material could be fairly attributed to carelessness, and evidence of criminal intent was wanting.

Hammondsport Plant of the Curtiss Co.

In the course of this inquiry information was received that frequent attempts had been made to conceal defects in motors and their different parts which were in course of manufacture at the plant of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. at Hammondsport, N. Y. Evidence having been obtained as to specific instances of this practice, there was an investigation in July last before a grand jury in the western district of New York, John W. Ryan, Esq., of Buffalo, being appointed special counsel for the purpose, which resulted in the return of indictments against Lewis Longwell and Hector Bordeau, subforemen in the assembly room of the Hammondsport plant, under section 3 of the Sabotage Act of April 20, 1918. Demurrers to these indictments have been overruled and the cases are awaiting trial.

North Elmwood Plant

In view of the conditions found at the North Elmwood plant of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., there was a special investigation through special agents of the Department of Justice for the purpose of discovering violations of the sabotage act, with the result that evidence was brought before the grand jury in the western district of New York, John W. Ryan, Esq., acting as special counsel, and indictments were obtained in September against Richard Eastman, foreman of the propeller department; Frank Truell, an assistant foreman; and David Rogovan, a workman, under the sabotage act. On October 9, these defendants pleaded guilty and were fined $500 each.

Liberty Iron Works

Testimony given in this inquiry in relation to alleged irregularities at the Liberty Iron Works, at Sacramento, Calif., led to a special investigation in charge of John W. Preston, Esq., special assistant to the Attorney General, before the grand jury at Sacramento in September last. Considerable testimony has been taken, but no indictments have been returned.

4. Cross-license agreement as to rights under airplane patents

In view of claims under alleged patent rights, and with the object of facilitating aircraft production by providing for manufacture on a definite basis, a corporation was formed under the laws of the State of New York known as the Manufacturers' Aircraft Association (Inc.). This corporation entered into an agreement with its subscribers—that is, its stockholders—called the cross-license agreement. The Government is not a party to the agreement, but it was recommended by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, was indorsed by the Aircraft Board, and received the approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

By the cross-license agreement the subscribers grant to each other licenses under all airplane patents now or hereafter owned or controlled by them in the United States, its Territories, and dependencies (except foreign patents and certain specified patents); the corporation is designated as the agent of the subscribers to execute licenses accordingly; each subscriber agrees that it will not enter into any agreement or arrangement whereby its privileges under United States airplane patents or inventions will be diminished or surrendered so as to exclude or restrict the operation of the agreement, and that it will not grant licenses under any such patents for use in airplanes with reference to which it is receiving royalties under the agreement to any other person, firms, or corporation on more favorable or lower terms of royalty than those provided in the agreement, or which may become more favorable or lower during the term of the license. Under the agreement in its original form, in providing for the payments to be made by subscribers, it is stipulated that each subscriber shall pay to the corporation $200 for each airplane sold and delivered by the subscriber until the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corp., and the Curtis Aeroplane & Motor Corp. (these corporations claiming to hold basic patents) had each been paid the sum of $2,000,000. A supplemental agreement has since been made modifying the provision for payments by subscribers and providing that the aggregate payments to both the Wright-Martin Corp., and the Curtiss Co., should be $2,000,000 instead of $4,000,000.

The agreement has been criticized upon the ground that its provisions constitute a hindrance to the progress of invention in the important airplane field and as being in restraint of trade. Whatever ground for criticism exists in this respect is to be found in the terms of the agreement itself, as these are quite definite and determine its operation and effect. I shall not deal with the question of the legality of the agreement, as the question was specifically submitted by the Secretary of War to the Attorney General whether the association and the agreement were in contravention of the antitrust statutes of the United States, and the opinion was expressed by the Attorney General that they were not. That disposed of the question, in the absence of a contrary decision by the courts, so far as the action of the executive departments is concerned.

To the question whether the patents of the Wright-Martin Co. and of the Curtiss Co. are basic patents and whether the payments for which the agreement provides constitutes a proper compensation for the rights conferred, it would require an exhaustive examination of the patent situation to give a satisfactory answer, and this inquiry has furnished no opportunity for such examination. For this reason no opinion is expressed upon the point further than to say that, if the validity of the agreement be assumed, the amount of the payments was a matter of sound administrative discretion and there is no ground for the conclusion that the amount as fixed in the supplemental agreement could not fairly be allowed. It is also asserted that the Government is left liable to other claimants, but this also requires an opinion upon the validity of certain patent claims which could not be dealt with in this inquiry.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The controlling facts and the conclusions in relation to the matters reviewed have been stated under appropriate headings. It would be impossible to restate them in a brief summary. The defective organization of the work of aircraft production and the serious lack of competent direction of that work by the responsible officers of the Signal Corps, to which the delays and waste were chiefly due, were matters for administrative correction through unification of effort under competent control. The provisions of the criminal statutes do not reach inefficiency.

It is not within the province of this report to make recommendations with respect to administrative policy, but it should be said that under the direction of Mr. Ryan and Mr. Potter there has been improvement in organization, and progress has been made in gratifying measure.

2. The evidence discloses conduct which, although of a reprehensible character, cannot be regarded as affording a sufficient basis for charges under existing statutes, but there are certain acts shown, not only highly improper in themselves but of especial significance, which should lead to disciplinary measures. The evidence with respect to Col. Edward A. Deeds should be presented to the Secretary of War to the end that Colonel Deeds may be tried by court-martial under articles 95 and 96 of the Articles of War for his conduct (1) in acting as confidential adviser of his former business associate, H. E. Talbott, of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co., and in conveying information to Mr. Talbott in an improper manner with respect to the transaction of business between that company and the division of the Signal Corps of which Colonel Deeds was the head; and (2) in giving to the representatives of the committee on public information a false and misleading statement with respect to the progress of aircraft production for the purpose of publication with the authority of the Secretary of War.

3. The absence of proper appreciation of the obvious impropriety of transactions by Government officers and agents with firms or corporations in which they are interested, compels the conclusion that public policy demands that the statutory provisions bearing upon this conduct should be strictly enforced. It is therefore recommended that the officers found to have had transactions on behalf of the Government with corporations in the pecuniary profits of which they had an interest should be prosecuted under section 41 of the Criminal Code.

4. The Federal Trade Commission should be requested to report upon the proper cost of mahogany for airplane propellers, to the end that upon the coming in of its report the question of the propriety of further action with respect to the transactions of the Mahogany Manufacturers' and Importers' Association may be determined.

5. It is recommended that the representatives of the Department of Justice should keep in touch with the progress of the reaudit of accounts so that it may be advised of the complete enforcement of the rights of the Government in final settlement of accounts and that the Government has been fully protected against unnecessary loss through waste and the absence of suitable factory supervision.

6. Permit me also to suggest that a special division or subdivision of the present Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice should be assigned to the consideration of suggested delinquencies in connection with aircraft production so that the work already done may be appropriately followed up. In particular, it is recommended that the activities in relation to spruce production, which, being largely centered on the Pacific coast, it was impracticable to embrace in the present inquiry, should be carefully scrutinized.

I have the honor to remain,

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. MORSE. Hearings were resumed last Monday on this nomination, and we have all been supplied with the report of the hearings. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], chairman of the committee, for the efficient service he has rendered the Senate as chairman of the Armed Services Committee in making available to us at a very early hour the

report of the committee so that we might study it, as I have done.

In my judgment there are three main questions involved in the Talbott case. First, there is his insensitivity to the conflict-of-interest problem, which I think is the same as exists in the Wilson and Stevens cases. Here again I incorporate by reference, so that I will not have to repeat those long arguments, my objections to Wilson and Stevens, which likewise apply to Talbott, in connection with the conflict-of-interest problem, and the inescapable affinity of interest which they will have in carrying out their duties in the Defense Department in connection with great concerns which are doing business with the Defense Establishment. I say that it is not good public policy to place officials of corporations in charge of the Defense Establishment when the corporations which they served are going to do a great amount of business with the Defense Establishment. Find other posts for them in the Government, but do not put them in such positions of judgment and decision. Do not put them in a position where they will have to disqualify themselves with respect to specific contracts, for that will not remove the suspicion, because when they disqualify themselves from passing on some particular contracts, all that means is that some colleague and associate in the Defense Establishment will have to pass on such contracts for them.

I should think we would be better students of human behavior than to assume that association does not breed intimacy, that association does not result in the creation of very many intangible psychological factors of which I think we can take judicial notice—factors which are bound to play a part when former officers of great corporations come to pass judgment upon negotiations and proposed contracts to be entered into with such corporations headed by men who in the past were their colleagues. We ought to be on guard against such temptations. That is why the burden of my argument in the other cases, as in this one, has been directed so much to the matter of the indirect interests and influences which motivate human behavior. These men are human.

Mr. Talbott stated at the second hearing:

> In my previous appearance before the Armed Services Committee, I disclosed my holdings in businesses which now have, or reasonably may have, dealings with the Department of Defense. At that time I did not appreciate fully the fact that my holdings in two of the companies involved—namely, Chrysler Corp. and Electric Auto-Lite Co.—would be of moment in the consideration of my availability for the position of Secretary of the Air Force.

I am surprised that he did not. I am surprised at such naïveté. I am surprised that he thought that question would not be raised. He leaves me with the impression, as I read his testimony in cold print, that he thought this nomination would glide through the Armed Services Committee without any question being raised. He was disillusioned. Questions were raised. I think what he does not fully appreciate is that questions will continue to be raised so long as he occupies that post. It is that insensitivity about him that bothers me in connection with this nomination.

The next point I raise is that I believe that holdings in corporations which do business with the Defense Establishment represent a continued indirect interest on his part. In his second hearing he offered to divest himself of holdings in the Talbott Corp. or have it get rid of stock in corporations which do business with the Defense Department.

Talbott is to receive substantial pensions from Standard Packaging, Inc., amounting to $6,000 a year, and from the Talbott Corp. amounting to $3,000 a year. I think those are indirect interests which, in my judgment, disqualify him for this post, and that in the interest of good government and playing it safe we should not confirm the nominations of men with that kind of interest when in positions of decision and judgment they themselves are going to be involved in defense contracts.

The report of the House committee and of the Hughes investigation speak for themselves. All I wish to say in addition, in connection with the Hughes investigation, is that as a young man 30 years old Talbott was connected with the Dayton Metal Products Co. and the Dayton-Wright Co., which was composed of Kettering, Talbott's father, and himself. He always had substantial holdings, but was the smallest holder in each.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] pointed out that as a young man he was shop foreman. However, he had a considerable interest in the company. It may be satisfactory to the Senator from Massachusetts to believe that he knew nothing about the business of the company at the time, but I am not so convinced. Mr. Talbott was connected with the company. He was active in the company, and had holdings in the company. I am not one who thinks that he was ignorant as to what was going on so far as the business of the company was concerned. I judge that he had a very close relationship with his father, and I presume that in that kind of father-son relationship there would be a great mutual interest in the business of the company. I think it is a bit unbelievable to think that even though he was merely the shop foreman, although a member of the firm and having holdings in the firm, he was moving in a vacuum.

These companies did substantial airplane construction for the Army Signal Corps during World War I when the Signal Corps was in charge of all air operations.

President Wilson appointed Charles Evans Hughes to investigate the aircraft program and report upon it. One of the chief subjects of the Hughes inquiry was the operation of Talbott's companies. A business associate of Kettering and the elder Talbott was a man by the name of Deeds who participated in the organization of Dayton-Wright and had been a vice president of Dayton Metal Products Co. The Hughes' report and subsequent House report stated that there was a real question as to whether Deeds had in fact divorced himself from the company's operations, and serious questions were raised also as a result of certain confidential telegrams which were sent by Deeds, here in Washington on the procurement front, to the company.

Even 35 years later, when one reads those telegrams, one need not be told that some chicanery was afoot.

Colonel Deeds was in charge of aircraft production for the Signal Corps. He sent telegrams to the senior Talbott and Kettering which purported to be confidential communications and were related to aircraft procurement and the procurement of land for Signal Corps operations in and around Dayton.

The texts of the telegrams are set forth on pages 5 and 6 of the hearing of February 2.

Talbott in his first committee appearance stated that these communications were unfortunately worded but did not constitute anything improper. In his appearance on Monday he stated he would fire anyone who emulated Deeds' conduct. If there was not anything improper about Deeds' conduct, there would not be any basis for firing one who might emulate him. However, I wish to say that Mr. Talbott was a little better briefed and coached, apparently, by the time he got to the second hearing than he had been before his first appearance before the committee.

Hughes recommended that Deeds be court-martialed but Secretary of War Newton D. Baker conducted a supplementary inquiry which cleared Deeds to Baker's satisfaction and a court martial was not held, despite the fact that the Attorney General concurred in Hughes' recommendation as did the House committee.

Talbott, in his first committee appearance, stated that subsequent civil litigation which was prosecuted exonerated his companies from any alleged wrongdoing. As I brought out in my colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the civil litigation had nothing to do with the Hughes investigation, and therefore there was no exoneration at all in the subsequent litigation. These suits were for the recovery of taxes, and the record is in no way explicit as to the connection between the tax suits and Deeds' activities, and there is nothing in the court decision about it either. In the last hearing, Talbott said he was in error, and that the suits had no connection with the subject of the Hughes investigation. Apparently there was more coaching and better briefing before the second hearing.

Mr. President, it is not possible to gloss over that testimony and say that this experienced business executive, this man of the business world, when he came before the committee in the first instance, was not familiar with the whole Hughes investigation and its nature, not familiar with the controversy, and not familiar with his connections with Chrysler and Auto-Lite. In fact, his attitude, as is apparent from the cold print as I interpret it, impressed me in the same unfavorable way as I was impressed by the attitude of Wilson and Stevens. They thought that they would sail through the committee hearings and would not have to say very much. They thought it would be like the case of witnesses who could

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

not recall but who really wanted to conceal and then when the committee bore in they had to come back a second time. In this instance the nominee had to come back a second time. What the nominee said the second time is quite different from what he said the first time.

I close by saying that I do not think that men who conduct themselves as witnesses in the manner that this man did before the Armed Services Committee, who showed the lack of sensitivity they showed toward their indirect interests, as involved in the problem of confirmation, are men whose nominations to high position in the defense establishment it is safe to confirm. Therefore I shall vote against the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am a new member of the Committee on Armed Services, and I would prefer to have the chairman or a senior member of the committee respond to the senior Senator from Oregon. However, for the moment the chairman of the committee is not on the floor. I speak because as a member of the committee I am unwilling to sit on the floor of the Senate and let the impression stand that the committee did not thoroughly consider all the matters which have been placed before this body by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or that the committee has been insensitive or negligent in connection with the nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that if he can find one word in the transcript of my remarks which justifies such an inference, from anything which the junior Senator from Oregon has stated, I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky produce the word.

Mr. COOPER. I answer by saying that it could be inferred that the Members were insensitive if the facts which have been stated by the junior Senator from Oregon were all the facts. But there are other facts which are not being placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to assure the Senator from Kentucky that he is wrong in making any such interpretation of the motivation of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. COOPER. I am not charging the Senator from Oregon with improper motivation. I am speaking of the inference that can be drawn from his statement.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's language does reflect upon my motivations whether he intends to or not. I shall let the record speak for itself. I consider the committee to be an able committee, and I believe the members of the committee went into the question thoroughly, and I do not believe that they were insensitive to the facts. I think they made a thorough investigation.

I completely disagree with their judgment, but does that mean that I am charging them with insensitivity? Of course not. I am not charging anyone on the committee with insensitivity when I state what I think are the nominee's direct or indirect interests. The Senator from Kentucky does not share my judgment. That is no reflection on him nor on me.

Mr. COOPER. No. I should like to suggest that the Senator from Oregon did not present all the facts heard by the committee to the Senate when he made his statement, and I make that same observation to the Senator from Tennessee. In its hearings the committee has insisted in every instance that the appointee divest himself of any property assets which could bring about a conflict of interests. The committee has gone even further. It has rejected the proposition of disqualification which was suggested by some of the nominees.

With respect to the nomination we are considering, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that it is perfectly proper to look into the business transactions of the company, of which he was president, with the Government during the First World War. It is proper also to ascertain his attitude toward any practices which any Member of the Senate or of the committee think improper. I agree perfectly with that attitude.

What I do disagree with is the presentation of the facts by the junior Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Tennessee, and the emphasis and inferences they draw from the facts. I do not think the full facts have been laid before the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, if I were to read the entire Hughes report and House committee report into the RECORD the Senate would have all the facts before it that are pertinent to the issue I have raised. I have asked to have them printed in the RECORD. Surely the Senator from Kentucky does not wish me to take the time to read the full reports to the Senate. If he wants to have me do so, I shall be very happy to read them.

Mr. COOPER. No; but I shall proceed with my own statement. I think I shall make clear the difference between what I consider to be the proper emphasis and what the Senator from Oregon has considered to be the proper emphasis in regard to this matter.

In the first place, the Hughes report is not, as it might appear, directed against the nominee, Mr. Talbott. It covers the field of aircraft production in World War I. It also was directed against certain improper activities of Colonel Deeds. I am not here to defend anything that Colonel Deeds did. I simply wish to point out to the Senate, and in particular to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that nothing in the report is directed against the nominee, Mr. Harold E. Talbott, personally. In a few moments I shall proceed to refer to him in his official capacity as an officer of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. at that time. But at this point, it is only fair to make clear that the report does not contain any charges against him personally; it does not charge him with any personal wrongdoing, nor does it impute to him any personal impropriety.

Question then arises whether as an officer of the company Mr. Talbott was guilty of any impropriety or any wrongdoing. First, there is nothing in the report to indicate that Mr. Talbott had personal knowledge of any of Colonel Deeds' telegrams, and he said to the committee that he did not know about them, other than perhaps the first one. If the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Tennessee could show that the Dayton-Wright Aircraft Co. in the prosecution of its contracts during World War I was guilty of any wrongdoing or of any improper transactions with the Government, there would then be basis for a charge that, as an officer of that company, Mr. Talbott was chargeable with wrongdoing. I should like to take up that point. The Senator from Oregon is a very fine and a very thorough student. When he has studied the record, I think we usually can say he has been very careful in his study, and that his statements are correct.

However, when the Senator from Oregon states that the case which was tried between the Dayton-Wright Aircraft Co. and the United States did not consider any of the matters contained in the Hughes report, I believe the Senator from Oregon is in error. I shall proceed to expand this point.

The Hughes report suggests, among other things, that unconscionable profits were made, and suggests that there might have been some relationships between Colonel Deeds and the officers of the company which led to improper real-estate transactions. But in the case——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield, to permit me to comment on the profit point?

Mr. COOPER. I should like to finish discussing this point, if the Senator from Oregon will permit me to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. In the case of Dayton Airplane Company against United States, which was decided on October 4, 1927, in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, the question of profits and the question of the purchase of a plant were considered; and in each instance the court held that there was no evidence of any wrongdoing or any improper action on the part of the company. It held that there was no evidence of fraud, as has been suggested.

I am not defending the company; I know nothing about it, and I know nothing about any of these persons; but, in all justice and fairness, these facts should be in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield in regard to that fact?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the fact that Hughes charged the company with unconscionable profits should be in the RECORD, and I think there should also be in the RECORD the fact that nothing on the statute books at the time would have permitted the court to force a reduction of those profits. But the action of the court has nothing to do with the Hughes finding that the profits were unconscionable. What Charles Evans Hughes was telling the Congress and the President of the United States was, in effect,

that "Those profits should have been reduced." Mr. President, certainly they should have been reduced.

On the other hand, the court was quite correct, for on the basis of the law which then existed, the court could not say to the company, "You are not allowed to deduct for tax purposes the deductions you have made," for nothing then on the lawbooks would have prevented the deduction.

On the other hand, Charles Evans Hughes was giving a report on the basis of public policy, and was pointing out that the conduct of that company and of other aircraft companies was such that during World War I they mulcted the American people by making profits which were too high.

Fortunately, we now have on the statute books a law by which we can reach such profits a little easier than it was possible to do during World War I.

I believe the Senator from Kentucky is failing to draw a distinction between the nature of the Hughes report and the nature of the case which finally came to trial.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I believe the difference is very clear, and I think it bears out my point that the emphasis on this matter is misdirected.

The real issue in this matter is whether there is anything in the record which disqualifies Mr. Talbott. I repeat, there is nothing in the Hughes report which charges Mr. Talbott or imputes to him any improper conduct as an individual.

I repeat that in the case of the Dayton Airplane Co. against the United States, Mr. Talbott, being president of the company, the court held that there was no improper or unlawful conduct on the part of the company. In all fairness, I think these facts should be made a part of the record which is before the Senate.

So I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of Dayton Airplane Co. against the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Oregon asked that the other matter be made a part of the body of the RECORD. In view of that fact, it seems to me that, rather than to have the decision referred to by the Senator from Kentucky printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, it should be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. Then, Mr. President, I modify my request, by asking that the decision of the court be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been out of the room for a few minutes. When the Senator from Oregon placed in the RECORD the Hughes report, was the letter of the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, included?

Mr. MORSE. I think it was included; but if it was not included, I shall see that it is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make sure of that, because I think it only fair to have the letter included.

Mr. MORSE. I give assurance that the letter will be included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Is there objection to including at this point in the RECORD, as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, the court decision to which reference has been made?

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAYTON AIRPLANE CO. v. UNITED STATES (CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, SIXTH CIRCUIT, OCTOBER 4, 1927—Nos. 4657, 4658)

1. Estoppel ⇐ 62 (2)—Rules of estoppel and fair dealing held applicable to Government's wartime contract.

Rules of estoppel and fair dealing applying between individuals held applicable to contract between wartime contractor and Government, acting through Secretary of War and his subordinates exercising an unlimited discretion.

2. United States ⇐ 73—Provision of Government's wartime cost-plus contract for airplanes, requiring preservation of records for 6 years, held not to show decision of accounting officer was not final.

That Government's wartime cost-plus contract for airplanes required manufacturer to preserve accounts and records, subject to examination by Government, for 6 years, held not to show that decision of accounting officer in settlement of such contract was not intended to be final.

3. United States ⇐ 75—Contract in settlement of Government's wartime contracts held final, unless impeached for fraud or mistake.

Government's contract with airplane manufacturer in final settlement of several prior cost-plus contracts, after full performance, held final, unless impeached for fraud or mistake.

4. United States ⇐ 75—Allowance to wartime airplane manufacturer under cost-plus contracts for depreciation of land and buildings, held not result of fraud or mistake vitiating settlement contract.

Allowance made to wartime manufacturer of airplanes for Government under cost-plus contracts, on account of depreciation of outfit of land and buildings obtained for performance of contracts, held not result of fraud or mistake, vitiating contract made by Government and manufacturer in settlement of all claims arising under prior contracts.

5. United States ⇐ 66—Provision of Government's wartime cost-plus contract respecting depreciation charges held not so manifestly unfair as to indicate inadvertence or overreaching.

Provision in Government's wartime cost-plus contract for construction of airplanes, specifically authorizing manufacturer to charge as part of costs, depreciation of plant arising from inability to sell it after passage of war conditions, held not so manifestly unfair to Government as to warrant the conclusion that it had been inserted inadvertently or through overreaching of manufacturer.

6. Evidence ⇐ 48—Courts judicially know that Director of Aircraft Production must act through authorized representatives.

Courts may take judicial notice that the Director of Aircraft Production, like Secretary of War himself, must act through his authorized representatives, and that, especially in wartime, a contract must contemplate such representation.

7. United States ⇐ 75—Government's contract in final settlement with wartime airplane manufacturer held valid compromise and settlement, unavoidable by Government on theory that certain claims relinquished by manufacturer lacked merit.

Government's contract with wartime airplane manufacturer, in settlement of prior contracts made after each party had allowed and disallowed certain claims of the other, held an accord and satisfaction or compromise and settlement, which could not be avoided by Government on ground of an obvious lack of merit in relinquished claims of contractor.

8. United States ⇐ 75—Particular items held properly allowed as costs and bonus under Government's war time cost-plus contract for airplanes.

Wartime manufacturer of airplanes under cost-plus contract held properly allowed to charge, as part of costs, money paid for services of public accountants, for railroad transportation of employees, and properly allowed to recover a so-called bonus for savings in cost production over estimated or "bogey" price.

9. United States ⇐ 66—Provision of Government's cost-plus contract for airplanes, allowing manufacturer percentage of savings over estimated cost of production, held not against public policy.

Provision in Government's wartime cost-plus contract for airplanes, allowing manufacturer a bonus consisting of 25 percent of money saved through production at less than estimated cost, held not against public policy.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Western Division of the Southern District of Ohio; Smith Hickenlooper, judge.

Action by the United States against the Dayton Airplane Co. Judgment for plaintiff for part only of recovery sought, and defendant appeals, and plaintiff cross-appeals. Remanded, with directions to dismiss.

Alexander Holtzoff, of New York City, and Haventh E. Mau, United States attorney, of Cincinnati, Ohio (Herman J. Galloway, Assistant Attorney General, and John A. McCann, Special Assistant Attorney General, on the brief), for the United States.

Judson Harmon, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and F. W. M. Cutcheon, of New York City (John B. Marsh, of New York City, Murray Smith, of Dayton, Ohio, George Hoadley, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rollin Browne, of New York City, on the brief), for Dayton Airplane Co.

Before Denison, Moorman, and Knappen, circuit judges.

Denison, circuit judge: In 1917 and 1918 the United States, hereinafter called the plaintiff, and the Dayton Airplane Co., hereinafter called the defendant, entered into a series of cost-plus contracts for the building of airplanes for various war purposes. The last contract superseded the others in most particulars, and contained detailed and elaborate provisions for the conduct of affairs under it and for the steps to be taken in the final settlement thereof. Performance of it, as later modified, was finished in March 1919. Thereupon an adjustment of most of the matters involved was negotiated and agreed upon, whereby defendant was paid in full for all its allowed claims, and the matter apparently closed, except that a few relatively small items were not covered, and for them defendant continued to prosecute its claims before the proper departmental board.[1] Later, the successor board concluded that large overpayments had been made by the plaintiff to defendant; and for the amounts so found, plaintiff brought this

[1] We find no tenable basis for the theory of the successor board that the contract had not been performed or terminated but only suspended, so that power remained in that board to readjust and redetermine everything.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

suit. The claims for which it declared aggregated about $2,500,000 made up of nine items. The case having been transferred to the equity docket, and coming on for trial accordingly, plaintiff abandoned two of the items; upon four defendant prevailed; and upon two and a part of another plaintiff had judgment for about $525,000. From this the defendant appeals. Plaintiff appeals from the disallowance of interest and from the failure to award recovery upon three of the items claimed. Details can be better stated in connection with the items.

(1) It is first to be observed that this contract and the actions under it were not made or taken by officers who must find in a statute clear authority for their every act. In such contracts with such an officer the public is dealing with an agent of known and limited powers. Once beyond these powers, principles of estoppel or fair dealing have no application against his principal. Here the scope of the contract was not limited by any statute. The Government was acting by the Secretary of War, in a national emergency of the first class. His discretion was unlimited; it must be exercised through subordinates; in the absence of fraud or bad faith, the exercise of such delegated authority is the Secretary's exercise of it. Rules of estoppel and fair dealing apply in full as with individuals. In this class of contracts, and for effect on future emergencies, if for no other reason, a sound public policy must require that the Government keep its contracts and stand by its settlements as an individual must. In that atmosphere the questions of this case are to be approached. *Clark* v. *U. S.* (95 U. S. 539, 544, 24 L. Ed. 518); *Daniels* v. *Tearney* (102 U. S. 415, 422, 26 L. Ed. 187); *St. Louis Hay & Grain Co.* v. *U. S.* (191 U. S. 159, 24 S. Ct. 47, 48 L. Ed. 130); *U. S.* v. *Atlantic Co.* (223 U. S. 1, 40 S. Ct. 423, 64 L. Ed. 735); *McArthur* v. *U. S.* (258 U. S. 11, 12, 42 S. Ct. 225, 66 L. Ed. 433); *Freund* v. *U. S.* (260 U. S. 60, 61, 43 S. Ct. 70, 67 L. Ed. 131); *Reading Co.* v. *U. S.* (268 U. S. 186, 188, 45 S. Ct. 469, 69 L. Ed. 907).

The record is rather barren as to the division of departmental authority. We think we may rightly infer that next to the Secretary of War, after the reorganization of the Air Service as a separate branch of the Army, largely superseding the Signal Service, was a major general, in charge of that entire service; that the Air Service was divided into divisions and/or bureaus; that the Bureau of Aircraft Production had charge of making contracts and the Division of Finance directed the making of payments thereon, and necessarily the determination of the proper amount, except as there was later set up the Claims Board of the Air Service, which was the appellate and the final departmental arbiter as to the amounts due to all contractors in this service. The record shows that Lieutenant Guthrie was assigned to the defendant's plant, in the early part of the time, as assistant accounting officer, then as accounting officer, and later taking the title of finance officer. He was in frequent consultation with his immediate superior, who was Captain Ong, and who was district finance officer ASAP (Air-Service Aircraft Production). If question arose as to which of these officers did not wish to make a decision, they consulted the Chief of the Finance Division, ASAP, at Washington, Lieutenant Colonel Downey. With these aids a tentative decision was reached, whereupon the accounting officer either issued a voucher entitling defendant to payment, or held the matter in suspense.

No contention is made that any officer who, or board which, purported to exercise the authority of the War Department in taking the various actions shown by the record, did not have and exercise the full authority of the War Department in that respect, save as such action was subject to current revision by the departmental superiors.

During the contract performance, plaintiff had paid to defendant some $30,000,000 on account of the amounts being earned. After performance, these payments were reviewed, further claims were considered, and a complete account was stated by the proper accounting officers of the Air Service in the War Department. These results were embodied in contract exhibit 1816–C, signed by the parties. It contained an express release from the defendant to plaintiff, covering all liabilities in the subject-matter. It did not contain, in terms, any release of any claims by plaintiff against defendant; but there was no suggestion of the existence of any such claim. The accounts had shown large sums due from plaintiff to defendant; the net result had been reached by the rejecting of some claims which defendant was making against plaintiff and by overruling some objections which plaintiff was making against defendant's claims. It was a complete accord; and it was promptly satisfied by the payment by plaintiff to defendant of the full amount so found due. The procedure, more fully stated, had been that, from time to time, plaintiff paid the greater part of the bills rendered under the contract; that from time to time plaintiff's representative raised questions about certain items, which thereupon were laid over for further consideration; that, after the completion of the contract, all these accumulated matters and claims back and forth, as well as defendant's claims presented as for final settlement, were discussed by defendant's officers with plaintiff's officer at Washington, in direct charge of such settlements; that he decided all matters in controversy; that his decision was formulated into contract 1816–C; that a further reviewing authority had been reserved to the Claims Board in the Air Service, and so contract 1816–C was expressly made subject to the approval of that board; that it was so approved by that Board; and it was then completely performed by payment. It is quite apparent that this ended the matter, unless the plaintiff could show sufficient reasons for setting aside this settlement; and such reasons must be found in mistake or in bad faith, fraud, or overreaching on the part of defendant's officers. Neither the original nor the amended complaint charged any bad faith, fraud, or overreaching, except in one matter of appraisal, nor charged any mutual mistake, unless such charge could be found in the theory that some of the items allowed and paid to the defendant were wholly unauthorized by the contract.

Not only does the evidence demonstrate a definite and final settlement in the nature of an accord and satisfaction, but there are express contract provisions as to the finality of decisions so reached. The contract provided for the constant representation of the plaintiff at the plant by an "accounting officer," who continuously computed and ascertained the state of accounts. Article VIII, section 11, provides that a final adjustment [of the accounts due or payable hereunder] shall be made upon the termination of the contract, and that any and all amounts then due by either of the parties hereto to the other shall be immediately paid. Article IX provides: "The decision of the accounting officer on questions of the determination and allowance of payments shall prevail, except that either upon the completion of the contract by the contractor or its termination by the Government, or whenever claims amounting in the aggregate to $5,000 shall have been disallowed by the said accounting officer, the contractor may appeal to a board consisting of three persons appointed by the Director of Aircraft Production, whose decision shall be final and binding upon both parties." Every matter which has been in controversy in this litigation is a "question of the determination and allowance of payments." We see no distinction between the words "shall prevail" and "shall be final and conclusive," particularly when the latter words are used to describe the effect of an appeal from the decision characterized by the former words. It is not to be supposed that the decision of this accounting officer should prevail against one party and not against the other, or that a conclusion, an appeal from which is to be final or conclusive, has any less than final force itself if there is no appeal.

It is further to be noted that every question now in dispute (save appraisal, otherwise controlled) was of a character fit to be finally decided by the accounting officer on the ground at the time, or his superior officers, whose decisions would become his. The true meaning of "actual cost of production," "indirect labor," "other items of overhead," "all expenditures in connection with this contract," "other manufacturing expenses necessary," etc., as used in such a contract, can be decided by a court in later litigation, but they can better be decided by the participating engineer or accountant. In this spirit, the contract provides (article XXII) that the Director of Aircraft Production shall be the final arbiter of "any and all disputes arising hereunder." The accounting officer, the division finance officer, the Chief of Finance Division, and the Claims Board were all agencies of the Director, and their decisions, unappealed from, were his.

(2) It is urged that a decision of the accounting officer was not intended to have this final character, because the contract requires the defendant to preserve for 6 years all its accounts and records subject to examination by the plaintiff; and it is said that this provision is inconsistent with the claimed finality. We do not so regard it. Arbitration, no matter how final and binding, may always be revised and set aside upon proof of mistake or fraud; and the contingency that the award or decision might later be challenged on one of these grounds fully justifies and satisfies the provision for keeping the records.

(3) We conclude, upon the ground of the contract finality of the decisions of the Aircraft Service officers, as well as upon the ground of agreed compromise and settlement, the contract evidenced by 1816–C is not to be impeached unless for mistake or fraud. *U. S.* v. *Mason* (260 U. S. 323, 43 S. Ct. 128, 67 L. Ed. 286); *U. S.* v. *Fuller* ((8 C. C. A.) 14 F. (2d) 813, 827); *U. S.* v. *Bentley* ((6 C. C. A.) 16 F. (2d) 895, 897); *Ohio Sav. Bank & Trust Co.* v. *Willys Corp.* ((3 C. C. A. Dec. (1926), 16 F. (2d) 859).

(4) The chief item in controversy relates to the valuation of the plant. The contract recited that defendant had provided itself with a large and expensive outfit of land and buildings for the performance of these contracts. It was agreed that the complete cost to the defendant of these lands and improvements should stand to defendant's credit in the final settlement, and that the manufacturing accounts should be charged from time to time with the actual depreciation of the property accruing while in use. This actual or accrued depreciation was to constitute, and was in effect treated as, a part of the expense of operation from month to month in determining the cost of production. The contract further provided that, in the final settlement and before having this property turned back to defendant for its further private use, the defendant should be credited with any special depreciation resulting from the difference between original cost and the then market value, due to the lack of any ready sale or any normal market for property which had been constructed or acquired for war purposes, but the need of which, in industries after the war, might be nonexistent. A provision of this kind was obviously appropriate and fair. This particular provision is said to be according to the standard form of similar cost-plus contracts, which form was prepared under the direction of the War Department by a

joint commission of Army officers and businessmen. It is quoted in the margin.[2]

It specified that the market value, as thus affected, should be fixed by a board of appraisers like arbitrators. This was done; and this board fixed all values, and found and stated that this special depreciation was (upon the plan acquired from the Domestic Building Co.) about $514,000. In determining the amount to be paid and which was paid by the plaintiff, effect was given to this figure. The trial court found that this special depreciation was erroneously allowed. The sole pleading complaint on this score was that this appraisal was the result of mistake, or fraud, and should be vacated. The trial court did not, however, find any fraud or mistake upon the part of the board in fixing this amount; nor can we. The appraisers, including the umpire, are criticized because their action was hasty. We cannot adopt this criticism. The umpire was able and impartial. He had been constantly familiar with this great plant, and with the commercial situation which depreciated its market value. After only brief specific attention, he was just as competent to fix this depreciation, relying upon his judgment of the familiar situation, as he would have been after much delay and hearing many witnesses. It is as obvious from this record as it was to everyone at the time that, whether the fair valuation of this property for turning back to defendant under the contract should approximate the reproduction value less accrued depreciation, or should be a much smaller sum, dependent on the property's availability for any manufacturing purpose which could utilize so vast a plant, was a question expressly decided by the contract.

On behalf of the plaintiff it is urged that the appraisal is such a gross undervaluation as to furnish inherent evidence of a mistake or of a reckless indifference equivalent to fraud. The only support which plaintiff claims for this conclusion is found in the subsequent history of the property. All the evidence on the subject is undisputed; and we find nothing dictating that inference. A few weeks after the appraisal and in connection with the final settlement and a temporary leasing of the plant thereafter to the plaintiff, defendant offered to sell the plant, including some items added, to the plaintiff for precisely this appraised value at which it and they had been charged against defendant in the settlement, after deducting this depreciation, and which may be roundly stated as $645,000. That the United States held for many months an option to buy this property at this appraised price, finally letting it lapse, does not confirm the theory that this appraised value was fixed at an unreasonably low figure, in order to take advantage of the United States. A few months later defendant sold the property to the General Motors Corp., still subject to this option or right of purchase by the plaintiff at this appraised price. The fact clearly is, in our judgment, that the sale price from the defendant to the General Motors Corp. was this same appraisal value, plus additions, viz $645,000. Confusion about this comes, we think, from observing only the final entries upon the ledger of the General Motors Corp., and from not giving proper force to the original data and memoranda upon which these entries were based. The general negotiations for sale and the final sale cover not only this particular plant but other property belonging to defendant and other properties belonging to an allied corporation and also a contract for the personal service of Mr. Kettering, who was a stockholder of defendant and the other allied corporation. The entire consideration paid by the General Motors Corp. for everything was about $8,000,000, paid in its capital stock at par ($100, the stock then having a stated value of $88 per share). No doubt the tying-up contract with Mr. Kettering was one of the great objects of the purchaser in this transaction, which was undertaken and carried through as an entity, so that it was not very important to the purchaser what valuation was entered on its books for the tangible property; but everything was separately and distinctly valued in the various memoranda and the instructions given to the bookkeepers. In the preliminary contract this plant was given a valuation of $500,000, but this was expressly said to be an estimate. When the final distribution was made upon the memorandum of instructions it was given precisely the foregoing appraised value, as modified by additions and changes after the appraisal. Some of the property covered by the general purchase was bought directly and some was acquired through purchase of the stocks of formerly owning corporations. The net result was that about five and a half million dollars were charged either to "investments" or "investments in allied corporations," and about two and a half million dollars were charged to "good will." This particular tangible property, at the same appraised value, formed one of the items making up the total charge to "investments." These facts all support rather than contradict the inference that the sale price of this particular plant should be taken as $645,000, approximately, and not as some indefinitely greater sum.

In this connection plaintiff further shows that about a year later the General Motors Corp., in connection with the separation of properties which it was then making among subsidiaries, entered this particular plant on its books at the valuation of nearly $2,000,000. However relevant such a valuation might be, the evidence was, when offered, plainly incompetent, because it was merely the unsworn statement of a stranger to the suit, being a corporation not connected with defendant save in the indirect way that the former stockholders of defendant had become holders of a relatively trifling fraction of the stock of the General Motors Corp. Later, the defendant, perhaps feeling compelled by the presence of this testimony in the record, introduced as witnesses the officers of the General Motors Corp. who had charge of this revaluation. Their explanation of what it was and of the reasons for it is not improbable, is not disputed, and should be accepted. They say that the General Motors Corp., having acquired several enterprises with large good will items, like this one, found its good will account on its books at an unsatisfactorily high figure. It therefore determined upon the general policy of reappraising its physical properties at reproduction value, less depreciation; and it had such an appraisal made of its various properties, including this one; the appraisal being made by professional appraisers of good standing. The result was that the book valuations of many properties, including this one, were largely increased and the good will account on its books was correspondingly decreased, leaving its capital stock account unchanged. It is familiar knowledge that in 1920 or 1921, the reproduction value of such a plant would have been much greater than its cost in 1916 and that such reproduction value would not of itself control its market value, but that the market value of such a plant in 1919 or 1920 would be highly speculative, depending upon finding a purchaser with need therefor. Upon the whole we do not think that the sale to the General Motors Corp. nor the revaluation by that corporation substantially tends to impeach the fairness of the appraisal by the appraisal board.

(5) Although the district court reached the conclusion, as we also do, that the appraisal could not be set aside upon any ground alleged or proved, that court was seemingly convinced, as we cannot be from the record, that the fair market value was greater than the appraisal by the amount at least of this special depreciation. So the court came to consider the making of the contract which had expressly provided that this special depreciation allowance, on account of the unsalability of the plant, should be taken into account on final settlement; and it concluded that this provision of the contract should be set aside or disregarded because so manifestly unfair to the plaintiff that it must have been included by the inadvertence of plaintiff's officers or through overreaching by defendant. We pass by, without consideration, the lack of pleading allegation which would justify this treatment of the contract; and we do so because the court below could, and perhaps would, upon proper terms, have permitted the pleadings to be amended so far as necessary. We pass by, also without consideration, the difficulties inherent in setting aside one element or provision only of a contract covering many closely interrelated subjects; and we take up the meritorious question considered by the trial court in this connection. Its view was that this special depreciation was dependent mainly on the fact that this plant, intended to employ 5,000 or more workmen, was situated several miles from Dayton, the nearest place where workmen could live, and that this fact made it so unsuitable for any business to which it would otherwise be adapted as to cause this lessened valuation. The appraisal shows that this element, location, was given effect by the board, but shows, too, that the finding of special depreciation was dependent also upon another element. The great size of the plant made it, in 1919, relatively unsalable, regardless of location. It is familiar knowledge that at that time such plants usually could not be sold, except at sacrifice prices. So we cannot fully accept this view by the court below; but, resting on this premise, it found further that this loss had been already suffered by defendant or its predecessor in title before the contract with plaintiff had been made, and hence that there was no justification for permitting defendant to recoup the loss, in the final settlement of this contract. This conclusion was supported first by the

[2] "Depreciation: Depreciation shall be determined as follows: The cost to the contractor of its plant, including real estate, buildings, machinery, and appliances, built or otherwise acquired for the performance of this contract at the date of their acquisition, shall be determined. It is represented by the contractor that such cost so defined is, in respect to real estate, buildings, and power plant comprised within that portion of their plant acquired from the Domestic Building Co., the actual cost of the purchase hereof by the contractor from Domestic Building Co.; and further that such cost to the contractor is the amount of the actual cost (as defined) to the said Domestic Building Co. and the contractor hereby undertakes that the records of such cost shall be made accessible to the accounting officer forthwith for confirmation or adjustment and determination, the accounting officer to proceed immediately to examine the same and to advise the contractor thereof with due diligence. The fair market value of the same property as at the date of the completion or cancellation of this contract shall be determined by a board of three appraisers, one selected by the Government, one selected by the contractor, and a third selected by these two. The need or requirement for a factory building or completed plant of the size and character of the contractor's plant in the neighborhood where located and the probability of the contractor securing a tenant promptly or having an established business available to occupy the premises at a fair rental, shall be considered as one of the important factors to be taken into account in arriving at a fair market value of the plant at the termination of the contract; the weight to be given thereto being left to the sound discretion of the appraisers. If the said cost price of the same property shall exceed the said fair market value thereof, the Government shall pay to the contractor this difference less the depreciation already paid on the same property."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

view that, although the sum fixed upon had been the actual cost to the defendant upon its recent purchase of the property from another company, yet, on account of the identity of the two companies, the sale price was not controlling, and that, in any event, the contract was too late in date to reach back to that sale for a measure. To consider the force of the first view requires a further statement of facts. Three men, Messrs. Deeds, Kettering, and Talbot were, or had been, largely interested in some or all of various Dayton corporations. Among these were the Dayton Engineering Laboratories Co. ("Delco"), the Dayton Metal Products Co., the Domestic Building Co., the Delco Light Co., and the recently organized defendant, the Dayton Airplane Co. Prior to the first Government contract with defendant, the Talbots and Kettering had become nearly sole stockholders (two-thirds and one-third) in the Metal Products Co. and in defendant, and Kettering owned only a minority interest in the Domestic Building Co. The Talbots were not then interested in Delco or Delco Light or Domestic Building. Kettering was the only common stockholder in the two corporations, vendor and vendee, and he did not control either. Clearly the sale was not by one company to itself under another name, and the sale price cannot be, for that reason, disregarded. However, the existing personal and the former business relations between these various stockholders were so intimate that perhaps a court of equity should not be particularly impressed by the sale price which they had fixed. In our view, it is not this sale price which is important, but rather the actual cost to the vendor just recently incurred. Coming again to the facts:

The defendant had quarters in and near Dayton which had been sufficient for its relatively small needs. The Delco Light Co., also operating in Dayton, had been greatly expanding and was looked upon as needing a very large plant. Accordngly, the parties interested, through the medium of the Domestic Building Co., had planned for and substantially finished a plant intended for the Delco Light Co. at this point, several miles from Dayton, where there were good transportation facilities but no dwellings. Recognizing the handicap of having to bring labor daily from such a distance, it had been a part of the plan to build near the plant the necessary large number of dwellings, and, in anticipation, this had been named Moraine City. At the time involved, only a few houses had been built, but the plan was progressing. It was obviously the judgment of the capable businessmen who were the promoters that, in connection with this plan for house building, the location was suitable for and would be acceptable to the Delco Light Co. for carrying on its anticipated business. It is equally plain that if such a plant were erected at such a place, but without providing dwellings for the labor and without knowledge of what use could be made of such factory, its unsuitability for sale upon the general market would immediately greatly depreciate its production cost; but, in connection with the existing plans, there is no reason to doubt that it was fairly worth its full cost. The enterprise was at this stage, when, about the time the United States entered the war, the demand became urgent for immediate aircraft production upon an immense scale and with great speed. The defendant was as well fitted as any concern in the country, if not better, to be used as a basis for the development of facilities to supply this demand; but, to undertake to do so, it must have a great increase in manufacturing facilities with the utmost speed. It was at once apparent that this proposed and still incomplete Delco Light plant was the most suitable property available, and the associated parties controlling these corporations, Domestic Building Co. and Delco Light Co., offered for that purpose to turn this plant over to the defendant and to let the Delco Light Co. meet its needs in some other way.

Under these circumstances something might have been said to justify the demand of a substantial bonus to the Delco Light Co. for abandoning its new plant to the defendant, and practically to the needs of the United States; but it was arranged that the plant should be sold to the defendant at its exact cost to the erector, the Domestic Building Co., whereby this same figure became the cost of the plant to the defendant. In these transactions we find no basis for adverse criticism, nor can we see that the defendant was planning to recoup from the United States a loss which had already been suffered by the improvidence of the promoters; on the contrary, the arrangement seems completely fair and just to the United States.

The only way we can see in which it might be urged that the builders had already suffered a loss by erecting a great factory for which, under future conditions, they might not find a purchaser, is to say that the suddenly developed war conditions had already upset the plans of the Delco Light Co. for its future business, and so the erection of this plant had become a mistake. Not only do we find no basis in the record for this conclusion but, if true, it would hardly be a controlling equity as against the fairness of the contract in question.

We do not overlook the respective dates involved. In May 1917, a group including Mr. Howard Coffin, the chairman of the Aircraft Board, and Colonel Foulois, the assistant to the head of the Army Air Service (then Signal Corps), came to Dayton and invited proposals from defendant for a relatively small number of training planes. In June, they came again and discussed the possibility of a large contract for battle planes. They then made the suggestion, or at least approved it, that the new Delco Light plant was ideally adapted for large-scale airplane building and ought to be made available to defendant for that purpose. Accordingly the transfer of title was arranged, and the sale made in the summer of 1917. It is to be assumed that the preparation of the property for its new use went forward with all possible speed, though the first contract, 1495, for 400 training planes, was not actually executed until August 1, 1917. Contract 1816, superseding 1495 as to training planes, and covering also 3,500 battle planes, was dated September 7, 1917. Contract 1816–1, on January 17, 1918, modified 1816 in various items. On April 1, 1918, contract 1816–A, superseded and modified the former ones; and contract 1816–B, which is the direct subject of the litigation and superseded all the others as to all the work (no planes except the 400 having then been delivered), was signed on October 15, 1918. It is now said that the special depreciation clause of contract 1816–B cannot be applied to this situation, because the property had been bought by defendant before the contract was made and hence could not have been acquired for the performance of this contract. That is too narrow a construction. This contract was in continuation of and substitution for the one of September 7, 1917 (1816), containing this identical language; and there is no reason to doubt that this property was acquired expressly for the performance of the contemplated contract or contracts, of which 1816 very soon became the agreed embodiment.

Nor do we overlook the contention that the adoption of the original building cost as the base of the special depreciation computation was the gradual development of a cunning scheme and was probably slipped over on the plaintiff's officers without their clear comprehension. This provision was, of course, not found in the contract of August 1 (1495), because that provided for the manufacture and sale of planes at a flat price. No question of plant cost or of depreciation was possibly involved. In the first cost-plus contract (1816) the provision appears in language substantially identical with this. It is stated in such clear detail that it could not have been misunderstood by the captain who signed as contracting officer, the general who signed as Chief of the Signal Corps, and the able lawyer who had advised them in the matter and who signed as a witness (Mr. Harris). The only distinction between the provision as found in 1816, and as found again in 1816–B, is that the former contained a clause that this cost base should not exceed a fair cost, and this clause is omitted from the latter. The argument is that fair cost meant market value at the time, and hence that, if there had been a depreciation already suffered at the date of 1816, the cost base must be correspondingly reduced. We cannot give any such interpretation to fair cost. One who means present market value does not say "cost." If fair cost had in this situation any meaning distinctive from that of actual cost, it was prudent investment cost; and there is no suggestion in the record that the actual cost was not the fair and prudent cost. Any explanation needed for the omission of this clause in the second contract may be found in the fact that, at its date, the plant accounting officer had made the contemplated inquiry and had fixed the cost base in accord with contract 1816, and had been using it for many months as the basis of computing current monthly actual depreciation. The repetition in the latter contract of the provisions for inquiry into actual cost was seemingly unnecessary, but might have been advisable as a safeguard against errors which might later be found.

From the views so far expressed, it results that the decree below must be reversed so far as it awards to plaintiff the item of special depreciation.

The decree below also awarded to plaintiff the refund of about $30,000, which has been paid to defendant for the cost of maintenance of a recreation and amusement park, used during the contract period by the employees and their families. The contract provided that the operating cost should include "expenses of operation and maintenance of plant hospitals; also medicines and supplies for first aid to the injured, expenditures for hospitals and other organizations to cover a definite benefit to employees"; also "expenses in connection with employees' welfare, such as group insurance, conducting club rooms, reading rooms, and educational classes." During the performance of the contract practically all of defendant's employees lived in the city of Dayton; and in that city defendant, in association with other companies engaged in war work, maintained an amusement park. This was used only by employees engaged in war work. If the park had been maintained at the plant and by defendant alone, there would hardly be a contention that it was not welfare work in a broad sense, because contributing to the efficiency of the employees, and so a proper item of operating expense. The clause, "such as group insurance, conducting club rooms, etc.," is claimed to be a limitation, but it, at the most, gives rise to ambiguity. We do not see that the sharing of the park with other similar employees, working indirectly for the United States, or its location away from the plant and where alone it was accessible to the employees' families, makes any difference. In this situation, the expenses of maintenance were at first regularly credited up and paid to defendant. Later those items were suspended, and finally the whole accumulated item was submitted, as above explained, by the defendant and the plant accounting officer to Colonel Downey, Chief of the Finance Division, A. S., and it was allowed by him. This was a practical construction by both parties to the contract of an ambiguity in it. It was deliberately adopted, after the question was raised and while it was fresh, by those who had lived in the atmosphere of the contract and knew

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

its spirit. The adoption of this meaning was an element of the general settlement then reached. That meaning should not be afterwards repudiated by the party who declared it, even if the contrary view might years later seem the stronger one.

The remaining item of refund allowed to plaintiff in the court below was the sum of about $17,000, being the cost of taking certain motion pictures. The contract provided that the defendant should refrain from publishing any figures or other data disclosing the process of manufacture. It also provided that all pictures relating in any way to the progress of the work which the defendant might desire to publish it should submit before publishing the same to the Director of Aircraft Production, who might permit such publication and should have the right to censor the same. During the progress of the work, there was great difficulty in obtaining labor. Defendant thought that, by taking moving pictures of the production work and its results, and by exhibiting these pictures in the nearby territory, interest and enthusiasm could be created and much additional labor be recruited. The plan was submitted to the Assistant Director of Aircraft Production, who answered the contract definition of that contracting officer who was to represent the plaintiff during execution. He fully approved; and thereupon defendant caused the pictures to be taken, and paid therefor the item in question. The question as to their exhibition then arose. The film was then deposited in Washington with Colonel Churchill of the Military Intelligence Division. Later Colonel Churchill advised defendant of the decision of the Secretary of War, that the film might be retained by defendant for private exhibition among its employees only, or that it could be turned over to the Committee on Public Information for such public use as the committee might think wise, in which case the defendant would be reimbursed for its cost expenditures. The chairman of this committee, the Creel committee, asked that the film be turned over to it, and this was done. What use was made of the film by this committee does not appear.

(6) Save for the express prohibition in the contract against publication of pictures, there was then little or no doubt that the cost of this film might rightly have been considered as indirect labor (paragraph 4, Schedule A), or overhead; but the publication which is prohibited cannot be intended to be merely that private showing to a few persons which would be inherent in the making of the pictures, before they could be submitted to the Director for his approval and censorship; the prohibition of publication must refer to the giving of some general publicity. The permission and approval given by the assistant director cannot be overlooked. The contractor producing wartime necessities for the Government, and who comes for instructions to the officer apparently in charge of the subject-matter, can hardly demand from that officer a written letter of authority from his immediate or remote superior before the conference is undertaken. We may take judicial notice, that the Director of Aircraft Production, like the Secretary of War himself, must act through his authorized representatives, and that, especially in war time, a contract must contemplate such representation.

The case is not one where it appears that the assistant did not have the delegation of authority which the contractor might rightfully have supposed; that would present another question. From this record there is no reason to doubt that the assistant director did have the authority which he seemed to have.

These considerations alone would support the allowance of the claim made by the Director of the Finance Division, as a contemporaneous construction of permissible expenses, regardless of whether or not permission to publish was subsequently had. The allowance may also be well supported upon the express promise of the Secretary of War, made through Colonel Churchill, that if this film was turned over to the Creel committee for its use, the cost would be repaid to the defendant. True, upon that theory, an independent action might be maintained by defendant in the Court of Claims; but that ought not to be the exclusive remedy, where the subject was merely one item in the execution of the contract, was actually taken into account by the plaintiff in its settlement of accounts under that contract, and was paid in full. That circuity of action should not be necessary.

(7) The three items thus far considered upon their merits are also very well controlled by the theory of accord and satisfaction or compromise and settlement, already discussed. It is true that, at the time when various items then in dispute were submitted to the Chief of the Finance Division and by him disposed of in a way that was acquiesced in by all, no controversy had been raised as to the item of special depreciation. The appraisal had been made, and the voucher for the item had been prepared. No one questioned its propriety. At the same time, it underlay all the suspense items which were submitted to Colonel Downey. It was expressly mentioned and approved in contract 1816-C, which evidenced the final adjustment. The effect of this lack of contest would be different if there were any way to restore defendant to the position it would have had if this item had been contested and denied. It is at least probable that defendant would then have exercised its right of appeal, both as to this and the other items which were denied. The allowance without contest of the special depreciation was a part of the consideration leading to defendant's acquiescence in the denial of the other items; but, however much the effect of the settlement contract may be thus minimized as to the special depreciation item, this disparagement does not extend to the amusement park and motion picture items. They were contested, and their allowance was deliberately considered.

It is also argued that the items disallowed by the Chief of the Finance Division were claims of such tenuous character that they do not carry substantial appeal to a court of equity on the ground that acquiescence by all in their disallowance makes it improper later to open up the general account. The items submitted for allowance amounted to about $1,000,000. About $200,000 were allowed and $800,000 rejected. The largest item of the latter class was a claim for $500,000, arising because the existing contract at one time called for 5,000 planes and provided for paying the contractor a percentage of the saving made by him in the actual cost as compared with the then estimated and stated "bogey" cost. Later there was a modification by which the "bogey" cost and percentage were changed, so reducing the contractor's profit. Defendant consented to this change, upon the oral assurance that the reserved right of cancellation should not be exercised. Later this right was, in effect, exercised, and the change in the contract as to the profit basis resulted in this loss of profits upon the planes actually made and delivered. The claim was perhaps more accurately one for damages than for profits, and it very likely did not have legal standing; at the same time, it had some equitable appeal, and could have been pressed on review. The remaining $300,000 of items present, so far as we may judge, only claims of the class likely to arise under such a contract, and most of which might or might not, upon consideration, turn out to be rightful. We think the due effect of these allowances and disallowances and the acquiescence therein cannot be avoided on the ground of obvious lack of merit in the items disallowed.

As the account between the parties was left by the performance of the final settlement, 1816-C, the defendant's profits were such that it was compelled to and did pay to the United States war profit and income surtaxes which in their upper brackets amounted to, say, 75 percent of the profits. The refunds ordered by the court below were all taken in effect from these upper brackets, and defendant accordingly claimed that there should be a decree against it for only 25 percent of whatever refunds were found proper. Our disposition of the main questions makes it unnecessary to consider defendant's complaint with regard to the action of the trial court upon this subject-matter.

Upon the cross-appeal, the comment just made applies to the subject-matter of interest upon the refunds concerning the disallowance of which interest the plaintiff complains and appeals.

(8) The three remaining items of the cross-appeal pertain to the action of the trial court in refusing to disturb the allowance to the defendant and the payment to it of the sums claimed for the services of public accountants, $62,000 for money paid for railroad transportation of employees, $137,000; and for "bonus for savings," $850,000. As to all three of these items, the district court held that they were either expressly or fairly a part of the expenses or profits to which defendant was entitled by the terms of the contract. As to the first two, we see no occasion for further detailed discussion, and we affirm the court below. As to the third, the bonus for savings, the complaint is that, although the contract expressly provides therefor, it is to that extent void because against public policy, and that this position is emphasized in the present case by the unconscionable amount of profits resulting to defendant. This provision was common in governmental contracts during the war. Although it is said to have been new in governmental contracts at that time, it had long been common in private building contracts; indeed, it was almost a necessary corollary or incident of a cost-plus contract. Much is to be said both for and against the economic good policy of cost-plus contracts for governmental work; but it is well known that, during the war emergency, they seemed to be necessary, and that they were authorized and employed to a very great extent. To preserve the motive of self-interest on the part of the contractor and yet to neutralize any tendency on his part to increase his percentage by increasing cost, the theory was adopted that the parties should agree upon an estimated price, which would be the probable cost as near as they could foresee, and that then the contractor should be allowed, in addition to his flat percentage, a portion of any savings which he was able to make below the estimated or "bogey" price. In this case that bonus was 25 percent, and, as computed, it amounted to the sum named.

(9) With regard to plaintiff's claim that this provision was against public policy, it is enough to say that no authorities are cited to that effect, and that for the courts to undertake, years afterward, to set aside a wartime contract of the Government because against public policy should be and is, in our judgment, quite impossible. Even if the subject were otherwise open, it would be difficult to set aside only one contract provision which formed a part of the consideration for the counterpromises.

Nor are we impressed that defendant's profits were so unconscionable as to justify taking them away upon any vague grounds, if indeed, that might ever be done. The contract, or rather the series of contracts which were practically a unit, occupied some 18 months; the original capital invested was about $1,000,000 but, with borrowed money, general debts, and reinvested profits, the average capital employed during the last year was some $5,000,000. The total cost to defendant of its output was some $27,000,000, and its final net profit from these con-

tracts, after it had paid the excess profits taxes imposed to meet this kind of a situation, was about $1,000,000. Plaintiff proposes to find a reasonable profit by computing an annual percent, of customary amount, upon the original capital investment; on the other hand, where much additional capital is borrowed and both business and reputation, indeed financial existence, are involved, businessmen commonly compare their profit with their output. Upon this basis the profit, even including bonus, was not over 4 percent. We agree with the district judge that, under the circumstances, "the actual profits of manufacture (excluding special depreciation) were neither exorbitant nor excessive."

Upon the entire record, the case will be remanded, with instructions to dismiss the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to request that the Baker letter be printed in the RECORD, following the printing of the Hughes report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has assured me that the Baker letter will be included as a part of the Hughes report, at the end. That is satisfactory to me, but it may be put in at this point, if desired.

(The Baker letter referred to is as follows:)

JANUARY 16, 1919.

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: Upon the submission to the President of the report of the Honorable Charles E. Hughes and the report of the Attorney General covering the aircraft investigation, I directed that the specific recommendations contained in those reports be extracted for my consideration and for such action by me as might be required in the premises. These extracts were referred to the Judge Advocate General of the Army directing a thorough and comprehensive inquiry into the allegations affecting the conduct of Colonel Deeds. He was directed not only to review all evidence taken by Judge Hughes, which the Attorney General kindly made available, but to secure all other facts obtainable in this case.

The Judge Advocate General committed the matter to a board of review, consisting of officers of high ability and character wholly disassociated from any previous business or personal relations either with Colonel Deeds or with any matters affecting aircraft production. This board carefully and systematically examined all of this evidence and obtained all possible additional facts, and its conclusions are therefore based upon fuller inquiry than was found possible within the time and opportunities at the disposal of Judge Hughes, and this examination is, in effect, the accomplishment of the thorough inquiry which Judge Hughes had in mind when he suggested that these transactions be examined by a court martial. The purpose of Judge Hughes' suggestion is therefore accomplished.

This record undoubtedly shows that Colonel Deeds, absorbed in the activities of aircraft production, neglected to give his personal attention to transactions affecting his personal financial affairs, and this neglect on his part gave rise to appearance which required painstaking investigation in order to show their true character.

The unanimous report of this board of review, approved by the Acting Judge Advocate General, recommends that Colonel Deeds be not tried by court martial on any of the grounds suggested, and this recommendation has been approved by me.

Colonel Deeds was one of a large group of men who came to Washington at great personal and pecuniary sacrifice to render service to the Government in the great emergency caused by our participation in the war.

My duty as Secretary of War, with regard to any public servant under my jurisdiction, is clearly to bring about proper punishment for wrongdoing and equally clearly to protect those public servants whose conduct is faithful and upright against embarrassment, humiliation, or loss.

Very wide publicity has been attached to the acts of Colonel Deeds as a member of the Aircraft Board. I do not know if it will ever be possible to overtake the judgments which have been formed upon partial information on this subject. This Department, however, will make every effort to secure the widest publicity for the action now taken and for the grounds upon which it rests.

To carry this into effect, I am therefore transmitting to your committee for its information, and with the request for its publication in the record, if the proprieties of the situation permit, a copy of the report of the Judge Advocate General. Similar copies are being furnished the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, the Attorney General, and Colonel Deeds.

Inasmuch as the purpose of Judge Hughes' suggestion has been accomplished, I have directed that all the records in this case be filed in the War Department and that this matter be considered as closed.

Cordially yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me, to permit me to have the statements in the RECORD appear in proper sequence?

Mr. COOPER. Very well. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

If the Baker letter is to be printed in the RECORD, together with the Hughes report, I think there should also be printed in the RECORD, immediately following the Baker letter, the extract from the House committee report which has to do with the Baker matter and the court martial of Colonel Deeds. That material appears in the latest hearing, beginning on page 13, and continuing to the top of page 14.

I now ask unanimous consent that the material referred to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The following is quoted from page 18 of the House report under the headline "Responsibility for Deeds.")

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEEDS

Col. Edward A. Deeds, of Dayton, Ohio, was placed in charge of the Equipment Division of Aviation under General Squier in August 1917, 4 months after our entry into the war. Nothing appears in any of the hearings of any investigation to show why Deeds was appointed. Deeds knew nothing of aircraft. Deeds had never been connected with any Government activity. Secretary Baker says he never saw Deeds until after his appointment, although Deeds and Secretary Baker were both from Ohio.

Justice Hughes' report found that Deeds began his activities by centering aircraft operations at Dayton, Ohio; that he gave large contracts to his business associates—Kettering, Talbott, and others in that city—although they had no previous experience in such matters; that he located several aviation fields around Dayton in improper locations, and also located fields in Florida without authority or explanation; that Deeds was largely interested in corporations controlling the Delco ignition system used in the projected Liberty motor, whereas prior to its use on the Liberty the magneto system had been used on all airplane engines (p. 58 of record).

The following is from the Hughes report (p. 57 of record):

"At the inception of the Government's aviation activity in connection with the war and within the sphere of Colonel Deeds' important if not commanding influence, his former business associates were placed at once, through Government contracts, in a position where they had assurance of very large profits upon a comparatively small investment of their own money, and in addition were able to secure generous salaries which they charged against the Government as part of the cost of manufacture."

After reciting evidence in support of his conclusions, Justice Hughes finds:

"The evidence with respect to Col. Edward A. Deeds should be presented to the Secretary of War, to the end that Colonel Deeds may be tried by court martial under articles 95 and 96 of the Articles of War."

Justice Hughes' report in part 2 of this report includes a detailed statement of testimony on which the finding was based.

In the Attorney General's report (p. 58 of the record) this finding appears:

"I acquiesce in the recommendations of Judge Hughes that the facts be submitted to the Secretary of War."

Because of these findings and recommendations for court martial, it is proper to say that about 4 years before his appointment to produce aircraft Deeds achieved considerable notoriety in Ohio, where he was prosecuted in the Federal court for alleged bribery and criminal methods in driving his competitors out of the cash-register business, and was convicted by a jury after a trial lasting over a month and sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year.

An appeal was taken, with 50 assignments of error, and the case was reversed and no retrial was ever had (pp. 50–52). Deeds' innocence may be conceded, for the sake of argument, though no second trial occurred, but the charge, conviction, and court record were enough to put any responsible official on inquiry before giving Deeds a place of transcendent importance in charge of matters about which he knew nothing.

WHY WAS DEEDS' COURT MARTIAL PREVENTED?

For Deeds' alleged efforts to place large Government contracts with his business associates in Dayton, under questionable arrangements, and for other reasons stated in his report, Justice Hughes recommended Deeds for court martial (pp. 57–58), and Attorney General Gregory joined in the report to the extent of declaring Colonel Deeds' conduct inexcusable, reprehensible, and censurable, and recommended that all the facts be submitted to the Secretary of War (p. 58).

Based on the Hughes record, the Judge Advocate General's office on November 11, 1918, submitted its report approving the Hughes recommendations and holding, in addition, that if Colonel Deeds was under oath when testifying before the Senate committee he should be court martialed for perjury, if false statements were shown to have been made (p. 2652).

Subsequently, Secretary of War Baker sent word to the Judge Advocate General's office requesting that other witnesses be heard on behalf of Deeds and that the report be reconsidered (p. 2653). This action, your committee is informed, was unprecedented. Colonel Deeds' attorney and two business associates, connected with these same Government contracts, were thereupon heard and a new report rendered exonerating Deeds (p. 2687). Secretary Baker's activity in protecting Deeds against Justice Hughes' finding it at once astonishing and significant. With a record that affected lives of men and charges of inordinate selfishness supported

by specific facts. Deeds should have been placed on trial to be convicted if guilty, to be vindicated if innocent. According to the testimony Secretary Baker prevented such action.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was out of the Chamber for a few minutes; but I have been advised that the Senator from Kentucky has said that I had not fully or correctly stated the facts, and that it is a fact that no charge was made by Mr. Hughes of improper conduct on the part of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. Did the Senator from Kentucky make such a statement?

Mr. COOPER. I said there was no charge against Mr. Talbott as an individual of any wrongdoing or improper conduct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Did the Senator from Kentucky say there was no charge of improper conduct or wrongdoing against the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co.?

Mr. COOPER. I did discuss the point of Mr. Talbott's responsibility as an officer of the company. I pointed out that to hold Mr. Talbott responsible as an officer for any wrongdoing on the part of the company, there would have to be a finding of some wrongdoing on the part of the company. The court held there was no wrongdoing by the company.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If we examine page 4 of the latest hearings, we find that Mr. Hughes criticized very severely the promoters of the enterprise, namely, the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., and criticized very severely their action. I can read the particular paragraphs bearing on that matter if the Senator from Kentucky wishes me to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to permit me to address an inquiry to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COOPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I missed a part of the statement previously made by the Senator. I have read the hearings in regard to this matter. I am trying to ascertain from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether there is anything in either the court decision or the Hughes report which casts a reflection upon Mr. Harold E. Talbott, whose nomination to be Secretary of the Air Force is presently before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Nothing, except that the Hughes report identifies him as being the president of the Dayton-Wright Co., and the Hughes report then condemns very bitterly and strongly the officers of the Dayton-Wright Co.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But if it would be fair for the senior Senator from California to address the inquiry to the Senator from Tennessee, is the Senator now advocating the doctrine of guilt by association? Is the Senator from Tennessee enunciating the doctrine that because charges were made against other individuals, perhaps against a relative, 35 years ago and because this nominee happened either to be in the company, or related to someone who was in the company, the Senate should therefore withhold confirmation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from California has apparently missed the entire argument. Certainly the Senator from Tennessee has never advocated guilt by association, and never shall; and I am somewhat surprised that the Senator from California would insinuate that that might be the case now. Holding the president of a corporation responsible for the acts of the corporation is not guilt by association. The case here is that Mr. Charles Evans Hughes said—and I shall read but two paragraphs:

> The promoters of this enterprise, not content with these profits which were to accrue to them, either directly or through their ownership of the Dayton Metal Products Co., at once took advantage of the opportunity to increase their gains by salaries as executive officers of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. Dating from August 1, 1917, the salaries thus allowed were as follows: H. E. Talbott, Sr., $35,000; C. F. Kettering, $35,000; and H. E. Talbott, Jr. (30 years old, who was made president of the company), $30,000.

At that time, H. E. Talbott, Jr., was also receiving a salary of $18,000 from the Dayton Metal Products Co.

I read from the next paragraph:

> But the fact remains that practically at the inception of the Government's aviation activity in connection with the war, and within the sphere of Colonel Deeds' important, if not commanding, influence, his former business associates were placed at once through Government contracts in a position where they had the assurance of very large profits upon a relatively small investment of their own money, and in addition were able to secure generous salaries, which they charged against the Government as part of the cost of manufacture.

There are other statements similar to that. Reference has been made to guilt by association. Mr. Hughes talks about the company, he talks about the promoters, and officers of the company. The officers were Mr. Talbott, whose nomination is now before the Senate, his father, and Mr. Kettering. I know of no one who can be held responsible for what a corporation does other than its officers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In the Senator's study of the case, did he find that at any time the Hughes report recommended any action whatever against the junior Mr. Talbott?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, I did not; and let me say in fairness, I think he was in fact a junior officer of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co. I may say I do not think he was the commanding figure. But he was one of the officers and one of the promoters.

Mr. CASE. But Mr. Hughes did recommend that information be placed before the Secretary of War to the end that Colonel Deeds might be tried by court-martial, but he did not make any recommendation as to any action against Mr. Talbott, Jr. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Hughes set forth in his report that unfortunately what was done by the officers of the company, was not covered by the criminal sections of the code. He did recommend that Colonel Deeds be court-martialed; that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Tennessee and I have discussed this question in conversations in the committee room and on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator from Tennessee and I agree that the statements in the Hughes report are critical. To my way of thinking, there is no question about that. But the Hughes report, when it was referred to Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, imposed upon the Secretary the duty of deciding whether to proceed with the court-martial. He appointed a board of review, which heard additional witnesses. That apparently was a procedure about which there might be some question, but the Board heard them, and was convinced that there was no evidence upon which to court-martial Colonel Deeds. Later, the Secretary of War confirmed that action. So we have the situation of a very distinguished lawyer, Mr. Hughes, being critical, but of an equally distinguished lawyer, Mr. Baker, upon the hearing of additional witnesses, deciding that there was no evidence upon which to base a court-martial, or that would warrent such a court martial. That is the situation; is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I beg to differ with the Senator. That is not the situation. Nowhere did Secretary Baker differ with the Hughes report or with the same findings by the House committee, except as to whether Colonel Deeds should be court-martialed. There was no difference of opinion on the part of Secretary Baker, as to the improper action of the Dayton Wright Airplane Co., or its officers. The action of Secretary Baker referred only to the calling of another board, to determine whether Colonel Deeds should be tried by court-martial. I may say, Mr. President, that while I have always had a high regard for Secretary Baker, yet in reading volumes of testimony, as I have within the past few days, his indifferent attitude toward airplane production during the war is, I fear, a rather sad picture. The evidence also shows that when the Deeds matter had been passed upon by Hughes, by the Attorney General of the United States, and by the Judge Advocate General, for some reason Secretary Baker called in another board. This board, according to the House committee, called in two former business associates, after which Secretary Baker exonerated Deeds. But that has nothing to do with the factual findings with reference to what the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

airplane company did. It refers only to the court-martialing of Colonel Deeds and on this score I fear that somebody sold Secretary Baker a bill of goods.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as my colleagues on the floor of the Senate will recall, I vigorously opposed the nomination of Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense, and the nomination of Mr. Robert T. B. Stevens, to be Secretary of the Army. My position was not in any way based upon a lack of confidence in their qualifications or upon a lack of regard and respect for their character and integrity. It was based solely upon the fact that I felt the confirmation of their nominations would be contrary to the letter and spirit of the law which is now upon our statute books, a law which was wisely written into our statutes in order to prevent any abuse that might come about through a conflict of interest.

I never felt more certain of the soundness of my position, or more fearful that the action of the Senate in relation to these two nominations would lead us into serious difficulties in the future. But I do not intend to oppose the nomination of Mr. Harold E. Talbott, Mr. President, because I think the situation is entirely different. Arguments have been advanced today with reference to the relationship of Mr. Talbott to the defense of our country and to the procurement of supplies for it in 1917 and 1918. We have heard quotations from a very vigorous report by a former Chief Justice of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes, for whom no man in this country has greater respect than I. But, Mr. President, I do not think that such delinquencies as may have existed in the companies or in the individuals to which reference has been made in the report, apply necessarily to the nominee whose name is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to go back a little bit into history. I think I can speak from personal experience. I had a great deal to do with the procurement of war supplies in 1917 and 1918, and a great deal to do with the logistics of those critical years of the First World War. I was then a colonel on the General Staff and served as the assistant to Gen. George W. Goethals during those years. General Goethals was Director of Purchase, Storage, and Transportation. He had in his cognizance the entire responsibility of procurement, of storage, and of transportation of the supplies during that war. It was a highly important and difficult position.

I think it is impossible for us, after so long a lapse of time, particularly for those who were not connected with the war effort of the First World War, to realize the difference in the conditions existing in those trying days and those existing in the Second World War and since then. We were thrown into the First World War in April 1917. No preparations whatsoever had been made for the equipment of our military forces or for our defense. We had virtually no supplies. We did not have sufficient supplies to equip more than a very few regiments. I recall that in the spring of 1917 I used to go to Governor's Island and drill. All I had to drill with was a broomstick. We had no rifles, no small arms, no ammunition, no tanks, planes, or anything else. What is more important is that we had no standards of procurement. We had to depend on our own resources in order to map out and trace the path we would follow. We had to blaze a completely new trail in procurement and production.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At that time there was no airplane production in existence in this country, was there?

Mr. LEHMAN. There was no aircraft production; there was no tank production; and let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, there was virtually no production of any kind for war purposes.

I remember when I first came to Washington there was great need of haversacks and cartridge belts, and blankets for the soldiers—simple articles, of course, as compared with airplanes and tanks and guns. I had to go up State to a little island in the Hudson River—I forget its name—where someone had a warehouse full of second-hand goods which he had accumulated to supply the needs of little countries in Europe and Latin America. We bought those goods. We did not buy them under competitive bidding; we bought them at any price the owner wanted to charge, because we desperately needed those things to equip even a handful of men, the first contingent which was sent to Europe a few weeks later.

Mr. President, I know that there were things done in the First World War that we would not have thought of condoning in the Second World War or in any period between the two wars, or today, if, unhappily, problems of a similar nature should arise.

For instance, I have always been against cost-plus contracts. I was against them at that time as I am against them today. But we did not have any choice. If we were going to get any supplies, we had to make the incentive for manufacture and production sufficiently attractive to persuade people to make goods with which they were completely unfamiliar and as to which they had no experience or knowledge whatsoever.

I can say, Mr. President, that undoubtedly many of us cut corners during that time. In those days, those of us who wanted to procure goods, who wanted to get production, who wanted to equip the military, had to take short cuts in order to reduce delay and frustration. There was no choice if we wanted to speed up production of the goods which were so necessary for our own defense and survival.

I recall, Mr. President, that during the war and a short time after the war everyone was applauding the men who produced and got the goods for our defense, but after the war, as is so often the case, many were damning and condemning the very people who were most successful in procuring goods.

I recall painfully and with shame, that the Assistant Secretary of War, a man by the name of Benedict Crowell, than whom, in my opinion, there was no finer public servant, was indicted after the war. Yes, Mr. President, he escaped conviction, but he was indicted, and it took months, if not years, to clear his name. And even the great Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, was threatened with impeachment.

So I want to say, Mr. President, that if we are going to judge a man, particularly a very young man, who was undoubtedly under the influence of his father and of a partner of his father whom he respected very highly—by the standards of today rather than the standards that were accepted and followed 36 years ago—we may be doing a grave injustice to him and to the President who has nominated him.

Mr. President, I do not know Mr. Talbott. I have never met him, so far as I recall. I think it was right and just to interrogate him, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and other Senators did interrogate him in the Armed Services Committee. He may be a man of high character or he may not be a man of high character; he may be a man of great ability or he may lack ability. I do not know as to that. But I believe the President should have wide latitude in the selection of men for key positions and I am unwilling to oppose his nominees unless I believe their confirmation is contrary to law, as in the case of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stevens, or until I am convinced that they were guilty of acts that were immoral at the time they were committed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, although I have opposed nominations for several defense positions made by the President as vigorously as has any other Senator, because I felt convinced they were contrary to the letter or the spirit of our laws, I think this case is different, and, therefore, I am not going to oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Talbott whose name has come before us as Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, I thank the Senator for his very helpful remarks, which were to the point.

The Senator referred to General Goethals, and the Liberty motor, which was used in the first airplanes which came from the production line of Mr. Ford's factory and other factories, and was the result of designs that were made during that time. I should like to ask the Senator whether that was the successful airplane engine used in America and also in England and France?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not wish to rely on my memory of events that happened in 1917 and 1918, 35 and 36 years ago. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts knows, so many things have happened in my life since that time, that I should very much dislike to rely on my memory regarding the details of our procurement operations in World War I.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I wish to summarize my position in the matter of the nomination of Mr. Talbott, because, I say most respectfully to the Senator from Kentucky, that I think he has unintentionally left an impression in the RECORD with regard to the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that is not borne out by the facts, as the RECORD will show when the Senator reads it tomorrow. My summary of this case, referring first to the House investigation, is as follows:

First, the House investigation went into the whole question of airplane procurement, including the airplane policies of the Dayton-Wright Co., of which the present nominee was an officer at the time of the investigation.

Second, the Hughes investigation went into the matter of the conduct of Colonel Deeds, and the conduct of Colonel Deeds was the subject matter of the Baker report. The Baker report did not go into any finding of the Hughes report as to the manufacturing and profits policies of the Dayton-Wright Co., of which the junior Talbott and the senior Talbott were officers at the time. The Baker report went into the matter of whether or not Deeds should be court-martialed. A reading of the House committee report will show that it was the view of the House committee that for reasons of his own, whatever they may have been, although not satisfactory to the House committee at the time, what Mr. Baker had done was to have the matter reviewed by some persons close to Deeds in business. The House committee did not agree with Baker.

Be that as it may, the Baker report had nothing to do with the findings of Charles Evans Hughes in regard to the unconscionable conduct of certain airplane companies during the war in respect to the huge profits that were made out of a small investment.

The third point is that the circuit court of appeals case had nothing to do with the Deeds matter. It had nothing to do with the profits matter, insofar as any determinative decision was concerned, with respect to the question whether Hughes was right or wrong when he took the position that the airplane companies were making unconscionable profits.

The Senator from Kentucky is a great lawyer, and he knows that a court, in handing down its decision, cannot go beyond the pleadings. He knows that a court cannot go beyond the terms of reference in the case. If the Senator from Kentucky will read the circuit court of appeals decision which he has placed in the RECORD, he will see that the circuit court of appeals did not have jurisdiction over the issues that Hughes was raising in his report concerning the conduct of the airplane companies.

The Senator from Kentucky was quite right when he pointed out that the Hughes inquiry was a broad one, which went not only into the Dayton-Wright Co. policies and practices but also into many other companies.

In my judgment, it was the findings of the report by Charles Evans Hughes that had such great weight with the House committee at that time, and which laid the factual foundation by way of data and evidence that were needed for the passage of subsequent legislation which now makes it impossible to indulge in such conduct as was followed by airplane companies during World War I.

My good friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], does not change the fact by his argument or rationalization that the Hughes report was not very complimentary to these companies.

My good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], is concerned as to whether the Senator from Tennessee was indulging in an argument based upon a premise of guilt by association. If he was, so was the junior Senator from Oregon.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is well aware, and I think the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] should be aware, of the rule as to responsibility of corporate officers for certain corporate conduct. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I are not raising the question, nor did the court pass on it because it was not before the court, as to whether the officers of the Dayton-Wright Co., including the nominee under consideration, were responsible for the policies which were followed by Dayton-Wright during the war, to which Charles Evans Hughes directed his attention. However, Mr. President, I think we can take judicial notice that they were responsible. They were the officers. This nominee, even though 30 years old at the time, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, was an officer of the corporation. But the conduct of the corporation in respect to the Hughes charges was not at issue before the court. The Senator from Oregon has tried to make that clear. Evidently he did not make it clear to the Senator from Kentucky, because obviously the Senator from Kentucky, I judge from his remarks, misunderstood or did not hear the Senator from Oregon.

The Senator from Oregon has not kept from the RECORD today, the Senator from Kentucky to the contrary notwithstanding, a single operative fact connected with this matter. I have placed all the facts in the RECORD.

My next point by way of summary, and the one in which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] does not agree with me, but as to which he was willing to agree with me in the Wilson and Stevens cases, is the matter of indirect interest. Mr. Talbott has an indirect interest. If Mr. Stevens and Mr. Wilson had an indirect interest, so does Mr. Talbott have it.

If one of the bases for the objection of the Senator from New York to Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stevens was, as I thought it was, that he did not think it was good public policy, because of their affinity of interest, to place men who had been officers of corporations doing business with the Defense Department in positions in the Defense Department where they could do further business with the Department, then he ought to be standing with me against Talbott, as well as against Wilson and Stevens. The question of stock holdings has nothing to do with the burden of our argument in respect to Wilson and Stevens. The burden of our argument is on the basis of affinity and indirect interest.

That is a summary of my position, and I stand on it by saying that Mr. Talbott's nomination should not be confirmed, first, because he was insensitive to the ethical problems involved and he had a very bad memory, although it is unbelievable that he was not aware, when he came before the committee in the first place, of the Hughes incident which occurred in the past history of the Talbott companies. When he was first before the committee he thought Deeds' conduct was all right, and when he came before the committee the second time he said that if anyone conducted himself as Deeds did, and sent telegrams as Deeds did, he would fire him. That was a shocking example of backtracking, I think.

Furthermore, I am against the nomination because, in my opinion, he continues to have an indirect interest which disqualifies him.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the question of direct and indirect interest is a very important one in the consideration of the Wilson and Stevens nominations. As I recall, I brought out the fact that Mr. Stevens, in addition to a large interest held by his immediate family, had a remainder interest in a trust set up by his father under his will, under which 70,000 shares would go to Mr. Stevens on the death of his mother. That, I thought, constituted a very large direct or indirect interest in the company.

Furthermore, I objected to the nomination of Mr. Wilson because of the fact that the company which he had represented was the largest supplier of defense matériel to the United States Government. His immediate family also had, and continued to hold, very large stock interests which I believe constituted a direct or indirect financial interest in the company, and therefore emphasized the conflict of interest which exists today. As I understand, the man whose nomination is before us today, Mr. Talbott, has no interest whatsoever——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is not concerned at all about the pensions which he will be receiving? Does not the Senator believe they create an indirect interest, even though one may be only $6,000 and the other only $3,000?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not believe that a pension, which is paid for past services, affects the situation at all.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not think the fact that a man is drawing a pension from a company which is doing business with the Defense Establishment might influence his judgment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not believe that the pension he receives is in any way dependent upon the earnings of the company.

Mr. MORSE. He would not get it very long if the company went broke.

Mr. LEHMAN. I might receive a pension for services rendered 20 years ago.

Mr. MORSE. He would not receive it very long if the company went broke, would he? If the company had nothing with which to pay the pension he would not receive it, would he?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. LEHMAN. I think he might easily receive it.

Mr. MORSE. Where would he get it—out of the air?

Mr. LEHMAN. He might get it from a fund set up in trust for the payment of pensions which had accrued to previous servants of the company. That is not an unusual thing at all.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator think it is probable that on his part there will be a desire to keep the company pretty strong while he is receiving a pension from it? Furthermore, there is no showing whatsoever that these pensions are not dependent upon the continued success of the companies.

Mr. LEHMAN. In my judgment, such an interest is so slight and so attenuated that I do not believe it would influence me in my decision.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say very good naturedly that the Senator from New York has a remarkable but very unrealistic understanding of human motivations. I think he has failed completely to distinguish the Wilson and Stevens nominations against which he voted with the Talbott nomination for which he is voting.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there are two things which I think should be brought to the attention of Members of the Senate who have not heard all the debate, but who are present at this time.

The discussion has turned upon two documents, first, the so-called Hughes report, and secondly, the decision of the appeals court in the case of the Dayton Airplane Co. The central thing which ought to be kept in mind with respect to the Hughes report is that the Hughes report made no charge whatsoever against Mr. Talbott, Jr., or, for that matter so far as I know, Mr. Talbott, Sr. The Hughes report did recommend that the facts with regard to the conduct of a Colonel Deeds be placed before the Secretary of War for consideration in connection with a possible court-martial. That later was abandoned by the Secretary of War.

I have been unable to find any reference in any document to a suggestion that the Hughes report threw any blame upon Mr. Talbott, Jr., whose nomination is now before the Senate. In response to my direct question, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], said that he had not been able to find any. He did not say that the Hughes report had in any way placed a finger on the nominee whose nomination is now before the Senate.

The other document in question is the decision of the appeals court in the case of the Dayton Airplane Co. I am not sure whether or not the Senator from Oregon has read that entire decision. I heard him say a few moments ago that the court said nothing about unconscionable profits, or words to that effect. Actually, the court did say something about unconscionable profits. It appears in the final paragraph of the court's decision, which is found at the bottom of page 47 of the hearings before us on the nomination now pending. At the bottom of page 47, Senators will note that in the concluding paragraph the court said:

> Nor are we impressed that defendant's profits were so unconscionable as to justify taking them away upon any vague grounds, if indeed, that might ever be done. The contract, or rather the series of contracts which were practically a unit, occupied some 18 months; the original capital invested was about $1,000,000 but, with borrowed money, general debts, and reinvested profits, the average capital employed during the last year was some $5,000,000. The total cost to defendant of its output was some $27,000,000, and its final net profit from these contracts, after it had paid the excess profits taxes imposed to meet this kind of a situation, was about $1,000,000.

The court further said:

> Plaintiff—

Which, under its terminology, was the United States—

> proposes to find a reasonable profit by computing an annual percent, of customary amount, upon the original capital investment; on the other hand, where much additional capital is borrowed and both business and reputation, indeed financial existence, are involved, businessmen commonly compare their profit with their output. Upon this basis the profit, even including bonus, was not over 4 percent.

I invite the attention of Senators to that statement. That is the statement of the appeals court.

> Upon this basis the profit even including bonus, was not over 4 percent.

That was the court's answer to the suggestion that unconscionable profits were involved.

The court continued:

> We agree with the district judge that, under the circumstances, "the actual profits of manufacture (excluding special depreciation) were neither exorbitant nor excessive."
>
> Upon the entire record, the case will be remanded, with instructions to dismiss the bill.

Therefore, since none of the documents brought before the committee showed any imputation of blame or responsibility with respect to Mr. Talbott, Jr., whose nomination is now before the Senate, since the Hughes report dealt only with Colonel Deeds, although, according to the statement made, it covered the entire field, but found nothing to say about Mr. Talbott, and since the court of appeals, in considering the Dayton airplane case, did not find unconscionable profits, I can find no basis upon which I should withhold my assent to confirmation of the pending nomination.

Mr. President, in saying that I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not insensitive to the question of exorbitant profits in wartime contracts. The junior Senator from Oregon said that the situation as it developed in World War I laid the basis for legislation which since has been enacted to make it impossible to gain excessive or exorbitant profits. To a certain extent that is true, and the junior Senator from South Dakota was identified with the initiation of such legislation during the course of World War II, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. Therefore, I am not insensitive to the need for curtailing unconscionable profits and for enactment of appropriate legislation to control such profits, particularly in wartime.

However, Mr. President, I found nothing in the record to indicate that Mr. Talbott, the nominee before the Senate, was connected with the questionable action of Colonel Deeds in sending the telegrams to Mr. Talbott's father. I was unable to find anything in the record to indicate that Mr. Talbott himself had in any way condoned unconscionable profits. In fact, on direct examination he stated he did not condone such actions and did not condone the action of Colonel Deeds. He said that if he were confirmed as Secretary of the Air Force such a condition would not be permitted to exist in the Air Force while he was Secretary.

Therefore, it seems to me that the nomination should be confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kuchel	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	Young
Gillette	Maybank	
Gore	McCarthy	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harold E. Talbott to be Secretary of the Air Force? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from Idaho would each vote "yea."

The Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL] are absent on official business at the Pentagon. If present and voting, the Senators from Connecticut would each vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent on official business at the White House, would, if present and voting, vote "yea." The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is absent on official business, would, if present and voting, vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ],

the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present, would vote "yea."

I announce also that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—76

Anderson	Green	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Russell
Carlson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Mansfield	Williams
Frear	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	
Gillette	McCarthy	

NAYS—6

Fulbright	Kefauver	Morse
Gore	Kilgore	Murray

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Griswold	Purtell
Bush	Hayden	Smith, N. C.
Chavez	Jenner	Tobey
Douglas	Kennedy	Welker
Goldwater	McCarran	

So the nomination was confirmed.

PRACTICES IN CONNECTION WITH PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED LEAVE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a highly questionable procedure which apparently has been followed in the past by some of the agencies of this Government whereby annual-leave payments involving hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars have been paid to Government employees without such leave being taken and while these employees were actually drawing their regular salaries.

The manner in which this indirect raid on the Federal Treasury operates is that the agency will give the employee a 30-day notice that he is to be separated from the service. Immediately upon the date of separation the employee is paid in lump sum for all accumulated annual leave up to 90 days. The following day the same employee is rehired for the same job and placed back on the regular payroll where he works for 30 days as a temporary employee. At the end of the 30-day period he is reinstated as a permanent employee and automatically again begins accumulating annual leave all over again.

This has the net effect during the period involved of these employees not only being paid double for the work but also accumulating annual leave for the next year.

The officials of the Rent Stabilization Bureau have confirmed that this procedure was followed in that agency, and as a specific example of how the program operates, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a breakdown of the lump-sum payments to 49 employees of that agency totaling $86,266.88. In this instance these employees were given a reduction-in-force notice on May 26, 1950, effective at the close of June 25, 1950. On that date they were separated from the service and they received lump-sum payments as indicated. The following day all 49 employees were rehired for the same positions at the same salary, only they were $86,266 richer.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Office of Rent Stabilization—Employees reduced in force, effective Sunday, June 25, 1950, receiving temporary appointments Monday, June 26, 1950

[Employees as of June 25, 1950, receiving lump-sum payment, Washington, D. C., unless otherwise noted]

Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Lump-sum payments, annual leave
Bloomberg, Florence	Secretary (stenographer)	GS-5	$3,725	$538.15
Borjes, Harry A	Voucher examiner	GS-5	3,850	1,312.92
Boucher, Mae D	Placement officer	GS-11	5,400	1,307.38
Campbell, Kenneth A	Associate regional housing expediter	GS-15	[1] 10,750	2,952.96
Crilley, Raymond E	Assistant Deputy Housing Expediter (rental operations).	GS-14	9,000	3,059.16
Clarke, Clarke W	Field representative	GS-13	7,600	1,700.37
Comfort, William G	Director Budget, Planning and Finance Branch.	GS-14	9,000	1,829.75
Comrey, Halley S	Secretary (stenographer)	GS-6	3,700	429.26
Davis, Milton B	Comm. Ind. Econ. (housing supervisor)	GS-14	9,600	2,650.65
Diggle, Burnham	Deputy Housing Expediter (rental operations).	GS-15	10,750	3,501.53
Donine, Sophie	Time and payroll (supervisor)	GS-8	4,700	401.75
Dupree, Edwin D., Jr	General counsel (supervising attorney, assistant to Director).	GS-15	10,750	3,654.75
Edwards, Adolph M., Jr	Trial attorney (general supervisor)	GS-14	9,200	3,156.50
Engel, Anna M	Employees relations assistant	GS-9	4,850	1,331.10
Fishbein, David M	Business economist	GS-9	5,350	1,306.07
Green, Edna S	Time, leave, and payroll supervisor	GS-7	3,825	917.48
Hale, Golda M	Administrative assistant	GS-9	5,350	1,837.95
Hainback, Hazel S	Archivist	GS-12	6,600	2,093.45
Happ, Howell C	Trial attorney (general supervisor)	GS-13	8,600	2,936.92
Hardiman, Raymond M	Chief, Audit Section	GS-9	4,975	1,638.94
Hoffman, Charles N	Attorney adviser	GS-13	7,600	2,275.84
Hoffman, Laura E	Purchase clerk (typing)	GS-4	3,355	737.62
Hurley, James W	Special rent review examiner	GS-11	5,600	1,353.14
Kennedy, Dorothy W	Administrative officer	GS-12	[2] 6,800	1,666.25
McCarthy, John T	National Board Coordinator	GS-15	10,750	3,681.71
McLeod, John A., Jr	Attorney adviser	GS-13	7,800	1,842.04
Madigan, John J	Deputy Housing Expeditor (administrative).	GS-15	10,750	3,624.58
Matteo, Linda A	Director, Personnel Branch	GS-14	8,800	1,644.37
Milam, Luther M	Field representative	GS-13	7,800	2,625.45
Mills, Juanita N	Placement assistant	GS-9	4,725	478.76
Mills, Lorise W	Administrative officer	GS-12	[1] 7,400	2,505.13
Moore, J. Roy	Board coordinator	GS-13	[2] 8,400	2,089.74
Morell, R. Coy	Field representative	GS-13	7,600	2,559.65
Ninde, Virginia L	Voucher examiner	GS-4	3,355	933.32
Plummer, Charles O	Placement assistant	GS-7	3,825	869.00
Pohling, Joseph A	Chief, Reproduction Planning Section	GS-11	5,400	1,146.05
Propps, Arch L	Field representative	GS-13	8,200	2,214.44
Reeknow, Myra I	Time, leave, and payroll clerk	GS-4	3,115	330.40
Reimers, Leora	Secretary (stenographer)	GS-6	4,200	1,441.97
Siegel, Nathan	Trial attorney (general supervisor)	GS-14	8,800	2,248.41
Sparks, Donna	Clerk-stenographer	GS-4	[2] 3,355	810.15
Taylor, Jessie K	Time, leave, and payroll clerk	GS-4	3,195	784.27
Tompkins, Evelyn D	Voucher examiner (supervisor)	GS-7	4,575	805.21
Watts, Alexander H	Field representative	GS-13	7,800	2,130.17
Weed, Katherine L	Secretary (dictating machine transcriber)	GS-7	3,950	772.84
Weed, William H	Director, Administrative Services Branch	GS-13	7,600	2,489.90
Weissenberger, Mary L	Assistant to National Board Coordinator	GS-11	5,600	1,542.92
Wolcott, Wilma O	Secretary (stenographer)	GS-5	3,475	826.00
Workmaster, William E	Personnel Procedures Branch	GS-11	7,800	1,294.52
Total				86,266.88

[1] Atlanta, Ga.
[2] San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following this insertion, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD my letter of January 28, 1953, addressed to Mr. James McInness Henderson, Director of the Office of Rent Stabilization, along with the reply thereto, signed by William G. Barr, Acting Director, under date of February 3, explaining their position.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 28, 1953.

Mr. JAMES MCINNESS HENDERSON,
Director, Office of Rent Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: As I recall, the Congress appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, to the Office of Housing Expediter, some $2,000,000 which were marked for the payment of accumulative annual leave to those resigning from the agency during the fiscal year.

It has come to my attention that since only a small portion of this appropriation would be expended by reason of resignation, your office executed a plan whereby many of the permanent officials and employees who had accumulated 90 days' annual leave became aware of your proposed reduction in accumulated annual leave by the Congress. These persons were given the opportunity to resign and were paid in lump sum cash for the 90 days' accumulated leave, totaling anywhere from $300,000 to $500,000, and on the following work day all these permanent status officials and employees were placed on temporary status for the period of the accumulated leave, and at the expiration of such period were again restored to permanent status.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is the purpose of this letter to request a list of all such officials and employees, together with their civil service designation and salaries, at the earliest possible moment.

Awaiting a full report from you, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of January 28 addressed to Mr. Henderson and your telephone conversations with Mr. Madigan on February 2 concerning activities of the Office of Housing Expediter during the fiscal year 1951.

In that fiscal year the appropriation was made available through a series of actions as follow:

	For operating expenses	For terminal leave
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951	$8,615,500	$2,000,000
Reappropriated from 1950 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 27, 1950)	1,600,000	----------
Total	10,215,500	2,000,000
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong., approved Jan. 6, 1951)	1,200,000	----------
Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong., approved June 2, 1951)	250,000	−250,000
Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 43, 82d Cong., approved May 31, 1951)	750,000	−750,000
Total	12,415,500	1,000,000

The OHE was not covered by the General Appropriations Act, 1951, Public Law 579, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 6, 1950, which included the use it or lose it leave provision. There were no mass resignations during that year. The amount expended for lump-sum payments (terminal leave) resulting from normal turnover, including reduction-in-force, was $392,789.

However, it seems to us that your inquiry may be directed to activities in the fiscal year 1950. In that year funds also were made available in other than a single appropriation, as follows:

	For operating expenses	For terminal leave
Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 266, 81st Cong., approved Aug. 24, 1949)	$17,500,000	----------
Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 468, 81st Cong., approved Mar. 27, 1950)	1,400,000	$2,000,000
Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 583, 81st Cong., approved June 29, 1950)	600,000	----------
Total	19,500,000	2,000,000

The $2,600,000 made available by the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, contemplated the termination of rent control on June 30, 1950, although legislation was pending to extend it through June 30, 1951. In view of this and to work out necessary adjustments in the personnel of the organization, reduction-in-force notices were issued to all employees under date of May 26, 1950, with active duty through June 6, 1950, followed by annual leave or leave without pay through June 30, 1950 (unless prior to that date separation was requested, transfer to another agency made, or recalled to active duty). Subsequently, many notices were amended to show last day of active duty as June 30, 1950. A number of employees let their reduction in force become effective at the close of June 25, 1950, and were paid in lump sum for the accumulated leave to their credit at that time. Thereafter these employees were given temporary appointments for stated periods under authority of the then Civil Service Commission Regulation 2.114 (b) (3) and 6.101 (d). At various dates the reinstatement eligibles received conversion-to-reinstatement appointments.

As requested in your letter, a list of these employees is attached.

As of possible interest, of the $2,600,000 available only for terminal leave in the fiscal year 1950, only $1,061,494 was expended for that item, some $827,806 having previously been expended for lump-sum payments from the regular appropriation. As indicated above, $1,600,000 of the funds appropriated for 1950, chiefly the balance in the terminal-leave item, was reapportioned as part of our original 1951 appropriation.

All employees of the agency participated in mass voluntary leave without pay for a week during June of 1950 in order to assist in financing our operations. This included those who had accepted temporary appointments.

The total of the lump-sum payments to the 49 employees included in the attached list amounted to $86,260.88.

If further information is desired, it will be made available to you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. BARR,
Acting Director of Rent Stabilization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the fiscal year 1950, $1,061,494 was expended by this one agency alone on annual leave with some $827,806 having been expended for lump-sum payments from the regular appropriations.

I have been advised that this device has been used by practically all the agencies of the Government, and if so it means that millions of dollars are involved in the controversy.

Mr. President, I recommend that the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Government Operations examine the extent to which this questionable procedure has been followed and if laws have been violated, appropriate step taken. If this represents a loophole in the law, then it should be immediately corrected and the appropriations for these agencies reduced accordingly.

To say the least it is an unjustifiable raid on the Federal Treasury, and heads of every agency in the Government who have condoned this practice should be called to task.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Delaware has examined the law on the question of whether the practice to which he has referred would constitute a conspiracy by the head of an agency to defraud the Government of money?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I have asked the legislative counsel to prepare a memorandum on the subject, and the matter is also being submitted to the Comptroller General with the thought that if the payments are not in order, the individuals involved should be made to return the money.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it goes further than a returning of funds. I pick one name at random from the table which the Senator from Delaware has inserted in the RECORD—Edwin D. Dupree, Jr. He has a rating of GS–15, and he receives a salary of $10,750. He received a lump-sum payment of $3,654.75. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. In the Congressional Directory Mr. Dupree is listed as general counsel of the Office of Rent Stabilization, which is the agency that tells the landlords how to check inflation by holding down their charges.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is the chief legal adviser of the agency. Therefore it is apparent that he himself was involved in a conspiracy to defraud the Government of funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. These payments were made with respect to him and to seven other officials, who are considered important enough to be listed in the Congressional Directory as top officials.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that I am particularly interested in this subject because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that representatives of the agencies come to the committee and ask for deficiency appropriations to pay for so-called leaves. It would appear now that we have been opening up a new racket which has enabled some persons who have accumulated leave—and it involves top officials, as indicated in the Senator's table—to come before the Committee on Appropriations and obtain appropriations with which to pay for the leave, and then to go back on the payroll on the next working day and proceed to accumulate more leave.

I should like to ask one more question of the Senator from Delaware. Has he any evidence that such employees have received an additional check for accumulated leave?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not followed through on that point, to find out how many payments were made or whether the same individual received more than one payment for accumulated leave. In that connection, however, I should like to read one sentence from the letter sent to me by the Acting Director of Rent Stabilization, Mr. William G. Barr, under date of February 3, 1953. The letter is being printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks. In the letter Mr. Barr says:

> The amount expended for lump-sum payments (terminal leave) resulting from normal turnover, including reduction in force, was $392,789.

I read from another portion of the letter:

> As of possible interest, of the $2,600,000 available only for terminal leave in the fiscal year 1950, only $1,061,494 was expended for that item, some $827,806 having previously been expended for lump-sum payments from the regular appropriation.

Apparently the lump-sum payment practice has been a favorite pay-off throughout that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator from Delaware referred this matter to Mr. Brownell, our new Attorney General?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not yet.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish the Senator from Delaware would do so. It is a matter which should receive the very careful attention of the Attorney General. He should carefully consider this raid upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Michigan has made a very good suggestion, because definitely if there is a loophole in the law it should be corrected immediately, and if laws do prohibit this practice then appropriate action should be taken. I venture to say that there is not any Member of the Senate who believes that such a raid on the Treasury is proper or understood that these payments could be made in this manner.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe that there is in the conspiracy law any loophole which would make it possible to defraud the United States Government of funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me that under the rule the Committee on Government Operations would have jurisdiction of the subject, inasmuch as there are involved efficiency, economy, and administrative operations of the Government. I am confident that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], will give it immediate attention. The committee is now implemented with a very excellent staff. It is a matter concerning which the committee can make an investigation of a very fruitful and constructive nature without delay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to hear the Senator suggest that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not wish to take any credit from the committee which will investigate this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I understand that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish full credit given to the committee which will proceed to investigate to see how much bonus was paid, and so forth. I merely think this matter deserves the attention of the Attorney General, from the point of view of a possible prosecution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the matter should be referred to the Attorney General and also to the General Accounting Office. I believe it should be referred to both of them. Likewise I think Congress should study the problem and stop these unwarranted expenditures.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that I felt that both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Government Operations should study this practice to ascertain the extent to which this practice has been followed and just how much it is costing us. Unquestionably if the practice is followed throughout all the Government agencies, its cost will run into millions of dollars. I hope we will find that the practice is not widespread and that we have checked it in time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have talked to Mr. Ellis, the chief investigator for the General Accounting Office; and he is checking now to ascertain whether this practive has prevailed in other departments.

I doubt whether such a practice has been found to exist in other departments, for in going over the post audits such discharges might not be found. After all, if an employee was continued in the service, the audit would merely show the amount of money being paid to him, and it would not necessarily be found that later he did receive such a lump-sum payment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe it will be found now that we know how the plan operates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the kind of item which does not show up very freely in the appropriations process, unless one is looking for it particularly.

I think I should say now that the Senator from Delaware is entitled to congratulations and commendation for the job he has done in exposing this condition. From now on I believe the appropriate committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter will be able to go into it. From what I have seen of the Committee on Government Operations, I am confident this matter will receive the kind of attention it richly deserves.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. First, Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from Delaware for doing what I think is the best job I ever seen one Senator do single handedly in rooting out fraud and corruption in this Government. Our committee will be very happy to proceed immediately to look into this matter, if the Senator from Delaware cares to refer his information to our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that all the information is available to his committee. Earlier today I stated that—the Senator from Wisconsin happened to be out at the time—that this material was available to his committee, for I think it is the appropriate committee of Congress to handle it, although I also said that I believe the Appropriations Committee, which will be considering deficiency appropriations, as well as the regular appropriations for these agencies, should likewise be informed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Upon the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], our committee has appointed a three-man subcommittee to maintain constant liaison with the Appropriations Committees and to inform the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee of the House of any information which we develop which we believe might be of interest to them. So we shall be very happy to go into this matter.

I did not hear the entire statement the Senator from Delaware has made; but from what I have heard of it, it would seem that this situation definitely involves criminal action. Is that the Senator's thought?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not being an attorney myself, I would not wish to pass on that point; but the question has been submitted to the General Accounting Office, and I asked the advice of the legislative counsel of the Senate. Also, as the Senator from Michigan has suggested—and I agreed—the question should be submitted to the Department of Justice for a ruling. These payments are duplicate payments. These men are being paid lump sums for 90 days' leave, although actually they are continuing to work every day for the Government and are being paid for such work. I do not believe the law should even permit, if it does, such a situation. It is highly irregular, to say the least. If a violation of law is involved, of course these matters should be prosecuted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We found that the amount of turn-over of new employees seemed to be very large. Does the Senator from Delaware think the situation to which he has referred would account for such large turn-over figures, in view of the suggestion that various Government employees have been listed as leaving the Government services, but have returned the next day to the Government service, and have been accounted as turn-overs?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not had an opportunity to check to see whether that is the case. However, the source of information, which called this matter to my attention in the beginning, pointed out that on many occasions we read in the newspapers that X agency has made a reduction in force of 50, 100, or 500 employees; in reality they were only paving the way for these payments. I have read such notices many times, as have other Senators; and I have often wondered why, if such large reductions in force were made, there was a constant increase in the size of the force.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; every month we would read about a reduction of 3,000 or 4,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And yet the total number of employees keeps increasing. So the point is: Are these reductions, reduction in name only, and are they made only as an excuse to make such payments to the persons involved. For instance, in this case the effective date of the termination was Sunday, and on Monday morning the same employees were back on their jobs, at the same desks.

Mr. FERGUSON. So such employees never lost any pay for a day's work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they never missed a day's work and never lost pay for any day's work; they simply continued on the same jobs with the bonus additional.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that in such case notification would have to be given to the Civil Service Commis-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sion, for time after time that Commission has pointed out to the Appropriations Committee the amount of money needed by the Commission in making field checks—a sum running up to perhaps $1,000,000 a year. Similarly the Commission has referred to the large number of dismissal cases, and so forth. It seems to me it is rather unusual that this matter has not come to our attention from an official source, such as the Civil Service Commission. I believe there must be some part of the official procedure which would account for a notification and a check. If that has not been done, then there has been some dereliction on the part of that agency, also.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unquestionably there has been a slip somewhere. I believe it is up to the appropriate committee of Congress to ascertain just where the slip was made, how it happened, and by whom it was made, for all of us to recognize that we should not permit a procedure of this sort to continue.

At the same time, it is highly irregular, if not actually immoral, for the heads of agencies to use any such device—as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out—to permit the payment of a $3,600 bonus simply for accepting a termination notice 30 days hence, when knowing at the same time that he would not be laid off.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator from Delaware for calling this matter to our attention. I believe it warrants particular attention by the Appropriations Committee and by the Civil Service Commission. If legislation to deal with this matter is required, I assure the Senator from Delaware that we shall do everything we possibly can to have early action taken on such legislative measures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield to me, let me say that I believe we should give due credit in this matter to the Senator from Delaware, for he has called it to our attention. I know that all other Members of the Senate appreciate very much the action of the Senator from Delaware in calling the matter to our attention today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the next nomination on the executive calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert W. Burgess, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations made this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I should like to make a very brief statement with reference to the increase in interest rates proposed by the Treasury Department.

There have been some $9,000,000,000 borrowed by the Government on short term—11 months—obligations which had been at an interest rate of 1⅞ percent.

Secretary Humphrey announced that holders of these current bonds and future purchasers would be given the option of taking short-term bonds at 2¼ percent or 5-year bonds at 2½ percent, an increase of three-eighths and five-eighths of 1 percent respectively.

The total cost of this change will not be known until the Treasury announces the extent to which each option was exercised. However, the minimum cost to the Government would be $33,750,000—if all choose short-term bonds at 2¼ percent—and the maximum would be $57,250,000—if all choose the 5-year bonds at 2½ percent.

The administration's justification is that this move will tighten credit and thereby reduce inflationary trends. However, many economists feel that this could effect a savings in Government procurement of only a few million dollars.

The administration also contends that short-term bonds are too much trouble to handle and entail too much administrative expense.

The answer to this is twofold: First, there is no such thing as too much trouble if we can save money; and second, the Government will continue to have an immense number of short-term bonds outstanding.

The alternative to the Treasury's action would be to continue at current rates with short-term bonds and refund with the same kind of short-term bonds.

This move can be criticized as a strange beginning to the economy program promised by the new administration. Quite clearly the many million dollars of extra expense redounds directly to the benefit of banks, insurance companies, and other private investors in Government obligations, while the little people of America foot the bill. It is another example of concealed passing of the burden to the little people. It seems to me to place a dollar sign on American patriotism. Once the American people are enlightened as to the need for the sale of the bonds, I think the Government ought to be able to sell them without having to buy patriotism by an increased interest rate which would accrue to the benefit of those who already have bonds, and an increased cost to those who do not have them.

HAYS, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a few days ago the people of the Nation were shocked by the tragedy that befell parts of the British Isles and parts of the Netherlands and Belgium. It was only a little more than a year ago that the small town of Hays, in western Kansas, suffered a very disastrous flood and loss of property.

I have been informed that the mayor of Hays, Kans., the Hon. Vernon Meckel, through the chamber of commerce, asked individuals and officials in Washington for assistance and guidance to enable citizens of Hays to adopt Bussom or any Dutch town that had suffered tragic loss. I am happy to say that information was supplied as to how the people of Hays could help during this time of difficulty in the Netherlands.

I wish to commend such action to the attention of the Senate. If it could happen that such a spirit might permeate this country, and catch on, so to speak, what a decided help would be given stricken areas that have suffered tragic losses. In my opinion, it would be more beneficial than some results that have been obtained under the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I desire to speak on another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

PAYMENTS FOR ACCUMULATED LEAVE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the excellent presentation he has made today, pointing out a situation that should by all means be corrected, so that it will never occur again.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether it is his intention to have S. 242, which is now on the desks of Senators called up at this time. It is a bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At this time the acting majority leader would say no.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator inform me as to when the bill will be taken up?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for an answer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana to repeat his question?

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect S. 242 to be taken up?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall suggest that it go over for today. However, I am sorry that I cannot say exactly when it will come up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been waiting to learn when it will be taken up, because I shall have to leave the city on Friday and may not return until Monday night.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it will be of interest to the Senator, I think it is very unlikely that it will come up this week. So far as I am concerned, it will not be taken up this week.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be absent during a part of next week also, perhaps until Tuesday.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, I shall see to it that the bill is not brought up until Tuesday or later.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for making the request that the bill be held over is this: The bill may entail an expenditure of thousands of dollars per year for maintenance of a hospital in Colorado. This measure has been referred to and reported by the Committee on Finance, when, as a matter of fact, it should have been sent to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings have not been held, and we are without a report from the Department affected.

It occurs to me that before the Senate takes up a bill of this type and magnitude, hearings ought to be held to determine what will be required in the way of funds during the next 2 or 3 years in order to maintain the facility. There is no reason why the Senate should go into this matter blindfolded, so to speak. Hearings should certainly have been held. A report from the Veterans' Administration should have been requested and made available to the Senate before the bill was presented for action. As the matter now stands, we have no way of knowing exactly what expenditures will be entailed, or, for that matter, whether the facility is necessary at all. I note that the every incomplete report that accompanies the bill states that a 500-bed hospital is already available at Denver. It strikes me that the Senate should know whether existing facilities are full before authorizing the expenditure of funds for a hospital that could well result in duplicating bed-space.

I remind the Senate that the party now in power has pledged to bring more economy into the operation of our Government. This is a view I share also, and I frankly do not see how we can economize by legislating in the dark, so to speak. This bill authorizes the appropriation of an unknown amount of funds to accomplish something we have not been shown is necessary—or, for that matter—even desired by the Veterans' Administration, since there has been no report made by that agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minority leader talked with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, and with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] today, and has received assurances from both Senators that they do not expect to call up the bill until the Veterans' Administration has had an opportunity to make a full report.

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion, that should have been done before the bill was reported to the Senate. As it is, we have nothing to work with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that that has now been done, and both Senators from Colorado have assured me that they do not expect to call up the bill without notice. If they do, the minority leader will ask that it go over.

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS—LETTER FROM CHIEF JUDGE MARVIN JONES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week, during the debate on resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration providing for the appropriation of money for the Committee on the Judiciary, there was colloquy between other Senators and myself regarding the overwhelming burden of claims in immigration cases before the Committee on the Judiciary. There seemed to have been some misunderstanding as to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims. During the colloquy I may have inadvertently left an impression as to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims which could have been misunderstood.

As a result, the Chief Judge of the Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, has sent me a letter which clarifies the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in such matters. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1953.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read with interest your statement on the floor of the Senate on January 30, in which you make reference to the United States Court of Claims.

I would like to call you attention to the fact that this court has no orginal jurisdiction of automobile accidents. These come under the Tort Claims Act which gives jurisdiction to the United States District Court in all claims of this kind. We have only appellate jurisdiction, and this only when both parties agree to have the appeals come to this court. Therefore any private bills covering tort accidents would not come to this court unless by special reference or by special bill.

In the other type of claims to which you refer, the immigration cases, we have only overtime pay cases filed by immigration inspectors which are disposed of very promptly. Other immigration cases do not come to the United States Court of Claims.

You also make reference to what you term the slowness of the court in passing upon claims. That may have been true at one time, but in recent years the average time from the filing of cases until final disposition in this court has been less than the average time in getting through the district courts and the courts of appeal. This is shown by the report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. When a case has been completed in this court it is in the same position as when a case has gone through the District Court and the court of appeals. From both the Court of Claims and the court of appeals a petition for review may be made to the Supreme Court.

Naturally the great number of contract and other cases growing out of our immense defense program has greatly increased our workload. More than twice as many cases are being filed in this court as were filed some 5 or 6 years ago.

We have been endeavoring to get the Department of Justice to assign additional attorneys to look after matters pending before this court. If we succeed in this we will be able to continue to keep reasonably current in our disposition of cases.

Since your remarks, evidently made upon a misapprehension as to our jurisdiction, may have given an erroneous impression as to the reason for the numerous private bills based on personal injury by Army trucks or otherwise, I would appreciate your calling the contents of this letter to the attention of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Chief Judge.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in my review and study of President Eisenhower's message on the state of the Union I noted with approval and considerable interest, the first point in reference to our foreign policy:

> Our foreign policy must be clear, consistent and confident. This means that it must be the product of genuine, continuous cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of this Government. It must be developed and directed in the spirit of true bipartisanship. And I assure you Members of this Congress I mean that fully, earnestly, and sincerely.

I am sure that all Senators approve that expressed sentiment of our President and desire to work in that spirit.

Later in the same message, in reference to the Korean situation, the President of the United States took very forthright and firm action pertaining to the use of the United States Seventh Fleet in the waters surrounding Formosa. He said:

> This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China.

A little further on, the President said:

> I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. Permit me to make crystal clear, this order implies no aggressive intent on our part. But we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea.

Mr. President, my observation is that in the early part of the President's address there was a pledge of bipartisan foreign policy. Possibly there was consultation in reference to this fundamental change in the policy of our Nation. If so, I, as one Member of the Senate, did not hear about it.

Secondly, it is my honest opinion that the statement pertaining to the use of the Seventh Fleet is but part of the truth. It is, in fact, a rewriting of the history of our time. Former President Truman, in authorizing the use of the Seventh Fleet, or ordering its use in the waters surrounding Formosa, not only ordered the fleet to protect the mainland of China from any raids made from Formosa by the Chinese Nationalists, but also said that he would see to it that the Seventh Fleet protected the security of the island of Formosa and the security of the forces of Chiang Kai-shek upon that island.

Thirdly, that the life-lines and supply-lines feeding into the bases in Korea and other military installations of the United States and the United Nations would be protected.

Mr. President, I am not saying that what is stated in the President's message is not factual. I am saying, however, that what is stated there is not complete; and I, for one, do not intend to stand idly by and see the history of our times rewritten. I want to see the history of our times written objectively. I have previously said that before one can make honest judgments or evaluations of the actions of individuals one must have a fairly good objective knowledge of the history of the times in which we live.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, as the distinguished Senator is saying, that the straits of Formosa are not a one-way street, but a two-way street? Three hundred thousand or three hundred fifty thousand of Chiang's troops were on Formosa, while millions of Communists troops were on the mainland of China.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. It seems to me, as the distinguished Senator has said, that it is stretching logic a little to assume that our Navy was protecting some two million Communist troops from action by 300,000 or 350,000 at that time untrained and unequipped troops of Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, it is not my intention at this time to argue with the policies included in the message. I say only that when we evaluate the foreign policy of our Nation and formalize it in the form of an official document, it is absolutely imperative that we have all the facts. It is my honest conviction that policies derived from false assumptions may be more dangerous to the security of this country than poor judgment. The falsification of history has no place in a democracy; and I submit that the full intent and purport of this section of the state of the Union message is merely to state, as is stated, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as the defensive arm of Communist China. Mr. President, that is but part of the fact. The rest of the fact is that the Seventh Fleet served to protect our own installations, our own troops, and served to protect the security of the forces upon Formosa and to neutralize, at the time the order was made, any combat within the area.

Mr. President, I submit that all this is substantiated by the message of President Truman on June 27, 1950. He said:

> Accordingly, I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary of this action I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations.

All I am saying is that but half of former President Truman's statement was made the subject of comment in the state of the Union message by our new President, President Eisenhower. That section of President Truman's order to prevent any attack on Formosa was not referred to. This limitation or deletion modifies the intent of the order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understood the Senator from Minnesota, he stated that to the best of his knowledge no Member of the minority had been consulted concerning the President's recommendations in connection with the Seventh Fleet. I believe that in fairness I should say that prior to the President's state of the Union message the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State-designate asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, together with the majority leader and the minority leader and their counterparts on the House side, to attend a meeting at the State Department. I am not at liberty to discuss what happened at that meeting. I was not of the opinion that any great consultation took place, but I think fairness requires that I inform the Senator that the group was informed about certain statements which the President would make in his state of the Union message.

Yesterday the minority leader brought these matters to the attention of the Democratic Policy Committee. At the conclusion of our meeting the chairman of that committee issued a statement to the effect that the issues of war and peace are far too serious to be settled in the arena of narrow partisan debate; that we felt they could be solved only by the united wisdom and effort of all Americans, regardless of political affiliations, and that we were ready and eager to consult with the President as soon as the machinery for such consultation could be established.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the statement issued by the Democratic policy committee yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 3, 1953

> Americans everywhere have been gratified by the President's call for "true bipartisanship" in the development of foreign and defense policies. Even more encouraging are statements that high administration officials will consult with members of the minority party before—and not after—policy has been formed.
>
> We are ready and eager to consult with the President as soon as the machinery for such consultation is established.
>
> The issues of war and peace are far too serious to be settled in the arena of narrow, partisan debate. They can be solved only by the united wisdom and effort of all Americans regardless of political affiliations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say to the minority leader that I appreciate the information which he has given the Senate, and I greatly appreciate the expression of cooperation which he has made here today. That is exactly the spirit which is in my heart. I mean that in every sense, with all the sincerity I can command. Our foreign policy must not be a subject of partisanship. It, indeed, must be bipartisan. But, bipartisanship requires more than just being told or notified. I wish to say that if we are to have that spirit and if we are to get away from what some people believe existed only a few months ago, we must proceed in the full spirit of consultation, bipartisanship, and factual reporting of history.

I do not intend to stand idly by, on the floor of the Senate or in committee, and have the history of our times rewritten to justify a decision. The history of the times in which we live is grave and perplexing. The least we should expect is to have the history objectively and honestly reported, so that our assumptions may be sane and sound, and that upon those assumptions derived from study of national and international history we can work forward to a policy which will insure us what the President and all of us want—freedom, peace and security.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senator from Texas that I do not care to become involved in a debate of the subject at this time. I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree that this is not the time to debate the question of Formosa or the Straits of Formosa. I think that I speak the feelings of President Eisenhower when I say that he has the utmost desire to cooperate with Congress and that he has the utmost desire to work out these problems on a bipartisan basis.

Whether there was a consultation, as the Senator from Texas has stated, I will not discuss at the present time, but I am confident—and I make this statement from my heart—that there is no intention on the part of President Eisenhower to rewrite the history of the United States or to state half-truths, upon which to base assumptions or reach decisions.

I would rather have the debate on that subject held more fully at another time. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not press the point at this time. He has made his assertion. I am confident that answer will be made by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the appropriate time. I hope we will not get into a discussion of the subject at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have no intention of further discussing the subject. I thank the majority leader for his spirit of understanding. I shall be prepared at all times to join the debate whenever it comes before us on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield next to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with all due deference to the minority leader, I, as one Senator, would like to find out from the President what his ideas are. I am willing to use my own judgment in trying to cooperate with him in his desire to carry out his ideas. However, the point I should like to make is that the decision of the Minority Policy Committee is not the decision of the minority. After all, I do not want the Minority Policy Committee to make a decision for me. I should like to use my own judgment.

After all, the President of the United States is entitled at least to a fair chance to try to carry out what I consider to be the mandate of the American people. However, I should like to ask the minority leader at this time if it is expected by him that what the policy committee decides is to be the decision of the minority Members of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the minority leader merely read to the Senate the statement which was adopted by the minority policy committee. He did not attempt to speak for any

Member of the Senate other than the Members of that committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know, but what——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator will read the statement and then assume the same position which the nine members of the committee assumed, well and good. If he does not care to do so, of course, the Senator may—and I know he will—express his own personal viewpoint.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The point I am trying to make at this time is that, so far as the minority is concerned—certainly so far as I as a member of the minority am concerned—I do not want 9 Members of the Senate, out of 47 Members of the Senate, to decide what should be done and expect me to go along with them if in conscience and in duty I feel differently.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can assure the Senator from New Mexico—at least so far as I am concerned, and I believe I can say insofar as every member of the policy committee is concerned—that neither I nor any of the members of the committee would be so presumptuous.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope not, because, so far as the Senator from New Mexico is concerned, they are not going to speak for me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that he always votes his own convictions.

ORDER ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise on the floor of the Senate to speak on the order which was issued yesterday by Joseph M. Dodge, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the various departments and agencies of the United States Government. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the order may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this order is in furtherance of the objective which the President made in his message to Congress on the State of the Union. I am delighted to have the support of our new administration in this economy effort since I have worked in this direction for years. The President has called attention to the fact that it was the desire of the administration to balance the budget and then proceed to cut taxes. He brought to the attention of the people of the country the fact that there were available $80,000,000,000 in unexpended balances which did not include all funds, such as revolving and management funds, and permanent appropriations. The joint committee known as the Byrd committee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a member, has in its possession figures which would indicate that the total figure is closer to $102,253,000,000 as of June 30, 1953.

The order applies to both new construction and going construction projects.

I wish to quote from the budget page 1118:

> Authorized work: In addition to the commitments to complete work now under way or work to be started in 1954, agency reports indicate that, on the basis of present prices, almost $16,600,000,000 of construction work has been authorized, either by general or specific legislation, and may be undertaken after fiscal 1954 if funds are provided. About $12,400,000,000 of this authorized work is included in the river-basin programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. (P. 1118 of the 1954 budget.)

In the present budget there is also an item for civil public works of $27,800,000,000, the total cost of programs either under way or requested in the 1954 budget. We will have expended, through June 30, 1953, $12,926,000,000 on these programs, and the budget request for 1954 is for an additional $3,920,900,000.

Mr. President, the order of the Budget Director is a bold move in an attempt on the part of the new administration to get control of expenditures whether they come from new appropriations or unexpended balances, and to enable Congress to cooperate in this control.

The order apparently applies not only to civilian construction but also to military construction. It will not take very long for the new administration to make the survey, and therefore there will be no unnecessary delay in any essential project. I am sure that the order is intended to apply to all construction which has not been started as well as to construction which has been started but may not be continued. The purpose of the order is to look over the program and to determine whether or not such construction is necessary. If the construction is necessary the next step is to determine the most economical way of completing it.

There is a further item in the order which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. It is the part of the order which restricts recruitment of new personnel unless deemed necessary by the established criteria. In other words, the agencies must show real necessity for filling vacancies as they occur. I am sure that the discharging and immediate rehiring of employees, as discussed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], will not now be carried out, and that the practice referred to in his statement with respect to drawing money for annual leave or other leave, will not be continued in the manner he outlined.

So we find that from today on we shall have an administration which will reduce the number of Government employees, not in wholesale firings, except when agencies are abolished, but in a way which will really bring economy and efficiency. We shall be able to balance the budget, and we shall be able to reduce taxes, if the people in our respective States will not request more government and more spending than they can afford.

I believe it is essential that every person and group really try to cooperate with the present administration, in order that we may have a government of the size we can afford to support. If we do that, then we can proceed to reduce taxes, and the people will be able to spend their money for the benefit of their own families and their own businesses, rather than have much of their money used in the form of taxes to be spent for the operation of various governmental agencies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to make an observation, following the remarks which have just been made by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Michigan is correct. I sincerely believe that in all Government departments the personnel could be reduced to the extent of from 10 percent to 15 percent, and we would still have better administration than exists at the present time. I make this statement on the basis of my service on the Appropriations Committee, on which the Senator from Michigan knows I have served. I firmly believe what I have just stated.

During the Eighty-second Congress I tried to bring about such a reduction in the number of Government employees. I recommended such a reduction at the time when I happened to be chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and for the Department of Labor. I believe that if those agencies had gotten down to brass tacks in their operations, they could have reduced their personnel by from 10 percent to 15 percent, and could still have had better administration and could have rendered better service.

Notwithstanding that in that particular appropriation bill we did save $214,000,000, I was unable to make the personnel reductions which I believe could have been made. However, we were up against the idea of "bureaucratic Washington," and we were unable to have such reductions made in the number of Government employees.

So I am glad the Senator from Michigan has made the statement he has made today, and I hope the suggestion which has been made carries through. So far as I am concerned, I shall help the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's help, because we shall need everybody's help on this problem.

This order relates to one other item, I may say. The budget which was submitted to this Congress by the previous President provided for 140,000 additional employees. The order to which I have referred affects that item. Now necessity must be shown before such employees are hired.

Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget comes from the city of Detroit, Mich. He is capable of looking over the entire financial structure of our Government and has had experience in United States Government finances. I know he understands that field. He is capable of carrying out the necessary procedures, and is capable of making the essential cuts. I know that the people of the United States generally, as well as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in particular, will find in Joseph Dodge a very able man who will be able to advise with them and will be able to proceed to do a job which is well worth while.

I wish to compliment him for issuing the order immediately following the President's state of the Union message, and I hope it will be carried out by the administration with the aid of Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1953.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: One of the first and most important tasks of our new administration is to review the 1954 budget and to proceed toward the accomplishment of a balanced budget.

This review will take the initial steps toward that goal; will establish in definitive form how far we can go in that direction in the fiscal year 1954; and set the stage for the fiscal year 1955. It should help to identify issues that will be significant in the formulation of the budget for that year.

The problem is complicated by inheritance of the costs of a Federal debt of more than $265,000,000,000; indicated deficits for the fiscal years 1953–54 totaling $15,800,000,000; and accumulated unexpended balances of appropriations in excess of the total new obligational authority requested for fiscal year 1954.

It is clear that this situation will not be brought under control without action to reduce budgetary obligational authority, reduce the level of expenditures, critically examine existing programs, restrain commitments for new programs, and generally to drive for greater efficiency and reduced costs.

In this review the policies shall be as follows:

With respect to personnel: It is the policy to reduce the number of Government employees. Each department or agency head shall immediately restrict the hiring of additional personnel. No vacancies shall be filled until the department or agency head shall have determined to his satisfaction that:

(a) The positions represented by vacancies cannot be eliminated.

(b) Existing employees cannot be shifted to cover the vacancies.

(c) Increased efficiency, better utilization of personnel, or changes in standards and policies of department or agency operation will not make possible the attainment of (a) and (b) above.

It is the policy to achieve a progressive reduction of personnel for the remainder of the fiscal year 1953 and for the 1954 budget. Variations from this policy, as applied to individual departments and agencies, will be granted by the President in his review of the 1954 budget only upon specific request and adequate justification by the department or agency head.

With respect to construction: It is the policy to proceed only with those projects which are deemed clearly essential in terms of the objectives of this administration and on such projects to employ the strictest standards of economy. Each department and agency head is therefore directed to—

(a) Review all proposed or authorized construction projects on which work has not yet begun, and to propose initiation of construction during the remainder of the fiscal year 1953 and the fiscal year 1954 only on those projects which he determines meet the above criteria.

(b) Review all going construction projects in the light of the above criteria and take such action as he may deem appropriate, including action to stop the work.

With respect to all programs: It is the policy to operate at a minimum level of cost and expenditures. This policy requires that the necessity for all work be questioned and that action be taken to eliminate unnecessary programs and to hold the remainder to minimum levels. Each department and agency head is therefore directed to—

(a) Permit no increases over the January rate of obligations except on complete justification and specific approval, unless such increases are clearly necessary to meet requirements fixed by law.

(b) Initiate an immediate review within his department or agency calling for recommendations on the downward adjustment of program levels and for information as to the probable effect of such adjustments on Government services.

The results of these reviews should be used wherever possible in the 1954 budget revision procedure and in the preparation of submissions for the 1955 budget.

You are expected to translate these guides into proposals for specific revisions of the budget figures for your department or agency and to transmit them to this office in the form indicated in the attachment. Your proposals should be received by this office on or before March 2, 1953.

Pending the receipt of your recommendations and the President's decisions on proposed revisions of the 1954 budget, any significant deviation from these policies and criteria shall be reported to the Bureau of the Budget.

Your recommendations pertaining to the 1954 budget also should indicate the possibilities of making further changes in subsequent budgets where you propose that legislation now in effect be amended or repealed. Where your budget review indicates the desirability of a change in legislation, a draft bill or other proposal for action should be submitted for appropriate clearance as promptly as possible.

Legislative proposals, originating either in Congress or in your department or agency, which would affect financial requirements of your department or agency, should be reviewed in the light of the budget policies set forth above.

The recommendations which you make in response to this letter, like all other budget estimates, are in the nature of advice for the President, and are highly confidential prior to the time that the President formally has acted thereon.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE,
Director.

DECLINE IN BEEF PRICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I was amazed to read in this morning's newspaper, in an Associated Press dispatch, the following statement regarding the new Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson:

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, yesteday urged disturbed cattlemen to drop their "unwarranted pessimism" about declining prices and to stop dumping beef cattle on the market.

I read further from the article:

"The United States economy is fundamentally strong," Benson said. "Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability to cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle."

Benson promised no Government action to help stabilize cattle prices. There are no price support programs for meat animals, although they are permitted by law.

Benson's appeal for an "orderly pattern" of cattle marketing—

And so forth. Mr. President, I am fearful that this first statement by Secretary Benson in regard to what to me appears to be a huge collapse in our economic strength on the farms is being grossly minimized by the Department of Agriculture. When the Secretary of Agriculture asks the cattlemen to drop their "unwarranted pessimism" about declining prices, he overlooks the fact that from $5,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 has been wiped out of the American economy in the value of livestock in the last 10 weeks. Certainly the comment about unwarranted pessimism existing among the cattlemen of this country does not meet the problem. The cattlemen would like to remain in business. They are not liquidating their herds by choice. But such a situation is developing across the United States that the herds are being liquidated.

Many banks who have financed the loans made to the cattlemen in order to build the herds and to provide for the United States the 90,000,000 head of cattle that we have today were forced to call the loans. These loans were made on the basis of 70 percent of the then market value of approximately 32 cents a pound. Now banks are calling all these loans, because cattle are selling at from 15 to 18 cents a pound.

So the unwarranted pessimism which is said to exist in the cattle industry today is caused largely by the bankers who have helped to finance the increase in the livestock herds, and who now want the loans repaid because the unusual and rapid decline in price has wiped out the equities those cattlemen have. They now have no place to turn for production credit.

This problem is not faced only by the large ranchers, although many of the most wealthy ranchers are affected by losses running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars; but it confronts also the small farmers, those who have borrowed money from a bank for two cows, for instance. Because the bank examiners are stating that the former equity no longer exists behind those loans, today virtually every small bank in the country is forced to call loans. This creates a stampede of cattle into the market. In order to liquidate the loans the farmer must liquidate his present herds. Within a year we may have a scarcity of cattle, although meantime we may enjoy a very brief respite in prices as the stampede or run occurs in the market. But in the long run the Nation will pay very dearly for the liquidation of these herds, which is occurring while the Secretary of Agriculture stands idly by and issues statements in which he ask the cattlemen not to be unduly disturbed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am disturbed not only by statements similar to the one to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred, in which the Secretary of Agriculture requests that there be no

undue pessimism, but also by requests for commissions to study such situations. The need in this case is for action.

Let me also point out that the Senator is eminently correct when he says this matter is a very serious one to all farmers, not only to the large ranchers.

I have just returned from my home State of Minnesota, where many farmers are cattle feeders. Simple mathematics shows that it is not possible for a farmer to feed $1.52 corn to a $16 hog or to give expensive feed to $17 cattle, and to end in any condition except broke.

It is true that the banks are beginning to call in their loans, and it is true that the entire area of what is known as farm-perishable commodities is under severe economic pressure today.

I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact that the farmers' parity ratio as of today is 96. That means, in terms of prices, that in the price for which he sells the farmer is 4 percent below what he has to pay for the things he buys. In other words, he pays a dollar for something; he has 96 cents with which to buy that dollar commodity. That means he goes into debt 4 cents on every dollar unit. A year ago it was 107 percent parity, 2 years ago it was 111 percent. But at 107 percent the farmer could make a profit. At 102 percent he can break even or better and still have a little profit. But at 96 percent—and, Mr. President, it has been going down every day—the promise of "prosperity around the corner" is not going to save the situation. What is needed is a firm policy and a determined attitude on the part of the Government to do as the Senator from Oklahoma is saying now—to stop this movement before it gets out of hand. We saw farm prices collapse once before, and it not only wrecked the farmers but the entire economy.

Mr. President, I want to say one final word, if the Senator will permit me. With the statement of the Senator from Oregon concerning the interest rates on Government bonds, I concur 100 percent. I refer to the interest rate that is going to be paid on long-term issues of Government bonds. Mr. President, I ask any Member of this body who represents 1 farmer or 100,000 farmers: What is happening to the interest rates to Mr. Farmer? The farmers are going to pay and pay and pay. The farmer pays 6, 7, and 8 percent for short-term loans. General Motors pays 1½ percent or less.

Mr. President, the solid-dollar theory got so solid once before that it broke every bank in the country. I would in this hour add a note of admonition. In pursuing this solid-dollar theory based on high-interest rates and limited credit, let us not proceed to a point where we literally put the economy on the skids. That is exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma is directing his remarks to, and I thank him for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. Going back to what the Secretary appeals for in the way of an orderly marketing pattern instead of a stampede, the situation is not going to be remedied by issuing statements asking the disturbed cattlemen to "drop their unwarranted pessimism." It is not pessimism, but they are facing the facts. If the stock market or the eastern financial interests had seen $9,000,000,000 wiped out within 10 weeks' time, there would have been some commissions appointed, and some action to correct the situation would have been taken. Yet, despite the fact that livestock represents more than 60 percent of the total farm income, and that every State is affected, we find a statement made, asking that the cattlemen drop their unwarranted pessimism.

I should like to see a program designed to provide emergency production credit and to underwrite loans so as to enable the cattlemen to carry their herds during the period of this record-breaking decline.

If something is not done and done promptly we are going to see the Nation's livestock liquidated down to the danger point and the stock raisers forced into bankruptcy. It will then be more than 3 years before we can have adequate production which, under the law of supply and demand, can keep prices down.

Mr. President, it would not be so bad; perhaps if this crisis would correct itself rather sharply and soon. If the decline in the livestock prices had been reflected in the cost of beef this might have happened. But the price of steak that was based on 32-cent livestock prices has not reflected the 18-cent livestock prices today, and consequently the market has not absorbed or used up the unusually high market runs.

I would like to be fair enough to admit that the drought triggered off this slide in cattle prices, but it has continued long past the drought decline. And it has gotten into an accelerated landslide downward, as the cattle are stampeded to market and as the banks are forced to liquidate their loans because the price decline has wiped out their equities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the argument of orderly marketing needs careful examination. It is impossible to have orderly marketing in a depressed-price economy, unless there is extended extensive long-term credit. The reason there is disorderly marketing in the agricultural field today, particularly in regard to livestock, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, is that when the note comes due, the signer of the note pays; and how does he pay? He has to sell, and every time he sells in a depressed market, the price continues to go down, which in turn means that he must sell more in order to pay the note he signed at a time of high prices. Thousands of farmers bought feeder cattle at $32 a hundred, $36 a hundred, $28 a hundred, but the average price is now $17 a hundred. I submit to the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture that there is no such thing as orderly marketing in such a declining market price. There is, at present, no plan or program to check the constant flow of cattle that have to be liquidated in order to pay the notes which are coming due. By raising farm interest rates, which is being permitted in this country, the disorderly marketing to which the Secretary of Agriculture directs his attention is only aggravated.

I submit that the wheat farmer or the cotton farmer, without his commodity credit loans, without his price support props, would have as disorderly a marketing situation today as the beef farmer has. Why does he not have it? He has reasonably orderly marketing in wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco, because of a sound farm program which was initiated and which was effectuated. I realize that there is no mandatory price support program directing the Secretary of Agriculture to support livestock prices, but I am fully aware and cognizant of the fact that under the Agricultural Act of 1949 there is no prohibition on action. It is one of those discretionary measures which is in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. The need for action is here; the time to act is now—yet we hear from the Secretary of Agriculture only a plea for orderly marketing and a request not to be pessimistic. It reminds me of the 1930–32 philosophy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree that the Secretary does have power to act, and that action could be taken immediately to provide production credit. I venture to say that the mere matter of insuring these loans, through production credit, would cost Uncle Sam perhaps less than $10,000,000, perhaps nothing at all, and would stop this disastrous decline which has already taken about $9,000,000,000 out of the farm economy. Sixty percent of our American agricultural profits come from livestock, and when the livestock producer is taken out of business, the market for the rough feed, corn, and many other subsidiary items on which our agricultural prosperity has been based, is destroyed. The time is later than we think, and the danger is greater. We need action by the Department of Agriculture now.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The following-named persons to be Assistant Secretaries of Defense:

John A. Hannah, of Michigan.

Frank C. Nash, of the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Charles S. Thomas, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ralph A. Tudor, of Palo Alto, Calif., for the position of Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Fred G. Aandahl, of Litchville, N. Dak., as Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Orme Lewis, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Clarence A. Davis, of Lincoln, Nebr., to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Craig R. Sheaffer, of Iowa, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Harold E. Talbott, of New York, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Robert W. Burgess, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 4, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army, which was received by the Senate on January 9, 1953.

Francis Shackelford, of Georgia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was received by the Senate on January 9, 1953.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Seymour J. Rubin, of Illinois, to be Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art our refuge and strength: We commit our Nation, our cause, and ourselves to Thee. Grant to our anxious, groping hearts the assurance that behind the shadows and in them standeth One who slumbers not nor sleeps. We are beset by perplexity. Our needs are many. But our greatest need is of Thee. Until we find Thee and art found of Thee, the laws of our physical universe break our mortal life, and the laws of Thy moral order make mockery of our futile rebellion.

Breathe now Thy peace on hearts that pray—the peace that comes only when earth's jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will. Then as heralds of Thy all-embracing love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts as a holy sacrament the white bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice. In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 4, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa; Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio; and Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa; Mr. HARRISON, of Nebraska; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. REGAN, of Texas; and Mr. BURLESON, of Texas.

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Speaker announced as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; Mr. JOHNSON, of California; and Mr. CANNON, of Missouri.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate after today and until Wednesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate after today and until Wednesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate next week.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. POTTER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens whose deportation had been suspended, from lists heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AWARDING YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the awarding of Young American Medals for Bravery and Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN SURPLUS PROPERTY BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that there was no disposal, by sale, of foreign surplus property by the Department of Commerce, during the past year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN EXECUTIVE ELEMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the second quarter of the fiscal year 1953, December 31, 1952, there was an aggregate of 2,507 officers so assigned; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of that Board for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INJURY AND DEATH CLAIMS

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army" by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETIREMENT OF NON-REGULAR OFFICERS OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a

draft of proposed legislation to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED PUBLIC HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I take this occasion to advise my colleagues, the public, and all interested parties, of the program which our committee intends to follow in considering amendments to the labor law during this session of Congress.

It is the present intention of the committee to begin public hearings on amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act during the first week in March.

It will be of great assistance to the committee if all Senators who desire to introduce proposed legislation dealing with this subject will do so prior to February 20, in order that their proposals may be officially before the committee at the time the hearings begin. The committee has set up a staff to consider and coordinate these proposals before hearings are begun.

All individuals and groups who have definite proposals to offer by way of amendment to the act are urged to send their proposals to the committee by February 20, in order that they may be studied by the members of the committee and the staff.

All who wish to appear at these hearings and present testimony should write to the staff director of the committee, Mr. Philip R. Rodgers, indicating, as specifically as possible, the subject upon which they wish to present their testimony.

I hope this announcement will clarify the program of the Labor Committee with respect to the Labor-Management Relations Act, and that all groups interested in this problem will cooperate with the committee in the manner which I have outlined.

I should like to add that since I have become chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have conferred with Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, and with Mr. Walter Reuther and Mr. James Carey, president and secretary, respectively, of the CIO; and I am shortly to have a conference with Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, and also with leaders of the railroad brotherhoods, in order to invite them all to present, as promptly as possible, their suggestions for labor legislation.

The committee is making a careful attempt to bring together suggestions from both management and labor, in order to try to work out in conference, as far as we can, necessary amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act. Wherever we find areas of disagreement on this very important subject, on which it will be necessary to take further testimony, it will be our purpose to discuss them with all who are interested during the hearings beginning the first week of March.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit, No. 118, of Jacksonville, and Auxiliary Unit, No. 188, of Orlando, both in the State of Florida, favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Whereas the State of Texas retained all of its public lands upon annexation to the United States and such public lands were at that time dedicated by the State to its public-school fund; and

"Whereas it has been the historic policy of our Federal Government to gradually divest itself of title to public lands, granting these lands to the States for educational purposes, to land-grant colleges, and to homesteaders; and

"Whereas the Federal Government now owns 24 percent of all the land in the continental limits of the United States, not including the recently claimed submerged lands; and

"Whereas the States and the Federal Government have in recent years been involved in controversy over the ownership of submerged lands off the coasts of the States; and

"Whereas $14,372,354 in rents and royalties from the submerged areas are now impounded in the United States Treasury; and

"Whereas at present no significant new development of offshore lands can be accomplished because of this attempted Federal grab; and

"Whereas President-elect Eisenhower and a majority of the new United States Senate and House of Congress have spoken out for State ownership of submerged lands; and

"Whereas the present session of Congress will consider legislation determining the title to offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas the offshore area under dispute includes not only that within the historic State boundaries but also the area to the edge of the Continental Shelf; and

"Whereas the technical and experienced knowledge of personnel of the departments and staffs of the States relating to offshore development should not be lost to the Nation nor to the adjacent States in the problems arising in the Continental Shelf area: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of representatives of the fifty-third legislature (the senate concurring) most urgently recommends to the Congress that the entire tidelands controversy be settled by the early passage of a package bill which not only quitclaims to the States the land inside their constitutional State boundaries but which also provides for joint development by the States and the Federal Government of the Continental Shelf area; and that copies of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower and to all members of the Texas delegation in the United States Congress.

"Representative BILL DANIEL
(And all other members of the Texas House of Representatives)."

PROPERTY BASE FOR LOCAL TAXATION—RESOLUTION OF KENOSHA (WIS.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to receive this morning from Mr. B. A. Herrmann, city clerk of Kenosha, Wis., a resolution which had been adopted by the council of that fine community, on February 2.

The resolution pertains to the very important subject of making sure of an adequate property base on which taxes can continue to be levied by local governments. It points out specifically the problem posed by the United States Government's contracting for national defense materials and supplies.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 5208

Whereas many contracts being let at the present time by the United States Government for national defense materials and supplies remove such materials and supplies from local taxation by transferring title to the United States Government even when such materials and supplies are still in the form of raw materials or goods in process of manufacture; and

Whereas the National Association of Assessing Officers and similar organizations of public officials have, by resolution, condemned this practice as contrary to good governmental administration and sound public policy, and have pointed out that it not only impairs the property tax base in the cities affected but also causes an unfair imposition of the cost of the defense effort on those cities; and

Whereas the city of Kenosha is vitally concerned with this problem because materials of considerable value are involved in defense contracts between the United States Government and manufacturers located in said city, and the exemption of such materials from local taxation would have a serious effect on the ability of said city to provide essential municipal services to these manufacturers as well as to other local taxpayers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Kenosha requests the Congress of the United States to take appropriate and necessary action to the end that raw materials and goods in process of manufacture for defense purposes will not be eliminated as a source of revenue for the support of municipal services until such materials have been resolved into actual implements of defense and have been accepted by the United States Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

Dated this 29th day of January 1953.

NICHOLAS WADE,
President of Council.

Attest:

B. A. HERRMANN,
Clerk of Council.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

PARCEL POST RESTRICTIONS—RESOLUTION OF OWATONNA (MINN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Owatonna Chamber of Commerce, of Owatonna, Minn. The resolution favors the repeal of Public Law 199, Eighty-second Congress, on parcel-post restrictions.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE OWATONNA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

At a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Owatonna Chamber of Commerce, held on Thursday, January 15, 1953, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the Owatonna Chamber of Commerce is interested in the business welfare of its members in the retail, wholesale, and industrial field; and

"Whereas Public Law 199 (82d Cong.) places unreasonable limitations on parcel-post sizes and weights, and is undesirable for the following reasons:

"1. The present law limiting the size and weight of parcel-post packages discriminates against urban communities.

"2. It wastefully increases packing, shipping, and receiving costs because packages are limited to 40 pounds and 72-inch girth between first-class post offices, zones 1 and 2, and limited further to 20 pounds between first-class post offices in zones 3 to 8. Former limits, 70 pounds and 100 inches, were reasonable and efficient in size.

"3. There is no evidence that the postal deficit has been decreased by the restriction in size and weight as was predicted by proponents of the new law. The additional man-hours required to handle an increased number of packages would offset any appreciable increase in postage revenue.

"4. The present limitations deprive many communities of adequate, dependable package-delivery services. These are the communities which are either not supplied, or poorly supplied, by railway express and/or other privately operated services.

"5. Provisions of the present law are difficult for shippers and postal authorities to administer. Useless double checking of packages against this discriminatory law has become the rule, rather than the exception: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Owatonna Chamber of Commerce, in behalf of its members, urge all United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota to use their best efforts to effect an early repeal of Public Law 199."

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
OWATONNA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By JOHN D. HENDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

Dated January 27, 1953.

PARCEL POST RESTRICTIONS—RESOLUTION OF RETAIL DIVISION OF NEW ULM (MINN.) CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the New Ulm (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association. The resolution relates to the repeal of Public Law 199, Eighty-second Congress, concerning the restrictions on parcel post.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL OF PUBLIC LAW 199 (82D CONG.)

The following resolution was adopted by the Retail Division of the New Ulm Civic and Commerce Association, New Ulm, Minn., at their regular weekly meeting on Wednesday, January 14, 1953, at which restrictions on size and weight of parcel-post packages were discussed:

"*Resolved*, That all United States Senators and Representatives from Minnesota be urged to vote for the repeal of Public Law 199 (82d Cong.) for the following reasons:

"(a) The present law wastefully increases packing, shipping, and receiving costs because packages are limited to 40 pounds and 72 inches between first-class post offices. Former limits of 70 pounds and 100 inches were reasonable and efficient.

"(b) The present law limiting the size and weight discriminates against urban communities.

"(c) There is no evidence that the postal deficit has been decreased by the restrictions.

"(d) Limitations deprive many communities of adequate package-delivery services which are poorly supplied by privately operated services and by railway express.

"(e) Provisions of the present discriminatory law are difficult to administer for postal authorities, shippers, and receivers."

By the unanimous vote of 12 retailers present, the motion was duly made, seconded, and passed to adopt the foregoing resolution.

Respectfully submitted.

E. M. FRAHM,
Chairman, Retail Division, New Ulm Civic and Commerce Association.

Dated January 27, 1953.

GI LOANS—RESOLUTION OF POST 1947, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Post 1947, Veterans of Foreign Wars, St. Paul, Minn., which requests the Veterans' Administration to take certain action in connection with GI loans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas State Fair Grounds Post, No. 1947, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is interested in the welfare of all veterans; and

Whereas Government regulations prohibit banks and loan companies from charging veterans more than 4 percent interest on home loans guaranteed by the Government; and

Whereas said financial institutions were not willing to loan money at 4 percent interest, but by charging the seller a small origination fee, they were able and willing to make some GI loans; and

Whereas on December 15, 1951, the United States Veterans' Administration issued a regulation prohibiting loan companies and banks from charging such fees to the sellers of such homes; and

Whereas it is not apparent why the Government should be so interested in the financial affairs of such sellers of real estate, who are usually not veterans; and

Whereas as a result of said Government regulation prohibiting charging such sellers such a fee, it is now practically impossible for veterans to obtain home loans at 4 percent as originally intended by Congress, and as veterans usually only have a small amount of money for down payment, they are forced to purchase a home under a contract for deed under which the seller usually greatly increases the purchase price and also demands 6 percent interest, so that said seller will be able to sell said contract for deed quickly at a big discount and readily realize all of his money from his property at a great and unnecessary expense to the veteran, and also enable said seller to cancel said contract for deed and all of the veteran's equity in his home within 30 days, if said veteran through sickness or other misfortune should default in his payments under said contract; and

Whereas a survey showed that the lending institutions in the St. Paul area in 1952 made only a small fraction of the GI loans they made in the previous year of 1951, thereby greatly decreasing the work of said regional office at Fort Snelling, said office has recently revived the objectionable practice of refusing to answer all telephone calls whatever until after 2 p. m. notwithstanding said big decrease in the work at said office, and notwithstanding the further fact that a great many real estate men and others report that from numerous visits to the office at Fort Snelling they found the office help apparently had very little work to do, and that it takes practically a month to have a loan processed through said office, and that after being informed by said office that the loan papers have already been actually mailed, it still takes 5 or 6 days for same to reach St. Paul, a distance of only 10 miles, thereby greatly delaying the veteran's loan and making it impossible for any veteran to rely on such information: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of State Fair Grounds Post, No. 1947, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at 1044 Front Street, St. Paul, Minn., in regular meeting assembled this 20th day of January 1953, That the Veterans' Administration be requested to—

1. Increase the interest rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

2. Revoke the regulation prohibiting lending institutions from charging sellers of real estate an origination fee.

3. That the regional office of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Snelling be requested to accept and answer telephone calls regarding GI loans during all business office hours.

4. Reduce the time for processing GI loans.

5. Give accurate and reliable information as to the time of mailing the loan papers pertaining to such loans.

6. That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota and to Carl Gray, Director of Veterans' Affairs in Washington, D. C.

LOUIS OUELLETTE,
Adjutant, State Fair Grounds Post, No. 1947, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF AIKEN, S. C., ON OCCASION OF GAS EXPLOSION OF JANUARY 27, 1953—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, sometime ago a dreadful tragedy occurred in

Aiken, S. C., as the result of a tremendous gas explosion which seriously damaged property in the city and caused the death of a large number of people. Yesterday the General Assembly of the Legislature of South Carolina adopted a concurrent resolution expressing the thanks of the State for the generous and efficient assistance rendered by the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and the American Red Cross, to the people of the city and county of Aiken in their efforts to relieve the suffering caused the people of that vicinity by the explosion, and the fire which followed. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation for the generous and efficient assistance rendered by the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and the American Red Cross to the people of the city and county of Aiken on the occasion of the disastrous gas explosion on January 27, 1953

Whereas the city of Aiken on January 27, 1953, sustained its greatest single disaster since the War Between the States, when an explosion of gas in a building in the commercial area resulted in the death of about 10 persons and the eventual destruction of several buildings; and

Whereas the explosion caused the collapse of a part of the masonry of the buildings wherein several persons were entombed, throwing the population into a near panic; and

Whereas the city of Aiken and Aiken County were not equipped with trained personnel, machinery or equipment to cope with such a situation; and

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and American Red Cross came forward and generously offered their services without cost; and

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and American Red Cross took charge of the situation, moved in adequate equipment and trained personnel, cleared the debris, removed the dead, and cared for the injured; and

Whereas the American Red Cross remained constantly on duty and served hot coffee and sandwiches, and rendered assistance wherever possible; and

Whereas with the generous help of these agencies a critical situation was cleared completely in a minimum of time; otherwise, with the limited equipment of the city and county, several days would have been required; and

Whereas the senator from Aiken County, the Honorable John H. Williams, and the members of the house of representatives, the Honorable Edward C. Cushman, Jr., the Honorable W. Cecil Kenney, and the Honorable Frampton W. Toole, Jr., have requested the general assembly to take recognition of the generous and efficient assistance voluntarily rendered by these agencies to the people of the city of Aiken and the county: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the general assembly take recognition of the efficient and generous help which the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and American Red Cross voluntarily rendered the people of the city of Aiken and the county of Aiken, and go on record as expressing its appreciation on behalf of the people of the entire State, and particularly those of Aiken County, for such humane and public-spirited assistance; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK and the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, in the Senate of the United States; the Congressman from the Second Congressional District, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY; the Director of the Atomic Energy Commission, Aiken, S. C.; the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Aiken, S. C., and the Aiken County Chapter of the American Red Cross, Aiken, S. C.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 6, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — SUMMARY OF MONTHLY REPORTS ON CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH ISSUED DURING RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly reports on civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of Congress. The reports were concerned with employment and payroll during the period June–November 1952, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased by 33,781 during the period June through November 1952. The total in June was 2,596,762. In November there were 2,562,981 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Government showed a net decrease of 26,377 during the period from June through November 1952, dropping from 1,259,590 in June to 1,233,213 in November. Civilians employed by the Department of Defense decreased 7,404 during the same period, dropping from 1,337,172 in June to 1,329,768 in November.

Of the 7,404 decrease in civilian employment by the Department of Defense, more than half was in white-collar jobs. Defense Department industrial employment decreased 2,801 from 791,099 in June to 788,298 in November; and white-collar employment by the Defense Department decreased by 4,603 from 546,073 in June to 541,470 in November.

Part of the decrease in civilian agencies was in seasonal employment in such agencies as Agriculture and Interior Departments.

In October the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $10,181,000,000.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive branch agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Personnel and pay summary, June through November 1952

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In June numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In May was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,562,981	2,596,762	−33,781	$848,446	$808,906	+$39,540
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,233,213	1,259,590	−26,377	421,917	403,996	+17,921
2. Department of Defense	1,329,768	1,337,172	−7,404	426,529	404,910	+21,619
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,309	2,285	+24	1,181	1,067	+114
Department of the Army	539,496	543,869	−4,373	162,239	154,801	+7,438
Department of the Air Force	313,940	309,687	+4,253	98,663	88,624	+10,039
Department of the Navy	474,023	481,331	−7,308	164,446	160,438	+4,008

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1952, and comparison with June 1952, and pay for October 1952, and comparison with May 1952*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	May	October	Increase	Decrease	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	22,683	24,609	1,926		81,499	72,616		8,883
Commerce [1] [2]	21,412	21,369		43	55,765	52,031		3,734
Interior	20,046	21,736	1,690		60,739	56,380		4,359
Justice	12,819	13,896	1,077		32,396	30,993		1,403
Labor	3,068	2,948		120	7,913	6,743		1,170
Post Office	152,038	162,045	10,007		523,822	527,299	3,477	
State	10,819	11,435	616		31,431	31,755	324	
Treasury	33,949	33,979	30		88,451	86,720		1,731
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	126	132	6		250	257	7	
Bureau of the Budget	279	292	13		498	474		24
Council of Economic Advisers	21	20		1	34	31		3
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	3			3	10			10
Executive Mansion and Grounds	29	25		4	121	94		27
National Security Council [3]	12	12			23	21		2
National Security Resources Board	117	58		59	183	85		98
Office of Defense Mobilization	73	80	7		219	201		9
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	44	68	24		78	133	55	
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation	29	34	5		57	61	4	
President's Airport Commission	2			2				
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization [4]		13	13			32	32	
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	89	99	10		161	157		4
Defense Production Administration	264	231		33	490	380		110
Defense Transport Administration	105	73		32	234	169		65
Economic Stabilization Agency	7,290	5,069		2,221	17,403	10,557		6,846
Federal Civil Defense Administration	541	391		150	1,111	755		356
Mutual Security Agency	1,827	1,943	116		4,969	4,458		511
National Security Training Commission	3	3			7	7		
Renegotiation Board	201	386	185		559	665	106	
Small Defense Plants Administration	158	227	69		324	411	87	
Subversive Activities Control Board	16	16			31	27		4
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission [5]	68			68	107			107
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	8	7		1	10	8		2
War Claims Commission	52	73	21		185	207	22	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	86	91	5		457	456		1
Atomic Energy Commission	2,760	3,117	357		6,776	6,774		2
Civil Aeronautics Board	282	292	10		582	562		20
Civil Service Commission	1,570	1,891	321		4,742	5,277	535	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	74	80	6		136	140	4	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review [6]		3	3			6	6	
Federal Communications Commission	515	549	34		1,138	1,117		21
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	436	448	12		1,017	1,033	16	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	222	236	14		370	368		2
Federal Power Commission	332	334	2		699	658		41
Federal Security Agency [7]	11,383	11,886	503		35,461	34,823		638
Federal Trade Commission	349	344		5	680	647		33
General Accounting Office	2,412	2,551	139		6,114	6,181	67	
General Services Administration	9,034	9,004		30	29,178	28,628		550
Government Printing Office	3,059	2,989		70	7,676	7,722	46	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,131	5,281	150		12,625	12,444		181
Indian Claims Commission	7	8	1		10	11	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	931	967	36		2,093	2,023		70
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	8	18	10		15	33	18	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3,011	3,211	200		7,884	7,528		356
National Capital Housing Authority	111	120	9		353	359	6	
National Capital Planning Commission	3	3			7	6		1
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	4	1		3	13	1		12
National Gallery of Art	93	93			301	308	7	
National Labor Relations Board	552	584	32		1,173	1,318	145	
National Mediation Board	65	77	12		114	126	12	
National Science Foundation	42	57	15		117	135	18	
Panama Canal	4,188	3,529		659	19,397	18,964		433
Railroad Retirement Board	805	814	9		2,199	2,160		39
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,211	1,166		45	2,550	2,288		262
Securities and Exchange Commission	450	449		1	867	801		66
Selective Service System	1,824	1,918	94		8,180	8,081		99
Smithsonian Institution	192	194	2		645	524		121
Soldiers' Home	136	142	6		734	748	14	
Tariff Commission	104	106	2		193	192		1
Tax Court of the United States	63	69	6		125	131	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,482	9,041	559		21,300	20,915		385
Veterans' Administration	55,878	58,985	3,107		174,597	175,998	1,401	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	403,996	421,917	21,471	3,550	1,259,590	1,233,213	6,415	32,792
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			17,921				26,377	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [8]	1,067	1,181	114		2,285	2,309	24	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	141,277	148,281	7,004		402,419	396,698		5,721
Outside continental United States	13,524	13,958	434		51,450	52,798	1,348	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	81,103	90,323	9,220		274,670	276,666	1,996	
Outside continental United States	7,501	8,340	839		35,017	37,274	2,257	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	150,980	154,646	3,666		447,087	440,185		6,902
Outside continental United States	9,458	9,800	342		34,244	33,838		406
Total, Department of Defense	404,910	426,529	21,619		1,337,172	1,329,768	5,625	13,029
Net change, Department of Defense			21,619				7,404	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	808,906	848,446	43,090	3,550	2,596,762	2,562,981	12,040	45,821
Net change, including Department of Defense			39,540				33,781	

[1] November figure includes 3,318 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 1,209 from the June figure of 4,527.
[2] Exclusive of seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency created pursuant to Executive Order 10392, dated Sept. 4, 1952.
[5] Deactivated August 1952 and records transferred to State Department.
[6] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 552, 82d Cong., approved July 16, 1952.
[7] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[8] Includes employees assigned to Defense Supply Management Agency and employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1952, and comparison with June 1952*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	79,578	71,106	.....	8,472
Commerce [1] [2]	52,040	48,626	.....	3,414
Interior	52,695	50,125	.....	2,570
Justice	31,828	30,434	.....	1,394
Labor	7,714	6,596	.....	1,118
Post Office	531,644	525,070	3,426	.....
State	11,196	11,076	.....	120
Treasury	87,408	85,688	.....	1,720
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	250	257	7	.....
Bureau of the Budget	498	474	.....	24
Council of Economic Advisers	34	31	.....	3
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	10	.....	.....	10
Executive Mansion and Grounds	121	94	.....	27
National Security Council [3]	23	21	.....	2
National Security Resources Board	183	85	.....	98
Office of Defense Mobilization	210	201	.....	9
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	78	133	55	.....
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation	57	61	4	.....
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization [4]	.....	32	32	.....
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	157	149	.....	8
Defense Production Administration	490	380	.....	110
Defense Transport Administration	234	169	.....	65
Economic Stabilization Agency	17,157	10,428	.....	6,729
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,111	755	.....	356
Mutual Security Agency	1,236	1,067	.....	169
National Security Training Commission	7	7	.....	.....
Renegotiation Board	559	665	106	.....
Small Defense Plants Administration	324	411	87	.....
Subversive Activities Control Board	31	27	.....	4
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission [5]	54	.....	.....	54
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	10	8	.....	2
War Claims Commission	161	183	22	.....
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	14	.....	2
Atomic Energy Commission	6,771	6,763	.....	8
Civil Aeronautics Board	572	553	.....	19
Civil Service Commission	4,735	5,267	532	.....
Export-Import Bank of Washington	136	140	4	.....
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review [6]	.....	6	6	.....
Federal Communications Commission	1,113	1,091	.....	22
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,017	1,033	16	.....
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	370	368	.....	2
Federal Power Commission	699	658	.....	41
Federal Security Agency [7]	35,099	34,477	.....	622
Federal Trade Commission	680	647	.....	33
General Accounting Office	6,114	6,159	45	.....
General Services Administration	20,083	28,521	.....	562
Government Printing Office	7,676	7,722	46	.....
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,491	12,296	.....	195
Indian Claims Commission	10	11	1	.....
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,093	2,023	.....	70
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	15	33	18	.....
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,884	7,528	.....	356
National Capital Housing Authority	353	359	6	.....
National Capital Planning Commission	7	6	.....	1
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	13	1	.....	12
National Gallery of Art	301	308	7	.....
National Labor Relations Board	1,152	1,295	143	.....
National Mediation Board	114	126	12	.....
National Science Foundation	117	135	18	.....
Panama Canal	555	525	.....	30
Railroad Retirement Board	2,199	2,160	.....	39
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,542	2,281	.....	261
Securities and Exchange Commission	867	801	.....	66
Selective Service System	7,922	7,853	.....	69
Smithsonian Institution	638	518	.....	120
Soldiers' Home	734	748	14	.....
Tariff Commission	193	192	.....	1
Tax Court of the United States	125	131	6	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,300	20,915	.....	385
Veterans' Administration	173,316	174,751	1,435	.....
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,196,120	1,172,774	6,048	29,394
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	.....	.....	23,346	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,231	2,253	22	.....
Department of the Army	492,419	486,698	.....	5,721
Department of the Air Force	274,670	276,666	1,996	.....
Department of the Navy	447,087	440,185	.....	6,902
Total, Department of Defense	1,216,407	1,205,802	2,018	12,623
Net decrease, Department of Defense	.....	.....	10,605	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,412,527	2,378,576	8,066	42,017
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	.....	.....	33,951	

[1] November figure includes 3,318 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 1,209 from the June figure of 4,527.
[2] Exclusive of seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency created pursuant to Executive Order 10392, dated Sept. 4, 1952.
[5] Deactivated August 1952 and records transferred to State Department.
[6] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 552, 82d Cong., approved July 16, 1952.
[7] Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1952, and comparison with June 1952*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,921	1,510	.....	411
Commerce	3,725	3,405	.....	320
Interior	8,044	6,255	.....	1,789
Justice	568	559	.....	9
Labor	199	147	.....	52
Post Office	2,178	2,229	51	.....
State	20,235	20,679	444	.....
Treasury	1,043	1,032	.....	11
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	4	8	4	.....
Economic Stabilization Agency	246	129	.....	117
Mutual Security Agency	3,733	3,391	.....	342
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	53	.....	.....	53
War Claims Commission	24	24	.....	.....
Independent agencies:				1
American Battle Monuments Commission	441	442	1	 1
Atomic Energy Commission	5	11	6	 1
Civil Aeronautics Board	10	9	.....	11
Civil Service Commission	8	10	2	 1
Federal Communications Commission	35	36	1	 1
Federal Security Agency	362	346	.....	161
General Accounting Office	.....	22	22	 1
General Services Administration	95	107	12	 1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	134	148	14	.....
National Labor Relations Board	21	23	2	.....
Panama Canal	18,842	18,439	.....	403
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8	7	.....	1
Selective Service System	258	228	.....	30
Smithsonian Institution	7	6	.....	1
Veterans' Administration	1,281	1,247	.....	34
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,470	60,439	559	3,590
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	.....	.....	3,031	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	54	56	2	.....
Department of the Army	51,450	52,798	1,348	.....
Department of the Air Force	35,017	37,274	2,257	.....
Department of the Navy	34,244	33,838	.....	406
Total, Department of Defense	120,765	123,966	3,607	406
Net increase, Department of Defense	.....	.....	3,201	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	184,235	184,405	4,166	3,996
Net increase, including Department of Defense	.....	.....	170	

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1952, and comparison with June 1952*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Commerce	847	653		194	Department of the Army:				
Interior	3,856	3,206		650	Inside continental United States	254,130	251,790		2,340
State	175	183	8		Outside continental United States	31,690	33,116	1,426	
Treasury	9,182	9,163		19	Department of the Air Force:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States	159,547	162,353	2,806	
Atomic Energy Commission	85	89	4		Outside continental United States	20,275	21,508	1,233	
General Services Administration	124	148	24		Department of the Navy:				
Panama Canal	1,474	1,475	1		Inside continental United States	299,381	294,054		5,327
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,256	12,689		567	Outside continental United States	26,067	25,477		590
Total, excluding Department of Defense	28,999	27,606	37	1,430	Total, Department of Defense	701,099	788,298	5,465	8,266
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			1,393		Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,801	
					Grand total, including Department of Defense	820,098	815,904	5,502	9,696
					Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,194	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In May was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In June numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$9,602	$13,228	+$3,626	33,931	41,587	+7,656
State Department	137	142	+5	153	87	−66
Mutual Security Agency	9		+9		13	+13
Office of the Secretary of Defense	62	103	+41	162	178	+16
Department of the Army	7,450	9,929	+2,479	25,495	32,448	+6,953
Department of the Air Force	1,275	1,677	+402	5,376	5,118	−258
Department of the Navy	678	1,368	+690	2,745	3,743	+998

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR MONTH OF DECEMBER 1952

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1952, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1952, AND PAY, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 1952

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1952 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,500,478	2,365,607	−5,129	$768,745	$848,448	−$79,703
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,230,205	1,235,839	−5,634	387,242	421,919	−34,677
2. Department of Defense	1,330,273	1,329,768	+505	381,503	426,529	−45,026
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,297	2,309	−12	1,025	1,181	−156
Department of the Army	538,227	539,496	−1,269	146,318	162,239	−15,921
Department of the Air Force	313,140	313,940	+1,200	87,605	98,663	−11,058
Department of the Navy	474,609	474,023	+586	146,555	164,446	−17,891

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1952, and comparison with November 1952, and pay for November 1952, and comparison with October 1952*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	24,609	20,931		3,678	72,616	70,722		1,894
Commerce [1]	21,369	19,177		2,192	52,031	51,377		654
Interior	21,736	19,027		2,709	56,380	55,811		569
Justice	13,896	11,533		2,363	30,993	30,646		347
Labor	2,948	2,525		423	6,743	6,450		293
Post Office	162,045	159,687		2,358	827,299	825,217		2,082
State	11,435	9,976		1,459	31,755	32,095	340	
Treasury	33,979	29,782		4,197	86,720	86,845	125	

[1] December figure includes 3,153 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 165 from the November figure of 3,318.
[2] December figure is exclusive of 5,362 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1952, and comparison with November 1952, and pay for November 1952, and comparison with October 1952*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	132	149	17		257	250		7
Bureau of the Budget	292	258		34	474	470		4
Council of Economic Advisers	20	17		3	31	31		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	25	23		2	94	95	1	
National Security Council [2]	12	11		1	21	20		1
National Security Resources Board	58	48		10	85	82		3
Office of Defense Mobilization	80	64		16	201	215	14	
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	68	70	2		133	133		
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation [4]	34	30		4	61			61
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization	13	12		1	32	26		6
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	99	80		19	157	159	2	
Defense Production Administration	231	195		36	380	374		6
Defense Transport Administration	73	68		5	169	167		2
Economic Stabilization Agency	5,069	4,301		768	10,557	9,846		711
Federal Civil Defense Administration	391	390		1	755	763	8	
Mutual Security Agency	1,943	1,768		175	4,458	4,474	16	
National Security Training Commission	3	3			7	5		2
Renegotiation Board	386	339		47	665	682	17	
Small Defense Plants Administration	227	204		23	411	422	11	
Subversive Activities Control Board	16	14		2	27	26		1
Postwar agencies:								
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	7	6		1	8	8		
War Claims Commission	73	68		5	[3] 205	224	19	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	91	82		9	456	452		4
Atomic Energy Commission	3,117	2,721		396	6,774	6,788	14	
Civil Aeronautics Board	292	259		33	562	557		5
Civil Service Commission	1,891	1,718		173	5,277	5,249		28
Export-Import Bank of Washington	80	72		8	140	138		2
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	3	2		1	6	6		
Federal Communications Commission	549	476		73	1,117	1,108		9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	448	395		53	1,033	1,031		2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	236	207		29	368	385	17	
Federal Power Commission	334	287		47	658	660	2	
Federal Security Agency [5] [7]	11,886	10,836		1,050	37,451	37,542	91	
Federal Trade Commission	344	301		43	647	647		
General Accounting Office	2,551	2,229		322	6,181	6,192	11	
General Services Administration	9,004	8,160		844	28,628	28,974	346	
Government Printing Office	2,989	2,576		413	7,722	7,699		23
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,281	4,805		476	12,444	12,504	60	
Indian Claims Commission	8	7		1	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	967	[3] 846		121	2,023	2,017		6
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	18	16		2	33	27		6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3,211	2,868		343	7,528	7,479		49
National Capital Housing Authority	120	105		15	359	358		1
National Capital Planning Commission	3	2		1	6	6		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1			1	1	1		
National Gallery of Art	93	86		7	308	310	2	
National Labor Relations Board	584	555		29	1,318	1,328	10	
National Mediation Board	77	64		13	126	119		7
National Science Foundation	57	51		6	135	146	11	
Panama Canal	3,529	4,179	650		18,964	18,933		31
Railroad Retirement Board	814	715		99	2,160	2,191	31	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,166	1,027		139	2,288	2,266		22
Securities and Exchange Commission	449	400		49	801	793		8
Selective Service System	1,918	1,663		255	8,081	8,048		33
Smithsonian Institution	194	171		23	524	517		7
Soldiers' Home	142	129		13	748	750	2	
Tariff Commission	106	91		15	192	194	2	
Tax Court of the United States	[3] 71	63		8	131	133	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	9,041	7,459		1,582	20,915	20,926	11	
Veterans' Administration	58,985	50,863		8,122	175,998	176,085	87	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	421,919	387,242	669	35,346	1,235,839	1,230,205	1,252	6,886
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			34,677				5,634	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [8]	1,181	1,025		156	2,309	2,297		12
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	148,281	134,044		14,237	486,698	485,368		1,330
Outside continental United States	13,958	12,274		1,684	52,798	52,859	61	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	90,323	80,167		10,156	276,666	277,789	1,123	
Outside continental United States	8,340	7,438		902	37,274	37,351	77	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	154,646	137,684		16,962	440,185	440,679	494	
Outside continental United States	9,800	8,871		929	33,838	33,930	92	
Total, Department of Defense	426,529	381,503		45,026	1,329,768	1,330,273	1,847	1,342
Net change, Department of Defense			45,026				505	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	848,448	768,745	669	80,372	2,565,607	2,560,478	3,099	8,228
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			79,703				5,129	

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Deactivated Dec. 28, 1952.
[3] Revised on the basis of later information.
[5] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[7] Figures include Division of Commissioned Officers, Public Health Service, heretofore excluded from this report. Commissioned officers in December numbered 2,607 November figure has been adjusted for purposes of comparison, to include 2,628 commissioned officers.
[8] Includes 275 employees assigned to Defense Supply Management Agency and 46 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1952, and comparison with November 1952*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	71,106	69,241	.....	1,865
Commerce [1 2]	48,626	48,070	.....	556
Interior	50,125	49,655	.....	470
Justice	30,434	30,093	.....	341
Labor	6,596	6,345	.....	251
Post Office	525,070	522,937	.....	2,133
State	11,076	11,045	.....	31
Treasury	85,688	85,818	130	.....
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	257	250	.....	7
Bureau of the Budget	474	470	.....	4
Council of Economic Advisers	31	31	.....	.....
Executive Mansion and Grounds	94	95	1	.....
National Security Council [3]	21	20	.....	1
National Security Resources Board	85	82	.....	3
Office of Defense Mobilization	201	215	14	.....
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	133	133	.....	.....
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation [4]	61	.....	.....	61
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization	32	26	.....	6
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	149	151	2	.....
Defense Production Administration	380	374	.....	6
Defense Transport Administration	169	167	.....	2
Economic Stabilization Agency	10,428	9,720	.....	708
Federal Civil Defense Administration	755	763	8	.....
Mutual Security Agency	1,067	1,089	22	.....
National Security Training Commission	7	5	.....	2
Renegotiation Board	665	682	17	.....
Small Defense Plants Administration	411	422	11	.....
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	.....	1
Postwar agencies:				
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	8	8	.....	.....
War Claims Commission	[5] 181	184	3	.....
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14	.....	.....
Atomic Energy Commission	6,763	6,777	14	.....
Civil Aeronautics Board	553	548	.....	5
Civil Service Commission	5,267	5,239	.....	28
Export-Import Bank of Washington	140	138	.....	2
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6	.....	.....
Federal Communications Commission	1,091	1,082	.....	9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,033	1,031	.....	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	268	285	17	.....
Federal Power Commission	658	660	2	.....
Federal Security Agency [6 7]	36,875	36,965	90	.....
Federal Trade Commission	647	647	.....	.....
General Accounting Office	6,159	6,169	10	.....
General Services Administration	28,521	28,866	345	.....
Government Printing Office	7,722	7,699	.....	23
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,296	12,356	60	.....
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	.....	.....
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,023	2,017	.....	6
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	33	27	.....	6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,528	7,479	.....	49
National Capital Housing Authority	359	358	.....	1
National Capital Planning Commission	6	6	.....	.....
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	1	.....	.....
National Gallery of Art	308	310	2	.....
National Labor Relations Board	1,295	1,305	10	.....
National Mediation Board	126	119	.....	7
National Science Foundation	135	146	11	.....
Panama Canal	825	839	14	.....
Railroad Retirement Board	2,160	2,191	31	.....
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,281	2,259	.....	22
Securities and Exchange Commission	801	793	.....	8
Selective Service System	7,853	7,827	.....	26
Smithsonian Institution	518	515	.....	3
Soldiers' Home	748	750	2	.....
Tariff Commission	192	194	2	.....
Tax Court of the United States	131	133	2	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,915	20,926	11	.....
Veterans' Administration	174,751	174,844	93	.....
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,175,170	1,169,449	924	6,645
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	.....	.....	5,721	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,253	2,239	.....	14
Department of the Army	486,698	485,368	.....	1,330
Department of the Air Force	276,666	277,789	1,123	.....
Department of the Navy	440,185	440,679	494	.....
Total, Department of Defense	1,205,802	1,200,075	1,617	1,344
Net increase, Department of Defense	.....	.....	273	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,380,972	2,375,524	2,541	7,989
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	.....	.....	5,448	

[1] December figures include 3,153 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 165 from November figure of 3,318.
[2] December figure is exclusive of 5,362 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Deactivated Dec. 28, 1952.
[5] Revised on basis of later information.
[6] Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[7] Figures include Division of Commissioned Officers, Public Health Service, heretofore excluded from this report. Commissioned officers in December numbered 2,377. November figure has been adjusted, for purposes of comparison, to include 2,308 commissioned officers.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1952, and comparison with November 1952*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,510	1,481	.....	29
Commerce	3,405	3,307	.....	98
Interior	6,255	6,156	.....	99
Justice	559	553	.....	6
Labor	147	105	.....	42
Post Office	2,229	2,280	51	.....
State	20,679	21,050	371	.....
Treasury	1,032	1,027	.....	5
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	8	8	.....	.....
Economic Stabilization Agency	129	126	.....	3
Mutual Security Agency	3,391	3,385	.....	6
Postwar agencies:				
War Claims Commission	24	40	16	.....
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	442	438	.....	4
Atomic Energy Commission	11	11	.....	.....
Civil Aeronautics Board	9	9	.....	.....
Civil Service Commission	10	10	.....	.....
Federal Communications Commission	26	26	.....	.....
Federal Security Agency	576	577	1	.....
General Accounting Office	22	23	1	.....
General Services Administration	107	108	1	.....
Housing and Home Finance Agency	148	148	.....	.....
National Labor Relations Board	23	23	.....	.....
Panama Canal	18,439	18,394	.....	45
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7	7	.....	.....
Selective Service System	228	221	.....	7
Smithsonian Institution	6	2	.....	4
Veterans' Administration	1,247	1,241	.....	6
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,669	60,756	441	354
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	.....	.....	87	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	56	58	2	.....
Department of the Army	52,798	52,859	61	.....
Department of the Air Force	37,274	37,351	77	.....
Department of the Navy	33,838	33,930	92	.....
Total, Department of Defense	123,966	124,198	232	.....
Net increase, Department of Defense	.....	.....	232	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	184,635	184,954	673	354
Net increase, including Department of Defense	.....	.....	319	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1952, and comparison with November 1952*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Commerce	653	539	----	114
Interior	3,206	2,523	----	683
State	183	186	3	----
Treasury	9,163	9,260	97	----
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	89	94	5	----
General Services Administration	148	152	4	----
Panama Canal	1,475	1,492	17	----
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,689	12,405	----	284
Total, excluding Department of Defense	27,606	26,651	126	1,081
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	----	----	955	

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	251,790	252,498	708	----
Outside continental United States	33,116	33,121	5	----
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	162,353	163,810	1,457	----
Outside continental United States	21,508	21,506	----	2
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	294,054	294,466	412	----
Outside continental United States	25,477	25,544	67	----
Total, Department of Defense	788,298	790,945	2,649	2
Net increase, Department of Defense	----	----	2,647	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	815,904	817,596	2,775	1,083
Net increase, including Department of Defense	----	----	1,692	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In October was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$13,228	$11,690	−$1,538	41,587	39,143	−2,444
State Department	142	124	−18	87	87	----
Mutual Security Agency	9	9	----	13	13	----
Office of the Secretary of Defense	103	85	−18	178	178	----
Department of the Army	9,929	8,999	−930	32,448	30,645	−1,803
Department of the Air Force	1,677	1,482	−195	4,118	4,985	−133
Department of the Navy	1,368	991	−377	3,743	3,235	−508

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government in December totaled 2,560,478, according to certified reports from 72 agencies which were compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The December total reflected a decrease of 5,129, as compared with employment in November. This was the fifth consecutive monthly decrease.

Principal decreases were reported by the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Army, and the Post Office Department. This was the first time in 15 months that the Post Office Department did not report an increase. Employment by the Post Office Department decreased 2,082 during December, bringing the total to 525,217.

Partially offsetting these decreases were increases during the month reported by the Department of the Air Force, the Department of State, and General Services Administration. This is the third consecutive monthly increase in civilian employment reported by the Air Force. The increase since September has totaled 4,873.

Despite reductions in civilian employment by the Department of the Army, the total number of civilians employed by the Department of Defense increased 505 during December to 1,330,273. There was a net decrease of 5,634 in employment by the civilian agencies, bringing the December total down to 1,230,205.

Employment outside continental United States in December totaled 184,954, an increase of 319 over the November total of 184,635. Two hundred and thirty-two of the increase were reported by the Department of Defense and 87 were in the civilian agencies.

White-collar employment in December totaled 1,742,882, a decrease of 6,821, as compared with the November total of 1,749,703. Industrial employment in December totaled 817,596, an increase of 1,692, as compared with the November total of 815,904.

In the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, July 1 to December 31, total civilian employment in the executive branch decreased 38,880. In this period employment by civilian agencies decreased 31,981, and civilian employment by the Department of Defense decreased 6,899. Civilian employment inside continental United States decreased 39,384, and outside continental United States it increased 504. White-collar employment decreased 36,378 and industrial employment decreased 2,502.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 789. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 790. A bill for the relief of Irene J. Halkis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 791. A bill for the relief of Yousef Samaan Rauhana; and

S. 792. A bill for the relief of Saliba Douaihy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 793. A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Paulus Youhanna Benjamen; and

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Josef Radziwill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 796. A bill to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 797. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the organization of the Future Farmers of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 798. A bill to provide mandatory price support for beef cattle; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 799. A bill to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended; and

S. 800. A bill to amend the Export-Import Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 802. A bill for the relief of Edward Kowalczyk;

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson;

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasilios Zarkadis; and

S. 805. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 806. A bill to provide a 3-day period for the election of Members of Congress and the appointment of electors of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 807. A bill to provide for granting to the several States the mineral rights in public lands belonging to the United States; to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Frederick Wiesinger; and

S. 809. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Sperti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 810. A bill for the relief of Jan E. Tomczycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 811. A bill for the relief of George Mauner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 812. A bill to exempt amateur and semiprofessional baseball games conducted by certain nonprofit organizations from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 813. A bill for the relief of Helen Stembera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 814. A bill for the relief of Pauline Martha Fimeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 815. A bill for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 816. A bill for the relief of Bruno Lanier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Rev. Petros Constantine Remoundos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 818. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deportation of certain aliens who apply for relief from liability thereunder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the sale at certain post offices of tobacco, cigar, and cigarette tax stamps; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 820. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran; and

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Diarbekerian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 822. A bill to provide biweekly pay periods for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 823. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to determine the need for improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., via Destin; and

S. 824. A bill to authorize an improved entrance and channel for Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 825. A bill for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valentine Averdoff;

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman;

S. 828. A bill for the relief of Ruth Sonin;

S. 829. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Etti;

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman; and

S. 831. A bill for the relief of Pietro Meduri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 832. bill to authorize acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 833. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clementine DeRyck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request):

S. 835. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 836. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 838. A bill to legalize maritime hiring halls; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 839. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks, copartners; and

S. 840. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Ira T. Todd and Major C. Todd, copartners, trading as Todd Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 841. A bill for the relief of Dionysio Antypas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 842. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; and

S. 843. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Eugene Feigelstock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 844. A bill to authorize Federal aid with respect to the costs of constructing that portion of an approved hospital project which was commenced without Federal participation and prior to January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolutions to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Wash., and Oreg., as Lake Wallula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1937, RELATING TO CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS, TO STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, to the State of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 789) to extend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, to the State of Arkansas, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

At the suggestion of several farmers and farm organizations in Arkansas, and because of my own interest in the potentiality of irrigation, I am introducing a bill to extend the Water Facilities Act to the State of Arkansas.

This act, passed in 1937, applies only to the 17 Western States in accordance with the intent of Congress. Legislation is, therefore, necessary to extend it to Arkansas.

The program under the act is administered by the Department of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, which, of course, is already operating in Arkansas. It involves two types of assistance to farmers in maintaining, or increasing the productive capacity of their farms through the development and use of water supplies:

1. Technical assistance is provided in the installation and utilization of water facilities, and in the operation and management of farms using them.

2. Long-term loans—up to 20 years, or longer in the case of water associations—at 3 percent interest, are made for installation and repair of water facilities, where such credit is not available on reasonable terms from private sources.

Loans may be made to individual farmers (usually limited to $5,000) or to groups of farmers organized into incorporated associations. Group loans may benefit an entire community where a project is too expensive for individual borrowers.

Examples of the purposes for which a water facilities loan may be made are:

To construct or repair a reservoir or pond, well, stock water tank, pump, or similar facility to be used for farming or irrigation purposes.

To acquire a source of water supply.

To grade land so better use can be made of available land and water.

To refinance existing indebtedness if incurred to install a water facility.

To purchase equipment needed by such associations as soil conservation districts to construct or maintain water facilities.

The benefits under this act are not limited to irrigation, but are for water use generally. However, it is in the field of irrigation that I believe it could be most beneficial. Irrigation has been greatly developed in Arkansas over the past 20 years, principally, but not entirely, in rice production. In the principal rice area—the Grand Prairie—overdrafts of ground water have resulted in partial depletion and failure of some wells.

There has been some experimentation and succesful operations in the irrigation of other crops in other areas. Last year it was estimated that some irrigation was being practiced in 48 of the 75 counties. In addition, the State experiment station and the University of Arkansas, have undertaken study and experimentation. Courses in irrigation are offered at the University of Arkansas engineering school. Periods of drought, such as that of last year, have created great interest in irrigation.

I believe there are great potentialities for irrigation in Arkansas. I hope the introduction of this bill will stimulate interest in and study of the problems by the Federal, State, and local agencies, groups and individuals concerned.

TOLLS ON CERTAIN HIGHWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITH FEDERAL AID

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would permit States to charge tolls on Federal-aid highways which are made part of a State superhighway system.

Connecticut, and many other States, are facing a crisis in highway finance. Modern traffic has resulted in dangerous overcrowding of local highways. There is urgent need for a system of superhighways to relieve local congestion and to permit safe, high-speed traffic over longer distances.

Revenues from the gasoline tax, the typical method of State highway financing, are insufficient to provide both for the regular system of highways and the new, high-cost superhighways made necessary by modern conditions.

Small toll fees provide the most reasonable and equitable source of new funds. In Connecticut, and other States, the experience has been that motorists are happy to pay a small charge for the safety and convenience of multiple lane, limited access highways. We are planning to extend our superhighway system in response to an insistent public demand.

An obstacle in the path of extension is Federal law which prohibits the collection of tolls on highways constructed with Federal assistance, although it permits it in the case of bridges so built.

The bill I have drafted would remove that obstacle. It is needed because the development of the most efficient superhighway systems requires the inclusion of some routes which have been built with Federal aid.

I hope the bill will be given early consideration in the present session of Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 796) to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP IN HONOR OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the organization of the Future Farmers of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 797) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the organization of the Future Farmers of America, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Future Farmers of America is a great organization of American young men. Through my work as Governor of the State of Kansas and of the Congress, I know intimately of the splendid work this organization is doing through the schools in our Nation and in the communities of my own State of Kansas. Its primary aim is the development of agricultural leadership, cooperation, citizenship, and patriotism. It develops the confidence of farm boys and young men in themselves and their work. It creates within these young men an intelligent choice of farming occupations and nurtures a love of country life. The Future Farmers of America is a practical organization. It teaches a boy to be the best judge of a dairy cow or the best tractor mechanic. But even more important than that these young men learn what is good for our country and to hold the line against those things which are detrimental to our country. A Future Farmer believes that he lives in the greatest country in the world and that he should share in the responsibilities of keeping it that way. He realizes that he must work for what he gets and that to be a good citizen he must respect the rights of others; he is proud to be an American.

One thousand nine hundred and fifty-three is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of this great American organization. It is on the basis of the principles on which it stands and of the practical lessons learned by our young men that I am introducing this bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Future Farmers of America.

That organization has grown at a rapid rate. Today it has chapters in all 48 States, in Hawaii, and in Puerto Rico. Its approximate membership is 355,000 young men and 9,000 chapters.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the Future Farmers of America membership by States be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Future Farmers of America membership by States

State	Number of local chapters, June 30, 1952	FFA membership, June 30, 1952
Alabama	252	12,519
Arizona	25	1,113
Arkansas	281	11,002
California	214	10,826
Colorado	58	1,984
Connecticut	19	480
Delaware	18	681
Florida	143	7,858
Georgia	302	15,587
Hawaii	25	1,500
Idaho	58	2,940
Illinois	487	17,057
Indiana	263	7,465
Iowa	215	8,092
Kansas	187	6,895
Kentucky	225	10,464
Louisiana	237	8,728
Maine	44	1,217
Maryland	54	2,124
Massachusetts	26	894
Michigan	216	9,930
Minnesota	194	8,766
Mississippi	274	9,625
Missouri	242	11,547
Montana	57	2,212
Nebraska	124	4,901
Nevada	11	330
New Hampshire	21	404
New Jersey	36	1,321
New Mexico	52	1,843
New York	290	6,533
North Carolina	439	21,244
North Dakota	45	1,820
Ohio	332	10,065
Oklahoma	321	14,529
Oregon	76	3,510
Pennsylvania	293	10,528
Puerto Rico	105	6,427
Rhode Island	5	157
South Carolina	240	7,376
South Dakota	63	2,403
Tennessee	277	16,054
Texas	817	34,814
Utah	48	2,992
Vermont	26	642
Virginia	208	7,741
Washington	126	5,789
West Virginia	109	5,153
Wisconsin	273	13,647
Wyoming	45	1,240
Total	8,498	352,916

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT ACT OF 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Export-Import Act of 1945, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 800) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to make it possible to obtain insurance at reasonable rates for goods shipped abroad by American nationals against risks of war damage or expropriation.

I understand that at the present time such insurance is not available from any private insurance company or from any Government agency. Legislation now on the statute books makes it possible for the Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Commerce to provide marine war-risk insurance on cargoes. The bill I am introducing expressly provides that it will not cover this area to the extent it is already being covered by the Secretary of Commerce under Public Law 763 of the Eighty-first Congress.

A similar program of war-risk insurance has been authorized for air shipment of cargoes under the provisions of the Aviation War Risk Insurance Act (49 U. S. C. supp. V., sec. 711 et seq.).

The Mutual Security Agency working through the Export-Import Bank presently has authority to guarantee investments abroad in point 4 countries with which an appropriate agreement has been made and this guaranty may extend to a loss from expropriation and confiscation by the government of a nation participating in the mutual-security program. However, MSA has no program whereby an American citizen can obtain insurance against expropriation or war risk on a specific cargo stored abroad.

My bill is designed to create such a program by granting the necessary authority to the Export-Import Bank. Under the terms of the bill that bank could insure for a reasonable premium against damage or loss caused by war risk or by expropriation, seizure, or confiscation. The insurance coverage under the bill is limited to those risks which private insurance companies testified before our committee are now excluded from the policies written by them. It is not intended that the Government shall enter any field now being adequately covered by private insurance companies at reasonable rates.

Much has been said recently of fostering a policy of trade, not aid. If enacted into law, the bill I am introducing would be one concrete step along the road to achieving that policy. It would give American citizens assurance that their entire investment in cargoes sent abroad would not be lost because of risk of war damage or expropriation, confiscation, or seizure, whether by the nation in which the cargo happens to be located or by any other nation.

As you know, I am not one who wants to have the Federal Government handle matters which can be handled better by private business. However, there are areas such as those which would be covered by this bill which private business does not deem it advisable to enter. In such areas I feel it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to set up a program in order to assure continuation and development of business and industry in this country. The effect of the lack of an insurance program such as that for which this bill would provide has been to stifle export of materials and commodities which can be better marketed when they are located in the country where they are to be used. Obviously the more trade we engage in with friendly foreign nations the more opportunity we have to maintain a high standard of living in our own country. Encouragement of this trade will also provide a market for the products of the American factory and farm. In my opinion, passage of this bill would remove one of the existing barriers to the encouragement of trade with friendly foreign nations.

INCREASE OF CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL ELECTIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills, one to make election day a national holiday, and the other proposing a 3-day election period. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bills, and the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as follows:

S. 805. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 806. A bill to provide a 3-day period for the election of Members of Congress and the appointment of electors of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Today I have introduced two bills designed to increase participation by our citizens in national elections; one to make election day a national holiday; the other proposing a 3-day election period.

To my mind, election day is more important than the Fourth of July. On the Fourth of July, we commemorate our Declaration of Independence from British rule. But on election day we exercise the freedoms, liberties, and ideals imbedded in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

The opportunity to choose our own leaders in Government is the greatest right and privilege in the world. More than 61,000,000 Americans exercised that right last November, 12,000,000 more than at any previous election.

Many millions of those who voted did this at some sacrifice and inconvenience, taking time off from their jobs; in many cities and at many polling places being required to stand in line for hours before they could cast their ballot.

Women with children at home and husbands away at work encountered special difficulties due to restricted hours during which the polls were open. It is a tribute to their fundamental American patriotism that so many millions did go to the polls while casting no reflection on the good intent of other millions who did not find it possible.

On several occasions I have introduced and advocated legislation to have election day, in the years when national elections are held, declared a national holiday.

This year I am reintroducing the bill and also separate proposed legislation to provide that our national elections be spread over a 3-day period, beginning at 2 o'clock on the first Sunday after the first Sunday in November, and continuing through the normal voting hours on the subsequent Monday and Tuesday.

The 2 p. m. Sunday opening of the polls would deprive no one from meeting their religious obligations on the day of rest and worship, yet would permit many people to vote who are unable to do so without quitting their work on Monday or Tuesday.

The opening of the polls on both Monday and Tuesday would relieve the burden on our election officials, would tend to prevent congestion, long waiting lines, and extended delays at the polls, and would encourage all citizens to vote, including millions who heretofore have found it difficult or unfeasible.

I do not claim originality in this proposal. As a matter of fact it first came to my attention in an editorial by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., published in the newspapers of his organization on October 12, 1952, well in advance of the November election.

Mr. Hearst kindly sent me a reprint of his editorial—as I assume he did also to other Members of our National Legislature.

Mr. Tearst in his editorial contended that each election should be an expression of the popular will, adding:

"And that can only be done when the highest possible number of eligible voters express their choice at the polls." He continued:

"The basic objective, it seems to me, is that in this era of rush, when we, all of us, have so many things to do and such little time to do them, the duty and high privilege of voting should be made as easy as possible, providing the safeguards surrounding it are not thereby damaged."

The editorial also pointed out that in recent elections in Australia, 91 percent of the eligible citizens voted; in Great Britain, 83 percent; Sweden, 80 percent; Western Germany, 75 percent; Canada, 71 percent; and Israel, 72 percent, while such proportions have never been reached in the United States.

I do not need to remind my colleagues, I am sure, that I do not always concur with the policies or proposals of the Hearst newspapers, but I certainly do in this one.

The more people who are given the opportunity to express their political preferences at the polls in national elections, the better will be our Government and its leadership, both in the legislative and executive branches.

Whether legislation to extend the voting period to 3 days or to limit it to the present 1-day period but declare that day a national holiday is preferable, is a matter for the appropriate committees and the Congress to determine.

I can see definite benefits to be derived from each measure, and it is my earnest hope that the Congress give this proposed legislation earnest attention leading to positive action before the next national convention.

A recent patriotic expression came to me through the mail from Milford E. Shields, titled "The Ballot." It expresses well—thoughts and emotions that I am sure all of us share, and I quote:

"THE BALLOT

"Men call me the ballot. I am the voice of their loyalty, the proclamation of their freedom, and the charge of their authority.

"I grow strong with exercise, virtuous by use, powerful in popularity, and irresistible through enlightenment.

"I am the staff of the minority, the yoke of the majority, the balance of equality, and the root of good government.

"I am the record of men's determination, the testament of their political faith, the jewel of democracy, and the hope of the world."

May we implement this splendid declaration by making it possible, through the enactment of legislation, for more of our good citizens in exercise their franchise and cast their ballots in our national elections.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

S. 805

Be it enacted, etc., That the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, is hereby made a legal public holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the first Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the fourth Thursday of November, and Christmas Day are now made by law public holidays; and such holiday shall be known as National Election Day.

S. 806

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. The first Sunday, and the Monday and Tuesday next after the first Sunday, in November of every even-numbered year, are established as the time for the election, in each of the States and Territories of the United States, of Representatives and Delegates to the Congress commencing on the third day of January next thereafter; except

that (1) in any State which prior to the enactment of this amendatory provision had a time for such election different from the other States, the time for such election shall be any three consecutive days not later than the first Sunday, and the Monday and Tuesday next after the first Sunday, in November, and (2) the time for voting on Sunday shall not commence until after 2 o'clock postmeridian."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Time of appointing electors

"The electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed, in each State, on the first Sunday, and the Monday and Tuesday next after the first Sunday, in November, in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President; but the time for voting on Sunday shall not commence until after 2 o'clock postmeridian."

SEC. 3. For the purpose of any other law and reference to the day or date of an election for Representatives and Delegates in Congress or the day or date for appointment of electors of President and Vice President, shall be deemed to be a reference to the 3-day period referred to in the first section of this act, except that (1) for the purpose of computing a period of time prior to an election, such election shall be deemed to have been held on the first day of such 3-day period, and (2) for the purpose of computing a period of time after an election, such election shall be deemed to have been held on the last day of such 3-day period.

USE OF WIRE TAPPING EVIDENCE IN FEDERAL COURTS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from time to time, I have spoken on the importance of plugging loopholes in the Nation's antiespionage laws.

In my capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I feel a particular responsibility in this field. I want to do everything that is humanly possible to help enable my country to be adequate to the terrible challenge offered by Soviet techniques of espionage, sabotage and subversion, not only in this country but throughout the world.

At this time, I introduce a bill long urged by Federal law enforcement authorities to permit the introduction into Federal courts of evidence gained in national security cases through wire tapping.

This bill which sets up very careful safeguards and which applies only to a select group of crucial cases is, I believe, essential if we are to be adequate to the needs of this atomic and electronic age.

I send to the desk now a brief statement on the subject and ask unanimous consent that it, together with the bill and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 3, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 832) to authorize acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security and defense, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; the Director of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army; the Director of Intelligence, United States Air Force; and the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department are authorized under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Attorney General, in the conduct of investigations, to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals (act of June 8, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 631)), violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States (act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)), or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof, or, upon the express written approval of the Attorney General, that any information obtained by means of intercepting, listening in on, or recording telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, or any other similar messages or communications, be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103). The information thus obtained shall be admissible in evidence, but only when such evidence is offered in a criminal or civil proceeding involving any of the foregoing violations in which the United States Government is a party: *Provided*, That prior to acquiring or intercepting the communications from which the information is obtained, an authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies shall have been issued a permit by a judge of any United States court, authorizing the agent to acquire or intercept such communications.

(b) Upon application by any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies to acquire or intercept communications in the conduct of investigations pursuant to this section, a judge of any United States court shall issue a permit, signed by the judge with his title of office, authorizing the applicant to acquire or intercept such communications, if the judge is satisfied that there is reasonable cause to believe that the communications may contain information which would assist in the conduct of such investigations.

(c) No person shall fail to comply forthwith with the request of any duly authorized person, pursuant to this section, for the disclosure and surrender of any telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication, or copies or records thereof in his possession or under his control.

(d) No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this section otherwise than for the purposes hereinbefore enumerated.

(e) Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(f) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(g) For purposes of this section the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not.

(h) The Attorney General is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

The statement and editorial presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

On numerous occasions, I have pointed out that this Nation is everlastingly in the debt of the Honorable John Edgar Hoover whose vigilance in protecting the national security of this country has never been found wanting.

Not only has Mr. Hoover developed what is by far the outstanding collection of civil servants in this Nation, with the finest morale and esprit de corps of any governmental body that I know of, but he has retained, and rightly so, the complete confidence of the Congress and of the people by virtue of the superb record which he has compiled.

That record speaks eloquently for itself in terms of the apprehension of violators of the criminal laws of this Nation, and the near-perfect record of convictions.

But even deeper in our consciousness is an awareness of the great job which the FBI has done in protecting this Nation's internal security.

It is incredible to me, however, that in so many respects, we have tended to tie the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other key agencies by certain obsolete legal and administrative requirements. One such legal shackle is the present prohibition on the admissibility of security evidence obtained through wire tapping.

PURPOSE OF NEW BILL

I am, therefore, introducing a companion bill to H. R. 477, introduced by Congressman KEATING, of New York.

This legislation would provide for the interception of certain communications upon the express authorization of the Attorney General and the making of the information so obtained admissible in evidence in United States courts in criminal prosecutions arising out of investigations involving the safety of human life or the national security.

It would also provide, however, a severe penalty for the unauthorized interception of communications. The measure would thus strictly regulate wire tapping, while at the same time correcting the fantastic and incongruous situation which results in the protection of our country's enemies and the hampering of its protectors.

WE ALL PRIZE BASIC RIGHTS OF PRIVACY

I can assure my colleagues that no one deeply prizes more than I the right of privacy of every American citizen. But no patriotic American citizen should, I feel, have the slightest hesitation in giving to his sworn and able protectors the right to effectively serve as sentinels of his freedom.

I repeat: The bill has been very carefully drawn and adequate safeguards established in it.

I, for one, can see no reason why the United States Constitution should continue to be used by the very individuals who are working night and day to destroy that Constitution. And yet, the Bill of Rights is not sacrificed in the slightest by this proposed legislation.

INTEREST OF JUDICIARY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

I have long been interested in this subject, particularly because I have served as the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee to which legislation of this nature is referred.

In 1947 and 1948, I had the pleasure of serving as chairman of that committee, and in that capacity had held hearings on the Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson legislation—the fore-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

runner of the later Internal Security Act of 1950.

Those Judiciary hearings gave me added first-hand insight into the dreadful menace to this Nation offered by international communism. But ever since 1939 when I had first come to the Senate, I have sought to make our Nation adequate to the challenge from within offered by those who wish to destroy this country and all that it signifies.

NEW SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY AFFAIRS

In this Eighty-third Congress, it is my privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. At the very first meeting of this committee, I offered a motion to set up a permanent Subcommittee on Security Affairs. The motion was approved unanimously.

This subcommittee of which I am chairman and on which Senators FERGUSON and GILLETTE serve—will analyze the impact of international communism on America's diplomatic problems throughout the world. The subcommittee will consider the impact, in particular, of Soviet espionage, sabotage, and subversion on our foreign policy.

The subcommittee will in no way duplicate the work of any of the standing committees of the Congress. It will concern itself with basic policies rather than with individual cases as such involving loyalty and security. Already, I have set in motion machinery for this subcommittee to get into operation in full gear. A good deal of correspondence has been exchanged with executive agencies and private groups.

I should like to mention too, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a whole on Thursday, February 5, held an executive session in which it reviewed the broad outlines of this problem.

The Security Affairs Subcommittee will follow through in reviewing the details of this outline.

FOLLOW UP ON LEADS

I have directed counsel for the committee to follow up on a considerable number of policy leads already in our possession.

I expect to report from time to time to the Congress as a whole on this subject, particularly on recommendations for new legislation which may be necessary.

These reports, will, of course, be subject to the necessary security factors which govern any action in this highly sensitive field.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 3, 1953]

TO AID THE WAR ON SPIES

The new Congress properly concerned with strengthening national security, will have a good opportunity to help materially toward that end when a bill sponsored by Representative KEATING of New York comes before it. The bill should not be controversial, but it is—because it has to do with wire tapping. Muddled thinking on the part of opponents of even carefully restricted wire tapping has prevented passage of such legislation in the past. Chief beneficiaries of this muddled thinking have been the enemy agents in whose favor the ban on wire-tap evidence operates.

Under the Federal Communications Act of 1934 it is illegal to "intercept and divulge" any wire communications. The Supreme Court has held that this bars the introduction in Federal courts of any evidence derived from wire tapping. This restriction has placed the Federal Bureau of Investigation under a severe handicap in its war on spies. The Keating bill would remove this handicap by legalizing wire tapping in espionage investigations and permitting the use of wire-tap evidence in court. Permission of a Federal judge first would be required in each case where wire tapping was to be used. Permissive legislation of this sort should have been adopted long ago.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO OBJECTIONS TO CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON CALENDAR

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 64), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule VIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting "1." before the first paragraph of such rule and by adding at the end of such rule the following:

"2. Any Senator may file with the Secretary of the Senate a written objection, signed by such Senator, to any bill or resolution on the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and any such objection so filed shall have the effect with respect to such bill or resolution of an objection interposed under subsection 1 of this rule, and shall continue to have such effect for the remainder of the Congress unless and until withdrawn by such Senator either orally on the floor of the Senate or in writing signed by such Senator and filed with the Secretary of the Senate. The daily Calendar of Business of the Senate shall be prepared so as to indicate when an objection as provided for under this subsection is on file with respect to any bill or resolution, and the name of the Senator or Senators filing such objection."

AMENDMENT OF RULE WITH REFERENCE TO RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AND COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AND COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

"1. No resolution authorizing an inquiry or investigation, or extension thereof, shall contain any authorization for any payment from the contingent fund of the Senate. Any committee reporting any such resolution to the Senate involving an inquiry or investigation in the conduct of which expenses will be incurred shall include in the report on such resolution a budget setting forth its estimate of expenses to be incurred in such inquiry or investigation. Any such budget shall include separate estimates for personal services, hearings, and travel, and shall contain such other information as the Committee on Rules and Administration may require.

"2. Authorization to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate for the expenses of any inquiry or investigation hereafter authorized or extended shall be made by a resolution separate from the resolution authorizing such inquiry or investigation or extension thereof. No resolution authorizing or reauthorizing the payment of the expenses of any such inquiry or investigation shall be agreed to by the Senate until after the resolution authorizing such inquiry or investigation, or extension thereof, has been agreed to by the Senate.

"3. The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to prescribe uniform requirements for the form and contents of the budget required to be submitted under subsection 1 of this rule, and to make such studies as may be necessary to enable it so to prescribe.

"4. Whenever the head of any department or agency of the Government shall have detailed or assigned personnel of such department or agency to the staff of any Senate committee or subcommittee thereof, the appropriations of such department or agency from which the personnel so assigned or detailed is paid shall be reimbursed from funds available to the committee or subcommittee at the end of each quarterly period in the amount of the salaries of such personnel while on such detail or assignment; and the services of any personnel so detailed or assigned shall not be accepted or utilized unless, at the time of such detail, or assignment, funds are available to such committee or subcommittee for the reimbursement of appropriations, as herein provided, for the period of such detail or assignment."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (o) (1) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same, but no resolution which authorizes an inquiry or investigation, or an extension thereof, and does not contain an authorization for payment out of such contingent fund shall be deemed to create a charge upon the same."

SEC. 3. Senate Resolution 77, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to June 28, 1945, as amended, is repealed.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Earlier in the session I submitted Senate Resolution 24, for the same purpose, but the shift in the number of members on the standing committees of the Senate necessitated several changes, and the resolution I am now submitting is correctly and carefully worded in terms of the new Senate provisions with respect to the number of members on committees of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 66), submitted by Mr. FERGUSON, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That commencing with the Eighty-fourth Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.";

(4) Striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the

Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on three standing committees and no more."

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE MAKING OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be added as one of the cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, and that in any further printing of the joint resolution his name may be included as one of the original sponsors, thus making 64 Members of the Senate who have joined in sponsoring the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 4, I submitted a concurrent resolution, sometimes referred to as the single appropriation bill, to provide for annual limitations on obligations for Federal expenditure. The resolution is now referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration as Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

At the time it was submitted 45 other Members of the Senate joined me as sponsors of the resolution. Since Tuesday four other Senators have advised me that they wish to be included.

They are: The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the record show these Senators among the cosponsors of the resolution, and, in case reprinting of the resolution becomes necessary, to have their names inserted at the proper places among the cosponsors of the resolution.

I may add that, with the addition of these cosponsors, the resolution is now endorsed by a majority of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

DIRECTOR OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as Director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], as members of the Select Committee on Small Business.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him before American Federation of Government Employees on the subject The New Administration on Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Address entitled "Shoring Up Our Convictions," delivered by Leonard Riggleman, president of Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va., at the midyear commencement exercises at Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, on January 31, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Report by Navy Department with reference to achievements of Eugene Ely, of the State of Iowa.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Pamphlet entitled "The Supreme Issue in American Life Today Is—," published by the American Good Government League, Washington, D. C.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Editorial entitled "Protect Our Constitution," published in the Orlando (Fla.) Sunday Sentinel-Star.

Editorial entitled "Why Not a Pension for Our Ex-Presidents?" published in the Miami (Fla.) Herald.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article by Mr. Ben W. Gilbert, appearing in Washington Post, outlining the steps which the President can take to abolish segregation in the District of Columbia.

IMPORTATION OF GRAIN FROM CANADA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very personal letter from Mullin & Dillon Co., of Minneapolis, with relation to the importation of grain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULLIN & DILLON CO.,
Minneapolis, February 3, 1953.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some months ago we wrote you protesting the policy the United States has pursued for several years in permitting the importation of grain from Canada, thereby depressing prices to the American farmer and restricting and destroying the market and outlets for his products.

We appreciate very much your acknowledgment of our letter and the interest you demonstrated in the problem.

In the year just closed, 1952, Canada shipped into this country over 63,000,000 bushels of oats. As you know, your State of Iowa is an important producer of oats, and has in previous years, satisfied a part of the demand for this cereal in the eastern section of the United States. This market has been all but lost because of the policy of our Government which permits Canada to continue to flood us with oats and other grains. Right now feed grains produced by the American farmer are not only in abundant supply, but the surplus is of such size as to cause considerable concern and alarm among people, like ourselves, who are engaged in the marketing and distribution of American grain.

In view of the continued weakness of our grain markets with steadily declining prices and the questionable stability of our whole farm economy, it presently is more ludicrous than ever for us to continue a policy which is a great factor in lowering prices to the American farmer, while we are at the same time spending billions of dollars of the American taxpayer in order to support farm prices of the domestic producer.

We hope that your interest in the welfare of the American farmer, and particularly those of the Midwest, will prompt you to exert your influence for a reexamination of this whole policy and that you will do what you can to correct this very bad situation.

Respectfully,

MULLIN & DILLON CO.,
W. E. MULLIN, *President.*

USE OF OFFSHORE OIL RESOURCES TO PAY BETTER TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for some time now the subject of teachers' salaries has caused us all great concern. The teaching profession does not provide enough income for the educators of our youth to maintain adequate living standards. We must take some action to correct this condition. Mere oratory and hand wringing will accomplish nothing. We need a positive program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables comparing the income received by teachers with that received by members of other professions. I believe these tables prove that teachers' salaries are too low.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Median wage or salary income in 1949 according to the 1950 census of population [1]

Engineers, technical	$4,554
Skilled workers [2]	3,105
Teachers [3]	2,576

[1] Includes workers in the experienced civilian labor force in April 1950 who reported $1 or more of such income. Data are based on tabulations of a 3⅓-percent sample of the 1950 population census returns. The medians are, therefore, subject to sampling variability. These figures are based on tabulations which have not yet gone through the various clerical checking processes which normally precede publication. The figures are, therefore, subject to change.

[2] Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers.

[3] Includes teachers not elsewhere classified. College teachers, teachers of art, music, dancing, and a few other subjects are included in other categories of the classification system. The great bulk of elementary and high-school teachers are in the category presented here.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Average salaries of public-school teachers, doctors, and lawyers, 1939–51

Year	Teachers, public schools [1]	Lawyers [2]	Doctors [3]
1939	$1,420	$4,391	$4,229
1940	1,450	4,507	4,441
1941	1,480	4,794	5,047
1942	1,540	5,527	6,735
1943	1,640	5,945	8,370
1944	1,765	6,504	9,802
1945	1,900	6,861	10,975
1946	2,080	6,951	10,202
1947	2,380	7,437	10,726
1948	2,705	8,121	11,327
1949	2,890	8,577	11,744
1950	3,020	9,072	12,324
1951	3,095	9,375	13,432

[1] Includes teachers, principals, supervisors, school librarians, and counselors. Calendar year. National Education Association of the United States. Economic status of teachers in 1951–52, p. 14, Release No. 1, 1951, Schools and current economic trends.

[2] Mean net income of nonsalaried lawyers, excluding all nonprofessional income but not deducting income taxes. Weinfeld, William. Income of Lawyers, 1929–48. Survey of Current Business, August 1949, p. 18. Incomes of physicians, dentists, and lawyers, 1949–51. Survey of Current Business, July 1952, p. 6.

[3] Mean net income of nonsalaried doctors, deducting business expenses and receipts from nonmedical work but before deducting income taxes. Weinfeld, William. Income of physicians, 1929–49. Survey of Current Business, July 1951, p. 11. Incomes of physicians, dentists, and lawyers, 1949–51. Survey of Current Business, July 1952, p. 6.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When I first came to the Senate in 1949, I worked for a Federal aid-to-education bill. This measure got bogged down, however, and I see no hope for its immediate revival. But Congress will very quickly get a chance to vote on another measure which would alleviate the crisis in education and make possible better teachers' salaries. This proposal is known as the Hill amendment to the offshore oil bill. I am convinced that every teacher and parent with school-age children should press for passage of the Hill amendment with all possible vigor.

The offshore oil bill itself would take away from 40 to 100 billion dollars in oil resources which now belong to the 48 States and give them to 3 States. These oil deposits lie off the shores of Texas, Louisiana, and California in the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. The Hill amendment would, instead, devote these resources to the educational needs in all the States.

The thought of Congress giving away 40 to 100 billions of dollars in oil resources, part of which belongs to Illinois, made me think of the plight of the schools and school teachers in Illinois and the whole country. Here are billions of dollars which are to be given away at the very time when our school districts cannot raise enough money to educate our children properly. School teachers unwilling to suffer a reduced scale of living are leaving that profession because salaries are so low, and yet the huge increase in births during the past 10 years indicate massive and continuous increases in the number of children which we must educate. Meanwhile, we are forcing those teachers who are devoted to their work to suffer lower living standards. This is unfortunately true in the case of both public and privately endowed schools, and regardless of whether the teaching is at the primary, secondary, or university level.

I did some checking on the teachers' salaries to see how they have kept up with incomes in other professions. The average income of lawyers is three times that of school teachers, and doctors make over four times as much as the educators of our children. Skilled workers have higher incomes. Professional engineers, who have about the same amount of training as teachers, have incomes almost twice as high.

In short, when the incomes of school teachers are compared with the incomes earned by persons in other professions, the teachers are at the bottom of the list. The people who must prepare our youth to take over the leadership of the United States are made to suffer for their devotion. Others are leaving the teaching profession for better-paying positions, which means inadequate educational facilities for American boys and girls.

We are already in the midst of a crisis in education, and it grows worse every year. We need money to correct this situation. Yet it looks very much as though Congress may vote to donate from 40 to 100 billion dollars which, if retained, could be used to increase teachers' salaries and more properly educate our children.

So, Mr. President, I am sure it will be understood why I am against such a giveaway as that provided by the offshore oil bill. Instead, I am cosponsoring the Hill amendment which would stop this oil grab and use the money to better the plight of our schools and our teachers.

The oil-for-education amendment is a continuation of the land grant college policy fostered by Illinoisans Jonathan B. Turner and Newton Bateman and signed into law by an Illinois President, Abraham Lincoln. Under that law, the Morrill Act, each State was granted 30,000 acres of Federal land or land script for each Senator and Representative it had in Congress, the revenues to be used to promote higher education. The University of Illinois got its start through this land grant, and perhaps it would not have come into being without it. So there is nothing new in devoting public resources to education. It is a good thing to do in itself. But as an alternative to making an outright gift of $100,000,000,000, when the Federal Government already has a debt of over a quarter of a trillion dollars, it is absolutely imperative.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BEEF CATTLE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk a bill, which I ask be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 798) to provide mandatory price support for beef cattle, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a brief statement in explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on January 7, I introduced Senate bill 115, the purpose of which, among other things, was to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations under existing law, price support for a number of additional farm commodities at 100 percent of parity. One of the items covered by the bill is beef cattle.

At that time, the bill was urgently needed. Since then, the price of many farm commodities has continued to decline, but the price of beef cattle has skidded until producers of beef in our country are today faced with a serious and drastic emergency.

I have now introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide immediate and mandatory price support for beef cattle.

It had been my hope, as I know it was the hope of many other Senators on both sides of the aisle, that the new Secretary of Agriculture would do all within his power to check the disastrous decline that has been going on and is still going on in beef cattle prices.

On January 15 last, the average price being paid for beef cattle was around $19.70 per hundred. This figure equaled about 92 percent of parity and represented a decline of more than 25 percent in 12 months.

The average price for all cattle on the farms today is estimated to be around $17.50 a hundred, which means that in 3 weeks, the price has gone down from about 92 percent of parity to approximately 82 percent of parity.

On January 28, Secretary Benson made a brief statement on farm prices in general in which he noted that they had been declining. In the closing sentence of his press release he stated:

> We shall continue to use such price supporting devices as are available to us when and if prices sag below the levels prescribed by the Congress.

Mr. President, the plain fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to support the price of livestock now, but he continues to fail utterly to do anything about it. Therefore, I urge the immediate consideration and earliest possible passage of the bill I have just introduced.

On February 3, the Secretary of Agriculture was quoted as urging disturbed cattlemen to drop their unwarranted pessimism about the declining prices and to stop dumping beef cattle on the market.

I wonder, Mr. President, if the Secretary did not know that one of the reasons the disturbed cattlemen were dumping beef cattle on the market was because they were still being compelled to do so because of one of the worst droughts in the history of the Midwest and the Southwest.

I am sure Mr. Benson knew or could have known that the situation had become so severe that the President of the United States had declared an emergency and had allocated money for a disaster relief fund to help make it possible for cattlemen in the drought areas to buy hay.

I am sure that the Secretary knows or could have known that this drought and diminishing prices creating restricted credit compelled the livestock producers to go to the market with their cattle and sell for whatever price could be had.

Mr. President, the decline in livestock prices in the past 12 months has cost the farmers of our country nearly a billion dollars in 1 year, and, in my judgment, the national income is still raised or lowered by seven times the amount by which farm income is affected.

A few days ago, the Secretary said to one Senator "take off controls and that will eliminate compulsory grading." He then said "that will make cattle go up on the hoof and put meat down in the butcher shop."

Mr. President, I never heard a more desirable objective stated, nor did I ever hear a more erroneous statement as to how it might be achieved.

Mr. President, unless bold and vigorous action is taken now to support the price of beef cattle, we have no way of knowing to what extent the decline will continue.

At a press conference yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture said "that cattle prices have not skidded far enough to warrant emergency Federal aid."

Mr. President, one-half of the cattlemen in this country are already broke.

Does the Secretary feel that they should all be bankrupt before conditions would "warrant emergency Federal aid"?

The Secretary yesterday stated that he believed "skidding cattle prices will level off without the Government stepping in."

Mr. President, the prices must do more than "level off" if farm prosperity is not to be further tragically damaged. The price of beef cattle should be restored to at least 100 percent of parity.

We all know that the price of meat in the butcher shop has not been reduced proportionately to the decline in the price for cattle on the hoof. The bill I have just introduced would not affect the price of meat in the butcher shop, Mr. President, because the price levels are far above those justified even with the farmer receiving 100 percent of parity for his cattle.

This bill would direct the Secretary to use $25,000,000 immediately from the funds in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of beef cattle at 100 percent of parity. I am convinced that but little of the money would have to be spent.

The buying in the market place today, Mr. President, is at its declining level because the purchasers continue to force the price down as they try to buy as cheaply as possible from producers who, as the result of conditions beyond their control, are compelled to sell for what they can get. If they knew that through loans or purchases or other means available under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture had an emergency fund of $25,000,000 to support the price of beef cattle, it would go a long way toward halting the decline in prices and restore their level to the basis of at least 100 percent of parity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator whether it is not true that when the Secretary of Agriculture has merely announced that he was going to support prices, it has had the effect of stabilizing the market?

Mr. KERR. Many times when the producers were compelled to go to market for reasons beyond their control, the buyers, knowing the producers were going to be required to sell, lowered their bids. But as the Commodity Credit Corporation, through the Secretary of Agriculture, moved in to support the price at a fixed level, it was thereby stabilized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that at one time when such a situation prevailed and the Secretary of Agriculture gave indication that he would step into the market, the market began to stabilize, particularly with reference to the storable commodities. The mere mention of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture was going to use his authority under the law has had a stabilizing effect on the market. Is that not correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct; and, by the same token, when the Secretary says that prices have not declined to a level justifying Federal emergency aid, he is but giving a green light to purchasers to continue to force the prices still lower.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator is aware of the statement recently made by the Secretary of Agriculture about the desirability of orderly marketing, and calling upon the farmers not to be unduly pessimistic. The Senator, I am sure, is also aware of the fact that it is impossible to have orderly marketing in a price-declining economy, when as in the case of cattle, notes at the bank are coming due on the cattle, and when the only way by which to pay off the notes is to sell at a lower price. In other words, under such circumstances marketing become disorderly. Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct, because with each additional $1 per hundred decline, the banker sees the margin of safety on the notes of cattlemen further reduced, whereupon loans are called and additional cattle are forced on the market, making the procedure still less orderly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the farmers of America are deeply indebted to the Senator from Oklahoma for his vigilant leadership in the field of agricultural legislation, and I surely want to concur and associate myself with the bill which the Senator has introduced and with which I am familiar. I recall his efforts a year ago in this same area. But he has broadened the area of commodities now, which I believe is highly commendable. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will see the light and will seek advice and counsel from the Senator from Oklahoma and others in an effort to stabilize this very disastrous market.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am very thankful to have him associated with me in the bill. I share in his hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will see the light.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There seems to be a tendency at the present time to believe that there probably will be nothing done in regard to legislation for the farmer this year, but that there will be an investigation to see what to do, and to act next year. If that takes place, what will happen in the United States?

Mr. KERR. In that event, what will happen will be more of what has happened and what is now happening. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that there is little comfort and only a very slim hope for the producer, faced with the tragic realities in 1953, in the statement that a commission will be established to study the problem, with a directive to make recommendations in 1955.

The very uncertainty which has caused much of the decline to the present level will be exaggerated and accelerated, and the disastrous result will be increased.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I gather from what the Senator from Oklahoma has said that the more quickly the new Secretary of Agriculture can let us know what the farm program is, the better it will be for the farmer.

Mr. KERR. Provided that, when he lets us know what it is, it is an effective farm program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In other words, there must be some support.

Mr. KERR. It must embody some positive, dynamic proposals and suggestions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In regard to the statement that the farmers are urged to withold their meat and other products from the market, is it not a fact that at this particular time the bankers are holding notes of the farmers and calling on them to pay, and, therefore, if the farmer should request an additional loan the banker would say to the farmer, "You must sell. The market is going down." Is not that the advice the farmer is getting?

Mr. KERR. The banker is being compelled to take that position because it is realistic. After all, his loans when made may have had an adequate margin, but declining prices have eliminated the margin, so that the banker, in the protection of his own interest and that of his depositors, must call the loan, which takes away any protection from the producer and leaves him nothing to do but to sell on the market.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not criticizing the banker. That is the only position he can take, facing the situation which prevails at the present time, with no assurance as to what is going to happen in the future, so far as any protection by the Government is concerned.

Mr. KERR. That is correct. At the same time, the producer has the definite knowledge that the Secretary has stated, as I understand, that prices have not yet declined enough to cause a critical situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that once the agricultural price structure starts to decline in the rapid order in which it has begun to fall apart, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

movement accumulates velocity? In other words, the longer it declines the greater is the difficulty to stabilize the market and get the price structure back on a reasonable level?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct. It should have been done 2 weeks ago. It can probably be done better now than it can be done 2 weeks from today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not a fact that once agricultural prices begin to slip it literally involves the whole economy in a difficult price situation? Here we see the agricultural area of our economy under very difficult duress which, in turn, translates itself into the economic troubles of the bankers, and also the implement dealers, fertilizer companies, and every other aspect of the total economy in the agricultural area?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct. The strength and vitality of the national economy cannot remain above the level of that of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the existing law gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority, within his discretion, to stabilize prices?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary has limited authority under existing law. I believe it would be made sufficient under the provisions of the bill which I have introduced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's bill gives a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture, does it not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The existing law rests upon the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, the question is, What is the purpose and what is the price-support philosophy of the Secretary of Agriculture? It is in that area that there is great uncertainty in the United States as to just what the Department of Agriculture intends to do because of what I would call a nebulous price-support philosophy.

Mr. KERR. There is not only uncertainty, but there is a growing and expanding fear in the heart of every farm family in the Nation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he does not think the removal of price-control ceilings on live animals will be a very important factor in stopping this decline.

Mr. KERR. I will say to my good friend from Kansas that I cannot agree with him in that thought, for the reason that the price of cattle is skidding far below any proportionate or commensurate price consistent with the ceiling on the products. The price of the commodity is already far below the ceiling, and the removal of the ceiling can have no effect upon increasing the price.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was not the price skidding in December 1952?

Mr. KERR. It was, but it had not yet skidded much below a hundred percent of parity. The parity price for beef cattle on the 15th of January was at a level of approximately 82½ percent of parity, but today it is approximately 82½ percent of parity, and unless something is done, in another week it will decline still further. The purpose of my bill is to bring about support of the price of beef cattle at 100 percent of parity.

GRANTING TO STATES MINERAL RIGHTS UNDERLYING PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which provides for granting to the several States the mineral rights underlying public lands, ownership of which now rests in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 807) to provide for granting to the several States the mineral rights in public lands belonging to the United States, introduced by Mr. HUNT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, in introducing this bill I may say that it is quite consistent with views which I have held since 1943, when, at my direction, the attorney general of Wyoming allied himself with the attorneys general of, I think, every other State in the Union in opposing before the Supreme Court of the United States the suit of the Federal Government to gain control and ownership of the so-called tidelands, and, as the RECORD will show, I supported the legislation introduced last year to obviate the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. President, from my point of view the underlying principles and conditions with reference to the tidelands and subsurface rights in public lands in the Western States, ownership and administration of which are now under the jurisdiction of the United States, are identical. Fifty-three percent of the land area of Wyoming is Federally controlled, and Wyoming, therefore, as to matters which to my way of thinking are purely local, is under the jurisdiction of a dual administration.

For 14 years—8 years as a member of the Wyoming State land board, and 6 years as chairman of that board—I participated in the administration of public lands, and therefore have first-hand knowledge of the efficiency of the State Government as compared with the Federal Government in the administration of such lands, and I am thoroughly convinced that the mineral rights underlying Federally owned lands can be administered more directly and more profitably by local government than by the Department of the Interior—and I am not one who, generally speaking, is critical of the Department of the Interior.

The bill removes from the United States Government and gives to the State all mineral rights underlying Federally-owned lands, except national forests, national parks, national monuments, and wildlife preserves, lands that have been entered upon, land that has fissionable material in it, or land that is being used by the Government for a special service.

Furthermore, the bill provides for the assumption by the several States of existing leases and contracts, and provides for the administration by the States of the rights which will become the property of the States.

I have never been able to understand the theory or reasoning behind the retention by the Federal Government of the ownership of mineral rights in the Western States, when that theory is not and never has been applied to States not designated as public-land States. We of the Western States are as rightfully entitled to the revenues produced from minerals under public lands in our States as are the States in coastal areas involved in the so-called tidelands issue.

If these mineral rights are given to my State, income from them would make Wyoming self-supporting to a far greater extent, and thus lessen, if not entirely eliminate, a need for grants-in-aid programs.

In the year 1952 alone, the Federal Government was enriched to the extent of approximatley $18,000,000 by mineral production in Wyoming, and since 1920 my State from such production has turned over to the Federal Government $153,250,000, which I may say, rightfully belongs to the people of the State of Wyoming.

My bill does not provide for the transfer of surface rights to the State, in that I feel the surface rights—the extensive grazing areas, the huge wildlife population, the national parks, the wildlife preserves, and the national forests, including wonderful fishing areas—bring such recreation, pleasure, and profit to all the people of the United States that administration should remain with the Federal Government for the benefit of all the people.

THE PUBLIC LAND QUESTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who has a wide background and has had long experience in the administrative affairs of the Western States, particularly of his own State, remember that over a long period of years, for at least three-quarters of a century following the passage of the Homestead Act by Congress, it was the apparent policy of Congress to hold public lands in trust for the States until such time as certain laws or arrangements could be made to pass those lands into private ownership, and thus make them subject to taxation. Through the Homestead Act, which by means of a $16 filing fee for 160 acres of land the individual through certain development could own it. When settlers moved into western Kansas, a little drier country, the area was increased to 320 acres, the additional Homestead Act—then on into Colorado, through the short-grass country, it was made an additional 640 acres, meaning that 960 acres of land, called the grazing homesteads, could be patented by an individual. That was an indication that the Government's purpose was

to allow a man to take up enough acreage to make a living, upon payment of a $16 filing fee in each case, and also that the policy of Congress was to hold the lands in trust for this very purpose. Does the Senator remember that trend?

Mr. HUNT. I remember that trend, and I may say to the Senator from Nevada that that purpose now has been completely accomplished.

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HUNT. No longer are there any homestead lands in my State. I do not know about the Senator's State of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, the reason why we have public lands is that there has been no attempt by Congress, since the 640-acre grazing homestead law was passed, to arrange any method by which additional lands could be passed to the homesteader in one block, if we may call him a homesteader. At any rate pass ownership to the man who was trying to make a living on those lands, in such acreage as would support a family. That is to say, to enable him to raise a couple of hundred head of cattle, or a band of 1,500 sheep, a family unit.

There has been no attempt to transfer such land to private ownership since the Grazing Homestead Act providing for a tract of 960 acres, was passed, in order to provide enough acreage to enable a man to make a living for a family.

Land which is too poor on account of lack of water and rainfall to enable a family unit to exist on 960 acres remains in public ownership. Instead of trying to find a solution of the problem for the benefit of the people who have used public lands in my State of Nevada and your State of Wyoming for 60 or 70 years we have ceased searching for a method to put those lands in the hands of men who have continually used them during that period of time, and adopted a policy in 1934, through the Taylor Grazing Act, now administered by the Bureau of Land Management, switching that policy to establish permanent Government ownership, and therefore make permanent tenants out of every man, woman, and child who uses the extensive lands in the Senator's State of Wyoming and in my State of Nevada.

Mr. HUNT. I may interpolate to say that the young man who desires to start in the livestock business in Wyoming today just cannot do so.

Mr. MALONE. He cannot do it anywhere else, due to the very fact that the laws passed by Congress have been interpreted by the Government during the past 20 years in such a way as to preclude the sale of the large ranches to smaller owners because they cannot transfer the range with the patented land.

In my State, and I am certain the same is true in the Senator's own State, and also in every other Western State, a man may take up 160 acres, or whatever the amount of land might be, in areas where the supply of water is uncertain. Sometimes there is a flash-flood stream, which provides for only one period of irrigation. Of course, where the streams are larger, they provide opportunities for the storage of water, thus making it possible to develop valuable ranches but that is impossible in the range areas.

Then there are the stock-water rights involved throughout the public-land area, and also the irrigation water rights which make it possible to irrigate the tracts of land which furnish food for the winter period.

We also have a very great interest in the livestock unit, of which the public lands used in connection with the food-producing ranch is one factor, and the water rights necessary to irrigate the land is factor No. 2. Third, the patented feed-producing land is factor No. 3. Is that correct?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. They have adopted a policy through the Bureau of Land Management based upon the Taylor Grazing Act that established a permanent policy of keeping one factor of a settler's livestock unit—the public range—in perpetual Government ownership. It is of course well recognized that anyone who controls one factor of the livestock unit, either the range, the water rights, or the feed-producing ranch, can destroy the investment overnight. Control of the range factor has been kept in the hands of public officials and they are doing just what I have said they could do. They are now destroying the investment of the rancher and livestock man.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I have on my desk letters from ranchers complaining about the Forest Service and the Land Management Bureau and their arbitrary action in this regard.

They retain the right to cut the carrying capacity of the range any time they desire. They retain the right, at their discretion, to raise the price for its use. Therefore, they can destroy at their discretion the one factor which is necessary for a complete livestock unit and I may add they are doing just that.

Mr. HUNT. Every time there is an exchange of a lease, especially in the Forest Service, the number of cattle or sheep permitted on the particular lease is automatically reduced.

DESTRUCTION OF AN INVESTMENT

Mr. MALONE. Now we come to the crux of the problem. That was what I was leading up to. There is full control, which prevents exactly what is said to be desirable, that is, the breaking up of the large livestock interests.

The control is retained and exercised by the bureau which prevents the sale of part of the unit.

When a larger operator wishes to sell to a small rancher who desires to buy from a larger operator a unit which will support a family, there is nothing to sell. There is nothing to be transferred to the smaller operator since the range so transferred with the feed-producing property can be cut beyond the economic use of the smaller unit.

In Washington there are two bureaus, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, which absolutely prevent the very objective which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming knows is important to his State and to my State, and to every other public land State if we are to get out from under the status which has been described; and that is the full control of the range use.

My own thought is that Congress must meet the situation. It must not accept the policy of perpetual public land ownership in our States.

The percentage of federally owned land in my own State is 87 percent.

We must devise some way to recognize vested rights in the range. Last year I introduced a bill—and I intend to introduce it again—which would turn the Bureau of Land Managament into an adjudicating agency, to determine the customary use of the range—not to determine what it thinks the use ought to be and upset every long-time investment in the western country, as is now being done.

The worst of it is that the Bureau holds in its hands the power to do just that. That is what destroys the value of the investment. The bill to which I have referred would turn the Bureau of Land Management into an adjudicating unit, so that it could determine where the livestock interests had run their cattle over a period of the 60 or 70 years, in connection with feed-producing range.

Thus the use of the range would be adjudicated, just as the use of water is adjudicated. The State engineer does not enter the situation in connection with a certain stream and say to one user, "You have too much water. We will give it to your neighbor, Mr. Jones."

Through hearings, advertisements, and proper adjudication proceedings, the use of the water which has been enjoyed over the years is determined, and priorities are established, depending upon the year a given user started to use the water, in relation to other users.

Mr. HUNT. That is the principle of the beneficial use.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. That is the principle I should like to see applied to the range. It does not involve ownership of the land, but a determination of the use of the feed. The feed is absolutely valueless to Uncle Sam or to anyone else unless it is fed to livestock. It can be marketed only through livestock; and the livestock can be run only in connection with the feed-producing ranches, and the water rights which are in existence. Therefore, if we were to change the policy which has been established through bureaucratic control and give the users of the range the rights to which I have referred, they would not own the land, but they would own the use of the feed only so long as they used it.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a former Governor of his State, will agree with me when I say that the water user never owns the water. He owns the right to the use of the water. Such right can be lost by nonuse. I would treat the grass and the feed in the same way. The user would not own the land or the feed. He would own the use of it, so long as he continued the use.

This would encourage taking up lands for higher use, such as homesteading. If the economy should change, water

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

could be pumped in many instances. Such higher uses include also use for a mining claim, a fish and game preserve, or any other higher use. The user of the grass would have nothing to do with such use, and it would interfere with him very little in the exercise of his right, so long as he used it, in relation to other users.

Then we could go a step further and allow the purchase and sale of the range, just as water is sold. The Senator from Wyoming is entirely familiar with such procedures. The user of water establishes his right to the use of a certain amount of water in the stream as of a certain date. He can sell it to John Jones, who is above him or below him on the stream. He can apply to the State engineer for a transfer with respect to the place of use or place of diversion. When the maps are made and the application is submitted, the State engineer has only one criterion upon which to reject such an application, and that is if it injures a third party. If the transfer can be made without injuring a third party, he must grant it.

In that way the range would be blocked out, and there would be something to sell. But it is unthinkable to me that the Government should hold this land in perpetuity and make permanent tenants of all the users in the Senator's State and in mine. In my State the percentage of public land is 87 percent.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his contribution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior and junior Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL]; the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]; the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; both the senior and junior Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER]; the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; both the senior and junior Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. COOPER]; the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]; the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]; the senior and junior Senators from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. WELKER]; both the senior and junior Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS]; the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]; the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; both the senior and junior Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. GILLETTE]; the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]; both the senior and junior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE]; the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD]; both the senior and junior Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH]; both the senior and junior Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS]; both the senior and junior Senators from Minnesota [Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY]; the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]; both the senior and junior Senators from New York [Mr. IVES and Mr. LEHMAN]; the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]; the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]; the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]; the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]; both the senior and junior Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY]; the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]; both the senior and junior Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE]; both the senior and junior Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON]; the senior and junior Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN]; the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; both the senior and junior Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF]; both the senior and junior Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 833) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in explanation of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, today for myself and on behalf of 57 cosponsors I have again introduced a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. A similar bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman COLMER, of Mississippi.

I first introduced a similar bill on February 19, 1950, in the Eighty-first Congress. That bill was known as S. 2898. Last year, in the Eighty-second Congress, I introduced the measure with some minor revisions. That bill became known as S. 913. After public hearings and in due time, the Senate Committee on Government Operations unanimously reported S. 913 favorably, and on April 8, 1952, following full debate the Senate, on a roll-call vote, passed it by 55 to 8.

The bill we are introducing today is identical with S. 913 as it passed the Senate last April.

This proposed legislation is designed to remedy serious deficiencies related to appropriation procedures and the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes a positive approach toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

The swollen cost of operating the Federal Government, with annual budgets in excess of $70,000,000,000, and continuous annual deficits of billions of dollars that pyramid the already astronomical national debt dictate the compelling necessity of reducing the cost of government where it is prudent to do so in order to restore sound fiscal policies and balance the national budget, which, I am advised, is one of the major goals of the present administration.

Presently, the Congress and its Appropriations Committees labor under a tremendous handicap in passing judgment on budget requests for the executive branch of the Government. They have thus far failed to provide and are now woefully lacking in adequate facilities with which to procure the factual information that is needed and indispensable to enable them to make sound and judicious determinations with respect to appropriations requested in the budget, and as to amounts that are sufficient and not excessive for the proper functioning of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. This legislative handicap, Mr. President, is neither insurmountable nor unavoidable. It can be removed and this vital deficiency can be remedied. That is the purpose of this bill.

I may point out that paragraph (1) (A) of section 1 of the bill charges the joint committee with the duty "to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government"; (B) "to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget and the justification submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto." That is the heart of the bill.

Paragraph (D) of section 1 of the bill makes it the duty of the joint committee "to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security." That, Mr. President, is the goal the bill seeks to attain.

To enable the joint committee to properly function and render the services and perform the duties prescribed, the committee is empowered to employ a professional, technical, and clerical staff and, upon the written authority of the chairman or the vice chairman, the members of the professional and technical staff "shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

The joint committee is also authorized to hold hearings at any time,

whether the Congress is in session, in recess, or has adjourned, in order to examine into and inform itself on matters relating to the Federal budget, requested appropriations, and the expenditure of public funds. It will then report its findings to the two Appropriations Committees.

The need for this service to the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress is obvious. The Bureau of the Budget, an arm of the executive branch of the Government, employs more than 500 people the year around at an annual cost in excess of $3,500,000 to prepare and submit the annual budget of the President to the Congress. My recollection is that for this fiscal year we appropriated $3,800,000, in round figures. Every agency and department of Government has its own budget staff and employees separate and apart from the Bureau, the number and cost of which is indeterminable. All of these Federal employees represent the views of the executive branch with reference to appropriations to cover the operating cost of that branch of the Government.

Under the present statute, as it has remained in force for many years during the growth of the Government, Congress is not equipped with any facility or any agency of its own to give its undivided attention and effort to an analysis of the budget and to have represented before the appropriations committees any witnesses to present testimony primarily from the standpoint of the people and the taxpayers, who are to be affected.

When appropriation bills are before the committees of Congress, the hearings conducted are ex parte in nature. Witnesses appearing before the committee are the heads and representatives of the agencies desiring the money to spend. Their purpose is to support and defend the budget requests both as to necessity and amounts.

Mr. President, in my 4 years of experience on the Committee on Appropriations, I have never seen a representative of the executive branch of the Government come before the Appropriations Committee and ask for a reduction in funds below the amounts requested in the budget. As I say, it is their purpose, in appearing before the Committee on Appropriations, to support and defend the budget request.

The Appropriations Committees have not heretofore been equipped with professional and technical staffs charged with the duty or responsibility of thoroughly examining and evaluating proposed expenditures. Neither the Congress nor the taxpayers are represented by witnesses who are prepared and competent to refute with facts and reliable information the claims or the evidence submitted by representatives of the executive branch in support of the budget requests.

Under this procedure it is most difficult, if not impossible, for the Appropriations Committees to screen the requests before them and make fair and judicious decisions with reference to all appropriation items. They hear only one side of the case. A joint committee, as proposed, properly staffed and functioning, will be able to present to the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress factual information that will justify the entire elimination of some items and a reduction in the amounts of many others.

Since this joint committee, with the powers and duties conferred upon it, would constitute an overall watchdog committee over all expenditures in the executive department, the need for a number of existing special watchdog committees in both the House and Senate over particular appropriations and expenditures would be obviated. This committee would follow up on funds appropriated by the Congress, and would report on the prudence of their expenditures. On the basis of such reports, the Congress would then be able to make more intelligent determinations with respect to subsequent appropriations.

The need for the kind of facility and service this measure would provide has heretofore been recognized and confirmed by both Houses of Congress—by the Senate in the passage of Senate bill 913 during the last session of Congress by a vote of 55 to 8, and by the House of Representatives when its Appropriations Committee in the closing days of the last session of Congress adopted a resolution to increase its staff and asked for a $250,000 appropriation to pay the cost of such increase. The Congress further gave its approval by including in the first supplemental appropriation bill for this fiscal year an item of $500,000, $250,000 to the House and a like amount to the Senate, for increasing the staffs of their respective Appropriations Committees.

I may say, Mr. President, that attention was focused on the immediate needs for the facilities and services which this measure would provide, by reason of the fact that at the last session the Senate passed Senate bill 913, and when that bill reached the House of Representatives, a concerted effort was made to undertake to accomplish indirectly what this bill would accomplish directly and with specific congressional authority and direction.

So, Mr. President, I may say to my colleagues the machinery is already in motion, in both Houses, by appropriation and by enlargement of committee staffs, to try to do this very job.

The Congress cannot with good grace and conscience continue to ride herd on the agencies and departments of the executive branch for waste, duplication, and extravagance, if it is unwilling to set an example by putting its own legislative machinery in order. We, the Congress, cannot justify the hiring of two persons, or two special professional and technical staffs, and the spending of two dollars, when one is sufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, unless this bill is passed or unless a similar establishment to serve both Houses is created, both Appropriations Committees, with largely increased staffs, will be duplicating the same work over and over and spending $2 for every $1 that really needs to be spent. As I have said, I believe Congress should set the example by itself refusing to duplicate and by refusing to spend $2 when $1 can do the job.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree that not only can this great amount of money be saved in connection with congressional operations by means of this kind of joint action, but also that very frequently there is a waste of many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money in conducting our committee work on Capitol Hill, when we know, for example, that the same witnesses from the Pentagon Building will testify before both the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, where they will give exactly the same testimony; and thereafter we submit duplicate reports on which we spent many hours of time and large amounts of money, when one hearing would serve equally well for the purposes of both committees?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. Certainly such action as is proposed by this bill is imperative and impelling upon the Congress, if it expects the executive branch of the Government to avoid waste, duplication, and extravagance. The Congress itself should provide its own machinery and should set such an example.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Arkansas does not fear that the addition of a third party member to the list of cosponsors of the bill would handicap it, I would be very happy to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be happy to place the name of the Senator from Oregon on the bill, as one of its cosponsors. I have invited all Senators who have cared to do so to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. President, I believe the bill is nonpartisan, for I believe there are 30 Republican Senators and 28 Democratic Senators sponsoring the bill. If the Senator from Oregon will kindly join us in sponsoring the bill, then we shall have all three parties represented. So I am very glad to have him join as a cosponsor.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message said:

> Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can (1) reduce the planned deficits and then balance the budget, which means among other things, reducing Federal expenditures to the safe minimum.

He further pointed out that—

> The first order of business is the elimination of the annual deficit. This cannot be achieved merely by exhortation. It demands the concerted action of all those in responsible positions in the Government and the earnest cooperation of the Congress.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would be a clear manifestation of the intent and purpose of Congress to give its earnest cooperation in charting a fiscal and economic policy that would reduce annual deficits and Federal expenditures to the safe minimum, and ultimately would produce a balanced budget.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This reform is long overdue and is imperatively needed in the interest of a sound economy and national solvency.

Mr. President, I wish to take occasion at this time to thank all Senators who have joined as cosponsors of this measure. This proposal is a worthy one, in my judgment, and all of us should have a share in bringing about this reform.

I also wish to thank those who so ably assisted me in having a similar measure passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. President, in view of the hearings which were held on the other bill in the last Congress, in view of the fact that that bill was similar to the one now being introduced, and in view of the fact that at the previous hearings all related matters were fully discussed and developed, I trust that it will not be necessary for hearings to be held again, but that the committee will be able to act speedily in reporting the bill, so that the Senate can take action on it at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, which I have prepared, be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, BY SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, ET AL.

Section 1 of S. 913, as passed by the Senate on April 8, 1953, amends section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as follows:

Subsection (a) creates a joint committee on the budget composed of 14 members, to consist of 7 members each from the Senate and House committees on appropriations (4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party), who are to be chosen by the designated committees.

Subsection (b) provides that no person may continue to serve on the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, but reelected Members of the House may continue to serve, notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress; a vacancy in the joint committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, including any vacancy which occurs during the adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks. In the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled by the House committee, the remaining members of the joint committee may designate as temporary successor a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who was reelected to the House of Representatives.

Subsection (c) provides that the joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session. During even-numbered years the chairman shall be selected from the House, and the vice chairman from the Senate. During odd-numbered years the order shall be reversed.

Subsection (d) provides that a majority of the Members of each House shall constitute a quorum, and that a lesser number as may be determined by the joint committee may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcommittee may conduct hearings or investigations, but a majority of the members must concur before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

Subsection (e) sets forth the duties of the joint committee, as follows:

(1) To inform itself relative to the annual budget; to examine reports submitted on all Federal operations; to provide the Committees on Appropriations with the necessary information for adequate consideration of the budget; to utilize all reports from the executive branch and from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation relating to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions; and to report its findings to the Appropriations Committees with respect to budget estimates and to revisions in appropriations which are required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

(2) To recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate, changes in existing laws which will promote efficiency and economy;

(3) To make reports and recommendations, upon request, or as the joint committee deems necessary or desirable, on matters within the jurisdiction of any standing committee of Congress, on any subcommittee thereof, relative to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations; and

(4) To report to the Committees on Appropriations at the beginning of each session the total estimated cost of all authorized programs and projects during the current fiscal year, the next succeeding fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

Subsection (f) authorizes the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to hold hearings when Congress is in session, recess, or adjournment, to require the attendance of witnesses by subpena, to administer oaths, to take testimony, and to make expenditures as may be deemed necessary to carry out its functions. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman and shall be served by any person designated by them. Witnesses refusing to testify or failing to produce records are subject to penalty under the provisions of sections 192–194, title II, United States Code.

Subsection (g) authorizes the joint committee to employ and to fix the compensation of a staff director, an associate staff director, and other necessary professional, technical, clerical, and other temporary or permanent employees. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. Requires FBI loyalty and security investigation of all employees.

Subsection (h) provides that the joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, and subcommittees thereof, during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

Subsection (i) provides that professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon written authority of the chairman or the vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers and reports of Federal agencies, and data related to the appropriations proposed in the annual budget.

Subsection (j) requires that members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget, at the request of the Committees on Appropriations, or any subcommittees thereof, shall attend executive sessions of the committees to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

Subsection (k) defines the broad coverage of the term "agency" as used in the bill.

Subsection (l) authorizes the requisite appropriation to carry out the purposes of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

Section 2 proposes a new subsection 133 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, requiring that all bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations which are reported from committees must include reports in writing which estimate the probable cost of carrying out the legislative proposals over the first 5-year period of its operation. Such estimates may be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for review. Compilations of all such estimates are to be published semiannually.

Section 3 proposes a new subsection 139 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorizing the joint committee to recommend that joint hearings be held by the appropriations committees, and subcommittees thereof, without affecting their power to conduct separate additional committee hearings, or in any way affecting the independence of committee deliberations and decisions. The new subsection further provides that the chairman of each joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of such hearings, and the vice chairman shall be of the other body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, House bill 1979, a bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Frear	Knowland
Barrett	Fulbright	Kuchel
Beall	George	Langer
Bennett	Gillette	Lehman
Bricker	Goldwater	Long
Bush	Griswold	Magnuson
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Mansfield
Byrd	Hennings	Maybank
Capehart	Hill	McCarthy
Carlson	Hoey	McClellan
Case	Holland	Millikin
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Morse
Cooper	Ives	Mundt
Cordon	Jackson	Murray
Daniel	Jenner	Pastore
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Dworshak	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kennedy	Russell
Ferguson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Flanders	Kilgore	Schoeppel

Smathers	Stennis	Watkins
Smith, Maine	Symington	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Taft	Williams
Smith, N. C.	Thye	Young
Sparkman	Tobey	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the pending bill is merely an extension for a period of 2 years of the reorganization authority granted to President Truman under the Reorganization Act of 1949. It gives President Eisenhower exactly the same authority, and provides for the identical method of disapproval of any plans submitted thereunder—by the adoption of a simple resolution of disapproval by a vote of a majority of the qualified Members of either the House or the Senate.

The members of the Committee on Government Operations, and the Senate, have steadfastly maintained that the normal legislative process should be applied—in reverse—to the broad legislative authority granted to the President under reorganization acts. This view was upheld unanimously by the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, when it approved the bill extending the 1945 act. It was only after weeks of deadlock in conference that the present method of disapproval was accepted as a compromise, on the insistence of the majority of the conferees from the other body. Since this has been the unwavering view of the Senate, it was considered only proper that the committee should continue to express the known views of a majority of the Senate. Therefore, on January 27, 1953, the committee voted unanimously to report the bill, S. 597, introduced by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, to extend the reorganization act for 2 years, and providing that either House of Congress, by the adoption of a resolution of disapproval by a simple majority vote, could retain its normal legislative control over plans submitted under the act.

Following this action by the committee, the press assumed that the Senate was being urged to take action which was contrary to its position in relation to the granting of reorganization authority to former President Truman, and that, through some vague interpretation, the committee's action constituted a lack of confidence in President Eisenhower. This was far from the truth, since, as I have already pointed out, this action by the committee was exactly in accord with the similar action taken unanimously in the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress.

In view of the misinterpretation of the committee's action, however, and at the suggestion of the Senate leadership, I withheld filing the committee's report recommending the enactment of Senate bill 597, until it could determine as to what action the House would take. It is my view that, since the disapproval procedure prescribed in the 1949 act was adopted as a result of the insistence on the part of the majority of the members of the House conferees, it was incumbent on the House to act first, and to take full responsibility for any legal repercussions that may result from the adoption of plans which are opposed by a majority of the Members voting to disapprove a plan in either the House or the Senate. Accordingly, after the House had again approved the provision requiring the disapproval of plans by a majority of the qualified Members of either House, in its own bill, H. R. 1979, the Committee on Government Operations reconsidered its action in reporting Senate bill 597, and on February 3, voted unanimously to report the House bill to the Senate.

There has never been any disposition on the part of any member of the Committee on Government Operations to in any way restrict or to limit the reorganization authority being granted to President Eisenhower under the pending legislation. Rather, the committee was attempting to carry out what it considered to be the President's wishes in putting the legislative and executive branches on equal footing in the consideration of reorganizations affecting the executive branch of the Government. I am convinced that there is far greater confidence in the President at this time, and that there is a much larger percentage of support on the part of Members of Congress in granting this reorganization power to the Chief Executive, than there was when the Reorganization Act of 1949 was approved by the Congress. Certainly, therefore, there has been no disposition on the part of members of the Committee on Government Operations to question in any way the use of the power being granted to President Eisenhower under extension of the act.

Although the disapproval procedure may not conform to the views of a majority of the Members of the Senate, I feel that it will provide a medium by which many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have not yet been approved may be further implemented, and I strongly urge the approval of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan."

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not offering the amendment because I am opposed to extending the reorganization powers under the 1949 Reorganization Act. I believe that those powers should be extended. Certainly there still remains a great deal of needed reorganization, and I am sure it is the hope of all Members of Congress that further effective and beneficial reorganizations may take place during this session of Congress. Therefore, the amendment I have offered is not in opposition to the basic purpose of the law.

It would simply amend section 6 of the 1949 Reorganization Act, a section which contains a provision I have always opposed in any reorganization act of this character. The basic purpose of the amendment is to change the act by providing that a simple majority of either House may disapprove a reorganization plan in place of the present provision requiring a constitutional majority of either House.

The issue is not new, and the principal argument in support of retaining the law as it is is merely that since the President in the past administration was permitted to submit reorganization plans subject to the provisions of section 6, that the section should not be changed, and that the new President and new administration should be given powers identical with the powers which were granted to the preceding administration.

In my judgment that is the only valid argument that can possibly be made for the provision which requires a constitutional majority of either House to vote favorably on a resolution of disapproval if the plan is to be rejected.

I have grave doubts about the efficacy of such a procedure from the standpoint of the Constitution. It is true that we have indulged in this procedure in the past; but only on the ground of expediency has it any persuasion at all, in that it is said that it is difficult for the Congress, with its tremendous burdens, to devise and formulate legislation to bring about the reorganizations that are needed. So, after all, the reorganization law is a device which undertakes to lessen the burden on the Congress and to expedite the enactment of legislation dealing with reorganization.

I may remind my colleagues that every reorganization plan which will be submitted under this act will, if this measure goes into effect, actually become a statute, just as much as if Congress had enacted such a reorganization bill under the prescribed and established legislative procedures under which we operate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In the past, under the existing and preceding reorganization laws, each reorganization plan which has been submitted to the Congress has, if it has gone into effect, become a statute in the same way. So, Mr. President, under this bill reorganization plans will be in the same category as bills which are introduced in the Congress by Members of Congress. All of us are familiar with the procedure a bill must take—how it must be processed, and what action must be taken on it before it can become law. It was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that Congress, not the President of the United States, would initiate legislation; but the reorganization law now on the statute books, and which we now propose to extend, grants to the President of the United States the authority to initiate reorganization legislation, and makes certain distinctions of very great significance. One is that no affirmative action need be taken by the Congress to enable a proposed reorganization plan to become law. Mr. President, I do not believe that was ever the intent of the Constitution, the very first section of which provides that—

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Nowhere in the Constitution is any legislative power delegated to the Chief Executive, nor does the Constitution contain any provision authorizing the Congress to abdicate its responsibility and delegate to the President the absolute power to legislate.

Since no affirmative action by Congress is required in order to have a reorganization plan become effective as a statute, that process amounts to the delegation of a tremendous power and the abdication of the responsibility of the legislative branch under the Constitution.

By means of that process, Mr. President, the Congress abdicates its legislative power, and confers upon the Chief Executive a power which it is very doubtful that Congress has a right to confer. The Chief Executive is not only given the power to enact law without affirmative action by Congress in connection with its enactment of a law, but we provide that either branch of Congress may take affirmative action to prevent a reorganization plan from becoming law, not to enable a reorganization plan to become law. Under the law as it now stands—and this is the only feature of the law to which I am objecting—a constitutional majority must vote favorably in either House upon a resolution of disapproval.

Mr. President, no other legislation which comes through the regular processes of congressional action is given such a favored status. What do you think would happen, Mr. President, if the Senate were to amend its rules so as to provide that, notwithstanding the House of Representatives may pass a bill by unanimous vote and may send it to the Senate, before that bill can become law the Senate must by a constitutional majority of 49—not by a mere majority of the Senators then present and voting—pass the bill? Why, Mr. President, we would soon have the House of Representatives retaliate; probably it would then require, not a constitutional majority, but 60 percent of the elected Members of the House of Representatives to vote in favor of a bill before it could be passed and sent to the Senate.

It may be said, oh, well, we already have a precedent for such action. Of course, that is true, Mr. President. On the other hand, such an argument is a very poor and unsafe one, and gives very poor validity to a proposal to take similar action at a future time.

I was very much interested in some comments which were made by several of the Members of the Senate who have said they will support the pending bill in its present form. I heard one of them say, "I hope the time will come when we can get back on the right track."

Mr. President, this measure is on the wrong track. It violates the spirit of the Constitution. It establishes a dangerous precedent. It enacts into law a dangerous procedure which can be enlarged and expanded. Until we return to the right track, with traditional, sound legislative processes, we shall hear again and again the argument, "Well, we did it before, and we ought to do it for this administration," or "we ought to do it for the next administration."

Mr. President, I am ready now to get back on the right track. Let me say to you that I know this administration is new, and I also know that the new President of the United States has had great responsibilities suddenly thrust upon him, and probably he has not yet had time to consider the real danger that is involved in a procedure of this character.

I have every confidence that if President Eisenhower could have more time within which to deliberate upon this matter, and to consider it in the light of the Constitution of the United States, he would say to this body today, "The Senate is correct. I do not want the Constitution of the United States violated under my administration, either in letter or in spirit, merely because it may have been violated during some previous administration." I believe that the very fact that this extraordinary provision is set forth in the Reorganization Act caused the defeat of certain reorganization plans which were defeated in this body after having been submitted during the preceding administration.

I agree wholeheartedly with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maine that, certainly, there is no less confidence in the present administration than there was in the former administration at the time this power was conferred. It is not a question of a lack of confidence; it is a question of a new administration, and of that new administration and the new President helping to get this Government back on the right track—getting back to the Constitution, getting back to the democratic processes which have proved safe and sound throughout the history of this Government. That is all I am asking, Mr. President.

In my opinion, had the President of the United States—because there was confusion about this matter in the beginning—simply said, "I want you to observe the Constitution in letter and spirit in this matter, and if you believe that the requirement of a constitutional majority is wrong, and that it violates the Constitution, then amend the law as you extend it, to provide for action by a simple majority of either House." Had the President done that, or if he would do it now, he would, in my opinion, invite wholehearted confidence not only on the part of the Congress, but also of the country, confidence that whatever reorganization plans may be submitted, they will be sound and needed. Mr. President, the Congress in my opinion would then go along with the President more readily, because in my judgment certain of the plans that were submitted under the act during the previous administration actually came to the Congress with a measure of suspicion and distrust attached to them from the beginning, because some of those who had a hand in preparing the plans realized the difficulty and handicap placed upon the Congress should it desire to prevent those plans from becoming law. I can therefore assure you, Mr. President, having had the honor of occupying the position of chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at the time, that the members of that committee thoroughly analyzed and studied all the different plans. The result was that some of the plans were rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I should like to compliment the Senator on his very eloquent presentation of this subject. The Senator is completely consistent. It was the Senator from Arkansas who, when a reorganization bill was passed 4 years ago, led the fight to see to it that each House would have the opportunity to set aside unwise plans. It is worth noting that many of the plans which were sent to the Congress, some of which turned out to be dangerous plans, amounted to an effort on the part of the Executive to grasp more power and more authority. Insofar as the junior Senator from Louisiana can determine, had the provision as to disapproval by one House alone not been in the law, the probabilities are that not a single one of the plans, no matter how dangerous, would have ever been rejected. There was never a time when it would have been possible to get both Houses to agree to disapprove a plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if I may review this matter briefly, as I recall the history of legislation of this character—and I speak of the time since I first came to the Congress—the first time that I had occasion to give study to a proposed reorganization act was in 1938. I was at that time a Member of the House. A reorganization bill passed the Senate and came to the House. I do not remember all the details of the bill, but, as I recall, it provided that both Houses of Congress—not merely one, but both Houses—would have to disapprove a plan within 60 days, or within some other stipulated time.

Mr. President, I was but a young Member of the Congress at that time, but it struck me that that was a vicious violation—I repeat, a vicious violation—and a contravention of the Constitution of the United States. We do not enact legislation if, with a quorum present, one House by a majority votes against a bill.

What is now proposed cannot be justified except upon the basis of expediency; and, Mr. President, if the time should come when expediency prevails, when it dominates the affairs of Government, we shall be moving toward a dangerous if not a fatal goal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that this reorganization plan really is in a way legislation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is legislation, pure and simple. There is no question about it. It would become a statute.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I recall, one of the plans which had been sent to us, and of which the Senate disapproved, was a plan under which nominations of postmasters would not be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator will recall that there was on the statute books what was known as the O'Mahoney Act, passed by the Congress and signed by the President. Does the Senator mean to say that the pending measure would authorize the President to make such a change?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There can be no question that it would give the President the right to repeal certain laws.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When the Attorney General appeared before our committee, at the time that matter was under consideration, if my memory serves me correctly, he questioned very seriously whether, under the Reorganization Act, we could repeal an act passed by the Congress, because we would have to go through the same procedure required in enacting a law, that is to say, a bill would have to be passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President. That is the proper way to repeal or amend an act, is it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I may say to the Senator that I shall not oppose reorganization plans, provided at least the constitutional safeguard is observed. We hear much on the floor of the Senate about majority rule. If, with a quorum present, and by a majority vote, either House disapproves, I challenge the efficacy and validity of any procedure that may be written into a reorganization act that would say that that plan, under such disapproval, becomes the law of the land.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, is it not true that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled time and time again that the Congress of the United States cannot delegate its right to legislate to any body outside the Congress?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I accept the statement of the distinguished Senator. I am not trying to say that a court's decision may affect the situation, but I say that, of course, court decisions become the law of the land, but I reserve the right to disagree violently with any decision which provides that the Congress can abdicate its responsibility under the first section of the Constitution of the United States. I will say to the distinguished Senator, and to my other colleagues, that when the reorganization bill came over to the House from the Senate when I was a Member of that body, it contained a provision requiring both Houses to act affirmatively or to veto. I raised my voice against that measure at that time. I raised it in 1939 in committee, and I raised it on the floor of the Senate when the 1949 bill was under consideration, and I am happy to say, Mr. President, that at that time the Committee on Government Operations reported a bill providing that either House, by a majority vote, might disapprove a bill containing that provision, which was approved unanimously in the Senate.

The bill went to conference. The House bill provided that both branches of the Congress would have to approve or disapprove. The bill remained in conference for several weeks. We battled over that and other provisions.

The House bill, Mr. President, specifically named seven agencies of Government which were completely exempt from the provisions of the bill, which was a serious handicap to the President. It would be a serious handicap this time, Mr. President, if that provision should be reinserted in the bill. We yielded on that point and were able to pass a reorganization bill which did not exempt any agency. We finally compromised on the other provisions, and inserted provision for a constitutional majority of one House, instead of a simple majority and instead of a two-House disapproval. While I yielded most reluctantly as a member of the conference committee, I did so then under protest. I did so simply because at that time there was such strong sentiment for reorganization, and there was so much restlessness on the part of the Congress to have some authority conferred upon the President to expedite reorganization, in view of the fact that the Hoover Commission had already submitted its reports and the country was reorganization conscious and expected some action by the Congress to carry out the program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. I think many of us recall that at that particular time there was enormous pressure upon those of us who were then serving upon the committee, because the reorganization proposal had been sold on the false assumption that $5,000,000,000 would be saved by giving the President the authority which was recommended. Many persons who ordinarily believed in sound legislative processes were for greater Presidential reorganization powers because they thought that they were going to get an enormous tax reduction by saving $5,000,000,000. Since that time some 40 reorganization plans have come to the Congress, and only 8 have been disapproved. I fail to see that $5,000,000,000 was saved; I fail to see that $5,000,000 was saved; I fail to see that $500,000 was saved, and I have serious doubts that even $5,000 was saved by Congress relinquishing a vast amount of power which properly should be reserved to the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I believe that no such great savings have been effected by the reorganization plans so far submitted. I also say that while the recommendations of the Hoover Commission may have had the possibility of saving three or four or five billion dollars, these savings have not materialized. It may still have the possibility of bringing about great savings. The possibility is inseparable from the merit of the reorganization plan submitted. I will say that the plans which were submitted and which have become law have not resulted in the savings that were claimed, in my judgment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As one who had the honor of serving under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, it has been my impression, and I believe it would be the impression of those who have studied the question, that we shall never save 1 percent as much by reorganizing the Government as we could by having careful, efficient administration. It is the housekeeping aspect that is important; it is the way in which any agency is administered that saves money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is substantially a correct statement. A reorganization plan or a new statute may create the potentialities of considerable savings, but a careless administrator who cares nothing about economy, and permits waste and extravagance, can go on spending if Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has not yet developed one element in the whole picture which has always concerned the junior Senator from Louisiana, namely, the danger of substantive legislation being passed under the guise that it is a reorganization plan. I recall that at one time a responsible official of the Government stated that a certain type reorganization would require substantive legislation, but we lived to see a reorganization plan submitted to accomplish exactly that change of law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I understand the able Senator is referring to is that the Director of the Budget, as I recall, appeared before a congressional committee and testified that in order to effect a certain reorganization which was desired and which had been recommended by the Hoover Commission, it would require a change in substantive law, and, therefore, that it was not subject to a reorganization plan under the act. Later he changed his mind and came before the congressional committee and stated that he had changed his mind. I can appreciate a change of mind; I am not questioning that. I am questioning today the efficacy, the wisdom, and the constitutionality of the Congress of the United States abdicating powers to the President in legislative matters.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas upon the very worth-while proposal in the bill which he introduced today to provide for a consolidated Committee on Appropriations. I was very happy to join with the Senator in the introduction of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Arkansas was delighted to have the Senator from Illinois again cosponsor the bill with me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not true that, on the whole, the public holds the President responsible for effective administration? It does not hold Congress responsible, but it holds the President responsible.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish that were wholly true. Then I would not get some of the letters I receive from my constituents. Unfortunately, it is not true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is not my statement largely true?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it should be true that the President should be wholly accountable for the administration of laws which Congress enacts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also for the organization of executive departments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; organization under existing statutes. It is within the province and the duty of the Congress to prescribe limitations and other conditions upon which any executive branch or agency of Government can exist, and to prescribe the authority that shall be conferred upon such branch or agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, however, that if the President were to try to consolidate bureaus, the bureaus would then go immediately to Congress and lobby against the consolidation? Are not the forces of opposition against any reorganization plan very powerful, whereas the forces in favor of any reorganization plan are diffused and weak?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that I have found that both the agencies that oppose reorganization and the administration forces that propose it do a great deal of lobbying. I know of nothing to prevent lobbying. I know of nothing necessarily wrong in allowing presentations by both sides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not say there is anything necessarily wrong in such lobbying, but is it not true that any proposal for reorganization generally runs into great opposition, because the public's interest in a given proposition is diffused and weak, whereas the interest of a particular bureau which feels it is going to lose responsibility is very strong?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the Senator from Illinois can point to any plan previously submitted to Congress by which any bureau lost any power or responsibility. In the case of most of the plans, greater powers were conferred than were previously enjoyed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the President were to decide, as the Hoover Commission recommended, that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be consolidated. The net effect would be that the Army Engineers and their friends would descend upon the Senate and House in great strength.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; but I can point to the other side of the picture, too. Representatives of the Southwest Power Administration, of the Department of the Interior, and others, would be at the Capitol with their forces, insisting that the bill be passed.

There are two sides to the question. The United States is still a democracy, where both sides can have their say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, however, that since, in the main, the President will be held responsible, and since the forces against fundamental reorganization will be powerful, Congress certainly should give the President some extra powers with which to operate, so that he will not be thrown into a bear pit by the bureaus which will be nominally affected by his plans?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that he is giving testimony in confirmation of the statement I made earlier in my remarks, to the effect that the only argument that could be made in support of the proposal is one of expediency. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I take the position that we ought to stand upon the Constitution and the powers therein conferred, and not make a radical departure that would contravene the traditional processes of legislation in this Nation under the Constitution, which confers upon the Congress all power to legislate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we recognize that the Senator from Arkansas is being perfectly consistent in the position which he now takes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I trust I am still acting consistently.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand it, this is the position which has historically been taken by the Senator from Arkansas. There is no departure and no inconsistency whatsoever in his position.

On the other hand, there are Senators on this side of the aisle who voted for previous reorganization plans, I am one of them. I think we should not deny to the present President powers which we were willing to give to the preceding President, because the present President, even though of a different political camp, will be held responsible to the voters for the efficient administration of the Government, and, as Americans, we should be willing to give him power in the same way we were willing to give similar powers to the President of our political camp.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Again, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his testimonial regarding the position I have taken. There are only two reasons or arguments that can be presented. One is based on expediency, and the other is that it has been done before.

I do not believe any Member of the Senate will rise to challenge the soundness of the proposal I have submitted, which is based upon the Constitution and laws of our Nation. I do not believe any Senator will challenge the soundness or wisdom of the Congress retaining the legislative procedures and, therefore, the responsibility which the Constitution vests in the Congress, and in Congress alone.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The distinguished and able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] referred to the fact that the people look to the President to administer the laws, and to administer them efficiently. I completely agree with that statement. But is it not also true that the people look to Congress to set aside any dangerous plan that may be sent to Congress, when there is fear of the effect of adopting such a plan?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator's implication is correct. I believe those who are always insisting on majority rule are now becoming a little inconsistent in saying that they do not want just a majority to enact legislation; that they favor action by a constitutional majority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to keep the record straight, I may say that if my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, is referring to the proposed antifilibuster legislation, the group of Senators, with one or two exceptions, who have advocated that measure have never proposed that action to limit debate should be taken by a simple majority. Instead, we have favored a constitutional majority, as is provided for in the bill introduced yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], cosponsored by other Senators. So we are perfectly consistent in standing on our position of requiring a constitutional majority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator change his position so that he, at least, thinks it is consistent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I feel certain that the Senator from Arkansas will agree that there are some Senators who are just as much against the gag rule proposal as they are against the proposal to place unlimited powers in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In effect, the provision in the pending bill could be construed, in one sense, to be a gag rule, in that a minority could gag the majority, and prevent defeat of legislation proposed by the President of the United States.

Now we are talking of gag rule. In its final analysis and effect, that is absolutely what it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has referred to the steps that are proposed to be taken in the lifting of or doing away with filibusters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator from New York is mistaken. I did not refer to filibusters; I referred to majority rule. I believe the good Senator very earnestly subscribes to majority rule.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out this very vital difference—and the Senator from Arkansas has indirectly referred to it—that the debate on reorganization plans is limited to 5 hours, or thereabouts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that it is 10 hours.

Mr. LEHMAN. I stand corrected. Under the bill that has been introduced to invoke cloture and make it possible to bring a bill to a vote, provision is made for 14 days of debate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under what bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the bill which was introduced in association with many other Senators we would allow 14 days of debate before trying to invoke cloture.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator that it might be worse. It might be made less.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me continue. We have provided for 14 days of debate; and even after cloture is invoked, every one of the 96 Senators will have the right to speak for 1 hour more. That is certainly far from gag rule. That certainly is giving every opportunity for full, comprehensive, and thorough debate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would not the Senator say, since we have been so generous in this legislation as to provide a limit of only 10 hours' debate, it is a little unreasonable then to insist that, although a majority disapproves, the minority may force the closing of the debate which we have granted, and also force enactment of the proposed plan when a majority opposes it?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me reply to the Senator that I certainly would have no objection to increasing the length of time a plan may be debated. I am just as much opposed to gag rule as I am to any filibuster.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator object to a majority disapproving a legislative proposal?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say this——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator object to a majority disapproving a legislative proposal?

Mr. LEHMAN. The bill to which reference has been made provides for a constitutional majority. That is all I am arguing for now.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he is willing to support my amendment, which would require only a majority vote of those present?

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the Senator is opposed to the majority present and voting determining the issue.

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly support the right of the Congress to determine by a majority vote any ordinary legislation. But this bill differs from ordinary legislation which may be decided by a simple majority. This bill gives the Congress the right to veto a proposal or act of the President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There will be other important legislation coming before this body besides reorganization plans. Would the Senator invoke the same rule, that any bill, before it passes the Senate, must receive a constitutional majority?

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then why should there be any difference, except for reasons of expediency?

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator will further yield, I think there is a great difference between ordinary legislation and a reorganization plan which is sent to Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator point out those differences?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to point them out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Briefly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully concur in what the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said, that the people of the country look to the President of the United States, just as in every State they look to the chief executive, for the administration of the affairs of the Federal Government or of the State government, whichever may be involved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just a moment. Let me interrupt at this point. There is involved in this question a legislative program and legislative action which are entirely separate, apart, and distinct from administration and reorganization as such. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that certainly what is contemplated is that the President shall have the right to draw up plans of reorganization and submit them to the Congress for approval or for rejection, if that course is deemed advisable in the wisdom of Congress, by a constitutional majority. Certain rights were granted to the previous President, President Truman. I see no reason why we should not grant equal rights to President Eisenhower. Even though, as the Senator knows, I did not vote for President Eisenhower, I think his hand should be strengthened. I think he should have every opportunity of submitting to the Congress of the United States, and having accepted by the Congress of the United States—save by a negative vote by constitutional majority—any plans which in his wisdom he thinks are in the interest of sound administration. He is charged with the responsibilities of administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are giving the President every power. There is no restriction placed upon him with respect to the preparation of his plans, what they shall cover, the scope and breadth of them, and what they may encompass. We are making no restrictions whatsoever as compared with the power which was given to the previous President. We are simply trying to get back on the right track of sound legislative procedure.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator, as I stated earlier, probably before he came into the Chamber, that if we were to change this provision and require only a simple majority, we would inspire greater confidence throughout the Nation and among the membership of the Congress with respect to any plans which might be submitted.

The President is not going to prepare these plans by himself. No doubt they will be submitted to him, and he will give consideration to them before they come to the Congress. However, the basic work in connection with such plans is done at other echelons, before the plans come to Congress. Quite frequently they represent the views of someone not too far from the top in one or more of the departments or agencies.

We can continue, if we wish, this departure from constitutional processes; but, Mr. President, it is habit-forming. Today we hear the argument, "We did it once; let us do it again." We shall hear that argument the next time. Then as time goes on there will be proposals for enlarging these powers, and precedent after precedent will be established.

I am going to support reorganization. I supported the previous measure under the stress of necessity for reorganization. If I am forced to make the choice, I will not vote against enactment of the bill in its present form. However, I would be derelict in my duty and false to my conscience and my concept of responsibility if I did not earnestly plead with my colleagues to go along with me today in getting back on the right track and not departing from it any further. We shall then have sound government, and the responsibility will remain where the Constitution placed it. The responsibility for legislation—even for reorganization—is definitely the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution. The administration of the law is the responsibility of the President of the United States; but what that law shall be, what its provisions shall be, what restrictions, limitations, or conditions shall attach, are the definite, primary, constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the question further. I simply wish to make my position clear, and to say that my views have not changed since 1938, when we had a Democratic President. I came to the Congress with the high hope that we are going to have a great administration; and in many respects it was a great administration.

If the Senator from New York is interested, I may say that I did not vote for Mr. Eisenhower. I have a great deal of sympathy and respect for many of his policies, some of which differ from the policies of the past administration. I shall support the present President. However, I shall oppose legislation of this character when I think it contravenes the true concepts and principles of the Constitution. I shall oppose it irrespective of whether the present President of the United States is a Roosevelt, a Truman, or an Eisenhower; and I shall make my position known for the record. I shall let my words make such appeal to my colleagues as they may feel they merit.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the position he has taken in regard to the pending reorganization bill. I recall that as a Member of the House I took

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the same position. I agree with the principles which the Senator from Arkansas has expressed today. In answer to the argument advanced by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the effect that the American people are looking to the President to effect various reorganizations in Government, I will say that we know the American people have been very critical of Congress as a body and of individual Members of Congress for their failure to exercise their responsibility in that they allowed certain duties and powers of Congress to be delegated to the executive branch of the Government. This is a case in which we are again delegating legislative power to the executive branch of the Government, and are keeping for ourselves an executive function, that of vetoing a legislative act by the executive branch.

I had hoped that we had seen the last measure of that kind, and that Congress would not again pass legislation which delegates legislative powers to the executive branch of the Government. I certainly hope that this will be the last time that it will be done. I am not a little chagrined to mention that I am one who this time is yielding for the sake of expediency.

I believe the President has many reorganization plans which he has ready to send to Congress, and I feel that if the Senate should adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] amending the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, the bill would be tied up in conference for perhaps many days or even weeks or months, which would in effect hold up many worth-while reorganization programs. However, I am in complete sympathy with the principles expressed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I am glad that he shares the views I have expressed. If he and others would join me in voting for my amendment, we would make this last time the last time.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I trust we will have some support, too. I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment, after which I shall not insist further if the amendment should be rejected. I want to see the Reorganization Act continue in effect, and I want the administration given every opportunity to submit to Congress plans which in its judgment and wisdom are needed to reorganize our Government. All I ara asking for is that Congress not abdicate its responsibility, and burden itself with a provision in the act which in my judgment clearly contravenes the Constitution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I will say briefly on the subject which is being discussed that I share the principles and convictions which have been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I voted with him when the bill was first before the committee, and we supported as long as we could the Senate position that the bill should provide for a simple majority, instead of a constitutional majority. However, Mr. President, I shall vote now to support the new position of the committee, for what I consider to be the following valid reasons:

We gave the preceding administration and the former President an opportunity, under a certain formula, to propose some reorganization plans. The administration sent to Congress a number of plans, some of which were very good, and some of which were not so good. At least we had the opportunity to establish our opinion in the Senate in the bill we passed before but we were compelled to yield to the position held overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives. The position of the House favoring the simple majority prevailed. It became the law.

I think it is only simple justice and logic to give to the new administration the same opportunity, under the same formula and without changing the rules of the game, to submit its suggestions for reorganization plans.

Since the power and authority have been limited in the bill to 2 years, I am willing to grant precisely the same legislative authority to the present administration that we gave to the preceding one, after which I am frank to say I shall do all I can to reestablish the position of the Senate which is to initiate legislation, rather than to serve as a vetoing authority.

Mr. President, I wish now to address myself to an altogether unrelated subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

CONVICTION OF MINOR COMMUNIST LEADERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, under normal circumstances I would not in the least presume to take the time of Members of the Senate for the purpose of listening to some quotations from what a few minor leaders of the Communist Party in the United States have to say. Normally, at least, what they have to say is mostly of little consequence. What they have to say on any given topic is almost always a repetition of what Moscow has been saying over and over again—the most tedious kind of ever-the-same political propaganda—and I am certainly not going to bother the Senate of the United States with that. It seems to me, however, that these particular statements and this particular circumstance are so unusual that they might justify a few minutes' discussion at this time.

The Communist leaders, who recently were found guilty by a court in New York, have inadvertently written some new history in the books of freedom to be read by students of government around the world. I believe it would be worth while to call to the attention of our friends in every country exactly what happens in the mind of an American Communist when he is deprived of an opportunity to consult with his leaders abroad and when he is compelled to arrive at a decision based on his own individual experience.

A few days ago there occurred in a courtroom in New York City an extraordinary event. It was extraordinary in more than one sense. The most extraordinary thing about it was that for once—and, so far as I know, the only time—American Communist Party leaders were compelled to take a stand dictated by their own interests, not by instructions from their leaders in Moscow, and not on the basis of evidence brought in by courier or espionage agent. For the first time these American Communists had to make a choice affecting themselves, in their own behalf, of their own volition, and without benefit of consultation or guidance of any kind from the Kremlin. For the first time they had to speak their own minds one by one, each by himself, without consultation with their cadre leaders, and without much consultation among themselves. They had to do it without the protective shield of the so-called mass action, in which Communists, by indoctrination, take refuge when they do not know how to speak alone.

I believe my colleagues will agree that these are extraordinary circumstances for a Communist Party leader to find himself in anywhere in the world, the United States included. It is difficult for Communists to think on their feet, with no guidance from Moscow. It is difficult not to know precisely what the party line would have him say, and without opportunity to consult the men in the Kremlin. It is a difficult situation for them to have to quiver at the thought of making blunders, and to be in fear of the conclusions the political commissars would draw. In a word, these Communists had to stand on their own feet, and under Communist rules nothing is more dangerous.

But here they were, 13 minor Communist leaders in America, suddenly faced with a choice that would decide their own future; forced by circumstances to disclose their inner thoughts almost as if they were being psychoanalyzed.

It is because of these extraordinary circumstances that I believe this matter deserves mention on the floor of the Senate. I think it is fruitful as a source of study for all American students of government and students of government everywhere in trying to contrast the difference between a slave state like Russia and a free state like America.

The plight of these Communist leaders might have been somewhat less embarrassing by the fact that it was really an easy choice with which they were faced. After a trial lasting months, during which 15,000 pages of testimony were taken, these 13 lesser Communist leaders were convicted, by a jury, of criminal conspiracy to teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Each Communist had had a fair trial. Each had taken recourse to every constitutional tribunal that protects a man in this country, and which assures him that he is considered innocent until found guilty by legitimate court action.

Once the verdict of the jury was in, the judge—his name is Edward J. Dimock, and it should be embossed in golden letters in the annals of jurisprudence—had to pronounce sentence. He was struck by what was undoubtedly a most unusual idea, and one that I deem to have been a brilliant idea. The judge, if I may presume to imagine what was

in his own mind, probably argued this way: these 13 Communists have committed a crime under the Smith Act; after fair trial they have been convicted by a jury of conspiracy to teach the overthrow of the United States Government. They sought to introduce—I am still following what I take to have been Judge Dimock's train of thought—the Soviet system in the United States, and to replace our private enterprise, freedom, and capitalist system with communism and totalitarian tyranny. They had maintained throughout their trial that they had simply followed their political convictions and had done so sincerely, that they had done no more than give expression to their beliefs, in sincere conviction that the Communist way of life was superior to ours, that the Russian environment was a happier one than ours, that the Soviet system was a better one than ours.

But, in the jury's view, the trial has demonstrated that the accused had done more than that; it had demonstrated that they went beyond being members of the Communist Party, which is not outlawed in the United States; that they went beyond a belief in Communist theories—a belief which, by itself, is not illegal in the United States. The trial had shown that they actually had criminally conspired to teach other Communists that they must work to help overthrow the United States Government and to establish, by all means, including force, a Communist regime in the United States. This is the punishable crime, the judge undoubtedly said to himself.

Mr. President, that is undoubtedly what the judge said to himself, if I may presume to suggest what was in his mind at that time.

Later, as the court records reveal, the judge considered the crime which the jury had convicted those 13 Communist leaders of committing. It will be remembered that the accused were second-string Communists; they were not the top-echelon Communist leaders. So the judge believed that they did not deserve the maximum penalty. I, for one, believe that it was at that point that Judge Dimock was touched by a stroke of judicial genius. He asked the United States attorney, Myles J. Lane, who was the prosecuting attorney in that case, what he thought of the idea of permitting the defendants to avoid serving a term in jail and, instead, to have those Communist leaders go voluntarily to the Soviet Union, to live there under the regime which they felt so worth while.

That was indeed a remarkable idea. I should like at this time to call attention to the even more remarkable series of events which followed that suggestion by the presiding judge. His suggestion all of a sudden put all the Communist defendants on their own, without precedent and without guidance as to what to say, save for what they really wanted and preferred. Each had to speak for himself, without consultation with his Communist masters abroad. Each had to say from his heart and from his own mind what he believed to be most probably in his own best interest. I recommend all that followed to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate as one of the most extraordinary aspects of that case.

For a moment or two, matters proceeded normally in the court room. Mr. Lane, the prosecuting attorney, declared that he had no objection to having all 13 defendants head for the Soviet Union, after they had served their prison terms under the law, according to the conviction rendered by the jury.

But then the scene in the New York courtroom changed suddenly and dramatically. A discussion ensued which I believe to be unique in content and in circumstances.

I should mention here that in the course of the discussion, Judge Dimock said that he considered the proposal that the defendants go to the Soviet Union not at all in the sense of a deportation, but as an alternative, a sort of probation, and only—and this point is deserving of especial notice—if the 13 Communist defendants desired to do so, rather than go to the Federal penitentiary in the United States of America.

What happened? Defense counsel and several of the defendants emphatically rejected the proposal. To them, the proposal to go to the Soviet Union was "intolerable." I shall not here endeavor to encumber the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the names and exact words and asinine arguments of all 13 of those Communists and their protestations against taking a permanent holiday in the Soviet Union. Suffice it to say they employed every dodge and subterfuge in protesting against the proposal, which so far had merely been mentioned to their attorneys.

Mr. President, I may add at this point, parenthetically, that I have been informed today by the American Legion that the national commander of the American Legion is announcing in the press that if the judge will maintain this offer and keep it open, the American Legion is perfectly willing to finance the trip to Russia for these 13 defendants. So if a lack of funds is keeping them from visiting the Russia they love so much, instead of going to a Federal penitentiary in the country whose system they have been trying to befoul, the American Legion will be happy to provide those 13 defendants with tickets to Russia, the only consideration being that they simply be one-way tickets.

One of the defendants ranted against the proposal for fully 15 minutes. It was after that tirade that the judge asked the defendants point blank the following crucial question which I now quote from the New York Times of February 3, 1953:

> "If something like spending the rest of your life in Russia could be worked out," the judge asked, "as a substitute for prison, would that interest you at all?"

The answer was an emphatic, "No; I would reject any such proposition."

So that was the crucial question which the 13 Communist leaders had to answer to help decide their own future. They had to decide whether they preferred jail in the United States, or whether they preferred to go to Soviet Russia to enjoy what passes for freedom in that benighted land, the country they had long proclaimed to be the land where freedom reigns and prevails, "the workers' paradise," "the true democracy," "the great new order." Those 13 Communists unanimously rejected the opportunity to live in that environment, as an alternative to being placed in a Federal penitentiary in the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I should think that Communists at home, as well as those abroad, might well ponder the conclusion reached by those Communist leaders. It seems to me that under normal circumstances they would break out in tirades of the well-known Kremlin vintage if anyone were ever to suggest that perhaps things are not quite as good in the Soviet Union as Communist leaders claim, and that things in the United States are better.

However, when those 13 Communist leaders were confronted with the opportunity to go to Russia, and to go there with the American Legion paying their travel expenses, so that they could remain in Russia, they still insisted that jail in the United States is far better than the synthetic freedom existing in the Soviet Union under the Russians.

Mr. President, it must be clear even to the Communists in America, even to the synthetic liberals and pseudo-progressives whom these Communists have succeeded in befuddling and confusing, as it must be clear to every American and every man and woman under the canopy of heaven, that there is something pretty bad about communism when those who have been convicted and who have an opportunity to live in the land of the Communists, without any other restrictions or restraints, instead select life in prison in the United States, so they may someday once again be free under our bill of rights and under our Constitution.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at this point?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from South Dakota remember, if not the incident itself, at least the historic reference that at one time a Mr. Haywood, of Montana, along with a female companion, whose name has slipped my mind momentarily, was actually shipped to Russia? They were members of the International Workers of the World, and they had followed and preached a policy and principle approximately similar to those followed and preached by the Communists of the present day. Those two persons were actually shipped to Russia, and spent the remainder of their lives lamenting that fact and suffering the consequences. Is the distinguished Senator from South Dakota familiar with that episode?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot say that I am familiar with it, but I have a vague recollection of its historical accuracy.

Mr. MALONE. I remember it very well, although at the moment I do not

remember the exact year when it occurred.

Mr. MUNDT. I may add, from my own experience, a statement of a similar incident which occurred in 1945, when I was attending what is normally called, over there, a vodka banquet. I was then in Russia as a member of the House committee then studying UNRRA. At that particular reception and banquet, while moving around as one does under those circumstances, I came across a woman of past middle age, who was introduced as being one Anna Louise Strong. The name rang a bell in my mind, so I negotiated myself into the direction of that lady—not because of any pulchritudinous attraction on her part, but because of her political reputation. I sat down beside her, and said to her, "I have heard about you, Mrs. Strong. Were you not one of the important Communist voices in America for a time?"

She said, "That is correct."

In the course of the conversation we then had, which was kept on a congenial basis, I said to her, "I suppose you are one of the happiest women in the world now, because you have lived in Russia for some 10 or 15 years and have had an opportunity to experience all the advantages which you insist communism provides. You must indeed be a most happy and gratified lady."

That is the substance of what I said to her at that time, although, of course, I do not presume to quote it verbatim at this time.

Whether it was the influence of the vodka or whether it was because she had a temporary moment of complete honesty and candor, I do not know; but I recall vividly her saying to me then: "As a matter of fact, Congressman"—I was then in the House of Representatives, of course—"I am not happy at all. As a matter of fact, I am a disillusioned, bitter old woman."

Then she pointed out that the best hotel or apartment rooms she had been able to get in Russia were highly inferior to second-rate or third-rate rooms in the United States, and that the Russian experiment had not worked, but had been a great disillusionment to her.

So I said, "Well, that is interesting and informative and candid. Why do you not return to the United States to tell the people over there about it? You could render a great service." I recall her answer to that question, although I cannot repeat it verbatim. She said, "I am too old now. I have lost my influence. I have been away too long. If I were to make speeches of that kind or write articles of that type my left-wing friends would consider me a traitor and would do everything they could to discredit me; and those who are conservative have long ago discounted anything I might have to say. I think the impact would not be very effective, and I had better live out my days over here."

I have noticed in reading the newspapers that, several years ago, Anna Louise Strong did come back to this country and did make some statements which were derogatory of the Communist system. Later, I think she befuddled those statements with some other statements, so the final result of her report was not very consistent and not very cogent. But it is very interesting to note that those Communists who have visited Russia have almost invariably come back; and when they have come back at all they have been completely opposed to the Communist system—Eugene Lyons, for example, as set forth in his great book, Assignment in Eutopia. I happened to visit one night in an apartment in Moscow, formerly owned by Eugene Lyons, but in 1945 occupied by Henry Shapiro, the United Press correspondent in Moscow. It is the one which was built and made available for Eugene Lyons. It was the best apartment I saw in my whole stay in Russia, but it was inferior to an American standard-type apartment. But Lyons came back. As Senators who have followed the Communist development down through the years may recall, Benjamin Gitlow, while in Russia, became so completely disillusioned that today he stands as the only American Communist ever to have told Joe Stalin to his teeth that his system was a rotten and a rotting failure. And I know that language bespeaks the deviation among those American Communists who have stayed in Russia long enough really to understand it—of course, some of the travelers, some of those who make the vodka banquet circuit, some of those who go to Russia to sing, and some who go to study conspiracy in the Lenin Institute, of course, come back to carry on their nefarious practices here.

MOTIVATION OF A COMMUNIST

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, knowing that he has spent, not months, but years in the study of this situation, and considering him to be one of the outstanding authorities on the subject of the basic concept of communism as it is preached in this country. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, what is behind all this preaching, right up to the point of experiencing it? In the opinion of these people, is there something to be gained in prestige by them, so that, if they took over this country, they would then be in authority, and they themselves would improve their position, even though the rank and file were downtrodden? Or is there some basic semireligious fervor which actuates these people? What is the Senator's opinion regarding their position?

Mr. MUNDT. I think I must say in complete honesty to my good friend from Nevada that the reason the people in this country are motivated in the direction of communism varies tremendously with the individual, just as the reasons why patriotic and loyal citizens are motivated in certain directions are bound to vary. I have asked that perplexing question which the Senator has asked me, conservatively I am sure, of at least 30 or 35 American Communists or former Communists. I suppose of the 35, 20 or 25 have been former Communists who since then have broken with the past and are doing their best to reestablish themselves; so their answers would be honest. I am quite frank to say that of the other questions asked of many Communists, there is a grave reason to doubt the answers they give, because one of the first axioms of the Communist is to learn to lie deceptively to one who does not belong to the creed. But there are different reasons. I think as to some, the Senator is quite correct. The first Communists I ever met were in Denver, Colo., in the early 1930's; two young men who are very able, both of whom were moved in the direction of communism because, in their experience, religion had failed, and communism came in to fill an aching void and love, when they lost confidence and faith in God. But that is not true of all Communists. While it is true that all Communists ultimately become atheists, because there can be no affinity between religion and communism, that is not always the stepping-stone by which men become Communists. Some do so for prestige. Some do so, I think, motivated by a desire for power. Some do so because it is a racket—and a little safer racket to follow perhaps than peddling dope for a white-slave racketeer, or something else. Men are motivated by different reasons, and there is no simple rule of thumb that says, "Here is a Communist. I know why you follow that creed."

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from South Dakota has answered the question very ably. I know he is well aware, as the junior Senator from Nevada believes he also is aware, that many of those who follow and support Communist theories are not themselves Communists. They have some vague reason, economic or otherwise. They may not have done so well under our economic system, or they may feel frustrated. There seem to be people, highly educated, who for some reason think they should be getting along better than other people whom they see without such education.

There is a feeling of frustration or something which causes them to follow this theory as a fancied way out, whereas they themselves would be the first to repudiate belief in the precepts of communism. At least, the junior Senator from Nevada believes that to be true, and he believes the Senator from South Dakota will recall that in 1950, the junior Senator from Nevada rose on this floor to suggest that certain persons in the Department of Commerce were dangerous security risks.

A committee was appointed for the purpose of investigating the charges made by the junior Senator from Nevada, and in the course of a hearing lasting 3 or 4 days, we established the fact that they were actually dangerous security risks—the junior Senator from Nevada did not say they were Communists. After 3 or 4 days' hearing, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer rushed up to the Hill and agreed to fire the two men whom I had drawn into the net—Lee and Remington—if the hearing could be stopped.

I did not hear that agreement, but I know it was made, because I could never get the committee together again.

I was really after Mr. Gladieux, secretary to the Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Blaisdell, who was and had been

during the troublesome period in China in charge of that matter under my attack. They, Mr. Gladieux and Mr. Blaisdell, subsequently quit, for reasons best known to themselves—they knew we were on their trail.

I believe that is why they quit. As to Remington, it was established that he perjured himself when he denied that he was a Communist.

He has now gone to jail for a 3-year term—just as in the case of Alger Hiss—for perjury.

But as to Mr. Lee, I am unable to find him. Mr. Sawyer perpetrated a very snide trick on the American people when he went to great pains to clear Mr. Lee of all charges before he separated him from the Government payroll, for which he had developed a great affinity, so he could be rehired.

Then we have that great number of persons within this country, as to whom few of us believe to be Communists, who are supporting generally the theory of communism—perhaps some of them are honest men who are frustrated enough to support the theory of communism or any other "ism" that might improve their own status. These people are in some ways even more dangerous than the actual card-carrying Communist.

Does the Senator believe that that may be the foundation of much of this trouble?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly concur in the statement that a man who is under the influence of communism, who is dominated by the Communist concept, who is doing as directed by Communist masters, even though it is unwitting on the part of the individual, can be fully as dangerous as would be a card-carrying Communist. I know that we have a strange, assorted group of persons in this country to whom a writer has referred as being "anti-anti-Communists." While they proclaim vigorously against communism, they work more actively against those who attack communism. I think we must also recognize that this strange, assorted group of individuals sometimes contains patriotic persons who are not motivated by a lack of patriotism and loyalty, but who are very dangerous. I sometimes think it does not make very much difference to a man whose house has been burned down whether it is done by an arsonist who has built a fire under the back porch, or by someone who has carelessly thrown a cigarette. His loss will be the same, regardless of the reason of the person who caused the fire.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator share my view that if we take a group of 50 Communists and a group of 50 patriotic Americans and compare them we would find a very large percentage of persons in the Communist group who would be neurotic, psychopathic, and psychologically maladjusted, and with fear neuroses or emotional disturbances. When we analyze Communists we are dealing with a group of persons who, perhaps, have a larger percentage of psychological abnormalities among them than can be found in a group of normal patriotic persons. It seems to me that in trying to figure out what makes Communists tick we should recognize, in part, that we are dealing with people whom we have to be on guard against from the standpoint of psychological disturbances.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct, if we include the statement made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. Sometimes there are neurotic disturbances and biological difficulties. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that we must try to find the answer to why psychologically Communists behave as they do? Because, as the Senator has pointed out, once they see communism in its true state, they soon lose any affection for it.

Mr. MUNDT. I think, in that connection, we have been muffing a great opportunity in our school system in not dramatizing sufficiently our Bill of Rights.

Mr. MORSE. That is involved in my next question, because I have recently made a recommendation to the Ford Foundation that if it really wants to do something very educational in the whole field of Americanism, it should sponsor a series of television skits on the meaning of the basic freedoms as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. We talk a great deal about freedom, but to the average citizen, unless we speak in specific terms, our statements are pretty vague.

Mr. MUNDT. When the 13 Communists were confronted with the difference of a temporary loss of freedom in America for 3 years and an interminable loss of freedom in Russia, I believe it was the first time they ever realized the importance of living in America.

Mr. MORSE. I stated to the Ford Foundation that they could demonstrate to the people what freedom means by sponsoring a series of television skits on the Bill of Rights. I do not know just where the failure occurs in our educational system, but somewhere we are failing to develop a proper understanding of the difference between a police state and a free state.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator from Oregon completely, which, I will say, is a bit unusual.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from South Dakota would be surprised, if he knew me better, at how much we do agree.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Whatever the needs of the country may be, the Congress has a responsibility to hold inviolate the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. MUNDT. I do, and for that reason I join with the Senator from Ohio in his important proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join with us in the amendment, as he did a year ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio would not want to leave the inference that if I do not join him, therefore, I am not a believer in the Bill of Rights?

Mr. BRICKER. I am confident that the Senator will join with us when the measure comes to a vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to proceed without any further yielding.

To get back to the subject under discussion, the Communists in the New York courtroom found themselves in circumstances entirely different from anything they had ever experienced before. They were accustomed to sitting in on public councils and attending conspiratorial meetings. They were confronted with a situation as to whether they wanted to stay in jail in the United States for a few years, or whether they preferred to go to Russia. They acted independently for the first time in their lives and declared, "Give us jail in America rather than communism in Russia or in Europe."

I think, Mr. President, that is a tremendously important situation.

These Communists now were in circumstances entirely different from their usual habitats of party councils, conspiratorial meetings, of huddles over what to tell their gullible followers and how to promote communism in the United States. Here they now were faced with the simple question of whether they wanted to stay in the United States, but in jail for a few years; whether they preferred to stay in the United States—the country they detested so much that they advocated the overthrow of its constitutional government; or—whether, without having to serve time in jail, they chose to go to their proclaimed paradise, the Soviet Union.

And to a man, without a single exception, they all stated a preference for jail.

They rejected, with the utmost contempt, any insinuation that they would prefer the Soviet Union. One among them did so even though—or perhaps just because—he had been born in Russia. And they all made certain that they wished it to be widely understood that they never had, or now have, or ever will have any intention of going to Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, all this is, to a degree, despicable; to a degree pathetic; and to a degree, perhaps not very important. I am quite aware of the fact that these 13 minor Communist leaders will spend no more than 2 or 3 years in jail. But they did not know that when they protested against the alternative of going to Russia. You may also say it is common knowledge how badly many people—and especially Communists on this side of the fron curtain—misjudge conditions in Soviet Russia; how they sometimes believe what they read and hear from Communist propaganda organs to be gospel truth and actual reality. That is an unfortunate circumstance, especially for those who are the misled and the gullible. It is a circumstance, I am happy to say, that has been somewhat corrected in the past few years, and not in the least by the efforts of our own information services. They have made a concerted and truly conscientious effort to inform the world on what is actually going on in Russia. And the Soviets themselves have by their deeds contradicted their own words.

I am happy to say that during the past few years, as part of the Voice of America program of the State Department, with its so-called campaign of truth, we have been slowly but surely getting across to people everywhere, first, the truth about conditions under communism in Communist countries, and second, what freedom means to human beings in countries that are still happily free. But much still remains to be done. Much education is still required, as was brought out in the colloquy I have just had with the Senator from Oregon. The Soviets themselves have contradicted all the propaganda they put out as to conditions in Soviet Russia.

I am aware of all this; nonetheless, the case of the 13 Communist leaders in New York seems to me to be a striking example. It is here relevant to mention that the defense counsel himself praised Judge Dimock and the jury for the fairness of the trial. He said—and I should like to emphasize this—that Judge Dimock had given a sample of American justice at its best. In Communist countries, not even attorneys for the prosecution believe that trials are fair and equitable.

Mr. President, I believe that not even a hard-boiled Communist can, deep within his own conscience, remain unimpressed by fair judges, fair juries, fair trials, and fair justice, and by a fair choice between freedom in Russia and imprisonment in America.

Notwithstanding their tirades, their propaganda, and their criminal and political activities, I believe that deep within their own consciences Communist leaders know what the real situation is both here and in the Soviet Union.

I believe this to be true of Communist leaders everywhere—in the United States, in France, in Italy, in Poland, and in the Soviet Union itself. They are not blind; they are simply callous fakers. They are not idealists. They are only after careers, influence, power, pomp, and authority. They are not the humanitarians they profess to be. They are cold-blooded climbers, pushy people, seeking their own advantages as members of the party aristocracy and the ruling caste.

When the jig is up, and suddenly, as happened to the 13 Communists in New York, all they have learned, all they have spoken, all they have professed, does not count any longer, and the only thing that counts is compressed into a simple and basic choice, how else can it be explained that the 13 Communists chose jail in preference to the self-styled paradise of the Soviet Union? The only explanation is that when all the flimflam, gimmicks, subterfuges, and deceptions failed, when they got down to bedrock, when they were suddenly faced with deciding by themselves and about themselves, they naturally chose the safer, the better, and the more pleasant future for themselves.

The 13 Communists saw in the United States, even with a cell block for a future, what they could not see in the Soviet Union, where they might have lived as so-called free men. They saw and chose jail as the better future and the preferential present.

This case is the most revealing spotlight yet to reach into the mysterious crevices of the Communist mind, with all its deceptions and self-deceptions. Here is something which any school child can understand, something which any American or any foreigner can comprehend. It is a case seriously deserving of a place in the permanent record of the Communist mentality.

In conclusion, I may say that this case is going to be projected, so I am told, and so I shall do my best to insist, by all the media of information available to the free world, particularly by the major portion of the Voice of America programs for the next 60 days, so that every foreigner, wherever he lives, may hear on the air, read in pamphlet form, or in the newspapers, or see in the motion pictures, the evidence that, when the chips are down, jail in America is better than that which passes for freedom in the Soviet Union.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed consideration of House bill 1979, a bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that a vote might be taken on the reorganization bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, I should like to be heard briefly in support of H. R. 1979, and in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I favor strongly the adoption of House bill 1979, now pending, as passed by the House and as reported favorably by the Senate committee.

I oppose adoption of the amendment favored by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Because of the fact that I oppose his amendment, whereas I have always rather consistenly followed his leadership in the field of reorganization, I feel that I should state for the record the reasons why it seems to me adoption of the amendment would not be the proper course to be followed by the Senate at this time.

First, I think the field of reorganization is as nearly a bipartisan field as any other field that exists. We all favor reorganization of our Government. All of us know that gross extravagance, wasteful practices, inefficiency, and disorganization now prevail in many of the mushrooming activities of the executive departments.

In view of the fact that 2 years ago the Senate adopted the measure which is now proposed to be extended, it seems to me that, in the application of a truly bipartisan spirit, it is sound for the Senate to extend the measure in the form in which it was originally written. It seems to me that any other course would appear to place the Senate in one of two positions.

First, our amendment of the proposal, so as to give greater recognition and greater weight to the legislative position of either House, and less weight to the Presidential recommendations, would make it appear that the Senate has less confidence in the present President of the United States than it had in his immediate predecessor, to whom we granted the powers, privileges, and responsibilities that were contained in the act when it was passed in 1949.

I do not believe that the Senate, as now constituted, has less confidence in the present President than the Senate had in his immediate predecessor. That is one reason why I propose, if permitted, to vote for the measure in the same form in which it was adopted in 1949.

The second reason why I feel the proposed measure should be adopted as submitted is that we have been supporting this whole program because of an ardent desire to reorganize the Government. There is no Member of the Senate who has not expressed at home and on the Senate floor, on many occasions, public and private, his desire to see actual reorganization effected. There has been too little reorganization. Now there is an opportunity to have some of the more important reorganization accomplished.

It seems to me that a change in the measure at this time, which would make reorganization more difficult, would leave the inescapable conclusion in the minds of the general public that Congress was less ardent in its desire to effectuate actual reorganization than it was in the past.

For those two reasons, therefore, the Senator from Florida will regretfully vote against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I hope the amendment will fail of adoption. If permitted to do so, I shall vote for the adoption of the pending measure, by which the act which has been in existence since 1949 will be extended, without change, until April 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to my way of thinking, in House bill 1979 we have turned our form of government around. We have the cart pulling the horse, so to speak.

I have always thought that our Government was divided into three branches, namely, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. In the reorganization proposal which is now before the Senate we are not only taking away from the House and the Senate the right to stop legislation by majority vote, but we are making it impossible to stop it except by a constitutional majority in one House or the other voting against it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At that point I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the record in connection with action of the Congress on one of the reorganization plans. I refer to the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, providing for the reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Both Houses of Congress, by majority vote, voted in

favor of a resolution to disapprove the plan. Yet, because neither House had a constitutional majority—the vote in the House being 200 to 198 and in the Senate 41 to 33—we have a result whereby the Congress would have rejected any other proposal, and both Houses of Congress actually disapproved the plan. I think such a provision contravenes the Constitution in every respect.

The situation to which I have referred actually occurred under the present act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Arkansas in calling my attention to that circumstance.

The argument which a great many Senators seem to have in mind at the present time is this: We gave this power to the Democrats; and now let us give it to the Republicans.

In my votes in the Senate I shall vote on the merits of various proposals, regardless of whether they affect the Office of President or any other office. All along I have thought that we were doing wrong. I thought we did wrong when we gave the former President this authority. I voted against several of his reorganization plans. I ask the question at this time, Does any Senator know of a single reorganization plan which saved one red cent? If so, let him name it. Take the case of the Post Office Department, which is operated at a deficit. One of the reorganization plans provided for an additional office, namely, the Office of Deputy Postmaster General. That plan cost money. How could there be created the new Office of Deputy Postmaster General without an increase in the appropriation? I call upon Senators who are members of the Appropriations Committee to tell me whether or not the Post Office Department decreased its expenditures because of reorganization.

Who recommended the reorganization plan with respect to the Post Office Department? It was the Post Office Department. Who recommended the plan concerning the Department of Agriculture? It was the Department of Agriculture, not the President. The same situation will be found to exist all along the line.

In the main, reorganization has not accomplished anything in the past. We have seen examples of what I have referred to. The House and Senate have voted, by majority vote—not by constitutional majority—not to allow a certain plan to go into effect. Nevertheless, it went into effect. If the House or the Senate believes that a certain reorganization plan is wrong and should not be placed in effect, is it wrong for the House or the Senate, by majority vote of those present, to vote against it? Did the people of the United States elect a President to legislate, or did they elect the Congress to legislate? That is the question which confronts us.

When we find that we have made a mistake, should we not undo our mistake the next time the subject comes before us for consideration? That is the question which is now before the Senate. Personally, I believe that a simple majority of the House or Senate should have the right to reject any reorganization plan.

Upon one occasion a certain bill was before our committee. It was felt that it should not be passed because it would be an amendment of the O'Mahoney Act. The bill could not be brought up for consideration. Then a reorganization plan was submitted to accomplish the same objective. We voted it down. As I remember, the House passed it, but when it came to the Senate a constitutional majority voted it down.

Is it wrong to allow a simple majority of the House or Senate to disapprove a reorganization plan? That is what the pending amendment would accomplish. When we disapprove a reorganization plan, we are in the position of vetoing; but we cannot do it by a majority vote.

The pending amendment provides for disapproval of a reorganization plan by a simple majority vote of either House. I think we are certainly protecting the rights of the people when we allow a simple majority the right to act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are facing today in the Senate an issue that has troubled thinking Americans for many years.

It is obvious that changing times bring with them the need for changing Government machinery. A system that is efficient and workable one day may become inefficient and unworkable a year or a few decades later.

Congress has never been able to meet this problem adequately. From time to time, we have tinkered with the administrative machinery. But basically, we are a legislative body, and the problem is one of administration.

Since the earliest days of the administration of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, we have been delegating the power of reorganization. We have granted to two Democratic Presidents, subject to certain congressional checks, the right to reshuffle the executive agencies.

I am one who has never considered the results of this reorganization to be as great as its proponents have claimed they would be. Only too often, I am afraid, nothing has been reorganized except the labels.

I hope that the results we all want to accomplish will come from this reorganization.

Nevertheless, aside from the basic questions of war and peace, there are few goals more eagerly sought by the American people than the objectives of economy and efficiency.

I do not want to block any step which might lead to a more orderly process of government.

There is a vital need for conservation of our resources—for reducing the tremendous burdens which Government places upon our people—for keeping our national economy solvent. Even though it may not achieve all the desired results, Government reorganization is a step toward those ends.

Democratic Congresses of the past have voted this power to Democratic Presidents. I cannot see my way clear to opposing a similar grant of authority to another President, regardless of his political affiliations.

We are confronted with a proposal to place a certain limitation upon those powers. The suggestion is advanced that the Senate should have the right to annul the President's reorganization plans by a simple majority which could mean by 25 Senate votes. Under the provisions of past measures, we have made that right—which has been described as a veto—operative only upon a constitutional majority—49 Senate votes.

Those who argue for the right of veto by 25 votes contend that Congress should retain closer checks upon the process. Those who argue for the 49-vote veto argue that reorganization will be largely ineffective unless there are greater checks upon Congress.

Whatever the merits of these arguments, there are certain points that to me are inescapable.

First. The President believes that in order to carry out his program of bringing efficiency and economy to the Government he should have powers equal to those voted to previous Presidents.

Second. Regardless of the difference between a 25- and a 49-vote veto, Congress always has an ultimate check upon abuse of the reorganization authority. It can repeal the act itself or simply permit it to expire at the end of 2 years or if the proposed reorganization plan is obviously against the public interest I hope and believe at least 49 Senators will oppose it.

To vote lesser authority to the President than has been granted to previous Presidents could give rise to an unfortunate interpretation in the country. It could mean to some that the Congress of the United States lacks confidence in the present Chief Executive.

It could be interpreted by some people as an effort to hamstring the new President at the very outset of his administration.

I have made it clear that I am skeptical as to the beneficial results that will flow from this reorganization. But I cannot stand upon that thought alone as a basis for obstructing the President's program.

We have voted these identical powers to past Presidents. The achievements may not have been tremendous.

I believe that Congress has retained the proper safeguards against abuse of power.

Upon that understanding, I do not believe that I should stand in the way of the President's program and that belief will be reflected in my vote. I am ready to vote our new President the same grant of authority which we have given to chief executives down through the years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Texas has made the argument, which I have read and heard elsewhere, that a simple majority of a quorum, only 25 Senators, if a bare quorum were present, could set aside a reorganization plan. It might be interesting to note, from the opposite point of view, that it would be possible for a reorganization plan under attack to be sustained by one single vote in the entire Senate. Such a thing could happen with a bare quorum present if the pending amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the major premises laid down by the distinguished Senator

from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in support of the amendment.

The Senator from Texas has argued that changing times justify our taking a different course of action in carrying out our duties in Congress.

Mr. President, changing times cannot justify our changing the legislative system. I wish to point out, as one who has always stood for the principle of majority rule in the Senate of the United States, that I think it is a great mistake to follow a course of action which amounts in fact and in effect to giving the President of the United States quasi-legislative powers, because that is what we would do by the proposed legislation.

There are those of us who have fought this procedure in the past, and I certainly do not agree with the Senator from Texas, that because we gave quasi-legislative power to President Roosevelt and to President Truman we should continue to make the same mistake. I say that because if we follow the thesis to its logical conclusion we get ourselves into the position where we will never correct our mistakes.

I believe we have an opportunity now to correct a very bad mistake which Congress made when it in effect delegated some very precious legislative powers to the executive branch of Government. When that was done a grave mistake was made. Legislative protections belonging to the people were weakened.

Our legislative system does not belong to us as Senators; it belongs to the people of the United States. The difficulty with legislative procedural issues such as this is that they appear to be so abstract and theoretical that many people do not see their very direct relationship to our precious system of checks and balances. We are in effect attempting to delegate to the President a very precious right of the American people, namely, that the legislative function of this Government shall vest in the Congress. We increase the danger of government by mere men when we give any President the power provided in this bill.

The Chief Executive is not in any way handicapped if the legislative function of Congress is kept inviolate. He can present to the Congress any time he wants to a program for reorganization. If it is a sound program he ought to be able to convince a majority of the Members of Congress that it is a sound program. But certainly, Mr. President, we should not delegate to him the right to go ahead and do whatever he wants to do subject only to a veto by a constitutional majority rule. If a President cannot receive approval of a reorganization plan by a majority of both Houses of Congress then it should not be adopted.

I believe we ought to hold inviolate the legislative process of Congress. We ought to protect the majority vote rule in Congress because it is basic to maintaining democratic procedures. We ought to make clear to President Eisenhower, as we should have made clear to Presidents in the past, that we do not intend to increase executive power over functions which are basically legislative in nature.

After all, the reorganization of this Government is a legislative matter. It is for the executive to administer the legislative powers and prerogatives enacted by Congress. It is not for the executive to determine those executive prerogatives and powers in the first instance. In essence that is what we would be doing if we were in any way to limit the legislative authority of the Congress. This bill cannot be reconciled with sound constitutional theory in respect to the separation of powers and in respect to our checks and balances theory.

As one who fears the potentiality of a threatening increase of executive power in our country, I shall vote for the amendment, because I think it represents a much needed check on the danger of an executive exercising arbitrary power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was intrigued today by the observations of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], with respect to the alienation of the legislative powers of the Congress.

I shall detain the Senate only a minute or two to reminisce about one of the first reorganization committees which was set up at the other end of the Capitol, and of which I had the honor to be a member. There was a very ingenious Member of Congress at that time, from the State of North Carolina, to whom I pay tribute because I think he was one of the best constitutional lawyers who ever came to Congress, and certainly he was a fine lawyer in his own right. He it was, I believe, who hit upon the idea of utilizing the rule-making power of the House and of the Senate for the purpose of setting up a negative approach to legislation which should come to us in the form of a reorganization plan. I know of no other precedent, as a matter of fact, whereby a reorganization proposal can take on the form of law and can become effective and can embrace and involve the transfer of funds, the abolition of functions, and all that sort of thing, only if Congress asserts its disapproval. If there is any other approach like that in the field of legislation, I am not aware of it. But it was set up in the first instance as an exercise of the rule-making power of Congress. So the precedent was established at that time, and it has obtained from that day to this.

Mr. President, I think there has been over-emphasis, of course, on the question of simple majority as distinguished from constitutional majority, for while I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I had opportunity to examine a report relating to the membership on the floor of the Senate whenever a petition to end debate on the floor of the Senate—in short, to invoke cloture—was filed. I believe the RECORD indicates that on such occasions over a period as long as 15 years an average of 86 Senators were ready and available to vote.

A simple majority of that number would have been 45, and a constitutional majority of the whole number of Senators would have been 49. However, when we make allowance for the attritions which come from ill health, hospitalization, and so forth, we find that the actual difference between the two, when there is opportunity to alert the Senate that a reorganization proposal will be on the floor for a vote, would be very small indeed.

So, as I see coming from different sections of my State a volume of mail to the effect that an effort was made to hamstring the President of the United States, it seems to me those who write such letters emphasize out of true proportion the difference between a simple majority and a constitutional majority.

As for myself, Mr. President, it makes very little difference. I think I could support either one, although I will say that I do share some of the misgivings of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to the alienation from Congress of a legislative power.

It seems to me that the reasonable and appropriate thing to have done long ago would have been to put this matter on an affirmative basis, so that Congress would not be called upon to disapprove, by the vote of one House, but, on the contrary, would be called upon to approve affirmatively by majority vote any proposal which includes within itself legislative authority, for that is what it amounts to.

For the life of me, Mr. President, I do not see how under a reorganization act we can transpose to another agency in a department a balance which accrues to a certain function in that governmental department, and still escape the exercise of a legislative power. That is clear on its face. So perhaps this matter should have been reconstituted in the first place, so that it would have been an affirmative approach to a legislative duty.

However, that was not done. In the basic Legislative Reorganization Act of 1949, that negative approach was carried out. At this time, at this late date, I am not disposed to quarrel with this approach, because the damage, if any, to the whole theory of a legislative authority in a constitutional system of government has already been done.

I agree with my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that we are going to pay testimony to a violation of that principle again today. It is not a very happy thing to have to confess in public, but I shall do it.

I think time is of the essence here; and the chances are that before we could get a reorganization bill ironed out, so as to embrace an affirmative approach, several months would pass.

I am not unmindful also of the long period of time during which the Reorganization Act languished in the committee of conference. As I recall, it was there for nearly 2 months.

I think every reasonable person agrees that in our huge and sprawling bureaucracy the time to reorganize has come. Time cannot be lost if some economies are to be effected and if the basic purposes of reorganization—which are the improvement of the efficiency of the governmental machinery, the effectuation of economy, and other kindred purposes—are finally to be consummated.

Consequently, Mr. President, although I do a disservice, I think, to myself by going along with the kind of principle to which I have never agreed, I shall agree to do so today, by voting for the proposal which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall say only a few words about the pending amendment.

As one who once had the honor of serving on the committee which was considering the type of legislation which it is now proposed to extend, let me say that on that occasion I voted that a simple majority of either House should be able to set aside a reorganization plan. It was my theory that reorganizations should be brought about by teamwork between the Executive and Congress, and that Congress was giving the Executive an expeditious way of obtaining reorganizations upon which both the Executive and the Congress could agree.

However, when we go beyond the proposal to make it possible for a simple majority to set aside a reorganization plan, we are then making it possible for an Executive to make a law which the Congress would not pass, but would defeat if the attempt were made.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me we would do much better to limit the Executive to reorganization plans which can meet with the approval of Congress, and give the Executive merely an expeditious way of obtaining reorganizations of that type.

It was for that reason that I supported, when it was submitted 4 years ago, the same amendment that is being offered at this time. I support the same amendment now.

It is interesting to note, out of the experience we have had with the reorganization plans, that almost half of them have not met with any opposition whatsoever. In other words, almost half the reorganization plans which have been sent to the Senate and House of Representatives did not encounter objection to the extent that any Member of Congress would offer a proposal to set them aside. Of the plans proposed, only eight have been disapproved. I do not believe that Senators generally feel that we made a mistake in rejecting those eight reorganization plans.

It is also interesting to note that 4 years ago the administration proposed that in order to set aside a reorganization plan both Houses of Congress would have to vote affirmatively to reject it. If such an arrangement had been made, experience now indicates that not one reorganization plan would have been rejected. If that proposal had gone into effect, Congress would have completely handcuffed itself, in that Congress would have made it virtually impossible for itself to set aside reorganization plans.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], on behalf of the committee, in opposing the granting of such additional powers to the President, was correct. Experience has proved that he was correct.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that there have been two reorganization plans that went into effect although a majority of Senators voted against them. One of those plans involved the Federal Power Commission and the other the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In either case it was the right of the President—and he certainly could do so any time he cared to, in pursuance of the powers which existed under the Reorganization Act—simply to send to Congress a different plan, one which did not contain the objectionable features.

Under the bill, as the McClellan amendment proposes, the President could send us hundreds or thousands of reorganization plans; but when Congress finds a plan to be unsound, it seems to me Congress would be able to defeat the plan, just as Congress could have defeated it if it had been submitted in the form of a proposed law, and if it had been found that the proposed law, when introduced as a bill, did not meet with the approval of Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me? I should like to inquire whether it will be possible to obtain a vote on this measure before 4 o'clock? I have to leave before then, to take a plane at 4 o'clock.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall speak for only a few minutes. I wish to explain one matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well. I was simply hopeful that it would be possible for the vote to be taken soon, for I have to take a plane.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall take only 4 or 5 minutes on this matter, Mr. President.

I believe one matter has been overlooked in this discussion. We have been referring to reorganization plans as if they were ordinary affirmative legislation initiated within Congress itself. Of course, such legislation is always decided, and should be, by majority vote. On the other hand, what is really the situation in this case is that the power to reject a plan which is submitted to Congress by the President is really the power to exercise a veto over a proposal of the President. It seems to me, in that respect, there is a very great difference between this kind of procedure in the Senate and the ordinary procedure that is followed in connection with affirmative legislation proposed within the Congress of the United States itself.

I again say that, so far as I am concerned, I want to uphold the hand of the new President in every way possible in his efforts to bring about economy in Government. He has recommended that that be done; he has pledged himself to do it, and so far as I am concerned I am going to give him every opportunity to make good his proposal and his pledge. I am averse to placing any roadblock in his way that would be more severe than that which was imposed upon the previous President of the United States.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to digress, as did the able senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and advert for a moment to the subject of the Communist Party in the United States, and to urge him and other distinguished Senators to join me in support of my bill, S. 200, which recognizes the Communist Party as the evil, subversive organization that it is, and proposes that the Communist Party be outlawed.

Now, Mr. President, to the pending question. I sympathize with the point of view of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] regarding the pending bill, a point of view which I myself at first supported in committee; but, in view of the fact that the action was interpreted as a move to restrict the powers of President Eisenhower to reorganize the Government, I urge that the Senate support the committee in its last action and give the same authority to our present Chief Executive, President Eisenhower, as was given to former President Truman. I urge the Senate to reject the amendment, and to vote for the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there has been a tendency during the discussion of the pending bill in referring to the President as the head of the executive branch, apparently, to express the idea that the President has some particular power in connection with reorganizing the Government, or that there was something inherent in his office as President which endowed him with some extra authority as the reorganizing agent of the Congress. If I may, simply for the purposes of the record, I desire to recall the explanation I remember having heard a great many years ago when the first reorganization act was debated, namely, that it was not proposed that the President act as the President, and it was not proposed that the President issue Executive orders, but it was proposed that the President function as the agent of the Congress. If my memory serves me correctly, the first reorganization act was passed when the present Chief Justice, Mr. Vinson, was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I recall a discussion which was participated in by him, by an eminent Representative from Georgia, Mr. Cox, recently deceased, and by Mr. John O'Connor, then a Member of Congress from the State of New York. The discussion turned upon whether the Congress could delegate legislative power. It was brought out that in a rather famous case—the Kansas City Stockyards Case, or some such case, if my memory serves me correctly—it had been held that Congress could not delegate legislative power, but the theory of the reorganization act was that the Congress could create a commissioner, or could create an agent of the Congress, and could say to him, "Make certain examinations, conduct investigations, and here are some standards to guide you. If you find by these standards that you can promote the better execution of the laws and can bring about greater efficiency and economy, then you can make a finding, and it will become effective, in the absence of adverse action or direct legislation to the contrary by the Congress." The action of the agent would then become effective, because the person designated had acted as the agent of the Congress. That distinction was made, as I recall, by the present Chief Justice, in his discussion of the question at that time.

I mention that incident at this time because in certain legislation which has been proposed and which probably will be considered in due course by the Committee on the District of Columbia, the question may become important as to whether the Congress can say to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or to an elected council of the District of Columbia, "You may act as an agent of the Congress and make find-

ings, and if you make findings within the standards set up by the basic legislative act, then they can have the force and effect of law, in the absence of veto action by the Congress itself." I do not care now to develop the subject particularly, but it seems to me the discussion to which I have referred should be noted as a matter of historical record, because I think the concept set forth is essential to an understanding of the validity of the transfer of duties from one agency to another, and the repeal, in effect, of existing law, with the creation of new law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my friend from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that theory were spelled out to its logical conclusion, I would say that if the Congress can make the President an agent for one legislative purpose, the Congress can certainly make the President an agent for any legislative purpose. That would necessarily involve such a thing as a declaration of war. So, if the concept were carried to its logical conclusion the Congress could then delegate to the President the power to make a finding and to declare war, instead of the Congress doing it. To that theory I certainly would not subscribe.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the theory as expounded at the time of the passage of the original Reorganization Act was that the creation of the agent of the Congress had to be circumscribed by certain limitations. The President, or the agent of Congress, could not make a declaration of war unless he complied with certain standards, and the findings would have to square with those standards. Whether it would be possible to get the court to determine whether the standards were complied with I do not know. I merely thought it well to mention the discussion which took place in the consideration of the original Reorganization Act many years ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to take but half a minute to file a respectful dissent to the doctrine just enunciated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that legislation can be passed through some doctrine of agency. I have now heard about everything, it seems to me, in the field of legislation when I heard that novel argument. When I hear that Congress can delegate its legislative function, I reply that in my opinion the Constitution abhors such a doctrine. The Constitution places the legislative function in the Members of the Congress, not in any of their agents. Mr. President, in suggesting this doctrine, Senators are confronted with something that is ominous from the standpoint of legislative theory. About all that should be necessary would be to state the premise that the legislative functions of the Congress cannot be delegated because that is the premise of the Constitution of the United States. There cannot be found in the Constitution a syllable which empowers the Congress of the United States to legislate by agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not sure whether this is a quorum call or a vote on the McClellan amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a quorum call. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Frear	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young
Griswold	McCarthy	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The vote now comes, does it not, on the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and pass the bill as it was reported from the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will again state the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provision of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business. If present and voting the Senators from Indiana and the Senator from South Dakota would each vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senators from Pennsylvania, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Vermont would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—16

Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Eastland	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Long	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Maybank	Stennis
Hill	McCarthy	
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	

NAYS—64

Anderson	Bricker	Byrd
Barrett	Bush	Carlson
Beall	Butler, Md.	Case
Bennett	Butler, Nebr.	Chavez

Clements	Ives	Potter
Cooper	Jackson	Purtell
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kennedy	Smathers
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Kuchel	Sparkman
George	Langer	Symington
Goldwater	Lehman	Taft
Griswold	Magnuson	Thye
Hayden	Malone	Tobey
Hendrickson	Mansfield	Watkins
Hennings	Millikin	Wiley
Hoey	Monroney	Williams
Holland	Murray	Young
Humphrey	Pastore	
Hunt	Payne	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Gore	Mundt
Bridges	Green	Neely
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Duff	Jenner	Welker
Ellender	Martin	
Flanders	McCarran	

So Mr. McCLELLAN'S amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand that there is to be no record vote on the final action with respect to the reorganization bill. However, since the McClellan amendment has been rejected, if there were to be a yea-and-nay vote on the bill, I would vote "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1979) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to comment very briefly on one part of President Eisenhower's message on the state of the Union. As I reflect on his address, particularly on the much publicized decision to unleash the forces of Chiang Kai-shek for raids upon the mainland of China, grave questions arise in my mind, questions which I believe should be aired publicly and asked of the President and his Cabinet officers, because we are here dealing with the threat or possibility of enlarging the war, perhaps exploding it into a global war.

The first question which arises in my mind is as to how much of a policy is contained in the statement by the President.

Frankly, Mr. President, I had looked forward to the President's state of the Union message with great anticipation. When he went to Korea to survey the situation, I shared the hopes of millions of Americans that with his military experience, he would find a new solution to hasten the end of the fighting. My hopes were enhanced by persistent reports in the press that General Eisenhower and his Cabinet, on their cruise back to the United States, were formulating a new plan for Korea. I had expected to hear the President outline this new plan in his state of the Union message—since nothing could be more important to the state of the Union than ending the Korean war.

I cannot help saying, Mr. President, that my hopes were dampened when I learned that the sum total of this new plan for Korea amounted to permitting the Chinese Nationalist forces to operate from Formosa in making raids on the Chinese mainland.

My understanding, Mr. President, is that the Nationalists have already been making raids. While Mr. Truman's original order in June 1950 neutralized the Nationalist forces on Formosa itself, it did not seek to prevent, nor has it prevented, pin-prick raids by Chiang's forces from the Pescadores Islands and the island of Quemoy, much closer to the mainland than Formosa. There have been numerous reports on this in the press.

Furthermore, I call attention to the fact that our Chief of Naval Operations who was quoted in the New York Times of yesterday as saying that there had been raids made from Formosa itself, with the knowledge of the Navy and without any effort on the part of the Navy to prevent such raids from being made. Clearly, Mr. President, there is a vast difference between hit-and-run raids made by small forces from islands close to the mainland, and large scale attacks across 90 miles of open water. The first can be accomplished speedily, secretly and with a small, mobile naval force. The second can only be a major operation, requiring substantial naval and air protection, since they are easily detectable during the 90-mile crossing.

But graver questions also arise from the President's new Formosan policy.

First: how much beyond the present pin-prick raids is Chiang capable of mounting at the moment—without American arms and men?

The answer seems to be: zero.

That answer comes from none other than Dr. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist Chinese delegate to the United Nations. He told reporters in New York last Saturday that Chiang's forces alone would be able to operate for the present only on a rather small scale—as they have been operating—and that large scale operations against the mainland could not be forthcoming for a year or two.

The second question is: how much military aid, if any, does the President propose to give Chiang Kai-shek in order to enable him to do more than pin-prick the Chinese mainland?

Is this military aid to be diverted from other areas of the world—such as Indochina or Europe or even Korea? Is this administration going to increase the amounts for mutual aid requested in the 1954 budget? If so, by how much?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is there the slightest question or doubt in the Senator's mind that equal amounts of money or equal amounts of equipment in the hands of South Koreans would be just as effective, if not more so, in assisting our position there than in any other hands the Senator can think of, including those of the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly we know that we are much further along in building up the South Korean forces than we are in rebuilding the Nationalist forces on the Island of Formosa.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it reasonable to believe that the South Koreans, who are already operating in the area of combat, are therefore assisting us in a position held there in such a way as to make it much more to our advantage to aid them rather than to take from them in order to help others who are not now on the mainland to get there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly would not be in favor of taking aid from the South Koreans. I wish to be clearly understood. I have supported the aid program for Formosa, and I think we are doing a fine job there. I was over there in December, and I saw some of the work that was being done. But if we are going to enable the Chinese Nationalists to make large-scale mainland attacks, we must take some armament and equipment from someone in order to give them the extra equipment they need. I pose that as one of the questions. Are we going to take it from Korea, from Indochina, or from Europe? I do not know what the answer is. I believe that is a question which ought to be answered if the American people are to know what our program is to be—what the new, bold, positive foreign policy is to be. I am simply trying to pose some question which I think ought to be answered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wonder if the Senator, who has been referring to the so-called pin-prick operations, noted that yesterday General Wedemeyer, in commenting on this same pin-prick step, praised President Eisenhower's statement and at the same time said that he hoped and expected that it would be followed immediately by certain steps, namely:

Chinese Nationalist raids against Communist China.

United Nations bombing of the Chinese mainland.

Economic and naval blockade of the mainland.

Eventual invasion of the mainland.

Removal of United Nations restrictions on bombing the Yalu River bridges in Korea and assembly points in Manchuria.

Adoption by the United Nations of a policy of doing everything possible to preclude the consolidation of Communist aggressive gains everywhere, without committing large American or other ground forces to the continent of Asia.

United States technical aid and equipment not only for the Chinese Nationalists, but also for the Japanese, Filipinos, Malayans, Burmese, Indochina, and other Asians who desire to defend their countries against Communist aggression.

Decision by the United States to go it alone if its allies and the United Nations fail to support such a program.

Using the program as outlined by General Wedemeyer, I ask the Senator, if that program were followed up, whether he would still designate it as a pin-prick effort?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not only would I not designate it as a pin-prick effort, but furthermore, I would be willing to hazard the prediction that by no means

could that kind of program be put into effect within the budget which has already been submitted to the Congress. I think the American people are entitled to know what the program is to be.

Let me say in all fairness that I do not believe that either President Eisenhower or his administration has ever contemplated the kind of program suggested. I have no right to make this statement because I have no way of knowing, but I cannot believe that they are planning such a program. However, that points up something which I wish to bring out, and that is danger of the implications of the mere statement that we are going to turn the Chinese Nationalists loose. It starts people thinking in that direction. It causes them to think that we have a plan to do such things; and when we begin doing such things as are outlined we know what the ultimate step is almost certain to be. It is bound to be war, and I believe the American people ought to know what it is we are planning to do, and whether or not these are steps which may lead to world war III.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. When the Senator says that the ultimate outcome of such steps is bound to be war, does he mean all-out world war III?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do. Not only that, but a very significant part of the program outlined is cutting loose from the United Nations and going it alone. That was one of the latter steps which General Wedemeyer suggested, unless the other nations agreed to go along and do what is outlined.

Mr. KERR. If we either permitted ourselves to get into the position of going it alone, or brought it upon ourselves, who would suffer the most from such an act, and who would profit the most?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The consequences of going it alone, to my way of thinking, are so terrible that I am not sure that I can speculate on anyone wanting to do it. Of course we would be isolated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator not think that the United States would suffer most?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do.

Mr. KERR. And that the Soviet Union would profit most?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly that is what the Soviet Union is trying to do—break the allies apart. Let me say in all fairness that President Eisenhower made a very fine statement in his message with reference to the United Nations, and I do not want to leave the implication that he is advocating going it alone. He showed in his message that he was not thinking of it. However, the implications of this bold, positive program which was stated with practically no clarifying statement makes people now think along the lines read from the newspaper article by the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. While I agree personally with the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the President of the United States has no intention of taking those additional steps, does the Senator agree with me that the mere fact that a man like General Wedemeyer has made such a statement means that the statement will be carried in every newspaper in every country throughout the world this side of and behind the iron curtain?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. The danger of making the deduction that such a program is in the making will face us and stare us in the face.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think there can be any question about the truth of the Senator's statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If we should carry out such a plan, does the Senator from Alabama have any idea of what England, France, West Germany, and Italy might do?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; but I believe the inevitable effect of it would be to drive them away from us. We have succeeded pretty well in the past several years in drawing the nations of the world to our side. We have done a very effective job in lining up the free nations of the world, and undoubtedly that kind of program would not be supported by those nations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would drive them away, in other words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would eventuate in our going it alone, as the article states toward the end.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Alabama know whether the President of the United States, before taking this positive step, consulted with our friends and allies abroad, particularly England and France?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say a word about it during the course of the delivery of my prepared remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. The President has stated with a degree of positiveness, which I applaud, that he will pursue a bipartisan policy. I applaud that statement, because I think that if we are to survive and if we are to be successful in repelling the Soviets a bipartisan policy is absolutely necessary.

I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether this act was taken after consultation with the leaders of the Democratic Party, either through the Foreign Relations Committee or otherwise, so that they could discuss it and consider it and offer their advice.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the Senator from New York that I understand there was no consultation ahead of time. There was preparation for the announcement. They were warned or cautioned or advised that the announcement was going to be made.

Mr. LEHMAN. There was no consultation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There was no consultation so far as developing a policy was concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I wanted to establish.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator to say that he was in Formosa recently.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I was there in December of last year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator aware—I was not aware—that the principal function of our Seventh Fleet was to protect Red China from invasion by Nationalist Chinese troops stationed on Formosa? Was that his impression when he was in Formosa? Was it his impression that the Seventh Fleet's main function was to protect Red China from Nationalist Chinese attacks?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no; and I believe a reading of the original order would show that that was not the primary function of the Seventh Fleet. I believe that the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa will themselves admit in so many words that they have valued very highly the protection which they have received from the Seventh Fleet.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not talking about the protection to which the Senator refers. I am referring to the protection of Red China from the Chinese Nationalists.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the Senator from Arkansas. The primary function of the Seventh Fleet was to protect the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. It was to protect Formosa from the Communists on the mainland.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understood the President correctly the other day, the whole implication of his statement is that he is taking away protection from Red China. He did not refer to the protection of Formosa. The whole point was the removal of protection from Red China which the fleet had been giving. Is that not what he said?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was contained in his message, and I thought it was an unfortunate statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was it a true statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think it complies with the intent of the order directing the fleet into the Formosa Straits.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the removal of protection from Red China is of no great consequence, as I understand the Senator to say, then does the President's statement constitute any real change in the existing policy at all?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that doing what has been done was inevitable. In other words, the fleet was assigned there for the purpose of protecting Formosa at a time when the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa were helpless.

I was there a year earlier. I was there a year ago in December, and I went into the field with General Chase and other American officers, and I saw what they were doing.

There were 400,000 or 500,000 Chinese Nationalists there, and they were in some kind of army. However, when we sent our large military mission there under the leadership of a very able and distinguished officer, General Chase, did he accept that as an army ready to take the field? Of course not. General MacArthur advised our committee in the MacArthur hearings that they were not ready to take the field. General Chase first of all found many thousands of senior officers who had to be weeded out and replaced by young officers who had to be trained. Then he started rebuilding that force right up from the individual soldier, unit by unit, through the squad, platoon, company, battalion, regiment, to the division. When I was there a year ago last December he was training that force at the battalion level. The soldiers were fine looking physical specimens. At the battalion level they had excellent training.

Last December when I was there he told me he had several divisions which he had completed building and streamlining and staffing with young officers. They are ready to do something and to advance themselves. Therefore there is a certain amount of relaxation of the urgency of the Seventh Fleet's defending them. Therefore I say the other feature was almost inevitable in coming about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield further.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama will agree with me, I am sure, that in the way the statement of the President was phrased it was designed to leave the implication that our policy up to now had been motivated primarily by a desire to protect Red China from invasion from Formosa. If that is a correct analysis of the speech, does the Senator think that is designed to enhance bipartisan cooperation on this side of the aisle in the development of a policy in this field?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not want to use the term "motivated" or to say that the motive was to do that, but I do want to say that the inevitable result was to do that. With the statement worded as it was, it was inevitable that people throughout the United States would receive the impression that our Seventh Fleet had been there for the purpose of defending the Red Chinese, when as a matter of fact we know, and the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa will admit, that the Seventh Fleet has been a wonderful source of defensive strength in protecting the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa while they were building a force capable of defending Formosa.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will permit me to make a further observation, I should like to say that against the background of the accusations that our policy has been dominated by pro-Communists, such a statement certainly was unfortunate, was it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly think it was, particularly when it is coupled with a very fine plea in behalf of a bipartisan foreign policy. In that connection I call attention to the words "developing and directing," with particular emphasis on the developing of a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is it not a fact that when President Truman issued the order which placed the Seventh Fleet between the coast of China and Formosa, at that time the Chinese Reds had not attacked the United States forces in Korea?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. Is it not a fact that after the Chinese Communists attacked our forces in Korea the effect of the operation of the Seventh Fleet was to protect the 1,500-mile railroad which supplies the Communist forces in Indochina and also supplies the Chinese Communist forces in Korea with matériel? In other words, the fleet remained there so that no one could cut that railroad and no one could attack the coast of China.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the chairman of the committee that, of course, I realize some persons do make that argument. On the other hand, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee who he thinks was in a position to cut that line or to bomb it. Certainly the Chinese Nationalists were not.

Mr. WILEY. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the chairman of the committee would suggest that United States planes should have done it.

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then no one is left but the Chinese Nationalists, and they did not have the planes or equipment or men or matériel with which to do the job. So the Seventh Fleet was really a protection to Formosa.

Mr. WILEY. Was not it also a protection to the mainland of China?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how anyone can properly argue that it was actually and factually a protection to the mainland of China, when no one was capable of assaulting the mainland of China.

Mr. WILEY. Of course I cannot agree with that assumption.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think our military authorities will say that. Furthermore, General MacArthur said that the primary objective of the troops on Formosa was to protect Formosa, and he said they were not ready.

Mr. WILEY. I agree that they were not fully ready; but it is obvious that if the Seventh Fleet operated to protect that railroad, it operated for the benefit of the Communists.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but it did not operate in that way. At that time the Chinese Nationalist forces on Formosa were, with our help, increasing their strength; and the time may not be far distant when they will be able to do a successful job in cutting that road. It was Admiral Fechteler, I believe, who was quoted in yesterday's New York Times as saying that at no time had our fleet tried to prevent any sortie from Formosa, and that there had been sorties, and that the Navy knew about them and did not try to stop them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to call attention to the lead article in today's New York Times. I now read from it:

NEW POLICY OPENS CHINA'S RAIL LINES TO RAID, SAYS WILEY—AIM IS NATIONALIST BOMBING OF MANCHURIA-CANTON ROAD WITH UNITED STATES-BUILT PLANES, HE ADDS—FOE MIGHT DIVERT TROOPS—JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF DIRECT END OF PROTECTIVE SCREENING OF FORMOSA BY SEVENTH FLEET

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—The Senate's Republican foreign affairs spokesman, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, declared today that the Eisenhower administration's new Asian policy involved a hope that Chinese Nationalists using United States supplied aircraft would break up Communist rail communications in mainland China.

This, Senator Wiley told reporters as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was the specific military significance of President Eisenhower's order recalling the United States Seventh Fleet from acting as a shield, as the President put it, for the Communist China mainland.

"The purpose," Mr. WILEY said, "was to open the way to Nationalist bombing of the 2,000-mile railroad running from Manchuria to Canton, the South China Sea, and the frontier of French Indochina."

My question is this: Does not the action referred to amount to more than a pinpoint raid? Does it not amount to a change in the attitude of the United Nations and the United States, when using the United States fleet and planes for the purpose of smashing these rail lines in the interior of China? If this be desirable, should not the minority, as well as the majority, have been consulted or at least extended the courtesy of a notification that this was the purpose behind the removal of the Seventh Fleet?

It seems to me we are due an explanation as to whether this information is to be conveyed only to the majority party, or whether both parties are to be consulted somewhat in regard to a move of the importance of this one and such a change in the character of the war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that I had not seen the article to which reference has just been made. But I did state publicly substantially what I have stated here on the floor, namely, when the Commander in Chief, who has just returned from Korea, withdraws the fleet, it must be, as he stated, that the fleet operated as a barrier, in substance, against the China coast. If it operated as a barrier against the Chinese coast, it certainly operated to protect the Communists.

It is not that the Chief Executive or anyone else has said this to me; but the newspapers say that we are sending more and more supplies to Chiang Kai-shek.

Moreover, as the Senator has stated, already there are fights occurring on the islands off the China Coast.

The newspapers also say that the Chinese Communists have no particular navy which could withstand anything in the shape of an invasion. If the newspapers say that, what is the commonsense implication which results from the President's order? It simply is that in the judgment of a great military genius, which President Eisenhower is, it is in the interest of the public welfare and in the interest of the United States of America that the Seventh Fleet be withdrawn, in order that we shall not make it possible for the Communists to center their energies and their attacks upon our troops in Korea.

In other words, if there is a diversionary attack—to use the military term—on the coast of China, the result will be to weaken the Chinese Communist forces in Korea. That will mean that our troops there will not be killed by such Chinese Communists forces as have to leave Korea and go to the coast of China, to defend that coast.

I am sorry that I have to leave the Chamber at this time, for I am compelled to take a 5 o'clock train to New York. I did not wish to have it implied in the slightest degree that anything I said is the result of a confidence in me by the Chief Executive. What I said is, it seems to me, simply a common inference from the facts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the chairman of the committee leaves the Chamber, I wish him to understand clearly that I have not said one word in criticism of the President's order. In fact, I said it was inevitable eventually.

Mr. WILEY. It is a good order; is that what the Senator from Alabama means.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said it was inevitable, eventually, that that be done, and that it has been developing all along. But I said that by stopping with the simple statement that he was doing that, and by not saying that such action does not imply any aggressive action on our part, he left unanswered some questions which the American people are entitled to have answered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Alabama know whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff were consulted prior to this order?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have read an article by a columnist who says they were not consulted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me to do so, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, an article by a well-known columnist, Marquis Childs, regarding this matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I join in the request which has been made by the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to my distinguished colleague, with whom I serve on a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, that Mr. Dulles advised me that after his trip to Europe he would be very anxious to confer with the entire subcommittee, both the Republican members and the Democratic members, on the entire policy which now is under discussion.

I have purposely refrained from making any comments about the matter, although I know a little about it.

As soon as possible, I plan to call a meeting of the Far Eastern Subcommittee, to go into this entire matter and to see whether we can obtain a full understanding of what the whole policy is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I know how determined he is to work out a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is my entire purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I pay tribute to the Senator from New Jersey, and I say that I think Mr. Dulles will strive to do that. But I make the point that we need some very early clarification of this matter, in view of what has been said in various columns, editorials, and newspaper articles, such as one referred to today in the Senate Chamber by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. Our people should know what they are to expect.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems evident to me from what the Senator from Alabama has reported, and from the statements made by the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the implications of this new policy as enunciated by the President are very far-reaching in their effects. I think there can be no question about that.

The Senator from Alabama has reported with regard to a visit he made to Formosa last December, and he has described the great improvement in the morale and in the training of the forces under Chiang Kai-shek. I was very glad to hear that that change or improvement has come about largely because of the protection afforded by the fleet which was stationed there 2 years ago. But I may ask the Senator from Alabama whether he, as a result of his observation, felt that, without widespread and comprehensive help and support from the United States, in the form of planes, in the form of landing craft, in the form of tanks, and in the form of other necessary items, any large-scale operations could be undertaken by the Nationalists within any measurable time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no, not at all; neither would the Nationalists be at a point so far advanced as they are now in training and in rebuilding their defenses, had it not been for the very great help from the United States, not only in the way of matériel and supplies, but also in the way of fine military leadership.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If that be the case—and I am sure the Senator from Alabama has stated the case accurately—does it not appear to the Senator from Alabama that the American people should be clearly advised as to the implications, the serious implications, of this whole new policy? Does it not also appear to the Senator that our allies and friends abroad, with whom we have been working in close association, and on whom we must depend in the future if we are to repel the aggression of the Soviets, should have been consulted, should have been advised, and should have had within their possession information as to all the facts, so they could advise in regard to the policy to be taken?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall come to that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether he considers the present contribution by our associates in the United Nations to the resistance of aggression in Korea as being representative of effective collective-security action? I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, of the forces in Korea, this Nation alone has supplied more than 350,000, and that all the other 16 member nations of the United Nations have supplied less than 35,000. Does the distinguished Senator from Alabama consider that as being representative of effective collective-security in action? If aggression were to break out elsewhere in the world, would he want that to stand as a precedent on the basis of which this Nation alone would bear more than 90 percent of the manpower burdens and contribution of the United Nations, and suffer more than 95 percent of the casualties of the United Nations members?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator, by the use of the term "representative" means adequate, I certainly do not, and I never have believed that they have done their share. But I point out that it is the first time in the history of the world that we have been able—yes, that anyone has been able—to get so many nations to participate, even though the participation has been greatly inadequate on the part of many of our allies. I believe in all fairness the Senator will agree with me that, in considering this question we ought to remember—and certainly President Eisenhower remembered when he made his address—that Malaya and Indochina are tied in with it, and that we are not furnishing the manpower in Malaya, the British are furnishing it there; we are not furnishing the manpower in Indochina, the French are furnishing it there. I believe that in considering this subject we ought to keep those facts in mind. I certainly concede to the distinguished Senator that by no means have the other members of the United Nations who agreed to take part with us in the defense against aggression, contributed what they should have contributed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Alabama will agree with me that, despite some of the comments in the House of Commons, the American people have shown great restraint in the war now going on in Korea, because, under the policies that have been followed heretofore, though our planes have been attacked, we have restricted our pilots so that they would not even pursue the attacking planes in hot pursuit across the Yalu River. The distinguished Senator from Alabama will recall that in the so-called MacArthur hearings the fact was brought out that it was the unanimous recommendation of every one of our commanders in Korea, air, sea, and land, that at least in hot pursuit the flyers who had been fired upon should be able to attack those planes, even though they went back across the Yalu, and even though no bombings were carried on. That was agreed to in the highest levels in Washington, clear up to the President of the United States; but, when the matter was submitted to the State Department, to some of our embassies, to some of the foreign governments overseas, after making a few inquiries and finding out that they took a rather dim view of such a doctrine of hot pursuit, the recommendation was completely dropped. So I think the Senator will agree with me that, despite the debate in the House of Commons, this Nation has shown for 2½ years tremendous restraint in Korea, under great provocation.

With that background, I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who was the Vice Presidential nominee of his party in the recent election. Day after day our flyers are being subjected to attack south of the Yalu River, many of our planes have been shot down, and a number of our bombers have been shot down. They have been shot down by Soviet-manufactured planes. We do not know who is flying them, perhaps Chinese Communists, possibly North Korean Communists, or it may be Soviet Union Communists, but since they all do their fighting north of the present battle line, we are not quite sure even in the case of the planes that are shot down just who the pilots are. They are being propelled, however, by jet fuel.

I do not know whether, in view of the considerable discussion taking place on the other side of the aisle, there is a concerted policy on the part of the Democratic minority to embarrass the new administration, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if he really believes that this Nation should continue to be complacent about the shipment of jet fuel to China when that fuel can be placed in planes which are used against our men, the British, the French, the South Koreans, and other allies present in Korea. Should we complacently sit by and permit Finnish tankers to make the long trip through the Mediterranean Sea, through the Suez Canal, through the Indian Ocean, through the China Sea, and finally, with the cargo safely in the hands of Communists, to be used for the purpose of inflicting casualties upon the American troops?

I do not believe that the people or the Government of the United States can be expected for any prolonged period of time to sit complacently by while either ammunition or jet fuel is used for the purpose of inflicting casualties upon our troops in Korea.

I should like to know the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Alabama with reference to that question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California, who is very able and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, formerly a member of the Armed Services Committee, has covered a great deal of ground in propounding that question. First of all, let me say to the distinguished Senator that I take complete responsibility for the statement which I am making today, and I may say, it is completely in line with the statement I made to the press immediately following the President's address. I said just what I am saying now, except not quite in such great detail. I stated that I felt the President should, at a very early date, issue a clarifying statement in order that we in this country might know what the full implications of this new policy might be.

I am not discussing the idea of a China blockade; I am not discussing the question of bombing across the Yalu River. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have considerable sympathy with our fliers who felt that they had to pull back when they reached the Yalu River in hot pursuit. I do not recall that the testimony went so far as the Senator says it did. I do not recall the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am not criticizing the President's order. Let me make that clear. I said a while ago that I felt that eventually the action which has been taken would have to be taken. It is a development of the fact that as the strength of the Nationalists is built up, a change in the status of the fleet is almost inevitable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say before I lose the thought that the point I am making is that it does suggest implications such as the Senator would read in the statement of General Wedemeyer. It does imply things to the minds of people all over the United States which I think should be answered.

Moreover, Mr. President, I am eager that we shall not get off on the wrong foot, that we should really have what the President said he wanted to have, namely, bipartisan cooperation in developing and directing—those are the two terms he used—our foreign policy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator, and I stand to be corrected, that I read the testimony not very long ago, and the fact is that on the doctrine of hot pursuit not only was it agreed to by every responsible commander in Korea, Army, Navy, and Air Force, but it was transmitted to Washington and approved in the very highest councils of the Government, up to and including the then President of the United States himself. Then the matter was submitted to the State Department to sound out some of our allies. That Department did not even bother to sound out all of them. It made some informal soundings, and when it found two or three that did not want to follow the doctrine of hot pursuit, it completely ignored the recommendations of every responsible commander in Korea. It ignored the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the action by the President of the United States.

The reason why I think it needs some emphasis, I will say to the Senator, is because of the very point which in my opinion, the distinguished Senator, able as he is, has missed, namely, that up to the time of the action of President Eisenhower, what we have constantly done has been to signal in advance to the Soviet Union just what our future course of action would be, and we have also signalled it to the Chinese Communists, so that they were in a position to bring their massed fleets of planes down to the very waters of the Yalu River, because they had, in effect, been assured by the United Nations organization that no matter if a Communist plane had one wheel north of the waters of the Yalu River, it would not be bothered by a single bomber or fighter of the United Nations' forces. So they could move their vast supply depot, their supplies of planes, their great dumps of ammunition, and bombs down to the Yalu River with absolute assurance, as though they were in a safe deposit vault.

Another thing I want to point out, Mr. President, because I think it is important, is that when the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman, put the neutralization policy into effect between Formosa and the mainland, it gave protection to the Island of Formosa at a time when it needed protection, but it also gave precisely the same kind of assurance to the Communist regime in China that it would not be bothered by raids upon the China coast. It not only gave that assurance, which may have been proper at a time before the Chinese Communists entered the Korean War—that point can be argued and men may honestly differ—but it continued to carry that assurance even after the Chinese Communists entered the Korean war in force and had been determined by the United Nations to be an aggressor, just as the North Korean Communists had been.

As I understand the argument of the Senator from Alabama, it is that instead of conducting a psychological campaign against the Communists, under which they will not know from time to time necessarily what is going to happen to them, there should now be a precise definition on the part of the Government of the United States and on the part of the United Nations members not only to our own people and the people of the free world, but to the men in the Kremlin and at Peiping, who would give their very eye teeth if they could have assurances so that they might know what their requirements may be in the future and what they might do, but also permanent assurance as to what the National Gov-

ernment of the Republic of China might do.

To me, Mr. President, it would seem to be the height of folly to signal in advance and to give that type of assurance to the men in the Kremlin and the men in Peiping, who are responsible today for inflicting 130,000 casualties upon our troops and who have inflicted tremendous casualties upon our United Nations allies. I can see no valid reasons for giving them any such assurance.

I should like to see the Communist world sit on the anxious seat for while, rather than have the free world constantly twiddle its thumbs and wonder what the men in the Kremlin may do next.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, again the Senator has covered a great amount of territory. He made the statement a few minutes ago—and I wish to assure him that I agree with him—that the American people have shown great restraint. Regardless of what others may have said, we have leaned over backward in the conduct of the Korean war, in order to try to build up representative assistance, if that is the term the Senator used, from the other members of the United Nations. I think we can keep the Communists on the anxious seat, but I do not believe it is right for us to allow to develop, either in the United States or among the Nationalist Chinese, the feeling that we are going to do all the things mentioned in the article read in the Senate this afternoon unless it really is our intention to do them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that we must not open our hand and show all our cards. But when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations uses one of the great newspapers of the Nation to announce that the purpose of the withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet is to permit the furnishing of American-made aircraft in order to bomb Chinese rail lines, I certainly feel that if such information is to be public property, then, in the confidence and secrecy of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the members of the minority party should be advised as to what is going on. That does not mean that the information would be disclosed to the Kremlin or to other countries behind the iron curtain, but I feel that we are properly entitled to know, from our representatives on the Committee on Foreign Relations, what commitments are being made by the United States, what is involved in the withdrawal of the fleet, and whether we are going to find ourselves involved in a blockade of the Chinese mainland, with bombing attacks being made by American-made planes, without any member of the minority party, anxious to participate in a bipartisan foreign policy, knowing anything about such action before it happens.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Before I ask my question, I think I should say that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] presents an unanswerable proposition when he points out that there can be no justification at all for the shipment of jet fuel to Communist China by any economic group which considers itself to be one of our allies.

The Senator from California and I have stood together on this point for some years in the Senate, and I certainly think, as I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, that we have a right to call upon our allies to join with us in stopping the shipment into Red China of goods which are going to be of aid to our enemies, in killing not only our boys, but also the boys of our allies.

However, I am very fearful that if we start a course of unilateral action on our part, we might conceivably find ourselves standing alone; and I think that by standing alone, there is much greater danger of our becoming involved in an all-out war with Russia than if we are standing with our allies.

So I ask my friend, the Senator from Alabama, if he would find any serious objection to a conclusion which I have expressed for some weeks, namely, that I believe one of the first things President Eisenhower ought to do is to call for a conference with the top ministers of our allies, to see if we cannot come to some agreement that will bring an end to the actions which the Senator from California has so rightfully pointed out, and which I think are the cause of Russia feeling that she is becoming successful in driving wedges between and among the Allies.

Instead of making announcements as to what is going to be done with the Seventh Fleet in Asiatic waters, and taking other unilateral action on the part of the United States, does the Senator from Alabama see anything wrong in my proposal that the President proceed forthwith to ask the heads of Allied nations to sit down with us, to see if we cannot negotiate a united Asiatic program, since we have no united Asiatic program today?

I believe that until there is such a united Asiatic program, there is going to be an increasing risk of having this country involved in an all-out war. I am convinced that once Stalin knows that there is a united Allied program, and each of the Allies begins to deliver its share, in keeping with their obligations and responsibilities under such a program, then, for the first time we are going to stop Russia in Asia.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have always believed that the United States ought to be ready at all times to engage in conference with the high officials, or chief ministers, or whoever the proper officials may be, of any of the Allied countries. Somehow or other, we seem to shy away from conferences. I should like to see the United States participate in some conferences. At least, I should like to see this country take the position that if any other country is willing to sit down at a conference table with us, we will accept an invitation, or we will offer an invitation.

General Marshall once said something that impressed me. He said that wherever there was a conference table, the United States ought to be the first country to be present and the last one to leave. I endorse that statement. I think it ought to be made the policy of this Government.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator that the United States ought to be willing to sit down at conferences, but my question is this: Does the Senator agree with me that the United States ought to initiate such conferences?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I certainly think we ought to initiate conferences, which should promote helpful results.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada, although I desire to finish my statement soon.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from Alabama is making a very important statement. Perhaps many of us may not agree with it, but at least it is important.

Is the distinguished Senator familiar with the fact that both England and France have independent economic and military pacts with Russia, which read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact which England and France have with us, and that the pacts with Russia are in good standing for another 10 years? There has never been any move to cancel them, and perhaps the movements of Great Britain and France in trying to stop our actions in the Pacific may be in an effort to live up to their pacts with Russia.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have heard the Senator make that statement. I do not know the details of any such arrangements. However, I am not arguing that point; I have not the time to do so today. I am arguing the point of the implications which I think are dangerous in a statement that is left more or less hanging in the air.

The Senator from New Jersey has said that Mr. Dulles desires to meet with the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as soon as he returns from Europe, and review the whole situation. I shall look forward to that conference with a great deal of interest. I hope it may be helpful.

If I may do so, I desire to continue with my statement.

According to the New York Times news summary of February 1, the naval forces of the Chinese Nationalists are comprised of some 60 boats and some small ships, the largest of which is a 1,400-ton destroyer.

Much has been said here about the Chinese air force, and about the Seventh Fleet keeping the Chinese from bombing the mainland, or preventing some kind of movement there. I submit that until recently the Chinese Nationalists have not been able to make a movement, and it will be some time before they are able to make a movement in force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From time to time we have heard reports similar to those referred to by the Senator from Alabama

earlier in his statement, namely, that the Seventh Fleet has permitted a series of unpublicized hit-and-run guerrilla raids to be made by Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese coast. Is it proper to ask the Senator from Alabama if his understanding on this point is similar to mine?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me give my authority for my statement. There was an article in the New York Times of yesterday—if I remember correctly, an Associated Press dispatch—which quoted Admiral Fechteler, who is Chief of Naval Operations, I believe. He was authority for the statement contained in an article in the New York Times which referred to operations from Formosa.

There never has been anything to prevent Chinese Nationalist raids from the islands along the shore. By the way, that is something which many people have not understood. The Chinese Nationalists have always controlled some 20 islands along the coastline. It is quite an impressive line of islands. Never at any time has there been anything in the order to prevent raids from those islands on the mainland; and that is where most of the raids have been made from, although more recently, according to this statement, there have been raids from Formosa which the Navy at no time tried to interfere with, although it knew they were being made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one further comment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from Alabama knows, the senior Senator from Illinois has always been strong admirer of the present President of the United States. He still is an admirer of the present President of the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I join the Senator from Illinois in that admiration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say also that the Senator from Illinois agrees in general with the foreign policy which the President announced in his state-of-the-Union speech. I was however somewhat surprised because I felt there were certain ungracious comments in the speech of the President when he said that under the preceding administration "the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China." As I understand it, the Senator from Alabama, like the Senator from Illinois, feels that this statement was in error.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said it was an unfortunate statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. An unintentionally unfortunate statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know. Let me tell the Senator what I said when someone asked me about that. I could pick out several other examples. I said, "Oh, do not worry about it. The campaign is too recent. We are still making campaign speeches, perhaps."

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if it is true that the Seventh Fleet protected the Nationalist forces from the Communist forces on the mainland and for a long period of time did a great deal to protect them; and if it is also true that, as the Nationalist forces began to increase in strength, hit-and-run guerrilla raids on the part of the Nationalists were permitted by the fleet from Formosa, the Pescadores, and other islands, then would we not get much better bipartisan foreign cooperation if those facts were stated and admitted? Would not that be much more accurate and gracious?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is undoubtedly true.

I wish to refer to the air forces. I have just said something about the naval forces. I am not saying this to be derogatory in any sense. I wish to see the forces built up. I think we are doing a fine job in building them up and helping them to build up such forces. We should continue until we have a fine fighting force, a great bulwark against communism in that part of the world.

The air force is comprised of some 300 operable planes, including transports, I should imagine that it would be disastrous to attempt any large-scale crossing of the 90 miles of water between Formosa and the mainland with a force of this size unless the American Navy and Air Force paved the way. Therefore, the next question is, Even with substantial material aid from America, can Chiang Kai-shek carry out any large-scale raids on the mainland from Formosa without either United States naval protection or United States air protection, or both?

I invite attention to the fact that a couple of days ago Chiang Kai-shek was quoted in the press as saying that he did not at any time want any ground forces. Did the omission of naval and air forces imply that he did want them? I do not believe that he could ever make a successful large-scale raid without such coverage. If he cannot make a crossing without such United States protection, does the President intend to commit the United States naval and air forces for this purpose? I think before we go one step further with this supposedly new policy we in Congress and the American people deserve an unequivocal answer to this question from the administration.

The fourth question is, Supposing that Chiang Kai-shek is able to make a large-scale raid on the mainland using only material aid from America, and supposing he finds himself facing a Chinese Dunkirk, having to evacuate large numbers of troops suddenly and under fire; what is our course in that event? Do we commit our naval forces to help such evacuation? Do we commit our air forces to protect such an evacuation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Most important of all, do we commit United States ground forces to help cover such an evacuation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish, very briefly.

Mr. President, a Chinese Dunkirk is more than a remote possibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should dislike very much to see it, because I hope that when the Chinese Nationalists move they will be able to hold and will not require help. At the same time, it is a possibility which we simply cannot dismiss without serious consideration. Our obligation in such an event should be considered now. It is one which the administration has not yet faced with the American people.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who perhaps as much as any other Member of the Senate has had experience with the United Nations organization and has been to various sections of the world, that it seems to me that he is suggesting—inadvertently, I think—that the same type of signaling our course of action in advance should now be followed by the Eisenhower administration as was followed with such fatal effect by the Truman administration. I say that in no narrow spirit of partisanship whatever, because with respect to policies in Europe, when there was a true bipartisan consultation I joined with the late distinguished Senator Vandenberg of Michigan in voting, almost without exception, for measures or policies with respect to Europe, including the Greek-Turkish program, the NATO ratification, and our program of economic aid to Europe, as well as our military assistance program. But we did not have that type of real bipartisan consultation so far as the Far East was concerned.

The fatal defect in the foreign policy of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman so far as the Far East was concerned was that in the earlier period they followed a policy in China, first, of suggesting a coalition with the Communists which has not worked anywhere else in the world, and, secondly, when the Chinese Nationalist Government had finally been forced to withdraw to the island of Formosa, the President of the United States, on January 6, 1949, I believe—and the Secretary of State a day or two later—made public statements which, of course, were known not only by the American people, but by the men in the Kremlin and those at Peiping as well, to the effect that the Government of the United States would not send any further arms or ammunition to the Government of the Republic of China. The islands were theirs almost for the asking.

The next thing was that in his speech before the National Press Club Mr. Acheson on January 18, 1950, stated that the defense line of this Nation would include Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, and he left the Republic of Korea and Formosa outside of that defense line.

I know that what I am about to say is always open to the charge of its being hindsight rather than foresight, but I may say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that if he cares to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the period before, at the time, and immediately subsequent to Mr. Acheson's speech, he will find that I called attention to the dangers of that type of policy. I submit that had Mr. Acheson, instead of saying that Korea and Formosa would be outside our defense line, merely stated to the National Press Club that we would not be unconcerned by aggression wherever it takes place, and that if aggression takes place in the Far East or in Europe the Government of the United States will at that time take such action as our national interests require, the men in Peiping, the men in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang, and, yes, the men in the Kremlin, would not, in

my judgment, have dared to move. They would have had no assurance that they could move without some measure of resistance being put up to them. But, having what they felt was somewhat of a guaranty that this country would be unconcerned with what happened in Korea, we did not prevent the Korean war; in fact, we invited the Korean war by such a policy.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, able as he is, that if we followed the policy which he suggests, and if we were to telegraph ahead our punches, both those of ourselves and of our United Nations allies, and give any such assurances to either the men in the Kremlin, or the men at Pyongyang, or the men at Peiping, we might not be serving the cause of peace; in fact, we might be merely inviting other acts of aggression on the part of the Communist world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I do not have time to comment on the various points which my very distinguished friend has covered. I certainly challenge his statement that there was no bipartisan policy established for the Far East, and some day I shall show him the statement made by the late Senator Vandenberg on that very point.

So far as concerns the coalition in China which the Senator has mentioned, I will not debate it at this time, but I will say it was recommended by practically every person whom we sent there to have anything to do with the Far East, including military leaders, and was specifically recommended in a telegram from General MacArthur, General Wedemeyer, and, and Admiral Spruance. If anyone wishes to check that statement, let him read paragraph 13 of that telegram.

Mr. President, as I have said, I am not going to enter into a discussion of all these points. I cannot hope to do so. I do not say we have to signal our punches to the Communists; but, if now we are going to do all those things General Wedemeyer says we ought to do, and those things the chairman of our committee was quoted as suggesting, although I will say in fairness to the chairman that he practically denied that he was accurately quoted, if I understood him correctly, the Communists will be put on notice.

The fifth question is: Who protects Formosa in the event Chiang's raids provoke a Communist attack upon the island?

The implication in the state of the Union message is that President Eisenhower is in full agreement with the hard core of Mr. Truman's order, namely, that the Seventh Fleet should protect Formosa from attack.

The answer seems to be: We, the United States, protect Formosa.

I cannot help believing this puts us in a somewhat strange position. It is our official policy to permit Chiang to make large-scale raids on the mainland—beyond the "pin-prick" attacks of the past. Yet, if the consequence of these new raids is an attack on Formosa, we, not Chiang, will bear the brunt. I do not mean that he would not protect Formosa; of course he would, but it would be our Seventh Fleet and our carriers and our other forces that would really give protection against an attack on the island.

But there is an even graver question—one far more dangerous to Formosa and to us: Who is to protect Formosa should Chiang's raids serve to provoke air attacks by the Communist air force—said to be a large and highly modern one? Formosa is small and highly vulnerable to such attacks from the air.

Does the President intend to commit United States Air Forces and personnel to the protection of the Formosan skies? Or does he intend to leave Formosa to the mercy of the Communist air force—for certainly the limited Nationalist air force could not offer adequate protection against the Communist planes. The American people have a right to know.

Actually, Mr. President, all of these questions boil down to one simple question which I am sure everyone can understand: Is this the first step toward enlarging the war in Asia? Is this the first step toward involving United States forces on the mainland of China? Is it the first step toward more casualties, instead of less? Is it the first step toward global war?

I hope the answer to all these questions is "No." We do not have the answers to them yet. I hope we may get these answers from the administration.

Before concluding, I wish to say a few words about this process of policy-making in the field of foreign policy.

I should like to call attention to two sentences in the President's state of the Union message, with which I agree wholeheartedly:

The first is:

It—

Our foreign policy—

must be developed and directed in the spirit of true bipartisanship.

The second is:

The policy we pursue will recognize the truth that no single country, even one so powerful as ours, can alone defend the liberty of all nations threatened by Communist aggression from without or subversion from within.

These two truths, so aptly stated by President Eisenhower, mean that foreign policy-making must at all costs be developed by a partnership—a partnership of the parties here at home, and a partnership with our allies abroad.

If this administration is to build this vital partnership arrangement, it must recognize—and recognize now—the crucial distinction between being consulted as a policy is being developed and being told about a completed policy just before it is announced.

It was said on the floor of the Senate that certain Democratic leaders were told of the decision on the Seventh Fleet prior to its announcement. That is a long, long way from true consultation and cooperative building of a policy. I understand that our allies got the same treatment. It is now perfectly clear that this Government went ahead on its own and without any encouragement from our allies.

This, I suggest, is a far cry from the bipartisanship that existed during the time of Senator Vandenberg—or, I may say, as Senator Vandenberg used to call it, unpartisanship—when the Senator was actually called in to conferences at the State Department and the White House, and actually helped to hammer out policies in concert with the responsible officials. It is a far cry from the almost daily consultations with congressional leaders of both parties on the various drafts of the North Atlantic Treaty.

It is also a far cry from any sort of true partnership with our allies abroad—at least judging from the consternation this new Formosan policy has caused throughout Europe and, I may say, throughout the world. I doubt that any of us would consider himself a true business partner if we were merely told of a business decision just before it was put into effect.

President Eisenhower himself seemed to recognize this when he said that foreign policy must be developed and directed—note the word "developed"—in the spirit of true bipartisanship.

Yet the very first step taken has disregarded this pledge.

We hear much talk about a new positive foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration.

But who among the minority party is being consulted in the development of this new policy? Who among us is being called—or is to be called—to meet in the heads-together conferences where policies are hammered out?

And who among our allies has been informed of this positive new policy? Are we to treat our allies as partners or as pawns?

I, for one, have no idea what may be the full implications of this so-called positive new foreign policy. I find many of my colleagues in the Congress equally bewildered. We ask—and we should ask—what this policy is committing us to or what it is involving us in. I am unable to answer that and I doubt whether anyone else can.

The fight against communism has been very costly in lives as well as in money and materials. There will be great costs in the future.

But I would suggest that there are two costs of our foreign policy that we can never afford to pay: disunity at home, and a split with our allies abroad. As President Eisenhower himself says:

No single country, even one so powerful as ours, can alone defend the liberty of all nations threatened by Communist aggression.

Should an irreparable split with our allies leave us standing alone against the Communist world, we will look back with horror—and perhaps with desperation—upon our failure to make them our full partners in the business of developing and directing this global conflict against communism.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that these questions are asked, these possible risks are raised, not in a spirit of partisan criticism, but in the true spirit of bipartisanship in which I wholeheartedly believe.

EXHIBIT 1

DEMOCRATS REVIVE "TAFT WAR" CHARGE

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—When he was campaigning for the Republican nomination for President, Senator TAFT, Republican of Ohio, a year

ago made an important speech on foreign policy at Seattle. He urged that the Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Formosa be given the power to assault the mainland of China held by the Communists.

The proposal caused something of a political uproar in Washington. Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, said it would mean all-out war on the Chinese mainland, with the United States in the war. Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, said such a move would mean a "Taft war" in China, this being a reference to TAFT's denunciation of the "Truman war" in Korea.

The more ardent advocates of the Nationalists immediately seconded the Taft proposal. But they pointed out that such a move could be made only with the help of the American Navy and Air power.

In the same talk at Seattle TAFT declared he had no confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said if he were President he would remove them. This is interesting in view of the speculation over President Eisenhower's decision on Formosa and how that decision was reached.

It has been reported that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not consulted on the decision to remove the Seventh Fleet from the Straits of Formosa. This is not strictly accurate. The sequence of events was as follows:

In an early stage of the state of the Union message the Joint Chiefs were told that such a move was being considered.

But President Eisenhower indicated he would reject it. Paragraphs drafted for inclusion in the message on the subject were torn up and thrown in the wastebasket.

This was the last the Joint Chiefs heard of the matter. Officially they knew nothing more about it until they heard the President read the paragraph in his speech that drew world headlines.

The leak 3 days in advance of the message itself had, of course, made plain what was coming. Significantly, two top military men, both long advocates of a strong policy in Asia, were called upon for support. They were Admiral William D. Leahy and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, both retired but influential. It was the first public statement Leahy had made in a long time.

At the time of the hearings into MacArthur's dismissal by President Truman, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, testified that for the United States to become involved militarily in China would be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. His testimony angered MacArthur's friends and those who favored a dynamic policy in Asia.

The decision on Formosa, taken without the prior knowledge of the Joint Chiefs suggests an interesting possibility. In setting policy President Eisenhower may go around them to rely on other military advisers. One of these is Adm. Arthur W. Radford, the Navy's Commander in Chief in the Pacific area.

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 568, Calendar No. 23, an act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I do not know how much time will be involved in the consideration of House bill 568. I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] will speak on the bill. If he can give us an indication of how long he will speak, perhaps the further consideration of the bill can be put over until Tuesday, as the first order of business at that time. After all, no notice has been given that the Senate would have a long session tonight.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield to me, let me say that I believe the course suggested by the Senator from Colorado would be a fair one, for the Finance Committee has just concluded the hearings. The testimony presented before the committee was available to the Senate only just before noon. So I would appreciate having this measure set for Tuesday noon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be convenient to the leadership to have this bill put over until Tuesday noon, reserving its position in the meantime, and have it taken up at that time as the first order of business?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course the bill is now before the Senate.

For the information of the acting minority leader and the other Members of the Senate, let me say it is the purpose of the leadership on this side of the aisle, once our business for today is completed, to move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday.

If that course is agreeable to the Senate, then I shall immediately move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, in order to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, in the hope that action on those nominations can be completed. If there is any serious problem in connection with the consideration of any of the nominations on the Executive Calendar, any nominations in that category which might not be finally acted upon today, would also go over until Tuesday, in which case they would be taken up at that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would such nominations be taken up first on Tuesday, or would they be taken up after House bill 568 is considered on Tuesday? I ask these questions for the reason that the present legislation on this subject will expire on February 15, and we must take action on the bill, one way or the other, before the present act expires.

So I wonder whether action on the present Executive Calendar, if continued until Tuesday, would be the first order of business at that time; or would it be taken up later on Tuesday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Colorado. The understanding was that the Senate would adjourn from today until Tuesday. Of course, at the time when that understanding was reached, we did not know how late the session tonight would last or whether House bill 568 would be out of the way before the Senate adjourned tonight.

The idea is to take up first the Executive Calendar, because there are on it some important nominations which the administration feels it is extremely important to have confirmed, so that the nominees can begin the performance of their duties.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me ask the Senator from California whether any of the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be found to be controversial, so far as he knows.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I cannot tell whether there will be discussion of the nominations, or how prolonged such discussion may be. The nomination of Dr. Conant was reported from the Foreign Relations Committee by unanimous vote, although I understand there has been considerable discussion regarding it. There might be some discussion of the nomination on the floor of the Senate.

After Senators read the report—which, I may say, every Senator has on his desk, and has had all day today, in the case of the hearings on the nomination of Dr. Conant—I am hopeful that some of those whose opposition was previously indicated may feel that some of Dr. Conant's remarks have been misinterpreted.

In the case of the nomination of Walter Bedell Smith to be Under Secretary of State, I know of no opposition to it. The nomination was reported unanimously. I hope it can be confirmed this evening.

In the case of the nominations in the Department of Defense—namely, that of Frank C. Nash to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, and that of John A. Hannah to be Assistant Secretary of Defense—I have heard of no opposition. I believe those nominations were reported unanimously from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield to me, let me say that I hope all nominations which have been reported from the Armed Services Committee and are now on the Executive Calendar will be acted on tonight. I know of no objection to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the case of the nominations of members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we know of no opposition. I think they were unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So I know of no opposition to them.

I hope that even though it may be necessary to consider on Tuesday some matters on the Executive Calendar, such action will not delay the further consideration by the Senate of House bill 568, which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] desire to discuss.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I can set at rest the mind of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. It is not my intention to debate this measure at length. It is my intention to place before the Senate the facts as to it, before the vote is taken.

If the further consideration of House bill 568 is put over until Tuesday, I believe that either Senators who are interested in the congressional principle which might be established by that measure or Senators who are interested in the subject itself will be familiar with it, and that there would be no reason why in a reasonably short time we could not dispose of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as the junior Senator from Colorado is concerned, it will be all right to have the further consideration of House Bill 568 go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE TO PERMANENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], on February 4 called attention to a situation in the Office of Rent Stabilization by which permanent employees were separated by a reduction in force, and collected lump-sum payments for accumulated annual leave. It appears that on the day following their separation they were reinstated as temporary employees, which reinstatements, on the expiration of the accumulated leave, were converted to permanent appointments.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware has again done a commendable job. I do not rise to debate the merits or demerits of the action that took place in June of 1950, but rather to inform the Senate that whatever loophole may have existed as the result of decisions by the Comptroller General following the adoption of the Lump-Sum Leave Act of 1944 has already been plugged and corrected.

I think it my duty to state here, for the protection of the employees involved, that the practice was not illegal, provided the particular employees did not return to their permanent appointments prior to the expiration of time equivalent to the amount of annual leave which had been accumulated. I have been informed that they did not do so in this instance. Although the practice was entirely within the law, the manner in which it was done may have been irregular. I trust that the present head of the Rent Stabilization Agency will look into the facts more thoroughly before taking any additional hasty action and discharging any more employees.

During the Eighty-second Congress, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I recommended to the Senate corrective legislation, which is now Public Law 233. Until Public Law 233, approved October 30, 1951, became effective on January 6, 1952, there were a number of different leave systems in effect in the Federal service. Among such systems were the following:

First. General systems: Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees were subject to the Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts of 1936, as amended. However, because these acts provided different benefits to temporary employees than to permanent employees, it was ruled by the Comptroller General that temporary and permanent employees were under different leave systems.

Second. Postal field service: Employees in the postal field service were subject to Public Law 134.

Third. Foreign Service: Employees in the Foreign Service of the Department of State were subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946—Public Law 724.

Fourth. Miscellaneous groups: A number of other small groups of employees were subject to a variety of different leave systems.

It was apparent to me that these different systems, all operating side by side, caused confusion, created inequities, and affected employee morale. Moreover, following the adoption of the Lump-Sum Leave Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, the Comptroller General held that when an employee transferred from one leave system to another, payment for accumulated annual leave was required. Accordingly, employees going from one job to another, or changing from temporary to permanent status, or transferring from an agency under the general leave system to the Foreign Service, or vice versa, came into a windfall for accumulated annual leave.

For these and other reasons, the matter of leave was the subject of long consideration, finally culminating in the passage of Public Law 233.

Under this law, most of the previously existing systems were abolished, and over 98 percent of all Federal employees were brought under its coverage. Thus, at one fell swoop the opportunity of cashing in on accumulated annual leave, by changing from one leave system to another, was removed from the reach of most Federal employees. That was intended, and that has been accomplished with one remote exception, as follows:

On November 26, 1951, the Civil Service Commission presented to the Comptroller General for decision several questions regarding the new leave act. Among these was one having to do with lump-sum payments, reading, in pertinent part, as follows:

> If an employee who has received a lump-sum payment for annual leave * * * is reemployed before the expiration of the period covered by the leave * * * would such an employee who received a temporary appointment limited to less than 90 days be required to make refund and be credited with leave?

In reply the Comptroller General stated:

> Under the provision of the Lump-Sum Leave Act it seems clear that a refund of compensation and a corresponding credit of leave is mandatory in the case of an employee reemployed under an appointment of 90 days or more. However, the same would not appear applicable in all respects to an employee who receives an appointment for less than 90 days since said act appears to contemplate a refund only in the event the reemployment carries with it a potential right, at least, to the accrual of leave. Obviously, an appointment for less than 90 days would preclude an employee from being entitled to any leave accruals unless he should happen to receive another appointment or appointments without a break to complete the 90-day period. Thus, under such circumstances, a refund of the lump-sum payment received by an employee in a prior position would not be required provided the employee does not receive another appointment or an extension of his short-term appointment of less than 90 days without a break in service.

Under the ruling, the loophole is shown to be similar to this: John Doe has, let us say, 60 days annual leave to his credit. His service is terminated on April 1 and he is given a lump-sum payment for his 60 days annual leave. On April 2, he is returned to work under a 60-day temporary appointment. After the 60 days, he remains out of service for 1 day, and then returns to work on a permanent basis. In this manner he has received 60 days leave pay and 60 days work pay covering the same 60-day period, and then, following the 1-day break, he reenters the service on a permanent basis.

It is not believed that this remote possibility is the result of law, but occurs because of an erroneous interpretation given to the law by the Comptroller General. In light of this, it is believed that the Comptroller General should again consider the questions with a view to seeing whether it would not be in keeping with the intent of the act to hold that a refund of compensation with a corresponding credit of leave is required when an employee is reemployed prior to the expiration of the period covered by accumulated leave to his credit for which he is given a lump-sum payment.

Accordingly, I have today addressed a letter to the Comptroller General asking that he review his decision dated December 14, 1951, volume 31, to see whether his ruling should not be changed, in keeping with what I feel to be the intent of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, there has been considerable talk about so much money having been spent. If I were here to debate the merits or demerits of the particular case that has been called to our attention by the Senator from Delaware, I would have to state to the Senate that this action on the part of the Office of Rent Stabilization actually saved the Government money. I know there are those who may be shocked by that statement. However, I can prove conclusively that the result was a saving of money to the Government.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further legislative business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the

appropriate committees; and withdrawing the nominations of Vernon D. Northrip, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, and Joel D. Wolfsohn, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which were sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AUTHORITY TO THE SECRETARY TO RECEIVE AND TO REFER NOMINATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive from the President of the United States the nomination of the Under Secretary of State for Administration, and other nominations to offices in the Department of State and the diplomatic service, during the adjournment of the Senate, and that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Craig R. Sheaffer, of Iowa, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Ralph A. Tudor, of Palo Alto, Calif., for the position of Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior;

Fred G. Aandahl, of Litchville, N. Dak., as Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior;

Orme Lewis, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and

Clarence A. Davis, of Lincoln, Nebr., to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to read the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY AND CHIEF OF MISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission, Class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that this nomination go to the foot of the calendar, because one of the Senators would have to be notified, and we sent word to him that we would consider the other nominations first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter B. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

Earlier in the proceedings of today,

Mr. WILEY said: Mr. President, I wish to say to my associates that I have to leave now, to take a train to New York. I had expected that the nomination of General Smith would come before us today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the nomination of General Smith, together with a biographical sketch of General Smith, be printed in the RECORD when his nomination comes before the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Committee on Foreign Relations on February 4 recommended—by a vote of 15 to 0—that the Senate give its advice and consent to the nomination of Walter Bedell Smith to be Under Secretary of State. As Under Secretary, General Smith will be second in command in the Department of State and will be Acting Secretary of State at such times as Mr. Dulles may be absent from his post.

The position of Under Secretary of State is one of the most important positions in our Government. The selection of the man to occupy that post imposes grave responsibilities upon the President and upon this body.

In order that the Senate might be in a position fully to discharge its confirming function in this important appointment, hearings were held to examine the qualifications of General Smith. Those hearings, edited to eliminate material of a security nature, are available to the Senate.

The Committee on Foreign Relations believes that General Smith is eminently qualified to fill the post of Under Secretary. He has had a distinguished military career. He has a fine reputation as an able administrator. He has served in recent years with distinction as our Ambassador to Moscow and as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

To my mind, General Smith represents that rare combination of the military man and the civilian administrator. His training and experience have been in both fields.

It is particularly important that the top officers in our State Department thoroughly understand the Soviet Union, its objectives and the methods it uses to reach those objectives. General Smith has had a great deal of experience in handling the Russians. He understands, perhaps as well as anyone in our Government, the nature of the Communist threat to us and to the free world generally.

During the course of our hearings, the Committee on Foreign Relations examined carefully into the John P. Davies case which has occupied public attention in recent years. Mr. Davies is a Foreign Service officer who was involved in a case appealed to the President's Loyalty Review Board. That Board affirmed the findings of the Department of State that there were no grounds for dismissing Mr. Davies from the Government service on the basis of his loyalty to the United States after having heard the testimony of General Smith.

General Smith knew Mr. Davies while the general was serving as Ambassador to Moscow and testified that his experience with Davies led him to believe Davies was a loyal official. The general was not in a position, however, to give his judgment on Davies' motive in making certain suggestions to the CIA. The committee examined this matter most carefully with General Smith who brought with him the transcript of his testimony before the Loyalty Review Board. The committee was satisfied that the incident giving rise to a question about Davies' loyalty took place nearly a year before General Smith became Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In order to explore the matter fully, we created a subcommittee to study testimony given by General Smith to the Senate Judiciary Committee in this connection. That subcommittee reported, and I quote, "We concluded, upon the basis of evidence which was shown to us, that there is nothing of substance in his testimony which would detract from his availability or his service in the post of Under Secretary of State."

So much for the Davies case. It is covered in more detail in the published hearings of the committee.

The committee learned from General Smith that he is in full agreement with Mr. Dulles and the President that there must be close and continuous cooperation between the Executive and the Congress in the development of this country's foreign policy. General Smith stated: "I do not see how * * * the Congress can be expected to give the support to our foreign policy that it must have if it is to be successful unless you are pretty thoroughly brought into the foreign picture, and that means the briefing from time to time not only on foreign affairs, but on the product of our intelligence community."

This statement is in line with those which have been made by the President and I believe it is incumbent upon us to do our full part in developing a close partnership as we formulate our foreign policy.

A number of other matters were covered in the hearings which are available. We discussed ways in which the Department might be strengthened, the necessity of close cooperation in fashioning a more effective overseas information program, and the development of a foreign policy toward the Soviet threat based upon determined opposition, rather than upon mere containment.

But these matters are in the record for all to read and I urge that you do so.

In concluding my remarks, I want to express my personal confidence and admiration for the new Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and the Under Secretary designate, General Smith. President Eisenhower is to be commended for their selection. These men face great tasks. Our Nation needs such men as these to help us meet the tremendous challenge that lies ahead.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: WALTER BEDELL SMITH, GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith was born in Indianapolis, Ind., on October 5, 1895, the son of William Long and Ida Frances (Bedell) Smith. He married Mary Eleanor Cline of Indianapolis on July 1, 1917.

General Smith began his military career in 1910 as a private in the Indiana National Guard. By 1917, when he entered the Officers Training Camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison, he had advanced through the non-commissioned officer ranks to the grade of first sergeant.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Officers Reserve Corps on November 27, 1917 and moved through the successive commissioned ranks to general in the Army of the United States on July 1, 1951. He received his commission in the Regular Army as a first lieutenant of infantry on September 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920. His permanent rank as a major general on the regular list dates from March 29, 1942.

Upon graduation from the Officers Training Camp in November 1917, the general was assigned to the 39th Infantry of the Fourth Division and served with this unit in France in 1918. Following the war, he spent six years in the normal infantry command and staff assignments with the 379th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Regiment and the 12th Infantry Brigade.

In April 1925 he was detailed to the Bureau of the Budget where he served 4 years; first as assistant to the chief coordinator and

later as executive officer and deputy chief chief coordinator of budget. In April 1929 he was ordered to the Philippine Islands for a 2-year tour of duty with the 45th Infantry Regiment at Fort William McKinley.

He was returned to the United States in March 1931 to attend the advanced course of the infantry school at Fort Benning, Ga. Upon graduation in 1932 he was assigned as secretary of the infantry school and served in this capacity until August 1933 when he was ordered to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to attend the command and general staff school. In August 1936 he was selected to attend the Army War College in Washington, D. C., and upon graduation he returned to the infantry school at Fort Benning for an additional 2 years as a member of the staff and faculty.

In October 1939 General Smith was appointed to the War Department General Staff in Washington, where he served first as assistant secretary and later as secretary to the General Staff during the critical period between October 1939 and January 1942. In February 1942 he was appointed secretary to the Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

In September 1942 General Smith became Chief of Staff in the European Theater of Operations, and shortly thereafter was appointed Chief of Staff to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the North African Theater. When SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces) was organized on January 1, 1944, General Smith was appointed as Chief of Staff of this headquarters and remained in this capacity until the end of the war. On behalf of the Supreme Commander, he signed the instruments effecting the surrender of Italy and Germany.

In February 1946 he was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union, remaining in a military status during this assignment. His resignation as Ambassador was accepted by the President on March 25, 1949.

From April 1949 to October 1950 he served as commanding general of the United States First Army with headquarters on Governors Island in New York City.

In October 1950, General Smith was appointed by President Truman as Director of Central Intelligence and took the oath of office on October 7, 1950.

DECORATIONS

United States

Distinguished Service Medal (with two Oak Leaf Clusters).
Distinguished Service Medal (Navy).
Legion of Merit.
Bronze Star Medal.

Foreign

Knight Grand Cross, Order of the British Empire.
Knight Grand Cross, Order of the Lions of the Netherlands.
Grand Cross, Order of the Crown of Belgium.
Knight Grand Cross, Order of the Crown of Oak of Luxemburg.
Knight Commander, Order of the Bath (United Kingdom).
Grand Office, Order of the Legion of Honor (France).
Grand Officer, Order of Glory, Nishtan Iftikar (Tunisia).
Grand Officer, Order of Ouissan Alouite (Morocco).
Grand Officer, Order of Military Merit (Brazil).
Grand Officer, Polonia Restituta (Poland).
Silver Cross, Virtuti Militari (Poland).
Cavalier First Class, Order of Kutuzov (Russia).
Croix de Guerre (with Star), France, 1918.
Croix de Guerre (with Palm), France, 1944.
Croix de Guerre (with Palm), Belgium, 1944.
Croix de Guerre (with Palm), Czechoslovakia, 1945.

HONORARY DEGREES

Degree, institution, and date

Doctor of Literature (Lit. D.), Louvaine, 1945.
Doctor of Laws (LL. D.), Duquesne University, 1949.
Doctor of Military Science (D. Sc. Mil.), Pennsylvania Military College, 1949.
Doctor of Laws (LL. D.), Hofstra College, 1949.
Doctor of Civil Laws (D. C. L.), Colgate University, 1950.
Doctor of Laws (LL. D.), Butler Univerasity, 1950.
Doctor of Laws (LL.D.), Amherst College, 1951.
Doctor of Laws (LL. D.), Wesleyan University, 1952.

PUBLICATIONS

Eisenhower's Six Great Decisions, Saturday Evening Post, 1945.
My Three Years in Moscow, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1950.

Earlier in the proceedings of today Mr. FULBRIGHT said: Mr. President, I have a short statement I have prepared for insertion in the RECORD after the nomination of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith is brought before the Senate. I have an appointment in my office, and must leave the floor now, but I ask unanimous consent that after the nomination is made the order of business, this statement, which is in approval of the nomination, incorporating three editorials, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

It gives me great pleasure to be able to approve the appointment of Walter Bedell Smith as Under Secretary of State. I have seldom approved an appointment in the executive branch with as much enthusiasm as I approve this one.

I will not take the time of the Senate to relate the experience and achievements of General Smith. It is in the report of the committee. In fact, his career in public service has been a long one, and is well known. His experience is especially well suited for this new position in the Department of State. I think it an excellent appointment and that the country is fortunate to have his services.

I append hereto three editorials about General Smith, with which I am in agreement.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 14, 1953]

GENERAL SMITH'S NEW ROLE

When he quits as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and takes over as Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith will bring with him into his new office a wealth of talent and experience not matched by many Americans in either the military or civilian field.

For General Smith—who will now retire from active service in the Army—has had a genuinely distinguished career whose varied nature, both military and nonmilitary, has well equipped him to handle the heavy responsibilities of the second most important post in the State Department. Top-notch soldier, excellent staff planner, hard-headed negotiator, impressive diplomat, outstanding intelligence expert, and an experienced, civilian-minded administrator, he clearly has the qualifications needed to do a good job as the chief deputy of Secretary-designate John Foster Dulles.

A measure of General Smith's exceptional abilities is the fact that he began his Army career with a 6-year stint as a private in the National Guard. Commissioned a second lieutenant in the First World War, he then had behind him little more than a high-school education, but over the years he performed so outstandingly and with such brilliance—especially in planning—that his military star rose steadily until he became General Eisenhower's chief of staff in the Second World War. It was in that capacity that he earned the title of "general manager" of the massive and unprecedented operations against the Axis in Europe, and it was during that period, too, that he went to Lisbon to take part in the super-secret negotiations on Italy's surrender.

Though primarily a soldier, General Smith displayed in his wartime role a penetrating understanding of all the immensely complicated economic, political, and diplomatic problems involved. Accordingly, in 1946, not long after VE-day, the President called upon him to doff his uniform and put his nonmilitary talents to work as United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Then, after 3 years in Moscow—where he served with distinction in the teeth of the Kremlin's mounting hate-America campaign—he returned to this country to assume command of the First Army, his last assignment before becoming head of the CIA—an agency still subject to criticism but one that has been much improved under his direction.

In view of this record, it is not surprising that President-elect Eisenhower has singled out his good friend—his "godsend" during the war and a man whom he regards as one of the great chiefs of staff of all time—to be second in command to Mr. Dulles in the State Department.

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1952]

BEDELL SMITH: A GOOD CHOICE

General Eisenhower once called Walter Bedell Smith, whom he has selected for Under Secretary of State, one of the great chiefs of staff of all time. It was General Smith, newly promoted from lieutenant colonel after 27 years in service, who directed the detailed planning for the Normandy landing. As his citation for the Distinguished Service Medal said, he had initiative, foresight, tact, and administrative ability of a high degree, as well as superior judgment. He showed these qualities in the trying post of Ambassador to Russia in the years 1946–49, and there can be no doubt that he showed them also in his subsequent—but necessarily not so much publicized—labors as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Moreover, the work of the CIA, which is under the direction of the National Security Council, brings its Director into close contact with the interrelated problems of international relations, mutual security, and defense.

General Smith has been a good soldier and a good servant of the public. He is a happy choice for this civilian post. President-elect Eisenhower and Secretary-designate Dulles can be congratulated on getting his services, and so can the rest of us.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 12, 1953]

GENERAL SMITH HAS THE QUALIFICATIONS

There is a strong traditional prejudice in this country against placing military men in civilian governmental jobs. Yet in recent years this prejudice has had to give way to the hard fact that in many instances military men, on the basis of their past record, seem to possess the best qualifications.

That circumstance applies in President-elect Eisenhower's choice of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as Under Secretary of State. The appointment is of course subject to the confirmation of the Senate. The close relationship between the two men suggested that General Smith would be singled out for a post in the new administration even more important than the one he has held as head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

General Smith's capabilities first came to public attention when he served during the crucial days in World War II as Chief of Staff to General Eisenhower. More pertinent to the post for which he has now been nominated is his 3 years' service as United States Ambassador to Russia. The experience gained there should be of great benefit to the State Department in the handling of its most difficult and delicate problem.

As an administrator General Smith has shown singular talent. He should, therefore, be in a position to relieve the Secretary of State of the many routine details of so large a Department and give him greater freedom to work on matters of policy. In short, on past performance General Smith promises to be a valuable addition to the team the President-elect is assembling around him in Washington as the inauguration approaches.

Earlier in the proceedings of today

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey said: Mr. President, because I must leave by train very shortly in order to keep an important engagement, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with remarks that may be made on the confirmation of the nomination of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

I should like to add a few words to those of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with the approval of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith to be Under Secretary of State. I believe that General Smith is a most appropriate and happy choice for this important office.

Secretary Dulles, like his recent predecessors, is finding that his office requires him to be absent from Washington much of the time. During the Secretary's absence his deputy, therefore, in fact, is the Secretary of State. That was true of James Webb, of Robert Lovett, and of David K. Bruce, who served for long periods as Acting Secretaries during the absences of Secretaries Marshall and Acheson.

The selection of General Smith is most appropriate for he brings to his office a fine combination of unusual talents. By temperament, training, nature, and endowment he possesses the ability to make decisions and to administer large organizations and great numbers of men. He also has the ability to inspire confidence in others and to assume leadership in a most persuasive and dignified way. His years of training as Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. have given him an intimate knowledge of Russia, its government and people. And since Soviet Russia is the most powerful nation with which we have to deal, and since the world to a very large extent is led by the United States and the USSR, it is very important that the State Department should have at its head a man who knows our most powerful opponent in the cold war. Not only does General Smith know the Soviet Union, but he also knows communism, to which the Soviet leadership is inextricably wed. He has learned at his post as head of the Central Intelligence Service the true state of affairs with respect to communism both at home and abroad. He knows how Russian expansionism operates both in the open and clandestinely, and he is trained in assessing the moves of communism so that in meeting its many threats he will be able to guide American policy in ways most appropriate to each occasion. I believe that in this respect he will bring to the Department of State a talent which it has needed for a long time.

I am fully aware that the recounting of his peculiar qualifications for the position of Undersecretary of State may sound like a eulogy; but eulogy or no, these are the facts. And I am sure that the unanimous vote of our committee to recommend him to the Senate for favorable action is a testimony of the committee's great confidence in General Smith's ability.

There was only one question raised in connection with this appointment, and on that matter the chairman has spoken, namely, General Smith's relations with John Patton Davies. I would only like to add to our chairman's statement that the matter was gone into most thoroughly before our committee; and I am sure that there no longer can be any doubt in the minds of any of the members of our committee that General Smith's actions and relations in this matter were appropriate, sound, and consistent with the security interests of the United States. Incidentally, the Davies case concerned a matter that had occurred over a year before General Smith became the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, and so concerned him only indirectly. Let me assure the Senate that the examination of General Smith's testimony, and his oral testimony before our committee and subcommittee set up to look into certain aspects of his background only served to make entirely clear his eminent qualifications for the position for which he has been designated.

In closing these brief remarks, Mr. President, permit me to say that it is my considered opinion that the appointment of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith to be Under Secretary of State is timely, farsighted, and inspired. His great reputation for outstanding service to his country, his loyalty, and his exceptionally extensive and intimate knowledge of the forces with which the United States must deal in the world make him an outstanding appointment. I am convinced that he will be able to inspire new confidence in the State Department and bring back to it the public esteem which is so important for its effective functioning. Personally I wish to congratulate President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on this appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Personnel).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles S. Thomas, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of True D. Morse, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Earl Coke, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John H. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Romeo E. Short, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY AND CHIEF OF MISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission, Class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Conant to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission, practically an Ambassador to Germany, presents a very difficult problem for me, which grows out of the position which Mr. Conant took in an address delivered at a luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association in New York City on October 7, 1944. In that particular address Mr. Conant set forth a demand for the disarmament of Germany, which included several statements which I fear will make it exceedingly difficult for him to be effective in the position for which he has been nominated.

For Mr. Conant as a scientist I certainly have a very high respect. As the person to express the current policy of the United States Government in bringing Germany into the Western European defense community, however, I have very grave doubt.

In the fall of 1947 the junior Senator from South Dakota, together with the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, was a member of a Select Committee on Foreign Aid, designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to visit Europe and to consider economic conditions and social and political conditions there, as a backdrop to the proposals under the Marshall plan, which was, at that time, of course, not law. The committee was more popularly known as the Herter committee, and was divided into subcommittees assigned to various countries. It fell to my lot to be

assigned to Germany, and I was chairman of a subcommittee consisting of five Members of the House of Representatives and members of the select committee. The other members of that committee were the distinguished Representative from Ohio, Mr. Vorys, the distinguished Representative from Illinois, Mr. Vursell; the distinguished Representative from Georgia, Mr. Cox, who recently passed away; and the distinguished Representative from Louisiana, Mr. Overton Brooks.

We spent between 5 and 6 weeks in Germany and Austria, following a study, which was an intensive one, in which we went from community to community, day by day, and held meetings day and night and on Sundays with our own representatives in the military government and with German officials. We wrote a report. Our recommendations are a matter of record. Certainly, the recommendations which the committee made are considerably at variance with the recommendations which Mr. Conant made in his speech of October 7, 1944.

I recognize, of course, Mr. President, that Mr. Conant's address was delivered during the war, and that the recommendations which our committee made had the benefit of the developments of 2 years of postwar realinements and revealments. No one would say, I think, that anyone in October 1944 knew the full import of the policies of Russia or her hopes or ambitions as they are evident today, and probably not even as we felt them to be evident in 1947. But the attitudes expressed and the recommendations made in Mr. Conant's address in 1944 must be regarded as pretty much the forerunner of the so-called Morgenthau plan.

On pages 27 to 32, inclusive, of the committee report there is a reprint of Mr. Conant's address, and from that I wish to read a few sentences as indicating the difficulty which Mr. Conant would have as an Ambassador to Germany under the current policies of the country.

As I say this, I recognize that some members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, disturbed by some of the testimony which came before that committee, have, as I have understood, contacted the Bonn government and have received assurances that that government would welcome the appointment of Mr. Conant. In comment, I merely wish to say, in fairness to all concerned, that probably this address has not been made available or has not been widely circulated in Germany, but I see in it and in the attitudes which Mr. Conant expressed the possibility of certainly grave difficulties, if not dangers, when it comes to implementing the current policy of the United States, of NATO, and of the European defense community.

In his address at that time, President Conant said:

> It is when we look into the more distant future that doubts arise. For some maintain that to be successful the disarmament of Germany and Japan will require a profound alteration of the industrial potentialities of these countries. Indeed, to my mind, there can be no escape from this conclusion.

In his address President Conant then developed the theory that all the sources of electrical power for Germany should be outside Germany, and that the industrial plants of Germany should be broken down. This proposal was the forerunner of the dismantling policy which our country followed, unfortunately, for some period of time, without adequate consideration of the cost to this country, or the implications for the defense of Western Europe.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota the fact that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I sat throughout the hearings on the nomination of Dr. Conant. I may say that when the address to which the distinguished Senator is now referring was first called to my attention, I had somewhat the same feelings the Senator from South Dakota has just expressed. However, after listening to the testimony of Dr. Conant before the committee, I felt that an entirely different light had been thrown upon him.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to page 83 of the hearings, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator. Dr. Conant there said:

> The origin of my remarks on this highly controversial subject was quite different from those of most people. What I had in mind in making this speech was something that very, very few people knew at that time; namely, that we were in the process of developing an atomic bomb. Whether it would be used before the war was over, none of us knew. We were not quite certain that it would work, but I was convinced by the fall of 1944 that it would work sometime.
>
> Needless to say, I could not under any conditions reveal that knowledge. I was, however, speaking in terms of what I foresaw about the future when atomic bombs would be a weapon. This is shown by some introductory statements in this speech.
>
> I say, for example, in apologizing for speaking to the assembled group of the Foreign Policy Association on a subject which was not particularly in my field, I said, "A layman——"
>
> Senator SMITH. Will you give us the date of that?
>
> Mr. CONANT. Yes; this is October 7, 1944. It was the first and only time that I made a public address, as far as I am aware, on this subject.

I may say parenthetically to the Senator from South Dakota that the Morgenthau plan was proposed in 1943, so by no stretch of the imagination could Dr. Conant's speech in 1944 have been considered the forerunner or the activating agent, so far as the so-called Morgenthau plan was concerned.

Dr. Conant continued by saying:

> I may say this speech was subsequently printed in Life, I think, in April; I cannot give the exact date, in April of 1945.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. April 2.
>
> Mr. CONANT. Thank you.
>
> Senator TAFT. It was printed in full in Vital Speeches, November 1944.
>
> Mr. CONANT. I am using the text here that was in my files, and I say, "These views of mine as a layman are, by necessity, highly flavored with my experience with problems of science and technology as they affect the military situation of a country in these days."

And in the third paragraph I say, "The underlying thesis of my remarks is simple. It can be summed up in a few words. Modern science and technology have so transformed the art of war as to require us to rethink many of the problems involved in an international attempt to keep the peace."

I shall not continue to quote. I merely wished to call to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota the fact that one of the greatest scientists of our country, a great chemist, perhaps one of our leading chemists, had gone to the White House, together with Dr. Vannevar Bush, to consult with the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, relative to the atomic program which was then in a more or less theoretical stage.

Dr. Conant had knowledge which very few Americans possessed. Yet he knew the dangers of an industrial complex in a nation which possibly could use such facilities for developing an atomic weapon, which this Nation itself had not even at that time developed. I think Dr. Conant was trying to point out some of the dangers of an industry that could be used for military purposes, unless there was some kind of basis for controlling it, or at least of preventing its use for aggressive warfare.

If that connotation can be inferred from or placed upon Dr. Conant's speech of 1944, I think we can then see a vast difference between his views and the so-called Morgenthau plan, which, as I have always understood it, was primarily for the purpose of returning Germany to a rural or an agricultural economy—and Dr. Conant in his testimony before the committee made perfectly clear that such a plan was not in his mind. It was not Dr. Conant's idea that Germany should have no industry. To the contrary, instead of its being a very bitter speech, following the general outlines of the Morgenthau plan, Dr. Conant's approach, I think, if the entire speech is read, definitely shows a sympathy for the problems of the people of what was at that time an enemy country, and an understanding of the facts once the war was over, and the Allies had won it. He was merely pointing out that some consideration must be given to the question of how the industry might be used, whether it would be used for the manufacture of armaments and as a threat to the peace of the world.

In all fairness, I have pointed out these facts.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has called my attention to page 86 of the hearings, where the following occurred:

> Senator SMITH. Doctor, did you advocate the destruction of the German industrial plants?
>
> Mr. CONANT. No; what I advocated was a cautious rebuilding of them and a redistribution of industry. I speak of electrical power. I speak with favor of a book which was much discussed—a book by Marlow and Moulton, in which the authors suggested that Germany's main source of electrical power might be located beyond her borders.
>
> Now, I know the importance of electrical power for manufacturing bombs. What I was envisaging was what has come to pass in Russia, not what has come to pass in Germany; namely, the possibility of apparently innocuous industrial plants producing atomic bombs without anybody knowing it. This

would be true even if you had armies all over the place.

I thought the Senator might like to have that information.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have the distinguished Senator from California place that information in the RECORD. As a matter of fact, I had hoped to develop both those points. I am glad to have in the RECORD the parts which the Senator has read.

It is true that Dr. Conant was one of the original committee which had to do with the development of the Manhattan District project, which was the code name used for the atomic-energy program in its early phases; and it is true that, reading his speech in its entirety, as I have done, one can see throughout the speech the fears which could grow out of his knowledge of the importance of electrical energy in the development of atomic power.

There are, however, some phases of it to which I wish to draw further attention. I should like to quote further from page 84, in the paragraph following that which the distinguished Senator from California has read, these sentences:

I did not foresee the occupation of Germany by the powers; I did not foresee the whole Russian problem; I do not claim to have foreseen the developments of the post-war period except in one respect, and that is the tremendous potential for immediate war destruction by a highly industrialized country, which had no inspection.

The total intent, I think, of Dr. Conant's speech at the time was largely to plead for setting up some sort of international inspection which would, when buttressed by a redistribution of the industrial plant of Germany, make it impossible for Germany to engage in secret production of the atomic bomb. I recognize that. However, in pursuing that objective Dr. Conant certainly did make some statements which were unfortunate, it seems to me, and which might be embarrassing in connection with the administration of his duties as ambassador. For example, at page 29, in the reprint of that article, we find the following language:

There is little doubt that a considerable proportion of the German youth today are convinced believers in all that Germany has stood for in the last 10 years. It would be a miracle indeed if bitter defeat suddenly changed their minds. One has to be an incurable optimist to believe that any process of education—particularly one sponsored by other nations and imposed from without—will change the views of these youths hardened by the party discipline. In time, of course, we can hope for modification of this attitude. But the time is not 10 years or even 20, it is the span of life in which those now young become old and in which new social forces arise to influence a new generation of German people.

What concerns me is that Dr. Conant now is assigned the task of accomplishing in 8 years, and within the first 10 years, the modification of the attitude which he at that time said could not be hoped for in 10 years or even 20 years. I am afraid that these statements will plague him. It would be naive to expect that statements in this article and his whole testimony will not be circulated within Western Europe and within Western Germany.

Continuing with the article, Dr. Conant says:

To return now to a consideration of the measures to be employed if the disarmament of Germany is to be effective for a generation—I believe that it can be demonstrated that a drastic change in the German industrial scene and a considerable degree of redistribution of European industry will be required.

Yet, Mr. President, Dr. Conant will be over there to rebuild the industry which was destroyed during the dismantling period.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to the fact that, first of all, we must constantly keep in mind the knowledge which Dr. Conant had, which probably not more than a handful of Americans possessed at the time, and consider that situation in connection with the speech which he made.

Secondly, I respectfully submit that we should also keep in mind that it was a very restrained speech, in a way, because even then this country was engaged in a vast struggle with the Nazi rulers of Germany. We must remember that the speech was made during a period when we were actually engaged and our armies were locked in war in Europe.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to the fact that, on the other side of the world, there was a distinguished American who, as a matter of fact, participated and played a very important part in the defeat of the forces of the Japanese Empire then under the leadership of Tojo and others. Yet he went to Japan as the supreme commander; and I believe that at the time he left Japan he commanded more respect than any other American has ever commanded in a foreign country in our entire history, and probably more respect than any foreigner has ever commanded in any other nation of the world in all history. So the fact that Dr. Conant may have made the speech to which the Senator referred should be considered in the light of the discussion which we have had here today. I believe that the people of Germany will recognize him for the great scientist that he is, and as a very great president of one of the leading American universities.

In his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations I was very much impressed by the discussion which Dr. Conant had with the committee, and by the clarification which he afforded. He made it very clear that, as United States High Commissioner, and ultimately as Ambassador, it would of course be his duty, his desire, and his interest to carry out the policies of the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Congress in relation to Germany. So, I think that, with the exception of those who, of course, will always try to make trouble abroad, the great bulk of the German people, when they understand the background of the situation, will recognize that Dr. Conant is coming there as a distinguished American who desires to help the people of Germany remain a part of the free world of freemen.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, let it be clearly understood that nothing that I am saying is intended in any way to disparage Dr. Conant as a great American or a great scientist. However, in looking over the picture which is presented in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems to me that I cannot escape noting those things which will make it difficult for him to accomplish the mission on which it is proposed to send him.

The suggestion was made with respect to a drastic change in the German industrial scene because of the dismantling of its industrial plants. I know to a certain degree the bitterness which that program developed in Germany. This speech in October 1944, whatever its timing may have been with relation to the Morgenthau plan or the plan presented at Quebec, was pretty much the thesis which was adopted in the Potsdam Agreement in July 1945. The dismantling of German industry was written into the agreement in order to guarantee reparations to the Russians of possibly $11,000,000,000 worth of equipment. They were assured control of the industrial equipment in that portion of Eastern Germany which was assigned to Poland. They were assigned all the dismantled plants in the eastern zone, that is, in the Soviet zone of Germany. In addition, they were promised 25 percent of the dismantled plants in the western zones; and an additional 15 percent of the dismantled plants in the western zones was to be made available to the satellite powers of communism. That was the continuation of the idea expressed by Dr. Conant when he called for this drastic change in the German industrial scene. Then he went on to say in his address:

To be sure, I suppose no one would advocate that we should build up Germany as a great industrial power immediately the war is won. I suppose no one who pays even lip service to the theory of disarming our enemies would propose to lend money freely to Germany to rebuild the industrial plants now being reduced to ruin.

Mr. President, that is exactly the policy of the United States today. Initially in the Marshall plan we did not stop the dismantling program. It was the recommendation of the subcommittee of which I had the honor to be a member which included such a recommendation among its other recommendations in the fall of 1947, that dismantling of plants in Western Germany be stopped.

I read from the committee's economic recommendations:

5. That the dismantling of plants in Western Germany be suspended in order that the list of those scheduled for dismantling may be restudied by a congressional committee to determine where they can best be used for the economic recovery of Europe, or alternatively, that a procedure for review of the list be established, with application to all of Western Germany if possible, in such a manner as to permit full weight to considerations of European recovery, and full knowledge of the facts by the Congress.

Consistently with that recommendation I introduced two resolutions in the House of Representatives. One was a

resolution of inquiry, asking for an investigation of or for further information on the dismantling program. The resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives. The other resolution I introduced requested that the dismantling program be suspended until the purposes of the resolution of inquiry were accomplished.

Growing out of the adoption of the resolution by the House of Representatives there was an investigation, and there was adopted the so-called Humphrey report, which resulted in reclaiming—I forget the exact number—approximately 186 plants which had been scheduled for dismantling.

We were witnessing in Germany in 1947 the carrying out of this program of redistribution of German industry. Plants were being dismantled and taken to Russia. I remember very well the story we were told about the ball-bearing plant—and ball bearings are a strategic items—which was being dismantled, a part of it being sent to Britain and a part to Russia. I remember the story we were told, to the effect that 1,500 German workers in Essen were engaged for a year and a half in tearing down the largest steel mill in the Ruhr, and being fed and paid by funds which we provided in conjunction with the British. That big steel plant was being sent to Russia as a part of the reparations and as a part of the plan for redistributing the industrial potential of Germany. The American taxpayers then were called upon to provide funds with which to rebuild the plants of Germany itself, as well as of other countries of Western Europe, in order to restore the industrial capacity which in 1944 Dr. Conant went on record as saying should be redistributed.

I continue to read from the address:

Few, indeed, would advocate that American firms once again be permitted to build huge factories in Germany which might become arsenals for our enemies as such factories are today. But there will be those who wish to start the discussion of the disarmament of Germany from the premises that nothing must be planned which will seriously dislocate the economic life of the German people. Here is the real issue.

Then he goes on to say:

Those who object to the approach which I have just advocated paint a terrible picture of the results of the policy in question. Without the rebuilding of industrial Germany, they declare, Europe will be in chaos for a decade. I would reply:

Which is worse, the scene you depict or a third world war? You speak of the bitterness which drastic changes will cause among the German people, but this bitterness will be but a small addition to the hatred inevitably present in a defeated nation, particularly a nation nurtured on the Nazi doctrine.

That of itself is evidence that even at the time Dr. Conant was voicing that theory there were those who feared the bitterness which those changes would produce, and those who feared that without rebuilding industrial Germany Europe would be in chaos for a decade.

It would appear on the evidence as of today that those who disagreed with Dr. Conant at the time were clearer in their vision of what would come after the war than was Dr. Conant.

That is not to disparage Dr. Conant as the great scientist he is. He was possessed by the idea that there must not be a place for the development in secret of an atomic bomb or anything corresponding to it. But the fact remains that his statement is a matter of record. It is published in the hearings of the committee. It will be circulated in the area in which Dr. Conant is to take over in an effort to try to eradicate the bitterness which that policy had engendered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I congratulate him and the House committee on the stand taken by the committee in 1947. I may say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and perhaps some other Senators in addition to the senior Senator from California, were members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and we were also in that part of the world at approximately the same time the distinguished Senator from South Dakota visited there. He was then a Member of the House of Representatives.

I remember very well the hearings which were held in Germany in 1947. We came to practically the same conclusions that were reached by the committee of the House of Representatives. I believe they were proper conclusions. But I should like to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that both of those committees were in Germany in the year 1947. Perhaps we would have had the same foresight in 1944, but I rather doubt if in the midst of the war—and some of us served in that war and had friends and associates killed in it—we would have been quite so temperate in 1944 as we were in 1947.

I believe it would be unfair to have the impression left that Dr. Conant was advocating the sending of these plants to the Soviet Union. Many of us were very critical of the policy that was being followed in 1946 and 1947. But also, in fairness, it should be noted that the Soviet bear had shown its teeth with a good deal more vigor than many Americans had thought it would when we were fighting as allies and associates of the Soviet Union.

I quite agree with the Senator from South Dakota that the administration was a little naive, because as late as 1946 and 1947, after the bear had shown its teeth and after the agreements of Yalta had been violated, it was still following a policy which did not make sense to us.

In all fairness to Dr. Conant, it should be stated that his speech was not made in 1947, with the knowledge we were fortunate enough to have in that year, but it was made 3 years earlier, while we were engaged in a life-and-death struggle both with Germany and Japan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield, to permit a brief addition to the statement which has just been made?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I should merely like to add to what my colleague from California has said that of my own personal knowledge Mr. Conant in the years 1943 and 1944 spent much of his time—many months of it—in working on the atom bomb. At that time not even his own wife knew his address, which was at some general location in either New Mexico or Montana. No one at Harvard University knew where Dr. Conant was at that time. I cite that because the entire endeavor of his brilliant mind, his entire endeavor in the hard work he did, was centered on developing the atom bomb.

Then he returned in October 1944 and made the speech to which reference has been made. At that time he had in his mind the entire background which the Senator from California has so well described.

I wish to add that to what my colleague from California has said regarding the attitude of Dr. Conant's mind on October 7, 1944.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, what I am saying is not intended to be a censure of Dr. Conant for having the point of view he had in 1944. Impressed as he was with and engrossed as he was by the potentialities of the atom bomb, and engrossed as he was in his work, and being the great scientist that he is, it was natural that he should see the potentialities of a German industrial plant when applied to the production of the atomic bomb.

As a matter of fact, I personally recall that when Gen. George Marshall appeared before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, of which I was then a member, when we were discussing appropriations for the Manhattan District project, in the year 1944 and in the spring of 1945, on two different occasions when questions were being raised by some members of the committee as to whether we should give the Army engineers another billion dollars, the argument that General Marshall used was that we were then engaged in a race of time with the Germans, that we knew the Germans were engaged in work on heavy water and in experiments on heavy water; and General Marshall feared at the time that unless we proceeded with the work, it might be possible that the Germans would beat us to development of the atom bomb. Those conversations were had in very secret executive sessions which were held at the time. Of course much of that which transpired then has since appeared in the public press and in the article by former Secretary of War Stimson, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post some months ago, in which he spoke of the skepticism which was raised in the committee about continuation of those appropriations.

I was one of those who supported continuation of the appropriations for the Manhattan engineering project at the time when that matter was being weighed in the balance by the House Appropriations Committee and when some of the members of the committee thought that the fact that a billion dollars had been committed and the fact

that there was little of a definite nature to show for it should be brought to attention on the floor of the House of Representatives.

So I am not surprised that Dr. Conant was impressed by the potentialities of the atomic bomb when joined with the industrial plant of Germany. General Marshall was afraid, at the time, that the Germans might get the atomic bomb before we used it.

So the point of view of Dr. Conant at the time is not being censured by me. Nothing that I say is intended in that way.

I am simply suggesting that the expressions he gave to some of those views and the way he gave them at the time create a tremendous problem and a serious doubt as to how he would be able to perform the responsibilities he would have in going to Germany at this time.

For instance, let us consider questions he raised in his address, as appears at page 31 of the hearings—and this is Dr. Conant speaking:

> Consider the situation in the 1950's—which would be preferable, a Germany industrially strong still occupied by foreign troops ready to act if reconversion to armament manufacture starts, or a weak industrial Germany readjusted to a new life and free from alien soldiers? Which is preferable from the point of view of the eventual reentry of the German people into the family of equal nations? Which is likely to be more successful, a disarmament plan resting on military force which must act rapidly when the alarm is sounded, or a plan based on a low industrial potential?

Dr. Conant was pleading for the latter, namely, "a weak industrial Germany readjusted to a new life and free from alien soldiers."

But today the American policy, the policy of the European Defense Community, calls for a Germany which is industrially strong. That policy is in direct contrast to the implications of the statement Dr. Conant made at that time, when he was considering the situation which would exist in the 1950's and was asking which would be preferable.

Mr. President, we are now in the 1950's. Dr. Conant is now to be sent to Germany, to the industrially strong Germany which he decried in 1944. I suggest that point simply in an endeavor to measure the problem which confronts Dr. Conant if he now goes to Germany. It seems to me it is extremely difficult. I hesitate, Mr. President; I might cite some instances in which other persons at the same time had different points of view as to the economic future of Europe and as to what was necessary for the economic health of Europe.

I could even cite the speeches which some of us made in the middle of 1941, when we thought it would be much better to let Germany and Russia destroy each other, because in 1941 we were not enamored of either nazism or communism. Anyone who wishes to be specific on that point might refer to the speech I made in the House of Representatives on July 3, 1941. In that speech I made that point, and at that time I said that we should address our efforts to getting the war in the west called off and letting nazism and communism engage in mutual destruction.

But I do not stress that, Mr. President, because it does not seem to me that it would be possible, probably, for anyone to have gone through the war period, in World War II, without expressing ideas which would indicate that he wanted the United States to win the war. We were in the war, and we wanted to win it.

However, when a man is nominated to be our Ambassador to Germany under present conditions, to carry out present policies, and when he may be confronted by statements which called for a destruction of the industrial plant of Germany and its redistribution and the setting up of another economic pattern, and when he has spoken about the difficulty of reorienting the German mind, and when now he would be called upon to go to Germany and do the exact opposite of what he prescribed, the situation is a very difficult one.

I might proceed at some length to quote other paragraphs or recommendations in 1947 of the Herter subcommittee, for Germany and Austria; but I think the point I wish to make is clear.

Inasmuch as the statements I made at those times were made on record before the war, during the war, and following the war, and also in 1947—statements regarding what I believed to be necessary for the development of conditions under which Europe would live in peace—and inasmuch as in the report we pointed out that the economic health of Europe centered so strongly about Western Germany and what was necessary there, I find myself in a very difficult position, now that the nomination of Dr. Conant is before the Senate.

I felt that I would be unfair to the recommendations we made and to the commitments and statements I had made in the past unless I pointed out this difficulty and made perfectly clear the basis upon which I shall have to resolve my own doubt when the matter comes to a final decision.

I thank the Senate for its courtesy to me.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I find myself in about the same position as that in which my colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], finds himself, regarding the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Conant to be United States High Commissioner for Western Germany.

I can share entirely my colleague's views in questioning the qualifications of Dr. Conant, in the light of what has occurred concerning the treacherous, insidious Morgenthau plan. The record shows that a few of us had the courage to stand in this Chamber back in the Eightieth Congress, and some of us probably prior to that time, and point out that it would be complete folly to destroy the potentialities of Germany, in view of her strategic situation in Western Europe, and to try to keep her in a submerged, subdued agricultural and industrial status.

I believe that developments have shown how fallacious and how unwise was the viewpoint of those who supported the infamous Morgenthau plan.

I am surprised that at this late hour, with only seven or eight Members of the Senate in the Chamber, we should consider this important nomination.

I realize that the new administration is entitled to a full measure of cooperation, and I have pledged that I would give such cooperation, because I think that on November 4, the people voted for a change. Now the people have a Republican executive department of government and Republican control in the Congress.

But I wonder whether we are justified in proceeding at this time with this nomination. The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is not present. I have a high regard for the distinguished Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is acting majority leader at this time, during the debate; but I should like to call attention to a portion of the hearings appearing on page 109. I have had considerable doubt about Dr. Conant, because I am not one of those who go along blindly and with complete servility merely because the question in issue involves a great American who has rendered a service to his country. Of course all Americans should render service to their country when they are called upon to do so.

Of course, Dr. Conant is a great college president and a noted scientist. Admittedly he has done much in contributing to the development of our atomic program. But I was shocked when I attended briefly the hearings earlier this week, when this nomination was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, and when Dr. Conant was a witness. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from California to the few brief excerpts which I shall read from page 109 of the hearings, because I should like to have their comments.

I read:

> Senator FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield so that I might ask one question?
>
> Mr. Conant, I want to ask a question as to whether or not you had been offered the High Commissionership by President Truman?
>
> Mr. CONANT. Yes; I was offered it by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, who said he was speaking for the President.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. When was that?
>
> Mr. CONANT. It was discussed with me in September, let me see, 18 months ago, that would be a year ago last September—I have got to get my dates. We are in 1953—that would be in September 1951.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. It is apparent from the fact that you did not accept it?
>
> Mr. CONANT. I did not accept it.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. Was there any particular reason——
>
> Mr. CONANT. This was the Ambassadorship, did you say?
>
> Senator FERGUSON. No; I said High Commissioner.
>
> Mr. CONANT. No; then I am wrong. I was not offered the High Commissionership; I was offered the Ambassadorship.
>
> That was 18 months ago.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. Well, 18 months ago we didn't have an Ambassador.
>
> Mr. CONANT. No; they were looking forward to having one.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. I see. Were you offered the High Commissionership?
>
> Mr. CONANT. No; I was not.

Senator FERGUSON. Was the President anticipating that when they got an Ambassadorship there, as to whether or not you would serve as Ambassador?

Mr. CONANT. Correct.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, it was not open at that time.

Mr. CONANT. Well, I refused before events showed that it was.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you give us your reasons for refusal.

Mr. CONANT. Well, it seemed to me that it was going to be, from their point of view, a short time. An election was coming up; the question of who would be President after January 20, 1953, was open. It was understood that this would be until that date, whichever party was in control. Presumably they wanted to change the Ambassador. It was quite impossible for me to leave Harvard under a leave of absence.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; briefly.

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator suggesting, or is it a correct statement of the meaning of the testimony that he is reading, that Dr. Conant was the Truman-Acheson selection for this position?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is not making that charge. He is merely referring to the printed testimony appearing on page 109 of the hearings; and those questions and answers can speak for themselves. It is my own interpretation that the famous Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and his President and Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman, 18 months ago, offered the Ambassadorship to Dr. Conant. That is what I am saying.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; briefly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, the distinguished Senator made a remark which was quite correct, although perhaps I missed a part of it, but having served on the Appropriations Committee myself, I know the Senator does not bow in servility before any administration, Republican or Democratic; and I may say to my colleague from Idaho neither does the senior Senator from California.

There were but six Members on the floor of the United States Senate who voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Dean Acheson, and the present senior Senator from California was one of the six who did so. I am not greatly impressed by the argument that because a man was tendered the position of Ambassador to Germany should that position open up, but did not accept it, should be foreclosed from consideration by the Eisenhower administration. Only today we have confirmed Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who has had a long and distinguished career in this Government, and who has served in varying capacities under the previous administration. I would say to my friend from Idaho, and most respectfully, that if we followed the doctrine that no one who had either been offered a position or who had served his Government in an appointive capacity within the past twenty-odd years should be considered for appointment by this administration, we would, I think, close our eyes to some able and conscientious public officials.

Secretary of State Dulles served as Ambassador, and did, I think, an outstanding job in the organization of the United Nations and in the negotiation of the treaty of peace with Japan. I certainly would not think the fact that he had held an appointment under the previous administration should foreclose consideration of him for employment under the present administration. I think there may be other such men, Republicans or Democrats, who have great capabilities, and each one, of course, would have to be judged on his own merits. So I most respectfully say to the Senator from Idaho, knowing as I do his great interest, his sense of fairness, and the fact that he himself has been very critical of the program of dismantling the industry of Germany—as was the Senator from California—it does not make sense that, by inference at least, the fact that he was offered an appointment by a previous administration should be charged as a responsibility of Dr. Conant's.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from California for that observation, and I wish to say that, having served with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee and in other capacities, I can testify to his courage and to his complete independence in discharging his duties. I may merely comment briefly, Mr. President, on the suggestion that because a person has been rendering service to the Truman administration in some capacity, that should disqualify him for service in the present Eisenhower administration. I certainly would not be so stupid as to make such a contention. But, in partial answer, I should like to refer to one more question and answer, appearing on page 110, in the questioning of Mr. Conant by the Senator from Michigan:

Senator FERGUSON. But did the question of policy that Mr. Acheson might have wanted carried out enter your mind as the reason you declined to accept the offer of Ambassador?

Mr. CONANT. No, I would not think so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; briefly.

Mr. CASE. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is putting his finger on the thing that disturbs me in connection with this nomination. Certainly, Mr. President, many men have rendered very able service to the Government in the Truman administration, and they certainly are not disqualified for further service in Government because of that fact. What disturbs me is the identification of Dr. Conant with the policies expressed in the Potsdam agreement and the fact that I think current policy calls for a disassociation.

I noted a few days ago the President's denunciation of commitments made in secret conferences, and I cannot believe that the background of Dr. Conant was brought to the attention of the President.

Again I say, not with any idea of censuring Dr. Conant for taking the position which he took at that time, that I am pointing out the difficulty he will have in implementing policies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator for that observation.

I do not desire to detain the Senate at this late hour, but I should like to reiterate that the question which is bothering me is that, as High Commissioner, possibly when agreements are signed with Germany at some future time, Dr. Conant will be reflecting the policy and the political thinking on foreign issues of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson, rather than reflecting the thinking of this administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Idaho may not have been in the Chamber at the time I discussed that question with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Dr. Conant made it very clear, because there had been some expressions in the committee that some of his remarks might be subject to misinterpretation, that he has a thorough understanding of the fact that as High Commissioner he will be representing the Government of the United States—not only the President and the State Department, but also the Congress of the United States—in carrying out the policies which the Government now and in the future may determine upon.

So, I think the record is very clear that he will not be carrying out any policies of any past administration.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am satisfied, Mr. President, that that is the interpretation placed upon this entire affair by my distinguished colleague from California, but I am wondering whether the American people have had ample assurances that as High Commissioner, Dr. Conant, a great champion of the New Deal—I care not whether he can dissociate himself from his past record, which speaks for itself—will not be going back to the philosophy of Mr. Acheson.

I commend the Senator from California for having voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson, but I am wondering whether the Senate, in confirming this nomination, is rendering a real service not only to the American people, but to this administration.

Of course, the President should have the right to select prominent Americans whom he considers duly qualified to serve as commissioners and ambassadors. But, likewise, under the Constitution, the Senate has the responsibility to screen such appointments and to confirm a nomination if it is considered desirable.

I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Conant because I believe that in this country today there are not only college presidents and scientists who are qualified to serve in this exalted position, but I think the country needs outstanding, highly patriotic, and highly qualified Americans to serve in such positions.

It is difficult for me to comprehend the justification for such an appointment at a time when efforts are being made to cultivate a better understanding between the nations in Western

Europe and between Germany and the United States. I think a great disservice is being rendered to the American people and to the Republican administration by even proposing such a procedure as this.

I know that the nomination of Dr. Conant will be confirmed. There are only a few Members of the Senate present at this late hour, and the question is not considered important enough for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to be present at this time. Yes, Mr. President, I believe in cooperation, but I also believe in discharging my duties. I may be wrong, but, at least, I shall be true to my convictions in opposing the nomination of Dr. Conant to be High Commissioner and subsequently to be Ambassador to Germany.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not reiterate what I said before the committee with reference to the nomination of Dr. Conant; but I may say to my friend from Idaho, who brings up the testimony on pages 109 and 110, that I happen to know, as a matter of personal knowledge, that there was a great deal of criticism at Harvard University because Dr. Conant had been absent for two or three critical years during the war. He had been working for the Government in various capacities.

I did not know that he had been offered this appointment in September of 1951, but I can assure the Senator that if he had left Harvard University at that time he could not have received a leave of absence because there was too much feeling among members of the governing board of Harvard that the university needed its president on the job at that time. As Dr. Conant said, he could not at that time take a leave of absence. At the present time he can retire and leave Harvard to choose a new president in an orderly way.

I say that, Mr. President, because I am confident that there is not involved the question of the views of the previous administration or the views of the present administration. I assure the Senator from Idaho that, to the best of my knowledge, Dr. Conant, even if he had wanted to do so, could not have obtained leave of absence from Harvard at that time, and he was not in a position to retire.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Massachusetts has not answered my query. It is not a question whether Dr. Conant was able to take a leave of absence from Harvard University prior to his retirement age. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to tell me whether it is true that former President Truman and Secretary Acheson 18 months ago offered to Dr. Conant the ambassadorship to Germany. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would answer the Senator, on the basis of the information contained on page 109 of the hearings, that it is true. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not inconsequential whether Dr. Conant at that time was able to leave the university? The facts are not altered in any way. He was considered fit and qualified in every way by the State Department and by the Truman administration, as far back as 18 months ago, to accept this assignment. In view of that irrefutable fact, it is difficult for me to understand why he should be offered a similar position, at this time, after the American people, on November 4, rendered a verdict that they wanted a change. They did not want Acheson's policies in the foreign field. They want nothing to do with the Truman administration. Is not that a fact?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

I would say to my friend from Idaho that I believe Dr. Conant, whom I have known for a period of 40 years, is one of the ablest men in this Nation today. He has proved himself as a scientist, as a university president, as an administrator, and as an educator. Now he is able to retire from Harvard University. He has no means of his own. He will have to take his retirement pay after he ends his job in Germany. I believe he will be an able diplomat.

Dr. Conant is a controversial figure in some of his writings. As I said the other day before the committee, he would not have been a good president of Harvard University if he had not been a controversial figure. As I see it, a good president of a university is a man who is thinking ahead of the rest of us, who is leading us, who is familiar with the ways and means of education, and who has knowledge which enables him to give us ideas to think about and work upon.

Every president of Harvard University has been a controversial figure; and as a Harvard man myself, I venture to hope they will be controversial in the future.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is there anything in the record or in the accomplishments of Dr. Conant to indicate that he will be an able diplomat?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Idaho, that I was a classmate of Dr. Conant in college. I watched him become a great scientist, one of this country's great scientists in the chemical field, and an international figure in that field.

I happened to be a member of one of the governing boards of Harvard when Dr. Conant was nominated to be its president, and was one of those who had a very small part in looking into his qualifications in order to determine whether he should be made president. I said with all earnestness then, as I am saying now, that a great president of a university must be primarily an educator, and that any university which takes such a man must take a chance on his administrative abilities.

Dr. Conant was an educator. He has become a great administrator and a great leader of thought in this country on social and welfare questions. He has ventured into the international field.

If ever there was a man with background, with demonstrated ability in several fields, it is Dr. Conant—a man whom I know, respect, and admire.

I believe Dr. Conant will make an excellent diplomat. He knows what it means to follow the laws, to follow the Constitution, and to uphold prestige. He knows what is required to qualify one as a good diplomat. I am confident that he will follow the leadership of President Eisenhower and of Secretary of State Dulles to the best of his ability.

I hope the Senator from Idaho and I may have a discussion on this subject a year from now. At that time I believe the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts contend that having been a controversial figure throughout his college career qualifies Dr. Conant in any way to be a successful diplomat?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say it qualifies him because he had to be a thinker. Not only is he a thinker, but he is also willing to express himself in a way that he knows may bring up controversy, in order to carry forward his point, in order to get men like the Senator from Idaho and myself to debate his qualifications. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to propound a question to the able and distinguished Senator from Idaho with respect to his statement that Dr. Conant had been previously offered the Ambassadorship and had not accepted. Would not the fact that he did not accept the Ambassadorship when it was offered him be to his credit?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The reason why he did not accept the appointment was that he was not in a position to take a temporary leave of absence in order to fill the position possibly only until January 20, 1953, when, as he pointed out in the hearings, it was anticipated that there might be a change in administration.

I say that it was not to the credit of Dr. Conant that he declined the invitation to serve as an Ambassador at that time, because the record seems to indicate that he was acting solely from a selfish standpoint, on the basis that the appointment would have been only a temporary one, probably for the space of 1 year or 18 months.

Mr. THYE. I do not see the situation in the same light in which the distinguished Senator from Idaho sees it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately preceding the vote on the confirmation of the nomination, there be printed a biographical sketch of Dr. James Bryant Conant, and also a statement by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the nomination of Dr. James B. Conant to be High Commissioner of Germany.

There being no objection, the sketch and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES BRYANT CONANT

Born: Dorchester, Mass., March 26, 1893.

Family background: S. James Scott and Jennett Orr Bryant.

Education: Bachelor of arts, Harvard, 1913; doctor of philosophy, 1916; doctor of laws, University of Chicago, 1933, Yale, 1934, New York University, 1934, Princeton University, 1934, Amherst, 1935, College of Charleston, 1935, College of William and Mary, 1936, Williams, 1938, Dartmouth, 1938, Tulane, 1939, University of California, 1940, University of Pennsylvania, 1940, Bristol University (England), 1941; doctor of laws, Queens University, 1941, University of North Carolina, 1945, University of Toronto, 1945, LHD, Boston University, 1934, Tufts College, 1934; doctor of science, Columbia University, 1934; Stevens Institution, 1934; University of Wisconsin, 1935; Cambridge University (England), 1941; doctor of science, McGill University, 1945; DCL, Oxford University (England), 1936; doctor of laws, Baylor University 1947; University of Illinois, 1947, University of State of New York, 1947. Doctor of literary, Hamilton College, 1947; doctor of science, University of London, 1946, University of Lyons (France), 1947; FEIS, Educational Institute of Scotland, 1947.

Marital status: Married Grace Thayer Richards, April 17, 1941. Children: James Richards, Theodore Richards.

Experience: Instructor in chemistry, Harvard, 1916–17; assistant professor, 1919–25; associate professor, 1925–27; professor, 1927–29; Sheldon Emery professor of organic chemistry, 1929–31; chairman, department of chemistry, 1931–33; elected president Harvard University June 21, 1933; visiting lecturer summer school, University of California, 1924; research associate, California Institute of Technology, 1927; chairman, National Defense Research Committee, 1941–46; member, Educational Policies Committee, 1941–46; member, board of scientific directors, Rockefeller Institution since 1930; member, General Advisory Committee, AEC, since 1947; Sachs lecturer, Teachers College, 1945; Terry lecturer, Yale, 1946.

Awards: Honorary fellow Emanuel College, Cambridge; Commander Legion of Honor (France); Commander Civil Division Order of British Empire.

Military service: Served as lieutenant, Sanitary Corps, United States Army, 1917; Major Chemical Warfare Service, 1918.

Societies: Member American Chemical Society; American Academy of Arts and Sciences; American Philosophical Society; National Academy of Sciences; Massachusetts Historical Society; Royal Society (England); Royal Society of Edinburgh; Chemical Society (England); honorary member, Phi Beta Kappa; Sigma XI; Alpha Chi Sigma.

Clubs: Tavern, Harvard, Algonquin (Boston); Century, Chemists, University of Harvard (New York); Cosmos (Washington); Athenaeum (London).

Author: Organic chemistry, 1928; the Chemistry of Organic Compounds, 1933 (revised edition, 1939); Our Fighting Faith, 1942; On Understanding Science, 1947; Practical Chemistry (with N. H. Black), 1920; Education in a Divided World, 1948. Editor volumes II and IX, Organic Syntheses.

Home: 17 Quincy Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Office: Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Mass.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The nomination of Dr. James B. Conant to be United States High Commissioner for Germany comes to the Senate with the carefully considered, unanimous approval of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I am sure that all Members of the Senate are familiar with Dr. Conant's world-wide reputation as a scientist and as an educator. A native of Massachusetts, he attended Harvard University and received his Ph. D. degree in 1916 at the age of 23. He was a major in the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army in World War I and returned to teach chemistry at Harvard where he became chairman of the chemistry department in 1931. Two years later he was chosen as the twenty-third president of Harvard University and he served with distinction in that important position until his retirement 2 weeks ago. He knows Germany—the people and the language.

Dr. Conant was one of the first men to see the possibilities of making an atomic bomb, and it was he and Dr. Vannevar Bush who persuaded President Roosevelt to undertake the Manhattan District project. He has continued his close association with atomic developments. But his contribution to national defense has by no means been limited to atomic energy. He was a member of the small group of scientists who invented the amphibious vehicle known as the "duck" which was so widely used in invasion landings all over the world.

As president of Harvard, as one of our leading scientists, and as a citizen with an extraordinarily wide range of interests, Dr. Conant has written and spoken extensively in a frank, direct, and provocative manner on many highly controversial subjects. Inevitably, he has himself become a controversial figure.

It was perfectly natural, therefore, that some objection should be raised to his nomination to an extremely critical diplomatic post. The Foreign Relations Committee heard every citizen who asked to be heard on the matter. There were only three of them. Two opposed confirmation and one favored it. In addition, the committee heard Dr. Conant.

I think it is significant that out of all of Dr. Conant's voluminous writings and other activities only four main points were raised in opposition to his nomination. The committee considered these points carefully. We questioned Dr. Conant about them, and we read the documents involved. We unanimously concluded that the issues raised were not sufficient to bar his confirmation.

I think it is also significant that Mr. John T. Flynn, who furnished the bulk of the testimony opposing Dr. Conant, made this statement to the committee:

"I certainly will offer no objection to Mr Conant's appointment on the score of his eminence as a scientist, an educator, or a citizen whose loyalty and capacity in his field is unchallenged, and who is making a sacrifice to undertake a very difficult and embarrassing role. I do not wish to cast the faintest shadow upon his high sense of citizenship."

But Mr. Flynn and others do object to Dr. Conant's appointment on other grounds.

First, it was charged that Dr. Conant during the war had supported the Morgenthau plan to reduce Germany to an agricultural and pastoral state. This charge was based on a speech which Dr. Conant made on October 7, 1944, before the Foreign Policy Association. That speech is included in the hearings. When read in full, it does not sustain the interpretation that it is an argument for the Morgenthau plan. Further, we have Dr. Conant's statement to the committee that the speech was written before he ever heard of the Morgenthau plan and that subsequently he remained silent on the subject of postwar control of Germany for fear that his views would be mistaken as endorsement of the Morgenthau plan.

It is quite apparent to anyone who reads Dr. Conant's Foreign Policy Association speech that his views were in no way marked by the vindictiveness which characterized the Morgenthau plan, and they were much less extreme. Where the Morgenthau plan contemplated a tremendous reduction of German industry, Dr. Conant spoke merely of a redistribution of German industry and of the establishment of an international inspection system. His views on these points were conditioned by his foreknowledge of the atomic bomb which, of course, he could not explain at the time he was speaking in 1944.

The second point raised against Dr. Conant was that his social, economic, and political views are too radical to be representative of prevailing American opinion. This charge was based on a magazine article entitled "Wanted: American Radicals," which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly for May 1943. Again, when the article is read in full, it seems effectively to dispel any doubts about Dr. Conant's fitness for a high Government post. It is also in the hearings, where Senators can read it if they wish. The article describes the views of a hypothetical American radical and specifically states that those views are not necessarily Dr. Conant's own.

Among other things, the article declared that this hypothetical radical would advocate the confiscation of all property once in every generation. In answer to a specific question from me, Dr. Conant categorically assured the committee that he himself did not so believe.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a speech which Dr. Conant made before the Chamber of Commerce in 1947 and which states his own political philosophy. In this speech, he said that "equality of opportunity" is one of the "unique ideals which are the hallmarks of American democracy" and that "equality of opportunity could only be a reality in a political democracy; it would have meaning only in a competitive society in which private ownership and the profit motive were accepted as basic principles."

The third objection raised to Dr. Conant's nomination was that he was too tolerant, or naive, concerning communism and Communists. This objection was based primarily on the fact that certain individuals have been allowed to remain on the Harvard faculty. It was based also on Dr. Conant's final report as president of Harvard, in which he said that there were no open or disguised Communists at Harvard and that "even if there were, the damage that would be done to the spirit of their academic community by an investigation of the university aimed at finding a crypto-Communist would be far greater than any conceivable harm such a person might do."

It was obviously impossible for the committee to investigate the Harvard faculty; nor was the committee called upon to do so. It is the nomination of Dr. Conant which is before us, not the nomination of any of his faculty members.

The committee did, however, question Dr. Conant closely on the Communist issue. Dr. Conant pointed out the distinction between a university and a Government agency, and he has certainly had ample experience in both, including the most sensitive agencies in Government. He stated that he would not tolerate employees in his organization in Germany if there was any doubt about either their loyalty, their security, or their fitness. He made the flat statement:

"I would say, when in doubt in a Government agency, do not employ him or get rid of him."

Finally it was asserted that Dr. Conant's views on education rendered him unfit for the post of High Commissioner. The main supporting evidence cited to the committee was in a speech Dr. Conant made last year in Boston before the American Association of School Administrators. It has been widely reported that Dr. Conant in this speech declared that private schools are divisive. The speech is in the hearings, and Senators who read it will find that the word "divisive" is not used at all. Dr. Conant confessed to the committee that he was not even sure how to pronounce the word, and I sympathize with him, because I have some doubts about that, also.

A careful reading of the speech and of other pronouncements on the subject by Dr. Conant shows that he is not against private schools; he is for public schools. The speech specifically states that Dr. Conant does not question the right of any group to organize its own private schools. But he does oppose the use of tax money to help support private schools.

Whatever we may think of this position from an educational point of view, there is no question but that it is based squarely on decisions of the United States Supreme Court and is unassailable from a legal point of view. I do not think the Senate should reject a man for upholding Supreme Court decisions.

But, in any event, we are not considering Dr. Conant for the position of Commissioner of Education. We are considering him for the position of High Commissioner for Germany.

The most serious objections to Dr. Conant lie in the fact that, because of his earlier views on postwar control of Germany, and because of his views on education, he would not be acceptable to the German people. On this point, there is abundant evidence that his appointment has been enthusiastically received by the German Government and the German people. Chancellor Adenauer has publicly welcomed the appointment, and the non-Communist German press has also hailed it as an excellent choice. Dr. Conant himself realizes that his views on education in the United States would not be applicable to education in Germany.

The Committee concluded that there were no reasons why Dr. Conant should not be confirmed. On the contrary, there are a number of positive reasons why he should be. He is one of the most distinguished men in America, as a scientist, as a thinker, and as an administrator. His appointment is in line with President Eisenhower's campaign pledge to recruit the ablest men in the country. It is a compliment to the German people, and I am sure that fact will not be lost on them.

Dr. Conant has demonstrated a capacity to grow, to undertake new assignments, and to do them superbly well. That is true of his scientific achievements; it is true of his administration as president of Harvard; and I am sure it will be true of his service in Germany.

The Committee on Foreign Relations had all the evidence before it. The committee heard testimony for 2 days and conscientiously studied the documents involved. At the end of that time, the committee voted 15 to 0 to recommend Dr. Conant's nomination to the Senate. Who are the 15 Senators who without a dissenting vote have concluded that Dr. Conant is well qualified for this important post?

There is the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a distinguished educator in his own right. There is the able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who has been associated with Dr. Conant's work in atomic matters. There is the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the majority leader; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is so interested in German affairs; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the chairman of the majority policy committee.

On the other side of the aisle, there is the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has served on the Foreign Relations Committee longer than any other member; the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who has had wide experience in Germany; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], another distinguished educator and student of European affairs; the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]; the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Leaving myself out of the picture, I submit that the combined judgment of these men should carry weight with the Senate. Everybody makes mistakes, Mr. President, but these 15 men do not all make the same mistake at the same time.

It is important that Dr. Conant's nomination be confirmed as promptly as due deliberation allows. I do not have to emphasize to the Senate the critical situation in West Germany. The Secretary of State himself found it necessary to go there only yesterday. We need to have a High Commissioner on the spot, and we dare not leave the post vacant longer than is absolutely necessary.

I hope the Senate will adopt the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James B. Conant to be High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Conant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 10, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

H. Lee White, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy:

William A. Alfano	John M. Green
James P. Anderson	John D. Gustafson
Walter D. Atchison	Owen P. Hackett
Clifford W. Bascom	Richard H. Haffner
Gerald L. Boyd	Donald G. Hallahan
John A. Boyd, Jr.	Donald P. Hamm
William E. Brewer	Lyle G. Hangartner
Carroll Brown	Kenneth A. Harris
Charles A. Buell	Alfred C. Herzog
Harold L. Burstyn	Edward W. Hille
Robert H. Caldwell	John C. Hines
Gordon N. Carpenter	William F. Homer
Robert L. Cave, Jr.	James I. Johnston
Bruce H. Collins	Sidney F. Johnston, Jr.
Joseph P. Corcoran	Alfred L. Jones, Jr.
Frederick K. Cross	Everett J. Jones, Jr.
Michael B. Crouch	Robert J. Kelley
Wilfred L. David	Robert C. Kelsoe
Cameron V. Dostie	James K. Lackore
John F. Drain	Robert E. Lay, Jr.
William G. Drury	Robert H. Loreaux, Jr.
Franklin F. Eckhart	James W. Lyle
David O. Edwards	Harry E. Lynam
Newell LaM. Erickson, Jr.	James E. McConnelee
	John T. McQuesten, Jr.
Raymond T. Fleming, Jr.	Leonard Martin, Jr.
George B. Fraser	William V. Matthews
Owen K. Garriott	Wayne P. Melchiori
Peter P. Gillis	Richard F. Middendorf
Earl H. Godfrey	
Townsend R. Morey, Jr.	David R. Snow
	Charles W. Stephens
Howard S. Morton	William L. Stiff
Joseph A. Murphy	Robert J. Stinner
Thomas W. Oliver, Jr.	Robert Techo
David W. Owen	Robert L. Thomas
Frank J. Pauly	Sverre O. Tinglum
James G. Perkins, Jr.	John H. Tinley
Richard L. Perkins	Leonard M. Voynow
Michael H. Porosky	Edmund M. Waller, Jr.
William H. Porter	
Robert N. Remund	James D. Warren
Robert R. Reynolds	Edward W. V. Webster
John F. Schmidheini	Franklin K. Wheelock
Eugene R. Schutt	Donald C. White
Jack W. Scott	Clyde A. Williams
Donald J. Smith	Curtis B. Winn
William L. Smith	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Roscoe H. Canon, Jr.
Robert S. Divine

John A. Walsh (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

James P. Ahearn	Carl G. Eaton
James E. Alexander	Robert D. Evans
Curtis E. Caudill	William J. Hallam
William S. Chambless	Francis W. Haskins
Leon Hecht, Jr.	Richard E. Johnson, Jr.
Christen B. Henricksen	John C. Mason
Raymond R. Hower	Donald L. Meloche
Richard Jennings	Richard E. Patterson
Clayton L. Comfort	Russell C. Pearson, Jr.
Joe D. Deadwyler	John D. Stewart
Richard G. Deem	George W. Swift
Charles E. Dorffeld	Frank K. West, Jr.
Beryle C. Duca	

Louis W. Rodrigue, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Edwin S. Epstein, III (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Robert W. Berray (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confimed, to correct name.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Gerald H. Barkalow	Paul G. Merchant
William B. Bickel	Lawrence T. O'Toole
Thomas L. Bowers III	Forrest C. Ozburn, Jr.
William J. Burke	Jerry C. Patterson
Charles LeR. Bush	Clay S. Sayers
Terry F. Carraway	LeRoy E. Souders
Hamilton A. Chandler	Thomas P. Stewart
Carleton R. Cooper	Charles I. Stratmann
Eugene R. Coulson	Alexander S. Stromski
James L. Ellis	Lonnie D. Tennison, Jr.
Edward J. Fagan	
Roy E. Grozier	Tommie N. Weathers
Darl W. Jewell	William H. Wells
Harold E. McCumber	Richard A. Wigent
Edwin D. McKellar, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

William C. Robinson

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Harold K. Alsobrook	Joseph T. Horgan
Harry H. Dinsmore	John J. McGreevy
John H. Ebersole	Earl H. Ninow
John F. Egan	Charles J. Savarese, Jr.
Robert R. Foster	
James D. Gardam	Martin G. Webb, Jr.
Robert S. Graham	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy:

Harold D. Bodle	Robert W. Odell
Kenneth W. Carlson	Preston C. Oliver
Calvin D. Garrett	Robert E. Osman
Mearle H. Jay	Herbert L. Reid
Willis E. Joiner	George C. Swanson
Robert W. Kiefer	Robert L. Trett
Donald L. Kirkbride	William H. Vinson
Jay V. Nickelson	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Joseph P. McGonnell, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS

James J. Brown, Jr.	Robert C. Millsop
Norman E. Mann	Winthrop P. Smith

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert W. Bagby	George H. Green
Robert McL. Bailey	Edwin J. Hodder
Bernard Chap	Ralph C. Johnson, Jr.
Donald W. Dike	John B. McVeigh
Kenneth E. Follmar	Robert R. Perkins

Patricia DeBerry (civilian college graduate) woman, to be ensign in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy:

Edward A. Ambrose	William H. Kolb
Floyd H. Anderson, Jr.	Robert L. Koon
Paul P. Bennett, Jr.	Russell D. Leonard
Edward H. Blackmon	Clifford "B" Longest
Staley W. Brown	Raymond J. Mac-Cracken
Billy "B" Bryant	
Emanuel N. Buckley	Wilbur B. McDuffie.
Howard B. Campbell	Allen E. McMichael
James R. Cole	Alonzo L. Mangham, Jr.
Jerdon J. Dean	
William R. Dolan	Carl R. May
Gordon E. Elliott	Buther L. Newman, Jr.
Milford D. Elmore	Harry A. Oakes
Richard M. Garver	Joseph M. O'Neill
Robert L. Gill	Stanley C. Peake
Hubert M. Goding	Richard N. Rossan
John W. Guinn	Denson L. Smith
Richard R. Gutekunst	Edgar T. Steward
Douglas E. Haggin	Donald E. Tapscott
Andrew J. Havice	Dominic A. Verme
Ernest J. Irvin	Lee P. Vise
Earmon R. Jones, Jr.	John E. Wells
Charles J. Jordan	Leland E. White
Paul N. Jula	James R. Wilson
Jean P. Kirsch	John W. Wolf
Jerry B. Knight	Johnny W. Young

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

Anne C. Beck	Zuleime L. Martin
Rachel Z. Benard	Florence M. Meyer
Robina W. Beveridge	Lucille M. Michaud
Billie J. Gallineau	Filomena E. Ortenzi
Ellen G. Graves	Agnes E. Rinas
Stephanie D. Gurgul	Floy I. Smalling
Reba B. Jordan	Ruth M. Wiles
Myrtle P. Liu	

Tolbert F. Hobson, Jr. (civilian college graduate), for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line (Aviation) in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Eugene H. Bouslog	James F. Murphy
James V. Clampet	Eugene R. Murray
Henry C. Dinger, Jr.	Jacob L. Pawer, Jr.
Robert L. Field	Earl L. Reardon
Chester J. Hardenburg, Jr.	George E. Russell
	Kenneth M. Sandon
Edgar W. Harlan	Harold C. Schwan
John G. Herndon	Charles A. Smith
Ronald H. Jermstad	Stewart E. Tangeman
Robert C. Kaiser	Robert F. Valentine
William H. Kernan	William F. Wade
James W. Kissick, Jr.	John W. Wood
James E. Liles	Charles M. Woodworth
Walter G. Markham	

ENSIGNS

James R. Edixon	William A. Wehner
Sylvester C. Messina	Harry W. Wright
Raymond A. Pettigrew	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert W. Bennett	Norman L. Kaufman
Michael Bisceglia, Jr.	Daniel A. Lewis
Charles O. Brown	Charles H. Lowry, Jr.
Orval W. Buell	William B. Shields
Roger T. Burson	William A. Skinner
Edward J. Casey, Jr.	Robert E. Taylor
George H. Davis	Dale D. Tool
Richard G. Delozier	Robert E. Vaughn
William J. Dixon	Myles P. Vayo
Alvin H. Grobmeier	James E. Ward
Stanley Hecker	Roy E. Williams
James E. Henry	

ENSIGNS

James E. Bowen	Emile E. Nordan
James E. Breedlove, Jr.	Carroll S. Page, Jr.
George A. Church	Archie E. Prelogar
Robert F. Clemens	Robert R. Reyner
John C. Clore	John J. Schlank, Jr.
Robert A. Hackett	Carl F. Solterer
Carl O. Hausler	Gregory W. Stanley
Alfred C. Leis	Leon L. Stine, Jr.
Glenn S. Lockhart	John W. Ward
William G. McLaine	Donald B. Wikeen

The following-named women officers to be ensigns in the line of the Navy:

Mary M. Barnett	Doris E. Summers
Nancy L. Beecher	Bobbie J. Thompson
Jean O. Casanova	Myra Wallace
Hillewy H. Nordin	Ann E. Webster
Camille O'Connell	Eleanor A. Whitgrove

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles D. Bridges III	Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Homer Fults	Monroe B. Sorge
Donald R. Haines	Leslie W. Williams

ENSIGNS

Douglas E. Cope	Charles W. Rixey
Robert B. Graham	John A. Wasson
Billy M. James	

Marianne E. Tomljanovich, woman officer, to be ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy.

Howard F. Noble, Jr., officer, to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy:

James A. Martin
John W. Rasmussen
Nicholas F. Truog

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve to the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b), or title 34, United States Code, section 634, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Vincent A. Albers, Jr.	Vincente T. Blas
William J. Alford	James H. Bolton
Albert D. Allen, Jr.	Rudolph W. Bolves
Terence M. Allen	Frank R. Booth, Jr.
Andrew J. Anderson, Jr.	Richard L. Brenchley
	Leslie R. Brimmer
Francis Andriliunas	Thomas S. Brown
Charles Armstrong, Jr.	John G. Buckman
	Talman C. Budd II
Marion G. Austin	Michael Burin
Charles A. Bacarisse	Charles W. Burke
Richard C. Barrett	Francis M. Burleigh, Jr.
Olav Barth	
Frederick M. Bates	Richard R. Burritt
Charles M. Bengele, Jr.	Theodore W. Buschman
Bruce Berckmans, Jr.	Bobby K. Chaffins
Bruce E. Biel	Donald R. Chapell
Norman W. Birkenmeier	Frank R. Chase, Jr.
	Charles C. Chisholm, Jr.
Russell P. Bishop	
Charles T. Blaine	Stephen M. Clark
James C. Click	Thomas O. Klett
Donald K. Cliff	James C. Klinedinst
John E. Coble	William H. Knobel
Joseph E. Coleman, Jr.	John J. Krasovich
	Donald F. Lambert
Francis X. Colleton	Roger R. Larson
Gorton C. Cook	George P. Lawler
Joseph H. Copeland	Robert E. Lee
John W. Cottom	William G. Lenoir, Jr.
Eugene E. Crews	James W. Lohmeyer
Robert J. Crinnion	Harold S. Lonergan
Richard L. Critz	Thomas A. Looney, Jr.
Robert C. Crosson, Jr	David C. MacMichael
Francis M. Cryan, Jr.	William T. Macy
Chester J. Daigle	George F. Maddox
Richard F. Dalton	William J. Madigan
James L. Day	Joseph A. Mahaney
Francis D. DeGeorge, Jr.	Irvin B. Maizlish
	John C. Mandery
Robert H. Dent	Frank P. Marcus
Donald L. Diamond	Thomas E. Mattimoe
Frank DiCillo, Jr.	Donn W. Maurer
Robert E. Dickson	William H. May
Dean J. Dion	Joseph J. McCaffrey
Robert F. Dion	Paul W. McGillicuddy
Newell T. Donahoo	Robert W. McInnis
Thomas E. Donnelly	Philip G. McIntyre
Bernard E. Driscoll	Roland O. McKee
Jim T. Elkins	Hubert P. McLoughlin
Clarence N. Ellis	Harold J. McMullen
Frank B. Ellis	Dean E. Mears
John T. Enoch	Thomas L. Miller
Gerald A. Etman	Corbin B. D. Mitchell
John E. Fahey	Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Norman C. Farrington, Jr.	Hodgen P. Montague, Jr.
William E. Farris	Robert J. Mooney
Judson W. Faw	Guifford W. Moore
Thomas J. Felker	Elliott T. Morris
Walter K. Fialkowski	Ralph F. Moser
Robert H. Fields	Joseph E. Motherway
Edwin A. Flinn, Jr.	Richard A. Mueller
Bernard G. Fleisch	Arthur L. Mullen, Jr.
Charles T. Ford	John A. Murphy, Jr.
Robert J. Fortin	Robert P. Murphy
Alexander G. Fotiades	Richard V. Myers
Norman D. Fournier	Neil A. Nelson
James E. Fowler	Clinton C. Norment
John P. Freeman	James T. Norwood
Richard A. Froncek	Bernard F. Oakes, Jr.
Malcolm C. Gaffen	Terrence P. O'Brien
John O. Gallagher	Thomas S. Oden
Emile E. Gautier, Jr.	Victor D. Odermat
Vincent J. Gentile	James H. Olds
James R. Gibson	Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
Paul R. Giordani	Herbert P. Olney
Raymond D. Godfrey, Jr.	Herbert F. Olsen
	Robert M. Otteraaen
John J. Grauer	Bruce M. Parsons
Alfred M. Gray, Jr.	Frank H. Peirson
James C. Gray III	Phillip L. Pelletier
MacDonald Greer	Louis M. Pelosi
Richard W. Griggs	Hollis W. Plimpton, Jr.
Bernard V. Gustitis	
Robert G. Haggard	Gerald H. Polakoff
Albert E. Hawkins	Joseph V. Price
Donald H. Helgeson	Louis G. Proctor
Joseph E. Hannegan	Robert D. Purcell
Clayton G. Herbert, Jr.	Francis X. Quinn
Charles I. Heverly, Jr.	James W. Quinn
Billy J. Hill	John C. Ranney
James L. Hoffman	John B. Reddington
Charles W. Hoffner	Edmund J. Reagan, Jr.
John S. Hollingshead	Nathaniel N. Reich
Darrell L. Howarth	John A. Richardson
Sidney A. Huguenin, Jr.	William E. Riley, Jr.
	Karl E. Ringer
Kenneth D. Hyslop	Robert F. Ritchie III
James F. Irish	Stanley G. Roberts, Jr.
Rhonald D. Iverson	William C. Roberts, Jr.
George A. Johnson	
Lee R. Johnson	Carlo Romano
Oliver K. Johnson, Jr.	Earl N. Roper
Joseph S. Jordahl	William M. Ross
Daniel B. Jordan	Harry M. Runkle
Bernard A. Kaasman	Joseph B. Ruth, Jr.
Raymond H. Kansier	John M. Schaeffer
William H. Keith	John H. Schaefer
John E. Kelleher, Jr.	Robert Schell
Thomas E. Kelly, Jr.	Miles J. Schlichte
Robert N. Kennedy	Walter J. Schoen, Jr.
Kenneth K. Kisselle, Jr.	Charles J. Schroering
	John J. Schwartz

Lawrence R. Seamon	Frank D. Topley
John M. Searcy	Edward J. Townsend
Robert M. Searles	John J. Twomey, Jr.
Raymond C. Sheehan, Jr.	Richard H. Vaught
	Ray B. Wade
John F. Shaw, Jr.	Phillip C. Walker
Perry J. Shertz	Norman D. Walls
Edward H. Silber	Guy W. Ward
John E. Simmons	Joseph K. Welland
Benjamin B. Skinner	Frederick R. Weinert
Robert K. Slack	Robert E. Werckel
Daniel L. Slavens	Hugh S. West
Teddy C. Smith	Cyrus N. White, Jr.
Bradley S. Snell	Daniel Wills
Kenneth M. Sorrells	George M. Wilson
Morgan L. Spence	John A. Wilson
Leonard D. Stewart	Charles R. Winfield
Maco Stewart	John G. Word
Broman C. Stinemetz	Herbert L. Wright
Collis P. Suderman, Jr.	Austin N. Wyrick
	John T. Yant
Harry E. Summers	Donald P. Young
Gordon A. Sweitzer	George P. Yourishin
David C. Theophilus	John S. Yurasits
Joseph P. Till	Bernard Zimberg
John R. Tobin	Robert E. Zubeck

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Grace M. Belcuore	Jeanne M. Piaja
Joanne A. Bookwalter	Ruth F. Reinhols
Gussie R. Calhoun	Ulla W. Revsbeck
Patricia Cowan	Anne S. Ritter
Helen M. Dunkelberg	Louise M. Snyder
Nancy S. Flint	Faye V. Stewart
Catherine M. Gregory	Mary E. Wicking
Billie R. Lowe	Nancy M. Williams
Ruth J. O'Holleran	Mildred J. Wright

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Florence E. Alwyn	Mary A. Hester
Beatrice B. de Paul	Dee LaV. Lawson
Dorothy R. Dreyer	Julia E. Silver
Mildred L. Gockel	

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Lillian E. Baines

ENSIGNS

Barbara A. Preston
Helen G. Ritchey

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty:

Herbert F. Buss	Cletus P. McGrath
Merico L. Catallo	Lewis D. Minor
Louis J. Cignotti	Dorris A. Reddick, Jr.
Ernest L. DeFazio	Eddie F. Reynolds
William E. Douglass	Allen D. Sandy
William W. Draper	Harold L. Sawyer
John W. Dugan	Joseph W. Scott, Jr.
Lee H. Hardee	Harold Sobol
Harley S. Hardin	Clifford M. Stark
John A. Hedin	James E. Stone
Gerald G. Herndon	James A. Weatherspoon
Charles I. Herriotts	
Henry R. Marshall III	Walter J. Zience
Jeter R. Mathews, Jr.	

Samuel F. Leader, officer of the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, in lieu of captain, for limited duty, in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 6, 1953:

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY AND CHIEF OF MISSION

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be United States High Commissioner for Germany and Chief of Mission, class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter B. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Frank C. Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Charles S. Thomas, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

To be members of the Board of Directors

True D. Morse, of Missouri.
J. Earl Coke, of California.
John H. Davis, of Virginia.
Romeo E. Short, of Arkansas.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Vernon D. Northrop, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Joel D. Wolfsohn, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. Davis B. Carter, of Beaumont, Tex., candidate for holy orders in the Episcopal Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast created man in Thine own image; grant us grace fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and, that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations, to the glory of Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 3, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 243. An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State (for Administration).

The message also announced that the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, of Georgia; Mr. FERGUSON, of Michigan; and Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia, members of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy. Mr. SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, is an ex officio member of the Board.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WATKINS, of Utah; Mr. LANGER, of North Dakota; Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois; Mr. MCCARRAN, of Nevada; and Mr. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, as members on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BUSH, of Connecticut, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy; also Mr. IVES, of New York, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 6, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Capitol.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in order to accept membership on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 132) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBAT PAY ACT OF 1952

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WHICH COMES FIRST?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the old gag, "Which comes first, the chicken or the egg?" The modern version now circulating on Capitol Hill is: "Which comes first, tax reduction or expenditure reduction?" The fact is they must come together, and they must come this year. The budget must be balanced, taxes must be cut, and expenditures must be reduced by $10,000,000,000 if our campaign promises are to be kept—and it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, a $10,000,000,000 reduction in the budget was promised. If made, the budget can be balanced and both the excess profits tax and the 11 percent increase in individual income taxes can be dropped June 30. If the $10,000,000,000 cut in expenditures is not made then we cannot have a balanced budget and at the same time make these two tax cuts on June 30. The question before this House, therefore, is, "How best can the job be done?" Personally I believe it is easier to cut expenditures if we cut taxes. "We cut our cloth to fit our pocketbook." Less cash in the pocketbook means less cloth unless we go into debt.

Mr. Speaker, what this House needs, as I see it, is more backbone and less bickering. Let us do the job the people expect—the job we promised to do.

MEDICAL CARE OF DEPENDENTS OF PERSONNEL OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide more equitably for the medical care of dependents of personnel of the Coast Guard under certain circumstances.

The purpose of the bill is to make dependents of Coast Guard personnel eligible for treatment in hospitals and medical facilities operated by an armed force at places where the Public Health Service does not operate a hospital. Admission and treatment of dependents of Coast Guard personnel in an armed force hospital would be subject to the same conditions and limitations as apply to dependents of naval personnel. If enacted it would remove an inequality in the medical service available to dependents of Coast Guard personnel when the Coast Guard is operating in the Treasury Department.

Dependents of Coast Guard personnel are eligible to receive hospitalization and other medical services at hospitals and dispensaries of the Public Health Service under section 326 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944 (60 Stat. 421; 42 U. S. C. 252 (b)) which provides that—

> Subject to regulations of the President, the dependent members of families (as defined in such regulations) of persons specified in subsection (a), other than temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, shall be furnished medical advice and out-patient treatment by the service at its hospitals and relief stations, and they shall also be furnished hospitalization at hospitals of the Service, if suitable accommodations are available, at a per diem cost to the officer, enlisted person, or member of a crew concerned. Such cost shall be at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time by the President for the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel at any naval hospital, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 80).

At many places where personnel of the Coast Guard are stationed the Public Health Service does operate medical facilities. However, at others, for example, Honolulu, T. H.; Long Beach, Calif.; San Juan, P. R.; and Argentia, Newfoundland, the Public Health Service does not operate a hospital. Dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed at such places must travel at their own expense to a distant place to obtain Government medical services. For example, for those at Long Beach and Honolulu the nearest available Public Health Service hospital is at San Francisco, Calif. Government medical services are for all practical purposes not available to dependents so situated.

Hospitals and medical facilities operated by an armed force are in some instances located at places where Coast Guard personnel are stationed but where there is not a hospital operated by the Public Health Service, for example, at Honolulu, T. H., and Long Beach, Calif. Although dependents of personnel of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are eligible for treatment in such facilities, dependents of Coast Guard personnel are not eligible except when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Navy. The bill would make dependents of Coast Guard personnel eligible for treatment in these facilities during periods when the Coast Guard is operating in the Treasury Department.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 7, marks the eighth anniversary of the so-called Yalta agreement. Two years ago I denounced this infamous approach to a peace settlement of World War II and called for its repudiation.

Earlier this week, this Congress most enthusiastically received President Eisenhower's realistic position with respect to the secret understandings of the past which, by their expedient or inexpedient provisions, have cost the United States untold billions for defense, occupation costs, and foreign economic support, and have led the free world to the brink of another global war.

I have this day introduced a resolution, employing the clear and simple language of the President's message, calling for the repudiation, by the Congress of the United States, of these commitments and secret understandings which have never been ratified by the American people.

Such resolution on our part will be a positive step in a positive foreign policy which this Nation must pursue if it is to lead the way from darkness into the light.

While it is true that the passage of this resolution will not immediately chase the Communists out of Port Arthur, or remove the iron curtain in Europe, nevertheless it will have tremendous propaganda value throughout the world. The cloak of legality, which the Soviet Government has used whenever it suited its purpose, will have been removed.

The passage of this resolution is a necessary step in the new foreign policy.

USE OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to broaden the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for the use of national-forest lands. The bill is designed to simplify and streamline some of the housekeeping problems of the Forest Service. I do not know of any controversy in connection with this legislation. However, I believe that a brief description is appropriate.

Pursuant to the acts of June 4, 1897—Sixteen United States Code, 551—and March 4, 1915—Sixteen United States Code, page 497—the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service has issued special use permits for 80 different types of uses ranging from summer-home residences and resorts to pipelines, sawmills, and cemeteries.

There are 50,800 permits in effect of which 29,200 are charge permits which produced a revenue of $666,197 in fiscal year 1952. The remaining 21,600 free permits are for uses of a noncommercial nature to public or semipublic organizations, other Government agencies, or are in connection with an authorized use of the national forests such as the grazing of livestock.

The act of June 4, 1897, authorizes the issuance of revocable permits only. The act of March 4, 1915, grants authority to issue term permits for summer homes, hotels, stores, or other structures needed for recreation or public convenience not exceeding 5 acres or of more than 30 years' duration.

The proposed bill would continue the authority contained in the act of March 4, 1915, but broaden the acreage limitation from 5 to 80 acres and add to the types of facilities which could be authorized. In addition to recreation it would authorize the issuance of term permits for facilities necessary in connection with public convenience or safety; facilities and improvements for industrial or commercial purposes when related to or consistent with other uses of the national forests; and permits to States, counties, municipalities, or public or nonprofit groups for buildings and facilities necessary for education of public activities.

An example of the need for broader authority involves the 603 permits for resort enterprises on the national forests. The area occupied by resort operations varies from 1 to over 80 acres, but because of the 5-acre limitation it is necessary, if the permittee requires a term permit, to issue two permits—one a term permit and the other a revocable permit

for those using over 5 acres. This not only increases the costs of administration for the Government but frequently discourages or hampers the investment of private capital in providing resort or other facilities needed by the public. Most loaning institutions will not lend money on the basis of permits which are of a revocable nature.

Under existing law only revocable permits can be issued for industrial facilities such as sawmills, mining, lumber, and construction camps on national forest lands. Although traditionally these permits are seldom revoked, permittees investing large sums of money on Government lands should have greater assurance of tenure. There are some 276 sawmill, and 347 construction and industrial camp permits in effect.

A large number of permits to public and nonprofit organizations including States and their political subdivisions are in force. These include 212 permits for schools—mostly the small country type, 101 churches and 138 cemeteries, as well as permits for highway maintenance stations, storage grounds, wharfs, boathouses, outdoor camps, etc. Authority to grant permits which provide greater tenure would often facilitate the programs and activities of these public bodies. Frequently local laws or ordinances prevent the expenditure of State, county, or municipal funds unless a long-term lease or permit carrying assured tenure is secured.

The authority granted by this bill would enable the Forest Service to deal on a more businesslike basis with thousands of permittees who desire to use national forest lands for commercial and private uses, which will increase the general usefulness of the national forests and can be accommodated without detriment to the public interest. It will also simplify and reduce the costs of administering uses of national forest lands.

DEFERMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, that provision of the Selective Service Act permitting large-scale deferment of college students ought to be repealed. In fact, it never should have been passed and I so stated at the time. It has produced a bad affect and growing resentment among thousands of families whose sons have been forced into service because of their inability to attend college. This sort of special privilege has no place in the American system.

A selectee upon being deferred so that he might enter or continue in college leaves a vacancy in the call. But the quota must be filled and the draft boards must drop back and pick up the next in line. This continues until one is found who is ineligible for college deferment. Maybe he was financially unable to attend college; or it could be that he just did not want to attend; or maybe he did enter but was unable to keep up in his work. Whatever the reason, it is wrong to jerk him up, so to speak, and place him in the service ahead of turn as a replacement for a selectee who was financially able to enter or remain in college and because of which he was deferred.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with numerous college students about this matter. Without exception, all have agreed that such deferments are unfair and highy discriminatory. I particularly recall that one went further and said, "But you cannot blame us." He was right, we could not blame him. The Congress is to blame for authorizing and continuing such an intolerable situation. Congress ought to correct it.

A few days ago, in reading an editorial on this subject, I came across these words:

> By and large it has been the boy who has not been able to go to college whose family has had to mourn in the Korean war.

Truer words were never spoken, and it is most significant that these were the words of an outstanding educator and very lately a president of a famous American university.

May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this have the immediate attention of the Armed Services Committee and the Congress. I hope that legislation will soon be reported and passed which will put an end to this highly discriminatory provision of our Selective Service law.

The editorial to which I referred appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of February 1, 1953. It is as follows:

> UNFAIR DRAFT DEFERMENT
>
> Retiring as president of Harvard University to become United States High Commissioner to Germany, Dr. James B. Conant strongly attacked draft deferments for college boys as causing "growing popular resentment."
>
> Dr. Conant's criticism is consistent with his previously expressed views on this subject. He added force to his remarks by saying, "By and large it has been the boy who has not been able to go to college whose family has had to mourn in the Korean war."
>
> The Daily News has steadily opposed as undemocratic special privilege the large-scale system of college deferments. We have pointed out that it was bound to produce a bad effect among thousands of families whose sons have had to perform their 2 years of required military duty—and it has.
>
> Selective Service officials have been asserting for months that mounting manpower demands and falling manpower pools would force stiffer requirements in college exemptions, probably this year, certainly in 1954. General Hershey, Selective Service Director, recently declared the aim should be to get more men to start college work after their 2-year draft hitches, instead of before.
>
> Last fall the number of college-deferred registrants was fixed at 207,000. By next autumn, it is anticipated 100,000 discharged men will be ready to enter college. But some educators want the preinduction deferments to continue, with, perhaps, a gradual shift from the system eventually.
>
> This does not squarely face certain stern realities. Draft calls this year will average 50,000 or so a month, possibly more. There has consequently been talk of inducting fathers; even discussion of extending periods of service. Such measures would intensify the already strong feeling of resentment against indiscriminate college deferments.
>
> In a much-needed Congressional revision of that system the present shortage of trained technicians and scientists must, of course, be considered. But adjustment of the draft law to meet that problem can be made without retaining the unfair and inequitable preinduction deferments over the whole range of higher education.
>
> It is the duty of young men to get college educations, but it is their first and foremost duty to serve their Government whenever called upon to do so.

PINNISH TANKER EPISODE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, whistling in the dark as a relief from reality is both tragic and expensive.

The shameful incident of a Finnish tanker sailing unmolested to the stronghold of our enemy carrying fuel for weapons of destruction—destruction of American and allied youth, destruction of American and allied property, dramatically focuses our attention to:

The folly that we must halfheartedly fight a war to avoid war;

To the farce that we may talk sense, justice, and reason, with vicious men who have been dethroned of reason;

To the fraud that we must pretend friendly and diplomatic relations with Russia, our brutal and dangerous enemy;

To the faithlessness of allies who while riding piggy-back on our strength and resources continue to make overtures to the enemy.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, whistling in the dark to escape the frightening countenance of our true position is tragic and expensive.

Old-fashioned realism, courage, faith, and honor will help us. An enemy who makes war is dangerous until defeated. Those who help our enemies are dangerous, no matter their diplomatic words of friendship or their economic urgency.

We face the challenge of world leadership—positive, honorable, and effective. Let us not be a front for world bickering.

I proudly join General Eisenhower, a great military leader, and I hope and pray a great civilian and Presidential leader, in positive, firm, and determined action to end fraud, farce, shame, and to achieve victory over the enemies of freedom.

DISSOLUTION OF INTERSTATE BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this very limited time to announce

that on last Monday—February 2—I introduced in the House H. R. 2473, a bill to provide for dissolution of interstate bank holding companies.

It is my honest and candid opinion from experiences that the continued monopoly of credit will eventually reduce the workingman and the farmer to serfdom, and any tendency in that regard must be fought.

The concentration of tremendous economic power through control of banks by the holding-company device is the open road to such credit monopoly, and this danger is becoming more serious every day.

Laws now forbid branches of banks except within a State or restricted area, but holding companies know no such limitations. Banks must confine their activities to banking, but through holding companies they can control businesses of all kinds all over the world.

H. R. 2473 definitely ends such unlimited powers and leaves the control and regulation of banks to the States.

I am sure that all bankers who are sincerely interested in the public welfare will support my efforts to obtain enactment.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on the first legislative day following February 15, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend as a part of my remarks a statement by Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, made before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Wednesday. It will exceed the cost allowed. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted, because it is very valuable information, not only to Members of the House but also to the country. General Gray for almost 2 hours gave a wonderful description of the growth of the Veterans' Administration, its functions, and the economy which has been shown in operating those various departments. It is one of the most remarkable statements I have ever heard the head of any department make.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO JOINT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 133) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. SCHENCK, Ohio; Mr. TRIMBLE, Arkansas.

Joint Committee on Congress on the Library: Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. HARRISON, Nebraska; Mr. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; Mr. REGAN, Texas; Mr. BURLESON, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. VORYS, Ohio; Mr. JOHNSON, California; Mr. CANNON, Missouri.

CONSIDERED JUDGMENT NECESSARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, these are very trying days and I think each and every one of us should be as cautious as possible in forming our judgment and in expressing our opinions, because in my opinion the most serious challenge that has confronted any living generation of people in the known history of man confronts men and women everywhere who want to be free.

Utterances during a campaign are one thing; the responsibility of conducting government as a majority party and a member of the majority party is quite another. We Democrats in the minority very easily could say we are going to vote to cut taxes and we are going to vote to do this, and that, and to do everything else; but as far as I am concerned, I am not going to do that if the national interest of my country will be adversely affected or imperiled. I believe that over and above everything—and I know that is the view of my colleagues—in the performance of our duties we should be cautious in forming our opinion before we get the facts on the world situation as it develops day by day, week by week, and month by month. I for one, as a Member of this body, feel that my obligation is not as a Democrat but as an American. It is an American challenge that confronts us, a challenge to all Americans. I am going to do everything I can for economy and tax relief, but I am not going to vote for either if I think it is against the national security and the national interest of the United States, because over and above everything is the national security and national interest of our country.

My remarks have no reference to any of my friends who have made observations, and I want none of them to think I am answering them; I am making my remarks affirmatively and impersonally and not as a result of views expressed by some of my colleagues whose views I profoundly respect; I am simply expressing my own opinion as a Member of this body directly charged with responsibility. We are 435 Americans in this body and 96 in the other who are charged with direct responsibility, a responsibility that rests upon each and every one of us; and over and above everything else is the national security and the national interest of the United States of America.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AND PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not; what may we expect by way of program for next week?

Mr. ARENDS. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that due to the fact that next week will see the celebration of Lincoln's birthday a heavy program is not contemplated for the week.

Mr. RAYBURN. At least there will be nothing controversial.

Mr. ARENDS. There will be nothing controversial.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONFUSION OR CONSIDERED LEGISLATION?—AN UNFAIR CHARGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many, many times I have profited by the remarks made by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If I understood him correctly today—and if I did not I hope he will correct me now—he takes the position that it is his duty and he intends to perform his duty which is to protect and advance the interests of the United States of America, reserving to himself the right to determine on each occasion what his position should be. Am I right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. That is a broad statement, which is correct. I was particularly emphasizing the difference between campaign promises and the responsibilities of the majority party.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I can adopt the same theory and I do so now.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that perhaps we all necessarily waste some of our time if Members on either side challenge the integrity of

other Members when they take a position or make a statement.

Tuesday last, H. R. 1979, a bill to extend, until April 1, 1955, the Reorganization Act under which a President may send to the Congress a plan calling for reorganization in the executive departments, and which would become the law of the land unless a majority of the elected Members of either the Senate or the House, within 60 days, passes a disapproving resolution, was adopted by a vote of 389 to 5.

My vote was one of the five.

Press and radio comment as well as letters from constituents, indicate there is more or less confusion as to the measure which was before the House.

The bill was not a reorganization plan. It was a bill giving the President authority to send to the Congress, prior to April 1, 1955, any plan which he might have in mind and the adoption of which he thought, through reorganization of the executive departments, would bring about economy or efficiency in the executive departments.

As far as I have been able to learn, no one has any objection whatsoever to any suggestions of that nature from any administration spokesman or from any citizen—no matter what his status.

Fortunately, all discussions of legislation similar to H. R. 1979 bear out the fact—and it is an undisputed fact—that every President from George Washington to Eisenhower can send, and in practice, innumerable times has sent to the Congress by way of the executive departments or his spokesman, hundreds of bills proposing measures, many designed to give the country both economy and efficiency in the Federal Government.

In my judgment, as I stated in the debate on Tuesday, a grant of additional power which enables a President to pass legislation unless it is vetoed by either Senate or House, is not only clearly unconstitutional, but unnecessary.[1]

In my opinion, there is not a single Member of the Congress, not a responsible reporter, editorial writer, or radio commentator who is not of the opinion that today, and for at least some months, any measure incorporated in a bill or a resolution sent to either branch of the Congress which gave the slightest evidence of giving greater efficiency, more economical administration of the executive departments, would be approved almost overnight.

Nevertheless, and apparently because two former Presidents were granted this authority to send down plans, it was argued that President Eisenhower should be given like power, even though he did not need it. Otherwise, it might be argued that the Congress was expressing a lack of confidence in the President.[2]

Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman were given authority in more than one instance which should not have been given them and which resulted in harm to the country.

I have no fear that President Eisenhower will make a like mistake.

Because the Congress in time of emergency gave one President unconstitutional authority is no reason why another President, even though we have utmost confidence in him, should be given like authority.

As was stated on the floor in the debate, an unlawful grant of unconstitutional power to one President seems to be a strong argument, as was evidenced by the debate and vote on this bill, that a similar grant, even though it was illegal, should be given each succeeding President who demanded it.

The acceptance of that superficial unsound argument might destroy constitutional government.

Having always been not only an advocate of, but having in my congressional duties here practiced economy, sought efficiency, I shall support any and all reorganization plans which the President may send down and which, in my judgment, give promise of, if they do not insure, economy and efficiency.

My emotions were deeply stirred. Tears of happiness almost came to my eyes, almost overflowed upon the floor, as I heard our Democratic friends and the New Dealers on my right pledge allegiance to President Eisenhower in his efforts to bring about economy and efficiency.

Anxiously do I await the first plan which will come before the House and which separates from office appointees of the last two administrations who have shown either inefficiency or wastefulness in the performance of their Federal duties, or whose services are no longer needed.

That the President is determined to give us both efficiency and economy is evidenced by the orders of at least two members of his Cabinet and to which reference was made on Tuesday. It is my hope that the house cleaning will continue.

Then, why this statement today? Because and only because, of what happened on Tuesday during consideration of the bill.

Being practical and realizing that the bill would become the law of the land, as it will when today, or soon, it is adopted by the Senate, I desired to make it immediately effective and to prevent the rejection of a plan because it comes in the closing days of a session. I, therefore, offered an amendment—a perfecting amendment, if you please—which read as follows:

On page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 6 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) If at any time within the said 60-day period, a resolution of either House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall be defeated, after a resolution of the other House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall also have been defeated, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect immediately.'"

That amendment, considering the language of the reorganization legislation, is, in my opinion, as concise, as clear, as unmistakable in purpose, as any amendment which could be written and which was designed to accelerate the operation of the legislation.

Nevertheless, two distinguished minority Members of the House, both lawyers of ability and experience in the Congress, both members of the House Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]—the latter to a less extent than the former—charged by innuendo that the amendment was a tricky device to, by indirection, reinsert into the bill the committee amendment which had been stricken.

Said the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF]:

Mr. LANTAFF. Just one observation: If the disapproving resolution is adopted by a majority of the House then action by a majority can disapprove a reorganization plan, and this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is merely a device to have a majority approve a disapproving resolution which would in effect put the House right back in the position of adopting the original Hoffman amendment.

• • • • •

But now the distinguished chairman of our committee is offering us another amendment, a double negative, if you please, under which he seeks to introduce a new procedure. A resolution disapproving a plan could be adopted by a simple majority thus thwarting President Eisenhower's wishes on the first thing he has asked us to accomplish.

Said the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DAWSON]:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. It seems to me that the amendment accomplishes this: Under the present law, a matter comes up in the House when a disapproving resolution is filed in that House, and if no disapproving resolution is filed in the House then the plan will become a law, but under this amendment it compels two shots at turning it down. If it is brought up in one House, then by virtue of having been brought up in that House it is thereby brought up in the other, though that House has not filed a disapproving resolution. So we see once more those who are against the bill are trying to kill the President's plan as sent down.

I apologize for my inability to agree with the inference drawn by my two distinguished colleagues and as set forth above. But, I cannot permit to go unchallenged their interpretation either of the amendment offered or of my motive in offering it. It was offered, as I have stated, to accelerate the effective date of the bill. No other purpose was in mind.

It was not a device to permit a majority to approve a disapproving resolution and no reading or interpretation of it justifies that assertion. The amendment, if adopted, would not have put back in the bill the committee amendment. The amendment does not justify the statement that a resolution disapproving a plan could be adopted by a single majority.

Read it again and you will note that it merely accelerates the date when a plan, not rejected by either House, would become effective.

The statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] that the adoption of the amendment "compels two shots

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 764–786, inclusive.

[2] Prior to 1949 it required the veto of both Houses to reject a plan (Public Law No. 263, 79th Cong., 1st sess.). In 1949, when the law was extended, it then permitted a majority of one House to reject a plan. That action was not necessarily an expression of lack of confidence in President Truman; it was a recapture, in some degree, of the legislative power vested by the Constitution in the Congress.

at turning it"—a proposed plan—"down" is erroneous, is apparent upon a reading of the amendment.

The further statement by the gentleman: "So we see once more those who are against the bill are trying to kill the President's plan as sent down" is completely without foundation.

Permit a repetition:

Just why my two colleagues should make the insinuations they did, should misapprehend the purport of the amendment, is beyond my comprehension.

The charitable construction to put upon the unfounded charge they made is that they just did not know what they were talking about.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, no further opportunity to question the purpose or effect of the amendment or my motive in offering it, I am printing herewith the major portion of the remarks made when it was before the House:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 2, after line 9, insert:

"'SEC. 3. Section 6 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'"(d) If at any time within the said 60-day period, a resolution of either House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall be defeated, after a resolution of the other House stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan shall also have been defeated, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect immediately".'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to making a statement about this amendment, because, and only because, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated a while ago that he thought the President had been very magnanimous in dealing with the Congress, let me say this: I do not consider it any great generosity for anyone to recognize my constitutional right to do what I think should be done with reference to legislation. The desire for "rubber-stamp Congressmen" for "yes men" went out several years ago. The Members of Congress are entitled to vote as judgment may dictate. The President himself should and I think would be the last man in the world to try to dictate to us what we should do, even though all of his life he has been a military man and most of that time subject to and the giver of orders. I do not have any idea that he intends to attempt to tell Congresswomen and Congressmen what to do.

Now, let us just see whether an amendment will be defeated even when the purpose is to make this legislation more effective. I do not like this bill—I will not vote for it for the reasons I have given—but as it will become the law of the land I want to make it as effective as possible. What will this amendment do? Over the years in discussion on reorganization legislation Members have complained that there might be a situation late in a session where a proposed plan came down, came down too late to be made effective or where effectiveness might be unduly delayed, and it was discussed—and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will agree with me—it was discussed in committee and with administration leaders as to how that situation could be remedied. So this amendment provides that in certain contingencies, if certain events happen; that is, a rejection of a resolution disapproving a plan by either House; that is, a rejection of a disapproving resolution by both House and Senate, then on adoption of a resolution, the act would become effective immediately. How does that strike my friends on the minority side for cooperating with the President?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment would simply accelerate the effective date of a reorganization plan, upon determination that neither House was willing to override.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Has the gentleman given thought to the legality of that operation as against a resolution that might be affirmatively adopted for a plan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I have considered both and I thought this was the quicker way. This would do the job now. I have made some study of this and have consulted legal experts, and I was assured it was constitutional.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot quite fix the occasion in my mind, but it seems to me there was an occasion where the question was raised as to the legality of this approach. That is the only reason I inquired of the gentleman, because, as I say, somewhere in my recollection—I am not able to say just where—there was some such question raised.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not exactly on this particular amendment but on this very point, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] raised a similar question whether both Houses could, by affirmative resolution, put a plan into immediate effect. This is just a little bit quicker, as it is a part of the Reorganization Act itself—and if adopted will make unnecessary additional legislation to bring the same result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may we please have the Clerk again report the amendment?

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. From the standpoint of clarification of the amendment, I would direct this question to the chairman of the committee. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the only thing this amendment does is to speed up the effective date, in case there has been action on the part of one House disapproving the resolution, or if it makes contingent upon that action the fact that both Houses must have taken that action? In other words, the gentleman by his amendment is requiring both Houses to take action to reject a plan, is he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Only the legislative procedure prescribed in the Reorganization Act which is that if within 60 days either House adopts a disapproving resolution—the gentleman knows the way we do that: The resolution comes from the committee stating that the House disapproves; if that resolution is voted down here and over there then, of course, the plan becomes effective and that takes care of the objection which the gentleman and others raise about plans coming down late in the 60-day period.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But, of course, the gentleman takes away from the other body the right to take opposite action from the action taken by the first body.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no; no.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My understanding of the gentleman's amendment is that if one House takes action disapproving a resolution of disapproval, then the other House takes action approving the disapproval resolution, then it must necessarily take a concurrent resolution in order to make the plan effective.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no, no; it just accelerates it. I call on the gentleman now to give us that support in behalf of the President on reorganization which he pledged a little while ago.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It merely provides that if a resolution which is brought in here to disapprove a plan is defeated and a resolution is brought up in the other body and that resolution is defeated, then the plan goes into effect immediately instead of waiting 60 days; that is all.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. Just one observation. If the disapproving resolution is adopted by a majority of the House then action by a majority can disapprove a reorganization plan, and this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is merely a device to have a majority approve a disapproving resolution which would in effect put the House right back in the position of adopting the original Hoffman amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The observation of the gentleman from Florida is not accurate; it is not a device to do by another method the same thing as the former amendment. If a resolution disapproving a plan passed in one House by a simple majority, it would not kill the plan, but the plan would not go into effect until the full 60 days; that is all. If, however, the plan were disapproved by a constitutional majority that, of course, would kill the plan, just as under the present provisions of the act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the confusion attendant upon the interpretation of this amendment which has not been presented to the committee, has not been given consideration by the committee, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

If action of that type on a reorganization plan is desired it can always be taken by concurrent resolution after action on the part of each House on the same subject matter. Therefore I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us but one question: The President of the United States has asked us to extend the present law under which he can send up reorganization plans to accomplish the balance of the Hoover Commission recommendations and to achieve the efficiency and economy he pledged during the campaign. The House has clearly indicated its desire to give the President that power. But now the distinguished chairman of our committee is offering us another amendment, a double negative, if you please, under which he seeks to introduce a new procedure. A resolution disapproving a plan could be adopted by a simple majority thus thwarting President Eisenhower's wishes on the first thing he has asked us to accomplish. We must beware, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] put it so well the other day, of Greeks bearing gifts. The proponents of this amendment are the same Members who would deny the powers sought by the President. Let us vote down this amendment and support Mr. Eisenhower in the first thing he has asked for—merely an extension of the power of reorganization.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I call the attention of the membership on both sides to the language of this amendment;

"If at any time within the said 60-day period a resolution stating in substance."

Now, that is rather strange language.

Mr. JUDD. That is the very language in the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the amendment clearly undertakes to accomplish what the gentleman from Michigan says it will accomplish, that is one thing; but it seems to me that this amendment is capable of two constructions. It has never been presented to or considered by a committee of the Congress. I am accepting the gentleman's word that it means what he said it means and I am accepting the word of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. But this particular amendment has never been considered by any committee. It seems to me it would be unwise to adopt the amendment at the present time without further study of its implications. While I shall vote against the amendment my vote will not be any indication as to my state of mind on the amendment if I had an opportunity to study it and understand what its significance is and what it means.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan, it should be pointed out that the Reorganization Act itself uses these words:

"A resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan."

So the language incorporated in the amendment is in line with the language in the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. May I just make this one other statement. The gentleman from Michigan did not indicate to me he was going to offer this amendment. Probably there is no reason why he should. But as far as having the opportunity to look into it, and to see what its effect might be, I have not had that opportunity. From what I can understand of the amendment, and I want this in the RECORD in the event it is adopted, the only effect of the amendment that could possibly be found in the language would be to accelerate the effective date of the reorganization plan. This acceleration would come about by action of both the House and the Senate in refusing to adopt a disapproving resolution on a reorganization plan.

I have no great feeling about the amendment. It may be that it is perfectly all right and would work to the best interest of reorganization, but, as I say, I do not know. Maybe I ought to have a definite opinion about it, but I do not. As it appears on its face I do not see where it could be destructive of what we are trying to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, I want to beg his pardon for not submitting it. We have been present here, we have been busy in committee, and it was only late yesterday that I whipped the amendment into shape after discussion of the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my position is pretty much the same as that stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. If appropriate language was considered by a committee that would accelerate the going into effect of a reorganization plan after the terms of the reorganization law had been complied with by both branches, a disapproving resolution, that would be one thing and, as far as I am concerned, I think I would approve it. But, on the other hand, I am not so sure this amendment accomplishes that purpose.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. It seems to me that the amendment accomplishes this: Under the present law, a matter comes up in the House when a disapproving resolution is filed in that House, and if no disapproving resolution is filed in the House then the plan will become a law, but under this amendment it compels two shots at turning it down. If it is brought up in one House, then by virtue of having been brought up in that House it is thereby brought up in the other, though that House has not filed a disapproving resolution. So we see once more those who are against the bill are trying to kill the President's plan as sent down.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to point out that this matter was discussed in the committee, if the gentleman will recall. The discussion appears on page 22 of the printed hearings. The question before the committee there was, How could this be done? It seems to me there was agreement that there ought to be a way of accelerating the effective date of the reorganization plan, and it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan clearly accomplishes the purpose and nothing else.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always glad to yield to my friend. By the way, in all fairness, I want to make this observation. Anyone who should place any construction on the position of the gentleman from Minnesota as being opposed to the effect of this bill would be doing not only the gentleman from Minnesota an injustice but doing himself an injustice, because the gentleman from Minnesota is taking a position in accordance with his judgment and his conscience. While a Democrat, I respect the gentleman from Minnesota, and I know that the remarks that he made today and the position he takes are actuated by the exercise of his judgment and his conscience.

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate deeply the confidence of the gentleman, and he knows it is reciprocated. I agree that, with so much confusion regarding this amendment, perhaps it ought not to be passed today. I do not want it to go through if anybody thinks it is a trick to defeat reorganization. All it could do would be to speed it up a few days, and I do not think the Republic is going to stand or fall on whether a plan goes into effect a few days earlier or at the end of the 60 days' period.

I think I can testify as to the good faith of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I would rather have the amendment fail than to have anybody thinking or saying that it is an attempt to play an underhanded trick to defeat reorganization. That is not its objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my state of mind and I have no such opinion as that. I do not think that is anyone else's position. However, I think the observation that this amendment comes from a source that is opposed to any reorganization is a proper argument to make and proper for us to consider, not on the question of a trick but on the question of consideration of the amendment itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think this way. I will have to take this bill and as that is the situation, I would like to make it as effective as possible. I would like to see the President in a position to do a good job and do it quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no doubt as to the gentleman's intention and I am not arguing with the gentleman as to his purpose, but I do say that I have grave uncertainty as to whether or not this amendment will accomplish this purpose. It has never been considered by the committee. I have never considered it and I certainly have been on the Committee on Government Operations for some few years now in the consideration of the present bill and the one in 1949 and I am acquainted with the history of past handling, and I think that it would be unwise to adopt this amendment because of the uncertainty and the confusion that exists in relation to its meaning and its effect; not its intent, but its effect.

MY DUTY AS A CONGRESSMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I feel good today—you know, I take Vita-Long. It gives me vim, vigor, and vitality.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member, I wish first of all to express my gratitude and thanks to my folks back home who have honored me with their highest trust and confidence. It is a pleasure as well as a duty and responsibility to have been sent here by the democratic choice of one's own friends and neighbors. They, of all people, know all about us—the worst as well as the best. I promise only that I shall do my very best, day by day, to merit the honor and repay the confidence with solid work.

I wish also to pay due respect to this august assembly of which I am very proud to be a part.

It is perhaps appropriate at this time that I clarify in some degree my stand on some matters, that I give all of you some idea of what may be expected of me as a new Congressman representing the Eighth District of Louisiana.

I came here, Mr. Speaker, as a Democrat, and I expect to go home a Democrat. I fought hard in the past election. But on January 20, when President Eisenhower took his oath of office, he then became my President as well as the President of all the people. I expect to do all that I can in my small way to help him make the best President that the United States has ever had.

And I shall not hesitate, even as a timid new Member, to introduce bills on matters which, in my judgment, concern the good of all the people. In that connection, I wish to discuss with you this afternoon two matters which in reality are but separate aspects of the same major problem—the problem of Central Government encroachment on States and individuals. I shall use as illustrations the problem of the so-called tidelands or the submerged lands, on which I have introduced, as of January 9, 1953, a bill, H. R. 1398. A second example of this nefarious encroachment in the direction of expanding Government ownership of lands and businesses is represented by the Kisatchie National Forest in my district. I shall introduce a bill on that aspect of the problem at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Government owns approximately 24 percent of all of the land in our mainland. This does not include the Indian reservations. Besides owning all of this land, Uncle Sam, apparently bent upon going into this landlord business on a whole-hog basis, is the proprietor and operator of tens of thousands of housing units in this country. He is the largest rent col-

lector in all the world today with the exception of Russia.

Only one other government in the world is a larger landholder. This is Red Russia, which owns or controls all of the land in that communistic, godless country where private ownership is forbidden.

The United States Government owns 1,053,161 acres in Louisiana alone. It owns 1,484,733 acres in Mississippi. In these States, as in all the others, Federal ownership of land is being expanded. Sixteen different Federal agencies control and administer the federally-owned timber lands. Forty different Federal bureaus, agencies, and departments have the power to buy land.

Louisiana is a small State, but because of the Federal Government's encroachment upon our lands and the taxable wealth, it becomes smaller. And slowly but surely this creeping socialism is coming upon us. Today they own in Louisiana large blocks of rent houses, upon which they collect the rent, and, as I have set out before, large acres of land.

That brings us to the matter of the Kisatchie National Forest. Gentlemen, the present area of that forest exceeds the area of any one of the three smaller parishes of my district. Some 560,685 acres are now owned and administered in five divisions, the exterior boundaries of which include 877,066 acres. That is bad enough, but eventual purchases may include as much as 1,274,977 acres—between one-fifth and one-fourth of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana. Many of the purchases were made between 1933 and 1937 at prices ranging from $1.48 to $4.23 per acre.

Having said all of that, I am still concerned with the redistribution, the denationalization of lands in my district which are good for agricultural purposes. Much of the land which the Federal Government now owns is agricultural land, land that for generations was cultivated, land upon which countless thousands of people have lived and raised their families. It is true that we had difficulties in the 1930's—most of the United States and the world was having trouble—but most of that land was picked up for a song in time of distress. Today it is a wilderness, set aside for the purpose of growing timber, and it will take many years for it to produce much of value to us.

The amount that the parish, or county, receives from the sale of this timber is very, very small indeed, and for that reason the parishes find it hard to obtain enough taxable wealth to exist on, while at the same time here are hundreds upon top of hundreds of our American soldiers who have gone forth and fought to preserve the very tendency that we are permitting this creeping socialism to destroy.

Regardless of how bad land is needed for homes, this property cannot be possessed, or cannot be bought by anyone. It stands there as a monument to our ignorance, or I might say lack of interest in the people who need homes.

These men are housed in small rental homes, and many of them in districts very unsanitary and unhealthy. They would like to go upon this land and build homes and there raise their families.

I believe that it is a God-given right for our citizens to possess the land upon which they may earn a living. I do not think that we should retard progress by trying to put this land back into a wilderness, from which we rescued it once before. And I think that we should go forward with progress, building homes, carrying out the command of the Bible—"be ye fruitful, multiply and replenish the earth." If that does not mean that the land is meant for homes for the people of this country, then I do not know how to read.

Less than 25 years ago, the United States Government owned 33 percent of all the lands in 11 Western States. Today it owns 54 percent of it. This land pays no taxes for the support of our schools, colleges, universities, highways, and other public improvements of local and State governments.

Now after acquiring ownership of one-fourth of the Nation's soil and a staggering number of dwelling units, this Government is trying to reach out to sea and lay claim to ownership of those areas off the shore of some of our States.

Right now our "Good Uncle" is seeking to grab the oil and gas in these offshore areas. Who knows when this grab will be extended to fisheries, to port and dock rights, beach facilities, and each and every other use related to our coastal waters? Where are we drifting? Where is all of this to end?

It is a serious, a very critical situation. It constitutes a dire threat to our American system of government. What is to happen to private ownership and development under this new system? Where does it leave free enterprise which is the heart and soul of our American capitalistic system?

It is bad enough that Uncle Sam has gone into the land and housing business in a wholesale way. He at least presumably has a sound and marketable title to these possessions. In the case of the tidelands, he seeks to acquire additional possessions without any just claim to title.

I admit that the United States has paramount power and dominion over navigation, commerce, war activities, and so forth, but this does not bestow title to the soil and resources in navigable waters upon the United States nor does it destroy title, whether in States or in private owners.

Reverting to States' rights, who can have a better right to the offshore tidelands than the State upon which they border? They say that we can only go out 3 miles from Louisiana. The United States Government has no right to any land, or anything else, to which the right has not been relinquished by the State. The State of Louisiana and the State of Texas have not relinquished such rights.

There, in my humble opinion, lies the real question. By what right could the United States Government claim to possess the lands beyond the 3-mile limit of Louisiana? In my humble opinion, they do not have any more right than would Russia, should they set claim to the land beginning at the 3-mile limit. And if the Federal Government proved conclusively that we do not possess that land, that the oil does not belong to the State of Louisiana, then by what right would the Federal Government base her claim that she owns the offshore oil? She could only possess such property and only have such rights that have been relinquished to her by the several States.

We would like, my friends, to obtain the oil lands for Louisiana in order that we can build a better school system. We are now engaged in an effort to give all of our citizens equal educational rights. We give all of our children now free school books, free hot lunches, free transportation to and from school. But we need to enlarge this system. The tidelands oil would enable us to do just such a thing, and I hope that this Congress will pass such a bill in order that we may go forward with our educational system.

Title of all States in the American Union to the soil and all resources in their navigable waters is supported by the Declaration of Independence, the Treaty of Independence with the British Crown, entered into in 1783, and several United States Supreme Court decisions.

I do not believe that anyone will dispute the proposition that if the United States does not have title to the submerged lands beneath navigable waters within the respective State boundaries, it is not entitled to them or whatever they may produce.

If we are to intelligently discuss the question of title to these submerged lands, we must look back to the original source of such title. This would, of course, stem back to the time when the original States became free and independent sovereign States under the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

Then, we find that the next link in the States' chain of title to these lands was developed by the provisional treaty which was entered into by and between the Original States through the Congress of the Confederation and the British Crown on November 30, 1782, in which we find the following provision:

Article 1: His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz: New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence-Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treats with them as such; and for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquishes all claims to the Government, proprietary and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof: and that all disputes which might arise in future on the subject of the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is hereby agreed and declared, that the following are and shall be their boundaries, viz:

Article 2: * * * East by a line to be drawn along * * * the rivers that fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the river Saint Lawrence; comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States.

This provisional treaty was ratified by the definitive treaty on April 11, 1783, between the original States through the Congress of the Confederation of the United States.

Therefore, by both the Declaration of Independence and the Treaty with the

British Crown which followed the Revolution, the original 13 States were free and independent sovereign States, to whom the British Crown had relinquished not only all claims to the Government, but also all proprietary and territorial rights of the same.

For the next 6 years, or until the United States Constitution was written in the 1787 convention and ratified, finally, in 1789, the original States functioned under Articles of Confederation, article IX of which provided that—

> No State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United States.

In *Harcourt* v. *Gaillord* (12 Wheat. 523 (1827)), the United States Supreme Court held:

> There was no territory within the United States that was claimed in any other right than that of some one of the Confederate States; therefore, there could be no acquisition of territory made by the United States distinct from, or independent of some one of the States.

When the Constitution was written by the 1787 convention of delegates from the original States, they were very careful to provide that the blood-bought right of government and their proprietary and territorial rights confirmed by the treaty with the British Crown in 1783, was made the supreme law of the land by a specific provision in the United States Constitution, which the people of the original States ratified finally in 1789.

Article VI, clause 2 of the United States Constitution provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that on Saturday, August 25, 1787, on motion of Mr. Madison, made in the convention, article VIII—later made article VI by the Committee on Style and Revision—was reconsidered and, after the words "all treaties made," were inserted the words "or which shall be made," with the explanatory statement that—

> This insertion was meant to obviate all doubt concerning the force of treaties pre-existing, by making the words "all treaties made" to refer to them, as the words concerned would refer to future treaties. (69th Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. No. 398, at p. 618.)

So, it is, that the 1783 treaty of the Revolution by which the British Crown relinquished to the original States all proprietary and territorial rights of the British Crown became, and is now, the supreme law of the land.

The same article VI of the Constitution requires all Members of Congress, and State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, to support this Constitution, which makes said treaty the supreme law of the land.

The Supreme Court of the United States has, on more than one occasion, interpreted and confirmed the proprietary rights thus acquired by the original States in all of the submerged lands within their boundaries. This will be clearly seen by a reading of the decision by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Martin* v. *Waddell* (cited as 16 Peters (41 U. S.) 367) and also *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391), both very old cases.

In the McCready case the Supreme Court has this to say:

> The principle has long been settled in this Court, that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away. In like manner, the States own the tidewaters themselves, and the fish in them, so far as they are capable of ownership while running. For this purpose the State represents its people, and the ownership is that of the people in their united sovereignty. Citing *Martin* v. *Waddell* (1842), supra. The title thus held is subject to the paramount right of navigation, the regulation of which in respect to foreign and interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant of power over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State. * * * The right which the people of the State thus acquire comes not from their citizenship alone, but from their citizenship and property combined. It is in fact a property right and not a mere privilege or immunity of citizenship.

THE TITLE OF NEW STATES

The title of new States admitted into the American Union since the adoption of the Constitution, to their submerged lands was recognized by our Supreme Court in 1845. In that year the Court in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212), had this to say:

> By the preceding course of reasoning we have arrived at these general conclusions: First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively; secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States.

In this and many other cases the United States Supreme Court has held over a period of many years that the various American States have owned their tidelands.

You might wonder, and for that matter, so do I, why the successor to this same Court in 1947 and again in 1950 upset the settled and accepted law of the land in the now famous California, Texas, and Louisiana tidelands cases. Apparently without rhyme or reason was this radical departure made from the sound and well-reasoned doctrine laid down by the jurisprudence and settled law of the land.

It can only be explained by the unfortunate trend in recent years toward a paternalistic, a centralized government.

This prompts the query, Whither are we drifting? Where is all of this to end?

Such a trend would be logical in some of these Red-dominated countries, but it is certainly not in ours.

Slowly but surely this creeping socialism is taking charge of America. And, my good friends, in spite of the armies that we can build, and all of the great navies, great submarines, the great air forces and the atomic bomb, if this thing continues, this creeping disease known as socialism will one day take charge of America, and they will not have to fire a gun.

Private enterprise, individual ownership, the proud heritage of Americans, is what sustains our Government today. And as soon as that is gone, then and only then will creeping socialism or communism take charge of our Government. I pray that the day never comes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is high time that we do something up here to put our great country back upon the track of democracy, of States' rights. Let us return to the American system that our great founding fathers envisioned. Let us take Uncle Sam out of the land-owning, rent-collecting, States' rights-grabbing category and put him back into his rightful role.

Let us pass this House bill No. 1398 which I have introduced as one step in this direction.

Let us stop aping Red Russia.

America is a great country. Let us help to keep it great.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO FEDERAL SECURITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 last I introduced H. R. 2446, and our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] introduced H. R. 2447, an identical companion bill. These two bills are practially identical with H. R. 2678 which I introduced in the Eighty-second Congress with the exception that the tax levy is reduced from 3 percent in the old bill to 2 percent in this legislation.

This legislation, if enacted, will provide a pay-as-you-go Federal security program for all. Federal security for the aged and disabled is a most serious and urgent problem facing us as a Congress. The interest of our colleagues in the House in this plan is evidenced by the fact that 188 Members signed the petition to bring the legislation on the floor for consideration in the Eighty-second Congress.

The existing old-age security law has now been demonstrated to be wholly inadequate and ineffective to meet the problem. President Eisenhower in his address to the joint session of the Congress on February 2 said:

> In another but related area—that of social rights—we see most clearly the new application of old ideas of freedom.
>
> This administration is profoundly aware of two great needs born of our living in a complex industrial economy. First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control. Second, the welfare of the people demands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain dispensable social services.

In the light of this responsibility, certain general purposes and certain concrete measures are plainly indicated now.

There is urgent need for greater effectiveness in our programs, both public and private, offering safeguards against the privations that too often come with unemployment, old age, illness, and accident. The provisions of the old age and survivors insurance law should promptly be extended to cover millions of citizens who have been left out of the Social Security System. No less important is the encouragement of privately sponsored pensions plans. Most important of all, of course, is renewed effort to check the inflation which destroys so much of the value of all social security payments.

To bring clear purpose and orderly procedure into this whole field, I anticipate a thorough study by an appropriate commission of the proper relationship among Federal, State, and local programs in this whole field. I shall shortly send you specific recommendations for establishing such a commission, together with a reorganization plan defining new administrative status for all Federal activities in health, education, and social security.

A significant announcement recently was made by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States calling attention to the inadequacies of the present social-security system and endorsing the enactment of legislation covering all workers based on two major premises: First, a pay-as-you-go system; second, universal coverage to all gainfully employed. While this position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce is a noteworthy one it is deficient in that it does not go the whole way and cover all aged whether gainfully employed or not. One of the major deficiencies of the existing system is that it is limited to special groups of employees and leaves unprotected many millions of both employed and unemployed.

There are at present 13,200,000 aged 65 and older, around one-third are presently employed—3,800,000. Of the 9,400,000 remaining, some 3,700,000 are receiving OASI benefits and about 6,000,000 are receiving railroad retirement and civil-service benefits. Under the proposal of the United States Chamber of Commerce this would mean that some four or five million may be additional recipients, rapidly decreasing in number over the next few years.

The release of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States issued January 25, 1953, is as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 25, 1953.

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States have voted overwhelmingly in a Nation-wide referendum for a sweeping expansion of the social-security program to cover all working and all retired persons.

The proposal was carried by a 16-to-1 majority. It got the heaviest vote of any of the 93 referendums in the chamber's 41-year history.

The plan would extend social-security benefits to some 5,000,000 aged persons who have not been able to qualify under the present program and most of whom receive relief checks under a combined Federal-State old-age assistance program.

In addition to guaranteeing protection of all persons aged 65 and over, and coverage of all working persons under the system, the plan would put social security on a year-to-year, pay-as-you-go basis. It calls for paying benefits out of each year's tax receipts and eliminating the confusion and dangers of reserve financing.

The chamber's 3,200 member organizations consist of local and State chambers of commerce and trade associations with a membership of 1,500,000 businessmen.

Text of the policy statement follows:

"Experience now demonstrates that adherence to the basic purpose of a sound social security program for the aged requires:

"(a) Adoption of a reasonable plan, in lieu of Federal grants for old-age assistance, to extend immediate protection under the old-age and survivors' insurance system to the present unprotected aged; and

"(b) Periodic adjustment of the equal taxes on employer and employee and the tax on self-employed to support benefit disbursements on a current basis.

"Enactment of the chamber proposal by Congress would mean:

"1. Paying basic OASI benefits to all today's unprotected aged and ending the present discrimination against more than half of the aged population.

"2. Eliminating Federal subsidy of State relief programs for the aged, thereby saving a billion dollars annually in Federal public-assistance grants.

"3. Extending coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance system to all gainfully employed, not presently covered under contributory social security.

"4. Financing benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis thereby establishing a direct relation between income and outgo."

The chamber made no specific statement as to how the present $17,000,000,000 trust fund fits into pay-as-you-go financing. But Dean Mitchell, of Hammond, Ind., chairman of the chamber's committee on social legislation, points out that this balance represents only about 3 years' revenue under the proposed extension of coverage.

"Actually," Mitchell said, "this $17,000,000,000 is more of a cushion than a reserve in the actuarial sense. It has become evident that the trust fund is not the proper way to finance a government program of this kind. The mere existence of a large fund is a constant temptation to raid it for more immediate benefits. At the same time, if the social-security program follows its present course, the fund will not be adequate to meet the demands against it when the millions of persons who have been brought under the program in the past 17 years begin to retire in large numbers.

"Of course, no one questions that the future claims will be met. But the Government will meet them by additional taxes, and not by reliance on the fund.

"The present size of the fund only reflects the fact that much more money was collected in taxes than was needed to pay the relatively small number of aged who could qualify for benefits. It may be possible to eliminate it entirely because the money has actually been used for Government purposes and the fund consists only of notes that the Government has issued as collateral for the money it took from the fund. But I would not quarrel with the idea of keeping a reasonable balance of social-security funds in the Treasury to smooth out unexpected short-range changes in revenues and benefits."

Under the present law, the Federal Government is involved in two types of programs for the aged. It administers directly the old-age and survivors' insurance system which now covers less than 80 percent of the work force and pays benefits to only one-third of the present aged.

It also contributes the major part of the costs for the State-Federal system of old-age assistance, which is a relief program governed by the needs of the recipient. The Federal share of old-age assistance costs is now running at a billion dollars a year.

The Federal Government is also involved in the civil-service-retirement program and the Railroad Retirement System, as well as in pension programs for veterans.

The Chamber proposal does not abolish civil service, railroad retirement, or veterans' pension systems, but is intended to establish a universal base for all social security and to integrate the present hodgepodge of Government retirement programs.

The size of relief expenditures by the Federal Government would be substantially reduced by ending the need for Federal grants for old-age assistance, which now equals more than half of all Federal grants for public assistance.

Congress originally visualized the old-age assistance program as a temporary and transitional program which would disappear as the Social Security System expanded and matured. Instead, OAA has grown rapidly and now has 2,700,000 aged persons on its relief rolls. Under the Chamber plan, the OASI system would be immediately matured, the Federal Government would consequently immediately withdraw from old-age relief. Any need for relief to needy aged persons, above that provided by the extended Federal OASI program, would be much reduced in size and left entirely to States and local communities.

The Christian Science Monitor in its issue of February 2, 1953, in a leading editorial said:

SIMPLIFYING SOCIAL SECURITY

After nearly 18 years it is natural that Americans should have learned some things about the operation of the Social Security Act of 1935 and its amendments.

Two significant surveys of opinion about this subject were made public last month. Both are from sources identified with business on a broad scale, yet neither is unfriendly to the basic aims which were set out for social security when it became law under the New Deal.

One is a project report by the Tax Foundation, Inc., whose trustees include officials of a number of large corporations. It includes comments obtained by asking State welfare administrators for their views on the Federal public-assistance program.

The other is a news release on a referendum taken among the 3,200 member organizations of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The vote was the most one-sided of any such canvass taken in the national chamber's 41 years. It favored a proposal to extend old-age insurance under the Social Security Act to all working and retired persons, including about 5,000,000 aged not now qualified for these benefits. It would thereby seek to reduce the volume of relief payments being made through the alternative plan of Federal-State old-age assistance.

In other words, the proposal would hasten the original social security intent of bringing virtually all under the contributory insurance plan instead of the public-assistance dole.

This is characterized by the Chamber as a move toward putting social security on a year-to-year, pay-as-you-go basis. The degree to which that effect would follow would depend on the measure of abandonment of the insurance trust fund, which now contains $17,000,000,000 of government securities. There have been doubts whether any real and suitable store of value exists in which actuarial reserves for so large a program can be invested, but the head of the Chamber's social legislation committee concedes that the trust fund will serve at least as a cushion for eventual heavy demands.

Where the main hope lies in such a program is that it will permit simplification and improvement in efficiency of the public assistance program which would remain,

and that this function of relief on the basis of need could be turned back mainly if not entirely to State and local hands.

With this purpose the views of the State administrators largely concur. Many of them add that further economy of money and effort could be made if the four categories of Federal support—old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled—were all thrown into one account and computed as aid to overall State programs.

The fact that such business groups and welfare administrators favor assuming responsibility for another 5,000,000 retired persons through the old-age insurance mechanism marks an acceptance of the idea that older citizens deserve a floor of support as a matter of right rather than having to prove claim to it on a basis of need.

There are cases in which special circumstances call for aid outside that minimum. The floor need not be so high as to absolve close relatives from responsibility or to estop the State from recovering through liens part of the aid it advanced while relief recipients retained use of their homes.

But through broadening the coverage of contributory old-age insurance and diminishing the field of relief-type assistance it should be possible materially to simplify the handling of the social-security program in the United States while preserving its true objectives.

H. R. 2446 and its companion bill, H. R. 2447, have for their purpose providing a solution to this momentous problem of old-age security on a pay-as-you-go basis with Federal old age security for all, as stated in the title to the bill. This legislation embodies the program of the Townsend organization which down through the years has waged a relentless battle for the enactment of legislation for nationwide old-age Federal security on a pay-as-you-go basis. The thanks of the oldsters of America are due to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder of this great humanitarian movement, who by his own great courage, industry and indomitable will power and effective organizational abilities has carried on this relentless fight for old-age security. The advances we have made in the last decade in this large field of human rights are due to a large extent to Dr. Townsend and his loyal supporters and to the legion of coworkers in the fight for full and equal rights to America's aged citizens.

On December 31, 1952, the Federal Security Agency records show that there was held by it total assets of $17,441,718,877.92, $16,960,377,304.69 of which, "invested" in the so-called Government bonds, has already been spent for carrying on the regular activities of the Government. These funds are no longer available as assets for meeting the obligations of the Social Security program and paying the annuities for which the fund was created. In order to meet these payments it will be necessary to levy an additional tax on all the taxpayers of the Nation whenever current receipts are insufficient to meet these payments.

As given to me by the Federal Security Agency, the following tabulation summarizes the financial operations of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for the period January 1, 1937 to December 31, 1952:

Jan. 3, 1937 to Dec. 31, 1952

Employers and employees contributions to trust fund	$23,758,047,894.39
Interest on investments	2,327,352,603.09
Transfers from general fund	15,386,400.00
Reimbursements for sale of surplus material, services, etc	33,600.33
Grand total	26,100,820,497.81
Less: Benefit payments	8,036,193,731.22
Administrative expenses	589,907,888.67
Repayment to general fund for tax refunds	33,000,000.00
	8,659,101,619.89
Grand total	17,441,718,877.92
Total assets on Dec. 31, 1952	
Total investment in Government bonds	16,960,377,304.69
Total cash on hand	481,341,573.23
Grand total	17,441,718,877.92

The committee on social legislation of the United States Chamber of Commerce recommended that a position be taken by the chamber designed as far as possible—

A. To extend coverage to groups not now covered, thus eliminating the long-range problem of uninsured aged which has been used as the excuse for Federal old-age assistance. This goal has consistently been advocated in chamber policy.

B. To channel immediately the long-range OASI system's funds into providing a floor of protection for all today's aged, thus reducing pressure for public assistance, veterans' benefits, further increased benefit levels, and expansion to disability, medical care, and so forth.

C. To eliminate all Federal grants for the old-age relief programs, leaving any residual relief for State and local action.

D. To achieve checks and balances within the system by creating an immediate relationship between current benefits and the taxes required to pay those benefits, thus eliminating the present temporary situation of deceptive and misleading low costs and large reserves which invite unwise benefit increases and improvements.

The Tax Foundation in its projects report No. 31 states:

The concept that public aid be given to those unable to support themselves was brought to this country by the early English settlers. Although the basic idea of providing public relief for those in need remains, there have been three major changes over the years.

The first is a change in public attitude. Recipients of relief once were objects of disgrace and humiliation. Today it is recognized that many of these persons may not be to blame for their plight and that consequently the community should assist them.

The second major change has been a gradual shift away from complete local responsibility for the support of needy persons. Originally, individual localities took care of their own indigent. As government became increasingly centralized, incomplete local automony made localities dependent on State action for the necessary powers to administer public assistance. State governments also began to share in financing public assistance. By 1931, they provided 18 percent of total public-assistance expenditures, while local governments bore 82 percent of the costs.

The continuing trend toward centralization of Government power, plus increased welfare costs that strained the capacities of State and local revenue system, finally brought intervention by the Federal Government. From a modest 13 percent contributed by the Federal Government in 1936 after passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, the Federal share grew to 34 percent in 1941 and 48 percent in 1951. Over the same period local governments' financial share of public assistance dropped to a mere 11 percent by 1951.

The third major change has been the gradual fragmentation of the single, all-encompassing general relief program that dated from colonial days. In establishing eligibility requirements for public assistance, State laws in the present century have differentiated between methods of treatment for specific types of aid. This division of public assistance into specific classes and consideration of each as a separate entity has resulted generally in unintegrated and complex programs.

Consequently, there are today five distinct classifications of public assistance: (1) Old-age assistance, (2) aid to dependent children, (3) aid to the blind, (4) aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and (5) general assistance, which usually includes all cases not coming under one of the first four programs or under the social-insurance programs.

It is gratifying to the supporters of a national overall old-age program on a pay-as-you-go basis that such outstanding organizations have at last come around to supporting such a program which will replace the existing haphazard, inefficient, economically unsound and inadequate program of social security. The program we propose in this legislation, it is believed, in the long run will cost the American taxpayer less than existing programs and will provide adequate social security for all of the aged and disabled of America. Being based on a pay-as-you-go basis it will obviate the necessity of attempting to provide for a reserve such as is sought under existing legislation.

If 30,000,000 workers in the United States are to be promised pensions of $100 a month, and if those pensions are to be backed by reserves that actuaries consider adequate, then the reserves will grow to a total of about $375,000,000,000. That many billions of dollars will have to be invested in bonds or other fixed interest securities of the United States. Yet all the marketable securities of the Federal Government total only $226,250,000,000. Pension reserves necessary for full funding amount to nearly eight times the total reserves of all life-insurance companies in the country. That is an indication of the size of the problem involved and the weakness of the social-security reserve system.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, has reported:

When the Social Security Act was passed, in 1935, the basic idea was that contributory social insurance would be a first line of defense against destitution. It was expected that, as time went on, Federal and State Governments would have less and less of a burden under the public-assistance laws.

Today, however, the number of needy persons receiving public assistance is greater than it has been at any time since the passage of the Social Security Act. Moreover, the number of aged persons receiving public assistance is nearly twice as great as the number of persons receiving benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

It is also true that the largest proportion of persons receiving what we call general assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, consists of persons who are suffering from physical disability. If our social-insurance system covered disability, we would be able to reduce considerably the burden on States and localities for providing this general assistance.

The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance made its report and recommendations some time back. The Council consisted of 18 outstanding leaders, representing practically all segments of our industrial and social life. Their recommendations are significant in that they point out the deficiencies of the existing program for social insurance. The Council found three major deficiencies in this old-age and survivors insurance program, which I quote verbatim:

1. Inadequate coverage: Only about three out of every five jobs are covered by the program.

2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for old workers: Largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.

3. Inadequate benefits: Retirement benefits at the end of 1947 averaged $25 a month for a single person.

While it is true some of these defects have since been corrected, especially by increasing monthly payments, the program is still inadequate. In the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration, Annual Report, 1947, section 1, pages 7, 18, 39, it is said:

Under our present provisions it would be possible for an individual to work at some time during the course of his working life in jobs covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the retirement plan of a State or locality. According to the length and timing of such employments, he might become eligible to receive retirement benefits under one or more or all of these plans. Another man, with similar earnings under several of the programs may go through a working life without ever acquiring retirement rights under any. Conceivably the survivors of a worker who dies might be eligible for benefits under a Federal old-age and survivors insurance system as well as under a State workmen's compensation law and under general veterans' legislation. Another family, equally in need of income to replace the father's earnings, may have had no opportunity to gain protection under any of these programs.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Comissioner for Social Security, in an article appearing in the Social Security Bulletin for December 1948, said:

Today we have Federal old-age and survivors insurance and railroad social insurance systems that cover the risk of wage loss from old age, premature death, temporary and permanent disability, maternity, and unemployment. We have unemployment insurance laws in all the States and Territories. We have 1,800 permanent full-time public employment offices. We also have temporary disability laws in three States, covering loss of wages due to nonindustrial accident and sickness. Besides these forms of social insurance, we have in effect federally aided State-wide old-age assistance programs in all the States, aid to dependent children in all States but one, and aid to the blind in all but four States.

It is said that there are more than 13,000 pension plans covering 7,000,000 employees in United States industry.

First United States pension was established by Grand Trunk Railroad in 1874. Next came Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, in 1892. A Chicago bank started one in 1899. It is an old idea, but 90 percent of plans in effect today are less than 10 years old.

Notwithstanding the complex and numerous social-security programs, Federal, State, and industrial, there are millions of aged citizens in need not covered by any pension plan.

Under the Townsend program this monstrosity would be obviated. The money would be collected from month to month to pay the annuities as needed and it would go back into the bloodstream of commercial activities every month as spent. The payments under the existing social security law are based upon the amount of earnings received by the annuitant. While these payments in recent years have been very substantially increased, they are still wholly inadequate to meet the living needs of these retired workers. Furthermore, only the favor groups coming under the law are entitled to participate in the program.

Herbert Hoover, chairman of the Hoover Commission, in a letter to Chairman Doughton, of the Ways and Means Committee, on April 25, 1949, said in part:

I wish to say at once that I strongly favor governmental provision for protection of the aged and their dependents.

The problem before the Nation is to obtain a workable system, with a minimum of administrative cost, a minimum of bureaucracy, adjusted to the economic strength of the country which gives an assurance of security to this group. In my view, we have not yet found that system.

I should like to make two general observations:

1. There is an illusion about the whole Federal old-age and survivors insurance. Because the taxes on payrolls are paid into a trust fund and paid out without appropriation by Congress, there is an idea that these are neither taxes nor Federal expenditures. They are just as much a burden upon our national economy as any other tax or any other Government expenditure. Also, payroll taxes, however justifiable, are, like all other taxes, a burden on the standard of living of the whole Nation. A considerable part of the payroll taxes paid by employers in the long run is passed to the people as a whole in prices, and a considerable part of the taxes paid by wage earners is passed on by demands for increased wages.

* * * * *

3. There are serious faults in the Federal insurance system.

(a) The original concepts, as embodied in the Social Security Act of 1935, were that the money to pay for the benefits would come from employees and employers by a tax on payrolls, and that the system would be self-sustaining. The original actuarial basis of the system was faulty and was made worse by the legislation of 1939.

One of the methods of this system contemplated building up a reserve fund in the early years to compensate the subsequent increased benefits. The moneys collected from the payrolls have been, and are at present, in excess of the payments to the beneficiaries, and the trust fund of about $10,000,000,000 has been accumulated and invested in Government bonds. The growth of expenditures for benefits under the present act apparently will exhaust this reserve in from 5 to 10 years, and the general taxpayer will be forced to make up the annual deficit. This deficit, it is estimated, will rise ultimately to about $1,700,000,000 per annum.

(b) An additional burden, however, is thrust on the general taxpayer. Under the present system the Federal Government has used the surplus income of the trust fund (amounting to the $10,000,000,000) for its current expenses and placed its I. O. U. (in the shape of Government bonds) in the trust fund for the money thus used. It is estimated that the benefits paid out will begin to exceed the receipts (upon the present basis of the payroll tax and benefits) in a few years. When this occurs, the Government must redeem its I. O. U.'s from the trust fund. The money to redeem them must come from the general taxpayer. Even if the bonds were sold to the public, ultimately they must be redeemed by the taxpayer. As those who have already paid the payroll deductions are also taxpayers, they will, to some extent, be paying for their insurance twice over.

I cannot agree with the economic arguments before your committee which are to the contrary. The simple fact is that the money has been raised by a tax, and except for benefits already paid, has been used as current expenditures by the Government, and must be replaced from somewhere—the taxpayer.

* * * * *

I suggest that the committee consider abandoning the whole reserve fund concept and that the Federal insurance system be put on a pay-as-you-go basis. It should be no more difficult to calculate for a year ahead the amount of payroll taxes required to meet the outgo than any other taxes. The present reserve fund of $10,000,000,000 could remain as a balance wheel. It could be drawn upon temporarily when advance calculations of the tax prove inadequate and then could be restored the following year. This procedure would enable the Congress to fix the tax as needed and to appropriate the budget annually. In the latter matter, it has no voice at all at present. Such a method of pay and collect as you go would avoid the faults pointed out in paragraphs 3 (a) and (b) above.

Mr. Speaker, our bill plows new ground by providing for the needy disabled. The social-security agency reports.

The United States is unique among major industrial nations in its lack of a general disability-insurance system. Compensation for wage loss due to incapacity is confined in this country to work-connected accidents or diseases in industry and commerce, to service in the Armed Forces, and to employment in the railroad industry, or by Government. Two States provide benefits for temporary disability under arrangements similar to unemployment insurance and with the same coverage. In June 1947, these special systems, in the aggregate, reached very few of the 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 persons disabled on an average day and recently in the labor force, who but for their incapacity would be working or seeking work.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, on January 29 made a clear-cut appraisal of this Townsend plan which I quote:

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after 16 years in this House most of the older members have come to classify me as one of the conservative members of the House; but in spite of

that fact, I want to on this occasion say a good word for the Townsend plan.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago during the House debate on H. R. 6000, a bill to revamp our unsound social-security system, I said:

"When I compare the two programs for social security—the one contained in H. R. 6000 and the one contained in the Townsend plan—I am convinced that the Townsend plan is to be preferred to H. R. 6000. In my opinion, after careful consideration, the Townsend plan is more equitable, more practical, more just, much easier and cheaper to administer, and less costly in the long run.

"Today the 3,200 members of the United States Chamber of Commerce by the overwhelming vote of 16 to 1 have endorsed the two principal planks of the Townsend plan, namely:

"First. Complete coverage of all aged people.

"Second. Pay-as-you-go basis for the social-security system."

Mr. Speaker, when a Nation-wide organization as powerful and important as the United States Chamber of Commerce endorses the main features of the Townsend plan, and at the same time points out how unsound our present system of social security is, that is real progress.

The fact that such action was taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce demonstrates the effectiveness of the campaign that the Townsend clubs have been carrying on in the face of ridicule, political obstacles, and New Deal propaganda. It should also advance the cause of the worthy old people of the Nation and speed up the time when they will be given just, proper, and adequate support.

This legislation—H. R. 2446–H. R. 2447—would provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal annuities permitting retirement with benefits at age 60 or for total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; it would give protection to widows with children; it would provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. It would end for all time the unsound social security trust fund, which puts a double burden on the taxpayers. If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problems of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With the accelerating advance in technology and with the commercial development of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are not covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation.

The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of modern industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are now millions among us 60 years of age and over who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security and are receiving no support from any source or hopelessly inadequate support. This plan would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It is financed by a gross-income tax in which all participate. It is a pay-as-you-go system, and annuities will be paid currently each month out of currently-raised revenues, and the sums so received by annuitants must be spent within 30 days. Under the plan the existing system of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance will be abolished and a new program substituted therefor. This proposal gives recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth of American industry which they helped to create. These annuities are provided for those self-respecting American citizens as a matter of right.

Mr. Speaker, old-age security should be provided with neither the stigma of charity nor of poverty. It should be given as a matter of right as dividends from the national wealth the aged have helped to create. Such a program which would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law would have a stimulative effect upon our economy and would help to make available jobs to all the young who will replace the aged as the latter move into retirement at a decent standard of living. Only noncontributory annuities will meet the needs of those now grown old who are in need because of past neglect in providing an adequate contributory retirement system.

There is much confusion and misunderstanding as to the needs of our elderly citizens in America today. For the middle-aged, odds on reaching a ripe old age are about the same now as they were in George Washington's day. Chances of living from babyhood to 40 are getting better all the time. Most childhood diseases are about through, as killers. From 40 on, life expectancy has not improved much. Old-age ailments still take about the same toll, year in and year out. An individual aged 40 or over can look forward today to a life span somewhat longer than his grandfather expected at 40 a half century ago. It is claimed that a man aged 60 can expect to live no longer than his ancestor could after 60 at the close of the Revolution, 170 years ago.

New figures from the United States Public Health Service reveal that all the new drugs, all the new techniques of surgery, all the scientific research, to date, are doing little to add years to the life of the individual who has reached middle age. What medical science has done, so far, is to add greatly to the child's chances of living to middle age and beyond.

Saving enough money to retire on is becoming more and more difficult. To retire on $5,000 a year takes $112,000 in investments. That income will buy old-age comforts that $1,500 bought in 1900.

Retirement habits are changing. Most people now look to social security and pensions to see them through old age. Back in 1900, just 53 years ago, $25,000 was considered enough capital for a man and his wife to retire on. Without much trouble he could find safe mortgages or other investments to bring him a return of 6 percent. A $25,000 investment, at that rate, was good for $1,500 a year, which was enough to support a man and his wife comfortably at that time.

A resident of my own district recently wrote:

My wife and I are old. She is 75 and I am 81 years. We have worked hard and saved carefully all our lives that we might have enough to take care of us during our declining years. We have a total income from interest and dividends amounting to about $1,000 a year. We face stark despair.

The need for a national old-age security program is made crystal clear by the following case described in a news item in a leading newspaper in my own district:

Recently a fine old man died in the local county hospital. He was 86 years old and for many years had been a trusted employee of the University of Washington, retiring prior to the social security era and before a retirement system could aid him. For many years he received old-age assistance in Washington. After his wife died he sold his modest home and had about $2,000 when he left Seattle to come to Oregon to live with a daughter, some 4 years ago. He was told by the welfare authorities that he should notify them when his money was used up, and they would reinstate him on the old-age assistance rolls of that State. They promised to mail him two monthly old-age assistance checks in care of his daughter in Oregon, which they did. Then the monthly checks stopped. At the end of 3 years he had used up all of his savings for living expenses and applied to the Washington State welfare office for reinstatement on the old-age assistance rolls. He was refused further aid, on the ground that he had been absent from the State for more than a year and had lost his citizenship there. Then he applied for old-age assistance in Oregon but was informed that he was not eligible, because he had not lived in Oregon for the required 5 years. In spite of the sincere efforts of the staff workers of the Oregon State Public Welfare Commission to try to persuade the State of Washington to help him, he was still refused aid, and Oregon had to put him on the general assistance rolls where he still remained at the time of his death. He told me that he received about $30 a month at first, all of which he gave to his widowed daughter with whom he lived. Later his monthly grant was raised to $57. After his daughter died, and later, shortly before his death, the couple who furnished him board, room and care received a somewhat larger amount. Welfare red-tape made him a "man without a country". I know of many similar cases of injustice toward the aged. Many changes are needed in the laws, rules and regulations.

What are the chances now of a person 65 years old or more taking care of

himself? Judged by the experience of our present 13,200,000 oldsters 65 and over, they are not very good. According to recent surveys, almost half of them suffer some degree of economic hardship. Theoretically, a man during his working years should pile up a surplus adequate to carry him through retirement. But in 1948, only about 1,500,000 of those 65 and over could support themselves on income from investments and savings. About 3,500,000 had no incomes; another 4,500,000 had incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Only 1,500,000 received social-security pensions; 2,500,000 got old-age assistance payments. Chances of employment are poor. Even at the peak of the war effort, only one-third of the people 65 and over were employed, many of them on farm jobs.

Fifty years ago, no one was troubled by this question. There were older people, it is true, but only some 3,000,000 Americans had passed the age of 65. Today that age group has grown to well over 13,000,000. Their number is expected to double in the next 25 years. At the same time, their proportion to the total population has been increasing. In 1900, 1 out of every 25 Americans had celebrated his sixty-fifth birthday. Today the figure is 1 out of 13.

The fundamental strength of our democracy is the recognition and appreciation of the fact that an individual citizen living happily and enjoying the fulfillment of his hopes and dreams for personal welfare and security is our richest resource. This applies to individuals of all ages. The United States, the most prosperous Nation on earth, can ill afford not to provide generous treatment for its aged. It is a Nation with only one-sixteenth of the earth's population and only 6 percent of the world's area, but it produces nearly seven-sixteenths of the world's goods. Our people own 46 percent of the world's electric power; 48 percent of its radios; 54 percent of its steel capacity; 60 percent of its life insurance; 85 percent of its automobiles; with the most schools, the most churches, and the best health record of all nations. Yet we refuse to provide meager subsistence for our aged.

These senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries, and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They ask only simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed. These aged American citizens are entitled to have vouchsafed to them by their country "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The American Congress should prove that humanity is still on the march here in America and for America's aged by enacting an old-age annuity plan that will provide for all of our old people, not only a selected few, annuities sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

I most respectfully and sincerely urge my colleagues to give attention to this important problem of old-age security at this session of the Congress and to join with us in an appeal to the Ways and Means Committee to grant an early hearing on social-security legislation. It has been too long put off. The needs of the aged suffering under the inflationary economy through which we are now passing make this an emergency problem and one that should have early consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WAMPLER, for an indefinite period of time, on account of official business.

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. WATTS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. HILLELSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, February 6 to 13, 1953, on account of official business.

Mr. NEAL, until February 13, 1953, on account of domestic affairs at home.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a resolution adopted by the Virginia Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article.

Mr. UTT and to include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include a letter from the news director, Cleveland television channel 9–WXEL.

Mr. PROUTY and to include a resolution adopted by the Vermont Legislature.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances and include letters.

Mr. HORAN in two instances, and include articles.

Mr. REED of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON in three instances and to include articles.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include an article.

Mr. GROSS and to include a speech by former Representative Wood, of Idaho.

Mr. FINO (at the request of Mr. RADWAN) and to include a speech he delivered on February 5.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. POULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include an essay.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCMILLAN.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. WALTER and to include a column by Dorothy Thompson.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include an editorial from the Denver Post of February 2, 1953.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. DEMPSEY and include a letter.

Mr. CONDON and to include an article from the Washington Post.

Mr. CARNAHAN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mrs. PFOST and to include an editorial by Paul Bitzer on minority rule.

Mr. HOWELL in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL).

Mr. BARTLETT and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous material.

Mr. EBERHARTER in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROYHILL and to include copy of a bill which he has introduced.

Mr. NEAL and to include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GUBSER and to include a letter from Mr. Charles E. Moore.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an editorial from the National Tribune.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include a resolution by the Jewish Council of New Haven, Conn.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may include in an extension of remarks certain extraneous matter which he has been advised by the Public Printer exceeds the two-page limit and will cost $588.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD and include an article.

Mr. YORTY in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 243. An act to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

432. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the proceedings of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Los Angeles, Calif., August 3–8, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 240, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

433. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel for the 6 months period ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, Public Law 220, Eighty-second Congress (5 U. S. C. 275 (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

434. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing by rank and age group the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law for the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

435. A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government, for the second quarter of fiscal year 1953 (December 31, 1952), pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

436. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing reservations made from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

438. A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report for the National Park Trust Fund Board for fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 6 of the act to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes, approved July 10, 1935 (49 Stat. 477; 16 U. S. C. 19); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed list of the lands exchanged for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity, pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

440. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a group of letters dealing with certain cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, 'An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army' by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

442. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pertaining to an act which authorizes and directs the Department of Justice to establish a Young American Medal for Bravery and a Young American Medal for Service, pursuant to the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 397–398); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

443. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Eighteenth Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 2679. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2680. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2681. A bill to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2682. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2683. A bill to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2685. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class parcel post; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2686. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2687. A bill to terminate executive power to authorize the appointment to a permanent position in the classified civil service of any specified individual who has not passed a competitive examination; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2688. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2689. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to official stations of circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2690. A bill to provide for the grant of certain lands to the American Falls School District No. 381, American Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2691. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to iron-ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2692. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 2693. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 2694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, as a business expense, the cost of providing care for children under 6 years of age, if such care is to enable the taxpayer to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2695. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 2696. A bill to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2697. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Hubbell, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2698. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Beatrice, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2699. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2700. A bill to allow the deduction for income-tax purposes of amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2701. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2702. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2703. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2704. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2705. A bill to extend the excess-profits tax for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2706. A bill to impose a 5 percent Federal excise tax in the case of parimutuel betting on horse and dog races and other events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2707. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2708. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the work clause shall not apply to work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2710. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2711. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by increasing the statute of limitations in the case of certain crimes involving disloyalty to the United States to 15 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2712. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2713. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2714. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2715. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a fidelity trust fund in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2717. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain hospitalized or otherwise incapacitated veterans and certain medical and dental students; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2718. A bill to create the United States Medical and Dental Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2719. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2720. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2721. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2722. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2723. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY.

H. R. 2724. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2725. A bill providing for the sale of certain lands in the Kisatchie National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2726. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide for price support at 100 percent of parity for the 1953 and 1954 crops of each basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2728. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., Lake Wallula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 2729. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of concerts conducted under municipal auspices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the abandonment of the flood-control project for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2731. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct a direct preference primary for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2732. A bill for the addition of levee and channel improvements to aid flood control on the American River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2733. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2734. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the interest on certain obligations issued by the States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2735. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 so as to authorize longevity step increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 10 of the General Schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2736. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working, and to allow an income-tax exemption for any child who is supported by the taxpayer and who is a member of his household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2737. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2738. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, known as the Water Facilities Act, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, so as to extend the provisions of such act to other areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2739. A bill to amend subsection 406 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (relating to misbranded food); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2740. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2741. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2742. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to study the need for smog control in the vicinity of airports in order to promote safety in air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2743. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2744. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2745. A bill to assist in preventing defective construction of housing aided under Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2746. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2748. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2749. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of the City and County of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2751. A bill to provide an educational grant to children of certain veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the issue of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2753. A bill to provide certain increases of disability and death compensation payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2754. A bill to amend section 9 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2755. A bill to provide that post-office fixtures and equipment for use in first-, second-, and third-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2756. A bill to provide more equitably for the medical care of dependents of personnel of the Coast Guard under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2757. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of concerts conducted under municipal auspices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2758. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to classical ballet performances conducted under certain auspices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 2759. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to limit the taxicab licenses to be issued in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2760. A bill to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2761. A bill to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2762. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2763. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2764. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2765. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2766. A bill to extend the benefits of the Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 to certain members of the uniformed services who have served or shall serve in a combat zone in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 2767. A bill to allow widows and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 2768. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2769. A bill to amend section 704 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by restoring certain authority for factory inspections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to acknowledge, confirm, and establish the title of the States to the navigable waters and lands beneath such navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to change the name of the Savannah River project in Georgia to the "Brien McMahon Atomic Energy Plant"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control, and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain secret agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 134. Resolution directing the Civil Service Commission to furnish the House of Representatives with a list of Federal positions not under civil service rules and regulations, together with the names and home States of individuals occupying such positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 135. Resolution to bring about rescission of the order curtailing postal service of the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to pass a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALLECK: Memorial of the Eighty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Indiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing laws which require the States to collect Federal gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts concerning Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts concerning legislation to incorporate Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relative to requesting that proper steps be taken that will effectively remove any discrimination against an honorably discharged Indian veteran and that all rights and privileges are accorded him that are enjoyed by his fellow comrades at arms; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging passage of legislation requiring that all imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to its origin and the date of processing and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail handler removing said label; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Tara Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Jessie American Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2773. A bill for the relief of Ruth Thunder Hoop; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Kina Kenyei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 2776. A bill for the relief of Henry N. Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2777. A bill for the relief of Charles Gordon Furman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Antonio Scorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2779. A bill to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PINO:
H. R. 2780. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Reda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FORAND:
H. R. 2781. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Matook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GARY:
H. R. 2782. A bill for the relief of Edmundo Belfort Saraiva de Magalhaes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Ponciano R. Mauricio, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Nissim Towfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Wera Fazio, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HINSHAW:
H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of Homa Faily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HOWELL:
H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Martin J. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lai Kun Tay Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KILDAY:
H. R. 2790. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louie Gee Loy (Mrs. Eng Yee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Esther E. Ellicott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LYLE:
H. R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Robert Lewis Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2793. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Nagare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McINTIRE:
H. R. 2794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godreau Daigle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McMILLAN:
H. R. 2795. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Leonidas Camarinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Roger Zeender; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H. R. 2797. A bill for the relief of Maria Narciso and her daughter, Maria Reyan Narciso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MASON:
H. R. 2798. A bill for the relief of H. O. Schundler and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 2799. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Babette Kraeutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 2800. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. NORRELL:
H. R. 2801. A bill for the relief of David Zorub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 2802. A bill for the relief of Frank K. (Frantisek) Binder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Bernard Kalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of Georgette Charalambo Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. POAGE:
H. R. 2806. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to Mr. W. C. Pallmeyer and Mr. E. M. Cole; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. RIEHLMAN:
H. R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Bernard Kalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Ulysses A. Pournaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 2810. A bill for the relief of Mate Derokov (also known as Matt Derokov); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2811. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2812. A bill for the relief of Shigeru Gerald Nagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMALL:
H. R. 2813. A bill for the relief of William E. Aitcheson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 2814. A bill for the relief of Funghin Liu Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. R. 2815. A bill for the relief of Floyd C. Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:
H. R. 2816. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Yuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2817. A bill for the relief of George A. Ferris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

39. By Mr. BEAMER: Resolution of the Indiana State Council, Knights of Columbus, adopted at their fifty-first annual State meeting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

40. By Mr. BUSH: Petition or memorial of Rev. Woodrow J. Klinger and citizens of Tioga County, Pa., that a law be passed to keep fictitious crime out of our living rooms prior to 9 p. m. every night of the week; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

41. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of citizens of Chelan, Spokane, Douglas, and Pend Oreille Counties, Wash., in support of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

42. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. Ernest Woodrow and others of Aitkin, Minn., urging passage of law to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

43. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of protest relative to the removal of national defense materials and supplies from local taxation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

44. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit No. 118, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of adequate social-security program and relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

45. Also, petition of Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit No. 52, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of adequate social-security program and relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

(Reports of other House committees were printed in the RECORD of January 29, 1953.)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1952, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1952 to January 3, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gillis W. Long	Chief counsel	$4,821.99
Walter L. Fitzpatrick, Jr.	Chief investigator	3,412.78
Farley W. Warner	Associate counsel	1,673.62
Ara M. Hamill	Clerk	1,584.97
Margaret J. Robey	Stenographer	887.56
Raymond D. Watts	Staff assistant	446.87
Mildred Arbutina	Clerk	1,229.91
Total		14,057.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Total amount expended from July 1952 to Jan. 3, 1953, inclusive	20,851.87
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 30, 1953	9,148.13

HALE BOGGS, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of majesty and mercy, as we address ourselves daily to the difficult task of building a greater nation and a better world, may we be supremely concerned about observing those moral and spiritual standards and principles which Thou hast ordained.

Grant that we may do all within our power to safeguard and perpetuate the good name of our beloved country and to extend its influence as a vital force in bringing peace and prosperity to needed humanity.

Show us how we may encourage the hearts and strengthen the hands of our leaders and chosen representatives who are striving to achieve for mankind a nobler and happier way of life.

We pray that integrity of character, reverence for human personality, devotion to duty, and the fear of the Lord may be the virtues whereby we are known among our fellowmen and the nations of the earth.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 6, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1979. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable J. L. PILCHER as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-third Congress from the Second Congressional District of Georgia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the honorable E. E. Cox, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. PILCHER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR 1952 (H. DOC. NO. 82)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1953.*

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great many vague and disturbing rumors that there is under consideration the absorbing of the Veterans' Administration, or large parts of it, by placing various functions in another department. I certainly hope that will not be done. It will mean utter confusion. It will mean much poorer service for the veterans. It will be entirely unsatisfactory. They have called the horrible war in Korea a police action. If you do make the Veterans' Administration subordinate to some other department it will be giving these veterans police-action care in the United States. They deserve the best and it must be given them.

SMALL BOAT CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to address the House because I was informed this morning that the Bureau of Ships of the Department of the Navy has just let a contract to build 23 air rescue boats to a Canadian shipbuilding firm to be built in Nova Scotia.

As I am sure the House knows, the Bureau of Ships has in the past, under a so-called offshore procurement policy, awarded contracts for building smaller naval craft to foreign shipbuilding plants in Holland, Italy, and other foreign countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the Navy or the Bureau of Ships. This policy is not of their doing. I am saying, however, that the Congress should review this policy which, I understand, was dictated by former State Department officials.

I am asking for a complete, factual, and immediate report from the Navy. I wish to know the percentage use of rated capacity of our American small boat-building facilities as against the percentage rated capacity of foreign boat-building plants which have been getting contracts to build our small naval vessels.

If, as I believe to be the case, our American workers are suffering from lack of employment while foreign boat-building plants are relatively busy, then such a policy of diverting work to foreign countries is distasteful to me and I am sure is distasteful to every American citizen and taxpayer.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, 24 Members of the House of both parties are today sponsoring a resolution for the appointment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumers. These are Members representing big city areas. The administration's decision to remove a large proportion of the controls on cost-of-living items and to properly end such controls except on housing, rents, and strategic materials by April 30 inaugurates an experiment in a free economy during postwar mobilization and of substituting indirect controls over money and credit for direct controls over prices and wages. Such a move has the best chance of success if all elements in the economy are equally vigilant in the protection of their interests.

The President has stated that—

> We shall have to watch trends closely. If the freer functioning of our economic system, as well as the indirect controls which can be appropriately employed, prove insufficient during this period of strain and tension, I shall promptly ask the Congress to enact such legislation as may be required.

A constructive purpose can be served by the sponsors of this resolution and one very useful to the administration in considering the position of consumers as it develops; if justified, the sponsors could hold informal hearings for information on this subject in preparation for definitive hearings by the Rules Committee.

It will be recalled that the House took cognizance of the situation of consumers when last the Defense Production Act was before it for amendment by including among the functions of the Joint Congressional Committee provided for under such act the function of determining "the fairness to consumers of prices authorized by this act." With controls on consumer cost-of-living items being removed, this responsibility needs to be vested in a new committee.

A constructive political philosophy for our society which could well be adopted by the administration could be called that of a consumers' economy. But this requires equally strong representations from management, labor, farmers, and consumers. It is adequate consumers' representation which is distinctly lacking today and this resolution seeks to make up for it.

The text of the resolution and the names of the sponsors will be found in the Appendix.

FUTURE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL NEEDS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the latest estimate of the Veterans' Administration advises that by 1975 it will need 265,960 hospital beds as compared with the present program for 131,000. It is indicated that the average daily load in hospitals in 1975 will be 232,600 as compared with an actual of 96,305 in 1951. Assuming that the experience of the average Member of Congress is similar to my own, I am satisfied that the membership has been impressed with the great demand for hospitalization and medical care of veterans legitimately entitled to this service. It will be recalled that the Congress has repeatedly sought to provide necessary moneys for the construction and operation of needed hospital facilities.

As evidence of what the current veterans' hospital situation is in my State,

I attach hereto a copy of a survey recently made and transmitted to me by E. Roy Stone, Jr., department commander, the American Legion, in South Carolina.

During the last session of Congress after having authorized the construction of additional hospital facilities throughout the country, including the cities of Columbia and Greenville, S. C., and after having provided the moneys and purchased the sites, the then President cancelled the program.

It is indeed pathetic that honorably discharged veterans are actually incarcerated in the common jails by reason of the lack of hospital facilities. To be sure, we are conscious of the necessity to practice rigid economy but this is an instance of false economy. These are instances where young men are being called from their homes into service and as they actually leave, their fathers, honorably discharged veterans, well advanced in years and many of them bedridden, are not receiving proper medical or hospital care.

Let it not be said that the ax of economy fell first upon those who have given so much for so many and are now in need. I am inviting the attention of the Congress, the President, and the Veterans' Administration to this great and immediate need.

HOSPITAL REPORT

The following report was adopted by the department executive committee at its meeting on January 11, 1953:

Hospital statistics: This hospital has a standard bed capacity of 609 with an operating bed capacity of 603, classified as follows: General medical and surgery, 470; tuberculosis, 79; orthopedic and neuropsychiatric, 60. As of December 10, 1952, the operating bed capacity was 548, classified as follows: General medical and surgery, 452; tuberculosis, 79; orthopedic and neuropsychiatric, 23. This is a loss of 55 operating beds since December 1, 1952. The waiting list for South Carolina veterans seeking hospitalization as of December 12, 1952, was 240, of this number 65 were for treatment for orthopedic disabilities, and 5 of the 65 were service connected. The average patient load has been approximately 536 per month. With a patient turnover of approximately 103 percent per month. The waiting list for the 12-month period ending November 30, 1952, averaged 97 per month.

Veteran statistics: In order that a fair comparison, and an overall picture of the Veterans' Administration hospital operating bed situation, as it pertains to South Carolina, may be realized, an analysis of comparable veteran populated States and Veterans' Administration hospital bed capacity is submitted for study and consideration:

State	Number of veterans	Number of beds	Type
South Carolina	205,000	609	79 TB; 60 O. P. and N.; 470 GM.
Mississippi	208,000	2,682	950 GM; 793 domiciliary; 939 NP.
Arkansas	213,000	2,849	754 GM; 2,095 NP.
Oregon	211,000	1,958	412 GM; 377 NP; 155 TB; 814 domiciliary.
West Virginia	218,000	2,086	1,586 GM; 500 domiciliary.

States with a small veteran population, but having more beds than South Carolina:

State	Number of veterans	Number of beds	Type
Arizona	83,000	1,122	192 GM; 146 domiciliary; 784 TB.
Colorado	177,000	1,437	656 GM; 781 NP.
Nebraska	152,000	967	967 GM.
New Mexico	83,000	739	250 GM; 489 TB.
North Dakota	90,000	562	562 GM.
Utah	84,000	696	130 GM; 566 NP.
Wyoming	39,000	928	151 GM; 777 NP.

NOTE.—The veteran population data was as of Sept. 30, 1952, and obtained from the Research Division of the Veterans' Administration. Figures quoted do not include all veterans of the present Korean conflict.

In view of these statistics, it is easily understood why the Department of South Carolina, the American Legion, feels that the veterans of this State do not have adequate hospitalization. It is also easily understood why the Veterans' Administration hospital in Columbia, S. C., is constantly crowded with a long waiting list. The situation is such that untold numbers of veterans seeking treatment, either do not file or recall their application for hospitalization, when advised of the delay and uncertainty of their admission. One can also understand how such a situation is working a tremendous hardship upon those veterans who are financially unable to pay for private hospitalization.

Tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric patients: The situation is far more serious in relation to the care and treatment of tubercular and neuropsychiatric cases. South Carolina veterans are dependent upon hospitals outside the State for beds in these two categories, and these beds are difficult to secure. The Veterans' Administration hospital, Oteen, N. C., capacity 997, for tubercular patients only, operates at capacity at all times, and has a long waiting list for admission. Neuropsychiatric beds are simply unavailable except in service-connected cases. Whether the opening of the new neuropsychiatric hospital in Salisbury, N. C., scheduled for June 1953, will relieve our situation remains to be seen, but it should afford some relief.

State institutions: A recent check with the superintendent of the South Carolina State Hospital revealed that they are caring for 203 neuropsychiatric and tubercular veterans. It is of interest to note that the State hospital has only 1 physician for every 486 patients, while in the Veterans' Administration hospital, the ratio of doctors to patients is 1 to 78. The ratio of nurses to patients in the State hospital is 1 to 223. One can, therefore, well understand the need for additional Veterans' Administration hospital beds for South Carolina veterans.

General summary: It is of interest to note relative to the cost of hospitalization to veterans that the average length of hospitalized days for the various categories of disabilities in Veterans' Administration hospitals is as follows: Tuberculosis cases, 205.8 days; neuropsychiatric and neurological cases, 178.3 days; psychotic cases, 482.1 days; and general medical and surgical cases, 30.08 days.

From the standpoint of South Carolina, the economic status of great numbers of our veteran population is such that their productive capacity will be greatly impaired if they are denied needed hospital treatment because of prohibitive costs in private hospitals and lack of facilities in the Veterns' Administration hospital. It also must be noted that considerable sentiment in South Carolina to the effect that if State institutions have to provide for tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric veterans because of lack of Veterans' Administration facilities, then Congress should enact legislation and provide necessary funds by which such State institutions could be reimbursed.

The American Legion, Department of South Carolina, and the citizens of South Carolina generally, have been ever mindful of the needs of large numbers of war veterans of our State, especially those who are ill or who have physical disabilities, service-connected or otherwise. Continuing efforts have been made since the very end of World War I, to have sufficient hospital and medical facilities provided for the adequate and proper care and treatment of our comrades who needed physical or mental rehabilitation in order that they might be restored to the status of useful and happy citizenship.

Unfortunately the Veterans' Administration at the national level, and the various other powers in Washington, including the Congress, have not always been so considerate of our State, as all available facts will definitely show.

We, as citizens of South Carolina and as good Americans, to be sure, stand firm in our belief that rigid economy should be practiced at all levels of Government, but we consider any so-called economy to be shortsighted that permits billions to be spent, of taxpayers' money, on apparently unnecessary causes, while men who have offered their all for our Nation in time of emergency, are allowed to suffer and sometimes die, for lack of badly needed treatment in hospitals, and by able medical men.

To refer briefly to the historical record, some 12 years after the end of World War I a hospital to be known as a United States veterans facility was constructed in Columbia, S. C. As it was regularly filled to overflowing, largely with general medical and surgical cases, an addition to the existing hospital was authorized and constructed in 1937. Since that date our Nation has experienced World War II, with our State sending more than its quota of men to the conflict, and now we are in the midst of another serious war in Korea, to which again this State has readily furnished its full quota of manpower. Yet, not one single additional bed for the care of veterans has been provided in the State by the Federal Government. Indeed, the Veterans' Administration has only recently, because of curtailed appropriations, closed some 60 of the existing beds in the Columbia facility, and this on top of the cancellation for reasons that were apparently political, in 1948, of the authorized addition to the hospital in Columbia, and of the authorized 200-bed hospital in Greenville, S. C., for which, we understand not only authority but appropriation had been granted.

The above report, prepared by interested and experienced men who know the facts, will show conclusively that South Carolina, when compared with other good States, has been treated in so unfair a manner that it is, indeed, hard to believe the actual facts as given. We think it only fair to assume that the veterans of our sister States need the facilities that have been provided, and that these facilities are being put to good use. Why, then should South Carolina not be given equal consideration? Frankly, we'd like to know the answer.

Why, indeed, should for example, another State in the same general section of our Nation, with almost the exact number of veterans as South Carolina, have more than four times the number of veterans hospital beds as our State? And there are numerous other States, several being referred to in the attached report, with a like ratio of beds per veteran, in every case showing that for lack of consideration South Carolina leads all the rest.

It is our earnest hope that the Members of Congress and the officials of the Veterans' Administration give immediate consideration to the crying need in our great State for more adequate care of the mentally and

physically ill veterans of the two World Wars and of the Korean conflict.

NOTE.—The legislative committee is requested to present the matter in strong terms, at the proper time, to the General Assembly of South Carolina, through proper channels, to the Governor of South Carolina, to our Senators and Congressmen, and to the Veterans' Administration.

Thus, in view of the preceding analysis of the hospital bed situation as it affects veterans in South Carolina, the following recommendations are in order:

RECOMMENDATIONS

No. 1: That the department of South Carolina, the American Legion, formulate plans to secure an additional annex to the present Veterans' Administration hospital, Columbia, S. C., to provide 200 additional beds for South Carolina tubercular veterans.

(a) This annex would release the present 79 beds used for tubercular patients and restore them to the general medical and surgical service where they are badly needed.

(b) This annex would provide an additional 121 beds for the treatment of tubercular patients and partially relieve a serious situation which now exists in South Carolina, and which will increase in the future.

No. 2: That the American Legion Department of South Carolina, urge the construction of the proposed hospital for South Carolina be put back in the Veterans' Administration hospital construction progrm. It is further recommended that a continuing study by the Legion in South Carolina be made of the hospital bed situation and that all public authorities be fully informed of the need for additional hospital beds for the veterans.

CAPITOL PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I knew, of course, that this was a General Motors administration, but I did not know that General Motors had a car 85 feet long. It so happens, however, that on C Street SE., between First and Second Streets, 85 feet of curb space is set aside for Governor Adams' unloading with signs saying "No parking at any time." Members of Congress, their secretaries, and other efficient, hard-working Capitol Hill employees need at least part of that space to park their own cars. If he has a car 85 feet long he should have proper parking or unloading space. It seems to me, however, that while Members of the White House staff have no parking in front of their homes then the members of the Cabinet should have the same as well as Members of the Senate and Members of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it might be well to inform the Members of the House that the cars of congressional secretaries are impounded and removed from that area and the same threat has been made against Members of Congress. Apparently this is the beginning of the era of domination of the legislative branch of the Government by the executive.

Mr. SUTTON. Being a member of the District of Columbia Committee and on the subcommittee dealing with traffic, I realize the traffic problem that we have in the vicinity of the Capitol, and I appreciate the Member of Congress who brought this to my attention. This 85 feet is a very valuable spot and is direly needed for parking for Members of Congress as well as their secretaries.

I hope these "no parking" signs will be removed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL HILLBILLY MUSIC DAY

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for appropriate reference a House joint resolution which states that the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1953, be designated as National Hillbilly Music Day in recognition of the contribution made to American music lore by the writers, singers, and players of hillbilly music.

A statue will be dedicated in Meridian, Miss., to the memory of its native son, James Charles Rodgers, on the twentieth anniversary of his death, May 26, 1953. He was universally known as Jimmie Rodgers, the blues yodeler and America's singing brakeman. He was a pioneer in that type music that has built an industry out of hillbilly, or country, music.

At 14, Jimmie Rodgers became a railroadman, assistant foreman to his father. His first job was on a work train, but soon he had a regular run on the New Orleans & Northeastern, from Meridian to New Orleans. He had always wanted to sing, but lacked confidence. The railroad crews heartily enjoyed his rollicking ballads of the railroads, his plaintive crooning of plantation melodies, and songs of hills and rivers. He was a railroadman—and a minstrel. During 1917 and 1918 Jimmie served his country by doing what was required of all railroadmen, attending to his trainman's duties. The casualty of one of his best friends during World War I caused him to write his first composition, a sentimental song. From the first his railroad buddies liked the song and so did the young fellows in Meridian.

In the spring of 1920 Jimmie Rodgers had a siege of pneumonia and for 3 months in the autumn of 1924, he struggled desperately to overcome tuberculosis. The following years he and his wife, Carrie Williamson Rodgers, fought against poverty and the ravages of tuberculosis. In May 1927 the Jimmie Rodgers Entertainers broadcast over a new radio station, WWNC from Asheville, N. C. By a strange coincidence the officials of a large recording company tuned in on the new station and hearing Jimmie Rodgers, they found a natural. His local popularity increased, but later he was truly discovered in Bristol, Tenn., by a Victor record scout, who was searching the hills for talent. Still battling tuberculosis, Jimmie Rodgers began a career that was fabulous even in the phonograph industry. It is estimated that the blues yodel records sold over 5,000,000 copies.

Jimmie Rodgers left a mark on all hillbilly music. He has been recognized for the simplicity of his accomplishments. His songs dealt with real problems. They came from the heart and the people responded.

Jimmie Rodgers' obituary in the Meridian Star stated that he was an honorary member of the Texas Rangers, a Mason and a Shriner, but perhaps his closest ties of friendship always cherished by him and frequently referred to in many of the songs of his original composition, were found within the ranks of the railroadmen of the Meridian section with whom he served as railroad brakeman before entering upon his professional career, and from whom the active pallbearers were selected. The singing brakeman died in New York City where he had gone 3 weeks prior to his death to make recordings. Under the care of a full-time nurse, he believed himself able to make further contributions to the development of country music in America.

The demands for hillbilly music have continued to multiply since Jimmie Rodgers made his first recording, and some state as much as five-fold since World War II. Ten years ago if a hillbilly record sold 10,000 copies, it was a hit; today a 50,000 sale is mediocre. These tunes continue to come from the plains, the prairies and the hills. Once a specialty product marketed mainly in the deep South, hillbilly music has a nationwide sales field. With the war, hillbilly, or country, music quickly came out of the hills. Many of our large training camps were in the South. The GI's who might never have been exposed to this relatively unfamiliar music heard it constantly. They liked it—and brought the songs home with them. Postwar shifts in population helped spread it, and disk jockeys followed through and gave country music to a widening audience. It all tied in with a trend toward simpler songs—and nothing is simpler than country music.

Back in 1930 country singers started going highly commercial when Gene Autry's popularity began. Following him came a long procession of names, including Hank Williams, George Morgan, Red Foley, Ernest Tubb, Roy Acuff, Jimmy Wakely, Eddy Arnold, and others. The home of the Grand Ole Opry has become known as the Broadway of country music.

Roy Acuff has said:

If you aren't a country boy, you can't write or sing country music. It is simplicity of our songs, I guess. More than that, it is something in here—something in the heart.

The question has been asked: What kind of music is it? It has never been definitely named. Hillbilly or country music comes near. There are many who believe history will write it down as the true American music. Writers of this type music, like Fred Rose, say theirs is the music of a people who may not know the mathematics of a Wagnerian opera or a Brahms symphony, but they know what it is to hear the sound of songs like those that Jimmie Rodgers wrote and sang: Old Pal of My Heart, The Land of My Boyhood Dreams, Mississippi Moon, Waiting for a Train, and so on. These songs tell a story and touch the heart of country and city folks alike.

Mississippi can be truly called a musical State, if one judges by its singing folk, rather than by the number of its symphony orchestras. Living close to the soil, they have retained the lore, the customs, and the songs of their ancestors. The songs of the railroad, the river, and the field are a part of our heritage. Jimmie Rodgers helped to maintain that heritage, not only for the State of Mississippi but for all home-loving Americans.

My resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1953, is hereby designated as National Hill Billy Music Day, in recognition of the contribution made to American music lore by the writers, singers, and players of hillbilly music.

THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR IS 100 YEARS OLD

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Eighty-second Congress an important anniversay was observed in Washington. I refer to the completion of 100 years of service to the Capital City and the Nation by the Evening Star which celebrated its centennial on December 16, 1952. This remarkable newspaper reflects the devotion and marked ability of Crosby Noyes and Samuel H. Kauffmann and their descendants. For three generations the policies of the Star have been determined largely by these families, and these policies have embraced not only problems of the Federal Government but strictly local interests as well. The Star is a Washington newspaper, but its influence reaches far beyond the District limits.

I first began to read the Star 34 years ago while a student in this great city. One of the high points of that period was a visit to the editor's office to interview the senior editor, Theo W. Noyes. I continue to think of him as the embodiment of highest newspaper standards. From 1908 until 1946 he was the Star's policy maker and one of the finest civic leaders Washington has ever produced. Many worthwhile reforms and civic improvements must be credited to him.

In the valuable document, the centennial edition recently issued by the Star, the careers of the two families, Noyes and Kauffmann, are depicted. Four generations have participated in the Star's impressive achievements. On the staff at this time are Crosby Noyes Boyd, Rudolph Max Kauffmann, John W. Thompson, Jr., Newbold Noyes, Jr., Crosby S. Noyes, Wilmott Lewis, Jr., Rudolph Kauffmann II, Godfrey W. Kauffmann, John H. Kauffmann, and Samuel H. Kauffmann, the Star's president since 1949.

In 1946 Benjamin M. McKelway, the able and respected associate editor, was selected to be the editor after 26 years' employment in various positions, beginning with copy reader. He fills a job previously held by only two men, Crosby Noyes and Theo Noyes.

It has been the privilege of many Members of Congress to become personally acquainted with the splendid representatives of the Star assigned to Capitol Hill. Serving now are Jerry O'Leary and Robert Walsh. Another staff member whose good work has been noted is Caspar Nannes. Many others could be mentioned.

In 1907 the first cartoons of the famous father-son team—Clifford and Jim Berryman—appeared, and their drawings have produced many a congressional chuckle and comment.

I am sure the Members join me in extending good wishes to the Star as it begins its second century.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from an address by Mr. Samuel H. Kauffmann to the Newcomen Society, sketching the Star's 100-year growth:

On next December 16, 1952, as you know, exactly 100 years will have passed since the Star began publishing. In that period of time, a new concept of the journalistic function has evolved—the idea that a newspaper should have one purpose in life, and only one purpose: to serve the public; to serve it with the truth. As a sample study in the development of this idea, the Star has an unusual advantage. It is not so much that our paper has taken the idea more seriously and applied it harder than other newspapers, although we like to think that the Star has been close to the front of the march. It is, rather, a question of continuity of development.

For the past 85 years, ownership and management of the Star have been in the hands of one group of people. In 1868, Samuel H. Kauffmann was elected president of the company. The ideas of the man of the same name who had the honor of taking over in 1949 may be different from his grandfather's, but they descended from those earlier ideas in an unbroken line of training and experience. Opinions differ, of course, as to whether this particular sort of continuity is desirable—there are some who think it tends to in-grow the institution concerned. But the stability of our operation has given those of us working on the Star today an unusual perspective on the trend of ideas in our trade. And the trend itself is more easily discernible in the case of the Star than in the case of other papers. When a newspaper changes hands frequently, the alterations of aim and attitude through which it passes can be explained too easily in terms of the changing whims of management. But when a newspaper stays for a long time in the same set of hands, the development of its policy depends on the natural process of growing up—the growing up of the entire industry as well as the individual paper. The Star, in other terms, provides us with a case history in which we can study, in its purest form, the process by which a newspaper struggles toward maturity of conscience.

The Star was founded by a printer named Joseph Borrows Tate, who served in his spare time as an officer in a military unit known as the Washington Light Infantry. At 34, Captain Tate had a round beard, a flat press, $500—and a simple but daring idea. He thought he might make a success with a nonpartisan paper, selling for a penny, which would concern itself above all with what was happening in Washington. The precedents were against any such notion. Already, more than 100 newspapers had failed here. Of the four which had survived, two were kept by political factions. The other two were the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, which then did unofficially what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now does officially, and the National Intelligencer, itself a Whig Party organ, publishing polished essays on highbrow subjects and evincing a profound disregard for the actualities of the day. No local paper thought enough of local Washington news to assign a reporter to it.

Good soldier that he was, Captain Tate charged boldly into this forbidding situation. His bugle call was a stirring one: The Star, he said, would be "free from party trammels or sectarian influences * * * devoted in an especial manner to the local interests of the beautiful city which bears the honored name of Washington." That stands as a fair statement of our objective today. Unfortunately, however, we have no way of knowing whether Captain Tate came at all close to keeping his promises. The first edition of the paper—the only one produced under his management of which we still have a copy—provides very few encouraging clues. The contributions of the Star's single reporter to the four-page sheet, on that day at least, appear to have been somewhat haphazard. His chief claim to modern fame was a two-sentence story beginning: "Our courts are sitting, but the business with which they are engaged is not of a very interesting character." Whatever else it may lack, that statement has the unmistakable ring of honesty.

Six months after launching the paper, Captain Tate decided it was time to retreat. The Star was sold to Mr. Wallach—Steamboat Bill, you recall. For 2 years, Wallach ran it in association with a man named William Hope. Thereafter, for another 12 years, he himself was the sole proprietor. Tate, meanwhile, retired to the salaried security of the cashier's cage, where he died in 1858, at the age of 39.

Wallach was an experienced newspaperman, having previously run a paper in Texas and served as associate editor of the old Washington Union. His intentions with respect to the Star were precisely what Tate's had been. He was out to make it, as he wrote, "emphatically the Washington newspaper." He wasted no time about it. The day he took over the Star, he celebrated by increasing the paper's page size. Immediately, new orders began pouring in to the little office at Twelfth and D Streets, where the press rattled ever louder and more merrily in a shed at the rear. The orders kept pouring in until the Star could boast that it had more circulation and advertising linage than all other Washington papers combined.

What else did the Star of Wallach's time have a right to boast about? It seems to have had three big qualities, none of them usual in those days. The first and most important was an attitude of honesty, indefinable, but nonetheless genuine. In leafing through those early pages of the Star, the modern reader very soon begins to feel something more than amusement at the quaint turns of phrase and twists of journalistic technique. He begins to feel, in short, that those who were putting out the paper were doing their best to be fair to the people and events they were writing about.

Secondly, the Star a "news" paper, even in those days. It was, moreover, a Washington

newspaper, as Tate had said it would be. It is hard for us to realize, now, that the business of printing news—the ordinary stuff that mattered to people and interested them—was looked down on by most editors of the time as a somewhat vulgar occupation, beneath the dignity of the true journalist. The editor of the Star did not feel this way. He told his readers what was happening in their own back yards—the story of the riot in Swampoodle, the fire on the Avenue, the debate in a citizens' political meeting. The public was appreciative.

Wallach kept his promise that the Star would be politically nonpartisan, and from this arose the paper's third good quality in that early period. Nonpartisanship then was such an unusual point of view in the journalistic profession that it required constant definition. Wallach was outraged whenever anyone called his paper neutral. "The Star," he proclaimed editorially, "is independent, not neutral. Neutrality implies being undecided. No one * * * can really fancy that it is in our nature to fail to have an emphatic opinion upon every subject worth forming an opinion about." The editor reserved his special scorn, however, for critics who attacked the Star as the organ of this or that political party. The conflicting accusations came from so many quarters—as they still do today—that he proposed the calling of a convention to decide who really owned his paper's editorial soul. Particularly persistent were charges that the Star spoke for the administration in power—then the Democratic administration of Franklin Pierce. To these charges, Wallach gave a careful answer:

"We treat the present national administration," he wrote, "just as we would feel it to be our duty to treat it were the Whigs in power. * * * We have seen enough of politics to believe that it is the duty of the independent press to open the eyes of the country to the character of much of the abuse always being heaped upon the Government of the United States, we care not which party may be in power." Thus wrote William Wallach, in 1853. Those words may have echoed in our editorial subconscious mind ever since. For if the Star has displayed any one political tendency over the years, that tendency seems to have been to take a sympathetic view of the tribulations of the men bearing actual responsibility for the conduct of our Government.

Our editors also seemed a little doubtful as to how far they should concern themselves with the accuracy of the news. Though the Star could pride itself on being more reliable than its competitors, there is no doubt that its attitude on this point was more relaxed than it is today. It cheerfully parroted stories appearing in other papers—stories it had no way of verifying. It was known, on occasion, to kill somebody off in an obituary and then resurrect him the next day—after the supposed corpse had put in an appearance, his health sound and his dudgeon high. When things like this happened, the Star assumed the outraged attitude of an innocent bystander. It had been hoaxed—somebody had told it a lie, which it had accepted without further question as the truth. Such was the unblushing, and presumably satisfactory, explanation. Perhaps it was not wholly without reason that the column adjoining the Star's editorials for years was headed: "Washington news and gossip."

Such practices, of course, were not peculiar to the Star. On the contrary, they were typical of newspapers of the time, and more typical of most other papers than they were of ours. But the fact is that the Star, along with other newspapers, had a good deal to learn about its public responsibility. It has been learning ever since.

A man by the name of Crosby Noyes had much to do with the first stages of this learning process. A native of Maine, he rode into Washington on a farmer's wagon on a New Year's Eve in 1847, aged 22, and with $1.61 in his pocket. He learned his way around working as a bookstore clerk, as a theater usher, as string correspondent for a number of northern newspapers and as local route agent for the Baltimore Sun. He came to work on the Star in 1853, and soon was serving as Wallach's right-hand man, at a salary of $12 a week. The editor relied on him; the city and the Government officials here trusted him. When Abraham Lincoln finished his second inaugural address, it was to young Mr. Noyes that he handed his script—the Star made the text in that evening's edition. In the postwar years, as Wallach's preoccupation with the rustic life led him further and further astray from his office desk, Crosby Noyes took more and more control of the paper's routine operation. When the chance finally came to buy the Star in 1867, he was ready and willing.

Four friends joined him in that $100,000 purchase. There was Clarence B. Baker, who had been business manager under Wallach. There was Alexander Shepherd, a municipal politician whose faith in Washington—with the Star's help—was to bring the modern city into being. There was George W. Adams, able correspondent for the New York World, and several other out-of-town newspapers. Finally, there was Grandfather Kauffmann. He had put out a small newspaper in Ohio before he came to Washington during the Civil War to work for the United States Treasury Department. These five published the paper for 1 year as "Noyes, Baker & Co.," until the present Evening Star Newspaper Co. was formed under a special charter granted by Congress. Clarence Baker dropped out in a matter of months, and Alexander Shepherd sold his interest to the other partners in 1874. The Adams, Noyes, and Kauffmann families have carried on ever since.

Under the dominant influence of Crosby Noyes as editor, the Star was to grow and prosper for another 40 years. It also was to take long strides along the road leading away from the old idea of personal journalism, toward the new ideal of newspapering as a carefully organized exercise in public responsibility.

This was the era of the emergence of the yellow press, and the practices of journalistic sensationalism that go with the name. Crosby Noyes saw to it that the Star not only resisted the new doctrine, but also took the field as its sworn foe. He blasted away at what he called the "modern penny dreadful * * * packed with horrors"—murders, rapes, elopements, divorces, and so on. He predicted that in the long run this sort of thing would never have a chance against "clean, sane, reputable journals."

While all this was going on, a number of younger men were growing up with the Star. The ideas they acquired and the lessons they learned were to affect the character of the paper for nearly half a century.

There was Rudolph Kauffmann, eldest son of the original Samuel, whose son, Max, now is the Star's esteemed vice president. Rudolph came to the paper in 1875. He was one of the first Washington reporters to cover his assignments on a bicycle, and became managing editor in 1898, serving in that position until his death in 1927. There were Thomas C. Noyes and Victor Kauffmann, both of whom went to work in 1889. Tom became city editor and then news manager. Victor made his contribution as Sunday editor.

But the men of the then younger generation who were to lead the Star through the period of its greatest growth—the first team, so to speak—were Crosby Noyes' two older sons, Theodore and Frank, and Fleming Newbold, Frank Noyes' brother-in-law.

Theodore Noyes joined the Star staff in 1877, and 10 years later was named associate editor. He succeeded to the editorship upon his father's death in 1908—he held that post until 6 years ago, when he died at the age of 88. Gentle, kindly—and extremely stubborn—he devoted his journalistic career to three basic propositions. First, the people of Washington must have the same right other Americans have to vote for their national Government. Second, the rest of America must recognize an obligation to help support the capital of the United States of America as the Nation's city. Third, the Star must always tell both sides of every story. No Washingtonian needs to be persuaded as to the importance of the first two points—and experience seems to indicate that many non-Washingtonians are yet to be persuaded. For the moment, it is the third point which concerns us. Theodore Noyes made an absolute fetish of it. If anyone had a valid complaint that the Star had unfairly omitted essential facts from any story, the Star would write that story again. It might be days later—but the full, unbiased report had to be given.

On his editorial page, Theodore Noyes shunned equally the pretense of omniscience, the bludgeon of invective, and the needle of satire. He believed he had more chance of converting sinners to his point of view by gentle persuasion than by hotly attacking them. In all his life, he never used a typewriter. He made his views known to his subordinates on the Star by memoranda scribbled on the backs of envelopes, letters, and galley proofs—or, when illness forced him to stay at home, through the medium of an old-fashioned, two-handed telephone. In those later years, much of the burden of directing the paper's editorial operation fell to his nephew, Newbold Noyes, the Star's associate editor. But Newbold Noyes died in 1942, and Theodore kept in constant touch with the office almost to the day of his death.

The second son, Frank, was primarily concerned with the business side of the Star's operations—he served as president of the company from 1910 until a year before his death in 1948. In this capacity he led the paper through a remarkable era of physical growth, for it was the two decades between 1910 and 1930 which saw the Star converted from a prosperous small-town business to the great metropolitan enterprise we know today. But Frank Noyes' interest in journalism, and his knowledge of it, went far beyond considerations of business management. He had had 8 years' experience editing a newspaper in Chicago, and he had inherited from his father the same stern code that made Theodore the newspaperman he was. The full significance of that code is the more readily appreciated in Frank's case because, as first and long-time president of the modern Associated Press, he projected these ideas beyond the walls of the Star office into a field where they influenced the whole course of journalism in this country. And the bread which the Star thus cast on the waters of the outside journalistic world infallibly returned to have a magnified effect on our paper.

Frank Noyes did not, of course, create the AP in his own image. It was the need for an impartially reliable news-gathering service, not subject to anyone's dictatorial whim, which brought about this great cooperative endeavor. But the philosophy of personal, sensational and selfishly-controlled journalism which the AP had to combat was precisely the philosophy which Crosby Noyes had despised. And when the AP founders began to look around among their number for someone equipped, by nature and training, to lead the fight for free, unbiased news, Frank Noyes was their logical choice.

Now for a few words on the newspaper business as a business. Just as the Star grew, over the years, into an attitude toward the news quite different from the one it held in the early days, so too it grew into a new sense of its business responsibility. Neither development would have had meaning without the other. The idea that a newspaper should not allow its business interest to affect its news policy or edi-

torial judgment is now pretty generally accepted. But it is fair to say that the Star has carried this idea further than many other newspapers. We have found it wise to make a complete separation between our editorial and business functions, leaving them wholly independent of each other.

The president of the Star, for instance, would not more think of directing its editor what position to take in the coming Presidential campaign, than the editor would think of telling the president of the Star what advertising policies are to be pursued. The editor's job, and that of the news department, is to pass on to the public the information and opinions which the Star has acquired. The job of the business management is to bring our readers and our advertisers into contact with each other. It is as simple as that. This does not mean at all that these two departments are isolated one from the other; on the contrary, there is the fullest exchange of ideas and suggestions. All departments of the Star are free to offer comments, even criticisms, touching on all phases of our operation.

The editor, like the president, is an elected officer of the company, and therefore his decisions are subject to the approval of the board of directors. But the fact is that no board of directors of the Evening Star Newspaper Co. has ever given an instruction to the editor of the Star.

This principle of editorial independence has been practiced on our paper through three generations. In 1890, the Star was in the midst of a hard fight to remove railroad tracks from the downtown streets of Washington and from what was to become the Mall. Because of its large advertising budget, the railroad undoubtedly felt the Star should accord it certain editorial courtesies. The Star did not budge an inch. It said: "The Pennsylvania Railroad is a very rich and powerful corporation. But it has not enough money to buy a line of editorial opinion in the Star, and this it very well knows." Shortly thereafter, the tracks were removed from Washington's streets and peace reigned once again on the banks of the Potomac.

We have seen that by the time the Star was 50 years old it had accepted most of its responsibilities as we conceive them today. There was, however, one field in which it had not yet done so. Advertising still was in pretty much the same unholy mess that it was in during the Wallach era. True, the Government had made some feeble efforts to bring the medicine men within the bounds of legality, but they still were going almost as strong as ever. Fakers in the financial field, on the other hand, were going stronger than ever, promising huge dividends on the most dubious investments. And merchants were pushing their so-called bargain advertising to lengths their forebears had hardly dreamed of. Washington had tried a system which worked in some other cities, forming an advertising club of reputable local merchants who might work together to stamp out piratical practices for their own protection. Here, however, the effort had failed.

The man who undertook to straighten all this out was Fleming Newbold. He served as business manager of the Star in Frank Noyes' regime, and held the president's job himself during the last year of his life. In 1910, Mr. Newbold recognized that the anything-goes philosophy of newspaper advertising was hurting the reputation of newspapers. He believed the Star should accept the same sort of responsibility for the honesty of its advertising content that it did for the news content. He knew if we acted on his theory it would affect some advertising revenue. But he was convinced that the principle was sound.

Other newspapers, elsewhere, had tried to censor their advertising copy, but none had succeeded in making the censorship really effective. This time it was different. The Star invited readers to let it know whenever they found themselves to have been misled by one of its advertisements. Whenever there was a justifiable complaint, the cause of the complaint had to be corrected—or that advertiser had to get along without advertising in the Star.

The public cooperated loyally, and so, of course, did all the reputable advertisers, which means all the advertisers that matter. Today, we have a really effective Advertising Club as well as an active Better Business Bureau, and with their help the campaign still is going on. One result has been that advertising in Washington has maintained a high level of honesty. Another result has been that the Star has established itself more securely than ever in its position of leadership in Washington—not only as an advertising medium, but also as a force operating for the best interests of the city.

This is the way things have always worked out on our paper. If the years have taught us anything, it is that the only course which makes any sense—business sense, or any other kind of sense—is the course steered by the compass of public service. Our whole experience leads us to the conviction that so long as our first concern remains the welfare of our readers, the success of our business operation should be assured.

We have faced a lot of competition in our time, and we never have found ourselves disadvantaged by standing as close as we could by Mr. White's brief commandment. The powerful, rich, and clever of the newspaper world, one by one, have made their way to our city and tried their hands here—Frank Munsey, Arthur Brisbane, William Randolph Hearst, and many other noted journalists of past and present days. We are always glad to see them come. And we are always sorry to see them go.

And so tonight, not only are we looking back over the past hundred years with a feeling of honest pride, we also are looking forward to the next hundred years with an equally strong feeling of hope.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to join with the gentleman from Arkansas in commenting upon the one hundredth anniversary of the Washington Evening Star. It is a great newspaper, it has given notable recognition of the development of the city of Washington and many of its editorial policies have had universal support in this Congress and elsewhere.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman. I am sure we speak for the Membership of the House when we wish the Star many more years of service.

THE ALL-PARTY CONGRESS (MOSCOW)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, most of us were primarily concerned last October with our very interesting political campaign, and consequently, the American press and radio largely ignored the All-Party Congress convened in Moscow to receive the blueprint for Soviet Russia's future program.

The major theme of that meeting appeared to be the Soviet program to destroy the free world's alliance against communism through a system of economic warfare. Stalin contended that the prospect of war between the capitalist countries is greater than the prospect of war between the Communist world and the free world, because of the certainty of further development of economic rivalries between capitalist countries.

Yesterday there was a significant news item from Moscow which pointed up the further implementation of the Soviet trade-war policy. Premier Stalin had a lengthy interview with Senior Luis Bravo, the new Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. from the Argentine. Exchange agreements for the Russian and Argentine products were apparently the main topic of the conversation. Significantly, this was Premier Stalin's first interview with a representative of a western nation in some 4 years.

The lesson for America is obvious. We must work quickly to eliminate more and more of the economic barriers that make trade difficult between the nations of the free world. Economic warfare between the free nations plays directly into the hands of the Communists.

The Congress can take effective action in this field in the next few weeks by extending the Reciprocal Trade Act without the present restrictive amendments which serve to nullify the purpose of the law. Other steps to eliminate trade barriers should follow in rapid order.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to establish a bipartisan joint congressional committee to advise the President on foreign policy. I believe this resolution will set up the machinery for a genuine bipartisan foreign policy for America.

The idea of a bipartisan foreign policy is not new, though I believe my plan is an original method of effecting it.

Only yesterday the independent Washington Star, in an editorial, said:

> President Eisenhower's promise of bipartisanship sounded fine but by the end of the week there was a rather hollow ring to its echo. On the matter of Formosa there appeared to have been little or no bipartisanship discussion before the action was taken.

I have been thrice elected to Congress from a Republican area with increasing majorities. I have pledged myself to support the best interests of our country and I intend to do so. Since the President has expressed his wishes, I believe we Members of Congress should avail ourselves of this opportunity to assist the President in deciding upon a truly bipartisan foreign policy.

One week ago today our President appeared here to deliver his great message. In that message he asked for our cooperation when he said that "our foreign

policy must be a product of continuous cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of this Government." Furthermore he emphasized the need for bipartisanship when he expressed his desire for a foreign policy "developed and directed in the spirit of true bipartisanship."

We know of the futility of the great debate in the last Congress which consumed many months of our time and at best ended in a draw. We all hope that now the shoe is on the other foot we do not have a repetition of this episode. My plan for a genuine bipartisan foreign policy would not limit debate. In fact, it would encourage debate on an informative basis totally removed from the partisan criticism level.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my plan as expressed in this resolution is sound and its adoption is urgently needed to win our fight for peace and freedom for the people throughout the world.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House today for 45 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

HOLLAND FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Thirteenth District of New Jersey has many historic landmarks. Not only is the Statue of Liberty off its shores but one of the oldest churches, the Old Bergen Dutch Reformed Church, is in it. I went to public school No. 11. Outside of that great freedom school is a statue of Peter Stuyvesant. Naturally, when the recent disaster in Holland took place, it brought back boyhood recollections of the early Netherland influence in my district. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its profound sympathy for the brave people of the Netherlands who have suffered such heavy losses both in lives and in property as the result of the recent storms and floods which have ravaged their country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the introduction of the resolution. It is a most thoughtful act, the adoption of which will be deeply appreciated by the people of that grief-stricken country.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] deserve consideration. I have been informed by the police officers or guards in charge of the parking lot on New Jersey Avenue that every morning they turn away practically 200 to 250 cars owned by secretaries who are unable to find a place to park. Now, aside from the action of the District officials in giving a mere employee, not an elected official of the White House, 85 feet of parking space up here on Capitol Hill, I think perhaps the officials of the Congress should look into the possibility of acquiring more parking space so that the girls, our secretaries, will not have to park maybe half a mile away from their place of business. So, I think it is deserving of some consideration.

PARKING SPACE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week every Democrat who voted, with two exceptions, voted to extend to the President legislative functions. It is the bill to enable the President to submit reorganization plans which become law unless vetoed by a majority of the Members of either House that I am talking about. They pledged, and you all heard them, oh, how they pledged allegiance to the President. Today three of them, our colleague from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] come to the well and complain because former Governor Adams, a former Member of this House—and mind you in 1945, he voted for the amendment I offered the other day, together with 163 other Republicans—just because he has a little parking space somewhere on the Hill you gentlemen forget your profession of conversion of last Tuesday. You come in and complain about parking. Where do you want this capable Presidential adviser to park, down in Maryland, or out in Virginia somewhere and then have him walk in and be late on his job of advising the President. I am certain he wants no special privilege, but really now, how can he help the President, run errands for him, if he cannot park his car somewhere near his home, his job?

Why not be consistent? Why "backslide" so soon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 23, 1953, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT FLOOR MANAGERS OF TELEPHONES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 136) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1953, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the two assistant floor managers of telephones (one for the minority), Doorkeeper's Department, at the basic rate of $500 per annum each, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EQUALIZE, STABILIZE, AND REDUCE FEDERAL TAXES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, since this session began, I have introduced bills directed at various phases of our national tax system. In the main, they are proposals calculated to implement the administration's expressed program of encouragement to business, provide relief for taxpaying individuals, and lend support to independent action and prosperity in our farming communities.

The Federal income taxes of both individuals and corporations are scheduled to be automatically and substantially reduced during the next 2 years, regardless of action on the part of the Eighty-third Congress. But it is not enough merely to return to a tax program which was unsatisfactory when it was in effect, a tax program that will certainly be no more satisfactory in 1954. As President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message:

The tax structure as a whole demands review. • • • We must develop a system of taxation which will impose the least possible obstacle to the dynamic growth of the coun-

try. This includes particularly real opportunity for the growth of small businesses. Many readjustments in existing taxes will be necessary to serve these objectives and also to remove existing inequities.

Every American taxpayer can applaud those words. They are words of warning that must be heeded, for it is quite possible that our revenues may be too drastically cut, unless new and presently untapped tax sources are immediately brought within the taxpaying fold. And it is certain that unless we adopt corrective measures of the kind that I am proposing, all individual taxpayers, all bankers, and innumerable businesses of practically all kinds will remain in the unhappy and inequitable tax situation which they have occupied during the past two decades; while perhaps half of our farmers will be required by law to pay individual taxes that should by rights be paid by someone else. These inequalities were originated and promulgated by previous administrations dating back to 1916. They should be, and must be, corrected.

We are confronted today, Mr. Speaker, by the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, we may sit calmly by and permit automatic tax reductions to go into effect as scheduled. On the other hand, we may speed up the time of individual tax reduction, as urged by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, in the hope that the Congress will then cut the garment of our Federal expenditures to fit the cloth of our contracting revenues. In either case our tax problem can be more easily solved if we locate new sources of revenue at the same time that we give tax relief to those who are now paying too much in taxes. This can be done.

In House Joint Resolution 61, which I have introduced in several previous Congresses—even though I knew that the spendthrift New Deal administrations would have none of it—I am again proposing a constitutional limitation of Federal income taxes. Let me say at once, however, that the percentage limitation named in this resolution—25 percent—is by no means conclusive. As I pointed out in a speech on this floor on March 17, 1952, the rates can be graduated, low rates for the little taxpayer, higher rates for the large taxpayer, but a tax ceiling low enough to encourage individual initiative and business expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it must be definitely and finally written into our basic law that there is a limit to the amount that Congress may take from the incomes of its citizens and their businesses, so that in years to come—perhaps a generation from now—when the spenders may once more find themselves in power, they will be legally restrained from imposing such intolerable tax burdens as the country has had to bear in the last two decades. Let me say further that such a limitation of taxes must be tied up with a limitation of expenditures, a limitation of the Federal debt, and a provision that many of the unfair exemptions and special privileges that exist today will be done away with for all time.

This last-named provision—the elimination of many of the special tax privileges now in the law—is the subject of my bill H. R. 1559. That bill proposes to repeal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code that provide exemption to certain favored organizations and corporations from payment of income tax on earnings.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the first steps toward Federal income-tax equality of business competitiors were taken in the Revenue Act of 1951. They were feeble steps, slightly affecting building and loan associations and mutual savings banks, and quite unfairly imposing upon farmer members of cooperatives the income tax that should be paid by those corporations themselves. On December 17, 1952, the Wall Street Journal made the following pertinent statement in its weekly tax summary:

Federal taxes paid by savings and loan associations this year will be small. Savings and loan associations, together with mutual savings banks, became subject to Federal income taxes for the first time this year. They are taxed only on profits after dividends and provision for a specific reserve. The associations each year can add as much to this bad debts reserve as they deem necessary, up to 12 percent of their total share capital at the end of the taxable year, minus the surplus and reserves at the beginning of the year, but not more than the net income for the taxable year. Since reserves and undivided profits of savings associations generally are less than 10 percent of saving capital, the associations this year will be permitted to make substantial tax-free addition to reserves. The associations also will pay out more in dividends this year than they did in 1951.

The Journal concluded with a highly significant quotation from a savings and loan official, who said:

The tax is fine as it stands now. But as soon as Congress finds how little revenue it produces, I'm afraid there will be agitation to make it tougher.

He was quite right, Mr. Speaker. I give notice here and now that I am initiating the agitation to make the Federal income tax tougher on all building and savings and loan organizations. And if my motives are questioned in seeking to put a heavier tax burden on these associations that still try to maintain the fiction that they are solely for the thrift of little people, let me call to your attention another article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1952, under feature headlines on page 1 that said, "Free rose bushes, bigger returns on money boom savings and loan groups—Assets soar 279 percent since prewar; competitors' gains range from 112 percent to 157 percent—Hopalong is lending a hand."

I shall not attempt to read the article, but under permission previously granted I shall insert pertinent parts of it at this point in my speech:

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr., staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

As a super-salesman of thrift, Mr. Hahn is typical of a growing number of executives in the 5,980 savings and loan associations scattered across the country. Many of these associations are handing their customers everything from free rose bushes to higher returns on their money. And the customers seem to be loving it.

Both the salesmanship and its successes, its can be noted, are coming in doses which sometimes curl the hair of the s. & l. men's arch-competitors—savings banks, commercial banks, and life insurance companies. The savings and loan folks are growing a lot faster than these rivals. Their assets at the turn of the year will add up to an estimated $21.8 billion—279 percent greater than in prewar 1940. Over the same period, savings banks' assets have grown 112 percent, life insurance companies' 136 percent. Time deposits in commercial banks—mostly savings by individuals—have risen 157 percent during the period.

Some of the salesmanship shows up in advertising budgets. Savings associations plunked down nearly $20,000,000 on ad campaigns last year. According to a Financial Public Relations Association survey, commercial and savings banks combined—with nine times the assets of savings associations—spent only $43,000,000.

Assets of savings and loan associations rose a record of $2,800,000,000, or 15 percent, in 1952, according to Charles L. Clements, president of the United States Savings & Loan League. Morton Bodfish, chairman of that industry trade group, adds: "If the present rate of growth continues for another decade, ours will be a $50 billion business."

The growth of the savings and loan associations has been tied directly to the Nation's postwar housing boom. The associations are required to put most of their cash into residential mortgages. If houses hadn't been sprouting up all over, the s. & l. men would have had no place to invest most of the accumulated savings.

Gains for some individual institutions have been near fantastic. Whittier Savings & Loan in the Los Angeles metropolitan area has hiked assets 174 percent in the past 11 months. Home Federal in Chicago has marked up gains of 32 percent in the past year and 194 percent over 1945. And Mr. Hahn's First Federal in New York has rung up one of 234 percent since World War II's end.

* * * * *

Savings and loan associations are located in every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Pennsylvania has the most, 896, followed by Ohio with 609, Illinois with 577, and New Jersey with 488. And although they are known by different names in various places, they're the same type of institution.

In New England, for example, they're often called cooperative banks. In Louisiana they are homestead associations. Elsewhere, they are building and loan associations, building associations, savings associations, building and loan companies, building and saving companies, savings and loan companies, and home and savings associations.

One of the biggest member-getters for these groups is the relatively high rate of return on funds put in. Most places the interest paid by savings and commercial banks runs below the dividend rate of competing savings and loans. For one thing, the latter have a much bigger proportion of their funds invested in relatively higher-yielding mortgages on homes than do banks or insurance companies. For instance, mortgage holdings of the savings and loans on one- to four-family nonfarm homes top $16,000,000,000, more than the total held by savings banks and insurance companies combined though the latter have fourfold as much total assets.

In Chicago, the four largest associations all pay more than the 1½ percent commercial bank rate. They now pay from 2 to 2½ percent, but three of the four plan January 1 boosts which will lift the range to 2½ percent and 2¾ percent.

Dallas savings and loan outfits pay 2½ to 3 percent, compared with 2 percent paid by savings departments of commercial banks on deposits up to $10,000. Most downtown Los

Angeles associations are now offering 3 percent, compared with 2 percent for the highest-paying bank; and big Coast Federal Savings & Loan Association, largest savings and loan, in the city, is boosting its dividend to 3½ percent at the year-end.

What such a boost can mean was recently demonstrated in Rockville Centre, N. Y., a Long Island suburb of New York City. Most New York area savings banks and savings and loans alike pay a return of 2½ percent, but the County Federal Savings & Loan of Rockville Centre jumped to 3 percent last December 31. By midyear, its assets had soared 39 percent to $72,500,000, making the institution the largest association in the State.

Southern California's fast-growing associations have written some outstanding success stories with higher rates, too. For example, one in Bakersfield pays a 4-percent dividend, but you have to wait your turn to plunk down your money. There's a lengthy waiting list of prospective members.

Associations in the Los Angeles area are among the most aggressive business getters. Glendale associations, for example, advertise their 3½ percent interest rate in New York City newspapers. And on their home ground, Los Angeles area associations are leaving few stones unturned.

* * * * *

When Home Federal, one of Chicago's Big Four associations, moved into the Loop in July, it gave to new members such items as clock radios, fountain pens, and silverware. The size of the gift depended on the size of the investment—one of $1,000, for example, brought a set of silverware.

Results? Home Federal's savings accounts in July increased by $14,500,000, compared with $700,000 in June and $700,000 in August. On November 30, its total assets stood at $59,500,000, up almost one-third from a year earlier.

The cold hard fact is that the Nation's 5,980 savings and loan associations are operating practically without Federal income tax on their huge earnings. That is why they can afford to give away rose bushes, clock radios, fountain pens, and sets of silver; that is why they were able to spend $20,000,000 in advertising campaigns last year; that is why they are erecting fancy new buildings, not only in Washington but everywhere else; that is why they can pay 3 percent interest on deposits against 1 or 2 percent of commercial banks, and that is why they look forward to a $50,000,000,000 business in another decade.

They are Federal income-tax free, though it is conservatively estimated that they would have paid $249,500,000 into the Treasury last year had they been taxed like the commercial banks which are their competitors. A quarter of a billion dollars that had to be paid by other overburdened taxpayers because New Deal administrations were afraid to buck this growing octopus. Another quarter of a billion dollars would come in taxes from the mutual-savings banks, if they were not pampered and petted and given preference under the fiction that they are somewhat different from commercial savings banks that pay their share of the Federal costs.

H. R. 1559 proposes to tax these tax-dodging institutions by removing the secondary loopholes of escape that were written into the 1951 Revenue Act.

Mr. Speaker, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks have a real place in the American economy. They have served a good purpose, and have accomplished great good. But the same can be said of all commercial banks, of the Ford Motor Co., of General Motors, and many other corporations—all of whom pay the regular corporate taxes. Why should not the savings and loan associations and the mutual savings banks pay the regular corporate taxes also? I object strenuously to their pretense—and it is a pretense—that they are little agencies for the thrift of little people. Nothing could be further from the fact. Whatever they may have been when they started, they are today big and important bankers, and, as Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, said in debate on the floor of the Senate on September 21, 1951:

> If we leave them tax-exempt the day will come when they and the other tax-exempt organizations will have all the money in the country.

Mr. Speaker, they must be taxed and taxed in full on their earnings. Such taxation will equalize their operations with those of taxpaying commercial banks, and they will pay into the Treasury of the United States half a billion dollars, thereby providing some measure of relief for presently overburdened individuals and corporations.

Furthermore, H. R. 1559 proposes to correct the gross inequity that was perpetrated upon the American farmer by the inclusion in the 1951 Revenue Act of a miserable method of making him pay individual income taxes on the earnings of his cooperatives, even though he receives no cash patronage dividends and has no prospect of ever receiving cash for the dead horse that has been handed him in the form of stock or scrip or book allocations. Only now, as their Federal income taxes for 1952 are falling due, are the farmer members of cooperatives beginning to realize what a dirty trick the Truman administration played on them. Since many of our colleagues in the House, Mr. Speaker, were unaware of the injustice they were perpetrating, and many others are new and have no knowledge of the disservice performed upon their constituents by their elders in Congress, I want to stress how the officers and managers of many cooperatives wheedled Congressmen into accepting a tax on farmer members when it should have been borne by the cooperatives themselves.

Let us use real names and real places, as supplied by the Department of Agriculture's slick-paper publication called News for Farmer Cooperatives. Here are recommendations taken from the November 1952 issue of that publication, urging you to stock your pantry shelves with such nontaxpaying products as Diamond walnuts, product of the California Walnut Growers Association, of Los Angeles; Rockingham turkeys from Rockingham Poultry Marketing Cooperative, Inc., of Broadway, Va.; picnic hams from the Shen-Valley Meat Packers, of Timberville, Va.; Ocean Spray cranberry sauce from the National Cranberry Association, of Hanson, Mass.; Blue Diamond almonds from the California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento; Clover Honi-Spred put out by the Finger Lakes Honey Producers Cooperative, Groton, N. Y.; Land O' Lakes butter from Land O' Lakes Creameries, Minneapolis; co-op eggs from Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va.; Sunsweet prune juice and dried apricots from California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose; Tri-Valley apricot juice from Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco; Donald Duck frozen orange juice from Florida Citrus Canners, Lake Wales; Welch's frozen grape juice from the National Grape Cooperative Association, Westfield, N. Y.; GLF Vitafed flour from Cooperative GLF Exchange, Ithaca, N. Y.; Flav-R-Pack frozen strawberries of North Pacific Canners and Packers, Portland, Oreg.; Sunkist oranges from the Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles.

And these, Mr. Speaker, are only a very few of the tax-escaping cooperative products that my colleagues will most likely find on their own pantry shelves when they go home tonight—while they fret and fume over ways to cut taxes and still meet the extravagant budget that the Truman administration has wished off on us.

For instance, if they come from the Middle West, they may use the gas and oil and cola drinks of the Consumers Cooperative Association of Kansas City, which is so big and so important in its tax-dodging position that it proposed last year to show Mr. Mossadegh of Iran how to run the oil refineries he had snatched from Britain.

If they come from San Francisco, they would almost surely find on the pantry shelves the sugar of the California & Hawaii Refining Co.—C. & H. whose treasurer naively told a congressional committee a few years ago that "we became a cooperative to escape taxes."

If they come from Pennsylvania, they might smoke Country Gentleman cooperative cigars. If they come from Ohio, they might buy cooperative insurance; if they were sick in Oklahoma, they might have a cooperative doctor; and if they happened to die in Minnesota, they might well have a cooperative funeral accompanied with a patronage dividend in scrip on which their estate would have to pay income tax.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, none of these concerns—practically all operating under corporation laws—pay Federal income taxes because they claim the millions of dollars that they earn are somehow unlike the dollars that other companies earn, and that they should therefore be required to pay no taxes—or little taxes—or what they themselves may determine to be a tax—for the support of our boys in Korea, or for the support of our desperate program to build up armed forces that will keep this Nation free. They expect to be protected, but they refuse to pay any part of the high costs of protection.

Mr. Speaker, they must be made to pay—regardless of the fictions with which they surround themselves: The fiction that they are merely partnerships, although they have organized as corporations; the fiction that they are agents of their members, though the agency provision of the law was abolished nearly 30 years ago; the fiction that they have no tax liability under the rules of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Here is the first paragraph of a report that was submitted to the Ways and Means Committee in the spring of 1951 by the wise and authoritative tax staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department. Listen while I read it:

The fact that cooperatives are corporations and that Congress has the constitutional power to tax them as corporations may appear so obvious that discussion of the proposition is unnecessary. However, general statements have been made to the effect that the cooperatives are only agents, partnerships, or trusts, with the implication that they are not entities in their own right capable of having income subject to tax. For this reason it is necessary to establish beyond question the fact that the cooperatives are separate corporate entities which are taxable as such.

And then our experts went on to prove in that report beyond any possible doubt that they are corporations, and taxable as such. Then why not tax them?

If they were taxed, how much money would the Government collect? When that question was asked, Mr. Speaker, back in the New Deal days, the answer always was, "Oh, not very much." But recently I asked the tax experts of the joint committee the following question:

What is your estimate of possible revenue to be derived from taxing these various organizations in exactly the same way that other corporations are taxed and without any consideration of their claims that patronage dividends are not income?

Let me now read you the answer to my question which I received only a few days ago, after exhaustive study by the experts of the joint committee:

Some 6 months ago we made an estimate of the revenue which would be raised under your bill. The estimate was about $800,000,000, in addition to the amount resulting from the Revenue Act of 1951. It should be understood that this estimate is necessarily crude because we do not have satisfactory information on current earnings of many of the groups covered by the bill and were forced to piece together whatever data could be found.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we could expect receipts of nearly $1,000,000,000 from the taxation of cooperatives, building and loan associations, and mutual-savings banks alone, and that estimate is a minimum because, as the reply clearly states, "satisfactory information on current earnings" is not available—largely, I presume, because of the laxity of the Internal Revenue Bureau in enforcing the 1943 requirement that tax-exempt groups file annual statements.

My own estimate of the amounts that would result from full application of the new bill which I have introduced, H. R. 1559, is as follows:

Farmer cooperatives	$331,645,000
Consumer cooperatives	30,353,000
Retailer-owned cooperatives	13,863,000
Mutual fire and casualty insurance	71,200,000
Others	17,500,000
Mutual-savings banks	256,000,000
Savings and loan associations	249,508,000
Production credit associations	3,661,000
National farm loan associations	3,905,000
Credit unions	12,500,000
Government businesses—	
Federal, State, and municipal	491,000,000

The grand total is $1,481,145,000—and that figure is conservative.

I now call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the final section in H. R. 1559, which is new and added to the measure since it was introduced before.

Section 8 reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall, as promptly as feasible, prepare and submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a plan, with appropriate proposed legislation, for subjecting Government enterprises of a proprietary and competitive nature to tax burdens equivalent to those imposed on private business.

I am told that my estimate of half a billion dollars revenue to come from the taxation of such Government-owned businesses as TVA, Bonneville, the Mississippi Barge Line, and the many banking enterprises which are run on taxpayers' money, is far too low. Probably that is right, for there are nearly 100 of these Government businesses competing with taxpaying enterprises.

Mr. Charles Edward Wilson, formerly president of the General Electric Co., and now chairman of the Grace Lines, estimated in a speech before the Commerce and Industry Association of New York last September that the sale of all Government-owned businesses would produce at least $27,000,000,000, which could be used to reduce the national debt; that such a sale would reduce Government's interest payments by half a billion dollars a year; and that taxation of these businesses in private ownership would bring in $1,000,000,000 a year instead of my more modest estimate of $500,000,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury will find out the correct answer when the provisions of H. R. 1559 become law.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on a diversity of topics in the short time I have had the floor—tax limitation by constitutional amendment; reduction of the national debt; reduction of taxes to individuals and corporations; and collection of taxes from cooperatives, building and loan associations, and other tax-exempt groups. These topics are all interrelated; they are part and parcel of the same tax problem, and should be considered together.

We must reduce Federal income taxes, for our people cannot endure the heavy tax burden that is now placed upon them. We must place a limitation upon governmental expenditures, Federal taxes, and the national debt to protect our economy from future political spendthrifts. We must defend our system of free private enterprise by taking Government out of business, and we must do it before the bureaucrats become so strong and so firmly entrenched that they and not we will be the bosses. We must also end tax favoritism to some at the expense of the rest, by a revision of our tax system so that all men and all corporations will pay on all of their earnings.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the year in which this reform should be accomplished. This new administration, in turning over a new tax leaf, should see to it that the new tax leaf will provide an equitable, a just, a well-balanced, and a bearable tax load for all the people of America.

We can do it. Will we have the courage to do it?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

UNITED STATES SHOULD EXTEND DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH REPUBLICS OF UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOEVEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is determined to extend a helping hand to people who are enslaved behind the iron curtain. His recent statements about a new policy of liberation are clear and unequivocal. For the first time since 1945 enslaved people everywhere have heard a voice which assures them that some day in the foreseeable future they will be free. John Foster Dulles, the new Secretary of State, supports the President's position.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which aims to express the sense of this Congress that our Government should seek to establish full diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. We must strive to free these people from the steel chains that bind them to Communist Russia against their will.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to all who want to see, that the free world is running second to the Communist world on the propaganda front. This is an inexcusable situation. Approval of my resolution will serve notice on the Kremlin that the United States is determined to reverse that situation and that henceforth we shall take the initiative on the propaganda front all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Kremlin has maintained the fiction that the Ukraine and Byelorussia are free and independent republics and if one were to believe what he can read it would appear that they are. But I assure you that it is only a pretense. Historically the record shows that as early as 1921 the Ukraine joined in the Treaty of Riga with Poland and Russia. This seems to indicate that Ukraine enjoyed a separate status. Also, when the Union of Socialist Republics was organized in 1923, the Ukraine and Byelorussia was each considered a separate nation and each reserved the right to freely withdraw from the Union.

In a burst of Communist campaign oratory in 1936 Stalin boasted that these two Republics having reserved the right to secede from the Union that steps should be taken to guarantee that the constitution which bound the three nations together should not be a meaningless scrap of paper. What irony.

It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that this constitutional guaranty of autonomy

finds support in the distinctive national banners and emblems of the two states and are presumed to symbolize independent sovereignty of the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

And further, Mr. Speaker, to clinch the argument the Kremlin insisted that the so-called republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia were entitled to have a separate and independent status in the United Nations. Delegates from these countries sit today in the United Nations and their right to do so has never been challenged.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, does the United States fail to establish full diplomatic relations with the Ukraine and Byelorussia? No logical excuse exists why this has not been done. There is a suspicion, however, that to do so would be inconsistent to the Acheson policy of appeasement.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the policy of appeasement ended when Dwight D. Eisenhower took the oath of office as President of the United States on January 20, 1953.

Mr. Speaker, our new President has charted a new course in foreign policy. He has charted it with firmness and with a determination to carry it through. In his great speech to us a week ago he said:

Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices—except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of my resolution is only one of the devices that can be used to beat communism on the propaganda front. Let us start by extending full diplomatic relations with the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The time to start is now.

House Concurrent Resolution 58

Whereas the Soviet Government in Moscow fosters, through propaganda media the appearance of independent will and status on the part of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; and

Whereas in the historical order, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic exercised its complete sovereignty as a signatory, along with the separate states of Poland and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, to the treaty of Riga in 1921, the official text of which appeared in three languages—Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian; and

Whereas on the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the sovereign and independent status was affirmed to the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. by the First Union Constitution which declared that each of the member Republics shall retain the right to freely withdraw from the Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has given the impression that it favored the sovereignty and independent status of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. when it was stated that Republics should have the right to secede from the U. S. S. R. and that such right was to be more than a meaningless scrap of paper; and

Whereas sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. is set forth in the Constitution of 1936 which provides: "The right freely to secede from the U. S. S. R. is reserved to every Union Republic"; and

Whereas said Soviet Constitution provides that each Union Republic has the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives with them; and

Whereas said constitution also provides that each union republic has its own republican military formations; and

Whereas the fundamental law as expressed again in said Soviet Constitution provided: "The supreme soviet of a union republic; * * * (e) decides questions of representation of the union republic in its international relations; (f) determines the manner of organizing the republic's military formations"; and

Whereas in contrast to the conditions prevailing in other soviet republics, the distinctive national banners and emblems of state maintained by the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. are presumed to manifest symbolically the sovereignty and independence of these states; and

Whereas the Government of the United States recognizes the delegations selected to represent the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. as accepted nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas the people of the United States recognize the sovereignty of the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, which is in harmony with the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence of the United States; and, therefore, stand ready to render to these peoples and to the peoples in the Soviet Union any assistance for the strengthening of their freedoms and their economic development; and

Whereas it is clearly incongruous from every viewpoint to maintain the recognition by this Government of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. in the United Nations without the peace-oriented opportunity to establish direct diplomatic concourse with their respective capitals of Kiev and Minsk: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States, in support of a policy of liberation, should proceed to establish direct diplomatic relations with the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and in the creation of posts of representation in the capitals of Kiev and Minsk, respectively, consistent with diplomatic procedure in such matters.

THE LATE ADOLPH J. SABATH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD an address delivered by me on January 30, 1953, at the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D. C., in connection with the memorial services conducted for the late Honorable Adolph J. Sabath.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The contribution which Adolph Sabath made to the United States was more than the mere statistical record of having been a Member of Congress longer than any other man in history.

His real contribution was in the service he rendered—service to people, to thousands of individuals whom he helped in countless ways to establish themselves and their families in this land and thereby develop it into the greatest nation on earth. And in the service he rendered in helping bring about the enactment of social-security legislation affecting the lives of millions of people, as well as many other progressive measures.

His real contribution lies also in the spirit he exemplified by his unceasing championship of causes in behalf of the "little" person. From his earliest battles in Congress for improvement of conditions under which immigrants were brought into this country to his equally zealous battles in behalf of the humane legislation in his later years, Adolph Sabath could always be found on the side of human rights.

But there was one great difference between him and many fellow advocates of the progressive causes which he supported so ardently.

As a product of the hard school of politics he realized the strength of the opposition in any given situation. He knew the handicaps and the obstacles to achievement. He could weigh the possibilities, figure the angles, and estimate the chance of accomplishing even the minimum goals. Likewise he could judge the political consequences for the contending parties, of success or failure. He realized that progress came through compromise.

In other words, my friends, Adolph Sabath was that rarity in public life—a practical idealist.

Striving always toward goals that seemed unattainable he was never discouraged when achievement fell short of the mark.

He might be dissatisfied with the result, but discouraged—never. Every step of progress was to him an urge to further progress, every backward step a challenge to advance.

Adolph Sabath was a man whose buoyant spirit knew no defeat, but rose again after each reversal, to resume the fray—because he believed in the things for which he fought, and because they were right.

In short he possessed that inner spark which we call faith—that striving toward perfection which is man's link with the Lord.

You do well to memorialize him at this Sabbath evening service of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.

In doing so you honor a man who throughout his life lived up to the injunction of the ancient prophets that we should all "Do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly before thy God."

TUTTLE CREEK RESERVOIR, KANS.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced into this Chamber H. R. 2730. The purpose of this bill is to abandon the flood-control project for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans., which was authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 28, 1938.

H. R. 2730 is intended to save the tax payers of the United States, from fifty to one hundred millions of dollars in cold cash. I shall prove absolutely in a few words that the passage of this bill will do just that.

In considering the merits of the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam we must bear in mind that soil conservation and flood prevention measures on the uplands of the Blue River Basin are absolutely essential to the welfare of the Nation. That such measures must and will be taken in the near future and the sooner the better. We must consider also that such measures, properly taken, will prevent, to a large degree, flooding of the lowlands. As to what degree there is some difference of opinion, but it will be at least 50 percent. Some competent engineers assert that this system will

result in 100 percent prevention of floods. Experience in the Washita River Valley seems to bear them out. But the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam does not take into account any such contribution by soil conservation measures. Therefore any contributions that may be made, and made they must be, will render useless the Tuttle Creek Dam by just so much. This conclusion is so plain that "even he who runs may read."

Inevitably, within a few years when these upland measures are taken, 50, 75, or perhaps even 100 percent of Tuttle Creek Reservoir will be rendered useless. Mr. Speaker, if this is not a vicious duplication of effort, a useless waste of the taxpayers' money, then I would like to see an example.

In view of these facts would not the Eighty-third Congress be wise to withdraw all unexpended appropriations for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam, refuse any further appropriation, and abandon entirely authorization for construction until all proper and necessary soil conservation and flood prevention measures have been completed upstream? Congress should in this session appropriate sufficient funds to promote measures of soil conservation and flood prevention in the Blue River Basin with all possible expediency. After such steps have been taken, and this can be done for a fraction of the cost of the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam, we can well discover what flood prevention measures, if any, may be needed on the main channel of the Big Blue River. Many competent engineers assert that there will be no additional steps necessary. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to rescind authorization of Tuttle Creek Dam is a measure in full accord with the announced purpose of this administration to eliminate all appropriations not presently essential to the economy of the Nation. It is in strict accord with the principles avowed in the platforms of both political parties, to cut expense and reduce taxes in every possible manner.

Mr. Speaker, I have given to this Congress reasons for abandoning Tuttle Creek Dam based on cold, hard, economic facts. There is yet a better reason, based on morality and elementary justice. On these grounds we dare not construct Tuttle Creek Dam. We must not unnecessarily drive 3,000 law-abiding, God-fearing people from their homes. If you, my fellow Congressmen, could go among these people, eat at their tables, worship in their churches, visit in their schools and community activities as I have been privileged to do, there is not a single member of this Congress who would vote $1 to construct Tuttle Creek Dam until all other measures of flood prevention had been completed. In the interest of economy and a proper regard for humanity this Congress should pass H. R. 2730 or a bill of similar import.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a constituent in regard to this matter:

RANDOLPH, KANS., *February 2, 1953.*

DEAR MR. MILLER: Even though we would not be directly affected by Tuttle Creek Dam, I am surely convinced it is terribly wrong. Very few people in the valley and surrounding territory think otherwise, although the engineers are trying to get the story spread that so many are selling their property to the Government and that lots of people are waiting to have their appraisal so they can sell. This is all wrong. The few that have agreed to sell are very scattered, one here and one there. I know of one case where the Army engineers were so anxious to get a foothold that they offered a man $2,600 for a little old house in the very small town of Barrett. The man had been wanting to sell his house for some time and was asking $800, so, of course, he took the Government up on such an offer. I got this information from good authority, since my niece has been living in the house. There are several similar cases scattered through the valley.

We, like everyone else around here, hope and think this terrible thing can be whipped and are certainly pulling for you down there in Washington.

Sincerely,

Mrs. IVAN ISAACSON.

SCHOOLS FOR CONGRESSMEN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the administration plans in the way of rent control. Certainly there was little in the President's message to lighten the concern of 200,000 Chicago families who fear that come this spring they will be evicted from their homes.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will remain to hear me through. I am trying to save their party from the quick and big smash that came to it in the last Republican administration. I want two strong political parties. I want to save the President's honeymoon from being junked in a patch of blackberry bushes. As things are going now it will not be long until that happy honeymoon has ended among the thorns and thistles. I do not want that to happen because these are critical times and if our people remain happy and contented and secure, it matters little to me who gets the credit.

I am sincere, and I am speaking from the bottom of my heart, when I seek to open your eyes before, through inadvertence, you join in dumping what could be a happy honeymoon into a bed of thorns and thistles.

I admit I had been concerned that among the first 100 persons appointed by this administration to the family of counselors to the President were very few who are not listed in the Social Register and among the directorates of big banks and big corporations. My concern was not lightened yesterday when I read in the Washington Post the article by Sigrid Arne, a news-feature writer of the Associated Press. I call attention to the fact that this article came from the Associated Press, which all of us know is factual and not sensational in its treatment of the news. Mr. Arne tells us of two schools established to teach Congressmen and others in Government, social manners so that they can have contact with the Capital's powerful new people. One course is to cost $100 and that will consist largely of telling the Congressmen which of the various pieces of table silver to use. The other course is to cost $300. That course is to last for 6 weeks and it will be for 4 afternoons a week devoted to telling the Congressmen what to wear, what to say, and just when he can enter, and just when to leave a social gathering of what Mr. Arne calls the "powerful" new people.

That sort of thing is not democracy. There are not, and if this country is to achieve its destiny there never will be, two classes in the United States of America. There are two classes in the Armed Forces. There is the class with all the privileges socially and otherwise in the Armed Forces—the officers and the enlisted men. There can never be in the civilian life of the United States two classes, the rich and the poorer class.

I am speaking today for people who cannot afford to pay $100 to $300 for a course in social manners. I am speaking for 200,000 families in my city of Chicago who fear that come this spring they will be evicted from their homes.

The men of great wealth that the administration is calling into the public service are, I take it, all honorable men whose devotion to their country is just as keen as my own. I think they will endeavor to render to their country and to the administration the best that is in them. What I am afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that the President having around him so many advisers living in an atmosphere where there is no want cannot adequately be alerted to the distress in other areas.

I do not know what the administration plans in the way of rent control. Certainly there was little in the President's message to lighten the concern of 200,000 Chicago families who fear that come this spring they will be evicted from their homes. Certainly the honorable and estimable men and women that the President has appointed to advise and assist him have no problem of trying to stretch a modest pocketbook into a roof over their families.

That is a very real and vexatious problem when you have to live with it. In my district, on the South Side of Chicago, thousands of families live with that problem day and night. They are much more concerned in how they are going to get the money to pay the rent than they are in the particular eating utensils that they should use when they sit down to dinner. Mr. Speaker, they are harassed and worried.

If rent control is terminated this spring, they face eviction. Some of them, by sacrificing in food and clothing, may be able to scrape up the money to meet the increase. Some may be fortunate in having landlords who will act reasonably. Indeed, some of the responsible real estate dealers in Chicago are now seeking to get pledges from landlords that with a lifting of rent controls rents will not be increased to exceed 10 percent. But they admit that there are plenty of vultures and that there is no way in the world under which they can be controlled. By and large, with the lifting of rent controls this spring will come tragedy and desperation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to inform some of my colleagues that I represent a district that lies wholly within the city of St. Louis. The possibility of

dropping rent controls has made those people extremely uneasy and fearful. I have been flooded with letters asking that something be done to keep controls on by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not alone a question of the thousands of families alone in the gentleman's district, but in other cities throughout the United States the same situation exists. The present law, as we know, is in a sense a local option. In other words, it is not Federal rent control imposed, but it is where a community votes, outside of critical-area communities, where a community votes by its people in a referendum or through its duly elected officials to have rent control, then the Federal Government uses its machinery to carry out the law. In every community where rent controls have been removed, I think it is fair to say that within a comparatively short time rents have increased, on the average from 30 to close to 50 percent. There are thousands of communities throughout the United States, under existing law, where either the people themselves, or through their duly elected officials, have voted in favor of a continuance of rent controls. It is my understanding that the recommendation of President Eisenhower confines itself, so far as any future legislation is concerned after the expiration of the present rent-control law, to critical defense areas. Of course, that means that communities like Chicago, Boston, and New York, and others could not be considered "critical area districts," because under the Federal law a critical area district has to be one where there has been a substantial advent of new industries and a swelling of population in connection with the national defense. Yet we have that problem in the large cities.

For example, in Boston, according to the last information I have received, we have nine-tenths of 1 percent vacancies. That is how close the law of supply and demand is operating. That means a substantial increase in rents will follow failure to extend the present law. Seven-tenths of 1 percent of vacancies and two-tenths of 1 percent in connection with the sale of property. The situation is very much the same in many of the large metropolitan cities of the country, particularly in Chicago. It would seem to me it would be a serious mistake if the present law is not continued. I hope that the leaders of the Republican Party will recognize the seriousness of the situation and extend the present law, which certainly is the minimum that should be passed. Under it they are able to bring relief to millions of people who come from thousands of American families, relief in a direction where relief is necessary. There should be a continuance of the present law.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for hitting the nail on the head.

All we are asking is that in every community the right be given to people in that community to solve their own problem. Certainly everybody wants eventually to see the end of rent control, and in many localities it has been possible to do that. In cities like Chicago, and I think St. Louis, and Boston, and others, vacancies both for rent and for sale are still less than 1 percent and everyone is agreed that for stability there must be a 5-percent vacancy. It is a serious problem when vacancies are below the minimum point of safety. When the point of safety is reached the controls should be removed. All we are asking is that the people in particular communities be permitted to decide when that point has been reached.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HYDE. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to a situation on the edge of Washington, which is supposed to be a critical area. They extended rent control in Montgomery County not so long ago, and the following week they turned down a request for apartment-house zoning on the ground that they had too many apartments.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am not acquainted with the situation in Maryland, certainly not as intimately as my distinguished colleague from that State, but I think his appreciated comment illustrates the point that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made and that I am seeking to emphasize: We want the people of each locality, where they are familiar with the conditions in the locality, to pass judgment on the local problem. If I should speak of conditions in Chicago and was contradicted by somebody who never had been in Chicago, I would be in almost the position as the gentleman would be were I to debate with him conditions in his own State. Certainly the gentleman should not object to the people of Chicago, through the local governing body, deciding for themselves when, in their judgment, rent control safely could be lifted.

I cannot say with positiveness and on personal knowledge that it will result, as some say, in 200,000 Chicago families being evicted for sheer inability to pay the boosted rents. Some judges of our courts in Chicago, honorable men, who are on the spot and who are close to people and conditions under which they live, say that the number will run that high. Some say it will run as high as 300,000. But say that the number is only half as great as the 200,000 estimate of the judges in our courts in Chicago. That would mean 100,000 Chicago families being thrown on the streets.

Do the Republicans want that to happen? Is the smile and favor of the real-estate lobby worth the price?

I say, and I am emphasizing it, to you on the other side of the aisle, if you permit that to happen you will be reaping a harvest of thorns and thistles. If you do it with your eyes open you will deserve the thorns and thistles. I respect you profoundly as worthy colleagues and as men of honor. I know that with knowledge and with intention you never would be party to throwing one hundred thousand families in my city of Chicago on the streets with no shelter to receive them. I know that many of you come from communities where people are well off and there is no housing problem. Many of you come from rural communities where there is no need of rent control and the vexatious problems in congested urban centers are entirely out of the zone of your existence. All that you know on this subject is necessarily second-hand. The sources of your information are not always as pure as they are represented to you. Some of your informants, I concede, are sincere, but when a man is in the real-estate business, values of properties based upon and soaring with increased gross-rental receipts, or in the business of mortgage loans, the interest rates increasing with the gross-rental revenues; sincerity cannot be divorced entirely from interest. From where he stands the end of rent control, even at the cost of 100,000 families or more in one city being disposed, is not only sound economically and morally by its good business.

We in Chicago are not asking you for anything except the right to permit us to decide how we are going to meet the problem that is our own headache. In the Eighty-first Congress when it was proposed to end all Federal rent control, and it looked like that would be done, I, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, was largely responsible for the provision in the rent-control law of that period that rent control would be ended in all communities except those where the local governing body by affirmative action had declared for its continuance. I want to stop here to pay a tribute of warm affection to the memory of the late Eugene Cox, of Georgia. He was sincerely and strongly opposed to rent control, both in principle and in practice. But he did believe in the right of the people in any locality, in any community, to decide for itself how best to meet the problems that were of personal and intimate concern to the people of that community. He was on the Rules Committee in the Eighty-first Congress, and when I told him of the distress that the lifting of rent controls would bring to my constituents in Chicago and the constituents of other Members of Congress from that great city, he said that he so believed in home rule that he would vote on the Rules Committee to report the bill out even though he did not believe in rent control.

That is all we are asking now. We are asking that rent control shall be continued only in those communities where the people want it. Continue Federal rent control for another 2 years, on the condition that in no community would it continue effective until first the local governing body by affirmative action had so petitioned. I would go further. If during the 2-year period housing conditions in any locality became so stabilized that Federal rent control safely could be lifted, and without disastrous repercussions, I would make that position through the simple expediency of an action by the local governing board of the community which would be in the nature of a decontrolling mandate to the Federal rent-control authority.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word now to the country and to the landlords. In the Eighty-first Congress when we had public hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, the spokes-

men for the large real estate operators came in. I may have been a bit rude. But when the small landlords came in and we held night sessions in order that we might hear them, even though I was for rent control they seemed to sense that I was their friend, and I was very genuinely.

Before the crash of 1929 we had a vast construction boom. Luxurious hotels, palatial apartment buildings, and skyscrapers were going up in Chicago and in the cities and smaller towns all over the country. The money came from the savings of little people who invested in what were called gold real-estate bonds. The men of large affairs who had the advantage of financial advisers kept away from them, but the little people went for them, hook, line, and sinker, and to the tune of over $5,000,000,000 in Chicago alone, over $15,000,000,000 the country over. That is a lot of money. It represented the life's savings of many thousands of men and women who depended upon the interest from its investment to maintain them in old age. By buying real-estate bonds they were told they were fastening their savings on the firm and sure foundation of the best improved real-estate properties possible to erect. They were assured that after that all would be milk and honey.

The equities were sold to other individuals and groups representing the savings of the little people. They paid the inflated costs of construction. They paid the inflated costs, and too often the rigged costs, for land acquisition. All they had to do was to put up every dollar they could raise, and the rest was easily arranged by mortgage commitments. Meanwhile they were the owners, the landlords if you please, and they thought all they had to do was to sit by and wait for the rents from tenants to pay off the bonds and the secondary mortgages.

But the properties had been built in a time of prosperity inflation, just as at the present time, and the amortization of the mortgage indebtedness was geared on the high rents continuing indefinitely.

Well, of course the inflated prosperity did not continue. The crash came, the properties all went into bankruptcy, the equity owners were washed out completely, and the bondholders by the device of a deposit agreement printed in agate line were divested of their control and eventually of most of their investment. The properties representing $15,000,000,000 of their savings—and they are today among the finest hotels, apartment buildings and skyscrapers in America—fell for the most part into the hands of the persons who had sold the bonds—at commissions as high as 25 and 30 percent—and who had profited from the real estate and mortgage transactions, without ever investing as much as one red cent.

This is the group represented by the real estate lobby. If the small landlords think that it represents them their day of disillusionment will come as surely as night follows the day.

With the then great Governor of North Dakota, now the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the other body, I was privileged to lead through the Loop district of Chicago one of the longest parades of outraged decency that the great city of Chicago has ever seen. I want to say that people of Chicago always have had a deep and abiding love for the gentleman from North Dakota, based upon his concern for them when they were starving and being kicked about. The equity owners and the bondholders were united in their distress.

We are riding to the same fall today. The landlords are sold properties on the base of gross rental receipts. The higher the rents the greater the property sells for. The higher the rents, and the prospective profit in ownership, the easier it is for real estate sales to move. Then comes a recession, from inflation we get back to normalcy, and with rents based as they always are on the ability of people to pay there just is not the money coming in to the landlord to meet his mortgage commitments.

I know its a pleasant thing to look ahead and see nothing but roses and sunshine. To the landlord, who has his troubles and plenty of headaches, the prospect of quick and big revenues of boosted rentals is an understandable lure. But I do not want to see him wake up with a hang-over headache. I don't want to see him, cleaned out and starving, marching with the other victims in another parade of outraged indignation against the gentlemen of the real estate lobby. I am the genuine friend of the landlord as I am of the tenant. I am trying to save him from the bad counsel of those he may now think are his friends. And it is only because I went through the experiences of the early thirties that I see a little more clearly than a younger generation what is ahead.

In the Banking and Currency Committee of the Eighty-first Congress I fought for the inclusion of the formula that the landlord was entitled from his rents to receive sufficient to cover cost of maintenance and repairs, to allow for depreciation, and to return a reasonable yield on investment. That was fair. The committee adopted the formula, it became part of the law. I would say today that under rent control the landlords are better off than ever before in the history of our country to the extent that their rental space is occupied, that tenants are regular in the payment of rent, and that rental receipts uniformly provide some degree of yield after maintenance expenses and depreciation allowance.

The premature lifting of controls will change all of this. It will result in disturbances. Some landlords may be successful in benefiting from large rent increases. But as their profits increase, so will the selling value of their properties. Others will rush in to buy, and their expectations of yield will be based upon the figure of their purchase price.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time is not far off when it will be possible to lift rent control in Chicago and maintain the stability of the real-estate market. That time has not arrived. The worst thing in the world that could happen to real-estate owners in Chicago is to lift the controls now. With 100,000 families facing eviction anything can happen. And from the standpoint only of property values, instability is fatal.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished minority ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and my dear friend from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. When these rent controls are taken off in numbers of States and the rents are jacked up beyond the capacity of the "forgotten man at the base of the economic pyramid," as Roosevelt put it, to pay, and he is ousted, where is he going to go? Where are those tenants going to live?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. There is no place for them to live. I do not by any means intend this as a suggestion, but I remember back after the smash, in the last Republican days, when farmers were being evicted, very conservative farmers, out in Nebraska and Kansas and that region. They were being thrown out of their homes and they took to pitchforks. Now, I do not believe in that sort of thing. We do not want that to happen again, but I do not know what is going to happen. If you throw 100,000 families in Chicago and a similar number in other communities out on the street and you pile up their furniture on the sidewalk and there is no place to go, I would not wish to be responsible for what might happen.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is there anything to prevent the City Council of the City of Chicago or the State Legislature of the great State of Illinois from passing a rent-control bill for the city of Chicago if they think it is necessary? Is there anything to prevent that?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The city council of Chicago has no power to act in the matter of rent control unless we give it that power by extending the present law with the provision that it shall not be effective in Chicago unless prior to April 30, 1953, the city council by affirmative action has moved for its continuance. There is no State rent control legislation in Illinois and there is no reasonable likelihood of its enactment in the brief time remaining. The only hope, as I see it, is in what we do here. I agree with the gentleman that the determination should be left with the city council of Chicago.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The big difference is that if the city council establishes rent control there, then the city of Chicago and the taxpayers of Chicago must pay the cost thereof. That is right, is it not?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Unfortunately, it is not a question of cost but of authority. The city council is without authority to establish rent control. It is now dependent upon what we do.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I think they should have the first right. I think all controls should be at the local level, and not be directed from Washington.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield further, in my State of New York the municipal councils of cities have no power unless the State legislature gives them that power. The same powerful interests, the real-estate lobby, that are

in control here in Washington now and are doing their best to take off rent control everywhere, are very active up in Albany, N. Y., at the present time, and are seeking to circumscribe and limit if not nullify the powers of municipalities to do what is needful to protect the tenants throughout the length and breadth of New York.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I take it there is nothing to prevent the State legislature of the great State of Illinois or the State legislature of the great State of New York from passing legislation to make possible rent control in any hamlet, village, or city of their respective States.

Mr. CELLER. I would say that is rather naive.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Why does the gentleman say that?

Mr. CELLER. It is naive because if the gentleman goes up to Albany and sees the interests in control in Albany and their power, that eats into so many of the seats in the assembly and senate chambers in New York, he would not say what he is saying now. It is most difficult to get the tenants represented or have their interests represented in the legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean that right in the local community where the problem exists, it is most difficult to get that?

Mr. CELLER. I absolutely do say that.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I say to the gentleman that the Chicago Daily News which, as the gentleman knows, is a Knight newspaper, and certainly supported this administration, in an editorial some months ago said that Federal rent control in many ways was preferable to State rent control. But I want to be quite candid with my colleagues here. We have no State rent control legislation in Illinois, but we do have a Republican administration. I presume the Republicans there will follow the party line as drawn in Washington.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to express my opinion that the gentleman from Illinois should be commended for bringing this subject before us this afternoon. To me it is a very important subject.

In line with what was said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I think it should be borne in mind that the same thing is true in some of the capitals of the States of the Union as it is true here in Washington, where we see a combination of great wealth having quite an influence upon the legislation that is passed in the National Congress.

We all know that the real-estate lobby is one of the highest-spending lobbies that was ever maintained in this Congress. I think I would not be far wrong if I said that the real-estate lobbies in the State legislatures are spending a great deal of money, too.

Aside from that fact, in most of the State legislatures the majority of the members of both the house and the senate come from rural areas, and they do not by any means feel the acuteness of the situation as we who come from the large cities do. That is another reason why it is so extremely difficult to get the proper type of rent-control legislation through the State legislatures.

It also occurred to me as I was sitting here that we know from experience that the one matter in which prices could not go too high in this country during this great inflationary period was in the matter of rents. It is because we have always maintained a fairly more constructive rent-control program than we did on foodstuffs and on building construction and on everything else. And that is why if the statistics are examined, they will find there was less inflation in rents than there was in any other major item so far as necessities are concerned. So, I say again, I think the gentleman should be highly congratulated in bringing this subject before us this early in the session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, rent controls are not justified unless we are in a state of war or in a state of emergency. I think we can all agree on that. I think we all agree that any kind of controls are not justified unless in time of war or in an emergency. I think the answer to my friend's question is that the justification for the continuance of some form of rent control at the Federal level is based on the fact that the present emergency is national in nature, and is a challenge to our Government and to all of our people. The resources of our Government are employed to meet the challenge of international communism. As a result of that, therefore, this problem has an impact on our economy not only throughout the country generally, but in the several States of the Union and the communities of the several States. I think the answer is that in time of war, and speaking purely from the practical angle, rent controls are necessary on a national level. We all know that there was a continuation of rent controls after the termination of World War II in view of the emergency which now confronts us and in view of the expenditures of many billions of dollars to prepare ourselves for defense in case of attack by Stalin and his gang of international brigands. That, in turn, affects the economy and brings about a situation which, starting from the Federal level, reaches down into and affects us locally. The cause of all this, of course, is Stalin, but the cause, from the point of view of our internal economy, is the expenditure of vast sums of money and the appropriations which have been made necessary in order to prepare ourselves to defend ourselves in case of attack. That, in turn, has its effect upon the State and the communities of our Nation. I think under the circumstances, the extension of the present law, reserving to the local authorities the right of local option, as is provided in the law, would be the wise thing to do. And under the circumstances again, it being a practical question, and viewing this from a practical angle, is advisable.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman that we should look at it from a practical standpoint. We would not have required rent controls if it had not been for World War II. Now we are in another war. It is a cold war, it is true, but it is just as expensive and the same conditions prevail. It is a continuing condition, and in that continuing condition, certainly rent controls are economically and morally justified.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. To answer my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to say that there is not a State legislature in the entire United States that is not now in session. There is not a State legislature which, if they find locally a situation where any city in the State needs rent control, could not pass legislation to provide that control. Do you not think, may I inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that all problems can be best solved at a local level and not from Washington?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot subscribe to the statement that all problems can be so solved. I think probably we can come to a meeting of minds in some respects with regard to these questions. But confining ourselves to rent, the gentleman mentions that the State legislatures are in session. Let us assume that all of the legislative bodies of our respective States are in session at the present time. Let us assume that for hypothetical purposes. The present law enables the State legislature to pass any such law now. We do not prohibit the legislature from stepping in now if the legislature desires to do so, and the legislature can pass State laws. But we say that this situation arising as a result of Federal activity and the grave emergency, and in view of the acute distress that will follow, therefore, the Federal Government should be interested in solving this problem and should have some part in controlling rents within reasonable limits not only from the economic angle with which countless millions of people are concerned, but because of the moral issues involved, which to me are much more important and which have been so eloquently and effectively stressed by our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. So it seems to me that the State legislatures have the power, under the present law. But that does not mean that if they do not exercise it we should not do something about it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield. I addressed myself to the Republicans, and I am happy to accord them the fullest participation in the discussion.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. Why would it not be better to permit each State, if they think it is necessary, to enact a rent-control law and thereby stand the cost of administering that law, and thereby relieve the taxpayers over our entire Nation from paying for something in Chicago or something in Kansas City

or something in St. Louis that the State could well pay for itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman feel that that plan should have been followed during World War II?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Possibly not, but we are not now at war.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would agree with the gentleman, with reservations. Technically we are not.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I was just quoting your own former President, Mr. Truman.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a distinction, but to me it is only a matter of degree. My friend's admission that he feels we were justified in acting during wartime seems to support my position, with this exception: I do not think my friend would confine it to war. If an emergency existed which justified continuances, the Federal Government again should step in and take control of the situation. I can see where my friend and I might honestly disagree, where the emergency might exist, where it should be continued. I think there are conditions where the Federal Government should step in. Is that not right?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Not in a locality. I think that the local citizenry should be able to determine whether or not an emergency exists and not somebody in Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. They have it under the present law.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But the present law, as I understand it, provides that if a city council, for instance, determines that rent control is necessary, then the Federal Government continues to maintain an office there and pay the cost of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, and properly so, because there is an acute situation existing throughout the country as a result of the appropriations made with reference to our national defense, bringing that impact of dislocation upon countless millions of American families, unless something is done. Viewing the situation from a moral angle first, and secondly from an economic and practical angle, you are going to have an increase in rents of from 30 to 50 percent when controls are taken off. That has evidenced itself in areas where it has already happened. I understand what is in my friend's mind.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am a firm believer in local self-government.

Mr. McCORMACK. But if the gentleman admits, from a practical angle, from the practical situation that confronts the country, what the necessities call for us to do, if it is practical in time of war to have rent control, certainly if an emergency exists it is practical to have it now. It might then be a question of fact in the minds of different persons as to whether or not the emergency is acute.

I think the question of whether the Federal Government should step in during time of grave emergency is well settled; and as I view it we have a great emergency and the Federal Government is justified in entering into the picture because the situation arises from the action of the Federal Government.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York who has served so ably on the Committee on Banking and Currency in three Congresses.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, may I first add my word of commendation to the gentleman from Illinois for all that he has said here and for bringing this matter before the Congress at this time. I know how hard he has worked in previous Congresses upon this same subject; I know that he knows the subject very well. I am glad to endorse all that he said and to join in endorsing, too, that which our distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has said.

Let me point out how things are working under local rent control in New York under the option given by Federal legislation. May I say that it is not working out well there. The pressures, as was indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], are terrific upon the State legislators. When we set up local State control, the first thing they did was to give an across-the-board increase, and they have now given an off-the-record assurance to all the landlords in the State that they are going to get another 20- to 30-percent increase.

This is not a local problem, but it is affected by many situations and has an effect in many adjoining places. As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out so very well, the necessity for rent control is brought about by a national emergency. You can try to cut a little off the national budget and maybe you can take a little bit off the taxpayer's national tax by cutting out a national rent control bureau. But bear in mind that the taxpayer who pays his taxes to the locality, whether it be the municipality or to the State, is the same taxpayer who pays his tax to the Federal Government. So if you take off a little from the taxation necessary to support this at the Federal level you are going to have to add it on to the tax bill at the local level. You will find all of these local forces given the power to deal with the subject will shoot all of these rents sky high. Instead of leveling off inflation and stopping it, it will shoot the spiral of inflation still higher; because every time you add a dollar to cost of shelter it necessarily pushes up that spiral of inflation.

You are not going to solve this problem by letting rent control die at the national level. Look at the situation you have and how this thing spills over State lines. Take the city of New York, for example; do you not think that across the river in New Jersey they are affected by the defense building that is going on around the city of New York? And what do you think happened in Chicago, Ill., and Gary, Ind.? Do you not think it spills over State lines there too? What has happened in Pennsylvania with the building of the new steel mills? Do you not think it spills over State lines into New Jersey, New York, and Delaware? What happened in Paducah where we put in a new atomic-energy plant? What has happened along the Savannah River where we put in a new atomic-energy plant? This problem was not brought about by any local need but was brought about by the national emergency, and we must solve it as a national problem.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that he has no confidence in the local government of his city or his State, that he has no confidence in the legislature or in his representative to that body in his State? Does the gentleman mean he has no confidence in the great legislative body of the State of New York?

Mr. MULTER. Let us not bring in these outside things that do not have a real bearing on the subject. Certainly I have confidence in the Legislature of the State of New York, but this is not a thing that affects New York alone, not at all; it does not work out at the local level; it works at the national level.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. If the gentleman from New York will permit me to answer, although I realize I have no right to do it, because the question of the gentleman from Missouri was directed to the gentleman from New York: I have every confidence in the City Council of Chicago, and I am asking the Congress to leave to the City Council of Chicago the determination of whether rent control should be continued in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as far as the legislature in Illinois is concerned, there is little, if any, chance of a State enactment on this subject because of the refusal of the legislature to redistrict the State as provided by the State constitution. It is a shameful condition, and I am sorry to say that the blame belongs pretty equally to the down-State membership of both parties, although, of course, much the greater part of the down-State legislators are Republicans. As it now stands, Chicago has 60 percent of the population of Illinois with only 39 percent of the representation in the State legislature. If we had the representation as provided in our State constitution, there would be no problem of quick enactment of enabling legislation. The same interests, and I am speaking of the real-estate lobby, that are working here to end Federal rent control, I am afraid are working even more effectively in Springfield. Unless we act here, Federal rent control ends in Chicago on April 30, 1953. In 2 months after April 30, 1953, the Illinois Legislature will adjourn. I take it my colleagues will agree with me the real-estate lobby will not find much difficulty in holding the fort for two brief months. If 100,000 Chicago families are to be saved eviction from their homes, this Congress must act and act quickly.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I would like to point out that in my district the real-estate interests have constantly opposed public housing and rent

control. They argued against rent control, that rent control should not be on the Federal level, that it should be by home rule. Last year the Congress gave that right to the localities, and last year the Republican administration which took over Reading, Pa., dropped rent controls, saying that the Congress had ducked its responsibility, that it was the responsibility of Congress to enact rent control.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Are we to understand from what has been said here that all of the legislatures in all of the States are controlled by the real-estate lobby and that we do not have men of sufficient courage to vote their convictions in the various States?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. We are simply saying to you that you have an opportunity now of doing a very simple thing, continuing the Federal rent control law and making it effective only in communities where local governing boards have asked for its continuance. That is very simple.

Let us leave out all of the pressures. If you do not do a simple thing, if you do something that causes in one city 100,000 or 200,000 families to be evicted from their homes, then we might suspect that perhaps there is somebody in the corner calling the plays.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to take this subject up in an official way with the new Secretary of Agriculture before our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, either before now or in the next few days, however, our original committee meeting has been continued or postponed several times and I have been advised that 3 or 4 weeks will elapse after we start hearings before the Secretary will be before us for the purpose of answering questions or discussing the many agricultural problems. Presumably that time will be taken up in trying to find out just where the Department stands on various problems in an effort to try to make the platform, the campaign promises, and the effects of declining farm prices, all come out to one answer.

If that be the fact, I should at this time place in the RECORD some observations based upon the experiences which I have had as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations during the last 4 years. First, let me say that the Secretary is completely wrong when he says that this is the most over-expanded example of bureaucracy in the Government. The Department of Agriculture is the only department of Government that is operating with 40 percent less people on 30 percent less money than in 1940, before the war. The average of the other departments for increase is in excess of 300 percent. The department issued a three or four-page statement the other day. It appeared to be the statement of a splendid gentleman. It was filled with high-sounding platitudes. But it did read like the statement of one who had been in conference with those who sponsored the Republican farm bill of the Eightieth Congress—that law, you will recall, provided that if there was a shortage of a given commodity, one of the six basic commodities, you could have 90 percent of parity support price. Of course, if there was a shortage, there was a demand, a market, and therefore no need for a support price, but that measure passed in the Eightieth Congress, provided that if there was a surplus of as much as 30 percent, so there was real need for price support, then the farmer was assured of only 60-percent support. In other words, a farmer was told, "If you do not need it, we will help; when you really need it, we won't." The farmers never did feel the effects of that law for control of Congress was changed before its effective date and the Democrats repealed it.

Now in that statement the other day the Secretary said that he would carry out the law. Well, that was most gracious of him. There was nothing else for him to do except to carry out the law, if he is honorable and I know he is. But, he did not express any confidence in or any feeling for the existing agricultural programs, which are the only things that will save a complete crack-up of the farm picture today. When I say that, I am not trying to represent that you should deal differently with the farmer. But, you have your minimum wage laws, you have your protective tariffs. And, there was a day when you could have cheap commodities, low priced commodities, and various raw materials. That was a day when we had untapped billions of feet of timber; that was a day when we had unlimited supplies of iron ore; that was a day when we had hundreds of millions of acres of fertile land that had never felt the plow. That day is gone. With a greatly increasing population, we have exhausted about 40 percent of the tillable, yes, fertile land of this country, and fully that much or more of our timber. You cannot have low agricultural prices, or low priced agricultural products today, and make it up by draining your natural resources, because we do not have them. If you will check the records on every depression that we have had, Mr. Secretary, you will find declining farm prices were in the lead. And, they have been declining for the last year or year and a half; they are declining today, and the only thing that has kept a complete break-through is the support price, 90 percent of parity for basic commodities and much less for other commodities.

Now I have read in the press in recent weeks where various writers have said: Why, in regard to price of farm products, in regard to price of cotton, in regard to price of anything else, they are getting 90 percent of a fair price.

Let me tell you what parity is under the law. It is a formula by which the farmer is given in gross income the purchasing power, approximately equivalent to the comparative purchasing power he had in the period 1909 to 1914. In the period 1909 to 1914 the farmer did not have to spend more than half his gross income for farm machinery, for insecticides, for fertilizers, and one thousand and one other things. So, if you put the farmer on the same comparative level that he had in the base period 1909 and 1914, in view of the difference in the cost of the farm operations, he is far behind. Parity is not and has not and has never been claimed to have been a fair price. It is a formula, 100 percent of which, presumably would give the same comparative gross purchasing power as in the base period 1909 and 1914. Why, that was a period when it was understood that the farmer could not afford to send his children through college unless they worked their way, when it was taken for granted that farm houses went unpainted and did not have bathroom facilities in by far a majority of them, when farming drained off our soil, depleted our timber, and eroded our lands.

Of course, there were exceptions, those with specially good locations, possessed of extra-management capacity—but I am talking of the average, those who had control of the millions of acres of land now gone. Mostly because, after urgent necessities were met, there was not enough left to plow back in the soil. Through your farm programs, REA, price supports, soil programs whereby the rest of us put something back in the soil, you have raised the living standards of the farmers to where they are living like the rest of the population. I think that is a sound, progressive step and I think it is a step that has helped to bring about the prosperity of the rest of our people.

In saying this I hope you do not think I am criticizing the new Secretary of Agriculture. Everyone I have heard mention him has said that he is a fine Christian gentleman with the greatest of intentions to be a fine Secretary of Agriculture. I had hoped that I could give him the benefit of my views based on what experience I have had in presiding over these hearings on the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the last 4 years and being on the committee for 8 years. I had hoped I could do that in an official way, but apparently that has to be delayed 6 or 8 weeks. If, in the meantime, those in charge of the Department are making their pitch as to where they stand, I want him to check these matters, because certainly, now is the time and not after this thing continues to the point that falling farm prices bring the rest of it in on top of our heads.

I am not going to try to tell the Republican Party how long they will stay out of office if they let another depression happen. I think they are aware of that. They might not take my advice as being well-intentioned. But I will say this: I am much more interested in the welfare of this country, which I think is tied to the welfare of the farmer and agriculture, than I am in either party.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wonder whether or not the gentleman from Mississippi has requested an opportunity to consult with the new Secretary of Agriculture so that he may have the benefit of the views of the gentleman from Mississippi, who has had so much experience.

Mr. WHITTEN. The Secretary has been most courteous to me. When the Secretary was in the South, in Atlanta, before Christmas, he called me and we had a fine telephone visit. He has been by my office. I happened to be out. I have been in contact with his office and was in the Department although he was out. I am sure I can personally sit down and discuss some of these matters with him. However, there again, it will not have the effect of official questions and answers in a consideration which I think we might have had otherwise. However, here today I am trying to point out some of the things that certainly are involved in this question of farm prices.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman knows I have gone along, and my voting record will show that even though I come from a city area, a large consumer area, I have voted consistently to help the farmer. Is there not something wrong that requires investigation when the farmer is being pressed down and is not getting fair prices, yet the consumer is paying top prices? Is there not something wrong somewhere in between that requires our attention? Should not the farm and the city representatives get together and find out what it is that keeps the farm prices down and the consumers' prices up? What is wrong about it? Does not that merit our attention?

Mr. WHITTEN. It does. It is hard to do. We cannot pick out any one segment. But one thing I can point out is that since World War II there have been 11 freight-rate increases. I do not pass on the merits of those increases. Perhaps behind them there may have been increased wage contracts, and behind them there may have been the increased cost of living. I am saying you do have a cycle and where other things keep costs up you cannot make it up by decreasing the cost of farm commodities and have the farmer make it up by depleting the soil.

The point I would make here is that when these other things are fixed by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the courts, by legislation we pass, by protective tariffs, by minimum wage laws, or by the bargaining power of labor unions, however they are fixed or whatever the merit of the change, if you do not put some floor under the price of the original raw material that goes into the price to the consumer, the high prices of these elements push the price of the raw material right into the ground. We will either pay for it now or in the future by further exhausting the natural resources on which we all are dependent.

I do want to compliment the gentleman and the Members from his area for the very fine spirit they have shown in the support of agricultural programs in the years I have been in this Congress.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Mississippi has made a very worthwhile statement on the floor of the House today. We have been talking in times past about inflation. Deflation has definitely hit the rural areas of this country, and in hitting the rural areas of this country it has an impact upon their purchasing power. Already certain farmers who are engaged in certain enterprises have been seyerely hit. Some of them have lost the earnings of their lifetime. I am thinking about the farmer who spent money to buy feeder cattle at a high price. Of course, we all know what has happened to the price of feeder cattle in the last few weeks.

May I say to the gentleman, however, that I think the Secretary of Agriculture has a very definite responsibility to the farmers of this country. Some of his policies are given to him in broad outline by the Congress. The gentleman referred to the 90 percent of parity provision. That applies to the six basic commodities. But, the Secretary has discretion in other items, and he has been reluctant lately to express his opinion as to what he should do in that regard. That has meant that he has placed the market in a chaotic condition. I would also like to say that a number of farmers are approaching the planting season, and if the Department's policy is going to be one of letting the law of supply and demand be the sole and governing factor as to what the prices of agricultural commodities should be, the wheat farmer ought to know that before he plants his wheat. I am referring now to the spring wheat farmer so that he can make a proper adjustment. I know the gentleman from Mississippi feels the same way about cotton. The same thing is true with all of the other crops that the farmer grows. I know that the Secretary of Agriculture is a fine, Christian gentleman. I have read that, although I have not had an opportunity to meet him. I am sure he is going to do the very best he can, and I am sure that we, on the Democratic side, are going to do what we can to help him because we do have the interest of these individual farmers at heart. They are the people who give us our bread and butter. But we do wish that he would be a little more aggressive in making his views known. It has given some of us the impression that perhaps the Republican Party has not had a farm program that has been planned, an aggressive program to meet these emergencies. That is indicated by the number of commissions that we have had to refer these decisions to.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his statement very much, because I know he has been very active in these matters here. I think I can point out at this point, if I may be permitted one further comment, the total cost of all of the price-support programs is less than one-tenth the cost to the Government of the conversion of industry to meet our wartime needs. The total cost of all of the price-support programs is much less than one-tenth the amount of money spent on consumer subsidies and for increases in wages resulting from our wartime needs. So if we make that kind of comparison, you can see where the justice of the situation lies. So far as the cotton program is concerned, the Federal Government has made a profit out of its cotton operations in the field of supports. The farmer is the only one who increased his production and his production plant without a firm contract at cost plus a profit. But the major point of all of this is that we are in this boat together. I too would like to see a balanced budget. I take my hat off to no Member of the Congress so far as my own efforts for a balanced budget are concerned, but I do point out that we have a national debt of about $260,000,000,000. You have firm commitments on a large part of your expenditures and if you are going to meet this problem at all, you will have to keep the wheels of industry turning and we have got to have agricultural commodities selling at a price which keeps the farmers prosperous. If we do not do that, we are going to crack up regardless of how much we cut the appropriations that the Congress makes because these funds have already been spent, and they are now outstanding obligations. You are already committed to pay them. The only way you can do it is by having a prosperous economy. If you are going to let farm prices drag you down, and they have already started that tumble, you might just as well look for a repetition of some of the very unfortunate occurrences of the past.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I commend the gentleman for the sincerity of his statement in regard to the control of farm prices. The Secretary of Agriculture happens to come from my State, and I can testify to his sincerity and to his desire to do a job. I think the gentleman is sincere and honest in what he says. But I would like to know if anything has been done in the last year and one-half to control the sliding down of farm prices. I think the gentleman stated that this drop in prices has occurred in the course of the last year or year and one-half. If that is true, why start now to criticize the Secretary of Agriculture since we have only been in office for a month? What has been suggested to the predecessor of the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to this problem?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say this to the gentleman. I have had pending for the last year, and have now pending several bills which would do much to correct this situation. I offered the provision whereby a part of the customs receipts were used to buy surplus commodities and convert them to good use. I do not mean these remarks to be critical of the Secretary's inaction. If I wanted to play politics, and if I wanted to criticize the Secretary, I would wait until after the farm program of the new administration is written, and then if written in line with the thinking of many

Republican leaders, I would have plenty to criticize.

I am trying to point out these matters and things before mistakes are made. Now I certainly am not being merely critical, but rather I view it as giving a very fine gentleman a chance to make good—to profit by experiences of the past, throw off the counsel of those leaders who would have wrecked us under the law passed in the Eightieth Congress.

I hope he will accept the challenge and be the Secretary for Agriculture, for the welfare of agriculture is and remains the base for our general prosperity for today and the welfare of our children tomorrow, for how we treat the land will largely determine their well-being.

MOSCOW BURP

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to an ever-increasing number of persons throughout the world, the man or woman who embraces the Communist doctrine is of questionable intelligence. Last week, however, 13 Communist leaders convicted here of conspiracy exhibited what must, under the circumstances, be considered remarkably good sense.

Given their choice of sentences by Federal Judge Edward J. Dimock, the 13 decided upon imprisonment in the United States rather than deportation to the Soviet Union.

Their decision does not seem to have set too well in Moscow. On February 4, 2 days after the defendants here had announced their preference, Izvestia published an editorial designed to offset the embarrassing implication that Russia may not, after all, be considered utopia by all Communists.

All progressive humanity—

Izvestia declared defensively—

is proud of the Soviet Union. • • • The Soviet Union is a genuinely popular state. • • • It enjoys the unanimous support and boundless love of all the workers.

What prompted the 13 Communists to reject the opportunity to live in this "genuinely popular state"? One reason, the defense attorney said, was that Russia does not customarily admit deportees.

Article 129 of the Soviet Constitution, however, states:

The U. S. S. R. affords the right of asylum to citizens of foreign countries persecuted for defending the interests of the working people.

There have been several instances in which victims of such so-called persecution have been accepted by the Soviet Union. Remember Valentin Gonzalez, Fred Beal, Alexander Weissberg, and Margaret Buber-Neumann?

Certainly those names are familiar to the 13 Communist leaders. It is quite possible, in fact, that the defendants had the names of men such as Gonzalez and women such as Margaret Buber-Neumann in mind when they made their decision.

Gonzalez gained fame fighting as a Communist in the Spanish Civil War under the name El Campesino—The Peasant. After the war he fled to Moscow. He soon found himself branded a Trotskyite.

Gonzalez was assigned to manual labor on the Moscow underground railway in 1941. He escaped to Iran in 1944, only to be recaptured by the Soviet forces then stationed there. He spent the next few years in slave-labor camps from Siberia to the Caucasus.

He escaped again—this time for good—in 1949. Last year he detailed his experiences in Russia in a book entitled "Life and Death in Soviet Russia." He revealed that in 1939, on the boat from Le Havre to Russia, he was told by Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenberg:

You'll have to prepare yourself for a shock when you see what things are really like. You foreign Communists have been idealizing the Soviet Union. Socialism isn't perfect yet. There are many weaknesses and failures—and many enemies and saboteurs. • • • The "paradise" is a propaganda invention.

Fred Beal is another foreign Communist who fled to, and from, the Soviet Union.

In 1929, Beal, an American Negro party member, took part in a strike of textile workers in Gastonia, N. C. Violence flared. The chief of police was killed. Beal was sentenced to 20 years in prison in connection with the murder. The case was appealed, and he was let out on bail.

Beal went to Russia. He was assigned to lecture throughout the country on the evils of life in the United States. He was shocked to find ragged beggars in Leningrad, child slavery in the Tashkent silk mills, and incredibly poor conditions in factories in Kharkov.

Beal left in 1933 on the pretext of visiting Germany. He returned to the United States and surrendered. He served 4 years in prison, then was paroled. Today he works quietly in a knitwear factory.

Alexander Weissberg and Margaret Buber-Newmann were among the thousands of German Communists who sought asylum in Russia after Hitler rose to power. These Germans were forced into slave-labor camps, then handed over to Hitler when the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed.

There is a good possibility that many Russians would like to change places with the 13 Communists here.

The typical Russian, after all, gets less than 40 pounds of meat a year, while the average American prisoner consumes nearly four times that amount.

Too, the average urban dweller in crowded Russia is limited to approximately 38 square feet of dwelling space. Inmates of United States prisons are allotted 54 to 65 square feet each.

Of course, any jail in a free country would be preferred by many Russians, considering the purges now sweeping the Soviet Empire.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Senate side of the Capitol where the Vice President and members of the California delegation entertained the Flying Wheels, the paraplegic basketball team from Long Beach, Calif. I saw those Flying Wheel paraplegics playing basketball at the Walter Reed Hospital last night against the Richmond paraplegic basketball team, and it was one of the most thrilling games I have ever seen. The Flying Wheels, the California paraplegics, rolled up a magnificent score of 67, I think the largest score that has ever been made by any similar basketball team. These boys play in their wheel chairs. Their precision, their sportsmanship are remarkable. It was a rare treat to see them. I wish every Member of Congress could have been there. I wish everyone in Washington could have seen that game.

Mr. Speaker, it illustrates very clearly why we should have a Veterans' Administration to take care of veterans. It gives them an opportunity to get their health back, get their strength back insofar as they can, their rehabilitation, and all of the services to which they are entitled. If those men are put out of Veterans' Administration hospitals into Public Health hospitals or private hospitals, they will not have the opportunity to progress and develop physically and otherwise that they now have. This is one of the reasons I am so anxious to have the Veterans' Administration be kept as a department by itself. We created it step by step over the years. The older Members here in Congress know that. First we had the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Vocational Rehabilitation Department, and hospitals under the Public Health Service and elsewhere. It was chaotic; men's folders were everywhere; there was no cohesion, no coordination. Now there is a Veterans' Administration. It could be improved, I know, and ought to have more money in some ways. But to scrap it, throw away what we have already done in unity, I think would be tragic.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I just want to interrupt the gentlewoman, if I may, for 1 minute to say how much I want to commend her personally for the splendid work and splendid leadership she has given in the matter of the care and treatment of veterans. She has given years of her life to this service and knows whereof she speaks. Her enthusiasm, her sympathy, may I say her love for these boys, is deeply appreciated, and is certainly appreciated by many of her colleagues.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate very deeply those kind words. I know the interest the gentlewoman from New York has in these men; we all have an interest in them. America would not be a free country today if it were not for them. It is just a matter

of how best to take care of them. I have watched the wheels go around for 40 years here in Washington, and I am so anxious not to have the organization that has been built up since 1917 for the veterans ground under.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend their remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIEHLMAN.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include a statement by President Jones of Rutgers University.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances, in one to include excerpts and in the other questionnaires.

Mr. REED of New York in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD and include a resolution from the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

Mr. RADWAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. BENTLEY.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. JENSEN explaining and complimenting Samuel Goldwyn on his production of the spirit of Hans Christian Andersen.

Mr. BRYSON and include a report from the Department of the American Legion of South Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and include a short editorial.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. CELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANDRUM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and include an article.

Mr. CARNAHAN in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BELCHER (at the request of Mr. WICKERSHAM) and to include a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Senate.

Mr. YATES in two instances, in one to include the final address of Adlai E. Stevenson, and in the other an address of Robert Kuh before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI).

Mr. GROSS and to include a letter from Prof. A. R. Lauer, of Iowa State College.

Mr. KEATING in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial recently appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. MULTER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1979. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

444. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, relative to transferring to the Young Men's Christian Association of Coatesville, Pa., four 28-foot pulling whaleboats (without engines) hull Nos. 20204, 20205, 20206, and 20207 for use in training in boat operation, pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, as amended; 34 U. S. C., Supp. V, 546f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management furnishing a tabulation showing the withdrawals of public lands in certain cases, for the period from January 1, 1952, through December 31, 1952, pursuant to an act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C., sec. 471, 43 U. S. C., sec. 141, et. seq.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2818. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide permanent price supports for oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and cottonseed at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2819. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend for three additional years the requirement that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide permanent price supports for oats, rye, barley, flaxseed, and soybeans at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend for three additional years the requirement that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2822. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2823. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2824. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2825. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent brothers and sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2826. A bill relating to withdrawal and reservation of public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2827. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Arsistance Act of 1952, with respect to the number of nonveteran students required in approved schools; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 2828. A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085); as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2829. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 2830. A bill to provide that employees in the postal field service shall receive benefits from the proceeds of certain vending machines; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2831. A bill to authorize an appropriation of $25,000,000 for emergency relief for victims of the February floods in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2832. A bill to authorize Federal aid with respect to the costs of constructing that portion of an approved hospital project which was commenced without Federal participation and prior to January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2833. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2834. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on certain admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 2835. A bill to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2836. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2837. A bill authorizing the construction of parking facilities for automobiles of Members of Congress and their staff personnel in the courtyard of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2838. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2839. A bill to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2840. A bill for the transfer by the United States to the Territory of Hawaii of certain land in the city and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2841. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2844. A bill providing that the ratification of the revenue bond act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1951 regular session of said legislature, and to all extensions of the period for issuance and delivery of revenue bonds thereunder, heretofore or hereafter enacted by said legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2845. A bill to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii title to property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2847. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2848. A bill to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2849. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii", approved June 19, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2850. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to increase the annuities of present and future annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2851. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide methods of obtaining on a voluntary basis the opinions of the qualified voters in each State on issues and questions of current national importance as an aid to the Federal Government in the formulation and execution of policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2853. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2854. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, pocketbooks, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 2855. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide permanent price supports for oats, rye, barley, flax, grain sorghums, and soybeans at 95 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2856. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that prices of basic agricultural commodities shall be supported at 95 percent of parity for the 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2857. A bill to promote economy and efficiency in the operations of the executive branch of the Government by providing an equitable method of reducing the number of employees therein; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 2858. A bill to amend section 474 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the excess profits credit in the case of certain taxable acquisitions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require manufacturers of farm machinery sold in interstate commerce to identify each such machine by a serial number; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2860. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 2861. A bill to permit deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2862. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2863. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2864. A bill to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection 432 (f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2865. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 2866. A bill to permit veterans to suspend or delay their programs of education or training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 in order to perform services as missionaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE (by request):

H. R. 2867. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2868. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2870. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 2872. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO (by request):

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the granting of patents and copyrights in perpetuity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the emergency hay program of the Department of Agriculture until April 30, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution pertaining to the recent Netherlands disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution designating the month of February in each year as American Heart Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Ford Motor Co.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution establishing a bipartisan joint congressional committee to advise the President on foreign policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution designating the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1953, as National Hill Billy Music Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:
H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. HOLTZMAN:
H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. POWELL:
H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. RODINO:
H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. SCOTT:
H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mrs. SULLIVAN:
H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. WIER:
H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. YORTY:
H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution providing for the creation of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. KEATING:
H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the revulsion of the Congress at the inhumane purge of Jews in the Soviet Union and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the Free Territory of Trieste; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. SIEMINSKI:
H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress for the people of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution favoring the extension of diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. WICKERSHAM:
H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the valor of the Forty-fifth Division; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. REES of Kansas:
H. Res. 137. Resolution authorizing the printing of the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation repealing laws which require the States to collect and send to the Federal Government the tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:
H. R. 2874. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of James K-Thong Yu, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. AYRES:
H. R. 2876. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Pinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BAKER:
H. R. 2877. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byron Marcy UnKauf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2878. A bill for the relief of Elemer Rostas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DONOVAN:
H. R. 2879. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Juan Onativia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FALLON:
H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaline Spagnola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Arnesch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of James L. Curry and Phoebe Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of Stella King Beardin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
H. R. 2886. A bill for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2887. A bill for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2888. A bill for the relief of Diana Toy Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Agmata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Paul Chun, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Nalani Jean Damon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Jeanette Etsuko Amano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2893. A bill for the relief of Susumu Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Midori Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Fukuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Fumie Shimoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of Yukiko Nerita; to the Committtee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Frederick Ricard Conradt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GRAHAM:
H. R. 2899. A bill for the relief of Igor Shwabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Gizella Ostreicher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HRUSKA:
H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Helen Stembera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JACKSON:
H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Frantisek (Frank) Rejlek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Azizollah Halimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Said Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MILLER of New York:
H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. OSTERTAG:
H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Just Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2908. A bill for the relief of Christopher Carl Moser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PRESTON:
H. R. 2909. A bill for the relief of the Citizens Bank of Glennville, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:
H. R. 2910. A bill for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:
H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of the estates of Otto F. Henning and Bessie M. Henning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:
H. R. 2912. A bill for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 2913. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. WOLVERTON:
H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Bettendorf, Iowa, Business and Professional Women's Club and units of the Scott County, Iowa, PTA urging legislation making railroad cars readily visible at night to approaching motorists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

47. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Carl W. Burkholder, Steilacoom, Wash., relative to stating a grievance and asking that a judgment will be rendered granting him relief from imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

48. Also, petition of Florida State Townsend Auxiliary Unit, No. 188, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of adequate social-security program and relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

49. By Mr. HOWELL: Resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the New Jersey Council of Churches on civil liberties for use by the churches of its 14 member denominational bodies as guide for further consideration on this subject; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dipl. Ing. Gerd Remagen, Cologne, Germany, relative to the planning and building of the America House in Cologne, Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art in heaven and in all Thy works, we pause at this wayside altar of prayer, in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues, to commune with Thee, unseen source of beauty, goodness, and truth, that the radiance which is the light of the world may shine upon us and illumine our path of action. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service, unsullied by base motives of self-interest, as again with the golden gift of a new day at this white altar of devotion we pledge unswerving firmness of purpose, integrity of character, purity of heart, and cleanness of hands, in the fulfillment of our high and holy calling as servants of the Republic. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1953,

The Secretary of the Senate received a message from the President of the United States on February 7, 1953, submitting the nomination of Donold B. Lourie, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 7, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 243) to amend Public Law 73, Eighty-first Congress, first session (63 Stat. 111), to provide for an Under Secretary of State for Administration.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1979) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JENNER, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 82)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1953.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the calendar year 1952, there had been no exchanges of lands with States, counties, and municipalities which were classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS FOR POWER SITES IN CONNECTION WITH IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law, that during the calendar year 1952 there had been no reservations from all lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on withdrawals and restorations of certain public lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF FOUR PULLING WHALEBOATS TO YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, COATESVILLE, PA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Young Men's Christian Association of Coatesville, Pa., had requested the Navy Department to transfer four 28-foot pulling whaleboats (without engines) for use in training in boat operation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

BRACEY-WELSH CO., INC. v. UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATION FOR "FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES," DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1953 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1951–52 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the elimination of the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER on January 30, 1953, p. 674, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, expressing appreciation for the generous and efficient assistance rendered by the Atomic Energy Commission, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and the American Red Cross to the people of the city and county of Aiken on the occasion of the disastrous gas explosion on January 27, 1953; ordered to lie on the table.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MAYBANK on February 6, 1953, p. 880, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

TURN-OUT AT POLLS IN DE PERE, WIS.—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as each election approaches, the American people are reminded anew of the fact that

our record as regards the proportion of our citizens who cast their ballot is not all that it should be.

In this connection, however, I should like to point out that one city in my State, De Pere, has established a nationwide reputation for a magnificent turnout of 99.69 percent at the polls last November.

De Pere's great example is something of which we of Wisconsin are indeed proud, and which we hope will serve as an inspiring example to communities throughout the Nation.

The Legislature of the State of Wisconsin recently adopted a joint resolution relating to the matter.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. McCARTHY on January 23, 1953, p. 505, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect; with amendments (Rept. No. 37); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ON COPPER IMPORT-TAX SUSPENSION—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. FREAR, members of the Committee on Finance) submitted minority views on the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 35.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 845. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for Mr. THYE and himself):

S. 847. A bill for the relief of storm-stricken areas in the Netherlands, the British Isles, and other areas of Western Europe; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 848. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 849. A bill to encourage fuller participation by small business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power;

S. 851. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall;

S. 852. A bill for the relief of Zacharias Aristedes Samothrakis and Virginia Zacharias Samothrakis; and

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 854. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Brown; and

S. 855. A bill for the relief of Kirill Mihailovich Alexeev, Antonia Ivanovna Alexeev and minor children, Victoria and Vladimir Alexeev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 856. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 857. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Hide Yashima Thompson;

S. 859. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Clapanhoo, of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States;

S. 860. A bill for the relief of Juanita Andrada Lach and Leticia Androda Lach; and

S. 861. A bill for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 862. A bill for the relief of Wilton J. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 863. A bill for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 864. A bill for the relief of Virginia Miles; and

S. 865. A bill for the relief of Glenn L. Whitlatch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Sep Nadolny;

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler; and

S. 868. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Santamarina-Becerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 869. A bill to establish a Metals Credit Corporation in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of domestic strategic and critical metals and minerals in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 870. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Weber; and

S. 871. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Zografos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 872. A bill to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia and in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; and

S. 873. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Theodore E. Straus; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 875. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution stating a policy concerning war damage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

REINSTATEMENT OF WILLIAM A. BURKETT AS A SENIOR SPECIAL AGENT, UNITED STATES TREASURY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 845) to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The bill would restore William A. Burkett to the position of senior special agent, United States Treasury, with the same seniority that he would have attained had he not voluntarily resigned his position on August 18, 1950, in order to bring to light evidence of corruption especially in the office of the collectors of internal revenue in Northern California and Nevada.

No better recommendation for the enactment of this bill can be given to the Senate than to quote from the book by Senator KEFAUVER entitled "Crime in America." This is what he said:

"Credit for originally breaking the internal-revenue scandals, involving employees of the offices of the collectors of internal revenue for Northern California and for Nevada must go to William Burkett, a young and diligent former special agent of the Treasury Department's Intelligence Unit in the northern California district. The shame of it is that neither the district office nor the Internal Revenue Bureau in Washington acted promptly on Burkett's disclosures. Eventually the young agent resigned in disgust. * * *

"Mr. Burkett's courage, high spirit of decency and loyal service to our Government was one of the real bright spots in the crime committee's investigations, and I hope Mr. Burkett will be appropriately rewarded for being such an outstanding American."

Mr. Burkett is a graduate in law and accounting and is a World War II disabled veteran with a 10-point veteran's rating under civil-service regulations.

I am not sure that Mr. Burkett desires reemployment with the United States Government at this time; however, in view of the fact that he was forced to give up his employment status in order that he might be free to cooperate with the California Crime Commission, the Kefauver committee, and the Congress, I feel that Congress can do no less than to reinstate Mr. Burkett with full civil-service rights, thus affording him an opportunity to make his decision.

Prompt action by the Congress to recognize the contribution made in the interest of clean government by this former employee not only will give proper recognition to the outstanding service of Mr. Burkett but also will have a tendency to reimpress upon all Federal employees that once highly respected principle—that "a public office is a public trust."

I am introducing this bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, and together we urge the prompt enactment of this legislation.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT ACT OF 1953

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an analysis of its provisions, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Construction Contract Act of 1953."

SEC. 2 (a) No executive agency, acting either on its own behalf or on behalf of any other agency or corporation, shall award or enter into a construction contract upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis unless it shall be provided in such contract that all mechanical specialty work involved in the performance thereof shall be done by independent mechanical specialty subcontractors or by a contractor qualified to perform such mechanical specialty work and that, before any mechanical specialty work is commenced, the name of each of the independent mechanical specialty subcontractors or the contractor qualified to perform mechanical specialty work who is to perform any of such mechanical specialty work shall be submitted by the contractor to the procuring executive agency and approved by such agency.

(b) This section shall not be construed to forbid or prevent the contractor under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee construction contract from himself performing any kind of mechanical specialty work under a contract awarded to or undertaken by him provided he is a contractor qualified to perform such mechanical specialty work.

(c) This section shall not be construed to apply to the following construction contracts:

(1) Contracts to be performed outside of the continental limits of the United States which limits shall be deemed to include Alaska.

(2) Contracts in which the aggregate amount involved does not, or is estimated not to, exceed $25,000.

(3) Any contract with specific reference to which the agency head determines that the procedure prescribed herein would result in undue delay and that the public exigency will not admit of the incident delay.

SEC. 3. (a) No executive agency, acting either on its own behalf or on behalf of any other agency or corporation, shall award or enter into a lump-sum construction contract unless (1) the names of the subcontractors who will perform all mechanical specialty work involved in the performance thereof, and if requested in the invitation to bid or otherwise by such executive agency, the names of the subcontractors who will perform such particular nonmechanical work involved in the performance thereof as such agency may specify in its request, and the cost to the contractor of the mechanical specialty work, and of such nonmechanical work as may be so specified by the contracting executive agency, to be performed by each subcontractor named, is set forth in any written bid submitted in connection therewith or, if there is no written bid, given in a written statement by the contractor to the contracting agency before such contract is awarded or made, and (2) the name of each such subcontractor designated in said bid or statement and the cost thereof to the contractor as set forth in the bid or written statement, is specified in the contract.

(b) This section shall not be construed to forbid or prevent any contractor from himself performing any part of the mechanical specialty work or any particular nonmechanical work as to which the contracting Federal agency requests the name of the proposed subcontractor, under a lump-sum construction contract awarded to or undertaken by him provided there is specified in the bid or written statement, and in the contract, as required by subsection (a) of this section, that the contractor will himself perform such part of the mechanical specialty work, or that particular nonmechanical work specified by the contracting agency in any such request, and the cost at which he will perform the same.

(c) No contractor under a lump-sum construction contract shall have any work performed by any person other than the contractor or subcontractor specified in the contract to perform the same, except in accordance with the provisions of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section.

(d) If a subcontractor specified in a lump-sum construction contract shall fail or refuse to perform or complete the work so specified to be performed by him in accordance with the terms of his subbid and/or subcontract therefor, the contractor may engage a substitute or different subcontractor provided he first submits in writing to the contracting agency the name and contract price of the substitute subcontractor.

(e) If a contractor under a lump-sum construction contract is able to secure or have performed any kind of work specified therein to be performed by a particular subcontractor, by a different or substitute subcontractor at a lower cost than the cost specified in his contract, the contractor may engage such substitute subcontractor: *Provided*, That he first submits to the procuring agency in writing the name of the substitute contractor and a copy of the proposed contract with such substitute subcontractor, and such substitute subcontractor is approved in writing by the procuring agency: *And provided further*, That in case of construction contracts made or awarded after bids pursuant to advertising, that such substitute subcontractor shall be one whose name was set forth as a proposed subcontractor in one of the bids filed pursuant to such advertising.

(f) In the event a contractor shall have work specified in his contract to be performed by a particular subcontractor, performed by a different or substitute subcontractor under paragraph (d) or (e) of this section, the total contract price of his lump-sum construction contract shall be adjusted by the full net difference in cost in the event such substitution shall result in a lower cost to the contractor than that specified for such work in the construction contract.

(g) No executive agency, acting either in its own behalf or on behalf of any other agency or corporation, shall award or enter into a lump-sum construction contract unless in addition to the requirements of subsection (a) hereof, the name or names of all sub-subcontractors who will perform mechanical specialty work thereunder and the most of all such work to be performed by each such subcontractor shall be set forth in any written bid submitted in connection therewith, or if there is no written bid, given in a written statement by the contractor to the contracting executive agency before such contract is awarded or made.

(h) No contractor under a lump-sum construction contract shall have any mechanical specialty work performed thereunder by any sub-subcontractor other than one named therein as in subsection (g) of this section, unless and until the name or names of the different or substitute subcontractors and the contract price of the mechanical specialty work to be performed by each is submitted in writing to the contracting executive agency.

(i) This section shall not be construed to apply to the following construction contracts:

(1) Contracts to be performed outside the continental limits of the United States which limits shall be deemed to include Alaska.

(2) Contracts in which the aggregate amount does not, or is estimated not to, exceed $25,000.

(3) Any contract with specific reference to which the agency head determines that the procedure prescribed herein would result in undue delay and that the public exigency will not admit of the incident delay.

SEC. 4. The Comptroller General or any of his duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of 3 years after final payment, have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of any contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to any such construction contracts.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act—

(1) the term "executive agency" means any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government including any wholly owned Government corporation.

(2) the term "construction contract" shall mean a contract for the erection, repair, moving, remodeling, modification, or alteration of any public building or public improvement and the erection, repair, moving, remodeling, modification, or alteration of any building or structure upon real estate intended for shelter, protection, comfort, convenience, or for production or proc-

ossing including without being limited to, bridges, tunnels, dams, foundations, piers, abutments, viaducts, aqueducts, reservoirs, water-supply projects, water-control projects, water power development projects, hydroelectric-development projects, disposal projects, transmission lines, locks, docks, jetties, and breakwaters.

(3) the term "mechanical specialty work" in connection with a construction contract means all plumbing, heating, piping, air conditioning, refrigerating, ventilating, and electrical work, including but not being limited to the furnishing and installation of sewer, drainage, water supply and distribution piping and plumbing, heating, piping, air conditioning, refrigerating, ventilating, and electrical materials, equipment, and fixtures.

(4) the term "contractor qualified to perform mechanical specialty work" means a "contractor" as herein defined who customarily performs himself and does not subcontract mechanical specialty work and who has and maintains a supervisory, administrative, and technical staff which has proven on previous construction work to be competent to supervise, control, and direct the kind of mechanical specialty work involved.

(5) the term "independent mechanical specialty subcontractor" means a person who as subcontractor undertakes with a contractor to do and does mechanical specialty work under a construction contract with independent financial responsibility to the contractor for administrative and technical supervision of mechanical specialty work and the completion thereon including the payment for labor and material thereon, and who has adequate tools and capital equipment and who has a technical staff which has proven on previous construction work to be competent to supervise, control, and direct the particular kind of mechanical specialty work involved.

(6) the term "contractor" means a person having a direct contractual relationship as prime contractor with an executive agency, acting either on its own behalf or on behalf of any other agency or corporation, for the performance of a construction contract.

(7) the term "person" means an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or other organized group of persons. All reference to contractor or subcontractor shall include individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, or other organized groups of persons who are contractors or subcontractors.

(8) the terms "lump-sum contract" and "lump-sum construction contract" means a construction contract, whether awarded after bid or negotiated, under which the price is fixed or to be fixed by any method other than cost plus a fixed fee.

(9) the term "sub-subcontractor" means a person who undertakes with an independent mechanical specialty subcontractor to do and does mechanical specialty work under or pursuant to construction contracts provided for in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to create any privity of contract between the United States Government or any agency thereof, and any subcontractor or sub-subcontractor under any construction contract, or to give any subcontractor or sub-subcontractor any cause of action against the United States or any agency thereof arising out of the failure of any person to comply with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. Whoever, being a contractor for the performance of a construction contract, shall employ a subcontractor to perform work under a construction contract specified therein to be performed by a particular subcontractor, or whoever, being a subcontractor for the performance of mechanical specialty work under a construction contract, shall employ a sub-subcontractor to perform mechanical specialty work under such construction contract specified therein to be performed by a particular sub-subcontractor, other than the one named in such construction contract or one substituted in accordance with the terms of subsections (d), (e), or (h) of section 3 of this act, shall be fined not more than $5,000.

The analysis presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

THE FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT BILL

I. SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS

The first part of this bill (sec. 2) is applicable to Federal Government cost-plus construction contracts only. It provides that if the general contractor holding a cost-plus contract is not qualified by previous experience to perform mechanical specialty work (plumbing, heating, piping, air-conditioning, electrical work, and the like) he must subcontract this work to independent qualified mechanical specialty subcontractors. Of course, it does not require a general contractor who is qualified in these fields to subcontract.

The second part of the bill (sec. 3) relates only to lump-sum construction contracts made by the Federal Government and does not require any contractor to be qualified by experience. It simply provides that the general contractor shall state in his bid (1) the names of the mechanical specialty subcontractors, if any, that he intends to use to accomplish the mechanical specialty work and such other parts of the work as may be designated in the advertisement by the agency in question, and (2) the cost to the contractor of this work which will be subcontracted. It then provides that the contractor may have the work done by a substitute or different subcontractor in the event of default by the one named. In such event there are no restrictions on who he may engage as a substitute. It also provides that he may engage a substitute or different subcontractor to reduce cost provided he engages a subcontractor who has previously filed a bid with some general contractor and provided the substitute subcontractor is acceptable to the Government. In the event savings are effected by the substitution of different subcontractors for those named in the bid, the bill provides that such savings shall be reflected in the reduction of the contract price payable by the Government. The bill contains (in sec. 3 (g) and 3 (h)) similar protection with respect to subcontractors of mechanical specialty work.

The provisions of the bill expressly do not apply to contracts to be performed outside of the United States and those for $25,000 or less, or in cases where the agency head determines that public exigency would warrant waiver (secs. 2 (c) and 3 (i).) The bill expressly provides that it shall create no cause of action by a subcontractor against the Government (sec. 6). Penalties for violation are set forth in section 7. At the discretion of the contracting agency the provisions of section 3 may be extended with respect to particular contracts to construction subcontractors in other fields.

II. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR COST-PLUS CONTRACT PROVISIONS

The provisions requiring a contractor unqualified in these fields to subcontract mechanical specialty work on cost-plus jobs is urgently needed not only to prevent waste of Government funds through attempts of inexperienced people to perform this complex work on a cost-plus basis but to retard absorption of independent small and medium businessmen in the mechanical specialty subcontracting field resulting from what is in effect Government subsidization of the integration of general contractors on cost-plus work.

This problem was studied by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives in 1942, the study involving testimony from more than 250 witnesses and over 120,000 miles of travel. In its conclusion the committee stated with respect to cost-plus contracting:

"This type of contract (cost-plus-fixed-fee contract), among other things, led to the refusal on the part of contractors to sublet specialty contracts such as electrical installations, plumbing, heating, and the like when they were totally unprepared either to plan or execute them." (H. Rept. No. 2272, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 43.)

In 1952 this question was again thoroughly studied by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate committee report on S. 2907 contains the following conclusion:

"It was pointed out that on cost-plus contracts many general contractors who lacked the necessary experience, skill, capital equipment, and engineering know-how were undertaking to acquire it and set up their own mechanical specialty subdivisions at Government expense. Since these contractors' operating costs are paid by the Government under the terms of their contracts there is an inevitable tendency not to subcontract this work to the existing mechanical specialty contractors and the Government is losing the benefit of having this work done by experienced people." (S. Rept. No. 1969, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 7.)

During World War II when cost-plus contracting was usual, the result might have been the almost complete elimination of the mechanical specialty subcontractor from the economic scene if it had not been for the so-called OPM agreement. Under this agreement sponsored by the officials of the OPM, labor leaders agreed to forego so-called golden time on cost-plus contracts, and the Federal procuring agencies agreed to require subcontracting of mechanical specialty work. If this agreement had any legal force it has clearly expired now and there would be no protection to the Government or the subcontracting industry if defense emergency should in the future make cost-plus contracting usual on Federal construction. Of course, there was a lot of cost-plus contracting immediately after the Korean incident and some Federal construction is being handled in this manner at the present time.

Section 2, dealing with cost-plus contracts only, is designed to prevent a general contractor from undertaking at Government expense and without responsibility as to cost, mechanical specialty work, such as electrical work, heating and plumbing, with which he has no previous experience and which he normally subcontracts to mechanical specialty contractors. The theory of this is that any responsible person who is willing to risk his own capital on a construction contract which he takes at a fixed price is entitled to undertake the performance of any part thereof, whether or not he is qualified by previous experience to perform the same cheaply, but that a person without previous experience and technical qualification in specialized mechanical work has no right to undertake such work on a cost-plus job and thereby gain his experience and know-how at public expense.

The result of this in the past has been immense waste of public moneys. It is a totally unjustifiable waste in times, like the present, when able, experienced mechanical specialty subcontractors are available to do the job efficiently and inexpensively. It amounts to a Government subsidy of big business by means of which small-business men may be eliminated from the national economy—a result which is directly contrary to the frequently expressed legislative policy of aiding and protecting small business. It is unfair both to the taxpayer and to the thousands of independent small- and medium-business men in the highly competitive mechanical specialty contracting industry now qualified to perform such work economically.

III. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR THE LUMP-SUM CONTRACT PROVISIONS

Only a few years ago the percentage of cost of construction represented by the so-called mechanical specialty work—heating

and piping, plumbing, air conditioning, electrical, and the like—was quite small. Today it is a very large part of the cost of any construction job. On many large Federal projects it may be as high as 50 percent of the cost. On some much more. General contractors do not normally find it necessary to secure subbids for work other than mechanical specialty work. The cost of preparing the various subbids on mechanical specialty work is very high—perhaps as high as or higher than the cost of preparing the general bid based in large part thereon.

The general contractors may be said to fall into two classes. The majority who carefully obtain the lowest subbids before making their general bid and who use as subcontractors the lowest responsible subbidders on one hand, and on the other those who indulge in bid-shopping after the award. These last of course are encouraged by the subcontractors who engage in bid jobbing. The Senate Judiciary Committee report aptly defines these terms as "the continuation of negotiations between the contractor and the subcontractor after the former has been awarded the contract on the basis of a bid given him by the latter and has a virtual monopoly on the particular construction involved." (S. Rept. 1969, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

The practice and effect of bid shopping was carefully explained by the Tax Court of the United States in its findings of fact in *Ring Construction Corp.* (8 T. C. 1070 (1947)):

"There is a practice among some contractors of shopping among subcontractors, after successfully bidding for a construction job, in order to obtain lower subcontract prices then those previously submitted and used in making up the successful bid. Such a contractor is known as a bid jobber or bid shopper, and there is a policy among subcontractors either not to bid with a contractor known to be such a bid jobber or to bid so high that he, the subcontractor, can still come down on his price and get the job. This results in an increase in the price quoted to the bid shopper, but may also result in a decrease in the bid made by the bid shopper, who expects to buy the subcontractor's services or materials for less than the bid received."

In that particular case the Tax Court protected the Government by approving the recovery of the unearned profit, stating:

"Moreover, we think that the costs computed in bidding were high, not only because of the general uncertainty of war market and labor conditions, but because * * * expected to reduce them greatly by shopping among or haggling with subcontractors—a practice, under the evidence, causing subcontractors in general to bid high or refrain. He testified that he actually did so shop or haggle, and the sub-bids were thus reduced about $600,000."

The Court, however, did not have occasion to go into the most damaging aspect of bid-shopping from the standpoint of the Government—that it has resulted in a very large proportion of the most reputable and highly skilled subcontractors completely withdrawing from Federal construction work. It stands to reason that the consequent reduction of the field of open competitive bidding and the tampering with competitive processes involved has increased the cost of Federal construction.

All segments of the construction industry agree that bid-shopping is an evil in the industry detrimental to the best interests not only of the industry itself but the Government as well on Federal construction projects.

It is forbidden by the code of ethics of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., and branded contrary to the best interests of the customer in their pamphlet Undivided Responsibility—Key to Lower Construction Costs.

It is condemned by the Handbook of Architectural Practices issued by the American Institute of Architects as disadvantageous to the owner (Government).

It is contrary to the trade-practice rules promulgated for the electrical contracting industry by Federal Trade Commission.

The Senate Judiciary Committee found the practice to be prevalent and increasing, in the report which referred to the increase in the practice in the following language:

"This obviously, will make it increasingly difficult for both the ethical general contractor and the ethical subcontractor to compete against those members of the industry who engage in bid-shopping. The inevitable result is to restrict the number of qualified subcontractors who are willing to participate in Government construction work, and it makes those who do participate put in their bids at the last minute and sometimes at an artificially increased figure to the distress of the general contractors." (S. Rept. No. 1969, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).

Of course the practice of bid-shopping is not confined to Federal construction but it is more subject to the force of public opinion on private work than on Government work where relationships are usually impersonal and transitory. Moreover, the Congress necessarily prescribes by legislation the rules under which contracts will be let by the Federal Government. The Government necessarily determines the conditions on which it will do business. Failure to include in the regulation of contracting any regulation of subcontracting procedures has resulted in waste and been an encouragement to the unfair trade practice of bid-shopping. In addition to protecting itself the Federal Government should have procedures reflecting an ethical tone.

Section 3 dealing with lump-sum contracts is designed to reduce the incidence of bid-shopping by preventing unjust enrichment of unscrupulous general contractors derived from shopping the bids of their mechanical specialty subcontractors, after an award of contract has been made to them at a figure based upon legitimate bids prepared at the expense of such subcontractors. The bill does not prevent a general contractor from securing mechanical specialty work to be done at a cost lower than that indicated by the bid upon which the contract price was originally based, but provides that any saving in doing so shall accrue to the benefit of the Government by reduction of the general contract price. In the case of contracts awarded after competitive bid, this section also limits the mechanical specialty subcontractors who may be substituted to those who have invested their time and capital in preparing estimates for some bid made on the job.

It should be noted that the Federal construction-contract bill does not provide for separation of contracts an anathema to general contractors provided in the legislation of a number of States including Arkansas, Ohio, Delaware, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina. Nor does it arbitrarily designate the subcontractors by separate bidding as the Massachusetts statute aimed at bid-shopping. It accomplishes the essential purpose of this State legislation by a method leaving complete flexibility to the operations of the general contractor and without adding measurably to the administrative burden of the executive agencies.

IV. HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION IN THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The Federal construction-contract bill, S. 2907, was introduced late in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress (on March 24, 1952) by Senators KILGORE, SPARKMAN, and FERGUSON. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Hearings were held by a subcommittee appointed by Senator MCCARRAN, of which Senator KILGORE was chairman, on April 29, May 20, 21, and June 3, 1952, and have been printed in full. In the very closing days of the session the bill was reported out by the Judiciary Committee (S. Rept. 1969). It was then June 27, 1952, and it did not come to a vote.

In the meantime eight companion bills were introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives Jackson, Bender, Jonas, Miller, Priest, Lane, Shelley, and Havenner. In the House it was also referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and to a subcommittee of which Mr. LANE was chairman. Since the bills were not introduced until late in May of 1952 there was not sufficient time for formal committee action.

V. SUPPORTERS AND ENDORSERS OF THE FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTROL BILL

This bill and its objectives have long been advocated by the following three national associations of small-business men each long established as the spokesman of the industries indicated by their names:

National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc. (organized 1901), 3,100 subscribing members.

National Association of Master Plumbers (organized 1883), 13,000 subscribing members.

Heating, Piping, Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc. (organized 1889), 1,165 subscribing members.

Each of these associations not only speaks for the number of its subscribing and dues paying members but believes that it represents in this matter the views of approximately 60,000 other businessmen in the industries indicated who are not subscribing members.

Each of the associations is organized in local chapters throughout the country. For example, the National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., has 99 local chapters. The National Association of Master Plumbers has 400 local associations and 46 State organizations. The Heating, Piping, Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., has active chapters in 40 cities.

The bill has also been endorsed by two other large organizations of businessmen in the construction industry and their membership, the Sheet Metal Contractors National Association with over 1,200 members throughout the Nation and the Sheet Metal and Roofing Contractors Association. Moreover, it has received the endorsement of a number of smaller or local organizations of businessmen including the Massachusetts Electrical Contractors Association, the Construction Industry Association of Mobile, etc.

In addition to the support from these business or employers groups the legislation has been wholeheartedly endorsed by the A. F. of L. craft unions concerned—IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) UA (United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry) and the Sheet Metal Workers Union. Secretary Durkin filed a statement in favor of its passage when he was president of UA.

AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage fuller participation by small-business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 849) to encourage fuller participation by small-business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

The proposed Export Insurance Act would facilitate through a system of insurance the granting of sound credit terms to foreign customers of America. There is no subsidy involved; the Export-Import Bank, through a Foreign Trade Insurance Division of the bank to be created under the bill, would have authority to insure an exporter, particularly small- and medium-sized firms, against the risk of nonpayment by a foreign customer because of foreign government prohibitions against the payment in dollars. In such case insurance could be issued up to 100 percent of the amount then due. In other instances, exporters could be insured up to 90 percent of the amount due. Only loans on sales with the usual sound terms would be made. The bank would issue capital stock of $100,000,000 subscribed by the United States. The funds from such sale would finance the operations of the Foreign Trade Insurance division of the bank.

Studies in past years show that an overwhelming preponderance of our foreign exports go to American big business. The Export-Import Bank now makes loans to exporters. Such loans, however, are small in number and are made only to very large firms which do not have very much need for the kind of aid contemplated by the bill. Financial institutions which have helped small exporters in the past have charged up to 10 percent for their services. In view of the fact that many small exporters have a profit margin of not over 5 percent, such charge is very high. On occasion, therefore, banking firms have taken over foreign accounts in which they had an interest through such loans.

The Congress should do everything possible to enable American small-business firms to obtain a fair share of our foreign trade.

BRONISLAW SEP NADOLNY

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Bronislaw Sep Nadolny.

The bill would grant permanent residence in the United States to a Polish sailor who arrived in the United States as a stowaway.

Bronislaw Sep Nadolny, at the age of 16, was a worker in the anti-Communist Polish underground. When he was 18, Russian forces put him in the Polish Navy. Later he served in the Polish merchant marine.

In 1948, when Nadolny was 21, and serving on a Polish merchant ship, he jumped ship at Casablanca, north Africa, because he feared to return to Poland. Later the same year, he worked his way to Habana, Cuba, on a Norwegian boat, and from Habana, he stowed away to New York. He now lives in Cleveland, Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 866) for the relief of Bronislaw Sep Nadolny, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETSUKO MOTOHARA KIBLER, WIDOW OF ROBERT EUGENE KIBLER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler.

The purpose of the bill is to admit to the United States for permanent residence Setsuko Motohara Kibler.

Mrs. Kibler is the widow of Robert Eugene Kibler, an American citizen who lost his life in a plane crash while serving with the United States naval forces in Japan.

I am introducing the bill at the request of Harvey A. Kibler, of Mansfield, Ohio, father-in-law of the woman for whom relief is sought.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 867) for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. ENRIQUE SANTAMARINA-BECERRA

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Santamarina-Becerra.

Dr. Enrique Santamarina-Becerra is a native of Spain and a graduate of Ohio State University, from which he received his degree of doctor of philosophy in August 1952.

He now holds the Muelhaupt scholarship, under which he is pursuing research into the endocrine functions of the pineal gland.

Dr. Enrique Santamarina-Becerra is married to an American girl. He desires to remain in America, continue his scientific researches, and become an American citizen.

I introduced a bill in his behalf in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, but it was not reached for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 868) for the relief of Dr. Enrique Santamarina-Becerra, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX OF RETIREMENT ANNUITIES AND PENSIONS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 875) granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill which would exempt from income-tax purposes all amounts up to $2,500 received as a retirement annuity or pension.

During the past few years I have had occasion to learn a great deal about the problems of our older people, and I have sought to aid them in their struggle to stretch their incomes to meet continually increasing living costs. Annuities and pensions based on an income of a decade or even 5 years ago do not provide for the basic needs of a great majority of the annuitants and pensioners.

The bill would exempt any amount up to $2,500 of yearly income received as a pension or annuity from any employer, public or private. By not having to pay tax on this income, the annuitants would have more cash to cover the high costs of food, shelter, clothing, and medical care. These people in most cases are not able to supplement their incomes because they are either not physically able to work or cannot find employment because of their age. There is an obligation on the part of the Congress carefully to survey their needs and provide relief which is sorely needed. I believe that some relief, as prescribed in this bill, is warranted.

POLICY CONCERNING WAR DAMAGE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution stating a policy concerning war damage. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) stating a policy concerning war damage, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

When I introduced a similar measure (S. J. Res. 171) on July 5, 1952, I stated that I did so in order that there would be available for consideration a proposed legislative declaration of Federal Government responsibility with reference to war-caused damage. Introduction of that joint resolution was accompanied by a statement summarizing the activities in this field of the Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the Eighty-second Congress. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 7, page 9588.)

Having been chairman of that subcommittee throughout the Eighty-second Congress, I am vitally interested in seeing that the Congress adequately discharges its responsibility to consider what Federal legislation may be required in connection with insurance or indemnity of war-caused damage.

In the interval since adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress, I have found no development in our international relations which lessens the need for consideration of this problem. I am therefore introducing anew proposed legislation on the subject of war damage. As I see it, unless the Congress is willing to recognize some responsibility in

this field, there is little use in trying to prepare detailed legislation outlining the acts to be taken by the Federal Government to insure or indemnify against war-caused damage.

The joint resolution can serve as the means of determining whether the Congress is ready and willing to take this first step by recognizing a degree of Federal responsibility for war-caused damage. The joint resolution contemplates that legislation detailing the scope of that responsibility would be deferred until it becomes practicable to prescribe the precise steps the Federal Government can take to meet effectively and equitably any responsibility it recognizes.

My study of this problem has led me to believe there is a natural tendency to avoid its consideration because of its unpleasant nature. But ignoring the problem will not solve it. It is closely related to national security in two ways. Adequate solution of the problem will provide the means for continuing military and defense-supporting production which would otherwise be interrupted or destroyed by war-caused damage. Moreover, the more assurance people have that war-caused damage will not wipe out their assets, the higher will be their morale and the more efficient will be their contribution to the national defense effort.

At the present time, no insurance can be obtained from private insurance companies to cover the risk of war-caused damage to real or personal property in the United States. It is therefore understandable that many individuals and corporations are concerned about this matter. The problem still requires congressional consideration.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY FOR PEOPLE OF THE NETHERLANDS IN THEIR RECENT FLOOD AND STORM DISASTER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the profound sympathy of the Congress for the brave people of the Netherlands who have suffered such heavy losses as the result of the recent storms and floods. These disasters have affected all the Low Countries and the United Kingdom, to whom I think we should express our sympathy, and in particular to the Netherlands, which has borne the brunt of the disaster.

The resolution is designed as a companion to the concurrent resolution submitted in the House of Representatives by Mr. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), submitted by Mr. KENNEDY, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its profound sympathy for the brave people of the Netherlands who have suffered such heavy losses both in lives and in property as the result of the recent storms and floods which have ravaged their country.

RULES OF PROCEDURE IN CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS AND DEROGATORY REMARKS MADE IN DEBATE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference two concurrent resolutions, one of which provides for rules of procedure in congressional investigations, and the other one provides for rules of procedure for derogatory remarks made in debate by Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the concurrent resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas congressional investigations are one of the most important of the legislative processes, since Congress constantly needs factual, well-balanced information in many different fields to enable it to act wisely in the public interest; and

Whereas the investigative power of Congress affords protection against abuse of governmental power and a most effective means of focusing public opinion upon national problems; and

Whereas the flow of information to the people through the medium of congressional investigations has gained new importance with the advent of new methods of rapid communication; and

Whereas such investigations should be preserved as a means of effecting good government, without permitting them to be used as an instrument for abridging the constitutional rights of citizens: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the following provisions of this concurrent resolution are adopted (1) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 2. Insofar as practicable, any person or organization whose activities are the subject of investigation by a committee, or about whom derogatory information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of a committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the derogatory material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting on the character of any individual or organization which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of a committee shall be first reviewed in executive session and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

SEC. 3. Any person or organization whose activities are the subject of any investigation by a committee, or about whom a derogatory statement is made or material is presented at any public hearing of a committee, shall—

(1) be given an opportunity to present evidence in his or its own behalf at the same session and, if possible, on the same day;

(2) be permitted in appearances before the committee to be accompanied and advised by counsel, who shall within appropriate limits be entitled to question such person or representatives of such organization in order to bring out all pertinent facts;

(3) be permitted to file with the committee a limited number of interrogatories to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory material about such person or organization;

(4) be entitled to have the committee subpena witnesses for limited direct or adverse examination by such person or organization, or by his or its counsel, subject to the discretion of the committee; and

(5) be permitted to file at the conclusion of the evidence a rebuttal attempt, which shall be made a part of the record and considered in the committee's report.

SEC. 4. Any witness who asserts a bona fide claim of privilege shall be entitled to present such claim to the committee, either in his own proper person or through counsel, and secure the committee's ruling.

SEC. 5. No subpena to inquire into the private affairs of any individual shall be issued by any committee except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

SEC. 6. No person shall be required to testify in executive session of any committee unless a majority of the committee expressly rules that the public interest requires that such person's testimony shall be kept secret. Any such examination shall be held before not less than two committee members. Testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and shall not be released, or used in public hearings, without the approval of a majority of the committee.

SEC. 7. No witness before a committee shall be compelled to testify as to his religious or political belief unless the committee rules by majority vote that such testimony is relevant to the inquiry.

SEC. 8. Until after the committee has been given a reasonable time to file its report, members of committees shall refrain from making derogatory comments about a witness in either House or elsewhere and shall refrain from revealing the contents of any committee report or the conclusions contained in such report prior to its issuance.

SEC. 9. Minority reports, if any, shall be filed at the same time as majority reports on investigations involving the private affairs of individuals.

SEC. 10. All of the evidence involving the private affairs of individuals upon which a committee report, finding, or conclusion is based shall be made public concurrently with such report, finding, or conclusion.

SEC. 11. A verbatim record shall be made of all hearings. Records of public hearings and published portions of executive hearings shall be made available to the public upon payment of the cost thereof.

SEC. 12. Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, news reels, and television. It shall be the responsibility of the committee chairman to seee that the various communication devices and instruments do not unduly distract or frighten the witness and interfere with his presentation.

SEC. 13. As used in this concurrent resolution, the term "committee" includes a standing or select committee of either House of Congress, a joint committee of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That no Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall make before the Senate or the House of Representatives, respectively, any derogatory remarks with respect to any citizen or resident of the United States without making a reasonable effort, if time permits, to notify such citizen or resident of the exact nature of such remarks, where and approximately when they will be made, and the procedure that such citizen or resident must follow if he desires to submit an answer to such remarks under this rule. If any such remarks are made without such notification, the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, depending on where such remarks were made, shall mail to such citizen's or resident's last-known

address a printed copy of such remarks and information concerning the procedure that must be followed if he desires to submit an answer to such remarks under this rule. Any citizen or resident of the United States who is derogated in any remarks made by a Member of the Senate or the House of Representative before the Senate or the House of Representatives, respectively, may submit an answer to such remarks to either the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, depending on where such remarks were made. If such remarks were made orally on the floor, then the answer shall be read on the floor by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, depending on where such remarks were made and such answer, if received in time, shall be printed in the daily and permanent editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following such remarks. If such remarks were in the form of an extension of remarks, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, then the answer shall not be read on the floor but shall be printed in the Appendix. In either case, such answer shall be subscribed and sworn to before any duly authorized notary public, and shall not exceed in length the remarks that it answers or one-half a printed page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whichever is the greater.

SEC. 3. The first section of this resolution shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

The statement by Senator KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

One of the resolutions sets up a code of conduct for committees. The other deals with a related problem. It might be said to set up a code of procedure, where the names and reputations of individuals are concerned, for the floor.

I do not say that either of the resolutions is perfect as drawn, because the subject is complex. Their purpose, however, is to set up a procedure which protects the fundamental rights of the individual, and yet at the same time preserves without impairment the whole process of congressional investigation and constitutional immunity. It is not an easy balance to strike.

Let me first consider the resolution establishing a code of conduct for committees. The criticism of congressional committees, I believe, has generally centered around these points:

(a) Congressional investigations frequently assume the aspects of a trial of an individual without safeguards of regular court proceedings.

(b) Legislators appear in the role of judges and combine the functions of prosecuting and judging which should be separated.

(c) The witnesses may be exposed to such penalties as loss of their jobs, character assassination, or injury to their reputation, as a result of the attendant publicity.

(d) Appearances before investigative committees are not subject to procedures laid down by Congress.

(e) Legal rights of individuals guaranteed by the Bill of Rights are abridged by congressional investigations. Another objection—somewhat intangible—but of great danger to a democracy, is the fact that conformity to prevailing ideas is enforced by fear of censure before a congressional committee. In this connection the question is raised whether some investigations do not impose tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling which John Stuart Mill once described as "tendence of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them."

As a result of resentment against methods employed by certain investigating committees, the committee on the Bill of Rights of the bar association of New York City made a study of the subject. In its December 1948 report, which was adopted by the association, the committee found that most complaints centered on the belief that inquiry into witnesses' personal affairs violated some right of the individual to immunity from official inquisition or some right in the nature of a right of privacy. The bar association committee felt that some of the conditions complained of are inherent in the conduct of the legislative process or are due to the shortcomings of particular individuals concerned in making the investigation. Much of the criticism, however, the committee considered justified, and it felt that certain rules could be adopted which would insure to a much greater degree the observance of ordinary principles of fairness and justice.

There have been several attempts beginning in the Seventy-ninth Congress to prescribe procedures of investigating committees and to protect the rights of witnesses.

There have been many proposals made for reforms in the conduct of congressional investigations.

One such proposal is the voluntary adoption of self-imposed rules by individual committees to guide their conduct. Such measures have been taken by certain committees.

These chairmen are to be commended for their vision and their pioneering in the field of committee reform. However, it seems evident to me that rules imposed by individual committees themselves, while a step in the right direction, are not the final answer. No halfway measure should stand in the way of congressional action establishing rules for proper procedure for all committees.

A code of fair conduct for all investigating groups—adopted by House and Senate as part of their standing rules—would have the effect of avoiding confusion and promoting uniformity. It would give Congress and the country a yardstick by which to test the performance of every committee investigation. A code of procedure for administrative agencies has been established. Why not a code for congressional committees?

I think this code is workable. All its elements can be found in the best practices of the most successful and most respected investigating committees.

Briefly, this is what the resolution provides:

1. That a person or organization shall be notified of the nature of the charges against him, of the matters to be inquired into, and of the derogatory material to be presented.

2. That he be given an opportunity to present evidence in his own behalf.

3. That he be permitted counsel, who shall be entitled to question him within appropriate limits in order to bring out all pertinent facts.

4. That he be permitted to file a limited number of interrogatories to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory materials.

5. That he be permitted to file at the conclusion of the evidence a rebuttal statement.

There are also outlined safeguards regarding subpenas, safeguards for information developed in executive session, safeguards for the private affairs of individuals—and I think I should expound a bit on how television has been treated.

In this resolution, we have television, which is a new method of communication but one that is here to stay and with which we shall have to deal, just like any other method of communication. In other words, these same rules would apply, whether the hearing is conducted in executive session, covered only by the press, or covered by the press, still cameramen, radio, newsreels, television, and so on. But we have placed in this code the responsibility upon the chairman of the committee to see to it that none of the communication devices annoy the witness. If the chairman decides they do, then it is his responsibility to see that the annoyance is ceased.

Therefore, the code set up under this resolution does not force television upon any committee. If the committee chairman determines that televising is hindering the work of the committee, then it is his responsibility and his duty to stop the cameras.

So much for the code of conduct for committees. Now let us consider the related problem as it applies to actions on the floor.

We are all familiar with section 6 of article I of our Constitution which granted constitutional immunity for any speech or debate made in either House. There is a sound basis for this guaranty—it recognizes that free legislative debate is the very bedrock of freedom itself.

The second resolution which I have introduced seeks to preserve that freedom of debate but it seeks also to give an individual whose reputation may be harmed by having his name mentioned in a derogatory manner here on the floor of the Senate, the opportunity to defend himself. It seems to me that this is a fundamental concept—the concept of self-defense.

Without going into details, this resolution which is being introduced today tackles the problem in this manner: It provides only that insofar as practicable a Member who intends to name an individual or an organization in a derogatory manner shall first notify that individual or organization of the nature of the charges to be made. The individual or organization may then file with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate a sworn statement, if he so desires, giving his side of the story—and this sworn statement shall be read on the floor and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the charges.

That, it may be said, is all right when a Member knows 10 days or a week in advance that he is going to make certain charges, and thus has time to notify the individual or organization, but sometimes names are mentioned in running floor debate. We have taken care of this eventuality by providing that in such cases the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate shall notify the individual, or organization, at his or its last known address that such charges have been made, after which the sworn statement may be filed and read. In the final printed version of the RECORD the denial shall follow the charge.

It is obvious that this does not completely solve the problem. But it is a step toward providing a way in which the denial can catch up with the charge for the reader and listener of today; and it is a further assurance that the historian of tomorrow will find the other side of the story immediately following the charges in the permanent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In conclusion may I say that I do not claim for these resolutions any finality of draftsmanship. These are problems which have worried many of us and these are the best solutions that a number of us, thinking and working together, could produce as a starting point. Undoubtedly, there will be many more ideas on the subject as these resolutions pass through committee and floor consideration. Let us welcome and consider them all, in a nonpartisan manner, for these are nonpartisan matters.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY FOR PEOPLES OF THE NETHERLANDS, GREAT BRITAIN, AND BELGIUM, IN THE RECENT FLOOD AND STORM DISASTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original concurrent resolution expressing sympathy for the peoples

of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium, in the recent flood and storm disaster. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was read, as follows:

Whereas the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium have suffered tragic loss of lives, homes, and farms from the destruction wrought by storms and floods; and

Whereas the ties of blood, kinship, and fellowship between these countries and our own are of ancient tradition, precious to the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress on behalf of the people of the United States expresses its deep sympathy, affection, and concern for the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, whose countries have been ravaged by disaster, its admiration for their courage in adversity, and its hope for the early restoration of their homes and livelihoods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "How To Aid Holland," which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 8, 1953. I think the editorial is very stimulating.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO AID HOLLAND

The response to last week's disaster in the Low Countries and Britain has been truly heartwarming. Schoolboys have brought their classmates' pennies to the Dutch Embassy here to aid the victims of the flooding from the North Sea. Numerous private aid groups have been set up in Washington and other cities to collect funds to help repair the damage that in Holland alone runs well over a billion dollars. Secretary of State Dulles has been named by President Eisenhower to head a Cabinet committee to recommend aid measures for the stricken countries.

The question naturally arises: What kind of aid? Here no decision has been taken. Most immediate relief needs for clothing and food have been met by the governments concerned, with the help of the United States Army in Germany. Holland was of course, the worst hit. The long-run choice as respects the Netherlands probably must be between aid for economic reconstruction and military aid to make up Dutch NATO commitments. The Dutch Government has shown a commendable desire to do everything possible to avoid cutting its defense contributions.

This, it seems to us, is a clue to the best kind of aid. Psychologically it is important for Holland to meet her defense commitments by herself as far as possible. Defense is the most basic of national responsibilities, and it would be destructive of this sense of responsibility if the commitments were postponed. More productive use, no doubt, could be made of the same amount of money or goods by concentrating on economic reconstruction. The need is of course, prodigious. Holland's recovery has been set back 2 to 3 years; 90 percent of her onion export crop has been destroyed and her earning capacity has suffered many other blows.

Here is a great opportunity for the whole NATO community. The Netherlands has been a leader, not only in furthering the European army concept, but in the much broader field of European unity. Perhaps, with the leadership of the United States, the disaster could be treated as an attack on all the NATO countries—an attack by the sea instead of an army. Aid on that basis, with each NATO country contributing a share, could be the best kind of evidence of a spirit of unity and interdependence in Europe. This is a chance to introduce in practice the all-for-one and one-for-all concept which underlies NATO and which Secretary Dulles is pursuing. It would be one way to make the calamity yield a dividend of good.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address delivered by Senator MAYBANK before National Cotton Council of America at Dallas, Tex., on January 26, 1953.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address entitled "America and the Future," delivered by him before the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on February 9, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before the Women's National Democratic Club, at Washington, D. C., on January 19, 1953.

Address entitled "Christianity's Role in Korea," delivered by Hon. You Chan Yang, Ambassador from Korea, on February 5, 1953.

Address on the sociological causes of crime, delivered by Prof. J. Pope Dyer, of Chattanooga, Tenn., before the East Ridge Kiwanis Club, on January 29, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him before the American Institute of Banking, on February 7, 1953, at the Astor Hotel, New York, N. Y.

Article contributed by him to the Reserve Officer magazine with reference to celebration of National Defense Week.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Statement and letter by Michael W. Straus in connection with his resignation as Commissioner of United States Bureau of Reclamation, together with the President's reply.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Transcript of proceedings at dedicatory prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 5, 1953.

Sermon on the subject Why Has God Blessed America? by Rabbi Joseph Utschen, of Beth Sholom Congregation, Topeka, Kans.

By Mr. POTTER:

Address delivered by Admiral Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, before the annual chamber of commerce banquet at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on January 28, 1953, together with a letter from Hon. James Robertson, mayor of Sault Ste. Marie, transmitting the address by Admiral Spencer.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Righteousness Exalteth a Nation," by Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-el, New York City, January 20, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Sermon entitled "The Revolt Against Intelligence," delivered by Rev. George S. Siudy, Jr., in the First Congregational Church of Minneapolis, Minn., on January 11, 1953.

By Mr. BARRETT:

Statement issued by Charles F. Guild, 1953 chairman of Uinta County, Wyo., PMA, giving returns from questionnaire sent to 224 farmers and ranchers in his county.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "Fire-and-Rehire Racket," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1953, relating to the discharging and rehiring of Government employees.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Letter on the subject Northwest Power Shortage, written to the editor of the Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World, and published in the January 3, 1953, issue.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "He Gives Some Back," published in the Northwest Arkansas Times, of Fayetteville, Ark., on February 5, 1953, relative to a voluntary refund on a defense contract.

Article entitled "Fulbright Scholars Show Work," published in the Washington Post on February 8, 1953.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Article entitled "A Good Stewardship," published in the New Mexican, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., on January 19, 1953, in tribute to the retiring Secretary of the Interior, Oscar L. Chapman.

Editorial entitled "Harry S. Truman: An Appraisal," published in the New Mexican, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., on January 18, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Local Man Bares Deal on Beef Sent to United States," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of February 3, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Editorial entitled "Tax Laws Unfair to Working Wives," published in Redbook magazine for February 1953.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Article entitled "Man Becoming Ace in Record Time To Get Hero's Welcome," relating to Capt. D. D. Overton III, of Andrews, S. C., published in the Columbia (S. C.) State.

MRS. DOLLY CURTIS GANN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short statement in tribute to Mrs. Dolly Curtis Gann, who recently passed away.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week one of the Nation's outstanding women and a former Kansan passed away. I refer, of course, to Mrs. Dolly Curtis Gann, who passed away at the age of 81 years.

She had been a resident of the District of Columbia for more than 60 years, coming here with her late brother, Vice President Charlie Curtis.

Mrs. Gann was a native of Topeka, Kans., but had spent most of her life in the Nation's Capital. Mrs. Gann took a leading role in Republican women's activities. She was president of the Washington League of Republican Women Voters from 1938 until 1944, and was a former president of the Senate Women's Club.

Survivors include two nieces, Mrs. Webster Knight, of Providence, R. I., and Mrs. Charles T. George, of Fort Worth, Tex., and several grandnephews and grandnieces.

Funeral services were held a week ago, Monday, at the Hines Funeral Home in this city, and burial was in Cedar Hill Cemetery.

One of Mrs. Gann's very close friends and a very active Republican worker in the District of Columbia, Mrs. Howard A. Coffin, prepared a tribute to Mrs. Ed-

ward Everett Gann, which was given before the League of Republican Women at their regular meeting last week. I ask unanimous consent to have it made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. EDWARD EVERETT GANN GIVEN BEFORE LEAGUE OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN BY MRS. HOWARD A. COFFIN

There will be laid in her grave today one of the great women of this country and this generation.

Dolly Gann, from Kansas, known to the entire Nation, personified for most of us—not only the true spirit of the American pioneer woman, but also symbolized the spirit of Republican women everywhere.

Dolly Gann, a really beautiful feminine woman, had unflinching courage. She never at any time was known to falter in her determination to carry on for her principles in the face of any situation whatsoever.

Dolly Gann grew with the years. She had a wonderfully inspiring philosophy of not permitting her fine calm and dignity to be disturbed in any circumstance. She did not believe in worry. "Do the very best you can for your project," she always said, "but do not spend valuable time and energy in worry." She took whatever situation was at hand and never complained. She had an unerring sense of justice, and if she criticized, it was constructive always.

She loved people especially, and to mingle among them. She had perfect loyalty to her friends and was always there with sage advice and to put in a word in their behalf. One of her favorite remarks was, "Don't you think people are wonderful to me?" Another was, "I have had such a happy life."

She lived actively and with great zest until the very end of her 81 years.

Every moment of her life wherever possible Dolly Gann was trying to further the principles and interests of the Republican Party.

She was never too busy or important to go to a meeting, to speak when asked, to collect a vote or a dollar, or sell a ticket—or knit a bootie for a baby or a scarf for a soldier. Mrs. Gann had more honor stripes for knitting for the Senate ladies' Red Cross than any other member.

She admired enormously our Republican leaders and backed them up at every opportunity.

A long-time president of the League of Republican Women and member of the board of directors, she worked hard and made a successful job of it, as many of us old timers know.

But after she retired she made her great influence felt from her home and it was always kindly and helpful.

She worshipped her brother, the late Vice President Charles Curtis, and her husband, the late William Gann, and was a wonderful wife and sister.

She was a splendid housekeeper and although she had no children of her own, she was Aunt Dolly to many loving nieces and nephews. She loved young people and they returned it.

Dolly was admired by both Republicans and Democrats—the latter recognized her splendid qualities. She was unanimously elected President of the Senior Congress Club.

Her passing will be a great loss in many of our lives but the spirit of Dolly Gann will go marching on and will be our inspiration always.

NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] in recognition of National Boy Scout Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

At this time I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to one of America's great agencies, the Boy Scouts of America, which operates under a Federal charter granted by Congress. The Boy Scouts of America was established 43 years ago, and Boy Scout Week is now being observed throughout the Nation. Many of you are actively connected with Scouting and I am sure that all of you are aware of the effective program of character development, citizenship training, and physical fitness which it is conducting for the boys of this Nation. Over 20,000,000 boys and men during the past 43 years have unselfishly rendered service to their communities as members of this organization. The present membership is over three million, and in these critical days it is reassuring to know that we have such a great force for good working in all sections of the United States.

The Boy Scouts of America is open to boys of every race, color, and religious belief. The movement has reached into every village, town, and city neighborhood. Scout groups are sponsored by churches, schools, veteran posts, service clubs, granges, industrial, labor, and other civic institutions.

One of the finest Nation-wide good turns was performed last November when Scouts delivered 30,000,000 Liberty Bell doorknob hangers in connection with the nonpartisan get-out-the-vote campaign. Scouts have rendered outstanding civic service also in recruiting blood donors, and in training for civil defense.

I know of no agency which is doing a more effective job of character development, citizenship training and physical fitness. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in extending to the Boy Scouts of America our profound appreciation and greetings on this occasion of their forty-third anniversary.

President Eisenhower, in his first message to the Boy Scouts of Amercia as their new honorary president, told its 3,200,000 members that "if you will follow the Scout oath, America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth."

I should like to have President Eisenhower's message to the Boy Scouts, which was released to the press on Saturday, included in the RECORD as part of my remarks on the occasion of Boy Scout Week:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

It is with great personal pleasure that I extend to you my warmest congratulations on your forty-third anniversary and greet you on the occasion of Boy Scout Week 1953.

Your present crusade "Forward on Liberty's Team" is proving to be most effective. Americans everywhere must be proud to know that the Boy Scouts of America registered its three-millionth active member during the past year. I understand that the present membership has now reached a new high of 3,200,000 Scouts, Explorers, and leaders, and that since 1910 there have been 20,200,000 American boys and men enrolled.

This birthday message is addressed to every Scout and leader in the Boy Scouts of America. I urge you all to live up to the high ideals for which Scouting stands—your duty as patriotic citizens. If you will follow the Scout oath, America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PLIGHT OF THE DAIRYMEN OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the Senate for about 3 or 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the midst of our many concerns over developments abroad and the critical issues of the present moment, I think it would be well to see what is happening to some of our forgotten people here at home. I refer at the moment to our dairy farmers.

I was alarmed to read the testimony offered by a spokesman for the Agriculture Department before the Senate Agriculture Committee during the past week describing the increasingly critical situation confronting the American farmer. Prices being received by the farmers are declining steadily, while the costs of what the farmer must buy continue to rise.

Among all the elements of the farm population, none has a greater claim on our attention than the dairy farmers. I should like to call the attention of the new administration and of the Nation at large to the plight of the dairymen of New York, who are the backbone of one of New York State's great industries, and who are at the heart of the agricultural economy of my State.

I was interested in reading some figures which were put out not long ago by the Department of Agriculture showing the return which farmers receive for their labor. They have, of course, made great strides since the early 1930's. Their return per hour of work is several times as great as it was in the period 1932–36. But it is still very far below the level it should be.

I call attention to the fact that the dairy farmer in New York State received in 1951 a return of only 78 cents per hour for his work, including all his investment. This compared with a return during the same year of $2.20 per hour for those Corn Belt farmers who raise grain for cash sale, and $2.25 per hour for farmers in that same area who engage in hog and beef fattening. Sheep ranching paid up to $3.57 an hour in the northern plains country. But the dairy farmer in 1951 received a return of only 78 cents an hour in the central northeast area, 81 cents an hour in eastern Wisconsin, and 76 cents an hour in western Wisconsin.

In 1952 dairy prices continued to go down and dairy costs continued to rise. I do not have any exact figures comparable to those I have cited for 1952, but I am sure they would be less. I have seen an estimate from the head of the Dairymen's League of New York that the income of dairy farmers supplying the New York City milk market would drop nearly $6,000,000 in the first half of 1953. This official said that the uniform price received by dairymen for milk in January 1953 will probably be 62 cents less per hundredweight than in January of last year, and that in February 1953 the decline would be 75 cents below February 1952.

These figures should alarm us into remedial action. The Department of Agriculture should immediately take steps to bring relief to the dairy farmers of New York State and to other areas where such relief is required. An adequate short-range and long-range program should be instituted to meet the short-range price situation and the long-range cost and market situation of the dairy industry. Neither New York State nor the Nation can afford a condition of severe hardship upon the dairying industry and the vast numbers of people dependent upon that industry in New York State and elsewhere.

I remember the days of tragic distress among the dairy farmers of New York in 1932, 1933, and 1934, and the years immediately thereafter. As Governor of New York I took many steps calculated to meet that distress, and the Department of Agriculture and the national administration took parallel measures. I hope we shall never see such conditions return. At the least sign of them—and I think there may be such signs now—preventive measures should be taken. I hope the appropriate officials will move to discharge their responsibility in this vital field without delay.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in ancient times Greece, Palestine, China, and many other countries of Europe and Asia were rich farming countries. Deforestation and soil erosion by wind and water made them poor. It will be many years before they fully recover from the ill effects of the neglect of their soil resources. In the meantime the people of those countries are suffering untold poverty and privation. No nation can progress beyond the limits of its soil. The greater majority of our American farmers and stockmen have become conscious of the fact that not only their own welfare but that of the Nation is tied up in the soil and its continued production.

The Soil Conservation Service is our best tool for continuing the education of our people to a greater consciousness of the need for soil conservation, as well as in carrying out the program itself. The SCS has done a good job and has accumulated a wealth of experience and technical ability that could easily be dissipated if this agency should be subordinated to and "coordinated" with and split up among other agencies responsible for this program. The SCS is in a better position to proceed with an orderly and permanent program of soil conservation than any other agency of the Government. Soil conservation is a scientific job. The program, as directed by the SCS, has been the scientific application of soil conservation principles to the land, and this is one of the main factors in its success.

In connection with this most important subject I ask unanimous consent that an article printed in the Country Gentleman for December 1952, by Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, former Chief of the SCS, and entitled "They Are Wrecking Soil Conservation," be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE WRECKING SOIL CONSERVATION

Soil-conservation progress in our country is in serious danger. Forces are at work to weaken, render impotent, or even to wreck the Soil Conservation Service and its program—the first such program undertaken anywhere in the world and one which now is being imitated in many parts of the world.

The soil-conservation program we built so carefully on a sound foundation of scientific research, devotion to our land, and cooperation of farmers is threatened by powerful forces which would discard many time-tested methods of SCS, would thin out the ability of trained technicians to do a good job, would diffuse conservation research, and could lead the program into the blind alley of political control.

It seems almost incredible that I should have to speak out and express my belief that the whole great structure of the SCS is being undermined. I don't like the role of a critic. When I retired from the Department of Agriculture last April, after having served nearly 50 years, I felt that I was entitled to catch up on my hunting and fishing, in which I'm about 15 years behind.

But as I observe what is happening to the soil-conservation program, I am left no choice. I couldn't sleep nights if I stayed silent while the Department of Agriculture, in the guise of "coordination," puts conservation on the wrong track. After all, I spent 28 years preaching the need for conservation before the Government did anything about it. I spent 18 years helping to build the soil-conservation program. I feel that I have a stake in the future of our land.

To give you this whole, vitally important picture, let's look back briefly. The Soil Conservation Service was established in 1935 by Congress and was an outgrowth of the earlier Soil Erosion Service, started in 1933, the first attempt by any nation to halt the appalling losses of soil and soil fertility. We knew in the beginning that soil conservation would be a long hard job, without any short cuts. First, research would have to be carried out to get the needed answers before we could make practical plans for farms. When it came to actually stopping erosion, practically nothing was known about the whole complex relationship between water, soil, slopes, plants, methods of tillage, and so on.

We also knew that each farm presented a separate and distinct problem. You couldn't just give a farmer a batch of practices and say, "Here, these will fix your soil." No, you had to have the means to prescribe an exact conservation plan for each farm, one that took into account all these complex relationships for that farm, and for the watershed of which the farm was a part.

We recognized, too, that the farmer would have to do the conservation job. The Government couldn't do it for him. This meant that the soil-conservation program had to be decentralized, with local control and management. This was done through the development of locally organized and farmer-operated soil-conservation districts. The SCS would furnish the technical know-how to aid the districts in getting the job done.

We have every reason to be proud of the soil-conservation program carried out under this system. Progress was slow at first. But each forward step laid the way for several additional steps. In recent years the program has been moving at a progressively faster pace. In fact, as I look back over nearly 50 years of study and work on the land, our progress seems miraculous.

During the past 20 years we not only built a foundation of research, skill, and organization—we also completed about a third of the total conservation job, a job that was more than 200 years in the making. The SCS and the soil-conservation districts have done their work efficiently. For every $1 of taxpayers' money spent by the SCS more than $5 worth of effective and lasting conservation has been applied on the land. Farmers and ranchers are now carrying out permanent, scientifically planned conservation work on more than 140,000,000 acres in soil-conservation districts and plans have been blueprinted for 246,000,000 acres. The SCS and the districts could finish the remaining conservation job in only 20 years, if supplied the trained manpower and the money. And it would be a high-quality conservation job.

This could be done, if SCS were left alone to go ahead with its job. But SCS hasn't been left alone. It is being coordinated with the ACP—or Agricultural Conservation Program—which operates under the Production and Marketing Administration. In the process there is a clear and present danger that SCS will become a mere appendage for the more powerful PMA.

Let's look at ACP a moment. Some folks find it hard to understand why we need two conservation programs, both aimed at the same land. Frankly, so do I. Of course, I know that when the AAA was outlawed in 1936 by the Supreme Court, some means were needed to justify payments to farmers cooperating in adjustment programs. Conservation was becoming popular, so it was borrowed as a basis for payments. But while the SCS has promoted permanent conservation based on complete farm plans pinpointed to the individual farm, the ACP has been a shotgun affair, offering farmers a catalog of practices from which they can pick and choose and for which they receive payment. Many of these ACP practices are desirable, but paying a farmer year after year for applying the same practice to the same land just doesn't add up to progress in soil conservation. Even such permanent installations as farm ponds or terraces don't add up to conservation unless applied in the right way, at the right place on the right land.

ACP is a monster of a program, spending around a quarter of a billion dollars a year where SCS has been costing about $60,000,000. Even so, ACP is merely one of 25 major operations and around 80 suboperations administered by PMA. And the whole theme of PMA's philosophy is economic controls and subsidy, not the single-minded scientific approach to long-range protection and wise use of the land.

Obviously, it is wasteful to have two Federal agencies aiming at soil conservation. The conservation programs should be unified. But it appears to me that the power-hungry, politically motivated PMA now is engulfing the Soil Conservation Service. I am sure that public acceptance of SCS is such that PMA would not dare to try to take over the SCS soil-conservation program all at once. But PMA can achieve the same objective by chipping away at SCS, stripping the smaller organization of its essential functions, one by one, and changing its character.

This chipping away has begun in earnest since the Secretary of Agriculture's much-publicized Memorandum No. 1278 of February 1951, which was supposed to coordinate the USDA's conservation programs. Under this memorandum all agencies of the USDA dealing with soil resources were to get together.

As I understood it, the SCS was to direct the technical phases of the Department's permanent soil-conservation work. At the time, I believed this coordination to be a step in the right direction, but in actual practice I am afraid it has turned out to be a trap for SCS. At least, when SCS was responsible only for running its own program, the quality of conservation work could be maintained at a high level. Now, however, SCS has been thinned out to some extent and is threat-

ened with still more dilution. SCS technical men have been overburdened, I fear, with additional work for the PMA, seriously reducing the assistance they can give cooperators in soil conservation districts. The effect may be to improve ACP practices, but it slows down the complete farm conservation plans—the only kind which in the long run can give the Nation security of its soil resources.

A recent realinement of responsibility for the survey and research work in the USDA would take away from SCS much of its research in soils, crop management, and water management—and would load down the SCS with responsibility for national soil surveys. On paper this might seem logical—but not if you really understand the needs of soil conservation. The SCS evolved a unique kind of land survey—the land capability survey—a relatively simple, streamlined survey designed for one purpose: to show the farmer how his land is classed from a conservation standpoint. Now, to divert the SCS to the job of gathering the great amount of technical data wanted by soil scientists for purely classification purposes is bound to slow down practical soil conservation.

Most serious, in my opinion, are the moves to take research away from the SCS on the ground that it isn't a research agency. To strip SCS of research would be like taking the tools out of a farmer's shop on the grounds that he should take all of his repair and maintenance work to the factories that made his machines. The first need of SCS was special research—in fact, before soil-conservation work started, there weren't even any applicable data on the rate of soil loss from different slopes and soils under various conditions of rainfall and cropping. A progressive soil-conservation program will always have need for a closely geared research division to get answers to the special problems that constantly come up in field work.

One of the principal reasons advanced by those who would submerge the SCS in the PMA is the charge that soil-conservation work isn't moving fast enough—and by some strange logic they reason that a mongrelized or divided program would do the job faster.

Every year of experience I have had convinces me that the future of our land demands a clean-cut program aimed directly at one goal—conservation.

The soil-conservation program, if continued at the rate it has been going recently, could be completed in about 35 years to the stage where only maintenance would be required. However, I am convinced that there would be great savings of land and money if the program were speeded up to aim at a 20-year goal. As I have figured it, the longer period would require the investment of 260,000 man-years of technical aid to farmers, while the 20-year period would take only 210,000. Thus, there would be a saving of 50,000 man-years—and there would also be a saving of 6,000,000 acres of land which would be lost or so seriously damaged by erosion as to have little value if we waited an extra 15 years to complete the program. Altogether, the faster conservation job would save us more than a billion dollars' worth of costs and land.

Under the speed-up plan the annual cost of soil-conservation work would rise as fast as SCS could train men for the technical work. The expansion would rise in 5 or 6 years to a top of about 15,000 technical man-years a year, and a cost of about $100,000,000 a year. This maximum would be maintained for only 3 years or so and then would steadily decline. At the end of 20 years, the basic conservation program would be completed and work would level out to a maintenance basis at around 6,000 technical man-years, costing about $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 a year—a cheap enough national fee for maintaining our soil resources in a healthy state. Even in its most expensive year the speeded-up soil-conservation program would not approach the annual expenditures of the ACP.

For the long-run future it should be obvious that we cannot continue the amazing duplication of two conservation programs. We must, sooner or later, come to just one program. It seems to me that common sense dictates that it should be the program of the SCS.

If national policy dictates continuance of conservation payments to farmers, let these be made on a selective basis, aimed at the actual needs of the land. Let them be made for installation and complete land-protection and sound land-use programs on farms in line with technical requirements of genuine conservation. Let them be used to help finance the heavy land-treatment costs involved in watershed improvement for upstream flood control. Let them aid farmers in developing needed new lands.

But let's stop this foolish business of trying to buy conservation on a catch-as-catch-can basis at so much per acre for any and all acres. It just can't be done that way.

Above all, let's take a new sober look at what has been happening to the Soil Conservation Service and its program. The soil-conservation program we had before the wreckers got to work is still the program we need for the future. Let's restore it and give it a green light to go ahead with its job—a job that is vital to the future of our Nation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before resuming consideration of the bill dealing with the suspension of certain import taxes on copper I should like to get the executive business out of the way and return later to the consideration of legislative business.

I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees; and messages withdrawing the nominations of J. Howard Rossbach, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator, and John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration, which were sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953; John Carson, of Michigan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner; which was sent to the Senate on January 13, 1953, and Robert Kiyoichi Murakami, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1953.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Donold B. Lourie, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration; and James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. Lee White, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert Clement Watson, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ralph A. Tudor to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred G. Aandahl to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Orme Lewis to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clarence A. Davis to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Craig R. Sheaffer to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATION OF HOWARD H. GORDON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the name of one of the nominees to the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation was inadvertently omitted from the list which was sent to the Senate the other day. I refer to the nomination of Mr. Howard H. Gordon, of Virginia. His name has been sent by the President to the Senate today. In anticipation of the sending of the nomination to the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has already examined Mr. Gordon. We would like to have his nomination confirmed.

I know of no opposition to the nomination. All the hearings are printed, and were available last week.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consider the nomination of Howard H. Gordon, of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard H. Gordon, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the measure before the Senate is House bill 568, to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

The same sort of suspension legislation has been passed and approved on three prior occasions. In the Eightieth Congress, Public Law 42, approved April 29, 1947, provided for a suspension from April 30, 1947, to March 31, 1949.

In the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 33, approved March 31, 1949, provided for a suspension, for the period from April 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950.

In the Eighty-second Congress, Public Law 38, approved May 22, 1951, suspended the import duty on copper from April 1, 1951, through February 15, 1953, or the sooner termination of the emergency proclaimed by the President.

The pending bill would suspend the 2-cent tax on copper. I should explain that 4 cents is the tax fixed by the law, but this has been changed to 2 cents because of reciprocal trade agreements.

The proposal is to amend the law so as to continue the suspension until June 30, 1954. The Committee on Finance has approved the extension. There is before the Senate a majority report, and also minority views referring to one of the very important features of this subject, but which I suggest is not directly involved in the immediate matter being considered, although it should not be neglected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from Colorado is in favor of continuing the suspension of the tariff on copper?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am in favor of this particular measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Colorado in joining those who favor a low tariff and free trade, and I hope that this evidence of his conversion will continue during the session.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The junior Senator from Colorado has always supported the reciprocal-trade system when it had proper provisions in it for safeguarding American payrolls. He has always opposed it when such safeguards were not provided. The junior Senator from Colorado has supported this particular measure with some reluctance and regret because the situation involved could have been avoided by proper prior policies affecting our domestic production of minerals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Colorado permit me to quote a little poetry at this time?

Mr. MILLIKIN. By all means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When I was a boy in Maine I used to sing a hymn in the Congregational Church which I attended, two lines of which ran:

> And while the lamp holds out to burn
> The vilest sinner may return.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and I hope that he will never forget the Biblical lesson which he has learned, from which he departs sometimes.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the first public legislation passed by the House in this Congress was H. R. 568, on January 19, recognizing the urgent need for prompt action. Chairman REED of the Ways and Means Committee presented the bill which had been reported unanimously from his committee, and he was joined by the ranking minority spokesman, Representative COOPER, of Tennessee, in asking immediate consideration of the measure. The House action was unanimous.

Now the Senate Committee on Finance, after 2 days of hearings, has reported the House bill without amendment. I urge the Senate to follow the course adopted by the House so that the bill may be disposed to today, and without amendment.

What does the bill do? It simply amends existing law by extending until June 30, 1954, the suspension of the import tax on copper. The present suspension will expire on February 15, just 5 days from today, and I am hopeful we shall act affirmatively today.

Copper imports are essential to our Nation and to my State. Domestic mine production in 1952 met only 60 percent of our requirements, a condition which has long prevailed. I have in my hand an abstract of the report of the Bureau of Mines as it appeared in February 6, 1953 issue of the American Metal Market, showing total domestic mine production of only 924,469 tons. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINE PRODUCTION OF COPPER IN UNITED STATES, 1952

WASHINGTON.—Despite continuing requirements for copper in excess of supplies and despite all efforts to increase the latter, mine production of copper declined slightly in 1952, amounting to 924,500 tons compared with 928,330 tons in 1951, according to the Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior. The year was relatively free of labor strikes, and the dominant reason that production failed to maintain, or better the 1951 record was that the grade of ore produced at some important mines declined in 1952.

In Arizona, the leading copper State, more copper ore was produced than ever before, but output of copper declined 5 percent. Copper production in Utah and New Mexico, the second and third largest producers, rose 5 percent, while in Montana (fourth in importance) it gained 10 percent.

Production at the Greater Butte project of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company began in the first half of 1952 and caused Montana's rise in output. The Utah Copper mine of the Kennecott Copper Corp. at Bingham, Utah, was strike-free in 1952 in contrast with several earlier years, which permitted the gain in the State total. The Chino mine at Santa Rita, N. Mex. (Kennecott) operated 7 days a week throughout the year and some increased output resulted from the uninterrupted work.

General factors affecting the copper industry in 1952 were discussed in MMS 2132 published a few days ago. That report contains data also on smelter, refinery, and secondary production, as well as figures on imports, consumption, and stocks.

The following tables and State reviews for 1952 were obtained from current preliminary reports on mine production of gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc prepared in the regional offices of the Bureau of Mines. The mine data included in the regular monthly series of reports on copper likewise are prepared in the Bureau's regional offices. The figures are given in terms of recoverable copper content of ores and concentrates.

Arizona: As usual Arizona was the leading copper-producing State in the United States in 1952. Output dropped 5 percent but except for 1951, 1950, 1943, and 1929 was the highest on record. Production of copper ore, 44,525,000 tons compared with 42,791,070 in 1951, was the largest on record, but a decline in the grade of ore mined at some of the large properties caused the drop in recoverable copper.

The Morenci mine continued to be the largest producer, although production was 13 percent less than in 1951, followed by the New Cornelia, Ray (Kennecott), Inspiration, Copper Queen, Castle Dome, Miami, Magma, Bagdad, and United Verde mines. Outstanding gains were made at the Castle Dome, Inspiration, and New Cornelia properties.

The copper mountain (Morenci) maintained its rank as the chief copper-producing district in 1952 with 125,535 tons (143,921 tons in 1951). The other districts, in order of importance with 1951 production in parentheses, were: Globe-Miami 92,750 (90,225), Ajo 64,150 (63,093), Mineral Creek (Ray) 47,400 (50,580), Warren (Bisbee) 27,330 (27,271), Pioneer (Superior) 17,000 (17,662), Eureka (Bagdad) 8,950 (9,087), and Verde (Jerome) 4,400 (9,742).

Open-pit operations in 1952 produced more copper ore than in any other year; output at the six open pits—Ajo, Bagdad, Inspiration, Miami (Castel Dome), Morenci, and Ray was 36,700,000 tons compared with 34,939,237 in 1951. Both open-pit and underground methods are used at Inspiration

and Ray. All six copper smelters—International Smelting & Refining Co. at Miami, Magma Copper Co. at Superior, Phelps-Dodge Corp. at Ajo, Douglas and Morenci, and American Smelting & Refining Co. at Hayden—operated continuously throughout the year.

California: Except for small lots of copper are treated in 1952 California's production came mainly from ores mined principally for other metals.

Colorado: Copper production rose 5 percent in 1952. The Treasury Tunnel Black Bear (Idarado) was the only substantial producer in the State.

Eastern States: Production of copper by the Bethlehem Steel Co. at its Cornwall mine (Pennsylvania), Tennessee Copper Co. at its Tennessee mines, and Vermont Copper Co. at the Elizabeth mine was 14,946 tons compared with 16,140 in 1951, or a drop of 7 percent. The steel strike in midyear which closed the Cornwall mine was the dominant factor in the decrease.

Idaho: The sharp rise in production in 1952 was caused by increased production at the Blackbird-Chicago mine, Blackbird district, Lemhi County, this mine began to produce late in 1951 and accounted for 38 percent of the total production of Idaho in 1952. Most of the remainder of the output came from the Coeur d'Alene region.

Michigan: The decrease of 13 percent in 1952 was caused mainly by a labor strike, from September 9 to November 10, at properties of the Calumet & Hecla Consolidated Copper Co., and to curtailment of operations at the Champion mine of the Copper Range Co. during a railroad strike from March 10 to April 29. The Quincy Mining Co. operated its tailings plant continuously throughout the year.

Missouri: Lead-copper ores of southeast Missouri yielded 1,726 tons of copper in 1952, compared with 2,422 in 1951.

Montana: Montana was the fourth largest copper-producing State in 1952 among leading States. Expanded production, 10 percent more than in 1951, can be ascribed very largely to the start of production at the Greater Butte project in the first half of the year.

Nevada: Output in 1952 was virtually unchanged from 1951. Production came principally from the Ruth and Kimbley open-pit mines of the Kennecott Copper Corp. (Nevada mines division), and the Morris Brooks and Ruth Pit Extension pits, operated by the Consolidated Coppermines Corp. Small shipments of copper ore were made from other properties, and some production resulted from materials treated mainly for other metals. Kennecott continued to develop the Deep Ruth underground mine and to project plans for opening the Veteran pit. All of the foregoing properties are in the Robinson district, White Pine County. The Anaconda Copper Mining Co. pursued development of the Yerington mine, Lyon County, not scheduled for production before the end of 1953.

New Mexico: New Mexico was the third most important copper-producing State in 1952. Production was 5 percent more than in 1951 and exceeded output in any year except 1942. By far the largest producer was the Chino open-pit mine at the Kennecott Copper Corp. (Chino mines division at Santa Rita), which operated continuously 7 days a week throughout the year. Copper was also produced at the Banner-Miser's Chest group of the Banner Mining Co., the Atwood mine near Lordsburg, and some fluxing ore was shipped from the Stauber open pit. Copper ore mined was at a record rate in 1952; 8,390,000 tons compared with over 8,024,111 in 1951.

Utah: Utah easily maintained its rank as the second most important copper-producing State, accounting for nearly three-quarters as much copper as Arizona and nearly four times as much as New Mexico, ranking first and third, respectively. Most of the copper production is derived from copper ore produced at the Utah Copper open pit (Kennecott Copper Corp. at Bingham), which operated continuously throughout the year and is regularly the leading copper-producing mine in the United States. Among other Utah properties, only the United States & Lark group produced more than 500 tons of copper. These two mines accounted for more than 99 percent of the State total. More than 97 percent of the total ore mined and treated—33,000,000 tons in 1952 compared with 31,456,857 in 1951—was copper ore.

Washington: The increase of 11 percent in Washington in 1952—4,525 tons, compared with 4,089 in 1951—resulted from increased output at the Holden mine of the Howe Sound Co.

Mine production of recoverable copper in the United States in 1952, by months [1]

[In short tons]

Region and State	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
States east of the Mississippi:													
Michigan	2,328	2,045	1,947	2,309	2,182	2,078	2,431	2,120	531	334	1,464	2,043	21,812
Other	1,443	1,215	1,349	1,165	1,359	933	1,030	1,323	1,215	1,370	1,234	1,310	14,946
	3,771	3,260	3,296	3,474	3,541	3,011	3,461	3,443	1,746	1,704	2,698	3,353	36,758
Missouri	184	146	170	165	158	140	130	131	159	130	107	106	1,726
Western States:													
Arizona	35,165	31,115	35,640	34,695	34,685	28,990	29,980	27,430	31,830	34,555	34,545	34,720	383,350
California	70	70	70	90	90	80	60	60	80	60	60	60	820
Colorado	232	271	335	306	273	288	336	332	286	285	227	217	3,388
Idaho	235	226	225	218	233	204	243	290	280	309	250	250	3,023
Montana	4,407	4,891	5,683	5,124	4,796	5,204	5,472	5,840	4,900	5,355	5,512	6,136	63,320
Nevada	3,370	4,270	4,140	5,370	5,520	5,190	5,290	4,950	5,010	4,960	4,300	4,670	57,040
New Mexico	6,900	6,448	6,784	7,108	7,283	5,971	6,389	6,525	6,409	6,432	5,751	5,000	77,000
Oregon									1				1
Texas		1	3	3	4	5	2						18
Utah	22,935	21,660	22,405	23,635	25,265	24,500	24,615	24,770	23,850	24,900	22,000	22,965	283,500
Washington	401	333	481	340	380	341	303	393	386	457	280	430	4,525
	73,715	69,285	75,763	76,889	78,528	70,772	72,693	70,592	73,002	77,373	72,925	74,448	885,985
Alaska [2]													
Total United States	77,670	72,691	79,229	80,528	82,227	73,923	76,284	74,166	74,907	79,207	75,730	77,907	924,469

[1] Revised figures.
[2] Alaska monthly totals based on smelter receipts.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the Finance Committee report makes it clear that our monthly requirement runs around 174,000 tons, so that we must import each year, about 600,000 tons of copper. With an import tax of $40.00 a ton, a great burden will be placed unnecessarily upon our economy unless this bill is passed. Why should we be penalized for importing a critical metal when our mines are unable to meet our needs?

Mr. President, copper affects the lives of all of us, both in war and in peace. Automobiles take 18 percent of our total supply; electric manufacturers consume 27 percent, telephones 5 percent, light and power lines 8 percent; construction takes 11 percent, other wire uses 13 percent, and all other needs consume the remainder. The continued employment of hundreds of thousands of workers depends upon assurances of uninterrupted supplies of copper.

If we fail to act, contracts will be disrupted, price changes will occur across the entire economy, and production schedules in our industries will be seriously and adversely affected. Copper from such an important source as Chile may in larger quantities find a way into the world market, and the rate of imports would thus be decreased.

So, Mr. President, to meet the needs of our defense procurement, to assure the boys in Korea that we will not have to ration ammunition, and to provide for essential civilian needs, let us take action to assure continuous supplies of copper. Let us pass this bill without amendment—today.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado whether one of the reasons for questioning the wisdom of continuing the 2 cents-a-pound import duty on copper might not be that it presents in itself an unusual anomaly. We are protecting foreign copper which does not cost less but more than domestic copper. Why should any duty be placed on copper selling at 36½ cents a pound when the domestic price is 24 cents a pound? Protecting copper which costs more than domestic copper seems to me to represent a most unusual anomaly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the distinguished Senator from Vermont has

pointed out one of the most atrocious phases of government policy which has characterized our national activities. I can think of nothing which reaches the height of idiocy that is reached by our present policy, under which we maintain a ceiling on domestically produced copper while allowing the importation of foreign produced copper, for which we pay 36 cents-plus a pound, while our domestic ceiling is fixed at 24 cents a pound.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like further to explain to the Senator from Colorado, if he needs explanation, that I signed the minority views, on which I hope the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will speak, merely to emphasize my conviction that in the difference between 24½ cents and 36½ cents lies the important problem with relation to the price of copper, and that the 2 cents a pound is merely a fly bite or flea bite, or something of that sort, whose only beneficial effect, so far as I was able to determine from the testimony, lies in making it possible to produce for the American consumer some goods made out of copper at a cost very minutely lower than would prevail under normal conditions.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There are circumstances in which the 2-cent copper duty might become important. My own judgment is that at the present time it is a very small tail on a very large dog.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself wholeheartedly with the views expressed by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and, of course, the views expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

It is seldom a tariff question is so simple as this.

The domestic production of copper over the 11 years 1940–51, averaged a little more than 1,000,000 tons per annum. The domestic consumption averaged 1,500,000 tons.

Currently, too, we produce about 1,000,000 tons a year, and our requirements are much larger—probably about 1,500,000 tons.

Thus, with the absolute necessity of encouraging the importation of copper, nearly one-third of our requirements being produced abroad, it would seem almost suicidal to allow a duty on copper to be reinstated.

So we have here a perfect case. The interests of the national defense program, of labor, of management, of the State Department, and of Connecticut and all of America all merge in suggesting a decision favorable to this bill.

I shall not dwell upon the importance of the bill to our relations with foreign countries, particularly Chile, Canada, and Mexico, which are affected. But I should like to stress my belief that enactment of the bill is essential to the well-being of all copper fabricators and of all working men and labor unions connected with the copper-using industry. Incidentally, Mr. President, I understand that the bill has the support of all the important producers in the copper industry.

In my own State of Connecticut, which is the recognized center of the copper-fabricating industry, the jobs of thousands of workers are dependent upon the maintenance of adequate supplies of this metal. The same may be said for many other States; in fact, Mr. President, the American standard of living depends in large part upon the existence of adequate supplies of copper.

Most important, of course, is the interest of consumers and taxpayers; and here, also, there can be no reason to doubt that their interest would be best served by the passage of House bill 568. The reimposition of a 2-cent tariff, when the world market price of copper is 50 percent above the domestic price, could do only harm, and no good whatsoever.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I have said, we have here nearly a perfect case; and I earnestly urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this bill.

In concluding, let me say that in determining the tariff, the question of need seems to me to be the most important question to be considered. When it is necessary to import a commodity in order to take care of our own needs, it would seem to me to be a great shame to allow our Government to place a tariff on that commodity. The only effect of doing so would be to increase the cost to our own people, which would seem to me to be a wholly unnecessary and, in fact, a suicidal thing to do.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have been glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Let me say that I had agreed to yield at this point to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], but he is not now on the floor.

Mr. President, we have to import in the neighborhood of 500,000 or 600,000 tons of copper a year to meet our domestic and our foreign needs. For that reason it is argued that the imposition of a 2-cent tariff on copper places a burden upon this import requirement. The importation is critically necessary in order that we may obtain the copper metal we must have in our defense program. That explains the reason why this bill is before the Senate today.

The Senators who have signed the minority views have done, I believe, a very constructive thing in submitting those views. I am in entire agreement with the sentiments therein expressed. I, myself, would have signed the minority views, except for the fact that I believe it to be the duty of the chairman of a committee to present a committee report, if he can do so, rather than to join in minority views.

The committee report itself points out:

> Your committee has taken cognizance of the wide disparity between prices for domestically produced copper and prices paid domestically for foreign copper and of the possible repressive effect of this disparity on domestic production.

I repeat that in the United States we are operating on domestically produced copper with a 24-cent ceiling; and we are paying, domestically, 36.5 cents a pound for foreign-produced copper. Such a situation cannot be defended from any point of view one may take. It is obvious that it is dangerously repressive from the standpoint of stimulating the domestic production of copper. Our policies have seriously impaired our stockpiles by making it necessary to release copper from our stockpile for domestic industrial purposes. Matters have even gone to such an extent that money is sent from the United States to foreign countries, to stimulate the development of copper mines there, so that copper produced from those mines can be shipped to the United States, at the price to which I have referred, thus depressing still further the exploration and development of our own copper resources.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD a very brief, skeletonized statement on this subject. I shall quote again from the report of the committee dealing with the question of a ceiling of 24 cents in the United States on domestically produced copper, while we are paying 38-cents-plus a pound on foreign production. I read:

> Your committee has taken cognizance of the wide disparity between prices for domestically produced copper and prices paid domestically for foreign copper and of the possible repressive effect of this disparity on domestic production. Amendments were considered to deal with this situation but since they were involved in possible future price control and future domestic mining incentive legislation, it was concluded the subject could more appropriately be considered after there is a clearer view of the future of price controls and further study of the domestic mining situation and measures necessary for its improvement.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska took the lead in submitting minority views, to which the Senate at an appropriate time I hope will give serious consideration, as a basis for action which must be taken to prevent the destruction of our mining industry in very many important aspects.

The committee concluded that it would not be appropriate to take up such a vast subject in connection with this relatively minor matter, which is being considered under a time limitation. Those who favor this bill include, among others, the present Secretary of Commerce; Ben H. Brown, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary of State; and Jess Larson, Administrator of the General Services Administration. The following copper producers have indicated approval of the bill:

Calumet & Hecla, Consolidated Copper Co., Michigan; Castle Dome Copper Co., Arizona; Copper Canyon Mining Co., Nevada; Copper Range Co., Michigan; Magma Copper Co., Arizona; North Carolina Exploration Co., North Carolina; Phelps Dodge Corp., Arizona and Texas; Quincy Mining Co., Michigan; Tennessee Copper Co., Tennessee; Vermont Copper Co., Vermont.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wonder whether the information which the distinguished chairman has indicates

whether the firms whose names he has read are now receiving a subsidy for the production of copper.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator referring to a subsidy by virtue of the differential which we have been discussing?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No. Is it correct that a number of companies have an arrangement whereby they receive more than the domestic price for their product?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Government has the privilege of paying a base price to several of the companies mentioned for the copper which they produce out of new development of their mines, equal to the present domestic price.

Mr. President, in dealing with the stricken condition of our mining industry, brought about, in part, by what I suggest are the very imbecilic mineral policies which rests our defense on foreign production of strategic and critical materials, I should say that the record of the Senate has been good. On three or four occasions the Senate has passed mining-incentive bills and bills intended to remedy the existing defects; but the bills got no further than the Senate. I hope that under the new administration and under new auspices we may enact legislation, both as to ceilings and as to mining incentives which will remove the present crippling price disparity between domestic and foreign copper. Those of us from the mining States have frequently on the Senate floor pictured the evils which would result from the policies we have followed. That is no longer a matter of prophecy; it has come to be an accomplished fact in all the western mining States.

There may be a few exceptions, but in all the western mining States, speaking generally, everyone, every company, and every outfit engaged in the mining of minerals, unless possessed of very rich veins of ore, or unless the company is very rich, is busted, or busting, or closing down. The things which we have always prophesied have come to pass, so that now this great United States of America cannot confront its defense problem with a sufficient quantity of critical and strategic material produced within the United States to enable it to defend itself. I urge that this bill be passed.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF LORD MILNER OF LEEDS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are honored today by having with us on the floor of the Senate a very distinguished guest from Great Britain. I refer to Lord Milner of Leeds. Lord Milner was chairman of the British group of the Interparliamentary Union from about 1945 to 1950, and he is still a member of the delegation from that body. Lord Milner was Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons from 1943 to 1951. The King made him a peer in 1951, and he is now a member of the House of Lords. I know that all Members of the Senate welcome him, are very happy to have him with us today, and glad to have him accorded the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The privileges of the floor are very heartily accorded to our distinguished guest. Under the rules of the Senate a Member of Parliament is entitled to the privileges of the floor. We welcome him and are very, very glad to have him with us. [Applause.]

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in a moment I intend to propose an amendment to the bill under consideration, but before presenting the amendment, I desire to state very definitely that those of us who have signed the minority views are not at all opposed to the importation of copper or any other strategic material of which we ourselves do not produce a sufficient supply. We are not opposed to the importation of all that is needed in this country at this time. The only objective we have is to develop our own natural resources to the limit of their capacity, and at the same time to give the producers of the United States the same price we pay to producers in foreign countries.

With that main objective in view, I have proposed an amendment, which I shall read, myself. The amendment proposes to insert, on page 1 of the bill, following line 9, a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. After February 15, 1953, no ceiling price shall be imposed or maintained under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, upon articles of domestic production, of the same type and character as those with respect to which the import taxes are suspended by this act, unless such ceiling prices are applied equally to such articles when imported.

Mr. President, the essential purpose of that proposed amendment is simply to pay the American producers, including American laborers, the same price for the copper we use, whether it is domestic or foreign, that we are paying for foreign copper. In other words, the objective of the amendment is to encourage the development of our own natural resources and the production to be derived from them. It is true that we are deficient now to the extent of about one-third of the amount of copper we need, since, under the program in Korea, we are apparently using far more copper than we ever had used before in any similar situation.

None of us wants to make it impossible to import sufficient products to meet our needs to the fullest capacity. We have been self-sufficient with reference to copper in most of our history, and I am not certain but what we would be in that situation today if we treated our own producers as we are treating the producers of other nations. That is the main objective of this proposal.

The chairman of the committee and the other distinguished Senators who have spoken have referred to the fact that hearings were conducted before the House passed the bill. There were very brief hearings before the Senate committee reported the bill. I telegraphed to different firms in various sections of the country who I knew wanted to be heard. None of the representatives of those firms was able to get to Washington in time to be heard. One representative got approximately half way from Arizona to Washington by plane, but when he received my message that the hearings had been concluded and the bill had been reported, he returned to his home State.

That is indicative of the fact, Mr. President, that there were not sufficient hearings held. The subject has not been sufficiently explored. Each time a bill of this tenor comes up there is said to be emergency, that there are only 5 days left before existing law expires, and, therefore, we must act.

Then, Mr. President, we hear another story; we are told that we will take plenty of time later on to explore the entire mineral situation and take some affirmative action to develop the mineral resources of America in a business-like manner.

Mr. President, I think there is only one way to proceed in an emergency of this kind, and that is to take care of the problem which confronts us at the moment. The problem is, Are we going to pay a 12½-cent premium for the production and the importation of foreign copper, while keeping domestic copper under a 24½-cent ceiling, or are we going to be fair with the producers and the miners in our country and let them receive the same price?

My amendment is a very simple one. It would merely require that the administration permit domestic copper producers to receive the same price for their product as the price received by foreign copper producers on the copper which is imported into the United States.

At present, domestic copper producers are held to a ceiling price of approximately 24½ cents a pound set by the Office of Price Stabilization. By contrast, imported copper has been permitted to come into this country and bring whatever price the market will bear. Thus, at present and for some time past, the price paid in this country for imported copper has been 36½ cents a pound.

This price discrimination in favor of foreign copper production places all the incentive on the development of foreign copper while it operates as a strong deterrent to the development of domestic copper. With the import tax on copper of 2 cents a pound suspended, foreign copper is given a 12-cent advantage over the American product. Even if the import tax should be collected again after February 15, foreign producers would still have a 10-cent a pound advantage over domestic producers.

In any discussion of a tax of this sort applied specifically to imports, we are always subjected to a barrage of propaganda about barriers to international trade. The public is given to understand that it is a terrible thing to impose any kind of a tax on imports. This general theme is repeated over and over again in many of the leading newspapers and magazines and apparently it has had a considerable effect on public opinion.

Yet, consider the facts in this copper situation. By operation of the price-control system, domestic copper producers suffer a discrimination amounting to 12 cents a pound as compared with their foreign competitors. In effect, it is the same as if domestic copper producers were subject to a Federal tax of 12 cents a pound while their foreign competitors were permitted to sell imported copper entirely tax free.

This 12-cent discrimination against domestic copper producers is a barrier to production of copper in this country in just the same way that a tax on imports is a "trade barrier" against international trade.

If we are not going to place any tariff or tax on imports, at least let us not inflict any discrimination on domestic products. If we cannot give the American producer an advantage, at least let us give him equal treatment.

I have no objection to importing copper to supplement our own production when our needs are greater than domestic producers can meet; but I believe it is profoundly unwise to discourage the development of domestic sources through such gross discrimination as this. To mention only the long-term national defense aspect, we are very foolish not to make every effort to locate domestic ore bodies and provide for their proper exploitation.

My amendment would place both domestic and foreign copper production on an equal basis. It would not impose any tariff or duty or import tax on foreign copper. At the same time, it would remove the present barrier to domestic production. I do not see how anyone can justify continuing the present situation under which foreign producers are given such a tremendous advantage—12 cents a pound—over domestic production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Nebraska has stated that it is unfair to give to foreign producers the advantage of 12 cents a pound over domestic production. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in Peru, from which we obtain much of our copper, the American producers there are paid on a basis of 24½ cents a pound, and that the Peruvian Government retains 12 cents?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think the Senator is correct in his statement, but the application is to Chile rather than to Peru.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. The Senator is correct. I meant Chile. As I recall, approximately 90 percent of our foreign imports of copper come from Chile, and most of it is produced by American companies operating there, which are paid by the Chilean Government on a basis of 24½ cents. In other words, the Chilean Government through one of its departments purchases all copper produced by American companies on a basis of 24½ cents per pound and resells it to us for 36½ cents.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, to assist in understanding present Federal operations with respect to copper, the following brief summary is presented:

The Office of Price Stabilization has placed a general freeze on domestic copper prices as of the base period, December 1950–January 1951, so that the ceilings for most domestic copper producers are 24½ cents a pound. A few copper producers which were charging more during the base period have a slightly higher ceiling. Although some regulations have been applied to importations of copper, they have been largely ineffective, with the result that the market price for imported copper has been 36½ cents a pound for some time.

The NPA, operating under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, has charge of allocations of both domestic and foreign copper to all essential users. Allocations are handled in such a manner that each copper fabricator or other user receives an allocation of a stated number of pounds of domestic copper and a stated number of pounds of foreign copper. As a result, each firm receives part of its supply at approximately 24½ cents and part at 36½ cents.

There are four principal programs which provide a stimulus to domestic expansion of copper production:

First. The Emergency Procurement Service—part of GSA—is charged with buying stockpile copper. Data on stockpile purchases are generally classified information, so no attempt was made to secure any figures. However, EPS has made no contracts with any companies above the OPS ceiling price.

Second. The Defense Minerals Procurement Agency—DMPA, part of GSA—is engaged in trying to maintain and increase the supply of domestic copper through two principal programs. One program involves what are called maintenance-of-production subsidies. Under this program, cash subsidies are paid outright for production in high-cost mines, whose costs are so high that they could not continue to operate under the domestic ceiling. Such subsidies range from 2 to 10½ cents a pound. At present, eight copper mine operations receive this type of subsidy. Two other applications are pending, and two additional applications for the subsidy have been turned down on the ground that the mining operation is not under way. These latter two operations will probably be assisted to open under another program.

The gist of this whole Government-control program as to copper amounts to this, that if there is the right kind of an approach, the industry gets assistance for the production of high-cost copper and it operates its mines. If it does not have the right contacts and approach, it does not get that assistance; which indicates extreme partiality in the management of these programs.

Third. The second DMPA program, which is the more important one, provides for assistance in the developing of new proved ore bodies—with the emphasis on the "proved"—which have never been opened. This assistance takes the form of loans, Government purchase contracts, or accelerated tax amortization. Under this program, there were 153 applications for production loans, 47 applications for purchase contracts, and 41 for accelerated tax amortization. In some cases, the same firm applied for two or three of these types of assistance. Of these various applications, a total of 17 have been granted. In addition, there are 30 applications of various sorts that have not yet been finally passed on.

Fourth. The Defense Minerals Exploration Administration—DMEA, under the Department of Interior—gives financial assistance to the exploration of prospects. The standard form of assistance is the payment by the Government of 50 percent of the cost of exploration. Under this program, during the period from June 1951 to December 1952, a total of 149 applications for copper exploration have been received, of which 30 are active—approved—72 were declined, 30 represent projects on which exploration work has been completed or applications were withdrawn or otherwise handled, and 17 are pending. Since a few, perhaps a half a dozen, of those classed as withdrawn, terminated, or otherwise handled, were approved, and did receive Government assistance, it would be accurate to say that between 35 and 40 of this type of application were approved and did receive Government assistance.

Mr. President, the sum total of this activity is that there have been in the neighborhood of 200 applications—I got the admission from various departments of the Government that there had been fully 200 applications for assistance of one kind or another, and I believe perhaps there is a large number in excess of that—and out of the whole number about 17 have been assisted.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is time we stopped treating the copper situation as an emergency every time the question arises, and have only 5 days left in which to hang a big tail on a small dog. I believe it is the other way around, and that we should start now and decide that we are going to treat the American producer at least as well as we treat the foreign producer. I am asking no advantage for the American producer; I am asking only that he be treated fairly, as we treat the foreign producer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few moments ago I heard my distinguished colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] say that undoubtedly there would be incentive legislation to promote mining in this country. I have in my hand now one proposal for such incentive legislation. It is a bill to establish a Metals Credit Corporation, in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of domestic strategic, critical metals and minerals in the United States.

The bill contemplates no restrictions or barriers of any kind upon the importation of foreign ores and foreign metal, it would let them come in, but it does provide a market for our domestic production. It does provide for stockpiling domestic production. It does provide that that stockpile can be sold to industry, or can be sold to our military in case of need.

I believe we are laying ourselves wide open to exploitation by foreign producers of metals if we do not continue to produce metals ourselves. The very fact

that there is a disparity between the price of copper produced by foreign peoples and copper domestically produced in the United States of 12 cents, I think, should be a warning to us that we should protect ourselves against that kind of exploitation. Perhaps 24½ cents is a sufficient price for copper. If it is, that is what the price of foreign copper ought to be, too.

My bill would not interfere with the importation or purchase of any foreign-produced metal. I realize, as does everyone else, that we must have metal. As the leading manufacturing and producing country in the world the United States must have metals. In fact, we use 50 percent of the production of the metals of the world, and it is right that we should have them.

I have also reached the conclusion in the past few years that tariffs do not do the job. I recall that when I first came to the Senate we had to abandon the policy of protective tariffs so far as the sugar-beet and sugar industry in the United States was concerned. We had to adopt another policy, and we did adopt another policy and another program. The Congress enacted what was known as the Costigan-Jones Sugar Act. That was a complete abandonment of tariffs.

Prior to the enactment of that law we depended entirely upon a protective tariff to protect our sugar industry. I think we have now reached the point where we are going to be compelled to adopt a new approach, instead of a protective tariff, so far as our metals are concerned.

If my bill were enacted, we could repeal all tariffs of every kind and description on all critical and strategic minerals. I think that is what our country wants to do.

I am not surprised that in the new Republican administration, with a Republican House and a Republican Senate—the first such administration we have had in 20 years—the first bill to be enacted by the House was to do away with an import tax on copper. I am not surprised that that is the first bill; but it has a significance to me. It means that so far as metals are concerned, protective tariffs belong to a bygone day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the situation to which the Senator has referred indicate that when the Republican Party comes to power it becomes more intellectually responsible than when it is out of power; and when it is in power it sees that most of the measures previously taken by the Democratic administration, against which the Republicans objected when they were out of power, are pretty good policies after all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am unable to pass on that question. No doubt my friend from Illinois is speaking from the Gospel, but I do know that whether we have a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, whether we have a Republican Congress or a Democratic Congress, domestic industry can no longer depend upon the protective tariff. So I think we must look around for other remedies. There must be a remedy, because unless we continue the production of such strategic and critical metals as copper and a long list of others, and have a supply of them on hand, we are going to be held up almost at the point of a gun by foreign producers of those very metals. We are getting it in the neck now to the extent of 12 cents on copper. We will get it in the neck with respect to every other ore and metal we produce, as fast as we pass out of the production stage. We shall be held up, and we shall have to pay through the nose. We cannot continue our economy without copper. We must have it.

Our good friends from Connecticut say that we have only 5 days left in which to act on this bill. Connecticut is a great protective State. In passing, I must say this about Connecticut——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Connecticut is a protective State with respect to those commodities which Connecticut produces, but Connecticut seems to be a free-trade State with respect to copper, so that the manufacturers of Connecticut may get cheap copper. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and a high price for brass.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no intellectual or moral connotation in what the Senator from Colorado says about the high price of brass, I am sure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. Of course, I meant metal.

What the Senator from Illinois says is true. Connecticut wants free trade so far as raw materials are concerned, but Connecticut wants a protective tariff so far as fabricated metals are concerned; and Connecticut gets such protection, too.

What I am talking about today is the raw resources, the raw metals. I am certain that we cannot longer depend on a protective tariff to protect the producers of such metals. I repeat—and I should repeat over and over—that we must continue to produce them, unless we want to lay ourselves wide open to producers in other countries, who will make us pay through the nose for such metals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the bill which I am introducing, together with a statement with respect thereto.

The bill (S. 869) to establish a Metals Credit Corporation in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of domestic strategic and critical metals and minerals in the United States, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill and statement referred to by the Senator from Colorado will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Domestic Metals and Minerals Act of 1953.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) "Domestic strategic and critical metal" shall mean any metal or metal ore or concentrate not fabricated into finished form which comes from a deposit within the United States, and is determined to be strategic or critical under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

(b) "Domestic strategic and critical mineral" shall mean any mineral or mineral ore or concentrate not fabricated into finished form which comes from a deposit within the United States, and is determined to be strategic or critical under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

(c) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the several Territories and possessions of the United States.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this act to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of domestic strategic and critical metals and minerals in order to encourage and preserve the mining of such metals and minerals within the United States, to provide a stable and ready supply of such metals and minerals for industry within the United States, and to provide for the national defense.

CREATION OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the purpose of this act there is created a body corporate to be known as the Metals Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of the Interior, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary).

GENERAL POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 5. The Corporation—

(a) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(b) may adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(c) may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business;

(d) may sue and be sued but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy, of all suits brought by or against the Corporation, except that the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless (1) it shall have been brought within 6 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought, or (2) in the event that the person bringing such suit shall have been under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time the right accrued, the suit shall have been brought within 3 years after the disability shall have ceased or within 6 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought, whichever period is longer. The defendant in any suit by or against the Corporation may plead, by way

of set-off or counterclaim, any cause of action, whether arising out of the same transaction or not, which would otherwise be barred by such limitation if the claim upon which the defendant's cause of action is based had not been barred prior to the date that the plaintiff's cause of action arose, except that the defendant shall not be awarded a judgment on any such set-off or counterclaim for any amount in excess of the amount of the plaintiff's claim established in the suit. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provision of this subsection to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation, except that (1) any such suit against the United States based upon any claim of the type enumerated in section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code may be brought in the United States Court of Claims, and (2) no such suit against the United States may be brought in a district court unless such suit might, without regard to the provisions of this act, be brought in such court;

(e) may acquire personal property necessary to the conduct of its business but shall not have power to acquire real property or any interest therein except that it may (1) rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, and (2) acquire real property or any interest therein where necessary to carry out the Corporation's stockpiling program, or to secure or discharge obligations owing to the Corporation, or to otherwise protect the financial interest of the Corporation;

(f) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(g) shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding;

(h) may enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements;

(i) may borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation, except that the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed the aggregate $6,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs;

(j) shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid;

(k) shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers;

(l) may make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business; and

(m) shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of metals or minerals owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of the Interior.

SPECIFIC POWERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 6. In the fulfillment of the purposes of this act the Corporation is authorized and directed to use its general powers only to—

(a) purchase domestic strategic and critical metals and minerals at prices determined by the Board of Directors of the Corporation, which in the case of each such metal or mineral shall be not less than the average cost of production of such metal or mineral in the United States, and in quantities deemed appropriate by such Board to carry out the purpose of this act;

(b) stock-pile such metals and minerals in quantities deemed appropriate by such Board to carry out the purpose of this act;

(c) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of stockpiles created under authority of subsection (c) of this section, and provide through normal commercial channels for necessary refining or processing of such metals and minerals into forms most suitable for stockpiling; and

(d) sell such metals and minerals either before or after stockpiling to industrial users within the United States at prices determined by the Board of Directors of the Corporation, which in the case of each such metal or mineral shall be not less than the price paid for the acquisition of such metal or mineral.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall be an ex officio director and shall serve as chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate not in excess of the maximum then payable under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as may be fixed by the Secretary, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Federal Government the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 8. In addition to the Board of Directors there shall be an advisory board reflecting broad mining and business experience in its membership and consisting of five members who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Not more than three of such members shall belong to the same political party. The advisory board shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each 90 days; shall survey the main policies of the Corporation, including its policies in connection with the purchase, stockpiling, and sale of metals and minerals under this act; and shall advise the Secretary with respect thereto. Members of the advisory board shall receive for their services as members compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such, together with their necessary traveling expenses when going to and coming from meetings.

EXECUTIVE STAFF

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CAPITAL STOCK AND AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION TO PURCHASE SUCH STOCK

SEC. 10. The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury not more than $100,000,000 for the purpose of subscribing to such stock. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States on the amount of its capital stock at such rate as may be determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of the Treasury.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT APPLICABLE TO CORPORATION

SEC. 11. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" immediately preceding the name "Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated," and (2) by inserting immediately after such name a semicolon and the following: "and Metals Credit Corporation."

COOPERATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

SEC. 12. The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of the Interior, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of the Interior or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of the Interior, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 13. Strategic and critical metals and minerals owned or contracted for by the Corporation shall be exempt from the provisions of section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 14. The Corporation shall make a comprehensive annual report of its operations to the Congress as soon as practicable after the first day of January in each year.

CRIMES AND OFFENSES

SEC. 15. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts, and agreements, employees, and operations, except that such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words "Metals Credit Corporation" or any combination of the same, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do or purport to do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

The national interest requires that we keep an active, healthy mining industry. With only 7 percent of the world's population, we use approximately 50 percent of the world's minerals. Without mineral production, we would deteriorate to a third-rate power and the greatness of our country would gradually fade out of existence.

In our efforts to assure ourselves of mineral supplies, we have placed special emphasis upon foreign production. Billions of taxpayers' money have been shipped abroad under the guise of mutual and military aid programs, but have actually been used to encourage the production of minerals in foreign countries.

It is a well-known fact that docks, railroads, and other transportation facilities, as well as mills, have been constructed with taxpayers' money to insure foreign production. Floor prices and long-term contracts have been extended. Ship lines have been subsidized, and foreign production has finally started to pour into the United States.

Labor conditions in foreign mines are quite dissimilar from those in the United States In South Africa, for example, there are sections in which labor can be had for as little as 15 cents a day.

The metal mining industry in the United States pays high wage scales and from 50 to 75 percent of the cost of the production of metals is paid to labor. The end result of this program is not only denying the United States a healthy, active mining industry, but is denying American workmen the right to work in American mines at American standards and maintain American homes and families in American mining camps.

Throughout the mining sections of the Nation, this stress is found on almost every hand—men highly skilled in the art of mining are migrating to other districts where compensation for their skills is more realistic.

In my State alone, 83 percent of the mines have closed down in the last 10 years. In California, 77 percent; in Arizona, 69 percent; Montana, 71 percent; Idaho, 71 percent; Nevada, 62 percent; Oregon, 92 percent; New Mexico, 73 percent; Washington, 82 percent; Utah, 43 percent; Wyoming, 75 percent. Seventy-three percent of the mines in the 11 Western States have closed down in the last 10 years. The situation is worse this year than at any time since I have served in the United States Senate.

The Callahan Lead & Zinc Co. mine, supporting an entire community and working under the most efficient methods known in the mining industry, has been forced to close. Other mines in other States—not just in the West, but in the East, the South, the North, and the central parts of our country—have likewise been forced to the wall. The great Tri-State District, consisting of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri, is struggling to keep body and soul together.

The Congress of the United States has considered many pieces of legislation to help, aid, and assist the mining industry. Tariffs have been imposed from time to time because certain other industries enjoy tariff protection from low-cost foreign competition. The great manufacturing centers of the East could not long exist without protection against the inroads of low-cost manufactured good from the so-called backward nations.

Tariffs, however, are overcome by depreciated currencies and other adjustments which are used by the shrewd foreign trader in his effort to drive the American worker out of his job. To ask for the enactment of legislation in the form of a high tariff for the domestic mining industry would, in my opinion, be one of the greatest mistakes that any representative from a raw-material-producing section of the United States ever made. A tariff of 1 1/16 cents on a 12-cent market doesn't compare with a tariff of 3 cents on a 4 cent market and, therefore, even with the reimposition of low tariffs on inflated markets, the protection is not given to the domestic producer.

Others have suggested outright subsidies, premium price plans, and the like, but in each instance there has been splits recorded in the mining industry and the big fellows continue to thrive with their foreign holdings while the little fellows gradually go to the slaughter.

Mr. President, it is not a question of efficiency of mining operation—some of the most efficient mine operators this Nation has ever known are today suffering economic bankruptcy. It is a question of meeting American standards and of producing American raw materials for America's safety and security.

Do the Members of the United States Senate remember what happened during World War II when 59 ships out of 61 were sunk carrying raw materials to our borders? Do they not remember the sullen faces of Defense officials faced with the problem of getting metals to meet the national emergency? How many remember the training of boys with wooden guns? How many remember the Defense agencies, deprived of substantial sources of raw materials, fighting to get them produced in this country by releasing thousands of men from the armed services to our mines—yes, more than 6,000 soldiers were released back to our mines after they had served more than 2 years in the United States Army because the number one bottle neck was metal shortages. Have we forgotten the seriousness of these occasions? Have we forgotten that the safety and security of our Nation is involved? Have we forgotten that stockpiles, regardless of how valuable they are, are known to our enemies and that the only way we can maintain a safe economy in our country is by maintaining a healthy, strong, and vigorous mining industry?

Will this Congress pass a subsidy bill? The answer is quite obvious—it will not! Will it enact legislation which will provide long-term contracts to domestic producers similar to those extended to our foreign friends? The answer is again, "No." And yet this Congress is witnessing the greatest destruction of not only our mines but of mining personnel and the ability of America to produce. With the disintegration of our mining forces and the closing of our mines—what then?

Members of Congress recall the two-price system which recently prevailed for metals. The attempts of our Government to keep the costs of our military program as low as possible by keeping a ceiling on the price of metals, but did the foreign producers accept these ceilings insisted on by our defense agencies? They did not. The foreign price, in practically every instance, was above the domestic price and the foreign producer laughed at the Untied States trying to fix a price for metal outside of its boundaries. How silly can we be?

If we get 40 percent of our copper outside the United States and have to pay 36 cents a pound for it, while our domestic producers are compelled to pay 24½ cents to produce it, what would happen if we had to buy 60 percent of our copper from outside the United States? What would the price of lead be today to the American consumer if we had to import all of our lead?

Look at our recent experiences on nickel, and tin, and copper, and a hundred and one other items which were produced almost entirely outside our borders. We were forced to pay what the traffic would bear. We were forced to pay through the nose.

Can any American citizen deny the American miner the right to a reasonable profit? Can any sensible American citizen say that the United States should depend upon foreign production for all of its metals?

The uninformed seem to think that we can start a mine like a grocery store or a factory, overnight. The facts are that it takes years of planning—years of work—and years of know-how to get the job done. We have neglected our mining industry while we have extended parity prices to our farmers—we have refused to extend parity prices to our mineral producers. The time has come to assure the mineral producer within the United States that he can sell at a profit, taking into consideration American standard costs of production.

The United States Government has financed an elaborate exploration and development program which is most commendable, but I want to prophesy that the greatest incentive which has ever been offered to the domestic miner will be an assurance that he can take his product into the market place and sell it at a profit.

Tax relief is a fine thing, but tax relief can't help the man who is going broke. What we need is a genuine incentive, a stimulant to greater production. This, my bill provides.

To insure an active, healthy domestic mining industry; to insure the safety and security of this country; to insure our very existence in time of war, I am introducing in the United States Senate today a bill to establish a metals credit corporation in order (1) to provide a stable market and (2) a ready supply of domestic strategic and

critical metals and minerals in the United States.

Mr. President, this bill will not interfere in any way with the domestic manufacturer from buying his metal abroad at the cheapest possible price he can buy it. It will not interfere with world trade, nor the establishment of dollar credits in the United States with which to buy our American products. It will not encourage artificial barriers between nations in trade relations. It will not interfere with the reciprocal trade program of our Government. It will not violate any of the solemn compacts which we have entered into in our efforts to bring about peace in the world. It will not even offend Russia, nor change a cold war to a hot one. It will be the best insurance policy this country has ever adopted. And I prophesy, Mr. President, that if we buy the production of American mines, we will be able to realize a profit from this production in the long pull.

The demand for metals throughout the world will increase as industrialization takes place, even in the so-called backward nations, and building and establishing a sound, vigorous mining industry is the answer to a great many problems which heretofore have gone unsolved.

Tax is realized from active mines; employment, markets for manufactured goods made along the eastern seaboard, heavy volume of traffic for railroads and truck lines, local markets for power facilities, maintenance of a stable economy in a country which has known the terrors of sharp fluctuations in metal prices—these are but a few of the reasons why this legislation should be enacted into law. It will eliminate many of the abuses of the past—it will give stability to the mining future—it will provide safety and security for our country and will give your children and my children a chance to engage in the mining business within the United States if that is their wish.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the committee to which this measure is referred will call hearings, not only in Washington, but throughout the land, and if there are those within our country who want to deny the American miners the right to sell their products at the average cost of production within this country, then the United State Senate should know who these people are and what the reasons are for denying American citizens the right to produce metals within this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared for the Colorado Mining Association publication. I shall read only a few sentences, to indicate the nature of the statement:

The domestic mining industry has come upon evil days. Hour by hour it is spluttering toward a dead stop. Not only have both political parties been taken over by the internationalists, but the mining industry of these United States is completely dominated by them. I hear hopeful men say Congress will enact a protective tariff but it would be easier to drive a freight train through the eye of a needle than to get a protective tariff measure for domestic metals through Congress. Quite to the contrary, the importation of metals will be stepped up and there will be no serious consideration of protection of any kind for the domestic producer. Only the uninformed do not know that the internationalists in the mining industry completely dominate the strategic and critical metals vital to our security and our defenses, heir direction, and our policies with respect to them, their prices, and their production.

I ask that the entire statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The domestic mining industry has come upon evil days. Hour by hour it is spluttering toward a dead stop. Not only have both political parties been taken over by the internationalists, but the mining industry of these United States is completely dominated by them. I hear hopeful men say Congress will enact a protective tariff but it would be easier to drive a freight train through the eye of a needle than to get a protective tariff measure for domestic metals through Congress. Quite to the contrary, the importation of metals will be stepped up and there will be no serious consideration of protection of any kind for the domestic producer. Only the uninformed do not know that the internationalists in the mining industry completely dominate the strategic and critical metals vital to our security and our defenses, their direction, and our policies with respect to them, their prices, and their production.

Nevertheless domestic metal production is essential to our security and our economy, and I want to do something that will preserve it and prosper it. And it is later than we think.

As our domestic mines close down, our mills and beneficiation plants must close their operations too. Then will our mines be flooded, caved, and ruined beyond repair, and following that misfortune our vaunted know-how and techniques will disappear. The great skills we have developed in mining, handling, and treating ores will be transplanted elsewhere on the globe and lost to the United States. Thus we become a weaker and more dependent nation. Internationalists think that would be good for both us and the world. I think it would be very bad for all.

It may be too late to do anything about it, but I think Americans should make one last try to shake loose from the shackles of the international cartels and their airtight control. There is too much at stake with respect to the future of this Nation for us to succumb and surrender without a struggle.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill in the Senate creating a Metals Credit Corporation which will be empowered to purchase strategic and critical metals produced domestically, stockpile them, and sell them, but never for less than their purchase price.

One of the agencies that has rendered the Nation and American farmers a splendid service, and at the same time has made a substantial profit for the Government, has been the Commodity Credit Corporation. This Corporation has stabilized farm prices when otherwise the bottom would have dropped out, and it has accumulated vast supplies of food and fiber that saved the day when, through the devastation of war, extreme shortage occurred.

That identical operation will save the very sick and dying domestic mining industry if my bill is enacted into law. It follows the precise pattern of the Commodity Credit Corporation statute, which has worked so well in agriculture for so many years. The only losses the Commodity Credit Corporation has incurred has been in the storage of perishable farm crops, such as eggs, butter, cheese, and potatoes. Since metals can be stored for thousands of years without deterioration, that difficulty does not encounter a metals credit corporation.

My bill proposes to store only domestically produced ores. It permits foreign-produced ores to supply the current needs of American industry, so the processors, fabricators, and manufacturers and the proponents of increased imports ought not oppose it. In fact, I think it is a foolproof measure which can be enacted and would preserve and prosper domestic mining and protect our emergency needs by building up a supply of the materials absolutely necessary to win the next world war. Guns and tanks and planes become obsolete overnight but not the raw metals which can be used to build late models.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when I refer to the internationalists I do not necessarily mean the political internationalists. I mean those who operate the cartels—and there are cartels with respect to all these metals. If we neglect our production in this country, we invite the operation of metal cartels throughout the world, and we are going to be the victims of them. We are going to be completely victimized by them. So it is very important that we enact some sort of incentive legislation to keep our mining industry alive.

I hope that Senators interested in the security of America, in its stockpile, and in all the things so essential and vital to it will look my bill over very carefully, because I think it indicates at least one way to save ourselves at the present time.

I have just one word more that I should like to say. In the committee hearings on this important bill the other day I was surprised to discover that, while our military needs for copper are very great, and while we have adopted in Congress as a policy the stockpiling of copper and other strategic and critical metals, our military, instead of getting all the copper they need at 24½ cents a pound, must buy 40 percent of their copper at 36½ cents a pound and 60 percent of their copper at 24½ cents a pound. I was surprised and shocked and astonished that our Government should set the price of domestic copper and compel it to be sold in this country. In other words, so far as copper is concerned it cannot be shipped out of the United States; it must be sold at home, and it cannot be sold for more than 24½ cents a pound.

The pending bill is supposed to be a defense measure, and it is a defense measure, I presume, under the necessities of what my colleague from Colorado has described as policies that are ruinous. However, our military must pay the high price of 36½ cents a pound, and if we stockpile any of it for our future needs for the protection of our country we must pay 36½ cents for that copper.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment which I have offered be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 2. After February 15, 1953, no ceiling price shall be imposed or maintained under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, upon articles of domestic production," of the same type and character as those with respect to which the import taxes are suspended by this act, unless such ceiling prices are applied equally to such articles when imported.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views on the pending bill.

There being no objection, the minority views (Rept. No. 35, pt. 2) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By way of background, all Members of the Senate should realize that under policies established by the previous administration and continued up until now, the price of domestic copper has been held to approximately 24½ cents per pound, while imported copper has been permitted to bring whatever the market will bear. Thus, during recent weeks, the price paid in this country for imported copper has been 30½ cents per pound. This strange result has been achieved through the imposition of a price ceiling on domestically produced copper, which ceiling has not been applied to imported copper.

This extreme price differential in favor of foreign copper production operates as a strong incentive to the development of foreign ores, and a strong deterrent to development of domestic copper ores. With the 2-cents-per-pound import tax on copper suspended, foreign production has a 12-cent advantage over American production. Even if the import tax should be reimposed, foreign producers would still have a 10-cent-per-pound advantage over domestic producers.

We have no objection to bringing in foreign copper to supplement our own production when our needs are greater than domestic production can meet. However, we do believe it is profoundly unwise to give a price incentive to foreign production while discouraging the development of domestic sources through such gross discrimination as is evidenced here. To mention only the long-range national defense aspect, we are very foolish not to make every effort to locate domestic ore bodies and provide for their proper exploitation.

During consideration of this bill by the Senate Finance Committee, an amendment was informally proposed which would have prohibited any price ceilings on domestic copper below the price level at which copper was permitted to be imported—in other words, the world price. Unfortunately, the urgency of committee action was so great that it did not prove possible for the committee to give adequate consideration to this major aspect of the copper situation.

No blame attaches to the committee for its inability to delve into this question. However, in our judgment, Congress would be wise to explore the whole copper problem thoroughly. If policies now or hereafter followed result in persistent favoritism to foreign production at the expense of American production, we believe we may live to regret our lack of foresight in failing to stimulate adequate American sources to carry us through the emergencies we may face in the future.

HUGH BUTLER.
RALPH E. FLANDERS.
GEORGE W. MALONE.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.
EDWIN C. JOHNSON.
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.

COPPER—DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND FOREIGN IMPORTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am glad Senators realize that the general disposition of most individuals and companies in the production field is to be in favor of free trade on what they must buy and in favor of a duty or import fee on what they sell in competition with foreign goods.

This very disposition, Mr. President, makes such producers a ready prey to the international free-trade advocates, by pitting one against the other.

CONTINUAL EMERGENCY PRESSURE

I agree with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] that mining, and, in fact, practically all other industries, have been pressured almost beyond endurance through emergencies, both real and synthetic, during the past 20 years.

BUREAU OFFICIALS DECIDE FATE OF BUSINESS

We are fast reaching the point where the fate of the entire industrial structure of the Nation is in the hands of Government officials, and, generally speaking, in the hands of Government bureaus, where they know very little about the business affected by their decisions.

NOT READY TO ABANDON SMALL MINER OR BUSINESSMAN

I am not ready, as my colleague from Colorado seems to be, to abandon completely the small miner and businessman of this Nation in favor of imports produced by cheap foreign labor.

It is well known that American business is divided, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado stated.

BIG VERSUS SMALL BUSINESS

Big business generally is in favor of free trade—no duty or import fee to protect our standard of living in competition with the goods produced by cheap foreign labor. And little business, generally speaking, is in favor of such protection—the floor under wages and investments.

Big business for this purpose is defined as a business of such a nature and of such a size which can place its branch plants behind the low-wage curtain on foreign soil and ship its products into our country at a lower cost than the wage-living standards in this country will permit.

Little or small business may be defined as any business which is not in a position, either through size or type, to so place a branch plant. Therefore, such small business is dependent on markets which it can secure in competition after paying the wages and other labor support which obtain in this Nation, including industrial insurance, job insurance, social security, and other emoluments.

LABOR PROTECTION PAID—MORE THAN TOTAL FOREIGN WAGES

I believe it is well known that in some of the industries in this country producers pay more for such protection alone for the worker, including industrial insurance, job insurance, social security, and other safeguards, than the producers in many other competitive nations pay in total wages.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

AMENDMENT STIMULUS TO DOMESTIC PRODUCERS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I was interested in hearing the Senator from Nevada say that my amendment would be a stimulus to the small producers. I should like to ask if also the large producers might not increase their output tremendously if they received the price for locally produced copper which now obtains for imported copper.

The Senator from Nevada may know something about the potential development of copper in the Western States. The report I have received indicates that we could easily be self-supporting if the copper producers, large and small, were accorded the treatment which we are giving to the foreign producers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada has the idea that if all the influence of the large business organizations which have branch plants behind the low-wage curtain were to withdraw at this moment, the price would soon be equalized.

INCOMPETENT BUREAU OFFICIALS

However, I will say further to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, for whom I have the highest regard, that in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada the only way we will ever equalize the price of copper will be by keeping the problem out of the hands of bureau officials, who in many cases know nothing about the copper business, or any business, as a matter of fact.

That has been the customary procedure. Anyone who knows anything about any business or has had any experience in a business, his appointment to a position that deals with such a business is precluded.

I believe that to have been the procedure of the administration which has been in power for the past 20 years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to finish one point first; then I shall be very happy to yield.

AGAIN DUTY—FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the only way in which we can equalize the wage-living standard in this country and the foreign-living standard is through the levy of the duties, excise taxes, or imposts, or whatever we care to call them, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

CONGRESS DODGED THE RESPONSIBILITY

In 1934 Congress took occasion to dodge that responsibility by transferring from the Tariff Commission, which is an agency of Congress, to the State Department, which is an agency of the executive branch of the Government, the constitutional responsibility with which the Constitution charges the Congress.

I doubt the constitutionality of that act, as a matter of fact.

Only one more step remains, Mr. President. In article I, section 8, the Constitution specifies that Congress is charged with levying taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. Congress now has kept only one of those responsibilities; in other words, Congress can still levy taxes.

But I suppose it will be only a matter of time until that responsibility and authority are transferred to the Executive. For 20 years the levying of taxes by Congress has been only a matter of form, anyway, for Congress has simply read the menu backward; Congress has ascertained what the President wants, and then has levied taxes to that extent.

Last fall the people of the United States finally caught up with the economic one worlders and made different arrangements.

If we continue with the free-trade policy and continue to place more authority in the executive branch of the Government, removing it from the legislative branch, the Republican Party will have turned into a whitewashed Democratic Party and will probably get just what it deserves at the next general election.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DIRKSEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

WHY SUBSIDIZE FOREIGN PRODUCERS?

Mr. CASE. Last fall it was my privilege to visit the upper peninsula of Michigan, particularly the town of Houghton, and to observe in that area some of the mines which have been abandoned, or at least are not being worked because of the anomolous situation which prevails when we have a ceiling price on domestically produced copper, but invite the importation of copper at a much higher price. Those Michigan producers found it simply impossible to understand why we should, in effect, subsidize the production of foreign copper by denying the domestic producers their natural market at home through the medium of the imposition of a price ceiling on their commodity, which had the effect of preserving a portion of the domestic market for imported copper.

That is why the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska seems to me to have particular justice and appeal. I hope that before consideration of this bill is completed in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, whose interest in and support for the domestic mining industry are so well known, will agree to take the amendment to conference, to see whether something can be worked out to make it possible for our domestic producers to have a fair chance at their own market.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am happy that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has injected that thought. Let me say to him that it only hits and glances off the subject. What brought about the ceiling price to begin with? It was the removal of or the absence of any tariff, any duty, or any excise tax to equalize the production cost due to the differential in wage and living standards at home and abroad, in the case of the copper industry. That is what made all of this procedure possible.

NO TIME TO STUDY FACTS

Furthermore, as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, practically every time we pass a bill we are under the heat of an emergency, and are told that the bill must be passed at once, either today, tomorrow, or by Thursday; and there is no time for any of us to study the bill, to ascertain its effect. As a matter of fact it is probably the only method that would work—no time to think.

CHANGED 75-YEAR-OLD POLICY

So we have changed a 75-year-old policy, a policy of the protection of the workingmen and investors of the United States, through the imposition of import fees or duties, as they are called by the Constitution of the United States, to regulate foreign trade.

ABANDONED WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

We have utterly abandoned the workingmen and investors to their fate.

SUBSIDY FOR FOREIGN GOODS

Of course, as is continually suggested, we can appropriate taxpayers' money for the purchase of all the imported commodities and goods together with those produced here—for example, imported textiles, crockery, and machine tools imported from Japan and Germany or other low-wage nations—and thus fix the price. The price would then be fixed in a Government bureau. We tried that policy out on dried eggs from China, while we stored our own eggs in caves. We finally gave away the powdered eggs.

We bought foreign potatoes imported under the free-trade policy, and then painted the surplus potatoes green and bought kerosene and used it to burn the remainder. We were trying to stabilize the market for all the potatoes grown in the Western Hemisphere in the absence of a duty on imports—and, I suppose, for all the potatoes grown in Europe, too, if it were possible to ship potatoes that far. Finally we burned the evidence.

FURNISH COPPER TO FRANCE

In the case of copper it will be found, if the record is studied, that in the case of our own ECA or point 4 or Marshall plan or UNRRA, or whatever it was called at the time—after all, the name is immaterial, for the final effect is the same, namely, a burden on the wealth of the United States—we paid the top price for thousands of tons of copper and then gave the copper to France.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES NEEDED COPPER

No doubt that was done at a time when the industries in the State of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut needed the copper.

A DUTY OR IMPORT FEE DOES NOT PREVENT IMPORTS

At this point I wish to say that a duty or import fee does not prevent imports, if such duty or import fee is based on the differential of the cost of production based on the difference between the standard of living in the United States and the standard of living in the foreign country producing the commodity. Such a tariff or duty will bring such commodities in on our standard-of-living costs. Such a tariff or duty will not prevent the importation of 1 pound of copper.

VENTURE-CAPITAL INVESTOR

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. I am sure the Senator from Nevada will agree—and I agree with him—that the tariff does not impede the importation of copper, but it does place an additional burden on the consumer, so long as we have to have the copper.

What is the justification for placing the additional burden on the consumer? That is a question which I should like to have the Senator from Nevada discuss, if he does not mind doing so.

Mr. MALONE. I certainly am happy that the Senator from Connecticut has brought up that question at this point.

Venture capital is the kind of capital which goes into a mining business, because a mine cannot be developed in 1, 2, or 3 years; it takes 5, 6, or 7 years to develop it. Venture capital is the only kind of money that ever goes into a mining business until the mine has been proved.

So why is the tariff necessary? It is necessary because of the necessity of some assurance to the potential venture-capital investors over a period of years and some integrity on the part of the Congress that that policy will be maintained, before the investor will invest his money.

The theory the distinguished Senator from Connecticut advocates, namely, to have a tariff imposed only on a commodity where there is an excess of production in terms of the total consumption of the Nation, is the most preposterous and fallacious theory I have ever heard advanced. In the case of strategic and critical minerals and materials, we never would reach that point, because under those circumstances no investor would invest his funds in such a business. What assurance does an investor who is 300 or 3,000 miles removed from this Capital—the seat of Congress—have that when the production equals consumption that Congress will reimpose the tariff? Congress has no settled policy at all in connection with duties, imports or excises. Additional cost, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has made a point, but in this case the additional price would be $40 a ton, which cannot be found in the price of the fabricated product. The purpose of the duty or import fee is to protect those who invest in the property just as the duty on fabricated brass products is to protect the investor in those industries.

In the case of a 15 percent to 64 percent ad valorem tax on brass products, has the distinguished Senator from Connecticut ever computed the amount of tax on the copper content? I ask the Senator from Connecticut that question. He will find that it will amount to several thousand dollars per ton.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I respectfully say to my friend, the Senator from Nevada, that that is beside the point and is not at all pertinent to the question of whether this tax should be reimposed.

The question is why a tax be reimposed at a time when we must import half a million tons of copper. That is the real question before us.

I shall agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada about some phases of his thinking—with which I am somewhat familiar—regarding tariffs. However, when we are faced with an absolute need and when we must import copper for national security purposes—for all purposes we have to import approximately one-third of what we use—I cannot for the life of me see why any one should wish to tax imported copper, and thereby automatically increase its cost, even though, as the Senator from Nevada suggests, the tax or tariff is small when we translate it into the cost of the fabricated products.

Mr. MALONE. The reason for a duty or import fee on copper is to inspire confidence in potential venture capital investors. If such protection is not established the domestic production is likely to decrease, not increase, since there is no floor under wages and investments, therefore no protection from the low-cost foreign-labor products.

Mr. BUSH. I would differ on that point with the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I do not believe there is any lack of risk capital available, in the case of the copper industry. I believe the copper industry has done very well and has made very good profits and has paid very good dividends. I have read the annual reports of some of the copper companies, and they seem to be doing very well. The stockholders do not seem to be complaining, even though we are holding down the domestic price to 24½ cents.

TAXPAYERS IN THE COPPER BUSINESS

Mr. MALONE. I think the distinguished Senator is entirely correct with respect to three of the principal companies. But does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut know what help these companies are getting from the Government—that the Government is in partnership with them?

Mr. BUSH. I know that they are receiving some assistance from the Government. They are getting a great deal of business.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator also ought to know that they are getting short amortization periods and a guaranteed unit price in some cases for the investments they make. He should know that when they go into business, all except the very large companies, borrow money from the General Services Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corpporation, or some other trick organization of the Government, and that every taxpayer in America is in the copper business with them, except that he does not draw a dividend.

TARIFF OR DUTY—NO EFFECT ON DIVIDENDS

Mr. BUSH. I submit he will draw less, if a tax is placed on copper imports.

Mr. MALONE. The record does not support your statement. We are paying more for foreign copper now with no duty than ever before in history. The duty based on fair and reasonable competition will result in more venture capital invested in the business and more copper mined. With a definite policy laid down by Congress, more copper mines will be found. The same argument was used on this floor in 1947; it was said, "No, there are no more copper deposits." The junior Senator from Nevada knew then of a copper deposit 100 miles southeast of Reno, which the Anaconda Copper Co., one of the best companies in the world, is now working. That copper deposit was discovered more than 40 years ago; but changing economic conditions had to make it feasible of operation.

Under the free-trade policy we have had for 20 years, there was no incentive to invest the money necessary to work it.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator seriously suggest that, if this bill should not be passed and the tax should not be waived for another 17 or 18 months, whatever the period may be, it would have any serious influence on stimulating additional investment in the copper industry?

Mr. MALONE. Oh, yes; not in the case of the companies that are getting the taxpayers' help, but in the venture-capital field, seeking new deposits and new copper. That kind of capital simply will not go into the business now. The duty of 2 cents per pound is insufficient—but if it became the settled policy of Congress it would encourage investors. No one on earth, least of all a Member of the Senate, knows what our policy is in regard to foreign imports and foreign trade; but, as a matter of fact, no one can go into the mining business in this country, no one can go into the textile business, no one can go into the brass business without a duty or import fee. The companies engaged in pushing this bill through, without a duty or import fee, whatever to make up the wage and other cost differentials must have tariff protection; otherwise they would not be in business for 60 days.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

THE PRICE OF COPPER

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that what is holding back investment in copper on the part of venture-capital is not really this tax we are talking about, nor is such investment dependent on whether we extend this tax. After all, as the Senator himself has pointed out, the ultimate effect of it on the consumer, while adverse, is not very great. The point about which he is talking—and I may say I do not think it is particularly relevant to this bill, though I do not in any way challenge the Senator's right to discuss it—is the question of the price of copper. Is not that correct?

PARTNERSHIP WITH THE GOVERNMENT—THE TAXPAYER

Mr. MALONE. The price of copper. Always, when there is no emergency such as we have now, and such as we have had most of the time during the past 20 years—when there was no emergency in 1949, copper dropped to 16 cents per pound because the foreign production dominated the market.

The venture-capital investors may be stung a couple of times, but when he is continually stung, and when he can see absolutely no policy in Congress in regard to his investments, he finally gets enough and quits.

There is no new money to go into the mining business now to get copper, tungsten, mercury, or any other mineral, without some kind of partnership from the Government.

They demand either a short amortization period or a guaranteed price, or the loan of money, or all three. This is a common remark, "make the Government your partner, and they will take care of us." So they come back here. Who has occupied most of the hotel rooms in Washington during the past 15 or 20 years? They have mostly been occupied by people coming to Washington to get the Government to go in partnership with them. Why? Because the policies of the Government make it impossible for them to operate without taxpayers' money. It is simply impossible. The mining industry is virtually shut down at the very height of a war prosperity, at the height of employment, except where Government money is in the business. That is a general statement, and, of course, there are exceptions, but they are few.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very sympathetic toward some of the things the distinguished Senator says about the people who come to Washington wanting favors from the Government.

Mr. MALONE. We say we want to lower taxes, yet the very policies established by the Congress of the United States make it impossible for them to operate with the taxpayers money.

Mr. BUSH. Many of them come to Washington in an effort to cooperate, too.

Mr. MALONE. They all want to cooperate in the use of the taxpayers' money—I have seen few exceptions.

Mr. BUSH. I have.

Mr. MALONE. The policies set by Congress and the Executive bring them here to survive.

Mr. BUSH. At least some of them have come to Washington to attend to their legitimate business.

Mr. MALONE. Of course it is legitimate business but the congressional actions—a lack of definite policies create the business.

Mr. BUSH. But that has very little to do with the import tax.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to know exactly what the distinguished Senator thinks the question is.

Mr. BUSH. The question is whether we should impose an additional cost on consumers of copper, when there is an importation from foreign countries of one-third of our annual need. The question is, why should we tax that which we ourselves need?

Mr. MALONE. I thought I had made that entirely clear.

Mr. BUSH. No, that is not clear.

Mr. MALONE. Our wish is to produce more domestic copper—under a wage standard of living several times that of the competitive nations—there is no inducement for new venture capital to prospect and explore for new copper deposits. If independent capital is invested during the present emergency there is no floor under this investment and no settled congressional policy, therefore, when it is over the imports will cause a drop in the market, as evidenced in 1949 and the investment is gone—also the jobs are gone.

THE CHILE WAGE EARNER

I was coming to that in my statement. The amount is $1.17 on the so-called curb exchange. The company has agreed to pay $1.00 for 19.37 pesos. Even when the foreign producers pay $1 for 19.37 pesos, instead of the curb rate of $1 for 125 pesos, they are not up to the wages which we are paying in this country.

It is claimed that there are other emoluments which make up part of it. Africa will be a large producer when it

comes in. Our own Phelps Dodge Co. is interested in that area.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that we must have a long-range policy to attract venture capital in the mining business. It is like the Senator's brass companies: If Congress were nibbling at the duty and fussing with it every few days, they would be selling out within a month. Their nerves could not stand the strain. But we have had a definite policy of protection for them continuously, and I hope we shall continue it, because, although I have seen no computations with reference to it, I have no doubt from the state of the business that the duty is adequate.

The Connecticut brass companies manufacture lipsticks. One could not find the duty of 2 cents per pound for copper in that commodity but it can be found when we put a 64 percent ad valorem tariff on the finished product. That is why the duty on the manufactured product comes to as much as several thousand dollars per ton on the finished product.

I am for the duty on the Senator's brass products, but he is against a duty on our raw-copper mining which serves the same purpose—to equalize the standards of living of this Nation and Chile.

Mr. BUSH. No, I am not.

Mr. MALONE. He will finally be for us when we pull ourselves up by our boot straps, when we finally produce sufficient copper to furnish the domestic market, then the Senator would favor a duty on it. That is what the Senator is saying.

I should like to continue this debate until the Senator is satisfied.

Mr. BUSH. I am sure that would be quite impossible, with the progress we are now making.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator ask the question again?

Mr. BUSH. I cannot possibly see the need for placing a tax on an import which we simply must have; and regardless of what the Senator says about stimulating investment in copper mining, it could not possibly change the fact that for the next 17 or 18 months, at least, we are going to have imports in excess of our domestic production. Therefore, there should be no tax imposed on them.

A SUBSIDY ON IMPORTED PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONE. What I shall have to do is to turn the Senator over to Casey Jones, who is the head of the National Wool Growers Association. This debate does not cover wool but it is in the same category. Every wool grower, every sheepman, in America is broke, because on the Senate floor, in 1947 or 1948—I think it was in 1947, about the time we had a brainstorm with reference to copper—we placed a tariff on imported wool. The President vetoed the bill. We did not have sufficient votes to pass it over the President's veto. So we took his advice and put on a subsidy. It amounted to a 45-cent-per-pound subsidy on every pound produced in the United States.

Wool can come into this country from anywhere else in the world and enjoy free entry so we pay a subsidy on all imports.

As a result there is less wool produced in the United States today than there was 20 years ago—than there was 5 years ago—and the amount is growing less and less. That is a shining example of a material which we must have and of which we produce approximately half of the supply.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator will concede, will he not, that the requirements of copper are greatly swollen today?

WE JUMP FROM ONE EMERGENCY TO ANOTHER

Mr. MALONE. That is true of wool, also. That is exactly the reason for the situation which I have been discussing. People will not put their money into it because they know we have no firm policy, or any idea of what we are doing. We are simply jumping from one emergency to another, and we finally meet ourselves coming back.

We could go into the subject of textiles. Connecticut does not produce all the textiles it consumes. But there is a tariff, and the textile mills could not live 60 days without it.

This is a preposterous line of thinking. If we removed the tariff from every product in the United States of which we do not produce enough for the domestic consumption, our economic structure would sink without a trace.

COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS KILLED SHARPSHOOTING

In the old days, when there was a lack of communication, many people asked for a duty on what they produced but for free trade on what they bought. I want to point out that with the communications we have today, when somebody is continually broadcasting over the radio, no secrets will be kept very long. We have passed the point of such sharpshooting—we must adopt a definite policy.

Mr. President, I had to come to the Senate to hear the preposterous public argument that each one should have a duty on what he sells and should have free trade with reference to what he buys. I had never heard that stated publicly. I had heard it in confidence, however. It would be nice if one can get it.

Several things have been mentioned on which I should like to touch lightly. I have a short statement to make.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President, we talk about national defense. The greatest national defense move in the world would be to put a floor under wages and investments in this country in connection with the articles we need for national defense. It is removing such protection that makes it necessary to import more and more such products. Then if we should suddenly get into trouble we could not keep the lines of transportation open.

"GOING CONCERN" INDUSTRIES

We must have a "going concern" mining industry, a "going concern" textile industry, a "going concern" brass industry. That is what we need—good healthy "going concern" industries throughout this Nation. How can it be done? Through protection of the workingmen and investors.

GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY TARIFFS

It is said it costs more for national defense when there are duties and import fees on critical, strategic minerals and materials. I point out that the Government of the United States does not pay the tariff. When any branch of the Government brings in such products for national defense purposes, it does not pay the tariff. If the importer is a private company, it pays the tariff, manufactures the shells, or whatever the product is, and sells them to the Government charging the tariff on copper or any material back to the Government in the price of the munitions or other material; so it is just out of one pocket and into another. If Congress establishes confidence in potential investors in the country, production in strategic minerals and materials will increase.

Mr. President, in the minority views is stated:

> We have no objection to bringing in foreign copper to supplement our own production when our needs are greater than domestic production can meet.

I signed the minority report, because, of course, in addition to destroying utterly the people who are in the copper business in a small way, the independent copper producers, the lack of a definite policy is deterring capital investments in new copper deposits.

CROWNING INSULT

Then, of course, the crowning insult is to pay 10 cents a pound more to companies producing copper where the wages are about $1.17 a day, 146 pesos, as against $15 a day paid by our domestic producers.

Mr. President, to debate a subject such as this before the Senate today we must first determine our objectives. What are our objectives?

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the junior Senator from Nevada are the long range development and stabilization of domestic production, and to preserve the economic integrity of the United States of America.

CONGRESS—CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The first approach to these vital objectives should be a definite and settled policy by the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility to "regulate foreign commerce—to lay and collect—duties, imposts, and excises"—Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

Mr. President, that first approach was made impossible when the Congress, the legislative branch of the United States Government, retreated before the determined attack of the executive branch and completely abrogated its constitutional responsibility to "lay duties, imposts, and excises," through the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

"RECIPROCAL TRADE"—A CATCH PHRASE

Through that act, named the "reciprocal trade act," a catch phrase to sell the one economic world theory to the American people, the Congress, in complete and brazen disregard of the Constitution of the United States, transferred the power to "lay duties, imposts, and excises" to the President—the executive branch of the United States Government.

CONGRESS STILL HAS LEFT—THE RIGHT TO TAX

All that is necessary now is for the Congress, the legislative body, to transfer to the President the right to tax, that is about all they have left.

I would suspect that some Members of the Congress would like to do just that. They are so proud that they did transfer to the President the right to regulate foreign commerce, through the imposition of duties, imposts, and excises that they might approve transferring the right to tax.

STATE DEPARTMENT—ONE ECONOMIC WORLD PLAN

The act has been administered since the date of the act, 1934, by a State Department bent upon the destruction of the economic integrity of this Nation in favor of the one economic world theory, of averaging our wage-living standards with the lower standards and sweat-shop labor of Europe and Asia. That is their objective, as I shall show in a little while as we get along with the subject. What we are asked to do today is to take a small bite, but it is just such precedents which count in this body.

Mr. President, Congress, not content with the State Department's random cutting of practically all "duties, imposts, and excises" below the differential of the cost of production, due in a large measure to the difference in the wage standard of living here and abroad, has started to fuss and fiddle with what remains of the duty or excise tax set by Congress in 1932 on the important commodity we are discussing.

The State Department arbitrarily cut the duty from 4 to 2 cents a pound at their secret economic conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947. Every man on this floor who was a Member of the Senate in 1947 will recall that no Representative in Congress, no Senator, and no businessman could worm his way into one of those secret conferences in Geneva where our State Department and the foreign nations were discussing cutting tariffs, import fees, and duties.

DESTROYING THE LAST VESTIGE OF POLICY

The question before the Senate today is, Shall the Congress again defer the pitiful remnant of the original 4 cents a pound fixed by it in 1932 and remove the last vetige of a floor under wages and investments in this Nation? So the potential investors of venture capital in this country are told, "Hereafter you are on your own. We are even destroying the little policy that we have."

If we defer the 2 cents, we are destroying any semblance of congressional policy.

1930 TARIFF ACT

Under the 1930 tariff act, which laid down the policy of a flexible import fee to be adjusted 50 percent up or down on the basis of that differential of the cost of production, due, of course, mostly to the difference between the wage standards in this country and those abroad.

THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Congress must lay down a long-range and well-understood principle of a floor under wages and investments, supported by flexible import duty, and adjusted upon the basis of fair and reasonable competition, if venture capital is to be attracted. That is what Congress had in mind in the passage of the 1930 Tariff Act. For 20 years we have heard the statement that the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was a major cause of the depression. That act was not passed until 1930, and the depression came along in 1929. That was just a small discrepancy in time.

FALLACIOUS REASONING

The principal reason advanced for the removal of the 2 cents a pound duty is that no protection should be afforded the workingmen and investors in any field of domestic production when such production is less than the current consumption. It is difficult to imagine a more fallacious and erroneous conclusion.

The basic precept in a nation of higher living standards of course must be that Congress will accept its constitutional responsibility to "regulate commerce with foreign nations—to lay and collect duties, imposts and excises."

LONG-RANGE POLICY—VENTURE CAPITAL

As I have said, Congress must then lay down a long range and well understood principle of a floor under wages and investments—supported by flexible import duty—and adjusted upon the basis of fair and reasonable competition—if venture capital is to be attracted.

This principle applies not only to the production of copper, but to all other commodities, including wool, cattle, sheep, textiles, crockery, zinc, lead, mercury, tungsten and watches. We cannot indulge in sharpshooting.

The time has come when everyone knows other people's business, in regard to what tariffs, what duties, what imposts and what excises are levied, as well as what taxes.

It is impossible now to go before a congressional committee and obtain a duty on what one sells and free trade on what one buys. That is, the junior Senator from Nevada thought it was impossible. But those who are supporting this extension are the ones who are buying this metal as their chief raw material, and who have a tariff of from 15 to 64 percent ad valorem on the fabricated brass products which they sell.

PRESSURE—BRANCH PLANTS BEYOND LOW-WAGE CURTAIN

The companies which produce the foreign copper have plants behind the low-wage curtain. Mr. President, we have not heard the last of that principle. From now on when American capital in a large business can go behind the low-wage curtain with its branch plants we shall have pressure on the Congress, just as we have it now. It is said that there is an emergency, and that we must act by Tuesday or Thursday. Why? The little business people are 3,000 miles away from the capital and invest their money and their work in an effort to make a living do not depend entirely on borrowing money from the Government, on short amortization periods, or on a guaranteed price. We make it impossible for them to operate.

FREE TRADE ONLY BETWEEN EQUAL STANDARDS

Free trade can be established only between nations of equal living standards, without danger to the higher standard of living nation. It is axiomatic.

CONGRESS CONTINUALLY FUSSING WITH IMPORT DUTY

With Congress fussing and fiddling with the floor under wages and investments, it is like a man fishing for catfish and continually bobbing the cork on his line. He gets no fish; and industry gets no investments when the problem is treated in that way.

ECONOMIC LAW AND "SNAKE OIL"

There is little new in the application of the basic economic laws. However, there often crops up a new brand of snake oil to soothe the effect of the abuse of such laws.

FLEXIBLE DUTY DOES NOT PREVENT IMPORTS

The application of the flexible duty or import fee, on the principle of fair and reasonable competition, does not prevent imports, but it does bring them in on our standard-of-living level. The difference is paid into the United States Treasury and is available to apply to the budget, to lowering taxes, or to pay on the national debt. In addition, it acts as a floor under wages and investments in this Nation.

One further point is that it acts as an encouragement to raise the standard of living in other nations, in the sweat-shop labor nations and others, simply because they cannot profit by holding it down. They will pay the difference into the United States Treasury a few times, and then they will say, "The party is over. We might as well raise our own wages and standard of living, and create a market at home." That is what we have done in the past 50 or 75 years.

ENCOURAGE FOREIGN NATIONS TO RAISE THEIR LIVING STANDARDS

As I have said, an American flexible duty or import fee, adjusted upon the basis of fair and reasonable competition, would encourage foreign nations to raise their own living standards, since they could not profit from holding their wage-living standards down.

A LOADED GUN AT THE HEAD OF WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

With an industrially inexperienced and irresponsible State Department continually in a position to destroy an investment under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, and to import unemployment—and that is what we are doing,

Mr. President—the effect is like a loaded gun at the head of the workingmen and investors of the Nation. The inevitable result is that, of course, the independent potential investors in prospecting and exploring for new supplies are stopped in their tracks.

FEAR THAT FLEXIBLE IMPORT DUTY WILL CAUSE BREACH OF CONTRACT

A further reason advanced for the Congress to continue its interference with the principle of a floor under wages and investments in copper production is that there is fear of a breach of the contract between the nation of Chile and the private copper companies now operating there.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT SHOULD ESTABLISH INTEGRITY OF INVESTMENTS

If the State Department is worth its salt it will establish a world-wide policy thoroughly understood by all nations, that the independence and bodily safety of Americans must be of first consideration, and that the integrity of contracts with such citizens must be preserved.

FORM OF BLACKMAIL

Beyond that, it is a form of blackmail; and no individual or nation can pay such a price without at some not far distant future time creating an irreparable breach in diplomatic relations. Such a breach will come as soon as we start paying the blackmail.

Because of our timidity in this field and our willingness to divide the wealth of the taxpayers of this Nation with the lower living standards of the world on any and every pretext we are continually subjected to such pressure.

If the principle of bribing a country to fulfill its contracts with our private citizens or companies is continued, it will result in an established policy of the free flow of cheap labor goods into this Nation from wherever an American investor may be induced to establish a manufacturing or production plant.

FREE TRADE SAME AS IMPORTATION OF LABOR

There is no effective difference between the importation of the products of the sweat-shop labor of Europe and Asia and the importation of the cheap labor itself.

FOREIGN NATIONS EVADE AGREEMENTS

The State Department, in its secret 1947 Geneva Trade Conference, cut the already inadequate copper tariff in half—from 4 cents to 2 cents a pound—on October 30 of that year, in return for a will-o'-the-wisp fancied advantage for American products to be imported by Chile. Let us see what happened. These wishful thinking advantages eluded them on the wings of that nation's quota system, trade and exchange permits, manipulation of the value of their currency in terms of the dollar, and other subterfuges peculiar to present-day foreign nations' reaction to our exports.

I certainly believe, with the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], that what is necessary is a thorough overhauling of the foreign trade program. Committees in Congress are capable of doing just that.

MANIPULATION OF MONEY EXCHANGE FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

If we do not understand the problem, let us understand it. It does not matter what foreign nations do to their tariffs in an agreement. All they have to do is to create another price for their pesos and encourage the imports which they want, while discouraging the imports which they do not want. Is it understood by Senators that all foreign nations have to do is to give some other nation a more favorable exchange? There are already four or five different rates of exchange. I will come to that question pretty soon. By means of manipulation of the exchange trade with certain nations is made advantageous without technically breaking a trade agreement with the United States. No State Department can be so silly as not to know that, so it must have been intended to be that way.

I should like to see a committee of the Senate go into the question of trade agreements, which merely slide off the body politic; and also investigate their currency manipulations which other foreign nations, including the sterling bloc and other nations, indulge in to discourage imports which they do not want, and to encourage imports which they want. Their trade agreements with this Nation has no effect. I say that without any fear of contradiction. Then what is the effect, Mr. President? The effect of every one of them is to further divide the wealth of this Nation with the foreign nations of the world, and to further discourage investments in this country.

We are now in a position, Mr. President, where, if suddenly we were to get what we pray for—peace and no emergency—our business in this country would be down.

One of the customary methods utilized by foreign nations, including Chile, to evade our exports is to give the favored nation in each case an advantage in exchange rates thereby making it more profitable to import that nation's goods.

As reckless as the State Department is with the stability of the investments in an American industry through its one-economic world concept Congress went them one better. While the State Department was negotiating the cut in the duty or import fee support of the copper industry from the already inadequate 4 cents to 2 cents per pound, Congress, out of a clear sky, removed it entirely, using the very arguments which have been made on this floor today. I need not say any more on that point.

CONGRESS DODGED ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. President, not content with the shifting of its constitutional responsibility to "regulate foreign commerce—to lay and collect—duties, imposts, and excises" to the President, thus dodging all responsibility to the workingman and investor, the Congress gave the President the right to fix prices—ceiling prices on all commodities.

The President did fix the ceiling price on copper. He said 24½ cents per pound was enough for an American producer. The fact that an American miner cannot even produce copper for that price in a going concern mine, to say nothing of attracting new venture capital into the business was of course no consideration to a one-economic-world-minded President of the United States.

Of course, I do not believe that he—the President—ever saw the agreement. It was all done by a State Department which had nothing on its mind except some fancied foreign advantage which it never secured.

HUMOROUS IF NOT TRAGIC

It is, of course, a ridiculous procedure, and it would be humorous, if it were not tragic. Mr. President, to fix an arbitrary ceiling price on anything without control of the other factors entering into the cost is like putting your finger on the snout of a teakettle to stop the escaping steam without pulling the fire under the kettle. You know you are going to get scalded, but you do not know how badly or how soon.

CEILING PRICE SHOULD BE REMOVED

The ceiling price should be removed immediately. An amendment was offered in committee to remove any discrimination in price between domestic and foreign copper, but it was rejected. Such an amendment should be attached to the pending bill. I heartily approve of the amendment offered by my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

FIVE METHODS OF DESTROYING PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

First. Congress, starting with the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, created a horde of agencies and Government bureaus designed to deliberately hamstring domestic investments in the industrial fields of this Nation, at first innocently enough by an unsuspecting Congress—at least I hope it was unsuspecting, because it would sound very bad now—through the first Trade Agreements Act of 1934, called the Reciprocal Trade Act by an internationally minded administration, in order to sell free trade to an unsuspecting American public.

Second. The Securities and Exchange Commission, in reaching out to determine the feasibility of an industry before securities can be sold, effectively stops the sale of such securities in most cases, except where they want to promote someone in a business. The situation must still be clear in the memory of the Members of the Senate. Furthermore, when they want to ruin a man in business, whether it be mining, textile, or other business, if, after he starts to sell securities, the Commission gets a crank letter, they publish the letter to the world and say, "we will investigate this man." Whatever the result, from that day on he will never sell the same securities again.

WILL INVESTIGATE THE SECURITIES COMMISSION

Mr. President, I hope personally to again look into the policies of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I started this investigation in 1947 and 1948.

The Republicans lost control of the Senate in 1948 and I lost my committee.

I now am chairman of the Minerals and Fuels Committee, and will proceed again with the investigation.

Third. Price-control legislation.

Mr. President, I have already commented on what I think of price-control legislation, in time of peace or any time aside from time of emergency or a constitutionally declared war. Of course, there may come a time when labor is not available and when no material is available, and when it is essential to hold everything in status quo for a time. However, it is silly to do so when labor is available and when we are building.

Fourth. Assessing the taxpayers of this Nation to support foreign countries' policies with which we do not agree and over which we have no control.

I refer to their trade policies. I refer to their colonial policies. I refer to all of the manipulations of monetary systems and subterfuges with which they enter into such manipulation to bilk one another and us.

Fifth. Subsidies which can be paid or withheld on the whim of a bureau official, who determines the eligibility of an industry or an individual citizen for such subsidies.

Mr. President, we all know that with these practices we have just about stopped the wheels of machinery, not only in mining, but in all other businesses which are now dependent upon an emergency, or, as the former President used to say, a police action.

At least we now have a President who is facing the issue.

THE CHINESE CIVIL WAR

I digress to say that many of us made speeches on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere praying that we would withdraw the Navy—the Seventh Fleet—and allow the situation in China to be turned back into a Chinese civil war which has continued for 5,000 years of recorded history. The State Department succeeded in the 5 or 6 years subsequent to World War II in turning a Chinese civil war into a war between us and China. Now I hope the President will follow through by blockading the coast of China.

Mr. President, the Chinese have no aviation gas except that which either England or the United States ships to them. What is supposed to be a spokesman for England said the other day: "We will defend our Chinese commerce with our fleet."

Mr. President, without going further into the subject, it should be noted that both England and France have independent military and economic pacts with Russia which read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact with us.

If I were advising the President of the United States, I would suggest that he ask England to make up its mind which side she is on because the further we go and the more we get into the power of this European intrigue, the more we must cater to their blackmail and submit to the machinations of their governments about which we know nothing.

Mr. President, it is the hope of the junior Senator from Nevada that we are witnessing the end of the fussing and fiddling with the economic structure of this Nation by the Congress of the United States. The junior Senator from Nevada also devoutly hopes that the new administration and the Eighty-third Congress will again establish long-range principles and policies concerning the investment of venture capital.

Mr. President, I say that because it would take the taxpayers of this Nation out of the business of the Nation.

CONGRESS PUT THE TAXPAYER IN BUSINESS

That is to say, it would take the taxpayers out of the business that Congress has put them in. Then we complain about large appropriations. Mr. President, we should be ashamed of ourselves.

After the things to which I have referred—namely, the putting of the taxpayers into the industrial business of the Nation, and then making it absolutely necessary for those businesses to make the Government their partner—the taxpayers of the United States are made the partners of those who go into the business. Congress laid down the rules for that process.

Mr. President, we may blame Mr. Truman, who is gone, or Mr. Roosevelt, who is dead, for all these policies; but the Constitution provides that such things can be done only if Congress votes them.

So the weight of these difficulties falls on the Congress.

GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY THE TARIFF

Mr. President, question has been raised as to whether the Government pays the tariff.

The last of the Executive orders exempting the Federal Government from tariff payments terminated with the signing of the Peace Treaty with Japan on April 28, 1952. However, under the act of June 30, 1914 (34 U. S. C. 568), and section 12 of the act of February 19, 1948 (5 U. S. C., Sup., 219b, 626e) shipments consigned to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force are admitted free.

Under section 502 (d) (6) of the act of June 30, 1949 (41 U. S. C. Sup. 204), known as the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, any imported materials which the authorized procurement agency shall certify to the Commissioner of Customs to be strategic and critical materials procured under the Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (60 Stat. 696), are admitted free. So, Mr. President, I hope we hear nothing further to the effect that the tariff increases the cost of our national defense or retards our national defense program in any way whatsoever.

Under no circumstance does a tariff cost the Federal Government any money, and this fact applies to products fabricated from raw material upon which a private importer has paid a tariff and has passed it along in the price of the finished article. The Treasury Department collects the tariff when the product enters the country, and the department of the Federal Government purchasing the product pays the tariff as part of the price when it buys the finished product. It is merely a bookkeeping transaction. The money is out of one Government pocket and into another.

The demand for free trade on copper comes, as might be expected, from the brass fabricators and the companies which have plants behind the low-wage curtain.

DUTY ON BRASS; DUTY ON COPPER

Sixty to seventy-five percent of the raw material utilized in the production of brass is copper. Therefore they make much of the duty of 2 cents per pound equaling $40 per ton.

They demand and have an established policy of a duty of from 15 to 64 percent ad valorem on their brass fabricated products, and admittedly could not stay in business without it. The integrity of their investment is utterly dependent upon such protection; it is the floor under the wages and investments in the brass business. Mr. President, I am thankful that they have it, for it holds up the economic structure of our country and its employment and investments.

But what are we told by the experts in the trade, Mr. President, especially when not only the brass business but the watchmaking business and the manufacture of intricate tools are concerned?

The experts tell us what we really should know, namely, that the workers in those industries are vital to us in time of war. At such times we could not do without them. What would happen to us in time of war if we were without them, Mr. President? We might learn the answer to that question the hard way if we continue this free-trade idea and have duties or tariffs only on commodities of which we have an oversupply.

So the copper miners are asking similar treatment from Congress; namely, establishment under the wages and investments in the copper-mining business of a long-range floor representing roughly the difference between the wage and standard-of-living levels here and abroad, just as the brass fabricators asked and received years ago, and it has now become an established policy.

FACTORS CLEAR

Therefore, a person who wishes to go into the brass business knows with what he has to contend. He knows he must contend with competitors in the United States; and he knows that if he can handle that end of the business, he can make the grade.

He does not have to watch Congress, although Congress must be watched by the miners, the wool growers, the crockery manufacturers, the watchmakers, and those engaged in many hundreds of other industries which I could mention if I had time to do so—he knows the rules of the game.

On many of the brass-fabricated products the duty of 15 to 64 percent ad valorem would amount to several thousand dollars per ton on the basis of the copper content. So where do we get the idea that a tariff of 2 cents a pound will make any difference in the selling price of the fabricated products? In the case of most

of them, we cannot find any difference on that account, no matter how sharp our pencils may be. So it is ridiculous to compare the 15 percent to 64 percent ad valorem duty in the case of brass-fabricated products with the small duty on copper, when we consider the amount of copper utilized. The $40 per ton duty which places a floor under the copper miners' wages is lost in any computations of cost.

WORKERS' WAGES—CHILE

Mr. President, there has been particular reference to the production of copper in Chile, which is the principal exporter to the United States, and will be for some time until probably there is full production or increased production in South Africa. One of our domestic companies is interested in Africa, as also are some English companies. There is a tremendous potential production there. This problem has only started.

THE PRINCIPLE ONCE ESTABLISHED

Once the principle is established, how can we discriminate against South African producers, once that production begins? Furthermore, how can such foreign shipments be protected in case of war?

I happened to have represented the Senate Military Affairs Committee before the War Production Board during World War II. It was found that at times approximately 80 percent to 90 percent of the ships carrying chromite and manganese from South Africa were being sunk. Those were anxious days, and at that time we were really combing the United States for those ores. The national security is involved.

THE CHILEAN'S WAGES

I hope now to clear up the point about the wages paid. The Chilean copper worker receives an average of about 146 pesos a day. The free-market exchange of the Chilean peso fluctuates at around 125 pesos to $1. Therefore if a copper worker wanted to convert his wages into dollars, he would receive about $1.17 a day, and he would have about 125 pesos with which to buy food, clothing, and anything else he wished to buy in the markets of Chile.

The comparison of the purchasing power of the Chilean copper worker to that of the American copper worker is $1.17 to $15. In the United States there may be some copper-mine worker's wages under $15, but that is about the average. Fifteen dollars was the average wage paid to copper miners in the United States for the month of November 1952, the most recent month averaged by the Department of Labor. The figure of $15 a day includes some overtime pay. It is not important, except to show that a copper-mine worker in Chile receives about one-tenth of the pay received by copper-mine workers in the United States.

Mr. President, there is an agreement between the two copper-producing companies operating in Chile and the Chilean Government that they buy pesos at 19.37 to the dollar. That makes the apparent wages of the copper miners more, but the miners do not receive the difference. The Chilean Government receives the difference between the 19.37 and the 125. Therefore, the standard of living is never raised.

Most of the 35.5 cents paid for Chilean copper goes to the Government of Chile. The purchasing power of the workers' peso is only $1.17 per day, and the copper companies gross only about 8 cents per pound on copper.

I want to say right here, Mr. President, that this information is being gained independently of the copper companies. The net receipts for the copper companies are much less. It costs the copper producer an average of about $7.54 per day per worker for wages, not including such benefits, as housing. The purchasing power of the wages for the worker is only $1.17 and the difference goes to the Chilean Government. We are in fact subsidizing the Chilean Government. I am not commenting on whether it is a good or a bad idea, but I am giving you what I believe to be the facts.

Of the current Chilean price of 35.5 per pound, 16.5 cents reverts to the Chilean Government. The remaining 19 cents accrues to the producing companies. The method of imposition of this tax is as follows: a base price of 13.5 per pound for electrolytic copper, 13.25 cents for fire-refined copper, and 13.125 cents for bessemer copper is established by Law 1760 as amended. That portion of the sale price between 13.5 cents and 24.5 cents is divided equally between the companies and the Government. It is rather an intricate set-up, Mr. President. The companies have made a contract with Chile giving that nation $1 for 19.37 pesos.

The income received by the companies which is subject to this tax is as follows: income in excess of 13.5 cents per pound is deductible from taxable income for the purpose of computing income tax.

NO DUTY ON PRODUCTS NOT PRODUCED HERE IN COMPETITIVE QUANTITIES

There is no duty on products which we cannot produce or do not produce in sufficient quantities for competition, such as tin, nickel, natural rubber, spices, hemp, and so forth. No one has ever contemplated such a thing. That would simply be a tariff for revenue only. Most other nations have it but we do not. The principal nation with which we are dealing in connection with this copper business has it.

However, we are past the point of sharpshooting. You cannot say to zinc and lead and copper producers that you must have free trade because there is short supply.

You cannot say to the textile industry that you will lower the duty to allow England and Scotland and other competitors to come in with their low-cost labor, and make it profitable for those countries to hold their labor costs down.

In other words, if they paid the difference in the living standards into the United States Treasury, it would not be long until the wages and the standard of living would go up and create a greater market in their own country.

THE WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. President, I want to show further the utter fallacy of the theory that anything in short supply must be free trade. Of course, when you take the duty off then you are always going to be in short supply.

The question of wool is not before us, but I had a telegram from K. C. Jones, who is the secretary of the National Wool Growers Association. The telegram, from Denver, Colo., reads:

> Allied Wool Industry Committee, with National Wool Growers Association, National Wool Marketing Corp., and Western Wool Handlers Association, meeting in Denver today, adopted resolution of policy your statement on foreign trade as made by you in Reno, May 9, 1952.

What was that statement, Mr. President? The wool people of the United States, represented nationally in Denver, adopted the principle that I laid down in one of my speeches and this is the paragraph:

> Promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American working men or the American farmer or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

Mr. President, to establish the utter fallacy that the duty should only refer to an industry where there is full production for the domestic market or an overproduction, I have established here the wool production for the year's domestic production 1949, 1950, and 1951, and the consumption for those years, both domestic and imported.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Domestic produced	Imported	Consumption
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1949	120,376,000	272,503,000	500,361,000
1950	119,086,000	466,848,000	634,809,000
1951	117,915,000	361,216,000	484,157,000

Mr. MALONE. These figures show that we continually import wool, and that the imports are increasing, while the domestic production is decreasing as the result of the very lack of policy on the part of the Senate of the United States which we are discussing here today in regard to copper.

Mr. President, the question of wool is not before us but it will be before we adjourn. It is a strategic material because we do not produce the amount we need. So what did we do? We imposed a duty in 1947 which was vetoed by the President and then a subsidy was suggested by him and we passed it. But the subsidy has long since passed out of all usefulness because it does not make up the difference and we are going out of the sheep business and wool business in

the United States of America. No one in his right mind is going to buy a band of sheep now because of the continual fussing with the tariff in the Congress of the United States.

THE PLANNERS LONG-RANGE PLAN

The junior Senator from Nevada has evidence here which proves the aims of these international planners. I quote from an article by Arnold J. Toynbee, in Look magazine, dated November 18, 1952. Mr. Toynbee is billed as an Englishman and the world's foremost living philosopher-historian. After he had led up to the idea of one world government, through all this mess of intricate congressional maneuvering, he writes, as the crux of the article, one paragraph, as follows:

This, though, would be unlikely to be the end of the process of western constitutional development, for a western electorate—

He means the Atlantic Pact governments, and later he goes on to say that we would include other states as they became eligible—

would soon begin to ask itself why it should not elect this common western legislature as well as the local national legislatures.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that he refers to the Congress of the United States as a "legislature." I suppose the State legislatures would then become county commissioners, or would be reduced to about that stature, anyway. I continue the quotation:

If democracy means the control of governments by legislative bodies that are elected and reelected by the people, then democracy would call for the direct election of a common legislative body charged with the supreme responsibility of controlling the western community's common executive services.

Mr. President, that is where you are riding in connection with free trade and one economic world; and when you go down this time, Mr. President, that is it—you then join them to save yourself.

TWO APPROACHES TO THE ONE WORLD—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC

There are two approaches to the one world objective, and I may say that one of them is political and the other is economic.

The political on which we are centering relates to communism. The Communist, Fascist, and Socialist governments have a common objective—government ownership with the individual owning nothing. They do not differ except as to the method of approach, and except in the matter of getting control of a government.

The Communist will shoot in order to gain control and the Socialist will spend you into it, as we have been doing here for 20 years. A Communist is just an impatient Socialist. That is the political approach.

What is the economic approach? The so-called Reciprocal Trade Act is the start.

So, Mr. President, we are being led one step after another into an economic trap, entanglements with other nations, and finally we are in the mire beyond redemption.

Mr. President, the extension of free trade on copper is the first wedge and it is only a question of how far they will go from here.

TRADE, NOT AID

Mr. President, we have been bombarded with another one of those trick phrases that attempts to lull the American people into a false sense of security or to believe something which they would know to be false if they knew the facts. I refer to the phrase "Trade, not aid." Many people probably think that this is another American idea and the other people who hope that the American public will adopt it as their idea.

The propaganda over this Nation for trade, not aid, Mr. President, was a foot deep during the month of November, in almost every national magazine, with "canned" editorials in many newspapers. The nations of Europe have trained us to give them our tax money up to $10,000,000,000 a year, including the loans from the world bank and other lending agencies. They now propose to let us off the hook to a slight extent if we will give them our domestic markets.

All they want in order to let us off the hook for a part of the direct cash outlay is for us to give them our markets, the source of our income. It is just as if we went to a newspaper and said, "We do not want to ask you for money, but give us one-half of your subscription list. We want to start a newspaper."

SOURCE OF SLOGAN, "TRADE, NOT AID"

However, the junior Senator from Nevada wishes to reveal the true source of this slogan, and I quote from an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, February 1, 1953, the title of the editorial being "The 'Trade, Not Aid' Slogan," reads:

From the moment that Great Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Richard A. Butler, coined the slogan "Trade, not aid" it entered general circulation.

THE OLD MASTER

Mr. President, when Mr. Churchill last visited this country he inadvertently claimed the slogan.

He said, "What we mean by 'trade not aid' is still lower American tariffs."

They coined many other phrases, such as "reciprocal trade," "you cannot be prosperous in a starving world," and others under which we lived for 20 years. But we did not pin it on them then. We are doing that now.

PROPAGANDA WIDE CIRCULATION

Editorials, stories, and articles throughout the country attempted to make the American public think it was their idea and that it was a good one. The bombardment is still going on.

The internationalists are trying to soften us up so we will trade our markets for some agreements which will be kept only when it is to the advantage of the foreign country to keep them.

Treaties or agreements between countries, whether they be military alliances, mutual protection, or trade treaties, have become merely pauses for advantage.

With reference to past trade agreements, most foreign countries have manipulated their currency values, utilized quotas, or some similar subterfuge to gain the advantage which in effect breaks the agreement.

Others have caught us with a shortage, as Chile did with copper, and have boldly broken the agreement and forced a new one more advantageous to themselves.

THE ENTERING WEDGE

Mr. President, this question of whether or not Congress shall extend the suspension of the import fee on copper is the first wedge which these international intellectuals are driving to divide the markets of the United States with the rest of the world and reduce our standard of living to a common level.

Let me say, Mr. President, that as they induce the larger American companies to build plants behind the low-wage curtain, those companies join in the pressure, just as is being done today, for the duty to be removed. That means that the low-cost-foreign-sweat-shop labor is in direct competition with the $15 labor in this country. Therefore, no venture capital is going into the business.

THE DRIFT FENCE

Mr. President, we are now up against a drift fence, and it will not be long until we are up against another in the form of propaganda and pleas for another extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This would allow more agreements to be made with foreign countries who can break them by import license restrictions, subsidies, manipulation of currencies, and other similar methods whenever it is advantageous to them. These are the drift fences which are heading us for a corral.

Mr. President, that corral I refer to is called the Next Step in History. That will be when the Constitution of the United States will be changed and made subservient to some other document and the now sovereign United States of America would be only a state in some larger political unit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a history of the suspension of the import tax on copper by Public Law 43, Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE SUSPENSION OF THE IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Public Law 43, Eightieth Congress, suspended the import tax on copper from April 30, 1947, through March 31, 1949, and Public Law 33, Eighty-first Congress, enacted March 31, 1949, extended the suspension through June 30, 1950. Although the suspension of the tax did not become effective until 1947, most of the large imports of copper which entered during the war period were for the account of the Government and were entered free.

In the general agreement on tariffs and trade entered into at the Geneva Trade Con-

vention held in 1947, the United States reduced the import tax on copper by 50 percent effective March 16, 1949. With the termination of the suspension of the import tax on July 1, 1950, the tariff on copper was 2 cents per pound.

On April 1, 1951, the suspension of the import tax was again made effective until February 15, 1953.

"PUBLIC LAW 38—EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

"(Last extension)

"An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles (other than copper sulfate and other than composition metal provided for in paragraph 1657 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which is suitable both in its composition and shape, without further refining or alloying, for processing into castings, not including as castings ingots or similar cast forms) entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1951, and ending with the close of [February 15, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier] *June 30, 1954: Provided*, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of electrolytic copper for that month, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered Connecticut Valley, has been below 24 cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"In determining the average market price of electrolytic copper for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized and directed to base its findings upon sources commonly resorted to by the buyers of copper in the usual channels of commerce, including, but not limited to, quotations of the market price for electrolytic copper, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered Connecticut Valley, reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's 'Metal and Mineral Markets'."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the average earnings per day of the Chilean copper worker from 1937 to 1952.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The average earnings per day of the Chilean copper worker

	Pesos
1937	20.88
1938	23.80
1939	25.93
1940	27.73
1941	32.82
1942	38.04
1943	47.44
1944	53.91
1945	€1.55
1946	69.99
1947	83.68
1948	101.55
1949	114.00
1950	142.60
1951	------
1952	------

Source: Department of Commerce.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement of Chilean exchange quotations, yearly averages from 1930 to 1953, showing by years special ex-official exchanges and reflecting the agreements between private companies and Chile.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Chilean exchange quotations, yearly averages, 1930–53*

[Pesos per United States dollar]

Year	Special (ex-official)	Export draft rate	Official	Bank rate	Special commercial	Provisional	Free banking rate	Free rate (curb)
1930	8.26	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1931	8.26	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1932	14.05	33.38	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1933	13.34	33.18	----------	----------	----------	----------	34.02	----------
1934	9.64	25.07	----------	----------	----------	----------	24.74	----------
1935	19.33	24.26	----------	----------	----------	----------	25.07	----------
1936	19.38	26.05	----------	----------	----------	----------	27.85	----------
1937	19.37	25.58	28.02	----------	----------	----------	26.11	----------
1938	19.37	24.95	28.27	----------	----------	----------	27.14	----------
1939	19.37	24.98	30.93	----------	----------	----------	32.03	----------
1940	19.37	24.90	30.92	----------	----------	----------	32.82	----------
1941	19.37	24.90	30.90	----------	----------	----------	31.54	----------
1942	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	31.63	----------
1943	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	32.16	----------
1944	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	31.53	----------
1945	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	32.05	----------
1946	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	34.42	----------
1947	19.37	25.00	31.00	----------	----------	----------	47.15	----------
1948	19.37	25.00	31.00	43.00	----------	----------	59.82	----------
1949	19.37	25.00	31.00	43.00	----------	----------	77.74	----------
1950	19.37	----------	31.00	43.00	50.00	60.00	99.88	----------
1951	19.37	----------	31.00	43.00	50.00	60.00	----------	85.48
1952	19.37	----------	31.00	43.00	50.00	60.00	114.00	122.27
1953 (Jan. 31)	19.37	----------	31.00	43.00	50.00	60.00	116.00	127.00

Sources: Annual Report of the Central Bank of Chile, 1951. United States Foreign Service reports.

NOTE.—For explanation of the use of the various rates, see attached explanatory notes.

NOTE.—The free curb rate is applicable to the wage earner in purchasing his supplies and determines his living standard.

EIGHT DIFFERENT EXCHANGES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it adds up to eight different exchanges which are to nullify any agreement or agreements made with our State Department or with anyone else, which is to the benefit of the Government of Chile.

This is not an exception, Mr. President; it is simply a sample. Every foreign nation dealing with the State Department works on the same principle.

I now ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table explanatory of table No. 2 with reference to special exchanges.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rate	*Current use*
Special (19.37)	Conversion of export proceeds of large iron and copper mining companies in amounts equal to their local costs of production.
Export draft rate	Discontinued in January 1950.
Official (31)	Established as official rate July 31, 1942, prior to which 19.37 was the official rate. Currently applied to Government imports and a few essential imports, such as newsprint and sugar.
Bank rate (43)	Applied to imports of a few designated essentials and the proceeds of designated invisible exports.
Special commercial (50)	Used for a few designated essential imports and designated portions of nitrate export proceeds.
Provisional commercial (60).	Applied to the export proceeds of designated manufactures and agricultural products and to the peso requirements of large mining companies in excess of those that are required to be purchased at the 19.37 rate. Also used for designated imports and authorized invisibles.
Free banking rate (110).	Applied to all trade transactions and authorized invisibles not specifically covered by other exchange rates. Currently the most widely used import-export rate.
Free curb rate (127).	Used in nontrade transactions not specifically authorized by the Government; this is not a black market rate, but rather a tolerated free market.
Gold rate (approximately 167).	Used for imports of specified luxury goods and for the conversion of proceeds from gold and wine exports.

In addition, for a few specified agricultural exports a mixing system exists. Under this system, exchange proceeds are sold in varying proportions at the various existing rates.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the production and prices of Chilean copper from 1930 to 1953, in metric tons of fine metal content, together with the price.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Production and prices of Chilean copper, 1930–53*

	Production (metric tons of fine metal content)	Price of electrolytic copper for export (United States cents per pound at New York)
1930	220,323	[1]
1931	223,513	[1]
1932	103,173	[1]
1933	163,395	[1]
1934	256,700	[1]
1935	267,083	[1]
1936	256,209	[1]
1937	413,283	13.018
1938	351,180	9.695
1939	340,980	10.727
1940	363,041	10.770
1941	468,688	10.901
1942	484,353	11.684
1943	407,141	11.700
1944	498,519	11.700
1945	470,181	11.700
1946	361,038	14.700
1947	426,670	21.624
1948	445,067	22.348
1949	371,091	19.423
1950	362,787	21.549
1951	379,726	26.258
1952 (first 6 months)	187,200	[2] 28.700
1952 (last 6 months)	[1]	[2] 36.500
1953	[1]	36.500

[1] Not available.

[2] Price increased from 28.5 to 36.5 in May 1952.

Sources: Estadistica Chilena (official Chilean statistical publication); Monthly Bulletin of the Central Bank of Chile, July 1952.

THE DUTY ON COPPER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code, showing production, imports, and exports, 1908 to 1952, in short tons.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 3425, Internal Revenue Code [1]

[Import tax in cents per pound of copper content, unless otherwise stated]

Description	Import tax rate in—		
	1932	1945	1953 [2]
Copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles provided for in pars. 316, 380, 381, 387, 1630, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930:			
Copper bearing ores and concentrates	4	4	2.[3]
If products of Cuba	Free	Free	Free.
Composition metal provided for in par. 1657, Tariff Act of 1930, which is suitable both in its composition and shape, without further refining and alloying, for processing into cast forms.	4	4	2.[4]
Copper sulfate	4	4	2.
Metal scrap containing copper	4	4 [5]	2.[5]
Other	4	4	2.[5]
All other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930:			
In chief value of copper (including copper in alloys).	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound.[3]
Containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight, but not in chief value thereof.	3 percent ad valorem, or ¾ cent per pound, whichever is lower.	3 percent ad valorem, or ¾ cent per pound, whichever is lower.	1½ percent ad valorem, or ¾ cent per pound, whichever is lower.[3]

[1] Derived from sec. 601 (c) (7) of the Revenue Act of 1932, effective June 21, 1932, enacted for 2 years and, after several extensions, made permanent by sec. 501 of the Revenue Act of 1941. Taxes do not apply if "treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide."

[2] The reduced rates in this column were proclaimed, effective Mar. 16, 1949, pursuant to concessions granted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (Geneva).

[3] Import taxes have been suspended for most of the period since Apr. 30, 1947, by Public Law 42, 80th Cong. (Apr. 30, 1947-Mar. 31, 1949); Public Law 33, 81st Cong. (Apr. 1, 1949-June 30, 1950); and Public Law 38, 82d Cong. (Apr. 1, 1951-Feb. 15, 1953). The latter public law is due to expire at the close of Feb. 15, 1953.

[4] Subject to note 3, except that suspension in Public Law 38 did not apply to this merchandise. Hence, tax has been assessable thereon since expiration of Public Law 33 at close of June 30, 1950.

[5] Effective almost continuously from Mar. 14, 1942, until the present time, the duties and import taxes on metal scrap, including scrap containing copper, have been suspended by Public Law 497, 77th Cong., as amended and extended by various acts, the last of which is Public Law 535, approved July 14, 1952. This law is due to expire at the close of June 30, 1953.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF COPPER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now request unanimous permission to insert in the RECORD at this point, a table on imports and exports of copper from 1908 to 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Production, imports, and exports of copper, 1908–52, in short tons

Year	Production			Imports (unmanufactured)	Exports (refined)
	Mine	Scrap			
		New	Old		
1908	478,420	(1)	(1)	109,353	330,938
1909	563,261	(1)	(1)	160,900	341,423
1910	544,119	30,000	64,500	172,218	354,158
1911	567,382	31,000	76,000	167,304	393,277
1912	624,547	30,500	107,000	205,120	387,500
1913	617,785	45,000	91,500	204,389	408,956
1914	574,216	40,000	87,883	153,178	374,451
1915	744,036	75,000	121,187	167,849	293,782
1916	1,002,938	175,000	175,000	231,168	358,308
1917	947,717	188,500	194,900	278,210	515,390
1918	955,011	176,000	176,670	287,903	345,014
1919	606,167	124,590	152,600	214,694	219,080
1920	612,275	143,500	168,960	242,835	275,613
1921	233,095	85,310	131,990	175,236	298,059
1922	482,292	133,100	202,800	270,507	326,333
1923	738,870	140,000	270,900	338,237	364,690
1924	803,083	122,100	266,200	384,407	504,812
1925	839,059	129,200	291,010	326,486	484,033
1926	862,638	142,500	337,300	389,721	428,062
1927	824,980	150,880	339,400	359,161	461,233
1928	904,898	170,900	365,500	393,537	474,737
1929	997,555	222,200	404,350	487,156	411,227
1930	705,074	125,000	342,200	408,577	297,057
1931	528,875	85,700	261,300	292,946	202,608
1932	238,111	67,200	180,980	195,996	110,977
1933	190,643	77,800	260,300	143,717	124,582
1934	237,401	66,500	310,900	213,286	202,366
1935	380,491	87,200	361,700	257,182	200,735

[1] Not available.

Production, imports, and exports of copper, 1908–52, in short tons—Continued

Year	Production			Imports (unmanufactured)	Exports (refined)
	Mine	Scrap			
		New	Old		
1936	614,516	101,900	382,700	190,339	220,390
1937	841,998	123,200	408,900	279,878	295,064
1938	557,763	92,500	267,300	252,164	370,545
1939	728,320	212,800	286,900	336,297	372,777
1940	878,086	198,156	333,800	491,342	356,431
1941	958,149	313,697	412,699	735,545	103,602
1942	1,080,061	500,633	427,122	764,393	131,406
1943	1,000,818	658,526	427,521	716,596	175,859
1944	972,549	494,232	456,710	785,211	68,373
1945	772,894	509,421	497,095	853,196	48,563
1946	608,737	397,003	406,453	396,380	52,629
1947	847,563	458,365	503,376	413,890	147,642
1948	834,813	467,324	505,464	507,449	142,598
1949	752,750	329,595	383,548	552,709	137,827
1950	909,343	492,028	485,211	690,389	144,561
1951	928,330	474,158	458,124	489,376	133,305
1952	[2] 924,400	[2] 492,000	[2] 430,000	[3] 547,109	[3] 159,150

[2] Estimated.

[3] January-November, inclusive.

Prepared by Base Metals Branch, Minerals Division, Bureau of Mines, Interior Department, Feb. 10, 1953.

REESTABLISH CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let us reestablish the confidence of the American investors and workingmen in the Congress of the United States.

For the information of Members of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks my statement before the Finance Committee of the Senate on this important subject of protection for workingmen and the investors through a duty or import fee, based on fair and reasonable competition, which would establish a floor under wages and investments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA—SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in my opinion the Finance Committee of the United States Senate can and should be the safeguard of the economic system of this Nation. The question particularly before us today is that of foreign trade.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The Constitution of the United States charges the Congress with the responsibility of regulating foreign trade and this committee is charged generally with the subject that is covered by the bill before us that relates to foreign trade.

Mr. Chairman, the whole tone of the President's message yesterday laid down the policy of constructive plans to encourage the initiative of our citizens. He was equally positive in rejecting secret military treaties at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. While he did not mention the name of these places, it was generally taken for granted that he included them.

The President could well have included secret economic treaties made at Geneva, Switzerland, and later at Torquay, England, by that same State Department.

NO AMERICANS ALLOWED

Mr. Chairman, no American workers, investors nor Members of Congress were allowed to attend the Torquay Economic Conference sponsored by our State Department any more than they were allowed to attend the military conferences at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. It was under these conditions that the agreement was made with Chile at Geneva, Switzerland, to reduce the tariff on copper. The floor under wages and investments in that important industry of 4 cents per pound reduced to the arbitrary and meaningless amount of 2 cents a pound.

LONG-RANGE WAGE EQUALIZING POLICY NEEDED

Now, Mr. Chairman, the crux of the question seems to be whether the Congress should resolve the equalizing medium between the wage standard of living, here and abroad, whenever the foreign price is higher, or whenever we do not produce sufficient copper.

In other words, the point has been made here several times that you only need a tariff on a product when you have an oversupply.

OBJECTIVES—STATE DEPARTMENT

To arrive at a wise conclusion, objectives must be clear and well defined. The objectives of the State Department have been clearly to admit certain products of their own choosing of the foreign low-wage standard of living for the products produced by our own standard of living working people, and therefore remake the industrial map of the United States of America.

It is easy to do that. By manipulating that protection that makes up roughly the differential between the wage living standard here and abroad, you can remake the wage standard of living in this country and we have been engaged in doing that for 20 long years. The thing they have done in many cases to hold this industry to a certain point and not let it fall entirely—and we are talking about minerals, which is in that field—was to provide certain kinds of subsidies, and when we have emergencies—and they have had them almost continuously—to fix prices, premium prices, short amortization periods, guaranteed unit prices, loaning the money direct to the operator, and many other subterfuges to keep the industry from dying entirely but not allowing it to stand on its own feet. Such a fallacy as the State Department has followed

puts all investors in jeopardy and discourages venture capital in the particular business and the policy discourages such investments in the business since it is a sharp-shooting method and no assurance can be given any business that it will not be the next on the list.

CONGRESS DISCOURAGES PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

I might say that Congress, to the extent of its machinations in the copper field and other entries into this field has encouraged that feeling. Congress has in its power to lay down the principle upon which the protection of the workingmen and investors will be based that will encourage the investment of venture capital.

Venture capital is the only kind of capital that goes into a mining business until the soundness is proved in that particular mine. In other words, it is just like a wildcatter in the oil field, the prospector and the explorer.

Unless they have reasonable assurance that over the long years stretching ahead of them, where they have been spending money without return, that when they find this ore there will be an adequate return, then the money will not be spent.

FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Such a floor under wages and investments should be flexible and adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and should be, Mr. Chairman, without any doubt, in the hands of an agency of Congress. It always was in the hands of an agency of Congress, created by Congress, created by the legislative branch of the Government—not the executive branch of the Government or the judicial branch of the Government, but by the legislative branch of the Government. That was the Tariff Commission.

Now whatever you call it, whether you call it a foreign trade authority or Tariff Commission, that is immaterial. Whether you call a tariff a cow or an orange or an import fee it does not make any difference. The principle is there and must be maintained if you are to maintain your standard of living without a continual war, or emergencies, upon which you can base your reason for continually raising taxes and issuing more bonds to buy everything in sight.

OBJECTIVES—CONGRESS

The objective, Mr. Chairman, then of the Congress would be to maintain our own economic integrity and encourage the domestic production of strategic minerals and materials in the interests of national defense and our national economy.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is to develop new copper supplies in the United States. In the mining industry you must have prospectors. You must have investors who are willing to put up their money for exploration. To keep these men in the field at their own expense they must have reasonable assurance that they are not going to be destroyed from Washington, either by the legislative or the executive department.

I point out again, the executive department is always fighting for more power. I hope we have passed the peak of that fighting for power, and naturally, of course, the Congress in days gone by probably fought for power. Even the Supreme Court has been accused of trying to make law through decisions. I am not a lawyer and I will not comment on that.

CONGRESS SHOULD REGAIN ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWER

However, if we could just get back to the Constitution of the United States and let the Congress of the United States regulate that which it says it must regulate, in this case I feel there would be very little difficulty.

To keep these men, exploration organizations and prospectors, in the field at their own expense, they must have reasonable assurance that they are not going to be destroyed from either the executive or the legislative department in Washington. To have large mines you must first have small mines. For small mines you must have prospects.

PROSPECTOR—SMALL MINE—LARGE MINE

I would say over 35 years of observation and experience, perhaps 500 prospects may yield a small mine. Every one of those prospects represents the buried hopes of some prospector. Perhaps he goes on, gets another stake and goes to any other prospect. While he is digging in that prospect and until it pinches out on him or until someone convinces him it is hopeless, his full hope is buried in that one prospect. Five hundred of them would be a minimum for a small mine.

Perhaps 100 small mines—a prospect where some engineer might come in and recommend to a company with whom he has connections or an individual would spend $500 or $1,000 or $5,000 or whatever it would take—take 100 of those small mines and it would produce a larger mine. I expect if the record were searched, it would be nearer 200 or 300. All along are strewn the hopes of these men who are trying to do this. Why do they stay with it? They do it because prospecting, exploration, and mining gets to be a disease once they are in it and they have that bag of gold or they think they have it at the end of the rainbow. That is what keeps them going. Lately we have not been developing many of those men because for 20 years there has been no hope because we removed the bag of gold at the end of the rainbow. Instead, what you do is move into Washington and try to get next to some Government department to loan you the money and guarantee a unit price and a short amortization period and maybe other emoluments so that what you are doing is furnishing the know-how—if in fact you have it and a lot of them get the money who do not have it. The result is that the taxpayers of the United States are in the business whether they like it or not. That, of course, we have all kicked about, and that is one of the reasons why taxes are too high and appropriations are too high.

GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY TARIFF

The Government does not pay the tariff. That has been established here before this committee time and again. That is true on any product imported for the use of the Government or the stockpile. The President has that power and the power has been exercised.

If any material is imported by a private concern selling its products to the Government for national defense, the tariff would be paid to the Government and charged back to it through the manufactured product. In any case, the cost of the raw materials in proportion to the labor and other costs going to the manufactured article is comparatively small.

I want to refer briefly here to a remark that is made in editorials and articles in newspapers, who either mistakenly or otherwise support such a policy, to the effect that the original tariff was $40 a ton on copper. That sounds like an awful lot of money. But I would point out that the tariffs on the brass products that are manufactured are 15 or 64 percent. There is copper in something like a lipstick that costs a dollar, the copper content would be so small you can hardly measure it, but still, let us say it was half an ounce. What would 50 percent ad valorem on that amount to per ton? Nearer $10,000 or $15,000 a ton, I would say. So I agree fully with Senator FLANDERS that it has no possible connection with the flow of copper.

NEED CONSISTENT CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Of course, the point is continually made and has been made before this committee this time, and it was made 2 years ago when this matter was up for extension, by the advocates of free trade on a certain product, that since we do not currently produce enough copper for our own use, we must eliminate the protection to the domestic producer. In fact concerning any product which is in short supply, free trade should be the rule.

The point is further made that when we reach the point of full and adequate domestic production for the domestic market, then such product or industry must have protection.

The utter fallacy and futility of such a policy is fortunately readily apparent. The argument falls of its own weight. The conclusion is inescapable, if you take that philosophy, then, that if they believe that in the fields of minerals, precision instruments, crockery, and dozens of other essential products and industries, such industries must prove their ability to produce to the saturation point of the American market in competition with the products of low-wage foreign labor before protection will be afforded them.

CHURCHILL CLAIMED THE "TRADE, NOT AID" SLOGAN

It is a preposterous statement. They are selling it to the country through such slogans as reciprocal trade, trade, not aid, and all the preposterous slogans that, in the first place, Americans rarely invent. The last one, trade, not aid, is the only one recently that I have seen Mr. Churchill claim. He said when he landed in America that what they meant by trade, not aid, was lower American tariffs. I quoted him in a release.

In other words, it was not an American slogan. I have a pile of photostats from national magazines and editorials which covered this country nearly a foot deep immediately following the election. Mostly they were in the weeks immediately following the week of the 17th of November. That week was the thickest wave that went out, selling trade, not aid.

In other words, they were telling us to milk the taxpayers of this country and give them the money.

They would let us off the hook for a certain amount of that money if we would give them our markets or a source of the income that we have.

REQUIRES YEARS TO DEVELOP A MINE OR A MINER

It requires, as I have already stated, years to develop a mine or a miner. A miner is like a watchmaker or is like a mechanic or anyone else. It takes years to develop a good one. Mere technical information is not sufficient. Nor is it very much necessary. Experience is necessary for a workingman in a mine.

Four or five years is necessary to develop a mine.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked in the mines. I have worked in the mills.

The first job I had in a mill was using a No. 2 shovel on a concrete floor, on the mill floor. I finally worked up to the filters, which is not a highly technical job. You do not have to understand all the effects of the chemicals but you have to know the proportions to mix. Many of us learned that before we went to the universities.

You cannot develop, as I have already said, a mine during an emergency. It has to be done over a period of years. The history of nearly all the large mines will show anywhere from three or four to a half-dozen organizations and individuals who have wrecked themselves and their fortunes in working in the mines. It is like taking up a homestead. It sounds nice to take up a homestead out in the sagebrush. About the third fellow who gets it will make something out of it. The other two fade out of the picture for some reason.

The representative of the Tariff Commission here yesterday testified that some of the mines the Government is financing or supporting in one way or another would require

as long as 7 years to bring into production. I would say that is not uncommon. I think they are very lucky and they will find these mines they are bringing in like the Yerington one were very well prospected, as much as could have been done with nominal finances, long before these companies came in who now have the Government's support. I would say they would be lucky if they could do it within 7 years, and after all the work had been expended.

The Anaconda Co. will require about 5 or 6 years, counting their exploration work and expenditure, before they go into production.

As a matter of fact, they went through all this work before they were even willing to take the support from the Government including the short amortization period and guaranteed unit price to work the mines for them.

NEED GOING-CONCERN MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Chairman [Mr. MILLIKIN], you are from a mining State and you know the record is a familiar one in the development of mining properties. This time that it takes to develop a mining property; a long time is the rule and not the exception. Nothing but experience develops a prospect or a mine. Years and not months are required for the job. Therefore, we must have a going-concern mining industry. How can you do that? By a Congress whose duty it is to establish a definite policy relating to the domestic production and foreign production and foreign trade and allowing such policy to become the settled principle upon which the potential investor of venture capital can depend. Congress set the precedent in establishing the Interstate Commerce Commission, on principle. The railroads had for many years treated shippers as individuals making concessions as pleased them, every road having a different rate in many cases and almost a different rate for every principal shipper.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY SIMILAR TO ICC

Congress established the ICC, the Interstate Commerce Commission, to have jurisdiction over all railroad rates and set down a definite policy to be followed. What was that policy? It was the principle of "a reasonable return" on the investment. They did not say that a rate should be a certain amount here, and a certain amount there, but they said that there should be a reasonable return on the investment and they set up the ICC to study what that investment was, and to establish a reasonable return.

Mr. Chairman, I served 8½ years on the State regulatory body of my State and have held many hearings for the Interstate Commerce Commission. The principle works.

Congress could do exactly the same thing in this field. It could say to the Tariff Commission, or the Foreign Trade Authority, or whatever they wanted to set up with that responsibility—certainly not the State Department—and say to them, "You shall determine the tariff or the import fee, or whatever you choose to call that differential between the production cost in this country and abroad due mostly to the difference in the wage living standards here and abroad; you shall determine it on a basis of fair and reasonable competition." That is what they could do. Put the responsibility where it belongs. Let them go on principle.

There are competent men in the Tariff Commission. I have not reviewed the list very recently but the only difficulty with them in the last 20 years is that you have had a State Department and a Tariff Commission—at least two or three members of it—who have definite ideas on how it ought to be done. They have no right to intrude their ideas on how it ought to be done. The Congress should establish the policy as to how the Commission should proceed, then they are the technicians to do the work.

They (the State Department) do have a right under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which is not reciprocal at all, and the two words do not occur in the act, to manipulate tariffs. The act is a 1934 Trade Agreements Act and it is simply an act that transferred from the long experienced Tariff Commission, the responsibility of fixing tariffs to a State Department that has no interest in, or knowledge of, industry.

They have some foreign policy where they think they can trade certain industries to foreign nations to bring about free trade.

STATE DEPARTMENT ESTABLISHED FREE TRADE

Congress did not set this free-trade policy. The executive department set it through the State Department. In other words, the mere transfer of the responsibility of setting these tariffs did not establish a free-trade policy. However, Congress made the mistake of bestowing that power on a State Department that had free-trade ideas. Therefore they were free to carry them out.

They proceeded, of course, to lower practically all tariffs below that point of the differential of cost of production here and abroad due to the differences in the wage standards of living. That has the effect of free trade, even if it is only a few percentage points below that differential.

CONGRESS MUST REGAIN ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Now, Congress, in my humble opinion, must take cognizance of the effect of transferring its constitutional responsibility to the State Department and regain and accept its responsibility. It must return that responsibility to its own agent, the Tariff Commission. If they want to change the Tariff Commission in any respect, they have full power to do it, and lay down the policy which it is to follow, just as it did in the case of the ICC.

NO QUESTION OF HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has never been any question in the minds of the people who want to protect the investor and the workingmen, of a high or a low tariff. You have that thrown at you from every side—that you want to put a fence around the United States; that you want to preclude the entry of all products. Nothing of the kind is contemplated. Of course, an industry may have that wish at times, but no one who is charged with the responsibility of such a policy wants to do it. What they want is a tariff or import fee, or whatever you choose to call that differential, to be based on a fair and reasonable competitive basis where the foreign countries have equal access to our markets but no advantage.

Congress must return the responsibility to its own agent, the Tariff Commission, or whatever we choose to call its own agent.

The policy laid down should be that of a flexible tariff or import fee, and be continuously adjusted upon the basis of fair and reasonable competition. When foreign wage-living standards approached our own then free trade would be almost automatic. Most other countries have this system, but we do not.

There is no tariff on products which we cannot produce or do not produce in sufficient quantities for competition, such as tin, nickel, natural rubber, spices, hemp, and so forth. No one has ever contemplated such a thing. That would simply be a tariff for revenue only.

However, we are past the point of sharpshooting. You cannot say to the zinc and lead and copper producers that you must have free trade because there is short supply.

You cannot say to the textile industry that you will lower the tariff to allow England and Scotland and other competitors to come in with their low-cost labor, making it profitable for those countries to hold their labor costs down.

In other words, if they paid the difference of the wage-living standards into the United States Treasury a while it would not be long until the wages and the standard of living would go up and create a market in their own country.

THE WOOL INDUSTRY

Now, Mr. President, I want to show further the utter fallacy of the theory that anything in short supply must be under free trade. Of course, when you take the tariff off then you are always going to be in short supply. The argument falls of its own weight.

I just had a wire this morning from K. C. (Casey) Jones. I have not seen K. C. (Casey) Jones, who is the secretary of the National Wool Growers Association, for almost a year. This is a wire from Denver, Colo., dated the third:

"Allied Wool Industry Committee with National Wool Growers Association, National Wool Marketing Corp. and Western Wool Handlers Association, meeting in Denver today, adopted resolution of policy your statement on foreign trade as made by you in Reno, May 9 1952."

What was that statement, Mr. Chairman? The wool people of the United States, represented nationally in Denver, your own home town. What is this principle they adopted on the third? This is it. It is taken from domestic and foreign principles that I laid down in one of my speeches.

"Promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingmen or the American farmer or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry."

Now, Mr. Chairman, to establish the utter fallacy that the tariff should only refer to an industry where there is a full production for the domestic market or an overproduction, I have here the wool production for the year's domestic production 1949, 1950, 1951, and the consumption for those years, both domestic and imported. I wanted to submit it for the record.

Year	Domestic produced	Imported	Consumption
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1949	120,376,000	272,503,000	500,361,000
1950	119,086,000	466,848,000	634,802,000
1951	117,915,000	361,216,000	484,157,000

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question of wool is not before us. It will be before we are through. It is a strategic material because we do not produce the amount we this year need. So what did we do? We passed the tariff in 1947 which was vetoed by the President and then we passed a subsidy suggested by him. But the subsidy has long since passed out of all usefulness because it does not make up the difference and we are going out of the sheep business and wool business in the United States of America. Of course, we will never entirely go out of it but there is no incentive to go into it. No one in his right mind is going to buy a band of sheep because of the continual fussing with the tariff in the Congress and in the State Department. The free trade on wool together with the subsidy caused us to stabilize the world wool market with our own taxpayers' money.

WORKERS' WAGES—CHILE

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was particular reference to the production of copper in Chile, which is the principal exporter to the United States and will be for some time until probably we are in full production or increased production in South Africa. One of our domestic companies is interested in Africa, and I think some English companies, and there is a tremendous potential production there. This thing has only started.

The Chilean copper worker receives an average of about 146 pesos per day. The free market exchange of the Chilean peso fluctuates at around 125 pesos to $1. Therefore, if a copper worker wanted to convert his wages into dollars he would receive about $1.17 per day. In comparison, the purchasing power of the Chilean copper worker to the American copper worker is $1.17 to $15. We could say roughly $15. There may be some of the wages under $15. Say $11 to $15 in this country. That ($15) was the average wage paid to copper miners in the United States for the month of November 1942. November 1952 was the most recent month averaged by the Department of Labor. The figure of $15 per day includes some overtime pay. It is not important except to show that a worker in Chile receives about one-tenth.

Most of the 35.5 cents paid for Chilean copper goes to the Government of Chile. The purchasing power of the workers' peso is only $1.17 per day, and the copper companies gross only about 8 cents per pound on copper.

I want to say right here, Mr. Chairman, this information is being gained independently of the copper companies who have those contracts, and they are subject to any detail correction.

* * * * *

Senator MALONE. The net receipts for the copper companies is much less. It costs the copper producer on an average of about $7.54 per day per worker for wages, not including benefits. Yet the purchasing power of the wages for the worker is only $1.17 and the difference goes to the Chilean Government. We are in fact subsidizing the Chilean Government. I am not commenting on whether it is a good or a bad idea, but I am giving you what I believe to be the facts.

Of the current Chilean price of 35.5 cents per pound, 16.5 cents reverts to the Chilean Government. The remaining 19 cents accrues to the producing companies. The method of imposition of this tax is as follows: A base price of 13.5 cents per pound for electrolytic copper; 13.25 cents for fire-refined copper, and 13.125 cents for bessemer copper is established by law 1760 as amended. That portion of the sale price between 13.5 cents and 24.5 cents is divided equally between the companies and the Government. It is rather an intricate set-up, Mr. Chairman. The companies have made a contract with Chile which apparently sets the wage of the Chilean copper worker at more than $7 per 8-hour day, but the exchange rates included in the contracts make it possible for the Government of Chile to receive most of this wage, because on the free exchange of pesos for dollars the Chilean copper worker's daily wage would amount to only about $1.17 per day.

The income received by the companies which is subject to this tax is as follows: Income in excess of 13.5 cents per pound is deductible from taxable income for the purpose of computing income tax.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in closing—and I hope that the former Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Danaher, or any member of the copper companies or anyone else may feel free to ask questions. I think I am tough enough to take it and I know it is a tough subject, and it is going to get tougher.

SAME SITUATION—ZINC AND LEAD

What I am concerned about is that we are going to face the same situation with particular reference to zinc and lead in a very little while. The junior Senator from Nevada has recently been appointed chairman of the Minerals and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the distinguished Senator from Colorado, the chairman of this committee, is a member of it, and we have our work cut out for us. We cannot read the menu backward. We have to go into this thing and determine a principle which will keep us in the mining business in this country. We have to find out how that principle fits into the principle of people in other industries in this country. In other words, how we fit into the intricate economy of this Nation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, to illustrate the steps leading us into the one-world trap—I hope we will not be led, but there is a plan to do the job.

I quote from an article by Douglas Larsen, the NEA staff correspondent:

The offshore procurement phase of America's foreign-aid program is now considered the most vulnerable part of the Mutual Security Program with the incoming Republicans promising drastic budget cuts.

This is unfortunate, too, Mutual Security officials say.

He then proceeds to outline the different phases of these expenditures which are calculated to take the place of the Marshall plan, the ECA, and other appropriations.

He says in a later paragraph:

Even the United States labor groups have a motive for opposing offshore purchasing. One of the selling points on the program has been the claim that labor costs in Europe are about one-third of what they are in the United States. With labor costs the biggest chunk of production costs it makes the end product considerably cheaper if purchased in Europe, the argument goes.

THEY MEAN CHEAPER LABOR

Mr. President, it is said that we must get these materials, not confining ourselves to copper, but referring to minerals, crockery, textiles, and other products, whenever we can get them from a nation which can produce them better. What do they mean by better? They mean manufactured at a lower cost, by labor working for lower wages.

It is an attack on the workingmen of America, and it leaves the domestic investor without any protection for his product.

All I have ever heard anyone in business ask, is for an equalizer—it may be called by any name—a duty, impost, excise tax, tariff, import fee—but have something that equalizes the costs of production, that difference in the cost of production mostly due to the one factor of the difference in the wage standards and standards of living here and abroad. They want a flexible duty or import fee based upon fair and reasonable competition which would be lowered as world living standards improved.

FOREIGN INVESTORS—OR FOREIGN PURCHASERS

Mr. President, those who are mostly interested in evading this issue, or writing down the tariffs, duties, or import fees, or abolishing them, are those directly interested in purchasing commodities abroad or in establishing branch plants behind the low-wage curtain to manufacture or produce the products where they can be made cheaper, and lay them down in the United States of America, with the cheap water shipping, at costs lower than those products can be manufactured under our wage standard of living.

FACE THE ISSUE

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with anyone who faces the issue. If anyone alleges we are living on too high a standard, that we have priced ourselves out of the market—if the desire is to lower wages, if the desire is to lower the standards of living of the American workingmen, and to stabilize the costs at the foreign level, I have no quarrel with him. But I do have a quarrel with the man who says he wants to uphold the standard of living and at the same time put the American producer into direct competition with goods produced by the workingmen and investors of this country competing with those products manufactured by men working for $2 wages, 50-cent wages, or $5-per-day wages. That is the man with whom I have a quarrel.

TWENTY YEARS OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. President, the country and the workingmen and the investors have been badgered for 20 years with legislation that could not wait for adequate consideration.

I say without any fear of contradiction that there is not a Senator on this floor, and I include myself, who thoroughly understands the machinations and the intrigues and the manipulations of the currency systems of all foreign countries, which include South America, Asia, and Europe to defeat the agreements made with them.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to point out that legislation which did not pass this body has seldom injured this Nation, but that the hasty, the ill-considered, so-called emergency legislation, which did pass, has done almost irreparable injury to the basic principles and concepts of our people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there was an agreement that nothing so controversial as this amendment appears to be was to be brought up during this period, I am constrained to believe that the most orderly thing to do, perhaps, would be for me to withdraw my amendment so that the Senate may proceed with its action on the bill. I doubt very much if a quorum could be obtained. If we were inclined to filibuster, I have no doubt that my amendment would prevail, because it is very reasonable. However, under the circumstances, I think it would be best for all concerned if the amendment which I offered were withdrawn, and I now withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from

Nebraska has done a very gracious and a very proper thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 568) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 13, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate, Saturday, February 7, 1953, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Donold B. Lourie, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1953:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Allen Welsh Dulles, of New York, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Howard H. Gordon, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned ensign

John J. Dermody, effective January 27, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 408, Eighty-second Congress, Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be major

Italo W. Daniele, MC, O424202.

To be captains

Merrill M. Becker, MC, O1705373.
James C. Beyer, MC, O1920534.
Robert A. Gregg, MC, O976574.
Frank W. Hardy, MC, O975901.
Harold S. Kolmer, Jr., MC, O993979.
Wallace R. LeBourdais, MC, O1922384.
Harold C. Murphree, MC, O1718783.
Oscar L. Sapp III, MC, O1918807.

To be first lieutenants

Fae M. Adams, MC, K1891744.
Franklin D. Bell, DC, O984151.
Robert J. Byrne, VC, O1715750.
William A. Cameron, JAGC, O966075.
Francis M. Canter, MSC, O988538.
Bruce T. Coggins, JAGC, O543435.
Garland R. Farmer, VC, O938989.
George F. Harding III, MSC, O980804.
Bryce O. Hartman, MSC, O988527.
Warren G. Hoag, VC, O992472.
Reid W. Kennedy, Jr., JAGC, O961352.
Kay W. Lorentzen, VC, O991125.
Russell E. Mason, MSC, O1598631.
Stewart J. McConnell, VC, O2202613.
Erich C. Mehnert, VC, O1718887.
James R. Olin, VC, O2208950.
Raymond H. Osterholtz, DC, O1765661.
John C. Powell, Jr., JAGC, O552716.
Erven A. Ross, VC, O939684.
Howard B. Slider, Jr., VC, O1724873.
Robert A. Sturtevant, VC, O1776019.

To be second lieutenants

Elizabeth A. Galt, WMSC, M2919.
William F. Gilley, MSC, O1877430.

The following-named person for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army, in the grade of captain, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Aloysius M. Knier, O931958.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be captain

Richard J. Hillebrand, O31065.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Sammy J. Black, O964629.
Joseph M. Ebbs, O2210008.
Lavern R. Riesterer, O982775.

To be second lieutenants

James Bain, Jr., O1184618.
Gerald H. Britten, O1931357.
Kent L. Buck, O1875496.
Milton G. Carey, O2028668.
James M. Compton, O1883294.
Leo M. Dannemiller, O1880289.
David F. Edwards, O1820960.
James A. Evrard, O1926026.
Sammie L. Greene, O2205866.
Francis P. Gross III, O1889775.
Rodolfo Haeussler, O1887834.
Branch R. Hammock, O2203116.
George R. Hannah, O2204930.
Thomas J. Hennesy III, O1926139.
Charles R. Hogge, Jr., O1877437.
Lowell A. Holcomb, O999817.
Harold R. Johnson, Jr., O1887673.
Keith R. Kerr, O1885595.
Jack H. Leach, O1690976.
James L. Lester, O1887837.
Alexander Lopkoff, Jr., O1880262.
George W. Love, O982819.
Brutus A. Lowery, Jr., O2205931.
Francis J. Lynch, O1890035.
Kenneth L. Mann.
James J. Martin, O1885420.
Oliver J. Medaris, O1925211.
Oscar G. Mink, O1926300.
Bernard R. Moseley, O1880265.
Charles K. Nichols, O2038012.
John Ozaki, O1887501.
Joseph O. Patterson, O2210663.
Robert H. Redditt, O1887839.
Lee W. Roberts, O1925753.
Joseph H. Schmalhorst, O1882238.
Frederick W. Siewers, Jr., O1892344.
Charles R. Smith, Jr., O1916182.
Mario L. Urruela, O1887690.
Glenn E. Walls, O2004754.
Jerry L. Weikert, O1926001.
Hubert J. Whitener, O1925604.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective March 3, 1953, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Joseph P. Seymoe.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Charles F. Hudson, Jr.
Thomas P. Joyce, Jr., O1888088.
Charles E. Larason, O1916124.
Edward C. Lungren
Theodore R. Moody, O1888005.
Thomas L. Stanford, Jr.
Thomas R. Sutton
Sam S. Harrell
Morton F. Brann
Johnny J. Churchill
William P. Ferguson
Edward C. Fike
Clyde Fisher, Jr.
Allan J. Francisco, O1338806.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ralph A. Tudor, of Palo Alto, Calif., to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Fred G. Aandahl, of Litchville, N. Dak., to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Orme Lewis, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Clarence A. Davis, of Lincoln, Nebr., to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Craig R. Sheaffer, of Iowa, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Howard H. Gordon, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 10, 1953:

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Robert Kiyoichi Murakami, of Hawaii, to be third judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

John Carson, of Michigan, to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

J. Howard Rossbach, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATION

Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Joseph A. Mason, pastor, First Methodist Church, Rushville, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father in heaven, in whom is wisdom and strength and understanding, we reverently and humbly invoke Thy blessing upon the Congress of the United States and upon the people whom they represent.

Keep us ever mindful, O God, of those who are venturing their lives in our behalf, that whether by life or by death they may win for the whole world the

fruits of their sacrifice and a holy peace.

Grant and continue unto our Nation legislators who themselves have been taught the wisdom and ways of the kingdom.

Endow all Members of this Congress with a right understanding, a pure purpose, and sound speech.

Enable them to rise above all self-seeking and party zeal that that which they do here may be unto them, and unto Thee, a memorial to their devotion to their country.

Upon this special day, O God, we commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that great humble man whom Thou didst send to lead the Nation through perilous times and who like the Master gave his life to make men free.

We thank Thee, O God, for this high and holy heritage of freedom. Give us grace to claim it humbly and proclaim it proudly and to ever preserve it diligently and faithfully through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 9, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 568. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing sympathy for the peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium in the disaster suffered by them.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 12, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN E. MOSS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS LET IN CANADA

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I called the attention of the Members of the House to a fact which rather startled me, namely, that the Navy was letting a contract for construction of certain small ships in Canada to a firm in Nova Scotia. Since that time I have discovered a policy exists which I think needs review. In other words, in March 1950, the Secretary of Defense issued a directive to the Air Force, the Army, and Navy, whereby each one of them should spend in their procurement programs $100,000,000 a year in Canada. This action was taken on the recommendation of the United States-Canada Permanent Joint Defense Council with the United States Munitions Board concurring. One of the reasons, as I understand it, back of this directive was to bolster the economy of Canada.

At that time perhaps their economy did need bolstering, but I do not believe such is the situation at this time; therefore, I am writing to the Secretary of Defense asking him to review this procurement policy. It seems to me that the economy of our American workers is the one that needs bolstering at the present time.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, today in 27 of these United States and 1 Territory on an official holiday, our people are meeting to pay their respects to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, our martyred sixteenth President. That these meetings should be held in every State is, I am sure, the wish of a large majority of our people. Subscribing as I do to this same sentiment, I have today introduced a bill to make February 12 a national legal holiday. This bill, when passed by the Congress will be the final act in binding up the Nation's wounds. I ask that our colleagues across the aisle join in this action to make real and visible the recognition which is in all of our hearts.

May I quote from a sixth-grade history book, used in the Virginia schools, entitled "The Story of Our Country" by West and West, where it says of Lincoln:

In his death the North lost a loved and trusted leader but the South lost infinitely more—a great-hearted, sorely needed friend.

Jefferson Davis, in speaking of Lincoln's death, said as follows:

Next to the defeat of the Confederacy the heaviest blow that fell upon the South was the assassination of Lincoln. (Jefferson Davis in The Growth of the American People and Nation, by Mary G. Kelty.)

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

BETTER HIGHWAYS

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I obtained figures this morning which show that the Federal Government collected during calendar 1952 almost $1,000,000,000 from American motorists from Federal gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oil taxes.

Of this huge sum only about $550,000,000, or 50 cents of each dollar collected from motor fuel taxes, was used for highway construction. More than half a billion dollars of these revenues were diverted to other purposes than road building. This diversion of gasoline and diesel oil taxes to other than road building purposes should be stopped.

More Americans are slain each year on our highways by automobiles than are killed in Korea by enemy bullets. The casualty lists of those maimed and crippled on our streets and highways are longer than those of our battlefield wounded.

Everyone knows that the most effective preventative of death on our highways is better roads. Yet, despite this knowledge, our highway building program appropriations during the past 6 years has remained almost stationary despite the fact that our Federal revenues from highway users in that period have doubled.

With more than 53,000,000 cars already crowding our Nation's streets and highways, an increase of 21,000,000 cars over 1940, our roads are wearing out faster than they are being rebuilt, according to Commissioner MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads. This trend must, in the interest of safety, be changed.

The American people will pay for these better roads whether they obtain them to ride on or not. If the roads are constructed no one can dispute that the taxpayers will pay for them. If they are not built the taxpayers will pay for them just the same in the form of increased doctor, hospital, and repair bills, in increased maintenance and operating costs on their cars, and in higher automobile insurance rates.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 138) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the District of Columbia: SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland.

Committee on House Administration: J. L. PILCHER, Georgia.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: COURTNEY CAMPBELL, Florida.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: JOHN E. MOSS, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House a bill which would give to the Secretary of Commerce authority to control all imports and exports when necessary for the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry.

It is almost unbelievable that such legislation has never been enacted, for the control of imports and exports is so obviously necessary to protect the American economy and the American people from foreign exploitation.

Apparently few individuals, in or out of the Federal Government, are aware that, through the years, the code pertaining to imports and exports has become a hodgepodge, especially with respect to imports.

I have been a Member of this House since January of 1949, and I have yet to find two Government lawyers who will agree what imports, under the various laws, can or cannot be controlled. My bill will end that confusion, for under this measure all imports and all exports can be controlled.

We scarcely need to scratch the top layer of our memories to recall damage done to our country and our people in recent years by unwise imports.

Remember the winter of 1949–50 when the bottom dropped out of the egg market—when Midwest farmers were receiving only 15, 18, and 20 cents a dozen for eggs? What happened? The foreigners-first administration then in power agreed to take about three-fifths of Canada's egg production, and permitted the importation of hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried eggs every month from Communist China, on top of the domestic dried egg surplus stored in the caves of Kansas. Incidentally, that same administration permitted Communist China to ship in those dried eggs for many months after the start of the Korean war, over my repeated protests.

Remember the canned hams from Poland; the canned beef from Argentina at times of drooping livestock prices in the United States; and now 60,000,000 pounds of frozen New Zealand beef, some of it selling for as little as 39 cents a pound in the form of T-bone and sirloin steaks, at a time of a depressed American cattle market?

Remember the textile workers forced into unemployment, especially in the knitted-glove industry, by indiscriminate imports; and now the American bicycle and motorcycle industries crippled by imports, to mention just a few examples?

As for industry-wrecking exports, remember the shortages in the months following Korea? Remember the tons and tons of good American steel, copper, and other metals exported all over the earth to foreigners when our own small-business men, including military contractors and subcontractors, schools, hospitals, roads, and other construction programs went without and marked time, with tens of thousands unemployed as a result of these shortages?

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that these exports were permitted in the face of the so-called Export Control Act of 1949, which has been renewed on a year-to-year basis since it was first enacted. That act ties the hands of the Secretary of Commerce, the administrator, by making it necessary for him to crawl to the State Department for permission to clamp down on exports. That flaw in the act became doubly dangerous alongside an administration more concerned about the possibility of hurting the feelings, or rackets, of foreigners, or in the pursuit of some vague and vacillating foreign policy, than in the welfare of the United States.

The language of my proposed measure makes it clear that as far as exports and imports are concerned, the Secretary of Commerce has only one duty. That is the protection of the American economy and the American people through control of imports and exports. Under this bill, the administrator will not have to consult the State Department, any other agency, or any crackpot internationalist. When he sees American agriculture, labor, or industry injured by imports or exports, he can put a stop to such abuses forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation in the interest of the United States. I urge its enactment at the earliest possible moment.

TAX CUTS AND FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the demand for a drastic reduction in taxes and curtailing of Federal spending has not abated in my district following the election of a Republican President. The number of letters and telegrams, together with written petitions and appeals all dealing more or less with the problem of tax cuts and Federal spending, are substantially as great as they were prior to November 4, 1952. All this clearly demonstrates to me that the people are looking to Congress for remedial legislation that will ease and lessen the tax burden which prevails under the present existing Federal taxing authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein a very interesting and elucidative editorial taken from the Chicago Daily News of February 9, 1953. The editorial is helpful in that it analyzes the facts having a decided bearing on economies in all Government agencies. The editorial follows:

TAXES OR DEFICITS

President Eisenhower's call for thrift was followed promptly by a stern White House directive for immediate economies in all Government agencies. There is other evidence that the President intends to make stability of the dollar, by avoiding deficits, a major concern of his administration.

The next step is revision of the $78,600,000,000 budget prepared by Mr. Truman. Until drastic reduction is accomplished, General Eisenhower's goal of restoring the dollar's value will continue to dictate a policy of opposing tax reduction.

There are two schools of thought on how best to approach the problem of Government economy. One is to reduce taxes first, on the theory that Congress will then have less to spend. The other is to cut spending, and then adjust taxes downward to the reduced need.

General Eisenhower was elected on the theory that he is a conservative and a competent administrator. It seems to us that such a man cannot fail to recognize that lower taxes do not necessarily mean reduced spending.

The classic congressional attitude is: "Never vote against an appropriation nor for a tax bill." Politicians find it much easier to countenance deficits than to deny requests for funds.

In this, however, the legislators have generally taken their lead from the executive branch. It seems likely, therefore, that the new budget will be just about what General Eisenhower says it should be, although Congress may take the bit in its teeth on tax reduction.

The President's success at economy will be measured by his ability to trim the sums allotted for defense. That Department has asked $46,300,000,000, exclusive of foreign aid.

Furthermore, $10,000,000,000 must be trimmed from the total Truman budget to bring it down to estimated revenue in the 1953–54 fiscal year.

There are complications in the picture. First, of course, is the uneasy peace, which makes armed strength a first consideration. There is also some fear that, after 20 years of inflation, a sudden application of the brakes might rock the economy uncomfortably.

Regardless of theoretical conclusions, however, it is impossible to avoid a $10,000,000,000 deficit without taking a big whack at the defense budget. The issue there is how much can be trimmed without weakening our military strength. But informed sources believe General Eisenhower knows the extent to which the Pentagon has had both Congress and the White House buffaloed.

Quite aside from waste in procurement, the armed services have gotten themselves into a personnel situation that would be comic if it were not so expensive. A congressional hearing developed evidence that they are as heavy in brass as the palace guard of a banana republic.

The various services have about four times as many higher-ranking commissioned officers now, in proportion to enlisted men, as they had at the peak of World War II. The Regular Air Force has more colonels than first and second lieutenants combined.

The Navy, directly involved in the hearing in an effort to avoid demoting 5,400 junior officers, disputed the overall figures. But the very fact that such figures can be disputed indicates a chaotic personnel situation.

Economy in defense personnel, as well as in procurement and construction, could even result in a more efficient, hence better, defense. It can certainly make for happier taxpayers.

FOREIGN OIL OR AMERICAN COAL

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

Mr. Speaker, Illinois is the Nation's fourth largest coal producer, and well over one-third of the entire State output comes from the mines in my congressional district. The coal industry is our principal medium of livelihood, and as such is the largest contributor to the whole economy of this area.

Last year coal production in the State of Illinois aggregated about 46,000,000 tons, as compared with a total of 54,000,000 tons the previous year. At first glance a loss of 8,000,000 tons may not appear so spectacular as to be cause for alarm, but if we examine conditions in the coal areas a little closer, we will quickly realize that it has had a very serious effect upon the State's 20,000 miners and their wives and children.

If we apply that 15-percent decrease to my district, the picture will come into somewhat clearer focus, inasmuch as it is sufficient to leave more than a thousand of our miners without a single day's work for the entire year. That is how a 15-percent drop in production affects the working populace of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Illinois, and, of course, you readily understand that such conditions create an unfavorable chain reaction on the general economy of the area that is ultimately felt in every grocery store, barber shop, gasoline station, and in every other business house. For that matter, it is also very definitely reflected in the revenues of our churches and schools, for men who are out of work do not have the wherewithal to contribute to the upkeep of God's places of worship regardless of the intensity of the desire to do so, nor can they meet obligations of the State and community responsible for the furtherance of their educational systems.

When such conditions prevail, I believe it the duty of the Congressman responsible to those citizens to look into the matter and to exert every means at his disposal in their behalf. I have investigated the problems that are creating hardship in my district, and I have come to the conclusion that one of the major factors exerting a depressing influence on the coal industry in an otherwise brisk economy has its origin right here in the Capital of the United States. I find that this Government, by its failure to set a sane limit on the amount of foreign residual oil that may be brought into this country, is answerable for the distress that is invading our coal communities.

Residual fuel oil is competitive with coal for the generation of electric power and for other industrial uses. The amount of such oil imported into the east coast of this country last year was sufficient to inflict a 31,000,000-ton loss on coal's markets, and no relief is in sight unless this Congress acts to curb this tidal wave of disaster and poverty that has its origin in foreign refineries.

While the imports do not reach our Midwest markets, coal districts which regularly serve the east coast have found their output backing up and are thus turning to Illinois and surrounding areas for market outlets. In consequence, much of our business is choked off, and that situation is the prelude to shutdown mines and unemployment.

I ask the Members of this legislative body to join in damming the flood of foreign residual oil that is unfairly seizing coal's markets and bringing impoverishment to coal communities throughout the Nation.

PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several Members discussed the parking problem confronting Members and employees of the House.

In this connection, I would like to commend the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Russell, for making a study of the problem in an effort to find a solution.

The House parking lot is usually crowded to overflowing. This is especially true when the House is in session.

The only answer to that problem is more parking facilities.

It seems to me that it would be advisable to consider underground parking or perhaps a three-story structure on the House lot. Two stories could be above ground. The grade at the lot would permit an underground drive-in at street level from Delaware Avenue. On South Capitol Street the second floor could be reached by a drive-in at street level with a ramp leading to the top floor. That would triple the parking space at the New House lot, two-thirds of which would be indoors.

The traffic and parking situation is a difficult one everywhere here in Washington, as it is throughout the Nation.

There are many things that recent Democratic administrations have been charged with unjustly, but they cannot escape blame for growing parking and and traffic problems. The increasing number of automobiles is the best evidence of the high living standards that people have won over the New Deal years.

Seriously, a three-story structure on the present House lot would cost less than buying land. It would be more convenient for House Members, and would be a practical approach to cleaning up this mess.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include with my remarks President Eisenhower's message on Boy Scout Week which opened on February 7 and will close on February 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, you, my colleagues, I am sure are aware by this time that Boy Scout Week is being observed throughout the Nation. More than 3,000,000 members of the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating the forty-third anniversary of its founding. Six years after this great youth movement came to America Congress granted it a Federal charter in recognition of its effective program in the development of strong character, and training in physical fitness and alert citizenship.

Since 1910 more than 20,000,000 boys and men have had this training. These former Scouts have stated again and again that what they learned in Scouting has been invaluable in their adult lives.

Some phase of Scouting is open to every American boy who is 8 years of age or over, no matter where he lives or what may be his race, creed, or color.

Scouting is sponsored by churches of all faiths; by service clubs, veterans' posts, schools, and other civic institutions. Scouting is to be found in every American village, town, and city neighborhood. The Boy Scouts of America has also organized Scout groups overseas at military bases and in other locations abroad where American boys live.

The Scouting move has always aimed at making the American boy "physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." Its present crusade, "Forward on liberty's team," is that theme as carried out by four decades of Scouting but adapted to the needs of this generation. I am sure that many of you, my colleagues, perhaps most of you, have either been Boy Scouts or Scouters aiding in this great movement. If you have, you recognize it as one of America's greatest assets. And I need not urge you to do all in your power to promote and extend this movement. If you do your part, this organization, already in this year consisting of more than 3,000,000 American boys and men, will carry on its great tradition. But it will always need your help.

This fact was recognized by President Eisenhower in his first message to the Boy Scouts as their new honorary President. On last Saturday, February 7, he told the 3,000,000 members that—

> If you will follow the Scout oath, America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point President Eisenhower's message for Boy Scout Week, which opened February 7 and closes February 13. It is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

It is with great personal pleasure that I extend to you my warmest congratulations on your forty-third anniversary and greet you on the occasion of Boy Scout Week, 1953:

Your present crusade, Forward on Liberty's Team, is proving to be most effective. Americans everywhere must be proud to know that the Boy Scouts of America registered its three-millionth active member during the past year. I understand that the present membership has now reached a new high of 3,200,000 Scouts, Explorers, and leaders, and that since 1910 there have been 20,200,000 American boys and men enrolled.

This birthday message is addressed to every Scout and leader in the Boy Scouts of America. I urge you all to live up to the high ideals for which scouting stands: your duty as patriotic citizens. If you will follow the Scout oath, America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] may be granted a leave of absence for 10 days from this date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, we are shocked and aggrieved by the disaster that made so many of our friends of the Netherlands homeless and destitute. Our hearts go out to them and we commiserate with them in their suffering.

However, a nation that the Dutch helped to establish must not pause in a gesture of commiseration. We shall act and provide relief for the victims of the disaster. I have introduced today a bill which would admit 25,000 of the sturdy, dependable Dutch farmers and close relatives of Americans who trace their ancestry to the Netherlands.

I urge the Committee on the Judiciary to act on this legislation at their earliest convenience and I hope that the House will follow suit.

It is emergency legislation and should be treated as such. It is an expression of our good will toward the Netherlands and tangible proof of the everlasting bond that unites us with that nation, small in size but great in heart.

DOMESTIC MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak shortly at this time about the current domestic mining industry of basic metals, or rather to the present sad condition of such industry, for only by dint of great determination and ability to overcome great odds does that industry exist, even in its present emaciated form. These comments are not designed to be politically partisan. The present situation has existed for some time now. President Eisenhower has called for sound conservation of our mineral resources in his state of the Union address. He also has called for more trade and less aid. The emphasis on the reciprocal trade program was extension with necessary safeguards for domestic interests. Frankly, I do not know what he means by all of this but I assume that time may bring further explanation. I do know that, in the past, so-called sound conservation of our minerals has meant the closing down of active mines where capital and men had labored and produced. Apparently the closing down program was advanced so that we might pay lip service to international equality in production. I have heard nothing yet from the State Department to indicate any change in that bias. I know that the reduction of tariff allotments, plus currency depreciation, in regards to various metals and ores has meant little but the depression of price for domestic production and the concomitant depression of stored capital, skill, enterprise, going-concern value, and other priceless national assets. Mines once shut down may never reopen due to flooding or other causes, or if reopened it is only accomplished at great waste and expense.

We of the West are criticized for some sort of narrow partisanship, not political, because we have a dedication to the private, and American, development of vital mineral components of our flood tide of goods for use during periods of peace as well as war. Perhaps it is partisanship to insist that vital components should have a short lifeline in an age of submarines and an age when we may not have the usual 2 years of preparation and development to rise out of past blunder and error in the event of war. Another time may find us without friends to hold the line while we get ready to swing our great productive machine into gear. Perhaps it is a loyal partisanship to insist that we have inside U. S. A. an active and going production of all possible metals and materials basic to the sinews of war as well as peace. However, if this is partisanship, then it is that healthy and necessary partisanship so extolled as the motivating force in our sort of free-economic system; the pursuit of enterprising and calculating men who go into the hills and down into the bowels of the earth in the search of necessary ore. It is high time, yes, and long past, that these old-line American enterprisers be given that fair break, Government protection if you will, which is also supposed to be a part of our American way; a free area in which to pursue their objective—their contribution to our economy.

The result has been the outright destruction of the small American producer for the gain of a foreign producer, who ofttimes is the small independent's independent big brother with overseas holdings. We have seen feast or famine, boom or bust, haste and waste, climb up and fall back. Men of lesser stature would long have given up. But not the small independent domestic mineral producer. He is made of sterner stuff. He is a hardy, even hardheaded individual who never gives up trying. He expanded his production in response to frantic and wasteful demand brought up by World War II—with its few submarines—only to be cast aside in favor of foreign producers in an international world program. He again went into the mines in response to the need arising from the Korean war. What then is the result today of his enterprise and patriotism? The same old boom-and-bust world.

The British overshot their demand for lead and ended up with a nice stockpile. Finding this on their hands, they promptly dumped it in bloc lots on the world market and the American price, just approaching an economic level, took a nosedive. The result was as predictable as the rising of the sun. The small American producer sorrowfully has closed shop, discharged vital labor, pulled out of mines and wondered once again how he had been suckered into a game played with loaded dice. Presently American smelters are closing down for a lack of ore, yet price pressure is building up with the end of British dumping and a strike in Australia. Is this the American way of doing business? Are we forever to impoverish and beggar the small American metal producer, who is the key man in any all-out defense effort? Are we to destroy him for the selfish interests of international cartels, state trading agencies and big American holdings overseas?

We have no quarrel with international trade, the old economic law of buying in the more favorable market. We have no quarrel with necessary action to give a helping hand to areas of the earth torn down by war or that just now are coming out of bondage and into their own sunlight. We are fully aware that for some American producers to sell overseas, it is necessary that we buy goods from others. We know trade is a two-way street while aid a one-way avenue to no good end. What we quarrel with is that aggregatiton of policy, geared to these concepts, which has virtually wiped out any small independent domestic metal production, leaving us helplessly dependent on others in a dangerous world. Even now we are paying monopoly prices for vital materials only because we have no alternative. What would it be with the prowling enemy submarine fleet turned loose for war purposes in the oceans of the world?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that I intend to have much more to say on this subject. President Eisenhower has made reference in his message to the necessity for the extension of farm price supports—that wise and basic program insuring to the American farmer equality in the economic arena. We are, all of us, presently properly concerned over the diminishing net farm income. We learned in the twenties what happens when you price the farmer out of the market. Is it not time, then, that we learned as much of the same lesson as applied to the producer of other equally vital raw materials—the family-unit-sized producer of lead, of zinc, of copper, and other key parts of the raw materials of industry? If we are to insure economic equality and parity, and such a program seems to have overwhelming support, as testified to by farm price supports, air-mail payments, ship subsidies, minimum wages, all of which serve to insure a minimum demand to industry, then to me it only makes good

sense, economically and politically, that vital mineral development and production be covered under this protective blanket. I shall do everything in my power to support such a wise modification of the parity program.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for today may follow the other special order and may be extended to 60 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE NAVAL BLOCKADE OF CHINA

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of speculation at this time about a naval blockade or an embargo of shipments to China. It has been my privilege to study the subject of trade with China and the Communist bloc for a long time. A vast network of controls exists now which should be reviewed and analyzed carefully before taking further action. Many rumors about shipments of all kinds of materials to Red China are floating around. We know that trade of a certain nature is carried on by water as well as the regular overland routes of exchange between China and our Allies. China is a very large nation and borders many strange lands in Asia. Russia and the Soviet bloc of course have access to China both by water and land. After studying a large number of factors involved in trade with Red China, I think it would be entirely feasible and practical to take an intermediary step as a basis for future action. This intermediary step might be called operation spotlight which would give us a perfectly legitimate basis for seeing just how present controls are operating; just what is going to China and from whom and in what quantities while simultaneously we step up our negotiations with our Allies to get better international agreements bylateraliy and multilaterally. Operation spotlight could be a very comprehensive check by United States Naval Forces under the United Nations delegated authority of just how the embargo provisions of the Battle Act, Public Law 213, Eighty-second Congress, are working, how agreements in the international coordinating committe controlling trade with China are working and how the United Nations resolution on the same subject are being carried out. Our objective is to win the war; win friends and not win enemies so we must have a firm foundation for future procedure in this most important matter. I firmly believe this effort can provide such a foundation.

I. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF PRESENT CONTROLS REGARDING CHINA?

First, a brief review of present controls involving shipments to China should be made and analyzed. In general they are pretty comprehensive although the United States and Canada are the only countries who do not permit any exports of any description to that area.

(a) In accordance with embargo provisions of the Battle Act—Public Law 213, Eighty-second Congress—where no exceptions are possible, 65 countries who are recipients of our aid and certain other nonrecipient countries now have a complete embargo on China so far as shipments of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials are concerned. Our intelligence knows of no major ally who has knowingly permitted shipments of such war materials in this complete embargo category either to China, Russia, or the satellite countries.

(b) In addition, there is an international coordinating committee largely composed of the NATO countries, West Germany, and Japan where international agreements have been reached to prohibit the shipment of a large number of strategic items to China, Russia, and the Soviet bloc. This international organization complies with most of the provisions of the Battle Act on strategic trade with certain exceptions and weaknesses which I will point out in subsequent reports. Certain items are prohibited from going to China which are permitted to go to other Soviet-bloc nations. All vessels for direct military use such as warships and minesweepers are embargoed and tankers may not be delivered to Russia or the satellites. The sale of large merchant vessels to the Soviet bloc is prohibited and arrangements to restrict the shipment of strategic cargo have been established.

(c) Also, the United Nations has taken action to cut off strategic shipments to Communist China. The general assembly of the United Nations on May 18, 1951, adopted a resolution recommending that every nation apply an embargo on shipments to Communist China and North Korea of strategic items which are described in the same general language as used in the Battle Act. The weakness in this United Nations measure is the fact that each country determines for itself which commodities fall within the embargo category, and enforcement is left up to each nation too. Sixty nations have submitted reports or acknowledgements with respect to this resolution of which 42 indicate control which is regarded by the United States officials as generally satisfactory.

(d) Japan occupies a key position in the effort to control trade with Communist China and has maintained, ever since gaining its independence, an almost complete embargo on shipments to that area. In order to broaden and coordinate the control of exports to the Soviet bloc in the Far East, as well as to encourage Japan to cooperate as an equal partner in the program, Japan has recently—September 1952—been admitted to the international coordinating groups and a special committee has been set up in that organizational framework to deal with Far East matters.

(e) Special arrangements have been made in an effort to regulate the flow of strategic exports through the transshipment ports of Hong Kong—United Kingdom—and Macao—Portugal. This has been difficult since both these cities depend on trade with the interior of China for their existence. Furthermore, Macao has never had any customs regulations so that developing control procedures for that port has presented unusual problems. Nevertheless, the United States has established special regulations to prevent strategic materials originating here from getting through to the Communists by way of Hong Kong and Macao. Great Britain and Portugal are cooperating in taking measures to bring traffic through these ports under control although the situation remains unsatisfactory.

II. WHAT TRADE WITH CHINA COULD BE STOPPED BY A NAVAL BLOCKADE?

(a) Recently Russia has had as many as 100 foreign ships under charter at the same time, which means that during the charter period these vessels were largely beyond the control of western nations. These ships were leased in two different ways: time charter and voyage charter. The most serious situations could arise out of the substantial number of ships which were rented under time charter. This is very much like a car rental agency which places certain general restrictions upon the car before it is taken out but actually loses control of it when it is once taken over by the operator, in this case Russia. Such ships would fly western flags. Although there is an international agreement not to charter vessels to carry strategic cargoes, it is impossible to keep tight control of this type of shipping. Important shipping countries such as Panama, the United Kingdom, Greece, and Denmark make such transactions in line with this international agreement. Any such ships used by Russia to go to Chinese waters could, of course, be stopped by a naval blockade. Steps should be initiated by the United States to bring about international agreements in this type of shipping which would help in stopping the flow of important shipments to China and the iron-curtain countries.

(b) Of course, a naval blockade could stop any strategic or important shipments made by water, such as rubber from Ceylon. Ceylon has concluded an agreement with Communist China to provide her with 50,000 tons of rubber for the next 5 years in exchange for rice. Rubber shipments are made by water from Malaya, Indonesia, and other points which could be stopped. Rubber shipments to the Communist bloc from the small far eastern countries have been one of the main reasons in the past why the United States has not been successful in talking turkey with England on this subject. While the British do not send rubber to China they do ship rubber to Russia under a quantitative control process on the grounds that other loopholes should be plugged up before calling upon England to sacrifice the grain and timber which she needs very, very badly and gets in exchange for rubber. Great Brit-

ain also maintains that they only allow enough rubber to go through to take care of the civilian needs of Russia which, in my opinion, is impossible to estimate or differentiate under an aggressive dictatorship. I believe new sources of supply can and should be gotten so that our allies would not be dependent upon Russia and such strategic materials would be denied to the Communist war machines.

(c) Perhaps the big physical job that would be performed by such a blockade would be stopping the trade of nonstrategic goods shipped by water to China which is not illegal under present international agreements. This would include such things as cotton, jute, and fertilizer. Although quite a few countries restrict and screen important items from shipment to Red China, only the United States and Canada officially and publicly embargoes everything to this nation.

III. HOW EFFECTIVE COULD A NAVAL BLOCKADE BE?

(a) We must remember that China is a big continent and not an island that can be surrounded by a blockade. Our Navy could stop chartered ships, rubber, cotton and other materials shipped by sea which of course is very important.

(b) Such a blockade would not stop such shipments from landing in Burma, India, Indochina, and other places and sent by land legally or illegally to Communist China. Land transport would be very difficult, however.

(c) Such a blockade would not affect regular overland routes from Russia, the Soviet bloc, and China's neighbors.

IV. IS A NAVAL BLOCKADE OF CHINA WORTH IT?

(a) First, we must objectively consider what kind of a naval blockade we are considering. Are we talking about a complete blockade of all trade and all shipping or are we talking about a blockade of strategic trade in line with present international agreements?

(b) Are we talking about a blockade that will keep our friends away from China as well as our enemies? For instance, England trades with China in nonstrategic goods and evidently has no intention of doing otherwise.

(c) Many, many factors must be considered before making a logical and final decision in this important matter. Strictly from a point of view of trade, which I have been specializing in, I believe it would be helpful and entirely practical to start a screening operation immediately as an intermediary step for future action. A comprehensive United Nations naval operation could spotlight the China shipping situation and give us a chance to see just what is going to China, from whom, in what quantities and how embargo agreements are being carried out, while simultaneously working with our Allies to get better international agreements, bilaterally and multilaterally. This step I believe is worth taking and will furnish us a sound basis for future action.

THE MARDI GRAS BALL IN WASHINGTON

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is famous for its history, its industries, its resources, and its agriculture last but not least by any means. We are all proud of all the things Louisiana is noted for.

I should like to say now that Louisiana this year is celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase. I am happy to announce that President Eisenhower has accepted an invitation to meet with the President of France in New Orleans, I think in October, to reenact that momentous historical event.

I wish to state also that Louisiana this year, through its State society, is promoting the Mardi Gras ball in Washington which will be well attended. We have now in Washington, all the queens of the Louisiana festivals. We have with us Miss Angie Branch, International Rice Festival; Miss Gail Dugal, Jambilee Festival; Miss Janelle Roy, Camelia Festival; Miss Marian Hodges, New Orleans Mardi Gras; Miss Barbara Huff, Rose Festival; Miss Carolyn Landry, Dairy Festival; Miss Betty Rose Pigott, Paper Festival; Miss Jacqueline Sandifer, the Rose Festival; Miss Betty Lou Seabolt, the Forest Festival; Miss Sylvia Ann Segura, Sugarcane Festival; Miss Mavis Sinitiere, Shrimp Festival; Miss Patty Pope, Holiday in Dixie Festival; Miss Dorothy Etta Goff, Peach Festival.

I am speaking, I know, for the entire delegation in welcoming these beautiful queens to Washington, with the expectation that they may bring a message of hope back to Louisiana for the welfare of the country.

FARM PRICES

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, since the appointment of Ezra T. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture was made, there has been unrest and consternation in farm areas throughout the country. It could not be determined clearly then, or now, just where Mr. Benson stood on the question of farm supports. This program had taken many risks out of farming operations by stabilizing the price of commodities that the farmer produced, and at the same time limited production to meet the demands of the domestic and world markets. There is little doubt existing anywhere, apparently, that under the price support and quota systems, all segments of the people have been the beneficiaries both in war and during peacetime.

It could not be argued that a change in the price support laws on basic commodities by the new administration would save money for the taxpayers. It is not in the interest of sound economy to cast aside measures that had been beneficial to farm and urban areas and also had earned a handsome profit as well. Figures released recently by Commodity Credit Corporation showed that from all operations on basic commodities from the inception of the program in 1933 through December 31, 1952, there was a net gain in the amount of $13,000,000. On cotton there was a profit of $238,000,000.

Not until such time as the President himself makes a statement on the farm support issue will I be convinced that he has thrown overboard his campaign pledge of supporting basic farm commodities at 100 percent of parity.

One hundred and seventy-seven thousand Arkansawyers relied on the promise made by the then Candidate Eisenhower and cast their ballots for him. Farmers did not for a moment doubt the sincerity or honesty of purpose of the Republican nominee's program enunciated in October 1952, in his swing through the Midwest. Nothing was said then about "dependence on Government bounty" and a "free market" economy in the planting, cultivating, harvesting, and marketing of farm commodities.

In Secretary Benson's St. Paul speech of February 11, his first utterance since assuming the Cabinet post, there is a reasonable doubt in the minds of many that the philosophy portrayed was that of the President. Many feel, however, that the speech was cleared through the White House and the President's acquiescence given before delivery. If that is the case, there is quite a difference between the farm program of the Republican candidate for President who preached 100 percent of parity supports and the elected official who would consent to a speech by a member of his official family that—

> Price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in items of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided.

This language could be interpreted to mean that the Secretary does not favor any form of price supports for agricultural commodities, or it could mean that he would favor the so-called sliding scale parity formula which was incorporated in the Aiken bill and enacted in the Eightieth Congress and subsequently repealed in the Eighty-first Congress. Under the sliding scale system the support would be less when the supply increases. When the farmer needed the protection most, the support level could drop to 75 percent of parity.

TAX CUTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the important subjects up for discussion these days is the matter of taxation. In past years this body always has had a responsible fiscal officer of the Government, the Secretary of the

Treasury, make suggestions. Up to now we have not been able to obtain any suggestion from the Secretary of the Treasury as to whether or not we should reduce taxes now, or whether we should wait until later to find out what our financial situation is. It seems to me it is his responsibility, as the officer in the executive department chiefly responsible for the fiscal affairs of this country, to let us know what his position is. How can we legislate intelligently and as responsible individuals unless we hear from the executive branch on this matter?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the other special orders.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PARKING ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the House Administration Committee appointed a three-man subcommittee to collaborate with the Sergeant at Arms to study the increasingly acute parking problem on Capitol Hill. I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee and I am speaking today to ask the cooperation of the distinguished Members of this House in helping solve what seems now to be something of an enigma.

The legitimate demands for parking space for Members of this House and essential workers on Capitol Hill far exceed the number of spaces available. The Sergeant at Arms has received to date more than 1,200 requests for parking space but only 509 spaces are available if we allow for adequate car space. Parking bumper to bumper we may be able to squeeze out 817 places.

We must not only seek an immediate solution but also think in the terms of long-range planning as the situation is likely to become more pressing in future years.

In attacking the problem, we must not be selfish. We should, I think, make provisions for parking for tourists and others who have business on Capitol Hill.

Many thousands of persons, your constituents and mine, drive thousands of miles every year to come to Washington to see their United States Capitol. Thousands of others visit here on business with their Senators and Representatives. When they get here they should have a place to park.

Too often in Washington, Government employees have hogged choice parking spaces around their buildings, leaving the taxpayers who want to do business with the Government they finance to shift for themselves.

It is, I think you will agree, a knotty problem, fitting 1,200 cars into 509 spaces, and, of course, I am not referring to any automobiles 85 feet long.

I do not believe that everyone will be happy when we are through and the Sergeant at Arms issues the new parking stickers for our windshields. Nevertheless, we are going to do our best to accommodate all of the legitimate parking requests.

In a few days, you will be notified of your parking assignments. I again ask your cooperation in the study of the problem. We of the committee will be grateful to receive any of your suggestions.

Perhaps now we should begin to think of the long-range problem, too, of taking slum areas near the Capitol and converting them in parking lots for both the public and ourselves. This could easily fit into the plans for redevelopment of this historic section of Washington.

Serving with me on the subcommittee are our distinguished colleagues, Mr. DEANE, the gentleman from North Carolina; and Mr. WILLIAM COLE, the gentleman from Missouri. I am sure I speak for them too when I plead for your understanding, your cooperation, and your help.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think we all agree with the gentleman about folks who come from home being entitled to a parking space. But I call attention to the fact that the police report that out here in front of the Capitol folks who work downtown come in, take a cab or streetcar, then go downtown and leave their cars here all day.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman. That has been reported and we are considering that very problem.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not, will we have a legislative program for next week?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. There may be one bill, but it is not quite settled.

Mr. RAYBURN. Nothing controversial, I take it? The tax bill will not be up next week?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; I assure the gentleman the tax bill will not be up next week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might say for the information of the minority leader that he understands that there will be an appropriation bill that probably will be called up either on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust it will be the one that I will be slightly interested in.

The SPEAKER. I think the gentleman is interested in all of them.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NETHERLANDS, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND BELGIUM

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the people of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium have suffered tragic loss of lives, homes, and farms from the destruction wrought by storms and floods; and

Whereas the ties of blood, kinship, and fellowship between these countries and our own are of ancient tradition, precious to the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress on behalf of the people of the United States expresses its deep sympathy, affection, and concern for the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, whose countries have been ravaged by disaster, its admiration for their courage in adversity, and its hope for the early restoration of their homes and livelihoods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I think it might be well to show, and I might suggest the hope that it will be a unanimous vote. I think it will be a much more powerful message of our feelings if we manifest it by unanimity.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it certainly is a unanimous expression of sentiment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of New York) there were—ayes 98, noes 0.

So the resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, in which the Congress, on behalf of the people of the United States, expresses its deep sympathy, affection, and concern for the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium in these days of national calamity. Twice within the short span of a decade these three countries have been visited by devastation and destruction. Only a few years ago they endured the ravages and holocaust of war. They proved themselves worthy allies in turning the tide of battle, from which they emerged battered but unbowed. Steadfastly they devoted their resources and talents to rebuilding their countries. More recently they have joined with us in a common endeavor to strengthen the Atlantic community.

Just as they were enlarging their contributions to our joint effort, the forces of nature unleashed themselves on these countries. We do not yet know the full extent of the damage wrought by the combination of wind, sea, and rain, but

early estimates indicate that it will run to several billion dollars. In characteristic fashion the peoples of the United States have already responded through many private agencies and even individual efforts to assist our friends in another dark hour of their history. Equally characteristic is the grim determination with which the governments and peoples of these three nations have begun the slow and costly task of reconstruction. The Congress, always proud of these allies, is anxious to join its expressions of sympathy with those of millions of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those rare occasions when the moment of expression is as important as the sentiment itself. Although I do not subscribe to departures from established parliamentary procedures, Members will readily understand why I urge the immediate passage of this resolution, even though it has not been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Informal discussions with several of my committee colleagues leave no doubt in my mind that it has their full support.

In this case there is a particular reason why I do not like to depart from the practices of this House. An identical expression of congressional sympathy was incorporated in a resolution that was introduced in this body by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. It is in keeping with her life-long devotion to humanitarian causes. I know few women in public life who can match the deep grasp of the gentlewoman in matters affecting human welfare and improvement. Nothing would have given me greater satisfaction than to support the measure of the gentlewoman. Only the necessity for immediate action makes it desirable to pass upon the Senate version rather than that introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, for his gracious and kind remarks concerning my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 61, which is similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. I believe, however, it is important that our distressed friends overseas get a profoundly sympathetic expression from the people of the United States, through the Congress, as quickly as possible, without following the usual procedure of committee action before House consideration, as the gentleman from Illinois has already explained.

Two weeks ago, on February 1, our friends in the Netherlands, United Kingdom, and Belgium suffered a grievous blow from the greatest storm in the North Sea since the storm of 1703. Floods resulted which inundated that part of the Netherlands below the Hook of Holland down through the coast of Belgium, overflowing the great ports of Ostend and Antwerp and on the British Isles, the mouths of the Humber, Ouse, and Thames Rivers.

The loss of precious human lives and property throughout these areas is still being calculated. Current reports give the figures as follows: The Netherlands, 1,395 known dead and a further increase feared; the United Kingdom, 283, to which must be added the disasters suffered by the loss of the ferry boat, *Princess Victoria*, and the 132 people drowned; Belgium, 23 dead. Thousands of people have lost their homes throughout the inundated areas. In the Netherlands alone almost 66,000 persons have been evacuated. Property losses are estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The latest estimate from the Netherlands is given as $263 million; in Belgium $27 million in public property and no estimate available in private property; damage in the United Kingdom has not yet been reported. In the Netherlands 330,000 acres have been flooded, and reclamation of this land will be a long laborious process because of the salt which has penetrated it.

Relief has poured into the stricken areas from all countries. The Red Cross societies of 20 different countries, including Latin America, have already contributed over $4 million and it is expected that in the near future the amount will reach $10 million. Bedding, clothing, and food have been sent by relief organizations throughout the world. The American people have responded generously to the cause of their friends. The American Red Cross, including the Junior Red Cross, has made available cash and materials totaling at least $250,000 and other American agencies such as CARE, the Church World Service, the Foster Parents Plan for War Children, the War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Baptist Relief, the Save the Children Federation, and the Salvation Army have contributed approximately $400,000 worth of cash and material. Our Armed Forces and forces of other NATO countries have done a remarkably fine job in disaster and rescue work. Our helicopters have made spectacular rescues, and in addition tons of fresh water, medical supplies, sand bags and articles of clothing have been furnished by them.

Immediately following the tragedy President Eisenhower sent messages of sympathy to the heads of state of the three countries which are suffering so much. The Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, sent his condolences and upon arrival in the Netherlands issued a statement which included the following words:

> May we extend again on behalf of our Government and the American people our most heartfelt sympathy for your plight. We also renew our pledge to assist in relieving the suffering of your people.

The peoples of these countries, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, are tied together with us in the bonds of blood, kinship, and fellowship. Truly, the amazing courage which they have shown in the midst of their great adversity demands the admiration of the world. To show our feelings of deep sympathy and interest, I think it only fitting that the Congress has taken the action proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. It is in keeping with the highest traditions of United States humanitarianism.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House know that the administration is conducting psychological warfare, but we are not absolutely sure who is determining the policy, because we get contradictory reports. I think most of us are in favor of psychological warfare as a matter of foreign policy, but it appears now it has become a part of domestic policy and is directed against the American farmer. I have been disturbed by three reports in the papers today:

One is the report of a speech by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in St. Paul, Minn., my home city. It seems that his message to the farmers in relation to their present problems is pretty much that of the man who, while standing on shore, tells the drowning man that all he needs to do is to take a good deep breath of fresh air if he wants to be saved.

The second is the report about the international wheat agreement conferences. It appears that these conferences are stalled. That is a matter of great concern to the farmers of the Middle West, also.

The third is the information that President Eisenhower has withdrawn the name of John Carson for permanent appointment to the Federal Trade Commission. As you all know, Mr. Carson was first strongly supported by the cooperative groups and the farm organizations of the middle west, and has since gained recognition in support of the excellent manner in which he has conducted himself on the Federal Trade Commission.

BOY SCOUT WEEK, 1953

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this week more than three and a quarter million Boy Scouts and leaders in 543 local councils from Maine to California and from Florida to the State of Washington are celebrating the forty-third anniversary of the Boy Scout movement in America. I am proud to join more than 150,000,000 Americans in wishing this great organization "happy birthday and many returns of the day."

Forty-three years ago this week America was coming of age, getting ready to take its place as a leader among world nations. The automobile industry was just beginning to grow; the aircraft industry was in its infancy. A 1910 automobile won three straight races against budding aircraft in a Louisiana 100-mile cross country contest. An almost unknown aviator named Glenn Curtiss won a $10,000 prize by flying, nonstop, the 137-mile distance from New York City to Albany. The time was 2 hours and

42 minutes—just about the time it takes a jet plane to go from New York City to Denver today.

William Howard Taft was serving as the twenty-seventh President of the United States.

An American publisher returned from London to his home in Chicago with the germ of an idea that had taken firm root in England.

Simply stated, it was "the good turn" which has come to be a household word in this country because of the Boy Scout movement. An unknown Scout in London had approached the publisher who was lost in a typical London fog and offered help to find his destination. Upon arrival, the unknown Scout refused any compensation, with the statement that he was a member of the Boy Scouts, an organization dedicated to helping others. Today, a monument stands in England to this unknown Scout whose good turn spread the Scout movement to America.

America has reaped a bountiful harvest from the seed implanted 43 years ago. Scouting has brought comradeship, learning, adventure, self-reliance, and above all, the highest of ideals to more than 20,000,000 Americans who have enjoyed the benefits of its programs.

The Boy Scouts of America have grown to be the largest Scout group in the world. The good turn by the unknown Scout has been repeated in a million different places and in a million different ways. The Boy Scout has become recognized as a vital part of America. He has an enviable and unsurpassed reputation for service and kindness to others. This is one of the bulwarks of scouting.

Few of us know that the Boy Scout movement originated because a great leader of the British Empire became concerned at the lack of certain traits which were necessary in the men being sent out to him in the colonial empire. Today those traits which were then lacking are known the world over as synonyms for scouting. The Boy Scout is characterized by dependability, initiative, resourcefulness, self-reliance, and cooperation. The Scouts' record of service to their country in time of emergency or disaster is one in which we should all take great pride. They are among the first to volunteer in time of floods, hurricanes, war bond drives, forest fires, tornadoes, relief collections of food and clothing, tin and paper salvage, and hundreds of other tasks. For their unstinting patriotic efforts they have earned the personal thanks of every American President since 1910, and the gratitude and respect of the Nation.

Last November Boy Scouts put reminders to vote on the door knobs of 30,000,000 American homes—the largest single patriotic good turn ever performed by their organization. This project was hailed by all political parties as deserving of vigorous and continued support.

Scouting is a program for boys from 9 years of age all the way up to the time when they become voting citizens. Its programs are designed to supplement the teachings of the home, the church and the school. More than half of the troops are sponsored by churches of all faiths. There is no discrimination because of race or creed.

My own feeling toward the Boy Scouts of America is one of both admiration for a magnificent accomplishment and affection because of the tremendous appeal of scouting to the youth of our Nation.

The Scout program is based on five fundamentals: First, the boy; second, trained leadership; third, activity; fourth, organization; and, fifth, the ideals. The youth of America represents our greatest natural resource. In boys of Scout age we have a vast reserve of moral strength, physical vigor, and mental ability. But they must have training and leadership. To bring out their latent strength, continued and planned activity, such as can come only from an efficient organization, is necessary. These needs are provided by Scouting, always with the ideals of the Boy Scouts in the forefront.

The spirit of Christianity, honesty, and integrity instilled in these young people through Scouting is a real factor in placing them on the road to be outstanding leaders in our communities.

The cardinal principles of Scouting are the best kind of guarantee against the spread of godlessness and evil which flourish in some corners of the world today.

The problem of morality and of the way the Boy Scouts deal with it has engaged our particular attention. This problem, as we all know, grows much more acute in periods of war or emergency, even a period of cold war like the present one. In these times there is a special premium on honest, capable, conscientious, and forward-looking men in public and private life. We should give our strongest support to organizations such as the Boy Scouts, wherein lies our best hope of combating and destroying evil traits.

Thousands of years ago a great philosopher said that "a state to prosper must be built on soundness of moral character, and that this moral character is the principal element of its strength, and the only guaranty of its permanence and prosperity." I have always felt that moral integrity is something innate, the result of heritage, rearing, education, and training. This, I think, is implicit in the Boy Scout oath and the Boy Scout law.

I will not take the time to repeat the 12 points of that law now, although they are very simple and concise. I heartily recommend that each and every Member of Congress take the time to look them up and renew acquaintance with them. I will guarantee that we will find it an enriching and refreshing experience. I, for one, feel that nowhere, in just 12 words, can we find a better guide for our own conduct in the performance of our duties and responsibilities.

On Monday of this week, Boy Scout Explorers, being all Eagle Scouts selected from various sections of the country, each representing his own area, together with the three-millionth active member of Boy Scouts, came to Washington to deliver the report to the Nation for the Boy Scouts of America. The report was delivered in person to Mr. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

Each Scout was greeted by the President, and each received a personal word of greeting from the President.

Prior to these ceremonies I had the honor to be among the guests at breakfast honoring these Scouts. I was especially honored for the reason that one of the 10 selected Scouts was my host at the breakfast. He is from my community. He is Robert Peterson, of Emporia, Kans. Robert is an Eagle Scout Explorer of post 152. He is also a member of the Order of the Arrow. He is sponsored by the First Methodist Church of our city.

The visiting Scouts left a favorable impression upon those they met in the Nation's Sapital. We want them to come again.

A great statesman once said "the youth of a nation are the trustees of our posterity." A nation, however great, will stand stronger and longer on the amount of the character of its citizens than on the strength of its armaments. Across America today, over 3,000,000 Scouts are building the character of our future citizens by living according to the Scout oath. They are doing their best to perform their duty to God and country and to help other people at all times. They are being taught, and in turn teaching others, to improve themselves, to render service to their communities and to the Nation, and in all ways prepare themselves to take their parts in building a stronger America. Scouting builds the kind of boys that will make the kind of men democracy sorely needs. Today's Scouts truly are tomorrow's citizens, the trustees of our posterity.

And so, as we observe Boy Scout Week here in Washington along with the entire Nation, I offer warmest congratulations to the Boy Scouts of America and to the leaders who have built up this splendid youth movement. Twenty million members who have taken part in this movement find themselves better men because of it. The fate of a nation rests on its youth, and the Boy Scouts for 43 years have been molding our youth to keep America the greatest of all nations. May the future hold even greater success for the Boy Scouts. May they continue to help make America physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my statement the names of the 12 Scouts heretofore mentioned in my statement, together with the three millionth active member. They are Sammy Tyler, Eldorado, Ill., three millionth member; Henry Minton, Danbury, Conn., sponsored by St. James Episcopal Church; Edward Bannigan, Johnstown, N. Y., sponsored by St. Patrick's Church; Thomas B. Carmany, Lebanon, Pa., sponsored by Zion Lutheran Church; Emmett Sutton, Toledo, Ohio, sponsored by Sherman School Parent-Teachers Association; Newt P. Harrison, New Albany, Miss., sponsored by First Methodist Church; Robert B. Savage, Rocky Mount, N. C., sponsored by First Methodist Church; William R. Breedlove, Flint, Mich., sponsored by High School Parent-Teachers Association; Robert Peterson, Emporia, Kans., sponsored by First Methodist Church; Raymond W. Waddelow, Ponca City, Okla., sponsored by First Presbyterian Church; Harald C. Bakken,

Atkin, Minn., sponsored by American Legion, Post No. 86; Maurice W. Wippel, Jr., Ellensburg, Wash., sponsored by Knights of Columbus; and Robert Tucker, Tracy, Calif., sponsored by Church of Latter-Day Saints.

THE LATE DAVID AIKEN REED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to inform the House of the death of former United States Senator David Aiken Reed, who died at Sarasota, Fla., on Tuesday, February 10.

Senator Reed was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., December 21, 1880; attended private schools; was graduated from Shadyside Academy, Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1896, and from Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., in 1900, having entered the university at the age of 15; he studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1903 and practiced in Pittsburgh, Pa., 1903–17. He was chairman of the Pennsylvania Industrial Accidents Commission 1912–15. During the First World War he served as major of the Three Hundred and Eleventh Field Artillery from August 15, 1917, until his discharge February 26, 1919; lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve, 1919–22; awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; chevalier, French Legion of Honor; member of the American Battle Monuments Commission 1923–48; resumed the practice of law in Pittsburgh in 1919; delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1924, 1932, 1936, and 1940; appointed on August 8, 1922, and elected on November 7, 1922, to the United States Senate to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1923, caused by the death of William E. Crow, and on the same day was elected for the term commencing March 4, 1923; reelected in 1928, and served from August 8, 1922, to January 3, 1935; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1934; resumed the practice of law in Pittsburgh, Pa.

As a lawyer he had few equals. The firm of which he was a member was the outstanding legal firm in western Pennsylvania and in the course of his work he represented some of the greatest corporations in the United States.

As a Member of the Senate he was an unusually active and busy man, serving during the Sixty-seventh and succeeding Congresses until his defeat in 1934.

During the time that he was a Member of the Senate, his colleague was Senator George Wharton Pepper, and probably at no time in the history of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania did two abler men represent us in the Senate of the United States. Both were outstanding in service to the people of Pennsylvania and to the Nation.

For a number of years my contacts with Senator Reed were close and personal. He recommended me for appointment as the United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania. Subsequently President Hoover appointed me and I was confirmed by the Senate, and during the strenuous times of the prohibition era I had no stronger supporter than Senator Reed. He stood back of me and upheld me in my work. He once told me that he had no higher ambition than to serve in the Senate of the United States.

Now that he has gone, we shall all miss him and this Nation has lost a great and constructive statesman who did much to uphold our Government not only in its internal affairs but in its contacts and relations with other nations. And to his family we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the expression of my regret at the passing of the great former Senator from Pennsylvania, David A. Reed. I think he was one of the most able men that ever served in that body. I am proud of the fact that he came from the district I now represent.

One of the fine acts the Senator from Pennsylvania did was to help along the road my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], who has distinguished himself here as a Member of this body.

We in Pittsburgh always had great respect for the opinions of Senator Reed. Of course, I am of the opposite political party; nevertheless, I can say honestly and sincerely that as a much younger man when he was serving in the Senate of the United States I followed his career and received much inspiration from it.

I join the gentleman in expressing my regrets at his passing.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROY O. WOODRUFF

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also that all Members during any time next week when the occasion may present itself may extend their remarks on the life, character, and services of our late colleague, Hon. Roy O. Woodruff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we learned that our friend and former colleague, Roy O. Woodruff, died early this morning at Walter Reed Hospital, where he had been ill for several weeks.

Our colleague was born at Eaton Rapids, Eaton County, Mich., on March 14, 1876. He attended the public schools and was apprenticed to the printing business in 1891.

He enlisted as a corporal in Company G, Thirty-third Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and served during the Spanish-American War. He saw active service and, after being mustered out, entered and later graduated from the dental department of the College of Medicine in Detroit.

He followed his chosen profession in Bay City, Mich., from 1902 to 1911. In 1911, he was elected mayor of Bay City, Mich.

Always independent in thought and action, he was elected as a Progressive Republican to the Sixty-third Congress, serving from March 4, 1913, to March 3, 1915.

He was not a candidate for renomination in 1914, because he desired to, and did, serve in the First World War as an infantry officer. He was promoted to the rank of major during his service abroad.

Upon his return to this country, he was a candidate and was elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress, and served continuously thereafter through the Eighty-second Congress, and until January 3, 1953.

Although urged to be a candidate for the Eighty-third Congress and although his reelection was assured, ill health caused him to refuse to stand for reelection.

When I came here in 1935, our minority leader was the distinguished gentlemen from New York, Bertrand Snell.

One of his assistants was the able, conscientious legislator, Carl Mapes, of Michigan.

Another assistant leader who rendered distinguished service until his tragic death was William Ditter, of Pennsylvania.

Another assistant who gave long years of service on the Committee on the Judiciary was Earl Michener, of Michigan, at one time chairman of that great committee and who just a short time ago, because of ill health in his family, refused to stand for reelection.

Our colleague served for years with distinction on the House Committee on Ways and Means.

During the years of his service, Mr. Woodruff not only served as chairman of the Republican conference, but he was the personal friend and adviser not only of the Members who from time to time came to the Congress from Michigan, but to every colleague who sought his counsel.

Mr. Woodruff was a man of even temper, soft-spoken, considerate, and kindly, but nevertheless a man of profound convictions, who wavered not at all when a question of principle was involved.

He served the people of his district, of the State of Michigan, and of the Nation as a whole, long, well, faithfully, and courageously.

His reward, which he realized and cherished, was the friendship, the confidence, and the respect of every Member who over the years knew him.

If, in the hereafter, awards are to be made for faithful and loyal service to friend and to country, we know that our colleague will rank high on the list of good and faithful servants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with heavy heart we learned this morning of the death of Roy Woodruff. For 34 years he was a valued Member of the Congress of the United States. Here he won many high honors, first as a member of the old Naval Affairs Committee, where he aided

materially in the building up of the American Navy, and in recent years as a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee he aided in the economic progress of the Nation. He was a man of great knowledge and high ability. He was a kindly man and never knowingly did an injustice to anyone. Even in the midst of debate, he never permitted his partisanship to do an injustice to his opponent. To those who were privileged to enjoy his trust and friendship he gave a loyalty that was impressive.

For years Mr. Woodruff was a member of the Republican policy committee and presided with skill and fairness as chairman of the Republican conference.

Although in recent years a stout-hearted fighter for Republicanism, he entered Congress in the Sixty-third Congress as a member of the Progressive or so-called Bull Moose Party. A veteran of the Spanish War, he was a follower of the colorful Teddy Roosevelt and won the election on his ticket in 1912.

In the readjustment which followed in the next 2 years he was offered the Republican nomination, but preferred to be a candidate on the Progressive ticket. He was defeated, as he knew he would be, but it was characteristic of Roy Woodruff. He would not falter in the carrying out of his convictions. Four years later he returned as a Republican and continuously served thereafter.

In recent years his health has been poor, and finally he concluded, much to the regret of his legion of friends, not to stand for reelection.

During all his congressional career his devotion to his good wife and her devotion to him was touching. To Mrs. Woodruff and to other members of his family we extend our heartfelt sympathy in their hour of sadness. A great American has crossed the Great Divide, having lived a rich life and leaving his country better for his having lived.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character and public service of our late, distinguished colleague, and warm friend, the Honorable Roy O. Woodruff, of Michigan. It was my privilege to have served side by side with him on the House Committee on Ways and Means during his entire period of service there, and to have enjoyed a very warm friendship with him throughout the years. He was a man who possessed the highest attributes of Christian character as well as all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He was a man of outstanding courage, great ability, and of demonstrated devotion to the public service. I am sure I voice the sentiment of all of his friends in saying that he will be greatly missed, and we convey to his loved ones our deepest sympathy in the time of their great bereavement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years I knew Roy Woodruff intimately. He and I came to the Sixty-third Congress together. He was the type and character of man who drew friends to him because he was loyal and appreciative of friendship. His was a fine life. His was a great soul, and to his loved ones I send my deepest sympathy and my warm affection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly grieved this morning because I have lost one of my dearest friends, who passed away last night. I refer to Hon. Roy O. Woodruff, who has served with me on the Ways and Means Committee since 1933. One of the dearest of friends, a stalwart patriot, a soldier and officer of two wars. It is said that no man is worth more than he contributes to the social, civic, and spiritual upbuilding of the community in which he lives and the service he renders to the country to which he owes allegiance. The contribution which our dear friend has made is in part a measure of his great worth.

There is another yardstick by which his services to his country can be measured, and it is this:

> That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, that which dignifies a country, that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne and scepter of a nation—is character.

All these fine attributes of character we recognize in our departed friend.

The association which I have had with Roy throughout the years has endeared him to me, and I grieve his passing. I visited him at the Walter Reed Hospital last Saturday. It was difficult for him to speak, but when I told him that his colleagues were wishing him a speedy recovery his eyes brightened and he smiled.

We know from our association with Roy throughout the years why the people of his district have kept him in Congress for well over a quarter of a century.

It has been said that character is the invincible armor which will withstand every assault and march triumphant to the highest position of honor and trust within the gift of a grateful people. He has marched triumphant, step by step, in war and peace, to the position of a representative of a wonderful sovereign people.

I believe I can speak for my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, and for all Members in the House who knew him, in saying that we are proud of his patriotic record and service in the Spanish-American and the First World War. He was a colonel in the Army and distinguished himself on the battlefield meritoriously. I have seen the record of his activity in the Army—the record of a patriot—a worthy example to others called upon to the service of our country.

I am sure that we are all honored to have served with him in the greatest legislative body in the world. His friendship is a priceless treasure and perpetual inspiration to carry on.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Woodruff, and to his children in this hour of their great bereavement.

I wish to announce that the funeral will be held at noon on February 14, Saturday, at Joseph Gawler's Funeral Home, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. I hope that many of the Members will be able to attend.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, of course we all join with the gentlemen who have already spoken in expressing our feeling toward Roy Woodruff, because he was a man's man.

When I first came to Congress he hunted me up. He came to tell me that he had been employed down in southern Ohio, where I came from; that he and a group of eight men had built an electric power line through our section. From that time on we were just like boys from home. I had him come into my district several years later to look over some timber land. He was representing the Government as a member of the Joint Committee on Reforestation, whose duty it was to extend Federal forestry developments where this program was feasible. He recommended purchase of several thousands of acres in our section of Ohio. That also naturally cemented our relationship.

After that we went on the Ways and Means Committee at the same time, 20 years ago—Mr. Knutson, Mr. Reed of New York, Mr. Woodruff, and myself. That is the order in which we were placed. Of course, I feel really bad in my heart that Roy is gone, because he was a warm, personal, intimate friend of mine. A few days ago I wrote Mrs. Woodruff a letter and told her I was sure all of his friends would be glad to do anything we could to help her or him. That is the way we all feel today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who believe in one eternal God, who believe in a life beyond the grave, who have faith in the promises contained in the New Testatment, to us death does not mean the final termination of things; death means a temporary separation. The idea of a temporary separation, of death as being an open door, a portal to a newer and larger life, takes away most of the sting of death, and it certainly robs the grave of the idea of victory. This thought, that life and death is but a temporary separation with reunion later on is so well expressed in the little poem There Is No Death, by an unknown author, that I want to use the words of the author to express my feelings at this moment on the passing of Roy Woodruff. These are the words:

There is no death. The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore.
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forever more.

There is no death. The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death, although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms,

Although with bowed and breaking heart
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead; they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into a new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Though disenthralled and glorified
They still are here and love us yet;
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

And so on this occasion I express my feelings and I offer the solace of these words of the poet to the friends of Roy in this House. Roy was my friend; whence comes such another?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word of tribute to the memory of our departed colleague in addition to those expressions from his closest associates on the Committee on Ways and Means on which he served creditably for so many, many years. Although I never served on that committee I, like many other Members of this House, loved Roy Woodruff as fully and as deeply as though I had served on that committee. He was the kind of Congressman that other Members respect. His sincerity, his conscientious devotion to duty, his patriotism both on the field of battle and in the Halls of Congress, as well as his cordial, friendly geniality, attracted him to all of us.

Although my heart is heavy in learning this sad news, at the same time I rejoice in having had the privilege of knowing Roy Woodruff for these many, many years, and of having had him before me as an example. Although he will no longer walk down these aisles nor sit in these seats with us, his memory will live with us always. He will continue to be an inspiration for all of us to continue our labors in this Chamber.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened this morning to hear of the passing of our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Roy O. Woodruff. As dean of the Michigan delegation I was pleased to have him as my friend during the short time I have been a Member of this great body.

He never came on the floor of the House that he did not come and sit with me for a few minutes and ask me if there was something he could do in my behalf and then to encourage me in the work that I have been endeavoring to do. I found him always to be a fine gentleman, a great statesman, and a kind, helpful friend.

We shall miss Roy Woodruff, with his keen and helpful counseling, and his genuine interest in all of us. My heart goes out today in sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family who survive him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members of the House this morning in expressing my deep regret at the passing of our former colleague, and friend, Mr. Roy Woodruff.

Aside from being well versed in governmental affairs, Roy Woodruff was a very kindly gentleman in every respect. I do not think he ever said a mean word in his life about anybody. Anyone who had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Ways and Means with Roy Woodruff would consider himself a lucky individual. His deep knowledge of Government and governmental affairs, in the tax field particularly, he carried with great dignity. On many occasions I have consul ed with him about matters of which I knew he had a deep understanding, especially in the tax field. He had a host of friends.

I express my very deep sympathy to his devoted widow, and I regret personally very much his passing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked this morning upon learning that Roy Woodruff would no longer walk with us. We who loved him had known that he was seriously ill, but we loved him so much that we could not entertain the thought of actually seeing him go.

You will forgive me, I know, if I say that though he came here long before the thirties he always seemed to belong intimately to that valiant band of men of that era—men who stood for their principles and who, although greatly in the minority, never failed in their courage nor in their faith that America would remain the America that they knew, the only kind of an America that they could bear to envision.

I honor him as a great lawmaker, but I honor him even more as a Christian gentleman. I never knew such gentleness of spirit in any man. He was great in his humility and humble in his greatness.

To his wife I offer signal sympathy. I would like to remind the House that the Woodruffs as a friendly team did more perhaps than any other couple (except the DAN REEDS, with whom we always associate them), to make life among congressional circles pleasing, happy and friendly.

I never speak at a moment like this—paying tribute, in my small way, to one who has really proved his greatness—without a feeling of particular sadness for the wife left behind. I always come back to the same thought: I would like that wife and their family to know that not even death can take from them the love and strength that has been built into their lives. I say again to Mrs. Woodruff and to that family that those of us who know that there is indeed no death, also know that no person can live, love, and be honored without building behind in the hearts of his family, and in the hearts of his friends, both the strength to carry on and an unassailable faith that separation is just for a little while.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the passing of our colleague and I also ask, in view of the fact that all of the Michigan Members except two of us are unavoidably absent, that they may next week extend their remarks and have them printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Roy Woodruff, who retired from the Congress only a few weeks ago, was one of the most experienced and respected Members of the House.

Looking back over his life we find that it included service to his country, both in the Spanish War, and in the AEF during World War I.

It also included service as mayor of his native Bay City, and for 34 years as a Member of this House, where he became an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee, and chairman of the Republican conference.

He rendered a great service to his city, to his State, and to the Nation.

Over the years he has been a close friend of mine and of my family. I shall miss him greatly.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and to the members of his family.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my other colleagues in paying tribute to former Congressman Roy Woodruff. I shall always remember him for his deep convictions, his sincere patriotism, his friendly spirit, and his quiet ways. He was indeed a fine gentleman.

Mr. Woodruff was a great soldier, citizen, and statesman. He served his State and Nation well for a long period of years. His public service constituted a distinct contribution.

I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow at his passing and in extending sympathy to Mrs. Woodruff and the other members of his family.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the memory of my late colleague and former Member, Roy Woodruff, from the State of Michigan. It has been my privilege and pleasure to know and work with Roy Woodruff. I feel that I am a better and wiser person for having been privileged to know him. He did more for others than for himself. He made friends by being steadfast. He kept them by being honest. During his service in Congress he was faithful to every trust, conscientious in the performance of every duty, and at all times did what his best judgment told him was beneficial to those whom he sought to serve. He was strong in his convictions, taking at all times that view which he believed to be honorable and right. One of the fond recollections of my service in this distinguished legislative body will always be that I knew well and enjoyed the friendship and companionship of Roy Woodruff.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great sorrow of the death of Roy Woodruff.

He was a gentle soul if there ever was one, courteous, kind, thoughtful and considerate and yet, during his very long service in the House, he never failed to maintain with the utmost firmness his

views as to what was for the best interests of the United States.

There was never the slightest doubt as to where he stood and no cross current of transitory public opinion could change him, but in every debate and in every difference of opinion, he handled himself in such a way that those who opposed his views, grew to have great respect, even deep affection for him. I know of no Member who served in the last few Congresses who was generally so beloved by his fellow Members.

I will always cherish the memory of my friendship with him and his devoted wife, whose strength of character did so much to aid him when physical ailments in the late years made it difficult for him to carry on.

My deepest sympathy goes out to her in her irreparable loss.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, mine is a tribute of affection to the memory of a comrade. I was shocked when the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] announced the death of the Honorable Roy O. Woodruff. When I came to this body in the Eighty-first Congress he was among the great leaders on the other side of the aisle. His was a position of preeminence by reason of his long and honorable service, his charm of personality and the rare attributes of mind and heart that established him in the warm affection and the high esteem of his colleagues. In this I experienced a sense of reflected pride. Years before he had come to the Congress, when the eager blood of youth was in our veins and the cry of "Remember the *Maine*" was filling the air, he was my comrade in the old Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry. We were together at Camp Eaton in Michigan, then a month at Camp Alger near Falls Church, Va., and embarking at Old Point Comfort, Va., landed together from small boats on the coast of Cuba at Siboney. Together we were under fire for the first time on July 1, 1898, members of Colonel Boynton's Thirty-third Michigan, engaging Fort Aquadores while "Teddy" Roosevelt's Rough Riders were attacking San Juan Hill, a bunch of kids from the high schools of Michigan filled with the sense that they were carrying forward the destiny of these United States. Then, after the lapse of half a century we, in a sense, were comrades again, fellow Members of this House beset with the problems of the world leadership that came to us in a sequence of events that started with the Spanish-American War.

Roy Woodruff in his long and patriotic public service lived true to the "Spirit of '98." I shall miss him as another gone from the thinning ranks of the old Thirty-third Michigan. He was in every sense a great American.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, everybody loved Roy Woodruff. His gentle spirit and quiet manner bred friendship and it was always a pleasure to be with him. Roy Woodruff loved his friends, he never forgot them and was always ready and willing to help them in any way he could.

His lifetime was one of devoted service to his country. He was a soldier and bore arms in our Nation's defense; he served for many years in the House of Representatives and was faithful to the trust the people of his district had in him. He was loyal to his ideals and stood firm on the foundation stone of high principle. When he disagreed with his colleagues his disagreement was never tinged with rancor, he appreciated the other fellow's point of view. His love for his country and its preservation was outstanding and his affection for his wife and family was most devoted.

His death leaves a void in the hearts of his friends that will be hard to fill, but the warmth of his friendship will last forever.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent and heartfelt tributes to the memory of our beloved former colleague, Mr. Woodruff, which have been offered by his associates of a long period reflect the feelings of many of us who were privileged to know him but a few brief years. One did not have to know the gentleman from Michigan very long to acquire an appreciation of his profound Christian character and those qualities of gentleness and kindness which distinguished him as a public servant. At the same time he was a person of firm convictions and a sturdy worker in the causes in which he believed. He never sought advantages through devious ways but was always direct and earnest in the presentation of his views and in the counsel which he offered in this House. The memory of our friendship will always be cherished, and the splendid example which he set will be a constant inspiration.

CAPT. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, we talk about waste by the military. We are galvanized into action by excessive expenditures for oyster forks, or can openers, or poorly designed airfields in north Africa, and it is well that we should be. But are we ever aroused by examples of the appalling waste of men and ability in our Armed Forces, particularly in officer selection? Rarely. Not nearly often enough. We are too complacent and unwilling to question the actions of admirals on selection boards, even though they "cling with rigid devotion to obsolete tenets and routines"—to use a phrase of President Eisenhower—and write finish to the distinguished careers of naval officers who by up-to-date, reasonable standards deserve promotion.

Such a case occurred on July 8, 1952, to my mind one of the most shocking examples of waste and profligacy committed by the Armed Forces. Little has been said about it, and efforts are now being made to hush it up. It is a case in which the admirals disposed of a naval officer who would not conform, an officer who is perhaps the Navy's outstanding specialist in the field of atomic energy.

We know so little about the atomic world which lies just beyond the horizon, and there are so few people who are able to lead us to the wonders of the new world, particularly in the armed services. We have wealth, we have resources, but these mean little without the brains to put them to use. In times like these, frantically engaged as we are in a desperate race with the Communists for atomic supremacy, it is shameful to indulge in the luxury of wasting talent as we would materials. Materials can be replaced. Men cannot. That is why it is so incredible that the Navy should willingly discard its most dynamic nuclear engineer. That is why it is no exaggeration to say that in rejecting Rickover the Navy—by its own hand—has caused this Nation to suffer its first major casualty of the atomic cold war.

On July 8, 1952, a group of nine admirals sitting as a naval selection board ruled that Capt. Hyman G. Rickover should not be promoted to rear admiral. This was the second time that a selection board had passed him over. Having served 30 years in the Navy and having been denied promotion twice by selection boards, Captain Rickover will be forced to retire from active duty this June—at age 52. It may very well be that as a result of their nearsightedness the admirals have placed in jeopardy the success of the atomic submarine project, completion of which is scheduled in 1954.

Who is Captain Rickover? Why was he passed over for promotion by the admirals? Why is it important that his case be singled out for consideration out of all the worthy naval officers who have been passed over by selection boards?

Let me confess, Mr. Speaker, that until I went into the Rickover case, I had assumed that selection boards were doing a good job. I am not willing to make that assumption today. There are many faults in the selection board process which the Congress must look into for the good of the Navy and the Nation. Those who run the Navy in the final analysis determine whether the Navy shall be modern and fit. If service politics or even antiquated standards are to govern the promotion system, the Navy and the Nation are bound to be hurt. Mr. Speaker, I believe there must be hundreds of cases of deserving officers who have never been able to hurdle the admirals who make up the selection boards. It happens that I do not know of them; but I do know of the case of Captain Rickover and can talk about him.

In its issue of September 3, 1951, Life magazine describes Captain Rickover as one who "may be destined to go down in naval history as the man who exerted as much influence on naval shipbuilding as Robert Fulton." Comparison of Rickover with Robert Fulton is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, for just as Fulton revolutionized the commerce of his day by introducing steam as a motive power for ships, so Captain Rickover has been the one most responsible for the use of nuclear power for the propulsion of ships. A magnificent accomplishment by Rickover—yet the admirals discarded him.

Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Research for the Atomic En-

ergy Commission, has said about Rickover:

It is an understatement when I say that more than any other single individual in the entire nuclear submarine program, Captain Rickover is responsible for the present rapid development of the project. His careful and accurate planning, his unceasing drive, his thorough technical knowledge, along with his exceptional ability to attract top-flight assistants, is unsurpassed in my experience of 25 years of association with scientific and technical talent. The Navy is to be congratulated that it has within its ranks a man of this caliber who is able to contribute so materially to the country's security.

A tribute to Rickover by one of the leading scientific minds of the Atomic Energy Commission—and still the admirals ruled that the Navy has no further use for him.

The late Senator Brien McMahon, who was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said this about Rickover:

I wish I had more men like him and I will warrant that the Air Force, as it confronts its own project for nuclear powered vehicles, wishes the same. In all seriousness, I think the whole country as well as the Navy owes a debt to Rickover. I think he's proving that the impossible in the atomic field cannot only be done but done quickly and by economic means. * * * He has so much drive and determination that he rubs some people the wrong way; but if they are worthwhile people at all, it is my impression that usually they wind up as his fast friends. My hat is off to the man.

A fine commendation from Senator McMahon, who knew as much as any Member of Congress about the subject of atomic energy, for Rickover—and yet the admirals passed him over.

On June 14, 1952, President Truman laid the keel for the first atomic-powered submarine and in his address he stated:

The *Nautilus* will be able to move under the water at a speed of more than 20 knots. A few pounds of uranium will give her ample fuel to travel thousands of miles at top speed. She will be able to stay under water indefinitely. Her atomic engine will permit her to be completely free of the earth's atmosphere. She will not even require a breathing tube to the surface. The engine of the *Nautilus* will have as revolutionary an effect on the navies of the world as did the first ocean-going steamship 130 years ago.

At the same ceremony Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated:

The construction of the *Nautilus* has been made possible through many years of dedicated effort on the part of men of vision and enthusiasm in the Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission and private enterprise. The roster of outstanding contributors includes the Navy Bureau of Ships, the Argonne National Laboratory, the Westinghouse Electric Corp., the electric boat division of the General Dynamics Corp., and the Atomic Energy Commission's Reactor Development Division. The atomic submarine is an important concrete example of the kind of things that can be accomplished through a cooperative effort by scientists, industry, military men and a civilian Government agency.

There are many people who have played a role in events which have led to this ceremony, but, if one were to be singled out for special notice, such an honor should go to Capt. Hyman George Rickover, whose talents we share with the Bureau of Ships, and whose energy, drive, and technical competence have played such a large part in making this project possible.

A tribute from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission for Rickover—and yet the admirals discarded him.

On July 7, 1952, Secretary Kimball bestowed a gold star on Captain Rickover, in lieu of a second Legion of Merit, with a citation reading as follows:

Captain Rickover, more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition. His efforts have led to the laying of the keel of the world's first nuclear powered ship well in advance of its original schedule.

Secretary Kimball added the statement:

Rickover has accomplished the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy.

A medal and outstanding commendation from the Secretary of the Navy for Rickover—and yet the admirals discarded him.

On September 27, 1951, there was a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to discuss the expanded atomic production program. This colloquy occurred at that meeting:

Representative DURHAM. I think the Navy did a very good job on the reactor for the submarine, because that has been pushed very vigorously since the thing started, and it has made tremendous progress, as we all know.

The CHAIRMAN—

This is the late Senator McMahon—

This fellow Rickover is a tremendous fellow.

Representative PRICE. It is tremendous that we had someone like that because he was interested in it and he pushed it himself and he did a lot of pushing.

Secretary KIMBALL. This Westinghouse bunch is a very capable organization with this very intricate manufacturing thing for this titanium they have to make, and they got this machinery in 12 months and I said, "How did they get it in?" And they said, "Rickover made us get it in."

The CHAIRMAN. He stepped on a lot of toes over there and I think he has made some enemies, but I think he is a tremendous little guy.

An acknowledgment of real accomplishment by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for Rickover—and yet the admirals rejected him. Apparently, toes that are stepped on have long memories.

On October 26, 1952, the New York Times magazine published an article entitled "SSN-571, Making of the Atomic Sub." The article has this to say about the task force which developed the nuclear sub:

Behind the accomplishments is the unique task force, led by Captain Rickover. It is a surprisingly small group, a varied one and fiercely devoted. It is also slightly confusing, because its principal members shuttle back and forth between the AEC and Tempo 3. There are naval officers and civilians all mixed together, with rank wiped out. No uniforms are worn; in some cases officers work for civilians and in others commanders work for lieutenants. Two of the Navy men were with Captain Rickover at Oak Ridge in 1946. One, a lieutenant, is Rickover's over-all assistant; another, a commander, is a project officer, which means he takes prime responsibility for a given undertaking. He started with the *Nautilus*, later took on a second and different type of submarine General Electric is building, is now assigned to the atomic-powered aircraft carrier which has been authorized and will move on to a fourth project, nature unstated publicly. The civilians in the technical groups are of all shapes and sizes and backgrounds—chemists, physicists, metallurgists, engineers, production men.

They have all been recruited by Captain Rickover, and he is a ruthless recruiter; he has pulled men he wanted out of big industry and quiet colleges, laboratories and factories (a $16,000-a-year man joined up here for $7,500). They work 16-hour days and 7-day weeks and there is no premium pay for them. They shake their heads about it but they are so fascinated by it they have no thought of quitting. For one thing, they see in their boss a man who outdoes them in effort.

This is what his men think of Captain Rickover—and yet the admirals rejected him.

In the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, February 6, 1953, in an article entitled "The Case of Captain Rickover" it is said:

The man who, by official cognizance, has done substantially more than any other individual to build the United States Navy's first atomic submarine, twice has been passed over for promotion to rear admiral. He is Capt. Hyman G. Rickover. Unless positive steps are taken, he will be retired from the Navy in June. As an individual high in the Pentagon remarked to this writer, "We can get Rick any honors he wants, and a big paying job outside if he wishes, but he can't make rear admiral."

This is the difficulty, the tragedy of a specialist in military service: he will always remain a specialist. Though he may have performed the most meritorious service of any individual in the Navy since World War II, and even though he knows far more than any other man wearing gold braid about the atom and has directed its application to ships, still he isn't qualified to command the operation of those ships thereafter. Of course, he would not have to be a sea commander. He has a life's work ahead on his own atomic beach.

The atomic submarine which is now being built at the Electric Boat Co., Groton, Conn., is, by all accounts available to members of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, coming along better than anyone dared to predict. The credit, by the few official comments available, belongs almost exclusively to Captain Rickover. He promoted the atomic submarine program originally, at first against the traditionalist line officers of the Navy who said it wasn't practical.

After he had won them over, he had to direct the whole program, training and developing a staff, moving quietly, almost mysteriously, for 5 years, between the Navy Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the shipyards at Groton. In a year or so the atomic submarine will be completed and the Navy may have dropped its pilot.

Mr. Speaker, it is devoutly to be hoped that the admirals have not dropped the pilot too soon. Do they, have a replacement to compare with Rickover?

Even if it were not for his monumental accomplishments in the field of atomic energy, Rickover's other accomplishments are such as to make the action of

the admirals in refusing to promote him almost unthinkable. During World War II, Rickover helped perfect an underwater object locator which was used to penetrate mine fields; he contributed much to the infrared signaling device; to new methods of degaussing ships; to equipment to enable submarines to withstand depth charges and countless other devices. It is said that a four-star admiral put the following comment in Rickover's service jacket:

This man has done more for the Navy from an engineering point of view than any other officer.

How, then, could this admiral's colleagues on the selection board, in the face of such a comment, refuse to promote him? I do not know the answer, Mr. Speaker. Only God and the nine admirals comprising the second selection board know that answer to that one, for the proceedings of the selection boards are as deeply veiled as the most vital military secret. For all that we know—for all that even the Commander in Chief of the Navy, the President of the United States, knows, the standards for promotion employed by the selection board may be those recommended by Admiral Sir Joseph Porter in Gilbert and Sullivan's Pinafore when he sings:

I cleaned the windows and I scrubbed the floor
And I polished up the handle on the big front door.
I polished up that handle so carefulee
That now I am the ruler of the Queen's Navee.

Or—

I always voted at my party's call
And I never thought of thinking for myself at all.
I thought so little they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the Queen's Navee.

Talk about civilian control of the military—nothing is further from the truth. The admirals are powers unto themselves and unto themselves alone. Woe unto an officer who for one reason or another crosses an admiral.

It was probably an admiral's stepped-on toe with a long memory which deprived the Navy and the Nation of Rickover's further services. The New York Times magazine speculates that Rickover's failure of promotion may be attributable to the fact that—he—Rickover—

fights without stint for whatever he wants for his projects, he fights for his staff, he argues with his superiors, abortcuts standard procedures, ignores protocol, and risks hurting the feelings of those who do not agree. Perhaps in this lies the reason he has been passed over twice for promotion to admiral—and in such a case Navy regulations call for his involuntary retirement, effective next June.

There is another possible explanation, Mr. Speaker, the probability that the Navy has no room for an individualist—even one possessed of the brilliance of Captain Rickover. This is what might be termed "convoy mentality." You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that during the war, the Navy did a magnificent job of convoying men and material to the far-flung reaches of the world. One of the rules of the convoy restricted the speed of the entire group to that of its slowest vessel. No matter how fast a ship was capable of traveling, as long as it was part of a convoy, it was compelled to reduce speed to equal that of the convoy's slowest member.

Apparently, the admirals have transferred that rule of the convoy to the field of officer selection. They demand uniformity of thinking. They want a Navy of yes-men. Rickover is not of that pattern. He is an individualist. When he has a job to do he does it as promptly as possible, Navy protocol to the contrary notwithstanding. Maybe this is the reason why six captains, junior in rank to him were promoted to rear admiral. In this connection, I am informed that in the spring of 1950, the Westinghouse Co. was looking for a subcontractor to build the submarine hull to house the nuclear power plant. They contacted the Navy's submarine building yard at Portsmouth, N. H., and asked the commanding officer if he would design and build the submarine hull for Westinghouse power plant. The commanding officer said, "No." Westinghouse then went to the Electric Boat Co., which started work on it the very next day. This is the atomic submarine which will be completed next year. The point of the story is that the Portsmouth captain who turned down Westinghouse, is himself an engineering duty specialist like Rickover, and has since been promoted to admiral.

Why is it important that Captain Rickover's case be singled out? I think it should be singled out because it raises a serious question whether promotions to the top echelons in the Navy are made on the basis of merit. The selection board mentality is far behind the needs of the day. We are entering the atomic age. We are on the threshhold of new scientific marvels—new weapons for our military forces are on the drawing boards. We need scientists among our officers, not only line officers; and what qualifications do admirals of today possess to pass on the merits of those who see tomorrow's battles fought with tomorrow's weapons? They know little about the new vistas opening up. Those in the service who see the necessity for progress are doomed to frustration unless the Navy is revitalized.

In his book, Crusade in Europe, President Eisenhower says:

Indeed one of the most important characteristics of the successful officer today is his ability to continue changing his methods, almost even his mental processes, in order to keep abreast of the constant change that modern science, working under the compelling urge of national self-preservation, brings to the battlefield.

Rickover is such an officer—an officer with vision, with ability and with the courage of his convictions; one who is imbued with the necessity of keeping the Navy up to date. He knew he was right and was willing to sacrifice his naval career to combat the admirals, who said his dream of an atomic submarine was visionary. Time has proved him right. Not only are we building two atomic submarines today, but an atomic-powered aircraft carrier as well. It is said that by 1965 the entire United States Navy will be atom propelled. Moreover, the principle which saw the use of nuclear power in the submarine may be applied as well to the airplane. Yes; time proved that Rickover was right. The irony is that he will be forced to leave the Navy, while the admirals who thought he was wrong and who terminated his career will still be in command.

The only check that exists today in the supreme control which the admirals have over the Navy—the only check against the exercise of convoy mentality against officers is a civilian Secretary of the Navy with courage enough to stand up and fight the admirals. James Forrestal was such a Secretary.

In the book Fleet Admiral King, a naval record by Ernest J. King, fleet admiral, United States Navy, and Walter Muir Whitehill, commander, United States Navy Reserve, is the following:

Further difficulties arose when Mr. Forrestal did not agree with the recommendations of a Flag Officers Selection Board of which Vice Adm. P. N. L. Bellinger was senior member. After the recommendations had been submitted, Bellinger returned to his command, but Mr. Forrestal presently summoned the late Vice Adm. Marc A. Mitscher—the senior member of the board permanently on duty in Washington—and questioned him concerning the names of the captains recommended for promotion to the rank of rear admiral. Mitscher explained that the board had made its selections by established procedures and in accordance with its precept, and that those officers recommended were the best qualified, but Mr. Forrestal nevertheless took him to task for what he considered poor recommendations. When King learned of this, he made a point of informing the Secretary that the report of the Selection Board was entirely proper, following the practice of these boards ever since their establishment in 1916, and that it was distinctly inappropriate for him to reproach Mitscher, who, although the second senior member of the 11-man board, had only 1 vote. Forrestal asked King to accompany him to the White House to discuss the recommendations, and while driving there from the Navy Department, King tried once more to get Mr. Forrestal to accept them, assuring him that it would be a serious mistake to interfere with the Selection Board. In reply, Mr. Forrestal simply stared at him. King believed that the Secretary thought that he would be supported by Mr. Truman, or that King would back down before the President. As it turned out, the matter was not discussed with the President in King's presence, and the list as changed by Mr. Forrestal was subsequently approved by Mr. Truman without asking King's views.

Mr. Forrestal's action in tampering with the established processes of selection seemed to King of the gravest impropriety.

James Forrestal was unique. He fought the admirals when he thought he was right, not only about naval policy, but about promotions. There are few such men.

Secretary of the Navy Kimball, in spite of his respect and admiration for Rickover, was unwilling to stand up against the admirals. In a press conference on January 15, 1953, he said that he wanted Rickover promoted to admiral, that he thought Rickover should have been promoted to admiral, but that he would not insist that the Naval Selection Board do so. In this respect he was unlike Forrestal. Forrestal would never have permitted the admirals to browbeat him. He would have seen that Rickover was promoted.

We have an unfortunate situation, Mr. Speaker—what can we do about it? Insofar as Captain Rickover's case is

concerned, I have written to President Eisenhower asking his consideration of the matter. Although he has not seen my letter or been advised of the matter, I have been informed that he will not withdraw the pending appointments. I have written also to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body, pointing out that the action of the Selection Board has resulted not only in a flagrant injustice to a deserving naval officer, but as a matter of fact may well jeopardize the entire atomic submarine-construction project. I suggested that confirmation of those selected by the Selection Board be withheld pending an investigation of the entire matter. I have not yet received a reply. Whether anything will be done remains to be seen.

Insofar as the future is concerned, and other selection boards, I believe it is vital that we heed the advice of the great scientist, Dr. Vannevar Bush, as it appears on page 252 of his book Modern Arms and Free Men:

> The behavior of men in battle can be soundly estimated only by those who have spent a lifetime in military affairs; the applications that will probably flow out of future science can be soundly estimated only by those who have spent a lifetime developing and utilizing science. Military men have arrived rather generally at the first stage, where they can grasp the value of a device before them; they have by no means arrived at the second, where they can visualize intelligently the devices of the future. Yet military planning for the future that ignores or misinterprets scientific trends is planning in a vacuum. Military men are therefore in a quandry; there is a new and essential element in their planning that they do not understand. To leave it out is obviously absurd. To master it absolutely is impossible. * * *
>
> We have arrived at the point where military planning of adequate comprehensiveness is beyond the capacity of military men alone. Either they will learn to cope with the new situation or they will lose their franchise. So far, the course of events has come close to the latter alternative. The days are gone when military men could sit on a pedestal, receive the advice of professional groups in neighboring fields who were maintained in a subordinate or tributary position, accept or reject such advice at will, discount its importance as they saw fit, and speak with omniscience on the overall conduct of war. For one thing, professional men in neighboring fields have no present intention of kowtowing to any military hierarchy, in a world where they know that other professional subjects are just as important in determining the course of future events in the Nation's defense as are narrowly limited military considerations.

We are in a new age, an atomic age. Let us establish atomic age standards. In selecting the officers who are to govern the Navy, recognition should be accorded to officers who are scientists as well as those who are fighting men, a principle which the Navy today is unwilling to adopt.

I believe that this Congress must abolish selection methods which are governed by standards of 1916 when the basic Officer Personnel Act was passed. Under the Officer Personnel Act, the selection board which makes recommendations for appointments to the rank of admiral for engineering duty officers consists of six line officers and three engineering duty officers. It is a unique board, inasmuch as selection boards for every other branch of the Navy are comprised exclusively of officers of the particular branches in which they serve. Medical admirals sit on medical selection boards. Civil engineering admirals on civil engineering boards, and so on. Why should so many line officers be on the board? What possible knowledge do line officers have of the qualifications of engineering duty officers? Do they have any interest in engineering accomplishments? The Rickover case proved the contrary. I dare say that not one of the line officers who sat on either selection board ever took the trouble to visit any part of the atomic submarine project which Rickover had developed. Can they pass on the qualifications of a nuclear engineer?

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring an element of common sense and fairness to the engineering duty officer selection process I propose the following:

First. That the members of engineering duty officer selection boards which are convened to pass upon the promotion or retention of officers in flag rank shall consist of three line officers, three engineering duty officers, and three civilians who are selected by the President from among the outstanding scientists and engineers in the country.

Second. The chairman of such a board shall be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy designated for the purpose by the Secretary of the Navy.

Third. There shall be a stenographic record made of the entire proceedings of the board, copies of which shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. In the event that there is disagreement by members of the Selection Board, such disagreement, with reasons therefor, may be noted and attached to the stenographic report by the minority members.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, or the President shall have the right to reject the action of the Selection Board in whole or in part and to reconvene the board. In the event that there shall be disagreement among the members of the Selection Board, the Secretaries of the Navy or Defense and the President may substitute the name of an officer not selected by the majority, but approved by at least one member of the board. If either of the Secretaries does so, he shall make an appropriate notation on the report, with his reasons, in forwarding the report to the President for final appointment.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure will reduce the excessive power now possessed by the admirals and will permit civilian participation and control to a greater extent. It is obvious that the admirals will still retain predominant control, inasmuch as they will have six votes to three for the civilians. Most important, what the bill brings is a fresh, modern, scientific judgment to bear on the usual standards for promotion of the Navy, whatever they may be, and gives science its proper place in considering the selection of top officers. Moreover, it brings the power to dissent and disagree by competent outsiders.

The argument will be raised, Mr. Speaker, that this type of legislation will introduce politics into officer selection. The fact is that it will reduce the service politics that now exists and will permit the Commander in Chief of the Navy to openly designate those whom he thinks should operate the Navy. It is no secret that under the present law, if the President desires the appointment of an admiral, he may reject the selections of various boards until his nominee is approved.

The provision respecting stenographic reports will do away with the complete secrecy now surrounding the activities of the boards. The reports are intended only for the use of those officials who have duties to perform in the selection process. They are intended to be confidential and not open to the public. The Senate, which has the right and duty to confirm, should at least have some information on which it may act. Today its action is automatic. It is my belief that since 1916 the Senate has not rejected the recommendations of any Selection Board, in whole or in part.

In the book, Admiral Sims and the Modern American Navy, by Morison, the author, in passing upon Admiral Sims' views on selection board processes says: "No scheme is foolproof. Good men will be overlooked and bad ones selected upon occasion, no matter what precautions are taken. What is needed ideally, is an unprejudiced board with powers of selection and placement, possessed of adequate information on each officer."

To this must be added, a board with the ability to evaluate the information. Men are too precious to be wasted through improper action by selection boards. The selection process must be reevaluated if we are to maintain the morale of the men of the Navy, the Navy itself and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is deplorable that Captain Rickover's career, which has been one of splendid devotion to duty to the Navy and to his country, may be ended. If his splendid service is indeed to end now, we should at least seek to remedy the processes by which great talents such as his are lost to the Nation. We must keep constantly in mind the advice of Dr. Vannevar Bush that—

> We now need an adequate organization within the National Military Establishment for deliberate military planning in all aspects of modern war, not merely the strictly military part of a generation ago. When the President and Congress have set it up and started it in operation, they should review it constantly, they should review its methods and its personnel, and they must review its decisions, for upon them enormous appropriations will depend. (Modern Arms and Free Men, p. 257.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, for making this presentation to us this afternoon. The reason I rise at this time is because the gentleman asked why Captain Rickover's case should be singled out. I think it should be singled out for many reasons; one in particular is important not only to the Navy but to the whole of the United States and the free

world. The gentleman remembers the Committee on Atomic Energy. I know there are a limited number of men in the military line who are thoroughly indoctrinated in the field of atomic energy, and I would place Captain Rickover among the first three on that list. Being passed over twice he is scheduled for retirement. This is a loss not only to the Navy but to the entire country, a very serious and needless loss.

Captain Rickover was in charge of the Navy atomic-powered submarine program, also the aircraft carrier program. It has been his personal drive and influence and push behind the atomic-powered submarine that brings us to the threshold of realization. I personally feel that had it not been for an officer of this type we would not be near a realization of this program.

I heard the Secretary of the Navy, and a top member of the Atomic Energy Commission, a member of the Navy staff, commend this officer for his great influence in this program. Yet he is not good enough for selection.

If the policy of selection reacts in such a manner that it does harm to a man of the capacity and talents of Captain Rickover, it must, in my opinion, be a bad policy and something should be done about it. I do not think the Nation can afford to lose a man as important to the Navy in this particular program as is Captain Rickover. The gentleman, in my opinion, is deserving of much commendation for calling the attention of the Congress and the people of this country to this very serious matter.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I certainly appreciate what he has said. I know he has been one of those who has been active on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and has followed closely the activities not only of Captain Rickover but of the military services as well with respect to the undertaking and building of the atomic-powered submarine and the undertaking and building of the atomic aircraft carriers.

Mr. PRICE. One of the difficulties in getting officers within the Navy to be as interested in a program as Captain Rickover has been in this matter, is the fact that they knew they were out of line for promotion when singled out and placed on these special jobs. By passing over Captain Rickover we are further destroying morale within the Navy for these specialist assignments.

Mr. YATES. I agree entirely with what the gentleman has said. It certainly will be a deterrent to enlistments within the Navy of the kind of men with scientific minds and brains that we want today. Science has an important part to play in the well-being of the Navy and this important work should come from within the Navy as well as from without.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. First, let me corroborate all the fine things the gentleman himself, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] have had to say about the contributions of Captain Rickover. Everyone connected with the program recognizes the great contribution he has made. However, I cannot share the gentleman's criticism of the system which resulted in his failure of selection to the rank of admiral. Of course, it is the goal and life's ambition of every career officer to go to the top, but it is impossible for all of them to accomplish this goal.

While we know, you and I, the affirmative, the positive, the helpful things, that Captain Rickover has done in his career, we do not know the whole story necessarily. I know none of the members who sat on the board of selection, but this board had the whole story. It is conceivable—I do not say it is true—that in the whole record of this naval officer there were incidents, there were indications of a lack of qualification which is required in the rank of a commander, especially in connection with command at sea. So while I deplore the fact that Captain Rickover was not selected for the rank of admiral, if for no other reason than for the great work he has done, I do not think the fault lies necessarily with the system of selection.

Now having said that, let me inquire of the gentleman, who, I assume, knows Captain Rickover—I do not know the captain personally well enough to know what he complains of—does that necessarily mean because the captain has failed of selection of the rank of admiral that therefore his talents and his services will be unavailable to the Government to continue work in the atomic energy field?

Mr. YATES. Let me say to the gentleman that I met Captain Rickover for a few minutes a few days ago. I had brought this matter to the attention of the House several weeks ago when I made a 1-minute speech on the subject. I do not know whether Captain Rickover's services will be lost to the Navy as the result of the action of the second selection board, and I do not know whether or not it will be tenable for him to come back and work for the Navy inasmuch as he will be retired. I do not know whether he wants to work for the Navy in view of the fact he was passed over. But, I do know that as the result of having been passed over twice and having served in the Navy for 30 years that retirement is automatic when June comes. So, I cannot give a more specific answer to the gentleman than that.

Further on in my address I go into the selection boards and give some reasons why I think there should be a change in the manner of the selection of the selection boards, and I wonder whether the gentleman will indulge me to complete my address until I reach that point so that we can engage in further discussion.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have been waiting patiently until the gentleman completed his address.

Mr. YATES. I have not completed it yet.

Mr. COLE of New York. But since the gentleman yielded to the gentleman from Illinois I felt it was proper for me to seek his indulgence. Is it not fair to assume, if Captain Rickover is willing, that his talents will be available to, for instance, Electric Boat Co., General Electric, Westinghouse, the Navy Department, or any department, even the Atomic Energy Commission itself, anybody who is connected with the atomic program, and who recognizes the value of his services?

Mr. YATES. There is no question about that, and I think it would be desirable for Westinghouse or General Electric or for Du Pont or any one of the big atomic energy contractors to snap this man up. But the point I am making is that it is sad when the Navy has an atomic scientist of this type available, who has the encomiums given to him that have been given to him by outstanding authorities that I have enumerated in the preceding paragraph of my speech—it is sad when the Navy fails to recognize the talents of such a man and passes him over, and I think it may be attributable to the fact that the Navy refuses to recognize that scientists have a place in the Navy or among its top echelons.

Mr. COLE of New York. That they do have scientists in the Navy is without question. Captain Rickover's failure of promotion does not indicate that the Navy does not recognize the importance of scientists.

Mr. YATES. To my mind the Navy does not place sufficient emphasis on them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not these selection boards consist of human beings like all of us?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not these men have their friendships and their influences? I assume they have friendships that have been developed through their years of service in the Navy and the Army.

Mr. YATES. I assume that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without intimating that they are going out of their way to do things that are wrong, yet they are not perfect, are they?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. They can make errors of judgment, and they can give their friends a little break?

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The important thing about it is the fact that their proceedings are conducted in utmost secrecy, so that no one knows what they are doing.

Mr. McCORMACK. If they can give a break to someone who is a friend of theirs, can they not give somebody else a bad break sometimes?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have a case up in Boston where we have a brigadier general who is one of the finest men in connection with dealing with scientists. That is the big question in our armed services. These scientists are not going to be subjected to military minds and military dictation. The big question is how to have the scientists and the military men work together. We have a general up there who was passed over. He is going out and somebody else is going in there. It is the old Army clique. They are sore because we were able to stop the Cambridge Research Laboratory from being transferred to some place in

New York. Some of the people up there are sore and they are going to work it out on him.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. May I mention that in a few moments, I shall read from Dr. Vannevar Bush's book, Modern Arms and Free Men, in which he argues precisely as does the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much concerned about these generals who are talking and going into the civilian side of the Government. I have never met a general who did not talk of peace after war. I would like to meet one of them who talks about peace before war. I am very much concerned with the question of the military spirit in a representative democracy. The military has a proper place in our Government. I have backed them up. All throughout the war I fought against the use of the term "brass hat" and other such expressions. I shall continue to do so. I am very much concerned about retired generals, and yes, even generals in active service going into politics, for example, a certain letter written last year was not merely an accident. In a situation of a man commanding a military force, I was amazed and astonished, and it is about time that some of them realized their responsibility. This is a civilian Government and not a military Government.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say to the gentleman that I appreciate very much his bringing this matter before Congress, for it is a very important subject. It occurs to me that the Senate of the United States, the other body, passes on the recommendations made by the President in thousands of cases literally. To me an admiralcy carries a great deal of power; important responsibilities, important duties upon which the lives of many, many people depend and our strategy depends, are in the hands of an admiral.

I think the gentleman mentioned the fact that the other body has never really investigated the qualifications or given a proper evaluation of its own, of the men who were nominated to these very important positions.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me to correct the thought I think he wanted to express, I stated that the Senate does not have the information upon which they can evaluate properly the qualifications of those whom it is asked to confirm; and as far as I have been able to find out it has not rejected an appointee of a selection board to the rank of admiral since 1916.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is just what I wanted to emphasize. The other body when the matter of confirmation comes before it for a civilian post holds hearings; in many cases they investigate practically the entire life of the person whose name has been sent to the Senate. The exact opposite is true insofar as the appointment of an admiral is concerned.

I want to call attention to the great importance of the position of admiral as it has developed throughout the years. I think the gentleman is proposing a sound departure from present methods.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It seems to me we have only recently seen extensive hearings conducted by the other body in connection with appointees to cabinet positions. Certainly appointees to the cabinet carry much more responsibility than an admiral, but I still insist that the officers of flag rank in the Navy and officers of general rank in the Army hold tremendously vital positions and deal with the destiny and with the lives of those who are called into the defense services of our Nation. Why then should not the other body be in a position to demand and obtain the information necessary upon which to act intelligently and to determine the fitness of these officers who hold the destinies of our boys and our defense establishment in their hands? Under the present system the Senate gets nothing, because the processes of the selection boards are performed in the completest secrecy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's statement on this matter. I had not been informed before he started speaking that Captain Rickover has again been passed over.

The gentleman is probably aware that I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception and have had occasion on many times before our committee and outside of our committee meetings to hear Captain Rickover testify, and to become acquainted with some of his accomplishments.

Certainly I do not think that the gentleman has exaggerated the importance of Captain Rickover to the atomic energy program in its naval adaptation. I doubt very seriously that we would at this time be as far along the path toward completion of an atomic submarine had it not been for the persistence, sometimes I feel at the opposition of his superiors, on the part of Captain Rickover that such development be accomplished. I attended the laying of the keel of the new atomic submarine and I talked at that time with Captain Rickover. He was praised then very highly.

Here is a man 52 years of age, right in the prime of life, a man with an extraordinary scientific background and many accomplishments, a man who has adapted that knowledge of science to what I believe will be a revolutionary form of undersea craft that will make obsolete the submarines not only of our own country but of all other nations in the world. This new submarine will be of such cruising radius and will be so efficient in its operation, it will be devoid of certain deficiencies such as the need to come to the surface for air, which is now a part of the working feature of the present type of submarines, that it will put the United States, in my opinion, in a position far ahead of any nation in the world in this type of craft, and it may revolutionize completely the concept of naval warfare. Again I say this man has been responsible more than any one individual in the Navy for this accomplishment, and while I do not want to pass judgment on the Selection Board—they may have had their own ideas and their own reasons for their decision, yet it is incomprehensible to me as a Member of the Congress and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that this man with his rare accomplishments and rare abilities should have been passed over.

The suggestion has been made that his talents may be available to our country, and undoubtedly they will be in some form or other. But this man has stayed in the Navy as a matter of choice for 30 years. It is to him a career. He has a right to be ambitious in that career and to expect promotion even to the title of Admiral of the Fleet. I have not talked with him, but there is no doubt in my mind but what this promotion was something that he was looking forward to as the crowning event of his career. The fact that he will be available, and I hope he will be, does not clarify my mind as to the reason why he has been passed over. I hope that the information the gentleman is bringing to the attention of the public today through his speech will be considered by Members of the other body, and if there is a just reason, and I believe there is, that this matter should be given additional consideration and review, I hope it will be given review and that this man will be kept in the career which he has chosen, for the benefit of the Nation.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Let me say in closing that at a press conference held on January 15 Secretary Kimball was asked a question by one of the reporters:

> Does the Navy have a man who can replace Captain Rickover?

Kimball thought a moment and said:

> We have two or three.

It seems to me something is drastically wrong with our system or with our law which requires the retirement of an outstanding scientist in the Navy when we only have two or three others like him in the entire Navy to replace him on one of these projects. There is no question but what we in this country accept the principle that no man is indispensable, but when we, by our own hands, as a result of a law this Congress has passed, willingly throw aside talent that the Navy needs and can use, particularly today when we are engaged in this tremendous race with the forces of communism for first discovery in the mysteries of the atom, it seems incredible there is no change in the law which would permit the Navy to retain the services of such a person.

I happen to believe personally that he should have been promoted to admiral, but in this I am disagreed with by the Selection Board. But some attention should be given to this problem by the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate.

COMMISSION TO STUDY GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE TAXPAYING ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution to establish a Commission To Study Government Competition With Private Taxpaying Enterprise. The enormous growth of Government during the past 20 years is, as we all realize, a dangerous threat to the sovereign rights of the individual States and to the personal liberty of all of us. But possibly we are not as keenly aware of the threat to privately owned enterprises in all parts of the country because of competition from the purely business activities of the Federal Government.

One example of a Federal activity which is competing with private industry is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC reduces investment opportunities for banks, insurance companies, and other privately owned financial organizations. Congress did not intend this. When we enacted legislation establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we contemplated that it would make loans only when private lending institutions were unwilling to do so. Recent practice has been to grant RFC loans to borrowers simply because they are unable to get private money on their own terms. But the RFC is only 1 of 40 Federal agencies which are or have been engaged in banking and credit activities.

To mention only a few: Farm Credit Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Reclamation Bureau, Soil Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Mutual Security Agency, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Technical Cooperation Administration, Maritime Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Export-Import Bank, Federal National Mortgage Association. Other Federal agencies and corporations engaged in lending and credit activities are listed in special analysis D on page 1104 of the Budget document for 1954.

More than $12,500,000,000 in Federal funds are invested in these lending activities, with additional commitments of more than 9 billion.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is another example of Government competition with the private power industry. TVA has been a very controversial project. The press has carried many items on the extravagance and waste of TVA. Of course, supporters of public power have sought to defend all of these. I do not want to develop that controversy any further in connection with this bill, because I contemplate that the Commission to be established will be nonpartisan in every respect. But I would like to point out that in the field of hydroelectric power, publicly owned plants have increased almost six times in the past 20 years, and now represent an investment of $50,000,000,000—more than twice that of all privately owned utilities.

Another glaring example is public housing. The first Federal Housing Act was passed in 1937, to alleviate the present and recurring unemployment, which reason no longer exists. Like all other tax-free socialistic experiments, Government housing is the same kind of unfair competition for which private business would be haled before the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice for prosecution for monopoly in restraint of trade, and so forth.

There are four separate Federal housing bureaus:

First. Housing and Home Finance Agency: Employs 101 persons at salaries from $6,400 to $17,500, exclusive of many hundreds of secretarial and clerical staffs.

Second. Federal Housing Administration: Employs 279 persons at salaries from $5,400 to $15,000, exclusive of many hundreds of secretarial and clerical staffs.

Third. Public Housing Administration: Employs 92 persons at salaries from $6,400 to $15,000, exclusive of many hundreds of secretarial and clerical staffs.

Fourth. Office of the Housing Expediter: Employs 286 persons at salaries from $5,400 to $14,000, exclusive of many hundreds of secretarial and clerical staffs.

What have these four bureaus accomplished during the past 15 years which private builders and prospective homeowners could not have accomplished to alleviate the present and recurring unemployment and to remedy the serious housing shortage, which were the reasons stated for enactment of housing legislation?

I want it clearly understood that I am not singling out any particular agency nor endeavoring to pass on the degree with which various agencies are in competition with private business, but I am urging Congress to adopt my resolution in order that we will have the advantage of this Commission's survey and findings. It would operate in this field in a way similar to the study conducted by the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of Government Agencies.

Perhaps one of the greatest threats to free competition came in 1951, when Congress was considering the Defense Production Act. The Government asked for more power to carry on business pursuits, and an amendment was proposed giving the Government power to build industrial plants for the purpose of manufacturing, producing, and processing materials necessary to the national defense and to engage in marketing, transportation, and storage of such materials. If this amendment had been enacted, it might well have crushed private industry, which could not have long withstood the competition from the Federal Government, with its enormous capital resources. As you know, Congress rejected the proposal.

It will not be easy to get the Government out of competition with private business enterprises. This was demonstrated in the recent Dollar Steamship Company case. You will remember that in 1938, the Government undertook the operation of the Dollar Line and immediately changed the name to the American President Line. For the next 12 years, political appointees, with little or no experience in shipping, occupied the $25,000-a-year job as company president. Mismanagement was so notorious that Harry Lundeberg, president of the AFL Seafarers International Union, stated publicly that—

> The American President Line is run by the Government and is like a Government agency: you get a job there, not because you are a good seaman or a good maritime executive, but because you are a good politician.

When the company's debt to the Government had been paid, R. Stanley Dollar and his associates asked the Department of Commerce to return their property. This request was refused. The Government claimed that it owned the stock, and it offered the shipping company for sale to the highest bidder. The Dollar interests brought court action to enforce their claim to the $68,000,000 company, and the court ordered the Government to return the stock. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer refused; and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by a unanimous decision of three judges, cited Secretary Sawyer for civil and criminal contempt. The court said:

> Here we have the spectacle of a government which proclaims adherence to law as the governing force among men not only refusing for 6 years to submit to its own courts its claims to private property derived from purely commercial transactions, but endeavoring by every device to thwart and defeat the judgment of those courts after it has been rendered.

The Supreme Court affirmed this decision, but even then the Department of Commerce did not fully restore ownership of the steamship line to the Dollar Co. A settlement was later negotiated. The Dollar Line's case demonstrates the danger Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill warned us of in a speech in the Senate on March 27, 1878. Senator Hill said:

> I have said that I do not dread these (private) corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain, and control them; but there is a corporation we may all dread. That corporation is the Federal Government. From the aggression of this corporation there can be no safety, if it is allowed to go beyond the bounds, the well-defined limits of its power. I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this Government. It is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure to keep it always within its limits. If this great, ambitious, ever-growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall control it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it? As sentinels on the country's watchtower, Senators, I beseech you watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all States and people, and all liberty and hope, its playthings in an hour and its victims forever.

It is apparent from this statement that the dangers of government encroachment on private business activities have long been recognized, and something should have been done about it long ago. My resolution would do something about it by creating a commission of 21 members, representing overall manufacturing, industry, trade and commerce, transportation, banking, newspaper and magazine publishing, and other forms of graphic arts. Seven members of the Commission would be appointed by the President, seven by

the President of the Senate, and seven by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This Commission would have access to all Government records; and, after making a thorough study of Government functions which compete with private business activities, it would report to Congress on its findings and would make recommendations for getting the Government out of competition with private business.

I am recommending the creation of a special commission because the problem is so vast in its scope. Before Congress can act effectively on legislation to remedy the situation, it must have the advantage of a comprehensive report, with facts and figures in detail. The fact is that Government competition affects, in one way or another, a large percentage of the four million-odd business concerns in this country in different lines of manufacturing, commerce, banking, transportation, and the public services. To eliminate Government as a competitor would be the greatest boon Congress could bestow upon free, independent, taxpaying enterprise.

We all want to help the present administration balance the Federal budget, and we can help very materially by reducing the Federal payrolls to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars annually through the release of thousands of employees engaged in Government business activities, whom private enterprise needs and can readily absorb in similar employment.

I earnestly urge all of you to study the problem of Federal competition with private industry and to consider carefully my proposal to curtail the Government's purely business functions—which in many cases are operated at a loss to the taxpayer.

SHOULD CONGRESS INVESTIGATE COMMUNISM IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the question which forms the title of my discussion is now before the Congress and the American people. It has been placed there by the present hearings of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the proposed hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. It is not my intention to make an intemperate attack on either of these committees or any member of the respective committees.

I would like to state at the outset that I believe that congressional committees have the legal right to investigate a very wide latitude of subject matter. I believe that it is to the benefit of the Nation that a wide power of investigation be deposited with the Congress of the United States. Along with this wide legal power, which the congressional committees have, goes a tremendous moral responsibility to act wisely in choosing the subject matter to be investigated and to use a great restraint in exercise of this power.

I believe that it would be unwise for the Congress to send its investigating committees into the various colleges and universities throughout the land because, I believe, that such investigations would do more harm than good.

I state at the outset that I am opposed to the Communist philosophy. I am opposed to advocates of the Communist philosophy teaching in our schools. I realize that an individual could be a believer in the Communist philosophy and that he, at the same time, could render academic services in specialized fields of teaching without introducing into his teaching the political tenets of communism. Nevertheless, knowing as I do the vicious and amoral tenets of communism—which can quickly be summed up in their basic belief that the end justifies the means, I would prefer that the important position of guiding the thinking of students should not be subjected to the possible contamination of Communist teachers.

If it is conceded then that the belief in communism and the practice of its principles are so incompatible with the principles of democracy that a Communist teacher who is true to Communist tenets might, of necessity, be placed in a contradictory position because of the basic conflict in the two ideologies, then a solution to this problem must be sought. The first question we must consider is: Who shall do the seeking? I believe that this important responsibility lies squarely with local boards of education who are elected by the people of their respective areas, with regents or trustees who are usually selected and appointed by elected officials such as the governors of our respective States.

I do not believe that it is necessary to argue in detail for the principles of local control of our educational facilities, personnel, and curriculum. That principle is so well established and is so basic in the maintenance of a democratic society that I shall not waste time or space in affirming it further.

This principle stems from a deep-seated fear that at some time in the future a national tyrant will seize control of our educational system and subvert its influence from the common good to his personal benefit. That this fear has a genuine basis is evidenced by contemporary practice in totalitarian nations.

At all costs, Federal intervention—whether through obligated financial grants or through coercion by fear or intimidation or adverse publicity—must be avoided. The threat of coercion and intimidation is a real detriment to academic freedom in our higher institutions of learning.

Men who have devoted their lives to the preparation for teaching and the practice of teaching are, in most instances, set apart from the turmoil of every-day life. As a rule, they shun publicity and the very threat of a congressional investigation of their institution and personnel strikes fear to their hearts. They realize that congressional hearings, in the past, have often been marked by the use of unfair methods toward individual witnesses. They know that irresponsible charges against innocent people have been made public, although they have later been proven to be false. They know that their academic careers can easily be blasted and their reputations ruined through "trial by publicity" by a congressional committee. They know that, in the past, some Congressmen have been more anxious to obtain newspaper headlines for their own political aggrandizement than they have been anxious to do a thorough and efficient job of developing the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

They know that congressional committees have published lists of names in the past; the publication of which has had the effect of establishing guilt by association. These lists have been publicized without notification to the individual, without certification of their time of membership and without opportunity for the individual to renounce, explain, or deny inclusion of his name on such lists. I cannot help but state at this point that the establishment of the principle of guilt by association constitutes, probably, one of the most dangerous attacks on personal liberty in our generation. It undermines the constitutional principle of personal guilt and personal responsibility.

With this knowledge of the methods which have been used by a few congressional committees in the past, it is no wonder that the threat of congressional investigations in our colleges and universities has brought forth a multitude of protests from responsible newspapers as well as prominent educators and prominent citizens.

I believe that a congressional committee, therefore, should study very seriously as to whether it is wise to embark upon whole-scale investigations of colleges and college personnel for the purpose of exposing a few Communists. They should also weigh carefully whether their investigations will do good or harm to our educational system.

Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, recently appointed High Commissioner of Western Germany by President Eisenhower and confirmed by the Senate, made to the Harvard Board of Overseers a report under date of January 12, 1953. He had the following to say on this particular subject:

> As I have said on more than one occasion in the past few years, I would not be party to the appointment of a Communist to any position in a school, college, or university. There are no known adherents to the party on our staff and I do not believe there are any disguised Communists, either. But even if there were, the damage that would be done to the spirit of this academic community by an investigation of the university aimed at finding a crypto-Communist would be far greater than any conceivable harm such a person might do.
>
> As to the charges that some professors hold unpopular political opinions, the answer is, of course, they do. It would be a sad day for the United States if the tradition of dissent were driven out of the universities. For it is the freedom to disagree, to quarrel with authority on intellectual matters, to think otherwise, that has made this Nation what it is today. Indeed, I would go farther and say that our industrial society was pioneered by men who were dissenters, who challenged orthodoxy in some field, and challenged it successfully. The

global struggle with communism turns on this very point.

As to the balance between orthodoxy and unorthodoxy in any faculty which deals with controversial subjects, be it theology, philosophy, law, political theory, architecture, or economics, that is for each university to determine by its own procedures. The independence of each college and university would be threatened if governmental agencies of any sort started inquiries into the nature of the instruction that was given. The colleges of the United States have nothing to hide, but their independence as corporate scholarly organizations is of supreme importance. One need hardly argue this point in view of the dramatic examples of what occurred under the Nazi and Fascist regimes as well as what is now going on in totalitarian nations.

There is no doubt that the danger of communism, both from the standpoint of military aggressions abroad and attempts at domestic infiltration at home, has caused alarm in the minds of many responsible people. This is understandable and, in my opinion, justified. However, because there is danger, there is all the more reason for clear thinking, coolness of judgment, and proper evaluation of the extent of the danger.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and each American citizen must exercise his share of that vigilance. If our alarm at this danger is accompanied by clear thinking and proper evaluation of the danger, we will not become panicky nor hysterical, nor will we resort to the methods of the police states to combat the danger. If through fear and panic we desert our basic democratic principles and procedures, we will have lost immediately the liberty which we hope to preserve. There are certain risks which a democracy must take if it wishes to preserve democracy.

In October of 1952, the noted jurist, Judge Learned Hand, made a speech before the board of regents of the State of New York. His contribution to our thinking on this subject is, in part, as follows:

> God knows there is risk in refusing to act till the facts are all in; but is there not greater risk in abandoning the conditions of all rational inquiry? Risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry. I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose. Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving.
>
> The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion. I do not say that these will suffice; who knows but we may be on a slope which leads down to aboriginal savagery. But of this I am sure, if we are to escape, we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas.

Because of the risk involved in the democratic process and because of my doubt in the wisdom of Federal intervention, through congressional investigations of our educational personnel and procedures, I would not relieve, thereby, the responsibility of local boards of education, local boards of regents and trustees the obligation to exercise vigilance in apprehending and disclosing advocates of communism in our educational institutions. This is clearly a responsibility which they must exercise or a vacuum will occur into which Federal intervention will feel justified in filling. Certainly, if there is a breakdown on the part of responsible local boards in their continued responsibility to protect our educational institutions from subversion through Communist infiltration, I would feel obligated to change my present position. I do not believe that such a breakdown has occurred. We have, according to the United States Office of Education, 1,859 post high-school institutions of higher learning. These institutions employ 246,722 faculty members.

The enormous job of scrutinizing the files of these institutions, screening the faculty members in order to ascertain their political beliefs and associations, the taking of testimony regarding their writing and utterances, and so forth, would, I am sure, provide a gargantuan job for a much larger group of men than those involved in the present congressional committees interested in this subject. In fact, the very enormity of the job of investigation makes it imperative that it be broken down into its individual institutions and that such investigations, as seem necessary, be done by local responsible boards and citizens who have a full-time responsibility of this matter and who have long years of knowledge and association of the institution and personnel involved.

That a creditable job has been done in the main by responsible and interested regents, trustees, and boards, I shall continue to assert. To take the position that the famous and patriotic educators, industrialists, financiers, State governors, and civic-minded citizens who comprise our local boards of education, State boards of regents and trustees, have failed in their responsibility to protect our educational institutions from Communist infiltration is incomprehensible to me. That there has been a breakdown in the principle of local autonomy, I vigorously deny. I do not deny that a few Communists may at this time exist at one place or another in our educational system. Due to the secret nature of their membership, this condition might continue to exist after many years of congressional or local investigations. But, to magnify such occasional incidents as may exist into a matter of such importance as to merit attention of the Congress and justify the Federal intervention throughout the Nation with our educational procedures, seems to me to be adopting the policy of burning down the house in order to destroy the rats.

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, of the Ford Foundation, former president of the University of Chicago, testified before the Select Committee To Investigate Tax Exemption Foundations and comparable organizations on November 25, 1952, on the question of eliminating communism from a university. In this testimony he gives, what I believe to be, a valuable comment on this subject:

> Mr. HUTCHINS. I come then to the question of communism, and what to do about it. My view is, and has been, that it is necessary to resist the threat of Communist aggression by military means, that without this we may be overwhelmed by the tremendous masses of the Red Army.
>
> It is also my impression that along with this effort, which is now consuming the greater part of the resources of this country, that are dedicated to governmental purposes, along with this effort we must maintain and develop the basic sources of our strength, and the basic sources of our strength are the western tradition of freedom: Freedom of thought, freedom of discussion, and freedom of association.
>
> We have then, as we have had for the last several years, the very delicate problem of balancing security and freedom.
>
> Now, a university is a place that is established and will function for the benefit of society, provided it is a center of independent thought. It is a center of independent thought and criticism that is created in the interest of the progress of society, and the one reason that we know that every totalitarian government must fail is that no totalitarian government is prepared to face the consequences of operating free universities.
>
> It is important for this purpose to attract into the institution men of the greatest capacity, and to encourage them to exercise their independent judgment.
>
> Education is a kind of continuing dialog, and a dialog assumes, in the nature of the case, different points of view.
>
> The civilizations which I work and which I am sure every American is working toward, could be called a civilization of the dialog, where instead of shooting one another when you differ, you reason things out together.
>
> In this dialog, then, you cannot assume that you are going to have everybody thinking the same way or feeling the same way. It would be unprogressive if that happened. The hope of eventual development would be gone. More than that, of course, it would be very boring.
>
> A university, then, is a kind of continuing Socratic conversation on the highest level for the very best people you can think of, you can bring together, about the most important questions, and the thing that you must do to the uttermost possible limits is to guarantee those men the freedom to think and to express themselves.
>
> Now, the limits on this freedom cannot be merely prejudice, because, although our prejudices might be perfectly satisfactory, the prejudices of our successors or of those who are in a position to bring pressure to bear on the institution might be subversive in the real sense, subverting the American doctrine of free thought and free speech.
>
> The principal guide in this matter is due process of law. The limits that are set, then, on this dialog, on this conversation, on this independent thought and criticism, are the limits set by the law.

In conclusion, I believe that our colleges and universities provide the public form in which ideas are tested. They are the market place where theories are offered for sale. It is only through free debate on controversial matters and freedom to present orthodox and unorthodox ideas by both faculty members and students that balanced democratic minds can be developed. This is the democratic formula by which progressive ideas have been proven good and

retrogressive ideas have been proven bad. While teachers and students are free to present controversial ideas and arguments, advocate unorthodox views and criticize the status quo, we are assured that our democracy will be safe because these privileges and conditions are basic to the preservation of liberty. It is because I believe that these conditions are now present in our institutions of higher learning and it is because I doubt that there has been a breakdown in the security of these time-established procedures that I decry the present tendency on the part of congressional committees to rush in and disturb our educational institutions without what, I deem to be, a proper need for such investigation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FARRINGTON in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. BURDICK in three instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances.

Mr. BERRY in two instances and in one to include an editorial.

Mr. COON and to include editorials.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington).

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. UTT and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. MASON on the subject Our Ridiculous Tax System, and to include a newspaper article on the same subject.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include a list of the members of the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include an address he delivered before the Traffic Club of Washington entitled "Transportation at Midcentury."

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois) in four instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. DAGUE) and to include a resolution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include a directive recently issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOWELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, a request which I make annually in connection with Abraham Lincoln's birthday, to extend my own remarks and include therein a collection which I make of famous sayings and quotations of that great martyred American President, Abraham Lincoln, notwithstanding that the Public Printer estimates the extension will cost $273.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include a speech by Mr. Francis D. Pitts.

Mr. WALTER and to include an excerpt from the New York Times.

Mr. GRANT in two instances, in one to include a poem by J. Mitchell Pilcher, of Alabama, and in the other to include an article by Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star.

Mr. DOYLE and to include the constitution, bylaws, and history of the AMVETS Association, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $441.

Mr. TRIMBLE and to include an article.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. YATES).

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. YATES).

Mr. MACHROWICZ and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. GATHINGS and include an editorial.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in six instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two separate instances, in one to include extraneous matter and in the other an excerpt from a broadcast made by Elmer Davis on February 2, 1953.

Mr. NORRELL and to include an editorial published by the McGehee Times, of McGehee, Ark., on January 31.

Mr. JUDD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR in reference to a bill which he has introduced to establish quota limitations on the import of foreign residual fuel oil.

Mr. D'EWART (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and to include extraneous material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PRESTON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 568. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Commitee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 10, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1979. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the Eighty-third Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George Andrews.
4. Kenneth A. Roberts.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones, Jr.
9. Laurie C. Battle.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Harold A. Patten.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. John E. Moss, Jr.
4. William S. Mailliard.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. Robert L. Condon.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. George P. Miller.

9. J. Arthur Younger.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. Leroy Johnson.
12. A. Oakley Hunter.
13. Ernest K. Bramblett.
14. Harlan Hagen.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Craig Hosmer.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. Carl Hinshaw.
21. Edgar W. Hiestand.
22. Joseph F. Holt.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Norris Poulson.
25. Patrick J. Hillings.
26. Samuel W. Yorty.
27. Harry R. Sheppard.
28. James B. Utt.
29. John Phillips.
30. Robert C. (Bob) Wilson.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. William S. Hill.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Thomas J. Dodd.
2. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.
3. Albert W. Cretella.
4. Albert P. Morano.
5. James T. Patterson.

At large

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

At large

Herbert B. Warburton.

FLORIDA

1. Courtney W. Campbell.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Bob Sikes.
4. Bill Lantaff.
5. A. S. (Syd) Herlong.
6. Dwight L. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.
4. A. Sidney Camp.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. W. M. (Don) Wheeler.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Gracie Pfost.
2. Hamer H. Budge.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. Fred E. Busbey.
4. William E. McVey.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. ———.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Richard W. Hoffman.
11. Timothy P. Sheehan.
12. Edgar A. Jonas.
13. Marguerite Stitt Church.
14. Chauncey W. Reed.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Harold H. Velde.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. William L. Springer.
23. Charles W. Vursell.
24. Melvin Price.
25. C. W. (Runt) Bishop.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. Shepard J. Crumpacker, Jr.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. John V. Beamer.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. William G. Bray.
8. D. Bailey Merrill.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Charles B. Brownson.

IOWA

1. Thomas E. Martin.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. Karl M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James I. Dolliver.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. Howard S. Miller.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Myron V. George.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. Clifford R. Hope.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gregory.
2. Garrett L. Withers.
3. John M. Robsion, Jr.
4. Frank L. Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. James S. Golden.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. George S. Long.

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Charles P. Nelson.
3. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. James P. S. Devereux.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Frank Small, Jr.
6. DeWitt S. Hyde.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Angier L. Goodwin.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Laurence Curtis.
11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz.
2. George Meader.
3. Paul W. Shafer.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. Kit Clardy.
7. Jesse P. Wolcott.
8. Alvin M. Bentley.
9. Ruth Thompson.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. George D. O'Brien.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski, Jr.
17. Charles G. Oakman.
18. George A. Dondero.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Harold C. Hagen.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Frank E. Smith.
4. John Bell Williams.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Mrs. John B. (Leonor) Sullivan.
4. Jeffrey P. Hillelson.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. William C. Cole.
7. Dewey Short.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. Morgan M. Moulder.

MONTANA

1. Lee Metcalf.
2. Wesley A. D'Ewart.

NEBRASKA

1. Carl T. Curtis.
2. Roman L. Hruska.
3. Robert D. Harrison.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

At large

Clifton (Cliff) Young.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Norris Cotton.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. T. Millet Hand.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Charles R. Howell.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Clifford P. Case.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert W. Kean.

13. Alfred D. Sieminski.
14. Edward J. Hart.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Antonio M. Fernandez.
John J. Dempsey.

NEW YORK

1. Stuyvesant Wainwright.
2. Steven B. Derounian.
3. Frank J. Becker.
4. Henry J. Latham.
5. Albert H. Bosch.
6. Lester Holtzman.
7. James J. Delaney.
8. Louis B. Heller.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Edna F. Kelly.
11. Emanuel Celler.
12. Francis E. Dorn.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. John H. Ray.
16. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. James G. Donovan.
19. Arthur G. Klein.
20. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.
21. Jacob K. Javits.
22. Sidney A. Fine.
23. Isidore Dollinger.
24. Charles A. Buckley.
25. Paul A. Fino.
26. Ralph A. Gamble.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Katharine St. George.
29. J. Ernest Wharton.
30. Leo W. O'Brien.
31. Dean P. Taylor.
32. Bernard W. Kearney.
33. Clarence E. Kilburn.
34. William R. Williams.
35. R. Walter Riehlman.
36. John Taber.
37. W. Sterling Cole.
38. Kenneth B. Keating.
39. Harold C. Ostertag.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Edmund P. Radwan.
42. John R. Pillion.
43. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Thurmond Chatham.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. F. Ertel Carlyle.
8. Charles B. Deane.
9. Hugh Q. Alexander.
10. Charles Raper Jonas.
11. Woodrow W. Jones.
12. George A. Shuford.

NORTH DAKOTA

At large

Usher L. Burdick.
Otto Krueger.

OHIO

1. Gordon H. Scherer.
2. William E. Hess.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Frazier Reams.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. Alvin F. Weichel.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Robert Crosser.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. George H. Bender.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Sam Coon.
3. Homer D. Angell.
4. Harris Ellsworth.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. William T. Granahan.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Karl C. King.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph L. Carrigg.
11. Edward J. Bonin.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
14. George M. Rhodes.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. Walter M. Mumma.
17. Alvin R. Bush.
18. Richard M. Simpson.
19. S. Walter Stauffer.
20. James E. Van Zandt.
21. Augustine B. Kelley.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. Carroll D. Kearns.
25. Louis E. Graham.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.
28. Herman P. Eberharter.
29. Robert J. Corbett.
30. Vera Buchanan.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. John J. Riley.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Joseph R. Bryson.
5. James P. Richards.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Harold O. Lovre.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. B. Carroll Reece.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. J. Percy Priest.
6. Pat Sutton.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Jere Cooper.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Brady Gentry.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. J. Frank Wilson.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Wingate H. Lucas.
13. Frank Ikard.
14. John E. Lyle, Jr.
15. Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr.
16. Ken Regan.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

At large

Martin Dies.

UTAH

1. Douglas R. Stringfellow.
2. William A. Dawson.

VERMONT

At large

Winston L. Prouty.

VIRGINIA

1. Edward J. Robeson, Jr.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. Thomas B. Stanley.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. William C. Wampler.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

At large

Don Magnuson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert H. Mollohan.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. Will E. Neal.
5. Elizabeth Kee.
6. Robert C. Byrd.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Glenn R. Davis.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Charles J. Kersten.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Merlin Hull.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William H. Harrison.

ALASKA

Delegate

E. L. Bartlett.

HAWAII

Delegate

Joseph R. Farrington.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; and the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

447. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

448. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a statement regarding reapportionment of the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses" for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

449. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report showing that during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1952, no contracts were negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

450. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

451. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board covering fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

452. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Federal Power Commission Reports, Volume 9"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

453. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendations concerning the claim of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928, 45 Stat. 413 (31 U. S. C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

456. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

458. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

459. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Subversive Activities Control Board, pursuant to section 12 (c) of title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

460. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 2, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore line of the State of Connecticut, area 6, Niantic Bay to Connecticut River, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with nine illustrations.

461. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 29, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of provisions of the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River authorized by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of July 24, 1946, with respect to adopted improvement for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area, with a view to determining whether any modification of the plan for such improvement is advisable at this time because of changed physical or economic conditions, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on December 14, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 724. A bill for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 726. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 834. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of Lelia Park; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 969. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; with amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1194. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Kenneth McRight; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; with an amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2023. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2033. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Louis A. Schafer; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Hisami Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 861. A bill for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 960. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi); without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1193. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2915. A bill to amend certain sections of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2916. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2917. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2918. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2919. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, so as to insure that preference will be given in the acquisition of wool and wool products by the Federal Government, to wool produced and wool products manufactured within the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2920. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2921. A bill to facilitate the management of certain land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2922. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2923. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that individuals who shall have attained age 65 before July 1, 1952, may elect not to receive old-age and survivors insurance coverage with respect to self-employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2924. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2925. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2926. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $200 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 2927. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which may adversely affect competition or unduly tend to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2929. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of the annuity or pension which an individual or his spouse receives under such act in cases where either the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2930. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $175 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of old-age or survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2931. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to extend from 3 to 5 years the period of limitations applicable to embezzlement, theft, fraud, robbery, and burglary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2932. A bill to provide for an Independent Consumers' Council to represent the consuming public before Government agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2933. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2934. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2935. A bill to repeal the $75 work clause that applies to old-age and survivors insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2936. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10–A District Agricultural Association, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2937. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2938. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2939. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2940. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2941. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2942. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2943. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2944. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2945. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent brothers and sisters, and other dependent relatives, of deceased individuals who were fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2946. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2947. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 2948. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use

and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2949. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, so as to provide for import controls and modify the provisions relating to export controls for the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 2950. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2951. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2952. A bill to permit in certain cases children under 10 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2953. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 2954. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2955. A bill to provide that, in determining the order of priority for registering and inducting doctors and dentists under the Selective Service Act of 1948, credit shall be given for all periods of active duty in the Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2956. A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 51 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2957. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2959. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 2960. A bill dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 2961. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2963. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2964. A bill to allow percentage depletion of 15 percent for kyanite mines and deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 2965. A bill to allow percentage depletion of 15 percent for kyanite mines and deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2966. A bill to establish qucta limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 2967. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2968. A bill to reclassify supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into step-rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services, and to adjust inequities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2970. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock-modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2971. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2972. A bill to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2973. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2974. A bill to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2975. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2976. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2977. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army" by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2978. A bill to postpone reduction of education and training allowances to on-farm trainees under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for 12 months to allow for completion of the first crop year or animal cycle; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2979. A bill to provide a further opportunity for veterans of World War II who were in active military, naval, or air service of the United States on the delimiting date for initiating a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and who had not initiated a course prior to said date, to initiate such a course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2980. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the use of qualified optometrists for out-patient eye care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2981. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2982. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2983. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2984. A bill to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2985. A bill to expedite the replacement of lost keys to post-office lock boxes and drawers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2986. A bill to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of dependents, while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2988. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2989. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2991. A bill to provide emergency relief for certain natives of the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARBURTON:
H. R. 2992. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 2993. A bill to regulate the hours of service, compensatory time, and overtime in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2994. A bill to provide for temporary promotions in the field service of the Post Office Department to cover extended absences of 30 days or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNGER:
H. R. 2995. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2996. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:
H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution establishing a commission to study Government competition with private taxpaying enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:
H. Con. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing chapel facilities for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:
H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing sympathy for peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium, in the recent flood and storm disaster; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:
H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:
H. Res. 139. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives with respect to the recent campaign of racial and religious persecution conducted by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. Res. 140. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study the medical and hospital facilities and related activities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to a higher minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a certain commemorative postage stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits to additional and certain other classes of employment and workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):
H. R. 2997. A bill for the relief of Sprague B. Wyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Margot Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:
H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Sheri Lynn Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:
H. R. 3000. A bill providing for the extension of Patent No. 2,053,981, issued September 8, 1936, relating to method and means for flowing wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:
H. R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Floyd Strilitschuk Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:
H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Bishara Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:
H. R. 3005. A bill for the relief of Charles Sabah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Ruth Irene Ledermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:
H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Muriel C. Jennings (nee Curtis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLYLE:
H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Esther Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:
H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amalia Grass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Soumplis (also known as Tom Makrea); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:
H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:
H. R. 3015. A bill for the relief of the Wojcik family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Lovinger and Szerin Lovinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Felix Petrover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:
H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Edwin Walden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3019. A bill for the relief of Kui Hung Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3021. A bill for the relief of Morris Plevin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Julien Musafia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3023. A bill for the relief of Kaneshige Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:
H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of Sergio Emeric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:
H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Lorna Agnes Romero (formerly Agnes Ishikawa) and Dorothy Ann Romero (formerly Shiroi Moriyama); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:
H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Barbara Gene Coster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:
H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Tamiko Nagae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 3028. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giovanni Sepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Rezziero Boccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:
H. R. 3030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty M. Boyeramith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Sentouktsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Chin Yam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:
H. R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John R. Cleary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Frank Sopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 3035. A bill for the relief of Stephania Ziegler (Sister Benitia), Anna Hagel (Sister Clara) and Theresia Tuppinger (Sister Romana); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of Noriko Niwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:
H. R. 3037. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:
H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:
H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Jacob J. Schaftenaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:
H. R. 3041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:
H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:
H. R. 3043. A bill for the relief of Walter Jimmy Sims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:
H. R. 3044. A bill for the relief of Kim Ki Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:
H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of William Urban Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3047. A bill for the relief of Elmer E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 3048. A bill for the relief of Tatyana Karapancsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Roman J. Halla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 3050. A bill for the relief of Kenichi Kaneko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Eugenie Hoch, and her child, Yolanda Hoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

51. By Mr. BETTS: Petition of S. S. Weaver, requesting consideration of certain alleged copyrights set forth therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

52. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions of the executive board and general executive council of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, favoring restored residential mail delivery service at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

53. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of Ellen Mayo, recording secretary, and 136 other members of the Departmental Club, Corning, Iowa, urging amendment of the election laws which pertain to the United States Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

54. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bernardino Malong, Laois, Labrader, Pangasinan Philippines, relative to stating a grievance regarding his claim filed with the War Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

55. Also, petition of Nunilo D. Marapao, Province of Bohol, Municipality of Ubay, Philippines, relative to stating the grievances of a number of Filipinos regarding the loss of certain foodstuffs and money due to mistreatment by the Japanese in 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, in this pavilion of prayer, help us to fling open the shuttered windows of our darkened lives to the effulgent light of Thy presence, so that in our daily work we may reflect some broken beams of Thy glory. Teach us by the adventure of faith how to be victors over life, not victims of it, and that to live worthily we must have a faith fit to live by, a self fit to live with, and a cause fit to live for.

Enlarge the sensitive area of our sympathy, we pray. Write deep upon our hearts the suffering and pain of the shepherdless multitudes so broken by the burdens and stress of these cruel years. Grant us such a vision of our world and its appalling need as to make us sharers with Thee in saving it from the worst that is in man, to the best that is in Thy will and plan when Thy kingdom comes. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 10, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed, without amendment, to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) expressing sympathy for the peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium in the disaster suffered by them.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF CLINTON J. RILEY, JR., BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Treasury Department had settled the claim of Clinton J. Riley, Jr., in the amount of $3,710; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3841 OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LAW ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., entitled "Authorizing the sale to the Virgin Islands Corporation, a Federal instrumentality, of the electric light and power facilities and related assets of the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REPORTS, VOLUME 9"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the Commission's newly issued publication entitled "Federal Power Commission Reports, Volume 9" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

USE OF CERTAIN CERTIFICATES BY OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts were negotiated by that committee for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL TABLES REFLECTING BUSINESS TRANSACTED BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to additional and certain other classes of employment and workers

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to extend the provisions of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits sections of the Social Security Act to include additional and certain other classes of employment and workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States to the presiding officer of each

branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, January 26, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 2, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to a higher minimum-wage law

"Whereas after considerable study by the New England Governors' Textile Committee, confirming the fact that wage differences between the North and the South are one of the basic reasons for New England textile industry's plight; and

"Whereas an urgent need exists for action to eliminate such wage differentials: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States in favor of a new higher minimum-wage law with effective administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, January 26, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 2, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the Florida State Townsend Auxiliary, Unit 75, Miami, Fla., favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Utah; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating President Dwight D. Eisenhower upon his election to the Presidency of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the people of the United States, by their vote in the recent election have chosen Dwight D. Eisenhower, as the President of the United States; and

"Whereas grave and important questions face our beloved country and its people; and

"Whereas, by character, training, and experience, Dwight D. Eisenhower is preeminently qualified for this highest office within the gift of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, our sincere congratulations and best wishes for a successful administration as President of the United States of America, and extend to him our assurance of utmost loyalty and support in meeting and solving the momentous tasks that lie ahead. We invoke the rich blessings of a kind providence to preserve him in life and health, in order that he might ably and efficiently discharge the duties of his high office; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah and the Governor of the State of Utah."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Ivy Baker Priest upon her appointment as Treasurer of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the President of the United States has imposed special confidence and trust in the ability and loyalty of Ivy Baker Priest; and

"Whereas she has been appointed to the high office of Treasurer of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Utah, her native State, take pride in her integrity and devotion to duty which fit her for this important office: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our esteemed citizen, Ivy Baker Priest, our sincere congratulations and best wishes in receiving this appointment. May she have a successful administration with much satisfaction in the discharge of her duties; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah, and the Governor of the State of Utah."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Hon. Ezra Taft Benson upon his appointment as Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas Ezra Taft Benson, a distinguished citizen of the State of Utah, who by his achievements in the field of agriculture and his faithful discharge of duty in church activity, civic responsibility, Farm Bureau work, and national recognition in the Boy Scout organization, has been chosen, appointed, and confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Dwight D. Eisenhower; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has imposed special confidence and trust in the ability, loyalty, and fidelity of Ezra Taft Benson; and

"Whereas by his sterling character, high intelligence, and humility he is preeminently qualified to faithfully discharge the duties of this high office; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Utah and his friends everywhere are justly proud of his appointment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our esteemed citizen, Ezra Taft Benson, our sincere congratulations and best wishes for a successful administration as Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America. May he find much joy and satisfaction in the discharge of the duties of his office and achieve outstanding success therein; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ezra Taft Benson, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah, and the Governor of the State of Utah."

FLOOD CONTROL IN VERDIGRIS RIVER VALLEY—RESOLUTION OF VERDIGRIS RIVER FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION, NEODESHA, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the past 2 years, and particularly since the great flood of 1951, the people of Kansas have been keenly aware of the need for flood-control measures.

I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution submitted to me by the members of the Chamber of Comerce of Neodesha, Kans., requesting that sufficient appropriations be approved by the Congress to enable the construction of Toronto Dam on the Verdigris River.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Verdigris River Flood Control Association represents approximately 10,000 property owners with direct interest in flood control in the Verdigris River Valley; and

Whereas the Army engineers have repeatedly reported the proper approach to flood control for the Verdigris River is the Toronto Dam first; and

Whereas this matter has had favorable consideration in the past, but no appropriation having been made by Congress; and

Whereas the Verdigris River Flood Control Association deems it advisable to again present this matter for the attention of Government officials who are in position to recognize the necessity of flood control on the Verdigris River in order to prevent disastrous floods and also as a matter of water storage. A practical example is the Fall River Dam; and

Whereas it is considered by said association that United States Senators from Kansas, Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson, and Representatives Errett P. Scrivner, Myron V. George, Edward H. Rees, Clifford R. Hope, and Wint Smith, and United States Senators from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr and Mike Monroney, and Representatives William G. Stigler, Carl Albert, Tom Steed, John Jarman, Toby Morris, Victor Wickersham, and Page Belcher, and the Subcommittee on Civil Functions and Appropriations, in formal manner have brought to their attention the need of this matter and the appropriation of funds for the immediate beginning: Now be it

Resolved, That the Verdigris River Flood Control Association urge the above-mentioned parties to use their influence to obtain appropriations sufficient to construct the dam; and be it further

Resolved, That the Neodesha Chamber of Commerce relying on the good will and standing of our Government representatives do hereby urge them to help make the proposed dam a reality.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NEODESHA, KANS.,
BOB BACON, *President.*
J. M. STEFFEN, *Secretary.*

EARLIER OPENING DATE OF HUNTING SEASON FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL — RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE SENATE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of North Dakota,

which I believe has a great deal of merit and widespread interest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 4

Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow an earlier opening date of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl, and to provide compensation for damage to crops caused by migratory waterfowl

Whereas the farmers of the State of North Dakota have suffered substantial damage through the loss and destruction of grain by ducks while such grain is lying in a swath or shock; and

Whereas hunting season on ducks does not open until the month of October which prevents hunters and farmers from minimizing this annual damage through their hunting activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be requested to allow the opening of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl not later than September 15 of each year; and that the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service consider the feasibility of compensating farmers for crop damage directly attributable to migratory waterfowl; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.

ALLEVIATION OF FALLING PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF STATE SENATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted on February 10, 1953, by the Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature. The resolution requests the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Minnesota Members of the Congress to reenact legislation to alleviate steadily falling prices of farm products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress, to reenact legislation to alleviate steadily falling prices of farm products

Whereas selling prices of farm products generally have fallen drastically during the past year; and

Whereas prices of farm machinery and supplies, as well as tax burdens are rapidly increasing; and

Whereas there is no indication of relief in a market controlled by many forces, both domestic and foreign, and over which the farmer has no control; and

Whereas it has been the policy of our Government to aid and assist farmers suffering from sudden and drastic market changes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That this situation be called to the attention of the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Minnesota Members of Congress, with the request that steps be taken immediately to alleviate declining prices of farm products; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress.

Adopted by the senate, State of Minnesota, February 10, 1953.

P. G. TOBEY,
Secretary of the Senate.
ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. THYE) also presented a resolution of the Senate of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 35. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; with amendments (Rept. No. 38).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Asiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 877. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 878. A bill for the relief of David Lee Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 879. A bill to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland):

S. 880. A bill to amend the license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Janusz Plucinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Song Yong Cho; and

S. 883. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 885. A bill to prohibit the acceptance of certain offices or employment by persons who within 2 years have served as members of certain regulatory agencies of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 886. A bill for the relief of Aleen Archer Nield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 887. A bill to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT (for Mr. MUNDT):

S. 888. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Fisher; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vituili; and

S. 891 (by request). A bill for the relief of Albina Sicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 892. A bill to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 893. A bill for the relief of David T. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 894. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 895. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to extend to certain members of the Armed Forces who were placed on the retired list in advanced rank the same credit for foreign service performed prior to 1913 which is accorded to other members not so advanced in rank on the retired list;

S. 896. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain retired officers of the Regular Navy recalled to active duty during World War II, and for other purposes; and

S. 897. A bill to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 898. A bill to grant additional income tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled;

S. 899. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; and

S. 900. A bill for the relief of Walter John Gamel; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 901. A bill to grant former owners a preference with respect to the purchase of certain real property acquired under the reclamation laws and no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 902. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and rangeland management in the Rocky Mountain area, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 903. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof;

S. 904. A bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees;

S. 905. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits;

S. 906. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 907. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders;

S. 908. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 909. A bill to authorize the training of an adequate backlog of airmen to meet the civil and military needs of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 910. A bill for the relief of Fausto Leonardo Marcal;

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Randi Lu Clark (Sugimoto, Sachiko);

S. 912. A bill for the relief of Bruno Ewald Paul and Margit Paul;

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Emma Pomeroy Von Lewinski;

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Mark Vainer;

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys);

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Velko D. Kovacic;

S. 917. A bill for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda; and

S. 918. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 919. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to extend annuity benefits to employees at age 50 involuntarily separated from the service after having rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN (by request):

S. 920. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 921. A bill amending the definition of a dependent, for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 922. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 923. A bill to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 924. A bill for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 925. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from regulating the duration of certain leases for the use of equipment by motor carriers, and the amount of compensation to be paid for such use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer, of Iowa, the founder of chiropractic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONTROL OF WATER RESOURCES AND IMPROVEMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, among the most pressing of the problems that face our people is that of controlling the water resources of our country.

In Texas, as in so many other States, water is all too frequently a feast or famine proposition. In times of flood, water falls upon our land by the ton, washing away precious topsoil and smashing property and equipment. In times of drought, we turn to our reservoirs only to find that they are too few and depleted too rapidly.

Both National and local governments have taken important steps to meet this problem in the past two decades. Huge works have been authorized and constructed. But there is an important gap in the programs thus far set under way.

At present, there is no authority for direct local-Federal cooperation on flood-prevention programs in small, upstream-watershed areas.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to close that gap. It is similar to legislation sponsored in the House of Representatives by my good friend, the Honorable W. R. POAGE. It is the same bill which was approved by the House of Representatives during the last Congress.

The Senate was unable to consider the measure last year. But it is my earnest hope that we can get an early start in this Congress and bring it to the floor for action.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred three resolutions adopted by the soil conservation district supervisors at Mineral Wells, Tex., bearing upon this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 877) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolutions presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas upstream floodwaters are continuing to cause sediment, crops and property damages, and the loss of lives; and

Whereas upstream floodwaters can best be controlled by slowing down water where it falls with land treatment and small detention structures; and

Whereas the upstream flood-control program now being conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture needs to be continued; and

Whereas the upstream flood-control program as conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture needs further expansion over more major watersheds; and

Whereas upstream flood-control measures increase the life expectancy of major reservoirs; and

Whereas there is certain legislation being proposed to the 83d Congress for the purpose of placing all upstream flood-control work under the Corps of Army Engineers, whose work is confined to large reservoirs and downstream reclamation; and

Whereas H. R. 559, 83d Congress, seeks continuance of upstream flood control by the United States Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we strongly urge favorable consideration and passage by the 83d Congress of H. R. 559, by the Honorable W. R. POAGE, of Texas; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Committee on Public Works, to Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, of the Department of Agriculture, and to Members of Congress from the State of Texas.

We, the soil-conservation district supervisors of Texas, assembled in our 12th annual meeting at Mineral Wells, Tex., January 22 and 23, 1953, express our appreciation and commendation of the understanding of the problem of soil and water conservation expressed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his speech delivered at Omaha, Nebr., September 18, 1952. With the broad knowledge of the conservation problem displayed and with his expressed confidence in soil-conservation districts organized under State laws and governed by boards of local farmers and ranchers, we look forward to continuing and greater progress toward the solution of one of the greatest problems confronting the Nation and the world today—conservation of our soil and water.

President Eisenhower said:

"I'm a zealous believer in conservation, both as a national policy and as a personal creed. I have seen firsthand in many parts of the world what soil and fertility losses can do to civilizations. I have crossed great deserts that once were fertile granaries—now laid waste because man wasn't intelligent enough or didn't care enough to preserve his soil.

"To build a strong, secure United States, we must save our soil—and improve our soil. We aren't now doing the job fast enough or well enough. * * *

"The Soil Conservation Service is a competent technical agency that makes its know-how available to farmers in locally organized farm-run soil-conservation districts. It comes into the districts to help farmers only at their invitation. * * *

"I strongly favor farmer-managed soil-conservation districts, with the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies giving such help as farmers request."

Whereas the State soil-conservation law of Texas was enacted by the 46th legislature in 1939 and since that time 166 soil-conservation districts have been organized,

embracing over 90 percent of the State's total area; and

Whereas during the life of Texas soil-conservation districts, conservation accomplishments have been greater than during all past time and benefits through increased production and increased income have been great even during recent years of severe drought; and

Whereas we look forward with confidence to increasing progress and benefit through the continuing democratic functioning of the soil-conservation districts assisted by the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies of Federal, State, and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby commend the President for the strong position that he has taken; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be supplied to our President, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Texas Congressmen and Senators, the Governor of the State of Texas, and the Republican National Committee.

Whereas a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives has reported on its study of national civil works; and

Whereas the report of the subcommittee recommends that legislation applying to surveys and investigations by the Department of Agriculture on watersheds be abolished and that the remainder of the flood-control program of the Department of Agriculture be made dependent upon and subject to the approval of the Corps of Army Engineers; and

Whereas it is the sense of the membership and officers of this organization that such action, if taken by the Congress, will deprive the farmers and ranchers of this State and this Nation of a program that already has proved itself greatly beneficial to agriculture and rewarding to farmers and ranchers to the extent of protecting agricultural land, increasing production and yielding greater net returns; and

Whereas 75 percent of the damages from floods occur on agricultural lands in creek watershed areas which get no protection from the big dams and main stream improvements; and

Whereas it is the belief of this organization that the action recommended by the subcommittee otherwise would accomplish no worth while purpose but on the other hand would nullify and destroy the preparatory work that has been performed on numerous watersheds of the Nation by the Department of Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, in annual meeting in Mineral Wells, Tex., January 22, 1953, declare to the Committee on Public Works its belief that the recommendations of the subcommittee would be contrary to the best interests of agriculture and the security of this Nation and that the Committee on Public Works be urged to discharge the subcommittee and table its report; and be it further

Resolved, That the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, ask the Committee on Public Works give faithful consideration to the strengthening and acceleration of the flood-control program of the Department of Agriculture through such means as may be at its disposal; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Committee on Public Works, to Secretary Ezra Taft Benson of the Department of Agriculture, and to Members of Congress from the State of Texas.

DISSOLUTION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], my colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 892) to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BYRD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Senators BRICKER and ROBERTSON of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Senators FERGUSON and WILLIAMS, have joined me as sponsors of a bill which I have introduced in the Senate today for the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the bill the Secretary of the Treasury would begin next January 1 liquidating the 21-year-old temporary depression agency which has outstanding loans totaling upward of $700 million. The agency this year is costing more than $14.5 million in administrative overhead, and it is employing more than 2,000 people—about half of them in Washington and the other half in 5 branches and 32 loan offices scattered throughout the country and in Puerto Rico and Alaska.

The bill would direct that the net proceeds from the liquidation shall be applied exclusively to reduction of the national debt.

The RFC was originally established in 1932, for limited duration, with $500 million in capital supplied out of the United States Treasury. Under subsequent legislation its lending activities are now financed from $100 million of capital stock, Treasury borrowing authority and $250 million of retained earnings. Its lending authority extends until June 30, 1954, and it may have as much as $993 million outstanding at any one time.

Except the effective date which is necessarily moved forward, the bill we are introducing today is identical with one for the same purpose I introduced in the last session of Congress and which narrowly failed of passage in the Senate last year after it had been demonstrated that the agency's services were subject to abuse when it had nothing to do.

The bill would abolish the Corporation and its lending authority. It would start and expedite liquidation of the old-line RFC programs by the Secretary of the Treasury, contemplating the use of Treasury Department facilities both in Washington and in the field. It would provide for uninterrupted continuity in the services now rendered by the RFC in connection with current defense and preparedness emergency financing. It would transfer to other agencies the management of rubber, tin, and fiber enterprises, etc., now under the jurisdiction of RFC.

COMMISSION TO REGULATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION WITHIN THE METROPOLITAN AREA OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill by Gerald J. Glassman, who is executive assistant, Arlington County Public Utilities Commission, and secretary, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanation of the bill is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL BY GERALD J. GLASSMAN, WHO IS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT, ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION; SECRETARY, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Since the end of World War II, transit service in the Washington metropolitan area has been deteriorating, fares have been increasing, and patronage declining. The effects on the economy of the metropolitan area have been very serious: ever-increasing traffic congestion slowing commerce, oppressive highway construction costs, Government recruitment difficulties, business uncertainty, and displacement.

The extensive committee hearings which led to the reporting out of S. 3296 followed many years of studies and inquiries which never resulted in effective action to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

The 4 major carriers in the area, and the total of 14 carriers, are now regulated by 4 separate regulatory agencies, 2 of them far removed geographically from the area. As a result of lack of jurisdiction, conflicts in jurisdiction, and lack of centralized responsibility for transit among these agencies, regulation over individual companies is largely ineffective, and regulation over through interstate movements which, with intra-District movements, make up the bulk of traffic, is totally lacking. As a result, operations of the transit carriers are separate, uncoordinated, and inefficient.

The area Commission created by S. 3296 will provide for centralized responsibility for regulation of interstate and intra-District transit movement. With exclusive control over carriers transporting passengers within the District of Columbia and interstate within the metropolitan area, this agency can take direct action to correct specific fare, service, and financial problems affecting the major portion of the traffic, and through cooperative action with the States or by its own authority over intrastate operations which materially affect its interstate regulation, establish an integrated, coordinated transit system throughout the metropolitan area.

Under the proposed bill as amended, commissioners will be appointed at large from the metropolitan area to emphasize their

area responsibility rather than responsibility to any particular political jurisdiction.

A major virtue of this proposal is that the creation of the Commission and its functioning may be immediately accomplished without the delays attendant on an interstate compact. Action among the States and the Congress to expand its powers to embrace other operations in the area may proceed while the Commission functions to prevent further decline of the transit industry.

There is little doubt that, while this action is an important progressive step, the problem of adequate metropolitan area transportation will require further action by the States and the Congress. The regulation and administration of traffic control, street utilization, and development, and parking among the three separate political jurisdictions warrant further attention, cooperation, and probably additional legislation by the Congress, Maryland, and Virginia. There can be no final solution of the overall problem, however, if the central portion, regulation of the transit industry, continues ineffective and impotent.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN A NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONTROLLED POWERED FLIGHT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, 50 years have passed since, at Kitty Hawk, the Wright brothers demonstrated to the world that controlled aerial flight was possible. Since that time, America has gone forward by leaps and bounds in aerial commerce. As the coauthor of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which act has brought stability and regularity of regulation to commercial aviation, I take a great deal of pride in now joining with the various aerial groups throughout the country by introducing a joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight, occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, and I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE AND HOUSE RULES REQUIRING BILLS AMENDING OR REPEALING STATUTORY PROVISIONS TO SHOW CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which would require a change in the rules of the Senate and the House providing that each bill or resolution when it is printed, if it amends a statute, should contain a comparative print showing the part of the statute proposed to be amended.

I might mention that this is the practice which has always been followed in the Legislature of New York State, and I feel that such a procedure, if it were adopted by the two Houses of Congress, would greatly expedite our legislative work.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That subsection 1 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. (a) Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the Senate repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

CHAPEL FACILITIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to make available a room, with facilities for prayer and meditation, for the use of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The architect shall maintain the prayer room for individual use rather than assemblies and he shall provide appropriate symbols of religious unity and freedom of worship.

NAMING OF NAVAL VESSEL FOR THE LATE EUGENE ELY, OF DAVENPORT, IOWA

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to name, as soon as possible, a naval vessel of the proper classification for the late Eugene Ely, of Davenport, Iowa, in recognition of the said Eugene Ely's contribution to naval aviation in making on January 18, 1911, the first landing and takeoff by an airplane on a naval vessel at sea.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, relating to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, is amended by striking out the word and figures, "April 30, 1953," on page 3, line 10, and inserting in lieu thereof the following word and figures: "April 30, 1954."

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO MAKING TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, February 16, 1953, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address delivered by Senator MUNDT at the Kansas Day Banquet on the 92d anniversary of the admittance of Kansas to the Union, at Topeka, Kans.

Article entitled "Topeka Marine Officer Who Asked Combat Is Killed in Korea Action," published in the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal, February 3, 1953, concerning

the death in Korea of Marine Capt. Stanley Curyea.

Editorial entitled "Boost for Soil Conservation," published in the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, February 9, regarding Senate bill to provide tax relief for farmers on account of soil and water conservation.

By Mr. BEALL:

Letter addressed by him to Lithuanian-American Information Center relating to observance of 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

By Mr. BARRETT (for Mr. GOLDWATER):

Address delivered by Hon. Henry F. Ashurst before the Hassayampa Club at Los Angeles, Calif., August 18, 1910.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Address entitled "Wheat Faces Trouble Again," delivered by Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, at the annual meeting of the National Association of Wheat Producers at Omaha, Nebr., on January 30, 1953.

Editorial dealing with the reporting of combat plane losses in Korea, published in the Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Radio address delivered by Mr. Eric Sevareid on a CBS radio broadcast on February 11, 1953.

Article entitled "'National Origin': Fraud and Threat," published in the New Republic of February 16, 1953.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion, on the occasion of the 19th annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of Abraham Lincoln, at Springfield, Ill., on February 12, 1953.

Article entitled "Needed: An Independent Tax-Collecting Agency," written by Mr. Carl T. Curtis and published in the January 1953 issue of Tax Review.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Article entitled "Lafayette Native Works Wonders in Egypt," written by Robert C. Ruark, published recently in the Lafayette Advertiser, Lafayette, La.

By Mr. MORSE:

Text of radio program entitled "Jewish Life Program," broadcast over Station KPOJ, Portland, Oreg., on January 11 and 18, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Review of television program, It's Our Government, by Hal J. Miller, editor of the Government Standard.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Article entitled "A New Tariff Idea," written by Jack T. Pickett, and published in the California Farmer for January 24, 1953.

PRICE DIFFERENTIAL MADE IN GOOD FAITH AS A COMPLETE DEFENSE TO CHARGE OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Albert A. Carretta dealing with the subject of my bill, Senate bill 540, which I introduced on January 21, 1953. I am sending the original of the letter to the Committee on the Judiciary with a request that it be incorporated in the committee files on Senate bill 540.

Because I believe the Members of the Senate will be interested in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Carretta's letter to me be now read by the clerk as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the text of the letter to which the Senator from Nevada has referred.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 26, 1953.

Hon. PATRICK A. MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I today obtained a copy of S. 540, introduced by you on January 21, 1953, entitled "A bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor."

I believe that the bill is a good one, and I am especially interested in the proviso at the end of the bill which states:

"That a seller shall not be deemed to have acted in good faith if he knew or should have known that the lower price or more extensive services or facilities which he met were in fact unlawful."

My interest stems from my review of a case which was recently decided by the Federal Trade Commission. I wrote a dissent in that case, and I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you a copy of the recent decision of the Commission in the matter of Standard Oil Co. (an Indiana corporation), as well as a copy of my dissenting opinion therein. I am frank to say that my most difficult problem in writing my dissent concerned the determination of what the Supreme Court of the United States meant in its opinion in the matter of *Standard Oil Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (January 8, 1951), when it apparently added the word "lawful" to the words of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, which sets forth the good-faith defense available to sellers. After much consideration, I arrived at the conclusion expressed in part II of my dissent, which begins on page 5. I invite your attention to this particular portion of my dissenting opinion, and especially to the two marked paragraphs on page 7. You will note that my conclusion is almost identical in language with that set forth in the proviso contained in S. 540.

In my opinion, enactment of this bill will go a long way toward clarifying, for businessmen and for the Federal Trade Commission, the intent of Congress relative to the good-faith defense which is available to sellers pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ALBERT A. CARRETTA.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF UTAH DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 1953 AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH IN UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a proclamation by the Governor of Utah, the Honorable J. Bracken Lee, designating February 1953 as American History Month in Utah.

This meritorious undertaking is the result of the initial efforts of Mrs. Otto A. Weisley, State chairman of Americanism for the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The program is receiving the cooperation of Utah's educational system, the newspapers, radio and television, churches, and civic and patriotic organizations.

At this period in world history when our Nation is threatened from without and within by foreign ideologies, it seems most fitting that a resurvey of American history should be undertaken. Nothing will preserve our great principles and individual freedoms and liberties more than a thorough knowledge by every American of the significance of his country's rich historical heritage.

I take great pride and pleasure in complimenting Mrs. Weisley, Governor Lee, and the other organizations in my State who are devoting their time and efforts to so worthy a cause.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, January 17, 1953.

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR OF UTAH

Over the years there has seemed to be a tendency to overlook or forget the motivations that prompted our forefathers to draft the Declaration of Independence, or the significance of the many events in American history.

A knowledge of American history is one of the best deterrents to the spread of the various isms seeking a foothold in our country that I know. Its importance should never be underestimated and its teaching always should be emphasized in our public institutions.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have been in the forefront of organizations endeavoring to promote greater patriotism among our people as well as to stamp out subversion wherever it is found.

In cooperation with the Daughters of the American Revolution, and with other groups cooperating in this and similar projects, I am designating the month of February as American History Month in Utah, and I urge all our people to give particular attention to observing the month appropriately throughout the State, and particularly in our schools, colleges, and university.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor of Utah.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for several minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I note from the public press that the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, spoke at the Central Livestock Association's annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., a day or two ago and outlined his farm policies, and the farm policies of the Eisenhower administration.

Secretary Benson started his speech by stating:

The great crusade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now our President, is under way. You helped give him his mandate.

Mr. President, I submit that there were very few farmers in the United States who knew that they were giving the administration a mandate to reduce farm support prices, or that a great crusade was under way to pull the rug from under the farmers of the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my understanding, formed from the mail I have received from the farmers of South Carolina, that General Eisenhower, who is

now our President, stated that he would take the lead in support of 100 percent parity prices. That is the information my mail contains. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi on making his statement that there was no mandate given to provide the farmer disaster insurance instead of parity.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from South Carolina should realize that what was promised the American farmer was parity income. That was before the election. When, however, the officials of the Department of Agriculture came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when their nominations were before that committee for confirmation, they said that was the objective, but that it would be reached away off in the future. They said the objective was to get parity income. Their statement merely meant that their promise was worth just as much as the statement that the objective of all of us is to be against sin, but the place where sin will be abolished is in Heaven, and it appears that the place where the farmer will get parity income, if the policies being pursued are followed, will be Heaven.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Mississippi will further yield, does he remember that when the officials were before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry they stated that their objective was to give the farmers parity income?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to be misunderstood by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who sits beside me, and who is the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I made the statement to the press yesterday that I was going to ask our colleague on the other side, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to have the Secretary of Agriculture come before the Committee on Banking and Currency, not that that committee has jurisdiction over agricultural matters, but it does have jurisdiction over the Export-Import Bank and other international and farm banking organizations. I believe something constructive can be done, and I think it will be done, if the committee will look into the subject and take action to get the farm surpluses moving to where American farm products are needed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator, and I agree with him. I shall cover in the remarks I am about to make the subject to which he has alluded. But the Senator from South Carolina certainly realizes that the very basis of justice to the farmer is parity-support prices. It is only by obtaining such prices that he will be able to get proper returns for his products.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In his speech the Secretary of Agriculture repeated what has been said frequently in recent days, that the farmer will get parity of income by obtaining 100-percent parity in the marketplace. When he couples that with the ominous statement he made, that the price-support program should be used only as insurance against disaster, does not that indicate that what he intends to do if he has his way, is simply, so far as the farm program is concerned, to revert to the old system, so that when a bumper crop goes to market the only thing the farmer can do is to get the best price he can under the bumper-crop marketing conditions, which invariably will drive prices down?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is exactly right. As I understood the whole theory of our price-support program, it was to secure for the farmer an adequate share of the national income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And an orderly marketing opportunity.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that that was the philosophy behind the program when Congress enacted the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I remind my good friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that in the Defense Production Act we urged the farmer to increase his production. We urged the cattlemen to raise more cattle, so that there would be surpluses which could be stored in the event of further disturbance, and which would also perhaps be a brake against inflation. However, it never was the thought of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a member, that the parity program was designed to be merely insurance against disaster. He addressed the Senate on that subject the other day. Parity is what the farmer is entitled to, and parity is what the farmer requested. Moreover, the farmer raised the cattle, planted the wheat, and raised the cotton. Now he is told that he is a stepchild waiting for "disaster."

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina certainly realizes that since the great crusade which the Secretary mentioned started, since the mandate was given, and since he says we have been on our way, all the profit has been squeezed out of agriculture. There has been one disastrous break after another on the commodity exchanges, until today there is depression and gloom in the agricultural areas of the country.

What is the farmer met with? He is met with the cry, "Market your product in an orderly way; there is nothing we can do." It is the same old cry we heard back in 1932, the only difference being that at that time there was added the statement that "Prosperity is just around the corner."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to join with the Senator from Mississippi in the major thesis which he rises on the floor of the Senate to present and defend. I ask him this question: Does he agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the maintenance of a high potential surplus food power in the United States is an objective in which every man, woman, and child in the country has a vital interest from the standpoint of maintaining a high standard of living for all of us?

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon; and I believe that maintaining a food stockpile is more important to this country than the stockpile of metals which we have accumulated under our stockpiling program.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that, as we read history, we find that whenever a civilization starts a "break even" program in connection with food supply, or finds itself in a position in which the agricultural population are economically depressed, that civilization starts to decline?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that Mr. Benson is carrying out the 1952 Republican platform?

Mr. EASTLAND. Frankly, I do not know what the Republican platform says.

Mr. LANGER. I have it before me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that the policies which the Secretary announced were not the farm policies advocated by the President of the United States before the election.

Mr. LANGER. Let me read to the distinguished Senator a portion of the Republican platform, found on page 75 of the pamphlet entitled "Factual Campaign Information":

> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the marketplace.

Is not that what Mr. Benson is doing? Why should the distinguished Senator object? The people of the United States voted for this platform.

Mr. EASTLAND. For the simple reason that the only way in which the farmer can receive such prices is through support prices. It is the policy to reduce such support prices. If they are reduced to 60 percent, the price of wheat will fall to 60 percent of parity. If they are reduced to 70 percent, it means that the price of wheat will fall to 70 percent of parity. The only way to make valid the pledge which the Senator read is to assure the farmer a Government-guaranteed price through support prices which will give him parity income.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with my distinguished friend. I stand foursquare for 100-percent parity. I am not criticizing what he is doing, but I am calling attention to the fact that the line-and-a-half read by me is in the Republican platform.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to permit me to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of asking a question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], without my losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota, who has referred to the Republican plank on agriculture, if he supported that plank in the late campaign?

Mr. LANGER. I did not support that plank in the late campaign. As a matter of fact, I went all over North Dakota and warned the farmers of North Dakota that that plank was dangerous. I told them that the Republican presidential candidate could not change that plank, even though he said he was in favor of 90 or 100 percent of parity at Kasson, Minn. I told the farmers that the President was bound by that line and a half in the Republican platform. Some of the very persons who are now criticizing the President and criticizing Mr. Benson were at the Republican convention, but did not appear before the platform committee, which was headed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], to support either the 90- or 100-percent plank for agriculture. Had they done so that portion of the Republican platform might have been entirely different.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I quote from the statement by Secretary Benson——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me continue for a moment longer, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Secretary Benson said:

> I welcome this opportunity to come to this great agricultural area of the Nation and personally report on progress.

Mr. President, I submit that the farmers of the United States have given the administration no mandate to reduce support prices. The "progress" referred to by Mr. Benson has destroyed the foundation of agricultural prosperity in this country.

The Secretary further stated during the course of his speech that—

> Farm price support should provide insurance against disaster to the farm-producing plant and help to stabilize national food supplies.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator interpret that statement to mean that the farmer must be the victim of a disastrous condition before he can obtain the loan, to which he is entitled, on his wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, or whatever his product may be, despite the fact that the Government of the United States, under the Defense Production Act, enacted by Republicans and Democrats alike, urged that the farmers increase their crop production?

Mr. EASTLAND. Evidently the Secretary plainly meant that there would be low support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Those would be disaster prices.

Mr. EASTLAND. Evidently he meant that there would be low support prices which would prevent the bottom from falling out of the commodity market.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did he not use the word "disaster"?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. He stated that the purpose was to prevent disaster. In other words, instead of a support price of 32 cents a pound on cotton, it was made about 20 cents a pound.

Mr. MAYBANK. That would be "disaster."

Mr. EASTLAND. The support price on wheat was approximately cut in half. The theory of the American Congress was that there should be support prices to assure the farmer a profitable price in the market place.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It appears now that the "profitable price in the market place" means a disaster price. What I want the RECORD to show is that the Secretary says support will be provided only when prices are disastrously low. That would be even worse than the "peril point" we have fought so hard. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my interpretation.

Mr. President, the statement of Secretary Benson is at variance with what the Congress intended in enacting the price-support laws, and it is at variance with what American agriculture thought and believed was the purpose of the farm program. As I had always understood, the parity concept, of which the price-support program is only the administrative part, was designed to give the farmers their equitable share of the national income.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment.

Of course, it was disaster insurance; but the basic reason for support prices of 90 percent of parity was to assure the producers of basic agricultural commodities that they would receive their just and equitable share of the national income. Price supports are the only feasible and effective way to assure agriculture its just share of the national income. Adequate price supports are the only sure way to make certain that the farmer will receive economic justice. I submit that the farmers of the country have given no mandate, and have not intentionally participated in any crusade which would reduce their just income or standard of living, as is certain to happen if the present price-support statute is not continued for next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senator from Mississippi what the word "disaster" means to me. It was my understanding of the meaning of the word which impelled me to vote for the continuation of RFC. I note that the former Administrator of RFC, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is on the floor. A disaster loan is granted by the RFC when a community, for example, has been totally obliterated by flood or by hurricane or some other tragedy. A disaster loan is not the same as an ordinary loan. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will make clear in the RECORD what disaster loans mean under the legislation passed by Congress through the years. It was passed in connection with RFC legislation, under which a community had to show distress because of a disaster and in connection with the Agriculture Act under which the crops of a given area were either totally or nearly destroyed for one reason or another. These, Mr. President, are the terms of disaster. And that is what the Secretary of Agriculture is going to bring to the farmer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I gather from what the Senator from Mississippi is saying he feels it is necessary that we take some steps immediately to keep farm prices from going down, down, and down. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is certainly one of the features of what I am saying.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the prices on the basic farm commodities continue to go down, what does the Senator from Mississippi believe will happen to the economy of all America?

Mr. EASTLAND. We are headed for disaster, of course. Farm prosperity comes first always.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not correct to say that we have always found, in every depression, that the first thing that happens is that the prices of the basic commodities go down?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And that immediately thereafter the storekeeper cannot sell his goods?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And then the effect is felt by every segment of our economy.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And the economy eventually gets to where we found it in 1932. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that it is the fundamental philosophy of some people that prosperity must seep down from the top to the bottom. That philosophy will bring disaster today as quickly as it brought it in the 1930–32 period.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to a headline which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of yesterday. It reads "Benson Spells Doom of United States Farm Bounty." In that connection, Representative GATHINGS pointed out on the floor of the House yesterday that the figures recently released by the Commodity Credit Corporation show that from all

operations with respect to the basic commodities, from the inception of the program in 1933 through December 31, 1952, there was a net gain in profit in the amount of $113,000,000, and on cotton last year there was a net profit of $238,000,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is familiar with those figures?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does that fact not point out that misleading information is being given to the public, and does it not also point out that perhaps some officials of the Department of Agriculture do not yet have all the facts before them?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator is saying is correct. I will show that a great deal of propaganda, to the effect that farmers are losing their freedom with a 90-percent support price, is being put forth, when the truth is that the farmer is freer today than he ever was. Formerly, in the depression days, he was the slave of the banker.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Mississippi, I am sure, has in mind the statement which President Eisenhower made in his state of the Union message, to the effect that the welfare of the farmer was dependent upon the welfare of the Nation. Does not the distinguished Senator from Mississippi agree with me that the President's statement is the reverse of the fact, and that the stability of the Nation is fundamentally dependent upon the welfare of the producer of the raw materials?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator is correct. It is a fundamental principle of economics that when the farmer cannot buy, the wheels of industry cannot turn.

Mr. GILLETTE. Supplementing the question which was asked by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is there anything more unfortunate than the designation of the Nation's policies with respect to support prices on agriculture as disaster insurance? Is it not the concept of Congress that through the support-price program and through the system by which we utilize support prices, we are offering stability to farmers?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. And that Congress did not intend support prices to be considered merely as insurance to be paid after a disaster has occurred.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. The intention of Congress was to protect the farmer from disaster.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. That was the congressional intent.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after the Hoover debacle of 1930–32, promised——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to ask the Senator one question. Does he have a copy of the complete text of Mr. Benson's speech? I have been unable to get a copy of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. I shall be glad to send a copy of it to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I would appreciate having a copy of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after the Hoover debacle of 1930–32, promised agriculture a better day and promised and enacted legislation which has made agriculture prosperous. Farm price supports were finally fixed at 90 percent instead of 100 percent of parity because it was recognized that it was to the farmers' interest to maintain the commodity exchanges and the agricultural marketing system and it was thought, and soundly so, that by fixing the support prices at 90 percent instead of 100 percent, the exchanges could function normally. When cotton was much cheaper in proportion to other basic farm commodities, the support price on cotton was fixed at 95 percent of parity to bring the price level of this commodity in line with prevailing prices on wheat, corn, and other basic agricultural crops. This worked well.

Today agriculture is caught in a squeeze between high costs and falling farm prices. Depression and gloom prevail in the great farm areas of the Nation. Mr. President, the prosperity of the Nation is built upon agricultural prosperity. This country cannot long remain prosperous unless agriculture prospers. This Government, Mr. President, should be taking steps to increase farm prices instead of adopting a do-nothing, wait-and-see, Hoover attitude of placidly awaiting the catastrophe. Unless falling farm prices are halted, a major depression awaits this country. I submit that the first step should be to raise support prices from 90 percent to 95 percent of parity to partially compensate the farmer for his fantastically high costs.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he agrees with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in this particular. I notice that the Senator from North Dakota is quoted as having said: "Some of us feel that President Eisenhower ought to remind the Secretary of his own campaign pledge to help farmers receive 100-percent parity, or at least increase it."

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with that statement of my distinguished friend from North Dakota. I usually agree with everything he says and usually agree with most of his votes. He is one of the soundest and ablest Senators in this body.

The Secretary of Agriculture went on to say:

> But price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our effort should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system.

The Secretary stated that, in the administration of the Department of Agriculture, "the guiding purpose will be to strengthen individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of our citizens."

Mr. President, why the inferential assault on the price-support program? Why the talk of flexible price supports? Why all the bugaboo of uneconomic production, freezing acreage, and picking faults with the present law? Is it because next year the Department of Agriculture will oppose the renewal of the present price-support law? There is no doubt but that it is their intention. If this happens, it will deprive the farmer and the Nation of the most beneficial act ever passed for agriculture. By maintaining farm purchasing power, the price-support program has stabilized our entire economy. I submit that because of high costs, it is now inadequate and should be increased at once. The minimum should be 95 percent.

What are the facts? Is the objection to fixed price supports well taken? Is the claim that it will freeze production in uneconomic areas valid? There has been a tremendous shift in the production of rice into new areas. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous shift in the production of cotton to the far western States. We have seen a tremendous increase in cattle population in the southern States, until today the Old South is one of the leading livestock producing areas of the Nation. History shows that high farm-commodity prices, instead of freezing production in uneconomic producing areas, actually encourage the shifting of production to new areas. Prosperous crop prices are an incentive to other areas to produce a new commodity. If prices are not high and the reward not great, they will not go into a new business. The producer will not take a chance on untried crops involving new hazards. When prices are low and times hard, there is no shift or expansion of areas of production. Had it not been for the price of cattle which prevailed until the past few months, this industry would not have expanded into the South. Had it not been for cotton at 40 cents a pound, the cotton industry would not have expanded so greatly into the farm western States. There would be no incentive to invest in new equipment and new tools to venture into new fields in which a farmer did not have the knowledge that experience gives.

In fact, this country in the past 8 years, and under the present price-support program, has seen the greatest shift in agricultural production ever witnessed at any time in the history of the Nation.

The further charge is laid against the present Price Support Act that 90 percent inflexible support prices will deprive the farmer of his personal liberty and will make him a ward of the State; and then those who oppose 90 percent of parity make the trite and oft-repeated statement that the farmer must be a free man. What are the facts? We have had support prices of 90 percent of parity for a number of years. When was the farmer ever freer than he is today? When has his freedom been in the least curtailed? When was he ever freer and more independent of his Government than he is today? When was he ever

freer of his bank and lending agencies than he is today? Except where speculation enters, the farmers of this country owe less money and are less dependent upon the lending agencies than at any time since the Civil War. The point is that the present price-support law is responsible for that situation, Mr. President. Today the farmer enjoys the highest prosperity he has ever experienced in the history of the United States. He is free and is more independent than he has ever been.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, also, that employment in the United States is at its highest peak and factory wages are at their highest peak?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; because of farm prosperity.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the present law has worked well. Farm-support prices prevented a depression at the close of World War II. They have greatly benefited the entire economy of the country because they have given agriculture purchasing power.

I know that many persons sincerely oppose extension of the present law, and I believe the present Secretary of Agriculture is a sincere and honest man. He is a very able man, and I have a great deal of respect for him. He has stated that he will not pull the rug from under the farmer. I know that to do so is not his intention, but nevertheless it will surely happen if the present law is not extended and if support prices are not raised to 95 percent of parity, to help the farmer meet his increased costs during this critical time of readjustment.

Do not let us delude ourselves, Mr. President. Flexible support prices will reduce agricultural purchasing power; they will be a backward step. They will injure agriculture, and they can accomplish no possible good. As a rule the consumer gets no benefit when farm prices go down. This condition usually swells the profits of the middleman and the processor. A 60-percent support price for basic agricultural commodities will mean that prices will be reduced to 60 percent of parity. A support price of 70 percent will mean that the prices of basic agricultural commodities will sink to 70 percent of parity. This drop in income will effect the entire American economy, because when the farmers' purchasing power is reduced, he certainly cannot buy the products of American industry.

American farmers have been the stabilizing influence in this country. Within the past few years the American farmers' influence has prevented the passage of much radical legislation. In fact, American agriculture is politically the largest and most powerful of any conservative group in this country; and I speak as a southern conservative. Agriculture is the core of American conversatism. Mr. President, the one sure way to destroy the conservative influences in the Nation and set us on the road to socialism is to alienate the American farmer. I fear what will happen in this country if the American farmer is permitted to sink once again into poverty.

Mr. President, in my judgment, our farm policy must be to maintain the present price-support law; but, in addition, governmental machinery must be set up to assist private enterprise in exporting surplus farm products. After all, the maintenance of profitable markets is basic in any business or industry. I do not now think, and have never thought, that the present program of controlling agricultural surpluses by simply reducing acreage was sound and feasible. The weakness of acreage reduction to control surpluses is, where will it all end? Shall we continue to reduce acreage until we grow only enough cotton for American mills; only enough American pork and butter for American tables; only enough food to meet our own requirements, and abdicate our duty to furnish some of our abundance to the world? If our present policies continue, that seems to be the ultimate objective.

However, Mr. President, I recognize there should be the power in an emergency to impose acreage controls by the farmers themselves; but the most important thing is to sell surplus production and have it consumed in international trade. Surpluses should not be a drug on the market. On the contrary, if agricultural surpluses are properly handled, they are a blessing for our country. I think the promise of Secretary Benson to encourage foreign trade, which can be done, is fundamental to this whole question.

There should be a removal of trade barriers to such an extent as to enable us to market our surpluses and partially alleviate the want of the world. Necessity is a great master. I have always thought, and I now think, that the sure way to bring about an expansion of American agricultural exports is to create a crisis by a big surplus which will force us to act to open export outlets.

Mr. President, foreign trade is the key to the future of the United States and of the entire non-Communist world. It would be impossible for us to play into the hands of Moscow more completely than by isolating ourselves economically from the rest of the world. There is abroad a deep suspicion of our intentions. There is a historically justifiable suspicion of the trade policies of the Republican Party at home and abroad. Secretary Dulles is a witness to that statement, as evidenced by his speech last night.

I know that foreign nations must doubt our intentions when on yesterday practically every important man in the Government and the leaders of the Republican majority in Congress called at the White House to confer with the President on whether or not he should approve or disapprove a pewee, picayunish increase in tariff duties on briar pipes. As I understand, part of this industry, which is a hothouse industry that grew up after the war, desires to shut off the $340,000 worth of briar pipes a year that we purchase, three-fourths from Italy and one-fourth from France.

Here, the United States, the most powerful industrial Nation in the history of the world, with an industrial machine which we boast is the most efficient on which the sun has ever shone with a man-hour production of American labor which is today the greatest in the history of the world, with the United States the greatest creditor Nation in the history of the world, and yet the administration is in a state of paralyzed tension, to plagiarize President Eisenhower's expression, at the prospect of a little foreign commerce that might compete in some insignificant way with this strong giant of an American industrial machine.

We must live, associate with, and do business with the world. We are a member of the community of the free nations of the world. We have welded an anti-Communist bloc. It is basic that political alliances, international friendships, military alliances, and all forms of mutual-protection treaties must be based upon international commerce. This is the line between isolationism and the building of an international community of free anti-Communist nations. There is no middle ground. I submit, Mr. President, that we cannot meet our moral obligations as the leader of the anti-Communist bloc unless we trade extensively with other nations of the world.

It is my candid judgment that the decision which the President of the United States makes on tariff increases, in the present matter and in others which will confront him, constitutes the most important step which he will have to take during his administration. There are no steps which are fraught with more peril or which will mean more for the future of the world and the free nations of the West than the trade policies of the United States. I am certainly apprehensive, and I know men of good will in every part of the Western World must be apprehensive that, on the little $340,000 matter of the importation of briar pipes, before a decision could be made by the President, he had to call in the Mutual Security Director of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of State, and, in addition, a number of Assistant Secretaries. Why, we have there a good part of the Cabinet of the United States, and, in addition, we have the majority leader of the Senate, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and other influential Senators and Representatives. They are all lined up to see whether a few briar pipes could be imported into the United States. If the importation of such a small, picayunish item as a few briar pipes creates so much consternation, what does it portend for the major issues in international trade, Mr. President? Foreign countries will know that the renewal of our reciprocal trade agreements program is but an idle gesture if there is hesitation in the picayunish matter of a sackful of briar pipes.

Mr. President, Western Europe, Britain, and Japan are primarily industrial. They do not produce the food for their populations, or the fiber and the raw materials for their industries. In the case

of Western Europe, food and raw materials have historically come largely from eastern and southeastern Europe. Japan's food and raw materials have come from Korea, Manchuria, China, and the rest of the Asiatic Continent, now in ferment. These nations, our allies, cannot survive unless they secure most of their food, fiber, and raw materials from the Western World and from the United States. The position of Italy, Germany, and Japan is particularly hopeless unless there is an expansion of their trade with the dollar areas. If America's political leadership does not meet this test in a statesmanlike manner and serve our own enlightened self-interest by liberalizing our trade policies, then these countries must, of necessity, orient themselves toward the Communist bloc. In addition, Western Europe and Japan have lost their historic major markets for their industrial goods, which markets are now the countries within the Communist orbit.

Economic assistance cannot last much longer, and if food, fiber, raw materials, and markets are not available in the Western World to the western have-not nations, then there is no power on earth strong enough to prevent them from orienting themselves toward the Communist east.

Mr. President, because Western Europe and Japan have lost their trade relations with the eastern areas, now Communist, which historically furnished their food supply, a situation is created which gives American agriculture an unparalleled opportunity to enter these markets and enjoy the highest level of prosperity which we have ever enjoyed. This is a sound prosperity, a permanent prosperity. There is no need for farm surpluses to pile up if we will but trade. We can either supply the food and raw material requirements of our allied western nations by trade, or these requirements will be supplied by Moscow. There is no alternative. What would the Atlantic Pact be worth; what would any mutual security alliance be worth, if our western allies or Japan were forced to depend on Moscow for their food, their raw materials, or on Russia as a market for their goods? If this happens, then the billions of dollars we have spent abroad have gone down the drain, and all the sacrifices of the American people will have been in vain—all to placate unreasonable and unfounded fears by certain segments of American business.

Again I say, there can be only one course for the United States. We must remove trade barriers, reduce tariffs, and expand foreign trade. No farm program in this country can be successful without it. Without it the future lot of agriculture is poverty. Mr. President, I shall certainly cooperate with President Eisenhower where I possibly can, but I have a deathly fear that the policies of the administration will dry up and stagnate the flow of world trade.

I have heard that the briar-pipe matter will be referred to the Tariff Commission for further study. I do not know whether this is true or not, but if we are not to turn the clock back to the trade policies of McKinley and Smoot-Hawley, why this hesitation? If there is hesitation and equivocation on the importation of an insignificant amount of goods, our Government certainly does not intend to liberalize trade to enable this country to build a sound prosperity which can only come in a prosperous community of western nations. High protection, import embargoes, and isolation are as out of date in this world, Mr. President, as are hoop skirts and saddle bags. If there are hesitation and equivocation now, it is useless to renew the reciprocal trade agreements program. No international agreements would be negotiated; no trade barriers reduced. Nothing would possibly be accomplished. The United States is at the crossroads. We are strong and powerful. Our industrial machine is unmatched. We have nothing to fear. This great Nation must continue as the leader of the free world. We must welcome trade. We must remove trade barriers between ourselves and other nations. If we do not do this, Mr. President, but instead act as we are doing on the briar-pipe matter, seclude ourselves, we will be just as isolated, friendless, and endangered in the world as we would be if Russian influence predominated in Western Europe and Japan. If we do not trade freely with them Russia will. We have no other choice.

And so the great crusade is on. Look where it is leading. One disastrous break follows another on the commodity exchanges. Since the beginning of the crusade farm commodities have sunk so low that all the profit has been squeezed out of farm and livestock production until today agriculture is in a critical and chaotic condition, and what do we hear? The echo of everything that was said 20 years ago except the statement that prosperity is just around the corner. Falling farm prices can be stopped by the powers that be anytime they take the steps to do it. The basis must be a support price of 95 percent of parity and a little economic engineering to open gateways in the tariff wall.

President Eisenhower is the leader of the free world. He is a real leader; he is a strong man. Without him all is lost. I commend his action up to now, but I am disappointed that we are embarking, from all appearances, on old-line Republican trade and farm policies, which, if not rectified, will bring disaster to us all.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Mississippi a moment ago for a copy of Mr. Benson's speech. I received a copy, by special messenger, a moment ago. I have not had time to read it, but I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the annual meeting of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., at St. Paul, Minn., on February 11, 1953, be inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Utah is inserting Secretary Benson's speech. I had intended to insert it if the Senator did not.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS AND NEW HOPE FOR THE NATION

You confer upon me a signal honor and challenging responsibility by inviting me to speak at this great 32d annual convention of your association. The honor carries with it a grave obligation which, in view of national and world conditions, is almost overwhelming.

I congratulate you men and women of the soil, that from your number have come such stalwarts as Senator EDWARD J. THYE and other great leaders whom I might mention, many of whom are here tonight, and who are of the same solid stuff.

At the outset, I venture the assertion that no group in agriculture is in a position to recognize more clearly the needs of the agricultural industry and the Nation than this group who represent the men and women who live on the farms and ranches of the northwest. As one who has been reared among farmers, served them, and been served by them, I declare without fear of successful contradiction that our rural people are today the strongest bulwark we have against all that is aimed, not only at weakening, but at the very destruction of our American way of life.

It is gratifying to note that in recent years an increasing number of industrial, labor, political, and religious leaders have come to acknowledge this fact. It seems that man must get his feet into the soil to keep sane. In any event, no other segment of our population knows so well that "as ye sow, so shall ye reap." America and the world must learn this eternal truth. Failure to do so can bring only disappointment, suffering, and desperation.

Our rural people, men and women of faith and common sense, must plan an important part through their organizations in teaching this all-important lesson. From our rural families must come much of the faith, courage, and leadership to face effectively the local, State, national, and international problems of tomorrow.

As farm people, representing a most important part of our free enterprise system—our American way of life—do we have the courage to accept the challenge which faces our industry and the entire Nation? Will we recognize the facts and act promptly without quibbling? America must be kept strong if she is to preserve herself and provide effective world leadership. This strength must come not alone from armaments and military might. Her strength must be measured in the integrity, moral courage, and spirituality of her people.

Only a few weeks ago we exercised our God-given right of free agency at the polls. God grant we may never lose this priceless privilege. We have differed vigorously during a great political campaign, as is our privilege. But now the American people have freely spoken. We have chosen a President. He is our President. He needs, and will continue to need, our wholehearted support and our faith and prayers, as will his associates, in the difficult days ahead.

The great crusade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now our President, is underway. You helped give him mandate. I welcome this opportunity to come to this great agricultural area of the Nation and personally report on progress.

Important developments have come fast, yet only after solid and mature consideration. The pattern is emerging in a way to indicate the constructive approach with which your Federal Government will move forward.

The inauguration message and ceremonies inspired liberty-loving people everywhere. The state of the Union address was delivered to Congress February 2, less than 2 weeks following inauguration. Let us not lose

sight of our President's challenge to the Nation expressed in such statements as the following:

"Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can * * * reduce the planned deficits and then balance the budget, which means, among other things, reducing Federal expenditures to the safe minimum."

Look at these facts from the President's address:

Current year's budget deficit $5.9 billion.

Budget presented before this administration took office "indicates a budgetary deficit of $9.9 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

"The national debt is now more than $265 billion.

"In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payment totals over $80 billion.

"Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities, so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description * * *

"Permit me this one understatement," the President said. "To meet and to correct this situation will not be easy.

"Every department head and I are determined to do everything we can to resolve it.

"A balanced budget is an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar.

"This is one of the critical steps to be taken to bring an end to planned inflation.

"Our purpose is to manage the Government's finances so as to help and not hinder each family in balancing its own budget."

An immediate review of all Federal budgets was called for by Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. His directive said:

"The problem is complicated by inheritance of the costs of a Federal debt of more than $265 billion;

"Indicated deficits for the fiscal years 1953–54 totaling $15.8 billion;

"With respect to personnel, it is the policy to reduce the number of Government employees.

"With respect to construction, it is the policy to proceed only with those projects which are deemed clearly essential.

"With respect to all programs, it is the policy to operate at a minimum level of cost and expenditures."

As a member of the President's Cabinet and Secretary of one of the largest governmental departments, I have the duty and obligation to use my best efforts to help our President achieve these objectives. I have implicit confidence in his integrity of purpose. I believe in his program—and I know that you and your neighbors, along with solid citizens all across the Nation, want first of all a balanced national budget and a halt to inflation.

As the President has said, "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." The legacy handed to us is fraught with a conglomeration of the most complex and difficult problems.

There is no easy road to the accomplishment of turning America back from an era of unbalanced budgets, of free spending, of inflation, of taxation that had reached confiscatory levels, of giveaway Government programs that were steadily and surely undermining the moral and spiritual values of our people. But such a program is in keeping with the thrift and wise financial management that is so characteristic of the people of rural America.

The United States Department of Agriculture has acted without delay. We have already effected a regrouping of agencies for more effective administration. February 5 our staff and agency heads met to start immediately a complete review of all programs and budgets. We have a splendid staff in charge, and they are ready to give strong leadership in seeing that agriculture does its share in accomplishing a balanced budget.

It will be our effort to give even more prompt and efficient service to you and the agricultural interests of the Nation—and at less cost. We believe it can be done.

A drastic drop in cattle prices was in progress as we came into office. We know how much it has been costing your members, and we were grateful for the helpful letters, telegrams, and phone calls reporting conditions, offering suggestions, and expressing confidence.

The Department of Agriculture is your Department, and we are in Washington for the purpose of serving you and all other citizens of the United States. We want your advice and suggestions at all times.

We hope you approved of the steps taken to help stabilize the cattle markets.

January 28, just 7 days after taking the oath of office, I issued a statement pointing out that prices received by farmers have been moving downward slowly and irregularly for almost 2 years. The decline is about 12 percent from a year ago and 18 percent from the peak reached in February 1951. Prices paid by farmers, as measured by the parity index, have been substantially unchanged during this period, with the result that the net incomes of farmers have experienced a severe squeeze. These changes have been under way for many months. We inherited this situation.

Opinions differ as to the future course of prices to be received by farmers. Our analysis in the Department of Agriculture leads us to expect no major changes during the next several months, particularly in view of the continuing high level of consumer income.

We shall continue to use such price-supporting devices as are available to us when and if prices sag below the levels prescribed by the Congress.

The next day I released to the press a copy of this telegram to Gov. Dan Thornton, of Colorado:

"Am doing all possible to have OPS controls on meat removed. Have advised with the White House, Congress, farm groups, packers, stockyard people, and retailers. All I have learned confirms my earlier belief, expressed prior to my appointment, that OPS meat controls should be removed. In my official capacity, I reaffirm that stand. Removal of OPS compulsory grading of meat would be a good thing for all segments of the industry and the consuming public."

February 3 we followed through with a call upon producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing.

At the same time, we urged processing and distribution agencies to develop a greater consumer demand for beef. Prices to consumers have been sharply reduced, which will in turn move more beef into consumption and help stabilize the market.

It was again pointed out that the United States economy is fundamentally strong.

Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability in cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle.

The rapid buildup in cattle numbers has pointed to a somewhat lower level of prices than in 1951 or 1952. Recent breaks appear to be an unorderly and temporary overadjustment to what should be a natural reaction to this increase in cattle numbers. We feel that a return to orderly marketing will check the price slide.

Uncertainty on the part of both buyers and sellers has contributed to an unwarranted pessimism. Disturbed by the price trends, many feeders have let their cattle go at half finish.

Compulsory grading required by OPS and the retention of price ceilings on beef have contributed to price declines. Leaders in the industry whom we consulted agreed that the removal of controls would in itself tend to strengthen cattle prices and stabilize markets.

You were undoubtedly pleased with the announcement that followed next day:

"In conformity with the policy set forth by the President in his message to the Congress, we are developing a program for the orderly decontrol of prices. We are taking action on the decontrol of a number of items before the end of the week. * * * Decontrol of meat would also include lifting the compulsory grading requirement on beef and will eliminate price ceilings on pork, lamb, veal, and beef at all levels from the farmer through the retail store." The results are well known. We are all pleased.

I have said before, and I now repeat, that price-support programs now in effect or previously announced will be continued. This means price support for the wheat you will seed this spring at a level which will reflect a nationwide farm price of about $2.21 per bushel. It means a support price for oats equal to 80 cents per bushel; for barley, $1.24; for rye, $1.43; and for flaxseed, $3.79 per bushel. It means support for dairy products at prices which will be announced soon.

We have not been stampeded into ill-considered action by the price declines that have occurred during this past month, nor do we propose to be stampeded. The farm people of the country, I am convinced, should expect sound and constructive help from the Department of Agriculture, and that we propose to give them. There will be no blanket promises to embark on actions which we have neither the authority to invoke nor the means to implement. You, on your part, can contribute stability to farm prices by orderly marketing and an exhibition of confidence and cooperation.

As we move forward, advisory groups and committees will be used to bring to the Department of Agriculture the best judgments of farmers, farm organizations, and industrial leadership.

The 14-man advisory committee named by the President to work with the Secretary of Agriculture gave us a good start. This committee, changed somewhat in personnel, will be meeting from time to time to review progress and make additional suggestions.

For the International Wheat Agreement Conference of 46 nations now meeting in Washington, we are using two advisory groups. One is composed of representatives of the major farm organizations and the wheat industry. The other is a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives.

A special dairy advisory group will meet next week in Washington to bring to bear on the many dairy problems the best judgments available. They are the best men we could find, men recommended by the industry itself. This great dairy area will be well represented.

A large cotton committee drawn from all major segments of the cotton industry is also ready to start work. A group of capable, highly respected citizens is being appointed to advise us in the important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Other committees will be called as important problems develop and as work proceeds on major programs. We are willing to submit our case to the farmers. A lifetime of working for and with them, in all their fields of economic endeavor, has convinced us of our trust.

It will always be a definite part of our policy to seek the best possible advice from Members of the Congress and the entire agricultural industry through conferences with farm organization leaders, other advisory committees, and individuals regarding existing and proposed policies and programs. As the President emphasized in his state of the Union message: "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." Certainly in no area of the legacy handed us by the out-going administration are the problems more numerous or more difficult than in the Department of Agriculture.

The numerous programs and great decisions for which the Secretary of Agriculture has been given responsibility are almost unbelievable. The magnitude and import of the decisions he is required to make are humbling indeed, if not overwhelming. The Congress, through bipartisan legislation aimed to benefit agriculture, has provided far-reaching machinery pertaining to farm credit, research, marketing, and price supports.

It is our duty to administer faithfully these laws, not alone for the protection of the farmers, but for the good of all the people. We are firm in our resolve to do this. There will be no turning back from this responsibility. But as we administer these laws, there will be a thorough examination and reappraisal of each program. These efforts will be made in close cooperation and with advice from farmers and other qualified representatives of the industry. In other words, we want each commodity group to help develop a program it can make work with our help. We know that without the help of the industry and the blessings of a kind Providence, we cannot succeed. We are earnestly seeking both.

And now I would like to spell out for you, in broad outline, what will be the policy of our administration of your Department of Agriculture. It is the result of careful and prolonged deliberation in consultation with farmers, farm leaders, professional agriculturalists, Members of Congress, and others. I feel sure it is not perfect, because it has been developed by imperfect human beings. No doubt the policy will be refined and improved with the passing of time.

It has been influenced to some extent, no doubt, by an old-fashioned philosophy that it is impossible to help people permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. It is a philosophy that believes in the supreme worth of the individual as a free man, as a child of God, that believes in the dignity of labor and the conviction that you cannot build character by taking away man's initiative and independence. And, further, that character is the one thing we make in this world and take with us into the next. For what doth it profit if we gain the whole world and lose our own souls?

I believe that the people who live on the farms and in the rural communities of America also accept this homely philosophy. I am most anxious that they will always accept it as a dynamic part of their lives. It must be so if this choice land of America is to endure.

This, then, in part at least, will be the broad policy which will guide us. I hope you will concur wholeheartedly.

AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

The supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, should be "How will it affect the character, morale, and well-being of our people?" We need—the world needs—a strong America in the critical years ahead.

To me, freedom is a God-given, eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something more precious than life itself. It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.

With the development of mechanized commercial agriculture, the family farm has become closely geared into a complex interdependent industrial economy. There is no hope for peace, growth, or prosperity if each economic group is seeking its own advantage to the detriment of others. To make their best contribution to national welfare, farmers must have the full cooperation of industry and labor, because each is dependent upon the effective performance of the other economic groups.

Our agricultural policy should aim to obtain, in the market place, full parity prices of farm products and parity incomes for farm people so that farmers will have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to changing consumer demands in an expanding economy. This objective cannot be assured by Government programs alone. It can be achieved only with a steady level of prices, high employment and production, and rising output per worker in our total national economy.

The most important method of promoting the long-time welfare of farm people and the Nation is the support of adequate programs of research and education in the production, processing, marketing, and utilization of farm products and in problems of rural living.

The development of modern agriculture, which has made possible these great achievements, has placed the family farm in a vulnerable economic position because farm prices and income rise and fall more rapidly than farm costs. Hence, the guarding of farm levels of living requires a program of storage and price supports to help to assure stability of income. These supports should be designed not only to serve the welfare of farmers, but also—in the widest national interest—to prevent disaster to the farm-producing plant and the national food supply.

Price support laws will be carried out faithfully in every respect. There are mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the so-called basic commodities for 1953 and 1954. Other laws provide for supports on other farm products. While enforcing these laws, there will be formulated long-term programs which will more fully and effectively accomplish our overall objectives.

Price supports should provide insurance against disaster to the farm-producing plant and help to stabilize national food supplies. But price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our efforts should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system.

It is generally agreed that there is danger in the undue concentration of power in the Federal Government. Too many Americans today are calling on Washington to do for them what they should be willing to do for themselves.

Individual freedom and citizenship responsibility depend upon the principle of helping the individual to help himself. It is possible through individual and group action to solve many problems and achieve objectives locally with a minimum of Federal assistance and control. Your own association is an excellent example of this fact.

The principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. We seek a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maximum of dependence on free-market prices as the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market. However, the ability to avoid restrictions on agriculture depends in part on the willingness of other economic groups to adopt policies that permit flexible and dynamic adjustments.

Furthermore, inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture or any other segment of our economy. Relief programs should be operated as such—not as an aid to the entire agricultural industry. Emergency programs should be terminated as soon as the emergency is over.

No agricultural program should be manipulated to serve partisan political purposes.

In the administration of this Department, the guiding purpose will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen. We must establish a climate which will further promote, cultivate, and release the great reservoir of dynamic latent energy of every individual in this great Nation.

The days ahead are sobering and challenging and will demand the faith, prayers, and loyalty of every American. Our challenge is to keep America strong—strong socially, economically, and, above all, spiritually sound, if our way of life is to endure. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

We need a nationwide repentance to rid this land of corruption. We must return to the fundamental virtues that have made this Nation great. There is a force in the universe which no mortal can alter. This Nation does have a spiritual foundation. It has been established in keeping with great spiritual and moral principles, but there seems to be a tendency for us to lose our sense of uprightness and to willfully do those things which we must know to be wrong. This cannot continue with impunity.

God help us to raise our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things. May we have the courage to stand up and be counted, to stand for principle, for those noble concepts and ideals which guided the founding fathers in the establishment of this great land. Thank God for the promises that have been made regarding the future of America. I hope and pray we will merit and realize the fulfillment of these promises. God grant it may be so.

ATTITUDE OF ADMINISTRATION TOWARD THE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS subsequently said: Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] issued a statement yesterday in which he expressed his indignation at the new administration's attitude toward the price-support program. I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Senator from Montana be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION'S STAND ON PRICE SUPPORTS "SHOCKING"—"INSULT TO NATION'S FARMERS," MONTANA SENATOR DECLARES—"TALK OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS WHILE MILLIONS STARVE IS ABSURD," SENATOR MURRAY MAINTAINS—"NEW AGRICULTURE POLICY THREATENS RETURN TO FARM POVERTY OF 1920'S WITH FARMER COMPLETELY AT THE MERCY OF BIG CITY SPECULATORS IN HUNGER"

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, whose constituents produce much of the Nation's beef, lamb, and wheat, expressed himself as "shocked" by the new policy on price supports announced yesterday by Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration.

"It is obvious," Senator MURRAY declared, "that Mr. Benson either has no understanding at all of the measures which brought prosperity to America's farmers and an adequate supply of food to city dwellers or that, for reasons which I cannot grasp, he deliberately intends to return American agriculture to the chaos of the 1920's when our ranchers and farmers were completely at the mercy of big city, commodity market, speculators in human hunger.

"To say that price supports should be used only as 'disaster insurance' is an invitation to disaster," Senator MURRAY said. "To talk

of surpluses when millions of people in Europe, Asia, and Africa are undernourished or even starving is absurd—particularly so when we know that a properly planned distribution abroad of what Mr. Benson calls 'surpluses' will not only insure the continued prosperity of America's farmers but is also one of our greatest and least costly weapons against the spread of communism," the Montana Senator maintained.

"When Secretary Benson places price supports in the category of 'relief programs,' I believe he is insulting not only the intelligence but the integrity of America's most hard-working and most productive citizens. When he says that 'inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture,' I'd like to know just what groups of farmers or ranchers he is labeling inefficient. When he attempts to justify a refusal to maintain the democratic price support policy by implying that it has robbed the American farmer of character, initiative, and independence, the most charitable thing I can say is that Mr. Benson certainly hasn't met any of Montana's ranchers and farmers in recent years.

"Speaking for the people of Montana, I would advise Mr. Benson that thanks to agricultural policies he apparently intends to undermine, Montana's producers of beef and lamb, of wheat, and sugar beets—indeed, all the people of Montana—are independent, are men and women of character, and, if Mr. Benson doesn't promptly move to support farm prices, will surprise him by the initiative they show in replacing this administration by one which works for the interest of all our people rather than for the interests.

"The price-support program is our Government's guaranty to the American farmer that he will not suffer when he patriotically undertakes to produce the enormous quantities of food needed to keep ours the best fed army in the world, to keep our country the most productive in the world, and to offset the blandishments held out by Communist Russia to our friends abroad. The price-support program provides American agriculture with that stability which made it the most efficient in the world. Not only must the price-support program be maintained but the Congress must demand that President Eisenhower instruct his Secretary of Agriculture to promptly plan its extension beyond 1954 so that our farmers in turn may plan ahead. The alternative is a return to that insecurity, uncertainty, and potential bondage to the moneylenders which ruined America's farmers and its farm productivity in the twenties. I am positive that such an alternative will not be tolerated by the Congress. If this be the end of the new administration's honeymoon, so be it. It is far better to end the honeymoon than to end the farmer," Secretary MURRAY concluded.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY 13 BEAUTY QUEENS FROM THE SOUTH

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the great State of Louisiana is famous for its diversified farming, its delicious foods, and also for its prowess in the production of oil, sulfur, salt, and other minerals; last, but not least, the State is well noted for its beautiful girls.

It is my privilege to present to the Senate 13 queens from the southland, 12 of whom hail from Louisiana and 1 from Texas. Texas is so close to Louisiana that she also produces girls who are almost as beautiful as the girls of Louisiana. As I read the names of the girls, I hope they will stand so that the Senators may see them.

Angie Branch, rice queen, Crowley (Houston); Gail Dugal, yambilee queen, Opelousas (Lafayette); Dorothy Etta Goff, peach queen, Ruston; Marian Hodges, mardi gras queen, New Orleans; Barbera Huff, rose queen, Bogalusa; Carolyn Landry, dairy queen, Lafayette; Betty Rose Pigott, paper queen, Bogalusa; Patty Pope, holiday in Dixie queen, Shreveport; Janelle Roy, camellia queen, Lafayette; Jacqueline Sandifer, American Legion sweetheart, Bogalusa; Betty Lou Seabolt, forest queen, Winnfield; Sylvia Ann Segura, sugar queen, New Iberia; Mavis Sinetere, shrimp queen, Morgan City.

(As Mr. ELLENDER read their names, the young ladies rose from their seats in the gallery, and were greeted with applause by the Members of the Senate.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their warm reception of these fine young ladies. I am most proud of all of them. They hail from various parts of Louisiana and represent a fair cross section of my State. They will be in Washington for a few days and I wish for them the best of luck.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is with profound regret and sorrow that I announce the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Elbert Duncan Thomas, at Honolulu on Wednesday, February 11.

Senator Thomas had been in Honolulu since his retirement from the United States Senate, serving as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands taken from Japan during World War II.

I am sure the people of the State of Utah and the Nation, as well as the Members of this body, were shocked to hear of his death.

Although Senator Thomas and I were of opposite political parties and had different points of view, we nevertheless were friends and members of the same church. I visited him only a year ago in Honolulu at the offices of the High Commissioner. He appeared to be in excellent health and spirits.

Senator Elbert Thomas was a native of Salt Lake City. He attended public school in Salt Lake City, and received his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Utah. He held a doctor's degree from the University of California.

Senator Thomas had a remarkable and distinguished career and during its course he occupied many positions of trust and honor, both in his native State of Utah and in the Nation. He served in the Armed Forces of his country; as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in the Empire of Japan; as a professor at the University of Utah; as a United States Senator, and at numerous times as special representative of the United States in international activities.

Senator Thomas was a Member of this body for 18 years. He especially interested himself in labor and educational matters and in foreign affairs. During much of World War II he was acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and was afterward chairman. He served as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and later as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Senator Thomas was a devoted husband and father. He is survived by his widow of his second marriage and by three married daughters.

Literally thousands of citizens of the State of Utah attended his classes when he was professor of political science at our State university. His educational and other activities were so numerous and so varied that I cannot do justice to all of them in the time permitted me this morning.

Mr. President, in my own behalf and in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Elbert Duncan Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Utah.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the privilege of making some comments upon the late Elbert D. Thomas, formerly a Member of this body, of whose death we have just learned.

Mr. President, the death of our former colleague, Elbert D. Thomas, fills us all with grief. Elbert Thomas was our most distinguished scholar-statesman. A long-time resident of and Mormon missionary to Japan, he knew the customs and literature of both Japan and China thoroughly. A skilled classical scholar, he had been an inspiring teacher of Latin and Greek, while at the same time he knew modern Europe at first hand, its languages, its literature, and its problems.

Taking his doctor of philosophy degree at the University of California, Elbert Thomas then taught political science at the University of Utah from 1924 to 1932, when he was elected to this body as a Democrat to succeed the late Reed Smoot. He served in the Senate for three full terms or for 18 years, and was particularly active on the three Committees of Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, and Labor and Public Welfare, serving as chairman of the two latter bodies.

During the war his broadcasts to Japan in the Japanese language were of great value in their frank statement of our good intentions, and they immeasurably weakened the Japanese will to resist. With Admiral Zacharias he was, however, insistent on retaining the Japanese Emperor so that Japan after the war would not degenerate into anarchy.

As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator Thomas worked for a strong Army to resist aggression and to protect national and collective security. His contributions to our preparedness and to our effective fighting strength in World War II were great, and

unfortunately not sufficiently appreciated.

But Elbert Thomas was basically a man of peace. He strove on the Foreign Relations Committee for a peaceful world. He was an informed supporter of the idea behind both the old League of Nations and the present United Nations. I had the honor of being a cosponsor with him in 1950, prior to the aggression in Korea, of a resolution which would have pledged us to work for an agreement whereby the United Nations could more readily pool the forces of the world to resist aggression.

I came to know Elbert Thomas best from serving with him as a junior member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We had some difficult bills to consider—notably the proposals to repeal or amend the Taft-Hartley law, the Federal aid-to-education bill, and the upward revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The discussions and disputes frequently became very heated; but never Elbert Thomas. He was always calm, always charitable and understanding in his attitude, and always humane in his point of view. It would be impossible for any man to be a more fair or a more considerate chairman.

But Elbert Thomas was probably most proud of his part in getting the beautiful Jefferson Memorial erected. He was its real sponsor, and despite bitter opposition from partisans who did not believe Jefferson should be so honored, or who quarreled with the type of architecture finally chosen, he succeeded in having the memorial erected. He obtained the necessary appropriations; he advised on the architecture of the memorial, which is partially modeled on that of Monticello; he selected the striking quotations from Jefferson which adorn its walls. He was, in short, its founder and father, and countless generations will benefit from his work. I can imagine the deep pleasure which he enjoyed when he saw Jefferson's magnificent statement on the freedom of the mind emblazoned for all to read and ponder:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

But most of all Elbert Thomas was a thoroughly good man. Scholar and statesman, he was humble and unassuming. He was a devoted husband and father. He trusted other people, and brought out the best in many. He encouraged youth, and loved to help them up the ladder. He was charitable to his opponents and kind to his friends. He possessed a massive patience along with his brilliant and well-trained mind. He was the best exemplar of his religion that I have met. His life preached. Unfortunately he did not escape contumely and was forced to tread the bitter wine press of pain. The attacks upon him in his last few years, I feel sure, almost broke his heart and ultimately contributed to his death. But he did not revile; rather he forgave his traducers. May his spirit and example help us all to be more charitable and more truly Christian. I feel about Elbert Thomas what Robert Browning wrote of the Monk Caponsacchi in his poem, The Ring and the Book:

> Through such souls only, God stooping
> Throws sufficient of His light
> For us the dark to rise by.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleagues, and to express my very deep regret and personal sadness at hearing the tragic news of the death of our former colleague, Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah.

I had the great pleasure and satisfaction of serving with Senator Thomas in the Senate for more than 2 years. I had the honor and privilege of serving under his chairmanship as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that service, in committee and on the floor of the Senate, I developed for Senator Thomas great admiration, deep affection, and the most profound respect and regard.

Elbert Thomas was a distinguished statesman, soldier, educator, philosopher, and leader in civic affairs. But, above all, he was a deeply religious and spiritual man.

I know of no man who so completely combined the qualities of great determination and force with deep humility and charity. He was in every way a gentleman. Truly a gentle man, he was charitable to his opponents and to his fellowman, for he was possessed of an understanding of the weaknesses of those less fortunate than he. At all times he was sincerely and unfailingly interested and devoted to the welfare of his country.

His untimely passing is a great loss to the people of the United States whom he served so long and so well as an educator, as a statesman, and in recent years in an important position in the Pacific. I join my colleagues in a very deep and sincere expression of regret and grief at his passing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with respect to the tragic loss of Elbert Thomas I should like to say a few words. Few public officials are deserving of the title of statesman; but it may be truly said that Elbert Thomas was a great statesman. He recognized that a United States Senator should be a student of government, and he was such a student. He sought the facts and the truth and had the courage to follow the truth. Scholarly, kindly, understanding of human frailties, Elbert Thomas was a man of unimpeachable character. He loved people as people, and he sought to translate into legislation, programs and reforms which would give statesmanlike meaning to the principle that we are a government by law. He well realized the fact that as public officials Senators have the duty to promote the general welfare and to protect the dignity and spiritual values of the individual. American history will be richer in meaning and value because of the life of Elbert Thomas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BENNETT].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address a very brief question to the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. The acting majority leader will recall that at the opening of the Congress on January 3 resolutions were offered in the Senate expressing regret at the passing of our beloved colleague, Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. At that time the majority leader agreed—as a matter of fact, I think it was at his own suggestion—that a time would be set aside when Senators who were the friends and colleagues of Brien McMahon could, on the floor of the Senate, give expression to their feeling of affection, regard, and admiration for him. Several weeks have passed. I ask if the acting majority leader will at this time entertain the request that a definite time be set aside—perhaps on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week—so that Members of the Senate may have due notice of the arrangement, at which time any of us who may wish to speak about our love and admiration for Brien McMahon may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New York, who discussed this subject with me earlier, that I told him that our program following the completion of business today will be to adjourn until Monday of next week. We plan to have sessions of the Senate on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week. We plan to set aside Wednesday as a day on which remarks concerning the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut may be made, in conformity with the resolutions referred to, and prior discussion with the majority leader.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader. I suggest that in view of the small attendance in the Senate today, any Senator who wishes on next Wednesday to eulogize not only Senator McMahon but also Senator Thomas, will at that time have the opportunity to do so. Thus the occasion would be one of tribute to both these great colleagues of ours. I, for one, would like to make some further remarks about our late colleague, Elbert Thomas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no question about that under our procedures.

For the information of the Senate, I will say that when the several speeches which remain to be made today are completed, it is the intention of the acting majority leader then to move to take up the Executive Calendar, copies of which are on the desks of Senators, I believe, or at least are available.

Previous to this time I have discussed with the minority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] the intention of the majority leader to take up the Executive Calendar. So far as I know, there is no objection to any of the nominations which appear on the Executive Calendar. At least, no objection has been brought to my attention.

GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in a few days the active military career of one of this Nation's greatest combat commanders—Gen. James A. Van Fleet—will draw to a close.

I am confident that every Member of the Senate, along with every mother and father in this Nation who has a son now serving in the bunkers of Korea or awaiting orders which may carry him there, felt a tug at the heart on hearing that this courageous but modest leader had laid down his heavy burden of command and is coming home.

Truly a "soldier's soldier," General Van Fleet is retiring in his 61st year, after 38 years of military service. For the past 22 months he has led his tough and able Eighth Army in the grim Korean strife. Despite the frustration of a stalemate in the harsh mountains and dreary valleys of Korea, which conformed with political decisions beyond his control, despite his heartsickness over the loss of his only son in air action over Korea, this stalwart infantryman forged from men of almost every race, creed, and color, one of the most formidable fighting machines in all history. President Eisenhower recently summed up in a few short words the stature of this sturdy soldier when he described Van Fleet as "the best qualified combat officer in the Armed Forces."

Yet, in Korea and back a few years earlier in Greece, General Van Fleet demonstrated that he is far more than a successful, aggressive, resourceful, dogged fighter. He possesses also those innate qualities of patience, understanding, and love of people that have enabled him to rebuild the shattered armies of South Korea into a gallant and intelligent fighting force which now mans the greater portion of that 160-mile battle line.

I am sure that the good people of South Korea will never forget this modest leader of the 8th Army. Many of us read a few days ago of his personal farewell to the people of that nation—how he stood with President Syngman Rhee bareheaded in a bitter cold wind on the steps of the battered capitol in Seoul and expressed in simple, heartfelt words before more than 25,000 South Koreans his deep appreciation for their loyalty and devotion and his abiding faith in their determination to carry on to victory. Choked with emotion he closed with the words "I will always be one of you."

In war-torn Greece a few years earlier General Van Fleet was chief of the American military mission which remolded a riddled Greek Army into a competent fighting force and stiffened the Greek nation to the point where it became a much-needed stabilizing influence in the troubled Balkans.

I am sure that if we are ever privileged to see the secret files of the Kremlin we will find the name of General Van Fleet near the top of the Kremlin list of those persons in the Western World who have done most to stem the onrush of communism. No greater tribute can be paid any American citizen.

In World War II General Van Fleet hit the Normandy beaches as a colonel commanding the spearhead 8th Infantry Regiment of the 4th Division. But it was only a matter of months until his proven combat leadership carried him through the roles of battle commander of the 4th Division, the 90th Division, and later the III Corps. He bears on his body the scars of three wounds, all received as an American infantryman.

Like many other Floridians, I have a particular personal interest and pride in this noble soldier, as he is a Floridian, reared in the little town of Bartow, Fla., which is my lifelong home. We were schoolboys together in grammar school and high school. We hunted, fished, and played baseball together. In those early days we other boys respected Jim Van Fleet for his kindness, his humility, his honesty, and his courage.

His appointment to West Point was from Florida. Following his graduation from West Point, he served at the University of Florida as professor of military science and tactics, and football coach. Those early years of service have endeared him to thousands of Florida students and their families.

I have read that General Van Fleet plans to retire to an orange grove he owns at Auburndale, a few miles from my home town. Whatever is his decision, I know that the people of Florida and of the Nation will hope and pray for many years of bountiful health and happiness for General and Mrs. Van Fleet.

But it is hard for me to believe that President Eisenhower, in his great wisdom, will let our country lose the services and talents of such an individual. Since World War II the United States has produced few men with such a pronounced grasp of military and diplomatic problems. He has been tested and has shown qualities of true greatness in both fields. This Nation will continue to need his firm hand and seasoned experience in the troubled areas of the world.

In connection with General Van Fleet's return from Korea and his approaching retirement from active duty, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks three editorials, entitled "Salute to a Soldier," from the February 2 issue of Life magazine, "Van Fleet's Farewell," from the February 11 issue of the Washington Post, and "Van Fleet Is Praised for a Job Well Done," from the February 11 issue of the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks an excerpt from the "Off My Chest" column of the Polk County Democrat of January 27, 1953, of Bartow, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine of February 2, 1953]

SALUTE TO A SOLDIER

Gen. James A. Van Fleet has been ordered to give up his command of the Eighth Army in Korea, come home, and retire. He is turning 61, he is in his 38th year of military service, and he has had the field command in Korea for 22 months. He bows out with this tribute from President Eisenhower: "the best-qualified combat officer in the Armed Forces."

General Van Fleet deserves the salutes of all Americans. He was one of the best of our infantry commanders in World War II. He rebuilt, trained, and to all effects commanded the Greek Army which in 1948 and 1949 defeated armed communism in Greece, and thereby gave the first proof that an application of serious and intelligent American effort could reverse the Soviet tide.

As commander of the U. N. forces in Korea, he has brought his forces safely through difficulties too little understood at home. During most of his time there, he has been required to wage a stalemate war. A soldier born and schooled to win, he has had little stomach for it. Neither have the men under his command. Given inferior or faltering leadership, our forces in Korea might literally have fallen apart. The fact that they constitute a fine fighting army today is in great part due to James A. Van Fleet.

Much has been told of late about the rebirth and growth of the ROK army. That, too, has been in large part Van Fleet's doing. In a complex chain of command no single man decides and does everything. But it may be said that there probably would be no ROK army in Korea today, holding two-thirds of the line, if at the start of his tour there in 1951 General Van Fleet had not made up his mind on two disputed points—we had to have the help of the South Koreans, and they were perfectly capable of giving it if they had sufficient training, equipment, and backing. Aside from the military rewards of this decision, the political effects in Asia have been immense. For the re-creation of the ROK army with United States help and supervision has demonstrated that Americans and Asians can work together, fight together, and even come to like and respect each other. In the unhappy days of 1950 and early 1951, when "gook" was the American synonym for all Koreans, almost no one thought it could ever happen. General Van Fleet made it happen, and for this alone he would be entitled to any honor in the gift of his country.

[From the Washington Post of February 11, 1953]

VAN FLEET'S FAREWELL

The measure of the magnificent fighting spirit of Gen. James A. Van Fleet is contained in his farewell to the Eighth Army in Korea. "I find it very hard to leave you," he said on his departure for retirement, "and it hurts me to leave my work unfinished." That work is unfinished only because the nature of the limited war made a military victory as such impossible. The superb confidence shown by General Van Fleet has been at all times an inspiration to the United Nations force, and it is this sort of confidence, based on realistic assessment of strength, that denotes a competent commander. Every commander needs to believe that he can win.

Actually, the Korean war has always had more than the usual quantum of political overtones. In some ways they correspond to the political considerations that restricted General Van Fleet's campaigns during the rescue operation he conducted in Greece. Possibly a broad offensive of the kind General Van Fleet wanted would have made settlement easier. But the political aspects of war are a task for statesmen rather than for generals alone—especially in a coalition war—and the longer the Korean war has gone on the more important the political aspects have become.

Within the framework of his job General Van Fleet was a model man and a model leader of men. His belief in the offensive showed a willingness to take risks, a willingness that is all too rare among military men who traditionally always want more before they move. His task called for more than

military means, and these other means were not his responsibility. Men of good will everywhere will appreciate his great contribution to the defeat of aggression, and his inspiring leadership will live long in our military annals.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of February 11, 1953]

VAN FLEET IS PRAISED FOR A JOB WELL DONE

A change of command takes place in Korea today which involves a personality who is admired and respected throughout Florida, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, an adopted son of this State, turns over his responsibility as Eighth Army commander to Lt. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and returns to the United States after nearly 2 years on the far-eastern battlefront.

A review of the retiring commander's record in Korea reveals his stature as a leader. By sheer dint of his forceful personality, Van Fleet exerted an influence on our fighting men which was responsible for the high morale maintained in that theater. The fact that he accomplished this feat under unfavorable circumstances adds much to his reputation as a field commander.

It was in mid-April of 1951 that Van Fleet was called to Korea to assume command of the Eighth Army. Gen. Douglas MacArthur had just been relieved as United Nations commander for differences of opinion with the administration over how the war should be fought, and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway was given the job at Tokyo of directing the overall military effort.

Obviously that was not the kind of situation that made for a happy frame of mind among the troops. Already assailed by serious doubts as to the real purpose of the war, the fighting men were further perplexed by the discord among the Nation's top leaders.

Van Fleet's job was that of keeping our fighting team from becoming adversely affected by this situation. Then, as time went by, he had the added burden of boosting the morale of men who were asked to fight a war which carried no chance of victory.

Van Fleet's performance in Korea will stand for a long time as a miracle of combat leadership.

Floridians everywhere take great pride in the record of their adopted son, and they will continue to follow his career with keen interest; for although it has been indicated that the general may retire, the present world situation almost demands that a man of his capabilities be placed in a position where our Military Establishment can further profit from his experience as one of the outstanding field commanders of modern times.

[From the Polk County Democrat, Bartow, Fla., of January 27, 1953]

HERO COMING HOME

One of Polk County's favorite sons will be coming home soon.

With four stars on his shoulders, a chest full of medals on his tunic, and the gratitude of the people of three continents among his memories, Gen. James A. Van Fleet is scheduled for retirement a couple of months from now.

As one of this Nation's great leaders, General Jim has distinguished himself in three wars in little more than a decade—as a fighting man on the battlegrounds of World War II, as the virtual savior of Greece in its bloody fight against Communist guerrillas, and as commander of United Nations ground forces in Korea.

It must be hard for him to leave Korea to come home. He will be leaving behind his only son, a brave fighter like his father.

Jim, Jr., vanished in one of the bitter battles of last year. He is still listed as missing in action.

Not knowing whether his son is dead or alive in an enemy prison camp, is a galling emotion which the general shares with many another parent. It must be harder still on Mrs. Van Fleet, who hasn't the solace of being able to do something directly about the war, as her husband has been doing.

General Van Fleet has given fine service to his country far beyond the opportunities that fall to most men. He has richly earned the right to retirement and rest in civilian life. His neighbors in Bartow and Polk County will be eager to welcome him back.

But for the sake of the Nation which he has served and is serving so well, it is to be hoped that his former military commander, now occupying the White House, will claim General Jim's services still further in a high position at home.

DEATH OF RALPH HENRY CAMERON, FORMER SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce the death in his 90th year of Ralph Henry Cameron who served as a Member of this body from 1921 to 1927 as United States Senator from the State of Arizona. Mr. Cameron was born in Southport, Maine, in 1863, migrated to the Territory of Arizona when he was 20 years of age, making his home in Coconino County where he subsequently served as sheriff and as chairman of the board of supervisors. He engaged in stockraising and mining and later became nationally known as the builder of the Bright Angel Trail, which for the first time made it possible for tourists to visit the gorge of the Grand Canyon.

In 1908 Mr. Cameron was elected a Delegate from the Territory of Arizona to the 61st Congress and was reelected to the 62d Congress during which time he actively participated in the enactment of the legislation which enabled Arizona to be admitted into the Union in 1912. As a result of the election in 1920 he became a Senator from Arizona and served until March 4, 1927, when I became his successor. During his service here he was greatly interested in the development of the natural resources of Arizona and took particular pride in the passage through the Senate of the bill to authorize the construction of the San Carlos irrigation project, one of the principal features of which is the Coolidge Dam.

The passage of time has made it so that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is now the only Member who served with Mr. Cameron in this body. There are other Senators who became acquainted with him in subsequent years, and I am sure they will all join with me in extending our sincere condolences to his wife and daughter, who were at his side when he passed away yesterday in the city of Washington.

CLARIFICATION OF PRESS RELEASE OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on the floor, and I am sure he will appreciate my making the statement I am about to make. As I told the Senator from Louisiana earlier this afternoon, some of the members of the press seem to be a bit confused regarding a press release which our subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee issued for publication on Sunday. I refer to the Long-Stennis-Morse subcommittee which functioned at a time when the Senator from Louisiana and I were members of the Armed Services Committee.

Some of the members of the press have asked the junior Senator from Oregon why his name does not appear on the report, and they have misinterpreted a letter on the frontispiece of the report, signed by the Senator from Louisiana as not including the Senator from Oregon. It is simply a letter of transmittal by the Senator from Louisiana as chairman of the subcommittee to the chairman of the full committee, and it is not entitled to the interpretation they have made of it that it is only a Long report and that the junior Senator from Oregon is not a participant in the report.

So that there may be no misunderstanding among members of the press, and subject to verification by the Senator from Louisiana, let me say that the Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Oregon stand shoulder to shoulder behind the report. We have no differences over its contents.

Some newspaperman made a reference to me in regard to one sentence in the report in which the report relates that members of the committee were not in complete agreement with reference to a matter which I am not going to discuss this afternoon. There is no disagreement between the committee members at all on the principle involved. I only want to wait before making final commitment on the matter until full negotiations have been completed in regard to the Spanish problem.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what the Senator from Oregon has stated is correct. We joined in the statement. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was at that time unable to make the trip of inspection with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana, and, therefore, the Senator from Mississippi has every right to reserve his judgment. However, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana went carefully over every word in the report, not only once, but several times, and agreed on every word in it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, because he has cleared up a misunderstanding on the part of some members of the press.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in January of last year, I was privileged to address the Senate for 2 days in opposition to the then pending measure, Senate bill 1976, which provided for the so-called home rule for the District of Columbia.

Some thought I was engaging in a one-man filibuster. Others, including a substantial number in this body, recognized that we were engaged in a serious

debate on a troublesome question involving an important point of constitutional law, namely: The power vested in the Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia, and our utter lack of power to delegate that function to any group or body within the District.

I shall trouble the Senate now for only a few minutes.

I urged the Senate, last year, to withhold its vote until a case then pending in the United States court of appeals—Thompson against District of Columbia—should be decided. I urged that such a forthcoming decision might chart a clearer course of action for us. At that time, I used this specific language:

Before closing my discussion of the law cases which I consider applicable to the constitutional barrier forbidding a delegation of our legislative power to another body—council or what not—if the proponents of this measure and the rest of us in this body are willing to exercise a little patience and forbearance, we may soon have another judicial expression on the subject which may better chart for us a course we may pursue in determining our rights as the supreme legislative authority for the District of Columbia. * * *

Our power and the extent of a proper exercise of it is in issue, or, at least, it is an important issue, in a case now before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, if not directly, certainly by every implication and as a matter of great public consideration. It is of particular concern to thinking lawyers who are Members of this body and the House of Representatives. What the court may say will be of importance to them. It may be of vast importance.

If the sponsors of this bill could restrain their eagerness for its immediate passage, further light for us may come out of the able United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In many respects its jurisdiction is of wider range than our ordinary circuit courts of appeals. Its decision, no doubt, will case light and chart courses of thinking on a division of governmental powers, especially our own, in relation to what we may or may not do in the delegation of legislative authority. I will welcome a knowledge of the reasoning which that court may adopt.

* * * * *

Every lawyer who has tried cases has had experience with courts. Every lawyer who has argued cases on appeal knows that there are times when all the issues presented are not decided. There are times when a decision hides the real issues. There are times when the real issues are confused. The press indicates that there will be a decision en banc by the United States court of appeals, a court of able judges. A decision in which all of them participate will, if it discusses the limit of our power, go a long way toward dispelling doubt in our minds as to our power, and how much of our power we may properly delegate. I have no reason to doubt, because of the great public agitation locally for the past few years, the various so-called home-rule bills, the grave questions of law confronting us, and the flood of litigation which the court can reasonably and naturally anticipate pouring into its overflowing pond of litigated and pending cases, that it will meet and deal with this primary question head-on, with clarity, force, and reason. If it does—and I hope it will—the public business here will be aided to the extent the court may chart courses of appropriate action—not on policy—but on the power and the extent of our constitutional power as a legislative body under the precise language here involved. Some laymen are prone to mix policy with power. The courts rightfully steer clear of framing a policy. They can light the candles for us so we can better judge for ourselves the extent to which, if you please, we must ourselves exercise and the extent to which we may delegate our power to another.

We may do well to await a decision of that court or of the Supreme Court of the United States on the question in this particular case. Much time could thus be saved. Many headaches and some heartaches for the future may be spared.

Mr. President, in the argument and discussion of last year, it was my duty to quote to the Senate an expression of judicial authorities bearing on the question, and sustaining the view that we might not properly delegate our legislative responsibility to a council or to an assembly in the District. Nevertheless, the Senate on January 22, 1952, by a vote of 41 to 35, refused to recommit Senate bill 1976. We spent over a week on the question which in my humble judgment could have been resolved in a few minutes if we had troubled ourselves to consider seriously the point of law involved. Weeks upon weeks were consumed by the District Committee of the House in a consideration of the Senate bill 1976, and this at an untold cost. Public interest here was greatly aroused. Excitement at times reached fever pitch. The press was seriously divided. Three of the local papers opposed the measure, while one favored it.

While there was some sniping at me, in the main I was credited with being entirely objective, wholly devoid of bias or prejudice. My argument was based solely on the law. The clamor of the crowd, the pleadings of the special groups around here, and the slanted interpretations of some legal opinions were unconvincing to me. Some of us hewed to the line of reasonable legal construction, and adopted the clear and convincing reasoning already employed by the courts whenever they had been called upon to express an opinion on the power of Congress to delegate a legislative function.

On January 22, 1953, just 1 year to the day after the Senate had declined to recommit Senate bill 1976, the United States court of appeals rendered its decision in the Thompson case. As I had hoped, this able court precisely reaffirmed the authorities cited in my 2-day address to the Senate, and clarified again our constitutional course of action. The specific ruling in the Thompson case was that—

Congress may not delegate a legislative function to any group, assembly, or council in the District of Columbia.

Whenever this question arises again, Mr. President, I recommend a careful study of this latest decision to the lawyers in this body, and particularly to the members of the Committee for the District of Columbia. That decision will furnish a very bright and guiding light to those who would follow lay reasoning that under the Constitution we can create in the District of Columbia a body to do for us what the Constitution says we alone must do.

There may be some, sufficiehtly interested, who will read my speech on the subject delivered on January 14 and 15, 1952. The authorities which I called to the attention of the Senate, and upon which my reasoning was based, were expounded and approved in this latest expression of judicial authority. The Senate had before it my quotations at length form the following cases: *Stoutenburgh* v. *Hennick* (129 U. S. 141), *Metropolitan Railroad Co.* v. *D. C.* (132 U. S. 1), *Roach* v. *Van Riswick* (MacArthur & Mackey's Reports 171), *Smith* v. *Olcott* (19 App. D. C. 61).

These cases focused their directives precisely upon the point involved, the inability of Congress to delegate a legislative function. It was argued here that the Stoutenburgh case was inapplicable because some question of interstate commerce also was involved indirectly in that case. The Court adopted the view here urged. The minority judgment of the Court casts the Stoutenburgh decision aside on the ground of its dicta, but in so doing entirely bypasses its former decision relating to interstate commerce—*Nield* v. *D. C.* (71 App. D. C. 306; 110 Fed. (2) 246).

If the Supreme Court of the United States should hear this case—and it probably will—I have little fear that it will reverse the clear reasoning of the court of appeals in the Thompson case. To do so, the Supreme Court would also have to reverse itself in two very late expressions on the power generally of Congress to delegate a legislative function. I have already called the Senate's attention to the case of *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388) and the case commonly known as the sick-chicken case, *Schecter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495). There the Congress was forbidden to invest a Cabinet officer or the President with authority partaking of legislation.

As a lawyer, and because I took it upon myself to make an exhaustive study and exposition of all the forms of government established for the District of Columbia, I may be pardoned for bringing to the Senate's notice the fact that the views I entertained have met with this most recent judicial approval. The Senate will recall that I explained and explored in detail the fallacy of the argument based upon a sentence taken out of context from Madison's The Federalist No. 43. Much reliance could have been placed on such an authority were it not for the fact that no one theretofore, so far as I am advised, had ever troubled himself to expose the quicksand of such a tenuous contention.

Reverting to the Thompson case, we find the court of appeals, through Chief Judge Stephens, at page 20 of the advance copy of the decision, saying:

It is correctly suggested in *Roach* v. *Van Riswick*, that, for lack of a precise criterion, the determination of what powers are strictly municipal and may therefore rightly be conferred upon local corporations, and what powers are properly legislative and cannot therefore be delegated, is not always without difficulty. But we think that the constitutional provisions and principles and the rulings and reasoning above reviewed, which for this court are authoritative, clearly require the conclusion that the enactments of the legislative assembly of 1872 and 1873 which are under question in the instant case were of the character of general legislation, the power to enact which the Congress could not constitutionally, and did not, delegate to the legislative assembly.

Again, on page 23, the court said:

In view of the purpose and effect of the enactments as above described, we think that no other conclusion can reasonably be reached than that they were of the character of general legislation, the power to enact which the Congress could not constitutionally delegate to the assembly.

Even though the Congress may by preamble recite its authority for the passage of legislation, such assertion of power is not necessarily binding upon the courts. We cannot assume a power not conferred. We cannot by the same token delegate a power once it is conferred. This the court makes plain at page 26, saying:

But assuming that the Congress did regard the municipal enactments in question as within municipal power, that is not decisive of the question as to their validity. That question must be determined by the courts. We are referred to no judicial decision upholding as within the power of the municipal authorities of the District, the enactments referred to.

As one of the judges, Judge Prettyman, said, at page 38 of his concurring opinion, in referring to the way the minority opinion begged the question of the power to legislate by a body created by Congress for the District of Columbia:

We are not to determne what the law ought to be. That is for the Congress, not for the courts. • • •

Avoiding the dilemma in which I find the case, the dissenting judges cast the 1872–73 enactments outside the area of either legislation or license condition, a little of each but wholly neither. But their position in that regard seems to me most insecure. They say, first, that the legislative assembly was a legislative body. But, of course, it could not be a true legislative body. Under the Constitution the Congress is, and can be, the only legislative body for the District of Columbia. The assembly was legislative in the sense that the word applies to the adoption of municipal ordinances, and in that sense alone.

The minority view of the court did not treat at all of the question whether the Congress might delegate a legislative function. It proceeded entirely upon the theory, and argued, that what was then in litigation was a municipal regulation rather than an act of legislation; otherwise, it could not properly have said at page 60 of the opinion:

To repeal a regulation is to make a regulation, and whoever can do the one can do the other.

Certainly such a view has no application to a supreme legislative body such as the Congress for the United States, or a State legislature for a sovereign State, both acting within their constitutions. Certainly Congress can pass a law of many sections, it can repeal some or all, and it often does recite that if part of an act is declared unconstitutional, the remainder shall nevertheless be effective.

The minority opinion also lacks precision in its choice of words, for, without even touching upon our power to delegate a legislative function, it loosely says on page 60:

The ordinance before us was enacted by a legislative body and has always been subject to legislative modification or repeal.

I have made these remarks today with no thought of self-praise and in no spirit of "I told you so." I said, last year:

Until we define home rule within our constitutional powers, marking on the one side that which is the exercise of legislative power vested solely within us, and on the other side, that which is purely a regulatory or ordinance power, and until we come to some definition that will meet the acid test of a fair judicial determination, these and all our other labors on behalf of this indeterminable thing classified in this bill as home rule will be idle and futile gestures. Our labors are looking in substance. They are, I take it, but as "a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." The difficulty we face, as I see it, is: Can we give any responsible degree of self-government to the people in the District of Columbia without doing gross violence to the constitutional levy of exclusive legislative power upon the Congress? The answer to such a question, so far as I am concerned, is crystal clear; the right answer is not found in the pending measure, in this crazy quilt admixture of words of grants, restrictions, and reservations of power without the slightest apparent regard for the constitutional limitations placed upon us and for our own responsibility under the Constitution.

Quoting further from my speech, Mr. President:

Nowhere is there any responsible opinion of any lawyer or any court which has said to us, "Congress may delegate its legislative power in all cases to an agent—a council, if you please—or to any other body." The Congress cannot delegate a legislative function to the President, to a commission, or to any other agency of the Government. When Congress attempts to delegate a legislative authority upon another body, from that moment on it has departed from one of the cardinal principles of our constitutional form of government.

It was seriously contended by one of the cosponsors of S. 1976 that our power over the District was similar to our power over the Territories. Of course, it is not and never has been. The same contention was urged with some force before the court in the Thompson case. However, the court of appeals, quoting with approval a decision of a lower court on this subject, at page 13 of the opinion, said:

The court had been referred in the argument of the case to the laws establishing governments in the Territories as an example of the delegation of its legislative authority by the Congress which had received the sanction of judicial authority. But the court concluded that that was not a pertinent subject, saying:

"Non nostrum est tantas componere lites, but until it can be considered as settled, that the 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or other property belonging to the United States,' is identical with the power to exercise exclusive legislation over such district as may become the seat of government, the practice of Congress in regard to the territorial government furnishes us no authoritative guide in the interpretation of the clause relating to the District of Columbia." (MacArthur and Mackey's Reports at pp. 182–183.)

Considerable emotion was bestirred here locally when S. 1976 was under consideration. Columnists got into the act with a lot of irrelevancies. Even nationwide broadcasters took up the cudgels. Flames were sought to be fanned. Prejudices almost forbade dispassionate discussion. Objective thinking was thwarted. Motives of some of us who opposed S. 1976 became and were impugned. The logic and reasoning of the court recently will, I trust, assuage some injured opinions. Upon reflection, the errors of some who seek to blame Congress for all our ills and every existing condition to which they in their moment of superior wisdom may not subscribe, can, if they will, be arighted. It was even said in this body that it was un-American to deny the people of the District the right to vote, to elect a legislative assembly, to pass their own laws, and so on, and so on.

These emotional outbursts appealed to some lay minds. They soothed the troubled minds of those who may have had an unfounded feeling of persecution merely because they themselves have chosen to live here. But to say that something is un-American which finds its basis in the very roots of our Government, from Madison's time through all the years and in all the decisions of our courts, is stretching the simple question of law a little beyond its breaking point. It carries an argument beyond the realm of reason into the fields of temporary passion.

We were called upon in the Senate last Friday to abdicate our true legislative functions in the matter of executive reorganization plans. I had some decided views on this subject. I entertained grave reservations regarding the propriety and wisdom of permitting executive legislation to supplant congressional legislation. I do not now feel, nor have I ever felt, that expediency in the passage of reforms should be the criterion for us when it results in the abrogation of our legislative responsibilities.

Mr. President, may I, in all seriousness, commend a careful reading, study, and reflection by the Members of this body upon the unanswerable reasoning of our United States Court of Appeals here, when we attempt by statute to delegate a power vested exclusively in us by the Constitution of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, and then, immediately following that, resume legislative session in order that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] may make some remarks which they want to make this afternoon.

REVOCATION OF ORDER TO THE SEVENTH FLEET

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a press release of a statement issued by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on January 31, 1953, relative to the President's action in revoking the order to the Seventh Fleet requiring it to protect the Red Chinese mainland against combat operations by the free Chinese forces on Formosa.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MacArthur released the following statement on January 31, 1953:

"The reported decision of the administration to revoke the order to the Seventh Fleet requiring it to protect the Red Chinese mainland against combat operations by the free Chinese forces on Formosa will correct one of the strangest anomalies known to military history. This order issued in June 1950, proved to be a fundamental error which has contaminated the entire far-eastern situation.

"Its restriction upon the activity of the free Chinese forces gave public notice that the Chinese Reds were to enjoy unprecedented sanctuary in the struggle for Asia between the forces of communism and those of the free world. It was undoubtedly this decision with its implications which emboldened the Chinese Communist forces to intervene in increasing strength in Indochina, in Korea, in Tibet, and along the entire periphery of their aggressive advance in Asia.

"Actually it was this protection which permitted the transfer of the very Communist armies assigned to the coastal defense of central China for the attack upon our forces in Korea. Indeed, the concept of such sanctuary immunity unquestionably predominantly influenced Red China to enter the Korean conflict after the North Korean armies had been destroyed. For in the absence of assurance that his bases of attack and lines of supply to his rear would be safe, no military commander lacking both naval force and air cover would have committed large forces across the Yalu River.

"As a matter of historical record, when he did so, I immediately ordered the destruction by air bombardment of the bridges across the Yalu which would have imperiled his entire force. Within a matter of hours, my order was countermanded and these bridges, augmented and increased, have since borne millions of marching feet and hundreds of thousands of tons of supplies and munitions to sustain the enemy's operations against our hard-pressed forces. It has been stated that the purpose of the order to the Seventh Fleet was to prevent the spread of war, but the result has been just the opposite.

"It laid the basis for altering the localized character of the Korean conflict and set the stage for further involvements just as appeasement and indecisiveness have always done. The modification of the Seventh Fleet's orders should be supported by all loyal Americans irrespective of party. It certainly is time for this change."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief remark about all the nominations before the Senate today. First, I wish to thank the committee for making available to Senators far in advance of the session today the information regarding these nominees which we needed in order to pass judgment on them.

Second, I wish to say that I am high in my commendation of James J. Wadsworth for appointment to the position for which he has been selected.

I also wish to express my compliments to H. Lee White, of New Jersey, who has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. He is an attorney in the city of New York, living in New Jersey. He and his wife, the record shows, have only $1,200 worth of stock, and that stock is not in any of the corporations which can do business with the Air Force. Not only that, but in my opinion he has also followed another good policy; namely, severing his connection with his law firm for the duration of his service with the Air Force, and becoming only of counsel of the firm, and of course participating in payments from the firm only in respect to the capital account.

I was exceedingly pleased with Mr. White's qualifications, and also his sensitivity to what I consider to be the very important obligations of anyone holding a high position in our Government, and his making certain that under no possibility could he be even suspected of having an indirect interest in the position. In my opinion, he is highly qualified for the position to which he has been appointed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to speak briefly on the nomination of Mr. James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Representative of the United States to the United Nations. On behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I ask the Senate to confirm the nomination.

At the age of 47, Mr. Wadsworth is a man of exceptionally broad experience, including work in farming, in the New York State Legislature, in private business, and in the executive branch of the Federal Government. He has most recently been Acting Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, but prior to that he also had experience in the Economic Cooperation Administration and the National Security Resources Board.

I believe that Mr. Wadsworth's widely varied activities fully qualify him for the assignment as Ambassador Lodge's Deputy at the United Nations and that his broad experience will prove a valuable asset to our U. N. delegation.

His duties will be to work directly under Ambassador Lodge to implement the policies set forth by the President and the Secretary of State. He will represent Ambassador Lodge in the various committees and other bodies of the United Nations when Mr. Lodge himself cannot be present, and he will also conduct negotiations within the policy framework laid out by the administration.

The Foreign Relations Committee heard Mr. Wadsworth in executive session February 9 and voted without objection to report his nomination favorably.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think Mr. Wadsworth's attitude toward the United Nations is a realistic one. He is devoted to its principles, and he believes in keeping his eye on the ball, to use a slang expression, and in putting first things first. He is optimistic about the future, but he does not expect any miracles.

I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. President, I am happy to add a word of appreciation of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] about Mr. Wadsworth. I know that had the Senator from Oregon been present at our meeting when Mr. Wadsworth appeared before the committee he would have been, as we all were, impressed with his grasp of the problems before the United Nations, and his eagerness to take over this important work as the deputy to Senator Lodge. I sincerely hope the nomination will be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donold B. Lourie to be Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I desire, on behalf of the committee, to make a brief statement concerning the nomination of Mr. Donold B. Lourie.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the nomination of Donold Bradford Lourie, of Winnetka, Ill., to be Under Secretary of State for Administration, has approved the nomination without objection and recommends that it be confirmed by the Senate.

On February 6, 1953, the President sent the nomination of Mr. Lourie to the Senate for advice and consent to his appointment to be Under Secretary of State for Administration. The nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the same day; and on the ninth, the committee met in executive session to hear Mr. Lourie and to discuss with him his ideas about his new responsibilities.

Mr. Lourie will occupy the new position created by Senate bill 243—83d Congress, first session—namely, the position of Under Secretary of State for Administration. This bill, passed by both Houses of the Congress, was signed by the President on February 7, 1953. My colleagues will recall the discussion of that measure at the time the bill was referred to the committee.

At the time the committee reported Senate bill 243 to the Senate for favorable action, it called attention to the need for a man of outstanding ability to handle the difficult assignment of State Department reorganization. The committee noted the rapidity with which the State Department had grown and the many criticisms that have been directed against it for overexpansion of personnel and for overlapping offices and duties. In short, the committee believes the Department is in need of streamlining and that the Under Secretary of State for Administration will be required to spend much of his time on that task.

After hearing Mr. Lourie, the committee believes that he will be able to handle his difficult assignment. He brings to the State Department a wealth of broad administrative experience which should be helpful in improving the administration of our foreign relations. He comes without prejudice or past record to defend, and, therefore, should be able to take an objective and fair view of departmental operations and needs. He has a rich background of business and executive experience. Mr. Lourie started with the Quaker Oats Co. as a statistics clerk on July 13, 1922. Step by step he rose to the presidency, which office he attained on November 21, 1947. In the course of this rise he became the advertising manager, the sales manager, the vice president in charge of sales, and the executive vice president successively, prior to attaining the presidency. In addition, he holds a number of important business directorships, notably with the Mickelberry Food Products Cos., the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., the United States Gypsum Co., the Illinois Central Railroad Co., and the Mathiesen & Hegdler Zinc Co., of Illinois. His business record is one of energy and initiative and industry.

Once again the committee wishes to call attention to the importance of the new office and the need for providing the best talent available to fill that important office. The committee is satisfied that President Eisenhower has found such talent in Mr. Lourie and recommends speedy action on the nomination by the Senate in order that Mr. Lourie may embark upon his task immediately.

If I may add a personal word, it so happens that when Mr. Lourie was an undergraduate at Princeton University I was executive secretary of that institution, under the last President Hibben. I have known Mr. Lourie since he entered college as a freshman, and I followed him through his brilliant career as an undergraduate student. He was one of the boys to whom I, as one of the administrative officers of the university, was very close. I have naturally watched his career with great interest since he went to Chicago. First he was in the statistical department of the Quaker Oats Co., and from that low office worked his way steadily up, on sheer merit, until he became president of that great organization.

I can say without hesitation that in my estimation this is one of the finest appointments to an executive office the President has made; and I gladly add my word to that of the committee for which I am reporting, in the hope that his nomination will be promptly confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Donold B. Lourie to be Under Secretary of State for Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey rises to commend the President of the United States upon the character and quality of the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. Although Mr. White was born in New York and is therefore a native son of that great State, we of New Jersey are very proud, indeed, to claim him as an adopted son of New Jersey.

I predict that New Jersey and the Nation will one day review the record of H. Lee White as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force with a deep sense of pardonable pride. I am confident that the record he will write in the high office to which he has been appointed will mark him as the great American I know him to be at this moment when he is entering upon the high and lofty position which he will soon take over.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and of my distinguished colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON] with regard to Mr. White. I am glad to identify myself with the high recommendations which they have given to this distinguished gentleman. I do not know him well personally, but since his name came to us, and I was asked to check in my State with regard to his background and record, I took great pains to inquire in quarters where people would know the caliber of Mr. White. I am happy to report that from every source I heard only the highest kind of recommendation, both as to his character and his ability. So I am glad to add my word in commendation of this worthy citizen of New Jersey, and to urge the prompt confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

PATENT OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Clement Watson to be Commissioner of Patents.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for his selection of Mr. Watson to be Commissioner of Patents. He is a very capable lawyer and a very fine man. I wish him well as he embarks upon his new duties as Commissioner of Patents.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to add my personal endorsement of Mr. Watson. He lived in my old congressional district for a number of years. I have had the opportunity to come in contact with him on several occasions. I know him to be a very competent and efficient lawyer, and I am confident he will serve in his new capacity with the same distinction with which he has served in many other capacities in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert Clement Watson to be Commissioner of Patents?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NINETY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF OREGON TO THE UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 14, 1953, is the 94th birthday of the State of Oregon. It was on February 14, 1859, that President Buchanan signed the bill admitting Oregon to the Union, a victorious ending to a long struggle. The Oregon Territory, the subject through decades of conflicting claims by Spain, France, Russia, England, and the United States, had become American in 1846. England, the last remaining contestant, then signed a treaty recognizing the 49th parallel of north latitude as the dividing line between Canada and the United States, west of the Rocky Mountains, giving up its former insistence on the Columbia River as the boundary. This clarification of America's title to the territory gave a new impetus to the agitation for official territorial status, an agitation

that had gone on, pressed by a few persistent people, in Congress and out, since 1820. In that year Representative Dr. John Floyd, of Virginia, had attempted to have a committee appointed to look into the matter of occupying the Columbia River, and in 1822 he had again urged Congress to take action in the matter of Oregon Territory—the first bill applying the name Oregon to the land.

From 1827 through 1831, the subject was kept before Congress, and thus indirectly before the people, through the efforts of Hall J. Kelley, a Boston schoolteacher, who, through Representative Floyd, Senator Everett, of Massachusetts, and Senator Benton, of Missouri, had several petitions presented to Congress asking recognition of the Oregon Territory. It is a pleasure to pause here and do honor to the name of Mr. Kelley, a man to whose energy and public spirit Oregon and the other States formed from the Oregon Territory owe much. I recognize him as typical of the great number of citizens who realize that government is the business of everyone, and who, whatever their position in life, think out the problems of government and make their thinking known to those in official position to act. I like particularly, in this connection, to reflect on the fact that Mr. Kelley, not content with writing to his own Representative and Senators, sought out like-minded men in Congress, representing Virginia and Missouri, who were of a mental scope to match the continentwide expansion of the United States.

By 1843, while the Territory was still under the joint occupancy of England and the United States, it had set up its own provisional government. On August 14, 1848, President Polk signed the bill which he had been urging since 1846, to grant Territorial status to the Oregon country, and on March 3, 1849, the last day of Polk's administration, the Governor he had appointed, Joseph Lane, took office, having the good fortune to find the Territory already provided with a government in full working order. This is the only time in the history of the Nation that it has been possible for a newly appointed territorial governor, in a newly established territory, to take over a complete and smoothly functioning local government and make it the Territorial government.

Though the history of the Oregon Territory is full of international conflict and threats of war, the Territory is the one region of the United States that we acquired purely through diplomacy and settlement, and not by purchase or war.

Credit for the peaceful state of the Oregon country through the period of joint colonization and occupancy by England and the United States must be given principally to the justice and magnanimity of Dr. John McLoughlin, who was, from 1824 to 1845, head of the Columbia district of the Hudson's Bay Company, a region comprising all the northwest land beyond the Rocky Mountains and northward to the land claimed by Russia. While, with few exceptions, Members of Congress and other citizens of the United States maintained a bland indifference to the entire region, Dr. McLoughlin, as supreme local representative of the Hudson's Bay Company, and virtual representative of the English Government, could wield undisputed power. This power he used with admirable restraint, faithfully and honestly serving the interests of his company and his government, and working wholeheartedly for peace and justice. A Catholic in his childhood, Dr. McLoughlin seems to have been at least nominally a member of the Church of England through his adult life, until 1842, when he returned to the Catholic Church, being received by his friend, Father Blanchet. Through his years of power, whether as Anglican or as Catholic, Dr. McLoughlin was noted for the hospitable welcome and practical help which he gave to missionaries, Protestant and Catholic, whether English, French, or American. Even the agricultural settlers, who came in 1843 and after, and whose activities Dr. McLoughlin well knew would mean the end of the vast wilderness the Hudson's Bay Company must maintain for its fur business—even these farmers, the bane of the frontiersman and fur trapper, he welcomed as friends, gave them what help they needed, and lent them money and supplies. He could not have prevented their coming, and the eventual loss of the land by both England and the Hudson's Bay Company, to the settlers from the United States; but a man of smaller mind would not have perceived the inevitable development of the area, and a man smaller of soul would have made the difficulties of the early settlers, already great, almost insurmountable. Dr. McLoughlin stands for what we like to remember about the history of Oregon—the development from a truly paternal rule to a rule by the people; the peaceful transition from British and joint occupation to American territorial status; the protection of the interests of Indian and settler alike; and the impartial support of the civilizing influence of religion, without distinction as to creeds.

Among the missionaries welcomed and aided by Dr. John McLoughlin was Jason Lee, a New England Methodist, who first went to Oregon in 1834, with four companions. Following Dr. McLoughlin's advice, they located a mission on the east bank of the Willamette, 10 miles north of the present city of Salem. In 1838 Lee returned to the East, and stirred up interest in the Oregon country by conferences in New York with the board of managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church. Senator Linn, of Missouri, presented to the Senate on January 28, 1839, a petition signed by Lee and his companions and 31 other American residents of Oregon, calling upon the United States to take formal and speedy possession of the region. Lee made a speaking tour through the New England States, New York State, and the region around Philadelphia and Washington, in which he brought the importance of Oregon to the attention of thousands. A tangible result of this strenuous effort was the addition of a further party of missionaries, numbering 51 persons, who joined Lee and his companions in a new mission, 10 miles to the south of the old one, where they built a sawmill, a gristmill, houses, and the Indian school that later developed into Willamette University, one of the leading educational institutions, not only of my State, but of the West.

On February 14, the birthday of the State of Oregon will be fittingly celebrated by the presentation to the United States, to stand in honor in the United States Capitol, of statues of these two pioneer heroes of Oregon. I hope all my hearers will take the occasion to read the excellent summary of the early history of the Territory and State, prepared by Dr. Burt Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee, entitled "Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, Settlement," with its splendid summary of the achievements of these two great men. I have, of course, drawn upon this valuable booklet in the preparation of this talk, but there is much of interest that I have not had time to include.

Mr. President, I should like to take a brief moment to pay my sincere tribute to this great citizen of my State, Dr. Burt Brown Barker, the author of this historic narrative. He is noted for the outstanding service he has rendered as vice president of the University of Oregon. He is also a distinguished lawyer, a real humanitarian, and a keen student of Oregon history. I suppose that no man in America knows as much about the history of the Hudson's Bay Company and Dr. McLoughlin's relation to the activity of that company in helping to develop the great Pacific Northwest as does Dr. Burt Brown Barker.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter which I sent to all Senators, dated February 13, and the text of the historic narrative entitled "Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, and Settlement," written by Dr. Burt Brown Barker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. The thought of the early Oregon Territory, and the admission of the State of Oregon to the Union, inevitably makes me think of the comparable situation of our present farthest northwest Territory—Alaska. In the census of 1860, the first after Oregon's statehood was granted, there were 52,465 people, sparsely settled through that land of forests, mountains, and rushing rivers. Oregon had been self-governing for about 15 years, and a Territory for about 10, when it was admitted. Alaska, with its forests, mountains, and rushing rivers, has by the 1950 census 128,643 inhabitants, and it has been a self-governing Territory for 40 years. Let us take to heart the appeal of Alaska's officially chosen flower—forget-me-not.

In closing my comments relative to the birthday anniversary tomorrow of the State of Oregon, and the historic event which will take place in Statuary Hall in the Capitol tomorrow, when leaders of my State dedicate the statues of these two great pioneers and frontiersmen, I wish to pay my thanks to the Vice President of the United States, who has assured me that he will be present at the dedication ceremonies and will accept, in behalf of the Federal Government,

these great works of art as symbols of two great pioneers of the West.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 13, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the State of Oregon, I am pleased to present the attached historical narrative, Oregon, the Unique Prize, by Dr. Burt Brown Barker, of Portland, Oreg. The 14th of February marks the 94th anniversary of Oregon's statehood. Therefore, I am sure that you will find this narrative to be of special significance.

On Saturday morning, February 14, 1953, the State of Oregon will present to the United States the impressive statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee. These men were outstanding leaders in the early history of Oregon. It is with sincere pride that the State of Oregon places these replicas of its great men beside those of illustrious leaders of her sister States.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

OREGON, PRIZE OF DISCOVERY, EXPLORATION, AND SETTLEMENT

(By Burt Brown Barker)

I. DELAYED DISCOVERY OF COLUMBIA RIVER

The first in this series of distinctive events in the history of Oregon which sets it apart from the other States in the Union is the tardy way it was discovered.

It seems incredible that almost 300 years should elapse, after Balboa first saw the Pacific Ocean (1513), before the Columbia River was entered by Capt. Robert Gray (1792), a Boston navigator.

Commonly accepted authorities set 1492 as the date Columbus discovered America; 1607 as the date of the founding of Jamestown, Va.; and 1620 as the date the Pilgrims settled Plymouth, Mass.

It will be noted that between 1492 and 1607 there is a gap of more than 100 years which is devoid of recorded events of strategic importance on the Atlantic coast of the United States. It was different on the Pacific coast.

During that 100 years the explorers turned south toward milder climates and more lucrative fields. In 1513 Balboa discovered the Pacific Ocean. In 1521 Cortez in Mexico, and in 1532 Pizarro in Peru, were seizing and carrying to Spain great wealth in gold, silver, and precious stones. In 1542 Cabrillo entered the present San Francisco Bay. In 1578 Sir Francis Drake touched the southern coast of Oregon, landed and gave it the name New Albion (New England). It was on this trip that he surprised and looted one Spanish port after another, ran down ship after ship and stripped them of their treasures.

In 1580 Drake returned to England with 26 tons of silver, 80 pounds of pure gold, 13 chests of gold plate, and quantities of emeralds, pearls, and other precious stones. His vessel was only 100 tons burden, so he threw overboard much of the silks and other fabrics which it could not carry. When he landed in England, Queen Elizabeth dined with him on board his vessel, the *Golden Hind*, and conferred knighthood on him, while London took a Roman holiday.

Thus during the 100-year period of inactivity on the North Atlantic coast following 1492, the South Atlantic and the Pacific coasts were alive with Spanish and English adventurers. However, after the discoveries of Cabrillo in 1542 on the Pacific Coast, the Spanish became interested in the trade of the Indies and their ships followed the tradewinds from the coast of California to the westward, leaving the coast of Oregon and lands to the north untouched.

The English also gave up activity in the Pacific after the exploits of Drake in 1580. They became interested in the riches of India, and sent their vessels to the east around the Cape of Good Hope, without making any effort to follow up the exploits of Drake. This condition existed for almost 200 years.

At the close of the Seven Years' War in 1763, England again turned attention to the Pacific. The government offered a prize of 20,000 pounds for the discovery of the long-sought Northwest Passage. Capt. James Cook, in his first try in 1773, headed an expedition which discovered the Hawaiian Islands. On his last trip, on July 12, 1776, he set sail via the Cape of Good Hope for the land Drake in 1578 had designated as New Albion, a name the British had consistently kept alive.

In March 1778 Cook reached the Oregon coast, reportedly about 43° north latitude. Heading north, keeping in sight of land almost continuously, he noted the coast line with more care than others had done previously. He observed and named Capes Perpetua and Foulweather in Oregon, and Cape Flattery in Washington, which names are still preserved. Continuing, he landed at Nootka Bay on Vancouver Island, missing both the mouth of the Columbia River and the entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which later he sought specifically.

After spending a month trading with the Indians at Nootka Bay, he continued north through Bering Strait into the Arctic Ocean, until he was blocked by ice. This voyage for the moment put an end to the myth of the Northwest Passage. It was epochal so far as Oregon was concerned, for it established the fact that there was no water shortcut to the Pacific Northwest; the only water approach was around either Cape Horn or Cape of Good Hope, both being long and hazardous. It was an element in the isolation of Oregon.

Just as England had returned to explorations on the Pacific coast, so also had Spain. Spain came to realize that she had not followed up the exploits of Cabrillo (1542), so engaged had she been in her trade with the Indies, and in the riches of Mexico and Peru. Fearing lest she would forfeit what Cabrillo had won, she put forth a feeble and ineffectual effort under Viscano and Aguilar in 1602, but soon fell again into inaction. As the Russians began to press down from the north, and the English were again on the prowl, she realized that either a serious effort must be put forth, or she must retire from the conflict.

She began by fortifying Monterey and San Diego in 1768, and within a few years the Franciscan fathers under Junipero Serra had established their mission in the southern part of California. She then began anew her northern explorations, after more than a century and a half of inactivity. In 1774 Juan Perez went as far north as 54° north latitude.

The next year Brun Heceta and Bodega y Quadra were dispatched to the north. Heceta went beyond 50 degrees, and then turned back. He doubtless saw the mouth of the undiscovered Columbia River, and made an ineffectual effort to enter it on August 17, 1775. He noted and named the two capes at the mouth of the river. On July 18, he saw and accurately described Mount Neahkahnie which he named Table. He also located and named capes Falcon and Lookout.

Bodega y Quadra continued his journey to the north and explored part of the coast of Alaska. Spain had long worked on the theory that she had the right to all the western shores of both North and South America washed by the waters of the South Sea (Pacific Ocean) which had been seen first by Balboa (1513). This theory was based on the decree of the Pope, Alexander VI, who, after the return of Columbus, divided the world in two parts, by drawing a line from north to south through the Atlantic Ocean 100 leagues west of the Azores and Cape Verde Islands. To Spain he gave "all the future lands and islands found, or to be found, discovered or to be discovered toward the west and south."

England, per contra, took the position that Spain could claim only such land as she occupied. Merely to skirt the coast, touching it here and there, and giving names to a few capes, rivers, and promontories, was insufficient. To establish a legal claim she must actually settle and continue to inhabit the parts claimed. England disregarded completely any title or claim arising out of any decree coming from the Pope in Rome.

A further stimulous to these Spanish upsurges in explorations, was the activities of Russia in Alaska, and along the coast to the south. These began when Peter the Great of Russia gave the Dane, Vitus Bering, a commission in 1724 to explore and chart the coast of Alaska and south. He discovered the strait which bears his name. His last voyage was in 1741. It was on his discoveries that Russia based her claims to Alaska.

The furs which his men carried back with them, began the fur trade which later became the magnet which drew the English, Spanish, and finally the Americans to the north Pacific coast, and in the end led to the discovery of the Columbia River and the exploration and early settlement of Oregon.

The East India Co. made the next British attempt to enter the picture. The fur trade, which the Russians were now carrying on with China, was the cause of their entry. They were slow to begin because their business in the East Indies was so profitable. They had been given the trading right to the western coast of America, and thus no other English company could operate there.

By 1785 the company began to operate out of ports in India. In this way Captain John Meares, an interesting and spectacular character, sailed from Bengal in 1786. He probably was the first explorer actually to enter the Strait of Juan de Fuca, in 1788. He did not explore the strait fully. Rather he returned to the mouth, and then sailed south. He located Cape Disappointment, at the mouth of the Columbia, which he identified as the cape found by Meceta in 1775. He examined the location carefully, and satisfied himself that there was no river at that point, as indicated on the Spanish charts which he had. Thus Meares, as well as Heceta, had missed the Columbia, as if the river were in hiding.

But the Russians pushing down from the north, and the English operating out of the east through the East India Company, had struck the real Bonanza—the rich fur trade of the north. While rival explorers were locating new islands, bays, inlets, and gaining much information about the north, the English and the Russians were concentrating on the fur trade. The news spread rapidly, and soon traders were in full cry.

Nootka Sound, on the northern coast of Vancouver Island, was the magnet and became the local headquarters. This stimulated the Spanish until they entered every open bay and harbor along what is now British Columbia and southern Alaska. By this time a new government had been set up on the Atlantic sea coast, and a new flag, the Stars and Stripes, began to appear among the flags of Russia, England, Spain, Portugal, and for a short time, France. But for the moment Nootka and the north were in the limelight, and the coast of Oregon was accordingly bypassed.

Spain was now thoroughly aroused. With Russia in Unalaska, she realized that she must protect Nootka against all comers. She sent a flotilla of four vessels to fortify it. England and Russia each had colonization plans for Nootka. Into the thick of the melee Captain Robert Gray in the packet *Washington* and Captain John Hendrick in the ship *Columbia* sailed and cast anchor at Nootka Bay in 1780. No other vessels were there at the time and all seemed serene.

But the Spanish flotilla under Martinez soon arrived. In view of the fact that the American vessels had passports given by General Washington to permit a voyage of discovery round the world, they were not

arrested. The captains, however, were cautioned that it was prohibited by ordinance for any foreign nations "to sail the coast of America."

Soon thereafter the British sailed into Nootka and began to fortify it. Martinez seized their vessels and the stage was set for a war between Britain and Spain. But the war never materialized. Spain backed down and the matter was settled by arbitration. Meanwhile the rich fur trade had grown brisk and competition keen.

On his return to England in 1790, after failing to discover the Columbia, Meares published a pamphlet in which he indicated that he still felt that there was the long-sought Northwest Passage, connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. It was a tradition hard to kill. Accordingly, England determined once more to explore that possibility fully and settle it finally.

Capt. George Vancouver was given the commission. He was to examine and survey minutely the Pacific Coast, from latitude 30° to 60°; and, specifically, he was instructed to inquire into "the nature and extent of any water communication which may tend in any considerable degree to facilitate an intercourse for the purpose of commerce between the northwest coast and the country on the opposite side of the continent." That certainly was a commission broad enough to cover any rivers of extent flowing into the Pacific from about Mexico on the south, to Alaska on the north. Quadra, Heceta and Meares had stopped and examined the breakers at the mouth of the Columbia River; and maps since 1601 had indicated the presence of a river at or near the present site of the Columbia. But its existence had never positively been determined. Vancouver now had his chance.

In January, 1791, he sailed away in command of the sloop-of-war *Discovery* of 400 tons burden, and a much lighter armed tender *Chatham* in command of Lieutenant Broughton. He had ample equipment and personnel for a scientific voyage of discovery. He spent the winter in the Hawaiian Islands, and on April 17, 1792, arrived off the coast of California, at latitude 39°. Heading northward he reached Cape Orford, Oreg., April 24.

On the evening of April 26, under clear skies and with conditions peculiarly satisfactory for observation, he was at the point which Captain Meares had described so accurately. He was especially interested in Meares' description; and also he wanted to prove or disprove the assertion of Heceta that there was a river at this point. All day of the 27th he sailed along the coast, describing the landmarks so accurately that his position is easily identified. He appeared to be following Meares' description. After noon he identified Cape Disappointment and Deception Bay. He was now at the mouth of the Columbia. At this point his log read:

"The sea has now changed from its natural to river-colored water; the probable consequence of some streams falling into the bay, or into the ocean to the north of it, through the low land. Not considering this opening worthy of more attention, I continued our pursuit to the northwest being desirous to embrace the advantage of the breeze and pleasant weather so favorable to our examination of the coast."

Thus Vancouver, with charts and the Meares' log and the evidence of Heceta at hand, and with the discolored river water under his vessel giving full evidence of the presence of the river which he specifically sought, considered it not "worthy of more attention," and passed up another opportunity of history.

Now, a new group of merchant traders, also interested in breaking into the highly profitable fur trade, must be introduced. A small group of six Boston merchants in 1787 organized a company, for the purpose of entering the field as traders in the Northwest Pacific. They purchased two small vessels: a full-rigged ship called *Columbia*, of 212 tons, and a sloop of 90 tons called *Lady Washington*. The first was under command of Capt. John Hendricks, and the second under command of Capt. Robert Gray. They sailed out of Boston on October 1, 1787, and headed around Cape Horn for Nootka Sound. As Captain Gray sailed north along the Oregon coast, he noted what he thought to be mouths of rivers, but was never close enough to be certain. He and Hendricks gathered a cargo of furs. These were taken to China and traded for a cargo of tea and silk, which was taken to Boston.

In September of 1790 a second voyage was organized, and in June 1791 Gray was quartered at Clayoquot Sound near Nootka, where an unhappy winter was spent. In the spring of 1792 Captain Gray, in the *Columbia*, sailed south along the coast of Oregon and California. The weather was unpropitious and he turned north again. It probably was on his return trip that he met Vancouver, on April 30, near the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and discussed with him his experience in searching for the Columbia River, and doubtless was told by Vancouver that the river did not exist.

Gray had seen what he thought to be mouths of rivers, as he had passed up and down the coast, and determined to return, hoping in such openings to find furs in the hands of Indians where traders had not been. On May 7, 1792, he entered one such harbor which now bears his name. Proceeding down the coast, trading as he went, on May 11 he found himself in a great body of river water completely covered with whitecaps. Being venturesome, he steered in and recklessly did what careful mariners seldom do, namely, thrust the prow of his vessel into white breakers. But fortune was with him and he crossed the bar successfully and found himself in the mouth of the river which had appeared on maps from 1601, and had been observed by Quadra, Meares, and Vancouver surely, and probably by others.

Captain Gray remained and traded with the Indians in the lower reaches of the river near its mouth until May 20 when he recrossed the bar and sailed north where later he met and told the astonished Vancouver of his discovery. Unwilling to believe Gray's story, Vancouver the following October returned to the mouth of the river. He was never able to cross the bar in the *Discovery*, but Lieutenant Broughton in the *Chatham* was successful in doing so.

Thus the Columbia River was discovered and named by Capt. Robert Gray, after he crossed the bar at the mouth on May 11, 1792, 300 years after the discovery of America by Columbus. This discovery became a very vital issue in the subsequent contention that Oregon was property of the United States by virtue of discovery, and that, too, after the coast south of parallel 42 and north of parallel 49 had been known for more than 100 years.

II. ORIGIN OF THE NAME OREGON

The discoveries of Columbus and Vespucius caught the imagination of Europe and writers began to dream of romantic new far-away lands.

Comparatively soon after the publication of the voyages of Vespucius, Sir Thomas More published his Utopia in 1516, and in it placed the scene of his dreamland in a region far beyond the farthermost reach of any land seen by Vespucius. He imaged a new world with higher and broader political aspirations.

After a lapse of more than 100 years, Sir Francis Bacon published his New Atlantis in 1629. By this time Balboa had discovered the Pacific Ocean, the Spaniards had ravaged Mexico and Peru and visited a part of the western shore of America. Sir Francis Drake in turn had ravaged the Spaniards and in 1578, landed, claimed the country in the name of the English king, and named it New Albion (New England). Thus the name was applied to the Pacific coast many years before the first permanent settlement on the Atlantic coast. The Boston Sentinel (September 1787) notes the clearing of the ship *Columbia*, bound for New Albion.

Bacon chose to locate his New Atlantis in the region Drake called New Albion, a region students contend easily fits the description of the coast of southern Oregon.

During the 16th and 17th centuries of fables and myths, such names as Terra Incognita and New Albion were attributed to lands now recognized as parts of Oregon. Returning adventurers of these two centuries caused many writers to weave fanciful stories of legendary cities, such as Axa and Quivira, and place them in the newly discovered western coast of America.

In 1601 a map appeared on which the fabled city and kingdom of Quivira was placed in approximately the same location as that indicated as New Albion by Sir Francis Drake.

But no name, similar in sound or spelling to the name Oregon, has been found on any map, or in any book, until it was used by Maj. Robert Rogers in 1765, when, in a document to King George III he proposed to seek out the Northwest Passage. In this document he described his route as being "from the Great Lakes toward the head of the Mississippi, and from thence to a river called by the Indians Ouragon."

Major Rogers did not himself attempt such a journey, but the following year he outlined a similar expedition with Jonathan Carver as the draftsman of the party. This expedition also never materialized.

Subsequently both Rogers and Carver returned to England. In the interval before his return, Rogers appears to have learned more local geographical details. In 1772 he addressed another petition to the King. In this one he outlined the proposed journey, saying in part: "About the 44° of latitude to cross—into a branch of the Missouri and stem that northwesterly to the source, to cross then a portage, into the great river Ourigan." Thus he outlined a course which, in general, was subsequently followed by Lewis and Clark. Likewise he introduced for the first time the word Ouragon or Ourigan, which, with a slight change of spelling was to become Oregon.

But the change was not to come at the hands of Rogers, but by the work of his associate, Carver, who had returned to England with him.

In 1778 Carver published his book of Travels. It is in this book that the present spelling is found. In the text, for the first time so far as is now known, he used the expression "River Oregon or River of the West." He claimed to have learned the word from the Indians, with whom he lived on the upper reaches of the Mississippi River in 1766–67. But no student has been able to find any Indian word of a similar sound for the basis of such a spelling.

This book of travels was so popular that it was reissued in other editions and forms in Paris, Edinburgh, Dublin, Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere. Although Carver wrote of the river, he never saw it, and it remained for Capt. Robert Gray, an American, to enter it in 1792, 300 years after the discovery of America. He gave it the name of his vessel, *Columbia*, entirely oblivious, so far as known, of the name Oregon given it by Captain Carver.

Thus the name Oregon was used first for a river. It was definitely changed to designate the land, in a bill brought into Congress by Representative John Floyd, of Virginia, on January 18, 1822. In this bill he proposed the creation of Oregon Territory.

The young poet William Cullen Bryant apparently was impressed with Carver's book, and in 1817 he gave added popularity to the name when he wrote in his poem, Thanatopsis:

"Where rolls the Oregon and hears no sound
Save his own dashings, yet the dead are there."

Many scholars have speculated on origins of the name, but to date no satisfactory explanation has been found.

Thus a new land, which had had a mythical existence for two centuries, was finally materialized and given a new name of liquid sound and romantic significance, Oregon.

III. HOW THE OREGON COUNTRY BECAME A PART OF THE UNITED STATES

The purpose of this chapter shall be to show how the district west of the Rocky Mountains and north of 42°, became a part of the United States. This district is known historically as the Oregon country. It enjoys the rare distinction of being the only part of the United States which was neither purchased nor fought for in war. It came rather as a result of what is broadly called colonization.

(a) *Government action*

As a result of the Revolutionary War, the Mississippi River became the western boundary of the United States by the Treaty of Paris (1783).

Following the discovery of the Columbia River (1792), the Louisiana Purchase (1803) pushed the western boundary from the Mississippi River to the summit of the Rocky Mountains.

When President Jefferson organized the well-known Lewis and Clark Expedition (1804–06) and sent it overland across the Rocky Mountains, it became evident that the western boundary of the United States must again move west even to the Pacific Ocean.

How this came to pass is the next part of this story.

John Jacob Astor, with his Pacific Fur Co., followed the Lewis and Clark expedition and established a fur-trading post at Astoria in 1811. It was the first successful American settlement on the newly discovered Columbia. Following close on the heels of this new settlement came the North West Co. men, also seeking to be the first to explore and settle the new territory. The race between the North West men and the Astor men was a close one; the Astorians winning by 2 months. The party of Astorians who won, was waterborne, around Cape Horn, while the North West men came overland to the headwaters of the Columbia, and then down the river to its mouth. Imagine their surprise and disappointment on their arrival there to find the Americans erecting a trading post.

The American victory was short-lived. As a result of the War of 1812, Astor's partners at Astoria, fearing they would be victims of the English warship en route to capture them, sold out the company to their rivals, the North West Co. in 1813. Thus, the first American settlement in the new Oregon country came to an end.

Napoleon, hard pressed by England, sold the United States Louisiana without defined northern bounds. It became necessary to determine the northern boundary of the Louisiana Purchase. England was anxious to know how far to the north this purchase was supposed to extend. Each country appointed commissioners, and in 1818 they fixed the boundary between the United States and present Canada on the 49th parallel of north latitude, from Lake of the Woods west to the crest of the Stony (Rocky) Mountains. They could not agree on the line beyond that point. The American commissioners insisted on following that same parallel west to the Strait of Georgia. The English insisted on following that parallel to the upper reaches of the Columbia, thence down that river to the Pacific Ocean.

Being unable to resolve this difference, the parties decided to leave the land west of the Rocky Mountains open to joint occupation for a period of 10 years.

Following the convention of 1818, the young American Government took its first step to protect its interest in this new territory by entering into a treaty with Spain in 1819, by the terms of which Spain relinquished all rights to the territory north of 42° north latitude. In 1820 Representative Dr. John Floyd, of Virginia, had a committee report out a bill favoring the appointment of a committee to look into the matter of occupying the Columbia River. Nothing came of it. In 1822 he again urged Congress to take action touching on Oregon Territory. This is the bill in which the name Oregon was first applied to the land. In 1824 he presented, and had passed in the House, a bill to provide a territorial government for Oregon. It was tabled in the Senate. Meanwhile the State Department had been successful in writing a treaty with Russia, by which she surrendered all territorial claims south of 54°40'. Thus, by the treaties of 1819 and 1824, both Spain and Russia bowed out of the Oregon country, leaving contend for it.

The Territory involved was 880 miles long, 550 miles wide and contained 450,000 square miles. It was more than six times the size of New England, and 30,000 square miles larger than all the then southern States.

While these steps were being taken by the new government, the fur trade was being reorganized. In 1821 came the coalition of the two great fur companies, the North West Company, a Canadian group, and the Hudson's Bay Company, of London. After the coalition, they continued and did business under the name of Hudson's Bay Company.

In 1824, Dr. John McLoughlin, a chief factor of Hudson's Bay Company, was given control of all the business west of the Rocky Mountains. The headquarters was changed from Astoria to what is now Vancouver, Wash., and the business was greatly extended.

Thus the matters stood in 1827, when the commissioners again met to try to settle the boundary line from the crest of the Rocky Mountains westward to the Pacific Ocean. Again, as in 1818, the American commissioners argued that the line continue west on parallel 49, from the point where it stopped in 1818, and the British again argued that it continue on that line west to the Columbia River, and then that it follow the Columbia to the Pacific Ocean. They deadlocked again on the issue, and in the end decided to renew the old agreement, and allow the Territory to be subject to joint occupation, reserving to each party the right to terminate the agreement by giving a notice of 1 year.

Diplomacy having failed, nature had to take its course. During the period 1827–31, one Hall J. Kelley, a school teacher of Boston, working through Representative Floyd, of Virginia, until the latter's retirement in 1829, and also through Senators Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, and Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, had several petitions presented to Congress asking recognition of the Oregon country. Nothing came of them. However, in this way the subject was kept before Congress and indirectly before the people.

In 1834 the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church sent the Reverend Jason Lee with four assistants as the first Protestant missionaries to Oregon. They were received kindly by Dr. McLoughlin. He assisted them to locate their mission on the Willamette River, 10 miles north of the present Salem, Oreg.

In the interval, Dr. McLoughlin had greatly extended the activities of the Hudson's Bay Co., so that in addition to its extensive fur business it had large acreage of grain, and a special farm for cattle. Also, it manufactured and sold lumber and flour, and did some business in packing salmon.

Following the advent of Rev. Jason Lee in 1834, there came other missionaries in 1835, 1836, and 1837. Also, there came a number of American fur traders and trappers. An active trade in furs by Americans grew up along the coast. All this activity became evident to Lee, and in 1838 he returned east of the Rocky Mountains. He carried with him a petition signed by the settlers in the Willamette Valley, asking that Congress interest itself in the Territory. They had fears as to what might happen under the powers of joint occupancy, with the great Hudson's Bay Co., of London, becoming more and more dominant in the Territory.

Meanwhile, Senators Linn and Benton, of Missouri, had taken an unusual interest in the Oregon Question. Petitions came up from several State legislatures, urging Congress to interest itself in Oregon. When Lee arrived in Washington, the petition which he had brought from the settlers in Oregon was presented. Both Senators Benton and Linn supported it, and also made public addresses and wrote articles about Oregon. Lee spoke extensively throughout New England to large audiences. But Congress was adamant. No amount of agitation caused its Members to take more than a passive interest.

In 1840 Lee returned to Oregon with a large delegation of missionaries and mission assistants such as a physician, teachers, farmers, carpenters, mechanics, and a blacksmith. He set up a new mission center in what is now Salem. He also brought with him a sawmill and a grist mill, and had thus the making of a community, over and beyond merely a religious mission among the Indians.

(b) *Local action*

At this juncture, and while Congress was adamant in its refusal to give any recognition to Oregon, an event happened which was destined to develop into a local government, different both in its origin and outgrowth from that in any other region of the United States.

Ewing Young, a settler, died on February 15, 1841. He had prospered in Oregon and left considerable property, both real and personal. In the personal property was livestock. These at once presented the problem of herding to prevent their scattering, trespassing and being appropriated by neighbors. To complicate the problem he had died without known heirs in Oregon, and no State or government to which his property could pass by escheat, existed.

The Americans locally were more or less governmental conscious. The missionaries among them were especially so, as they had come from States with established forms of government.

The predominant group in the country was the Hudson's Bay Company and its ex-employees. This group had had a civil administration granted by an act of Parliament of July 1821. Acting under it, law and order had been well preserved in the Territory. But it was not entirely satisfactory to the temper and aspirations of the Americans, who had always before them the fact that they were in a territory open to joint occupancy; they were constantly planning ways and means to strengthen their position.

Clearly the death of Ewing Young raised the problem of civil administration. They had none. Congress had failed them, although as late as 1840 they had set forth in a petition to Congress the dire need they had for civil jurisdictional authority. Following the funeral of Young, the settlers present discussed the situation, and called a meeting to be held on February 18, 1841. At that meeting, most of the settlers of the valley were present, and a committee of organization of nine persons, representing all the different elements in the valley, was chosen. Dr. Ira L. Babcock was elected supreme judge, with probate powers. They also elected a person to act as clerk and recorder, and one to act as sheriff, and eight to act as constables. In the absence of a code of laws, the supreme judge was instructed to act in accordance with the laws of the State of New York. The meeting adjourned to meet the following June 1. On April 15, Judge Babcock appointed the Reverend David Leslie, one of the Methodist missionaries, to act as administrator of the estate of Ewing Young.

In this primitive way, the settlers made a start of self-government. The start advanced haltingly, as the committee on organization failed to report at the June meeting. The meeting adjourned to the first Tuesday in October, and the committee, to draft a constitution and a code of laws, was ordered to meet the first Monday in August. These meetings in turn seem never to have been held, and about the only concrete action which came out of these first efforts were the acts of Judge Babcock and of the Reverend David Leslie as administrator of the estate of Ewing Young. This seems to have been the most pressing matter, and in view of the smallness of the settlement and its peaceful habits, nothing else of importance appears to have been done.

The inroads of bears, panthers, wolves, and other predatory animals on the cattle of the settlers, proved the second rallying point to organize a local government. A meeting ostensively to discuss this problem was called on February 2, 1843, at the mission building which had now been relocated and was in the present Salem, Oreg. At this session, a committee was appointed to call a meeting of the settlers. Such a meeting was held at the home of Joseph Gervais on March 6, 1843. Again a committee was appointed. It was composed of 12 men and was delegated to take means for civil and military protection of this colony.

This committee went into action at what is now Oregon City, Oreg. Its meetings were attended by interested citizens. At the conclusion it called a general meeting of the settlers to meet at Champoeg, on the Willamette River, on May 2, 1843. At this meeting the committee presented its report favoring the organization of a new government. It soon developed that those present were not of one mind. Not all favored such an organization. The report seems to have been voted down. But the cause was not lost, for a division was called for, and when the count was taken the majority had voted to proceed to organize. The number by which the vote was carried has long been a question of dispute. The commonly accepted count was 52 to 50. But that it was a favorable vote is unquestioned. The discontented element withdrew and those remaining, proceeded to elect a supreme judge with probate powers, a clerk and recorder, a sheriff, and a treasurer, 4 magistrates and 4 constables. In addition, the meeting took an exceptional step. It elected a legislative committee of nine members. This committee constituted the first legislative body elected in Oregon. It was instructed to report at a public meeting the following July 5 (1843).

This committee held its first meeting on May 16 in a room in the old granary of the Methodist Mission, in what is now Oregon City. Its meetings were open. One of its members had a copy of the statutes of Iowa which was bound with the text of the Ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory. The original organic law adopted verbatim many phrases from the Ordinance of 1787 and the organic laws of Iowa. Instead of a governor, this organic law provided for an executive committee of three persons. This plan, however, was found unworkable and later amended.

After unlimited debate, in which the spirit of the old New England town meeting prevailed, the report was adopted, and it became known as the Organic Law of Oregon. Slavery was prohibited, and every free male descendant of a white man inhabitant of the territory was eligible to vote. No provision was made for taxation. The expenses of government were paid by voluntary contributions. This provision was soon found to be unworkable. Finally the large area was divided into legislative districts.

In this way the local people in Oregon, without either assistance or even encouragement by Congress, set up a provisional government, republican in substance, and grounded broadly on ideals of democracy. It was set up over against the more or less patrenalistic system of the powerful Hudson's Bay Company. It was the rule of the majority over and against that of the chosen few. It was a government destined to guide a people who were to colonize the land and cultivate the soil, and, in so doing, to go counter to the Hudson's Bay Company theory of holding the land as a great fur preserve.

(c) Colonization

At the time that the organic law was adopted and the provisional government was formed, the practical demands for governmental action were slight, due to the small number of settlers and their peaceful habits.

While these events had been evolving in the Oregon country, events throughout the more settled districts of the Middle West, southern and eastern parts of the country, were developing into what has been characterized as the Oregon fever. It is not the purpose of this article to give the details of these events, as space forbids, and a summary of them will serve the purpose. As a result of these activities, the year 1843 marks the beginning of a series of annual wagon trains, bringing several thousand Americans, men, women, and children, into Oregon, resulting in settlers' claims wherever such seemed most advantageous to them.

With this great influx of new settlers, the newly established government underwent many changes, demanded by the newly arrived settlers. But the changes were in form only, the essence remaining unaltered.

Similarly, the interest of Congress underwent modification. Congress began to discuss land bills and to indicate the number of acres allowable per person. Petitions from the increased number of persons in Oregon were given increasing attention. This meant some members gave vent to their feelings. Some members spoke highly of the territory, while others questioned its value. Senator McDuffy, of South Carolina, went to the extreme and said he wouldn't give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory.

Oregon became a campaign issue in 1844. Candidate Polk, for an issue, seized on the fact that Russia in her treaty of 1824 had surrendered her rights to the territory south of 54° 40', and popularized his campaign slogan "54° 40' or fight." It was a political inference that, unless England accepted the old demand of the United States for parallel 49 as the dividing line west of the Rocky Mountains, the United States would abandon that demand and insist on 54° 40' as the line of demarcation. On July 16, 1845, President Polk and James Buchanan, Secretary of State, offered England's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Packenham, to settle on the 49th parallel. Packenham refused, and Polk withdrew his offer, and said he would insist on the settlement at 54° 40'.

Following the so-called first wagon train of 1843, came succeeding trains in 1844, 1845 and 1846. These newcomers were colonizers. They sought land for homes. They had no interest in furs or fur trade. By 1846 it had become evident to Britain that under the "joint occupancy" clause, still in full force and effect, the colonizing Americans had won. Suddenly and without prior warning, Packenham submitted to Secretary Buchanan a treaty establishing the 49th parallel of north latitude as the dividing line between what is now Canada and the United States, west of the Rocky Mountains. Inasmuch as this had been the proposal of the United States since the issue was first raised in 1818, the treaty was submitted to the Senate of the United States and accepted, in the form submitted by Great Britain, on June 15, 1846.

And thus, without shedding a drop of blood or paying a dollar, the entire territory, known as the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the western fringes of Montana and Wyoming, came into the domain of the United States. It had been accomplished in good part by American settlers who entered and possessed the land peaceably, under a treaty agreement which had been in existence for 28 years and for about 25 of those years had been controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company of London.

During this time, the homemade provisional government was functioning, with executive, legislative, and judicial departments. All efforts to get Congress to extend a helping hand had failed. Some authorities in official Washington had taken the position that, until the dividing line was determined, Congress should not interfere. The treaty of June 15, 1846, put an end to that argument. Still Congress delayed.

Meanwhile the people in Oregon grew impatient. They were dissatisfied with certain provisions of the treaty which they considered favored the Hudson's Bay Company. They also disliked the idea that Congress was discussing a bill which provided that the officers of the new Territory, when established, should be appointed by the President. Hadn't they set up their own government in 1843, elected their own officers, and legislated for the welfare of the people of all the Oregon country, and maintained a stable government in working order since then? Why, then, they asked, after having successfully carried the burden without help from Congress, should it be necessary, that the President should appoint their officers and judges? The answer was—precedent. They answered, that in other Territorial governments the local people had not organized an independent government and governed themselves, as had the people of Oregon.

The result was that the provisional president sent J. Quinn Thornton as a representative to Washington. The legislature also sent an emissary, the colorful Joe Meek. Hence, these two men went to Washington to press the merits of the people of the Oregon country.

In December 1846, President Polk urged Congress to grant the Oregon country a Territorial status. Unfortunately, the question of slavery was rearing its ugly head. Bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House. Both contained the antislavery clause. Favoring passage were Senators Douglas (Illinois), Benton (Missouri), Houston (Texas), Webster (Massachusetts), Dix (New York), and Corwin (Ohio); while opposed were Calhoun and Butler (South Carolina), Mason (Virginia), and Foote (Mississippi).

The battle was bitter, and waged without asking or giving quarter, periodically through the year 1847, and until August 13, 1948, when Senator Benton was successful in forcing the bill through. It was signed on August 14, 1848, and became law.

The President appointed Joseph Lane to be the first Territorial governor. It took Lane until March 3, 1849, to reach Oregon and issue a proclamation declaring the Oregon country to have Territorial status. This having been done, Governor Abernethy, the provisional governor, cheerfully surrendered the provisional government in full working order to the Territorial governor.

In conclusion, we see that the Oregon country was called New England by Sir Francis Drake a quarter of a century before there was any permanent white settlement on the Atlantic coast of the United States; that an unusual chain of events delayed its discovery for more than 100 years after lands, both to the north and to the south of it, had been discovered; that the origin of the name "Oregon" had remained hidden, despite the persistent research of scholars; that the Oregon country, which comprises the present States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the western fringes of Montana and Wyoming, is the only section of the United States to become a part of the Union through colonization and diplomacy, and not as a result of war or purchase; that it established and maintained its own local government for a period of 6 years in the face of the unwillingness of Congress to give aid or even encouragement; and finally, when it was granted Territorial status, the people of

Oregon turned over this local government in full working order, and it became the Territorial government, an accomplishment not equaled by any other State in the Union.

Because of these facts, Oregon is herein represented as the unique prize.

IV. DR. JOHN M'LOUGHLIN

Dr. John McLoughlin was born at Rivière-du-Loup, in the Province of Quebec, Canada, on October 19, 1784. He was of mixed Scottish, Irish, and French ancestry. His grandfather, also John McLoughlin, came from Scotland, married Mary Short, an Irishwoman, and settled on a farm near Rivière-du-Loup. To them was born a son, John, who succeeded his father on the farm. He was not content to marry into the farming ranks. Across the St. Lawrence River from the farm of the son John, lived Malcolm Fraser, a member of the landed gentry well known in the community, and a person of means. The son John, the farmer, wed Angélique, the daughter of this Malcolm Fraser, the most prominent citizen of Murray Bay. Angélique's mother was Marie Allaire, a French Canadian. Out of this union came a son John, the John of our interest, being the third John in this indicated line. His mother was a Catholic, and the young John was baptized Jean Baptiste at Kamouraska by the local priest; he died in the faith of his mother, and lies buried in Oregon City, Oreg. It is this succession of marriages and births which gave the subject of this sketch the mixture of Scottish, Irish, and French blood, as indicated above.

Little seems to be known of the childhood of this young John McLoughlin. Doubtless he made visits to the home of his grandfather Fraser, where he seems to have been a welcome visitor. Here he may have met two brothers of his mother, Alexander and Simon Fraser. Simon had been a physician, in the Black Watch Regiment of the earlier Napoleonic wars. Alexander was a fur trader, and eventually became a wintering partner of the North West Company. In these two uncles one sees the fingerboards of the road young John McLaughlin was destined to follow.

When not more than 14 years of age, the young man began his medical apprenticeship under Dr. James Fisher, one of the most prominent physicians of his day, with whom he studied for 4½ years. He was admitted to practice at the age of 19. Thus we see the possible influence of Uncle Simon Fraser.

Very soon after having been given a license to practice, young John cast his lot with the North West Company apparently as a result of an attractive promise made to him through the efforts of his Uncle Simon. Whether or not his Uncle Alexander may have stimulated Simon McTavish, the most powerful person in said company, to make the offer, is unknown. But it does not seem a far cry to believe that the young doctor must have heard much of the fur trade in his boyhood associations in the home of his grandfather Fraser.

Thus in 1803 young Dr. McLoughlin began his services under a 5-year contract with the North West Company on a salary of £20 a year. At the end of the period (1808) he was re-engaged, for 3 years, at a salary of £200 a year, which contract was again renewed for 2 years (1811–14) when he became a wintering partner of the company.

He seems to have been popular among his associates who were increasingly annoyed at the manner in which the company was being conducted. It was fast becoming evident that an open clash with the bitter rival, the Hudson Bay Company was in the offing. The rivalry was so keen that the profits of both companies were nearing the vanishing point. Prudence indicated the necessity of a working agreement between the companies. The agents of the North West Company stood firm to drive ahead into disaster.

At this point Dr. McLoughlin led the discontented wintering partners in a rebellion against the agents. In the end, they were forced to open negotiations in London with the Hudson's Bay Company, which ended in the coalition of the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company in March 1821. Dr. McLoughlin was in London during the negotiations, but did not figure directly in them.

Among the assets of the North West Company, which fell to the Hudson's Bay Company, was all the property west of the Rocky Mountains, with headquarters at Astoria, renamed Fort George. On July 10, 1824, Dr. McLoughlin was appointed head of this region known as the Columbia district.

The significance of this appointment to the Pacific Northwest lies in the fact that the treaty of 1818, between Britain and the United States, settled the dividing line between the present Canada and the United States between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains, leaving the part west of the Rocky Mountains unsettled and open to future negotiations. This resulted in this district ultimately being open to joint occupancy, and thus ultimately to go to the country which settled it.

Hence, Dr. McLoughlin became a most important personage because, as the chief authority in this district of the Hudson's Bay Company, a distinctly British organization, he was looked upon as the representative of the British interests in the Pacific Northwest. After dealing for 10 years with the Indians of his district, he felt the necessity of having missionary work done among them, so that when Jason Lee and his little band of Methodist missionaries arrived in Oregon in 1834, he welcomed them and aided them in getting established along the Williamette River some 10 miles north of the present Salem.

In 1843 came the first overland train of settlers to Oregon. They were in no sense missionaries, nor in the least interested in the salvation of the Indians. They came for agricultural purposes, and were destined to run counter to the interests represented by Dr. McLoughlin, who wished the country to remain unsettled and the home of fur-bearing animals.

Even though it was evident that there was this conflict of interest, yet Dr. McLoughlin received these settlers pleasantly, made them loans, and ministered to their needs.

The early pioneers were fortunate in that Dr. McLoughlin was in command in the Northwest when they came. It is not that a man less favorably inclined could have prevented their settling, but he could have greatly increased the hardships of their lot which were severe enough at best.

Dr. McLoughlin resigned his position in 1845 and built his home in Oregon City. He took oath in May 1849, and made his declaration to become an American citizen. He died in his home in Oregon City, September 3, 1857.

As evidence of the feeling of the pioneers toward Dr. McLoughlin, the board of directors of the Oregon Pioneer Association passed a resolution at their annual meeting on January 18–19, 1886, asking the Legislature of the State of Oregon to appropriate funds "to erect a suitable monument to the memory of the late Dr. John McLoughlin, of Oregon City, and to place it in the statehouse."

A committee was appointed to bring this to pass. David P. Thompson was chairman. This committee recommended that a life-size oil portrait of the doctor be painted by William Cogswell.

The House Journal of February 5, 1889, shows that this portrait was presented to the State of Oregon at a joint meeting of the house and senate held in the house at 7:30 p. m., all members of both house and senate being present. John Minto presented the portrait on behalf of the Oregon Pioneer Association, and it was accepted by Sylvester Pennoyer, Governor of Oregon, and hung behind the chair of the president of the senate, where it remained till it was burned in the fire which destroyed the Capitol Building on April 25, 1935.

In presenting this portrait John Minto said:

"In recognition of the worthy manner in which Dr. John McLoughlin filled his trying and responsible position, in the heartfelt glow of a grateful remembrance of his humane and noble conduct to them, the Oregon pioneers leave this portrait with you, hoping that their descendants will not forget the friend of their fathers."

In accepting the portrait on behalf of the State of Oregon Sylvester Pennoyer, Governor, said:

"Then let this picture of the grand old man, whose numerous deeds of charity are inseparably woven in the early history of our State, ever enjoy the place of honor it now holds; and when our children and our children's children shall visit these venerable halls, let them pause before the portrait of this venerable man and do homage to his memory."

V. REV. JASON LEE

"Jason Lee was descended from a sturdy Old England and New England ancestry," we are told by his biographer, Cornelius J. Brosnan.

An old country forebear, John Lee, migrated to America in 1634 and became one of the early settlers of Newton, near Cambridge, Mass.

Daniel Lee, the father of Jason Lee, when a youth of 22 years, saw his first Revolutionary action, the Battle of Lexington. Later (June 1776) he enlisted with his brother in the Wadsworth Brigade, and went to reinforce General Washington in his operations in and around New York City, and was in the Battle of White Plains, October 26, 1776, where his brigade suffered losses.

On January 8, 1778, Daniel Lee married Sarah Whitacre, the daughter of a farmer near the town of Stafford, Conn. Sarah also was descended from old and sturdy New England stock. After marriage they lived for some years on a farm near Willington, Conn.; but later, probably about 1798, they migrated to a farm of 400 acres of virgin timber, near the present town of Stanstead, Quebec. When Daniel Lee moved north, his land was considered to be part of Vermont, and remained so until the international survey ran the dividing line between Vermont and the Province of Quebec through this settlement of Connecticut and Vermont pioneers. When the line was ultimately established (1842), Daniel Lee's log house was north thereof, and hence, in the Province of Quebec.

In this log house on June 28, 1803, Jason Lee was born, the youngest of 15 children, 9 boys and 6 girls. The father died when Jason was 3 years of age. Jason received his early education in the village school in Stanstead. At the age of 13, young Lee was self-supporting. He followed the occupation of a farmer boy in a new country. As he expressed it, "He was brought up to hard work," and "had seen the day when he could chop a cord of sugar maple in 2 hours."

He was converted by a Wesleyan missionary in 1826. In his diary he spoke of his conversation: "I saw, I believed, I repented." He continued to work as a manual laborer for 3 years thereafter or until 1829. In that year he entered Wilbraham Academy, at Wilbraham, Mass., a rising Methodist institution where he had the care of all the boys in a large sleeping hall, in which Lee had room No. 13.

Bishop Osmon C. Baker, a classmate of Jason Lee, leaves the following pen picture of him:

"Jason Lee was a large, athletic young man, 6 feet and 3 inches in height, with a fully developed frame and a constitution like iron. His piety was deep and uniform, and his life, in a very uncommon degree, pure and exemplary. In those days of extensive and powerful revivals, I used to observe, with what confidence and satisfaction, seekers of

religion would place themselves under his instruction. They regarded him as a righteous man whose prayers availed much; and when there were indications that the Holy Spirit was moving in the heart of the sinner within the circle of his acquaintance, his warm Christian heart would incite him to constant labor until deliverance would be proclaimed to the captive."

After graduation at Wilbraham in 1830, Lee served as a teacher in the Stanstead Academy and preached in the adjoining towns, and continued in this capacity until the opening came to go to Oregon. While contemplating how he was to get to Oregon, he saw in a Boston newspaper that Capt. Nathaniel Wyeth, of Cambridge, Mass., had returned from Oregon and was planning to go there again the following spring. He hastened to Boston and arranged to accompany Wyeth on his second trip, which was to leave Independence, Mo., in April 1834.

The meeting with Wyeth was in November 1833. Between that time and the date set for the departure to Oregon, Jason Lee went about New England, accompanied by two Indian boys whom Wyeth had brought with him from Oregon, preaching and addressing various missionary groups where collections were taken for his work in Oregon. The Indian boys drew record crowds. One such meeting was held in Lynn, Mass. The Zion Herald published a graphic account thereof in part as follows:

"Last Sabbath evening there was an address by Rev. Jason Lee, missionary to the Flat Heads. It was one of the most pleasant meetings ever held in Lynn, of a missionary character. Long before the time appointed to commence, the house was thronged to overflowing, and the audience hung upon the lips of the speakers with such an interest that it could not be mistaken. The collection did honor to Lynn; it amounted to $100."

Monday, April 28, 1834, the cavalcade headed by Nathaniel Wyeth, of which Jason Lee and his party of four companions were a part, headed out of St. Louis for Oregon. Lee, in a letter written en route, said that Wyeth's party was the most profane company I think that I was ever in.

En route Lee preached at Fort Hall, a brief, but excellent and appropriate exhortation on July 27, 1834, noted as the first formal Protestant religious observance to be held in the vast interior lying west of the Rocky Mountains. Captain Wyeth remained to finish Fort Hall, and Lee and his party proceeded to Fort Boise under the escort of Thomas McKay, and his Hudson's Bay brigade. From this point they journeyed alone to Fort Walla Walla, arriving September 1. While here, Wyeth and his party rejoined them, and together they proceeded to Fort Vancouver where they arrived September 15, 1834, warmly welcomed by Dr. John McLoughlin.

At the suggestion and under the guidance of Dr. McLoughlin, Jason Lee and his companions, Daniel Lee, his nephew, and Messrs. Courtney N. Walker, Cyrus Shepard, and Philip L. Edwards, located their mission on the east bank of the Willamette River, 10 miles north of the present city of Salem.

But Lee soon became convinced that he must have reinforcements, and among them should be women.

Accordingly on March 26, 1838, Lee started on his return trip to New York, carrying with him a petition signed by 36 Americans, including every member of the mission. This memorable document is said to have been inspired by Lee. The petition set forth the virtues of the Oregon country and its commercial advantages, and urged the United States to take formal and speedy possession. The document is dated March 16, 1838, and was presented to the Senate on January 28, 1839, by Senator Linn. Thus early did Lee interest himself in the political welfare of Oregon.

On his journey, he spoke at Alton, Ill., St. Louis, Carlinville, Jacksonville, Springfield, Peoria, and Chicago. In New York he impressed the board of managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church with the importance of the work. As a result they had him go on three extended speaking tours, one in and about Philadelphia and Washington; another in New England, from Connecticut to Canada, and the third through New York State. He spoke to crowded houses. In Hartford, Conn., by way of illustration, "hundreds went away unable to gain admittance into the church;" and thousands thus had Oregon and its importance brought to their attention.

The missionary society chartered the sailing vessel *Lausanne* to carry a large party of missionaries (51 persons) and their supplies to Oregon. This group was purely for missionary purposes. On October 9, 1839, the party set sail. The *Lausanne* dropped anchor at Fort Vancouver June 1, 1840, after a voyage of almost 8 months. Dr. McLoughlin greeted them most cordially and entertained them at the fort, providing comfortable accommodations such as a private sitting room and special dining tables.

The site of the so-called Old Mission on the Willamette was fast proving to be unsatisfactory. It was low, malarial, and subject to inundation. Lee had brought with him machinery for both a sawmill and a gristmill. There was no location for them at the old mission, while at Chemeketa, 10 miles to the south, was a stream with sufficient water in winter to operate them. Thus it was that the machinery for the mills was sent there immediately. When the sawmill was ready it began to cut lumber for a house for Lee, in 1841, and for another house called the "Parsonage," for the missionary teachers; and finally, for the new Indian school buildings. This later became Willamette University.

But soon the mission fell into evil ways. The Indian population had been depleted by diseases of the white man to which the Indians succumbed in great numbers. Dissatisfaction arose among the missionaries and their various assignments. Complaints continued to reach the missionary headquarters in New York. Many of these were from dissatisfied missionaries who had returned to New York from Oregon. The letters from the board, touching these complaints, convinced Lee that he should return to New York in the hope of making satisfactory explanations.

Accordingly, in late November 1843, Lee bade farewell to his Chemeketa friends and associates and headed for New York with his only daughter, then nearly 2 years old, in company with Gustavus Hines and wife.

He appeared before his board on July 1, and continued to do so until July 10, 1844. In the end, the board cleared him of the charges which had been preferred by his dissatisfied associates. But it was too late to return him to Oregon. The board had previously appointed his successor who was then in Oregon.

Lee left soon afterwards and went to be with a sister at Stanstead, his boyhood home. Here he was stricken with an illness from which he died on March 12, 1845. He was buried in the graveyard at Stanstead, where his body remained till on June 15, 1906, when his remains were moved to the Lee Mission Cemetery at Salem, Oreg.

On October 26, 1920, an oil painting of Jason Lee was presented to the State of Oregon. The portrait was done by Mr. Vesper George, of Boston, Mass. The funds for the same were provided by the Oregon Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The portrait was hung behind the chair of the speaker of the House of Representatives in the State Capitol in Salem, Oreg., where it hung until destroyed when the building burned on April 25, 1935.

The portrait was presented by Thomas A. McBride, justice, Oregon State Supreme Court. He said in part:

"The precious jewel of a commonwealth: the one thing above all others which it should treasure, is the memory of those grand and self-sacrificing men and women who laid the foundations of its greatness and prosperity.

"One of these treasured memories is the life and work of Jason Lee, the founder of American civilization in Oregon. Lee combined the fervor of a missionary, the foresight of a seer, and the patriotism of a loyal citizen."

The portrait was accepted on the part of the State by Ben W. Olcott, Governor of Oregon. He said in part:

"Unhesitatingly I say that Jason Lee was Oregon's most heroic figure. By every right of achievement, by every right of peaceful conquest, this portrait of Jason Lee should adorn the halls of the capitol building in our State, as long as those capitol buildings stand."

COMMITTEE SERVICE OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn my attention to an entirely different subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an excerpt from an article entitled "MORSE Wins Support of Portland Unions," which was published in the Oregon Journal of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE WINS SUPPORT OF PORTLAND UNIONS

Organized labor in Portland—the A. F. of L., CIO, railroad brotherhoods, and independent longshoremen—today joined in a chorus of protest against removal of Senator WAYNE MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee.

The vigorous complaints had their origin in a statement made by Chuck Hoffman, delegate for A. F. of L. electrical workers to the Portland Central Labor Council. He told the council Monday night, "MORSE is fighting alone. We should give him support."

At his suggestion the council passed a motion requesting the national executive board of the A. F. of L., now in session at Miami, Fla., to protest the disciplining of the Oregon Senator.

CIO leaders in Portland said they are taking similar action. Longshoremen said they had always supported MORSE and were with him now. Top leaders of the railroad brotherhoods were attending meeting in Salt Lake City but their offices said the brotherhoods were strongly in sympathy with the action of the Portland Central Labor Council.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks an excerpt from an article entitled "Central Council Urges A. F. of L. To Protest MORSE's Removal From Labor Group of Senate," published in the Oregonian of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Portland Central Labor Council Monday night determined to prod the A. F. of L. executive council, sitting at Miami, Fla., into protesting the removal of Senator WAYNE MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee.

But it rejected a proposal to call on the same authority to clean up the New York waterfront mess where crime investigators have charged racketeering, corruption, cargo

pilferage to members of the A. F. of L. longshoremen's union.

In its move to stir the A. F. of L. council into action on the removal of MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee, the Portland Council urged that all international unions also be enlisted in the drive to get him back.

AMERICA'S NATURAL RESOURCES—ELECTRIC POWER POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to address myself to another subject.

Mr. President, it is very important that I do some of my committee work on the floor of the Senate, because I am well aware of the fact that, it being Friday afternoon, a good many of my colleagues necessarily are out of the city and will perhaps appreciate my doing my floor committee work in their absence, but making available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of that work.

I wish to announce that today I shall give the first of a series of speeches in the Senate on the general subject of our natural resources and their development and use. I shall dedicate these speeches to one of the great liberals of our history, one of the great students of natural resource problems, and one of the greatest statesmen who ever trod the floor of the Senate of the United States. I refer, of course, to the late great Senator from Nebraska, George Norris. We cannot fill his shoes, Mr. President, but we can try to walk in his footsteps. We can note and follow his footprints of statesmanship. I believe it to be very important, at this particular time, with all the conflicting proposals which one hears with reference to what should happen to our natural resources, that we reflect on some of the great lessons and teachings of George Norris, because I hold to the view that, conservationist that he was, he was thinking decades ahead on the question of the kind of heritage and legacy we would leave to American boys and girls a century hence, from the standpoint of the natural resources of our country. The great Norris recognized that the streams, forests, and public domain of the United States belong to the people of the United States, and that the people of each generation hold those resources as trustees for Americans yet to be born.

Because I feel so deeply about the problem of conserving, preserving, and protecting the natural resources of our country for generations of Americans yet unborn, I propose today to give the first of a series of speeches which I shall deliver in the months ahead on the entire problem of natural resources.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTRIC POWER POLICY

Mr. President, as I have just said, the natural resources of the country are held by the people of our generation in trust for the happiness and welfare of future generations of Americans.

We must be on guard against any and all attempts to waste and exploit these resources for selfish economic interests of those who are inclined to place their profits above the general welfare. Therefore, I propose to deliver in the Senate from time to time over the next few months, a series of speeches dealing with some of the vital problems and questions involved in developing and maintaining a sound conservation program for our country.

Such a program is necessary if we are to keep faith with the historic work in the field of conservation conducted by two liberal and sound conservationists—Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. I plan to deliver this series of speeches because I am satisfied that the natural resources planks of the Republican platform, if enacted into legislation by the Eisenhower administration, would prove to be a serious threat to a sound conservation program, and, would constitute in fact, a wasting of the economic and defense potentialities of the streams and forests and public domain of our country.

LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES TODAY

Today, America stands as a foremost leader of the democracies in the world. Nations large and small look to us for guidance and aid. With the threat of communism challenging the free peoples throughout the world, the United States cannot afford to falter in its dedication to the democratic quest for constant improvement of the lot of the people.

All of us recognize the great political contributions that our democracy has made to our world. These facts are well known. America, the industrial giant, has done as much to foster and protect this political heritage of all freemen. Our technological attainments give us the tools with which to win the battles against armed aggression, and the struggle in civilian life for ever-higher standards of living.

WHAT IS THE BASIS OF OUR INDUSTRIAL MIGHT?

For generations, infant America struggled along in an inconspicuous way, while other nations assumed leadership in the world of industry and trade. Then suddenly a young giant America leaped to the fore as a leader of free men everywhere.

It is true that we have developed men of great technical genius. Also, we have made undreamed improvements in tools and in industrial arts that shot us forward generations in a few brief decades. But upon what were all these things based? What really made possible our vast mass production in recent years? I believe one of the answers will be found in the great prime mover, electric power.

PRIVATE INITIATIVE AND INVESTMENT

Many factors enter into this unparalleled record of achievement. Private initiative and industry are of basic importance. We must recognize the vast and steady accomplishments of private industry here and throughout the world, down through the years. But this alone is not enough to account for the tremendous strides the United States has made recently.

THE GREAT CONSERVATIONISTS

We must look for something more than private initiative and private accomplishments—great as these things are. During the past five decades there has been a constant struggle between those who believed that our natural resources and water power were for the benefit of all the people, and those who believed that they were for private exploitation. The fight on behalf of the people was led by such great conservationists as Teddy Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and George Norris. Out of this long struggle, which took place in bitter fights in and out of the halls of Congress, a great national electric power policy was evolved during the last generation.

THE EVOLUTION OF OUR NATIONAL POWER POLICY

This national power policy was slow in developing. At times it seemed as if it never would materialize. However, after endless and weary battles, a national policy was formulated in plainly written laws of Congress that told our people, all agencies of the Federal Government, and the world, that at last the United States was on its way to preserving its natural resources and water power for the benefit of all the people. What were these policies, and what did Congress say?

DAMS SHALL GENERATE ELECTRICITY

The first great pillar in our national power policy, I might say our basic one, arose when Federal dams were first constructed, although no power use was made of their priceless waters. It is hard to believe that for many years all these potential low-priced billions of kilowatt-hours were wasted to America. It is a cliché of economics that the labor of a human being is perishable, and, if unused, is gone forever. It is equally true that water emptied into the seas has a potential for power every bit as perishable. Once it has rushed beyond river banks, it is beyond recall.

After a historic struggle, Congress provided that Federal dams should include facilities for generating electricity. This was a long time ago. It first occurred in the Reclamation Act of 1906, and has been continued ever since.

PUBLIC PREFERENCE IN POWER SALES

Let us now consider the next principle that was determined by Congress for our national power policy. The Government is developing public property—streams and vast networks of rivers—belonging to the people. It is doing so with funds that are derived from all the people. Therefore, it is both logical and reasonable that such public property, developed with public funds, should grant a preference to the same public—or their public or nonprofit agencies—which made such construction possible.

It seems incredible, Mr. President, that after a generation of struggle, we should still hear today the generation-old private-utility chant that the privately owned and publicly operated utilities should be treated alike in receiving the use of power generated by public projects.

The public-preference principle is no accidental development in congressional law. It has a long and honorable history, based upon years and years of study which culminated into law. In the Reclamation Act that was passed in 1906, Congress stated this principle of preference in power sales to public agencies and cooperatives. Congress did so again in the Raker Act. A similar policy was followed in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, and in the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928. When Congress passed the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, the public-preference policy was reiterated. The same was true of the Rural

Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, and the Fort Peck Act of 1938.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that the preference for municipal and cooperative power was first established when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. The principle of it was established in 1906.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was established in the Reclamation Act, which the late Senator Newlands, of Nevada, had a great deal to do with, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So it did not begin in 1933, under Franklin Roosevelt, but began under Theodore Roosevelt. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Congress continued these clearly enunciated views in the Reclamation Act of 1939; and 5 years later the preference clause was continued in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Thus, the next pillar in our national electric power policy, namely, public preference to public nonprofit bodies, is a long and well-established congressional doctrine.

LOW INTEREST RATES

Natural resources are the property of all the people, and must be preserved and developed for their benefit.

Mr. President, I hope that by the time I conclude the series of speeches which I intend to make in the Senate during the next few months, I shall at least have broadened the understanding of the American people so that they will indubitably realize that they, and they alone, own the streams and the other great natural resources of the United States. Those resources do not belong to the private utilities of our country. The forests do not belong to the lumber companies of our country, to be used for exploitation purposes. The public domain does not being to those who would seek to so use it that they would change the western plains of America into an eroded China. The public domain belongs to the people of our generation in trust for future generations of Americans, and in the great natural-resource fight which will be waged in this Congress against an administration which, in my judgment, unless it is checked, will exploit our natural resources for selfish interests, I see an arousing of the American people to a clearer understanding of their vested interest in their own natural resources.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. When the Government builds a dam across a river or stream, it is, of course, the money of all the people that goes into the dam. Therefore, is it not right, proper, and logical that all the people should benefit from such construction rather than merely a few?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Alabama, and I commend the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], both of whom are now on the floor and both of whom have been so kind as to contribute to my discussion of this problem, for the fights they have put up on the floor of the Senate for years in support of the basic principle I have just enunciated. They are in support of our mutual view that it is the obligation of the Congress of the United States to protect the heritage of all the people in the natural resources of this country. Let me say to my friend from Alabama that if we do not remain constantly on guard, the movement which is under way to exploit our natural resources will take the form of law. That is the way the selfish end of private interests will be accomplished. If we are not on our guard, when multiple-purpose dams, to be built with the taxpayers' money, are being authorized, there will be inserted in the authorization act a sleeper clause which will give to the private utilities the power at bus bar. If the private utilities are given the power at bus bar, then we might as well give them the dam, because if they control the power at bus bar, then we might as well give them the dam, because if they control the power at bus bar, they control the dam. It would be cheaper for them to get their bus-bar proposal through than to own the dam. That is why the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois and other liberal Senators have fought so hard during our terms in the Senate for the building of Government transmission lines to load centers, because without a gridback system of Government-built transmission lines to load centers, then the dams are made really and in fact the property of the private utilities at bus bar. That raises the question of entering into fair, equitable, and reasonable contracts with all distributors of power, including private utilities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota in a moment. My record speaks for itself. I have supported on the floor of the Senate proposals which will give to private utilities fair contracts. But, Mr. President, the protection of the legitimate rights of the private utilities does not mean an emasculation of the preference clause. It does not mean that the Government is to use the taxpayers' money to build the dams and generate the power, and then discriminate in favor of the private utilities. After all, it is the interest of the taxpayers that ought to come first, and the preference clause is included to protect the ownership of the public in publicly generated power. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, not only for yielding to me, but for giving me an opportunity to tell him how much I appreciate what he is saying here today. It is because of the fact that we have had a group of liberals on the Senate floor for the past 8 or 9 years that we, in my State, have 612 miles of transmission lines built by the Bureau of Reclamation. We have there eight cooperatives which, by their united efforts, have secured a loan from the Government of $9,500,000, making the total of nearly $25,000,000.

I want my distinguished friend from Oregon to know that that takes care of 35,000 farmers in the very center of North Dakota, farmers who never could have obtained electric power had the Government, as the Senator has suggested, not stepped in to help them.

Furthermore, these loans are amortized. Within 45 years, those farmers are going to own that line. They are going to own the steam plant, and they are going to get the power from Garrison Dam, one of the greatest dams now being built. The fight is on now in North Dakota, the very fight my distinguished friend has just mentioned, namely, whether under the so-called preference clause the private utilities are to get an advantage over farm lines owned by the farmers' cooperatives.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution to this discussion. I am sure I need not say to the people of North Dakota anything about the record of the Senator from North Dakota in supporting public-power developments. I am sure the people of his State know his fine record, and I think it was one of the main reasons why he was returned to the Senate last November by the very complimentary vote he received across North Dakota.

All I want to say to my friend from North Dakota—and I say it to him as a Republican—is that the Independent Party welcomes him at this session of the Congress, to stand with it, as it will stand with him, in the fight we are going to have to make, in my judgment, to protect the people of the United States from certain groups within the Republican Party that are out to exploit the streams of America for the benefit of the private utilities.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that natural resources are the property of all the people, and must be preserved and developed for their benefit. It is proper and reasonable that the Government utilize its own agencies in developing programs for the preservation of those resources.

Consequently, under a wise congressional policy, the Federal Government has used its own lending power in order to make available to public projects, the low interest rates which the Government itself enjoys. Accordingly, another vital link in a congressional-power policy has been the granting of low interest rates to borrowers, where Government funds are used for the development of public property, or the supplying of essential public electric power services not available previously at reasonable rates.

The soundness of this policy is attested to by the fact that such loans have made possible large scale development of public resources and widespread use of power generated from such public projects. The fact is that people are prospering and enjoying electric rates less than one-half of what rates were before Government programs developed our natural resources. This is conclusive

evidence that such low rates have been of tremendous benefit to all the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Illinois correct in his understanding that the interest rate on loans to the REA Co-ops is approximately 2 percent?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not also true that while the 2 percent rate is less than the rate on long-term Government bonds, it is higher than the rate on short-term borrowings of the Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that to the degree to which the Government gets its capital from the short-term market and loans to the cooperatives, there is no net loss of interest?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

POWER FOR BENEFIT OF DOMESTIC AND RURAL CONSUMERS

In forging this legislation, Congress wanted the people to get the benefit of such power. This is eminently reasonable because the people's tax dollars made such projects possible. And in its legislative policy Congress declared that such power be used for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers. This policy was announced in the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, and in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This legislative policy was continued in the Bonneville Act of 1937, and repeated in the Fort Peck Act of 1938.

Only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service by 1935.

Since its establishment, REA has greatly stimulated the extension of service into rural areas. Between 1935 and 1953, about 4,000,000 additional farms had been connected to power lines by all agencies, public and private. More than half of the farms connected to central-station lines since 1935 received electric service from REA-financed systems.

REA estimated that 4,740,849 of the farms recorded in the 1950 census, or 88.1 percent, were electrified by June 30, 1952.

Mr. President, that is dramatics in social and economic action. It is a miracle which has taken place before the eyes of the American people in the short span of years from 1935 to 1952—an increase in the electrification of the farms of America from 10.9 to 88.1 percent.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the part which the REA has played in this marvelous development of rural electricity has not cost the Federal Government or the taxpayers anything?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. It has not cost the taxpayers anything. It has been self-liquidating in nature. But I say it has done more than that; it has created for the taxpayers of America a tremendous wealth, because out of this program there has been derived the wealth-creating production electrification of the farms of America has made possible. From our great natural resources there has been created a new economic wealth in the form of the production of power the like of which it is difficult to find a comparable example of in the history of economic life in America.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is making a magnificent address. He spoke about our resources earlier in his address. Is it not also true that REA has contributed much to making possible diversified crop planning, wise land use, and a balanced agriculture which not only has done so much for the farmer but has also made a great contribution to the preservation of America's precious soil?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. He knows—and it is good to get it into the RECORD—that the great advance in electrifying the farms of America has, in many respects, revolutionized American agriculture. Not only has it increased the diversity of agriculture, but in the section of the country from which the Senator comes, in fact, throughout the great Southland of America, the bringing of electrification to the farms has had economic and social benefits which even yet cannot be fully comprehended. But they are all to the good. They have resulted in tremendous economic and social advancement for all our people.

But, Mr. President, let us stress this point. The fact is that it would not have happened if we had left the job to the private utilities of America. Why? Because the private utilities do not stretch their lines into the backward areas. They do not go into the areas where consumers in large numbers do not already exist. They wait for the population to be there. They have not made the contribution they should have made to the development of agriculture in America by stretching their lines and helping to create a desire for people to go into the backward areas and bring land there under cultivation.

That is why I think it is very important that we keep in mind the great principle of Lincoln when he talked about the relationship of government to the needs of the people. He was constantly reminding us—and I have always said to my Republican friends that they should not forget this basic tenet of Republicanism—that it is the duty of a nation composed of self-governing people, such as ours, to do for all the people what needs to be done to advance their general welfare, what they cannot so well do for themselves, and which, by doing for them, will vastly increase the economic wealth and productivity of our Nation.

Oh, it is not possible to get away from that social concept and economic concept of the great Lincoln in regard to the relationship of government to the economic needs of the people. Yet we hear references to creeping socialism, some trying to delude the American people into thinking that when the Government constructs great multiple-purpose dams and builds great grid-back transmission lines, it is participating in creeping socialism.

Let us not forget what happened just a few short months ago. Let us not forget that the issues of the campaign then being waged are still the issues facing the American people. Now that the time has come when the people can reflect upon some of the fear arguments presented to them during the campaign, I believe they will see a little more clearly the relationship between the development of the great natural resources of our country for the benefit of our people and the preservation of a private-property system and the so-called free-enterprise system.

When he hear people talking in demogogic fashion about creeping socialism because we propose to preserve for all the people the Nation's natural resources, and develop the potentiality of our streams for all the people, their arguments answer themselves.

Just ask them to look at the Hoover Dam and the economic development around it; to look at the Bonneville Dam and the economic development around it; to the Grand Coulee Dam and the economic development around it. In the case of each and every one of these multiple-purpose dams, if we look at the economic development around each one of them, we find a prosperous, growing private enterprise system, with businesses coming in which never would have come in if the Government had not built the dam. That is what I call coordination and teamwork between Government and private enterprise.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the best guaranty of the preservation of the private-enterprise system is not to let monopoly gain a stranglehold on the Nation's natural resources, because monopoly cannot be reconciled with private enterprise. Monopoly chokes to death private enterprise. Monopoly merely saves the profits for the "big boys." Monopoly merely follows the table-crumb theory, of brushing off just enough of the economic sustenance from the table to keep the masses satisfied.

Mr. President, that is not enough. The masses of our people are entitled to be partners and participants in the development of the natural resources of our country. That is why I say to my liberal friends in the Senate, go to your posts. Get ready to fight, because I am satisfied that in this session of Congress we are going to have to put up a fight against devious attempts to take away from the American people their control over their own property, represented by their heritage and their legacy in the natural resources of our country.

Mr. President, I say that although we have made great progress since 1935, that is not enough. Electric rates were formerly far too high. Use was not free or widespread because the rates were prohibitive. So Congress forged the next essential link in its Federal power policy. This related to the sale of such power. In various acts, Congress provided that such power be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. This basic congressional principle was set forth in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, and the Flood Control Act of 1944.

How wise Congress was can now be judged by the vastly lowered costs since this policy was adopted—which are less

than half what they formerly were—and the resulting tremendous upsurge in popular consumption of all kinds.

ENCOURAGING WIDE USAGE AND PREVENTING MONOPOLY

One essential still remained in a sound Federal power policy. Accordingly, in the development of congressional electric power policy, the next principle enunciated by Congress was that where a Federal project generates power, in disposing of it the marketing policies should be designed to encourage the widest possible use of such power, and, at the same time, to prevent its monopoly. This principle was embodied in the Tennessee Valley Authority of 1933, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, and the Flood Control Act of 1944.

PIONEERING WORK OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Laws that Congress passes are often legislative mandates indicating the general outline which national policies should follow—blueprints for the work to be undertaken. When such legislation exists, it is usually the technical knowledge, initiative, resourcefulness, planning, trial and error of the responsible executive agencies that translate the blueprints into actual Federal power programs. Consequently, when we speak of the development of a congressional power policy, we have to examine the operation of the executive agencies and departments that carry out these congressional laws.

We must pay tribute to the Federal executives and the corps of civilian employees who are responsible for manning these Federal agencies. Many of the tremendous achievements that have taken place in the field of national power and federally aided power programs are attributable to the technical know-how of these agencies.

Our Nation has been slow to develop a tradition of public service which can be our surest safeguard against venality and sloth in Government. The men and women who have dedicated themselves to providing cheap and plentiful power for the people have also contributed to the creation of a tradition of unselfish devotion to the public welfare. This is a little recognized but important by-product of public power.

While such persons generally could earn several times as much pay in private industry, a devotion to their Government and the people compels them to give their best, year in and year out, regardless of the low pay and the often humiliating circumstances that commonly accompany work for the Government, such as an attack upon them by the Congress, going so far as even to deny them pay for a period of months, while they devote themselves unselfishly and patriotically to the development of the natural resources of our country. Of course, I refer to the Michael Straus case, and I digress to pay my respects to Michael Straus for the interest he has manifested in the people's stake in the Nation's natural resources.

Notwithstanding all this, in the various Federal agencies that administer the national electric power policy today, we have a corps of men and women, finely trained public servants, who should be a source of real pride to any democracy. Here we have a great operating organization. The men and women have been trained for years, at tremendous cost to our Government, in order to perform these technical tasks. They stand ready and willing to serve the American people now as they always have before. This has been one of our main sources of strength and inspiration in carrying out the policies that have been enunciated by the Congress in the various acts on Federal power.

WHAT THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED

Let us glance at a single typical illustration of power progress, the Rural Electrification Administration, which now serves about 4 million consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. With an average of 5 persons to the family, this program is serving about 20 million people today.

In 1935, when the Government sought to aid the people in the rural sections who were living in dismal kerosene darkness, the usual cry went up: "It can't be done." There was good reason to accept this conclusion. For nearly a quarter of a century the private utilities had attempted to do a similar job. Only they had gone down the main highways for the most part, leaving the backroads and hinterland farm country to the primitive and hand-labor methods of their grandfathers.

So pursuant to Federal law, REA was given the supposedly impossible job of going into such backwoods territory where there were only 2 or 3 potential consumers to the mile. Surely, no more difficult task could have faced any Federal agency. Yet with courage, resourcefulness, and technical skill, REA waded in. Look at what this Federal agency has done for some 20,000,000 American rural residents as a result of the enlightened power policy of your Congress.

In 1935, when the REA began its operations, a mile of rural line cost about $2,000, according to the Federal Power Commission. In a comparatively short time, this healthy young REA agency was building a mile of line for $1,000, and in some instances as low as $600.

Moreover, it was a better mile of line. Whereas the previous "battleship" construction was designed for city use, the REA pioneers designed an entirely new type of line that was specifically adapted to rural territory.

In addition, the REA program through cooperatives is a model in local democracy and private ownership. Equally important, the rural folks are paying back their Federal loans promptly.

The total repayments of principal and interest on these loans have been $394 million. This sum includes $50 million that were paid before they were actually due and only $722,000 were delinquent.

This means that only one-fifth of 1 percent of the total amount loaned is more than 30 days overdue. Let me repeat that figure—one-fifth of 1 percent. I venture the opinion that no bank or financial institution in the United States has such a marvelous record of collections. And remember, these loans were made in the heretofore underdeveloped areas of rural America.

I am sure Senators will be interested to know that in the 17 years of the existence of REA only a little more than $40,000 has been written off as uncollectible.

REA SETS THE PATTERN

As a result of our wise congressional power policy—in this case loans to local organizations of rural citizens—REA set the pattern for the private utilities as well. Whereas previously these utilities had almost completely disregarded local customers—except at prohibitive rates and charges which the country folks could not afford to pay—now they began competing fiercely with the REA cooperatives for this newly developed rural business.

What are the results of this proved Federal power policy in the case of REA? In 1935 before the REA was started, only about 10 percent of the rural areas and farms had high-line or central-station electric service. Today, thanks to a wise congressional power policy, nearly 90 percent of the rural residents of this country have such electric service. And at rates which are half or less of what they formerly paid.

Truly, electricity is now the perennial, cheap, uncomplaining hired hand of the countryside. Need any finer illustration be given of the proven and tested nature of a wise congressional power policy? The overwhelming facts speak forcefully for themselves.

In the words of Norris, the father of national electric power policy:

> How marvelous that this water, which once went wasted to the sea, can be put to work in this way to make life easier for humanity—lighten the burden of the woman at her washtub and in the kitchen, to ease the labor and toil of the farmer in his barn, to turn factory wheels which will provide payrolls and produce things to add to human comfort and security.

TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW

As a result of this tremendous accomplishment in all the Federal agencies having to do with the conservation and development of our water and power resources, there is available today a vast field of technical knowledge that was not in existence previously. In a real sense of the word, these agencies have been pioneers. They have drawn the best from private technology, and by adaptation and creation, they have increased, tremendously, the technological base of our power knowledge.

New problems and new situations have been a constant challenge. From wise policies of field work and experimentation by Federal agencies, we have developed our technical grasp on power matters. It is impossible to estimate the value of such technical knowledge and its benefits to the public users and private industry alike.

TECHNICAL AID FOR THE PEOPLE

From the beginning of our Government to date, Congress has attempted to pass legislation to provide essential public services that would enable it to do for all the people things that they could not do for themselves.

In the field of national electric power policy, the same thing has been true. Instead of being the helpless victims of their own lack of technical information, or being denied better ways of living because they could not afford engineering advice in order to attain such ends, now the people, or their agents, can turn to their Government departments for technical aid in the field of power. This is a very healthy sign of democracy. It permits the people to be educated, and then to do things for themselves.

Again let us take the illustration of the REA. This is no nationwide Federal bureaucracy. On the contrary, it consists of local organizations of local people, governing themselves. It is a good example of self-government of a free people put to work in developing their own economic life.

They choose their own board of directors and president. They hire their own employees to manage their own projects and they lay down the policies that shall be pursued.

This is democracy at work. It is a far cry from the claims of bureaucracy and Washington domination that the public power opponents describe in charges which have no relation to the actual facts.

Every form of liberty and freedom we possess today is the result of a long and bitter struggle against ruthless and selfish enemies. Once such freedoms are established they become the very essence of our liberty, and freemen should fight to preserve them.

Throughout the land, selfish forces are at work seeking to confuse the people, and trying to make them believe that the highly profitable interests of a few are the same as the needs of all the people who use electricity. In over a generation of time, the people and their representatives in Congress have forged out a wise national resources program that is designed to preserve our possibly dwindling heritage of natural resources and power for all the people.

It is a wise policy which has ripened into rich accomplishments. It is a sound policy that assures America of continued progress in the forward march of democracy.

Low electric rates, more productive farms, arduous tasks made lighter, comfort and leisure, thriving and expanding industry are but some of the results. But we cannot afford to plume ourselves upon the past.

Intelligent as we Americans are, we might as well admit that we continually underestimate the growing needs for electric power for basic industries, vital both to defense and to the civilian economy. We underestimated in World War II and we underestimated in the present crisis. It is time we got out of the habit of inadequate power programing.

Our experience shows that we have a basically sound program. We must use that program to meet our continuing problem with the boldness and imagination that characterize our people. If we will—and we must—then we shall truly keep faith with the great Teddy Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and the great George Norris.

PUBLIC POWER PREFERENCE AND PUBLIC POWER TRANSMISSION LINES—RESOLUTION OF WASCO COUNTY POMONA POWER COMMITTEE, THE DALLES, OREG.

Mr. President, I now present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Wasco County Pomona Power Committee of The Dalles, Oreg., favoring continuation of public preference provisions in Federal power legislation and congressional authorization for the construction of Government transmission facilities for bringing public power to nonprofit cooperatives and public bodies. I request that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in a democracy the government is not something different and apart from the people, but is, instead, the representative and instrumentality of the people, and what the government owns the people own; and, therefore, the government must always use government property for the greatest benefit of the largest number of the people; and

Whereas this basic principle of democracy has, since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and continuing without interruption to date, always been a part of the law of the land applicable to the hydroelectric generating facilities constructed and operated by the Government, by virtue of the provisions in different statutes under which the people, through governmental subdivisions or mutual self-help organizations such as cooperatives, have been given the first right to purchase the electric power generated by their Government-operated dams; and

Whereas to retain the integrity of this basic democratic principle, it is essential that the relationship between the Government and the people be direct, and without any intervening agent in the position of a toll-taker to profit both from the operations of the Government and the people, and, as a practical matter, it is absolutely necessary that the Government construct all transmission facilities which are needed to bring the power to the geographical points where it can be taken and used by people's organizations; and

Whereas eastern Oregon has been mutually benefited by this basic law, giving farmers' organizations the power to deliver to the widely scattered farms and ranches in this area, and without this benefit the cooperatives could not receive wholesale power at cost for delivery to these farms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to the Wasco County Pomona Grange No. 11, regularly assembled at Cherry Park Grange, this 3d day of February 1953, That the Congress be urged to continue to protect the interests of the people, as the owners of Government power-generating facilities, in their long-established right of first purchase of Government generated power, through their public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives created by the people for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress also be urged to make this right of first purchase by the people a realistic fact instead of only a theoretical right by authorizing the construction, by Government power-marketing agencies, of all transmission facilities needed to bring this power to public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives, and by appropriating the necessary moneys therefor.

WASCO COUNTY POMONA POWER COMMITTEE,
WALTER J. WEBB, *Master.*
LILLIE O. TINDALL, *Secretary.*

EVALUATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to discuss one further item, which is unrelated to the subject which I have just discussed, and which involves some floor-committee work which I need to do today.

I refer to a release issued by the Director for Mutual Security, Mr. Stassen. It is release No. 28. I wish to comment on the release by reading from and associating myself completely with the remarks which were made last night by Frank Edwards over the Mutual Broadcasting System, in regard to the problem which is represented by this release.

Mr. Edwards said last night:

In recent weeks the Senate has performed commendably by refusing to approve the nomination of various agency officials until those appointees had complied with the law. They were not confirmed until they had severed their financial relations with firms doing business with the Government.

Tonight I have before me some documents which disclose a situation which merits immediate Senate attention.

Mr. Harold Stassen, the Director for Mutual Security, has named a group of 55 business and financial executives who are to make an evaluation of the multibillion-dollar MSA program, at public expense. This group will be divided into 11 separate teams, 1 team to each country. The findings of these 55 men will determine how and where additional billions of taxpayers' dollars shall be spent in foreign-aid programs.

Mr. Stassen says: "The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in a position to make an objective and independent judgment."

Any Senator who is interested will find those words of Mr. Stassen's on page 3 of DMS No. 28, available at his office.

I shall make it available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a moment. It will show who are some of the men who have been chosen to exercise their independent judgment.

Mr. Edwards goes on to say:

Just who are these men whom Mr. Stassen has chosen to make what he calls an objective and independent judgment? Do they qualify and, if so, on what grounds?

I have before me another very interesting document covering the financial commitments of Mutual Security Administration, setting forth the list of banking houses which have handled more than $5 billion worth of MSA expenditures on a commission basis.

Upon comparing the list of financially interested institutions with the list of men selected by Mr. Stassen for Operation Tycoon, I find some very interesting connections. For example: On the team which will go to France at public expense to evaluate MSA performance is Mr. Orson Adams, vice president of the First National Bank of Boston. Checking against the record, I find that Mr. Adams' bank has handled $101 million worth of MSA funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is making a very interesting speech. However, I did not quite hear what the operation is to be

called. Is it Operation Typhoon or Operation Tycoon?

Mr. MORSE. It is Operation Tycoon, but I will tell the Senator what I think it will result in. It will result in Operation Typhoon, because it will flood this country with a lot of propaganda, which will make the rich boys richer before we get through with it.

Going back to Mr. Edwards' broadcast, he says:

On the team which will visit Belgium is Mr. Russell Wardburgh, vice president of Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City. His bank has handled more than $421 million worth of mutual-security commitments.

The team which will make what Mr. Stassen calls an independent and objective evaluation of MSA expenditures in the Philippines will have as a member Mr. David Grove, Bank of America, San Francisco. The Bank of America, according to the official records, has done more than $388 million worth of business in MSA commitments.

The list goes on and on. The records are available to any Senator who is interested. Mr. Stassen has selected men who are associated with concerns handling fabulous amounts of MSA financial commitments. He says he expects them to render an objective and independent judgment.

Not only does Stassen select men whose banks are doing billions of dollars' worth of business with MSA, but nowhere on the list will you find the name of a single representative of small business, farmers, or wage earners—the groups which make up the bulk of the Nation's taxpayers, the millions of men and women who provide the MSA funds.

In case any Member of the United States Senate is interested in Operation Tycoon and the relationships between its members and the MSA money, it might be well to check further into this matter.

The Senators who did such a commendable job in dealing with the financial affairs of Mr. Wilson and his teammates might ask some questions concerning Operation Tycoon.

Can a man deliver an objective and independent judgment on the expenditures of Government funds when he is connected with a bank that is making a profit handling those funds?

Some Senator might also inquire if any of the men chosen for Operation Tycoon were also contributors to Mr. Stassen's campaign funds.

To quote Mr. Stassen's own words again: "The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in a position to make an objective and independent judgment."

Truer words were never spoken. The taxpayers of America must look to the Members of the United States Senate for assurance that the men who make the decisions are not the same men who profit by them. Operation Tycoon needs a public airing.

I quite agree with that statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the press release DMS No. 28, dated February 9, 1953.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Harold Stassen, the Director for Mutual Security, announced today the appointment of a group of business and financial leaders to make an evaluation of the mutual-security program and personnel in 14 countries, 9 in Europe, and 5 in the Far East. The countries to be visited are those which involve the largest dollar expenditures in the program: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom; Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam—the Associated States of Indochina; the Republic of China on Formosa; and the Philippines.

The evaluation group, which will serve without compensation, is headed by Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board of General Foods Corp. Mr. Francis has selected 54 associates to assist him in the study. The group will divide itself into 11 teams. The mutual-security program will be studied in each country by a separate team, except for Holland and Belgium which will be studied by a single team, and the Associated States of Indochina which will be studied by one team.

The entire study group will meet in Washington February 9 and 10 for background discussion with Government officials responsible for administration of the mutual-security program. The teams will then go to their respective countries. It is anticipated that the reports of the various teams will be received in Washington toward the latter part of March. The preparation of the final report will be supervised by Mr. Francis, who will himself probably visit France, Germany, Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

Each team, within the area under its study, will look into the operations of the mutual-security program, including the current status of the different parts—both military and economic—of the program, the effectiveness of the program, and the effectiveness of United States organization and personnel. The group will look into, among other matters, the military end-item and training programs, the offshore procurement program, the use of defense-support goods or commodities financed by the Mutual Security Agency, the productivity program in Europe, and other major elements of the mutual-security program.

Mr. Stassen, in announcing the appointment of the evaluation group, said:

"I am delighted that this group of distinguished Americans has agreed to take part in the evaluation project. Knowing of their many other commitments, I would not have asked them to undertake a new obligation of this kind if I did not feel this particular project to be of real importance to the successful conduct of the mutual-security program. As is well known, President Eisenhower and those of us who are associated with him in this administration believe that this program is essential to the security of the United States.

"The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in position to make an objective and independent judgment.

"I believe that the work of this group during the next month will be of vital importance not only to me personally as Director for Mutual Security, not only to President Eisenhower's administration, but, in addition, to the welfare of the United States and of the whole free world."

Attached is a list containing the names and positions of the team leaders and the team members, and the countries to be visited.

MSP EVALUATION PROJECT

Task force coordinator: Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., Postum Building, 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Member: Mr. Edwin T. Gibson, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, 116th Street and Broadway, New York, N. Y.

DENMARK

Team leader: Mr. Walter Marden Ringer, chairman of board and director, Foley Manufacturing Co., 3300 Northeast Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

Members: Mr. Paul E. Miller, director, agricultural extension service, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.; Mr. Newton Franklin Korhumel, president, Korhumel Steel & Aluminum Co., 2424 Oakton Street, Evanston, Ill.; Mr. Henry Bradford Arthur, economist, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.

FORMOSA

Team leader: Mr. Harry Amos Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., 400 Second Avenue S., Minneapolis, Minn.

Members: Mr. Norwood Francis Allman, senior partner (Allman, Kops, and Lee, American law firm of Shanghai, China), 390 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Clinton Morrison, vice president, manager, and director, the Holding Co., 1119 First National Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mr. Raymond Tyson Moyer, deputy director, division of overseas activities, the Ford Foundation, 914 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif.; Maj. Gen. William Arthur Worton, USMC (retired), care of Jonathan Club, 545 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

FRANCE

Team leader: Mr. Joseph Peter Spang, Jr., president, the Gillette Co., 15 West First Street, Boston, Mass.

Members: Mr. Orson Adams, Jr., vice president, First National Bank of Boston, 67 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Norbert A. Bogdan (now in France), director of finance, Ford International, 445 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Robert March Gaylord, president, Ingersoll Milling Machine Co., Rockford, Ill.; Mr. Malcolm Chilson Stewart, general counsel, the Gillette Co., 15 West First Street, Boston, Mass.

GERMANY

Team leader: Mr. Reuben Buck Robertson, Jr., president, the Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Hamilton, Ohio.

Members: Mr. Matthew L. Devine, care of Cresap, McCormick & Paget, 100 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Bruce D. Henderson, general manager, purchases and traffic, Westinghouse Electric Corp., 401 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mr. Jefferson Ward Keener, vice president, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio; Mr. Charles Emerson Marshall, vice president, Texas Industries, Inc., 400 First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; Mr. Walter W. Tangeman, executive vice president, Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

GREECE

Team leader: Mr. Thomas A. Morgan, 217 East 62d Street, New York, N. Y.

Members: Mr. Reginald E. Gillmor, 2801 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. James C. Olson, partner, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Industrial Engineering Corp., 265 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Mr. James L. Palmer, president, Marshall Field & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Dr. R. L. Sexton, Medical Building, 1801 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

HOLLAND AND BELGIUM

Team leader: Mr. Paul Boole McKee, president, Pacific Power & Light Co., 1509 Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

Members: Mr. William T. Hamilton (now in Greece and Switzerland), purchasing agent, Ebasco Services, Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.; Vice Adm. Monroe Kelly, United States Navy (retired), Linkhorn Park, Virginia Beach, Va.; Mr. Hubert J. Soher, general partner, Hubert J. Soher—Economic Consultants, 2814 Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. Edgar Smith, partner, Edgar W. Smith & Sons, 852 Pittock Block, Portland, Oreg.; Mr. Russell L. Wardburgh, vice president, Guaranty Trust Co., 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

INDOCHINA

Team leader: Mr. Brayton Wilbur, president, Wilbur Ellis Co., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Members: Mr. Gordon W. Aitken, 331 Rock Road, Glenrock, N. J.; Mr. Arthur I. Bloomfield, senior economist, Federal Reserve Bank

of New York, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Robert Anderson Magowan, partner, care of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

ITALY

Team leader: Mr. Frederick C. Crawford, president, Thompson Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Members: Mr. Ernest Carhartt Brelsford, assistant treasurer, Thompson Products, Inc., 23555 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Carter Coslet Kissell, partner, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Col. Whitmell T. Rison, 2626 South Buchanan Street, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Lawrence E. J. Jamison, 25 Devon Road, Darien, Conn.

PHILIPPINES

Team leader: Mr. F. N. Belgrano, Jr., president, the First National Bank of Portland, Portland, Oreg.

Members: Mr. Stephen P. Chadwick, attorney, 656 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. William Howarth Dennick, consultant, McKinney & Co., Russ Building, 235 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. David L. Grove, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. Richard Walberg, general partner, Swinerton & Walberg Co., 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

TURKEY

Team leader: Mr. Frederick Morris Sayre, honorary chairman of the board, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

Members: Mr. Robert Biattner, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Amos Herbert Flint, chief engineer, Corn Products Refining Co., 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. John William Scott, Jr., comptroller, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

UNITED KINGDOM

Team leader: Mr. Henning W. Prentis, Jr., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.

Members: Mr. Arthur B. Foye, senior partner, Haskins & Sells, 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Mr. James H. McGraw, Jr., 79 East Seventy-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Hans A. Widenmann, partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close this discussion by saying to my good liberal friends in and out of Congress: Stop talking about a honeymoon. The issues are already joined. It is a fight between liberalism protecting the interests of the American people, and reaction, which seeks now by law the enactment of proposals, which will appear on the floor of the Senate in the months ahead, to exploit the American people for the selfish interests of a few. There is no time to wait or waste. We must join the issue with them, figuratively speaking, and fight them in the streets, in the alleys, and on the housetops, and not let them get their guns of exploitation entrenched to mow down, as they will, if we do not stop them, the public interest.

Mr. President, I know of no time in American history when it was more important that the liberals in Congress cling tenaciously to our system of checks and balances. That is why the junior Senator from Oregon, starting on January 3, right through to Inauguration Day, on January 20, took the position that he proposed to make certain that there is maintained a constant vigilance in applying the checks and balances of our Constitution against steamroller tactics in the Senate.

While on the subject, Mr. President, let me say to my critics that on January 20, when I blocked Cabinet nominations, I did so in order to keep faith with the forefathers of our country in making certain that time was provided for an analysis of recommendations of the Chief Executive to the Senate, and that no nomination would be steamrollered through the Senate.

For 8 years the junior Senator from Oregon, more than any other Senator, and many times in specific instances more than any other Senator, has objected to unanimous-consent requests when proposed by the Democratic majority, seeking to have immediate action without full consideration on the floor of the Senate. Why should I not apply the same principle to the Republicans? I shall never substitute the judgment of a committee for my responsibility on the floor of the Senate.

I make those comments because the broadcast by Frank Edwards and the evidence he presented in connection with the broadcast show again, I believe, how important it is that the liberals in the Senate be on guard and proceed to carry out their function of watchdogs, and do something more than bark. It is important that we bite into these issues and bring to the American people the facts they need to know in regard to the designs of a reactionary administration upon the public welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that certainly he has bitten hard today, and certainly he has sounded in most able and effective fashion a challenge to REA groups and other friends of public power and all others who are genuinely concerned with public power and our other great natural resources.

So I congratulate the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama in praising the Senator from Oregon on the purpose of his speech.

It may be that I am somewhat older than the Senator from Oregon and, therefore, have within me less bellicosity than does he. I hope very much that the incoming administration will not sponsor the measures the Senator from Oregon fears it will sponsor. Until it does sponsor such measures, I prefer to give the incoming administration the benefit of the doubt. I do not wish to have as close relationships with the incoming administration as might be indicated by the phrase "honeymoon," but I do wish to preserve friendly relationships with the administration.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I always admire very much his faith in people, but I have already seen enough and heard enough, having listened to and having read the proposals of the spokesmen for the administration, and being aware of their purport, to be convinced that this is the hour to start the battle. That is why I made my speech today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, that if he is convinced of that, of course he should begin the battle. But I do not wish to start indiscriminate firing until I see precisely what is under way.

Mr. MORSE. Figuratively speaking, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, that we are going to keep his gun in reserve, and we shall welcome his enlistment whenever he gets ready to join the ranks. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent entered into prior to the delivery of the address of the Senator from Oregon, the Senate agreed to adjourn at the conclusion of its business today until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon. Therefore, if there is no further business, under the previous order, the Senate now stands adjourned.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13, 1953:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A, Regular Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, Alaskan Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, 50A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, retired.

Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, 11A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner, 6A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Donold B. Lourie, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration.

AIR FORCE

H. Lee White, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

PATENT OFFICE

Robert Clement Watson, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, facing the clamant calls and the demanding tasks of another week we would bow for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy divine grace. We acknowledge before Thee that our lives are restless pools. We are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. Amid the tensions of these terrific days we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them, but praying for Thy empowering so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry.

May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In a divided and violent world may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because our records here and now shall write our names among today's peacemakers. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a special order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to appoint a Senator to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d day of February. Since the 22d day of February falls upon Sunday, the reading of the farewell address this year will take place on February 23.

In making the appointment the Presiding Officer always alternates between the two sides of the aisle. At this time the appointment falls to a member of the majority. The Chair takes great pleasure in appointing the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to perform this function.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE PILOTS' ASSOCIATION FOR THE BAY AND RIVER DELAWARE, BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Treasury Department had settled the claim of the Pilots' Association for the Bay and River Delaware, in the amount of $5,205.52; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF DEED C. THURMAN, JR., BY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Public Health Service had settled the claim of Deed C. Thurman, Jr., in the amount of $1,108.34; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO TRANSMISSION OF FIREARMS IN THE MAILS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution relating to legislation affecting Federal support for butter now before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas the Federal Government support of butter prices at the present level of 90 percent of parity expires on March 31, 1953; and

"Whereas butter prices already have fallen more than 15 cents a pound to that Federal support level of 67¾ cents a pound for grade A butter; and

"Whereas the dairy industry is already suffering severely and would be dangerously injured by a further drastic price drop; and

"Whereas the Federal Government can legally use its flexible powers after March 31, 1953, to lower the support price level to 75 percent of parity which would be a cut of about 11 cents a pound; and

"Whereas the present Federal administration is pledged to maintain through 1953 and 1954 the Federal price supports of six basic farm commodities including corn, a dairy feed, raising a major dairy cost; and

"Whereas the price support level for butter determines the level of Federal price supports for other dairy products and is therefore basic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of representatives and the senate concurring do urge that in simple fairness to dairying and to avert severe injury to producers and consumers of milk and milk products, the Federal Government forthwith announce that the present 90 percent support level for butter which expires on March 31, 1953, will be extended through the year 1954; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution, properly attested, by the proper officers of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ANCHER NELSEN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, the 6th day of February, 1953.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"By MYRTLE R. BARNES,
"First Assistant Chief Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate, the 9th day of February, 1953.

"CY GOSREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved February 9, 1953.

"C. EDWARD ANDERSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the 190th Fighter Interceptor Squadron of the Air National Guard of Idaho has just returned from a tour of active duty with the Air Force, stripped of its equipment and faced with the necessity of rebuilding completely in order to continue its function as part of the organized militia forces of the Nation; and

"Whereas it is necessary that the 190th Fighter Interceptor Squadron of the Air National Guard of Idaho, as well as other air-guard units of the Nation returning from active duty, be equipped with aircraft of the proper type for training purposes as soon as possible; and

"Whereas the 190th Fighter Interceptor Squadron of the Air National Guard of Idaho is a key part of the northwestern air defense and is in urgent need of proper equipment to perform this task: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to make an investigation and take such action as it deems necessary to implement the equipping of the Air National Guard units returning from active duty, and that the Air National Guard units be informed of the plans for the future equipping of the Air National Guard units; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho, to the Chief of Air Forces, and to the Chief of Air National Guard Bureau.

"This joint memorial passed the house on the 31st day of January 1953.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 5th day of February 1953.

"EDSON H. DEAL,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the cities of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Seward, Palmer, and Nenana, Alaska, together with the balance of the area known as the Alaska Railbelt, are hampered in their growth by a severe shortage of electric power; and

"Whereas military establishments within this most strategic section of the Territory of Alaska similarly are handicapped by a power shortage; and

"Whereas a preliminary study by the Bureau of Reclamation has established that a hydroelectric power dam and plant can be constructed at Devil Canyon on the Susitna River so as to generate 1,150,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually of firm power at a cost of less than 10 mills per kilowatt-hour; and

"Whereas this energy transmitted to the cities and areas named above would solve the power problems of the Alaska Railbelt and would find a ready market which would insure repayment of the Federal investment in the dam and power and transmission facilities.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States enact suitable legislation to authorize and carry forward construction of the Devil Canyon Dam on the Susitna River, together with appurtenant power production and transmission facilities, as a Federal project.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 2, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 5, 1953.

"CHAS. D. JONES,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DORA M. SWEENEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 10, 1953.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution F

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Senate of the 83d Congress of the United States to renew the International Wheat Agreement

"Whereas in operation and objectives the International Wheat Agreement has exceeded expectations in helping to stabilize the world wheat market and world wheat prices, and has contributed immeasurably to a better international understanding and cooperation; and

"Whereas said International Wheat Agreement has proved to be an effective bulwark against communism in those lands in which it has been used to provide wheat for hungry people; and

"Whereas to permit the International Wheat Agreement to expire would be to critically reduce this Nation's export market, which under the export allotment of this agreement has annually exceeded 250 million bushels of wheat; and would dangerously depress wheat prices; and necessitate drastic acreage restrictions on wheat producers; and

"Whereas termination of the agreement would deprive hungry people throughout the world of desperately needed food, and would provide communism with additional propaganda material; and

"Whereas the experience has demonstrated that food is of critical importance in aiding the extension and strengthening of democracy and the furtherance of peace and understanding throughout the world; and is equally important in combating the advancement of communism; and

"Whereas the cost of maintaining the International Wheat Agreement is but a small part of the cost of combating communism in comparison with the necessary cost of maintaining our military forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That it is the sense of this assembly that the International Wheat Agreement should be renewed on terms that are fair, just, and workable for all participating nations; and that this assembly does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Senate of the 83d Congress of the United States to take the lead, and in a sincere spirit of international cooperation and good faith, to resume immediately negotiations with participating nations to the end that the International Wheat Agreement be renewed and extended for a period of 4 more years; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be properly authenticated by the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, and sent to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Vice President, as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to each Member of the Senate of the United States.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 11. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 39); and

S. Res. 68. Resolution extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 40); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 41); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably 13 resolutions, and I submit certain reports thereon. Four of the resolutions provide for the payment of death gratuities to the estates of certain employees of the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, in reporting these resolutions to the Senate, has asked me to say that payment under the terms of the resolutions recommended is in accordance with the policy adopted by that committee last summer. This policy would have the customary death gratuities paid hereafter by resolution in accordance with a graduated scale based, under certain conditions, on the length of the Government service of the deceased employee. In this fashion, the estates of the older employees of the Senate, as well as those who have had long Government service before coming to the Senate will profit in accordance with that service.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief summary of the method to be used for the preparation of the resolutions in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be received, and the resolutions will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The summary presented by Mr. JENNER is as follows:

SUMMARY

1. Estates of Senate employees shall be accorded gratuity benefits by Senate resolution if such employees (a) die while in the service of the Senate, and (b) if they have

served 12 consecutive months on the Senate payroll at the time of their deaths.

2. Such gratuity benefits shall be computed on the basis of 1 month's salary compensation for each year served up to six or fraction thereof.

3. After 6 years' service, and while the employee is in his 17th year of employment, the next of kin or the estate of that employee shall receive one-half month's salary for each additional year of total service, or fraction thereof.

4. In no event shall the estate of a Senate employee receive more than 1 year's salary compensation by any death gratuity resolution.

5. Previous Government service, under certain conditions, shall figure in the amount which may be computed to be paid to the estate of a deceased employee.

6. Employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, serving on the Senate side, shall have the right of these same conditions, save that no compensation greater than 6 months' salary shall be paid to their estates or next of kin if they die in office.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses; with amendments.

S. Res. 44. Resolution extending authority for the investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 44);

S. Res. 45. Resolution extending the authority for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and the formulation of a fuel policy for the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 45);

S. Res. 56. Resolution providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 43);

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to have printed for its use certain matter relating to the immigration laws; with an amendment; and

S. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing expenditures for an investigation of national penitentiaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 42).

JANE E. HENDERSON

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Jane E. Henderson, widow of I. Henry Henderson, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AGNES P. DODGE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Agnes P. Dodge, widow of Louis Dodge, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 month's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HARRY BEST

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Harry Best, widower of Mabel Goodwin Haller, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ANNIE MAY BOLTON

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Annie May Bolton, widow of Guy T. Bolton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF 55TH ANNUAL REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 76), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the 55th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1952, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTIONS AMENDING SO-CALLED CLOTURE RULE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 77), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, 2,000 copies of the hearings on the Senate Resolutions 41, 52, 105, and 203, 82d Congress, first session, relative to amending Senate rule XXII relating to cloture.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 2570, AUTHORIZING THE CONDUCT OF PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARIES

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 78), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration 2,000 copies of the hearing during the 82d Congress, second session, on the bill (S. 2570) to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 926. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection, and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 927. A bill for the relief of Dr. Milan Gavrilovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 928. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Millionis; and

S. 930. A bill for the relief of Martin Anthony Beekman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 931. A bill for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 932. A bill to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 933. A bill for the relief of Alpheus Herbert McKenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 934. A bill to provide an identical basis for award of death pension to widows and children; and

S. 935. A bill to increase certain disability pension awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 936. A bill for the relief of Monika Klein;

S. 937. A bill for the relief of Virginia Grande;

S. 938. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Mintz;

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian;

S. 940. A bill for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gassarrini;

S. 941. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mascitti;

S. 942. A bill for the relief of Thomas Kominos;

S. 943. A bill for the relief of Oswald James Burton;

S. 944. A bill for the relief of George Vatakis;

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Moshe Gips;

S. 946. A bill for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen;

S. 947. A bill for the relief of John Marcos Pafalios;

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Panos Michalopoulos;

S. 949. A bill for the relief of Karol Herse and his wife, Maria; and

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Miltiadis Theodosios Svoronos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 951. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; and

S. 952. A bill to amend section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 953. A bill for the relief of Mary Thalia Wommack Webb; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 954. A bill for the relief of Robert Harold Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 955. A bill providing for the initiation and promotion of pasture development and water conservation development projects through certain experiment stations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 956. A bill for the relief of Julianne Lee Nelson (Strutzenberger); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 957. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; and

S. 958. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 959. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes;

S. 960. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations;

S. 961. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; and

S. 962 (by request). A bill to amend section 2151 of title 18, United States Code, relating to sabotage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 963. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 964. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 965. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 966. A bill for the relief of Demitrious Vasilious Karavogeorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 967. A bill to extend the duration of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 968. A bill for the relief of Elisa Ana Tesar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 969. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS (by request):

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PASTURE AND WATER CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the initiation and promotion of pasture development and water conservation development projects through certain experiment stations in Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and recommendations for soil conservation and management research on crop and pasture lands in Oklahoma, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and recommendations will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 955) providing for the initiation and promotion of pasture development and water conservation development projects through certain experiment stations in Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement, resolution, and recommendations, presented by Mr. KERR, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

On January 12 the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts held their annual meeting in Oklahoma City. The meeting was attended by 400 State soil conservation district supervisors.

These men came from every corner of the State of Oklahoma at their own expense in order to transact the business of their soil conservation districts and to join hands with one another to promote a sound soil conservation program in our State.

Oklahoma is one of the leading States in the matter of soil conservation accomplishments. Almost every square mile of the State is organized into soil conservation districts with the exception of one of the 77 counties.

At this meeting certain resolutions were adopted on the basis of the need of strengthening the program. A resolution which was adopted seeks an appropriation of $200,000 to initiate and expand the soil conservation and management research program under the Soils Division of the United States Department of Agriculture at the Red Plains conservation experiment station near Guthrie and the Wheatland conservation experiment station located near Cherokee, Okla. They further seek a continuing appropriation amounting to $100,000 a year to carry on the required research work.

Resolution No. 8 pertains to the management research program being conducted in cooperation with the land grant colleges.

The reason that I take the time of the United States Senate and ask inclusion of the documents in the RECORD is evident to every Member of this body. Never in our history have we been made so aware of the necessity of conserving and properly utilizing the soil and water resources of this land as at the present time.

Out in my part of the country we are still in the throes of one of the most severe drouths in the history of weather bureau records. Every day the necessity of conserving the soil and water of our land is being demonstrated to us. The other day I stood in the foyer of the Commerce Building and watched the lights flicker across a large map of the United States and saw it record the increase in our population at a rate of one every 13 seconds. It dramatically indicated to me the responsibility that is upon our shoulders to provide the food, clothing, and shelter which is needed for this ever-increasing population of ours. And, added to this—we are assuming responsibilities beyond our borders which cannot be taken lightly. We must conserve our soil—we must make our productive acres more productive, if we are to meet the ever-increasing demand upon our agricultural production plant.

I therefore urge that the action that was taken by the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts be vitalized by the passage of the bill which I have introduced.

RESOLUTION VIII

Whereas the soil conservation and management research program being conducted in cooperation with land grant colleges is of vital importance to soil conservation district operations by pointing out the best possible soil conservation measures and sound land use; and

Whereas funds for this purpose have been greatly reduced to the point of seriously crippling the research program; and

Whereas new investigations are needed for permeating or preventing plow-pans in soils and for wise development and use of pasture resources from brush land and in conjunction with crop rotations and fertilizer combinations on cultivated land to reduce erosion, utilize moisture and maintain agricultural production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts assembled in Oklahoma City this 12th day of January 1953, go on record requesting a special appropriation of $200,000 to initiate this project and $100,000 each year thereafter to continue this research in Oklahoma; the funds to be provided to the Soils Division of the United States Agricultural Research Administration for expanding the soils research at the Red Plains Conservation Experiment Station, Guthrie, and the Wheatland Conservation Experiment Station, Cherokee, and in field trial studies on cooperative farms; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of our Oklahoma delegation in Congress; the Secretary of Agriculture; the president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts; the Director of the Agricultural Research Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; and Chief, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Research Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW SOIL CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ON CROP AND PASTURE LANDS OF OKLAHOMA

Investigations are needed to give guidance to a better understanding of land capabilities and methods of conserving, developing, and managing soil, water, and vegetation for land protection and improvement on both

crop and pasture land of Oklahoma. Problems of this nature must be approached from this standpoint of combination of land-treatment measures and practices. The primary purpose of which would be to reduce erosion and runoff and fully utilize moisture, keeping in mind that the measures must conform to the needs of the land and to a long-time sustained agricultural program. Some of the important combination of factors are (1) sound land use, (2) water control, (3) soil improvement, (4) cropping systems and rotations, and (5) farm management. Such a system of land use and treatment factors involves the use of livestock. They are necessary in order to use the grass and forage that would otherwise be wasted.

Individual treatments and practices for controlling erosion, conserving moisture, and bringing eroded and unused land into production have been studied since 1929 at the Red Plains Conservation Experiment Station, Guthrie, Okla., and since 1939 at the Wheatland Conservation Experiment Station, Cherokee, Okla. The Red Plains station was the first of its kind to be established in the country. Much valuable information has been obtained, but the results show that terraces and contour cultivation alone are not enough. We need to know what results to expect from the application of land-treatment measures and practices of the above nature. To get the answer, or to arrive at the best solution of the problem, many elements must be examined individually and in combination to best determine the benefit-cost relationship. Some of this work is under way on these stations, but the research program needs to be expanded.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CROPLAND

Intensive land-treatment measures and practices are needed on approximately 7 million acres of cropland in Oklahoma. Plow pans are also very extensive on some 13.9 million acres of cultivated land of this State. This plow pan is a very dense soil layer occurring at the bottom of the tillage operations. It is so tight that plant roots often fail to penetrate it. Its presence greatly limits the movement of water into the soil and thereby increases runoff and erosion. This restrictive layer is also detrimental to crop production. Information is needed, therefore, to find out how this compacted layer is formed, why it is formed and how the formation may be prevented and destroyed.

Crop rotations

With the increased demand for more and more production of food and fiber to provide for the ever-increasing population, all possible methods of conservation farming for increased production need further investigation. The value of crop rotations of grass-legumes-fertilizer combinations needs to be determined for land of different capabilities. These studies should be especially designed to determine species of grass or legume to use, length of rotation, and effects of such rotations on controling erosion, reducing runoff, and maintaining crop yields. The pasture value of the sod-like crops in the rotations needs to be determined along with the effectiveness of such rotations and a livestock system of farming on erosion and flood control.

Tillage methods

Stubble mulch tillage is an important practice from the standpoint of wind and water erosion. Much more information, however, is needed on proper methods and machines for maintaining such mulches in periods of recurring weed growth and plant diseases, and effectiveness of stubble mulch tillage in combinations with legume-grass rotations on physical properties of soil, maintenance of fertility, moisture conservation, and erosion.

Organic matter

The serious loss of organic matter from cropland is alarming. Green manure crops and rotations have been effective but under arid and semiarid conditions, none of the usual methods were sufficient to maintain organic matter content. It is so important from the standpoint of soil and water conservation—physical—chemical properties and biological life of the soil, and production that intensive research is needed on all possible sources of organic matter, its nature and decomposition in soil and cropping and cultural practices for maintaining and improving the organic matter content of the soil.

PASTURE AND GRASSLAND IMPROVEMENT

Temporary and permanent pastures occupy about 18.5 million acres of land in Oklahoma, but approximately 8.5 million acres are eroded class VII land. Most pastures on this type of land are poor in quality, often misused, and land cover and production destroyed, and thereby runoff and erosion losses increased. To overcome these problems, careful consideration must be given to a greatly expanded program of range and pasture improvement and its proper integration with other phases of production development. Measurements are needed showing the effectiveness of fertilizers and different kinds of grasses and legumes on soil and water conservation under year-long grazing conditions on permanent pastures and cultivated croplands of different capabilities. A program of this nature involving adapted soils, fertilizers, lime, crop rotations, native or tame grasses, legumes, and supplementary feed requires careful planning and intelligent management. Therefore, all factors concerning these problems need to be fully determined.

The legumes and better grasses, which are naturally a part of a good cropping system, make good supplementary or winter pastures. The fields they occupy, however, must be planned so the livestock can be rotated from one to the other. The crops must be arranged in sequence so that there will be as few gaps as possible in the grazing schedule and at the same time provide as much cover as possible for erosion and flood-control purposes. In this way the crop rotations will become a part of a year-round pasture, and combinations of crops must be worked out to fit in with the permanent pastures. This line of research is of paramount importance to the establishment and maintenance of a stable system of agriculture. Wise development and use of grazing resources in conjunction with cultivated crops represents the key to economic stability, fertility maintenance, erosion control, flood prevention, and general resource development.

Gullies are prevalent on about 25.2 million acres of land in Oklahoma, and 12.75 million acres of which are severely affected. The exposed subsoil and rocks contribute greatly to high runoff, destructive erosion, and floods. This fact and recent interest in soil conservation and flood control has also increased the demand for new and better methods of reclaiming severely eroded land such as abandoned oil fields, mining areas, deep gullies, wet and salt areas, etc.

Brush control and pasture development

Competition from brush and other troublesome plants represents one of the greatest single deterrents to range forage production on millions of acres of land in Oklahoma and the Southwest. Control of these plants represents the most valuable range improvement and water conservation practices in such areas for producing more grass, beef, and dollars.

Not all of the 10,000,000 acres in Oklahoma covered with scrubby oak and other woody vegetation can be safely cleared because of erosion hazards, but a tremendous amount can be improved. If the brush was removed and proper management applied to those acres that are suitable for clearing, it is possible for the production of beef in this State alone to be increased (based on the present price of grass-fattened cattle) as much as $100 million annually. Before this can be done, however, investigations are needed to determine the most effective and economical means of controlling brush, the best chemical for a particular use and the most effective method and time of application.

There is also a definite need for better machines to apply chemicals. The airplane offers great possibilities and should be carefully and fully investigated. After the brush has been killed, however, there are many erosion control, use, and management problems. An adequate program will need to be developed for brush control, erosion control, water conservation, reseeding with grass and legumes where necessary, fertilization, grazing returns and management studies to determine the best and fullest productive capacity of the land under maximum use.

LAND AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH PROGRAM

Land is available on the Red Plains and Wheatland Stations for the basic studies. Some of the earlier findings, however, may need to be expanded in field trial studies to soil conservation district cooperators forms. The acres of land according to capabilities and conservation treatment needs for Oklahoma are given in the attached table.

FUNDS REQUESTED FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

We are requesting that funds be made available to the Soils Division of the Agricultural Research Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture to initiate this project this year. The best estimate at which we have been able to arrive indicates it will take $200,000 to initiate this project and approximately $100,000 per year to continue this project.

Land capability units and acreage of each in Oklahoma [1]

Land capability units	Present land uses				
	Cropland	Idle	Pasture and range land	Woodland	Total acres
Suitable for cultivation with—					
I. No special conservation treatment	3,243,303	32,265	1,078,365	62,693	4,416,626
II. Moderate conservation treatment	1,963,690	31,609	1,789,047	60,335	3,844,672
III. Intensive conservation treatment	7,045,510	288,072	5,401,687	108,128	12,843,397
Suitable for occasional cultivation with—					
IV. Intensive conservation treatment	60,874	32,097	179,099	3,461	275,531
Suitable for permanent vegetation with—					
V. No special conservation treatment	67,076	25,105	200,858	23,531	376,570
VI. Moderate conservation treatment	193,904	29,850	1,924,195	143,021	2,291,000
VII. Intensive conservation treatment	1,381,820	793,225	6,200,605	163,422	8,599,172
Suitable only for—					
VIII. Wildlife production	2,853	53,080	57,419	----------	113,352
Total	13,959,160	1,285,294	16,897,275	564,611	32,760,420

[1] Taken from Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 229.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA AND SATELLITE COUNTRIES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a group of other Senators on both sides of the aisle, I have sent to the desk an extremely important resolution which, in our judgment, calls for immediate action by the Senate.

This resolution, which is very brief, reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses (1) its profound sense of shock at the reports concerning the persecution of the Jewish people and the revival of anti-Semitism in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and (2) its expectation that without delay the Government of the United States of America will officially convey its grave concern over this matter to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and its request that prompt steps be taken to remove all cause for the fears that have arisen throughout the world concerning the future security of the Jewish people now residing within the borders of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

On February 11, a similar statement was adopted by 40 American Roman Catholics. This statement, which was joined in by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, offered special sympathy to the Jews in their new trial, denounced the growing anti-Semitism in the Communist world, and called upon the conscience of the world, through governments and the United Nations to protest against it.

The Commonweal magazine of February 20 carries an important editorial commenting upon this statement. Let me quote from this editorial:

It is particularly important that non-Jews speak, for there must be solidarity of freemen in something like this. When Jews are threatened, we are threatened; as the arrests of priests and the subversion of Catholic churches behind the Iron Curtain cast a shadow of threat on the Jews, the next group with independent allegiance and a devotion to something beyond Caesar.

Mr. President, it is obvious that in this situation the Senate should lose no time in expressing its sense of indignation at the revival of anti-Semitism in Russia.

No committee hearings nor prolonged deliberations are necessary for any Member of the Senate to satisfy himself that Jews in Russia are threatened by the same malignant forces that wiped out the Jews in Germany.

No committee hearings nor prolonged deliberations are necessary for every Member of the Senate to realize that not a day should be lost in voicing our protests against the unspeakable evil which threatens the Jewish people in Russia.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended for the purpose of permitting immediate consideration of this resolution of protest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. Furthermore, I propose to move to refer this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I certainly share with the Senator from Montana a sense of shock at the anti-Semitism which has apparently developed in the Soviet countries, and I think we should express our views on that subject. However, it seems to me that we should express those views in a form which meets the approval of the entire Senate, and not by means of a resolution suddenly presented in the Senate at a time when only about 15 Senators are present.

I think the same argument applies to any resolution which asks the Government of the United States to speak to another government and make protest. That is a serious matter in international law. It certainly should have the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is the phrasing of the resolution right? Offhand, it does not seem to me to cover the very point which the Senator is trying to cover, because it asks—

That prompt steps be taken to remove all cause for the fears that have arisen throughout the world concerning the future security of the Jewish people now residing within the borders of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

The persecution which has taken place up to this date has not been "within the borders of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics." It has been primarily in the satellite countries, which are not included in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

I call attention to that point for the reason that when we adopt a resolution of this importance it ought to be carefully phrased. It ought to be considered by the committee and framed in the proper language. Its phraseology ought also to be taken up with and considered by the State Department.

I therefore move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can promise the Senator from Montana that it will be reported back to the Senate this week for consideration.

Mr. IVES. May I speak on the motion?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It is open to debate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in the first place I want it distinctly understood that I am strongly in sympathy with the Senator from Montana in submitting this resolution. However, I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio that it does not hit exactly at the object, the goal, or the target at which it is presumably aimed. In other words, those in the satellite countries who are being persecuted are being persecuted presumably by Soviet stooges, and the wording of the resolution should contemplate this condition.

There is one further suggestion which I think should be followed in this connection, and that is that the resolution should be further amended so that our Government will be urged to bring this situation to the attention of the United Nations for appropriate action. Presumably it should be handled through the instrumentality of the United Nations, and not by direct contact between our Government and the Government of Soviet Russia. I think that such a provision should be added to the resolution.

On January 21 last I issued a statement which I released in connection with other remarks I made before the Jewish Labor Committee, which was assembled here in Washington at that time. The statement which I released read as follows:

Like every other decent American, I deplore the Soviet persecution of the Jewish people. To all who are acquainted with the Soviet record, however, the present outrageous and inhuman treatment of those of the Jewish faith residing behind the Iron Curtain should not be surprising.

I call upon the Government of the United States, through the medium of the United Nations, to take all possible action to bring these Soviet outrages before the bar of world opinion to the end that they shall cease.

I sent copies of that statement to Secretary Dulles and to Ambassador Lodge, Chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations. From Secretary Dulles I received the following reply:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 23, 1953.

DEAR IRVING: I have your letter of January 21.

You can be sure that I am in hearty sympathy with the spirit of the statement which you enclose.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

From Ambassador Lodge I received the following letter:

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

DEAR IRV: Many thanks for your letter and the enclosure.

Needless to say I have the same concern that you have in this matter, and I am actively studying it to see what is the best procedure.

With warm regards, I am,

Faithfully,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Chief, United States Mission to the United Nations.

It so happens that tonight in New York City there is being held a very large mass meeting, the purpose of which is to protest and condemn Soviet anti-Semitic action. In this connection, because I shall be unable to attend the meeting, I have sent the following telegram to Rabbi Jerome Unger, executive director of the American Zionist Council, in New York City:

FEBRUARY 16, 1953.

Rabbi JEROME UNGER,
Executive Director, American Zionist Council, New York, N. Y.:

I deeply regret that previous commitments prevent my attendance at your most important protest meeting. Although I cannot be with you in person tonight, I join with you, with all the feeling at my command, in your condemnation of the infamous anti-Semitism of the Soviet rulers. At the same time, I express my heartfelt sympathy for the unfortunate victims of Communist tyranny.

The outrages against the Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain are part and parcel of the planned Soviet campaign to enslave the entire world. The breaking of diplomatic relations with the State of Israel to seek the favor of the Arab countries is the most recent verification of this planned treachery.

The merciless slaughter of 6 million Jews by the Nazi hangmen is etched on the conscience of the free world. The Soviet emulators of their Nazi brethren must not carry out their treacherous schemes. We must go on record—with an overwhelming chorus of protest voiced by free governments and free peoples everywhere—by warning the Communist perpetrators of these horrible crimes that they will be held to strict account when the day of reckoning arrives.

If we fail to heed the cries of the persecuted—if we fail to raise our voices in protest—we invite the Soviet Union to continue to foment dissension, strife, and possibly war in the Middle East and in Europe.

Because of my abiding concern over the tragic plight of the Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain, I transmitted the following expression of my views to the Secretary of State and to the Chief, United States Mission to the United Nations:

"Like every other decent American, I deplore the Soviet persecution of the Jewish people. To all who are acquainted with the Soviet record, however, the present outrageous and inhuman treatment of those of the Jewish faith residing behind the Iron Curtain should not be surprising.

"I call upon the Government of the United States through the medium of the United Nations to take all possible action to bring these Soviet outrages before the bar of world opinion to the end that they shall cease."

The replies of Secretary Dulles and Ambassador Lodge are both heartwarming and encouraging. I am convinced that the United States Government will exert the utmost effort to put a stop to the Soviet persecution of the Jewish people.

IRVING M. IVES,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I am wholly in sympathy with the resolution which is being offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I should like to have my name added to it as a cosponsor, with the understanding that the changes suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio and myself be made in the resolution before it is presented for final action in the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York, and his name will be added as one of the cosponsors of the resolution. I wish to say that the proposed amendment suggested by the Senator from New York is a very appropriate one, and I am willing to accept it. I am willing to have the resolution amended as he has indicated it should be.

Copies of the resolution have been mailed to all Senators and to the secretary of the majority and the secretary of the minority. It has occurred to me that in view of the very desperate conditions which prevail in Russia at this moment and the very serious persecution of these unfortunate people which is taking place at this moment, it would be entirely proper for the Senate to adopt a resolution of this kind. Of course, the Government in proceeding in accordance with the terms of the resolution would use appropriate diplomatic phraseology in presenting the matter to the Government of the Soviet Union.

I am sure that a great many Senators would like to have their names added to the resolution, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that their names may be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution (S. Res. 70), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. THYE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. BUSH), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses (1) its profound sense of shock at the reports concerning the persecution of the Jewish people and the revival of anti-Semitism in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and, (2) its expectation that without delay the Government of the United States of America will officially convey its grave concern over this matter to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and its request that prompt steps be taken to remove all cause for the fears that have arisen throughout the world concerning the future security of the Jewish people now residing within the borders of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, just as I entered the Chamber today, a motion was made to refer the Murray resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I had hoped to have something to say regarding that resolution, and at a later time I shall extend my remarks in respect thereto.

In the meantime I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], both in offering the resolution and in his remarks. I also wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on the resolution.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—AMENDMENT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the so-called Wiley bill, being the bill (S. 589) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred, and will be printed; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

During all the years that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been under consideration by the American people, I have been proud to be one of its strong supporters both as Governor of Minnesota and as a Member of the United States Senate. I have felt that no greater obligation rests upon the American people than to use wisely the great natural resources that are available to us, and not to permit sectional interests, or selfish interest of any kind, to stand in the way of full cooperation with our neighbor, Canada, in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I believe that the time has come for action on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and I strongly urge that an effective program be worked out with Canada for full cooperation between these two great nations in this project, notwithstanding the fact that recent developments have resulted in separate consideration of certain phases of the whole program.

There has been introduced in the Senate S. 589, to set up a St. Lawrence Development Corporation for the purpose of building that phase of the canal which is at the International Rapids section on United States territory. This Corporation would have nothing to do with the power project and it would not undertake to provide for the Great Lakes connecting channels which are vital if the proposed waterway is to serve the interests of the entire area involved. These two phases are left to be handled either by other means or by additional legislation.

As a Senator from Minnesota I am unable to support legislation for the St. Lawrence seaway that does not immediately take into consideration the whole picture. It is a matter of great disappointment to me that at this time when the implementation of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is of the greatest importance to our national defense and to our economic stability, we propose piecemeal steps to undertake so great and vital a project.

If the canal at the International Rapids section is built, as contemplated in the pending legislation, and the construction of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes is delayed or sidetracked, it will simply mean that iron ore brought to the steel mills in the midcentral section of our country from Labrador and Venezuela will be in direct competition with the iron-ore industry of the Mesabi Range in Minnesota and the iron ranges in upper Michigan, without any compensating benefits to those areas as a result of the construction of the seaway.

I am deeply concerned over the situation because I am convinced that if we were to proceed only with that portion of the seaway which will directly serve heavy industry and the steel corporations in the Detroit and Pittsburgh areas, there would be insufficient support for later development of the channels in the Great Lakes serving upper Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, and adjoining States. This could, in my opinion, mean a delay in years, if not generations, before the complete waterway would be developed, for these States would find it difficult to command the public attention that would obtain the political support necessary to bring about favorable congressional action.

A waterway to the ocean by way of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence is an economic necessity for the future of Minnesota and the upper Midwest areas in the shipment of grain, in the development of package freight shipments on the Great Lakes, in the working out of a balanced transportation system, as well as in the shipment of iron ore and the utilization of the low-grade ores which we have in such great abundance to serve the needs of this Nation.

For these reasons I have been unable to join in the cosponsorship of S. 589, and I have urged that the whole project be considered on its merits in order that the needs of all segments of this economic area can properly be served. In order that such consideration may be given, with particular reference to the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes, I am offering an amendment to S. 589 to authorize an appropriation of $100 million for such improvements as

may be necessary to provide a deep waterway for navigation requiring a controlling channel depth of 27 feet through the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, including the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, the Straits of Mackinac, and the St. Mary's River.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT ENSHRINING OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the proceedings at the enshrining of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights in the exhibition hall of the National Archives Building, December 15, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address on agricultural conditions delivered by him before the Calvert County Farm Bureau, at Prince Frederick, Md., February 13, 1953.

By Mr. HUNT:

Citation delivered by Dr. Percy G. Lowery, president of the Pierre Fauchard Academy, in making the presentation of the 1952 academy's gold medal and diploma to the Assistant Surgeons General for Dentistry of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Declaration of Americans of Ukrainian descent on January 25, 1953, to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Article entitled "America on Its Knees," written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Chaplain, United States Senate, published in the Washington Sunday Star, February 8, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Rivers, Health, and Dogmas," written by Ralph W. Page, published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on January 7, 1953.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Editorial entitled "Farm Belt Fears," published in the Washington Sunday Star on February 15, 1953.

Editorial entitled "1910 Theories Won't Work on 1953 Farms," published in the Tupelo (Miss.) Journal on February 9, 1953.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

My Legion Prayer, by Daniel E. Lambert, commander, Bangor, Maine, Post, No. 194, American Legion.

Poem on prosperity and wars, written by Dr. Maurice E. Lord, of Skowhegan, Maine.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Letter regarding oppression of Ireland by the British Government, written by Timothy J. Holland, president of the Irish-American Associates.

By Mr. COOPER:

Editorial entitled "Tobacco Men Talk for All Export Trade," printed in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 15, 1953.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is concluded.

Under rule VIII of the Senate, the call of the calendar of bills and resolutions is now in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous censent that I may address the Senate for not to exceed a minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is fitting that on this 16th day of February 1953, we, the elected representatives of a free Nation, once again pause to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of another nation valiant in the struggle for freedom.

On February 16, 1918, at Vilna, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Today, on the 35th anniversary of that proclamation, the people of Lithuania suffer enslavement at the hands of brutal conquerors. They are forced, as their free representative to the United States, Consul General Jonas Budrys, has sorrowfully observed, "not only to forget the 16th of February, but to honor holidays and 'heroes' foreign to their hearts, the oppressors of their nation, the mockers and exterminators of their parents, their brothers and sisters, and themselves."

In Western Germany, the leaders of the Baltic national committee have charged that more than 1½ million Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have been forced into slave labor by the Russians. Thousands have been murdered. So tight is the Iron Curtain that not even a letter can be smuggled westward without subjecting its writer to imprisonment as a spy. The more striking, then, the achievement of those three youthful fishermen whom we honored here in Washington 1 year ago who wrested control of their vessels from its Russian crew and escaped, by way of Sweden, to Western Germany.

But in our concern for those who have escaped, we must not forget the tragic plight of those who are forced to remain behind the Soviet wall. As the Lithuanian-American Council forcefully reminded the previous administration, "The Iron Curtain will not be lifted if containment alone is sought." Let us seek, rather, by every means at our command, to hasten its lifting. I am confident that the new vigor with which the new administration has inspired our foreign policy will hasten it. This, together with the dogged persistance of the Lithuanian people in the struggle to regain their own freedom, will jointly bring about a day when the anniversary of February 16, 1918, can once again be celebrated on Lithuanian soil. Our great President has pledged himself that that day shall come. Addressing the American Legion on August 25, 1952, he said:

> We can never rest—and we must so inform all the world, including the Kremlin—that until the enslaved nations of the world have in the fullness of freedom the right to choose their own path, that then, and then only, can we say that there is a possible way of living peacefully and permanently with communism in the world.

I am proud to join in that pledge.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very appropriate remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in connection with the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, that proud nation which is undergoing untold suffering at the hands of the Soviet invaders.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of my message to the people of Lithuania and to all Americans of Lithuanian descent on this anniversary of their independence.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES ON OCCASION OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA, FEBRUARY 16, 1953

It is once again my great honor to extend to my fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent and to the gallant people of Lithuania my warm greetings on the anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

Together with freedom-loving peoples everywhere, we in America feel a sense of deep sorrow for the tragic plight of the heroic Lithuanians. On this 35th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the people of the United States look to the future with hope and inspiration, secure in the knowledge that the heritage of freedom which is Lithuania's cannot succumb to Russian tyranny. Lithuania's gallant resistance to the Soviet aggressors stands as a shining symbol of the free world's determination to stand firm against the pernicious forces of evil.

On this occasion, we reaffirm our traditional friendship with the people of Lithuania and voice our prayers for the liberation of this valiant nation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the tragedies of recent years was the loss of independence by the Republic of Lithuania. This Baltic nation, small in size but great in devotion to freedom, proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918. That event illustrated how a people, despite centuries of ruthless subjugation, could retain their national consciousness and at the first opportunity spring to their feet and take a place among the free nations of the world.

For two decades Lithuania was allowed a peaceful existence, and her 3,000,000 inhabitants worked hard to make their country a model democratic republic.

But Lithuanian independence became one of the first casualties of World War II, and she now languishes in bondage behind the Iron Curtain. Several hundred thousand patriotic Lithuanians are condemned to exile in various parts of the Soviet Union, while their beloved homeland is colonized by the Russians.

Today, on the 35th anniversary of that independence now so tragically lost, we pay tribute to the spirit of this brave country. We in America have proclaimed to the world that we do not regard with complacency the enslavement of once-free peoples. We will support and encourage those who strive to shake off their shackles. Knowing her long history of resistance against those who would deprive her of nationhood, we may feel confident that Lithuania will one day regain her birthright of freedom.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute to speak on the 35th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Lithuania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 35 years ago today, the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed.

February 16, 1918, is a day comparable to our day of independence, July 4, 1776.

It is a day of freedom—a freedom that continued from 1918 until 1940, and an annual reminder of freedom which will come again when the Communist invaders are overthrown.

I am proud, Mr. President, that our Government has never recognized the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union in 1940. We still recognize what was proclaimed 35 years ago.

Today, free-minded people in Lithuania, the million Americans of Lithuanian descent, and all Americans renew their faith that in the not-too-distant future Lithuania will once again take her rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

February 16, 1953, the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, will be celebrated by Americans of Lithuanian descent and friends of Lithuania everywhere.

It is an anniversary of real and poignant meaning to all of us. And were it not for the brutal annexation of Lithuania by the Russian Communists in 1940, Lithuanian Independence Day would now be a time of unqualified celebration. The Soviet Union in 1940, however, forcibly brought to an abrupt end Lithuania's 22 years as a free and independent republic. As a result of the Soviet Union's ruthless occupation and exploitation of Lithuania and her people, Lithuanian Independence Day is a time not only of pride in a memorable occasion 35 years ago, but a time when free peoples everywhere must renew their firm determination that ultimately Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors must again be free and autonomous. The enslavement of these countries and their peoples—many of whom have been separated from their families and deported to forced labor camps—is a revolting reminder of the evils of the Soviet power.

We can take pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the Russian claims to Lithuania and that our Government continues to recognize the Minister of Lithuania as that country's accredited representative to the United States.

But nonrecognition is not enough. We must dedicate ourselves and our policies anew to the halting of the Soviet menace, to the rebuilding of the strength and unity of the free world and to the final day when Lithuania is again independent. With Lithuania's many other friends in this country, I look forward with hope to that time when this valiant nation may again be free to determine her own government—when Lithuania's Declaration of Independence will be not only a matter of past pride but of present reality.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes with remarks on the 35th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on this 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, it is appropriate that we Americans recall to mind the vast humane traditions of our glorious past and extend to that heroic people in far off eastern Europe, as well as to their kinsmen in our own beloved land, and expression of sympathy, admiration, and encouragement.

Lithuania has known the tyranny of Soviet Russia since the early days of World War II. But centuries before, Lithuania had known the tyranny of Imperial Russia; and from its bondage, the Lithuanian people had won their freedom and affirmed their independence by creating a democratic republic. Today, the unhappy disposition of circumstances is such that Lithuania does not enjoy freedom. Lithuanian independence has been subverted and the democratic republic destroyed. But those who know the fearless character of the Lithuanian people, their vigorous nationalism, their dauntless courage, and their profound attachment to freedom, do not despair of the future.

However great the hardships, however severe the sufferings, the idea of freedom can never be eradicated from the minds of the Lithuanian people. Centuries of oppression have failed to destroy their desire for freedom, and there are assurances that the oppressors of today have achieved no greater lasting success than did their predecessors of yesteryear.

The history of mankind has shown that so long as the will for freedom glows as it does in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people, it cannot for long be denied them. I look for the day in the not-too-distant future when the national aspirations so richly deserved by the Lithuanian people may be realized. In the immortal words of the poet Byron, the Lithuanian people could well exclaim:

Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner, torn but flying,
Streams like the thunderstorm against the wind.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

As I pay my respects to our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent today on the occasion of Lithuania's Independence Day, I am deeply aware of the tragic situation that must cast a shadow over any celebration held on this February 16.

In 1940 the Republic of Lithuania was brutally deprived of its independence, as it had been on previous occasions in the long and eventful history of this gallant nation. Since 1940, Lithuania has been occupied by a foreign power, and the people of that country have been living under the cruel domination of a ruthless police state. Today's anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence takes on a deep significance for all freemen. Today must serve to remind us of our obligation to these people, who in 1918 proudly declared their independence after more than a century of oppression. It is our duty to help see that the suffering of the Lithuanian people shall not endure without end. We must resolve, in company with other freedom-loving people, that the enslaved people of Lithuania shall be aided to realize their dreams of a return to freedom.

The most concrete way in which we can express our admiration for this brave nation is by extending a helping hand to those Lithuanians who have managed to escape from behind the Iron Curtain and are now scattered throughout Europe. These refugees from tyranny are the representatives of their less fortunate countrymen. We must welcome a fair number of them to this country and assure that all of them find safe haven and an opportunity for livelihood, so that they may join us in our common fight for the independence of all enslaved peoples.

For this purpose we must seek the early revision of the McCarran Act and its adequate liberalization. This is one thing we can do now for the people of Lithuania and for the cause of freedom in the world.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland subsequently said: Mr. President, today, February 16, 1953, commemorates the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On this great national holiday of Lithuanian independence, it is for us, the free, so fortunately endowed with the God-given gift of freedom, to affirm again and again our faith, our confidence and our hope in the future destiny of the Lithuanian people.

The unconquerable spirit of her devoted people has been vividly epitomized in Lithuania's historic past—alternately glorious and tragic. Oppression, fear, poverty, enslavement, political execution, and planned starvation are but a few terms which attempt to describe the present fate of this great nation which, during the period of her independence (1918–40) had earned the right to take her place in the family of free nations throughout the entire world.

In saluting the great nation of Lithuania on this historic occasion, we humbly pray to our Almighty God that freedom will soon be restored to these freedom-loving people.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ROY ORCHARD WOODRUFF, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes, to pay a brief tribute to the late former Representative Roy Orchard Woodruff.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it was with heavy heart that I learned of the passing of Roy O. Woodruff, dean emeritus of our Michigan delegation and one of my closest personal friends. His death comes as an irreparable loss to Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who were privileged to have served with him, and to the American people for whom he dedicated 34 years of competent and faithful public service. All had a profound respect for his ability, integrity, and judgment.

Truly the words of Abraham Lincoln, on whose birthday he died, best describe the qualities of Roy Woodruff:

Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who knew me best, that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow.

I am privileged to say that I was among those who knew Roy Woodruff intimately. Throughout my service in the House, he counseled me as a new Member in becoming more proficient in the application of my duties. He was kind and understanding—with something good to say of every man.

I honor him as a wise lawmaker, an ardent patriot, a valiant soldier, and a great man. He was the kind of Congressman other Members respected. He was a man's man.

Roy Woodruff's distinguished career began with active service in the Spanish-American War where he served in the Santiago campaign with valor as a member of Michigan's Volunteer Infantry. In 1911, he was elected mayor of Bay City, Mich., and the following year was elected to the 63d Congress as a Progressive Republican.

He volunteered for service in World War I and distinguished himself as an infantry officer, serving for 11 months with the American Expeditionary Forces in France. After his discharge, he was elected to the 67th Congress where he served continuously thereafter through the 82d Congress until January 3, 1953. He gave his last full measure of devotion 6 weeks later on February 12.

Few men have had a more profound influence on my own career and philosophy than Roy Woodruff. His deep sense of personal responsibility to the Constitution and his strict adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, and equality, offered a shining example for me and others to follow.

We shall miss him. We shall miss his geniality and friendly spirit. We shall miss the values of his experience and judgment. We shall miss the services of this great and honorable man whose record of loyalty and devotion to this Nation is equaled by few.

In behalf of my colleagues in the Senate, I wish to extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Woodruff and members of the family in their great loss.

To the people of his district, yes, and to all the people of our great State of Michigan, we can say of Roy Orchard Woodruff, as Abraham Lincoln said in eulogy of a friend: "In very truth he was the noblest work of God—an honest man."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I had the privilege and pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives with Roy O. Woodruff. He was a generous friend, an able and devoted public servant, an outstanding patriot, and a fine character.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

GOOD NAVY RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the February 12, 1953, issue of the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N. J., which highlights the harmonious relationship existing between members of the Military Establishment and the communities in which they serve.

I commend Capt. James W. Boundy for the outstanding service he has rendered as base commander at the Bayonne Naval Depot in my State. I wish him well as his new station in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD NAVY PUBLIC RELATIONS

Capt. James W. Boundy, who yesterday left his command at the Bayonne Naval Depot to become general stores officer at Philadelphia has gone to his post with the sincere admiration of those with whom he came in contact during his 18 months stay here.

During his term in Bayonne he established active public relations work that demonstrated that he appreciates the good that comes from community participation and interchange of ideas.

He not only maintained friendly relations with Bayonne's officialdom, but also his door was always open to all citizens who desired to visit the base.

Not the least of these good relations was the fact that in every local charity drive, the personnel of the base contributed, the most recent being a check for $1,000 sent to the local branch of the March of Dimes.

This feeling of friendly relations between the base and the communities of both Bayonne and Jersey City was something new that was added since Captain Boundy took command.

He moves to Philadelphia with the best wishes of both the community and the officers and workers at the base.

Capt. Hugh C. Haynsworth, Jr., the new commander, has come to Bayonne with an accumulated surplus of good will which he can be expected to use to advantage.

ADELAIDE NACAMU—WINNER OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very proud that again one of the winners in the Voice of Democracy contest is from my own State. Her name is Adelaide Nacamu, and she is a Peekskill High School sophomore from Peekskill, N. Y. Miss Nacamu is the youngest girl ever to receive this honor.

To Miss Nacamu and her cowinners in the contest—Frank Lammedee, of San Marino, Calif.; Thomas J. Walsh, of the District of Columbia; and Robert Davis, of Hawaii—I extend heartiest congratulations upon their noteworthy achievement, and express best wishes for their future success.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the texts of the four prize-winning scripts.

There being no objection, the scripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Adelaide Nacamu, age 14, Peekskill High School, Peekskill, N. Y.)

There are some things that a person never forgets. One of my most unforgettable memories goes back approximately 3 years. You see, 3 years ago I became a citizen of this country under my own name. I had actually become a citizen prior to that time, but it was under my father's name due to the fact that I was a minor.

Becoming a citizen is quite an honor. I can still see the room in the Bureau of Naturalization and Immigration with the chairs all filled with people from foreign lands seeking citizenship in their adopted country. I can remember the thrill when the officer called out my name, and I can still feel the lump rising in my throat when I meekly answered to it. I stood there entranced. As I placed my hand over my heart and pledged allegiance to the flag the words took on a new significance. I had said those words over and over again in school, but today they meant something new. Now, as I say, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands," I feel as if these lines were written just for me—and they were. They were written for me and for every other American citizen.

After I again raised my hand and pledged to support the Constitution and obey the laws of the land, it was all over. And as I left the building, I felt a strange feeling creep over me. It was the feeling of equality. No longer was I a foreigner in the United States. I had all the rights and privileges of the other citizens. Bestowed upon me, however, was the weight of freedoms, because I now owed the United States something. I owed my loyalty in payment for these freedoms. It was, and still is, my duty to exercise my privileges. I found that some people have the wrong idea about American democracy. Many of us think that democracy is supposed to give us certain rights and liberties—for free. But to me this is not the way democracy works. In our democracy every right has its obligations and responsibilities. Anyone who claims his rights without also assuming his responsibilities is taking something that does not really belong to him. What we call rights aren't actually rights at all. They are privileges. They are granted with the understanding that they will be treated as privileges—or else will be forfeited. Yet, the way we sometimes abuse our privileges is something to be ashamed of. We seldom hesitate about accepting our rights as a matter of course—in fact some people go about demanding them, but when it comes to the responsibilities involved—well, we're just too apt to let others worry about them.

For every privilege there is an obligation. A child is thrilled with the privilege of receiving an allowance, but is saddened at the thought that 5 percent of it must go into the bank each week. Another example is that of a young man who at the age of 21 receives the privilege of casting his vote. At that time he becomes obligated to know the candidates for office, become acquainted with their platform, learn the issues, and then votes as he sees fit.

Heading the privileges my country gives me are the right to express my personal opinion, the right to write what I think, and to worship in the way I believe. Because only through these rights can my country grow in knowledge and strength.

I am, as is every American, proud and happy to be able to be of some service to the United States, because the reward is tremendous. Yet, I try never to belittle other countries, since they are important to the success and happiness of our own.

Since that day, 3 years ago when I became a citizen, I have been and still am proud to say that I am an American, and that is why I speak for democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Frank Lammedee, age 17, South Pasadena High School, South Pasadena, Calif.)

One of the hardest questions that I ever had to answer pertains to the very subject I'm speaking to you about now. It came from a dark, curly haired Italian boy who had long been intrigued at the fantastic Russian propaganda concerning the American democratic system of government. Naturally, Christo had many misunderatandings about America's democracy. But his basic lack lay in his inability to understand the word "democracy."

"Americans, I know them, I have seen them; but this democracy I do not know. I have not seen it. You will tell me, please, what it means."

I looked at Christo without speaking for a few moments, for I was at a loss for words. But then I proceeded to stumble through the textbook schoolroom definition of democracy. "It was a government of the people, by the people, for the people," I told Christo, "a government where everyone is free to act and think as they please within certain necessary limitations. Under such a government, one enjoys the right of free speech, free press, free religion, and free assembly, insured by a constitution handed down from our forefathers who fought for a land where men and women the world over could enjoy these rights which are basic desires of all men." That was it. That was all I could tell Christo of a democracy I had lived in for 17 years.

Christo nodded, saying, "Oh, now I understand. Now I see." But I knew by his puzzled look and dubious tone of voice that I had failed to tell Christo what a real democracy is.

Those gatherings after school at the nearby soda fountain to talk over a day's activities—that's what I forgot to tell Christo. The hours spent at the public library doing research for the first interscholastic debate; the long, hard days of football practice in anticipation of the first big game, and then the thrill of watching the hometown team score in the final quarter to bring victory and glory to the school. Oh, yes; I can't forget school—the chance to receive a free education, which is the one thing no man can take from another.

And, gee, there's dad. Boy, did we have some great pack trips up to the mountains for fishing and hunting. Of course, the greatest fun is always in telling mom and the gang about the big one that got away. That before-breakfast morning paper, in which we read about praise and criticism that our Federal administration is receiving, is something we seldom think about. Then once every 4 years, as the speculation of who will next sit in our White House arises, the people send forth their verdict amid the tumult of political campaigning. Yes; it is people that make a democracy.

Yet, it is more. For then comes Sunday—the day when Dad leaves his crowded desk at the office, the neighbor next door puts aside his carpenter's tools, Mom leaves the household work until another day, public officials lay aside the pressing demands of office, and one-and-all go to the church of their faith to pay homage to the One, the Almighty, from whose hand the living democracy we enjoy, flows. For wherein is the guiding philosophy of democracy, if not in the deep, human understanding of mankind found in Christianity. For as the "salt is lost if it loseth its savor," so is democracy lost if it loses sight of the ideal upon which its foundations rest—that ideal being the will of God as enacted in the lives of men.

Democracy is more than a word definable in so many words. It is rather a living truth that emanates from the hearts of freedom-loving men the world over. It is a government in which there is moral integrity and self-sacrifice on the part of every citizen as well as those in public office. Mom's hope for a new dress, Tommy's excitement at winning that scholarship to college, Dad's elation over that new raise, and Sis's worry for her boy friend, Bob, serving overseas. All of these are as much a part of a vital, living democracy as is political principle. Yes. Hope, opportunity, anxiety, and success are all the fruits of a real democracy. These are the rewards of free men, Christo, and this is why today I speak for democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Thomas J. Walsh, age 17, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.)

"Turn back, turn back," chattered the machinegun. "Back to America, back."

And then there was silence; Jan Jablonski listened. Jacob Stein raised his head. Phil Johnson strained his eyes to see the place from which the burst had come.

Silence—over Iron Horse Mountain on a peninsula called Korea. The wind blew, and with the wind came a voice, a voice which cried, "Liberty—freedom—democracy." Jan Jablonski heard and remembered a steel mill in Pennsylvania—the Church of Saint Stanislaus—his place in the line on election day.

Jacob Stein listened and thought of a grocery store in the Bronx, the synagogue on the Sabbath, Yankee Stadium and the series.

Phil Johnson heard and he could smell the sweat of men lifting cotton bales onto trucks in Georgia; he could hear the sound of the congregation in the little church singing his favorite spiritual; he heard a melancholy trumpet retelling the blues.

The voice spoke, and it talked proudly of the Declaration of Independence, of the Magna Carta, of a tall, thin man who told his people one November day that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth. The voice speaks of a man from Monticello, Va., who wrote that all men are created free and equal. It tells of the days when it was young—that was in the year 500 B. C. when the Grecians coined a new word meaning the rule of the people and put it into practice. Since that time many have heard the voice, others have not—Philip of Macedon silenced it—Julius Caesar stilled it. Recently Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler tried to put the voice out of existence, but they themselves were the ones who passed away. Today communism is trying to still the voice, but it cries out to modern man: "You have been made by God. You have not been created for the state; rather the state has been created for you. You were never made to be slaves, nor were you made to be masters."

Throughout the centuries, men have given their lives so that their posterity might also hear the voice.

On Iron Horse Mountain three of these men sit and wait. They are Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. They are white and Negro. Their ancestors have come from Israel, Africa, and Poland. They are all Americans. They listen to the wind and the voice.

Somewhere ahead of them the machine gun chatters once more, "Turn back, turn back." They answer the challenge with a burst of fire.

The voice speaks again. But this time it addresses itself to Heaven and says, "As You died to make men holy, so they die to make men free." And from beyond the stars another voice answers, a voice which sounds strangely like the voice of democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Robert Davis, age 17, Maui High School, Maui, T. H.)

It was on a Sunday. It started out like any other Sunday, I guess. I got up, ate breakfast, and got ready for church just as I have been doing on Sundays for as long as I can remember. Then I went out the door into the most glorious morning you ever wanted to see. The sun was shining, the birds were singing, and everything was beautiful.

I don't know, maybe I'm just sentimental or something but such a morning always makes me start to think and become aware of the things around me.

Since it was time to leave, I climbed into my dilapidated model A Ford and as I stepped on the starter, I thought, "Gosh, I'm pretty lucky to own this car. It isn't much of a car, but I went to work and earned the money to buy it. And you know, I was free to do that. Nobody told me that I couldn't work where I chose. Nobody denied me the right to own a car." Then I began to think, "I wonder what it is that gives me this freedom; I wonder."

I started out and on my way to church I met Manuel and Ralph in Ralph's jeep. I waved, and after they had passed, I began to think about them (you know how you always do when you have just met someone you know) and I remembered that Manuel was a Catholic and Ralph was a Buddhist. And here I was on my way to a Protestant church. It was then I began to realize what it means to us here in America to be free to worship in any way we please whenever we please. I suddenly felt personally grateful to those early American settlers who came to this country and established the right of free worship. Again I began to wonder—to wonder what it is that those early settlers gave us which in turn insures us that we can continue to have that freedom of worship which they fought and suffered for.

After church, as we stood around outside talking, I saw many people, ordinary people like you and me. But this morning I began to think of things which I hadn't paid much attention to before. Things deeper than outward appearances.

Over there was Mr. Warner for example; he had come from a humble background and by his own efforts had made quite a success of himself in local business.

Then I waved to Mr. Itagawa. He had come here as a laborer from Japan and was now a successful farmer.

About that time Dick hailed me to tell me the news. He had been awarded a scholarship which would allow him to continue his education.

And you know, these aren't unusual cases. They are examples of what our people are able to accomplish all over America. For the first time I became fully aware of the unlimited opportunities we have of making a success of our lives. Again I wondered what it is that gives us all this.

Sunday was quite a busy day for me because that evening I went to a meeting of our church young peoples' group. At the meeting we were having a discussion on American government, past and present. As we talked and argued, I could see that here was another thing that we have: the right to speak freely. As the discussion progressed, I began to see the answer to what I had been wondering about all day. It dawned on me that it was nothing new to any of us but was

something that I was just beginning to see in a new light.

We talked of George Washington, Molly Pitcher, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln: great Americans who had done great things for a common ideal.

We mentioned Mr. Mitchel, who lost a leg on Saipan; and Dick's father, who gave his life in World War II; and Harry Nelson, who only the week before had been listed as missing in action in Korea. Americans like you and me who have done their small part for the same great ideal. Yes, then I saw what it is that gives us freedom to work, worship, and speak, that gives us opportunity to learn and become a success. Then I saw what that ideal is that so many Americans have fought, prayed, and died for. Yes, I knew that the answer was and always will be, God willing, our wonderful heritage, democracy. And I realized that everything that had happened to me that day had truly been speaking for democracy.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the young people who wrote these essays, who have performed so brilliantly, are now sitting in the gallery of the Senate. So that all Senators may see them, I ask them to rise.

(Thereupon Miss Nacamu, Mr. Lammedee, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. Davis rose, Senators applauding.)

RELIEF FOR THE NETHERLANDS AND OTHER FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly on the flood situation in the Netherlands and the need for some additional legislation in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe that the United States Government should give some of its farm surpluses to the Netherlands and to the other flood-stricken NATO countries. I have not moved in this direction before, because I felt surely that this would be a big issue by now. Since this does not seem to be the case, however, I consider it necessary to speak out at this time.

There is no need for introducing additional legislation on this matter, since this has already been done by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who introduced Senate bill 847 last Tuesday, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I congratulate these two Senators on that action, but I believe it is worth while to bring up this subject at this time, because no statements have been made respecting the measure, and I think it should be brought to the attention of the American people for their consideration.

Senate bill 847 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, rather than the Committee on Foreign Relations. I agree that disposal of our farm surpluses are involved, but the primary point of the measure should be aid to those nations which have suffered from the ravages of inundation, destroying large amounts of farm production. In short, we want to help these nations with our farm surpluses; not merely to get rid of farm surpluses as conveniently as possible. Moreover, I believe the bill would fare better if it is rereferred to the Foreign Relations Committee, since its main sponsor is a member of that committee and can give it his personal attention.

I have no desire to upset the normal channels of international trade. No doubt the losses suffered by these countries will create a larger market in farm products for other nations, but the low countries can ill-afford to provide this increased market. Holland's economic recovery, for example, has been set back 2 to 3 years. I am told that 90 percent of her export crop of onions has been destroyed; and acreage losses have been 50 percent in fiber flax, 48 percent in potatoes, 42 percent in sugar beets, and 14 percent in grain, including 18 percent in wheat. Thus, our gifts should be designed to plug up the losses where we can do so from our surpluses. In this way, normal international trade will not be harmed.

One of the most significant aspects of these acreage losses stems from the fact that large sections were flooded with salt water. In the case of wheat, this means no crops for about 3 years. During the first crop year after a salt water flood, barley, primarily a feed grain, can be grown with yields which are 65 to 70 percent of normal. In the following year alfalfa can be grown, but wheat cannot be planted with success until about the third year.

Of course, Holland is primarily an importer of wheat. Nevertheless, she depends upon her own crop for nearly 11,600,000 bushels a year. The acreage loss on wheat being 18 percent, the annual loss for 3 years will be about 2,000,000 bushels a year, or a total of 6,000,000 bushels. This amount would amount to only 1 percent of our own wheat surplus of 600,000,000 bushels—125,000,000 bushels in Government inventory, 376,000,000 bushels on which loans have been made, and 100,000,000 bushels in commercial carryover. Not only can we easily plug up the gap in these countries' wheat losses, but such action would also be helpful in reducing the pressure on the wheat market here.

We also have surpluses of over 435 million bushels of corn and 2 million bales of cotton. In the case of cotton, there is much concern about the prospects for a fifteen- to sixteen-million-bale crop—two to three million bales more than normal.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to know all the ramifications of giving some of our farm surpluses to these stricken countries. But I do believe that the bill should go immediately to the Foreign Relations Committee and that hearings should be conducted as quickly as possible. Therefore, I am hopeful that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the main sponsor of Senate bill 847 will see fit to ask that the bill be rereferred to that committee, and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will agree.

I should like to add a final word. Although the senior Senator from Ohio and myself are often in disagreement on policy matters, we have fought shoulder to shoulder on several issues, and I have enjoyed it. We worked together on the public housing and slum clearance bill, Federal aid to education, the school health bill, the St. Lawrence seaway, and other matters, as well. I shall be happy to work in whatever capacity he feels necessary to secure the passage of Senate bill 847 which he is sponsoring. If this is his baby, I shall be very glad to be a sitter.

Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, Senate bill 847; an article appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times on February 4, 1953; and a release from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the bill, article, and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, to make surplus agricultural commodities available to public and private relief agencies (including foreign governments) for the relief of suffering caused by the recent storms in the Netherlands, the British Isles, and other areas of Western Europe. For the purpose of this act a surplus agricultural commodity shall be any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, or class, type, or specification thereof, acquired through price-support operations and determined to be in excess of domestic requirements. Such commodities may be made available at ports of entry in the donee countries at no cost, except such compensation as the President determines may be obtained without interfering with the fulfillment of the purpose of this act to relieve such suffering. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10 million for the purpose of carrying out this act, including the making of payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs of carrying out its functions hereunder. The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized in carrying out its functions hereunder to utilize in advance of such appropriations or payments any assets available to it, but the total amount expended under this act (based on acquisition costs, plus carrying charges and other expenses) shall not exceed the authorized appropriation.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of February 4, 1953]

GRAIN SURPLUS HAUNTS LOCAL BOARD OF TRADE

(By Edward Kandlik)

The ghost of Hoover's Federal Farm Board is haunting the Chicago Board of Trade.

The United States has a 600,000,000-bushel surplus of wheat, largest in its history. Canada and Argentina are edging us out of the export market. Another crop is coming up, and there's no place to put it.

Fear of the Government's 500,000,000-bushel wheat stocks acquired in price support operations is again putting open market quotations on the skids.

These disclosures were made Tuesday at a press conference at the Board of Trade called by Sylvester J. Meyers, recently elected president. He was aided by Everette B. Harris, secretary of the board, and Julius Mayer, a vice president.

LEADING FACTOR

The breakdown of the Federal Farm Board's farm-price support operation during President Hoover's term is acknowledged as one of the leading factors in bringing on the depression.

Meyers pointed out that grain prices have been declining about 2 years.

"They are causing much concern in agricultural circles and in general business circles as well," he said.

Meyers termed the present surplus of grain a natural result of tampering with economic law.

High Government-support prices were instituted when additional grain production was badly needed. It stimulated output both here and in foreign countries. At the same time high prices caused dwindling markets, he said.

SAYS PARITY TOO HIGH

Meyers said Government support of grain prices at 90 percent of parity is at too high a level and said a new figure should be set.

The United States has a surplus of about 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, about 500,000,000 bushels of which are held by the Government. This compares with a peak holding of 250,000,000 bushels by the former Federal Farm Board in 1931.

Under the present system of Commodity Credit Corporation loans, the Government's previous top holding of wheat was 408,000,000 bushels on April 30, 1942. This was pared down by feeding foreign nations during and after World War II.

Mayer, who is also executive vice president of Continental Grain Co., said it is the possibility that Government stocks of wheat might be dumped on the market that is causing fear and lower prices.

Meyers suggested that a two-price system might be established, one price for domestic use and the other for exports. Other means might be to guarantee farmers' income or afford them some sort of disaster insurance to protect against low prices.

Harris charged that a continuance of high farm-price support levels would necessitate acreage limitations on planting and the regimentation of farmers.

FLOODS IN THE NETHERLANDS: IMPACT ON AGRICULTURE

The disastrous flood experienced in the Netherlands early in February 1953 has hit some of the best agricultural land in the country. Preliminary estimates and general reports indicate that the area affected by the floods represents about 10 percent of the total agricultural area of the Netherlands and about 7 percent are said to be actually flooded. The region normally has 14 percent of the country's total grain acreage (18 percent of the wheat acreage), 42 percent of its sugar-beet acreage, 50 percent of its flax and flaxseed acreage and an acreage in food potatoes variously estimated at between 48 and 70 percent of the total food potato acreage of the country. This part of the Netherlands produced 90 percent of the country's onion output and all of its chicory output. Fruit trees and pastures were also badly damaged or destroyed.

The flooded area accounted for some 6 percent of the total cattle stock, 4 percent of the country's hogs, and 13 percent of all horses. Most of the hogs (50,000) and many cattle (30,000) and horses (20,000) are reported drowned. While the sugar factories in these regions are said to have escaped damage and sugar stocks are safe, large stocks of potatoes and animal feed were destroyed by the disaster.

Saturation with salt water will greatly complicate the job of restoring the land to crop production and it is the view of competent observers that the outlook for crop output in 1953 in the area affected by the floods must be judged most pessimistically. Experience at the end of the last war showed that on soil that had been saturated with salt water for 1½ years barley could be grown the year after the land had been pumped dry. Yields as well as the variety of crops that could be grown were affected for several years.

It is estimated in the Netherlands, that, as a result of the damage that has occurred, it will be impossible to grow any sugar beets at all this year in the area affected by the floods. It is believed that the Netherlands will have to import 160,000 metric tons of sugar at a cost of $18 million to make up for this loss of production. It is also estimated that additional imports of 60,000 tons of wheat will be required at a cost of $5 million. Moreover, the Netherlands expects to lose an export value of $10 million worth of flax and flaxseeds, $5 million worth of peas, $15 million worth of food and seed potatoes, and $3 million worth of oats and barley.

All in all it has been calculated that the total loss in exports plus expenditure on additional imports—all due to the recent floods—will amount to roughly $50 million worth of a variety of products. The value of the cattle that have been destroyed is estimated at $7½ million and the loss of potatoes in storage at $12 million. These estimates do not represent the total loss involved since they do not include the loss of livestock other than cattle, of the domestic portion of the crop that is unlikely to be grown this year, and the damage to dikes, to general agricultural installations, and to the buildings, many of which have collapsed under the impact of the water.

The catastrophe is said to be due to one of the worst floods that has ever occurred in the history of the region.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for one moment.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the splendid work being done for the people of the flood-ravaged areas of the Netherlands, Belgium, and England by Mayor Goebel, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and his emergency flood relief committee.

I believe that the mayor and his committee deserve the highest commendation for rising at this time of urgent need to volunteer relief for our European friends who were hit by the devastating tidal wave that ravaged their coastlines last week.

The toll in life and property is heavy, and the need for immediate rehibilitation is urgent.

I have been informed that the clergy, businessmen, schoolteachers, pupils, PTA groups, and other organizations in Grand Rapids and surrounding communities have already made substantial contributions to the fund, and that the money will be sent to the Netherlands, Belgium, and British Red Cross units for alleviation of these suffering people.

Those of us who saw the effects of the devastating Missouri River floods in our own country last April, which claimed several lives and caused a loss of more than $300 million in property damage, can understand well the needs of our friends overseas who were hit by an even greater tide.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. B. D. Zondervan, secretary of Mayor Goebel's flood relief committee, and a telegram from the committee to President Eisenhower.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYOR GOEBEL'S EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF COMMITTEE,
Grand Rapids, Mich., February 9, 1953.

Senator CHARLES E. POTTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

THE HONORABLE MR. POTTER: It is a pleasure to enclose herewith a copy of the telegram which was sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower from Mayor Goebel's emergency flood relief committee.

The committee for emergency flood relief was called into existence last Thursday morning at a meeting in the mayor's office. You will notice that the committee includes a representative group of businessmen, as well as ministers and professional men.

This emergency committee is launching a drive for funds on behalf of the people in the devastated areas in the Netherlands, England, and Belgium, which runs from February 7 to February 23. Inasmuch as there is no particular need for clothing, bedding, bed sheets, etc., it is the desire of the committee to raise cash during this drive.

The people of Grand Rapids will appreciate your consideration with reference to a continuation of the generous support and assistance given to alleviate the sufferings of the victims in the flood areas.

Sincerely yours,
MAYOR GOEBEL'S EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF COMMITTEE,
B. D. ZONDERVAN, *Secretary.*

[Copy of telegram sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Washington, D. C.]

Mayor Goebel's emergency flood relief committee wishes to express appreciation for the generous action you have taken to give assistance to, and alleviating the sufferings of, the flood victims in England, Belgium, and the Netherlands. We express our hope that it will be practicable to continue such support to the devastated sections in their efforts toward rehabilitation.

MAYOR GOEBEL'S EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF COMMITTEE,
GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say for the information of Senators that, so far as I know, there is no regular business presently to come before the Senate. I do not think there is even an executive calendar today, so that the remaining business will consist of such miscellaneous matters as Senators may care to present. I understand that when other Senators have concluded, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] will wish to make rather extended remarks on his recent report regarding military bases, after which I shall move a recess until Wednesday. On Wednesday, Senators desiring to express their appreciation of and respect for the life and service of the late Senator Brien McMahon will have an opportunity to do so.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE" IN HABANA HARBOR, CUBA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, 55 years ago Sunday morning last the people of the United States were astounded to read in the morning newspapers a report carried under glaring headlines by every daily paper in the United States. The consternation with which it was

received by the American people can be compared to that with which they received on another Sunday—December 7, 1941—the report of the assault upon our naval base and facilities at Pearl Harbor. The news story of 55 years ago informed the American people of a naval disaster affecting an American battleship, the *Maine*, which while riding peacefully at anchor in Habana, Cuba, had been sunk by an explosion which destroyed the ship and 266 of the officers and men on board.

The story of this disaster and the succeeding events which led up to a declaration of war with Spain the following April have been told many hundreds of times, and it would perhaps be pointless again to refer to it on this anniversary occasion were it not for two facts: First, that well over a half century has elapsed since the disaster occurred, and, as the years mount up fewer and fewer people are aware, or even interested in these events, and they are becoming continually dimmer in our recollection as those who participated in them pass from the field of the world's activities. The elapsed time since the sinking of the *Maine* will be more clearly in mind when it is realized that of the entire membership of the present Senate 40 had not been born February 15, 1898, and 21 more of our Members were in the preschool age, under 5 years.

Only 18 of our Members had reached an age where they have any recollection of the war events of that date, and only two Members of this body served as soldiers in the Spanish-American War. Those two members are the eminent senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the present speaker. Further indicative of the passing of the years is the fact that 234,000 men served in the Spanish-American War, and an additional 60,000 served in the Philippine Insurrection of the war period. Of these 294,000 men, a few more than 76,000, or but little more than one-fifth, are carried on the pension rolls today and these veterans are dying at the rate of 7,000 a year and, of course, as their age increases, the rate of their passing will be greatly accelerated.

But another reason why I feel justified in taking the time of the Senate to recount some of the facts and conditions surrounding the Spanish-American War is that so many of our citizens have a great misconception of that war and of its magnitude and are prone to dwarf the conflict in comparison with other wars in which we have since engaged.

Immediately after the sinking of the *Maine* a Board of Inquiry was instituted by the American Government and a similar one by the Government of Spain, for the purpose of determining the cause of the explosion which sank the battleship with a loss of 266 officers and crew. The cause has never been determined, though the weight of conclusion seems to be that the responsibility for the explosion should not be laid to the machinations of the Spanish Government. But, whatever the cause and whatever the responsibility for the occurrence the appalling catastrophe had the effect of definitely breaking the strained relations between Spain and the United States which over a period of many years had almost reached the breaking point because of the indignation of the American people and their consequent protest because of the treatment and abuse of the people of Cuba by the Spanish governmental regime.

It brought to naught all the earnest efforts of several of our Presidents to avoid an open break between our Nation and Spain and immediately crystallized the determination on the part of the people of the United States that they could not and would not longer tolerate the abuses of the privileges and liberties of an inoffensive people in the Western Hemisphere by the willful acts of a foreign government. The sympathies which had been extended to all the sister republics of South and Central America were extended in the fullest measure to the people still suffering in Cuba under the tyranny of imperialistic despotism.

Because of this attitude on the part of the American people a series of events immediately followed which culminated in a declaration of war on the 25th of April 1898. On the 23d day of April 1898, the President of the United States issued a call for 125,000 volunteers. In the light of modern discussion of draft laws and manpower mobilization, it is interesting to note that this call for 125,000 volunteers resulted in the most astounding demonstration of patriotic fervor the world has ever seen. More than 1 million volunteers offered themselves in answer to the call—more than 8 times the number needed to fill the request. The quota could have been filled entirely by former veterans of the Civil War because more than 100,000 of these veterans of the sixties were among the volunteers who answered the call. Thousands and thousands of men and sons of men who had fought under Grant, Sheridan, and Meade, and thousands and thousands of men and sons of men who had fought under Lee, Stuart, and Johnston, volunteered for service. Again, in the following month of May, a second call for 75,000 troops brought out almost as astonishing a response in the way of volunteers freely offering their services.

It has been often and well said that the great American Army which fought the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection, which immediately followed, was the only 100 percent volunteer Army that the world has ever known. Never before in the world's history and never since has an army been created for the conduct of a war which was composed in its entirety of men who freely volunteered for the service.

It has also been said often and truthfully that the Spanish War which followed was the only war in history that paid financial dividends and brought a financial return in excess of the money expended. Although the Spanish War was not fought for the purpose of aggression or acquisition of territory, the fact remains that the actual monetary returns to the United States far exceeded the expenditures for the conduct of the war.

A few further facts might well be cited which will be of interest in connection with this anniversary occasion and which can be classed as beneficial results in whole or in part from the Spanish War contest. It was responsible for the building of the Panama Canal. To it can be credited the passage of our first national defense act. And in the light of the necessity for national defense legislation which has forced us into action since 1898 and still requires our attention, the experience in enacting this first national defense measure can be well valued. The Spanish War brought about the researches which abolished yellow fever and other destructive diseases. It united the North and South and cemented these sections into one great people under one glorious flag. Former Confederate Gens. Joe Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee successfully and efficiently commanded contingents of boys from the Northern States. This war furnished every commander of importance in World War I, from the Commander in Chief down through the officer personnel. The war was fought with poor equipment, antiquated guns, black powder, and shamefully unsanitary food. It brought about the improvement in maintenance of the Army and Navy and the formation of an efficient Army through training camps. It marked the industrial reconstruction of the South and it taught the lesson of the unpreparedness which often claims more lives than war itself. It marked the birth and the rebirth of two nations. It resulted in the United States taking its place for the first time at the head of the table in the concert of nations. It taught us lessons in sanitation and disease control which, without a doubt, saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys during World War I and World War II, and are saving other thousands of our boys and girls in our present war involvement in Korea and elsewhere.

While I am referring to the sanitation and disease control during the Spanish-American War, I am confident that figures furnished to me by the Surgeon General of the Army will have particular interest. During a 4-month period, May to August, inclusive, in 1898, there were 369 battle deaths among our troops, while there were 2,061 deaths due to disease and nonbattle causes. During the calendar year 1898, there were 20,926 admissions to medical treatment facilities for typhoid fever and 2,192 deaths from typhoid fever in the same period. Also during the calendar year 1898 there were 90,416 admissions for malaria, with 349 deaths. During the same period there were 57,436 admissions for dysentery, with 215 deaths. To consolidate the figures, in that one year there were admissions to the hospital for these three diseases alone of 168,778, or well over one-half of the boys in service, with a total death toll from these three diseases of 2,755.

When it is realized that typhoid fever was practically unknown in our subsequent wars and death from these three diseases was practically nonexistent, some judgment can be formed of the value of the sacrifice and suffering of the men who served in the Spanish-American War in teaching our military medical

services how to combat disease, for at the time of the Spanish War there was lacking even the most elementary and rudimentary knowledge of sanitation and of the treatment of these disease scourges that had marked military camps and military service all through military history.

Are there those who still say in the face of this record that the Spanish War was a trivial affair? If so, perhaps some further figures may be illuminating. More men were engaged in our armies in this conflict, including the Philippine Insurrection, than the number engaged in the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, or the War of 1812. The average length of service was 14 months as compared with 9 months for World War I and 11 months for the Civil War.

Are there those who still point to the fact that there were no great battles fought? They might be interested in knowing that the loss in deaths from all causes in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection was six times the percentage of death losses of those engaged in World War I, and seven times the death percentage of the loss in the Civil War.

It might not be amiss again to remind Senators of some points of comparison of conditions of service during and after the Spanish-American War and comparable conditions of service in later wars and now. As one who served in both the Spanish-American War and World War I, I had personal opportunity to observe the conditions and to make comparison. The private in World War I received $30 a month, and today he receives in the neighborhood of $77 a month, but in the Spanish War he drew the magnificent sum of $15.60. In subsequent wars we have surrounded and protected our soldiers with every resource that studies in sanitation and medical protection have developed. While I was serving in Camp Thomas Chickamauga Park during the Spanish War, more than 25 percent of the men in the First and Third Army Corps were victims of typhoid fever alone. I have already referred to these disease conditions, but I vividly recall one occasion when the company with which I served, composed of 120 men, was able to turn out but 11 men fit for duty, because the rest of the men were in the hospital.

During the service of our soldiers in World Wars I and II, and subsequently, they were given the protection of a $10,000 policy of insurance. The Spanish War soldier had no such protection or security of any kind. In World War I a discharged soldier received a bonus of $60. In later conflicts he received separation pay. The Spanish War soldier received not one cent. Most of the States in the years following subsequent wars have voted a special bonus for their servicemen, but none whatever was voted for the Spanish War veterans. The Congress of the United States has made provision for an adjusted compensation for soldiers of subsequent wars. The Spanish War veteran received nothing. Vocational training has been made available but not for the Spanish War veteran. For more than 20 years following the Spanish War no provision whatever was made by way of service pension. No hospitalization was made available for these men until 1922—24 years after the war was over.

Another interesting comparison might be made in the way of benefits for our ex-servicemen by citing the difficulties of making proof required for participation in pensions and other benefits. After the enactment of the so-called Economy Act of 1933, boards were set up to determine the service-connected cases of applicants for pensions and other benefits for those who desired to trace their incapacities to their war service. But remember that the Spanish-American War veterans had practically no hospital records available. Thousands of their comrades were dead, 35 years having then elapsed since the time of service. These service boards examined 51,000 cases of World War I veterans at the rate of about 8 a day and found more than 41 percent of these cases service connected. Thousands of applicants from the Spanish War service were considered, not at the rate of 8 a day, but at the rate of 1,200 a day, and out of the entire list of applicants not 41 percent but a trifle more than 2 percent were found to have service-connected disabilities. Certainly, never in the history of this country has an Army of its soldiers been so carelessly treated as were these Spanish War comrades of mine.

I do not make the charge that this was intentionally done. I know that everyone in the United States is ready, willing, and anxious to see that every fair treatment is accorded to each and every ex-serviceman justified by the services which were rendered, but the fact remains that, because of the failure to compare properly the relative services and conditions surrounding service in our various other wars, there is a marked tendency to classify them all alike without knowing or understanding the conditions surrounding the sacrifices which these men made for our Nation and our interest.

I am told that these men today average over 77 years of age. In thousands of cases they are crippled and infirm, and in thousands of cases they are unable, through no fault of their own, to make proper proof of service-connected disability. They have lacked cohesion and have also lacked the desire to constitute themselves as a potent political force. I am not speaking of any pending pension or similar legislation. I am simply trying to present some facts in connection with the services of these old comrades of mine which may challenge the attention and consideration of those having future legislation primarily in charge.

I did not seek recognition today for the principal purpose of complaining of the treatment of the veterans of the Spanish War. I wanted to pay something of a tribute to these men by recounting a few facts relating to their service and sacrifice. "Remember the Maine" was as potent and moving a slogan in 1898 as was "Remember Pearl Harbor" in World War II or "Remember Buchenwald," in World War II, or "Katyn Forest" is today. The distressed cry and prayer for help of the poor, starving Cubans were heard by these men, and through their aid the yoke of foreign tyranny was broken forever over any portion of the Western Hemisphere. Their courageous spirit and voluntary sacrifice blessed millions of men, women, and children in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and elsewhere throughout the Western World. Their joint service wiped out sectionalism and furnished the final healing of the wounds of civil strife in their own land. The unselfish sacrifices made in assisting their neighbors, the Cubans, together with the Nation's attitude toward our American sister republics, furnished the cement for building the structure of pan-Americanism, from which has stemmed in so large a measure the impetus toward world cooperation for world security.

The Spanish-American War veterans have never asked, and the few remaining will never ask, for any reward for war service other than equality of treatment with the other fine Americans who have served and are serving their Nation, and a fair comparison of his service with theirs.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

SEVERANCE BY RUSSIA OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, events in the eastern Mediterranean during the past week should not go unnoticed or unmentioned in this Chamber.

The Soviet Union has made another maneuver in its calculated scheme of winning the Arabic-speaking peoples away from their traditional friendship with the United States and Europe. In breaking off relations with the State of Israel, Russia hopes to be regarded in many Middle East capitals as consciously bidding for the affections of the Arabic-speaking nations by appearing to take their side in the feud with Israel.

The United States should not be diverted from her course by this latest turn in the Soviet line. Our task has been and remains the same: To bring about a regional defense structure in the Middle East in order to resist the Communist threat and to provide a framework within which peaceful economic development may go forward to the mutual benefit of the peoples living there and of the rest of the non-Communist world.

To accomplish our purpose we must strive to bring about peaceful relations among the Middle East countries, as well as between those countries and other powers allied with us in common resistance to Russian imperialism. We must continue to strive for peace between the Arabic-speaking states and Israel. We must also seek to arrange amicable settlements involving Iran and Great Britain, and Egypt and Great Britain.

I know every Senator is delighted with the news that an agreement has been reached by Prime Minister Naguib and the British Ambassador to Egypt, Sir Ralph Stevenson, on the future of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. It is particularly gratifying to me to learn that Prime Minister Naguib has publicly praised our

Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Jefferson Caffery, for his "good offices" in helping to work out many of the details of this momentous settlement. When I was in Egypt last December I learned at first hand with what respect and admiration Mr. Caffery is regarded by the people as well as the leaders of Egypt.

I hope and expect that now the same sense of fair play and far-seeing statesmanship will lead to an amicable adjustment of the Anglo-Egyptian differences over the Suez Canal Zone, so that the defense of that strategic waterway and that important land bridge between Asia and Africa may be organized under the direction of a Middle East command.

I have reason to believe that, once Egypt has won her two great diplomatic goals in the Sudan and the Suez, a reasonable adjustment of her differences with Israel can be worked out. If this can be accomplished, the harsh words, the abrupt actions, and the obvious manipulations of the Kremlin with respect to Israel will come to naught.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is in very poor posture when it pretends to friendship with peoples of Moslem faith. The Moslem populations of the Middle East are becoming increasingly aware of the manner in which their coreligionists are persecuted and enslaved throughout the Asiatic portions of the Soviet Empire. I doubt if many of them will be duped by the renewed Soviet hostility to Israel into imagining that it portrays any real Communist preference for the Arabic-speaking Islamic peoples. This is strictly a tactical maneuver by Russia. It can be turned against her if we are wise and continue to work for true understanding and fair settlement of difficulties within the Middle East area, thereby leading to establishment of a common defense system in which every Middle East country can play its proper role, and behind which economic and social progress can proceed without Communist interference.

PARITY PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, February 11, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, spoke in St. Paul, Minn., to the Central Livestock Association, one of the largest livestock organizations in the world, which has to do entirely with the livestock producers of this country. This meeting was well attended. The large auditorium in St. Paul was filled on the occasion of the banquet when the Secretary spoke.

It was my good fortune to introduce the Secretary that evening, and therefore I was privileged not only to sit near him, but I also had an opportunity of observing the reaction of the audience, because I was directly in front of the entire assembly, and I followed the address by the Secretary very closely. I would say that the reaction of the audience to the address by the Secretary was good. Those in attendance paid strict attention to every sentence, and there was no question of the sincerity of the listening audience, because when the banquet came to its conclusion that evening those present gathered at the end of the convention hall, where the Secretary was, and pressed forward to shake his hand, to greet him, and to wish him well, and to state that they were impressed with what he had said.

I was not on the floor of the Senate last Friday, nor was I here last Wednesday, because I had been excused, and therefore I did not participate in the discussion which took place, but I have read the RECORD, and I have been much disturbed at the attacks which have been made upon the statements made by Secretary Benson in his address at the St. Paul meeting. It is for that reason that I am making these few remarks today.

It is my understanding that the address by the Secretary was inserted in the RECORD last week. If it had not been, I should have asked to have it inserted as of today.

Mr. President, we need to examine the record to make certain that an injustice is not done the Secretary of Agriculture in the criticisms which have been lodged against him and against the statements he made in his St. Paul address last Wednesday. He stated that he intended to support prices in accordance with the laws on the statute books. There was no equivocation in his statements; there were no "ifs" or "buts." He merely stated he was going to enforce the laws on the statute books.

I further gathered from the Secretary's address that it was his intention to give agriculture a place equal to that of the rest of the economy of this Nation; in other words, that it would be the Secretary's endeavor to give agriculture full parity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to one sentence in the Secretary's address, a copy of which I have before me:

> Our agricultural policy should aim to obtain, in the market place, full parity prices of farm products and parity incomes for farm people so that farmers will have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to changing consumer demands in an expanding economy. This objective cannot be assured by Government programs alone. It can be achieved only with a steady level of prices, high employment and production, and rising output per worker in our total national economy.

Is that the part of the address to which the Senator had reference?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that is precisely the part to which I was adverting. I wish to say further that it is impossible not to sense the feeling of sincerity of a person like Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture. He will not state one thing and do the contrary. I will say that to anybody and everybody, because Mr. Benson is a man of strong and deep convictions and a man of his word. What he states reflects the feeling of the man, and it will be what he will endeavor to do. If the Secretary says he will endeavor to obtain full parity in the market place for agriculture, those are not idle words.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota believes, does he not, that the Secretary does have authority under the present law to support the price of beef cattle if he sees fit to do so?

Mr. THYE. He has certain discretionary authority. However, I will say to my good friend from Oklahoma that the former Secretary of Agriculture had the same discretionary authority with respect to other commodities which were comparable in importance to those who produce them with the importance of beef to the beef producer. I refer to the situation of the pork producer a year ago. The Secretary of Agriculture was as dumb—strike the word "dumb"——

Mr. KERR. Was he as dumb as the present Secretary of Agriculture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remark will be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. KERR. I object.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is unfair in his manner of interruption at a point where a Senator is endeavoring to correct a word which he had not intended to use. When I used the word "dumb" I meant "as dumb as a stone." If the word should be corrected, perhaps I should have said "as deaf as a stone," because I, as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, brought to the attention of the former Secretary of Agriculture time after time a year ago, in the month of February, the situation with respect to declining pork and turkey prices, and the drastically low poultry and egg prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture was deaf to the pleas of the producers of pork and poultry. He never took any action to use the discretionary authority at his command until late in the spring, after the producer had marketed his pork. Then the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit, in May, to make some purchases which did not benefit the producer, who had long since shipped his pork, but which did cause the consumer to pay more, because the OPS, along with the Secretary's action in purchasing pork to stabilize the market, raised the price ceilings on certain cuts of pork, and the housewife was compelled to pay more.

Let me say to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma that if he and I wish to examine the record, we can both speak in criticism, not only of a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, but of a Republican Secretary of Agriculture, but we must recognize, however, that he has been in office for less than a month. I will say to my friend from Oklahoma that my purpose in rising today is to review the record, in order that we may justly appraise the present Secretary of Agriculture, along with the Secretary who retired on the 20th of January, as well as the administration which retired at that time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Of course I yield. Had the Senator from Oklahoma asked me to yield, I would have yielded before, at

the time he tried to put words in my mouth and interrupt my chain of thought while I was trying to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Minnesota had yielded to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THYE. I did yield; but the Senator from Oklahoma had spoken, and the Senator from Minnesota was proceeding with his remarks when the Senator from Oklahoma again interrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair understood that. The Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the present occupant of the chair? Is he presiding over the debate or participating in the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is presiding over the debate. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Presiding Officer for that information. I must say that, following his remarks, it comes as quite a shock to me.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. Indeed, I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. First, let me say that if I misjudged my good friend from Minnesota, I wish to apologize. I asked him whether the present Secretary of Agriculture had authority to support the price of beef cattle. Do I correctly understand that my good friend from Minnesota has said that he does have such authority?

Mr. THYE. The law gives the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to support the prices of perishable commodities.

Mr. KERR. Does that answer constitute an affirmative answer to my question?

Mr. THYE. The affirmative answer to the Senator's question is as I indicated earlier, that the previous Secretary of Agriculture was invested with the same discretionary authority which now rests in the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the present Secretary of Agriculture have authority to support the price of beef cattle?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the answer has been in the affirmative, and the Senator from Oklahoma knows it as well as I know it. The Senator from Oklahoma is only endeavoring to becloud the issue with respect to what Secretary Brannan failed to do a year ago.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KERR. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say a while ago that the present Secretary of Agriculture was going to support the prices of farm products on the basis permitted by the present law, or required by present law?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Or, if neither statement is applicable, I should like to have my good friend from Minnesota so indicate. I have for him not only the highest respect but the deepest affection. I asked him a question about the present Secretary of Agriculture, and he answered me with quite a lengthy criticism of the preceding Secretary. Then, as I understood, he stated that the previous situation was similar to the situation which exists at present. Naturally I inferred from his remarks that they would apply with equal vigor to the failure of the present Secretary. I had previously understood him to say that the present Secretary of Agriculture was supporting the prices of agricultural products in accordance with the present law. Is that what my good friend said?

Mr. THYE. No. The Senator is again trying to read words into my statement. I am very fond of the Senator from Oklahoma. If I have any wish at all, it is that I had the ability of the Senator from Oklahoma to cross-examine and quiz a person. Because I do not possess such ability, not being an attorney, while the Senator from Oklahoma is an exceedingly shrewd attorney, I must be very careful not to allow the Senator from Oklahoma to lead me into a marsh and then bog me down. So I shall be very careful to see that the Senator from Oklahoma does not get me out in a marsh where I shall be mired in the bog of words which I know the Senator is capable of throwing at me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I am humble in the presence of my good friend from Minnesota. I am of the opinion that he and I feel the same way about this matter. I believe we do. I understood him to say—and if I am in error I would appreciate his correcting me—that the Secretary of Agriculture either was supporting the prices of farm commodities in accordance with existing law, or had made the statement that he was going to do so. If I am in error in that respect, I should be happy to have my good friend correct me, using his own words, and to inform me as to what he did say in that connection.

Mr. THYE. Of course, the Senator from Oklahoma has seen a copy of the Secretary's speech. It is not my intention to stand here and engage in a lengthy debate with my dear friend from Oklahoma, because I have stated what I know his ability to be. I could not cope with him if he endeavored to engage me in a verbal exchange as to what this, or that, or the next phrase in the Secretary's speech means.

In reply to my dear friend from Oklahoma, I will merely say that the Secretary of Agriculture said, in effect, that his endeavor would be what I have previously indicated. I am not undertaking to quote the Secretary or to read from his speech. However, I know that many of the other listeners in the audience received the same impression which I received, because I heard them thank the Secretary for his statement, and comment most favorably upon it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I invite the Senator's attention to a quotation from the speech of the Secretary of Agriculture:

> Price support laws will be carried out faithfully in every respect. There are mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the so-called basic commodities for 1953 and 1954. Other laws provide for supports on other farm products.

I quote further:

> While enforcing these laws, there will be formulated long-term programs which will more fully and effectively accomplish our overall objectives.

I quote now from the paragraph preceding the one from which I have already quoted:

> Hence, the guarding of farm levels of living requires a program of storage and price supports to help to assure stability of income.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the impression I received from the Secretry's speech in St. Paul on last Wednesday was a sincere promise that he would endeavor with all his might to give parity to agriculture. We know that six commodities are listed as basic commodities. Mandatory 90 percent support is provided for those six basic commodities, which are cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, corn, and wheat. However, dairy products are also included under mandatory supports at from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity, to be applied in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, in his discretion, price supports ranging from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity are applied to dairy products.

There is also included in the act a provision which places the responsibility on the Secretary of Agriculture to support other perishable products from zero up to 90 percent.

Mr. President, in all my years of service in Congress I have endeavored to protect the diversified type of farmers, namely, the man who is engaged in the production of meats, whether it be beef, pork, poultry, or any other type of livestock. It is my opinion that we do not have a full, rounded-out agricultural program so long as we place only six commodities on the mandatory price support list and leave the fate of the other products in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, to support at whatever price he deems to be in the best interest of the Nation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota familiar with the bill which the Senator from Oklahoma introduced in the session of Congress last year and again this year, requiring support by the Secretary of Agriculture of not only beef cattle but poultry products as well, in addition to the six basic commodities?

Mr. THYE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I am familiar with the general provisions of the bill to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred. I, too, at the

beginning of this session, introduced a bill which proposed adding oats, barley, and rye to the mandatory list. There is no reason or justification why oats, barley, and rye, or, for that matter, any other grain that is storable, such as flax or soybeans, should not be included on the mandatory list. There is no reason why only peanuts, rice, cotton, tobacco, corn, and wheat should be designated as the commodities which will receive 90 percent support, and why the supporting of other crops, such as oats, barley, rye, soybeans, and flax, should be left to the discretion of the Secretary.

I believe that we should perfect the present law with amendments similar to those I and other Senators have proposed. However, we have not gone far enough in the field of research in our farm program. The entire emphasis of the Government, as well as of our economy has been on production. Our experimental stations in the field of research and scientific development, whether they deal with feed or livestock, are established for the purpose of assuring greater production. Our entire effort in our industrial plant has been on the production end. The effort has been to get the job done at minimum expense and in minimum time, in order to determine how much we can produce.

In the field of agriculture we have done a remarkable job, as the Senator from Oklahoma so well knows. We have literally made two blades of grass grow—yes, ofttimes even five or six blades—where one blade grew originally. We have made the dairy animal so productive in milk that she no longer produces only enough with which to feed her offspring, as nature first intended, but she is able to feed her offspring, and at the same time produce a great volume of milk for the production of food commodities in the form of dairy products, such as powdered milk and butter, for example. Mr. President, we have failed agriculture by not having made a scientific study of packaging and marketing, processing, and distribution of those commodities.

I need not tell my good friend, the very distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, that it is only a matter of a few years when we were highly criticized because the sandstone caves in Kansas were so full of powdered milk and butter and other dairy products that these perishables were threatened with complete destruction, or at least with being turned into inedible food, useful only as animal feed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I should like to complete my thought on this point. For that reason, Mr. President, any Secretary of Agriculture moves with caution when he is asked to make purchases of perishable commodities. He is confronted with what happened only a few years ago with reference to some of the perishable commodities. I need only refer to the potato program. We in the Minnesota Red River Valley produce a tremendous volume of excellent potatoes.

When 60 percent of parity was the mandatory support price we were being ridiculed as a producer group, and some of us in the Senate, whether we were from Minnesota or from other States, were embarrassed to see photographs of potatoes which were being allowed to deteriorate, either in the field or on old airplane runways, because there was no market for them. The Government was trying to do something about it. We certainly had red faces here on the floor of the Senate in trying to defend that phase of our farm-support program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Before we get to the potato question, my good friend a while ago said that the Secretary of Agriculture does have authority under existing law to support the price of beef cattle.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. He further stated that he himself severely criticized the preceding Secretary of Agriculture for not supporting the price of pork when it reached a price similar to the price of beef today.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then I should like to ask my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, whether he agrees with me that the present Secretary of Agriculture is entitled to criticism for not doing what the law permits him to do, namely, to support the price of beef cattle today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall answer my good friend by stating that my own recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture has been that a firm and positive statement would be wholesome and would have a reassuring effect upon the market, either in the case of perishables or in the case of storable grains. I have stated that, and I am not equivocating at all on what I have said publicly or on what I have said directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. I shall continue to say it.

However, I do remind my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that he, as a member of the Senate, had better look at a little of the past record, in order to make certain that previous Secretaries of Agriculture had likewise hesitated, although they had been in office a great deal longer than the present Secretary of Agriculture has been, for he has been in office only since the 21st of January 1953. The men who left office on January 20 had something to do with making the market soft, and, in that connection, I intend to read some things from the record before I conclude my speech in the Senate at this time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THYE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. KERR. My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, criticized the preceding Secretary of Agriculture for not supporting the price of pork when it went down to about what the price of beef is now. My friend was perfectly sincere in his criticism of last year, was he not?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I never speak unless I am sincere, for if there is one thing I dislike in men, it is demagoguery.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point?

Mr. THYE. Of course.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator from Minnesota would feel that if some Senators on this side of the aisle last year accused the Senator from Minnesota of being purely political in his criticisms those Senators were highly mistaken. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma has asked a question which only he himself can answer; I do not know how anyone else can answer it.

Mr. KERR. I asked the Senator from Minnesota this question: If there had been criticism of the Senator's attitude last year, by statements by Senators on this side of the aisle that his actions in that regard were purely political, is it a fact that those Senators would have been mistaken?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not know that anyone is now endeavoring to criticize Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle for their attacks because of the failure of the Secretary to purchase beef at this time. I am not so referring to any Senators who criticize. I simply say that such Senators possibly are asking the Secretary of Agriculture to do certain things, although he has not yet had sufficient time even to get such matters in his complete control, for he has been in office only since January 21.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point?

Mr. THYE. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of Agriculture did make the positive statement that the price of beef cattle had not yet declined to a point where emergency action was warranted, did he not?

Mr. THYE. I can only answer the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma by referring to certain figures which I admit are not the most recent, but they are the most recent ones I could obtain from the Department. Mr. President, if you and I examine these records, we shall find that the price of beef cattle has taken a drastic drop, but that drop has not altogether occurred in the last several months.

Mr. KERR. I understand, but——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma please bear with me for just a minute?

Mr. KERR. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Minnesota would answer my question.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Oklahoma will bear with me, I shall try to answer his question.

Mr. KERR. Thank you, sir.

Mr. THYE. But I must give the Senator from Oklahoma something constructive when I give him a reply.

Mr. KERR. In addition to the answer?

Mr. THYE. I wish to give the Senator from Oklahoma something constructive.

Mr. President, if we examine the record, we find that in 1951 hogs were selling at 97 percent of parity and beef cattle were selling at 141 percent of parity; and then in January of 1952 the price of beef cattle had dropped from 141 percent of parity to 129 percent.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of Agriculture could not support the price so long as it was above parity, could he?

Mr. THYE. That is correct, but I am just giving the Senator from Oklahoma the trend in the market.

As I have said, in January 1951, the price of hogs was 97 percent of parity. In January 1952, the price of pork was 81 percent of parity. The Secretary did not buy pork.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator from Minnesota say that the price of hogs was 92 percent of parity?

Mr. THYE. I beg the Senator's pardon. It can be seen, Mr. President, how easy it is for a person to be mistaken.

Mr. KERR. I am only asking a question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. And I have just asked the Senator from Oklahoma if he observes how easy it is to be mistaken.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota speaking of himself or of me?

Mr. THYE. The price, as I read the figure, was 81 percent of parity in January 1952. The Secretary of Agriculture did not buy any pork in January 1952.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. Let me continue, please.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a question on that particular point?

Mr. THYE. I ask the Senator to let me answer him; I do not want him to miss this point.

In January there was a conference between the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. We asked him why he did not buy pork when the price of pork was down to 81 percent of parity. He replied to us, "How am I to buy pork? Can you gentlemen tell me what I am to do with it after I have bought it?" That was his answer. Senators need not take my word for it; they can examine the committee hearings.

In January 1952 I again asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan: "Mr. Brannan, you are permitting many and many a young farmer who cannot take this loss to go to the wall, because you are not buying pork and are not stabilizing the market at this time."

But we did not get any affirmative statement from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think the Secretary of Agriculture did so fail?

Mr. THYE. Yes, and I told him so.

Mr. KERR. Then is it not equally tragic for the present Secretary of Agriculture to fail?

Mr. THYE. I must say to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that the then Secretary of Agriculture at that particular time had been in office for a long time and had been instrumental in asking for the increased production of pork, in order that there might be an adequate supply of meat to offset the inflationary trend in food costs. The Secretary of Agriculture then in office had been responsible for asking the producers to increase the production of pork. But when the producers responded to his request and gave him an increased production of pork—the increased production he had requested 8 months earlier—the Secretary of Agriculture then failed to support the producers by taking some of the surplus off the market at that time. Instead, he said, "I don't know what to do with the pork if I do take it off the market."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. THYE. I do not yield at this point, Mr. President; I wish to continue presenting my thought to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma.

The then Secretary of Agriculture did not make the decision to buy pork until late in the spring, when the bulk of the pigs had gone to market. That was my criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture then.

I will say that in the event I find any Secretary of Agriculture tardy in his action in providing supports, I shall be critical of him, whether he be of my political party or of the other political party. I may say that when Mr. Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, was before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in connection with consideration of his nomination to be Secretary of Agriculture, I asked him whether he would be aggressive in the use of his discretionary authority insofar as price supports on perishables were concerned; and he said, "Yes."

When I look at the price index, as given out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, and find in it that in January 1953 the price of beef cattle stood at 92 percent of parity and the price of hogs stood at 86 percent of parity, I must remind my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that the price of pork has risen 5 points, as compared to the low point in January 1952. So the Senator from Oklahoma and I must be fair when we examine the conduct of the previous administration and examine the record of the present administration and the present Secretary of Agriculture, who has not yet been in office 1 month. The previous quotation on beef-cattle prices, as we received it from the Department of Agriculture, was 92 percent of parity. My information, as I have received it unofficially, is that the price of beef cattle now is down to 80 percent of parity in some localities, but in general it is approximately 85 percent of parity. I say that is too low a price for beef cattle, and I do not make any "ifs" or "ands" about it; I say that price is too low.

However, I do say that Mr. Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, has his problems in exactly the same manner that Mr. Brannan said he had his problems a year ago, when he said, "Gentlemen, what am I to do with the pork if I buy it?" That is what he told me.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the release of controls has had something to do with the advance in the price of beef? Is not that taking place at the present time?

Mr. THYE. The release of controls has occurred so very recently that I do not think we can put our finger on a change in the price and say that it is the result of the release of controls. But there is a stiffening of the market. There is a general improvement.

Mr. President, I desire to say further to my distinguished friends, both from Utah and Oklahoma, that within the past year there have been two conditions specifically which have tended to soften this market.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The preceding administration was voted out of office, was it not?

Mr. THYE. Yes; it was.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator of the opinion that if the present Secretary of Agriculture should fail to do anything about the price of beef, the same thing might happen to him?

Mr. THYE. I may say that in the event the present Secretary of Agriculture does not do a better job than has been done with respect to perishable agricultural commodities over a period of the past 4 or 5 years, I shall be critical of him. I shall not go back any further, because the administration which went out of office on January 20 had had ever since 1933 to perfect legislation for the protection of the perishable agricultural commodity market, and had not succeeded in solving the problem with which we are faced.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THYE. I do not wish to yield for the next moment or so. Whether it was the fault of the Congress, or whether it was the fault of the administration which went out of office on January 20, there was a complete failure to find a workable program in connection with the support of perishable agricultural commodity prices; and the Senator from Oklahoma knows that quite as well as I do. The Senator from Oklahoma is too thrifty and too prudent a gentleman to want to go into the market to buy something, to be placed in dead storage, with the probable result that at some future time it would become deteriorated and would therefore be wasted.

I recognize that we have much to learn regarding perishable agricultural commodities. I want to see our surplus agricultural commodities disposed of in a useful manner, and from time to time I shall propose legislation providing for the full use of our perishable agricultural commodities. For that reason, on last Tuesday, when I could not be present in the Senate Chamber, I asked the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] our majority leader, whether he would join with me in the introduction of a bill to provide for the sending of some of our surplus agricultural commodities to the flood-stricken areas of Holland and the British Isles. Under favorable conditions, and in a favorable crop year, we in America are able to produce more than we can

consume domestically. At the present time, we seem to have more than we exactly need. For that reason, I have felt that we should extend aid to the stricken areas of the world which have been faced with terrific losses, having in mind particularly Holland, which faces a possible loss of one-fourth of its agricultural acreage for at least a period of from 1 to 3 crop years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is there not authority to do that under existing law?

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator mean to ask whether there is not presently existing authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to give away such surplus commodities in that manner?

Mr. KERR. Is there not authority now for the administration to include agricultural products, to which the Senator has referred, as part of the aid to be given to the stricken areas?

Mr. THYE. I do not know that there is any particular law which would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to give away any commodities it now has in storage. It would naturally be limited to commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THYE. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. Unless the Secretary of Agriculture acts under the authority he now has, or under some directive to be given him by the Congress, he will never have any beef products in storage, will he?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that beef is not the only thing that is involved. Pork, poultry, butter, and powdered milk are also involved.

Mr. President, I have never been narrow-minded on the subject of the agricultural-supports question. I have always thought of this subject from the standpoint of our entire agricultural production. I have not endeavored simply to have written into the law a provision with respect to something in which I personally was interested, nor have I endeavored to have the Secretary of Agriculture merely take care of some commodity which affected my State only. I have said time after time that we have failed to take care of our diversified type farmer. We have taken care of the producers of peanuts, rice, cotton, tobacco, corn and wheat, but we have not given sufficient thought to a program for the protection of the farmer who is producing dairy products, poultry, eggs, turkeys, pork, beef, and mutton, a program that would assure them that they will not be faced with disastrously low prices if and when they have been instrumental in producing more than merely enough to take care of the dire needs of the Nation.

Mr. President, if I sit in this body for the next 6 years—and I am privileged to do so, God willing—I shall work for a well-rounded farm program, a program that will particularly protect the family-type farmer, the man who is engaged in diversified type farming. It is the farmer of that type who is particularly interested in the enhancement of the fertility of his land, rather than in seeing it impoverished. He is the kind of man who will hand down to oncoming generations acres of land as fertile as it was the day he acquired it with standing timber or broke the virgin sod of our prairies. That is the type of farmer with whom we should all concern ourselves in this legislative session, because he is the forgotten man. The family-type farmer is the forgotten man.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I want to remind my good friend—and I thank him for yielding—that Senate bill 115, previously introduced during this session by the Senator from Oklahoma, covers every product to which the Senator has addressed himself. I commend him for his attitude in that regard, and I share it. But I would like now to ask him whether at the present time the serious emergency and the most pressing emergency with reference to agricultural products is not in reference to the price of beef cattle.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not agree that that is the most pressing and the most critical matter, because, Mr. President, there are two specific questions. If the producers gets the answers to those questions, we shall not have an emergency such as the one with which we are presently faced. The answer is, Mr. President, that in the year 1952 there was a drought in the cattle-producing area in the Southwest. The Senator from Oklahoma knows there was such a drought in his region.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is keenly aware of that. That is but one of the factors which have contributed toward bringing about the present emergency, but it has made the situation so drastic that, in the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, the most pressing emergency in the matter of prices of farm products is as it pertains to beef cattle. I hope the Senator will consider conditions and see if he does not agree with that statement.

Mr. THYE. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that that is a pressing problem. That problem, however, ceased to be the major pressing problem earlier in the past month. I was going to say, earlier in the year, but there has been such a short period of the year 1953 that the problem actually had its beginnings in the calendar year of 1952.

Mr. KERR. But the price——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma bear with me long enough to enable me to convey my thought to him? The only criticism I have of my distinguished friend is that he is so keenly aware of his ability to devastate a man's thought with certain words that he will get those words in when it is least advantageous to the speaker to have him get them in. The Senator knows that; and he is too able a man to deny freedom of speech on the floor at certain times. I say that in all good humor.

The drought condition occurred in the cattle producing area last summer and continued throughout the fall. On the ranges there was the greatest cattle population in the history of our nation. When the rancher was faced with short grass he commenced to cull his herds. When he culled his herds he sent livestock to market. Commencing in January of 1952 cattle were at approximately 129 percent of parity. That is when the rancher first started moving his cattle. It dropped from 141 percent of parity to 129 percent in one year's time. That was a recession under the Democrats; it was not under the Republicans. There was a leveling off in the inflationary price which stood as a threat in 1950 and 1951. When the drought came and the rancher was sending his cattle to market, a weakening was reflected.

Throughout the calendar year it will be found that the market continued to weaken. As the market proceeded to weaken, many a farmer asked himself the question, "Is this the beginning of a recession?" There was no positive statement of the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to allay his fear——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THYE. No, I will not yield. If the Senator from Oklahoma will remain here I shall convey my thought to him, and then I shall be glad to yield.

As I say, there was nothing to allay fear. I stated at that time that had the Secretary of Agriculture—whether it were Mr. Brannan, because he was in office until the 20th of January, or whether it were Mr. Benson, after he took office—stated emphatically, "We intend to step in and buy, if necessary, to firm up the market," the so-called fear which existed would have disappeared. I honestly believe that, Mr. President, and I think the figures will eventually prove that I am correct in my thinking on this question. The fact is that fear had crept into the minds of farmers who had bought 50 or 75 head of feeder cattle last fall, and they had been feeding since last July or August. They noticed the market sliding. They tried to figure out the situation and found that they really did not have any equity left in the feeder cattle, and the feed likewise was a loss. This fear caused livestock to be rushed to market, which further aggravated the situation and weakened the market.

Mr. President, there is no reason in the world why the market should slide as it has in the past few months, except fear. The fear was started with the movement of drought cattle, and then selling because of the fear that it was the beginning of a recession.

The cattle population is not out of proportion. We have full employment. At the present time we are faced with additional high appropriations for defense construction and other defense expenditures. Therefore, we are going to have full employment in this calendar year and full economy in every phase and can have in agriculture, too. We are going to have a consumption which will hold agricultural commodity prices high if we can allay this fear psychology. I do not think there can be any question about that. The price of beef is exceptionally low for no other reason than the existence of fear.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I wanted to make the point that it is a fear psychology which has brought prices down. If the producer will hold his livestock in the feed lots and market it in an orderly manner, I am confident that the market will stiffen of its own accord.

That statement is borne out by the St. Paul Livestock Association and the National Association of Cattle Dealers in convention in Chicago.

I have before me an article from a St. Paul newspaper containing a statement by W. P. Dolan, of South St. Paul, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Cattle Dealers and Order Buyers. I read:

W. P. Dolan, of South St. Paul, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Cattle Dealers and Order Buyers, warned that if the farmers "get panicky and rush cattle to market, prices will drop fast."

At Denver, Sam C. Hyatt, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, said producers generally are agreed with Benson that there is no practical way to support beef prices.

At Chicago, a group of prominent cattle dealers said farmers already are withholding beef animals from the market in an effort to stabilize falling prices.

Benson said the Government knew of no way to support beef prices and was putting its faith in an attempt to induce orderly marketing to halt the price skid.

Mr. President, I say, in all sincerity, that if we can convey the message to the producer that this is not the beginning of another major recession, we shall establish order in the selling of livestock.

I am confident that if we can reestablish order in the selling of livestock the market will firm itself, just as the pork market firmed itself in the past 12 months, during which it had gone from a low of 80 percent of parity up to almost 100 percent at one time last fall.

I will say to my friend from Oklahoma that he and I had better get right down to the facts and figures and try in some manner to convey the message to the producer that the market break has come about by fear selling. I shall not cease in my efforts to help the cattle producer. The Senator from Oklahoma can rest assured as to that. I shall make my voice heard with the administration in urging that we must not let the market break.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield. I am going to say something unpleasant about the past administration, and I do not want the Senator from Oklahoma to run off the floor.

Mr. KERR. I shall try to restrain to the best of my ability my impulse to run from the floor.

Mr. THYE. I had to beg the Senator to remain on the floor a few minutes ago, and I thought the Senator might leave again.

Mr. KERR. In that regard, I asked the Senator if he would yield, and he said "No," and I started to leave. Then I asked him if he would yield, and he said "Yes," and he made another 10-minute speech. That was his privilege; he does have the floor. The only reason why I started to leave was that he told me he would not yield.

I wish to say that I concur in the Senator's remarks about the fear psychology. I agree with him in his statement that in January the price of beef was about at parity. That was the middle of January.

Mr. THYE. No; February 3.

Mr. KERR. I refer to the record in that regard. The Senator from Minnesota said that in January the price of beef was at about 92 percent of parity.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct. I was trying to correct my own remarks by saying "February 3," to be exact. The Senator is correct. I referred to January of 1953, and I was trying to correct my remarks, because my official figures showed February 3.

Mr. KERR. I am glad to have the Senator correct his own remarks, and not mine.

Further, I concur with the Senator that the Secretary of Agriculture did not have the authority to support the price of beef cattle as long as it was above 90 percent of parity, but that he did have authority to support it when it went below 90 percent of parity, and I believe he said that at the present time it is about 80 percent of parity in some parts of the country.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And Oklahoma is one of those places.

I further concur with him that the Secretary of Agriculture could have removed a great deal of the fear by making a positive declaration that he was going to support the price of beef cattle to the extent permitted by the law. But I remind my good friend from Minnesota that instead of making that statement at the moment when the price of beef cattle had sunk to a point of 80 percent of parity, the Secretary of Agriculture said that the price of beef cattle had not yet declined to such a point that emergency action was warranted. Therein is the basis of the criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture by the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Oklahoma sincerely believes that his good friend and great friend, and a real friend of the farmers of this country, the Senator from Minnesota, agrees with the Senator from Oklahoma in that regard.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Secretary has discretional authorization to support from 0 to 90 percent; but if the market had just broken, along about February 3, from around 92, he had not had very much time to step in and commence to support the market. As I have said, he has discretional authorization to support when the price is between 0 and 90 percent. For that reason I am not condemning the Secretary, even though he did not step in to buy immediately when the market broke.

I have advised the Secretary that a firm statement in support of perishables might possibly stiffen the perishable market so that no action would be necessary. I still say so, without any question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that the representatives of agriculture have not asked the Secretary for support? Can the Senator inform us on that point?

Mr. THYE. That was evident from the statement I read from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, wherein there was reference to the livestock association.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the cattle growers as a whole have always taken the attitude that they did not want to be controlled by the Government, did not want any controls, that they wanted to take care of themselves, and stand on their own feet?

Mr. THYE. That is true, but even though they themselves did not ask for it, I am concerned about the man who has bought 75 or 100 head of cattle when they were offered in the drought-stricken area, and put them in a feed lot. He has no money to enable him to suffer a drastic loss in those cattle, because he is only a small operator. He may be a farmer operating entirely on a bank loan. He may be a farmer who would be compelled by a falling market to sell his personal property, if he suffered a drastic loss, after buying 75 or a hundred or a couple of hundred head of cattle.

When I see the market break as it has broken, I know exactly what is happening in the feed lot. It is the man to whom I have referred about whom I am concerned. I know the big cattle operator has told us to keep hands off. He told OPS, and he told legislative price-support advocates, to keep hands off him. But that was in the rosy time, when his prices went up to around 140 percent of parity.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I believe I quote my distinguished friend correctly when I say that he stated a few minutes ago that he thought that the evidence showed that if the Government would let things alone prices would firm back again. I am interested in what the Senator is talking about and I notice that for the first time in many months the price of meat is falling and the consumers are getting a break. I read where prime leg of lamb was 59 cents a pound Saturday as against nearly $1 a few months ago. This is all to the good for the consuming public and I, instead of bemoaning the decline in beef prices, thank God for it. The consumer is the important person in this country. I speak for him.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the Senator to permit me to say that I thank God that a great many of the consumers are getting the benefit. It is time the American consumers got a break in what is going on.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct, but through the drastic break in the prices the young operator, the young veteran who fought for the Senator and me a few years ago, who went into the business of farming since World War II, and did it entirely on credit, and got caught with 50 or 100 head of steers in the feed lot, could very well be cleaned out, his creditors could call every loan,

and he would be sitting there with nothing. Therefore such a drop is not to the best interest of either the Senator or me, or the consuming public.

Mr. TOBEY. I believe it is time for the United States to look facts in the face, and recognize that if a man cannot buy at the right price, he had better keep out of the cattle business.

Mr. THYE. I cannot subscribe to that, because the farmer is not responsible for what happens to him. He knows not at the planting time what his harvest will be. This is the planting time in some sections, and he knoweth not whether God will favor him with sunshine and rain, or he will be cursed with a drought. Therefore an examination must be made into production, whether crops or livestock, in order that we may be certain that he will have a food supply. If there is an abundance, and the market breaks because there is 3 or 4 or 5 percent of surplus, then I am not going to be a party to anything that is going to add to the possible distress that might follow to the producer or farmer.

Mr. TOBEY. When the Senator and I run for the United States Senate we take a chance, do we not? We do not know what the result will be in November. We take a chance, too.

Mr. THYE. That is a different situation from the one I refer to here.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In view of the extensive review which has been given of the cattle situation by the various Senators who have been speaking along with the Senator from Minnesota, I think the RECORD should not be silent on the part Government interference has played in the breaking of cattle prices. The Senator has referred to the drought as the precipitating cause. Drought certainly was an agent in sending the cattle to the market. But the situation involved the psychology that had been previously created by the rollbacks of the OPS. If I remember correctly, it was about 2 years ago that the Office of Price Stabilization proposed to initiate a series of three rollbacks. One of them was drastic. Congress took action which protested to such an extent that the last two were not put into effect. The feeder who bought the cattle from the grower at a certain price and then suffered the experience of having a rollback placed in effect had his fingers burned because of Government interference.

Mr. THYE. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. That situation operated to the injury of both the feeder and the grower. After that the feeder was more cautious, because he had bought his cattle and feed at certain prices. The Government stepped in and rolled back his prices, and he found that he was feeding for nothing. He was feeding for the fun of it. So Government interference is partly responsible for the attitude of the ranchers and stock growers, who say that they want the Government to keep its hands off. I think we ought not to lose sight of that fact.

Secondly, the maintenance of OPS posted price ceilings in the grocery stores of the big cities created a field in which the butcher, the packer, and the handler of cattle gouged the consumer, because the cattle had been bought for several months, at lower prices than were reflected in the market. The consumer has not been getting the benefit of the lower prices which both the cattle grower and the cattle feeder have been suffering for many months—perhaps as much as a year. So again Government intervention has interfered with both the legitimate price for the consumer and the legitimate price for the grower.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota are very pertinent and directly to the point. The factors to which reference has been made have had a tendency to put fear into the mind of the producer, which has brought about hurried marketing. But there is much more than livestock involved in the breaking of the market. I have been greatly concerned all fall to see the grain market breaking as it has broken.

If we examine the record we obtain an insight into what brought about the softening of the grain market. It was not a political party. It was not the election on November 4. It was excessive selling of Commodity Credit Corporation corn in the months of October, November, and December which softened the grain market. The harvest of corn usually comes along in October and November. If we offer Commodity Credit Corporation corn on the cash market at the same time the corn is being harvested, we shall have a break in the market. That is what took place.

Moreover, there were excessive imports of oats, which softened the market. The grain market is reflected in the livestock market. All the markets are wrapped up together in the mind of the producer, who watches the grain market, the livestock market, and the dairy produce market. All of them have a psychological effect upon the mind of the producer.

If we note the imports of oats, we see that in the calendar year 1951 and 1952 imports were more than double those of the previous year. In the calendar year 1950 and 1951 the United States imported 30,231,000 bushels of oats, and in 1951 and 1952 there were imports of 62,270,000 bushels. Double the amount of oats came into this country, as compared with the previous year, which broke the feed market. The feed market has a reflex effect on the livestock market.

With respect to wheat unfit for human consumption in the calendar year 1950–1951 the imports were 11,647,000 bushels. In the calendar year 1951–1952 imports were 29,920,000, more than double the previous amount.

If we go down the list we find that imports of rye were 1,342,000 bushels in the calendar year 1951–1952. This had a tendency to aggravate the condition of the markets and soften the entire agricultural marketing program. We are only now experiencing the full effects of the unwise action of the administration in the fall, when it sold Commodity Credit Corporation corn in the amounts which have been indicated, directly in competition with incoming cash corn.

We have been unduly critical of the present Secretary of Agriculture in the brief period of time he has been in office. Secretary Benson took the oath of office in January. Agricultural markets were on the decline at the time he took office, and the decline has continued. If we were to cease to criticize, and try to talk more constructively as Members of Congress with respect to a further study of the agricultural farm support program, we would have a tendency to stiffen the market rather than to soften it, as it has been softened.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I noticed that the Senator started his remarks by commenting on the speech of the Secretary of Agriculture in St. Paul. I sat here last week and heard the debate and criticism on that subject. I read the speech several times. It seems to me that 1 or 2 statements were lifted out of context, to form the basis of the criticism. After reading the speech carefully several times, I could not find anything in it to criticize. It seems to state a sound economic policy, and also seems to pledge the Secretary to carry out the Republican platform and to attempt, in some way or other, to develop new processes, new markets, and so forth, as well as a price support program to bring farm prices up to parity. It seems to me that when we consider the entire speech fairly and carefully, it is a complete answer to the criticisms which have been made.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I sat in the convention hall that evening watching the reaction of the audience to the speech of the Secretary. Frankly, I had the feeling that the audience was with him. When the meeting came to an end and the audience was free to come forward, members of the audience came forward by the hundred to shake the Secretary's hand. I heard comments right and left to the effect that it was a good, sound, honest speech.

That was the reaction of the farmers. I have received telephone calls from farmers in my State, and they say, "We do not like the farm price drops, but we realize that the Secretary cannot solve all the problems in a couple of weeks—and he has been in office only about that long. We will bear with the Secretary."

I am confident, Mr. President, that if we look at the background of Secretary Benson we shall see how well qualified he is for the position. He was raised on a farm. He has been an operator of agricultural lands. He was educated in the agricultural colleges of our Nation. He has a doctor's degree in agricultural economics. His heart is with the farmer. He is as much concerned over declining prices as though he himself were the producer.

I know, from talking with him, that it is his intention to put forth every effort to make an overall study of the entire agricultural program in order to aid Congress in the drafting and enactment of legislation which will give us a

sound support program and which will assure the producer that he will not be faced with a drastically low price whenever there happens to be a slight surplus of the product which he is producing. I am confident that ultimately we shall see a very constructive addition to our present farm support program. We have come a long way in a period of 20 or 25 years in the philosophy of the entire agricultural program. But we must still get at the weak spots in the overall program. One of the weak spots is our handling of perishable commodities, whether they be dairy products or citrus fruits. Citrus fruit growers are also faced with a serious problem. They, too, are producers of perishables.

The criticism on the floor of the Senate in the past week of the Secretary's speech in St. Paul was unjust. As I heard the speech and as I read it later, there was nothing in it which justified criticism of the kind to which it has been subjected, both in Congress and in the press of the Nation.

I am confident that Congress will come forth with a program which will not only protect the consumer but will also give him at all times an abundant supply of food and fiber.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to cite for the Senator from Minnesota some agricultural history in Congress. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota remembers the year 1934 and the slaughter of the little pigs?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. There was so much beef available, the suggestion was made that we get rid of it. I was a Member of the House of Representatives and I served on the Committee on Agriculture with the distinguished Marvin Jones. Henry Wallace, our Secretary of Agriculture at the time, came before the Committee on Agriculture and said that he could do something about the production of beef. He propounded a most amazing theory, Mr. President, and he wanted $3½ million with which to do it. He wanted to stop the production of beef. He was asked how he would stop the production of beef, and he replied, "We will sterilize the cows on the range and enforce birth control on cattle."

He wanted $3½ million with which to do that, Mr. President. What utter nonsense. That was suggested in all good faith by Henry Wallace, our Secretary of Agriculture. Beware of the Government taking care of the farmer. I say let the farmer take care of himself through his own ability, research, and persuasiveness. Let him not trust too much to Government to provide a crutch.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am very familiar with the philosophy advocated in the early thirties as to how to control agricultural production by forcing a scarcity of production on the consumer and compelling the consumer to bid for the product. That is the wrong psychology. It is an entirely wrong philosophy, Mr. President. I say we should have an abundance of food and fiber. However, because the producer cannot foresee what his harvest will be—and I may say that the producer of eggs, for example, cannot foretell what his production of eggs will be even though he orders 400 pullets, because half of them may die before the season is over——

Mr. TOBEY. Very generally that is the case.

Mr. THYE. Therefore, we must have an abundant supply of food. However, if that abundance is going to ruin the market for such food, we, as Members of Congress, must accept the responsibility of placing a floor under the product, so that the producer will not be liquidated in the process of producing more food than the consumer is willing to buy in the market place.

That is why we want to support agricultural products. We want to support them so that there will always be a certainty with respect to the consumer having an abundant supply of food and fiber, and that the producer will not go bankrupt merely because he happens to run into a season of favorable weather.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we in Congress try in a constructive manner to aid the Secretary of Agriculture in handling perishable products and other commodities we will do more for the producer than we can do by criticizing the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture at St. Paul on Wednesday evening.

INCREASE OF TITLE I LOAN INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION OF FHA—CONSIDERATION BY THE SENATE OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 27

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution No. 27 has been on the calendar since February 4. It was approved unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee and, so far as I know, there is no opposition to it. The joint resolution increases the title I loan insurance authorization of FHA from $1,250,000,000 to $1,750,000,000. This title covers insurance by the FHA of loans, for the repair, alteration, or improvement of existing housing.

The program is virtually at a standstill, and this fact is causing concern and financial hardship to home owners, lending institutions, contractors, and suppliers of building materials and equipment.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency is to take up a companion bill today or tomorrow. Therefore, if the final enactment of the legislation is not to be delayed unnecessarily, the Senate should act on the bill as soon as possible.

A moment ago I consulted the majority leader with reference to the joint resolution, and he informed me that probably the Senate would take it up on Wednesday of this week. Therefore, I wish to have the Senate take notice that Senate Joint Resolution No. 27 probably will be considered on Wednesday. My information is that there is no opposition to it, and therefore it should be disposed of promptly. It was unanimously reported by the committee.

THE UNION OF SAVAGE SADISTIC RAVAGERS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is in the spirit of brotherhood and kind regard for our fellow man, the spirit of true freedom, that I rise before this time-honored body to address my colleagues upon a subject of vital concern to freemen everywhere.

I have chosen for the title of my remarks the U. S. S. R., which from sad experience, I can only interpret to mean the Union of Savage Sadistic Ravagers.

Through the mediums of modern warfare—the last three wars of global significance which include the Korean war, we have become somewhat hardened to the brutalities which have constantly surrounded us. So used to tales of murder, brutality, and bloodshed have we become, that somehow these events leave us untouched unless they strike right home.

Yet I am sure that deep in the hearts of all of us there is still a genuine feeling for humanity the world over. Indeed it is that tender regard for those who are less fortunate than ourselves which constantly reminds us of that age-old story of a passerby who witnessed the sight of a man about to be hanged.

Said he, it will be remembered:

There, but for the grace of God, go I.

Soon—very soon, I hope—we will learn again, while we are still free, that the enslavement and murder of people in other lands directly or indirectly, and sometimes very swiftly affects our freedoms and our liberties here at home.

I refer at this critical period of our world's history to the total disregard for human liberty, and human decency which Soviet Russia has so recently again exhibited by its treatment of the last helpless group of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain—those whose unhappy lives down through the ages have been marked by tragedy, horror, and sorrow. I have reference, of course, to the present Soviet program of persecution directed against the Jews.

It is high time that we unmask the brutality of this despotic Soviet regime and expose it to the world for what it truly represents; namely, a sadistic ravager of all that is fine and decent in the hearts of freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, our America is a great Nation—it is a proud Nation. In the past half century we have contributed generously of both American lives and dollars in war and in peace to make the world a better place in which to live. But despite all our great sacrifices for others we are constantly being placed, sometimes by our foes and at other times by our allies, in a position of a nation on trial.

Since the end of World War II and throughout the present cold war, the highly successful propaganda campaign against America and those who subscribe to our concepts of freedom has given to millions of people throughout the world the lie that we are imperialistic in our aims and objectives.

Under this indictment we have permitted our people and our way of life to be led around by the nose.

We have been weak and faltering because of extreme beneficence and now we find ourselves at a crossroads, where sooner or later we may be compelled to act drastically and with all due speed.

Now, however, for the first time before all the peoples of the earth—all races and creeds—Soviet Russia stands exposed, naked in all its brutal ambitions.

Its bloody hands are stained visibly, for all the world to see.

The time has arrived for America to meet the war of propaganda—upon the record of Russia's sadistic deeds.

In our beloved country, and wherever in the world men live under well ordered law which prescribes and demands liberty and justice for all, there is a tender regard for the helpless in our midst.

In the cold, brutal anti-Semitic program that Soviet Russia is pursuing now, all elements of human decency are gone.

Today, in East Germany, we are witnessing the sad spectacle of the young, the old, the weak, the aging—recent victims of the horrors of Nazi concentration camps and extermination chambers—taking their few remaining possessions on their backs and fleeing once again into areas which give promise of freedom. It is only tranquillity and peace that they hope for.

In our short lives, Mr. President—yours and mine—we have witnessed this same awful spectacle on two occasions. I know of nothing to better describe the insane bestiality of the demons of the Kremlin. They mock and mimic Hitler at his worst.

The latest manifestation of Soviet savagery is merely the continuation of a well-conceived plan to exterminate every racial group behind the iron curtain and thereafter to exterminate democracy everywhere. Consequently, what I am describing to you is not something remote from our lives, but is the sort of thing that could happen tomorrow to other free people, even to ourselves, as it has already come to pass in many places throughout the world.

Mr. President, Soviet anti-Semitism is not new. This is true despite all the grand proclamations of cultural autonomy that were made public in many ways by the Soviet Government. That was a fiction.

The plain fact is that Soviet Russia has waged a constant war against Judaism.

In the 30 years since the Soviet Russian revolution, every trace of Jewish life has been obliterated. The Jewish schools, the Jewish press, the Jewish cultural and welfare organizations have been destroyed, and their leaders have gone into slave-labor camps. All remnants of religious and cultural movements have disappeared.

The organized campaign to drive Jews out of Russian public life was inaugurated by Soviet Russia in 1947. We are not interested in the fancy names that were used to describe it.

A similar drive was continued in 1948.

Consequently, when the Prague trials occurred, the world witnessed a debased parade of slanders that were taken bodily from long-discredited forged writings about the Jews.

Interestingly enough, the Prague trial spoke of plots by Jews. This indicated clearly that Soviet Russia had adopted anti-Semitism as a regular instrument of its national policy.

The recent Soviet break in diplomatic relations with the State of Israel, and the Soviet plot and connivance charges are no surprise to any informed person. Rather, they are logical parts of Soviet state policy to cease to have dealings with any democratic nations when it cannot force or bully them into the Soviet sphere of influence. It is diplomacy by terror.

The tragedy is the imperiled fate of nearly 3,000,000 Jews still living in the Soviet Union or in its satellites. It obviously signals a sharp continued step-up of the Soviet's anti-Semitic terror campaign against the Jews in Iron Curtain countries.

In the severance of diplomatic relations, we have another profound indication of Soviet policy which proclaims in all its infamy that the ends of Communist imperialism justify any means.

All of us can recall the days of cooperation with the Western World which had marked Russia's policy to consolidate socialism at home; and surely we remember the attempts by the then new and growing Soviet Union to woo diplomatic recognition from established powers.

Now look at them. Having achieved by extended olive branches and friendly smiles the very recognition which was all-important in those earlier days, Red Russia now turns and twists its diplomacy to suit a new end—to split the Western World, stir up neo-nazism, and inflame the Arab States into a pro-Soviet attitude, by stabbing Israel in the back and withdrawing recognition.

The history of nations that have used anti-Semitism in the past as an instrument of national policy is a record of disorder, chaos, and eventual disintegration from within. At first, these things were not readily apparent. On the contrary, with the secret police in complete control, terror was struck into the hearts of the helpless citizenry. Yet the leaders of such tyranny were constantly worried. Others before them had perished in purge trials. So those leaders wanted to assure themselves that a similar debacle would not happen to them.

Hence the necessity for choosing something upon which the minds of the people could be focused, instead of the economic, social, and political chaos that confronted them.

In short, we are dealing with a sick regime that is uncertain of its own present, and wishes to assure its future by imposing another reign of terror upon an innocent helpless people.

Today, Soviet Russia is using the fantastic big lie of anti-Semitism as a regular weapon of state policy. No charges are too preposterous to promote their diabolical aims of world domination. Now, even medical doctors and such clearly non-political relief organizations as the Joint Distribution Committee are grist for these Red lie-mills.

This concept of the scapegoat is as old as human history. Its pages are filled with a record of bloody pogroms that were used to divert the minds of the people away from the evils of a despotic regime was perpetuating, and the barbarism of its operations and plans. It is an old refuge, and one to which scoundrels resort in order to cover up their own depredations that cannot be performed in the broad light of day.

The objectives of such a policy are clear. They provide a whipping boy for the oppressed millions who live in horror and slavery within the Red borders. The purpose of such a scapegoat is to win new allies for the debased doctrines of communism, in the discredited Fascists, the revived Nazi groups, and other forces of reaction that want to destroy democracy at home and abroad. The plain fact of the matter is that this is an open admission of failure.

The claims of the Soviet Union are not being followed by corresponding achievements. The Soviet house of cards is beginning to crumble and fall from within.

In the cold war that Russia has been waging against the Western World, she has made much use of the word "democracy," just as she has frequently used the word "peace." Elaborate Soviet-inspired conferences are held throughout the world. Millions of documents and billions of words utter the praise of Russian "democracy." This appeals to impoverished peoples everywhere. Soviet Russia thus extols the virtues of their communistic government and their kind of "democracy."

Now, for the first time, we have a clear view as to what this democracy consists of. In its latest manifestation, anti-Semitism, the peoples of the world can judge and determine for themselves whether they prefer this kind of slavery to the democracy of freedom and justice that we know so well.

Here is a Soviet fraud on democracy.

No longer should America be twitted and led around by its nose.

It is time that we, ourselves, assume the leadership and proclaim to the world in unmistakable terms the kind of democracy that Russia is now practicing upon another minority in its latest anti-Semitism policy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I have been very much interested in the remarks which have been made today by my friend, the Senator from New Jersey; and I desire to compliment him for the fine degree of restraint he uses. I, myself, could not do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. In my judgment, the Senator from New Jersey has not been half so strong as he could well be in expressing himself in regard to this situation.

Let me hurl at the forces of darkness and hellishness over there the injunction of the New Testament:

> And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.
>
> For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

In indicting Soviet Russia, as the Senator from New Jersey has done so well and so truthfully today, does he realize that at practically every hearing held by Senate committees, including the meeting held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with Mr. Dulles, among the

numerous newspaper reporters present will be found at least two Soviet reporters. In fact, one is in the press gallery now, taking notes on what I am saying.

What suckers we in America are, Mr. President, when we allow access to our hearings to representatives of Tass, Pravda, and Izvestia. The time has come to call a halt to these things and to clean house ourselves. Let us not be suckers all the way through. Let us kick them out; that is what they deserve.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for the contribution he has made. I can assure him that I feel as deeply and as bitterly as he does.

Mr. President, the kind of brutal, sadistic savagery to which I have referred is not new to mankind. Many times before, nations and empires have used high-sounding terms to characterize their brutalities and their tyranny, yet they always ended in their own ultimate destruction.

We can now recall with profit the words of that famous British warrior, Galgacus, who lived about A. D. 85.

Yet these words which he used in condemning the Romans are as applicable to Soviet Russia today as the time when Galgacus first uttered them. He said:

> Robbers of the world, they have exhausted the land and now scour the sea.
>
> If their victims are rich, they despoil them; if they are poor, they subjugate them; and neither East nor West can satisfy them. Alone among men they covet with equal greed both poverty and riches.
>
> To robbery, murder, and pillage they give the false name of empire, and when they make a desolation they call it peace.

Could anything more aptly describe the debauchery of freedom that Soviet Russia is practicing today?

I leave this to the good judgment of my colleagues, and to history.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. A while ago the Senator from New Jersey referred to refugee camps in Germany, I think, as well as in Russia.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I was in Berlin, Germany, for several weeks, and in the month of December I visited the refugee camps in person. Five hundred persons a day come from the east side, where the Soviet regime holds sway, to the west side. The two sides represent the difference between darkness and light. One side is gloomy, the other is a picture of frightfulness turned to joy; there is the Christmas spirit on one side, the spirit of death on the other. I saw there men, women, and little children, made in the image of God, as much as I, and I saw their faces. Man's inhumanity to man is reflected in every face, as they come from the Soviet regime, on the east, to the west side. Thank God there is a west side, and may it grow stronger and stronger as time goes on, until it has done a perfect work.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution. The junior Senator from New Jersey remembers very well the situation which the Senator from New Hampshire describes. When I was in Berlin the last time, refugees were coming to the west side at the rate of 1,200 a day, so their number was even greater at that time. I think that was in August of last year. But, Mr. President, in addressing my fellow Senators today, there is one point I wish to make crystal clear. We are not dealing with a problem that is confined to any one nationality.

Nor are we appealing for sentiment alone, in order to help a remarkable people that is being oppressed and despoiled once more, laudable as such things are.

The fact I wish to emphasize is we are dealing with a preconceived, carefully planned scheme of Soviet Russian Communist policy. Soviet Russia is now attempting to win over the neo-Nazis in Germany. It wants to do the same thing with the Arabs in the Middle East.

Likewise, it has cooperated with fifth columnists everywhere.

And why is Soviet Russia doing all these things? The answer is perfectly plain.

The Kremlin is anxious to establish an anti-American axis.

The purpose is to gradually throw a chain of bondage around free peoples everywhere.

As they are consumed, one by one, the hope of Soviet Russia is to ultimately destroy America.

Make no mistake about it. We are dealing with a conspiracy that has for its object, the destruction of liberty and freedom everywhere.

Consequently, as the torchbearers of republican principles we should be the first ones to do something about this, if we intend to remain free.

We have no alternative but to wage ceaseless propaganda warfare against the lies, the misinterpretations, the baseless falsifications that form the basis of this Soviet conspiracy.

Lest you believe that I am talking about some theoretical problem that exists in the imagination of your speaker, let us now call the roll and review the nations that already have been steamrollered to death by this Soviet conspiracy.

While courageous Finland fought Russia to a standstill, in the ensuing "peace," a good chunk of Finland was bitten off by Russia and is now a part of the Communist regime.

Surely, we have not forgotten how Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Koenigsburg, and East Germany were gobbled up by Soviet Russia and have been completely absorbed by the Soviet Union.

Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, and Hungary followed quickly in the same deathly path.

We all know about the rape of Poland, and how that strong apostle of democracy, Czechoslovakia, went down under the Russian tyrants' heel.

But her activities were not confined to Europe alone.

Recall what happened in Outer Mongolia, Tannu Tuva, which is near Mongolia, and the port of Port Arthur, and Dairen. And in the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands in Japan.

Need we be reminded how Tibet and China and parts of Indochina have succumbed to Soviet imperialism?

And Communist North Korea is burning in the minds of all of us.

The warning is plain. The Soviet technique of infiltration, the big lie, divide and conquer, is aimed at destroying the free countries one by one, and eventually, this country as well.

There is the rollcall, Mr. President.

There is the warning.

Here is a challenge to free peoples everywhere, lest this tidal wave of communism engulf us all.

Are we a Nation of mice or are we men?

Are we believers in the principle that governments should be under law rather than men, or will we let the Soviet tyranny prevail?

This is the challenge and this is our responsibility.

We must never forget that wherever freedom is trampled underfoot—in this instance Soviet anti-Semitism—if we remain supine, it will not be long before it is trampled underfoot here at home, as well.

It is only proper and fitting that we shove back into their throats an epigram that is of the Communists' own making. As we witness their lies, deceit, and trickery, that makes a mockery and a sham out of their pretense to democracy, it is clear that this debased, corrupt system of communism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

In this latest campaign of Soviet anti-Semitism, this is the time for freemen to stand up and be counted as true believers in democracy.

This is a period when all of us who believe in freedom should cry out to the world against the latest form of barbarism of the U. S. S. R.—the "union of savage, sadistic ravagers."

In this vein, I submit, together with my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a resolution which, since it is short, I shall read:

> That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaign being conducted by the Soviet Union and its satellite states against members of the Jewish faith deserves the strongest condemnation, and that the attention of all persons believing in democracy and human freedom should be invited to the striking parallel between the Communist anti-Semitic campaign and like practices by other totalitarian movements, such as nazism and fascism.

Mr. President, I have been requested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to permit him to become a cosponsor of the resolution, and I am delighted to add his name. I send the resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) submitted by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FERGUSON) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaign being conducted by the Soviet Union and its satellite states against members of the Jewish faith deserves the strongest condemnation, and that the attention of all persons believing in democracy and human freedom should be invited to the

striking parallel between the Communist anti-Semitic campaign and like practices by other totalitarian movements, such as nazism and fascism.

REPORT OF AN INSPECTION OF CERTAIN OVERSEAS MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on yesterday the Armed Services Committee of the Senate released the report of an inspection of our overseas military installations in the North Atlantic and Mediterranean areas conducted by its Subcommittee on Military Public Works during the last congressional recess. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of that subcommittee which, in addition to myself, was composed of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The overseas inspection was conducted by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana. Other commitments prevented the Senator from Mississippi from joining us.

I wish to discuss with the Senate the report as well as the whole background of our military-construction program, which involves billions upon billions of dollars and which should merit the closest attention of the Congress now and for some time to come. This subcommittee, two members of which are no longer members of the committee, believes it has laid the foundation for heavy savings in our defense program. We believe we have uncovered some glaring mistakes and have taken steps which will result in the taxpayers receiving savings mounting into billions of dollars. We are equally convinced that the job has just begun. We believe that if the appropriate committees follow through, the end results will even exceed what we can now hope for.

This subcommittee had its origin last May, when the Department of Defense submitted to the Congress a request for authorization of $3,100,000,000 in construction for the three services for fiscal year 1953. When the junior Senator from Louisiana first saw the thousands of pages of backup data to support this enormous request, he suggested to the Armed Services Committee that we request the Secretary of Defense to reduce this requested authorization by one-half. It was because the Secretary of Defense replied that he had already reduced this request as much as he felt it was within his ability to do so that a subcommittee was appointed under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Louisiana to study this bill. Later we established that the services had asked originally for some $6,000,000,000, but that Secretary Lovett had refused to submit more than one-half that amount because of budgetary limitations.

Later, a letter was sent by former President Truman to the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], forecasting dire results if the amounts requested were greatly reduced. Articles began to appear in at least one nationally syndicated column forecasting calamity from our proposed budgetary trimming and insinuating that those of us seeking to reduce these requests were guilty either of ignorance or of unpatriotic motives.

When the authorization bill reached the Senate from the other body, we found that of the approximately $2,000,000,000 requested for projects within the United States, there had been practically no reduction made in the House of Representatives. With regard to the overseas program, the Department of Defense had been instructed to seek $250,000,000 of the amount requested from mutual-security funds, which had already been authorized.

Our subcommittee went to work on this bill under the severe handicap of shortness of time, actually less than 1 month from adjournment. We obtained the loan of three able civilian employees of the Defense Establishment—Mr. George Vinzant, Mr. Charles C. Phillips, both employed with the Army engineers, and Mr. Louis E. Dowling, Jr., of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department.

Some days our subcommittee sat as many as 14 hours taking testimony from the services. Our printed record ran to 709 pages after substantial deletion for security purposes. We reduced the amount requested for the overwhelming majority of the projects at home. The amounts requested for some projects were eliminated completely. Of the funds requested for 230 installations, the average project was reduced by approximately $2,800,000. The total reduction was nearly $700 million.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services accepted the report in its entirety, including two important substantive amendments which I shall discuss later.

Even before the bill reached the floor some of us had evidence that certain officials within the Defense Establishment were already approaching Members of Congress to show them the amount of reduction that would be effected within their districts and States, in order that they could anticipate the criticism from local civic-minded bodies that could arise over the disappointment that funds for their nearby installations had been reduced. Nevertheless, the bill passed the Senate without opposition, and in the conference between the two Houses, the Senate conferees, consisting of the Senators from Mississippi and Oregon and myself, were successful in sustaining almost every reduction contained in the bill. Thus, we had reduced this bill by almost 25 percent below the amount requested by the Defense Establishment, in a manner which could not prevent a single gun from shooting, a plane from flying, or a ship from sailing. Some items may be necessary to construct in the future, but the vast majority of those eliminated should never be built.

We were successful in maintaining two important amendments, both of which may lead to economies much greater than those effected by the careful item-by-item search conducted by our subcommittee. One was an amendment offered in the subcommittee by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], establishing a Director of Installations in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, who would be answerable not to the Secretary for Air, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Navy, but answerable and responsible only to the Secretary of Defense for advice about and surveillance of this gigantic worldwide construction program. This proposal was designed to remedy the inadequacies of the tools available to the Secretary of Defense to pare down these excessive requests.

After all, it is far better that the Defense Establishment never ask for unnecessary authorizations and appropriations than it is that a congressional committee must discover waste or excess and reduce or eliminate it. Once a request for an unnecessary authorization and appropriation is made, it is difficult to defeat it, because citizens of the locality affected are generally anxious to see the money spent in their area and they will usually do everything in their power to bring pressure upon their Senators and Representatives to obtain the funds. It is difficult for Senators and Representatives to resist this local pressure and it is likewise difficult for their colleagues to refuse to understand their plight. Thus when these vast requests are made, involving bases throughout the United States, the pressure upon Congress for the funds becomes so widespread and so intense from so many quarters that those of us who desire to reduce these requests find ourselves in danger of being enveloped as if by a tidal wave. It is, therefore, far preferable to cut off unnecessary requests at their source.

Thus far, the Stennis amendment has had amazing results. My best information is that since the enactment of this proposal, the services have requested about $5 billion of additional authorizations but the new Director of Installations, Mr. Frank Creedon, has been unwilling thus far to recommend any of this amount. This, I understand, he has done upon the theory that there have already been authorizations and appropriations for more money than the services have any prospect of spending in the near future and that before authorizing more money, we should see that all of the funds authorized are presently needed. Of course, the economies effected by the Stennis amendment will not be apparent to the public because they will not represent actual dollar and cents requests which were reduced by our committees. Undoubtedly, the savings will run into billions of dollars, so long as an able and prudent man, free from domination by the particular service involved, occupies the position of Director of Installations. I believe Mr. Frank Creedon to be such a man.

A second proposal which should bring additional savings was offered in committee by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], with regard to overseas bases. His amendment proposed that after the funds were authorized and even after the Congress had appropriated those funds, but prior to obligating them to any specific project overseas, the particular Secretary involved must come into agreement on project details with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. In pursuance of that section, the Senate Committee on Armed Services has withheld its approval of other items considered to be wasteful. A good example of such an

item is the Air Force proposal for approximately $3,500,000 million for additional construction at Rabat, Morocco, which is discussed in the overseas report.

The Air Force proposes to establish headquarters for operation of the North African bases at Rabat. The airfield at this point is French owned and under French control. At the time of our visit there, French fighter units were stationed at the field, with only occasional use by American planes engaged in administrative flying. The Air Force avers that the actual flying facilities—runways, taxiways, aprons, and so forth—are sufficient for its purposes both now and in the future, since they do not contemplate use of Rabat for operational flying. This is to say that construction now requested by them will suffice and that the American taxpayer will not be called upon for subsequent heavy dollar investments. While not questioning the earnestness of the Air Force in these statements, if past experience in our overseas operations is any criterion, then the subcommittee, as a practical matter, was inclined to view the enterprise with some misgivings.

Line items requested by the Air Force for construction at Rabat at the present time include communications and navigational-aid systems, barracks for 1,500 enlisted men, a commissary, road, and utilities systems, including electric- and water-supply facilities, storage and shop buildings. These items would cost in the present fiscal year $3,500,000. Already we were aware of a proposed supplemental request for another $3,500,000. Again using past performance as a yardstick, it can be expected that there will be future requests for construction of family housing, medical, recreational, and community facilities, adding additional millions of dollars to our investment.

Some 40 minutes away by excellent paved highways is the naval air station at Port Lyautey. Bearing in mind that the airfield proper would be little used by the Air Force the subcommittee can find no logical reasons why this latter installation could not be used jointly by the Air Force and Navy. While some additional construction would be needed for Air Force use, several costly duplications could be eliminated—navigational aids, crash and fire station, commissary and utility-supply facilities. Future construction might be eliminated entirely.

Had the subcommittee not visited the sites involved armed with the Saltonstall amendment, these expenditures would have been made without question. At least the Congress now has the opportunity to take a good direct look at the project and require a real and complete justification of the proposal. I personally believe it represents a needless duplication of strictly administrative facilities.

Now let me return to our detailed study of last year's military construction bill. After an altogether too-brief period for advance study of the requests the subcommittee began hearings on last June 17 on the bill. Those hearings continued on an almost day-and-night basis for 7 days. For the most part we went into the askings on an item-by-item basis—tens upon tens of thousands of items ranging in cost from $1,000 to $15 million per item. It was quickly apparent that there was no uniformity of policy as between the services. There was no uniformity as between commands within a service—for example, one Air Force command had been allowed to request service clubs where other commands had been required to defer such requests. Unit prices for similar facilities varied considerably among the three services, as, for example, in barracks and warehousing, which I will discuss in more detail later. Most glaring of all, however, were the requests for costly facilities, which, while no doubt desirable, added not one iota to our fighting ability.

For instance, we found the Air Force asking for wash racks for an average cost of $100,000 per wash rack. We sent our professional consultants to determine why the Navy was not asking for wash racks. Upon visiting a nearby naval base and asking the naval commander to see his wash racks, he professed his complete ignorance of the subject. Finally, upon further questioning, he pointed to a young man carrying a bucket of gasoline and a rag, and said, "There goes my wash rack."

We found many requests for alert hangars, averaging in cost around $300,000 each. When asked for an explanation of the necessity of an alert hangar, it was explained that a jet plane could not leave the ground with frost on its wings, and that it was necessary to have certain planes standing by ready to take to the air at all times. No one ever explained why the pilot or the mechanic attached to the plane could not simply take out a rag and wipe off the frost at any particular moment. When asked why alert hangars were necessary in warm southern climates, the Air Force explained that it was necessary to keep the planes in readiness in the shade so the pilot would not become uncomfortably hot sitting in the cockpit. Again there was no explanation as to why the pilot could no simply sit under the wing of the plane. Shortly thereafter the members of the subcommittee staff ran across a photograph of an alert hangar in Korea. It was a parasol which the pilot held over his head to shade him from the sun.

It occurred to members of the subcommittee that it would be cheaper to provide air-conditioning equipment to the cockpit of an airplane in hot climates than to provide a $600,000 air-conditioned alert hangar requested in at least one torrid area. At the present time the commercial airlines have certain portable air-conditioning units for the comfort of their passengers when their planes are on the ground. The subcommittee did not find the Air Force particularly interested in experimenting with inexpensive substitutes for elaborately designed buildings.

The subcommittee found that throughout the United States warehouse space was being requested by the Air Force and the Navy at an estimated cost of $8.40 per square foot. This request was yet being maintained although experience on bids being received throughout the United States reflected the fact that such warehousing was being obtained for only $7.50 per square foot, which was the amount requested by the Army. We found that the General Services Administration was acquiring warehousing in a high-cost area in New England at a cost of about $3.60 per square foot. While not practicable in all cases, the subcommittee concluded that such warehousing would be entirely adequate for most purposes. Our studies further indicated that the services could obtain adequate warehousing at an average of $6 per square foot, and this reduction was accordingly made. Subsequent experience has proved the subcommittee right on this savings, amounting to about 25 percent on warehousing. Responsible contractors working in the military construction field have since advised the subcommittee of the soundness of this action and have confirmed the subcommittee's opinion that heretofore the warehousing had been substantially overdesigned at needless increase in cost.

We found the amount of troop housing spaces to be excessive and accordingly reduced the amount of troop housing. Likewise we felt the cost of such housing to be excessive. The cost of housing, including mess, for each Navy man was $2,100. The cost for one Air Force man was $2,000. The cost for one Army man was $1,815. We thought that by more economical design the cost could be reduced even below the Army figure. The subcommittee was not impressed by the Air Force argument that an airman necessarily required more expensive housing than an Army man. Accordingly we required that all housing hereafter be designed at an expense not to exceed $1,700 per man.

Since that date personnel studies have been made to indicate that the number of personnel on Air Force bases was excessive and that it could be reduced by approximately 20 percent. In the immediate future such personnel reductions should be effected, and the amount of housing, messing, recreational, and other such facilities should be accordingly reduced wherever possible.

In this particular connection the Preparedness Subcommittee headed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has conducted a study which, if pursued, should bear much fruit. They found that in a fighter wing, for instance, about 22 men were required to keep 1 pilot aloft. Further, the subcommittee pinpointed certain organizational spots where manpower was excessive and its utilization poor. Their report has led to the formation of a commission of outstanding business and professional men to view the entire problem in our armed services. If manpower can be saved, dollars also can be saved, many of them in the military construction field through reduction in facilities.

The Army requested a large number of barrack spaces although at many installations existing facilities were more than enough to house the present strength and any foreseeable increase. As a general rule the facilities available were of a permanent or semipermanent type. The justification of the Army for this request was that it had calculated its construction capabilities in the event of full-scale mobilization and found that the demands upon its capabilities in the early stages of such mobilization would

be in excess of capabilities. It therefore proposed to take up this slack at the present time by the construction of barracks of a permanent type. Had the Army suggested that the slack be taken up in the heavy construction fields, such as ordnance production and other industrial facilities, it would have appeared more logical to the committee. The fact is that temporary housing represents the most simple type of construction and could be constructed promptly when required.

These excess facilities—which in many or most cases would have stood vacant—were not allowed. At bases where there were existing shortages of troop housing, sufficient barracks were allowed to make up the deficiency.

One of the most startling examples of prolificacy on the part of the services was the request of the Army for a Finance and Adjutant General School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. This case was succinctly stated in the report which accompanied the bill. This is what it said:

> The Army requests authorization for a building to house a Finance and Adjutant General School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., at a cost of $19.60 per square foot. The committee checked the unit cost of the recently completed General Accounting Office Building in Washington and found that it was built at the cost of $12.50 per square foot. After considering increases in construction costs since the GAO Building was placed under contract, unit costs would be well below $14 per square foot. The GAO Building is efficient and attractive and contains all modern conveniences. The committee does not feel justified in recommending authorization at Fort Benjamin Harrison of a building more elaborate than the GAO Building. As a consequence the authorization for Fort Benjamin Harrison has been deleted and the Army is hereby advised that its future consideration will be dependent upon the type, character, and cost of the requested facility.

The total cost of this building would have been $7,600,000. In conference we agreed to its retention but at a cost of $5,000,000, which on a unit-cost basis brings it more in line with reality and makes it more nearly comparable to structures of the type of the GAO Building.

One Army request, although small in dollar amount, highlights the fact that the services are not always zealous in pursuing possible economies. In one western State the Army asked for a railroad spur and loading ramp, the spur to cost about $25,000. We raised the question as to whether the railroad involved had been approached to participate in or build outright the spur. None of the witnesses before us knew. One colonel guessed that they would not. We were not interested in guesses and asked the Army to find out. At the bottom of page 625 of our hearings is this interesting little insertion made subsequently:

> The Southern Pacific has not been contacted, but it is the opinion of Sixth Army Headquarters that the railroad might be willing to construct this spur.

It will be interesting to see if any real effort is made to achieve this economy, small though it is, for the taxpayers.

Case after case, involving all three services, could be cited in addition to these. All in all it was not a pleasing picture. In the last days of the session we presented our recommendations for reductions amounting to nearly $700,000,000. The Senate passed the bill, and in conference only a few items were changed, with a very minor addition to the total dollar authorization. Our subcommittee believed then, and still believes, that greater savings could have been achieved if time had permitted the necessary studies. For example, common-use items such as hangars showed wide disparity in unit costs, clearly indicating a study which would have required considerable time.

This pressure of time also had not allowed us to give sufficient attention to the overseas program. Following our pattern for installations here at home, we made substantial reductions at overseas locations, but we felt it highly desirable, in view of the enormous amounts involved, to take a personal look at the overseas work. Consequently, very shortly after adjournment—August 5, to be exact—the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I departed on the inspection trip which resulted in the report now before the Senate.

At the very outset I think the Senate and the people should thoroughly understand that this report in no wise constitutes an effort on the part of the members of the subcommittee to impose their ideas in the field of strategy and tactics upon our professional men whose specialty is the military field. Already there are inferences coming from the Pentagon to that effect, the idea being of course to muddy the water and discredit not only the subcommittee but its report. Such a diversionary tactic is not unfamiliar to us, but I for one expect to expend all the effort necessary to see that we stick to the subject.

I make no pretense of being a military expert. My military experience was as a lowly commander of a small amphibious ship operating in the Mediterranean. I am sure that the Senator from Oregon claims no greater expertness in the military field. I believe I can say for both of us, however, that we have ordinary intelligence and can grasp the meaning of lavish use of funds and manpower when we see it spread before our eyes.

I think that we can agree that in measuring the temper of the people the Pentagon can make no claim to expertness. That happens to be the field in which those of us in political life as elected Representatives of our people in the Congress are expert. It is from that point of view that our criticism is made.

A close study of our overseas report which we now submit will reveal that we are not too greatly concerned with initial costs, although we believe them to be greatly excessive. On the other hand, I believe it will be seen that the members of the subcommittee are gravely concerned about the longtime cost of these overseas ventures, not only in money, but in manpower.

These obvious questions immediately arise:

How long will the American people agree to scattering hundreds of thousands of our young men to the farthest outposts of the world?

How long will the American taxpayer submit to the heavy drain on our public funds which the maintenance and operation of such vast military installations will require?

Last year 437,000 American boys were drafted into the service. Untold thousands of others—including doctors, dentists, and other professional men—were brought into the service under the reserve program. Hundreds of thousands of other young men who faced being drafted into the Army volunteered for the Air Force and the Navy.

Do our military planners in the Pentagon really believe that once Korea is ended the American people will continue to submit to these constant and enormous drains on our young manhood? Once Korea is ended, does any Senator believe that we will be able to continue military spending at the present rate?

We are not a warlike people. Never in our history have we been willing in peacetime to support our defenses as they really should have been supported. Even though we paid and paid bitterly for this national trait and though we may hope fervently that we will not repeat it, nevertheless we have never, as a people, seemed to profit from previous disasters.

I want this country to be as strong militarily as is necessary. I would personally be willing to support a program which would give us even more strength that might be generally presumed to be necessary. Yet I know, along with most of us, that the first faint hope of peace in the world will be met with a great clamor for a reduction in our Armed Forces.

In this report we are simply saying to the armed services that if their present planning calls for these vast outlays of dollars and men over a considerable period of time, then to that extent their plan is seriously, perhaps tragically defective. If our plan for defense calls for these things, then this subcommittee says to the Armed Forces, "You had better find a better plan. Regardless of its military sufficiency, it is seriously defective because it does not take into consideration a fundamental characteristic of the American people." That, Mr. President, is the essence of this report.

In recent days, our overseas report has been described by some Senators who have had access to it as startling. Let me say that I, too, was startled by what we saw and heard, even though I had been conditioned by weeks of hearings and study before the inspection began. We came home not too concerned about the mechanics of the program. They pale to insignificance in comparison with the high-level policy and planning aspects of the situation which we believe is bringing forth waste and extravagance now and for the future. What does it matter if we waste $10 million in constructing a $200 million installation when there is a serious question as to the need of more than one-half of the facilities constructed at the installations?

In the investigation of the North African air bases, loss of millions of dollars was uncovered in failure of the constructing agency to see that the proper type of gravel was placed in the foundations of the runways, taxiways, and

parking aprons. Little criticism was given to the construction of the huge base at Thule, Greenland, within 900 miles of the North Pole. There the construction job was well organized and efficiently prosecuted.

As between the two, Mr. President, the Thule project represents a manifold greater waste than the North African air bases. I say this because under the cloak of secrecy and with only a hint of the project to Congress, our Air Force placed an order for a construction job costing at least $250 million and which could eventually run much higher, when the expenditure of $100 million would have met the essential needs of that project. The fact that this grandiose project on the top of the world was efficiently constructed—the fact that it amounts to an engineering miracle—does not excuse the fact that a base to serve substantially the same mission could have been constructed at a saving of untold tens of millions of dollars.

Is it necessary that this nation attempt to maintain motor-overhauling shops and motor-rebuilding shops in the vicinity of the North Pole comparable to the type of things that would be expected at a major overhaul and repair base within the United States? Already we have repair crews which are able to haul entire new engines by air and install them in planes that may happen to be grounded anywhere in the world. Use of such crews could obviate the elaborate Air Force planning for a Little America at the North Pole. The bare essentials of a base in that area would be a runway, taxiway, parking apron, and fuel storage. For peacetime use vast quantities of parking apron barracks and warehousing would not be necessary. Under wartime conditions crowding and dislocation could be suffered on a short-term basis.

How about the requirement for hangars? Certainly one hangar could be justified, but let me point out that an aircraft hangar in that area would cost three and one-half times as much as the same hangar constructed in the United States. But a hangar built to the same specifications as in the United States is unsatisfactory in such a frigid climate. In that area it is necessary to insulate the hangar against subzero temperatures on the outside and to build it in such a way that the warmth inside will not cause the ground below to thaw out, thereby disturbing the strength of the foundations. Such an intricate design pyramids the cost to perhaps twice again as much as a hangar to serve the same purpose in the continental United States. Thus every enormous hangar large enough to house the largest bombers in the world will cost approximately seven times as much as the same type structure here at home. At such enormous cost one such hangar might be justified, but why build several of them? Would it not be better to plan to do only emergency work near the North Pole—only field maintenance and vitally needed emergency repairs—and return our planes to the heart of America for any major overhaul?

The difference in thinking, Mr. President, is the difference between spending several hundred million dollars and spending $100,000,000 at a given location. The difference in point of view is the difference between several thousand men spending year after year in the darkness and bitter cold of a land where the sun never shines during the winter, as against little more than a thousand men living on that base during peacetime.

Any American would be interested to see the type of housing accommodations necessary for human existence in the far north. Each room of living space and each foot of warehousing, recreation, utility, and eating space must be of a type to maintain reasonable heat on the inside against a temperature of perhaps 50 below zero on the outside. Thus the construction must be similar to the most elaborate cold storage warehouses in the United States. Naturally such construction is enormously expensive, but again let me emphasize that the difference in cost ratios would result in a building costing approximately 3½ times as much when constructed at Thule as it would be if the same building were constructed here at home. With the cost so enormous, it would appear that a cost-conscious administrator would ask for a bare minimum of such construction. Yet aside from the runways and taxiways on this base, I am of the opinion that the Air Force requested and obtained approximately three times as much of this type construction as was necessary.

Let me compliment the Army engineers and their civilian associates who built this amazing project. They accomplished the impossible. They did it efficiently and economically. My only objection is that we should never have undertaken such a grandiose project in the first place. We should have settled for a field that would have sufficed for landing, refueling, and field maintenance for bombers leaving the United States on their way to an attack on the other side of the world. During the last war, we successfully blasted our enemy from just such bases in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy without the elaborate trimmings with which the Air Force would now have us encircle the globe.

Generally speaking, my criticism with regard to the base on Greenland could be applied to perhaps 50 other bases around the world, although in lesser degree.

At this point, Mr. President, I desire to address myself to an aspect of this situation which troubles me greatly and which should trouble not only every Member of Congress but the people generally. I refer to the secrecy—much of it obviously unnecessary—with which our military men shroud many of their activities, using security as a pretext for not conducting public affairs in the public view and subject to the questioning of Congress and the taxpayers. We in a democracy believe that public business is the people's business. We believe in conducting public business in the open, subject to praise or criticism, agreement or disagreement, as the case might be. That to me is not only an important, but a fundamental principle of our way of life. If that be so, it should be a jealously guarded right. Yet, in many instances, and particularly in this public-works program, we see the military hiding, under a secrecy stamp for their own purposes, information the public ought to have and is entitled to. At the same time we find our military, again to serve their own purposes, take action which, in effect, violates their own injunction. The simple truth is that if the object is to praise some installation, photographs are furnished and information is made available. The military apparently "leak" favorable information to the press and periodicals and then stubbornly hold to their secrecy when a Member of Congress raises a pertinent question. This is no loose statement, Mr. President. I have here the documents to prove it with regard to the Thule base I spoke of a few moments ago.

I hold in my hand a copy of Life magazine, dated September 22, 1952, which contains 27 pictures and hundreds of words of text about this base. Almost every sort of detail is present, even to a map of the world showing what points of the globe could be struck by bombers operating from there.

I have here now a copy of U. S. News and World Report, dated May 23, 1952, which also contains a map similar to the one in Life. There also is a great deal of text which praises, in effect, the value of a base so located.

Frankly, I cannot conceive of any information our enemies could desire about this base which is not included in the material contained in these two articles. I point out again Mr. President, that the information in these articles had to be provided by the military; no one else had it.

Last week, I asked the Air Force to furnish me some detailed information on cost of certain items at Thule—runways, barracks, hangars. In answer, I received by hand 4 "secret" documents containing 9 pages of figures on line item costs. Of course, I had to dig out the data I wanted myself. The only unclassified information I received was a press release of March 29, 1952, which said that under the then planned program, the cost will be well under $200,000,000. In event of a planned expansion—which, let me say parenthetically, has not yet been authorized—the Thule base will cost under $250,000,000. I have here detailed figures on the various items, and I leave to the judgment of any Senator a determination of the accuracy of the Air Force definition of "well under," in connection with their statement that the cost will be "well under $200,000,000." I believe I could demonstrate on an item-by-item basis where tens of millions of dollars have been spent in unnecessary facilities. A "secret" stamp prevents such a demonstration.

In this same connection, I feel that I must advise the Senate of the situation with respect to the agreements which are being negotiated under the same cover of darkness. It will be noted that our overseas report goes into considerable detail in regard to this phase of our program. All sorts of commitments and concessions are being made by representatives of the United States without the knowledge of our people, and even without the knowledge of the responsible com-

mittees of Congress. Even when the subcommittee pressed for details of some of our agreements and of current negotiations, we were enjoined against publicly revealing the information made available to us. I hope the President will include these agreements in his announced intention of refusing, in the future, to enter into secret understandings.

I also call attention to the section of the overseas report dealing with France. I point out the following language in this section:

> The Department of State, with the concurrence of the Department of Defense, strenuously objected to the statements made under this heading for security reasons. These Departments insisted that all language except one sentence be deleted. Inasmuch as the one sentence standing alone would have little meaning, the entire section has been omitted. The subcommittee has made this deletion with great reluctance and only because of the security argument advanced, because it believes that some of the facts under this heading should be made known to the American people.

This language speaks for itself. Here, again, does the security device keep from the American people information to which I believe they are entitled, but which under the circumstances we must reluctantly withhold.

Again, let me say that this is a serious proposition. Somewhere, there must be a middle ground. I hope the proper committees find it, for the sake of our people and their future welfare.

Now let me return to my discussion of the construction program itself. Because there has been considerable public discussion of the fact that our subcommittee has refused to agree to certain overseas construction items under the terms of the Saltonstall amendment, I desire to discuss it briefly. For the most part the projects involve new starts. In view of the recommendation of the subcommittee, in its overseas report, that a more complete understanding be had between our Military Establishment and the Congress as to the entire program, we felt that the opportunity to reach such agreement should be preserved before the taking of initial steps which would commit this Nation to expenditures of additional hundreds of millions of dollars. When the Air Force protested this action, and predicted calamity as a result, the then chairman of our Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], referred the protest to the Secretary of Defense, for a report from his Director of Installations. Subsequently, the committee was advised that no delay would result if such congressional review was had rather promptly in the new Congress. Two relatively small items were recommended for release, and, I believe, subsequently have been released.

This overseas report covers many items which merit the attention of Congress and its proper committees. Our overseas construction organization was unwieldy and confusing, and recent steps taken to correct the defects should be reviewed to see whether proper results are obtained. Many of the facilities are overdesigned, and include unnecessarily complicated utility systems which can well become burdensome in military operations. I hope all Senators will study our comments on dispersal, because of the serious questions to which they give rise.

All these things, Mr. President, are important, but should not divert attention from the burden of the report, as set forth in our recommendation. I believe that now is the time to take inventory. We do not believe that over a considerable period of time the American people will support the grandiose program in money and manpower which our present planning contemplates. The Congress must not allow itself to be stampeded into a situation which, in the end, may not provide for us the vital defenses we need, and which in the meantime could lead to insupportable burdens in manpower and money.

Yes, Mr. President; we are laymen. None of us possesses the qualities of a military genius. We do know, however, the abilities, limitations, and temper of our people. They want to be prepared. They want us to be strong. They cherish, and will fight for, their liberty and freedom.

On the other hand, they will not support waste and extravagance in the name of preparedness. They want their dollars to go into fighting strength, not into elaborate trappings and trimmings. They want their drafted sons usefully occupied, not sitting idly in some Arctic wasteland or desert sand.

Mr. President, now is the time for the leaders of our Military Establishment to take heed, set a true and sensible course, and follow it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, to permit me to make a statement and ask a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I certainly commend the Senator from Louisiana and his subcommittee for the hard and conscientious work they have done. I know of no longer or more arduous trip than that taken by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Their studies were very painstaking and their observations most pertinent. Regardless of whether we agree with all the conclusions reached by the Senator from Louisiana—after all, that matter is, for the moment, beside the point—certainly the Senator has done conscientious and hard work and has given his honest conclusions.

As a result of the subcommittee's work, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, construction of approximately $146 million worth of such bases, as provided for under another law, was held up temporarily for further observation by the Department of Defense. At the same time the Senator from Louisiana was a member, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], of a subcommittee which considered all public works construction, for the benefit of the full Armed Services Committee of the Senate in the 82d Congress. I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] not only have concentrated the attention of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Reprsentatives on this important subject, which involves the expenditure of such large sums of money, and which also may involve questions of policy, but likewise they have concentrated upon these matters the attention of the Department of Defense.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the Department of Defense now has a full-time Director whose job it is to screen such projects and to take a second look at them, to see whether they involve duplication of effort between the Navy and the Air Force or between the Air Force and the Army, in the case of housing, construction of airfields, or construction of bases in any areas in the United States or, in fact, in any part of the world.

The Senator from Louisiana also knows that in the case of two projects which were so urgent that work on them had to proceed, an examination of the projects a second time was made because of the suggestion made by the Senator from Louisiana, and as a result a substantial amount of money was saved in their final replanning and construction.

As the Senator from Louisiana also knows, the Johnson subcommittee did some work on the so-called Moroccan bases, and will soon make its report on them.

So, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I certainly commend and congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee upon what he has done. I know his work will be appreciated and that the value of his thoughtful and conscientious and really very frank statement of conditions will be of benefit, whether or not the conclusions may all be adopted, or should all be adopted.

I desired to make this statement at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks because I have listened carefully to them, and also because I have read his report.

Mr. LONG. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and wish to assure him that it was a great pleasure to serve with him on the Armed Services Committee. He has been diligent and conscientious in his efforts to assure this Nation adequate defense at a reasonable cost. The junior Senator from Louisiana has enjoyed very much working with him in attempting to economize and save money for the taxpayers. However, after studying the situation and reducing what we believed to be excessive requests last year by about 25 percent in such a way as, in our opinion, would not at all jeopardize the security of the Nation—and the Senator from Massachusetts at that time supported such reduction—it was the conclusion of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we were merely scratching the surface of the unnecessary and nonessential spending in the entire military field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more brief statement?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the appointment of the Director to whom I have referred, and the enactment of the

law which made it possible, were on the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi, who saw the need of supervision and coordination of domestic projects, as well as foreign projects.

Mr. LONG. Yes, I certainly agree.

I believe it to be worth noting that we have never achieved what our goals should have been under unification. The testimony in this connection has brought forth the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in planning the defense, beyond providing that a certain base should be within a general locality, have not had the right to say what the cost of the base should be, or how many men should be placed on it. By establishing a director of installations we are beginning to give the Secretary of Defense some right to take a look at the elaborate planning which occurs subsequent to a decision by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a result of all the work of the subcommittee, the Armed Services Committee of the Eighty-third Congress has agreed to appoint a subcommittee to continue the work of the Long subcommittee, and all projects will come from the Department of Defense to the subcommittee for screening before final action is taken.

Mr. LONG. I am certainly gratified and encouraged to know that, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I first want to say to the Senate that the greater part of the report which the Senator from Louisiana has made relates to work performed by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon in their studies of overseas bases. The Senator from Mississippi, although a member of the subcommittee, did not have an opportunity to make the trip abroad with them. I commend those Senators in the very highest terms for their very sincere and very conscientious work under adverse conditions and under adverse criticism and, at times, in a discouraging atmosphere. To my mind they have rendered one of the outstanding services I have noted in the entire Congress during my fairly brief service here, and I think the fruits of their labor will increase for years to come. As the Senator from Massachusetts said, the report has focused not only the attention of the Congress but the attention of the public and the special attention even of those responsible within the services, upon construction problems and excessive expenditures for them.

The time is fast coming, Mr. President, when I think the American people will demand a more judicious use of the defense dollar and a more conscientious use of the manpower in our military department. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon have done a great deal to blaze the way, to point out the faults and to suggest constructive remedies. The people of the Nation are indebted to them for their very fine work.

COMPOSITION AND JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce for appropriate reference the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 44) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the purpose of this joint resolution is to fortify the independence of the Supreme Court, by amendments to the Constitution and thereby to forestall future efforts by a President or a Congress seeking to nullify or impair the power of the judicial branch of the Government. There are loopholes in the strict letter of the Constitution as it now reads through which such a thrust might be made. These proposed amendments are designed chiefly to plug up those loopholes and are four in number.

They would fix the number of justices at nine, make retirement compulsory at the age of 75, render the justices ineligible to become President or Vice President and, in constitutional cases, remove from the Congress its present power to impair the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

It is not necessary to point out to this body the place of the judiciary in the structure of the Government or that a judiciary that is not independent of the legislative and executive branches would not meet the requirements.

My colleagues well know that to Locke's "Wherever law ends, tyranny begins" there always should be added the truism that, wherever courts suffer an invasion of their independence, law ends.

Long before the tragic demonstrations by recent and contemporaneous foreign dictators making a mockery of constitutional rights, Americans had learned that written compacts and charters can be no more effective as guarantors of liberty than the vitality given to them by an independent judiciary charged with the duty of construction and enforcement.

While Americans will rally to the defense of the judiciary whenever it is subjected to an open assault, attention also should be devoted by us to the prevention of future attacks, especially upon new fronts.

In 1937 the Judiciary Committee was shocked into vigorous action by the attack upon the Supreme Court from without, at a point always known to be constitutionally vulnerable.

If we are to implement by practical action the generalizations of our orators, we must do so during the interludes of relative serenity. That is required by the theory, the spirit, and the common sense of constitutional self-government, which is a device to protect human nature against its own lapses. The genius of the American system is in empowering independent courts to restrain the legislative and executive branches whenever, in the heat of controversy, they forget the principles that they had cherished and the determinations that they had reached in calmer times.

The smoke has cleared long ago from the field of the 1937 battle, but there always is the danger of a renewal, sooner or later, of the campaign against judicial independence. The relatively slim margin by which that most recent major assault was repelled, thanks to the vigilance of the Judiciary Committee of this body, should serve as a warning that the defenses require reenforcement.

If those who realize that judicial review is not only "America's unique contribution to the science of politics" but also "the capstone feature of the entire [American constitutional] system," whose untrammeled and uninfluenced exercise is essential to the preservation of that system, again defer their support until the next hostile blow is struck, it may be too late. The 1937 packing plan, crudely disguised as a dotage-removal device, was frustrated largely because it became evident during the controversy that the normal processes of time soon would accomplish the desired result through deaths and retirements.

If the project of plugging those loopholes can be politically nonpartisan in spirit, as it is in purpose, there should be no serious opposition in principle.

There will be some who will consider it dangerous not to let a sleeping dog lie. They will argue that the Supreme Court can be safeguarded only by an awakened public opinion, which has preserved it so far, and that, were this fundamental bulwark ever removed, mere words on a piece of paper, even in the form of a constitutional amendment, would be of no protective efficacy.

While it is true, of course, that a revolutionary tide of overwhelming physical force can destroy any human institution, it is also true that, short of such an upheaval, organized society governs itself by law. It is significant that all dangerous assaults upon the American judiciary so far have been made without open defiance of constitutional forms, and the sole purpose of the present project should be and can only be to prevent future assaults of this nature.

It must be remembered that the question of whether the American system was to be established and maintained by popular pleasure, subject, as for example is the British system, to unlimited change or abandonment, or whether it was to be established and maintained by what Hamilton called a limited constitution, amendable only in the manner stipulated in the instrument, was decided when the Constitution was adopted and must be deemed settled until the fundamental principle of a limited constitution is abolished.

The fact that a dictator would not hesitate to overturn an established institution based upon written law as readily as if it were based merely upon tradition and public opinion does not lead to the conclusion that the strength or weakness of the foundation is unimportant. To advance such a contention would be like arguing that it is not worth while fortifying a structure to withstand ordinary seismic tremors unless it would also be able to withstand a major earthquake.

The purpose of plugging the loopholes in the Constitution's protection for the Supreme Court is to prevent, so far as possible and practicable, having a due

regard for all of the circumstances, a hostile, unprincipled, or shortsighted Executive and Congress from freeing themselves, within constitutional processes, from judicial review by controlling the personnel or powers of the Supreme Court and thereby rendering it inoperative as a truly coordinate branch of Government. Such preventive measures are worthwhile though it is realized that to fill holes in the dike will not fend off a tidal wave that some day might sweep over the top.

In seeking to thwart the restraints of an independent judiciary, Presidents and legislators have tried to penetrate many constitutional loopholes, and there exist many others in danger of discovery by hostile ingenuity and audacity. These loopholes expose the Court to possible interference of three general kinds: withholding certain justiciable questions from the Court, controlling decisions of the Court, and nullifying the decrees of the Court.

The remedy is a constitutional amendment that will plug the loopholes.

The Senate has few, if any, Members who are not thoroughly acquainted with the history of the Supreme Court and of the efforts to interfere with its independence, and of the origin and development of the doctrine of judicial review from its germ in Coke, down through its growth in seventeenth century England and eighteenth century colonial America.

We have all seen in our lifetime the methods which have been used in certain Latin-American Republics to reduce judiciaries independent on paper to subserviency to dictatorships, and the processes by which prewar Japan achieved fascism, with relatively little violation of the letter of their then written constitutions.

The six sections of this joint resolution are designed to plug up three constitutional loopholes and to provide for an age limit of 75 years upon the Justices in active service.

The three loopholes are the most dangerous that have been detected by those seeking methods of destroying what has been called the American triune system of government without daring openly to defy the letter of the Constitution.

While some of the most distinguished work done by the Supreme Court has been achieved by Justices over the age of 75 whose faculties were unimpaired and whose wisdom had been ripened by prolonged experience, there have been instances where adverse criticism justly has been brought upon the Court by aging Justices in their dotage. On the whole, the view has been expressed by many authorities, including former Justices themselves, who had passed the age of 75 years, that it would be well to require Justices to retire upon attaining that age, thereby, among other advantages, removing the chief ground of criticism of the Court urged in the 1936–37 period against the Nine Old Men.

The first of these loopholes is the possibility of packing the Court in much the same way that the British House of Commons gained control of the House of Lords. In his classic American Commonwealth, James Bryce characterized the omission of the Constitution to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court as "a weak point, a joint in the Court's armor through which a weapon might some day penetrate."

This omission impressed Bryce as remarkable because the intention to secure the independence of the judiciary was clearly expressed in the Constitution by the provisions that the President was not permitted to remove the judges, nor Congress to diminish their salaries. This proposed amendment would fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court at nine. Experience had demonstrated to those best qualified to express an opinion that nine is the most satisfactory number. Fewer would render the Court less representative of diverse backgrounds, temperaments, and viewpoints. More than nine would seem to be inconsistent with the effective functioning of the Court.

Justice Roberts has said in an address which, in January 1949, was published in the Journal of the American Bar Association:

> You will remember the great letter that Chief Justice Hughes wrote to the Congress in 1937, when the plan to increase the personnel of the Court was under consideration. He said justly then, as I think, that a court of nine is as large a court as is manageable. The Court could do its work, except for writing of the opinions, a good deal better if it were five rather than nine. Every man who is added to the Court adds another voice in council, and the most difficult work of the Court, as you may well have imagined, is that that is done around the council table; and if you make the Court a convention instead of a small body of experts, you will simply confuse council. It will confuse council within the Court, and will cloud the work of the Court and deteriorate and degenerate it. I have not any doubt about that.
>
> The remedy for the weight of work that is placed on the Court is to increase the discretionary jurisdiction and not to increase the personnel of the Court.

The fact that nine is the present number is naturally an important consideration.

The second dangerous loophole that would be plugged up by the proposals in this joint resolution is the one whereby Congress has the power to diminish or abolish the present power of the Supreme Court to hear and decide appeals involving constitutional questions, except to such extent as the Court itself, in the exercise of its own discretion, may deem advisable. Sections three and four of this joint resolution would modify the second paragraph of section 2 of article III of the Constitution by freezing in its present form the existing appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in constitutional cases, subject to being melted away only by constitutional amendment or by the Court in prescribing rules for the handling of its own business.

Upon several occasions, during attacks upon the Court's independence, there have been threats to strip it of the right to review cases raising constitutional issues. Such threats found expression as recently as the 1937 controversy.

One such threat actually was carried out in the intemperate Reconstruction aftermath of the Civil War. Many of my colleagues here are familiar with the case of *Ex parte McCardle* ((1869) 7 Wall. 506).

A New York State Bar Association committee, including in its membership William D. Mitchell, John W. Davis, Samuel Seabury and Harrison Tweed, mentioned that case in unanimously sponsoring such a constitutional amendment as is here under consideration. Chairman Mitchell's report said:

> By act of February 5, 1867, the Congress had provided that in habeas corpus cases appeal might be taken from the circuit courts of the United States to the Supreme Court. In 1868 one McCardle, not in the military service, was held in custody by military authority for trial before a military commission. He obtained a writ of habeas corpus from the circuit court, claiming his detention by the military was unlawful and that under the Consititution he could not be tried by a military commission. The circuit court discharged the writ and remanded McCardle to military custody. He took an appeal to the Supreme Court, and the case was there argued. While it was under advisement by the Court, the Congress passed, over a presidential veto, the act of March 27, 1868, repealing so much of the act of February 5, 1867, as authorized appeals to the Supreme Court in habeas corpus cases. Apparently, the Congress, satisfied with the judgment of the circuit court, feared that the Supreme Court would reverse it. The Supreme Court then held that its jurisdiction was gone and dismissed the appeal. *Ex parte McCardle* (7 Wall. 506). That incident occurred during the period of bitter feeling which followed the close of the Civil War. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent a possible repetition of action impairing the court's appellate jurisdiction in constitutional cases, of which the McCardle case is an example.

Justice Roberts has said of Congress' action that led to the McCardle case:

> That has never been done again. Nothing like it has ever been attempted, but it was done for political reasons and in a political exigency to meet a supposed emergency.
>
> It is difficult to say that Congress could not reach the same result by a rather indirect route. Following the precedent that existed when the Emergency Court of Appeals was created to deal with OPA questions, Congress, it seems to me under the present phraseology of the Constitution, could create a Federal court to hear certain classes of questions and provide that its decisions should be final.
>
> Such a court might have to decide very serious constitutional questions, as the Emergency Court of Appeals had to do, and yet, if the Congress provided that its decision should be final and binding on the parties, and without appeal, what is there in the Constitution to prevent it? What is there to prevent Congress taking away, bit by bit, all the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, not doing it by direct attack but by that sort of indirect attack?
>
> I see nothing. I do not see any reason why Congress cannot, if it elects to do so, take away entirely the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States over State supreme court decisions. The jurisdiction is exercised now under the terms of the Judiciary Act. Suppose Congress should decide to let the decisions of State courts of appeal be final on constitutional questions. How could the Supreme Court assert a power to take those questions, notwithstanding the act of Congress, in view of the language of the third article of the Constitution?

What may be called the third loophole that is sought to be plugged by this joint

resolution is the present eligibility of Justices of the Supreme Court to hold elective or appointive office. Section 5 of this joint resolution would render them ineligible to become President or Vice President for 5 years after leaving the Supreme Court.

This provision not only would remove possible political temptation from the Justices, but would also remove any suspicion that the judicial deliberation of the Justices was colored by political aspirations.

My reason for proposing this amendment is to relieve the members of the Supreme Court from all political pressure. I believe that, once a man has become a member of the judiciary, and particularly of our highest Court, he should devote his entire thought toward serving our Government without the slightest intimation that he might some day divest himself of his judicial robe to assume a different role in his country's Government. I think that this is a necessary proposal in order to protect the Justices from any suspicion that they, consciously or unconsciously, might be seeking public favor.

I want to say at this point that my proposal should in no way be taken as a reflection on any member of the present judicial setup. It is a matter of principle with me, and not a matter of personality.

Of course, the best-known instance of a member of the judiciary becoming involved in partisan politics after serving on the bench was that of the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes.

Students of history are acquainted with the fact that, after his appointment to the Court in 1910, an effort was made to draft him as a presidential candidate in 1912. He absolutely refused to allow his name to be used in the campaign and said he would not accept the nomination if his supporters were successful in obtaining it for him.

At that time, Justice Hughes said:

> The highest service that I can render in this difficult situation is to do all in my power to have it firmly established that a Justice of the Supreme Court is not available for political candidacy. The Supreme Court must be kept out of politics.

However, as all my colleagues know, 4 years later, when Justice Hughes was nominated at the Republican convention, he was persuaded to accept the nomination, resigned his post on the bench, and entered wholeheartedly into the campaign.

I believe that Charles Evans Hughes was right in 1912 and wrong in 1916. I believe a number of other true Americans will join me in this belief. In later years Chief Justice Hughes came to this viewpoint himself and expressed regret that the Constitution had not included just such a provision regarding Supreme Court Justices as the one here proposed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland on the very thorough study he has given to the problem of strengthening the foundations of our democracy. Undoubtedly, one of the weak links is the possibility that the Supreme Court could be packed, and the meaning of our Constitution reversed completely by such unwise legislative action. Certainly that is one loophole which we should close in order to protect ourselves in the future.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I certainly appreciate the statement of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I have not previously considered some of the Senator's proposals, but I believe the Congress should study them. Now is an appropriate time to undertake to strengthen the judiciary, and particularly to take the Supreme Court as far out of politics and as far beyond the reach of ordinary partisan politics as we possibly can.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I greatly appreciate the Senator's remarks. I believe that this joint resolution would certainly prevent the packing of the Court, in two ways. First, the number would be frozen at nine, so that no ambitious President could pack the Court, except by a change in the Constitution.

Secondly, the appellate jurisdiction of the Court, so far as constitutional questions are concerned, could not be taken away by the Congress; and thereby the Executive and the Congress would be prevented from interfering with the Court on constitutional questions, and the Court would be perfectly free to do its work as an independent arm of the Government.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive any messages from the President of the United States during the adjournment of the Senate, up to midnight Tuesday, and that such messages be referred to the proper committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Lloyd A. Mashburn, of California, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

IN THE ARMY

Col. Jacob Landes Hartman, O9551, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, for appointment as brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The officer named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States as a Reserve commissioned officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.) and sections 38 and 73 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Paul Kistler MacDonald, O296004, Illinois National Guard, to date from July 15, 1952.

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. Daniel Noce, O5226, United States Army, to be the Inspector General, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548, United States Army, to be commanding general, Third Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, O12470, United States Army, to be commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, O12687, United States Army, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, United States Army Forces, Far East, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall, O12199, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, O11658, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress, O4812, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Clare Partridge, O12630, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Halley Grey Maddox, O12852, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O6472, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wayne Carleton Smith, O16207, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Cornelius Edward Ryan, 07375, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gerald Joseph Higgins, O19530, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, O12830, United States Army.

Col. William Lenoir Wilson, O16950, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Emil Lenzner, O15810, United States Army.

Col. William Joseph Bradley, O15967, United States Army.

Col. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399, United States Army.

Col. Wallace Hayden Barnes, O16426, United States Army.

Col. George Edward Martin, O16802, United States Army.

Col. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904, United States Army.

Col. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060, United States Army.

Col. Edwin Rudolph Petzing, O8463, United States Army.

Col. Charles Harold Royce, O15769, United States Army.

Col. Paul Maurice Seleen, O16139, United States Army.

Col. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741, United States Army.

Col. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662, United States Army.

Col. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744, Dental Corps, United States Army.

Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, O5296, United States Army.

Col. William Lawrence Kay, O10349, United States Army.

Col. Harrison Shaler, O12080, United States Army.

Col. John Battle Horton, O15150, United States Army.

Col. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295, United States Army.

Col. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048, United States Army.

Col. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Andrew Rehm, O12772, United States Army.

Col. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., O17341, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. James Stewart Willis, O15607, United States Army.

Col. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422, United States Army.

Col. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654, United States Army.

Col. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745, United States Army.

Col. Robert Highman Booth, O18093, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672, United States Army.

Col. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776, United States Army.

Col. George Edward Lynch, O17715, United States Army.

Col. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

(NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Bacon Fraser, O247121, Georgia National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Maj. Gen. John Calhoun Henagan, O163943, South Carolina National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Maj. Gen. Albert Edward Henderson, O264146, Ohio National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Maj. Gen. Paul Henry Jordan, O241877, Tennessee National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Maj. Gen. Edward Devlin Sirois, O174246, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from May 27, 1952.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Ernest Nicholas Bauman, O262926, Illinois National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Brig. Gen. George Justus Hearn, O295111, Georgia National Guard, to date from June 8, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Jesse Scott Lindsay, O237198, Kentucky National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Julius Andres Stark, O143760, Ohio National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Charles Frederick White, O285841, California National Guard, to date from May 27, 1952.

Brig. Gen. Otis Minot Whitney, O279172, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from May 26, 1952.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, who hast created us with a capacity for the virtues of love and sympathy and kindness, we thank Thee for this new week called Brotherhood Week.

We penitently confess that we so frequently allow pride and prejudice, selfishness and self-interest to supplant and usurp the spirit of friendship and brotherliness which Thou hast ordained as the natural and normal feeling in the realm of human relationships.

Grant that during this week we may be inspired to cultivate a more congenial and magnanimous attitude toward all mankind.

May it be our deepest personal concern and our supreme national interest to release the radiant splendor which is hidden in the soul of humanity and to give ourselves sincerely and wholeheartedly to the glorious task of saving human hearts from despair and human lives from misery and degradation.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 12, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 69):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Elbert Duncan Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Utah.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE LITHUANIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice and the sentiments of my heart to the plea which Americans of Lithuanian descent today make in behalf of their kin in their native land.

Today marks the 35th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic.

The present condition of world unrest which has tragically placed much of continental Europe under the control and domination of a godless dictatorship finds the Republic of Lithuania temporarily deprived of its God-given rights to liberty and independence.

The people in that gallant little nation are slaves to a government which has despoiled them of their homes, their land, their religion—and their freedom.

Under the ruthless aggression of Soviet Russia, their social, ethnic, religious, and national traditions have been cruelly obliterated in the endeavor to transform their native land into a Communist satellite.

The cup of sorrow which the Lithuanian people have been forced to drink unites us with their sufferings. Our Nation, as a sovereign, has never recognized the Soviet absorption of the Republic of Lithuania, and on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is fitting that we remind the world of the grievous wrong inflicted upon a brave people. We join in their sorrow because we cannot rejoice in their freedom. Sympathy with their cause is notice to the world that we shall give no comfort to the tyrant who has despoiled Lithuania.

The courage of the Lithuanian people has surmounted their despair. Their freedom is celebrated everywhere today—except in their native land.

Descended from an ancient people, not related in any way to the Russians or other Slavic peoples, the Lithuanians developed their own language, their own culture, and their own traditions. They devised and chose their own form of government, and it is but natural that they harbor a yearning desire to recapture their independence and to preserve the ideals of their own culture.

Despite Soviet attempts to communize Lithuania, despite the forced migration of her people to Soviet slave-labor camps, the Lithuanian underground is still active and Lithuanian independence is still recognized by the United States.

During its brief era of independence after the First World War, Lithuania amply demonstrated her worth and ability as a member of the family of nations. By her progress in advancing the economic and cultural life of her people, she proved her qualification to discharge the solemn responsibilities of independence. On the basis of justice and righteousness, on the basis of the solemn principles of the Atlantic Charter, that independence should be restored to Lithuania and her people.

The spark of liberty has smoldered for centuries in the hearts of the Lithuanians, and their desire to be free has overcome all obstacles.

Our purpose in marking this anniversary, therefore, is to hold out to this courageous people the encouragement of friendship and the assurance of aid and sympathy. We join with them in their aspirations for freedom and will continue to refuse to recognize the predatory power which has usurped their land and their government.

Our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, out of the wealth of his own bouyant hope and courage, once told a group of Americans of Lithuanian descent that Lithuania will one day have a new birth of freedom.

On this 35th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic, it is our fervent prayer that the dawn of that day is not far distant, and that then the sunlight of liberty will again shine throughout the noble little democracy on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

LITHUANIA IN EXILE OBSERVES THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF HER NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LITHUANIA: UNCONQUERED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is such a small country, whose people never harmed anyone.

Why then should Red Russia, the largest land mass in the world fear its little captive? It is garrisoned by Red armies, combed by terror-police from Moscow, bombarded with Red propaganda, and its people subjected to every form of material and psychological pressure.

The contest appears to be so one-sided, so hopeless.

And yet Russia, the Goliath, is afraid of little David.

Why?

What is it in the Lithuanian people that the Reds cannot conquer?

Perhaps they remember imperial Rome at the height of its pagan power, trying to cope with a little band of Christians who were armed only with faith and love.

What happened to the ancient dictatorship will happen to the modern one while faith in God and the dignity of man survive to resume their progress.

That is what gives us confidence on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

The people of the United States never endorsed the enslavement of Lithuania or any other nation. They never will. Conscience may be slow to speak, but at last it is stirring. The American people have given a mandate to their Government to repudiate all secret agreements, and with a knowledge of their moral as well as material strength, to regain the initiative over communism.

This is the best news that the oppressed people of Lithuania have had in years. And this encouragement will reach through to them in spite of every frantic effort by the Kremlin to prevent the truth from being known.

Thank God for the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people, and for the leadership of the American people in championing the cause of freedom everywhere.

The long night of Communist terror is coming to its end.

Slowly, perhaps, but inevitably.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, courage is a quality of mankind that knows no boundaries. Venerated in all societies and in all eras, it is a characterisic of human greatness that rises above all others. Nor is courage a quality necessarily confined to the individual. Rather, it is something that often transcends the individual and ultimately joins with others on a higher plane of human endeavor where there is created a united spirit of courage universal in scope.

"Courage conquers all things," the Roman poet Ovid tells us, and truly courage does conquer all things when it has transcended the individual and united with a national spirit whose possessors have as their inspiration a righteous and just cause.

Such is the quality of courage held by the heroic people of Lithuania. Such is the vitality of their national spirit, and such is the righteousness and justice of their cause. Like other peoples in Eastern Europe, the Lithuanians have been suppressed in the most ruthless manner as a sovereign people, and they have lost their liberties; they have lost their rights as a sovereign people, and they have lost their right to the pursuit of happiness. But the Lithuanian people have not lost their will to live as a free nation, nor have they lost the heroic spirit necessary to regain that freedom. In the face of constant danger, every true Lithuanian has joined hand in hand with his brother, and with a solidarity of purpose that is an everlasting tribute to their national traditions they have together resisted the Communist tyranny fearlessly and courageously.

On this 35th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is fitting that we of the free world pause and reflect thoughtfully upon the fate of those people who are now enslaved within the sphere of Soviet domination. History has dealt severely with the people of Lithuania, but their spirit remains undaunted and their cause undefiled. By their courage to resist the oppressor, they have given testimony to their determination to remain faithful to their tradition of national heroism, and by their valor in servitude, they have inspired the entire free world to carry on, as they are carrying on, in the cause of freedom. To us all, the people of Lithuania have proved that "Courage conquers all things."

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps there has never been a time since Lithuania's loss of independence when its recovery seemed more imminent.

The declaration of President Eisenhower that secret agreements of the past are to be repudiated, establishes this as a policy of the new administration. It is evident that the promise by the President that a policy of liberation will be instituted shall also be carried out.

I will be proud to support a liberation rather than a containment policy. Too long have the brave and freedom-loving people of Lithuania suffered under a tyrant's heel.

Meanwhile, we must encourage the every breath of independence within enslaved peoples. Let the celebration of the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence be a heartening sign to all others who have lost freedom but not the desire for it.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a message which I sent to the Lithuanian Americans on their 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, February 16, 1953:

I am happy to greet Lithuanian Americans on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

It is indeed tragic that your kinfolk in the homeland are under the heel of domination of the oppressors in the Soviet Union.

Freedom and liberty are unknown there and we can all only look forward to the day when the Lithuanian people are free from this domination and, in fact, when all freedom-loving people will once more be free to determine the type of government which they wish to live under.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, all peoples, at one time or another in their history, have had their time of troubles. In the fortunes of nations, as in the case of men, there are rises and declines. This has certainly been true of Lithuania. And, on the very borders of east and west, not strong enough to withstand the advancing hordes from the east, the country has repeatedly fallen victim to superior forces.

Early in modern times, Lithuania was overrun by the Russians. Independence was lost, and the country became a part of Czarist Russia. For more than 100 years, Lithuanians endured this heavy yoke. They dreamed, planned, and worked to regain national independence. Toward the end of World War I, they saw their opportunity. When the Czarist Government of Russia collapsed, they saw their chance. On May 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. From that day to 1940, Lithuanians enjoyed the blessing of freedom. And, in freedom, they rebuilt their country as a model democracy of the eastern Baltic. Once again in 1940, however, the envious eyes of greedy neighbors fell upon Lithuania. Soviet tyranny simply could not tolerate free Lithuania as an independent neighbor. In June of that year, under some flimsy pretext, the Red army moved into Lithuania. In less than a month, the whole country was Sovietized, and was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then, the Lithuanians have had to carry the weight of oppression, imposed upon them by the Kremlin.

Since the end of the war, the outside world has received only fragmentary information from Lithuania. We know very little of the situation there. That little is both heartening and disheartening. On the one hand, we hear of purges, of arrests, and wholesale deportations to distance parts of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, reports reach us of underground forces working against the tyrannical government showing that the spirit of independence has not died, even under the most adverse circumstances. Today Lithuanians are not allowed to acknowledge their independence day. But we who have the privilege of celebrating this day can express the hope that freedom shall soon be regained in Lithuania.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my fellow citizens of Lithuanian origin on this 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I also join with them in their fervent hope that we may soon celebrate this day with unreserved joy, as the Republic of Lithuania once again becomes a free nation.

In my own State of Connecticut I have often had the privilege of observing the courage and strength of Americans of Lithuanian descent. From this I have acquired a great faith in the people of Lithuania, and a firm belief that the terrible trials which they are being subjected to will not diminish their determination to regain their freedom and independence.

On this February 16 I wish to reassure my countrymen whose relatives and friends are in Lithuania that we shall not cease working for the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania. Our Government has never recognized the Soviet Union's shameless attempt to annex and enslave Lithuania.

In the years between 1918 and 1940 the Republic of Lithuania dramatically demonstrated its ability to play an important role in world affairs. The economic and social gains of those years were the wonder of all observers. The world has a moral obligation to bring this heroic country back to its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, when the czarist government of Russia crumbled in November of 1917, all subject nationalities under Russia's oppressive regime saw their chance for liberation. One by one, all of them, scattered in all parts of Eastern Europe to the Caucasus, proclaimed their national independence. Brave and proud Lithuanians who had weathered many severe storms in this history, who had developed strong and sturdy national characteristics under adversity, who had successfully kept alive their love of freedom and liberty, proclaimed their national independence on this very day, on February 16, 1918, 35 years ago.

For the next 22 years, prior to the tragic events of 1940, all friends of freedom followed the steady progress made by Lithuania. All Lithuanians may well be proud of the splendid record of performance during those 22 peaceful years. Lithuania's political, economic, cultural and social life developed along broad democratic lines. The standard of living steadily rose. In short, during that relatively short and peaceful time Lithuania became a model democracy in northeastern Europe.

In 1940 the independent Lithuania became a tragic casualty of World War II. First, it was brought by brute force under the heel of the Red army. Then, when two tyrannies began to wage their life-and-death struggle in 1941, Lithuania came under the Nazi yoke. Finally, toward the end of that war Red forces came in once more as liberators and have been there as conquerors ever since. This liberation, on the Soviet model, has been so complete that since 1945 Lithuania has been isolated from the free world, sealed off from all passers-by and eavesdroppers. Soviet bulldozers have been at work trying to uproot the spirit of independence and of freedom. Patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanians have either been silenced, incarcerated, or carted by freight cars to distant parts of the Soviet Union. During the last several years there have been rumors, constantly repeated, that Lithuanians have been evicted from the Baltic shore and their place is being taken by Communist Russians and their supporters from the Siberian regions. In these tragic circumstances, there can hardly be a celebration of national independence day there.

We in this country, however, join Americans of Lithuanian descent today in their commemoration. To these people who did so much in the regeneration and rebuilding of independent Lithuania, who gladly made sacrifices for the well-being and happiness of unfortunate Lithuanians, we can say that we ardently hope that in the not too distant future, Lithuanians will also be celebrating independence day in their beloved fatherland.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1953, all Lithuanians and friends of Lithuania observe the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence, which created the free Republic of Lithuania. The culture of Lithuania extends back through the centuries and modern civilization is grateful to the contribution made by the intellectual leaders of this—one of the oldest nations on the European continent.

During its history, Lithuania has enjoyed long periods of freedom, self-government, and progress. Lithuania has also undergone periods of domination and control by more powerful neighbor nations who have made every effort to extinguish the light of liberty in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people.

An example of this came in 1795 when Russia occupied Lithuania and inflicted a period of enslavement lasting for over a century and a quarter. During this time the patriotism and loyalty, which is always alive in the hearts of Lithuanians, enabled its people to constantly carry on the incessant fight against the conquering tyrant who was temporarily in control of their government.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania unshackled the tyrant's irons and declared its independence by establishing the Lithuanian Republic. Soviet Russia recognized the Lithuanian nation as a free and independent state.

This free nation immediately, under its self-governing constitution, again demonstrated that if allowed to conduct its own internal affairs it would rapidly rise as one of the important nations not only of the European continent, but of the world. This progress as a free nation continued up until the year 1940 when the Russian tyrants again brought disappointment, sorrow, and disillusionment to the liberty-loving people of Lithuania.

As chairman of the Special Congressional Committe Investigating the Katyn Forest Massacre, testimony was presented in our hearings that Lithuania was one of the nations of Europe who lost millions of its population through massacres and genocide during the last decade by both the Communists and Nazi tyrants. Over a million of Lithuania's people have been murdered or taken prisoner by the Soviet Union during recent years. Arrests, murders, and deportations have been inflicted by the Communists upon the Lithuanian people. They are in constant fear of the dictators and the slave-labor camps within their own borders.

As chairman of the Katyn committee, I have filed a resolution which is now pending before the Congress asking that the final report of our committee, along with the seven volumes of testimony, be submitted to the American delegates at

the United Nations for action by that international body. One of the recommendations of our committee asks that the United Nations organization immediately make an exhaustive study and investigation of all mass murders and genocide, which the Soviet Government is inflicting upon all subjugated nations in Europe, including Lithuania.

I do hope that this great international body will follow up and take action against the tyrannical aggressor, who is today keeping so many liberty-loving people under bondage.

The spirit of self-government for the Lithuanian people will never die in the minds and hearts of all true Lithuanians. The pages of history record that Lithuania cannot be deprived of its liberty for long. Dictators who rule by fear; slave-labor camps; mass murders; and organized genocide cannot long succeed in their ruthless disregard of human rights. Lithuania will again regain its freedom and its constitution. Its fight for freedom and self-government must continue 'til victory is won.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. On the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, may I join with millions of other free people around the world who have followed the course of recent history of Lithuania with grief and concern.

Exactly 35 years ago today the Lithuanian people, in defiance of the mighty German Empire, proclaimed their determination to sever all bonds that had formerly tied the country to Russia and to restore Lithuania as a sovereign state based on democratic principles.

That happened while the First World War was still in progress and the Lithuanian territory was occupied by German armies.

At the time when the war ended the proclamation of Lithuania's independence became reality. Soon various nations, first of all the neighbors of Lithuania recognized the sovereignty of Lithuania and assumed regular diplomatic relations. The United States of America granted recognition on July 27, 1922.

The Communist regime which seized power in Russia in 1917 solemnly proclaimed its adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations, as expressed in President Wilson's 14 points. A peace treaty was concluded in Moscow on July 12, 1920, between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Lithuania in which the Soviet Government recognized without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and renounced voluntarily and forever all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

For two decades normal and peaceful relations have been maintained between the two neighbors. Several treaties were concluded during that period of time.

On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression pact was signed in Moscow by the representatives of the U. S. S. R. and those of Lithuania in which the Soviet government reaffirmed its obligation to respect Lithuania's sovereignty, integrity, and territorial inviolability in all circumstances. Before the termination date of the nonaggression pact, the Soviet government proposed to the Government of Lithuania that the validity of this pact be extended for another 10 years. This was done on April 4, 1934, and the pact was extended until December 31, 1945.

On July 5, 1933, a Convention for the Definition of Aggression was concluded in London between the Republic of Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. Among other things, both states agreed to consider as aggression the invasion by armed forces, even without declaration of war, of the territory of the other state. It was further agreed that no consideration of a political, military, economic, or other order may serve as an excuse for or justification of aggression.

In unprecedented disregard of these treaties and other solemn obligations on the part of the U. S. S. R., the Moscow Government delivered an ultimatum to Lithuania on June 14, 1940, demanding that free entry into the territory of Lithuania be immediately assured for units of the Army of the Soviet Union. Less than 12 hours were given for the reply of the Lithuanian Government. But even before the expiration of this term, armored columns of the Red army flooded Lithuania, as well as two other Baltic States.

All of the methods of sovietization under a people's democracy were first tested in the Baltic countries. The elections to People's Diet, people's government, agrarian reforms, and so forth, were all stage-managed by top officials of the Kremlin installed in Lithuania. The political will of the people was counterfeited by so-called elections of the People's Diet organized under the bayonets of the Red army and the pistols of the Soviet secret police agents.

As soon as the Soviets were established in Lithuania, it was no longer necessary for the Kremlin to distort the true nature of the facts. On June 30, 1940, Molotov bluntly declared that "the traditional Russian policy, practiced since the days of Ivan the Terrible, necessitated the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union." The People's Diet, in its resolution addressed to Moscow, frankly admitted that the "liberation" of Lithuania was accomplished "thanks to the Soviet Union."

I am proud to say that the United States has never recognized the fruits of the Soviet aggression on Lithuania and other Baltic States. On the contrary, it has denounced that act of violence and continues to regard Lithuania as a sovereign and independent republic.

It is to the everlasting credit to this country of ours and especially to the United States Congress which, in the interest of humanity, undertook an historic task to investigate the Katyn massacre. It was proved, beyond any doubt, that the horrible executions were carried out by the same Kremlin rulers who raped the Baltic States.

The massacre of 14,000 Polish officers shook conscience of the world, but millions of people behind the Iron Curtain subjugated and doomed to physical destruction offer an even more frightful example of Soviet crimes.

And I suggest that this Congress should enact necessary legislation to investigate the circumstances under which the seizure of the Baltic States was performed. Special attention deserves the Kremlin-staged elections to People's Diet which are constantly presented by the Soviet Government to the public opinion as justification of the aggression against the Baltic States.

Such an investigation would clearly show to the American public and the other people of the world the true nature of the Red Russian imperialism. It would clear away the confusion now surrounding the subject in the minds of the public.

May I take this opportunity to express my firm conviction that the cause of justice will finally triumph over the forces of enslavement and terror and that Lithuania will soon have her place in the family of free and independent nations.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 35th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and the free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant democratic republic.

Despite oppression and torture at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the once-free Lithuania continues to live and burn brightly in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad. Occupied by totalitarian power, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual, political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of Lithuania long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my hope that in this trying period of their history the people of Lithuania will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country has held for them. American sympathy with the Lithuanian people has been manifest in our press and in Congress, as well as in the official policy of our Government, first declared on July 23, 1940, which has refused to recognize Soviet Russia's absorption of Lithuania and has persisted in recognition of the established democratic republic.

Mr. Speaker, on this 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence I want to extend my congratulations to the people of that brave country and to all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry. I join in their prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to make these few comments on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Since a celebration thereof is forbidden in the homeland this year because of Communist aggression, suppression, and tyrannical despotism, it is more important that free people throughout the world join with Lithuanians everywhere in letting them know in no uncertain terms that we not only understand their plight in their homeland, but will do all within our power to ease their burden.

To the 1,000,000 loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, I say that they are not one bit less patriotic and loyal to the United States by continuing to show

a very active interest in their friends and relatives in Lithuania.

It is incumbent upon all of us who love freedom and liberty to devote our lives to the strengthening of the spirit of independence in the hearts of men all over the world.

We must never forget that an attack upon liberty anywhere is an attack upon liberty everywhere.

Let us continue to work together to free the enslaved, no matter where they may be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express today, on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence as a modern state, my continuing admiration for and sympathy with the heroic people of that indestructible country.

Lithuania has existed for more than 800 years, a large part of that time under cruel foreign domination. I am convinced that the present illegal incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which never has been recognized by the United States, cannot be—however inhuman it may be for Lithuanians—a permanent setback to the development of Lithuania. The country of Mindaugas and Vytautas can never die.

No, the country can never perish, but its people, many of them, are perishing. We know how more than 50,000 were deported to misery and death in the U. S. S. R. on the night of June 14–15, 1941, and how 3 or 4 times that number, at least, have been deported or exterminated by the Soviet Union since that time.

Oppressive Soviet exploitation is robbing Lithuania of its natural resources as well as of its people. But not, I believe, of its spirit. And certainly not of its friends and well-wishers throughout the free world.

I know that all Americans join me in sending warm greetings to the people of Lithuania on this tragic anniversary. We hope they may have the fortitude and the patience to endure until Lithuania once again takes its rightful place in the community of free nations.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, 35 years ago, the gallant people of Lithuania declared their independence.

From the late 1700's until 1918 her history had been one of continuous subjugation to the Russian Czars. During the First World War Lithuania was invaded by the German forces and remained occupied for a period of over 3 years. On February 16, in the year 1918, Lithuanian independence was proclaimed and she retained her independent status until the outbreak of World War II. During this period the country was forced to accept the quartering of Russian troops along the Baltic coast and in other portions of the country. Later, finding herself helpless, the country was overrun by Russian forces.

Although the largest of the three Baltic countries, Lithuania today is sealed off from the free world by a ring of iron. We know little of what transpires behind that iron curtain save in certain smuggled messages from that indomitable, liberty-loving people still hoping for that day of freedom—that day which will see again Lithuania among the society of the free nations of the world.

To Americans of Lithuanian descent, we hold out the hope that in the near future your anniversary, this 16th day of February, will be celebrated in the manner in which we celebrate our own Fourth of July, celebrating once again Lithuania as a free nation, free from the invader, free from the shackles of slavery, and again free and independent as a democratic nation looking forward to the future with the hope of permanent independence and standing with all free nations under God.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, one of the first victims of Communist aggression and oppression, has lost its independence but not its spirit.

As Lithuanians here in the United States and throughout the world somberly mark the 35th anniversary of their independence, they may look hopefully to the day when once again the principles of freemen will reign in their land.

Tyranny is weakening while the forces of freedom grow ever stronger.

Communism is being blocked more effectively each new day, and each new day brings new hope for liberation of the oppressed; brings new hope that free peoples everywhere will once more rise from under the aggressor's boot, and enjoy once more the inherent principles of liberty and the dignity of man.

New light of liberty is being cast over those countries darkened by tyranny's expansion. Our Government promises a forceful program of peaceful liberation, and this program, in collaboration with the effective underground movements of Communist-dominated countries, holds promise of evolving the lands of the oppressed into the lands of the free.

While the spirit of independence burns within the breasts of freemen, while an abiding faith promotes the will to be free, no free soul will be conquered; no nation will bow in subjection; liberty will prevail again.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of World War I the gates of liberty were opened for the people of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, the National Council of Lithuania—Lietuves Taryba—proclaimed Lithuania a free and independent nation. Thirty-five years later the people of Lithuanian ancestry are happy to observe this historic occasion. Conversely they also observe with sympathy and deep sorrow the 13th anniversary of the illegal reoccupation of their country.

During the interval of Lithuania's independence—to wit, 22 years—that nation made many contributions to the civilized world. Unfortunately, however, this period of freedom and liberty was cut short on the 14th day of June 1940, when Soviet Russia demanded that the Lithuanian Government become sympathetic and subservient to the Soviet Union. On June 15 of that year the Soviet Army marched into that brave country and occupied it. Shortly thereafter, as we have seen so often in numerous other countries, the Soviet-sponsored and supervised government brought into creation a puppet state subservient and obligated to the will of Soviet dictator Marshal Stalin. Since that ignominious day the Lithuanian people have suffered brutal and inhuman exploitation by the powers of the Soviet Government.

Little do we realize the hardship, pain, and suffering which those brave people endured under the ruthless heel of the Soviet Government. Thousands upon thousands of their citizens have been thrown into slave-labor camps and gradually eliminated through inhuman treatment.

Indeed, we are fortunate today that the new President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has proclaimed to the entire world that we will no longer tolerate the secret treaties which have enslaved millions of other people—to the detriment of those behind the Iron Curtain. This policy, as enunciated by the press, should give faith and comfort to those who have been persecuted by the Soviet Union; and it is earnestly hoped that a severe program toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will eventually bring about the liberation not only of the Lithuanian people but all the peoples of the Baltic States.

Freedom-loving peoples of the world do not recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania and continue to recognize the governments in exile throughout the world. The American people shall always stand in deep sympathy, and with respect, for the sacrifices being made by the Lithuanian people. Their courageous and firm stand against the unauthorized subjugation by Russia shall some day affirm itself by reestablishing a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence I am happy to have the opportunity of renewed expression of my great admiration for the people of Lithuania and the steadfastness and courage that have been theirs in the resistance of oppression during many trying periods.

I accompanied the Lithuanian-American delegation to the funeral of President Harding, and through the good fortune of acquaintance with the military in charge of arrangements was able to have placed at the head of the presidential casket the Lithuanian floral offering. This, it seemed to me, was appropriate and as the fallen President would have wished, since the grief of the Lithuanians was real, President Harding having been the friend of their cause.

Men and women of Lithuanian blood have made large contributions to the city of Chicago. I have been signally fortunate in numbering many of these good citizens among my friends, among them Leonora Nimhosk—now Mrs. Gatewood and the mother of a fine family of children—and her fine and noble father and mother, both born in Lithuania. Leonora Nimhosk was my coworker and secretary when in the name of the radio circle of the Rebuilders we were doing our best to leaven in some degree the distress of the great depression. It is of such blood as that of the immigrants who came from Lithuania, as did Mr. and Mrs. Nimhosk, her parents, that our United States of America has derived much strength. I might remark, Mr. Speaker, that one of our outstanding and beloved jurists in Chicago is a

Lithuanian-American, himself a native son of Chicago, his parents immigrants from Lithuania.

It is the destiny of Lithuania to be free, because it is not in the character of the Lithuanian people to accept bondage. Someday—and I have faith it will be soon—the Soviet clouds will be lifted and the sun again will shine, unhindered and unobstructed on the land of Lithuania.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the 35th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a good occasion for expressing our solidarity with this heroic people and our hope for their achievement of early freedom from the yoke of communism. The people of America and those of the free nations all over the world know how the Lithuanian people have suffered in the last few years, they know that their cause is a righteous one, and they hope that before long their homeland will obtain its freedom and the people of that country will again join the community of free nations.

On the occasion of this anniversary, we send our word of encouragement to all Americans of Lithuanian descent and to their friends and relatives who are trapped in that little country behind the Iron Curtain. We pray that their spirit of freedom may be rekindled and their desire to throw off the chains of enslavement may be strengthened.

The people of America will never recognize the forced subjugation of Lithuania by Communist Russia. The Lithuanians are one of the oldest peoples in Europe who have made great cultural contributions to Western civilization. The world has not forgotten those contributions, nor will it forget the sacrifices now being made by Lithuanians. We extend to them our greetings on this anniversary and our wishes that they will soon regain their national independence.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offor a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, of which 20,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Judiciary, and 1,000 copies for the House Committee on Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1953 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 46) which was read a first time and second time, and, with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to take up the 1953 supplemental appropriation bill on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I believe that the rules require the report to lay over for 3 legislative days. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and with the full committee. Everyone on the committee is agreeable to this procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As I say, I shall not object, but I do hope the leadership on the majority side will not make a practice of this on future appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. We will not do it on the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953.

EGYPT AND BRITAIN TO BURY HATCHET

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article from the Boston Herald of Friday which praises the United States Ambassador, Jefferson Caffery, and the work that he has done to get Egypt and Britain to bury the hatchet. His accomplishment is of great value to the peace of the world. In days when the foreign service has been so severely criticized at times, I am glad to point out that we have in our service men of great integrity and ability. It was thought that this Anglo-Egyptian agreement could not be reached, but the matter has been adjusted. We are very grateful for this achievement.

(The following is the article referred to:)

EGYPT, BRITAIN TO BURY HATCHET—AGREE ON SUDANESE—UNITED STATES ENVOY LAUDED

(By Edward Pollak)

CAIRO, EGYPT, February 12.—Egypt and Britain formally agreed today to let the Sudanese choose their own future and Premier Gen. Mohammed Naguib announced the door was opened wide for a successful understanding on the withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal zone.

Talks on Suez are coming very soon, Naguib said.

PARADE PLANNED

The final settlement of these two key problems in British-Egyptian relations could clear the way toward tighter cooperation between this strategic Moslem nation and the Western Powers in the cold war, perhaps in a Middle East defense command.

There was exultation in the foreign offices of Cairo, London, and Washington. And a public holiday was called for tomorrow in the Sudan, a land of desert, forests, and cotton fields that stretches from central Africa to the Red Sea. A ceremonial parade of celebration is to be held before Gov. Gen. Sir Robert Howe Saturday in Khartoun, the capital.

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, in announcing the Sudanese accord in Britain's House of Commons, said it was a reasonable settlement of this question which has long bedeviled our relations with Egypt.

Press officer Michael J. McDermott of the United States State Department said in Washington the United States is highly gratified. He termed this "an event of great importance, representing as it does agreement on an issue which has been the cause of great complications in relations between the two countries for several decades."

Here in Cairo, United States Ambassador Jefferson Caffery drew praise from Naguib for his mediation efforts.

"It was through Ambassador Caffery's good offices," the Premier said, "that many difficult points were ironed out. These had a direct effect on the successful conclusion of this agreement."

DESIGNATION OF MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 23, 1953

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 9, 1953, the Chair designates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 23, 1953.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISASTER IN HOLLAND, BELGIUM, AND ENGLAND

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are torn by the devastation being wrought by the North Sea in the gallant countries of Holland, of Belgium, and of the eastern shores of England. We have seen the TV and motion pictures and been horror struck by

the fury and the ravages of the storms. We have seen also the quick response of the Queen and the Queen Mother in Holland in the midst of that devastation. We have read of the young Queen of England and her tireless efforts to help her people. That such tragedy should come to England during the first year of her reign is sad indeed.

It was my privilege as Ohio vice regent of Mt. Vernon to share with the other members of the Ladies' Association in the welcome given the then Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh at the home of Mr. Washington. It was again my privilege in the absence of the regent to welcome there her Majesty Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard. Her simple graciousness to the groups of Girl Scouts assembled on the lawn will be remembered always.

Her Majesty's deep understanding of young hearts was exquisitely demonstrated when she wrote a most charming note to little Mary Brumbaugh in Painesville, Ohio. Mary had written Her Majesty suggesting that she visit her in her home there so that she might see how the simple people of this country really live.

And now these two young women, already carrying the heavy burden of the welfare of their people, are called upon to uphold them through the most appalling tragedy that has befallen their countries in centuries.

The resolution I had the privilege of introducing in an attempt to express the symphy felt by Congress, did not itself reach the floor. The House, in order to bring action at the first possible moment accepted the Senate's resolution unanimously. But in the meantime, after consultation with the two Embassies, I took it upon myself as an American woman to cable the two women whose hearts must be exceedingly heavy with the suffering of their people that they might know that the women of America had them in heart and mind, asking the Infinite to grant them wisdom and strength, endurance, and fortitude.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LAIRD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NAVAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past fortnight there has been much public discussion with respect to imposing a blockade against the traffic of war materials entering the ports of China. Everybody concurs that it is highly improper for members of the United Nations to engage in this traffic which has been of immeasurable benefit to North Korea and Communist China against whom the United Nations is engaged in open hostilities. Some persons have asserted that the responsibility for a blockade should be assumed by the United States Navy; others that it should be a joint undertaking by the fleets of the United Nations. There appears to have been no serious consideration to the imposition of a blockade by the Republic of China itself, which is the one government in the world which has the unquestioned right of blockade but lacks the naval vessels to carry it out.

In 1946 the Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the transfer of 271 vessels from the United States Navy to the Republic of China of various types of craft but specifically excluding those vessels of a combat character. The authority of that act expired by its own limitations in July of 1951.

In order that the Republic of China might have vessels capable of conducting a blockade of the Chinese ports, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the President to transfer by sale, lease, or otherwise, to the Republic of China under certain conditions, a total of six destroyers which I understand the Republic of China is presently capable of manning and provisioning.

To forestall any speculation as to the origin of this proposal, I must assert that its genesis is from my own consideration of the problem and is not inspired by any persons in the Executive Department either civilian or professional. Being confident that it is the preponderance of feeling in the Congress that our Government should extend to the Republic of China all military aid by way of training facilities and equipment that is possible, it seems entirely appropriate that such a program should also include naval vessels appropriate to the needs in that area.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

There is widespread feeling that a longer term for Representatives would add stability to the House and assure better service to the home districts.

Increased responsibilities and complexity of the problems we face today, membership in Congress has definitely become a full-time job. Despite the pressures of their work, the Members are necessarily compelled to devote considerable time at campaigning. This means that a Member at present has only 1 year of his term to devote entirely and completely to the performance of his duties.

I do not feel that it is a healthy situation to have the whole membership seeking reelection at the same time. My resolution would avoid that by staggering the commencement of the 4-year term, with the result that about half the membership would be up for reelection on a biennial basis.

Those not seeking reelection during the 2-year intervals, could devote their usual full time to issues before the Congress. The people would, therefore, be assured that a majority of the membership would be functioning—unencumbered by time-consuming requirements and political pressures of election years.

By staggering the terms of office on the basis of even-numbered and odd-numbered districts, the people would retain the privilege of voting for approximately half their representation every 2 years.

I believe that with the adoption of this amendment, the same close contact between the Representative and his constituency would be maintained and that economy and efficiency would result to the benefit of all concerned.

DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress two great Oregon pioneers, Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee. They have done much in blazing the path for and shaping the destinies of all Oregonians, and we are grateful to them. I feel it is most fitting therefore that their statues have been placed in the United States Capitol to stand among other noted leaders in our Nation's history.

The ceremony for the presentation of these two statues was held on Saturday, February 14, on the 94th anniversary of Oregon's admission as a State in 1859. The statues were officially presented by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, who has recently resigned as Governor of the great State of Oregon, to accept the duties and office of Secretary of the Interior. We are happy to have him here and feel honored to have him make this presentation, and also to have Vice President RICHARD NIXON accept these fine statues on behalf of the United States.

Fine addresses were also given at this ceremony by outstanding Oregon citizens. Mr. Leslie M. Scott, who from 1941 to 1948 served as State treasurer for Oregon, and who is director of the Oregon Historical Society, delivered an address entitled "John McLoughlin, Benefactor of Oregon Settlers." Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president of the Willamette University, of Salem, Oreg., gave an address entitled "Jason Lee, Missionary and Colonizer," while Dr. Burt

Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee and vice president of the University of Oregon, gave an address entitled "Oregon, the Unique Prize."

I feel that as the Members of the Congress pass daily through the Halls of our great Capitol, they will see these statues and catch the fine spirit and inspiration of these early pioneer leaders.

February 14, 1953, the 94th anniversary of the signing of the bill admitting Oregon to the Union, is the appropriate time chosen for Oregon to present to the Nation, to stand in the Capitol, statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee. These are two great men, men of whom Oregon can well be proud. To them can justly be credited more than to any other individuals the peaceful development, settlement, and civilization of the Oregon Territory and of the State of Oregon. Greater than their tremendous worth as individuals, however, is their importance as symbols of the democratic and republican tradition, common to all the United States, but shining forth particularly in the history of Oregon, and exemplified in the careers of these two men.

Dr. McLoughlin, local representative of the Hudson's Bay Company, constituted in his person the sole business and, since the Hudson's Bay Company was British, the sole governmental authority in the entire Columbia River region from the time of his appointment in 1824 until shortly before the time of his resignation, 1845.

It was under his mild and just paternalistic rule that the region grew from a wilderness of savages to a settled country, learned to govern itself and built schools and churches, and passed peacefully from British rule to joint rule, and from joint rule to American territorial status. McLoughlin himself, though faithful to his company and to the sovereignty of Britain so long as they held claim to the territory, chose to remain an Oregonian when Britain accepted the 49th parallel as the boundary line west of the Rockies, took his oath of allegiance to the United States, and died in his home in Oregon City September 3, 1857.

Dr. McLoughlin was noted for the welcome he gave to missionaries of all faiths, and the substantial help he afforded to them, and to the farmers whose coming spelled ruin to the business of the Hudson's Bay Company's fur business. In the long view, as anyone can see now, but few could see then, he could not have prevented the coming of missionaries, and the settling of the land by American pioneer farmers. He could easily have made their hard life far more difficult for them—which would have brought on a stubborn and perhaps bloody conflict, and probably hastened the inevitable establishment of American sovereignty over the region. He had the statesmanship, with the peace not only of the Oregon Territory, but even of the British Empire and the United States depending on his actions, to act and speak with unfailing firmness, tact, and wisdom, so as to maintain the business of his company and the authority of his government to the last possible moment, and yet to make the transition from authoritative to democratic government, from British to American sovereignty, smooth and easy.

One of the glories of Dr. McLoughlin's career was his hearty welcome of the Reverend Jason Lee, Methodist missionary, and his four companions, who came to the Oregon Territory in 1834. The missionaries came by the Oregon Trail, except for a slight detour at one point to avoid hostile Indians, and it is particularly gratifying to me, representing the eastern portion of Oregon, to retrace in memory their path, along the line now followed by the rails of the Union Pacific, from Huntington to Baker and then to La Grande, and then, on a less simply described route, up to old Fort Walla Walla at what is now Wallula, Wash.

With Dr. McLoughlin's help and advice, Lee established his mission on the Willamette. Going back east in 1838, Lee made speaking tours, talked with the governing body of the Methodist Church, and secured the presentation of a petition to Congress, signed by his fellow missionaries and other dwellers in his mission on the Willamette. Through these efforts, he enlisted support for the Oregon venture, and returned to Oregon with a party of 51, establishing a new and more ambitious mission, 10 miles south of the first one, and still on the Willamette. There he set up a saw mill and grist mill, with machinery he had brought from the east, and the band built and opened the Indian school that later developed into Willamette University.

The importance of Jason Lee in the history of Oregon is well summarized by the Reverend William Wallace Youngson, in his book, Swinging Portals:

> His was the first work, done by a resident of Oregon, to induce the Government of the United States to aid in colonization and support of the country, to settle it with American people and to establish here an American State.

INSERTION IN THE RECORD

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A638 a communication to the New York Times and a translation from a Norwegian newspaper following the extension of remarks of Senator LEHMAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SHALL WE BALANCE THE BUDGET OR REDUCE TAXES?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the most important issues before us is the balancing of the budget. One reason I came back to Congress is to help restore this Government to sound fiscal policies. What I want to know is, Does the President favor it? Does the Secretary of the Treasury favor it? I would like to get some sort of statement from the leadership on this important question before I come to vote on taxation. If it is the opinion of our leadership, supported by facts, that we ought to keep the tax level where it is until the budget is balanced, I shall vote that way, because it is my opinion that we cannot face international communism and all of the problems that perplex us until we restore this country to sound fiscal practices.

For a long period of time we have been operating on a deficit, and, as a result, literally millions of people have been robbed, through inflation, of the fruits of their savings. There are a lot of us who feel that the country ought to be put above party. We have come back here to help you do a job. What we want to know is, What is the job you want done? Is it safe to reduce taxes before curtailing expenses? Should we first reduce expenditures? Have taxes reached the point of diminishing returns, so that our total revenue would be increased or maintained at a lower level?

What is it you want? If the President will speak out courageously and boldly, and if the Secretary of the Treasury will do the same, and furnish us with the facts, I can assure you there are many of us who want to support them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure the gentleman heard the state of the Union message of the President. He made it very, very clear that he considers the first and most primary matter of governmental responsibility the balancing of the budget and the maintenance of the fiscal solvency of our Government. By every statement and remark he has made I think he has made that crystal clear—at least, there is no doubt in my mind about it, and there should not be any doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Texas, who speaks, as he always does, in a spirit of good conscience, sincerity, and good faith.

SHALL WE BALANCE THE BUDGET OR REDUCE TAXES?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the short colloquy that has just occurred between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may I say that we had a long rangy fellow here from Texas at one time by the name of Oscar Callaway. Someone interrupted him one day to ask a question and when the fellow got through attempting to ask him a question he said to Mr. Callaway, "Is that clear?" Oscar said, "Just as clear as mud."

So, if it is clear to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the situation as to whether or not we should reduce taxes or balance the budget, or either, is certainly not clear to me.

FREE POSTAGE FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

This bill would provide free postage for first-class letter mail sent to a member of the Armed Forces on active duty or in the active service of such Armed Forces, at an address of the Armed Forces within or without the United States, as well as providing free postage on letters sent by a member of the Armed Forces to any person in the United States.

When specified by the sender, letters not exceeding 1 ounce in weight shall be transmitted to their destination by airmail, dependent upon airspace availability.

This bill is intended to replace the act providing free postage for members of the Armed Forces in specified areas, and broaden its provisions.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on H. R. 1 which was reported out of committee by a vote of 21 to 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LENTEN SERVICES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday is the beginning of the Lenten season. Lenten season is a definite reminder to the Christian world that God-fearing people in every nation face a greater challenge than at any time in our generation.

And so as we enter this Lenten season, we do so with a deep realization that the success of our country will depend upon the spiritual and moral fiber of the people of America.

All churches in Washington of every faith will conduct special services during this Lenten period. I am at this time calling the attention of the Members of Congress to services that will be conducted during the next 6 weeks at the Lutheran Church of the Reformation. The services will be held each weekday except Saturday from 12:10 to 12:30, and will include hymns, prayer, Scripture lessons, and a 10- or 12-minute talk by pastors of various Protestant churches in Washington. These services are under the direction of its nationally known pastor, Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder.

Noon services have been carried on during the Lenten period at this church over a period of years and have been of great inspiration to those who have attended in the years gone by.

For those who are not familiar, the church is located just two blocks east of the Capitol Building, near the Folger Library. Unless you are attending services at another church, you are invited to attend. You are all welcome at these inspirational services.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I am prompted by a speech which I read over the weekend to make a very brief statement.

In the 10 years I have been here I have voted for every foreign-aid measure and I have voted against very nearly every amendment, and possibly every amendment to reduce foreign aid. But it does seem to me entirely appropriate that we should be very scrupulous and very conscientious to see that every penny that we spend on foreign aid is spent for a legitimate purpose and that we get a reasonable and fair consideration for the money that we spend. If ordinary prudence in the appropriation and spending of money for foreign aid is to be sneered at as "dollar diplomacy," I think things have come to a pretty pass.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], and there is no more capable man in the House, just told us that he has voted for all the appropriations for foreign aid and against all amendments, as I understood him, to decrease the amount. He added that if he was able to prevent it, none of the money which might be appropriated hereafter would be wasted. I have been on the opposite end of the program to which he referred. So far as I recall, I never voted for any appropriation other than for defense purposes for foreign aid except one, and that was Bretton Woods, when my good colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] talked me into it. I have always been sorry he was successful.

A committee print dated January 2, 1953, filed in the Senate, carried the following:

This subcommittee is critical of the high-level planning which is understood neither by the people of the United States nor the Congress. Likewise we question the extent to which the interest of the United States has been protected in negotiations with our allies for defense sites and facilities necessary in connection with such defense activities. In some instances our Nation has spent hundreds of millions of dollars developing defense bases where our allies will have every right to tell us to leave within a few years. In order to continue to maintain American troops on foreign soil, it might be necessary to make concessions to countries where the bases are located much less favorable to the American economy than any hardheaded businessman would otherwise permit.

We were impressed by the fact that the number of American boys stationed at remote bases in Newfoundland, Labrador, Greenland, Iceland, and many other locations was excessive. For example, on one base at a remote location, where our troops are sharing the facility with an allied nation, our ally had 450 men on its side of the field while this Nation had 2,500 men. It was our feeling that the American operation could well have been reduced to a scale comparable to that of our ally. Yet American planning will require an enormous increase of personnel at that base. The same thing is true of other bases. It was our feeling that the taxpayers were being unsuspectingly led into a program that would require the virtual building of small modern American cities, running into an investment of over $100 million each, at many points throughout the world, and the stationing of perhaps three-quarters of a million servicemen at remote points of the earth for the next generation. By contrast we feel that this Nation should concentrate on building airfields, supply depots, and naval installations in friendly and allied countries rather than keeping our youngsters living overseas for a lifetime. We consider it far preferable to rely upon our allies to guard and maintain airfields and other defense installations until American reinforcements could arrive in the event of a great global conflict. We can understand the wisdom of maintaining perhaps a dozen important defense bases at remote points in the world from which American operations could be expanded. We can understand the wisdom of maintaining small housekeeping units of perhaps 100 men each at other bases where large quantities of American supplies may be stored in anticipation of hostile attack upon our allies. However, we cannot understand a program which has 100 or even 200 groups of men in units of 2,000 to 5,000 sitting idly in the muck and mire of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Arctic Circle, waiting for a war which we hope to avoid.

Airbases involving untold millions of dollars have been constructed without any arrangement to defend such bases from easy capture by an enemy, notwithstanding the fact that thousands of airmen and American civilians are expected to live on such bases under the most unfavorable climatic conditions. Mobility of American reserves is a better answer to the threat of Communist aggression at remote points than an attempt to station and maintain enough American

boys at sparsely settled outposts to defeat a major enemy assault upon such points.

Another report on Senate Resolution 263, filed on the same day, should be read. Let me quote just a very small part:

The United States is faced with a situation which calls for a drastic revision of the organization of our Armed Forces. The purpose of this reorganization should be twofold:

1. To increase the efficiency of our Military Establishment.

2. To reduce the costs of defense to a point where the Nation's economic structure is no longer threatened.

The need for this reorganization is pressing. It will brook no delay.

There is no foreseeable end to the international tensions which have drawn the world into opposing armed camps. As long as those tensions persist, the United States must keep its defenses strong. We cannot afford to relax our guard.

For that period—for the period of the international tensions—we must resign ourselves to huge defense budgets. But we must not—we cannot—resign ourselves to budgets so swollen that our economic structure threatens to burst at every seam and let loose upon our citizenry a floodtide of inflation and bankruptcy.

The sins of the past—the failure of every American to wage a coordinated and ruthless campaign against waste—have caught up with us. Already, there are responsible officials who appear to believe that we have spent so much money already that we do not dare to spend more for weapons that are vitally needed.

The Senate Preparedness Committee does not believe we dare relax our rearmament efforts. We are convinced that the security of the United States demands that we forge ahead as rapidly as possible to acquire the weapons of war.

But we are equally convinced that there is a large field of waste which can be and must be eliminated. We believe that the armed services have still to shake off the traditions of a past in which the Nation could afford the luxury of putting 5 men to a task which could be performed by 1.

It is impossible, of course, to estimate the savings that could be made. But we have demonstrated that a very minor operation—comparable to the removal of a corn—already has opened the way to economies of nearly $50 million a year with no loss in efficiency. That minor surgery—the elimination or consolidation of 9,009 jobs at 26 installations—is commendable. But we think the situation calls for major surgery.

The Armed Forces are not suffering a minor ailment. They are bloated by too much fat—too much water—and it is binding the hard muscle of military strength. Only a surgeon—a highly skilled surgeon—can do the job.

The ailment is particularly deadly when the nature of our enemy is analyzed. He is rich—dirty rich—in manpower. During World War II, he mustered about 23,500,000 men for his armies. He suffered permanent casualties of 9 million men and yet, when the fighting ended, he still had 9 million men in the field. He was able to maintain that high level of military manpower while releasing another 5,500,000 from his fighting forces for civilian duties in the homeland.

Not only does he have vastly greater manpower resources, but he is in a position to make more economical use of them. He fights from interior lines of communication; he is dealing with a people inured to incredibly low standards of living; he has no regard for the morale of the home front, provided only that the home front does not flare into open revolt.

Our answer can only be superior weapons and superior organization. Whatever may be the situation in weapons, it cannot be said that we have achieved organization sufficiently superior to enable us to face the future with confidence.

Even this survey, which is little more than an approach to the problem, has turned up evidence that the armed services are far too "chair corps" minded.

(a) We cannot consider an organization efficient when it requires 1,600 men—plus a supply line too long to be estimated—to put 75 single-seat aircraft into the air.

(b) We cannot consider a training base efficient when it requires one man to feed, house, and train two and a half men.

(c) We cannot consider a ship efficiently run when it is manned by three and one-half times the number of seamen required to conduct a similar operation in private commerce.

(d) We cannot consider a battalion to be at a high peak of efficiency when more than one-fourth of its personnel find combating the enemy a secondary task.

(e) We cannot consider a division efficiently organized when a potential enemy division can outgun it by 10 percent on a man-for-man basis.

The foregoing from members of a party which created the conditions of which they now complain gives one half hope of better things to come.

It is now conceded that we cannot purchase worth-while friends.

All of which but strengthens the determination of some of us to continue the effort—redouble our efforts—to put the interests of our country first no matter what a left-wing commentator may write or say.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can recollect, I have not voted for one penny of this foreign aid in the 13 years I have been here.

I have been known in my district and wherever I am known as a very, very conservative Member of this House. In spite of that fact, the Dunn Survey, Inc., who have taken a survey of every precinct in my district, have found that a conservative, a known conservative, even runs ahead of a middle-of-the-roader, like President Eisenhower, and runs ahead of a known liberal in the labor precincts where it is 100 percent labor. I, of course, have always supported the Taft-Hartley Act and said I would be opposed to any amendment that would nullify it or reduce its effect, and there I ran ahead of the middle-of-the-roader, Mr. Eisenhower, who said in his campaign that he was for revision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now I want people to know that a conservative, a well-known conservative, can draw votes just as well as liberal candidates and middle-of-the-road candidates.

REMEMBER THE "MAINE"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the first legislative day following the 55th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor. The 15th of February is an anniversary reverently observed by the veterans of the Spanish-American War and by many patriotic societies. I hope its observance here on the floor of the Congress of the United States will continue through the years. Fifty-five years ago today, the news of the murderous destruction of the battleship *Maine* with the loss of 260 American lives was the sole topic of conversation in every home in the United States. Three decades or more had passed since the close of the war of the States, and we had been a peaceful people. Our Army numbered a scant 28,000. No officer in the Army for 30 years had seen as many as a full regiment of soldiery assembled together in any one place. Our Navy had been built up, but was still rated as far below that of the European powers. Moreover our coast cities were practically without defense. Spain, on the other hand, was still enjoying the prestige of the days when she was one of the great world powers. In Cuba alone there were 160,000 Spanish soldiers. To make matters worse from the American standpoint, all of Europe with the sole exception of Britain was solidly on the side of Spain. War with Spain had the prospect of these United States of America with an Army of a puny 28,000 and a small Navy being pitted against the united armies and navies of Europe, Great Britain excepted.

Fifty-five years ago today when an indignation seldom if ever equalled in its intensity was sweeping the people of the United States, the hour of decision was approaching. The American people dared to face and to accept the issue. It was one of the great decisions in the history of the world. That decision shaped the course of this universe of ours for a thousand years or more. Its consequences and its repercussions were more beneficial and universally affected the welfare of mankind more than any decision of similar character in recorded history. Had that decision been different, today there would be no sense of hemispheric solidarity and security. Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the other islands of the West Indies would be in hostile European hands; Haiti, Guam, and the Philippines possibly in Russian hands. It is well to remember that it was the Spanish-American War that brought about the annexation of Hawaii and which ended the negotiations of Russia with Spain for the purchase of the Philippines.

With a standing army of 28,000 and a Navy rated low in the list of the navies of the world, the American people dared the issue. Every man who served in the war was a volunteer—raw troops, if you please—wearing heavy winter clothing in the tropics, shooting inadequate Springfield rifles of smoking black powder, ill fed, badly equipped, trained

scarcely at all. Yet in 10 weeks the enemy was met on land and sea and smashed to smithereens. The naval engagements at Manila in the Pacific and at Santiago in the Atlantic saw the complete destruction of the proud Spanish fleets in a matter of hours. The land engagements were equally quick and decisive.

I presume I have read as much history, not as much as our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], probably the greatest scholar of history who ever sat in this Congress, but as much probably as the average man. I have never read of any war that was started against odds seemingly so forbidding, that was won with such rapidity and completeness, and that affected such wide, sweeping results. In 1898 the United States of America started on the march with destiny. Future historians, writing long after all of us are gone, will speak of the 50-year war that ushered in the golden era of a thousand years of American world influence. The 50-year war that reshaped a universe and affected the lives of every human being in every country started in 1898. Then a temporary cessation of 20 years and World War I. Another period for breath taking, and World War II.

I am surprised that modern American historians do not glimpse at the significance and the importance of the Spanish-American War. The modern treatment has been to minimize its importance. I am not criticizing the historians of the present era. Doubtless they are performing a service which will prove useful in the future when faraway generations are attempting to understand the miracle of the ascendency of the United States of America to world leadership in political thought as well as in material power. The changes from an old order, meeting the conditions of the horse and buggy, to a new order required in this highly mechanized period, have been many, touching into manifold phases, and they have come with violent suddenness. It is not strange, therefore, that in the writing of a historical novel the trend has been to overemphasize the collateral, to judge of the actions of the people of another period by the reasoning processes of the people of a modern world born and reared in the atmosphere and under the conditions of a world entirely changed. To understand the "spirit of '98" and to find in the events of that period the accurate historical chart the historian must disassociate himself from the present and endeavor to think, to reason, and to react, not as he would today but as he would have done were he born and reared among the conditions of that period.

I am the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in the National House of Representatives. There may not be another veteran of that war who will sit in this Chamber. While I am here I wish to leave some record for the researchers in the generations to come. There will come the time when the significance and importance of the Spanish-American War will be recognized as marking one of the great turning points in the history of the world. When that time comes the student chancing upon a volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks on this occasion will find, I trust, some small measure for judging the accuracy of the interpretations of a school of historians who did their appraisal of the events at the turn of the 19th century when a rapid succession of dynamic events—all indisputably the aftermath of the war with Spain—left them, as it were, off balance.

The trend in historical writing at the moment is in line with the trend in the style of public speaking. The effort is to avoid the dramatic, to play down the emotional. The result, of course, is that we have more men and women who are public speakers, a diminishing number of persons who turn out and remain to listen. The same trend in historical writing is manifest in a tendency to minimize, or to omit entirely, anything which appears to border on the dramatic or emotional. The so-called modern school of public speaking can and does serve a useful educational purpose; it can never inspire a great burning emotion, furnish the driving power to a crusade leading to great world-reshaping events. The history writers of today, responding to this trend, proceed on the false theory that the men and women of past periods in our history were without a sense of the dramatic and were emotional only when made gullible. In short, they take the bare skeleton of historical facts and surround them with personalities, queer automatons with their physical existence in the 19th century but their thinking being done for them in the mid-20th century.

Of course, the men and women of these United States when the 19th century was about to turn into the 20th century dramatized themselves and their country. The feel of an approaching national destiny gave them heroic stature. Of course, they were under the spell of an overpowering emotion 55 years ago today when in every home the news of the murderous destruction of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor aroused such white-hot indignation as never before had been experienced in our country. If ever the American people were united in the spirit of a courageous and daring crusade it was in February of 1898.

It is unfortunate that the approach of our present-day American historians to the "spirit of 98" is not more understanding and sympathetic. I have had many letters of surprise, of wonder, and of question from the men and women who lived in that era and from the men who served in that war. Why was the Spanish-American War receiving the brushoff treatment in the American histories used as texts in our high schools and colleges?

I spent hours in the Congressional Library with the American histories that are being used in our schools piled up around me—all the related books that gracious and accommodating attendants could locate.

I confess that I was stunned. At times my indignation was overpowering. I thought of my comrades, scarcely more than boys, who had died in Cuba. I thought of the 38 fever patients, young veterans of the Santiago campaign, who had died on the transport coming back to Montauk Point from the siege of Santiago, of the 200 others who died within days after our landing, of the countless others who died shortly after reaching home. And then to read in a book of history, written by an American and made available for the instruction of American youth, that the Santiago campaign was a summer's vacation.

I trust that veterans of the war with Spain and spokesmen for the patriotic societies will let the publishers of the Stream of American History, by Leland D. Baldwin, know what they think of smart-alec cracks as:

> Roosevelt had found the summer vacation profitable. * * * it wasn't much of a war, he noted rather pathetically, but it was the best we had.

Mr. Speaker, that which the historian Baldwin terms a "summer vacation" was the siege of Santiago. I do not like this gratuitous insult to the memory of my comrades who died at Santiago or who died shortly after the siege as a result of the hardships of that campaign.

I hope that the veterans of the war with Spain and the spokesmen for the patriotic societies will let the publishers of the 1939 revised edition of A Short History of the United States, by Richard H. Bassett, know that they have far more respect for his father, John Spencer Bassett, as an American historian on the war with Spain than ever they could have for him. The 1933 edition of John Spencer Bassett's work was 976 pages in length. Seventeen pages were devoted to the war with Spain. Come 1939 and the younger Bassett sought to correct the original narration as written by Professor Bassett wherever new evidence suggests a different emphasis. He increased the size of the volume to 1038 pages but reduced the coverage of the war with Spain from 17 to 7 pages. Listen to this, you veterans of the Santiago campaign:

> The event came not a moment too soon for the Americans. * * * A week more of hostilities might have thrown the entire force into a panic.

I do not like the implication of that remark. It has nowhere any substantiation in the fact. It is not history. It is merely the idle conclusion of a writer who wanted to brush off the Spanish-American War without going to the trouble of doing a little work in researching. I can assure the publishers of this work, which I understand is used in our schools, that there was never a time when the little American Army in Cuba was near to a panic. The "Spirit of '98" was not made of that sort of stuff.

In this connection it is to be noted that most of the passages in John Spencer Bassett's work of 1933 presenting the Spanish-American War in its true and heroic aspects Richard H. Bassett deleted from his enlarged and revised edition of 1939.

All through the late editions of histories that I examined in the Congressional Library I found manifest this trend to write down and to treat carelessly the war with Spain. All of the writers seemed to take it for granted that the war was brought on by what they describe as the "yellow press and the politicians." The politicians were the Members of this body who voted,

with only 16 dissenting, for the resolution setting forth the position of the United States, and the Members similarly minded in the other body. The yellow press was Hearst and Pulitzer, then engaged as the pioneers in the founding of a new American journalism appealing to wider circulation. If the writers of these histories had taken 5 minutes off to think, let alone to investigate, they would have known that the influence of these newspapers was confined almost exclusively to New York. In Benton Harbor and St. Joseph, Mich., we were fired with indignation just as hot as anywhere else in the United States. Our newspapers were the Press of St. Joseph, the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor, the Chicago Tribune, and the dailies from Detroit, Grand Rapids, and South Bend. Hearst and Pulitzer had no more to do with the state of our minds than the man in the moon. And if Senator Billy Mason was a gullible sap with Hearst and Pulitzer clapping him on I can only say that he was spokesman for the thoughts of the people of the Middle West and that they loved him for his stand.

As to the sinking of the *Maine*, the slant of most of the American histories I examined in the Congressional Library was decidedly anti-American and anti-Cuban. They suggest that the last persons in the world who could have done the dastardly deed were the Spanish. Now what were the facts: After the sinking of the *Maine* the Spanish Government made an alleged investigation and announced officially that the disaster had been occasioned by an explosion inside the *Maine*. This in effect was an accusation of carelessness, or worse, on the part of the crew of the *Maine*, most of whom had been killed. Years later the *Maine* was raised and when her keel was examined it was found that it had bent upward, thus definitely establishing that the *Maine* had been destroyed by a mine set off under her keel as she was lying apparently in a friendly harbor. I do not charge the Spanish Government with guilt because I always have been defense counsel and cannot countenance a finding of guilt without definite positive evidence beyond any reasonable doubt. But in my own mind I acquit the Cubans. That is borne out by all the evidence available. I think it is absurd to suggest that they engineered the blowing up of the *Maine*. I do not like this suggestion in any history book that is used in the schools of the United States. I fought in Cuba alongside Cuban soldiers. I would not permit, if I were the authority, to be used in our public schools an American history intimitating that the scoundrels who blew up the *Maine* were Cuban patriots. I do not think that is the way to promote and preserve the stout friendship that always should exist between the Republic of the United States and the Republic of Cuba. The sensible thing to do is to let the record stand where it is, without guessing and surmising on the part of historians. The Spanish claimed that it was an internal explosion; the evidence proved that it was not. Until there is new conclusive evidence, which it is doubtful ever will be produced, there must it end.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In my own district there is a Spanish War Veterans camp. It has a beautiful location down in the hill country of southeastern Oklahoma. If those old veterans were in their youth the victims of propaganda and were gullible they have certainly experienced a revolution, because they are the most substantial, solid group of people I have ever seen at one place at any one time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from the bottom of my heart for his contribution and tribute to the Spanish-American War veterans. They are a wonderful body of patriots.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a great privilege to yield to the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN].

HALF A CENTURY OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN PUERTO RICO SINCE THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the events which took place 55 years ago, and to which my distinguished colleague [Mr. O'HARA of Illinois] has made reference, had a tremendous significance for Puerto Rico—both for the 1,000,000 inhabitants the island had in 1898, and for the 2,200,000 inhabitants it has now.

The people of Puerto Rico in 1898 comprised a part of what remained of the once-powerful Spanish Empire, over which the sun never set. But many times before 1898, the sun had set on the Spanish empire. At the beginning of the 18th century, the European holdings of the Spanish Crown had been halved. During the first third of the 19th century, the Spanish empire retired from Florida, from Mexico—in those days this included California, Utah, Texas, and what is today the Republic of Mexico. It had retired in the new world all the way down to Patagonia.

In 1898, Cuba and Puerto Rico were the only remnants of this empire in the new world. Cuba had been fighting for 3 years in its endeavor to join the rest of the Spanish new world in the quest of freedom in independence. Little Puerto Rico, unable to resort to arms was endeavoring to attain freedom through constitutional means, for it was by no means realistic for 1,000,000 people born in the crossroads of the New World to live within the political regime whose capital was in the Old World.

The Spanish-American War was, therefore, no less significant for Puerto Rico because it was short. It severed the ties with Europe. It embarked them upon an American life.

More changes have taken place in Puerto Rico. By this, I do not mean alone a change from one sovereignty to another, nor the changes of a material nature having to do with the development of the island from an economic point of view. Far more profound and significant are the changes that have taken place in Puerto Rico in philosophy of life, in points of view, in the manner of thinking of the people. From a tradition of a monarchial system, Puerto Rico has evolved into a show-case of democracy within a republican form of government; Puerto Ricans have found a position of dignity for their public life within the United States political system under their own constitution, and within the federative association which has been created between the people of Puerto Rico and their fellow citizens of the mainland.

Many years elapsed before a workable approach was to be found in order to arrive at these results. Puerto Rico had been declared to be territory subject to United States sovereignty, but not a part of the United States in a constitutional sense. Two schools of thought developed which followed precedent and established usages. One would reason that since Puerto Rico was one of the many provinces of the Spanish Empire in the New World and since all the others became independent, the ultimate destiny of Puerto Rico should be independence as it was for the other provinces.

The other school of thought would reason that since all Territories of the United States are ultimately supposed to become States of the Union, the ultimate destiny of Puerto Rico must be to become a State of the Union. But in following these two schools of thought, the many difficulties to be overcome in either case were not given due consideration, and the years passed without noticeable progress being made in either direction.

By 1940, a new generation took the helm in Puerto Rico. It was composed of those who were born precisely by the time when the Spanish-American War took place. Its members had been educated and raised under the new regime. They were familiar with the United States since the beginning of their life. They were in a better position to weigh the factors involved in the question. They had a new approach. They went to work. Since 1940, Puerto Rico has made a new start. Its social, economic, educational, and political progress has been outstanding. Then Puerto Rico came to Congress with a new idea, and Congress accepted it.

Public Law 600 was enacted in 1950 in the nature of a compact. The compact between the people of Puerto Rico and the Government of the United States was completed with the acceptance of the terms of Public Law 600 by the people of Puerto Rico to whom it was submitted in referendum. Within the terms of this compact, the people of Puerto Rico created, with the adoption of a constitution of their own making the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was submitted to Congress for approval. Congress found that Puerto Rico had adopted its constitution within the basic terms of the compact, and with minor reservations in the way of stipulations to be accepted by the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico over which I had the honor to preside, Congress approved the constitution.

The Puerto Rico Constitutional Convention accepted the stipulations. The compact was perfected. And on July 25, 1952, the 54th anniversary of the land-

ing of General Miles' troops in the port of Guanica on the southern coast of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed. Puerto Rico attained the position of dignity which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represents.

The Constitution of the United States is not only a wise instrument of government, it is a dynamic instrument of government. I believe that a new dimension to the Constitution of the United States has been found. Perhaps this may become a valuable precedent in approaching similar problems of other areas not constitutionally incorporated but under United States sovereignty. There is no longer reason to limit ourselves to the concepts of statehood within the Union or incorporated Territorial government prior to admission into the Union. Here is a new concept—the concept of commonwealth status within terms of compact agreed to between the Congress and the people concerned. The terms of compact need not be the same in all cases. The formula yields itself to flexibility that it may be used in cases where the circumstances may not be identical. But it is based on the fundamental principle of American philosophy of government. It is government by the consent of the governed; it is government based upon the will of the people; it is government for free peoples; it is government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is a republican government built upon the theory of democracy; that is, the sovereignty of the people.

It can be said that, as in the case of its parent document, the Constitution of the United States, it is a dynamic formula. The terms of compact need not be static. With common consent, they may be adjusted with time to changes in circumstances.

Recently, the United States Government notified the United Nations of the fact that it would cease reporting on Puerto Rico as a nonself-governing territory. The people of Puerto Rico rejoiced at this announcement for they know they can no longer be classed amongst the nonself-governing peoples of the world. They are self-governing. It is indeed a fact to be proud of that when questions come up before the United Nations concerning encroachments by dictatorships over the freedom of other people, the United States may inform the United Nations that the United States, the champion of freedom in the world, in full agreement with the peoples over which it took responsibility half a century ago, has entered into a compact for continued union and for the common enjoyment of freedom and self-government which those peoples have enthusiastically accepted.

I wish to congratulate our colleague from Illinois, for having brought this question up before the House. We should all pay tribute to him as the only remaining Member of Congress who was one of those who risked his life in the Spanish-American War that these beautiful realities might ever come true. Without Americans like him 55 years ago, history would have been different.

Fifty-five years ago, the American people were suddenly awakened to the call of destiny by the reverberations of the *Maine* explosion. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] was one of those who answered the call which followed.

I was 3 years old when all this happened. I watched the American soldiers come into my little town of San Lorenzo to raise the American Flag. I now know there were only five soldiers. At the time, I thought it was a whole battalion. I made friends with the soldiers. In fact, the first English words I learned, I learned from them.

Little could I suspect then, there were other soldiers in distant Cuba, and amongst them some with whom I would have the honor to serve, half a century later, in this great Congress where the freedom of Cuba was proclaimed as a result of the Spanish-American War, and the birth of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was to be solemnly confirmed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the distinguished Commissioner from Puerto Rico and I congratulate him on the approval given to his great work here by the people of Puerto Rico in the elections of 1952, when I understand he received about 450,000 votes to his nearest opponent's 125,000. As a veteran of the war with Spain I am proud and happy that one of the fruits of that conflict is the American Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

When the United States acquired sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico as a result of the Spanish-American War, many thought that the United States was embarking on a policy of imperialism and world domination that would do away with, that would undermine our institutions and the spirit of freedom and democracy upon which they are based.

Fifty-five years have elapsed and there has occurred much to the contrary of what was then predicted by the critics of those days. As a result of the Spanish-American War, not only is Cuba independent, but the Philippines as well, and Puerto Rico has become a commonwealth under our flag, voluntarily united to the United States within the terms of compact which gives Puerto Rico freedom and security and the blessings of membership in a position of dignity within the political system of the United States.

We have no better friends in the Orient than the Filipinos; we have no more loyal fellow-citizens than the Puerto Ricans. For as it was bound to happen we used force only where and when force was necessary to remove the obstacles which lay in the path of our destiny, which destiny has always been that of being the champions of freedom.

One of the great heroic figures of the war with Spain was Capt. Richmond P. Hobson, later a Member of this Congress from Alabama. It is hard for this generation to picture in its mind the America of 1898. Spain was regarded as a great world power, and the Spanish fleet was feared. There was a real panic in New York, a panic somewhat similar to that which would obtain today if an atomic war were to come. Here was the fleet bottled up in Santiago Harbor, and it might escape. There was great concern.

A young naval officer appointed to the Academy from Alabama volunteered to sink a small vessel off the guns of Morro Castle to block the fleet in Santiago Harbor. He asked for volunteers to go with him. At that time, and I want you to think as they were thinking in 1898, that was regarded as certain death, that there was not a chance of escape alive for those who went with Hobson to sink that small vessel under the guns of Morro Castle. Yet, every man in the fleet volunteered to go with him. Seven volunteers were accepted. They went, they escaped death, and Hobson and his men became the heroes of America. Now when I find in these modern American histories that some of them are even omitting the name of Hobson and some of them, where they do mention it, do so begrudgingly I am very much distressed. Hobson personified the heroism and devotion to country of the America when the 19th century was nearing its close. The story of his heroic feat should live eternally. Today we have in this Chamber a colleague of ours who was born and raised in the town of which Hobson was a distinguished son. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

ADM. RICHARD PEARSON HOBSON, 1870–1937

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, our war with Spain, near the close of the last century, has been so overshadowed by more recent periodic world wars that we are in danger of losing sight of the significance of that short and victorious struggle.

The Spanish-American War served notice to the world that the United States of America was ready to take its place with the first-class powers. It proved the sectional antagonisms of a previous generation had so far subsided that North and South should vie with each other only in eagerness to fight under one flag and to die if need be for our united country.

One of the great popular heroes of that war was Lt.—later Rear Adm.—Richmond Pearson Hobson. As his hometown of Greensboro, Ala., happens also to be my hometown, and the district I now represent covers a portion of the district he once represented in Congress, it becomes my very happy privilege to place in the RECORD on this occasion a brief review of his career. In the following summary, I have recalled some of Hobson's deeds which demonstrate a zealous patriotism, a meticulous care in conception and planning, and an audacious boldness in execution that have seldom been equaled in naval warfare, and which brought popular acclaim to this heroic gentleman and great glory to his beloved country, including his native State of Alabama.

After attending private schools and Southern University in Greensboro, Hobson entered the United States Naval Academy and was graduated in 1889 as

the top man in his class. He then attended the French School of Naval Design in Paris where he graduated in 1893 with honors. Upon completion of his schooling, he was employed by the Navy in the construction of battleships and in conducting postgraduate courses at the United States Naval Academy for officers destined for similar responsibility.

When the war with Spain began Lieutenant Hobson was an assistant naval constructor. Afraid this assignment would keep him out of the conflict, young Hobson requested sea duty and was assigned to the fleet.

During the months of April and May 1898, the Atlantic coast cities were tense with apprehension. The exact whereabouts of Admiral Cervera's Spanish fleet were unknown and the Atlantic seaboard towns prepared to defend themselves from attack. Late in May dispatches arrived giving information that the Spanish Fleet had put into the harbor of Santiago, Cuba. With this news, ships of the United States Navy began to gather at Key West, Fla.

Realizing the entrance to Santiago Harbor was extremely narrow, Admiral William T. Sampson, who commanded the American Fleet, resolved upon a plan to block the entrance and thereby bottle up the Spanish Fleet. Because Lieutenant Hobson's plans for the piloting and sinking of a vessel across the entrance of the harbor were the most complete and practical of any submitted, he was given command of the *Merrimac* by Admiral Sampson and placed in charge of the dangerous operation. The *Merrimac*, a coal transporting vessel, was selected for sacrifice as a blockade because defective machinery impaired her usefulness.

Under Hobson's supervision, the *Merrimac* was stripped down and specially prepared torpedoes were placed where they would blow the bottom out of the hull when fired. The old boat was ready to end her days as a comparatively unknown collier and had become an illustrious name in American naval history.

Although it seemed unlikely that any would live to return, seven of many volunteers were selected by Hobson to help him man the doomed vessel. The brave crew set out on this heroic mission the night of June 2, 1898, but they were ordered back quickly when Admiral Sampson noticed that daylight was coming too soon.

In the foggy darkness of the following night, these seven men slowly eased the old *Merrimac* toward the harbor. Lieutenant Hobson was on the bridge. With him was first-class gunner's mate, George Charette. In his own story written shortly afterward, Lieutenant Hobson relates that he called out "Charette, lad, we are going to make it tonight. There is no power under heaven can keep us out of the channel."

As fog lifted and the moon shone brightly, an early attack was unexpected from the guns of the Spanish forts; but the *Merrimac* got within 500 yards of the entrance before firing began. Then a picket-boat to the left opened up with rapid-fire guns, aiming at the ship's rudder. The bigger guns of the fort sent a deluge of shot and shell down at the old collier. The *Merrimac* was nearing the narrow neck of the harbor where it could be most effectively blocked. But when the men tried to turn the ship across the channel there was no response. The steering gear was gone. They attempted to fire the torpedoes, but only two of the 10 exploded. The barrage from the forts had destroyed batteries and wiring on the others. Even the anchor chains were shot away and the ship drifted helplessly beyond the narrow neck where it might have choked the harbor.

Spanish mines or torpedoes finally sank the hulk and the brave men who had miraculously survived the heavy hail of steel and lead escaped from the sinking *Merrimac* to cling in the dark to a raft they had floated from the deck. The water was cold, but the men hung on with their heads below the edge of the raft until broad daylight, constantly wondering whether they would be discovered and shot in the dark by Spanish soldiers who prowled nearby in small boats.

With morning came a large steam launch to reconnoiter. Hoping there would be a responsible officer on board to whom they might surrender, Lieutenant Hobson hailed the launch and at once the Spanish soldiers leveled their rifles. The men in the water expected to be shot, but there was no volley. The aim was only precautionary. The men were rescued and later learned that the officer who helped Lieutenant Hobson into the launch was Admiral Cervera himself.

Hobson and his men were taken to Morro Castle and imprisoned. Later they were transferred to the city of Santiago. While held as prisoners, they were treated courteously and were recognized as brave and daring men by the Spaniards themselves, who even sent a small boat under a flag of truce to notify Admiral Sampson that Hobson and his men were all safe. In about a month these prisoners were exchanged.

It is highly complimentary to the sporting spirit of the American people that they never thought of judging Lieutenant Hobson on the basis of his success or failure to block the harbor, but solely on the effort he made. However, his heroic attempt to block the harbor was not the only deed for which he was acclaimed in connection with the Spanish-American War. It was Hobson who conceived the plan to cut out woodwork and other inflammable parts from the American ships to insure their safety in battle. This lack of foresight on the part of the Spaniards helped to destroy their fleet. As the Spanish Admiral Cervera later told Hobson, his men could not stick with their highly inflammable ships once they had been hit hard. "We had to jump into the sea or be burned up," Cervera remarked.

Before boarding the *Merrimac*, Hobson had carefully planned courses of future attacks against the Spaniards. He later quoted Admiral Sampson as saying he would have used those plans had the war been prolonged.

In view of Lieutenant Hobson's extraordinary heroism, President McKinley nominated him to be advanced to the rank of captain. This action was said to constitute the greatest material promotion as a recognition of gallantry in the history of the naval service. In 1933, 4 years before his death, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his exploit of 1898, and in 1934 Congress gave him the rank of rear admiral, retired.

It is a matter of strange interest that Admiral Hobson is remembered and honored for an attempt that was not entirely successful, while his later life is comparatively unknown, though in it he doubtless accomplished more for his country and its Navy than he did in the Spanish-American War.

He resigned from the Navy in 1903 for reasons of poor health and impaired eyesight. From 1907 to 1915 he served in Congress, representing the Sixth Alabama District. He was a strong advocate of American naval supremacy and of American leadership in the international peace movement. Rear Adm. Bradley A. Fiske wrote in a personal letter to Captain Hobson in 1934, just before Hobson was made rear admiral:

> As important and as gallant as were your services in the Spanish War, I think your putting through in Congress almost single-handed the legislation creating the Office of Chief of Naval Operations was the greatest service any individual has performed in a generation for the advancement of the Navy and defense of America.

While he was in Congress, Hobson was constantly concerned with plans for strengthening the Nation's defense and building up a strong navy. His speeches and other original material on national defense covered 100 solid pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was an outstanding orator, and a number of his fiery speeches to Congress later proved to have been remarkably prophetic.

Hobson was a leader in the prohibition movement, and after the eighteenth amendment was passed he launched a fight against the narcotic drug evil. The Biographical Directory of the American Congress states that he "organized the American Alcohol Education Association in 1921 and served as general secretary; organized the International Narcotic Education Association in 1923 and served as president; organized the World Conference on Narcotic Education in 1926 and served as secretary general and as chairman of the board of governors; founded the World Narcotic Defense Association in 1927, serving as president."

He was a natural-born fighter, an intelligent and intrepid fighter. His sudden death March 16, 1937, prevented his scheduled appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee to represent the Constitutional Democracy Association which was organized by Admiral Hobson and others to fight President Roosevelt's plan to readjust the Supreme Court.

Admiral Hobson, as is most fitting, is buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Though he no longer lives, the fight goes on against intemperance and drug addiction and tyranny and war. He has bequeathed us as a high legacy the causes for which he fought. They remain to challenge us.

I am impressed with what William Garrott Brown said of him in his The

Lower South in American History. After comparing Hobson to other American naval heroes, Decatur, Somers, and Cushing, Brown concludes:

To attempt a comparison of the four young heroes would be both useless and vain. Each measured his devotion by the poet's standard:

"Give all thou canst; high heaven neglects the lore
Of nicely calculated less and more."

But a longer retrospect would be equally appropriate. It might go back to the very beginnings of our national life; to Paul Jones and the *Bon Homme Richard;* to Washington himself on the icy Delaware. We need not stop even there. Our fancy wanders on to the beginnings of England's sea power, when the might of Spain was not cabined in blockaded harbors, but flaunted forth in armadas. Raleigh [sic] or Drake were as good a peg for a comparison as Cushing or Somers. It leads us even beyond history, into the legends and mythology of the north. For what was this at Santiago but the whole warfare of our race in little? What was it the watchers saw from the fleet but the immemorial ship that disappears into the unknown? What, but the young Siegfried entering the cave of the dragon? What, but Arthur passing into the dying day? To peer into the soul of this high-fortuned youth is to feel the higher mood of the race, in which all the wonders of our past have been wrought out. It is to lean upon the strength which shall fight the battles of this Republic so long as it survives and battles are to fight.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his eloquent remarks on one of the immortals of American heroism. He has made a profound impression on me in his maiden speech in this Chamber, and in that observation I am sure my colleagues would join.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for taking this time to bring to our attention the matter which is now before this body.

I spent a great many of my years as a teacher in the high schools, teaching social science, and particularly history. Before I came back to this honored body I was acquainted with a great many of the matters surrounding the Spanish-American War, and was particularly interested in many of the heroic instances of that war and what it meant, as far as the development of our Nation is concerned.

Almost immediately after the beginning of my service in this body I had the honor of helping to sponsor the passage of a bill which gave to the Puerto Rican people the right to write their own constitution. I was at the ceremonies last year which brought the constitution into being in San Juan, P. R. I could not help living history with those people at that time. One of the instances which I remember so vividly was when we went out to Fort El Moro, the old fort, and there, with the aid of our military, we saw the new flag of the Puerto Rican people go to the top of the flagpole at the historic old fort and fly for the remainder of the day alongside Old Glory. Governor Munos explained later that he had accomplished what a great many of the people, who live on that island but who would like to pull away from the Government of the United States, said they were going to accomplish; that is, the raising of the flag of Puerto Rico to the top of that particular flagpole. Yet it was done effectively and orderly under our sponsorship and under the leadership of their duly elected Governor and Commissioner; and, they still remain an integral part of the United States of America.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] that citizens of my State had no little part in the Spanish-American War which conflict really brought our country to its adulthood. We gave of our men, our youth at that time, and they served gloriously, not only in the Caribbean area but also in the Philippines. About 25 of our young men served with Col. Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders, and were present and did their part in that engagement which attracted so much publicity and patriotic emotions on the part of the American people. Our men suffered their casualties. Those fighters of 50 years ago have had their veterans organizations since then. We are proud of their service, military and civilian. Sometimes I think we pay all too little attention to the service of those who took an active part in this particular military era of our military experiences. I again say that what has taken place in Puerto Rico is perhaps one of the necessary and vital steps into our coming into a place of world leadership. We have given to the people of Puerto Rico a feeling that they are no longer what we have termed them heretofore—possessions of our country, but that they are really a part of our own American Government and our American way of life. I join with my colleague from Illinois in remembering with pride the courage and valor of our soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Spanish-American conflict; and, also, the services of those unsung patriots who have established a sound local government in the form of a new commonwealth for our citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] that perhaps no State in the Union had more active participation in the Spanish-American War in the combat zones, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific, than did the State of Colorado. There were at least 25 from Colorado in Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders. In the Philippines, Colorado soldiers were very prominent and wrote a brilliant page. That was followed in the years afterward when Gus Hartung and Rice Means from Colorado were among the fathers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to my good friend.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the Spanish-American War veterans, and those who fought in that conflict, founded the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the State of Colorado?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman is correct in that the Veterans of Foreign Wars was founded by the Spanish-American veterans who had served in the Cuban, the Philippine, and the Boxer campaigns. Originally, there were a number of organizations, including the Army of the Philippines of which Col. P. J. H. Farrell was commander in chief. Colorado veterans were the most active in the VFW, although Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York were also strong. Eventually all the groups were merged. Denver has the credit—and I know it is a distinction the people of Denver will always cherish—of being, in a sense, the birthplace of the VFW.

Mr. Speaker, I am closing my remarks on the occasion of this 55th anniversary observance of the sinking of the *Maine* by including a message from Ambassador Aurelio F. Concheso, delivered last evening at the *Maine* services of the United Spanish War Veterans of the District of Columbia. The Ambassador's address follows:

Mr. President, veterans of the Spanish-American War, ladies, and gentlemen, once again, in the incessant course of time, the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Cuban colony in Washington gather in this Capital of the United States to commemorate with religious fervor the tragic event of the battleship *Maine*, which was sunk in the harbor of Habana on the 15th of February in 1898, thereby sowing the seed of the common destiny of our two nations, because that episode so stirred the public opinion of this Nation that at the unanimous cry of "Remember the *Maine*" the illustrious Teddy Roosevelt was able to organize his Rough Riders, and entering the war against the metropolis, fought side by side with Cubans to conquer our longed-for independence.

From the middle of the 19th century, Cuba maintained in the hemisphere its indomitable will to be free and independent, as were her sister republic of the continent. In 1868 she initiated and fought the Ten Years War, in which victory did not crown the efforts of a nation that had shown a heroism far superior to that of any other nation on the earth. But the consciousness that had been aroused in the Cuban people to be independent did not weaken in the decade following the defeat of 1878.

Martí, as mentor of the new generation, and the centennial of whose birth we celebrate this year, together with Maceo, Gomez, and Calixto Garcia, as leaders of the Cuban hosts, declared the war of 1895. It was on this occasion that the sinking of the battleship *Maine* occurred, and the Government of the United States, obeying the generous mandate of the American Nation, declared war on Spain, to share with us the final struggle for independence; and it was at El Caney and at San Juan that these glorious veterans, here present, with their departed comrades and Cubans, sealed with their blood the final liberation of our country and the historical alliance of nations geographically neighbors—closer neighbors because of the indestructible solidarity of a common destiny which the succeeding years have made ever closer.

It is not strange, therefore, but a perfectly natural consequence, that in both the last wars which this great Nation has fought—in 1914 and in 1941—the Republic of Cuba has answered "Present," to face with you the same dangers you faced with us during the epoch of our liberation.

It is fitting that the organization of the United Spanish War Veterans continue, as it has since 1902, to recall the tragic sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and that Cubans and Americans—brothers by the generous blood of the sailors who sacrificed their lives in the magnificent triumph of right and justice—should gather at this religious ceremony.

Today more than ever, these ceremonies increase in vigor and perspective, and today more than ever, the democratic world needs such commemorations to make even more solid the spiritual ties that should unite nations, which by the design of history, are the trustees of western Christian culture, in a world agitated by the machinations of international communism which threatens to destroy democracy, liberty, and justice.

Peace eternal to the American sailors who gave their lives in holocaust for an ideal. Today, the present generations of both nations are vigilant to renew together, should it be necessary the supreme sacrifice for which they, the sailors of the battleship *Maine* surrendered their souls to their God.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given permission to extend their remarks at this point on the subject of the Spanish-American War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include as a part thereof a splendid address made by the Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, of Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., on yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I wish again to restate my feelings of sympthay that I have expressed previously here on the floor of the House not only for the courageous Lithuanians still under the thumb of Russian aggression, but for our own citizens of Lithuanian ancestry who feel so keenly the separation from their mother country because they can in no way communicate with their relatives and dear ones there.

Lithuanian-Americans, as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the Iron Curtain, will observe the day with fitting ceremonies, while Lithuanians in the homeland, completely shut off by the Iron Curtain, will silently and secretly join in observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the two world wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations. The cause of freedom was precious to her and her progress was remarkable. Today, Lithuania, as a nation, is being exterminated. Lithuania, together with other nations behind the Iron Curtain, is waging a great struggle against world-Communist expansion. Their freedom is not only for their own liberation but is a fight for freedom in the world.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit through which this small country had attained its independence, and it is the hope and prayer of all of us that Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the observance in Connecticut of this independence day of so much significance to the people of Lithuanian ancestry was held yesterday in the beautiful Bushnell Memorial Hall in our capital city of Hartford. In spite of a driving and splashing rain some 3,500 people from throughout Connecticut filled this auditorium joining in a commemorative program sponsored by the United Lithuanian Relief Fund Committee, consisting of a brilliant concert by the Lithuanian art ensemble "Ciurlionis" from Cleveland, directed by Alfonsas Mikulskis.

Just previous to the opening of the program, Attorney Frank Monchun introduced His Excellency, Lt. Gov. Edward N. Allen, who welcomed the audience to Hartford and expressed his official and personal greetings and those of Gov. John Lodge in appropriate words for the event.

Other remarks were made by United States Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, by my colleague in the House, the Honorable TOM DODD, and by me.

There then was presented a varied program of Lithuanian folk songs and dances by various ensembles of this large chorus dressed in multicolored, festive native costumes. The songs varied from sweet to happy to sad, and though the singers tried to show happiness on their faces, their songs reflected sad feelings in their hearts for those with whom their thoughts were on this day, for the Ciurlionis ensemble consists of recently displaced persons who have somehow escaped to freedom from their native Lithuania and have found refuge in our midst.

Their voices individually and in chorus sang out a plea for justice and freedom to their native Lithuania which today is being physically obliterated but their spirit and determination to once again have the freedom won in 1918 and which has been forcibly taken from them by the Soviets is strong.

During the intermission, the chairman presented a distinguished and forceful speaker—a great American who is tremendously interested in the plight of the people and the nation of Lithuania—and the thunderous applause given his remarks expressed the unanimity of agreement of the capacity audience. I refer to that eminent scholar, the Very Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, of Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., whose stirring address I include with my remarks and commend to every Member of this Congress with the plea that we join in all efforts to realize soon, full, complete independence of Lithuania and with it the restoration of the independence of all nations behind the Iron Curtain who seek freedom.

The address of Monsignor Balkunas follows:

LITHUANIA'S STATUS QUO IN 1953

Mr. Chairman, Governor Allen, Members of the Congress, Monsignor Ambot, members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to take this occasion to thank the President of the United States for his courageous stand in the message of the state of the Union in reference to the nonrecognition of any secret agreements of the previous governments with any other government concerning the status of any free people.

We American Lithuanians are pleased that the shameful agreements of Yalta and Potsdam will be repudiated. We do not have the secret texts of the agreements made at Yalta, but we do know that nine European nations with 100,000,000 inhabitants were subjugated by Soviet Russia. Add to this the few hundred millions of slaves of China, Manchuria, Mongolia, and North Korea and you have a perfect picture of Soviet Russia's victory over the free world.

At Yalta, Mr. Stalin was asked whether the Baltic States will have free elections. He answered that the people had already spoken and decided to join the Soviet Union. Of course he did not elaborate on the Soviet tanks, the secret police, the single Communist Party, and the farce elections. He did not mention the fact that Soviet Ministers abroad reported a 100 percent success in their elections, while the elections were still going on. The Ministers did not know that the elections were prolonged for another day, because of lack of interest by the populace. The results will never be known, because the ballots were destroyed.

Yalta's agreement was approved at Potsdam, when Eastern Prussia, called Little Lithuania, was granted to Russia. Let us briefly review the history of Russia's agreements with Lithuania, her occupation and annexation of the smaller republic.

I. SOVIET COMMITMENTS

1. Self-determination of Lithuania

By the act of February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian Council in Vilnius proclaimed the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian state. The constituent assembly was convened at Kaunas on May 15, 1920. Its first act was to ratify the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

The Bolshevik regime, which seized power in Russia in 1917, solemnly proclaimed its adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations, as expressed in President Woodrow Wilson's famous 14 points. This however, did not deter the rulers of the Soviet Union in 1919 from invading a large part of the territory of the Lithuanian state by armed forces.

2. Peace treaty

After the Lithuanian Army had repulsed the aggressor, a peace treaty was concluded in Moscow on July 12, 1920, between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Lithuania, article 1 of which reads as follows:

"In conformity with the declaration by the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republics, all peoples have the right to a free self-determination, including the right of complete secession from the State of which they were a part. Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory."

3. Treaty of nonaggression

On September 28, 1926, a treaty of nonaggression was signed in Moscow by the representatives of the Republic of Lithuania and those of the U. S. S. R. The pertinent articles of this treaty read as follows:

"Article 1: The treaty of peace concluded between Lithuania and Russia in Moscow on July 12, 1920, the dispositions of which maintain their validity and inviolability, remains the basis of the relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Lithuania.

"Article 2: The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually agree to respect their respective sovereignty and also their integrity and territorial inviolability in all circumstances.

"Article 3: Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any act of aggression whatsoever against the other party." (League of Nations; treaty series publication of treaties and international engagements registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, vol. 60, p. 153.)

Before the termination of the above-mentioned treaty, the Government of Moscow proposed to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania that the validity of this treaty be extended for another 10 years. This was done on April 4, 1934. The nonaggression treaty was extended until December 31, 1945.

4. Convention for the definition of the aggressor

On July 5, 1933, a convention for the definition of the aggressor was concluded in London between the Republic of Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. The U. S. S. R. and Lithuania agreed to recognize as the aggressor, in a conflict, that State which first committed one of the following acts:

1. Declaration of war on the other party.

2. Invasion by armed forces, even without declaration of war, of the territory of the other State.

3. No consideration of a political, military, economic or other order may serve as an excuse for or justification of aggression contemplated by article 2.

In the matter of nonaggression, the bilateral commitments and pledges of the Soviet Union with regard to Lithuania were explicit and precise. We are setting aside the multilateral international obligations of the Soviet Union on the same subject, resulting from the fact that (1) Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. adhered to the Pact of Paris (Briand-Kellogg pact) of 1928, and (2) both states were members of the League of Nations.

II. SOVIET DEEDS

1. Negotiations with France and Great Britain in Moscow, June–August 1939

When the deterioration of relations between the Third Reich and the western democracies was approaching its climax in 1939, Great Britain and France, in view of the new European situation created by increasing German aggression, attempted to arrive at a common policy with the Soviet Union. Mr. M. Litvinov's successor Mr. Molotov, Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R., proposed to the representatives of France and Great Britain that the Soviet Union extend protection and aid to the Baltic States, even in regard to indirect aggression. (See Gafencu Derniers Jours de l'Europe, Paris, 1944, pp. 219–235.)

All Soviet proposals of protection and aid were conditioned by the automatic principle of aid and assistance. This meant Soviet Russia's attainment of a free hand in the Baltic. This plan, aimed at the creation of prerequisites for the Soviet Russian invasion of Lithuania, was frustrated by the firm stand of Great Britain and France.

2. The Molotov-Ribbentrop secret pact of August 23, 1939, and September 28, 1939

While the discussions between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union were still in progress, Ribbentrop flew to Moscow. On August 23, 1939, 8 days before the attack on Poland by Hitler's armies, the U. S. S. R. and Germany concluded a treaty of nonaggression. On August 23 and September 28, of that year, secret protocols were added to this treaty and the boundary and friendship treaty of September 28, 1939. The texts of these secret agreements were published in 1948 by the Department of State of the United States of America. (Nazi-Soviet Relations, 1939–41.)

Following the defeat of Poland, new Soviet-German negotiations took place which resulted in the conclusion, on September 28–29, 1939, of a series of agreements. On the same day, a second secret agreement was signed amending certain provisions of the first. In these secret agreements Lithuania was given over to Russia.

These secret protocols alone constitute an explicit violation of all the treaties binding Soviet Russia and Lithuania and are acts of flagrant aggression by the Soviet Union against the Republic of Lithuania. All Soviet acts that followed the conclusion of these secret agreements were but an implementation of these agreements.

3. Treaty of Mutual Assistance and establishment of military bases in Lithuania, October 10, 1939

On September 27, 1939, Mr. Molotov expressed to the Minister Plenipotentiary of Lithuania in Moscow the desire to discuss some questions concerning the relations between the two states. On October 2, 1939, the Lithuanian delegation, headed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, left for Moscow. The negotiations were difficult and several crises arose. Wishing to preserve the neutrality and independence of Lithuania, her delegation resisted the demand of the Soviet Government that it sign the proposed Treaty of Mutual Assistance and allow the establishment of Soviet military bases in Lithuania. In the face of the Lithuanian refusal, Stalin resorted to an undisguised threat. He let it be understood that the problem posed was more serious than ever before.

With the beginning of the collapse of the European order, and before October 10, 1939, the Soviet Union concentrated its forces on the Lithuanian frontier. The pressure on the part of the Soviet Government became so great that the Government of Lithuania was forced to sign the Pact of Mutual Assistance which also provided for the establishment of Soviet military bases in Lithuania.

The preamble of the treaty once again reaffirmed the principle of respect of national independence and of noninterference in internal affairs and recalled the Treaty of Peace of 1920 and the Pact of Nonaggression of 1926 with its provisions for the peaceful solution of conflicts.

The Treaty of Mutual Assistance was the next perfidiously camouflaged act of Soviet treachery, aimed at the undermining of the independence of the Lithuanian state and the paving of the way for her absorption.

4. The Moscow quest for a pretext to invade Lithuania

From March 1940, world opinion was directed toward events of military nature. Hitler had begun his offensive against northern and western Europe. The forces of the great western powers were engaged against this offensive. Under these conditions, the Soviets could give free reign to their plans. A pretext had to be invented. This was done in the following manner:

(a) During April and May 1940, a fierce press and radio campaign against the small Baltic States and their "nonobservance of neutrality" was launched by Moscow.

(b) A desertion of Soviet soldiers from the military bases in Lithuania was staged.

(c) Further, Moscow accused Lithuania of having joined the Latvian-Estonian military alliance, which accusation did not correspond to facts.

(d) The Soviet agents in Lithuania themselves tried to foment strikes among the Lithuanian workers and technicians employed in the construction of barracks for the units of the Red Army.

In conformity with the fourth paragraph of the Mutual Assistance Pact, Lithuania was forced to accord the Soviet Union the right to establish garrisons in Lithuania, and the Soviet Union agreed to maintain them at their own expense. However, when the Lithuanian authorities asked the Soviet authorities to pay the expenses, the Soviet refused to pay them.

Such were the devious proceedings to prepare the invasion.

5. Soviet ultimatum of June 14, 1940, and the invasion of Lithuania by the armed forces of the Soviet Union

The final stage of the Soviet aggression against the Republic of Lithuania followed immediately. On June 14, 1940, at 11 p. m., several days after the Allied front in France had been pierced and Paris had surrendered, Mr. Molotov presented an ultimatum to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, repeating the above-mentioned allegations. He demanded the arrest of certain government officials, the formation of a new government, and free entry into Lithuania for the army of the Soviet Union.

The reply was to be given at 10:30 a. m., on June 15. But even before the expiration of this term, armored units of the Red army and cavalry divisions, 300,000 men in all, poured into Lithuania. The legal government of the Republic of Lithuania was dismissed and a new government composed chiefly of Moscow stooges was formed, the so-called elections for the Peoples Diet staged, and the incorporation into the Soviet Union performed on August 3, 1940, by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Possessing a very limited force, Lithuania alone was not in a position to resist forcibly the Soviet aggression. An appeal to the League of Nations was out of the question not only because of the political situation in existence at the time which had practically paralyzed the functioning of this international institution, but also because of the aggression against Finland the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics 6 months before, on December 14, 1939, was ousted from the League of Nations.

III. CONCLUSION

The facts related here speak for themselves. The contract between the written and verbal pledges of the Soviet Union and its deeds is alarming. What may tend to puzzle world opinion in the case of the Soviet aggression against Lithuania is the constant quest of the Moscow rulers to present an appearance of literal legality for their unjustifiable acts, and their constant practice of representing the victim of their own aggression as the aggressor. Besides the entirely false pretexts given above, the Moscow Government has shown a surprising flexibility in its justification of its aggression against the Republic of Lithuania: Reasons have been advanced concerning the security of the U. S. S. R.; the pretended political will of the people has been cited which found its expression in the so-called elections of the Peoples Parliament, organized under the bayonets of the Red army and the pistols of the agents of the NKVD. However, as soon as the Soviets were established in Lithuania, this subterfuge was no longer necessary. In Moscow on June 30, 1940, Mr. Molotov bluntly declared to Prof. Kreve-Mickevicius, Vice Premier of the Lithuanian puppet government, that "the traditional Russian policy, practiced since the days of Ivan the Terrible, necessitated the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union." And the Peoples Parliament, in the resolution addressed to Moscow frankly admitted that "Now the people, helped by the mighty Red army * * * have established in their country the Soviet Government. * * * If the people have been able to establish in their own country the only just order—the Soviet order—it is only thanks to the Soviet Union." I cannot clarify this more explicitly.

Please do not get a wrong impression. Lithuanians as such are not Communist-minded. Today, after 8 years of occupation, Lithuania has only 36,000 Communists (half of New York City's Communists), or only 1.5 percent of the whole population. Russia exiled to Siberia more than 600,000 Lithuanians. The persecution of the church still goes on. Annihilation of the nation is in full force. Lithuania morally is not subjugated.

We Americans of Lithuanian descent pledge ourselves to use every means to rectify the present injustice done to Lithuania. We know that our Government never recognized the annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union. We know that the cold war is fought with billions of American dollars and even with American lives in Korea. We know of the diplomatic duels of the Russian and American delegates at the United Nations. We recognize the import of the growing world opinion against communism and the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless this small nation, Lithuania, is suffering and dying for the four freedoms and for her national existence. Her resistance is active in the underground. And it is left to its own fate. Few more years and she may be obliterated. Time is getting very short. America and the free world must come to her aid.

Therefore let it be the will of this gathering: (a) To urge our Government to do everything in its power to bring the U. S. S. R. to the court of world opinion to explain its actions in violating all treaties made with Lithuania; (b) that the Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran secret agreements be abrogated; (c) to use the offices of the United Nations to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw its army, administration, and police from Lithuanian territory, thus to allow free elections and self-determination; (d) that the Soviet Government be prevailed upon to return to Lithuania the Lithuanians who were forcibly deported to the interior of Russia; (e) that the genocide convention be ratified by the United States; (f) to use all the facilities of the Voice of America and the Radio Free Europe for propaganda activities; (g) and, finally, that our Government again commit itself for freedom for all nations and especially the liberation of all the nations enslaved by Soviet Union.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Frank Goldman at the B'nai B'rith testimonial in memory of the late Adolph J. Sabath.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the congressional sponsored memorial services held here in Washington at the Hebrew Congregation on January 30 in memory for our late colleague, Adolph Sabath, of Illinois. It was a very beautiful service and the many fine tributes which were paid to our colleague, Adolph Sabath, were well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always miss Mr. Sabath. I never failed to receive help from him and his committee regarding a rule when I requested it. If it were at all possible for him to grant a rule he granted it. His kindness shall always live in my mind.

He always had a kindly greeting and extended a helping hand. I sometimes feel that here in the Congress we do not show during the lifetime of our Members our admiration and appreciation for what they do for us and what they do for America.

Mr. Frank Goldman, of Lowell, Mass., in my congressional district, the national president of B'nai B'rith, one of my close friends for many years, who is known throughout our country for his humanitarian work, gave the following truly inspiring eulogy:

EULOGY OF FRANK GOLDMAN, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE OF THE LATE ADOLPH SABATH

Some men are unforgettable; some lives are such rich examples of how full and good human existence can be that their memory is heartwarming and uplifting for all who come after them.

Such a man was Adolph Sabath and his life was such a life.

It was a long life filled with fruitful toil and blessed with 46 years of continuous service in the Congress of his country—longer than anyone before him in the history of our American House of Representatives. And yet, it is not the length of his life nor his unprecedented record of consecutive election victories that impresses us. It is rather the quality of his life and the quality of his service.

The Psalmist tells us that life is like a passing shadow. Our tradition assures us that this analogy has no relationship to the length of one's days but rather to the content of the memory one leaves behind. The shadow of some lives is the shadow of a bird in flight. It is quickly gone and almost meaningless. Other lives leave a shadow like that of a wall. It endures but it is comfortless and cold. But some lives leave shadows like that cast by a lovely tree. Beneficently, it shelters the wayfarer and is blessed by generations who experience the refreshment of its protection.

Our service tonight testifies to our belief that the shadow cast by Adolph Sabath's life belongs to the last category—that it will endure for blessing.

As a member of B'nai B'rith, Adolph Sabath leaves to our order a legacy of example, in a life that was marked by a high sense of loyalty, by integrity in public service and by genuine devotion to our threefold ideal of benevolence, brotherly love, and harmony.

As a Jew, he manifested not an empty pride of heritage but a will toward practical expression of the ideals of his faith. In his life as a legislator and as a humanitarian, he symbolized both the passion for justice and our tradition's great modifying factor of compassion—rachmonus—a profound sympathy for all his fellow men.

As an American, he exemplified the very qualities we cherish as being especially American—boldness of mind and venturesomeness of spirit, a passion for fair play and a devotion to living principles rather than to prejudices hallowed by unthinking practice.

Those who fully understand the quality of American democracy and the source of its strength will not find it strange that all these qualities should have coexisted in one who came to this country—a penniless immigrant from Bohemia—at the age of 15. Adolph Sabath arrived here alone and friendless—1 of 11 children he had had to earn his passage money by working on a farm and clerking in a store in the little Bohemian village in which he had been born—but he brought with him an unconquerable faith in the capacity of his adopted country to fulfill the promise of the American dream. America did not fail him and he did not fail America. He found a job in a Chicago sawmill and then laboring hard by day and studying diligently by night, he prepared himself for a legal career. He won a place on a magistrate's bench and then moved to a well-nigh permanent seat on a legislator's bench in the House of Representatives whose beloved dean he was to become.

Not only the American dream, but also the heritage of his fathers was given expression in that career, for it was marked by love of learning, love of people, and love of justice and freedom. Something of the poet Bialik's picture of the eternal student was reflected in the vision of this young man studying into the night learning the law that he would some day interpret and then help shape—and throughout his life he never flagged in his pursuit of truth and his devotion to education.

He loved people and they returned his love. His concern for the needs of human beings went beyond the boundaries of the congressional district which 24 times in succession elected him as its representative; it went beyond the boundaries of race, creed, or nationality. That love was expressed in his devotion to the American ideal of a democracy above the distinctions of color or religious belief. An immigrant himself who had arrived in this country in the very year in which the construction of the Statue of Liberty was begun, he strove throughout his legislative career to keep America's shores free for all who were worthy to come to them. There must have been special meaning for him in the familiar lines of Emma Lazarus, inscribed on the base of the statue and summarizing its great meaning.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
• • • • •
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

But no man, however dedicated, lives to see the fulfillment of all his hopes. Some of Adolph Sabath's dreams are still unfulfilled.

In his later years he witnessed the frustration of a cherished hope which had been generated and nourished by his lifelong love of freedom and justice. He longed to see the democracy to which he was devoted find roots in the Old World he had left. After World War I he was able to make a significant contribution to that dream by helping to bring about the establishment in his native land of an independent, democratic Czechoslovakia. For it was Adolph Sabath who had introduced Thomas Masaryk to President Wilson and had helped pave the way for their joint efforts.

Tragically, Sabath lived to see the destruction of liberty in Czechoslovakia when the Communist conspiracy seized power and dragged the land behind its Iron Curtain of ruthlessness and hate. The crowning irony is that Prague itself was to become the locale from which Communist anti-Jewish lies were first to lash out openly against Adolph Sabath's people.

It is not hard to feel that there is in Adolph Sabath's life a call to us to carry on—to uphold American democracy in all its fullness and to labor for the overthrow of tyranny and bigotry wherever they exist.

Sabath would not have given up the fight. In his 80th year he could not sit in the House and merely listen to debate. He himself told of an incident that had occurred when something about which he had a deep concern was being discussed: "I tried to sit still, but suddenly I found myself walking down to the well of the House to speak—against my will—absolutely." In this, too, he followed in the tradition of the Hebrew prophets who found that words on behalf of justice and truth were as a burning fire within them that could not be repressed.

A great and good man has the power to offer leadership not only in his lifetime, but also after his passing. Adolph Sabath's life will afford inspiration and direction to us for many years to come.

As it is said: "The memory of this righteous man will be for blessing."

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Eve-

ning Star celebrated its 100th anniversary. For 40 years or more I have read this great newspaper and would like to testify as to my belief that it tries to be absolutely accurate and always is if it has the facts. I know how anxiously I look for approval by the Evening Star of any measure in which I am interested. It has a very wide influence in this part of the country and has been noted for its integrity in connection with the dissemination of news during these last 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for this newspaper the best of luck and hope that it may continue to operate for hundreds of years longer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. McVEY) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

LOSS OF NATIONAL AIRLINES PLANE IN GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the proper committees of the Congress will start an immediate investigation of the crash in the Gulf of Mexico of the National Airlines plane Saturday afternoon which has apparently taken the lives of 46 people. The cause of the crash is unknown, although I have read newspaper accounts stating that the plane may have run into a tornado. The weather reporting facilities in the area, as far as I know, are quite adequate and it seems to me that if the weather was such this plane should have been grounded. I personally have flown this route on a number of occasions and several times I have been surprised at the type of weather that the planes were flying in.

My family and I have suffered a very severe loss as a result of this tragedy. Four of the finest citizens of New Orleans were aboard the ill-fated plane. They were Mrs. J. Cornelius Rathborne, Mr. and Mrs. John Morris Legendre, and Mr. Harry F. Stiles, Jr.

Mrs. Rathborne was a charming lady, a devoted mother and wife. Her friends were legion in New Orleans, Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D. C.

Many of you, particularly on the Republican side, will remember her vigorous fight in behalf of President Eisenhower at the Republican National Convention last summer. She will be greatly missed.

Mr. and Mrs. Legendre were likewise very active in the affairs of the city of New Orleans. Mr. Stiles was one of our leading attorneys, and contributed immeasurably to the advancement of our community.

People of equal prominence from all areas of our country were on the plane and while these investigations provide little consolation to the families and friends of those who have been lost, it is to be hoped that they contribute to the reduction of such disasters. We trust, Mr. Speaker, that the proper inquiry will be started at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois).

Mrs. HARDEN and to include an address by Hon. EDWARD H. REES.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include a talk on the subject "I Speak for Democracy."

Mr. BERRY and to include an article from the Wyoming Wool Grower.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON relative to Lithuania.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include an article.

Mr. LAIRD and to include a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois and include an editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. BONIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. REAMS in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. SPENCE and to include the final report of the Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $231.

Mr. RAYBURN and to include an address by Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson made in New York last Saturday.

Mr. COOPER and to include a press release which he will issue today on the bill, H. R. 1.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri and to include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech he delivered.

Mrs. KEE and to include two editorials.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCARTHY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI) in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. CRETELLA).

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include a telegram.

Mr. BENDER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter from the Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, regarding the Veterans' Administration and public health.

Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial.

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. McVEY) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE), until March 7, 1953, on account of necessary official business.

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), indefinitely, on account of illiness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

462. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $662,790 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

463. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual stockpile report, pursuant to section 4, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

464. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, together with pertinent recommendations for civil defense in our future national security structure, pursuant to section 406, Public Law 920 of the 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

465. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the 17th Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board covering the administration and operation for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report showing a claim paid by the Public Health Service during the calendar year 1952, pursuant to the Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the settlement of the claim of Clinton J. Riley, Jr., Port Clinton, Ohio, as owner of a livefish car and the contents thereof, by payment of $3,710; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

469. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 18th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; section 23 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, approved August 26, 1935; section 46 (a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940; section 216 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940; and section 3 of the act of April 25, 1949, amending the Bretton Woods Agreements Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

470. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3053. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 144. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3053, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3052. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3053. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3054. A bill to authorize the improvement of east basin, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 3055. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3056. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the 300th anniversary of the publication of The Compleat Angler, by Izaak Walton, whose name was chosen by the nationwide natural resource conservation society, the Izaak Walton League of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3057. A bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3058. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to previously excluded State and local employees of highway or road departments or commissions in Michigan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 3059. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3060. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONIN:

H. R. 3061. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3062. A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3063. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3064. A bill to increase the equipment allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3065. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to authorize insurance of loans and advances of credit made for the purpose of improving soil fertility, conservation, and land improvement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3066. A bill to provide naval assistance to the Republic of China in the augmentation of a naval establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3067. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3068. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of wife's, husband's, widow's, widower's, parent's, and mother's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3069. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to extend annuity benefits to employees at age 50 involuntarily separated from the service after having rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3070. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that amyotrophic lateral sclerosis developing a 10-percent degree of disability or more within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3071. A bill to amend section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the making and filing of elections; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3074. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 3075. A bill to authorize the city of St. Joseph, Mich., to use certain property heretofore conveyed to it by the United States as a public parking lot; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3076. A bill to require written opinions in all cases decided by United States courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3077. A bill to advance officers and enlisted men on the retired lists of the Armed Forces to the highest grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3078. A bill relating to the venue of actions for violations of the act entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct as a business expense the cost of providing care for children under 14 years of age if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3080. A bill to amend section 3115 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 3081. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to previously excluded State and local employees of highway or road departments or commissions in Michigan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 3082. A bill to exempt, in the case of certain veterans of World War I over 70 years of age, the income limitations restricting their right to receive nonservice disability pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3083. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of means of diverting water from the Red River to the Gulf of Mexico for flood control and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 3084. A bill to authorize the maintenance of certain works for navigation in Corpus Christi Bay area, Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3085. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3086. A bill to authorize the improvement of East Basin, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3087. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3088. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3089. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3090. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands and interests in lands for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3091. A bill to direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review reports on the Kentucky River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3092. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3093. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 3094. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, to make grants to States to assist distressed school districts in construction of urgently needed school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3095. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3096. A bill to assure an equity investment by mortgagors in military housing assisted under title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3097. A bill to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3098. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3099. A bill to encourage equity investments through extension of tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3100. A bill making an emergency authorization and appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Lake Charles, La., a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 3101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an additional month within which income-tax returns may be filed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3102. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in the case of certain fiscal-year taxpayers, that so much of a net operating loss as is properly allocable to 1948 may be carried over to the third succeeding taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3103. A bill to repeal the $75 work clause that applies to old-age and survivors insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3104. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, by reducing the age requirement for a widow's insurance annuity from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3105. A bill Pay-as-you-go Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 3106. A bill to provide that the income limitations contained in section 203 of the Social Security Act shall not apply during the remainder of the present national emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Sarah Louisa Rittenhouse in Montrose Park, District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution designating the 3d day of February in each year as Dorchester Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies and permanent location in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the persecution of Roman Catholics behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain secret agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval and condemnation of the Congress of the recent arrest and detention on spurious charges of nine eminent physicians by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of all similar instances of political and religious persecution by such Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. Res. 141. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Operation and Administration of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended by the Universal Military Training and Service Act of July 7, 1952, particularly with respect to the induction of physically defective persons; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 142. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the business practices of manufacturers and repairers of hearing aids and similar devices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 143. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Coral M. Home, widow of John D. Home, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to requesting an investigation by the Congress of the United States and to take such action as it deems necessary to implement the equipping of the Air National Guard units returning from active duty, and that the Air National Guard units be informed of the plans for the future equipping of the Air National Guard units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to legislation affecting Federal support for butter now before the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the enactment of suitable legislation to authorize and carry forward construction of the Devil Canyon Dam on the Susitna River, together with appurtenant power production and transmission facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 3107. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. A. 3108. A bill for the relief of Voula (Taloumis) Hatzikiayias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3110. A bill for the relief of Roy Sher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 3111. A bill for the relief of P. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomes Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Wendelin Schweitzer and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Hong and Ida Susan Wong, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Edward Workman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3115. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Scarcella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Makhavitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Belina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3118. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 3119. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha May Dykstra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3120. A bill for the relief of Zvonimir John Pifat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3121. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Jamil Bou-Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3122. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma de Sarmezey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Francesco Iurman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Haig, Zabelle, Louise, and John Gulbenkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahn and Suzanne Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Rosario Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3127. A bill for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn (nee Schipper), and Fella Borenstajn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3128. A bill for the relief of Masako Kato and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Henry Luis Gilbert Labayen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Angelo S. Philippas and Louis Philippas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Wesley Howard Leahy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Andreas Zapantis, also known as Andrew Zapantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Eleftheris P. Skoriopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lopez Aldama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Stephania Ziegler (Sister Benitia), Anna Hagel (Sister Klara), and Theresia Tuppinger (Sister Romana); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of M. Roman Decker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3140. A bill for the relief of John David Burk (Yutaka Iwao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Ami Kanagaki and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 3142. A bill for the relief of Waltraut Benteler LaMontagne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3143. A bill for the relief of Bayazit Tayhizian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3144. A bill for the relief of Elias Y. Richa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 3145. A bill for the relief of Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of commissioners of Tioga County, Pa., urging the Congress of the United States to amend the existing act of Congress so as to make the benefits of the Social Security Act available to any and all political subdivisions desirous of adopting the said plan for its officials and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

57. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Wisconsin, for the reopening of Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

58. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature requesting the Secretary of Defense to reactivate Camp McCoy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

59. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Local No. 223, Racine, Wis., expressing approval of the Government retaining rights in the offshore oil lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

60. Also, resolution of the National Licensed Beverage Association on the subject of reduction in the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as at noonday we pause at the footstool of Thy grace, our hearts are both bowed with awe and lifted up with hope. To a world where evil seems so rampant may our contribution be a life purged of self, of all impurity and hatred, moved by compassion and concern for all mankind. Amid pollution may our own motives be a part of the salt of the earth. In the darkness may our spirits be as the candle of the Lord, which no gloom can put out. May the great causes that will mold the future into the pattern of Thy desire and design, that will heal the world and rebuild it and usher in abiding peace, challenge the best that is in us and gain the supreme allegiance of our love and labor, as we serve our brief day. We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 16, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Breskin, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BRIEN McMAHON, LATE SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended to enable tributes to be paid to the life, character, and public service of Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the late Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON.

When a man dies his friends and colleagues immediately feel his loss in those positions of responsibility which he had occupied, and his true importance is strikingly brought to their attention by the necessity of finding someone else who can take up his work with something approaching his ability and devotion. After the first shock of personal loss when Senator MCMAHON passed away, probably most people said, "How can we ever fill BRIEN MCMAHON'S place in the program of the control and use of atomic energy?" The Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and his brilliant career as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy from its

establishment until his death—with the exception of one 2-year period—are lasting monuments to his work. There are very few men 48 years old—his age at the time of his death—who can point to such a substantial achievement.

But, in a sense, it is belittling to BRIEN MCMAHON to emphasize this achievement too much, because it may keep us from seeing what sort of a man he was as a whole, and we may not truly understand that his contribution to the atomic-energy program was only one very important element in his total effort to establish a policy of peace for the world. Instead of taking the simple and naive position that the United States had the atom bomb and that the threat of its use was sufficient to insure a permanently advantageous position for us in world affairs, he realized the implications of international rivalry in the field of atomic weapons, and devoted himself to reducing this rivalry as the supreme task in the area of a policy for world peace.

One editorial writer referred to BRIEN MCMAHON'S imaginative idealism and tough practicality, and these were the personal qualities that gave him the power to work for development of a great new weapon of warfare and, at the same time, to work for the creation of conditions in the world which would render this weapon useless. To appreciate BRIEN MCMAHON, we must understand both aspects of his work, and it seems to me that we are in some danger of overemphasizing the first, because it is more concrete and more dramatic, and that as a result we do not sufficiently recognize BRIEN MCMAHON'S role as a contributor to the programs of international cooperation and understanding designed to reduce the causes of international dissension and warfare. It is difficult to assess a man's life work when we are so close to it in point of time as we are to BRIEN MCMAHON'S, but there is a strong probability that his major contribution will seem to later historians to have been his leadership in the Congress in the movement to achieve a lasting peace, and that his role as a leader in the development of atomic energy will tend to assume a position of lesser importance.

There is not time today even to sketch the broad outlines of BRIEN MCMAHON'S efforts to prevent international dissension and to remove the causes of war. But one single act will illustrate his philosophy. On February 8, 1951, BRIEN MCMAHON made a 2-minute speech on this floor and introduced a resolution. The speech was a simple one; a lesser man probably would have felt that it was the occasion for drama and oratory. He opened with a few short paragraphs describing the then recent aggressions of the Soviet Union and its success in selling the idea that the United States is a warmongering nation while the Soviet Union wants peace. Particularly alarming was the Soviet program of telling the Russian people that the United States was determined to destroy them. BRIEN MCMAHON said, "It is within our power to correct the record, and I believe we should." To correct the record, he introduced the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, for himself and 22 of his fellow members, Republicans and Democrats. Of those 22, 20 are still Members of the Senate, and I think that BRIEN MCMAHON would prefer to have them remembered, too, on this occasion rather than having us think only of him. We must not forget the splendid support Members of the House of both political parties gave to the adoption of the resolution in the House.

The title of the resolution explained its purpose in simple language. It was called "A declaration of friendship from the American people to all other peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union." As amended by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the resolution was adopted without a rollcall vote in the Senate, early in May. The conference version was adopted in the Senate without a rollcall vote on June 18, and the House by a vote of 351 to 6 adopted the conference bill on June 26.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall add the text of this resolution, because I think that it constitutes one of BRIEN MCMAHON'S greatest contributions. That contribution consisted of a statesmanlike appreciation of the world situation, of the creative imagination to devise and propose a solution, and of the practical political skill to gain the almost unanimous agreement to the adoption of the proposed solution by the Members of the Congress. When we know that the proposal came from the man who was at the same time working with all his skill and power to produce atomic weapons it seems even more extraordinary, and it assumes even greater importance.

BRIEN MCMAHON said, on the day when he introduced the resolution, that "the prestige of the Congress of the United States is very great throughout the world, because it represents the American people. I believe adoption of this resolution will set forth the position of the United States in clear and unmistakable terms." And he then succeeded in making the resolution the formally accepted statment of our position.

I offer as a lasting memorial to BRIEN MCMAHON the Senate resolution declaring the friendship of the American people to all other peoples of the world. Instead of erecting a marble statue and placing wreaths upon it once a year, the Members of the Congress of the United States can do highest honor to its departed Member by working to make effective the philosophy expressed in the resolution which he proposed, and they adopted, as the statement of their own belief.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, adopted in 1951, reads:

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas in proof of this the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion"; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government, and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I very gladly and happily join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute today to the memory of my distinguished predecessor, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON.

When Senator MCMAHON met an untimely death last summer, cut off in his prime by an unsuspected and terrible disease, it brought sorrow and a sense of loss to thousands of people in Connecticut. In a comparatively short political career, his achievements were very great. As I said when the Senate convened last month, he was regarded by many as Connecticut's outstanding statesman of modern times.

The New York Times paid him a fine tribute in an editorial, following his death. I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEN MCMAHON did a lot, in a brief political career, to make the word politician a term of honor. He well knew how to get elected. In 1950, when Chester Bowles lost the Connecticut governorship to John Lodge by 17,000 votes, MCMAHON won reelection to the Senate by 44,593 votes. But once elected, MCMAHON turned naturally to jobs and causes that he believed would benefit his fellow citizens. As early as any man, he saw the necessity of a humane and vigorous foreign policy, which he visualized as a combination of firmness and friendliness. His proposals for world disarmament and a

global aid expenditure of $50 billions, his resolution expressing American good will toward other nations, the Russians included—these might seem visionary, but they caught the imagination of millions of Americans.

Senator McMAHON'S lasting monument may be his work on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. He fought with all his might to develop atomic fission as a defensive weapon, but he tried just as passionately to expand its constructive and healing uses. His heart was in this crusade, as everyone who heard him talk about it knew.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, BRIEN McMAHON'S memory will long endure. He will be remembered by the people of Connecticut, indeed, by the Nation, as an eminent leader in modern political life.

To Mrs. McMahon and to his young daughter, I extend deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

The people of Connecticut will be grateful that the United States Senate has set aside today for tributes to the memory of Senator BRIEN McMAHON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when Ellen Terry died, there appeared on the flyleaf of her Imitation of Christ the following:

No funeral gloom, my dears, when I am gone,
Corpse-gazings, tears, black raiment graveyard grimness;
Think of me as withdrawn into the dimness,
Yours still, you mine; remember all the best
Of our past moments, and forget the rest;
And so, to where I wait, come gently on.

She said further:

I should wish my children, relatives and friends to observe this when I die.

This wish was carried out.

Today we gather in memory of a colleague, BRIEN McMAHON, who has stepped in the journey that we all must take. In recounting his accomplishments, we strengthen ourselves. It is by thinking noble thoughts that we become noble.

It is rare indeed in Senate history that a man of such young years as BRIEN McMAHON came to occupy so important a position and to play so important a role in the work of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world. In 49 short years, BRIEN McMAHON was a judge, an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, a United States Senator, and the first chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The statute controlling this immense new power stands as a memorial to his effort. It was he who sensed from the very first when news came of the explosion at Hiroshima the ultimate meaning to mankind of this tremendous new weapon and of related weapons.

The problems with which BRIEN McMAHON wrestled in terms of preventing an atomic war, in terms of constructively utilizing this tremendous force for good, remain with us. All of us who knew him are aware of the contributions he made in this field of human endeavor.

Mr. President, I had a keen admiration for the man, for his ability, his talents, his eloquence, his sincerity. When I think of BRIEN McMAHON, a picture comes to mind. It is that of a gentleman. He possessed the qualities that truly constitute a gentleman. It was my good fortune to serve with him on the Foreign Relations Committee, to travel with him abroad, to visit with him in his home, and I became very fond of him. Between us there existed a tie of understanding and friendship.

As a Senator, he was consecrated to his work. I know of instances when he turned down sizable legal fees because he felt that to take the case would be inconsistent with his duties as a Senator. Those who obey the little voice of conscience within cannot stray very far from the great highway of right. That was BRIEN McMAHON.

What we admire in men are the ordinary virtues. I remember that as a young man I was told that there were four tests of character. First, the home test—how a man treats those with whom he lives. Second, the business test or official test—how a man conducts himself toward his customers and employees. Third, the social test—how a man acts toward those who do not enjoy the same social advantages. And fourth, the success test—how a man behaves himself when favorable circumstances bring him wealth, power, position, and honor. BRIEN McMAHON measured high in all these character tests. At home he was gentle and considerate; likewise he acted toward his fellow Senators and his constituents and his employees and others; and toward those who did not enjoy the same advantages or who had not succeeded as he had he was always the gentleman—the considerate gentleman.

He was a man of integrity. He had a fine legal mind, and in his service as a Senator he contributed much in the various fields of his activity.

There was a cheerfulness about him. He had developed a cheerful mood—a sense of humor. He always appreciated a good joke and usually had one at the tip of his tongue. He was a man who lived pretty much his own life in his own way—a reader, a thoughtful man.

There was an innate generosity about this man. I remember discussing with him at one time the different approaches—the liberal and the conservative approaches of Members of the Senate. By "liberal," I do not mean the way to the left approach, and by "conservative," I do not mean the way to the right approach. He brought out in his discussion the significant fact that it was well that there were these differences; that it was in the exchange of ideas, like flint striking flint, that the atmosphere was clarified. While this was his attitude, with St. Augustine, he felt: "Let others wrangle. I wonder." Brien was tolerant. He felt that to be sure one is always right is conceit. He always conceded the right of opposition views to others. He was a growing soul, one who would accomplish much. We shall miss him, but we know that he has gone on to his reward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are men who play a vital role in history, men who measure up to the needs of the day, men who seek to shape great forces instead of yielding to them. Such was our dearly beloved colleague and friend—the late BRIEN McMAHON.

BRIEN McMAHON was one who had a profound insight into the great tragedy of our times. He foresaw at an early date the catastrophe that could result when the terrible power of modern science was placed in the hands of the 20th century barbarians.

His fighting Irish spirit refused to quail before this awesome prospect. He saw the need for action and he was equal to the need. I can think of no better epitaph for any man.

BRIEN McMAHON has gone to his richly deserved rest and we are the poorer for his leaving. But he has left behind monuments which will stand long after statues of marble have crumbled to dust and tablets of bronze have corroded beyond recognition.

There is the Atomic Energy Act—the first rational attempt by mankind to control the elemental forces which may yet destroy our world.

There was his fight for peace with honor and his ideas stirred millions of people wearied with incessant war.

And finally, there was his warm, genial personality which endeared him to the hearts of his colleagues and the memory of which will remain with us for the rest of our lives.

Those of us who served with BRIEN McMAHON and could count him as a friend are doubly fortunate. Our lives were enriched by his very human, very generous presence, and our horizons were broadened by contact with a man who had a vision of the future.

To his grieving wife and daughter goes our deepest sympathy. To the American people whom he served so well goes our pledge to carry on in his tradition of humanity.

We have many grave problems and great tasks before us. We will be strengthened in our labors by the memory of one of the big men of our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point, several editorials appearing in newspapers throughout the Nation at the time of Senator McMAHON'S passing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN McMAHON

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which justly bears his name, stands as an enduring monument to the memory of BRIEN McMAHON. Like its author, the act is a compound of imaginative idealism and tough practicality. No single piece of legislation in modern times has been so freighted with meaning for the security of the United States.

Improvised to meet a major change in the nature of man's environment, the Atomic Energy Act introduced new concepts of governmental activity and extended governmental control into unprecedented areas. As chairman of the Senate committee which wrote the law, Senator McMAHON was a leader in the vital effort to transfer control of the tremendous new force from military to civilian hands. Later, as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he became the overseer—and the protector—of the civilian commission he had helped to create.

BRIEN McMAHON was as resourceful and realistic a political in-fighter as any man in the United States Senate. His skill manifested itself in securing civilian supremacy over atomic energy, in safeguarding the

fledgling Atomic Energy Commission from such extravagant attacks upon it as that launched by Senator HICKENLOOPER in 1949, in his insistence that the Commission repair some of the shortcomings that made it peculiarly vulnerable to criticism. The corollary idealism of his personality manifested itself in the daring disarmament proposals he put forward on several occasions. He recognized the terrible and tragic implications of atomic rivalry and sought, without ignoring in any way the essential considerations of national safety, to avert this rivalry by having the United States devote the immense sums it would entail to a program of world economic rehabilitation. The world, unhappily, was not yet ready to embrace so utopian a scheme.

As an official of the Department of Justice and later as a United States Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON was a stanch New Dealer—a consistent supporter of international cooperation and of domestic welfare programs. During the MacArthur hearings, he teamed with Senator MORSE to become one of the best-informed men on Pacific problems and proved of invaluable assistance in keeping the record straight. No small part of the devoted service he rendered to the Roosevelt and Truman administrations was to set realistic boundaries to their political aspirations, he had an earthy sense of what could actually be accomplished in the Senate. The idealists had reason to be grateful to him for it. He will be missed, and painfully, for his personal as well as his political virtues—for the mordancy and good humor and acid rationality he brought to debate and for the affectionate warmth that infused his human relations.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who died yesterday at 48, was one of the first Members of Congress to recognize the tremendous significance of atomic energy—both in warfare and in peaceful uses.

He was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has done a singularly competent job of leading the way in the development of this complex new servant of mankind.

He led the fight for civilian control of atomic power and handled the necessarily confidential phases with finesse and good sense.

His death from cancer is the more tragic because it is in the field of atomic energy, where Senator MCMAHON exercised so much vision, that some of the most hopeful research has been done on that dread disease.

[The Washington Evening Star of July 29, 1952]

SENATOR MCMAHON

No other Member of Congress, few Americans anywhere, knew as much about the atom as Senator BRIEN MCMAHON. Having looked into it with the greatest care, he was filled with such awe by its preternatural power, and by its capacity for either enormous good or enormous evil, that he became a man intensely and almost mystically dedicated to the task of controlling it for the sake of all humanity.

In 1944, when Connecticut first elected him to the United States Senate, Mr. MCMAHON was happily free of catastrophe visions. At that time, he was best known for having done a first-class job as head of the Justice Department's criminal division—a post from which he had resigned in 1939 to establish a successful private law practice. As a senatorial newcomer he was primarily interested in representing his constituency and advancing the cause of the Democratic Party according to the usual rules of politics. But then, in 1945, there came the atomic shattering of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and from that point on his overriding concern was to harness the tremendous new force for constructive purposes—above all, to keep it from destroying civilization.

Although then only a freshman Member, Mr. MCMAHON, because of the initiative he had taken in the matter, was named chairman of the special atomic committee that the Senate created in the 79th Congress. Later, during the Republican 80th Congress, the committee was expanded into a joint body representing both Houses, and he was its leading Democrat, becoming its head after his party rewon congressional control in 1948. Throughout all of these postwar years he was undeniably Capitol Hill's Mr. Atom—author of the unprecedented law establishing civilian rule over our gigantic nuclear-energy program; chief watchdog for the public in a field necessarily surrounded by a high, thick wall of secrecy; constant prod against lethargy in building up our A-weapons arsenal; and an eloquent advocate of world control to put an end to by far the deadliest armaments race in the history of mankind.

The longer Mr. MCMAHON lived with the atom, and the more he learned about the A-weapons being developed and about progress toward the indescribably destructive hydrogen bomb, the greater became his sense of urgency. His visions of catastrophe grew out of the hard and portentous facts made available to him, and on the basis of those facts he gave voice to impassioned appeals for special new efforts to persuade Soviet Russia to agree to a genuinely effective control plan. At the same time, aware that the Kremlin would be unresponsive as long as our own strength was deficient, he delivered equally impassioned appeals for a vast expansion of our atomic program to equip our Army, Navy, and Air Force with firepower far more revolutionary and far deadlier than any heretofore known.

It was not given to Mr. MCMAHON—dead now in his 48th year—to carry on with the work he regarded as a high mission. But if ever there is real atomic control, or if American strength in A-weapons and H-weapons is developed to a point formidable enough to make the Kremlin forswear aggression, a large measure of credit will be owing to him. And if the day comes when nuclear science succeeds in conquering diseases of the type that has conquered him, he will deserve some credit for that, too. The Nation—together with the world at large, for that matter—has lost one of its finer citizens.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

When the first atomic bomb fell over Japan, BRIEN MCMAHON was a freshman Senator, and a young man as age in that august body is counted. He might have been expected to share with almost everyone else the first shock of wonder, and then to leave to men older and assumedly wiser than himself the task of dealing with the new force. Instead, Senator MCMAHON, perhaps seeing more clearly than others the immense issues involved, perhaps seeing in this field his own mission and opportunity, stepped confidently forward and took up the role of leader. He studied everything available on atomic fission. He made constructive proposals for keeping the vast, unpredictable development in civilian hands. When the Atomic Energy Act was framed, it bore his name, and he continued as the hardworking and boldly imaginative chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

His major preoccupation, through the years that ended with yesterday's untimely death, was to insure that man's new discovery should be used for good, and not wholly for destructive purposes. He could be, of course, a shrewd politician. He was a faithful partisan of the Democratic cause. His last illness removed him from the ranks of presidential candidates as Connecticut's favorite son, and he might well have figured with increasing prominence on the national scene. Yet throughout it was the promise and peril of the atom that enlisted his best efforts and showed his real stature. "The controlled splitting of the atom," he wrote, "has brought a new age into being. This new age requires new understanding, new conceptions, and new answers." He himself tried to supply that understanding and those answers. Some of his schemes were beyond the realm of practical possibilities, like his proposal for a 5-year, $50 billion Marshall plan which was to include Russia. Nevertheless, he thought in large terms about a large problem—the largest, unquestionably, that mankind has faced since it started on the long pursuit of science.

Others will carry on the leadership which BRIEN MCMAHON inaugurated in this field. They will walk the more surely because of what he did, and they will think the more clearly because of his effective vision.

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1952]

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

BRIEN MCMAHON did a lot in a brief political career to make the word "politican" a term of honor. He well knew how to get elected. In 1950, when Chester Bowles lost the Connecticut governorship to John Lodge by 17,000 votes, MCMAHON won reelection to the Senate by 44,593 votes. But once elected MCMAHON turned naturally to jobs and causes that he believed would benefit his fellow citizens. As early as any man he saw the necessity of a humane and vigorous foreign policy, which he visualized as a combination of firmness and friendliness. His proposals for world disarmament and a global aid expenditure of $50 billion, his resolution expressing American good will toward other nations, the Russians included—these might seem visionary, but they caught the imaginations of millions of Americans.

Senator MCMAHON'S lasting monument may be his work on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. He fought with all his might to develop atomic fission as a defensive weapon, but he tried just as passionately to expand its constructive and healing uses. His heart was in this crusade, as everyone who heard him talk about it knew.

If he had lived he would have been 49 years old next October. Full of physical and mental energy, never ill until a few weeks ago, he seemed to have many years of high usefulness before him. The news of his death brings sorrow and a sense of loss to all who knew him or followed his career.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

The death of BRIEN MCMAHON at the age of 48 is a loss to the country. Senator MCMAHON had pioneered in one of the great governmental problems of our time. He had led in the effort to integrate atomic energy into the American constitutional system. He would have been the last to argue that the integration was complete or perfect, but he had helped lay out a series of ground rules which unquestionably point in the right way.

The terms of the problem were as simple as they were awful. Here was ultimate physical power reduced at last to human manipulation. It went without saying that a force so boundless was too big to be committed to private exploitation. But it went without saying, too, that a raw Government monopoly of this power would be a threat to liberty.

The tug as between private and Government control of atomic energy was not all there was to the problem. Once it was decided that Government should have the key role, the question arose, which branches of the Government? In its first dreadful manifestations atomic energy had been a military weapon. Not unnaturally, military men wanted to keep a firm control on this all but absolute weapons.

But if unmoderated Government control of atomic energy was against the long instinct and tradition of our kind of people and our kind of government, control by the military branch of the Government was even more so. What had to be worked out was a supple and yet firm harmony of principles by which atomic energy could be controlled and developed without damage to the people's liberty, their ancient and peremptory instinct for civilian control or their right to know in the broad what was going on.

These were the objectives of Senator McMAHON's McMahon Act for the control of atomic energy. The core of the act was the provision for a joint congressional committee which would supervise and superintend the overall work of the Atomic Energy Commission. In this commission work, in turn, there was provision for military participation and for contracting to private enterprisers. The result has been by no means all that is desired, but it has been less bad than many feared, and the prospect is at least hopeful. For these things the country will remember Senator BRIEN MCMAHON.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald of July 28, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

Connecticut's senior United States Senator, BRIEN MCMAHON died this morning. The man who would have been 49 years old on October 6 had served his State and Nation with distinction and his name had become legend the world over because of his knowledge and direction of the use of atomic energy in the United States.

All Connecticut, regardless of party affiliations, race, creed, or color, will mourn the young BRIEN MCMAHON who had so ably and conscientiously represented the Nutmeg State in the councils of state. He had gained the respect, admiration and love of his fellow citizens in Connecticut by his unswerving devotion to duty.

BRIEN MCMAHON was born in Norwalk in 1903 of moderately well-to-do parents. A lawyer, who had graduated from Fordham and Yale Law School, BRIEN MCMAHON went to Washington in 1933 as a member of the Department of Justice. He resigned in 1939 and returned to Norwalk where he resumed his law practice.

He was successful in his quest for election as United States Senator in 1944 and was reelected in 1950. On ordinary legislation BRIEN MCMAHON was a Democrat all the way, but on the subject of atomic legislation he had but one burning purpose—the utilization of this great power in the interests of peace and the common people of the world.

Naturally Connecticut feels that it has lost a great citizen but the Nation and the peace-loving nations of the world know full well that they too have lost an outstanding advocate. He died in service, service to humanity. He was a young man, too young to die, but the ways of fate are inexplicable. May he rest in peace.

[From the Hartford Courant of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

It is ironical that Senator MCMAHON should reach the height of his political career, nomination for the Presidency, just before he died. Perhaps he was destined never to be more than a favorite son. Yet this man cut off in mid-career yesterday was more than just another Senator.

It was easy to dismiss BRIEN MCMAHON, in jest or in the heat of political argument, as one who had a monopoly of atomic energy. Everybody is in favor of the atom, so here is some ready-made political capital. But, as death makes the controversies of this life fall away, BRIEN MCMAHON stands revealed as a man of greater stature than a political manipulator of the atom. The reason he won the unusual honor of being made chairman of a Senate committee, while only a freshman Senator, was that he was more sensitive than others to the need for doing something about the fact that the power of the atom had been released. As he said in a later Senate speech, "The clock is ticking, ticking, ticking, * * * and with each swing of the pendulum the time to save civilization grows shorter." Atomic bombs "might incincerate 50 million Americans in the space of minutes."

That is still as true as when he said it. But most of us merely shrugged our shoulders, saying that the power of the atom was something too big for us. Senator MCMAHON made it his business to do something about it. That is what got him the committee chairmanship. And in that position he did more than any other man to make sure that, in the transition from war to peace, control of atomic energy went into civilian hands. There was much pressure the other way.

Throughout his Senate career his accent was on peace. He urged ever more appropriations for atomic development, knowing that to survive this country must keep up its atomic power. Yet he also knew that even this, in the long run, meant only another futile arms race. Hence, his other gestures toward peace. One was the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution of a year and a half ago, designed to force on the Russian people, despite their government, an awareness of the friendship for the people of Russia by the people of the United States. Hence too, his dramatic plan, a year earlier, for what amounted to a worldwide $50 billion Marshall plan, if other nations, including Russia, would likewise cut their arms expenditures.

Nothing much came of either of these ideas. They were approved and endorsed, yes. But they set off no wave of response. Perhaps that means only that most of us were not able to see as far as BRIEN MCMAHON.

[From the Middletown Press of July 29, 1952]

BRIEN MCMAHON

United States Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, 48, died in Washington yesterday of cancer of the lung. His untimely passing brought forth sincere expressions of grief from men and women of all races and creeds, and from Republicans as well as Democrats. A native of Norwalk and the son of a successful contractor, BRIEN early made his mark in the Department of Justice, and shortly after his election to the United States Senate he rose to international eminence by his instant realization of the tremendous importance of atomic energy. In the Congress he became the chief exponent of legislation affecting the A-bomb, and although only a freshman Member, the Senate departed from long-established custom when it appointed him chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This followed passage by the Congress of legislation he proposed putting the development of atomic energy into civilian hands.

Although best known for his studies and public utterances on matters pertaining to atomic energy and the A-bomb, Senator MCMAHON was an influential member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and as such was prominently identified with legislation designed to prevent another world war.

Two years ago he proposed a world disarmament program and a $50 billion global aid project, which he predicted would ultimately save the country billions of dollars. The Korean war put an end to the project so far as early congressional approval was concerned, but the Connecticut lawmaker did succeed in having Congress pass a resolution last year expressing the friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the Russians.

Mr. MCMAHON was first elected to the Senate in 1944, and was reelected in 1950 by a large majority. His campaign at that time, which he conducted apart from that of former Governor Bowles, was masterly in its inception and execution.

Last year Wesleyan University recognized his contributions to his country and his efforts for world peace by conferring upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. It chose him to make the commencement address. Previously his own alma mater, Fordham, had conferred the same honorary degree upon him.

The Senator was a lifelong Democrat, a devoted Roman Catholic, and is survived by a widow and one daughter. He was Connecticut's favorite son candidate for the Presidential nomination at last week's Chicago convention, but sent a letter of withdrawal before the balloting began. However, Connecticut's delegation, of which John J. Tynan of this city, long a friend and admirer, was a member, declined to accept his withdrawal, casting their whole vote for him on the first ballot.

In his passing Connecticut has lost an able and distinguished citizen and the country a forceful leader in a field that bids fair to have a most persuasive influence on the world in the years to come.

[From the Des Moines Register of July 29, 1952]

THE SENATE LOSES A BOLD SPIRIT

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON's untimely death at 48 leaves a real gap in Congress. Much of the criticism of our foreign policy in Congress is negative and obstructive. But MCMAHON was always coming up with bold, imaginative proposals to break the vicious circle of cold war and atomic arms race.

One of these bold McMahon proposals became the law of the land—the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. He was just a freshman Senator when the awful fact of the nuclear fission bomb was sprung on the world. The administration, its chief scientific advisers, and the committee chairmen in Congress were all set to put through a bill giving the military permanent control of the frightful weapon.

MCMAHON was of the administration party, and had served in the Justice Department from 1933 to 1939. Yet he heard the cry of the younger nuclear physicists, and put himself at the head of the movement to block the administration bill and establish civilian control of the atom.

His intellectual leadership won him the post of chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, whenever his party was in power. And under him, the United States Atomic Energy Commission put its major reliance on the security of achievement—and still did better than the military had done with security by concealment.

None of Senator MCMAHON's more recent proposals became reality. Perhaps some of them were naive. But all our present habits of thinking are sufficiently dubious and dangerous in an atomic age so that it is a real public service to challenge them from time to time with imaginative alternatives.

America will miss BRIEN MCMAHON.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 29, 1952]

SENATOR MCMAHON'S DILEMMA

BRIEN MCMAHON's dilemma was that of many another man of good will in a world in which good will sometimes seems terribly rare. He was confronted by the awesome potentialities of atomic power. He wanted this power applied for the betterment of

the human lot; yet he knew that it had been released only in war and that it had to be hoarded for perhaps a more terrible conflict.

The Connecticut Senator did not, however, succumb to frustration or beat a retreat from the realities of life. As chairman of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, he strongly supported the creation of an American stockpile of atomic bombs. His hope was that the possession of this weapon might deter aggression; if not, it would be available against the aggressor.

Senator McMAHON did not confuse causes and results. He knew that the roots of war were not in atomic power, but in the minds of men. Men could use it for good or ill. That is why he proposed to the United States, to Russia, and all other nations that they reduce their expenditures on arms and use the money so saved in a great, worldwide attack on poverty and disease.

This humane challenge still stands unaccepted. Maybe it never will be accepted. What you think depends on your view of the perfectibility of men and of nations. Maybe ambition and avarice, self-righteousness, and hate run so strongly against what is noble and compassionate that the ideal of peace on earth will always be on the far side of the farthest hill. Or it may be that sometime men like Senator McMAHON will have their way on the earth.

[From the Greenwich Time and Press of July 29, 1952]

SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON

The untimely death of United States Senator BRIEN McMAHON came as a severe shock to the people of Connecticut. Connecticut's senior Senator, able and possessing qualities of statesmanship, was the victim of a malignant disease which cut him down in the prime of life at 48 and abruptly ended a career of public service that appeared headed for even greater heights than he had already achieved.

Senator McMAHON was held high in the esteem of his neighbors in Connecticut. Politically speaking, he was one of the most popular political figures in the State. Strong with the members of his own Democratic Party, of which he was the top leader, he had amazing appeal for those in the opposite party. In his last election he carried the State by more than 40,000 votes, attesting to the support he enjoyed among Republicans.

Senator McMAHON'S career was meteoric. A native of neighboring Norwalk, he made a name for himself in the Department of Justice in the early formative years of the Roosevelt New Deal, as a protege of Greenwich's former United States Attorney General Homer S. Cummings.

As senior United States Senator from Connecticut, he swiftly carved out a niche for himself in the United States Senate and because of his early and intense interest in the field of atomic energy, he became one of the outstanding civil authorities on the subject.

Ironically, Senator McMAHON was widely regarded as a possibility for the vice presidential nomination on the Democratic ticket. Whether that could have been accomplished or not in the atmosphere of the recent Democratic convention in Chicago will never be known. While the Democrats were selecting their ticket, Senator McMAHON was at death's door in a Georgetown hospital.

Those who knew BRIEN McMAHON intimately knew him as a warm friend. They respected him as an able, conscientious, dedicated public servant. Although they may have disagreed with him at times, although they took an opposite view politically, they knew him to be an outstanding Senator and a personable individual.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the record? Unfortunately, I have a commitment which I must meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The Senate adopted a resolution providing that all legislative business of the Senate be suspended until tributes have been paid to the memory of Senator McMAHON.

Mr. THYE. That is why I am asking unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make the insertion at this time. I have a committee commitment which I must meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. I do not believe the Senate should act on legislative matters at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the request of the Senator from Minnesota relates to the proceedings now taking place in memory of Senator McMAHON.

Mr. THYE. No; it does not. It relates to a concurrent resolution. However, in view of objection, I shall return to the floor at a later time and then make my request for unanimous consent. I am sorry for the interruption.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very proud indeed to have the opportunity of paying tribute to my dear friend and colleague who passed away last July while in the prime of his life, the senior Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN McMAHON. There was no Member of the Senate for whom I had greater admiration and affection. All of us gratefully recall his courage, his honesty, his kindness, and his devotion to duty. He remained steadfast to the very last to his conscience and to his great responsibilities. His services to his country were so great that they cannot possibly be recounted in a short address today, and I shall not attempt to do so.

BRIEN McMAHON was my friend, even before I became a Member of this body, years ago. I watched his progress and his steady growth intellectually, politically, and spiritually. He became not only a master in debate and a sound legislator, but to an unusual degree understood and interpreted the responsibility our country had assumed for world leadership. His was not merely a deep understanding of the problems of a great nation blessed with material wealth and power. His leadership reflected a constantly growing recognition that we must use all our moral and spiritual forces if we are to unify the freedom-loving peoples of the world and secure for them and for ourselves lasting peace and security.

BRIEN McMAHON was dedicated to building a strong military defense in cooperation with our friends and allies abroad. Like many of us, he felt that that was necessary for our security and for our survival. But he never for a moment lost sight of the fact that we can never hope to win a lasting and just peace by military strength alone. His efforts were constantly exerted to enlist the hearts, the minds, and the confidence of peoples throughout the world in the cause of freedom, collective security, and peace.

While discharging his duties as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he ever sought to make it perfectly clear to the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union and the satellite nations that the sole goal and aim of the United States was peace. He never wavered. He realized beyond most men that while military strength was essential, we must never close the door to peaceful negotiations with the other nations of the world.

I have spoken of his sense of duty and his courage. His courage was physical as well as moral. I well remember what I believe was his last address on the floor of the Senate some time in May when he was already stricken with his fatal illness and in great suffering. He came on the floor walking with a cane. His face was drawn and it was evident that his body was racked with pain, but he came to the Senate because he felt it was his duty to speak in behalf of humane, fair, and enlightened immigration and naturalization policies and to oppose discrimination and injustice. His words in their significance and wide implications transcended the particular bill that was being debated when he said:

> The good opinion of our neighbors abroad is not to be purchased by economic favors alone. Moreover it is not important to us solely as a means of securing military alliances. If we cannot do more than talk about freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual, if we cannot exemplify it—legislate it, if you like—we can never win the belief in our way of life, and the respect and the voluntary cooperation in our aims which I believe essential to our survival in a threatening world. * * *
>
> One of the great weaknesses of totalitarian countries is their inability properly to understand the intentions and views of other nations. Our immigrants have always been a major source of strength to us in this respect, as in many others.

These eloquent words may long serve as a guidepost for all of us.

We are today mourning a great legislator, a brilliant lawyer, and a wise leader. But, above all things, we are honoring a thoroughly good man who never wavered in the unending fight for justice and equality for all people. The Senate has lost one of its greatest Members. The Nation has been deprived of a loyal and devoted son, and we who loved him, of a greathearted friend.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in saying a few words in memory of and in tribute to our late distinguished colleague and friend.

I first came to know BRIEN McMAHON when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I was thrown in rather close contact with him because of the pendency of a new type of legislation and a new type of problem confronting the Congress and the country and, indeed, the world. That was legislation with reference to atomic energy. I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives that had jurisdiction over that legislation. In that capacity I often met with Senator McMAHON and talked with him and came to have great admiration for the very fine grasp he had of this subject and the pioneering effort

he was making in a new and strange field, in charting the course we should take in the management of this new power which had been unleashed in the world by the inventive genius of great scientists. Later it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, alongside Senator McMAHON; and I came to admire the man even more as I watched his work in the field of foreign relations.

It was my pleasure to join with Senator McMAHON in several of the measures he introduced. I was glad that a few minutes ago the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] referred to the resolution which Senator McMAHON, together with some 20 other Senators as cosponsors, submitted on the floor of the Senate, calling upon Russia to make good her boast that she was a great peace-loving and peace-making nation, and offering all the good offices of this country really to work out a peace by which the world could stand.

I remember another resolution Senator McMAHON was prepared to submit, and a proposal he did present to the world in a speech on the floor of the Senate, which I think must have challenged a great part of the world, in setting forth a willingness to join in a good-faith venture for the ending of the armaments race. I remember that Senator McMAHON spoke of the great good and the vast amount of reconstruction which could be accomplished throughout the world if we would use for the benefit of the world only a small amount of the money we were spending for armaments of destruction. All of us remember that at that time Senator McMAHON proposed to the other nations of the world, "If you will join with us in a real program designed to do away with the armaments race, we shall use only a small part of the moneys thus saved, but nonetheless a tremendous amount—$10 billion a year—to help in a world-wide program of reconstruction and development."

Of course that program was never adopted, but certainly it set the world to thinking about the dread results which might accrue if the terrible armaments race were continued, and about some of the desirable possibilities which might develop from a united effort on the part of the great nations of the world to take positive action in that situation.

Mr. President, I have often thought and I have often said that the greatest single characteristic of liberalism is tolerance. Senator McMAHON was a liberal in every sense of the word. He was tolerant. He was a clear thinker. He was fearless in his thinking and in his expression of his thoughts. He was concerned with the problems of the world, and he gave serious consideration to them and to an effort to chart a course which might steer us away from the cataclysm which could result from a continuing armaments race.

Senator McMAHON will long be remembered, Mr. President, not only by his colleagues, but by people throughout the United States and, indeed, by people throughout the world, for the part he played in bringing together into concrete from the serious thoughts as to the steps which might be taken in this troubled world.

Senator McMAHON was a magnificent American, a great Senator, a devoted husband and father, and a fine friend. He will be long missed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on the second day of January 1953, the Democratic conference unanimously adopted a resolution proposed by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], expressing our deep sense of loss at the passing of our esteemed colleague and beloved friend, the Honorable BRIEN McMAHON, Senator from the State of Connecticut.

I shall read the resolution, which is as follows:

Where as Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague the Honorable BRIEN McMAHON, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut; and

Whereas throughout his career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas, as our trusted friend and close associate, he was every ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the Democratic conference this 2d day of January 1953.

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to add my meed of tribute to the memory of a very much beloved friend, the late BRIEN McMAHON.

In speaking of Brien, I shall use the words of Henry Van Dyke, the eminent poet, and a former professor at Princeton University, who wrote so beautifully:

Four things a man must learn to do
If he would make his record true:
To think without confusion clearly;
To love his fellow-men sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely;
To trust in God and Heaven securely.

That applies to BRIEN McMAHON, now and for all time; and in loving memory I lay it, as a meed of tribute, upon his bier today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I deem it a great privilege and honor to join with my colleagues and with hundreds of others throughout the Nation in paying tribute to a great man, a fine friend, and an outstanding public servant, the late and esteemed BRIEN McMAHON.

I do not look upon this occasion as one of mourning, even though there is grief, to be sure, in the hearts of his friends and his beloved family. It seems to me that the opportunity that is ours today is to accept the challenge the spirit and life of BRIEN McMAHON have left to us. Surely his life demonstrates beyond all shadow of doubt the validity of faith in immortality, because the good deeds, the good work, and the spirit of BRIEN McMAHON live on.

It is particularly appropriate that we think of this departed friend and colleague today because the ideas he stood for and the principles he embraced are the ideas and principles that are needed by this world. The problems which engrossed him are still with us, and I suppose it may be said that Divine Providence has ways of demonstrating to those of us of lesser light what our responsibilities are. Some of us here leaned upon BRIEN McMAHON to give us leadership. Our responsibility now is to follow the leadership which he so well demonstrated and fulfilled.

I looked upon BRIEN McMAHON not only as a great Senator, not only as a magnificent public servant, but also essentially as a wonderful and fine man. He meant to me friendship. While my association with him was limited in terms of years, I can candidly say that it was intimate and it was rich in my respect and admiration for him. I had the privilege of learning from this distinguished American and of sharing in that great abundance which comes from a wholesome friendship. BRIEN McMAHON knew that to have friends one had to be interested in them, and to be interested as well in all his fellow men. He demonstrated that concern, not only in his personal associations but in the broader sense, in his regard for all mankind. So to me the life of BRIEN McMAHON stands in our generation as another example of what democratic living can and should be. He believed in human equality, and he practiced it. He accepted as articles of faith those inalienable rights given to us by our Creator, the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

He had a deep religious faith. He received strength from his full acceptance of and devotion to Almighty God. In this wonderful faith, he had the spirit of understanding and of tolerance, to which reference has been made this morning, that led him to offer a helping hand to those of us who sought his advice and counsel.

BRIEN McMAHON demonstrated what constructive thinking and wholesome living can do. One of the problems that has been so close to us these days has been the struggle with the forces of totalitarian brutality. BRIEN McMAHON was not merely an anti-Communist, Mr. President; he was not merely "anti" anything, he was for something. He was prodemocracy, profreedom, propeople. He had a positive faith, not a negative, critical cynicism. Every work toward which he directed his energies demonstrated that faith, his faith in the ability of nations to disarm and his faith in the ability of people to work for constructive good. This was exemplified in the resolution which he proposed and which proclaimed his faith in the people of Russia—not the rulers of Russia—to live in the spirit of friendship, and also proclaimed his faith, Mr. President, in the ability of the people of the United States to act in a spirit of compassion and of service and of humility, which is so much a part of our national character. He had this faith, and because he was a positive thinker and could reaffirm this faith again and again, he was a great leader at home and abroad. I would commend faith of that kind to all of us in these trying hours.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that many of us spent pleasant hours in the home of our late and beloved friend, Senator McMAHON, along with his very lovely and wonderful wife and daughter. We were able to share in the blessed happiness of that home. It is an attribute of a great man to have a fine and happy household. Senator McMAHON will be remembered by all of us as one of God's noble servants. America is a greater and stronger Nation because of BRIEN McMAHON'S service. The light of freedom burns brighter today because Senator McMAHON lived, worked, and died dedicated to democracy. Here is a patriot worthy of history's acclaim.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very glad to rise to add a few words to the tributes to BRIEN McMAHON we have heard from other Senators. My observations will be largely from a personal standpoint.

Brien entered the Senate with me. We were together as freshmen. He was in one party, I was in another; but from the beginning I always felt that we had many aims and beliefs in common. We were both interested in world affairs. We both later became members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and in that capacity I had the privilege of traveling with him to other parts of the world. I think we shared the same aspirations in our desire to solve the problem of achieving world peace. We had the same basic attitude toward the problem of controlling atomic energy. He was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I was not a member of that committee. But I came to know him best through the Foreign Relations Committee, before which came many international questions upon which we worked together.

With his other friends in the Senate, it is a satisfaction, though a melancholy one, to pay this brief tribute to really a great soul, a Member of this body whom I sorely miss, both as a friend and as a colleague.

I was glad to hear the reference by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] a moment ago to Brien's family. I also enjoyed intimacy with the family, not only with Brien, but with Mrs. McMahon and their lovely little daughter. I felt that I knew them as a part of my life here. Mrs. Smith and I enjoyed our association with them and discussing with them many absorbing national and international problems. We were on different sides of the aisle and on different sides politically; that fact did not divide us when it came to the fundamentals. I am happy, Mr. President, to have had the opportunity to pay this inadequate tribute to a friend whom I valued very dearly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, BRIEN McMAHON was a great American whom we knew as a fellow Senator and a friend. The spell of his name, the charm of his bearing, the power of his presence, the influence of his conduct, the impress of his character, will be the legacy of the Senate as long as Americans here speak, serve, and sacrifice for the well-being of mankind.

His eternal rest is the reward of one who gave unsparingly, unceasingly, unselfishly of himself in time of tensions and of threats. BRIEN McMAHON shortened his own existence so that human existence itself might be saved from the passions and fissions of an atomic and materialistic age.

This young man of Connecticut gave half his life in preparation for public service, and he gave all his life in the labor of love for his fellow man.

The estimate of the people of Connecticut, close to the heart and home of BRIEN McMAHON, was evidenced in their belief that he deserved to be designated to the highest responsibility of our Republic. That he should be nominated for the Presidency would be no mere generous gesture for them. It was their claim upon him as a public servant. It was their commendation of his public service.

It was in his Connecticut background that I first knew BRIEN McMAHON in 1946. The mutual love and the mutual understanding of a Senator and his people was an actuality that inspired me, just as every contact with Senator McMAHON was an inspiration to me in my fledgling days in this great body.

So, I am grateful for this opportunity, humbly and briefly, to pay tribute to a great patriot, and to a husband and father who has left an honored name to his loved ones, but a name that they must always share with a grateful people.

He was a valiant spokesman for practical love of neighbor. He knew that an A-bomb was no eternal security against atheism nor an H-bomb against hate. Those who deride human dignity and those who hate must be given a reason for not hating; they must be awakened to a new value of man in the image of his God—reasons and lessons which cannot be given by any external force and oppression.

The Atomic Energy Act has sometimes been called BRIEN McMAHON'S monument. No man worked harder for disarmament and control of arms. No man worked harder for the development and production of atomic arms for the security of America. Yet no voice was more urgent than his to invite all mankind away from the science of war and to the arts of peace.

It would be folly in these few minutes to try to recall the 48 years of achievement of BRIEN McMAHON'S heart and soul, but it would be equal folly for us to forget the living lesson of BRIEN McMAHON—that man is the living instrument by which the glory of God can be achieved, the glory that abides in peace on earth to men of good will.

To BRIEN McMAHON'S widow, daughter, and bereaved family, I express my sympathy.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate in the latter part of 1947 BRIEN McMAHON was already well on his way to a place of influence and well on his way to a place in history as the early architect of atomic energy legislation. I saw him flower and grow in influence in the Senate and in the Nation.

His many virtues have already been mentioned, and I shall not dwell further on them, but I should like to emphasize his fine mind as a lawyer. When I first came to the Senate and observed him on the floor, my attention was attracted to the admirable qualities of his highly trained, developed, and mature legal mind as reflected in his arguments. As time went on I learned that he was a seasoned lawyer with a distinguished record as an Assistant Attorney General. I saw, further, that he was the embodiment of the humane concepts of our great legal system, and that he adorned that great profession and lived up to its better traditions.

So, Mr. President, I like to remember him, and I want the record to show that we all remember him, as a very fine lawyer, one of the best in a great profession. I did not have contact with his religious life, which has already been mentioned here, except to this extent, that he possessed what I call "weekday" Christianity. He reflected its principles in his work during weekdays, which is the real test of religion.

As I think of his great spirit I am reminded of a story I once heard of an old prospector who had passed on in a cabin in the West, all alone, and had left this simple note:

> Never think of me as having died. Just think of me as having gone on an eternal prospecting trip.

So I feel that the great spirit of our departed friend is not dead, but has gone on an eternal prospecting trip where he will reflect, in the way of that other world, the very same qualities which he so nobly personified here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity of paying tribute to BRIEN McMAHON. I sat next to him in the committee room of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during trying times, and I knew him extremely well, both as a Senator and also on a personal basis. I also enjoyed the privilege of seeing him in his home. He had a very fine family, to whom I extend my sincere sympathy.

One of his outstanding characteristics, although he was a man who spent much of his time on very difficult problems, was his sense of humor. He had a very keen sense of humor which always made the work of our committee and the work of the Senate much more tolerable.

He had a very deep understanding of human relations and was guided by that understanding in much of the legislation which he sponsored and promoted on the floor of the Senate. As has been said, he was essentially a very tolerant man and was a true liberal in the best sense of the word.

The Nation has lost a great public servant, and we have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

> There is no flock, however watched and tended,
> But one dead lamb is there.
> There is no fireside, howsoe'er defended,
> But has one vacant chair.
> The air is full of farewells to the dying,
> And mournings for the dead;
> The heart of Rachel, for her children crying,
> Will not be comforted.

Soon after the adjournment of the last session of the 82d Congress, the grim-visaged reaper, whose name is Death,

made vacant still another senatorial chair by severing from earth and from all earthly things our beloved, illustrious, late companion, colleague, friend—the Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut's famous, faithful, favorite son.

When I remember him and the host of other official friends—

I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather;
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but him departed.

While this remarkable statesman was in the heyday of his manhood, while his senatorial service was at the zenith, while every breeze was bringing him promises of still greater official glory, from an affluent home of happiness, peace, and sweet content, from a loved and loving, cultured, charming wife and from a beautiful, talented daughter on the threshold of her teens, he was imperiously summoned by the insatiate despot's despot, who knows no mercy and feels no pity, to that bourne from which no traveler returns. With antique courage, philosophic resignation, and Christian hope, he obeyed the summons and went forth into the unknown land, leaving behind him an innumerable throng of weeping friends, who will mourn his loss until they are eventually reunited with him in the—

City of temples and turrets of gold,
That gleam by the sapphire sea,
Like jewels more splendid than earth may behold,
Or are dreamed of by you and by me.

By common consent, Senator MCMAHON was one of the greatest of all legislative authorities on the utilization of atomic energy—the latest and most alarming wonder of the world.

With surpassing ability and fidelity, he discharged all his official duties as Assistant Attorney General of the United States, as Director of the Criminal Division of the Federal Department of Justice and as a Member of the United States Senate. Throughout his official life he knew no guide but his judgment, no dictator but his conscience and no purpose but to love and serve his God, his country, and his fellow men. He habitually thought and sought and wrought in the superlative degree.

His passing is an irreparable loss to his State which heaped her honors upon him, to his Nation to which he dedicated his service, to his family that idolized him and to the countless friends who knew him but to love him; who named him but to praise.

It is our comforting hope and confident belief that this beloved one is now in the full enjoyment of the everlasting reward promised by the Master in the comforting words: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

And now beloved statesman, patriot, husband, father, friend, an affectionate last farewell—

All our hearts are buried with you,
All our thoughts go onward with you,
Come not back again to labor,
Come not back again to suffer,
Where the famine and the fever
Wear the heart and waste the body.
Soon our task will be completed,
Soon your footsteps we shall follow,
To the Islands of the Blessed,
To the Land of the Hereafter.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the death of BRIEN MCMAHON last July was a heavy blow to those of us who served here in the Senate with him, who knew him and loved him. He was at the very meridian of his intellectual powers and was at the point of greatest service to our country when stricken by the fatal malady.

In 1946 when he had served in the Senate scarcely a year, he became our leader in drafting the legislation upon which our American atomic energy program is based. He, more than any other Member of the Congress, seemed to grasp the tremendous potential of atomic energy for good or for evil.

He fought that the control and further development of atomic energy might be placed in the hands of civilian authority. He felt it was safer there. He understood so well that atomic energy has within it the power that could destroy our Nation and our civilization.

BRIEN MCMAHON dedicated his life to leashing the destructive forces of the atom and unleashing the constructive forces.

He became a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that he might the more effectively engage in the battle for peace. He sought hard to find a way to detach the Russian people from their leaders. It was just 3 years ago that he delivered on this floor his historic disarmament speech—a speech that challenged peoples around the earth.

He probed and planned. He worked relentlessly and tirelessly. He spoke courageously and forthrightly again and again, seeking to arouse our people and to awaken mankind to the dangers of the atomic age and the compelling necessity for peace. BRIEN MCMAHON never let up. He was of the stuff that knows no limitations. He carried on. He fought on.

"Where there is no vision the people perish." BRIEN MCMAHON was the statesman of vision whose imagination caught the horizons of tomorrow. He was the leader who spoke as one with authority. He was the patriot who gave his all to the service of his country. He was the prophet for the better day.

As one who was privileged to be thrown in intimate association with Brien in our membership on the Democratic Policy Committee and in many other ways, may I say we miss him. We miss his genial spirit and the warmth and friendliness of his smile and handclasp. We miss his hearty laugh and good fellowship.

We miss his many helpful and wise contributions to the work of the Senate. We miss the example of courage and devotion that he set for us. We miss the friend, the counselor, the helpmate, BRIEN MCMAHON was devoted to his family, his beautiful and faithful wife, his lovely and precious little daughter.

BRIEN MCMAHON will live in history as a great American. Surely he has gone to a rich reward to join the choice and master spirits that have made our America.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished colleague, a colleague who can justly be called America's first statesman of the atomic age; a tribute to the memory of a beloved American, a fine gentleman, and a sorely missed friend, BRIEN MCMAHON.

There is much to be said of such a man. The words of wisdom he uttered could be called to mind to illustrate his courage, his determination in action, and the brilliance of his thought. Example after example of his humanity, his sense of decency, and his wisdom come readily to mind. But there is little that need be said, for of BRIEN MCMAHON one need not talk. The man, himself, has impressed his fine personality and his noble acts and deeds on the memory of all with whom he came in contact. The friends of his childhood, those with whom he went to school, the people of the great State he represented here in the Senate, while they knew first of his kindness and partook of his generosity of soul, all of these knew well and at all times the true greatness which permeated his being. So, too, did we, his coworkers in the legislative halls of these United States. So, too, did the people of America. And so, too, did those many throughout the world who, terrified at the awesome power of the unleashed atom, saw in BRIEN MCMAHON the vision, the compassion, the new-age knowledge, and the singleness of driving purpose through which mankind might control the terrible power we have turned loose among the peoples of the world. In him they saw that character of leadership through which the atom's terrifying might could be converted from an instrument of destruction into an instrument of immeasurable value to all people. For if our world shall be permitted to endure despite man's inhumanity to man and despite the monstrous weapons through which that inhumanity may now find expression, it will be in no small measure due to the forceful insistence of BRIEN MCMAHON that the unleashed atom could be a source of good for all mankind; to his insistence that its power and potentialities be entrusted to civilian rather than to military hands; and to his insistence that as we spend billions to build our defenses we spend at least a modicum of that amount in building strength and good will throughout the world. It is because of his leadership in these three related fields that BRIEN MCMAHON will be recognized by historians of the future as truly the first statesman of the atomic age.

Such was the large and overriding meaning of BRIEN MCMAHON to the world. Such is our great debt to him. But on an occasion such as this, mention should be made of his ordered and purposeful life; of his days at school culminating in his graduation from that great Catholic institution, Fordham University; of his devotion to Christian teachings which

permeated his every act; of the host of friends he made; and of the true humility expressed in his unvarying courtesy to all with whom he came in contact. He was a leader whose greatness was tempered by humility, whose knowledge was warmed by understanding, and whose service to mankind was predicated on his devotion to a Christian life.

To his charming wife and lovely daughter I offer my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I first met BRIEN MCMAHON in 1936. He was then Chief of the Criminal Division of the United States Department of Justice. It was my good fortune to serve in a subordinate capacity in the division under his leadership.

He was a fearless prosecutor, but always true to the principles and guaranties of American justice. BRIEN MCMAHON was brilliant of mind, kind of heart, and he possessed an understanding of human values matched by few men. Respect for the dignity of the individual and faith in God were the driving forces of his relations with his fellow men.

I have always found it difficult adequately and properly to express myself upon the loss of one so dear and close to me as was BRIEN MCMAHON. On such occasions I usually take refuge either in Scripture or in poetry, because there I find the sentiments and the words which, at least, in my sight, do justice to such a lost one. So on this occasion I close my eulogy of BRIEN MCMAHON by referring to The Catholic Anthology, which contains the great poem, In Memoriam, written by Maurice Baring. I read only the following portion:

And in the portals of the sacred hall
You heard the trumpet's call
At dawn upon the silvery battlement
Reecho through the deep
And bid the sons of God to rise from sleep
And, with a shout, to hail
The sunrise on the city of the Grail:
The music that proud Lucifer in Hell
Missed more than all the joys that he forewent.
You hear the solemn bell
At vespers, when the oriflammes are furled;
And then you know that somewhere in the world'
That shines far off beneath you like a gem
They think of you; and when you think of them,
You know that will wipe away their tears
And cast aside their fears;
That they will have it so,
And in no otherwise;
That it is well with them because they know,
With faithful eyes,
Fixed forward and turned upwards to the skies,
That it is well with you,
Among the chosen few,
Among the very brave, the very true.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the tributes already paid to BRIEN MCMAHON, the late Senator from Connecticut, by those of his colleagues—whose privilege it was to have known and labored longer here with him than was mine—attest to his exceptional worth as an individual and to his stature as a great American, who served his State and Nation with honor and distinction. As chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and author of the McMahon Act for the control of atomic energy, the crowning achievement of his all too-short career can be recorded as the response of an intelligent, conscientious, and courageous American to events.

While the same election, that of November 7, 1944, which sent BRIEN MCMAHON to the United States Senate sent me to the National House of Representatives, our paths did not cross until 1950, when I became a Member of this body. Shortly thereafter it was my privilege to share membership with him on the policy committee, where I came to know, admire, and appreciate his splendid talents, as well as his gracious, kindly, and tolerant attitude toward his fellow men generally and particularly in his dealings with his colleagues here in the Senate. Endowed as he was, certainly all who knew him must agree that "the elements so mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'this was a man.'"

Stricken down, as he was, in his prime, afflicted by months of hopeless suffering, it is not for us, who knew and loved him, to question why as, we may be certain, he did not. Today is Ash Wednesday—from the time he could remember, this day had a special significance for BRIEN MCMAHON, as a child, a youth, and an adult—Christian, God-fearing man that he was—he thoroughly understood the outward sign of the cross placed on his forehead in ashes throughout the Ash Wednesdays of his lifetime, when his church reminded him, and all of us "remember man that thou art dust—and unto dust shalt thou return." So we may be assured that he understood and accepted, without murmur, the final cross that was placed upon him at the very zenith of his career and, regrettably prematurely, led him to the inexorable fulfillment of Ash Wednesday. What was mortal of BRIEN MCMAHON has returned to dust, but he knew the promise of resurrection and eternal life, and his imperishable and immortal soul goes marching on. Indeed, out of the shadowy mists of eternity, we might well hear him say:

Yes, I have lived! Pass on
And trouble me with questions nevermore—
I suffered. I have won
A solemn peace—my peace forevermore.
Leave me in silence here.
I have hope, no care,
I know no fear;
For I have borne—but now no longer bear.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent from the floor of the Senate on official business as a Member of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee aboard the U. S. S. *Wisconsin* on maneuvers. He cabled his office to request that the following tribute to the late Senator BRIEN MCMAHON be presented in his behalf, and I am glad to do so:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

I wish that I were present on the Senate floor to join with others today in paying tribute to my good friend and former classmate at Yale, BRIEN MCMAHON. He will be remembered in history as the man who saw clearly the need for, and led the way to, civilian control of atomic energy. It was an act of great statesmanship. We miss him today, as we face new and equally disturbing problems without the benefit of his wise counsel and calm judgment. It is little consolation to say that we are perhaps better prepared to face them because we have known and worked with BRIEN MCMAHON. We shall try to follow the example he set. If we are successful, the entire world will be the beneficiary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the Senate pauses today to reflect on the great services of our departed leaders, I would like to speak a few words about one of the ablest men of our century, BRIEN MCMAHON.

Death cut short his distinguished career that was unfolding in his great leadership for peace. Understanding, perhaps better than any other American, the terrible implications of atomic warfare, he sought not only the means for improving our strength in this field, but also ways of improving the strength of the United Nations and the principle of collective security so that these weapons need not be ever used.

Members of the Senate well know of his distinguished career as an attorney, how he served as one of the youngest men ever to fill a post as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the criminal division. We well know the sense of justice and faithfulness to public duty with which he exercised these great powers at the age of only 30. We know of his elevation to the Senate and the services he rendered in many ways in this body.

We are apt to oversimplify it when we call him Mr. Atom. This great work, which resulted in a true constructive program for our national security, but one looking forward from Hiroshima, not backward, not only preserved and advanced our knowledge and production of atomic weapons, but in the long run looked forward to the blessings of atomic energy for peacetime use.

It was this broad understanding of the entire problem and his grasp and leadership in this field that set the Nation on the right atomic course. I would hate to try to imagine the awful consequences of our atomic program if BRIEN MCMAHON had not lived.

First, his leadership in fighting through to the finish for a bill to give proper civilian control to atomic energy built in the Congress a foundation on which our world leadership in this field could grow. He changed the narrow exclusive purpose of atomic energy from a gigantic bomb project to one of tactical weapons and one of the most modern advances in this field for defensive purposes.

Who can know but that our progress under this program has already prevented the outbreak of world war III? Who can judge whether it was our efficiency and growth and understanding of the many phases of atomic energy that has held back the hordes of the Soviet Union from marching across Western Europe? Certainly we and the other free peoples of the world are stronger in peace today because of Senator MCMAHON'S foresight.

We all remember 3 years ago his brave fight for progress in solving the secret of the hydrogen bomb and of his efforts to concentrate greater efforts on tactical atomic weapons for field use.

Great as these contributions were, however, there is still a greater one in his insistence in a forward-looking program beyond the mere use of atomic energy for destruction. Brien dreamed of the day when this great discovery could be man's greatest friend and benefactor. Under his chairmanship, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy moved forward into these peacetime uses and led the fight for allocations of Federal funds for research in many diseases.

These funds, as they finally result in conquering the scourges of diseases to mankind, will undoubtedly result in the saving of many more lives, than were destroyed by the atomic explosions in World War II. This was the dream of Senator McMAHON.

It is significant that long before he knew that cancer would take his life he succeeded in earmarking some $6 million for research of atomic byproducts on this disease.

BRIEN McMAHON had the vision of the time when this energy would mean better lives for everyone. Not only in the field of medicine, but in industry, he saw its possibilities to help mankind carry the burdens of production with greater ease and less misery.

He was a kindly, considerate leader who always had the time for the little man who needed help. His friends in his native State of Connecticut attest to the thousands who owed help on their small problems to BRIEN McMAHON.

While his activities always searched for means to make the United States and the free world stronger in military ways, his efforts were devoted on the same generous scale to making the United Nations and the principle of collective security effective.

Much of his time was given to study of the problem of finding the means to prevent future wars. His great help in strengthening this instrument of peace will long be remembered as well as his great contribution in the field of atomic energy.

He was a man who served humanity well. His faith never faltered and his love and affection for the people of the United States and the world was with him to his death bed.

One of his last officials acts, only a few weeks before his death, was to submit a letter to the United States Senate on the closing night of the 82d Congress, urging his colleagues to stand fast against unwise reductions in the atomic energy program.

I have dwelt upon his greatness in official life, of his scientific contributions to atomic development and of his leadership to world peace. I may say in closing that in all his greatness, in these fields, his home and personal life as a husband and as a father, measured up in every degree to the excellence and character he possessed officially.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

One of the saddest experiences of my life was to learn of the passing of my good personal friend and one of the Nation's truly outstanding servants BRIEN McMAHON. I had known Brien for many years. At one time I had worked under him in the Department of Justice. I was an assistant United States attorney in Miami, and our late colleague BRIEN McMAHON was then the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

That was many years ago. His great ability in his assignment at the Justice Department caused him to be recognized generally as one of the outstanding attorneys of the United States. When he decided to leave the Department of Justice and return to Connecticut to launch a political career, the people of that great Commonwealth were prompt in recognizing their good fortune in having the opportunity to avail themselves of his services in the United States Senate. Everyone knows of his outstanding career as a Senator. It was his keen and alert mind which observed, long before most of us even realized there was such a thing as an atomic bomb, the necessity for a committee to supervise, in a broad and general nature, the development of this great force.

BRIEN McMAHON recognized probably before anyone else, the transformation that would be brought about in our country from the development of atomic energy. He was the one who raised his voice in the Senate calling for the creation of a Committee on Atomic Energy and he was author of the legislation which brought such a committee into being. Senator McMAHON served in the Senate as the chairman of that group—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and his wise counsel and valuable assistance in the continued development of the new and wondrous powers resulting from the harnessing of the atom has meant much to the entire Nation. All of this is well known and will be long remembered.

While my respect for the abilities of Senator McMAHON was great, my affection for him as a warm and human individual was even greater. Brien was generous and compassionate in every sense of the word. I was privileged to associate with him on many occasions before he came to the Senate, as well as thereafter, and never did I observe the slightest act or deed other than those which endeared him to those who were around him. Even though he was tremendously busy and great demands were always made on his time and energies, he never failed to find time to help those who needed his help and who called upon him.

When I first came to this body as a freshman Senator somewhat bewildered and frightened by the traditions and customs of the Senate, it was BRIEN McMAHON who in those early days always gave to me an encouraging word and friendly pat on the back. On several occasions when I needed his advice and went to see him he was most generous and helpful. His consideration to me was not unusual for I know it was his nature to help everyone who called upon him. His loss has been deeply felt already in the Senate of the United States and throughout the country. There are many of us who will continue for a long time to mourn his passing. But we can take comfort and gain inspiration from his memory. He was a man who did not waste his time in stirring cold ashes; he always continued to move forward hopefully and courageously. Let us think of him and be inspired to do likewise.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we commemorate today the life and death of a man who made an outstanding contribution to our country and the cause of world peace.

Senator BRIEN McMAHON and I came to the Senate together as freshman Senators. We served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. During this time I learned to know him well and to respect him.

As Chairman of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, Senator McMAHON rendered distinguished service to his country during difficult and perilous times. He was the prime architect of legislation that linked business, civilian, and military leaders in a joint effort to develop atomic energy because he foresaw its vast peacetime uses. He was determined that its development for constructive ends must march hand in hand with its development as a weapon of war.

At the same time, Senator McMAHON coupled his leadership in developing atomic weapons with pleas for world disarmament and peace, so that atomic energy could be used for benefit instead of bombs. From the day the atomic bomb was exploded over Japan, we witnessed our late colleague's determination to save civilization from possible destruction by the new and revolutionary forces of atomic energy. I well remember the day when he stood here on the Senate floor and solemnly warned the Senate, "The clock is ticking, ticking, ticking, and with each swing of the pendulum, the time to save civilization grows shorter."

But with all of his work in atomic energy, Senator McMAHON never lost sight of the aim to make weapons, and particularly atomic weapons, superfluous by building peace based on understanding and friendly relations with foreign nations. Toward the close of his career, he advocated that the nations of the world, including Russia, disarm and dedicate one-third of their former armament spending to peaceful reconstruction and development. Nevertheless, because Russia remained bent on world conquest, our late colleague took the lead in demanding the strongest atomic weapons for America.

I know we shall all miss BRIEN McMAHON here in the United States Senate. God bless him and keep him. His life exemplifies the biblical admonition which comes to my mind, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor than silver and gold."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Before the Senate resumes the consideration of legislative business the present occupant of the chair would like to take the liberty, from the chair, of associating himself with the justly earned, fitting, and eloquent eulogies of the day. The Senate lost a great Senator, and America a devoted patriot, when BRIEN McMAHON passed away.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President and the Congress of the United States, to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that in the planning and construction of the proposed Libby Dam in Lincoln County the economy of the area and the livelihood of the people be safeguarded through selection of the site for the axis of such dam and by appropriations required to provide services equal to those now existing; and requesting similar consideration for Montana people in the case of other Federal projects

"Whereas the water resources of the State of Montana are now of great importance in the further development of multiple-purpose Federal projects of the Columbia and Missouri River Basins; and

"Whereas it appears that in the planning and construction of some dams and water reservoir projects for the impoundment of Montana water, benefits to downstream areas are being planned or provided without an adequate balancing consideration of detrimental effects upon the Montana economy; and

"Where this lack of consideration is most apparent in the planning by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for the Libby Dam project on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County, where the site propcsed at public hearings and approved by Congress has been abandoned in favor of a site farther downstream which will much more seriously affect the economy of Lincoln County and northwest Montana; and

"Whereas the selection of the now favored site, only a few miles upstream from the city of Libby, by the Corps of Engineers would require excessive and probably uneconomic expenditures in order to replace existing transportation facilities and to prevent serious disruption of the timber and mining industries of Lincoln County with ultimate loss of steady and gainful employment affecting approximately half of Lincoln County's families; and

"Whereas the location of the axis of the Libby Dam upstream from the confluence of the Fisher and Kootenai Rivers would injure the economy of Lincoln County and northwest Montana to a much lesser degree, which injury could be alleviated by Federal expenditures far less in amount than those required in case of location at any site downstream from the mouth of the Fisher River; and

"Whereas location of the dam at this upstream site would greatly reduce total costs and provide vital protection for the economy of Montana with only minor reduction in water storage or the amount of electric energy generated at the dam, and would not substantially adversely affect the downstream areas of the Columbia River, for the benefit of which the Libby project is primarily intended: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the 33d Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1953 now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring hereby most urgently request that the Congress of the United States in making any appropriation of funds for the planning and construction of the Libby Dam, take such action as will insure that the axis of said dam will be placed upstream from the confluence of the Fisher and the Kootenai Rivers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this assembly request the Congress, in making appropriations for the construction of the Libby project, to define the compensations that shall be received from the Government of the United States by the county of Lincoln and by affected cities and school districts in said county for extraordinary expenses resulting from expanded services required in the fields of school and hospital facilities, health and sanitation, and police protection incidental to the construction of said project; and to provide all necessary funds and take all needed action to insure the construction of all transportation and other facilities needed to provide opportunity equal to that now existing of access to mines, to forests in Federal, State, and private ownership, and to manufacturing and refining plants, to the end that the present steady and continuous employment of Lincoln County people depending upon forests and mines for their livelihood will not be adversely affected; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be requested by this assembly to provide equal protection for the economy of Montana and the welfare of its citizens when making appropriations for similar Federal construction projects in Montana which have been or may be authorized; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the President and to the Congress of the United States, and to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DEAN CHAFFIN,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved: February 13, 1953.
"J. HUGO ARONSON,
"*Governor.*"

A resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., protesting against the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Frank E. Freeman, of McCall, Idaho, relating to the importation and mining of antimony (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the extension of the support price for butter from March 31, 1953, through the year 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on February 16, 1953, p. 1076, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

COMMEMORATION OF 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE AND ESTABLISHING OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC—RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Ukrainian descent at St. Paul, Minn., relating to the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Ukraine and the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE UKRAINIAN RALLY IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

We, the Americans of Ukrainian descent and the recently arrived Ukrainians who are about to become American citizens, residing in St. Paul, Minn., and vicinity, assembled at a mass meeting several hundred strong, on January 25, 1953, in the auditorium of the YWCA of St. Paul, at which were solemnly passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, by the authority of the Ukrainian Central Council (Rada) proclaimed a completely independent Ukrainian sovereign state under the name of the Ukrainian National Republic; and

"Whereas the Russian imperialistic forces, under the disguise of Communist ideology overran the free and independent Ukraine, and subdued her into Communist slavery for the benefit of Russian imperialistic aggrandizements; and

"Whereas Ukraine today is a country occupied by the Soviet Russian Communist armed forces and a puppet government has been installed against the will of the Ukrainian people, and Ukraine has been subdued into a colonial province of Russia; and

"Whereas the Communist regime in Ukraine has brought the Ukrainian people and the entire country to economic and cultural ruin and by tyranny has forced a Communist regime for the exploitation of the rich natural and human resources of Ukraine, not only for Russian aggrandizement but for the conquest of the world; and

"Whereas the freedom of man and the dignity of human beings are the most priceless values, in the name of which, through the course of enlightened progress of the human race, peoples throughout the world have progressively struggled for their national statehoods, in which they could assure their own national liberty, economic and cultural progress for the benefit of men and human rights; and

"Whereas we are deeply aware that the people of Ukraine are deprived of their national freedom and even of the dignity of man; and

"Whereas we are fully cognizant of the fact that the Ukrainian people continue to struggle for their national freedom and are striving by passive and active armed resistance for the reestablishment of a truly independent sovereign Ukraine, free from any foreign aggression and occupation; and

"Whereas we, who are so fortunate as to live in the United States of America and to enjoy real personal freedom and human rights, only naturally desire to see our kinsmen in our homeland enjoying at least a small fraction of the same rights and liberties as we do here; and

"Whereas in this fateful hour, when the destiny of the entire world is in the balance, whether the people are to live free and independent, or to become enslaved in Muscovite despotism, the indifferent attitude and apathy to our future national security may threaten our place in international relations as well as our national American entity: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That we, who are of Ukrainian descent, assembled at this mass meeting for the purpose of commemorating the 35th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of Ukraine, solemnly appeal to the Government of the United States and to all of the free nations of the world assembled in the United Nations—

"1. That since the Ukrainian people, for the past 35 years, have stood almost alone in their valiant struggle against the Russian and Communist imperialism, and since Ukraine by her geographic position, economic, and political importance, occupies a key position in our present struggle between the Western World and Soviet Russia, the United States and western allies should take greater cognizance of the present plight of the Ukrainian people and recognize the supreme importance of the Ukrainian problem in the present crisis.

"2. That the Ukrainian emancipation and the reestablishment of the free Ukrainian national state is not the problem of the Ukrainian people only, and it is not an internal problem of Soviet Russia, but it is an international problem which should be solved with the aid of the United States and the free Western World.

"3. That the Ukrainian liberation movement is a positive force in the struggle between the east and west, and the further neglect or negation of this powerful force is detrimental to our own American security and the freedom of the world.

"4. That American foreign policy should not be based on the preservation of an indivisible Russia, that great prison of nations, which threatens American freedom and the existence of the free nations of the world. The voice of the Ukrainian people was already expressed on January 22, 1918, and on subsequent occasions, and the national freedom of the people cannot be bargained at the will of the Kremlin Politburo, or Russian imperialists abroad of either right or left color, who strive to preserve the Russian imperial giant for a constant threat to freedom and further world aggression.

"5. We further appeal to the United States Government to extend moral, political, and material aid to the Ukrainian nation in her present struggle for freedom and in the process of emancipation from Communist tyranny as well as in the reestablishment in Ukraine of a democratic government by the will of the Ukrainian people, who already have expressed their legal will and affirmed it by shedding their precious blood in defense of it."

STEPHEN KOSHUBA,
Chairman of the Rally.
JOHN JANOWYCH,
Secretary of the Rally.
PETER BAYBAK,
Vice Chairman of the Rally Committee.
A. A. GRANOVSKY,
Chairman of the Resolutions Committee.

PROPOSED ELEVATION OF FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR TO CABINET STATUS—LETTER FROM SHERIDAN COUNTY (WYO.) MEDICAL SOCIETY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, a letter received by me, above the signature of Curtis L. Rogers, M. D., for Sheridan County (Wyo.) Medical Society, having to do with proposed legislation to elevate the Federal Security Administrator to Cabinet status. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHERIDAN, WYO., *February 15, 1953.*

Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUNT: The physicians in this community are deeply concerned about the proposed legislation to elevate Federal Security Administrator, particularly social security, to Cabinet status.

First. We understand the social security trust fund is a myth as most of the money has been spent for general governmental expenses.

Second. Elevation of the FSA to Cabinet status will add an enormous amount of prestige and power to a vast vote buying scheme and provide the perfect setup for socialized medicine.

Third. The activities of the Social Security Administration so far overshadow the Public Health services, there is grave danger that the more important matters of health would be smothered by the huge affairs of social security.

Fourth. Social security is the ideal springboard for socialized medicine by amending the act to (1) include permanent and total disability, and (2) to include the provision of socialized medical and hospital care for social security beneficiaries over 65 years of age.

We believe positive action should be taken to forestall President Eisenhower's recommendation to Congress for a Department of Welfare.

Very sincerely yours,
CURTIS L. ROGERS, M. D.
(For Sheridan County Medical Society).

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY WISCONSIN GUERNSEY BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions on the Senate floor I have pointed out the problem raised by synthetic products imitating the features of natural dairy products. The matter was the subject of the Wiley amendment to the oleomargarine law, which would have protected the rights of producers of natural butter without in any way prejudicing the right of the Nation's consumers to pick whichever table spread they choose.

We of this Nation enjoy a patent and trade-mark system designed to protect certain property rights, and yet we have failed to protect the great dairy industry of this country from unfair competition.

At this time I present for appropriate reference a resolution which I have received from Mr. Otto C. Kline, of the Wisconsin Guernsey Breeders' Association. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF WISCONSIN GUERNSEY BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas the oleomargarine interests have launched another bitter attack on the dairy industry and are misleading the public and Congress into using yellow color to imitate butter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Guernsey Breeders' Association assembled in annual meeting in Madison on the fifth day of February report to the Congress of the United States that in the interest of honesty and commercial morality a stand should be taken to stop this product to masquerade as butter.

Resolved, That the dairymen of Wisconsin and United States are willing to accept all the results of honest competition, but they protest that a substitute so cunningly devised and colored cannot be detected, except by scientific experts cannot be considered honest competition.

Resolved, That we ask all our members and all friends of the great industries of this State to write personal letters to their Congressman and Senators to effective support and strengthen the present law that the public may be effectively safeguarded from misrepresentation.

Resolved, That two copies of this resolution be sent the Congressmen and Senators from Wisconsin.

Respectfully submitted.

WISCONSIN GUERNSEY BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,
OTTO C. KLINE, *Secretary.*

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM HUBBARD COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION, DORSET, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have recently received from the Hubbard County Farm Bureau Association, Dorset, Minn., urging the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DORSET, MINN., *February 11, 1953.*

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator from Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the last meeting of the board of directors of the Hubbard County Farm Bureau the St. Lawrence waterway was discussed. And, since we understand that this matter will no doubt be brought up in Congress in the near future, we are writing you this to ask you to use your influence in behalf of this measure. And we are also urging you to support it whenever it comes up for action.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,
HUBBARD COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
MRS. JOHN AVENSON, *Secretary.*

FULL PARITY AND ADEQUATE CREDIT FOR FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF HUBBARD COUNTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE CO., NEVIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and

ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Hubbard County Mutual Fire Insurance Company, Nevis, Minn., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution requests that full parity and adequate credit be provided to farmers.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUBBARD COUNTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Nevis, Minn., January 28, 1953.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Hubbard County Mutual Fire Insurance Company met as an annual meeting January 4th, 1953, at Nevis, Minn., and adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas way back in March 1933 Congress adopted a commitment, to achieve full parity of income for farmers, and all farm-State Senators and Congressmen have pledged their support for this, as has President Eisenhower, in his speech at Kasson, Minn., where he said not 90 percent but full parity; and

"Whereas in spite of all of these promises, 19 years after March 1933, farmers are selling their hogs at $4 to $5 per hundredweight under parity, eggs at 75 percent parity, poultry, at 40 percent of parity, oats at about 65 percent of parity, and so on: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we submit that while Congress continues to discuss the soundest, best method of assuring the farmers full parity we demand that as an emergency measure to guarantee the farmers parity now in 1953, the Congress should—

"1. Reaffirm the commitment of March 1933, assuring the farmers of full parity of income.

"2. That an adequate appropriation should be immediately provided for Farm Home Administration so that the credit needs of all family type farmers for their operations, land purchases, improvements, expansion of herds, and so forth, can be met."

Very truly yours,

HUBBARD COUNTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
L. J. LAUGHLIN, *Secretary.*

CUSTOMS DUTIES IN REGION ADJACENT TO QUETICO NATIONAL PARK—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of resolutions urging that the Border Lakes adjacent to Quetico National Park be duty free for both countries, Canada and the United States, to commercial outfitters, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With reference to the resolution sent out by the Crane Lake Commercial Club on May 9, 1952, copy of which is attached along with a copy of the letter granting us an extension for the 1952 season on the proposed duties. We are at this time presenting the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at our regular meeting held on this 6th day of February 1953:

"Whereas we have studied and discussed the imposed duties on our equipment and supplies going into Canada from the United States side with the camp and resort operators of both countries in this area; and

"Whereas we find that the Border Lakes which are adjacent to the Quetico Park and are used by both the Canadian and United States resorts in a very cooperative and friendly way are desirous of remaining that way; Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Border Lakes adjacent to the Quetico Park shall be used duty free for both countries. But, if a commercial outfitter takes his equipment across the border and over a portage into an inland lake, then the duty may be collected as applied thereon. This would apply to both countries involved; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we wholeheartedly support the resolution adopted by the Northern Ontario Outfitters Association of Canada at their recent convention; it is further

"*Resolved*, That we send copies of this resolution and copies of the one adopted by the Northern Ontario Outfitters Association to the following interested parties: Honorable Deputy Minister of National Revenue, Ottawa, Canada; Hon. Bill Benidictson, M. P., Ottawa, Canada; Mr. C. Williams, collector of customs, Fort Francis, Ontario; Mr. William Klymko, Canadian customs, Fort Francis, Ontario; Honorable United States Ambassador to Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Senator Edward Thye, Washington, D. C.; Senator Hubert Humphrey, Washington, D. C.; Congressman John Blatnik, Washington, D. C.; Governor Elmer Anderson, St. Paul, Minn.; Attorney General J. A. Burnquist, St. Paul, Minn.; Mr. Chester S. Wilson, Conservation Commissioner, St. Paul, Minn.; Hon. A. O. Stanley, Chairman, International Joint Commission, Washington, D. C.; Collector of Customs, Washington, D. C.; Collector of Customs, Duluth, Minn.; Mr. Reg Thrush, Secretary of Northern Ontario Outfitters Association, Chapleau, Ontario."

CRANE LAKE COMMERCIAL CLUB,
JOHN G. HANDBERG, Jr.,
President.
ALVIN OSTLUND, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY CRANE LAKE COMMERCIAL CLUB, MAY 9, 1952

Whereas this club has a membership of 47 members operating 17 resorts and their chief source of income from the renting of boats and outboard motors, fishing tackle, etc., with and without guides for the main purpose of fishing in the boundary lakes between Minnesota and Canada, consisting of Sandpoint, Namakan, Little Vermillion, Loon Lakes, and Lac La Croix, and in Little Vermillion Narrows and Loon River and other Canadian lakes; and

Whereas Crane Lake is not a boundary lake but is connected with the international boundary waters by King William Narrows, about 2 miles long, which is further explained by a map which is hereto attached; and

Whereas across the above border lakes (Sandpoint, Namakan, Little Vermillion, Loon and Lac La Croix) and near the center of the above narrows and river (Little Vermillion and Loon) runs the international boundary line; and

Whereas if the provisions of the letter written to these resort operators on April 21, 1952, by William Klymko, a copy of which is hereto attached, are not complied with, any boat, outboard motor, and all equipment therein, crossing such international boundary line at any point in the above waters will be subject to confiscation by the Canadian Government; and

Whereas some of said resort operators have upward of 45 boats and canoes and upward of 30 outboard motors and in such case and on each boat, canoe, and outboard motor, it will be necessary to pay the duty of 37½ percent on boats and 35 percent on outboard motors, for the reason that it is impractical as well as impossible to operate a boat or canoes on such international waters without crossing such boundary line, and in addition to that it is practically impossible to determine exactly where such boundary line runs; and

Whereas the fishing season for 1952 opens May 17 and these resort operators have advertised the same as usual each year and they expect the usual large number of fishermen, yet for these resort operators to pay such heavy duties and taxes would be a calamity—for some ruin and others might eventually be forced out of business; and

Whereas the United States has no such duty or tax comparable thereto exceeding 7½ percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this club protest in every way possible to the enforcement of this order, especially for the year 1952, as no member of the club is prepared for it, and for the purpose of determining if a more equitable manner of handling the same cannot be worked out between the two Governments and that copies of this resolution be sent to Honorable Deputy Minister of National Revenue, Ottawa, Canada; Hon. Bill Benidictson, M. P., Ottawa, Canada; Mr. C. Williams, collector of customs, Fort Frances, Ontario; Mr. William Klymko, Fort Frances, Ontario; Hon. United States Ambassador to Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Hon. Senator Edward J. Thye, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Congressman John Blatnik, Washington, D. C.; United States Collector of Customs, Washington, D. C.; United States Collector of Customs, Duluth, Minn.; Hon. A. O. Stanley, Chairman, International Joint Commission, Washington, D. C.; Chester S. Wilson, commissioner of conservation, St. Paul, Minn.

CRANE LAKE COMMERCIAL CLUB,
ARTHUR N. POHLMAN,
President.
ALVIN OSTLUND, *Secretary.*
CRANE LAKE, MINN.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER OF NATIONAL REVENUE CUSTOMS,
Ottawa, May 17, 1952.

JOHN H. NELSON, Esq.,
Crane Lake, Minn., U. S. A.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowlege your letters of the 26th and 28th of April, with regard to the temporary admission to Canada of non-duty paid boats and other equipment for use in Canadian waters by guests from your commercial summer resort at Crane Lake, Minn.

After reviewing all the circumstances the Department has given full consideration to your representations, and it has been decided that the question of payment of duty on your boats and outboard motors used in Canadian waters be left in abeyance for this year.

We will obtain a report from the collector of customs at Fort Frances at the end of the season, and will then be in a better position to judge what action will be warranted in the future.

Yours truly,

G. B. URQUHART.

RESOLUTION OF NORTHERN ONTARIO OUTFITTERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas Canadian and American commercial outfitters use international boundary lakes in, and adjacent to, Quetico Park: Be it

Resolved, That no duty be charged on equipment thus used, but if any commercial equipment cross from such boundary lakes over portages into other lakes of the area, then duty be charged on equipment used by such parties.

CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF DOCKS AND PORTAGES IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that a resolution

adopted by the board of county commissioners of St. Louis County, Duluth, Minn., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution requests the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota to assist the United States Forest Service in obtaining funds to construct, improve, and maintain docks and portages in the Superior National Forest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN., JANUARY 26, 1953

Resolved, That the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Minnesota are hereby requested to assist the United States Forest Service in obtaining funds to construct, improve, and maintain docks and portages in the Superior National Forest; such an appropriation is deemed more urgent due to the establishment of an airplane ban in said area.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—RESOLUTION OF MIDDLE RIVER (MINN.) PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Middle River Parent-Teachers Association, Middle River, Minn., relating to the banning of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE ADVERTISEMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Whereas the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has called upon legislative bodies to ban alcoholic beverage advertisement; and

Whereas further advertising would only serve to increase the already unduly high and costly liquor consumption; and

Whereas through liquor advertising the privacy and teachings of the home is invaded and violated; and

Whereas America's young people are particularly influenced by this misleading and vicious advertising: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Middle River Parent-Teachers Association support such legislation, and call upon its duly elected representatives in Congress to do all in their power to pass laws prohibiting liquor advertising.

W. C. SEARLE,
ROBERT PRUKETT,
Resolutions Committee.

VETERANS TRAINING PROGRAM—LETTER FROM BRAINERD TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY, BRAINERD, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have recently received from the Brainerd Trades and Labor Assembly, Brainerd, Minn., in which it is urged that the veterans trade training program be placed under the direction of the Federal and State Departments of Labor.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAINERD TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
Brainerd, Minn., February 11, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: A matter of much concern has recently been called to our attention and we believe a recommendation is in order to make the program more beneficial to the participants.

The Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor has become cognizant of a Veterans Trade Training program under a newly organized group known as the National Association of Approving Agencies, who have taken it upon themselves to be authorities on apprenticeship and on-the-job training. Among them are representatives who must have B. A. degrees, and the question arises as to their ability to take over in the field of labor relations. The period of training recommended by this group is not sufficient to turn out skilled craftsmen, who can successfully make a livelihood.

In the States of New York, Wisconsin and California the Governors have placed the responsibility for approving apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs in State departments of labor.

We therefore recommend that when this matter comes to your attention, that you sincerely recommend that these programs be placed under the direction of the Federal and State Departments of Labor and the Apprenticeship Bureaus, whose personnel are trained craftsmen or experienced in the field of labor relations.

Looking forward to your cooperation in this matter, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
MILO ERICKSON,
Secretary.

SUPPORT PRICES FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—TELEGRAM FROM ROCHESTER (MINN.) DAIRY COOPERATIVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by me from the Rochester Dairy Cooperative, having to do with the parity of dairy products. I agree with the sentiments of the wire and hope that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will act to help the dairy farmer.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCHESTER, MINN., *February 16, 1953.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

The board of directors of this organization today unanimously passed a resolution recommending that dairy products be supported at the same percentage of parity as the basic commodities.

GEORGE P. DALEY,
President, Rochester Dairy Cooperative.

THE TIDELANDS CASE — RESOLUTION OF MOYER LOCAL OF FARMERS UNION, NO. 317, HOLLOWAY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Moyer Local of Farmers Union, No. 317, Holloway, Minn., concerning the so-called tidelands oil question, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas tidelands oil has been one of the paramount issues of the last presidential campaign in which Candidate Eisenhower stood for States' rights and Stevenson for National rights as it stood at that time and earmarked for school aid; and

Whereas President Truman on departing from the Capital assigned tidelands oil to and earmarked same for naval reserves. Now that the door has been slammed shut on tidelands oil, it will be up to the new President to reopen this case and make good his promise to the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Moyer Local of the Farmers Union, No. 317, demand that in case tidelands be reopened or changed in any way that it be assigned and earmarked for school aid to its former status.

MRS. MERLYN PETRICK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 799. A bill to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 46).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 970. A bill authorizing the construction of an appropriate memorial upon the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 971. A bill to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 972. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional land for the United States Border Inspection Station at Nogales, Ariz.; the preparation of plans and specifications for additional buildings and facilities on such land; the construction of additional buildings and facilities thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty; and

S. 974. A bill for the relief of certain Chinese children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 975. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 976. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to correct injustice and to provide for the payment of certain amounts of compensation to officers who were found under the provisions of that act to have been removed from the active list of the Army without justification and who were subsequently restored to the active list or advanced on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 977. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 978. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 979. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee; and

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Jang Kee Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 981. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,858,087; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 982. A bill for the relief of Helena Lewicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 983. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 984. A bill making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 985. A bill for the relief of Cesare Mazzonetto, Alma Zane Mazzonetto, Luciano Mazzonetto, and Mario Adriano Mazzonetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 986. A bill for the relief of Ishi Washburn and Terry Wendell Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 987. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 988. A bill for the relief of August Alcsuti and Vilma Kann Alcsuti;

S. 989. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng;

S. 990. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes;

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Yoko Itabashi;

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; and

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne T. can Amerongen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 994. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 995. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lilly Tschiga;

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Marguarete Emelianoff;

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife; and

S. 998. A bill to amend section 324A of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the nationalization of certain aliens serving in the Armed Forces in time of war or hostilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 999. A bill to provide an elected city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the request of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I introduce for appropriate reference six bills. I am introducing the bills at this time in order that they may be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia so the committee may then refer them to the appropriate subcommittees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1000. A bill to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1001. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes;

S. 1002. A bill to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of square 355 in the District of Columbia, acquired by the District of Columbia as part of a site for a wholesale farmers' produce market;

S. 1003. A bill to provide for the financing of open-air concerts and free children's concerts by the National Symphony Orchestra and for other purposes;

S. 1004. A bill to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia, as amended; and

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1006. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Spiros A. Magoulas;

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Arakas; and

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1010. A bill to provide that licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for power projects in the international section of the St. Lawrence River shall be conditioned so as to assure marketing preferences to public agencies and cooperatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1011. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1012. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of reserve components of the Army and Air Force who suffer disability or death from disease while engaged in inactive duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1013 (by request). A bill providing that the title to certain lands within the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation, Wis., shall be held in trust for the use of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., and for other purposes; and

S. 1014 (by request). A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of Sister Concepta (Ida Riegel); and

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schaitel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1017. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1018. A bill for the relief of George Ellis Ellison; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1019. A bill to provide a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.

S. 1020. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; and

S. 1021. A bill to authorize the dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1022. A bill for the relief of L. R. Swarthout and the legal guardian of Harold Swarthout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1023. A bill to supplement the railway safety appliance acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1024. A bill to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley and the Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims; and

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille Tribe, Too-too-to-ney Tribe and the Chetco Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the last three above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution providing for development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the public interest and for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; creating the St. Lawrence Development Corporation to finance, construct, and operate certain works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River as a self-liquidating project; authorizing the President to negotiate certain arrangements with the Government of Canada for the protection of the navigation rights of the United States on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River; authorizing the preparation of plans for disposal of St. Lawrence power in the interest of consumers in the State of New York and the New England States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution pertaining to the recent Netherlands disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Public Roads to designate a highway system to be known as the Lewis and Clark National Tourway; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPROPRIATE MEMORIAL UPON THE JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

The idea of establishing a suitable memorial to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase of March 9, 1804, by Thomas Jefferson originated with a group of public-spirited citizens from Missouri and the adjacent States. It was the dream of this group that those American pioneers whose intrepid spirit opened up the great western domain of our country should be honored through the erection of a fitting memorial on the site of the transfer of the upper Louisiana Territory and of many other events of great historical importance—a memorial whose dignity and beauty would serve as an inspiration to all Americans and a constant reminder of the frontiers which still challenge our courage and our fortitude today.

A résumé of what has transpired since the plans were conceived two decades ago is contained in House Report 2433 of the 81st Congress. Since that document is available, Mr. President, I will not repeat all the details at this time, except to say that the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission was established by joint resolution of the Congress in 1934; that funds were allocated in 1935 for acquisition and development of a historical site for the memorial; and that following the contribution of the necessary funds by the city of St. Louis, the Department of the Interior acquired the land within the historic site, aggregating 82.58 acres, by condemnation.

The plans for the site not only include the erection of the memorial itself, but also the preservation of the old courthouse, built in 1839, which houses a museum telling the story of our westward expansion; the Manuel Lisa Warehouse, built in 1818; the old cathedral, built in 1834, which contains a museum of religious treasures; the construction of a pioneer village, and many other exhibitions of historical significance.

In order to provide for suitable development of the site, a national architectural contest was held, financed by private citizens in the St. Louis area who contributed more than $250,000 to make this possible. Of the many designs and recommendations submitted, the one finally selected, which is known as the Saarinen plan, has, as its central feature, a great steel arch, approximately 590 feet high. The design has received the approval of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission and the Department of the Interior.

The total cost of the project has been estimated at $30 million, of which approximately $9 million has been expended for the original land acquisition and development. Of this amount, $6,750,000 consists of Federal funds and $2,250,000 of funds furnished by the city of St. Louis through the sale of bonds. In 1935, St. Louis voted a bond issue of $7½ million and $5¼ million is still available to be sold and the proceeds used for the development of the riverfront project when matched 3 to 1 by Federal funds, in accordance with the provisions of this bill and with the formula heretofore followed in providing funds for the acquisition of land for the memorial area.

Many legal and other obstacles have held up the project, including World War II. Bills authorizing the National Park Service to proceed with the development were pending in the Congress at the time of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, a volunteer citizens group working for the development of the area, advised Congress that in view of the national defense needs, it would request no appropriations. It is felt now, however, that the continued existence of this large riverfront tract, without either development or specific authority for its future development, is having a damaging effect on the business district of St. Louis. As a result, there has been increasing pressure to utilize this land for other purposes.

In the meantime, maintenance costs on the site must continue while the present generation is deprived of the patriotic inspiration and educational advantages and facilities of the proposed memorial. It is no longer either efficient or economical, Mr. President, to delay further the development of this project. The citizens who have worked so long and so hard to bring the memorial plan to fruition feel that the Federal Government should keep faith with the city of St. Louis and that the Congress should act now to authorize the development of the memorial, even though appropriations are not made available until a later date.

I would like to point out further that since the sesquicentennial of the purchase and transfer of the upper Louisiana Territory are at hand, it would certainly be most fitting and proper that the Congress authorize this project in its entirety at this time in commemoration of these events.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. President, that the proposed Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is not in any sense a local project of interest only to the citizens of the St. Louis area but is, on the contrary, a great national enterprise. A distinguished member of the board of trustees of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association has stated this most eloquently, and I would like to quote his words:

As a great mind is no better than its memory, a nation is no greater than its history and traditions. In order to profit by the virtues and to avoid repeating the errors of the past, it is necessary that the annals be preserved. Among the virtues of national expansion was the spirit of a hardy and courageous people, willing to tackle any odds; among the errors not to be repeated in human relations were the passive tolerance of lawless elements and the harsh treatment and broken promises to the fellow red man. The preservation of the annals of events and traditions are vital to our welfare, lest we forget the things we should remember, lest we repeat the things that have proven false.

And finally, Mr. President, I would like to quote briefly from the announcement of the architectural competition for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial:

The purpose of the memorial—

It stated—

is not only to commemorate the past but also, and especially, to keep alive in the present and in the future the daring and untrammeled spirit that inspired Thomas Jefferson and his aides to offer men of all nations new opportunities under democracy by consummating the Louisiana Purchase; the spirit that moved pioneers and heroes of thought and action from all the world to press westward with a constructive energy and courage scarcely equaled in history; the spirit that conceived and made possible the territorial integrity and national greatness of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 970) authorizing the construction of an appropriate memorial upon the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ELECTED CITY COUNCIL, SCHOOL BOARD, AND NONVOTING DELEGATE TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 32 other Senators, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an elected city council, school board and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia. The number of the 32 Senators is the largest group ever to propose a home-rule measure.

The bill is essentially the same bill that passed the Senate last year (S. 1976). The number of the new bill, I am advised, will be S. 999.

The size of the council proposed is changed from 15 to 9 to conform to the size of the present Citizens Advisory Council, created since the elected council bill was last considered. The school board also would continue as a nine-man body under this bill.

Consistent with this plan, there would be three wards with three members each of the council and school board to be nominated from each ward but elected at large. The bill provides for a Presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed mayor as before.

I shall submit to the District Committee, when it considers the bill, an amendment to provide a congressional veto along the lines of similar provisions in earlier home-rule bills.

The sponsors of the bill are myself and Senators BARRETT, BUTLER of Maryland, CARLSON, CHAVEZ, COOPER, DOUGLAS, DUFF, FERGUSON, FLANDERS, GILLETTE, GOLDWATER, HENDRICKSON, HUMPHREY, HUNT, IVES, JACKSON, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KILGORE, LEHMAN, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARRAN, MURRAY, NEELY, PASTORE, PAYNE, POTTER, SMITH of New Jersey, TOBEY, and SALTONSTALL.

The bill (S. 999) to provide an elected city council, school board and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ECONOMY ACT OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Economy Act of 1953. It is designed to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea and nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto.

I was very pleased to notice in a recent column by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Robert S. Allen, that the Eisenhower administration is considering the adoption of a new budget system which in itself will make possible a bookkeeping saving of $3,250,000,000. This new budget system is exactly the proposal that I have been making since the 81st Congress. It calls for a "consolidated cash budget."

The consolidated cash budget is the only way in which the national fiscal picture can be presented to the American people truly and accurately. It shows the actual flow of money between the Government and the people. It would be a true measure of the impact of the budget on our economy in that it would eliminate from the budget payments and receipts from Federal trust funds. I urge that our Government provide the American people with a realistic basis for relating the budget to the economic environment so as to permit intelligent debate on the budget by adopting the consolidated cash budget. I am pleased that this proposal has in the past strongly been supported by the Committee for Economic Development.

A second provision of my bill is designed to separate operating from capital expenditures of the budget. Every business concern makes such a distinction clear in its fiscal operation. The Hoover Commission proposed as one of its central recommendations that these two forms of expenditures be separated in our budget.

Basic to the fiscal operations of our Government must be the ability of Congress intelligently, carefully, and perseveringly to scrutinize the budget requests that come from the executive branch. We have been in the past derelict in our responsibility in meeting that objective. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill, as presented by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], which would create the Joint Committee on the Budget, and which would provide adequate staff to check carefully every budget item so that the Congress can carry out its responsibilities more carefully. In addition to that proposal, however, it is also necessary that Congress schedule its legislative action on appropriations more carefully. This is the third proposal in my bill.

The Economy Act of 1953 provides for the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate to work with the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to establish and then to adhere to a specific schedule for handling appropriation measures. In recent years appropriation measures have rarely been enacted in time for the beginning of the fiscal year. The uncertainties and waste arising from this delay should be avoided.

The fourth essential program in my bill provides for yea-and-nay votes on appropriation measures. There is a great deal of talk about economy, but that talk is not always accompanied by consistent action. The voters in a democracy have a right to know how their representatives have been acting on crucial appropriation measures. The Economy Act of 1953 is an effective way for Members of Congress to be counted on issues affecting economy. It would provide actual yea-and-nay votes on all appropriation measures.

Finally, the bill would establish a Presidential item veto. Such an item veto is essential in an overall program for economy. It can act as an effective barrier against logrolling and legislative riders and thus curtail the needless pork-barrel items from being included in the appropriation bills. An item veto is standard practice in 39 States. Congress itself has approved this plan in the past in authorizing the chief executive of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico to veto individual items in appropriation bills. This proposal is designed to establish that provision within constitutional limitations.

I make a plea for honest legislative consideration of the bill. The present budget practices of the Federal Government are more than 30 years old. They need to be revitalized to bring about efficient economy in Government. Our Government's antiquated budget should be placed on a businesslike basis. We need to streamline our budget machinery and thus provide a constructive and nonpolitical approach to the problem of our economy. We need to provide the facts to the American people, so that they can legislate economy intelligently and constructively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1006) to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriations measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

LICENSES GRANTED BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION FOR POWER PROJECTS IN INTERNATIONAL SECTION OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for power projects in the international section of the St. Lawrence River shall be conditioned so as to assure marketing preferences to public agencies and cooperatives.

The bill is identical with a bill being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR. Our joint purpose in introducing the bill is to insure that the benefits of cheap hydroelectric power produced by harnessing the St. Lawrence River will flow to the ultimate consumers.

The present New York Power Authority has expressed its resistance to any plan making preference sales to rural consumers, municipalities, rural cooperatives, and other groups entitled to preferences under the public-power policy which the New York Power Authority, in past years, did so much to develop. If this cheap power is sold directly to existing private power companies, the ultimate cost to the consumer will certainly not reflect the saving normally derived from public projects.

The bills are necessitated by the growing assumption that the Federal Power Commission may grant a license to the New York Power Authority for the operation of the St. Lawrence power project. There is some doubt that the FPC, under present law, has the legal authority to insert all the necessary safeguards of the public interest. Thus, there would be no assurance that the public would benefit from cheap St. Lawrence power. We propose to grant the FPC all the legal authority it needs, if in fact it needs any, to insist on the necessary safeguards. Our bill would remove all doubt. It would instruct the FPC to insert the safeguards into the license.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1010) to provide that licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for power projects in the international section of the St. Lawrence River shall be conditioned so as to assure marketing preferences to public agencies and cooperatives, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

SUPPLEMENT TO RAILWAY SAFETY APPLIANCE ACTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which is designed to close a gap in the present railway safety appliance law, and I request that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Although I have mentioned the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because I think this is where the bill would automatically go, yet if in the judgment of the Chair it should be referred to some other committee, I accept the judgment.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1023) to supplement the railway safety appliance acts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

As a result of the following cases, *Risberg* v. *Duluth M. & I. Railroad Co.* (233 Minn. 396, 47 N. W. 2d 113; cert. denied, 342 U. S. 832; rehearing denied, 342 U. S. 895); *Hartley* v. *B. & O. Railroad Co.* (194 F. 2d 560 (C. A. 3)); and *Patton* v. *B. & O. Railroad Co.*, and *Duquesne Slag Products Company* (C. A. 3), decided June 23, 1952, if a railroad company delivers a car with a defective brake to a consignee, so that the car is at the moment of an accident on the consignee's private track, the application of the safety appliance laws to the car is automatically terminated.

This means that a brakeman riding a car while still on the line of the railroad company, is covered by the absolute liability imposed by the safety appliance laws. The moment the car crosses onto the property of a consignee to whom it is being delivered, the brakeman is no longer protected, even though his duties on behalf of the railroad necessarily takes him onto the property of the consignee. This ruling is predicated on the words, "in use on its line" in the statute.

Similarly, though the carrier delivering a car with defective brakes might have responsibility to an employee of the consignee, be he a miner or warehouseman or a private industry employee, if he is injured while on the car immediately outside the gates of the consignee's property, once the car passes into the plant property the protection of this statute is lost to that worker. This is true even though the car involved is making a single move of only several hundred feet, part within and part without the property line.

This is unfair, unrealistic and contrary to the intended purpose of the statute. Congress intended to make railroads responsible for the cars they put into use, or submit to customers to load or unload at the beginning or end of the trip. Congress presumed that only railroads know and understand the mechanics of these safety appliances. It was designed to place on them alone the absolute responsibility for their good condition.

The bill would extend the carrier's present liability for defective equipment to injuries which result from such defects incurred upon the property of the consignee.

ENROLLMENT OF VARIOUS INDIAN TRIBES IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs two bills which provide for the enrollment of various Indian tribes in Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the bills, together with my statement, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1024) to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley and the Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to prepare a roll of the members of the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley living on the date of enactment of this act, and a roll of the members of the Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe of Indians living on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury the funds deposited therein pursuant to the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, to the credit of the tribes referred to in the first section of this act as proceeds of judgments in their favor rendered by the Court of Claims in case No. 45231, and to pay to each person whose name appears on the rolls of members of such tribes prepared under the first section of this act his per capita share of such funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of his respective tribe. The money paid to such persons under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such persons.

The bill (S. 1025) to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille Tribe, Too-too-to-ney Tribe, and the Chetco Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to prepare rolls of the members of the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, the Coquille Tribe, the Too-too-to-ney Tribe, and the Chetco Tribe of Indians, living on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury the funds deposited therein pursuant to the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, to the credit of the tribes referred to in the first section of this act as proceeds of judgments in their favor rendered by the Court of Claims, and to pay to each person whose name appears on the rolls of members of such tribes prepared under the first section of this act his per capita share of such funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of his respective tribe. The money paid to such persons under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such persons.

The statement by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I have introduced, for reference to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, two bills which provide for the enrollment of the members of various Indian tribes in Oregon and direct the Secretary of the Interior (1) to withdraw from the Treasury funds deposited pursuant to the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley, Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe, Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille Tribe, Too-too-to-ney Tribe, and of the Chetco Tribe of Indians, as proceeds of favorable judgments rendered by the United States Court of Claims to each such tribe, and (2) to pay to each enrolled member his per capita share of the funds on deposit.

The bill (S. 1024), which provides for the enrollment of members and distribution of the proceeds of judgments awarded the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley, and the Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe of Indians, by the United States Court of Claims, has reference to those judgments entered in the cases *Rogue River Tribe of Indians et al.* v. *United States* (64 Fed. Supp. 339 (1946)), and *Rogue River Tribe of Indians et al.* v. *United States* (89 Fed. Supp. 799 (1950)).

Those cases were brought by the Rogue River, Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia, and Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Indian Tribes, and others, to recover compensation for lands allegedly ceded to the United States under several treaties and for other alleged failures of the United States to meet treaty obligations with such tribes. The Court of Claims rendered judgments in favor of the Confederated Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Tribes and the Mo-lal-la-las or Molel Tribe, but denied recovery to the Rogue River and other Indian tribes. Final judgments were entered April 3, 1950, in amounts subsequently appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 736), and as specifically set forth in House Document No. 218, 82d Congress.

The second bill (S. 1025), providing for the enrollment of members of various tribes and for a per capita distribution of the proceeds of judgments awarded the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille, Too-too-to-ney and

the Chetco Tribes of Indians by the United States Court of Claims, refers to those judgments awarded in the case *Alcea Band of Tillamooks et al. v. United States* (87 Fed. Supp. 938 (1950)). This case was instituted by the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille, Too-too-to-ney, and Chetco Indian Tribes, and others, to recover for the uncompensated taking of their lands by the United States. Judgments were entered in favor of the Tillamooks, Too-too-to-ney, Coquille, and Chetco Indian Tribes for the value of their lands taken in 1855 plus interest on such sums from that date. However, the question as to the propriety of the interest awarded went to the United States Supreme Court on a writ of certiorari, *United States v. Alcea Band of Tillamooks et al.* (341 U. S. 48 (1951)), with the Supreme Court ruling that the Court of Claims was in error in awarding interest. Final judgments were subsequently entered by the United States Court of Claims. Funds for the satisfaction of such judgments were made available by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 736), in amounts as specifically set forth in House Document No. 218, 82d Congress.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing a dual purpose seaway and power project on the St. Lawrence River. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the joint resolution and my reasons for introducing it, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) providing for development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the public interest and for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; creating the St. Lawrence Development Corporation to finance, construct, and operate certain works in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River as a self-liquidating project; authorizing the President to negotiate certain arrangements with the Government of Canada for the protection of the navigation rights of the United States on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River; authorizing the preparation of plans for disposal of St. Lawrence power in the interest of consumers in the State of New York and the New England States; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The bill would create a St. Lawrence Development Corporation to finance, construct, and operate certain works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River as a self-liquidating project. It would authorize the President to negotiate certain arrangements with the Government of Canada for the protection of the navigation rights of the United States on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. It would authorize the negotiation of an agreement with the State of New York for the sale and transfer to that State of the power facilities, but attaching certain safeguards of the interests of the consumers of New York and of surrounding States.

It is a proposal for a dual-purpose project in association and partnership with Canada—for the construction of the seaway and the construction of a power project—the seaway to be operated jointly with Canada and the power project to be turned over to New York State to be operated jointly with the Province of Ontario, with an equal sharing of the power output. The novelty of this proposal is first in its dependence on reciprocal legislation instead of on a formal Canadian-United States agreement, and, secondly, upon the insertion into this resolution of provision for safeguards of the consumer interests—provision which was formerly taken care of by simple reference to an agreement between the New York Power Authority and the United States Army Engineers.

This important feature is contained in section 16, referring to the agreement between the United States and the State of New York which must be reached prior to the transfer of the power facilities. Specifically, it is required that the agreement provide "safeguards for preference consumers and domestic and rural consumers" based upon joint recommendations made by the Corps of Engineers and the New York Power Authority on February 15, 1946.

We have also added a provision whereby the Congress is to be notified in due time if any obstacles are confronted in the negotiation of the agreement between the Federal Government and the State of New York calling for the transfer to New York State of the power facilities.

The joint resolution we are introducing further differs from the one we originally introduced last year by our incorporation of the Aiken proposal of 1952 for the setting up of a Government corporation to build the seaway and the power project, the Corporation to be authorized to finance its operations by issuance of revenue bonds. Thus, the taxpayers are assured that the project will not cost them anything. The whole project is designed to be self-liquidating. And it will be self-liquidating.

The amount of capitalization authorized for the Corporation is based on 1952 estimates made by the Corps of Engineers. These may need to be revised somewhat, but this can be done when the bill is considered in committee, and when expert testimony on this subject is presented.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been too long before us. It should have been authorized years ago. It has been opposed for selfish reasons by the port cities, by the railroad and coal interests. Meanwhile, this great inland waterway resource has continued to be utterly wasted.

Now the question of whether the seaway should be built is academic. It is going to be built. Whether it will be built by us in association with Canada, or by Canada alone, is the only question left for decision.

The power project is going to be built. Whether it will be built with safeguards for the interests of the consumers or without those safeguards is the only question left for decision.

In my judgment, it would be a great fraud on the people of this country to build this power project without the safeguards. It would constitute an alienation of public rights—rights which could not be recovered for 50 years, if then. The private power lobby must not be allowed to gain its victory through the back door.

However, this is not the time to discuss at any great length the pros and cons of this particular bill. We are presenting this bill for the consideration of the committee and also for the advice and guidance of the Federal Power Commission, to indicate the legislative intent of at least some of us.

I am—and I think most of the sponsors of this bill are—cosponsors of the Wiley bill which provides for the construction of the waterway and permits the power to be developed by New York State on grant of license, without regard to safeguards. I think the procedure outlined in this bill—providing for a dual purpose project—is vastly superior in so many ways that those ways do not even need enumeration at this point. It would be better for the project. It would be better for our relations with Canada. It would be better for all the people of this country.

Nevertheless, if the Foreign Relations Committee feels that the Wiley bill provides a more practicable formula, I will support it. I want to see the seaway built. But I also want safeguards applied in the distribution of the power. I shall fight for that.

This proposed joint resolution would, as I said, authorize the development of the St. Lawrence River Basin by means of reciprocal legislation. The United States-British Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 provided that development of the Canadian-United States waterways could be authorized by one of two methods:

(a) By agreement between the two countries, or

(b) By concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of Canada.

On the 19th of March, 1941, an agreement was concluded between the United States and Canada pertaining to utilization of the water of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. This agreement provided for the development of the St. Lawrence, including power and a seaway, substantially as we seek it today. Unfortunately, this agreement was never approved by the United States Congress. The most recent action taken was, of course, the recommittal of Senate Joint Resolution 27 to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in June of 1952 by a vote of 43 to 40.

Subsequently, on November 4, 1952, the Canadian Government notified the United States Government that it no longer considered the 1941 agreement binding and did not intend to submit it to Parliament for approval. Canada informed us that she proposed to build the seaway as an all-Canadian project, but she left the door open for us to join in this project later if we wanted to. Hence for all practical purposes the 1941 agreement is no longer in existence.

We now propose to get the dual-purpose project built by reciprocal legislation. The introduction of this resolution will indicate to our Canadian neighbors that we are still interested in the St. Lawrence project as a dual-purpose project and that we still hope for and desire cooperation and partnership with Canada in this great development along our northern borders.

The joint resolution contains nothing which has not been previously brought to the attention of the Congress.

ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a

joint resolution to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I have today introduced a joint resolution to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission. I propose a Commission of 11 members to be appointed by the President; 5 from the Congress; 3 from the executive branch, and 3 from the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

The Commission would study the advantages of (1) constructing a railroad connecting the continental United States with Alaska, and (2) building a direct, much shorter highway linking Alaska with our western coastal States, and capable of bearing military traffic and equipment.

The Alaska International Highway Commission, of which I had the honor of being Chairman, in 1940 determined the feasibility of such a highway, but its recommendation as to routes was ignored by the executive branch of the Government.

A gravel road, following a much longer route and running east of the Rocky Mountains, was built instead. Its military value, in my opinion, is open to question, but it remains today the only overland route to the strategic Territory of Alaska.

The unrestricted gross weight for vehicles using it is limited to 15 tons, according to the latest information supplied to me, and regulations also exclude some types of vehicles from using the road, primarily for safety reasons.

A maximum gross of 21.5 tons is permitted for special multiaxle or trailer-type vehicles, and the maximum axle load is 12 tons.

Many of our modern tanks weigh approximately 47 tons and some tanks weigh much more. The combined weight of these tanks and the tractor-type vehicles used to transport them is 70 tons upward.

I would be among the last to discount the fact that the present Alcan Highway would be of some value in a military sense if we were to be compelled to quickly strengthen our forces in Alaska.

But its value to defense and security, I consider, would be much less than the citizens of Alaska or the United States have a right to expect.

To supply 3 ground force divisions over a 3-month period, I am informed, would require the means of transporting 300,000 tons—450,000 tons if equipment and replacement equipment for troops were included.

Some 50 ships of the Liberty or Victory type would be required to transport these supplies and equipment; many more if many items of organizational equipment, such as tanks, half tracks, and heavy field guns were to be moved.

Alaska simply does not have the ports, berths and dock facilities that would be required for such a fleet of merchant vessels in an emergency or the event of hostilities.

Army engineers in 1942 determined the feasibility of a railroad connecting the Pacific Northwest with Alaska, after extensive surveys and engineering studies.

As did the Alaska International Highway Commission preceding it, they favored for construction and logistic purposes a route utilizing the Rocky Mountain trench lying between the coastal range and the Rocky Mountains. This route has relatively easy grades, and terrain far surpassing that of the easterly Alcan highway, with its washes and muskeg.

One deterring factor to railroad construction in 1942 apparently was the absence of proven deposits of good steaming coal readily accessible along the proposed western route.

Since that time diesel-electric locomotives have widely replaced steam locomotives, and oil now is being produced in nearby areas of Canada which would permit diesel-electric operation over a railroad connecting our coastal States with Alaska.

Other changes have occurred in the decade that has elapsed since the Highway Commission and Army engineers reports.

A menace to the security of Alaska, the United States and the free world has arisen far greater in its potential than the menace of Japanese militarism.

Alaska's proximity to this menace increases the possibility that in the event of conflict she would be an initial target of attack, followed by attempted invasion and occupation.

Yet her lifelines for movement of men and goods in any considerable number or quantity are (1) the historic sea route with inadequate docking and transportation facilities at the northern termini, and (2) one narrow, long isolated road.

The Korean conflict has again demonstrated, in my opinion, the advantage to any armed force of land routes for the transport of equipment and supplies.

Such routes, both rail and highway, have been carrying equipment and supplies to the enemy from Manchuria, from other areas of Red China, and from Soviet Russia. The logistic support of the Red forces in North Korea has been sustained and extensive.

In contrast, American and U. N. fighting forces in Korea have been compelled, as they were in the Pacific campaigns of World War II, to rely exclusively on sea or air transport.

This disadvantage to us has been unescapable in meeting our commitments across the seas. It would be foolish and possibly tragic if we were to permit such disadvantage to exist in the defense of our own soil on our own continent.

Until a railroad or adequate direct highway to Alaska is built, or preferably both, we are taking, in my opinion, wholly unnecessary security risks.

Even in the absence of risk, such a rail line and such a highway should be constructed to open up new treasures of mineral wealth, enhance the mutual economy of continental United States and Alaska, develop new industries, and bring new opportunities to Alaska citizens.

The Wenatchee Daily World, one of the most influential and successful newspapers in the United States published in a city of its size, commented editorially a few days ago on this very point. It said, in part:

"Nothing discourages permanent settlement of Alaska so much as its lack of highways connecting with the outside world. True, progress has been made in that direction; but the one route for a fine, fast highway to Alaska is not being utilized, the Prince George-Whitehorse shortcut up the west coast."

"When the road is built," the newspaper continued, "Alaska will receive a flood of American traffic which will break down the psychological and natural barriers to immediate and rapid settlement of thousands of people who do not now choose to reside there because of the feeling that they are isolated."

The Wenatchee Daily World coupled the appeal for a direct highway to Alaska with one for the admission of Alaska to our family of States. The editorial stated:

"If it's population growth they [our national legislators] want in Alaska, two developments should be encouraged—(1) admission to statehood and (2) construction of a west-coast connection to the Alaska Highway which would greatly shorten the distance and stimulate a tremendous increase in travel. * * *

"Statehood for Alaska would help bring the highway, and the highway and statehood combined would accelerate both development and settlement."

Before our Government and that of Canada will act, however, I feel that both will wish concrete and specific information bearing on the present and prospective economic advantages of such a railroad or highway, plus new cost estimates of construction and operation.

That is the purpose of my resolution—to set up a commission that will provide us with such information.

Many changes have taken place in the 13 years since the Alaska International Highway Commission made its report, or the 11 years since the Army engineers made their survey.

New dangers have arisen to the free world, new concepts have developed of our needs for strategic minerals and materials, new requirements for our sustained economy have arisen, and new energies and uses of energy have been discovered.

The commission that I propose today can make a tremendous contribution to the welfare and defense not only of Alaska but of the United States. I hope its creation by the Congress will be speedy.

STATUE OF THE LATE DR. MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman; and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on May 22, 1953; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That the statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

INVESTIGATION OF PLIGHT OF PALESTINIAN ARAB REFUGEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for an investigation of the plight of Palestinian Arab refugees, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a brief statement in connection with the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 81), submitted by Mr. LANGER was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have historically maintained firm bonds of friendship with the people of the Arab world in our common objectives of freedom, peace, and world order; and

Whereas the people of the United States are genuinely interested in the political, social, and economic advancement of the

people of the Arab world in the furtherance of our common objectives; and

Whereas the people of the United States are compassionately concerned over the plight of nearly 1 million Palestinian Arab refugees who have been displaced from their homes by military operations; and

Whereas the concern of the people of the United States over the Palestinian Arab refugees has been evidenced by the substantial contributions made by the Government of the United States and by voluntary contributions by the people of the United States toward the relief of the Palestinian Arab refugees; and

Whereas the masters of the Kremlin have not only failed and refused to assist the Palestinian Arab refugees, but are plotting to create chaos throughout the entire Middle East; and

Whereas this diabolical plot, buttressed by false propaganda and intrigue, is designed to disrupt the amicable relations between the American people and the people of the Arab world and to advance the aims of the world Communist conspiracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an immediate, thorough, and complete study, survey, and investigation of—

(1) the plight of the Palestinian Arab refugees and the measures which have been taken to assist them;

(2) the efforts of the Communists to exploit the plight of the Palestinian Arab refugees in order to advance the aims of the world Communist conspiracy; and

(3) methods and plans for improving and making more effective governmental and intergovernmental programs of assistance to the Palestinian Arab refugees.

The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of its study, survey, and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate to the accomplishment of the purposes of this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings in or outside of the continental United States; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the 83d Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to request such information from any department or agency of the Government; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the hearings of the committee shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on January 31, 1954.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, international communism feeds on human suffering and human suffering knows no political boundaries.

These truths are evident in the situation in the Middle East where there are today some 1 million Palestinian Arab refugees who have been displaced from their homes by military operations. It is not my province to assign reasons for the dire plight of these million human souls. Proof of the concern of our Nation over this deplorable situation lies deeper than the millions of dollars which we have thus far contributed for the relief of the Palestinian Arab refugees, because with the contributions have gone our compassion and our sympathy as well as our hope for our friends of the Middle East.

Mr. President, human suffering has always found a warm response in the hearts and minds of the American people. In this particular instance, our instinctive humanitarian impulses to help suffering humanity are fortified by the strategic and economic importance of the Middle East which is even at this moment being bombarded by the poisonous propaganda of world communism.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, an address given by Edwin N. Locke, Jr., former regional Ambassador in the Near East, an address given by Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., President of the American University of Beirut, and an address given by Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon, all of which were delivered at a banquet of the American Friends of the Middle East, held in New York City in January 1953.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDWIN A. LOCKE, JR., FORMER REGIONAL AMBASSADOR IN THE NEAR EAST

It is not entirely unknown that my views as to what the United States should be doing in the Near East do not coincide with those of the Department responsible for the conduct of our foreign relations. Thus I gladly avail myself of this opportunity—I am not at all reluctant about it—to present publicly to you, and through you, I hope, to many others similarly interested and anxious, my own appraisal of the situation and the remedies so urgently required.

Differences of opinion can be a sign of good health and vitality, but when a certain course is persisted in, year after year, in the face of calamity after calamity and despite increasingly clear signals of disaster ahead, is this not evidence enough that something is badly wrong and that prompt changes should be made? At such a point, is it not sound and prudent to stop and take a fresh look, to consider a new policy, a new approach?

Now before we consider this question, and for those who may be expecting that I am about to direct critical remarks at Israel, let me state at once that I have no such intention. The United States has helped significantly in the creation of that new nation and in its subsequent support. There is every reason to believe that such a well-established friendship will and should continue. The present situation in the Near East, however, as I shall endeavor to point out, threatens the future of all freedom-loving states, Israel included. We are all in this together, whether we like it or not, and before today's common and terrible danger we must all do our utmost to meet just grievances and eliminate old enmities and fears. It is not a question of who is pro-Israeli or pro-Arab, but rather of what is best for America and the common cause.

So I trust that the distinguished journals of this city, which are possibly inclined to treat the Arab-Israeli quarrel with a little uncertainty, will feel confident that in giving this evening's proceedings full coverage they will not be engaging in any act of partisanship but performing instead, as they have so often in the past, a service of enlightening the American people.

I see no reason to be reticent about the Near East. We no longer have the time or the margin of safety for that. We must present the facts as we see them. President Eisenhower, in his splendid inaugural address, stated that one of the virtues most cherished by free peoples was the love of truth. I cannot do less than emulate the highest authority in the land.

I shall start, therefore, by saying a truthful but most unwelcome thing. I shall start by saying that we are rapidly losing the cold war in the Near East. We are losing it in the very heart of the area—the Arab states. And if we do much more losing there, we shall suddenly find ourselves engaged in a full-scale shooting war. This is not a matter of opinion. It is a plain and simple and all-too-disturbing fact.

Let us look at the principal trouble spots.

First, and before all, relations between Israel and her Arab neighbors are about as bad as they can be short of war. Only armistice lines serve as boundaries—armistice lines where the fighting was stopped 4 years ago in response to the pressure of world opinion and the exertions of many dauntless, peace-loving men in the service of the United Nations. Even the city of Jerusalem, so revered by Christian, Jew, and Moslem, is divided into two parts by a 50-foot strip of no-man's land. Most of the old city with such shrines as the Holy Sepulchre is on the Arab side. Most of the new city is held by the Israelis. But there are frequent violations of the armistice lines in both directions. Shootings are not uncommon and death is not a rarity. There is no trade across the lines, for the Arabs maintain a complete blockade.

The Arab refugees who fled from Palestine at the time of the fighting are insisting more vehemently than ever on the right to go back to their homes and farms and shops. And for those who may not choose to return they claim fair compensation for losses suffered and possessions left behind. Yet Israel has neither the space nor the resources with which to meet these demands, so the bitterness and tension on both sides grows and deepens.

Jew fears Arab, and Arab fears Jew. Neither side has any confidence in the other, and each asks constantly for arms.

Is that winning the cold war in the Near East?

Trouble spot No. 2 is the Arab refugee population and the United Nations agency established to help them.

There are one million of these refugees. They are now in their fifth year of homelessness. Such meager resources as they may have had in the beginning are now gone and most of them are completely destitute. Today there are no less than 870,000 receiving rations, and this figure is growing steadily. Two years ago there were 830,000 refugees on the ration rolls, a year ago 851,000 and by 1954 it is not unlikely that a total of 900,000 will be dependent on this type of charity for sheer survival.

Some months ago, after personal visits to a large number of refugees in camps and elsewhere, I said in a statement to the press that I considered their situation more serious than it had ever been before. I added: "Their morale, that precious spirit of courage and confidence which enables mankind to endure so much is failing. The refugees are inclining toward despair and extreme solutions." Today I would repeat that statement, and with increased emphasis.

The organization which was created by the U. N. to care for these unfortunate people has the formal title of United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. It is more usually known by its initials UNRWA. This organization is comfortably financed, receiving 70 percent of its funds from the United States, but the waste and inefficiency with which it carries on its work is shocking. UNRWA could well be the subject of a searching inquiry by an appropriate congressional committee.

Take a look at one example of this waste. UNRWA's relief budget for the present fiscal year, as officially approved this fall by the United Nations General Assembly, includes $16 million of supplies, primarily food, for

the refugees. This is equivalent to approximately 5 cents per day per refugee. But how much do you think it costs to distribute this food to the refugees and provide them with a very limited number of doctors and teachers? UNRWA spends on personnel alone more than $5 million. In other words, it cost nearly $1 just in salaries to distribute every $3 of supplies to the refugees. This surely is exorbitant, even after allowing for those employees assigned to nonrelief activities.

These two facts, then, stand out: the problem of the Arab refugees is growing more dangerous each day, and UNRWA, the organization established to assist them, is wasteful and inefficient.

Is that, too, a battle won in the cold war?

I come now to the third broad problem. General conditions of life for the great mass of people throughout the Near East are at a low level. Incomes often do not provide even the bare necessities for survival. Disease is common, education uncommon.

In Greece, and especially Turkey, the United States has played a decisive role in getting something done about it. Through aid programs, strictly limited as to both amount and duration, but directed at key spots, we have met with encouraging results and reactions. Both countries are now well on their way to playing a sound, strong, and self-supporting part in the free world. A similar program in Israel is of more recent origin but it too is showing signs of real progress.

Yet these tried and true methods have been rejected time after time by our Government in connection with the needs of the Arab States, which as far as sheer strategy is concerned occupy a position of unique and vital importance. Here we have the extraordinary and embarrassing spectacle of a Department of the United States Government which, on the basis of the most fervent justifications of need before congressional committees last spring, was granted $103 million for aid to the Arab States and now finds its program to have been so ill-conceived and its execution so weak and ill-managed that two-thirds of this amount will be unused by the end of the fiscal year on June 30 and that the other third which is being used is bringing us mostly dislike and distrust.

I can assure you from my own not inconsiderable experience in the area that American aid is urgently needed there in our own self-interest. I can assure you, too, that the right type of aid, properly controlled, is very much wanted and that with the help of a few good men a sound program can be quickly organized and bring with it results of value and significance to all concerned. But this is a job for the first team, not for the scrubs.

As these months of fumbling and inaction go by, and as the people of the Arab States learn more of their apparently hopeless lot in life and of what better conditions are coming to pass in other parts of the world, a burning sense of resentment and revolt possesses them. Like the refugees they incline toward extreme solutions.

Is this something we can ignore as of no great importance in the cold war?

There is a fourth source of trouble. It is the deep suspicion and hostility with which the Arabs look upon the British and the French. Most Arab countries have only recently achieved their independence, and in most cases they achieved it from either France or England. They are supersensitive regarding even the most inconsequential aspects of their national sovereignty. It should not be so surprising then, when we see the Arabs take such an absolute and uncompromising position against the continuance of British troops in the Suez Canal Zone. There are also British troops and British airfields in Iraq and Jordan, about which we hear less but which are nonetheless strongly resented and opposed. The French position in north Africa with its large Arab population is similar and is followed with equal interest, sympathy, and support by Arabs everywhere.

In the cases cited the British and the French are quite within the law as expressed in specific treaties and other such documents. And it is not unlikely that at the moment more stable conditions exist in those areas because of the presence and influence of foreign forces. Certainly there are vital strategic interests involved which cannot be disregarded, and which are of even more profound concern to our two most powerful allies in Europe than they are to us.

But have we been wise, have we met the test of leadership by largely standing away from these unpleasant matters until they had grown to emergency proportions, and then applying our influence only uncertainly and ineptly?

One of the attributes of statesmanship is the ability to discern a cloud on the horizon when it is no bigger than a man's hand and to do all that can be done to avert, eliminate, or minimize the approaching storm. In these times when the currents of nationalism and the revolt against low living standards are running so swift and deep in Asia and Africa, America with all her traditions of freedom and liberty, and all her enduring need for strong and sincere friends round the world, can never swim against such a tide of popular aspiration. She should instead exert herself to swim with it and to guide it into channels that are good and clear and free.

We have had to witness, however, the complete and unceremonious expulsion of Britain from Iran, riots and revolution in Egypt with violent antiforeign manifestations, similar disturbances in Iraq and Jordan, and revolt in French North Africa.

Has this strengthened the moral and material position of the West? Is this competent handling of the cold war by the greatest nation in the free world?

I come now to my fifth and final cause of trouble in the Near East. The Communists are as discreet and clever there as we are clumsy and dull witted.

The 1 million Arab refugees from Palestine get top attention. In 1 camp I visited recently near the ancient Roman city of Ba'albek, pictures of Stalin adorned many of the dismal rooms of the overcrowded army barracks in which 3,000 are now housed where less than 1,000 soldiers once lived.

Signs on the walls screamed, "Long live our father, Stalin."

I visited another camp in the Jordan Valley. The camp leader, at my request, brought about 2 dozen of the most important people into a tiny room to discuss frankly with me their problems, needs, and ultimate hopes.

They shook my hand and touched their heart. Then they spoke.

An intelligent, blue-eyed refugee arose first. His Arabic was pure.

"I thank God," he said, "that the United States and Great Britain have scattered us widely throughout this area. When world war III comes, we can show you how we can hurt your interests everywhere in the Arab States and help your enemies."

Then he coldly informed me that although he spoke English perfectly—had learned it at a British school—he would never speak the language again until the Americans had done something for the refugees and for the entire Arab world.

Another man, cultured and erect, said frankly, looking squarely into my eyes:

"We want the friendship of the Western Powers. If you help us, when world war III starts, we will help you. If you do not help us now, we will fight against you." I know he meant every word.

Among the nonrefugee population the Communists have also worked with great effect. This was brought forcefully home to me just a few weeks ago during my farewell call on the premier of one of the Arab States. He told me that until recently he had had only a few Communists or Communist sympathizers in his country. These he could take care of, he said, by putting them in prison or in concentration camps. "Now," he stated, "we have tens of thousands of them, and I can't put my whole country in a concentration camp."

Remember, too, that at the United Nations Assembly last December the Communist bloc suddenly changed its previous stand and sided with the Arab nations on the various Palestine issues. In appreciation the Syrian Foreign Office called in each member of that bloc and officially thanked them for their help. In Jordan, the Parliament drew up a resolution expressing gratitude to the Russian group, and it was passed by unanimous vote.

And now a new element has been added. The masters of the Kremlin have embarked upon a campaign to persecute and virtually exterminate from Soviet life those of the Jewish faith so unfortunate as to find themselves behind the iron curtain. The principal motivation for this new and odious policy is probably internal, but for the Soviet agents in the Near East it will be still another weapon with which to strengthen their own position with the Arabs and weaken that of the West.

By these and every other means the Communists hope to eliminate such power and influence as we may still have in these lands, deprive us of the fabulous oil resources of the Persian Gulf and the immense advantages of the air, land, and sea routes that pass through the Arab States, and finally encompass all within the Soviet orbit, thus changing, probably decisively, the whole balance of power between the free world and the unfree.

Does any of that show we are winning the cold war in the Near East? Should not these latest Soviet actions spur us to immediate counteractions?

The five problems I have outlined are no simple ones. Still I believe they can be solved, not in days, to be sure, yet certainly in the coming months and years. Indeed, we have no alternative, for, should the Near East recede into the darkness, who can tell what price would be required in lives and treasures to get it back, as get it back we would have to, if the world is ever to remain free and to reach that sunny upland of security, prosperity, and peace.

Three things are needed and needed at once; hope, talent, and an idea.

It is the Arab peoples who need the hope. They have believed uniquely in the United States, in its ideals and principles, for a hundred years or more. They still retain a residue of confidence in us, but under the torrent of our mistakes in the Near East since World War II this confidence is fast being eroded away. In a final effort of faith they are looking to the new administration in Washington to demonstrate that the old virtues still run strong in America.

On the first occasion, therefore, in the next few weeks, I urge that President Eisenhower, no one less, express publicly in short and simple terms our love and admiration for the Arab peoples, our understanding of their problems, and our keen interest in doing all that is reasonably within our power to bring about just and enduring solutions. The President's voice would come at the 11th hour, but psychologically it would work wonders. Such a lift in morale is essential, if the Arabs are to hold the line while a new effort is being organized.

I have said that the hope is needed by the Arabs. The talent is needed by the United States. We have been sending to the Arab nations in recent years—and there are some notable exceptions—third and fourth rate men. Is it a wonder that the results are as poor as they have been? We have concentrated our talent largely in Europe, with rather good effect to be sure, but meanwhile the Near East has nearly slipped away from

us. Extensive changes in personnel must be made both in Washington and in the field. Provide the talent and the job can be done. In times of stormy weather such as these I think of the famous lines of J. G. Holland entitled "Wanted":

"God give us men. The time demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And dam his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

I have spoken of hope and of talent. Here, then, is the idea I offer. Since the economic side of life is of high importance to a sound and happy future in the Near East, I propose that the United States sponsor the formation of an Arab Reconstruction Union, whose purpose would be the vigorous and coordinated economic development of the Arab States with special emphasis on the regional aspects. Lebanon has a population of only 1¼ million, Jordan the same even after including the refugees, Syria 4 million, Iraq and Saudi Arabia about 5 million each. To make the most of their great opportunities these countries require the closest contact and collaboration with each other. They cannot go it alone.

This Arab Reconstruction Union would plan the economic development of the whole area. It would arrange for the execution of such key projects as harbors, through roads and railways, and the harnessing of rivers, including those whose benefits might be shared with the refugees. It should be empowered to borrow money, locally and internationally, and to grant loans for sound and productive purposes. If possible, it should also be in a position to loan against the pledge of Arab owned property in Israel pending the working out of compensation arrangements.

This union should be primarily an Arab organization. The United States, and if possible other nations, could help initially in its creation, organization and financing, but only until the early day when we could confidently say "Sail on, O Union, strong and great," sail on, alone.

Surely this is a time when new hands must set a new course, when skill and courage will be needed to steer us through the dark waters to the brighter days beyond. Surely this is a time for a supreme effort, a time to show ourselves worthy of our high position, for at the end of the long voyage lies peace for the free world and the blessings of a brighter life for tens of millions of men.

TEXT OF SPEECH MADE BY DR. STEPHEN B. L. PENROSE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

I have been asked to speak on the subject America's Stake in the Middle East. The term is one which is familiar to most Americans and it frequently refers to the amount of money which has actually been invested in a given activity. This is one possible interpretation of the meaning of America's stake in the Middle East—the funds which have been invested by private concerns, missionary activities, educational institutions, and governmental agencies. A more important interpretation of the term is, "What America could lose if she were to be shut out of the Middle East through the development of enmity on the part of the people living in that part of the world." These two interpretations are not in the least degree the same, for a friendly Middle East is far more valuable to the United States of America than are our investments there. It is, therefore, the latter interpretation of the meaning of our stake which I intend to discuss tonight, and I hope that my emphasis on this aspect of our interest may tend to counteract the too frequent emphasis which is made on the dollar value of our relationships. Only too frequently are the people of the United States misled intentionally or unintentionally into attaching dollar signs to their activities thus producing in the minds of the people with whom they deal an assurance that it is the pocketbook and not the heart that is involved.

May I emphasize that what I have to say I am saying because it is of importance to all American citizens regardless of what may be their national background or religious beliefs. The stake of the U. S. A. anywhere is a matter now of urgent concern to all our citizenry. If I appear to speak with a frankness which to some may seem inimical to certain minority beliefs and ambitions, please remember that I am concerned only with the welfare of the United States in which I feel certain the vast majority of our citizens are truly concerned.

But the matter in its simplest terms—America's stake in the Middle East—is fundamentally the possibility of losing world war III before a shot has been fired. I would emphasize that I say lose, not winning, for the latter involves many additional factors which go far beyond the middle eastern area. But it is possible within the Middle East itself for the United States to incur such overpowering handicaps that she would be unable successfully to support her cause in case a third world war should come to pass.

It is impossible even to attempt a calculation of the money value of such loss. It would be an interesting experiment in mathematics to attempt such a calculation but one need only consider our hopes for the future of the entire world to realize how important this stake is to us.

The closure of the Middle East to friendly relations with the United States would inevitably mean the complete loss or at least the strict curtailment of freedom throughout the world. So far as Europe is concerned it would inevitably mean a destruction of the principles of national freedom and of self-government. This destruction would come about either through a domination of the totalitarian ideal in Europe due to the disruption of European economy or else to the establishment of an almost complete dependence upon American economy. The latter cannot possibly support the burden unless it assumes general political and economic control in the European area.

If this second alternative of dependence upon American economy were to come to pass it would inevitably mean a loss of free enterprise in the United States. The effort of supporting both our own and the European economy would necessitate rigid governmental control of the means of production and of our economic resources and this in turn would bring about a strict governmental control of economic, social, and even personal life. The establishing of a government which occupied such central importance in the life of the United States would itself mean a victory of the totalitarian system, thus in the case of either alternative the principles of government to which we are devoted would inevitably undergo destruction and disillusionment.

But, you will ask, how is it possible for such a black picture to develop? How could it come about that the Middle East might be closed to any further friendly relationships with us? What larger factors would be influential in producing this most unfortunate result?

It could come about simply through the loss of faith by the Arab States in the principles of democratic government as exemplified by us. You have heard from previous speakers at this conference that there has been within the past few years a tendency for the people of the Arab world to lose that faith. This is the more astonishing because as recently as the end of the First World War they were so profoundly impressed by our idealism that the Arabs would unanimously have chosen the United States of America as the mandatory power for the area had we not, in the words of Colonel Shishakley "chosen to wrap the curtains of our tent about us and retire into isolationism." The newly independent states which comprise the Middle Eastern area have in their governmental organizations sought to emulate these democratic principles. But we have succeeded, particularly since 1947, in raising doubts in the minds of all the Arab peoples concerning the reality of our devotion to our own expressed principles. They have begun to wonder whether they were not in a false front behind which we hope to operate in accordance with practices of other governments with which they are only too familiar.

We have shown only too plainly a tendency to forget the basic principles of the equality before God of men and nations which was the basis of our own democratic development. But, even more emphatically, we have demonstrated a shocking ability to forget our own revolutionary heritage, our own original devotion to the principles of freedom from oppression in spite of the possibilities of economic and political disaster. We of all nations on earth should be sympathetic to the aspirations of new nations which for centuries have lain under foreign domination to achieve at long last the independence and self-management of which we are ourselves so proud. Our lack of that sympathy has done more than anything else to disillusion the countries which had previously held us in such high regard.

Our failures in these respects have been the more dangerous because they have immediately been capitalized upon by the Soviet Union to supplant us in the minds of the Arab peoples as the champion of freedom and independence. The Communists are only too happy to charge us, rightly or wrongly, with imperialist tendencies and to establish themselves as the rightful friends of freedom and democratic expression in the Middle East. It is our errors which have contributed to their success. We who live in the Middle East know what success the Communists have attained in masking the road to slavery with the mirage of freedom.

It is also tremendously important to us that the attitude of people in the Arab world profoundly impresses the entire Moslem world, containing a total population of 300 million. Arab opposition to us would affect their views even though they might not solely control them. This is a basic aspect of our stake in the Middle East which must never be overlooked.

In view of what I have said it is apparent that our largest stake in the Middle East is the friendship, sympathy, and cooperation of people. In other words, our stake is ideal, not material. I cannot emphasize this too strongly. If we break these bonds of sympathy, we must, without question, lose everything else in the bargain.

I have spoken heretofore of what we have to lose. Instead of reference to losses, what have we to gain in the Middle East? First, we have the opportunity of gaining the devotion of a population twice that of the United States to principles of free ideal democracy. If we should succeed in this effort, we would at once provide a tremendous counterbalance to the crushing loss which we have suffered in China. We would provide a safeguard to India, which would still remain geographically accessible, one which would inevitably be strengthened in its sympathy for our aspirations. We would discover in this triumph a ripening of the fruit

of a century of devoted service by missionaries and educators through that part of the world who have in large part been responsible for the respect in which we are held.

In the second place, there would remain available to us the vast natural resources of the area, actual or potential, which could be used to strengthen the economies both of the indigenous states and of Europe as well. Thus strengthened, they would be a mighty deterrent to Soviet military conquest. Even more important would be their influence as a handicap to Soviet ideological conquest. It is worth note that Russia could not herself exploit these resources for the benefit of anyone but herself and that benefit would be derived largely from the denial of these advantages to us. In other words, Russia's major interest in the Middle East is on account of the harm which she could do to us by shutting us from it rather than from the gains from which she herself might make in terms of economic achievement.

In the third place, a friendly Middle East could provide a colossal defense area against Soviet military aggression. I would like to make it clear that I am referring to this area as a base of cooperative effort by the indigenous states for their own self-defense rather than as a place from which we could exercise military force. The Arab States are anxious to defend themselves against aggression of any kind and they could produce effective results to begin with by themselves and use our help available if necessary.

The importance of the Middle East as a defense area together with the economic contribution which I have mentioned could provide a permanent brake on the use of military force for purposes of conquest. It would thus be a larger contribution to the development of a permanent and lasting peace in the world.

Looked at either negatively or positively, our stake in the Middle East is of incalculable magnitude. Its value is so great as to justify an all-out effort on the part of the United States Government and of the private citizens of the United States.

In spite of our current self-imposed handicaps I feel sure that we can maintain and preserve our stake in the Middle East if we can approach the problems there with wise, courageous, and sympathetic aims.

SPEECH BY DR. CHARLES MALIK, MINISTER OF LEBANON IN THE UNITED STATES

People talk about the mystery of the East. Wherever this mystery exists, it certainly does not exist in the Near East. I assure you there is no special mystery about our part of the world. Our problems are by now fairly obvious. Whether it is Iran or Egypt or North Africa or Israel and the Arab States, or the relations of all these countries among themselves, or their relations to Turkey, or to the powers west or north or east of them, whether it is the fantastic deposits of oil throughout our region, or the extraordinary strategic importance of our location—who today does not have a fairly respectable grasp of these issues? I doubt whether any new investigation into the general conditions of the Near East can be instituted now which will uncover any startlingly significant facts hitherto unknown or inaccessible to the serious student. Our economic and social conditions, our political complications, the difficulties as well as the possibilities arising among the diverse components of our region, the spiritual and intellectual climate in which we live, and the apprehensions and yearnings which overtake us with respect to the outside world, in brief, our total existence is by now an open book to whoever cares to cast his glance seriously and fairly at us. We have not lain in vain for millenia on the open highways of the world.

I hold, then, that the difficulty of the West in general, and of the United States in particular, with respect to the Near East does not belong—at least in the case of those who determine western policy—to the order of the understanding, but to the order of the will. The Near East is thoroughly understood, or at least its salient features, so far as concerns any presuppositions for action, are adequately grasped. The difficulty is that there is a kind of paralysis of the will whereby matters are allowed to drift, month after month and year after year. But I believe the moment has come when the deliberation of indecision must soon issue in decisive action.

I do not, therefore, propose in the few minutes at my disposal to try to add to the fund of wisdom of a distinguished and enlightened audience like this concerning the Near East. I shall assume complete knowledge of the situation, confining my remarks only to such possibilities of policy and action as are likely to dispel, or at least to soften, whatever negativity of feeling might rankle today in certain parts of the Near East. The only significant news about the Near East today is not news of analysis and general information, but news of action or of real possibilities of action. I shall therefore set forth a series of propositions of a practical nature which I believe the present situation both demands and allows.

1. I regard the existence of the American Friends of the Middle East as a good bit of news about the Near East. For a long time the Arab world at least has complained, and rightly in my opinion, that, so far as the American public is concerned, the truth about it is distorted, or at best suppressed. The American Friends of the Middle East seem to dedicate themselves to the honest mediation of the truth, and not only with respect to the Arabs but with respect to all the peoples of the Middle East. This then is good news to us Arabs. For we believe that all that is needed to help promote a just American policy in regard to any situation, a policy that will incidentally also be in the highest interest of the United States itself, is for the American people, with their deep-seated tradition of fairness and justice, to know the real facts about that situation. The Arabs ask neither for propaganda, nor for favors, nor for any artificial whipping up of general American sympathy: the Arabs only ask that the broad masses of the American people, who I know absolutely mean well and would consciously wrong nobody, know the truth about them—about their state of mind, about their rights and grievances, about the problems besetting their existence, about their possibilities, and about their common aspirations. This task of being true to the truth and thereby of promoting mutual understanding, the American Friends of the Middle East seem to be eminently qualified to shoulder. And therefore my first proposition is this: Support, develop, and deepen the activity of the American Friends of the Middle East.

2. There are other agencies of good will whose quiet action constitutes another bit of good news about the Near East and its relations to the West. At least half a dozen centers of Near Eastern studies have recently arisen in the United States, of which perhaps the most celebrated is that at Princeton. There are some quarter of a million or more Americans who trace their origin to Lebanon and Syria and to other parts of the Near East; Americans of whom both America and the lands of their origin can be proud, and who have bestirred themselves, through their many organizations, to an active interest in our destiny and development. Conspicuous in the skyline of Washington today is a new beautiful structure, the minaret of the Islamic Center; when completed and organized, this center ought to mediate in the New World some of the wonderful riches of art, thought, and spirit of the great Islamic heritage. There is also the far-reaching activity of American free enterprise in the Near East, an activity that, partly on account of the requirements of its own interests, partly owing to the enlightened goodness of some of its leaders even apart from their interests, has built, and doubtless will continue to build, real bridges of good will and cooperation between America and the Near East. Who can measure the contribution to the Near East and to America of the great host of American missionaries who, throughout the length and breadth of our region, have for more than 100 years, unselfishly and in all humility and at times at a tremendous sacrifice, healed the sick, educated the ignorant, and tried as best they can to pass on a glimpse of the flame of love that was consuming them? And last but not least, there is the American University of Beirut, and its many other sister institutions of higher learning, which have done so much to help awaken the mind of the Near East to its condition and to its possibilities. And so my second proposition is this: Let these voluntary agencies, which constitute good news, deepen and develop their activity, for their future is big with opportunities for service and interpretation.

3. The Arabs must themselves assume responsibility for promoting firm and friendly relations with the American people. The diplomatic missions in Washington are doing what they can toward that end. But because the interest of the American public in the Near East is simply staggering and, therefore, the corresponding need for adequate interpretation is so great, and because the diplomats in Washington have their own official duties near the Federal Government, it appears that there is need for something above mere governmental representation; something that deals not with propaganda—a term that I hate—but with placing at the disposal of the American people, in simplicity and detachment, whatever they desire to know about the Arab peoples. It is a good bit of news that the Arab League is now seriously contemplating the setting up of precisely such an office. And therefore my third proposition is this: May this live project soon become a living institution, manned not by the best available people, but by the best people, both American and Arab, sought out and made available.

4. The peoples of the Near East, under the mighty impact of a variety of factors, are really awakening. They are demanding three things: That their governments be more and more responsive to them, that there be real administrative, social, and economic reforms, and that they be left to develop their own genius without outside interference. All of this is good news. The one novel thing in the Near East today is that it is no longer possible to treat with governments over the heads of their peoples, that there is developing a public opinion that is increasingly making itself felt, and that perhaps never before have the ordinary men and women counted so much in the scales of things. The future will depend on the emergence of a quality of leadership within and a depth of understanding without which will canalize the popular awakening into constructive channels. My fourth proposition, therefore, is this: If this fresh impulse of hope is not to turn into embittered darkness, if it is not to blame every problem and every disappointment upon the West, the West must, in all wisdom, try to understand it, and to encourage the forces of light and freedom and constructive action wherever they are found.

5. Two instances illustrate what I mean by good news, news of action: The situation in Lebanon and the situation in Egypt. One can also refer to other instances of real hope in the Near East, but I shall be satisfied with these two. Consider first the recent events in Lebanon—my own country. Our new President, Mr. Camille Chamoun, whom many of you know well, is an excellent leader, full of enthusiasm for his own people, and convinced of the possibility and necessity of transforming Lebanon into a model little state. The change in administration in Lebanon which took place without any vio-

lent upheaval and which brought to the fore such men of vision whom the people fully trust, is a bit of real good news about the Near East. My fifth proposition therefore is this: Let every man of good will support the movement of reform in Lebanon under Mr. Chamoun, to the end that Lebanon realize to the full its potentialities of being a genuine living center of freedom of thought and conscience.

6. My second instance of good news is Egypt. The emergence of General Naguib is one of the most significant events in the recent history of the Near East. There is more hope today, not only about Egypt, but about the whole Near Eastern picture, as a result of this event than there has been for decades. A real beginning in fundamental economic, social and political reform is made by General Naguib and his associates. Cleanness and efficiency is their motto, and the welfare and development, not of this or that class or clique, but of the people as a whole. One fact has unmistakably emerged from all the changes of government in recent decades, as also from the revolution of General Naguib: That the determination of Egypt to realize to the full its national aspirations, particularly in the Suez Canal and in the Sudan, is final and absolute. This is no longer a question of governments or regimes: This is the most ingrained conviction of the Egyptian people as a whole. And therefore my sixth proposition is this: Let western statesmanship exercise itself to the utmost to seize the present golden opportunity that offers itself in Egypt.

7. As the West endeavors really to understand the nascent forces all over the Near East, and to encourage—or at least not to stand in the way of—the impulses of light and positive action, it will be compelled, I am convinced, to reexamine its total policy with respect to the Near East. I believe such a fundamental reexamination of Western policy is a distinct possibility in the near future. I will therefore formulate my seventh proposition as follows: For this impending reexamination to be successful, for it to be adequate to the historic demands of the moment, first, it must be made on the profoundest possible plane, taking nothing for granted; second, it should treat the peoples of the Near East not as means only, but as ends and therefore equals, to be fully respected and loved in their own right; and third, the West must develop a high-level, long-range and, above all, coordinated policy, purged of the twin evils of fitfulness and drift.

8. The Palestinian situation continues to be a source of deep rancor in the Arab world. It is not a simple thing for the West, and especially for the United States, to have decisively helped in the creation of a new state in a region against the will of the inhabitants of that region, to have thereby caused to be displaced a million Arabs in order that a million Jews gathered from all over the world take their place, to have American dollars, however collected and however channelled, pour into the new state by the hundreds of millions, and to have Western, and especially American, leaders make every day prophetic pronouncements concerning the eternal destiny of the new state to civilize and develop and lead and even defend the Near East. Let me therefore say this: This situation will remain on our hands, causing bitterness and unrest for decades and perhaps generations to come, and nobody is going to forget that it is a function of the will of the Western World, and especially of the United States. In a region especially renowned for its memory, where experience deposits itself cumulatively in the form of anecdote and folksong and poetry and literature, it is difficult to efface or overlay the events of the past. This does not mean that nothing can be done. In fact four things can and should be done, and would prove most helpful.

First, rightly or wrongly, the Arabs are deeply convinced that present-day Israel is but a bridgehead from which the Jews, at the opportune moment, will sweep over and conquer the entire Arab Near East, or at least as much of it as possible, or as is necessary for them. Witness the uninterrupted—if presently a bit slowed down—flow of Jewish immigration; the openly expressed boundless dreams and ambitions of Zionist leaders, especially in regard to Arab Palestine, Transjordan and southern Lebanon; and the encouragement they receive from certain western statesmen. The Arabs, unless they are to turn to any source to help them achieve a sense of security, must be disabused of the conviction that the West has so to speak handed them over to the Jews. There are two ways in which this can be done. (1) The 3-power declaration of May 25, 1950, must be reaffirmed and strengthened. If this strengthened reaffirmation should come as a solemn declaration by the highest western authorities, it would make a deep impression; (2) the Arabs must be strengthened internally so as to feel that they can defend themselves against attack. Since, frankly, it is inconceivable that Israel will ever be forsaken by the West in case of emergency, but not inconceivable—or at least not inconceivable to the same extent—that the Arabs, notwithstanding any solemn declaration made by the West to the contrary, will not under one pretext or another be forsaken should Israel propose to expand, it is evident that there is thus an essential inequality in the ultimate sense of security as between the Arabs and the Jews; and that to redress this balance of inner security, the Arabs must be far more strengthened than they are at present.

Second, the West must urge upon Israel to perform an act of restitution to the Arabs that might call forth a response of good will and confidence on their part. For without Arab good will and confidence, Israel cannot endure. The only act that might begin to restore confidence is significant restitution of territory. But it happens that Israel occupies by force—as for instance in the case of western Galilee—more than was assigned to it by the United Nations. Therefore restitution of territory, besides being the only way to begin to restore confidence, is fully within the intent of the United Nations.

Third, this restituted territory is not only in accordance with the decision of the United Nations, nor will it only help to create good will, but also it will enable a considerable proportion of the Arab refugees to be repatriated. The Arab refugee problem is the most vicious source of disaffection and subversion in the Near East. It is naive to suppose, as past schemes seem to have supposed, that this problem can be divested of its political overtones and can be treated on a purely humanitarian or economic basis. A much bolder approach is clearly indicated. The only reasonable and in the end practicable solution of this problem is to make it possible for the greater part of the refugees to be resettled on Palestinian soil.

Fourth, the Western World, and the United States in particular, must lift the question of Jerusalem above the sphere of political strife and contention, and help honor the decision of more than two-thirds of the United Nations which have thrice willed Jerusalem as a corpus separatum. I have said so much about Jerusalem in the crucial days of 1949 that all I propose to say now is that Jerusalem, and not just the so-called holy places, can and should be internationalized; that, indeed, this is the repeatedly defied decision of the United Nations, a decision that the United States, doubtless for special reasons of its own, has not seen fit so far to respect; that to suppose that dynamic Zionism will ever rest short of taking hold of the old city, the site of the temple, is to talk cheap politics; that if Jerusalem becomes a center of high political activity, and so long as it remains such a center, there will never be peace in the Near East, and perhaps even beyond the Near East; and that the one single act by the United States that might help reestablish faith in America throughout the Arab world is for this country to declare itself and work for the internationalization of Jerusalem, an act that will only bring the United States, which has repeatedly said, as for instance lately by President Eisenhower, that its policy is to support and strengthen the United Nations, in line with the world organization.

My eighth proposition touching Palestine, then, may be formulated as follows: If peace and stability are really desired in and for the Near East—and I sometimes feel that some people don't really desire these things—and if the United States really cares to recover part of the goodwill and confidence which the Arab world has always until recently felt toward it, then the way to these ends is perfectly clear: let the powers-to-be absolutely convince the Arabs that they will not be overrun and swallowed up by the Jews, and let them only help implement, as they have helped implement other resolutions elsewhere in the world, the three standing resolutions of the United Nations, concerning boundaries, concerning refugees, and concerning the internationalization of the Holy City.

9. The extension of technical and economic assistance to the peoples of the Near East belongs also to the category of good news. Despite all the difficulties of the present, this program has a real future. If one allows his imagination to range freely over the possibilities of this thing, provided of course political, psychological and moral difficulties are overcome, one can see in the horizon tremendous schemes of development ushering in a new phase of civilization in the Near East. I believe such a picture is a distinct possibility. In this connection I may be permitted to make one observation. America usually calls forth in the minds of the peoples of Asia and the Near East for the most part the idea of dollars and technology. American pronouncements have confirmed us in this habit. Thus an American leader not long ago has referred to what he called "our technical missionaries," as destined to bring about peace and plenty throughout Asia. Now if I were an American, I would certainly be proud of the wealth and scientific advancement of my country. They signify a tremendous outreach of the human spirit. But if I were an American, I would also resent being looked upon by the outside world as only a dispenser of money and machines, or even of the know-how of making money and machines. I would strive to disabuse them of that idea. For surely I would know that my country could and should mean a deeper challenge to the world. In place of merely rousing the world to make use of me materially, I would study to impart a more creative meaning to it. I would crave to send forth not only "technical missionaries," but also social missionaries, political missionaries, intellectual missionaries, spiritual missionaries; men and women who could, through patience and love, so identify themselves with the condition of other people as to teach them some of the inner spiritual secrets which created my wealth and technology in the first place, and lots of other wonderful values besides. I sometimes feel that the programs of technical and economic assistance do not do justice to America. And thus my ninth proposition is that for all their short-term and long-term necessity, there are essential limits to these programs; and that America must sooner or later articulate a deeper spiritual message for the world.

10. The problems of the Near East cannot be abstracted from the problems of the rest of the world. Such an abstraction is not only impossible these days anywhere in the

world: it is particularly impossible in the Near East. This is at once our glory and our penalty for being where we are. Thus the deep and wide ramifications of our situation are not in truth susceptible of a permanent settlement except within the context of a total world settlement. Uncertainty and trouble in the Near East are not a passing phenomenon; they spring from the essence of the present world crisis, and can only be understood or met as an incident in that crisis. So long as the cold war lasts, the Near East will remain unsettled, no matter what in the meantime may or must be done here and there under the exigency of passing events. And therefore my 10th proposition is this: Let no one suppose that while the larger conflict rages, while it is not yet settled whether and how communism and the western world can coexist, the Near East, on which both sides to the conflict so critically converge—strategically, politically, economically, and culturally—will know real peace.

11. There is a threefold crisis in the Near East today. One phase of this crisis concerns the relationship to be established between the States and the peoples of the Near East on the one hand, and the outside world on the other. This is the problem of the place of the Near East in the world. The second phase of the near eastern crisis relates to the order to be established among the Near Eastern States themselves. What sort of arrangement is possible and desirable among the diverse States of the area? And the third phase of the crisis relates to the internal organization within each Near Eastern state itself. This is the crisis of ruler and ruled, of the rising masses, and of the sort of social, economic, and political systems that are likely to emerge, or that should be encouraged to emerge, from the present turmoil. This threefold crisis necessitates that a fresh and creative look be given the near eastern question, both by the peoples of the Near East and by the Western World.

I hold that our issues are all clear and lucid. They can be quickly mastered. Again therefore I assure you, there are no impenetrable mysteries about our part of the world. The difficulty is not of an intellectual order, but of a moral and practical order. Is there a determination, is there a will, is there a decision, is there a love, to help lift the Near East to the heights of which it is capable? The great ages of brilliance of the Near East were all ages in which our peoples were in profound touch with the Western World. And so my concluding proposition is this: let us all so deport ourselves that the Near East—confirmed in its dignity and self-respect, and understanding its real abiding interests—will not be lost to the free world, but will once again and in our lifetime become a shining bastion of freedom and truth.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, stability and security cannot possibly be maintained in the vital Middle East area of the world with approximately a million hungry, disillusioned, and embittered human beings, who are the objects of communistic propaganda designed to disrupt every semblance of order. The resolution which I have just submitted directs the Committee on the Judiciary to make an immediate survey, study, and investigation, of this situation. I do not know at the moment, Mr. President, what the solution to the problem may be, or even if there is a solution on the horizon. I do know, however, that if this country is to maintain its position of leadership in the world and to serve the cause of peace it is essential that we act and act promptly in the interest of international friendship and understanding for the people of the Middle East whose objectives of freedom, peace, and world order, are being impaired by the plight of the Palestinian Arab refugees.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would change the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on International Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to explain the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 82), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection (1) (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "Committee on Foreign Relations" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on International Relations." Subsection 6 (a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "Committee on Foreign Relations" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on International Relations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have reached a point in American history where we, in fact, recognize that our dealings with other nations are no longer "foreign" to us. We talk too much today about "foreign policy." The phrase itself has a bad sound, creates suspicion and fosters distrust. I think it is important that we talk instead about our "international policy."

Frankly, there is no domestic policy which is unrelated to our foreign policy, nor is there anything within the so-called foreign policy which does not affect our domestic policy. The term I suggest as an appropriate title for one of the Senate's most important committees is the Senate Committee on International Relations. We in this great Republic are the key to the success of international relations. I believe that my proposal offers a much more realistic characterization of our relations with other nations.

The chief problem that faces us today as a nation is international in scope. It is, in an attempt to more accurately describe our task in the world and more accurately describe our responsibilities as a nation, that I propose to change the name of our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to that of Committee on International Relations.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall press for that change within our committee.

I point out further that my suggestion is not new in terms of Senate procedure. The name of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, so designated by the LaFollette-Monroney Act, was changed only last year to the Committee on Government Operations, which, of course, is a much more accurate description of its functions and duties. I submit that to change the name of this important committee now known as the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on International Relations is more much in tune with the spirit which motivates our country today in its efforts at international cooperation.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS BY THE SOVIET UNION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week I prepared a resolution calling on the Senate to express its abhorrence of and condemnation at the persecution being indulged in by the leaders of the Soviet Union toward the Jewish people. Last Monday I observed, in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] submitted a resolution (S. Res. 70), in which he also expressed his hope that the Senate would go on record condemning the action of the Soviet Union. For that reason I shall not submit my resolution, but ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of the resolution of the Senator from Montana, and that it be known that I endorse everything he said in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, of which 20,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and 1,000 copies for the House Committee on Judiciary.

PRINTING OF STUDY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF NEGROES IN THE UNITED STATES AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a study of the National Security Resources Board and the Bureau of Labor Statistics prepared during the 82d Congress for the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, of which I was chairman, on Employment and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

Statement prepared by him on motion-picture film entitled "Hans Christian Andersen" and in tribute to Samuel Goldwyn.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him in observance of the 35th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Address delivered by Senator POTTER at the 13th Congressional District Lincoln Day observance in Detroit, Mich.

Statement of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and President in Exile Zaleski in reference to reprisals by Communist government for resistance, sabotage, and clandestine action behind the Iron Curtain.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Sermon delivered by Rev. John Courtney Murray, S. J., at the Red Mass, St. Matthews Cathedral, Washington, D. C., February 15, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "A Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," delivered last year by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University at the fifth triennial meeting of the Ukrainian Congress Committee in New York City.

Editorial entitled "Communism in Unions," published in the New York Times of February 11, 1953.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter and memorandum from Maj. Gen. C. L. Chennault regarding opposition to communism and activities in the Far East.

Article by Westbrook Pegler, regarding the use of Communist assistants in the making of certain investigations.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Editorial entitled "Recognition of a Servant's Role," published in the Deseret News of February 2, 1953, dealing with the role of the Senate in consenting to the ratification of treaties.

Article entitled "A Suggestion to Mr. John Foster Dulles, the United States Secretary of State," by Dr. G. Homer Durham, head of the political science department, University of Utah, published in The Improvement Era for February 1953.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, February 16, 1953, entitled "Publicity on Pardons."

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Annual report of the National Foundation for Consumer Credit.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorial paying tribute to John H. Griffin, editor in chief of the Boston Post, published in the Boston Post on February 17, 1953.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF RICHARD R. ATKINSON FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Richard R. Atkinson, for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1953, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate, to consider Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, pursuant to a rule adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, I give the required 6 days' notice with respect to certain nominations. Thereafter they will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The nominations are:

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The notice will be noted in the RECORD.

UPRISING OF THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, 32 years ago, on February 18, 1921, the Armenian people, one of the first victims of Soviet aggression, succeeded in overthrowing Communist rule, forcibly imposed upon them on December 2, 1920. This uprising was the first and only successful revolt against the Soviet Union.

Tragically, the freedom regained was short lived. The Red armies returned and reimposed their terror upon the Armenian people. Today, Armenia remains a subject nation, forced to exist under the despotic Soviet yoke.

This year, as every year, Armenians throughout the free world hail the heroic revolt of February 18, 1921. They look upon this day as living proof, which destroys the carefully constructed Soviet myth that the forces of communism are invincible.

This reminder will serve as an inspiration to all Armenians in the free world, struggling to free their homeland, and also as a message of hope to the courageous people in Armenia, who look to America as the great champion of freedom and democracy.

Mr. President, Mr. P. H. Darpin, a physician and surgeon of Detroit, Mich., has prepared a statement which aptly describes the events referred to, and I ask unanimous consent that his statement be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN THE COMMUNISTS WERE THROWN OUT

The free world seems to have accepted as fact that Communist rule in the subjugated lands is so viciously and absolutely entrenched that a successful uprising by the enslaved peoples is well-nigh impossible.

History, however, begs to differ.

For it is a matter of record that on February 18, 1921, after 2½ months of Soviet rule, the people of Armenia rose and reestablished the free and independent Armenian Republic.

Armenia had been sovietized under the pressure of Red armies on December 2, 1920. The Government of the Armenian Republic was then forced to sign a treaty with the Communists, whereby the Communists pledged to maintain an independent Soviet Armenia and to carry out no persecutions against those who, prior to the sovietization of the land, had been active in political parties other than the Communist Party.

However, immediately after their accession to power, the Communists ruthlessly trampled every provision of the treaty they had signed.

They imprisoned, deported, or shot the political leaders and intelligentsia of the country. They looted the towns and villages and established a reign of terror everywhere.

Oliver Baldwin, son of Britain's Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, who was an officer in the Armenian Army, and who had stayed on after the sovietization of the country, in his book Six Prisons and Two Revolutions thus describes the Communist plunderings:

"The amount of loot the commissars had collected during their regime was indescribable. In 1 room we found about 50 pairs of boots of different kinds, gold rubles, shirts, suits of European clothes, and silver trinkets of Caucasian work."

But the Communists were not satisfied with looting and plundering in Armenia. A reign of absolute terror was established. Leaders in all spheres of national activity—whether political, military or cultural, were arrested, imprisoned without trial and executed. And it was against this barbaric slaughter of the best sons of Armenia that the people rose.

Again to quote Baldwin as he describes the uprising of February 18:

"At about 6:30 on February 18, I awoke to find Dr. Usher shaking me by the shoulder. 'Listen,' he said. And then it came—rifle shots, Lewis guns, Vickers guns rattling like 1914–18, and on the breeze were borne shouts of the attackers: 'Hayastan, Hayastan' (Armenia, Armenia). I dressed in about 5 minutes and, taking a revolver, rushed into the street. All around there was firing, bullets whistled overhead. The attack was coming from the north, and thither I ran. Up the steep streets, followed and preceded by the inhabitants of the town. Every man knew his place. Every man was armed. From every house emerged old men and young, their women handing them bandoliers and rifles that had been hidden since December. 'Hayastan, Hayastan.'

"The excitement was tremendous. On the northeastern hill we met the first band of peasants. We kissed each other, we cheered.

"We placed Vickers guns in position and opened fire.

"Then came the call: 'To the prison! To the prison!'

"We rushed downhill shooting, calling, shouting. On every housetop stood a sniper—an Armenian. In the center of the town, two companies of Bolsheviks were taken like rats in a trap, and marched away."

And thus it was that in Armenia, two and a half full months after the establishment and consolidation of Soviet rule, tyranny was overthrown and the Red armies were chased out of the land.

And Armenia was once again proclaimed a free and independent Republic.

Today it is wise and important for the free world to remember the example of Armenia, to remember that the rule of Soviet tyranny is not one unbroken chain.

That chain was shattered once by an ancient and small people, whose wrath had been aroused; it may be shattered again, this time through the coordinated efforts of many.

REPORT ON THE SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, next Tuesday, February 24, the General Assembly of the United Nations will reconvene.

The hopes and prayers of the American people are with this great organization, and so are the hopes and prayers of all the peoples of earth.

In this atomic age, there is nothing more important than our unceasing quest for peace.

It is for this reason that I should like to submit now a brief report on the work of the U. N. General Assembly whose fall 1952 session I attended and participated in as a member of the United States delegation.

The experience of serving at the United Nations between October and December 1952 will long be a highlight in my memory, because it gave me first-hand, illuminating experience in the complex workings of this noble instrumentality for man's well-being.

I had hoped, of course, to report much sooner to the Senate on my experiences at the U. N., but in my new capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the 83d Congress, the pressure of events has thus far prevented me.

In view of the fact, however, that the Assembly is reconvening next Tuesday, I feel it appropriate that I submit some comments today.

COMMENTS TO BE INCLUDED IN RECORD

Under these particular circumstances, at this time, I will not presume on the Senate time to read in full the comments which I had prepared in this report. I shall ask that certain portions of these remarks be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My comments throughout this report will be submitted in complete friendship for this great organization, because I feel that everything which I, for one, can do to strengthen it, I should do.

MAN'S AGE-OLD QUEST FOR PEACE

From the beginning of recorded time, man has strived to organize for peace.

Toward that end, I shall submit comments in complete candor, because I believe in "letting the chips fall where they may."

I believe that the best friend of the United Nations is he who demonstrates sympathy and understanding for it, but who at the same time points out in a constructive fashion its limitations, its shortcomings, its trials and tribulations, and then suggests ways and means of overcoming these problems.

I COMPLETELY SUPPORT U. N.

I should like to affirm now very emphatically that I have supported the United Nations from its very conception during the war years.

I supported and voted for the San Francisco Charter. I have supported the U. N. in its first 7 years. I support it now, and I shall give it my continuing support.

I URGE AMERICANS TO SUPPORT U. N. FULLY

I urge my countrymen to do likewise. I urge them not to heed those who would try to dig a grave for the U. N. I urge my countrymen to maintain undiminished faith and confidence in this vital living organism, the United Nations, in its able Secretary General Trygve Lie, and in its specialized agencies.

I am keenly aware of the many problems of the U. N., but I say to my countrymen: "Let us mobilize our might and main; let us leave no stone unturned, to make this organization succeed."

Let us seek to fulfill the hopes of mankind that it will succeed. But if, heaven prevent, it should not succeed, let it never be said of our country that it was we who were at fault in failing to give the U. N. our complete support, or in failing to fulfill its highest potentialities.

As an American and a Republican, and in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, let me emphasize that I am proud of the role of leadership my country has played in the United Nations. I am proud of the significant contribution we made in launching the organization seven short years ago. And I am equally proud of the valiant efforts we have put forth since that time to make the U. N. work.

Mr. President, the road to world peace is a great deal rougher and much more full of detours than we hoped it would be 7 years ago when we ratified the U. N. Charter. But even though we have encountered many setbacks and many disappointments, we have learned a great deal since then, and we can push on now, confident that we are headed in the right general direction.

The General Assembly met in its seventh session at the new headquarters in New York, from October 14 until 4:45 a. m. on December 22, 1952, when it threw out the Soviet midnight propaganda charges against the United States relating to the treatment of prisoners of war in Korea. Delegations from the 60 member countries, including some 30 foreign ministers, participated. There was great popular interest. Some 360,000 persons visited United Nations Headquarters during this time, and about 160,000 attended the various meetings. Coverage of the meetings by press and radio services—both domestic and foreign—was, as usual, very great. Sometimes the operations of the U. N. are overshadowed by domestic issues. But by and large I doubt that there is any other political event on the earth which receives, day in and out, the press coverage throughout the world that the U. N. receives.

The annual Assembly sessions have become the outstanding world forum for the discussion of major international questions. All member countries, through their ranking spokesmen, present their points of view, both publicly in the debates and privately in conversations with other delegates. In addition, the Assembly deals with a great variety of problems relating to all areas of the world, and ranging in scope from fighting in Korea to the treatment of natives in Africa. Each year, also, the Assembly performs indispensable functions in the United Nations system: voting the budget, examining the administration, electing members of councils and other bodies, and reviewing the work of the United Nations as a whole.

The United States was represented at the meetings of the General Assembly by a very able delegation of Americans, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The delegation included individuals from both political parties, from the Congress, from business, and from the executive branch of the Government. It was a privilege to work with this fine group of men and women, who were supported by a group of devoted and hard-working public servants.

This year, the Assembly offered especially important possibilities for influence, good or bad, on public opinion in many lands on critical issues. The Soviet Union, not being able to offer a constructive program of its own, always attempts in the General Assembly to divide and split the countries of the free world and, especially, to turn them against the United States. In this endeavor, the Russians cleverly and unscrupulously seek to magnify and distort disputes and disagreements which arise from time to time between non-Commu-

nist states, thus promoting discord and interfering in the amicable relations between friendly states. On such vital matters as that of seeking an armistice in Korea, the Communists do what they can to promote disagreement among those U. N. members who stand together for defense against aggression. It is in this environment that the United States sought friendly agreement with its friends and action which would promote peace.

This had to be done during and just after a hard-fought American election campaign, when other countries were waiting to see what future American policy would be.

It was a hard job; but it is fair to say that, on the whole, the Assembly advanced the work and interests of the world community. It made a positive contribution on the Korean problem. It discussed difficult questions with moderation. It refused to lend itself to Soviet efforts to confuse and divide the nations of the world.

The overriding issue of the whole Assembly session was, of course, Korea. When the session opened, the Unified Command had exhausted every effort to break the deadlock over the repatriation of prisoners of war and to persuade the Communists to accept an honorable armistice. The Communists, however, had refused to accept any of the Unified Command proposals on the question of prisoners of war or to make any constructive proposals of their own.

The United States took the position that the Assembly should take any measures that were possible to persuade the Communists to accept an honorable peace in Korea. If, through the Assembly efforts, no armistice could be achieved, we wanted the Assembly to satisfy itself on whether the Communists really wanted an armistice in Korea. If not, the United Nations would have to face that situation then and determine what should be done.

The United States and 20 other powers submitted a draft resolution setting forth this general approach. The resolution endorsed the United Nations Command's stand against the forcible repatriation of prisoners, and called on the Communists to agree to an armistice consistent with this position. The U. S. S. R., however, insisted on the forcible repatriation of prisoners, even though that might mean their death at the hands of the enemy, and made a vague proposal which, as later amended, simply called for an immediate cease-fire without a solution of the prisoner-of-war question. The Soviets proposed the establishment of a commission for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question on the basis of the unification of Korea, such unification to be brought about by the Koreans themselves under the supervision of the commission. The "gimmick" in this proposal was that the commission would be composed so as to give the Communists an effective veto on its actions. This proposal was devised by the U. S. S. R. to distract the attention of other countries from the repatriation issue and to make the Soviet Union look like a dove of peace.

The Indian delegation undertook to work out a formula on the prisoners-of-war issue which could be accepted both by the free countries and by the Communists. After more than a month of consideration of the problem, the Indian resolution was finally adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Assembly; 54 votes to 4, with 1 abstention. Only the Soviet bloc opposed the resolution, rejecting the proposals even before they were submitted to the Chinese Communists and North Koreans.

The Indian resolution, as passed, requested the President of the General Assembly to transmit to the Chinese Communists and to the North Korean authorities specific proposals which would serve as a just and reasonable basis for agreement on the prisoners question, and to report the Communist reaction to the Assembly during its current session. The proposals stated the important principle that prisoners of war should be repatriated in accordance with the Geneva Convention, and that force should not be used against them, either to effect or to prevent their return to their homelands. The prisoners were to be turned over to a repatriation commission, with representatives from four countries; any prisoners of war who could not be returned without the use of force would, after a given period, become the responsibility of the United Nations, which would care for and dispose of them.

On December 14, 1952, the Chinese Communists replied to Mr. Pearson, the president of the Assembly, rejecting the Assembly's resolution. A similar message from the North Koreans was received a few days later, thus confirming Soviet predictions that her satellites would do her bidding.

The vote of the Assembly supporting the resolution was the largest majority ever achieved in the United Nations on an important political question. It was a strong endorsement of the position which the Unified Command has taken on the prisoner question. The Communists' rejection of this resolution fixes clearly on them the blame for the failure of the armistice negotiations. No clearer demonstration of this could be achieved than to have 54 states agree on an equitable peace proposal, only to have the Communist states reject it flatly.

On the last day of the Assembly the Communist bloc showed that it realized how serious a setback in world opinion it had received by the rejection of the nearly unanimous proposal of the General Assembly. During the night they demanded that a propaganda item entitled "The Mass Murder of Korean and Chinese Prisoners of War by the United States Military Authorities on the Island of Pongam" be placed on the agenda and considered immediately. This clumsy move was evidently intended to confuse other countries on the prisoner-of-war issue and, in particular, to remove from the Communists some of the stigma resulting from their rejection of the Assembly's proposals. It did not work. The members of the U. N. recognized the propaganda attack for what it was; and just before adjournment at 4:45 a. m., December 22, the Assembly decisively rejected the Soviet charges by 45 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. President, in retrospect the Assembly's action on Korea was a significant step forward. It represents a greater display of unity among the non-Communist world on the Korean question than we have ever been able to obtain up to this time.

It had, of course, been hoped that the efforts of the United Nations might find complete fruition in actual settlement of the Korean conflict. We know how anxiously the people of this country and of other peace-loving members of the United Nations are desirous of an honorable and speedy end of the Korean conflict. So, while we are by no means completely satisfied with the actions of the United Nations on the Korean issue, we do feel, as I have indicated, that those actions represented a genuine step forward toward solution of the problem.

Let me say, too, that for years it has been the hope and prayer, particularly of the people of our country, that the United Nations would recommend further economic action against the Chinese Red aggressor. I say "action," not mere words.

In recent weeks, as we are all aware, there has been great discussion as regards the future policy which our country will recommend to the United Nations in respect to Red China.

I shall not presume at the present time to go into that subject, other than to state that at the very minimum:

A. Other peace-loving members of the United Nations should and must contribute a more proportionate share to the conduct of the overall Korean effort.

B. The members of the United Nations should now give—and, for that matter, should long since have given—definite consideration to ways and means of completely depriving the Chinese Communist government of the wherewithal to wage continued aggressive war against the United Nations in Korea.

AUSTRIA

Another major problem considered by the Assembly was that of the Austrian treaty. This item was submitted by Brazil, in response to a memorandum circulated to member states by Austria, which is not a member of the United Nations. The western powers have tried for years to negotiate an Austrian state treaty with the Soviet Union. Early in 1946 we urged that consideration be given to a treaty to restore Austrian independence. But not until 1947 was the Soviet Union willing even to begin discussion of such a treaty. The treaty was discussed at 376 four-power meetings, in most of which the Soviet Union concentrated upon insisting on terms calculated not to safeguard the independence of Austria, but to perpetuate the dependence of Austria upon the Soviet Union, even after the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Soviet talk in the four-power meetings was backed up by Soviet action in eastern Austria, where hundreds of properties were seized under the claim that they were German external assets. The Soviet action had cost Austria over $700 million in the use of various properties. In the summer of 1949, the Western Powers made very large concessions to the Soviet Union, and it was thought that a compromise agreement had been

reached on the principal points that remained. However, the Soviet Union then, in typical Communist fashion, insisted on new and extraneous conditions for the conclusion of a treaty. Trying once again to break this deadlock, the Western Powers proposed on March 13, 1952, a short, simple treaty containing only the minimum essentials for restoring Austrian independence. This offer, too, has been rejected.

At the outset of the discussion in the Political Committee of the Assembly, the Soviet bloc refused to participate in the consideration of the item or in any vote on related proposals, and declared that it would not recognize the validity of any resolution. "Secret guilt by silence is betrayed," wrote Dryden; and on December 20, the General Assembly approved, by a vote of 48 to 0, with 2 abstentions, a resolution providing that the General Assembly should address an earnest appeal to the governments concerned to make a renewed and urgent effort to reach agreement on the terms of an Austrian treaty. The resolution called for an early termination of the occupation of Austria and the full exercise by Austria of its powers as a sovereign nation. Here, again, the Soviet Union was exposed to the whole community of nations as the power which is preventing an effective peace settlement.

TUNISIA AND MOROCCO

Two of the most important and controversial matters which came before the General Assembly involved the relationships of France to its north African protectorates, Tunisia and Morocco. Tunisia and Morocco are sovereign states which, by treaty, gave France authority to conduct their foreign affairs. They thus have the international legal status of protectorates. France, as a member of the United Nations, is obligated to develop self-government in these countries and to take due account of the political aspirations of their people. During the past few years, negotiations have been in progress between the French and the Bey of Tunis and the Sultan of Morocco, with a view to the progressive development of self-government in these countries. In neither case has it been possible to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion. As a result, there have been considerable friction and bad feeling between the French authorities and elements of the populations of these countries, accompanied by some disorders and bloodshed.

Thirteen Asian and African states requested the General Assembly to consider these matters, on the ground that they are related to the maintenance of international peace and security. The General Assembly, with the support of the United States, decided to hear both cases, and debated them at length. In general, the discussion was moderate, and most of the states sought to impress on both the French, the Tunisians, and the Moroccans the necessity of conducting their negotiations in a spirit of moderation and reaching agreed solutions fair to all parties. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly were in this spirit.

Mr. President, this Tunisian-Moroccan-French difficulty pinpoints once more the tremendous upsurge of nationalist sentiment which is so prevalent throughout Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. In this connection it seems to me that our duty is clear. We must help channel this potent force along constructive lines. We must recognize, of course, the legitimate aspirations of subject peoples for self-government and independence. At the same time, however, we must do what we can to make sure that such developments unfold within the framework of the peaceful procedures laid down by the U. N. Charter, and without jeopardizing world peace. That is why we have urged the French, the Tunisians, and the Moroccans to carry on their negotiations in a friendly, constructive manner.

UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP

One of the most important problems was that of admitting new members to the United Nations. The Charter provides that membership is open to peace-loving states which accept the obligations of the Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry them out. Many countries, such as Italy, the Republic of Korea, Ireland, and Portugal, found qualified by the large majority of members, have for years been striving for United Nations membership. But consistent Soviet vetoes exclude them. On the other hand, several Soviet-sponsored candidates have never been found qualified as peace-loving states willing to accept the obligations of the Charter. The Soviet Union has demanded, as the blackmail price for its agreement not to veto certain of the deserving candidates, the admission of the Soviet-sponsored applicants without reference to their qualifications. But the Security Council and the Assembly have not accepted this package deal, which would equate the qualified with the nonqualified.

Since it was impossible to reach a satisfactory solution of the membership question at this time, the Assembly established a committee to study the problem and report to the Assembly at the next session. The Assembly also approved a resolution, submitted by the United States, determining that Japan is qualified and should be admitted, as well as similar resolutions on Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Libya, and Jordan.

These were the main political problems in the two political committees of the Assembly. In addition, the Assembly also has, as part of its organization, committees dealing with economic, social, dependent area, budgetary, and legal questions. Among these varied fields of activity, I might mention briefly the discussion of economic problems in Committee 2 and the work of the Assembly in Committee 5, which deals with administrative and budgetary questions—the committee in which I represented the United States delegation most of the time.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

In the Economic Committee, the principal issues which received attention were economic development and issues raised by Soviet bloc attacks upon the free world, particularly against the United States.

With regard to economic development, the underdeveloped countries, which form two-thirds of the United Nations membership, continued to ask for urgent attention by the United Nations to their development problems. What these nations need are ways to open their vast resources of manpower and raw materials. The resolution on the United Nations technical assistance program, which corresponds to our American point 4 program, was enthusiastically approved by all but the Soviet bloc, as were a number of other resolutions intended to deal with the problems of economic development. Among these were a resolution stressing the importance of the flow of private investment and a resolution dealing with nationalization of resources, that is, the taking over of private resources by the state.

The resolution on nationalization as it was originally introduced in the Economic Committee by the delegation of Uruguay, was unfortunately worded. It called for United Nations recognition of the right to nationalize. It would have given the impression that the General Assembly favored nationalization as a matter of policy. It said nothing about the reciprocal obligation on the part of the state to give compensation to former owners in cases where nationalization takes place. The resolution, as finally adopted, however, was heavily amended; and while it did not, in the opinion of our delegation, present an adequate balance between the so-called right of nationalization and the duty to compensate therefor, nevertheless it did contain an Indian amendment which called upon governments to bear in mind the need to maintain the flow of capital in conditions of security, and mutual confidence. At the time of the final vote, many of the countries which supported the resolution made it clear that they fully recognized the obligation to compensate private owners, and that they interpreted the resolution as recognizing that duty. Although we voted against the resolution, its effect should not be overestimated, since it needs to be read in the light of the companion resolution on the flow of private capital.

In summary on this point, I should like to observe in all candor that the attitude displayed by certain member governments on the nationalization resolution was, in my judgment, unfortunate. It was unfortunate in terms of (a) their own well-being and development; (b) the confidence of the American people; (c) the well-being of the United Nations itself.

While much of the damage of the nationalization resolution was, as I have said, repaired, nevertheless the whole issue raised a very strong question mark in the minds of numerous observers on these questions: How genuinely aware of the need for international confidence and the need for fidelity to contracts are certain member governments? Do they really appreciate the fact that in destroying the property rights of others, they are destroying the very fabric of their own future well-being?

In the Economic Committee, the Soviet attacks followed the usual line of seeking to fix on the United States responsibility for all that is unhappy in this

world. We were accused of responsibility for depressed living standards in the underdeveloped countries, on the ground that the United States is sucking vast profits out of these countries for the benefit of American monopoly capital. The Soviets also charged that American monopolists are responsible for the Korean war and for the armaments race, which they are alleged to have started in order further to swell their huge profits.

I replied to these absurd charges by pointing out that the majority of Americans are little capitalists in one way or another. Our big companies are owned by millions of our citizens. I contrasted American life with life behind the Iron Curtain. I pointed out that the net profits of American corporations and of their stockholders have been decreasing since the Korean war began, in view of increased taxes. I referred to the assistance the United States is giving to the underdeveloped countries, and I pointed out that the United States might be able to increase this assistance when our defense and disarmament goals have been achieved, and when the world can have some assurance that aggression does not threaten.

BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

A major part of the fifth committee's work was a detailed consideration of the budget estimates of the United Nations for the financial year 1953. Mr. President, I am sure that Members of the Senate would be pleased to know how carefully we scrutinized every item in that budget.

In addition to the estimates themselves, as prepared by the Secretary-General, the fifth committee had before it the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. This committee of experts had previously reviewed in great detail the budget proposed by the Secretary-General for 1953, and its recommendations became the basis for Fifth Committee discussion and decisions.

As we proceeded with our discussions, it became apparent that, despite generally supported efforts to achieve economy, the level of assessments against member states would be some $2 million above that of 1952. Expenditures in 1953 contributing toward this increase were the higher amortization charge on the headquarters loan, the need for additional funds to complete the construction of the headquarters, and the cost of making Spanish a working language in the Economic and Social Council and its various commissions. In the light of these facts, the committee adopted a United Kingdom proposal, as supported by the United States, which set a target total of $48,700,000 gross for the 1953 budget. The Secretary-General was requested to adjust his estimates and, in effect, to submit to the Fifth Committee a new budget within this maximum gross total.

As a result of this request, and the complete cooperation of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly adopted a regular budget for 1953 which authorized U. N. expenditures in the total amount of $48,327,700. I am sure, all of us will agree that this is a reasonable figure when we consider the great goals to which the U. N. is dedicated. This amount is approximately the cost of a single destroyer.

The fact that this final budget total is only slightly in excess of $48,000,000 for 1952 is due to the sincere efforts of most member states to stabilize the expenditure level of the United Nations and to insure that the financial resources of the organization are devoted to only the most worthwhile activities.

The Fifth Committee also considered the report of the Committee on Contributions, which recommended a number of adjustments in the percentages of assessments against member states for 1953. Among these adjustments was a reduction of the United States assessment for the total budget from 36.90 percent to 35.12 percent, and an increase in the U. S. S. R. share from 9.85 percent to 12.28 percent. Consistent with the position of the United States for the past several years, the United States spokesman in the Fifth Committee vigorously pressed for immediate action to reduce the United States share to one-third. The point was stressed that it was not in the best interests of the United Nations to be dependent upon any one member state for such a large proportion of its financial resources. The economic ability of other states, particularly the Soviet Union, to pay more was also emphasized.

The United States delegation submitted a resolution which called for the return of the proposed 1953 scale of assessments to the Contributions Committee for adjustments which would be required by the immediate application of the principle that no one member state should pay more than one-third of the regularly budgeted expenses of the organization. While this resolution did not find favor in the Fifth Committee, the committee did adopt a compromise Canadian proposal which, while approving the scale recommended by the Contributions Committee for 1953, decided that beginning January 1, 1954, no one member shall pay more than one-third. This action was approved by the Assembly. The United States abstained on the vote taken on this issue both in the Fifth Committee and in the General Assembly. In explaining the United States vote, I expressed regret that the Assembly had not seen fit to approve a position which the United States believed to be eminently reasonable, and pointed out that any obligation on the United States to pay its assessed share in 1953 stemmed from the United Nations Charter, and not from the vote of the United States representative.

While not being all that the United States had urged, the contribution decision taken by the Seventh General Assembly is significant in that, for the first time, the United States has been given formal assurance by the Assembly that its share of assessments will be reduced to 33⅓ percent beginning January 1, 1954. The language of this decision, as taken by the Assembly, makes it mandatory that the Committee on Contributions reduce the United States share to one-third, and recommend other adjustments as subsequent to that, in drawing up its proposed scale of assessments for 1954.

Mr. President, sometimes the United States is accused of pinching pennies, because of our attitude toward the regular U. N. budget. This charge is grossly unfair. With us, the one-third ceiling on the regular U. N. budget is a matter of principle. No international organization of 60 nations should ever be dependent upon any single state for a predominant share of its financial support. Our Government—and that includes the Congress—has consistently adhered to that principle since 1946.

Furthermore, anyone who will take the time to examine the record will realize that the United States has been more than generous. Are we not contributing some 65 percent of the U. N. expenditures for Korean relief and rehabilitation? And have we not contributed the lion's share of the U. N. outlay for Palestine refugees, for the Children's Fund, and for other special programs? The record speaks eloquently for itself.

I shall not pretend to draw up a balance sheet for the session, either for the United Nations itself or for the United States. We must remember that, as the central authority of the whole United Nations system, the General Assembly must devote a great deal of its time at every session to technical, routine, cumulative business in many fields. On the big political problems its record is full of disappointments. This year, the Assembly did not bring peace in Korea, or contribute more fighting forces to those who have been so long engaged in stopping Communist aggression there. It did not bring Austria freedom from occupation. But in these and in many other cases the work of the General Assembly was definitely helpful to the international community, including ourselves. In the world struggle of today ideas, judgments, and morals play their part. The Communists realize this, and try desperately to use every medium to twist and distort truth. It is essential to our role as a great civilized, leading country that we accept the fact that all countries—large and small—have their interests and opinions concerning world problems. It is part of the task of our kind of leadership in the modern world to enter honestly and frankly into the discussion of these problems with other nations; to seek to convince others of our case; to be willing to be convinced by facts when others present them; and to reach agreement and mutual accommodation where that can be honorably done.

On the whole, these discussions in the United Nations are helpful. The mere fact that serious, dangerous problems can be brought up and discussed in the United Nations tends to relax tension, to focus public opinion upon the issues in a more rational way than would otherwise be the case, and thus work toward real solution.

The Assembly has often been called the town meeting of the world. I sometimes call it the crossroads of the world. It is not only a great public meeting of the nations; it is also an unrivaled opportunity for people of practically all nations who work on international

problems to come to know each other personally. This is valuable. Even though the United Nations provides no magic for achieving peace, it does provide us with the chance, through public speeches and private contacts, and through generally acceptable resolutions which we help to formulate, to move toward solutions for individual problems.

I cannot close this brief review of meetings of the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations, which I attended, without referring to the problem of American Communists on the U. N. The gravity of this situation persuaded me that it was of vital importance to the future of the great cause which the United Nations symbolizes that remedial action be taken as promptly as possible. It was for this reason that I did what was within my power to promote early action, and to this end I devoted considerable attention to the matter during the time I was in New York.

Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this body would agree that only American citizens with the highest sense of loyalty and only those who have the confidence of our people should serve as members of the U. N. Secretariat. The American people are bitterly opposed to communism and the evil principles for which it stands. They resent the thought that any of our nationals who embrace the Marxian doctrine should ever fill any kind of post as an international civil servant.

I wish I could say that all of those United States officials primarily concerned with the problem up until the end of 1952 had clearly recognized its seriousness, but unfortunately I did not always find that to be the case.

Rather, I found a tendency in many quarters to delay and delay forthright action. I often found an inability to understand the temper of the American people and the American Congress. I found an unawareness of the rights and obligations of the host country. The results of this condition of mind in some individuals were extremely regrettable.

I do not for one moment underestimate the difficulties and complexities of the situation.

But I very definitely feel that had foresight universally been shown, and had there been a genuine determination completely to solve the problem, the issue might never need have come up in the way it did, with the resultant harm to the prestige of the United Nations.

My own aims have been several, as follows:

(a) To maintain the highest possible confidence of the American people in the United Nations, by—

(b) Making sure that the U. N. so conducts its own affairs as always to be fully worthy of such confidence.

I have wanted to prevent to the greatest possible extent any impairment in the morale of the employees of the U. N. Without a high morale, the effectiveness of this great organization would be severely damaged.

At this point, I should like to note that, as all of us are aware, at the very end of his administration, President Truman issued an Executive order establishing procedures for the screening of all Americans on the International Secretariat and in the specialized agencies.

Moreover, immediately following his appointment, our former colleague, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our new representative to the United Nations, asked the FBI to screen not only all the Americans on the Secretariat, but also the employees of the permanent United States mission in New York.

In all fairness to the U. N., I should like to observe that the number of Americans who have been under suspicion in any way constitute only a small number of the more than 2,000 Americans now employed on the Secretariat. I make this point not to minimize the seriousness of the problem, because actually so far as I am concerned, there is no room for a single American Communist or individual with Communist sympathies or affiliations inside the United Nations. I make the point merely to put the problem in its proper perspective.

I feel of course, that every country must recognize the truly international character of International Civil Service and must protect that Civil Service from criticisms which might be unfair. At the same time, where the criticisms are justified against certain individuals, there is every reason to act expeditiously to remove the basis for the criticism.

I repeat, the great majority of the Secretariat personnel, headed ably and faithfully by Mr. Trygve Lie, the Secretary-General, are devoted public servants whose loyalty to their pledged obligations as such does not impair but rather expresses their loyalty to their country.

As the General Assembly reconvenes one of the critical issues which will come up will be the reactions of the foreign delegations to the report of the three-man panel of international jurists.

I, for one, found the report of that panel eminently sound and just. I feel that the report more than amply protected the rights of the international civil service, while giving due consideration to the rights of the host country.

SUPPORT VIEWS OF PANEL OF JURISTS

I respectfully urge the members of the various delegations to support the recommendations of the panel of jurists, to support them not only because the recommendations are fair but because, in point of fact and in reality, they constitute the only feasible approach which the American people could tolerate.

WE WILL NOT TOLERATE SPIES

The American people would not tolerate for one moment a requirement on them to continue to pay one-third of the salary of a single individual who refuses to state on the witness stand (a) whether he is now or has ever been a member of the Communist Party; (b) whether he is now or has ever been engaged in espionage against the United States; (c) whether he would or would not support the United States in a possible war against an aggressor state.

I ask any foreign government which has doubts on this score, "Would you tolerate for one second an individual of your nationality working within the confines of your country, albeit on international soil? Would you tolerate for one second an individual who would refuse to admit whether he was or was not engaged in espionage against your country?" Of course not.

LAW OF SELF-PRESERVATION A PRIMARY LAW

I have little patience with any individual who condemns the right of the United States Government to protect its internal security.

I have little patience with those who scream "hysteria" or "witch hunt" when we simply take reasonable precautions to preserve ourselves as a nation. The law of self-preservation is still the first law of nature and the first law of government.

I urge, therefore, that the members of the United Nations not permit themselves to be sucked into the Soviet efforts to "fish in the U. N.'s troubled waters" by stirring up dissension on the report of the panel of international jurists.

CONGRESS CLOSELY WATCHING U. N.

I point out to them in all candor that the Congress is closely watching the developments at the United Nations. It will regard the action of the foreign delegations on this issue as a key index of whether or not the foreign governments really understand the public opinion of the United States and of the United States Congress, just as we in turn seek to understand the public opinion of foreign governments and peoples.

We are keenly aware that there is a considerable difference in the background of various countries toward civil-service rules. We are aware that in many countries civil service has indefinite tenure, whereas in our country termination is more feasible under our civil-service standards.

We are aware of the fact that many delegations are keenly desirous of protecting civil liberties under due process of law, but we yield to no country in our fervent devotion to that principle—which is after all the bedrock of the United States Constitution.

We feel, however, that the duly constituted committee of the United States Congress, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security had and has a perfect right to ask questions of the type I have stated above, and those questions should have been answered by the members of the international civil service.

It is extremely regretful to me that so much time has had to be spent on this Communist issue, while the substantive political and military issues about the U. N. have often had to be set aside.

Ever since my first contact with Secretary of State Acheson back in September on this problem, I have expressed the hope that the internal disloyalty problem might be met so decisively that it would be resolved once and for all, and would never again rise to plague us.

Unfortunately that did not prove to be the case. I hope, however, that the problem will now be resolved; and I am confident based upon very encouraging conferences and correspondence with our great Secretary of State Dulles and with our splendid Ambassador Lodge that they are on the way toward ending the problem once and for all.

I regret that I have had to spend so considerable a portion of these comments in reference to this problem, but I feel that I have no alternative in view of the fact that I had personally devoted so much attention to the problem during the U. N. session in New York in addition to attention given to it by my staff, and in view of the fact that I was therefore in a position to comment with a fair degree of expertness on the problem.

Let us neither inflate nor deflate the problem—neither overestimate it beyond its real proportions nor underestimate it.

I would say in conclusion, Mr. President, that this Nation must not make the error of overestimating the overall strength of the United Nations as an instrument to find peace. But neither must we underestimate the strength of the United Nations. We made the error in the early days of the U. N. in overestimating its strength as an instrument to preserve peace. Today I fear that too many persons are underestimating that strength. That is also an error.

Time after time during my service at the General Assembly I saw the representatives of tens of millions of people stand up to be counted on the side of spiritual values and freedom and against the forces of moral degradation and slavery. I heard the representatives of large and small free nations denounce the materialistic, atheistic forces which would turn the world back to the control of force and fear and tyranny. Time after time I heard reaffirmations of faith in the noble destiny of man. I realized that the aspirations of all people—although not of all governments—regardless of race, creed, or color, are common in that they desire peace and freedom, and that these aspirations can be achieved if man but has the will and the firm determination to direct his God-given abilities and energies toward their fulfillment.

We have in being an instrument to bring people together, an instrument by which free democratic processes can fuse the aspirations of mankind into a force so great that it can never be overcome. Our hopes and our prayers are one with those of our President, who said in his inaugural address that we must respect the "United Nations as the living sign of all peoples' hope for peace and strive to make it not merely an eloquent symbol but an effective force."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair correct in understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin is submitting a report?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

DEATH OF HON. DAVID AIKEN REED, FORMER SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, with deep regret and a profound sense of personal loss I announce the death of the Honorable David Aiken Reed, who served in this body as a Senator from Pennsylvania from August 8, 1922, to January 3, 1935.

Senator Reed passed away on Tuesday, February 10, at the age of 72 after an outstanding career of distinguished service to his State and the Nation.

On Friday, February 13, he was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery and was accorded the high military honors he had earned as a soldier on the battlefields of France in World War I.

David Aiken Reed was one of that patriotic group of young men who took part in the first officers' training camp organized at Fort Niagara, N. Y., to provide emergency officers before our entry into World War I. He served as a major of field artillery from August 15, 1917, until he was separated from active service as a lieutenant colonel after the war. His outstanding record won for him the Distinguished Service Medal and the French Cross of the Legion of Honor.

Senator Reed was a courageous fighter for a strong, sound, solvent America.

He was a vigorous opponent of adventures in Government which he believed were contrary to the Constitution.

He was outspoken in his criticism of Government spending in excess of revenues.

He fought to safeguard freedom of the individual, to advance the expansion of private enterprise, and for the protection of American industry.

Senator Reed was a man of brilliant legal attainments. He was recognized as one of the leaders of the American bar. During his service in the Senate he exerted a powerful influence on national and international affairs.

He was one of the American delegates to the London Naval Arms Conference in 1930 and served as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

It was my privilege to be associated with Senator Reed in political, military, and governmental activities. I am proud to pay tribute to his constructive statesmanship and patriotic Americanism.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania mourns the passing of her distinguished son. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family in this hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. President, I offer a resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may add a word to his very wise and fitting remarks regarding former Senator Reed?

Mr. MARTIN. I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the clerk first read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 80) submitted by Mr. MARTIN, for himself, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. David Aiken Reed, formerly a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to identify myself fully with this resolution, and, if appropriate, I should like to associate myself with those who have offered it.

I knew David Reed long before he ever came to the Senate of the United States. I did not have the privilege of serving here with him, but he was in college with me some years ago, and he was among my most intimate friends of that period. I knew him from the time he was a very young man. I followed his career in college, which was a brilliant one. I followed his career after his graduation from Princeton University. I followed his career during his brilliant legal life in Pennsylvania, and it was my privilege to be among those who rejoiced when he came to the United States Senate. While he was here I had occasion frequently to correspond with him and to see him on matters of business and on matters of Government.

I am happy to add this brief word to the eloquent remarks of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, in tribute to this great American statesman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], for himself and other Senators.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY—ARTICLE BY WILLARD EDWARDS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news story which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, January 25 under the byline of Willard Edwards. This news story deals with an official Communist document, drafted by the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States and approved in Moscow, outlining the policies and objectives of the American Communist Party.

Because this Communist program is in the nature of a blueprint for Communist operations, I believe the news story to which I refer will be of great interest to my colleagues. I wish to call particular attention to the statement that one of the Communist Party's main objectives will be "the formation of blocs of legislators in Congress" to work for the achievement of various legislative purposes, one of these Communist-espoused purposes being the repeal of the McCarran-Walters Immigration Act.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the news story to which I refer may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES REDS MOURN SETBACK IN '52, CHART FUTURE—AIM AT ACTION WITHIN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, January 24—A document outlining the future role of the American Communist Party is under examination by congressional investigators.

The paper, drafted by the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States and approved in Moscow, has been

submitted to Red cells throughout the Nation as a program for action in 1953.

The Republican victory in the November elections is conceded by the Communist leaders to have constituted a setback for "a soviet America." The hope for its resurgence depends upon secret operations within the framework of the Democratic Party, the national committee noted.

TURN ON PROGRESSIVES

The document suggested the dissolution of the Progressive Party, which has been used as a vehicle for Communists in the past, and the backing of a national labor party which would include Negroes and "poor farmers."

One of the Communist Party's main objectives will be "the formation of blocs of legislators in Congress" to work for the following:

1. Repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which tightened security procedures to prevent Communists from entering the country. A sizable group in Congress is active in promoting repeal of this law, which went into effect December 24.

2. Repeal of the Smith Act, which made advocacy of revolutionary overthrow of the Government a crime, and the Internal Security Act, which forced the registration of Communists.

AIM AT TAFT ACT

3. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, which restricted the power of union bosses and opposition to measures which would outlaw industrywide bargaining.

4. Passage of Federal fair employment legislation to provide governmental power over employers.

Coalition is the new keynote of the Communist program. This means working with any political elements in pursuit of desired objectives. Repeal of the Immigration Act is regarded as especially vital, and Communists will be permitted to aid organizations working to dissolve this law even though such organizations are hostile to all other Communist aims.

The program repeatedly stressed that the heart of the resistance movement lies in labor, the poorest strata of farmers, and the Negro people. These groups generally vote Democratic and oppose the Fascist Republican Party, the document said.

PAST ERRORS ADMITTED

In a confession of past errors, the national committee lamented its support of the Progressive Party and failure to direct the sharpest fire against Republicans. The forces led by Henry A. Wallace in 1948 should not have split from the Democratic Party, it said, but should have remained within that party to work from the inside.

In the past Communists have overestimated the radicalization of the masses and should not seek to establish a great new mass party until it has been built up within the ranks of the labor, Negro, and poor farmer classes in the Democratic Party, the Red leaders decreed.

The Progressive Party is written off for future activities with a tribute for performing yeoman service in the struggle against reaction. But it cannot be a major vehicle in the emergence of a mass people's party led by labor, the paper said.

ELBERT D. THOMAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was with deep sorrow that I learned the sad news of the death of our former colleague, Senator Elbert Thomas, in Honolulu on last Thursday. Perhaps no Member of the Senate today had such long, close, and intimate association with him as was my privilege. He was my friend, my counselor, and so often my leader.

I served with him on the Education and Labor Committee and its successor, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for 13 years, most of which time he was chairman. I served with him on the old Senate Committee on Military Affairs for 9 years and all through the hard, grinding, anxious years of World War II.

The Committee on Education and Labor and its successor had before it many highly controversial measures, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, and bills for Federal aid for education.

No matter how sharp the dispute or bitter the debate, he was always the gentleman and the scholar, the man of peace and good will, seeking the truth and striving to help others to find it. Often have I seen a quiet word of wisdom from him dispel the storm and guide the course to the desired goal.

As chairman of the old Senate Committee on Military Affairs during the war years, he was the leader in shaping the momentous legislation that gave us our mighty Armed Forces that brought the final victory.

As a young missionary in Japan years ago, he had learned to speak the Japanese language and, during the war, again and again, he broadcast to the Japanese people with words of persuasion and challenge. He contributed immensely to assuring the Japanese people of our good intentions and to breaking down their will to continue the war.

Most of all, Elbert Thomas wished for peace and freedom for ourselves and for all nations. As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, he worked closely with Cordell Hull and was a leader in bringing into being the United Nations. He labored tirelessly to strengthen the free world and to remove the causes of war by raising the lot and the hopes of men everywhere.

As we think of Elbert Thomas the scholar, the teacher, the author, the patriot, the humanitarian, the statesman, the world citizen, the man of quiet wisdom, the understanding neighbor to all men, the fighter for freedom and the prophet for peace, we know that no labor of his love brought him greater personal satisfaction than his sponsorship of the beautiful memorial to Thomas Jefferson. It was he who labored in season and out of season, over bitter opposition, to bring into being the memorial and to make certain that it was a memorial worthy of Jefferson and befitting our great Nation. He labored to make certain the design and architecture, and selected the moving quotations from Jefferson that adorn its walls.

At the time of the completion of the memorial he wrote the volume which he called Thomas Jefferson, World Citizen, Memorial Edition. In the book we find these words from Elbert Thomas:

> I hope this book may reflect that concept of Jefferson's philosophy which has guided me in the gospel I preached, the Americanism I taught, the patriotism I directed, the people and State I have represented, and the deeds I have tried to live—whether in my life as a student in one of our public school systems (Jefferson's dream); as a main street merchant, when I learned the simple ideal of American economic life, that only he who earns can honestly and completely enjoy; as a missionary who accepted his theory that a faith based upon reason and understanding is the only lasting one; as a teacher, learning each day to appreciate more fully the American life by teaching it, and explaining the culture of other lands and peoples in a spirit of appreciation rather than of comparison; as a soldier and a military administration officer, who wanted not only to win a war but also to build Americans by making more complete and thoughtful the American youth while under arms; as a public official, who admires Cleveland because he taught that public office was a public trust, and who likes to think of an election as America's way of calling men to serve.

As PAUL DOUGLAS said of Elbert Thomas in this Chamber last Friday, he was a thoroughly good man. Scholar and statesman, he was humble and unassuming. He was a devoted husband and father. He trusted people and brought out the best in others. He encouraged youth and loved to help them up the ladder. He was the best exemplar of his religion. His life was a sermon.

Elbert Thomas wrote the following tribute to Thomas Jefferson:

> Surely it is by now evident to the reader that Jefferson was not only an American. His sympathies were universal. He expected all the benefits of good government, as he hoped to see it established in the United States, to spread throughout the world. He was opposed to all forms of oppression wherever they existed. He was against ignorance in any form, was for the diffusion of learning throughout the world. He was not afraid of the universal application of all the doctrines which underlay his own philosophy of government for America. He was the great world prophet of liberty.

Whether Elbert Thomas realized it or not, I am sure that in writing these words he was giving voice to the aspirations of his own heart.

Today we pay our hearts' tribute to the great American, the world citizen, Elbert Thomas.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator Elbert Thomas, with whom I was closely associated in the work of the Senate over a long period of time. During the course of that rewarding association I came to know the qualities that made Senator Thomas one of the most highly respected and beloved persons serving our country here in the United States Senate.

Senator Thomas served the people of his State and Nation for over 18 years. He was twice chosen chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and its successor, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During Senator Thomas' tenure as chairman of our committee, I was ranking majority member and worked in close harmony and understanding with him in the consideration of many diverse and difficult legislative problems. I greatly respected his vast wisdom and superior intelligence. While he was completely self-effacing and modest, everyone on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats alike—acknowledged his fairness and objectivity, and, over all, his sincere desire to obtain the passage of legislation designed to insure the attainment of far-reaching economic and social gains for all the people of the Nation. His single-minded devotion to the highest ideals of public service made him a great figure in the State and in public

life of the United States of America. Many legislative achievements, too numerous to outline here today, stand as a perpetual monument to Senator Thomas' work. His activities were not confined to the fields of education and labor, but, in addition, Senator Thomas, as wartime chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, sponsored and obtained the passage of legislation vital to the success of our Armed Forces in World War II.

This gentle and self-effacing man was ever alert to attempts to infringe upon the civil liberties of other Americans. He could be stern and forceful yet completely reasonable when the occasion demanded, and was never one to avoid a controversial issue. He stood rock-firm and steadfast in his long and successful fight for the rights of religious and racial minorities. I always found his words and actions a source of encouragement to me in the difficult problems that came before the Senate during our long association.

The record Senator Thomas made here in the Senate is a monumental one. By seeking to emulate his example all of us in the years to come will be able to gain a clearer insight into the troublesome problems of this difficult time. The wisdom and strength of character which Senator Thomas exemplified will always stand as a model for those of us who are attempting to carry on in the noble tradition which guided the efforts of this truly great American.

COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks to an issue which I believe will be coming before the Senate in the very near future; namely, the issue of taxation of cooperatives.

The enemies of the cooperative movement are prepared again to begin applying pressure on the Members of the Congress.

I am convinced that most Americans—and certainly Members of the Congress—desire to be objective and fairminded with regard to the question of taxing cooperative enterprises. My own judgment, however, is that the campaigns which have been inaugurated by the National Tax Equality Association against cooperatives have in the main been unfair and unjust.

The cooperative movement is essential to the health of the American economy. My own State of Minnesota has more cooperatives and more members of cooperatives than any other State in the Union. We are proud of this achievement because we now have one-half million people in our State familiar with business problems and familiar with the responsibilities they have toward making their cooperative self-help enterprises successful. Minnesota is a rich State and cooperative members in every corner of our State who own shares in their marketing and purchasing cooperatives have helped make it so. The cooperative provides furthermore a practical study in true democracy.

I have recently had an opportunity to read a very fine article by Jerry Voorhis, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California for 10 years, on the subject of cooperatives and taxes. Mr. Voorhis is now executive director of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. His analysis of the question of cooperative taxation has impressed me as a clear presentation of a good case. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Voorhis' statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES AND TAXES—CO-OPS PAY THEIR TAXES, THE SAME AS ANYBODY ELSE

Cooperatives in this country are now required to pay, and do pay, every tax that any other business pays. Cooperatives pay property taxes, sales taxes, school taxes, county assessments, State and county license taxes, vehicle taxes, social-security taxes, Federal income taxes, and a lot of other taxes. They pay their taxes under the same laws as competing or other businesses pay them. In fact in many middle western towns the cooperative pays more taxes than any other business.

THE AGRICULTURAL EXEMPTION WAS PRACTICALLY WIPED OUT IN 1951

For more than a quarter century Congress has had a policy of encouraging farmers to form cooperatives. It has thought this was a better way. Better than Government programs. Better than leaving individual farmers at the mercy of speculators and middlemen. So Congress passed section 101, paragraph 12 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section tells how a nonprofit farmer cooperative has to operate to qualify under its terms. It says business must be limited to farmer producers. It says that patronage refunds must be paid to nonmembers on the same basis as to members. It limits the rate of interest paid on stock. It sets forth six other rules such co-ops have to follow. Then it used to say that those cooperatives willing and able to operate under these terms could have exemption from Federal corporation income taxes. The point was that they would have a neglible amount of taxable income anyway.

But in the tax bill of 1951 Congress practically wiped out any tax exemption which 101 (12) had allowed, even to these specially regulated farm co-ops. Congress said, in the 1951 bill that even cooperatives qualifying under section 101 (12) must now pay full corporation income tax on all their net margins which are not paid or allocated to patrons—just as all other cooperatives have always had to do. It can now be said that not a cent of money passing through the hands of any cooperative which would be taxable against any other business goes untaxed.

It is true that 101 (12) farm cooperatives are not double taxed on interest paid to their stockholders. But their stockholders pay full individual tax on that interest. And all other co-ops and their stockholders must pay double taxation on all interest paid by the co-op on its stock.

The tax authorities treat interest paid in co-op stock like they treat dividends on stock paid by ordinary corporations.

Under the Revenue Act of 1951 all cooperatives must report to the Bureau of Internal Revenue all patronage refunds paid or allocated in amounts of $100 or more. And co-ops just like other corporations must report to the Bureau all payments of dividends to stockholders in amounts of $1 or more.

PROFIT BUSINESS AND NONPROFIT BUSINESS

All through its history our country has allowed American citizens to organize and conduct nonprofit businesses. Ours is a free country. Most of our businesses have been organized to make a profit for their stockholders and for the business itself. But America has always believed that groups of people should have the same right to organize nonprofit businesses as to organize profit ones. We have believed that there should not be any discrimination or penalty against either kind of business.

A nonprofit business is one that seeks to benefit the patrons who use the business rather than the stockholders. Some such businesses have been set up in such a way that the business is obliged to pass on to its patrons the entire amount of what would otherwise be profits. All cooperatives are obliged to do this. Several thousand other businesses pay patronage refunds too. And the law treats all these patronage refunds just the same way. If any business—quite regardless of whether it is a cooperative—binds itself to pay patronage refunds to its patrons the business is not taxed on that money. No business can in justice be taxed upon money that belongs to someone else. The difference between cooperatives and other businesses is simply that cooperatives always obligate themselves to pay or allocate what would otherwise be profits to their patrons. But other businesses choose to do this to a much lesser extent. But any business can do it right now. And to the extent that any business does do it, it is in the same tax position as the cooperatives.

When Members of Congress have sought to draft bills to tax patronage refunds they have not been able to find a single provision of the Internal Revenue Code that they could repeal or even amend. They have had to draw up a special provision applying only to cooperatives. And they have had to attempt to write language that would make one party—the cooperative—taxable on property that belongs, all the time to someone else—the patron.

Such legislation would be rank discrimination. Business profit is taxed in the United States. So long as this is true, all businesses, cooperative and otherwise, should be taxed as they are now taxed on any profit which they may make. But a business that loses money is not taxed as if it had made a profit. Neither should a business which chooses to be a nonprofit business be taxed upon money which might have been income if it had kept and owned it but which in fact it could not legally keep and which it had never owned. This is why cooperatives stand firm for the right to pay patronage refunds to their patrons without being penalized for so doing.

CENTRAL FACTS

If a cooperative in the United States today derives any income for itself it pays a full Federal corporation income tax upon that income.

To repeat, all cooperatives pay all taxes just as those other businesses do.

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVE PATRONS

Eighty-six percent of all the businesses in the United States never pay any Federal corporation taxes at all. The reason is that 86 percent of all our businesses are either individually owned businesses or else they are partnerships. In the case of all such business the law quite properly levies the tax on the individual owner or the partner, not on the business. This is because the partners are the ultimate recipients of all the income derived from the business. The partners in a business may choose to take their shares of the business income in some other form than cash. They may reinvest the money in expansion of the business. Still the law makes no attempt to discriminate against them or to tax that income twice—once against the individual partners and a second time against the business as such.

Now every cooperative in this country is a kind of partnership belonging to its member patrons. And the whole purpose of every cooperative is to benefit its patrons and not itself. The members have organized

cooperatives for the exact reason that they sought to meet some need for goods or services on a nonprofit basis. Cooperatives are obligated by their bylaws, to act as trustees for their member-patrons of any funds that may pass through the cooperative. Co-ops must pay to their patrons as partner-owners of the business whatever net margins may be made upon their patronage. If any of these funds could constitute taxable income to anyone, they are taxed against the cooperative patrons at the full individual income tax rates. In other words, cooperative patrons who are likewise members and owners of the cooperative businesses are taxed just like business partners are taxed. The only difference is that the cooperative is also taxed, whereas the partnership, as a business entity, is not.

If a woman spends $13.99 on a dress marked down from $19.99 she does not report $6 of income on her income-tax return. No one can make income for himself by spending money on goods he consumes. Co-op members are no different from other people. If they buy groceries or gasoline or electric appliances or any other article of personal use and receive a price reduction in the form of a patronage refund their income is not increased. All that has happened is that the net amount of their cost of living has been reduced. But where a cooperative member obtains any services or goods from his cooperative which he uses in a business such as farming, then his patronage refund does have the effect of increasing his income from that business. And upon this he, like everyone else, is fully taxed.

CO-OPS HAVE NO TAX "ADVANTAGE"

Many co-ops pay more total taxes than any other business in their towns. But sometimes the amount of income tax paid by a cooperative will be less than it would be for another type of business. Why is this? It is not because of a difference in the tax laws. It is not because of a difference in tax rates. It is not because the cooperatives have any tax "advantage." It is only because of the way cooperatives treat their patrons. Cooperatives must divide what would be the profits of another business among their member-patrons in proportion to their patronage. They must do this because the way a cooperative is organized the money belongs to these patrons. It does not belong to the co-op.

Therefore on money paid out in patronage refunds a cooperative is not taxed. But neither is any other business. No business is taxed on money it doesn't own nor on money it is legally bound to pay over to someone else—in this case its patrons.

PATRONAGE REFUNDS, HOWEVER PAID AND WHETHER OR NOT REINVESTED, BELONG TO MEMBERS, NOT THE CO-OP

The last question is this: Cooperatives sometimes pay patronage refunds in stock or patrons equity reserves or in some other form than cash. Should these refunds be treated differently from patronage refunds paid in cash? The answer is no. Of course, the co-op's patron has to pay a tax on the refund in either case. It is his property whether he receives it in cash or in a share in ownership of an oil well or a creamery, or a coffee roaster.

But what about the co-op? Some people argue that if the patronage refund is paid in cash, then it is all right for the co-op not to be taxed on it. But they say if the refund is not paid in cash, then the co-op is gaining an unfair advantage and ought to be taxed on that amount of money. They are wrong.

Here again it's a question of what a business wants to do—not of what it can do. Co-ops want to spread ownership over their assets among all their patrons and members. This is what they do when they pay patronage in forms other than cash. Other businesses could do this, too. They could bind themselves to pay patronage refunds and then let their customers decide to take them in stock in the business. If they did, they would no more be taxed on that money than co-ops are. So there's no "unfair" advantage.

In the second place, no business is required to pay income tax on money invested in its stock. And when cooperative members agree to take their patronage refund in stock, they simply agree to reinvest some of their money in their own business. The cooperative could just as well draw a check and pay it to the member. The member could then turn around and use the check to buy stock in his co-op. So to tax a cooperative on patronage refunds not paid in cash would be levying a penalty tax on the right of cooperative members to invest in their business. No other tax like this has ever been heard of.

Cooperatives do not have access to the source of investment funds which other businesses have. Co-ops belong to their members. Nearly all of those members are people of modest means. Co-ops must rely for most of their capital upon their member-patrons. And the one time, as a rule, when their members have funds to invest in their cooperatives is when they receive their patronage refunds. To penalize those members' right to reinvest those funds in their own business would be to place a block in the road of the growth of cooperatives which no other business faces.

When a proprietary business retains earnings for expansion or other purposes, its stockholders do not pay taxes on that money. The corporation does. In the case of the co-op, the shoe is simply on the other foot. The member-partners of the cooperative pay the taxes on deferred patronage refunds. The co-op does not.

SUMMARY

But suppose a co-op does not pay out all of its net savings in patronage refunds. What happens then? It pays a full Federal corporation income tax on that money. If a cooperative does business with nonmembers, it can pay them patronage refund on the same basis as to members. Or it can retain the margins from nonmembers' business and pay full Federal corporation income taxes on it. There is no other alternative. A co-op cannot divide the savings made on nonmember business among the members. Because the members are only entitled to refunds in proportion to their own patronage. If more than that is paid to members, then the co-op must pay taxes on that excess amount first. The only real difference between taxes paid by cooperatives and taxes paid by other businesses is this: Co-ops must pay patronage refunds to their members. And, those refunds aren't taxed against the co-op. They can't be because they don't belong to it.

The question is whether any group of free men and women have a right to carry on a nonprofit business without being penalized for doing so. This right is fundamental for farmers, and consumers, and small-business men and newspapers, and doctors and their patients, and any other group of American people. It is as fundamental as the right of free speech, or free press, or free religion. It is part of economic freedom.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement entitled "Legislative Objectives of Farmer Co-ops," published by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives likewise be printed in the RECORD. The Council represents some 5,000 local cooperative associations, serving approximately 2,500,000 farm families in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF FARMER CO-OPS

1. Preserve the economic balance between the Nation's agricultural and industrial production.

2. Insure the greatest measure of competitive enterprise free from regulation in production, marketing and distribution of farm products and supplies and related economic activities.

3. Improve the efficiency of farm production and marketing through research, education, rural electrification, adequate roads and highways, adequate soil, water and forest conservation practices and development of more industrial uses of farm commodities.

4. Improve the Nation's health and living standards through upgraded diets in terms of animal products and protective foods.

5. Improve our agricultural marketing system so as to make it capable not only of performing marketing functions under conditions of balanced supply and demand but also of handling surplus production, to avoid buying and selling operations by Government.

6. Periodically reexamine our farm program and national policies with the advice and counsel of farm organizations, so as to keep them up to date and to insure maximum decentralization of administration to State and local levels.

7. Assure fair prices in international markets by eliminating the abuses of State trading, currency manipulation, discriminatory licensing, and other devices for undermining fair market structures.

8. End price and wage controls under conditions short of all-out war.

9. Promote economic stability through a sound national fiscal policy with special emphasis during a period of inflation on a balanced budget, Government economy, money and credit controls, and encouragement of individual and institutional savings.

10. Strengthen our agricultural land-grant colleges and revitalize the work of our experiment stations and extension services.

11. Encourage farmer self-help through farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives.

12. Decentralize formation and operations of programs to conserve soil and water with increased responsibility in the hands of local conservation districts and increased emphasis on extension-type education in conservation.

13. Enact legislation to make the mutual lending agencies of the Farm Credit Administration farmer-owned and farmer-controlled, with minimum governmental supervision.

14. Help low-income families to help themselves through vocational education, sound credit and new oportunities for off-farm employment through incentives for expanded local industry.

15. Develop our forest resources on a basis of sound cropping and sustained yield practices and maintain such resources through adequate conservation services, including fire, disease, and insect protection.

16. Decentralize the administration and supervision of public grazing lands by increasing the autonomy and responsibility of local officers with respect to public land management.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of February 9 I addressed a communication to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BRIDGES] and the chairman of the

House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. JOHN TABER. My comments in these letters pertained to the difficulties encountered by the Veterans' Administration in providing adequate medical and dental care.

It is absolutely imperative that the Veterans' Administration be given the medical and dental budgets necessary to provide the care which is authorized by law.

Unfortunately, the 82d Congress did not provide adequate funds to meet the commitments of the Veterans' Administration with respect to veterans of World War II and Korean veterans, so far as medical and dental care are concerned. Furthermore, the cutting down of hospital-bed facilities by the Veterans' Administration because of a budget deficiency has worked a severe hardship upon thousands of veterans.

One of the largest veterans' hospital installations happens to be in my home State of Minnesota, at Fort Snelling. It is an outstanding hospital, working under the auspices of the dean's committee of the University of Minnesota Medical School. I have just returned from that State, where I have been in consultation with the manager of the hospital. There are hundreds of cases awaiting entrance to the hospital, which has a budget which is inadequate to provide for the care of needy veterans who are entitled to medical care under the law. There may be times when the Congress of the United States feels motivated toward economy; but I submit that in a situation in which we have authorized by law a commitment to men who have served in the Armed Forces, the least that can be expected from the Congress of the United States is adequate funds to fulfill such authorizations and obligations. If we wish to economize, I suggest that we do it otherwise than at the sacrifice of the health and welfare of those who have honorably served their country and who have been promised by their Government that they could enter veterans' hospital installations.

Therefore I send to the desk copies of the letter which I sent to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and Representative TABER, along with their replies. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Copy of letter sent to Senator BRIDGES and Representative TABER]

FEBRUARY 9, 1953.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: For some months numerous veterans' organizations in the State of Minnesota have repeatedly brought to my attention an increasingly critical and difficult situation in respect to the services of the Veterans' Administration. The lack of adequate funds for veterans' medical and dental care has become a prime problem of the Veterans' Administration. Under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict are entitled to medical treatment and dental care when the condition is established as service connected.

Since October 1952, the Veterans' Administration has materially curtailed these medical services to veterans because of shortage of funds. Let me cite an example of the drastic nature of the cuts made by the Congress in 1952. The Veterans' Administration requested $405,808 for the Fort Snelling Hospital for dental care and treatment for October, November, and December, 1952. Only $46,975, 11½ percent of the request, was actually appropriated. For the first 3 months of 1953, the Veterans' Administration requested $530,763 for Fort Snelling Hospital. Of this amount only $167,575 was appropriated. These reductions by the Congress mean that thousands of veterans will not receive justly deserved attention to their dental needs. Unless the Congress appropriates additional funds, only a small portion of the presently needed work can be performed and the over-all backlog will continue to grow.

Thousands of soldiers are being discharged from services in Korea who are badly in need of dental treatment as a result of their service in the Armed Forces. Virtually no World War II veterans are able to receive dental care for service-connected conditions at the present time. In addition to the severe restriction of dental care for World War II and Korean veterans, it is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration has had to eliminate in excess of 2,500 hospital beds due to shortage of appropriations. It has been necessary for the Veterans' Administration to reduce its medical, nursing, technical, and attendant staff to keep within the limits of the drastically reduced budget.

The manager of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Snelling, Minn., has informed me that there is a long waiting list of veterans direly in need of medical and dental care. I am informed that this deplorable situation is existent throughout the country. It is existent at practically every Veterans' Administration hosiptal in the country.

This appears to me to be an appalling situation and a sad commentary on our great democracy. Certainly the least the Congress can do is to care for the physical needs of those men who have offered their lives in the struggle to keep our country secure and to protect our democratic principles.

I most urgently appeal to the members of your committee to provide adequate appropriations to insure that every eligible veteran receives the medical and dental treatment provided by the law. This service to our veterans is a solemn obligation of our country and must be met.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 11, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I have your letter of February 9 concerning the need for additional funds for medical and dental treatment of veterans.

A supplemental estimate is now being considered by the House committee requesting $5,000,000 additional for the medical operating program, and I am advised that the administration believes that the appropriation of this additional amount will enable them to have funds available for some of the backlog of applications for medical and dental treatment.

I assure you that when the supplemental appropriations bill reaches the Senate, the need for such funds will have sympathetic consideration in our committee.

Sincerely yours,
STYLES BRIDGES, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have your letter of the 9th. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices has been holding hearings on the request of the Veterans' Administration for additional money and their recommendations will be embodied in the next supplemental bill that is reported. I imagine that the bill will be on the floor of the House sometime within the next 2 weeks.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

THE LONG-MORSE REPORT ON OVERSEAS MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a little committee work to do on the floor of the Senate today. [Laughter.]

The first item I wish to take up is in the form of a brief reply to two superficial editorials which appeared in the local press of recent date on the subject of the Long-Morse subcommittee report to the Committee on Armed Services.

I refer to the editorial published in the Evening Star of Monday, February 16th, and to the editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, which I believe can best be described as a newspaper suffering from journalistic schizophrenia. It seems to be permanently split in its journalistic personality between its effort to represent itself to liberal groups as a liberal newspaper and an editorial policy which for a great many months past has belied its representations to the liberals. It has become the editorial medium of a reactionary administration. Its editorial of this morning is a good example of its superficiality. The editorial to which I refer is entitled "Senators Off Base."

I wish to make just a few comments on the Long-Morse report today, because I intend at a later time to speak at greater length, perhaps in a series of speeches, on the problems raised by the Long-Morse report. I assure the Senate today that we do not intend by a mere filing of the report to stop pressing for the military reforms alluded to in the report. We intend to carry forward the presentation of the evidence and data, within the appropriate security safeguards for our Government, to the end of bringing about savings of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, which the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon are satisfied can be saved without in the slightest degree weakening the Nation's defenses. To the contrary, Mr. President, such savings would actually strengthen them. It is our belief that if we strengthen the national economy—and I say this particularly to the Washington Post—we do much to strengthen the Nation's defenses.

Of course, I realize that editorial writers usually are writing against a deadline, and therefore to expect them to do very much book work in the preparation of their editorials is expecting a great deal, if not too much. Therefore,

of course, there is the temptation, particularly when there is involved a politician whom they do not like, because he has dared to suggest that perhaps the newspaper in question is not the great oracle of public information which the editorial writer would have readers believe, to do the kind of hatchet job on him which the Washington Post tried to do this morning and which the Star tried to do on Monday evening.

Of course, both editorials show a lack of knowledge of the background of the Long-Morse report on the part of the editorial writers. The background of the Long-Morse report is not a 6 weeks' flying trip to Europe, across north Africa, and as far as Turkey. It is not a 30,000-mile trip undertaken by two Senators, followed by their sitting down and writing a report and proceeding to tell the Pentagon, as alleged military experts such as the Washington Post would have its readers believe, how the defenses of the country should be operated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As the Senator from Oregon well knows, the 6 weeks involved were 6 weeks of almost continuous listening, from morning until night, to all of the top brass which we criticize in the report. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. We were briefed on an average of one to three times a day. The report was made following about 18 months of hard, concentrated work on the part of the subcommittee and the professional staff which served the subcommittee. I refer to the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee which for the past 2 years has taken the evidence in the first instance on all requests of the Pentagon for authorization of funds for military installations. This subcommittee, which has been under the exceedingly able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and which has had two other members, namely, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the present speaker, in the past 18 months has been the agency of the Senate that took the first look at the requests of the Military Establishment for authorizations of funds for the building of military installations needed for the defense of the United States.

I say—and I say it in all modesty, because I know what my colleagues on the subcommittee have done—that as of this hour there are no other Members of the Senate who are so fully informed regarding the details involved in the military installations of the United States as are the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I very much appreciate the Senator's compliment, and I believe the Nation is indebted to the Senator from Oregon for the long hours of work and toil he devoted to helping pare down those demands.

Inasmuch as the editorial to which the Senator from Oregon is referring would attempt to criticize us for making certain recommendations, contending that no one but the military can be informed, it might be well to point out that we borrowed from the military some able civil engineers, whom we had assist us in paring down by approximately 25 percent the amounts the military were requesting in a $3 billion authorization bill. With the assistance of some of their own employees, we were able to save the taxpayers approximately $700 million last year, in a way that would not at all reduce the defense of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. That was one of the points I was going to reach in a few minutes, and I might as well discuss it now. I should like to advise the Washington Post and its editorial writers that if they had done the proper amount of book work, they would have discovered that for approximately 18 months this subcommittee spent hours, days, and weeks of time in examining and working with the Pentagon officials. In fact, let me say—and I can say this as a member of the subcommittee, because in doing so I am paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee—that I have heard, not once, but many times, some of the highest officials in the Pentagon say to me, in referring to the work of the subcommittee under the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that in their years of coming to Capitol Hill they have never observed any other committee or any other subcommittee that has worked so hard, so thoroughly, and so fairly as has this subcommittee in working on the proposed authorizations of funds for the Military Establishment.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, when the Pentagon officials last year requested the authorization of more than $3,000,000,000 of expenditures for military installations, we met with them in the committee room day in and day out, and sometimes until 2 o'clock in the morning, going over the most minute details of their requests. That practice had not been common, let me say, in considering requests for authorizations from the Pentagon, but we did that, and we considered the requests most carefully before we made our report to the full Armed Services Committee. We believed that before reporting to the full committee we had better know the details backwards and forwards, from A to Izzard. As a result of the work the subcommittee did, we went before the full Armed Services Committee with the recommendation to pare down by approximately 25 percent the more than $3,000,000,000 authorization requests of the Pentagon. We submitted our report to the full Armed Services Committee, and answered the questions of the full committee.

Mr. President, you know, of course, what happens in such circumstances; you know what happens when any subcommittee of a Senate committee comes before the full committee with such a proposed reduction in requests as did this subcommittee in its recommendations last year regarding the requests of the Pentagon for authorizations for the Military Establishment. You know, Mr. President, who are heard from under those circumstances. In such cases a committee begins to hear not only from colleagues, but also from economic forces across the Nation that would lose something as the result of the kind of savings this subcommittee recommended last year in its report. Furthermore, our colleagues on the full Armed Services Committee heard from those sources.

To the everlasting credit of each and every member of the full Armed Services Committee last year, I wish to say that after they heard the defense by the subcommittee of its recommendations for economy in the military budget, they backed us with a unanimous vote. That report came to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous backing of the full Armed Services Committee, and it went through the entire Senate itself without a vote against it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out that he and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself have never regarded ourselves as military experts. But in carrying out our duties as Senators and members of the subcommittee, let me tell you what we considered ourselves to be. We regarded ourselves as an impartial, fair-minded jury; and we placed upon the Pentagon officials the burden of proof in substantiation of the claims they were making for authorizations of funds for military installations. It is in that capacity that the members of a subcommittee should always function in carrying out the obligation entrusted to them. We required proof.

Sometimes that requirement was surprising to some of the "brass." Too frequently they have become accustomed to getting what they want by means of the use of "fear" arguments. Too often they have found that all they have to do is scare the politicians and scare the American people, and then the politicians will tremble at the knees, and will say, "We cannot go before our constituents and justify the making of a cut in the military budget when secrecy and security prevent us from disclosing the facts that justify the cuts we wish to make."

That is the position in which the subcommittee has found itself, Mr. President. We have been confronted with many scare arguments, but we have continued to call for facts and proof in support of military requests for funds. I think the Star and the Post editorial writers should be ashamed of themselves for making the statements they have made in their editorials without at least trying to ascertain whether in the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Oregon there were evidence and data which we were not free to disclose because we cooperated, as we should, as patriotic Senators and citizens, with the Pentagon and with the State Department in not disclosing the secret data and evidence which it would be necessary to disclose, I assume, if we were going to satisfy such superficial writers as those who wrote the editorials in the Star and in the Post.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, in our work for the past 18 months we had the assistance of military experts and engineering experts, some of them loaned from the Pentagon and some of them selected by the committee from sources outside the Pentagon.

Mr. President, the report was not simply written on the observations made during a 30,000-mile inspection trip. The report was written on the basis of the knowledge and understanding we developed as the result of months and months and months of hard work on this entire question, involving the details of the military installations of the United States.

Then, of course, in both the editorials there is something that is very amusing, because the editorial writers seem to think they strike the knockout blow, by means of language such as the following, which appears in the editorial published in the Post:

> But the Senators do not confine themselves to items on which they have first-hand knowledge. "We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans," they say, yet they proceed to make broad criticisms of those plans. "We cannot say with the slightest assurance," they aver, "that it would be beyond an enemy's capabilities to break the backbone of our armed services by surprise attack." They criticize the command setup under which General Ridgway and General Norstad wear two military hats. Without giving their criteria for judgment, they question whether more than half the present number of American troops in Europe is necessary.
>
> The big question on all this, of course, is, How do they know? One observation—that mobile reserves are better insurance against aggression at remote points than Americans stationed at strategic bases abroad—is clearly—

Note this, Mr. President—

> is clearly refutable by the difficulty in transporting large numbers of troops quickly.

Keep that in mind, Mr. President, as I read this gem of editorial fallibility from the Washington Star:

> Nor has it equipped them to pass dogmatic judgments—as they have—on what needs to be done for the long-term security of the Nation. They flatly declare, for example, that the United States should reduce the number of its troops abroad; they come out against the possibility that our country may find itself "stationing three-quarters of a million servicemen at remote points of the earth for the next generation;" and they unqualifiedly assert that "mobility of American reserves is a better answer to the threat of Communist aggression" than an attempt to hold such outposts with enough of our troops and airmen to defeat a major enemy assault.

Mr. President, I have a very delicate job to perform now in the use of language, because I want to answer what really is very amusing on the part of these two editorial writers, without in any way violating the national security. I think I can do so, and I ask the Senator from Louisiana to check me. I believe I can do it by putting it in this way: The amusing thing about the comments in these two editorials, and the proof of the complete falaciousness of the observations of the editorial writers, as the Senator from Louisiana, sitting on the floor of the Senate at this moment, knows, is that in respect to the observations of these two editorial writers in relation to our report, it was some of those very things that the highest military officials of our Government asked us to delete from our report, because they were so completely in conformity with the military policy being developed by the Pentagon officials, that they thought it might be better if we did not make those comments at this time. I ask the Senator from Louisiana, is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Basically the Senator is correct in saying that we were requested to delete some of those statements, by an argument which basically said they were so sound they should not be put in the report.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, Mr. President, the very language of our report which the Star and Post editorials criticize most severely is in fact in line with the judgment and policy of some of our top military planners. It merely shows how wrong editorial writers can be when they do not do their homework, when they write against a deadline, and are not fair to their readers. I do not expect them to be fair to politicians, but they should be fair enough to their readers to get the facts and publish the facts rather than distort and misrepresent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Of course, I am sure the Senator agrees with me that the use of unnecesary secrecy is a vicious offense against the taxpayers of this Nation. If the ordinary person should take these documents, stacked to the height of a man, which contain an average of perhaps 20 lines to each page, and each line having a request of anywhere from $1,000 to $15,000,000, and go over them page by page, line by line, as we have done, he could see where expenditures should not be made. But again, we find that the argument of secrecy is urged. It would be very bad to let our enemies know where all this money is proposed to be spent, we are told, and we are therefore restrained from advising the public in many instances as to where unnecessary expenditures are being made.

Then there is another problem which disturbs us. We find our Nation, not with the consent of Congress, not even with the knowledge of Congress, sending certain agents overseas to bargain for the stationing of vast numbers of troops that we believe any fair-minded American would agree should never be sent. But we cannot tell the public about the number of troops wanted, and where it is desired to send them, and of the absurdity of sending them there in the first place. Why? The reason is that while our Nation is negotiating an agreement, which to some of us may seem unwise, it might embarrass our negotiators to let it be known that there is criticism back home of what they are negotiating. It is supposed to be a matter of military secrecy that we are getting ready to do something that many of us think is unwise.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for that contribution, because it has to do with the very next point in my speech, namely, the whole problem of secrecy, and the difficulty that problem presents to the subcommittee in making the representations we would like to make in order to leave no doubt even in the minds of any superficial editorial writer, as to the soundness of the positions we take on each point of this report.

Mr. President, I agree there must be a strong program of secrecy, in that our punches are not to be telegraphed to a potential enemy. I agree with that, and I would be the first to insist that we resolve doubts in favor of keeping information secret, if there is any possibility that it might be an aid to a potential enemy. But I point out that, in my judgment, the Pentagon Building has simply gone hog wild on this whole matter of secrecy. It wants us to keep concealed from the American people a great deal of vital information which the American people are entitled to have, if they in turn are going to be fair judges of the demands of the military for a large share of the economic resources of the United States.

Let me tell you, Mr. President, I never stand in awe of brass or braid; I judge men by their brains. Let me tell you, further, Mr. President, there is no necessary causal connection or relationship between brass and braid on the one hand and the brains in the heads resting on the shoulders that carry the brass and braid. These men must be judged from the standpoint of what they propose, and on the basis of intellectual criteria. So it is necessary for a subcommittee such as ours to pierce through the fear and the scare arguments into the facts, and then do, as we did with the Pentagon Building when we completed our findings, two things, neither one of which was mentioned by these two superficial editorial writers.

On October 1, the subcommittee held an executive meeting with officials in the Pentagon Building. We forewarned them concerning our findings. We talked the findings over with them, informally and formally. We made a record of the hearing. At a later date, if it shall become necessary, Mr. President, I shall discuss some of the record on the floor of the Senate with respect to nonsecurity items, because the Pentagon Building has known for months the position of the subcommittee. We were exceedingly fair with the Pentagon Building in giving them due notice and opportunity to correct their mistakes. I shall say something in a moment about what they have done in regard to their mistakes.

The second thing the editorial writers did not know was that we went over the report with a fine-tooth comb, so to speak, and eliminated from it those provisions which officials in the Pentagon Building and in the State Department thought might be embarrassing or unwise from the standpoint of security, but not from the standpoint of the merits of the observations.

Oh, Mr. President, I wish I had a transcript of the record that I could present to the Senate as to what some

of the top brass in the Pentagon Building have said about the merits of this report.

We did not comb out one particular matter, because, in discussing it with them, they had to admit that it did not involve national security, as did the other material we had agreed to take out. It really involved our judgment. It involved a public-policy question about which the American people are entitled to have open discussion, because we cannot separate the question of mobility of defense and offense from the question of the manpower problem which confronts this session of the Congress as to whether or not we shall continue to send abroad, into the cold war of Europe, while our boys are dying in a hot war in Korea, the thousands and thousands of American manpower we found the military intends to send. We want to make clear to them and to the State Department that Eisenhower is right when he points out, in effect, that, after all, we and our European allies are in this effort together, and they have got to stand with us, which means, Mr. President, that they must put up a larger share of allied manpower than they have furnished up to this time. We have a right to look to our allies to do more of the manning of bases abroad. What we are pointing out is that a waste of American dollars, a waste of American manpower, and that some evil psychological effects to which I shall come in a moment, are involved in sending increasing thousands of American boys abroad to man bases in French Morocco, in Libya, and other parts of Africa, and in Europe, when many of them can be manned by the troops of our allies and maintained and operated by them, so that the bases may be in full readiness to receive our planes in case it becomes necessary to fight a third holocaust.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Unless someone does what we did in this report, Mr. President, there are going to be several thousand men living in Iceland, not Air Force men, but Army men, for the most part, thinking that perhaps some day the Russians may try to take Iceland. It does not make good sense to have these men stationed there, perhaps for a generation, waiting for a war which we hope to avoid. It is time some action was taken about it before we provide housing for that personnel and before we have an agreement undertaking to defend people who would not be willing to agree to defend themselves.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Louisiana is saying is that the United States of America is providing Iceland with an army, and the United States is being asked to police the capital city of Iceland and to defend Iceland with American military manpower, while Iceland is not offering any manpower of its own for military defense. The subcommittee asks the Pentagon officials and the American people if they think that is a sound public policy for the United States of America.

Mr. LONG. I completely agree with the Senator, and I say that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not take some steps to avoid such a situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next point I wish to record in this discussion of the Long-Morse report involves what has already happened as a result of the report, and a discussion of what has already occurred as a result of the executive meeting we had with the officials in the Pentagon Building in early October. We not only had a formal meeting in the Armed Services Committee room, where a transcript of record was taken, but we had a series of meetings in the Pentagon Building, in the offices of some of the top officials.

I do not intend to betray any confidences, but it is perfectly proper for me to say that great appreciation was expressed to us for bringing to light some of the mistakes we disclosed, and for placing some men in the Pentagon Building in such a position that our report and findings could be used as the weapon for beating over the head some who were responsible for mistakes. Some changes were made correcting some of the mistakes.

Mr. President, if you had sat with me in the executive sessions of the Committee on Armed Services and listened to top military officials recognize that mistakes were made, you would know that they gave their reasons for them; and there are reasons for some of them, such as the speed with which it is necessary to work in a program so expansive as the present one. But that does not reduce one iota the importance of bringing out the facts about the mistakes, and letting those in positions of authority do what they can to see to it that the mistakes are corrected, and that the same mistake will not be made again.

Mr. President, that is, in part, the contribution of this subcommittee, recognized at the Pentagon Building. Of course, I realize that it is almost a pattern of conduct on the part of brass and braid not to admit mistakes publicly. They never like to do it. It is not playing the Army game or the Navy game or the Air Force game. But mistakes were made.

Let me cite just one of them, because it is being mentioned in the press these days, and there is an attempt on the part of some to whitewash it. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon were in Morocco and inspected the controversial bases. We can answer the question, "Vas you dere, Sharlie?" We saw. As a member of the Johnson subcomittee, the present speaker sat for days when that subcommittee investigated the waste and the extravagance that went into the Moroccan bases.

Incidentally, the present President of the United States even mentioned that during the campaign. Millions of dollars were wasted. In spite of all the military snowstorms to cover up the facts, they cannot be covered up. It is impossible to cover up the facts about the waste in connection with the Moroccan bases.

I walked down into the gravel pit at Nouasseur. I saw with my own eyes strata as high as the base wall of the Senate Chamber where steam shovels had been taken supposedly to obtain gravel, when from 40 to 60 percent of it in spots was clay. It was dumped into trucks and hauled out onto a supposed runway and used as the foundation layer for that runway.

Is it any surprise that when a 200-ton compactor was put upon that runway, as we saw with our own eyes, the runway gave way, to the tune of thousands of square yards? We saw with our own eyes the so-called dental areas. It is said that a dental repair job is being done on the runway. The dental repair jobs are extensive. A space in the runway as large as the surface of the Senate Chamber is taken out. Then a bulldozer is set to work. Lying close to the surface of the runway are found rocks as large as a football, rocks which never saw a stone crusher.

Does anyone believe that a good runway could be built with that kind of foundation? Is it any surprise that while we were there, under cross-examination I obtained an admission from the high brass that the 200-ton compactor which we saw on the hard stands was not on the runway because the Air Force official who was to be in charge of maneuvers starting October 1 requested that it be taken off the runway, since if it were left working on the runway by October 1 he would not have left a runway upon which it would be safe for him to conduct his maneuvers.

It is easy to sit in an ivory tower in the Star or the Post editorial rooms and imagine something when one has not the facts, and then use such imaginings to poison the minds of the reading public with respect to a matter which is vital to American public policy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, editorials of that sort may be calculated in some way to discourage Senators or Representatives from finding the places where waste is occurring and doing something about it.

The Senator from Oregon is familiar with the situation which we found at Naples. Three thousand of our boys are there. We could discover no justifiable excuse for 3,000 American soldiers in Naples. In fact, we could find no reason for 100 men being in Naples. To this day we have not discovered why 3,000 men should be in Naples. They have been there for years. We find that the plan is to send more and more men overseas instead of bringing men home.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for bringing up the Naples case. I had quite forgotten it. We found such a mass of horrible examples that I had forgotten this particular one.

Mr. LONG. Someone criticized the fact that the findings of the subcommittee were based on a 6-weeks' trip. I suggest to the Senator that if we had had more time we could have found a great deal more.

Mr. MORSE. There can be no doubt about that.

Let me tell the Senate about Naples. When we reached Naples we had a Navy briefing. It lasted a long time. I thought that sooner or later we would find out what the mission was all about. We never did find out what the mission was. We reached the conclusion that

the mission was for them to support one another; but we never found out what the need was for that particular operation. When we returned we wrote to the Secretary of the Navy and said that we would like to have him tell us. He stated that he would take the matter under investigation. We still do not know.

A very humorous thing occurred the other day in committee—and it is proper for me to mention it. We were told that one of the answers to our inquiry as to what the mission is at Naples is that CINCNELM is located at Naples. If so, we said that we were never so informed all the time we were there. We never found a trace of CINCNELM there. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon said, "We do not believe it." So we asked to have some high Navy men sent to the committee. They came in yesterday afternoon.

I said, "I have just one question to ask. Admiral, where is CINCNELM located?" As to the answer, I will not disclose where it was said to be located, but the answer was not Naples. It wasn't even on the European continent. I laughed and said, "The state rests; witness excused."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I think it might be worth while to point out to the layman what CINCNELM means. It is a Navy abbreviation, I believe, for "Commander in Chief, Northeastern Atlantic and Mediterranean." The explanation to us was that originally CINCNELM was supposed to command the northeastern Atlantic area and the Mediterranean, but inasmuch as we had joined the NATO Command under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, those activities had been taken over under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that CINCNELM did not command the 6th Fleet, which was in the Mediterranean area. In fact, CINCNELM commanded nothing in the Mediterranean or northeastern Atlantic, but CINCNELM's activities had been reduced to the point where all that CINCNELM had to take an interest in was the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. The best excuse we have had so far for 3,000 men being in Naples, apparently for years, is that CINCNELM has his headquarters there, but CINCNELM does not have his headquarters there. We have never yet been able to determine why there should be 3,000 Navy boys stationed in Naples.

Mr. MORSE. That is a good example of what I have been describing. It is one of the things which has led the junior Senator from Oregon to say—and he has received much criticism for it—that he believes a great deal of the organizational setup of our military in Europe is a monstrosity. We had better streamline it not only in the interest of saving millions of dollars and of saving manpower, but in the interest of a sounder, more effective defense and security against Russia.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. To give a rough idea of what it means in terms of dollars, men were inconvenienced by being drafted and taken into the service and compelled to live overseas without their families. Three thousand men at an average of, let us say, not less than $3,500 in salary apiece means an unnecessary $10 million every year which the taxpayer must pay in salaries alone, not to mention the construction which we saw being undertaken by reason of a tortured construction of the law, and various other expenditures of that sort.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana suggests that the construction work which we saw in various parts of the world on our trip was being done under a tortured construction of the law. He is right. For example, we found the use of a little "sleeper" clause in present legislation which makes it possible for the services to do a little emergency building, up to $200,000 or thereabouts, on various items. They do not have to come to Congress for authorization for such construction. They can transfer funds around to their hearts' content, and start a job on an emergency basis, spending as much as $200,000 on it. But that expenditure does not complete the construction. We then find in our hypothetical that we have an investment of $200,000, and that half a million dollars more will be needed to complete the project. Then the services come to us with requests for authorization to complete what was supposed to be a little emergency job.

What do we say in our findings? We did not conduct tea parties arriving at our findings. We thought we owed the Senate Armed Services Committee a certain responsibility. When we saw these things we said they ought to be stopped. That is why in the October 1 meeting, for example, I said, in effect: It is my position that we must change the rules so you cannot play the game that way. We must make some changes so that you cannot go ahead and spend $200,000 without getting direct and specific authorization, at least, from the Armed Services Committees of the Congress. There must be some checks placed on such activities.

Mr. President, some checks must be placed on the Armed Services Establishment. The whole system of checks and balances, which is a great bulwark and strength of our Government, must be applied all the way down the line. This is a good example of where it ought to be applied.

I also pointed out during that October 1 meeting—and I restate my position on the floor today—that we must get it through the heads of those in the Pentagon that the authorization of a project does not mean the authorization necessarily is irrevocable once it is made. No, Mr. President, even the appropriation should not be considered as being irrevocable. We must maintain a constant vigilance in that regard, and when we find that conditions have changed and there is no longer the same need for a project, we must be much more ready than I think our record in the Senate and in Congress as a whole has been up to now, to put in a stop order and recover the funds, rather than to proceed on the assumption that once funds are authorized and appropriated, that is the end of the matter.

I quite agree with the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the members of the Committee on Armed Services that we need a watchdog committee which will constantly check on the use to which authorized and appropriated funds are being put.

There are other instances which I could cite, and I shall now refer to the Bordeaux incident. It may enlighten the editorial writers of the Post and Star, if they are capable of enlightenment and capable of opening their minds to the facts.

The Senator from Louisiana and I went to Bordeaux. We always had a habit of taking a vacation from the brass and going off on our own when we inspected a base. We were always very careful to try to see what we thought was there to be seen, and not to limit ourselves to what the brass might wish to show us. So at Bordeaux I took a little trip for myself and spent a long time moving from tent to tent—Mr. President, mark the word "tent"—and I sat down with some boys who were attached to a corps of Air Force engineers. A few months previously they had been stationed in Louisiana, where there was a lot of work to be done and where the quarters were adequate. To my shocking surprise, I found that they had been at Bordeaux for over a month without a single assignment of any kind. They had just sat there in tents. Mr. President, you can well imagine the morale of those boys. It was not good. You can well imagine the letters they were writing back to their parents and to their friends and to their Senators and Representatives in Congress. The question they kept asking me was: "What are we here for, Senator?"

I said, "I am sure I do not know what you are here for."

So we proceeded to try to find out. This was to be the second year thousands of boys were being kept in tents in Bordeaux. Mr. President, if you have ever lived in Bordeaux in the rainy season, you know it is not a very pleasant place, and that it is not very pleasant to live in tents. Certainly anyone would prefer to live in a better kind of quarters if they could be obtained. We became satisfied that the responsibility for not even having Dallas huts built in Bordeaux to meet the rigors of the second winter lay in the Pentagon. That is where the responsibility was.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator does not overlook to point out that proper building materials were available and that the men could have built themselves some housing, but they had not been permitted to do so.

Mr. MORSE. I was coming to that. That was to be my final thrust. Mr. President, there was no excuse for putting thousands of men through a second winter in Bordeaux in tents. There was no excuse at all for moving them out of Louisiana until decent quarters were available for them in Bordeaux.

When we returned home, one of the first things I asked at the October 1 meeting was "Why did you do it?"

A high official in the Air Force said, "We did it for psychological reasons."

I said, "Whose psychological betterment were you concerned about? Was it the psychological betterment of the boys? Was it the psychological betterment of the French?"

So far as the boys were concerned, they were met by inscriptions on walls all over Bordeaux reading "Yanks, go home." The boys told us some sad tales about what had happened to them and the reception they got when they went into town. It was not for the psychological betterment of the French either.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out these were Air Force engineers. They were skilled men. They were not even allowed to repair their living quarters. As the Senator from Louisiana has also stated, there was some lumber available which they could have used to build themselves better quarters. The arrangements with the French prevented their doing such construction work. They could not get any hot water, and they could not repair the facilities which were denying the hot water to them. Why? We cannot say much about it, because the section dealing with it is one of the sections we had to strike from our report. The State Department did not want us to discuss the French situation because it might interfere with negotiations. Therefore I cannot say any more about it, except that I assure the Senate there is no excuse for the conditions under which we found the American boys living in the muck and mire and unsatisfactory conditions in which we found the men living in Bordeaux and certain parts of the world during our 30,000-mile trip.

I revert to the wise statement of President Eisenhower. As I have stated before, and as I have demonstrated here today, when I think Eisenhower is right about something I will fight just as hard in his support on the floor of the Senate as I intend to oppose him when I think he is wrong. That is my duty as a Senator. I think what he said in his state of the Union message on this subject is commendable:

> Fifth. Our policy will be designed to foster the advent of practical unity in Western Europe. The nations of that region have contributed notably to the effort of sustaining the security of the free world. From the jungles of Indochina and Malaya to the northern shores of Europe, they have vastly improved their defensive strength. Where called upon to do so, they have made costly and bitter sacrifices to hold the line of freedom.
>
> But the problem of security demands closer cooperation among the nations of Europe than has been known to date.

President Eisenhower is irrefutably right when he makes that statement, and it is a part of the burden of our report. That is why, as two Senators, assisted by a very able professional staff of military and engineering experts, we submitted our findings in a report bottomed upon 18 months, at least, of work as a subcommittee in investigating the details of the installation program of the Military Establishment. The report, I submit, is so sound, based as it is on the evidence gathered on our trips and hearings, much of which I cannot publicly disclose, that at our October 1 meeting and at our informal conferences in the Pentagon the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and I received admission after admission of its accuracy from the officials at the Pentagon, and their promises that they would proceed to rectify the mistakes. I desire to say that, to their everlasting credit, they have taken our representations to heart, and as they have already testified in recent days, they are bringing about a great many changes and reforms which have been pointed out as needed by our report.

I have one more point to make, and then I shall close my discussion of this item. You will understand, Mr. President, the great danger a politician faces when he stands up against one of the most powerful pressure groups in America, namely, the military pressure group. When one criticizes the military he finds that by various devices, such as superficial editorials, attempts will be made to misrepresent him and, in some way, somehow, leave the impression that he does not believe in strong defense, or that he wants to bring the boys home and go isolationist.

The Senator from Louisiana and I make no such recommendation at all, Mr. President. We know that we must have a large number of troops abroad. But we are warning the American people that if we do not put a check on the military, we shall have far too many troops abroad, doing the work that our allies ought to be doing for themselves to a greater degree. That is the burden of our argument and the weight of our argument on the manpower issue—not that all our boys should be brought home, but that there are too many of them in some places.

When, for example, we point out, as we do in our report, that, in our opinion, some great mistakes have been made in construction, with the result that it might be possible for an enemy to break the backbone of our defense in certain areas, then we are subjected to criticism by editorials such as those which have appeared in the Washington Star and the Washington Post, in which we have been criticized for regarding ourselves as military experts. However, Mr. President, we have not claimed to be military experts. In the case of some of the bases the verdict was rendered, not by us, but by the brass and the braid itself. Without mentioning the base, I can tell the Senate of a base which has cost several hundred million dollars. We inspected it at length. We examined the location of the gasoline storage tanks and their relationship to the camp facilities. In our inquiry, the Senator from Louisiana did the cross-examining, and a brilliant job he did. He said, "General, suppose the Russians were to drop, not an atom bomb, but just one ordinary blockbuster on one of those gasoline tanks. What would happen?"

Mr. President, what answer do you suppose we received to that question? The answer corresponded to what seemed to us to be obvious, namely, "The entire base would be lost."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Oregon could go further, if he wished to do so, and could state that one of the best officers located on that base pointed out to us: "Senator, they would not need to drop a bomb; it would take only one man with a little pack of matches to destroy this base."

Mr. MORSE. That is absolutely correct, Mr. President.

So when two Senators returned home and, backed up by a professional staff which supports every statement they make, submit a report which is criticized by some editorial writers who know nothing about the facts, but who try to tell the American people, in effect, that our report should be taken, as says the Washington Post, "with a grain of salt," then let me say that there are some salts that those writers should take. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we were disturbed about another thing, namely, the problem of peace. In these days we have almost reached such a point that if we talk about peace, we are smeared as being Communist. In fact, Mr. President, we have gone so far afield that we have let Russia, with her vicious lying propaganda and phony peace proposals, in large sections of the world, steal the peace issue away from the United States. It is a great tragedy affecting, as it does, the lives of millions of fellow Americans and free men around the world.

I shall continue to vote, as I have voted in the past, for every last dollar needed to defend my country and the allied free nations. I am in favor of the defense necessary to make certain that Russia dare not attack militarily. But, Mr. President, we are not going to win the peace through war. We are going to win the peace on the economic and spiritual fronts. We are going to win the peace only by getting millions upon millions of persons in the world who today are in doubt—and I am afraid they are also in the dark—about America's true plans, to understand that we stand for peace, that we seek only what the great Vandenberg stood for, namely, the ultimate establishment of a system of international justice through law. We must make clear that until the sunshine of that bright day can come, we intend to stand with free men everywhere in a defense strong enough to check Russian aggression.

For that kind of a defense program, Mr. President, always count me in. But the American people also should be forewarned of the danger of a military war psychology. They should recognize that we found too much of it abroad. We did not hear the brass and the braid talk about avoiding a third world war. We did not hear them say, "If the alarm sounds." On the contrary, we heard them talk about "when the alarm sounds." The paradox in many of their briefings was that they talked about "when the alarm sounds," and almost in the next breath would express concern about what they felt was growing dis-

sention at the grass roots of the country in which their base was located.

Is it surprising? Stretch foreign military bases from New York City to San Francisco, and man them with thousands of foreign military personnel, and see what the reaction in America would be. That is why President Eisenhower is so correct when he says that we must work out this problem in a spirit of cooperation and unity with our allies, and with an understanding of what the mutual economic and military security program is all about.

On that score I say we are not doing enough. We had better make clear to the American military that their job is defense; but the job of winning the peace is the job of every one of the 160 million American people, working in unity and cooperation with our allies abroad, and with a recognition that we shall win the peace primarily on the economic front. All of us must recognize, Mr. President, that greatest defense weapon America has is not the atomic bomb. It is true that the atomic bomb is the greatest offensive weapon we have in case of a war, but it is not the greatest defensive weapon we have. All of us must recognize that the greatest defensive weapon we have is the economic productive power of our friends abroad. Yet, Mr. President, today in the United States there are powerful forces whose representatives we meet day in and day out in the reception rooms standing with their hands out, asking for special legislative favors which will strengthen economic isolationism in America, but will endanger the peace. Mr. President, whether we like it or not, we had better read history and recognize that never in recorded time did any nation reach the great pinnacle of military strength which is ours today, in comparison with the strength of other nations of the world—and in generations gone by other nations have approached that pinnacle—and then followed a course of economic isolationalism, and survived.

Mr. President, today I would have my fellow Americans remember that the economic productive power of the countries in which millions of persons are now struggling for freedom constitutes our best defense weapon. Thus, when the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon argue for whatever funds are necessary for military defense, but warn that a great deal of the funds is being wasted, we also argue for the kind of economy and the kind of economizing that will make it possible for us to help strengthen the greatest defense weapon we have, namely, the economic productive power of our allies. Yet Senators who stand on the floor of the Senate and argue, for example, that the output of the factories of France, Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, India and all the other countries of the free world is important to the American citizen, and that we ought to do what we can within our economic abilities to help build up the economic power of those factories, are subjected to an avalanche of abusive and brutal criticism. I do not know what can be done to get the American people to see before it is too late that we are to win the peace with peaceful means, or we are not going to win it at all.

I am not one who scares easily, Mr. President. I am not the least bit frightened by Russia. I know full well, as Senators have heard me say before on the floor of the Senate, that if we are ever foolish enough to let ourselves become so weak that Russia can defeat us, she will try to do so, because she knows that the nation that believes in protecting the dignity and guaranteeing the freedom of the individual person represents a level of civilization and a political ideology and a philosophy foreign to the Russian conception and threatening to the existence of communism. Russia knows that to be so, and we must get other peoples of the world to understand it. We must cause them to realize, Mr. President, that the police-state methods of Russia, the enslavement policies of Russia deny to the individual both political and economic freedom. That will never be done by making war. As I listen, as we all do now so frequently, to those who urge us to support steps which would constitute, really, if we were to follow them, leading us into a third world war, I would like to say to them, "And then what?" Of course, we can defeat Russia. In my judgment, alone we can defeat Russia if we must. We can level her cities. We will lose some of our own, and millions of our citizens, but we can impose upon Russia a devastation so much greater than anything that she can impose upon us that alone, unaided, we can bring her to her knees, if we want to pay the price; indeed we can level all the great cities of China now, if we want to pay the price. But will that win the peace? What then, ask I? Does anyone think we could then walk off? Does anyone think we could turn our backs to the devastation which would be wrought? Does anyone think that after we have spent billions upon billions of dollars, which will jeopardize our free economy for decades to come, we shall have solved the problem of peace by winning a war?

I am firmly of the conviction that the winning of such a war will mean no peace until mankind rehabilitates itself after the war; and that would take decades.

The saying has been recorded in American history, "Fight we will, if fight we must." We as a free people will live up to that historical precedent. My prayer and my plea to the American people today, Mr. President, is, let us keep our heads. Let us recognize that our generation is called upon to make tremendous sacrifices in the interest of permanent peace and the maintenance of that great goal of Vandenberg's, a system of international justice through law.

Bad politics as it is, I submit it is sound statesmanship to say to the American people that the challenge and the duty of our generation is to make the economic sacrifices we shall have to make in order to help build up that great defense weapon which is ours, namely, the economic productive power of our allies. The wonderful thing about it, Mr. President, is that it will pay. In the long run it will pay, because in the long run that kind of program will bring to the backward areas of the world and to our allies an enlightened capitalism hitched to the political freedom of a free society; and only with that kind of an economy and that kind of political rights, is there any hope of attaining the peace.

I wish to thank the Senate for permitting me to do this committee work on the floor of the Senate today. I spoke, Mr. President, longer than I had intended, and I apologize to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for so doing. But I spoke from my heart, because what one sometimes reads in the newspapers in these days makes him wonder whether the editorial writers have forgotten the challenge of journalistic statesmanship which is theirs, namely, to present to the American people the facts concerning the great crisis, the solution of which is upon us whether we will it or not. The kind of solution will determine whether we have peace or war.

I turn now for a moment to submit a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Matter of Bases," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 17.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MATTER OF BASES

Grand strategy dished up by Congressmen usually should be taken with more than a grain of political salt and almost always with a strong dash of caution. But the report on American global bases just issued by Democratic Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, and Independent Senator WAYNE MORSE would seem to rule out partisan motives and to raise some quite pertinent strategic questions without jumping into strategic planning itself.

The two Senators have made a 30,000-mile survey of military installations. They found much to praise in efficiency, morale, and economy. But they are asking whether a good many bases, located not by decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff but by the several services, may not be dispersing strength in indefensible points at the expense of powerful mobile striking forces held in ready reserve. Perhaps also at the cost of fewer very strong bases which could be held and employed in counterattack.

They do not question advance bases as such. And they should not. What would have happened in World War II had not Britain held out and the islands been fully employed by American forces—or had Hawaii fallen to the Japanese? On the other hand, how much might the war have been shortened had the United States been able to hold Manila Bay and Britain Singapore?

It is not today's counterparts of such great bases that Messrs. LONG and MORSE appear to question—nor, we would assume, the outposts of the plane and radar screen. It is what appear to them to be installations that fall in between and seem vulnerable, unduly expensive, and unrelated to any overall plan.

These are questions which a layman can rightly ask and which Congress' Armed Services Committees can properly inquire into. The result may be justification of some of these bases, but, in the process, also a tightening up and a rethinking of the whole problem by the JCS.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the people of the United States would be well advised to read carefully every word the Senator from Oregon has said here today. He has rendered the Nation a great service in clearly standing for the

things which in his own heart and conscience he thought to be right. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I know of no other Member of the Senate who has been less susceptible to influence in one way or another to change his judgment from what he believed to be in the interest of the United States. Many times, and in many respects, he has demonstrated himself to be a man of conviction and a man of great learning. He has applied himself diligently to the study of the Nation's defense needs over a period of several years.

The junior Senator from Louisiana was one of the few Senators who supported a motion to add the Senator from Oregon to the Armed Services Committee. He believes that the Nation has suffered a substantial loss in being denied the services of the Senator from Oregon on that committee, because he is one who has the ability and the experience to know where savings can be made. He has shown excellent judgment in determining the country's military needs.

I should like to supplement a few things which the Senator from Oregon has said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that I deeply appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, when I referred to the failure of the Senate to place the Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee, I should have said that while only six Senators voted to support him for a position on that committee, many Senators have since told me that they regretted that they were not in position to vote for him. They were fearful that if those of us on the minority side attempted to dictate to the majority side who should be members of a committee, the majority might exercise its power to determine who the minority members should be on this side of the aisle.

Tactically, the Senator from Oregon was in a very disadvantageous position. The junior Senator from Louisiana admires the Senator from Oregon as a man of conviction and sincerity who is willing to make whatever sacrifice he believes the situation requires when he makes an unprecedented move which he believes in his own heart and conscience he must do.

Mr. President, there has been some criticism of the junior Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon in attempting to address ourselves to any questions of strategy. If the Members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services are not in position seriously to question the strategic planning of our generals and admirals, let me ask who is?

There are not as many persons exercising independent judgment as some might think, because I detect in the military the fact that each subordinate officer must be very, very careful insofar as criticism of his superior officers is concerned. So, if a few highly placed officers make mistakes, the Nation is in grave peril.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Pearl Harbor investigation ever uncovered the full facts at the time it was made. The reason for that was because at that time it could not be revealed that this Nation had broken the Japanese code more than 20 years previously, and that during the time Japan was preparing to attack us we were intercepting her messages and knew she was going to attack us. We had been receiving her messages and they were known in the highest councils of the American Government. It is true that we did not know precisely at what point and precisely at what hour she would attack, but our highest military leaders knew the attack was coming before it fell. Our military commanders in the Pacific had been advised that they should be prepared for the possibility of a Japanese attack. What did we find? We found that the Pacific fleet was operating under the old comfortable peacetime procedure of coming into the harbor for a Saturday night party, and on Sunday the ship would be short of officers and crewmen.

When the attack occurred, we lost our planes on the ground and we lost almost the entire Pacific Fleet. There was one fortunate circumstance in that we had sent three of our major aircraft carriers to deliver some planes at Wake Island. Those carriers were returning from Wake Island when they ran into a storm and had to reduce speed because of the storm, so that they were not lost in the Pearl Harbor disaster.

If anything was proved it was that we cannot rely upon our military men to be infallible. Only by good fortune did we have any of our Pacific Fleet left after the Japanese attack; all of which leads to the conclusion that mistakes can be made.

Mr. President, I have been concerned regarding the lack of unification in our services. The Air Force does not attempt to pass judgment on anything which the Navy does, nor does the Navy attempt to pass on what the Air Force does. I was amazed to hear the testimony of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, when he stated that in determining that a certain base should be established in a given locality the Chiefs of Staff did not attempt to pass on whether it should be a $50 million base, a $100 million base, or a $250 million base. Nor do they attempt to pass on the question of whether there should be 100 men, 1,000 men, or 10,000 men stationed at a given base.

General Bradley explained that the Unification Act contains provisions which prevent the Joint Chiefs of Staff from passing on such a question. Somewhere down the line the decision must be made by someone in the Air Force, if an air base is involved, or in the Navy Department, if a naval base is involved, or in the War Department, if an Army base is involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the point the Senator is now making is one of the most important findings of our subcommittee. It adds up to the need of amending the Unification Act so there can be genuine unification. We would not have had the character of testimony from General Bradley to which reference has been made if there had been a Unification Act which really gives to the Secretary of Defense and to the Chiefs of Staff the authority to make decisions and to declare the unification which we need but which the present act does not provide. We in the Senate tried to do something about it. The Senate passed a series of amendments to the Unification Act, which had been recommended by the Armed Services Committee, seeking to remove some of the weaknesses in the present act, but they were emasculated in the House.

The Senator is making an important contribution when he points out that one of the things we need, if we are to prevent such mistakes from happening and make a better use of the military dollar, is an act which gives the authority needed to make savings and issue orders which require the three services to coordinate their efforts and work as a team.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not plan for the number of personnel which each service is to apply to a given task. There, again, someone should make a study of the situation. If there are twice as many men on an airbase as are needed, it means that there must be built twice as much barracks space, twice as much space for feeding the troops, twice as much brig space, twice as many automobiles, twice as much automobile repair space. And so it goes. The economies which can result from reducing excessive manpower are almost innumerable.

The waste of manpower in the military is almost beyond description. The Johnson subcommittee made a recommendation in which they questioned the use of some manpower. For example, it was found that a commercial company operating a tanker would have approximately 43 men in the crew, while the Navy operating a Navy oiler, which serves substantially the same purpose as a tanker, would have 282 men on the ship, or about 7 times as many men as the tanker. What is the necessity of having seven times as many men as would be used for the commercial operation? There will be an attempt to justify that. Those responsible can argue it until they are exhausted if they care to do so, but they will never convince me that they need 7 times as many men, because I can too well remember my wartime experience, when I was the commander of a lowly amphibious craft, a ship with a crew of 2 officers and 15 men. I did not want that many men. I was not thinking about the taxpayers as much as I was concerned about the fact that we had no room for all those men, with the limited facilities at our disposal. Yet we had to take 2 officers and 15 men. As a matter of fact, we divided up our schedule for services, so that half the crew would be off at all times and only half the crew would be on duty while we were around in port, where the men could go ashore and enjoy liberty. The ship was designed for a crew of 10. It could have been operated by a crew of seven. Yet we had

more than 15. I cite my experience as an example of the great waste of personnel in the last war.

The investigation of the air bases showed that at one base where it was possible to put only 75 pilots in the air in single-seater planes, and there were 1,200 men on the base, the largest single category was the motor pool of 258 men, as I recall.

That reminds me of the story that Winston Churchill wrote with regard to the Anzio operation. He said that when our troops went ashore he asked them to report to him day by day the number of men who were landing, and also the number of vehicles, the tanks, and the like; he asked if possible to be given a breakdown of what they were putting ashore. After a week he received word that even though we achieved complete surprise, the Germans had achieved a superiority of infantry. We had a little bridgehead of 7 miles, and we had landed 14,000 trucks with 2 men to the truck, a driver and an assistant driver. Of the 72,000 men we had landed, one-third of them were tied down in the trucks. He said, "I can see how the Germans achieved a superiority in infantry, but we certainly have a superiority of chauffeurs."

I have every good wish for the military, and I hope they will dig deeply enough to find where manpower is being used unnecessarily, because correcting that mistake could represent an enormous additional saving.

In his campaign the President of the United States made the statement that if we are to balance the budget and have an economical Government the greatest savings must be made in the military expenditures; and I am completely convinced that that is true. I am convinced that 25 cents out of every dollar we are spending on the military can be saved if a careful enough study is made on an item-by-item basis, with properly qualified experts to advise where the reductions can be made. Thus, if we hope to balance the budget and accomplish a reduction of about $10 billion in excessive spending, most of it must be saved in the Military Establishment. That can be done if a close enough study is made to bring out the facts.

I do not say that as one who is making a wild guess, but because the subcommittee of which I was chairman, and of which the Senator from Oregon was a member, found we could save about 23 percent of the requested funds even after the President of the United States sent a letter to the chairman of the entire committee saying "if you reduce the bill you are going to wreck the Nation." We saved the taxpayers $700 million in a way that did not jeopardize anything. We found innumerable items which could be and should be reduced.

Furthermore, we believe that some of the planning should be questioned. Let me mention one item I have in mind. Many of the demands for funds are based upon doing things which our allies are committed to do. For example, in certain areas, where we have bases, requests will be made of us to spend large sums of money to defend the area by land and air and sea, where the land is held by allies of ours who are receiving our money under the mutual assistance program. If our allies cannot hold their own soil with the aid we give them, which amounts to about $6 billion a year, then I think it is time we reconsider our program for military aid. It would obviously indicate that our military aid money is being wasted.

I think such a suggestion could well apply to the situation whereby we staff great numbers of fighter units in areas overseas where France and England should be responsible for air defense, because certainly the French and the English should be able to train their pilots to fulfill the air defense missions for bases in their lands.

I should like also to underline the issue the Senator from Oregon raised regarding our ultimate hope, which is not war, not victory, but peace. That is a point we should certainly carefully consider in our military planning. So far as I can discover, little effort is being made to work toward peace in the program. The program is directed toward ultimate victory in the event we find ourselves at war.

Let me suggest a question to my colleagues. What would we think if Soviet Russia were building enormous bases in Newfoundland, in Labrador, in Canada, in Mexico, in Puerto Rico, in Bermuda, in the Bahamas, in Cuba, and if she were moving vast numbers of troops in ever larger numbers? How would we feel if Russia had started a vast construction program building bomber bases throughout those areas, and moving into them planes, weapons, and materials in a constantly increasing flow? I say that the people of this Nation would gain the impression that Soviet Russia was planning to attack us if she continued to send such increasingly large numbers of men into those areas. We should follow the idea in our planning that Russia is not the only nation that could give provocation toward war.

I do not say that we should abandon our program with respect to bases. I am in favor of having as many airfields as I have heard discussed. But I do believe there are too many men on those airfields. I believe they are overstaffed and topheavy, and have too many headquarters. Every time a headquarters is established the desire is to put 2,500 or 3,000 men there. It seems that a general or an admiral has to have two or three thousand men under his command wherever he goes. The headquarters can be carried on with smaller numbers.

In north Africa, at the headquarters formerly commanded by General Olds, I understand the general who has succeeded him has about 500 men under him. I believe a study would indicate, perhaps, that they could get by at other headquarters with 500 men, if they had to. I am sure that if the top command told the general in command that he would have to get by with 500 men, he would find a way to make 500 men do. Yet, there are requests to vastly increase that number.

We have been holding our requests for additional facilities at Rabat where there is no United States flying except administrative flying. Administrative flying means flying the general around from that field and also Members of Congress when they come to that area. But the United States does not fly planes to defend the Moroccan complex, or to defend the airbases from the base at Rabat. To the junior Senator from Louisiana it seems very wasteful to build the large communications facilities which have been requested for that area, when we already have a duplicating facility to the north, at Sidi Slimane; a facility at Nouasseur to the south, which is supposed to serve the same purpose; and a facility 40 miles away by good highway at the naval base at Port Lyaute. But once they start spending so much money in these areas, we find that there is no end to it. The program envisions more spending and more and more men.

We certainly hope that this program will be fully studied. We believe that great economies have been effected. The junior Senator from Louisiana is under the impression that the new Secretary of Defense and his Secretaries for Air, Navy, and Army, will be making every effort to find where there are unnecessary items of expenditure and will reduce them. In that direction, I believe, lies our best hope of balancing the budget and at the same time providing the security to which the Nation is entitled.

THE FARM OUTLOOK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, September 7, 1952, was a fine day in the Middle West. In the vicinity of Kasson, Minn., there was a warm sun and a pleasant breeze from the north. There on a delightful day thousands of farmers had gathered to hear a distinguished Republican address them on farm policy. I quote some of the remarks he then made:

> And here, and now, without any ifs or buts, I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the Basic Farm Act, passed by the votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

The speaker was evidently a man convinced of the righteousness of his cause. He did not stop at this but went on in the following words:

> I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal in ways that minimize Government control and protect the farmers' independence; and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity.

The speaker who uttered these significant words was General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower.

I am sure that he sincerely meant what he said. He is aware of the high place of agriculture among us. He was, therefore, earnestly intent upon saying to the Nation that the farmer should get his fair share of the national income. In order to assure this fair share to farmers he believes that they should get not only 90 percent of parity but full parity. This, I take it, means parity at 90 percent as established by law, plus 10 percent.

So far, so good. But the Republican Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, does not seem to be in agreement with the solemn promises made to the electorate last year by the Republican candidate. In his press conference of February 5, 1953, Mr. Benson said:

> When you have high support prices, prices that are normally above what the free market would be, there is always a tendency for that to encourage increased production.

I gather that the Secretary's objection to support prices is that they encourage increased production, the thing that he evidently regards with abhorrence. If you regard a thing with abhorrence, you naturally seek means to remove it. In this case then, I judge that Mr. Benson would be in favor of lowering the price bases of farm products that now encourage agricultural production so that production would be decreased.

The great State of Minnesota seems to be the battleground of Republican contradictions about farm policy. It was in Minnesota that General Eisenhower promised farmers full parity for their crops and by the context of his words led all American farmers to believe that the farm policy of the Democratic Party would be continued under the Republican Party if it should come to power. I am prepared to believe that our President is not a farm expert. But I also believe that he was perfectly sincere in his statements to the American people on the farm problem.

On February 11, 1953, less than a month after the inauguration of our new President, Secretary Benson addressed the Central Livestock Association at St. Paul, Minn. His address is headlined by the Washington Post as follows: "Benson Spells Doom of United States Farm Bounty."

There he promised to carry out present laws providing for compulsory supports at 90 percent of parity for 1953–54. This, of course, is the law as written, and the Secretary must enforce it. But what about the future? What is the Secretary's attitude toward the farmer and farm supports?

As nearly as I could gather from the Secretary's language, which is obscure in some respects, he seems to be in favor of letting nature take its course in the market and on the farm. He believes that farmers have a right to take a risk even if the cards are stacked against them. He is opposed, he says, "to price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in items of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided."

Then he lays down a generalized philosophy in these words:

> Inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture nor any other segment of our economy.

The assumption here is that the American farmer is inefficient. The fact is that the American farmer is a miracle of efficiency. Last year only 5½ million farmers were responsible for our prodigious outpouring of food and fiber crops.

If, however, Mr. Benson is to apply the philosophy that inefficiency should not be subsidized, then he will find himself in sharp conflict with ancient Republican Party doctrine.

Dozens of highly inefficient industries are protected and subsidized by the United States Government at the expense of all the people through protective tariffs. The very fact that these industries have to have high tariffs is proof that they are inefficient. For, when an industry is highly efficient—as the automobile industry is—it not only does not demand high tariffs but is able to export in competition with like industries throughout the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may interpolate that I was very much pleased by Mr. Henry Ford's statement of yesterday on that point.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator would like to list the 100 inefficient industries in the United States which he thinks ought to be destroyed.

Mr. FULRRIGHT. There are one or two cases pending now. I think a good example is the briar-pipe industry—not that it should be destroyed——

Mr. TAFT. That is a small industry which involves an investment of only a few million dollars. What main industries would the Senator like to destroy by reducing the tariffs?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My point is—and I shall pursue it a little further—that if the point Mr. Benson was making was that agriculture is inefficient and therefore should not be subsidized, as would appear from the statement which I have just quoted——

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the Senator's position, hundreds of inefficient industries which are protected by the Republicans ought to be destroyed. I should like to know what industries the Senator wishes to destroy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is attempting to put words in my mouth. I did not say they should be destroyed. This is the point with respect to what the Secretary said:

> Inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture nor any other segment of our economy.

There is an assumption that agriculture is inefficient. I deny that. But if that is his philosophy, I should say that it is not in accord with the ancient protective tariff policy of the Republicans, because the very purpose of the tariff is to protect from competition industries which necessarily must be inefficient relative to products which might be imported.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does he think——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not yield just now. I wish to make my point.

As the Senator well knows, for many years a number of industries have had protection under the traditional Republican doctrine. This is a difference which goes back to the beginning of this country. The Senator knows that on many occasions I have taken the position that we ought gradually to relax our tariff policy and go more and more toward free trade. I grant that we cannot do so overnight. I also grant that there are perfectly legitimate reasons why this country should study the cases of industries which have been built up because of our tariff policy, from the point of view of compensation, as when we take properties for public use. I am perfectly willing to accept that principle.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As to industries, I will say that practically every industry we have sheltered with a tariff policy could be classed as an inefficient industry in that sense. I believe there are a number of them. I will give an example of what I tried to do last year. I had control of the bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act. That was the most recent example of a trial of that issue on the floor of the Senate. As I recall, every Republican who voted at all voted against the repeal of the quota law. That is an example I want to cite. I do not think the repeal of such a law would destroy an American industry. In my opinion, it adds a very small amount to our imports, and at the same time does a great deal more harm to our agriculture as a whole than is gained by a few cheese manufacturers.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator from Arkansas says that an industry is inefficient if it must be protected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say that the makers of blue cheese who cannot compete with blue cheese from Denmark are not entitled to protection. I made speech after speech on the subject a year ago. It is not a new subject. It is not anything new for me to try to repeal that section of the law, which favors the blue cheese manufacturers. It means that they cannot compete with the manufacturers of blue cheese in Denmark and other foreign countries.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from Arkansas say that it is an inefficient industry because they must pay three times the wages, in order to provide the American standard of living, than the wages that are paid in Denmark?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say that the protective tariff is just as much a subsidy as the support of prices on agricultural products. The Secretary of Agriculture is taking the position in his statement, as I read it, that agriculture is an inefficient business and that it ought to be left to stand by itself and to compete in the market place.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Secretary's speech in that way. What I understand is that we should not stimulate by support production which is larger than we can possibly hope to dispose of. That is something that does not happen in the case of a tariff, but it can happen by oversubsidizing any particular crop which can be produced in such great quantities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio is making a refinement in the Secretary's speech. I have a great deal more to say about the Secretary's speech, but the part I have quoted does not lead me to the conclusions expressed by the Senator from Ohio. The point is that in my view a tariff is just as much a subsidy for an industry as an attempt to help the farmer under the support-price program. They are both subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not saying that we are not trying to protect agriculture and support it, as most Democrats have, but what the Secretary's speech means to me is that he does not approve of the existing program. What he will do in the future I do not know. I assume he is coming to something like the so-called Aiken bill. However, the whole implication in his speech is that he does not approve of the existing program.

Mr. TAFT. The implication I get is that he feels that if a guaranteed price is set too high it will lead to a volume of production which cannot be disposed of. Is it not correct to say that the Democratic administration has left on our hands billions of dollars worth of crops, including large quantities of corn which have spoiled, and a lot of other commodities which have been bought but which the Government has not been able to dispose of? The Secretary has the tremendous problem of trying to get rid of that great surplus of commodities which was bought by the last administration. No doubt he is concerned about the possibility of having to buy a still greater amount unless the matter is adjusted so as at least in some way to check the excessive production in certain fields of agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that there are difficulties connected with distribution. However, I wish to call his attention to a statement which I believe was made the day before yesterday. It was made by Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, who pointed out that the real trouble lies in the distribution of those products. Taking the world as a whole, there is a real shortage, and he pointed out that it was a shame that the production of this country could not be put to good use. That statement was made by the present Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse. That is where the effort should be made. An effort should be made toward better distribution of the products. It seems to me that our attention would be much better spent on freeing the markets so that the agricultural products we produce could get into the places where they are needed. One way of doing it is to remove a large number of tariffs, which have been traditionally Republican tariffs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not correct to say that in the last year we subsidized and gave away wheat to the extent of some sixty or seventy million dollars?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. But the Senator feels that we should give away still more?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I am making is that——

Mr. TAFT. That would provide better distribution, but we would be giving the products away. That is the only difficulty about the Senator's better distribution proposal, as I see it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there would be difficulty if we permitted other countries to sell us a few articles. I am not suggesting either that this is a panacea. There are other considerations, of course, and I do not think, if we did away with our tariffs, that overnight there would be a millenium. However, one of the important factors has been the exclusion by tariff and quotas of goods coming to this country, the sale of which would give other countries the purchasing power to buy our goods.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield again?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say something about wheat. One of the reasons why our export of wheat is down over that of the preceding year—it is only a small reason, but it is a typical one—is due to the exclusion of cheese imports from Holland, Denmark, and Switzerland. Those countries had been purchasing wheat from us, and to the extent that they have not been able to sell us their cheese, in the amount of X number of dollars, they could not buy wheat from us. Therefore, we are gradually restricting our markets for agricultural products.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas, I am sure, is aware of the fact that we are buying $15 billion worth of goods from the world. In other words, we have spent $15 billion for imports, and the money has been scattered all over the world for people to use in buying goods from us. The difficulty with wheat is that people in foreign countries will not pay the price we must charge for wheat. As a matter of fact, the wheat exports under the International Wheat Agreement must be substantially subsidized by the United States Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am aware of that fact. One of the main reasons is that industries have traditionally been protected by tariffs, and the rest of the world could not sell us anything. That was true not only last year but for the past 40 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have a favorable balance of trade. We have been gathering in all the world's gold. Now we have the gold and we still will not let other countries sell to us. After the First World War they owed us debts, and we refused to take their imports. I am not telling the Senator anything new, but I still believe there is much truth in what I am saying. We cannot continue to sell them more than we buy from them indefinitely, year after year, ad infinitum.

Mr. TAFT. As the Senator knows, compared with the $15 billion we are spending for imports, the estimates of additional imports which would come into our country if we took off all tariffs, do not exceed $1 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think that is quite correct.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that is the highest figure that has been used. It has been estimated that if we took all tariffs off, the additional goods they would export to us would not amount to more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to know why Republicans are so concerned about keeping on the tariffs if such a small additional amount of imports would come into the United States if all tariffs were removed. As I said, with respect to the cheese we were dealing with only a tiny segment. All imports of cheese amounted only to about 4 percent of our total consumption.

If what the Senator from Ohio says is correct, I do not understand why he is so insistent upon keeping tariff protection. Why not give it up? If it is such a small matter, the Senator from Ohio should not be so disturbed about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Hundreds of thousands of workmen in Ohio are engaged in the pottery industry, which probably would be wiped out in the event the protection was removed. I have concern for those workmen. They have labored all their lives in that industry, and I do not think they should be deprived of work and forced to try to find jobs in other industries, when they have reached ages at which probably they could not find other jobs. It seems to me perfectly obvious that the interest of this country is opposed to creating increased unemployment by means of the destruction of American industries.

The bicycle industry is in a similar situation, perhaps. It is not a large industry, but the total amount of dollars involved is not small to the probably 300,000 or 400,000 men who are engaged in that industry. The continuation of that industry involves the very life of those men, and represents to them the difference between living and not living. The destruction of that industry would make it virtually impossible for them to live.

I do not believe that the benefit this country would receive by means of another billion dollars of imports would compare with the difficulty which would arise from the increased unemployment which would occur in the ways I have pointed out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I did not originally begin to discuss that matter, although it is one in which I am greatly interested.

I do not criticize what the Senator from Ohio is doing, because I think this matter constitutes perhaps the most fundamental difference between the two political parties, a difference which goes back to the days of Calhoun. I have always thought that if any one thing could be selected as the cause of the Civil War, this is it. This matter takes on a somewhat different aspect at this particular time, of course.

In reply to what the Senator from Ohio has said, I would say that he is concerned about a particular industry in his State. That is a perfectly legitimate concern. On the other hand, if we are to have freedom in the market place for agriculture, which is apparently what Secretary Benson wants, I say the same principle should apply with equal force to the pottery makers in Ohio. I cannot reconcile the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to domestic agriculture and the attitude of the Senator from Ohio with regard to domestic pottery. Are the Republicans saying that they are more concerned about pottery makers than about farmers?

Furthermore, in the case of pottery I would say that if it be true that the

American pottery makers cannot compete under any circumstances with foreign producers of pottery, then the American pottery industry perhaps is uneconomic and inefficient, and a procedure for its gradual elimination possibly should be provided. I do not think we should arbitrarily put an industry out of business by repealing the tariff overnight, and not provide any work at all for those who have been engaged in the industry. I should like to have the present administration consider the principle that is applied in other cases, when the Government, for the public welfare, provides that private property shall be taken. If a certain industry, in reliance upon our policy and in good faith has been built up, and if we then decide that in the interest of the 160,000,000 American people—in contrast to the 100,000, or whatever may be the number, who are engaged in that particular industry—the tariff on the product of that industry should be repealed, then provision should be made for shifting the workers from that industry, which obviously cannot compete with the foreign industry.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I say that our system of enterprise can compete. I am never willing to accept the idea that, upon balance, and for most of our people, the great majority of them cannot compete with the people of other countries. Of course, in specific cases, over short periods of time, there are dislocations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, let me say that the threat to the American pottery industry does not help solve the European problem, because the threat to that industry comes almost entirely from Japan, where the wages paid in the pottery industry are approximately one-tenth of those paid in the pottery industry of the United States. Of course, wages constitute a substantial part of the total cost in the pottery industry. There is nothing inefficient about the Ohio pottery industry. The simple point is that the American pottery industry workmen must be paid approximately 10 times what the Japanese pottery industry workmen are paid. As a result, if all tariffs are removed, the Japanese will take over the pottery industry.

Then the Japanese will find another industry in which they can be equally efficient, as compared to American workmen, but in which the wages paid Japanese labor are also perhaps only one-tenth of the wages paid American labor. In that way the Japanese can put that American industry out of business.

So if we admit the validity of the principle the Senator from Arkansas is advancing, namely, free trade, then it is perfectly possible to put out of business almost every American industry, except a mass-production industry. Even in the case of mass-production industries, I am not sure that the Japanese could not develop mass-production industries which could more than meet the costs of American mass-production industries, particularly in view of the fact that the wages paid to Japanese workmen are perhaps one-tenth of those paid to American workmen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, Mr. President, what the Senator from Ohio is saying is that the foreign workmen know more about these matters than our workmen do, and thus can outproduce our workmen. I do not believe that is so.

I do not know much about pottery; but in the 5-and-10-cent stores I see large amounts of pottery that do not appear to be hand painted; it seems to be mass produced. I do not wish to go into the details of that subject, for I do not have enough knowledge about that specific industry to be able to discuss it.

However, I have assumed that the pottery industry is one in which the Europeans have excelled. On the other hand, I realize that importations from Japan constitute a very grave problem in this field, which we have to meet. If we do not make some provision to enable Japan to trade with the free world, Japan will have no alternative but to trade with Russia; there is no use in deceiving ourselves about that.

Of course, Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss the tariff problem. My intention was to discuss the activities of Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture. On the other hand, the tariff problem is one which has long constituted the fundamental difference between the two political parties, and I believe this is as good a time as any to discuss it.

My point is that if the Republicans still feel so strongly about the desirability of tariff protection for industry, in the case of the pottery makers and the briar-pipe makers, I do not understand why the Republicans are going to abandon agriculture, which they seem to be willing to do. The Republicans seem to be perfectly willing to put agriculture in the market place, and that is what concerns me.

A little later I shall mention some of the industries and some of the specific subsidies or handouts which the Republicans originated approximately 100 years ago. The Republicans were really the originators of the handouts, back in the 1860's and 1870's, in the case of the railroads.

However, to return now to a discussion of the agricultural situation, let me say that the very fact that these industries have to have high tariffs is proof that they are inefficient. For when an industry is highly efficient—as is the automobile industry—it not only does not demand high tariffs, but is able to export in competition with like industries throughout the world. If then we are to adopt Mr. Benson's theories about subsidizing inefficiency, it follows that we ought tomorrow to abolish tariffs protecting inefficient industries.

And if we are to proceed upon his implied assumptions of the rich values of unfettered free enterprise—I am speaking here about what Mr. Benson has said about agriculture—we ought also to abolish fair-trade agreements, which in many ways penalize the efficient in behalf of the inefficient. Whatever argument may be made for these agreements, they certainly are not an expression of free enterprise, which dictates that a man ought to be able to buy and sell at prices established, not by law or by manufacturers, but by the market.

As for the uneconomic production on the farms, of which the Secretary complains, I want to make the following points: First, economic production would mean that farmers would grow no more than could be currently consumed on a hand-to-mouth basis. They would never create so-called surpluses. There would never be any wheat, cotton, or corn in storage, other than the amount consumed currently.

This is not only impossible; it is also undesirable. It is impossible because a farm is not a machine or a plant that can be cut off by throwing a switch. The perils of weather and insects are such that no man knows, when he plants a crop, whether he will raise abundantly or poorly.

It is undesirable for a number of reasons. We never know when we may have a crop disaster inside the United States; and an absence of stored stocks can therefore be highly unfortunate to the Nation. If, however, we should have little food or fiber in storage and if we were faced with a national emergency—such as another Pearl Harbor—then we would be confronted by a calamity of the first magnitude.

In any event, it is catastrophically wrong to regard the American farm nowadays in terms of pure economics or of doctrinaire concepts of any kind. We do not use food abroad as a political weapon. We do not, that is, supply or withhold food to others as a weapon by which to bribe or bulldoze them to adopt our political point of view. Nonetheless, our so-called surpluses of foods and fibers have been instruments of the first importance in carrying out our foreign policy. Suppose we had had no food with which to supply Tito when Yugoslavia recently was ravaged by drought. What then might have happened in that country, which is one of Stalin's most troublesome problems?

What for that matter might have happened in Italy, threatened internally by Communists, if we had not been able to supply its starving population with food after V–J Day in 1945?

What might have happened in India a little while ago if we had not been able to supply her with 70 million bushels of wheat? And what may happen tomorrow in another place if, when an emergency arises, we should have to say to some hard-up ally, "We are sorry, but we have nothing to spare beyond our own needs?"

Oddly enough, at the very time when Secretary Benson indicates a fear of overproduction of farm products, his Under Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, and the Director General of the U. N. Food and Agriculture Organization, Norris E. Dodd, show concern over the dangerous worldwide food shortage. Mr. Morse was quoted by the Washington Post of February 17 as advocating that extra food produced by the United States should go to hungry people in other nations. He believes that such a program offers us a chance to increase our national security and to expand United States farm markets. This confirms my own belief that our agriculture problem is not nearly so much one

of overproduction as it is a difficult and worldwide problem of distribution.

I think, therefore, that in these times it is extremely dangerous to regard agriculture in purely theoretical terms or doctrinaire concepts. I myself would think it suicidal to put our agriculture upon a productive hand-to-mouth basis just as I regard it as suicidal for us to indulge in hand-to-mouth thinking.

Since I have small ability to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable I do not know whether our farm policy is to be guided by the Republican campaign promises or by the views of the Secretary of Agriculture. But we should know clearly and beyond dispute, as this is a matter that goes to the heart of our economy and affects every person in the United States. In the meanwhile the Department of Agriculture seems to be taking a remarkably cool and detached attitude toward the drop in farm prices.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The argument about not doing anything about low farm prices serves to remind us that for 2 years these prices have been going down, and the Democrats did nothing in any way to prevent it. The figures on farm prices show that in 1951, for instance, the monthly average of the index of prices received by farmers was 302. On January 15, before the Democrats went out of office, it had fallen to 267, a decrease of more than 15 percent. The figures relate to the overall farm prices, the prices of all farm products. At the same time, the costs of farmers had slightly increased, namely, from an index of 281 to 282. How can the Democrats, 1 month after the Republican administration has taken office, attack the Republicans, when prices declined steadily for 2 years under the Democratic administration? Who was responsible, if Government was responsible for falling prices? Who but the Democratic administration, for the past 2 years, can be responsible when this fall took place entirely within their term of office during those 2 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator would pay closer attention to the point I am trying to make, it is that the whole implication of Mr. Benson's speech is that he does not approve of the price supports now in effect. I think the fact that he has taken that attitude has had a very depressing effect, certainly upon the psychology of all those who are engaged in agriculture. It has had such an effect in my State. Representatives of the cotton country have been here, and the complaints we get——

Mr. TAFT. Prices fell steadily for 2 years; so the low prices are Democratic prices, not Republican prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not at the moment. As soon as I make my point, I will yield to the Senator. I do not desire to cut him off, but I want an opportunity to comment on some of his observations. What I think is the disturbing feature of Mr. Benson's speech is that he has left the impression that he is not following the assurances and the promises of the President of the United States in his speeches that I quoted in the beginning, and also the follow-up speech that he made at Brookings, S. Dak., sometime later in October. I did not care to quote them all; but on several occasions he made the flat promise to sustain, he was committed to sustain, the existing support level, as he kept saying several times, not merely at 90 percent but at 100 percent. I submit that any ordinary person would interpret that certainly as meaning that he was not going to return to the so-called flexible support price, or lower support prices. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What I complain about is the nerve of the Senator from Arkansas and of the other Democratic speakers on this subject in trying to blame low farm prices on the Republicans, who have been in office now for less than 30 days, when for 2 years prices had been declining under the Democratic administration, in spite of any policy they pursued. Any policy apparently would have been better than what has actually been pursued. Mr. Benson did not abandon price supports; he is for price supports. He has advocated price supports at many times. Merely because he does not happen to approve of a particular figure, or may want to change that figure as in the interest perhaps of higher prices ultimately, is certainly no evidence that he is against price supports. But how can the Senator stand here to attack the Republicans for low prices when for 2 years under a Democratic administration prices have steadily declined and costs have actually increased?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio says Mr. Benson is for support prices. The Senator well knows the implication of the clear language of Mr. Benson's speech was that the only kind of support prices he would favor would be disaster support prices, that when the sheriff knocks at the door, he is willing to come to help the farmer, I assume, to the end that he may not go to jail. But it means very low support prices, and that is not satisfactory to the farmers. Yet that is the implication of the Secretary of Agriculture in his speeches which has caused great concern throughout the country.

It is not merely the Senator from Arkansas who complains. The Senator from Ohio well knows that there have been some criticisms from his own side, such as occurred in the discussion of this same question on Monday. The Senator from North Dakota, [Mr. YOUNG] for example, one of the leading agricultural experts on the Senator's side of the aisle, was very much disturbed about the speech. It is not merely the Senator from Arkansas who is critical. So I am led to believe that the correct interpretation of Mr. Benson's speech is in accordance with my own views.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the point that needs to be made here is that in November 1952, the parity ratio stood at about 100, which is a matter of statistical record, and in December it stood at 99. At the present time it stands at about 95. There has been a constant downward slide in prices of farm commodities. What I protest is not only the economic statistics which we have, but the psychological warfare which is being waged against the farm economy by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, he continually talks about a philosophy of farm price supports which I submit is not in the law. The present law does not refer to preventing disaster. The present law contemplates a balance in the American economy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The present law contemplates a fair and reasonable price, and yet the Secretary of Agriculture talks about a drowning man. As a distinguished Member of the House, Representative MCCARTHY, from my State, has said, "The Secretary's speeches sound like a man telling a person who is drowning, out in the lake, 'Take ten deep breaths, and you may save yourself.'" That is about what his speeches add up to. What the people want to know is the farm economic philosophy the Secretary of Agriculture has; and they are beginning to understand what that philosophy is. It is the old flexibility, with more "flex" than "ability." That is about what it adds up to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's thought. My next paragraph deals more specifically with the statistics, and the real point that follows is not merely the price in dollars and cents; it is the parity ratio, the relation between what the farmer is getting and what he has to pay. That is the point to which I am now coming. What the Senator said about the parity ratio is, of course, eminently so. Failure to bring about parity is what is getting the farmer into a squeeze. If we had a general lowering of prices across the board, including what the farmer buys, the situation certainly would not be so serious as it is.

To resume, the Republicans are not inclined to do anything about it except to let nature take its course. If this also takes a large number of farmers into bankruptcy and takes the country to the threshold of a disastrous depression, what will have been demonstrated is that stubbornness has taken the place of reasonableness. And if this policy should conflict with the stated promises of General Eisenhower in the Republican campaign perhaps this will be one more morsel of cynicism fed to the American people who will become the more dubious of solemn promises made by public men and a great political party.

It is bad enough that farm prices should precipitously decline from their recent high levels. But it is even worse

when the prices of things that farmers sell go down while the prices of the things that they buy either remain stationary or go up. Here the farmer is caught in a squeeze that could well crush him to death. And here the facts—as opposed to the promises of campaign oratory—are dismally clear. The prices received by farmers on December 15, 1952, averaged 9 percent below August and 12 percent below December 15, 1951. While farm prices were falling 12 percent the prices paid by farmers for things they need fell only 1 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me finish this paragraph, and then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely want to ask a question, if the Senator will yield. It has been pointed out that there was a decline in farm prices in 1952. Was not the Democratic Party in control of the Government during that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I have not tried to deny that. The point is the inference to be drawn from the statements of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture is making speeches and giving interviews regarding removing the main insurance against farm disaster. Prices have been going down. Prices are still above parity in many cases, because of the Democratic program of support prices.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator if he can name one farmer anywhere in the United States who has been refused price supports by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not made any such assertion. The Secretary has not refused to carry out the law; I make no such charge as that. Under the discretionary provisions of the law he has discretion which he could use, but he has not seen fit to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When I heard the Secretary of Agriculture talk about applying the law insofar as 90 percent of parity is concerned, I thought it was like a schoolboy saying that he is going to attend school when he gets his education.

The question is, Mr. President, What is the philosophy of the Secretary of Agriculture insofar as other commodities which are not under mandatory price supports are concerned? They represent more than 80 percent of the agricultural income. The Secretary has discretionary authority. What is scaring the pants off the farmers today is that Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, seems to be looking at the figure "0" instead of at the "90 percent" in the discretionary field. It is nothing more nor less than psychological warfare against the farmer to adjust the market. The last time the American farmer got adjusted, he was adjusted completely out of business.

I shall listen to the Senator from Arkansas with interest. I now have my documentation on the matter, and we shall go to work and see what the picture is in the agricultural field.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the Senator is concerned about the discretionary authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. As to any of the commodities which were under price support——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Pardon me. I did not quite hear the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With reference to the commodities which were under support, in the discretion of the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, does the Senator know of any instances in which Mr. Benson has refused support?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The ones which are causing the most difficulty did not need support until very recently. The Senator's question is too speculative. I cannot say what Secretary Brannan should have done, had he continued in office. But conditions became acute immediately after the election. It is quite reasonable that he should not undertake any vast change in policy in view of the election. But the matter of beef prices is a good example——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I fully recognize that the price of beef has declined. The Senator from Arkansas is a member of the committee which was greatly concerned a few weeks ago with reference to price controls. Has beef reached a lower level in proportion than has the price of broilers in the Senator's State during the past 2 years when prices were not supported? Are cattle producers in any worse situation than were some of the broiler growers in the Senator's own State during the past 18 months?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a relatively short period it was a very disastrous situation. It adjusted itself very quickly. The broiler industry, I think, is a much more flexible industry. It adjusts itself much more quickly because broilers are produced in approximately from 12 to 14 weeks.

At the time to which the Senator has referred the price dropped to below the cost of production. The broiler industry is much more adjustable than is the cattle industry. The Senator is more expert in the broiler industry than I am, but I know a little bit about it. My State is approximately third, I think, in broiler production. The industry has been on a fairly satisfactory level, since the decline which occurred, I think, last May.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point, I wish to reiterate, is not what is happening under existing support prices, but what is the philosophy of the Secretary of Agriculture. The import of his speech was that he was going to abandon price supports. The only purpose of this speech is to try to clarify the situation not only in our own minds but in the minds of the people of the country. If the Republicans feel that I am misinterpreting what has been said, it is perfectly legitimate for them or for the Secretary to say, "You have misinterpreted what was meant. We are going to see that the people are treated fairly."

If I am wrong, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to be told that I am wrong and to have pointed out to me in what respects I am wrong. I am not charging that the Secretary has misapplied or violated the law. The question is, What is his policy and to what can we look forward? In my State a farmer buys heavy machinery which has become a very important part of modern agriculture. Cotton-picking machines cost approximately $7,000 or $8,000. The farmer must plan ahead. He will not buy that kind of machinery when he is not sure what is going to be the policy in this field. It becomes cumulatively a very serious matter. It is a disruptive influence and it is getting spread around among farmers as a result of the kind of speeches and interviews we have been hearing from the Secretary of Agriculture. That is the main point I was trying to make.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that is all that is concerning the Senator from Arkansas, I believe his fears can be allayed very easily. It is my understanding that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is an enthusiastic supporter of the flexible farm-support program, which was sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a Democrat, a former Secretary of Agriculture, which statute is now on the books, and which I believe the Senator from Arkansas voted for, but which, as the result of various extensions of the 90-percent formula, has never been allowed to go into effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is wrong about the Senator from Arkansas. I sometimes forget just how I voted, but I should be very much surprised if the Senator from Delaware found that I supported the flexible support law. I believe he is speaking about the Aiken bill, is he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; that bill was passed in the 80th Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the 81st Congress the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] sponsored a bill which was a modification of the Aiken bill, but which was practically the same as the provision in the flexible farm support program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should have to look that up. I would say generally that I have been for 90 percent support prices on the basic products at every opportunity. I recognize that as to some perishables we have very great difficulty. We know we had an unsatisfactory experience in the case of potatoes. The trouble was that the farmers were too smart for the Department of Agriculture and produced too much.

I would say what was done in regard to potatoes is an example of a mistake. I think the purposes of the Department were proper, but the Department did not anticipate what the farmers could do when they got busy and really undertook to produce.

As the Senator well knows, cotton is an example of a product on which the

Commodity Credit Corporation made a tremendous profit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, but I should like to proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not bother the Senator further, but I should like to clarify one point. We hear much about the money the Government has made on various commodities the Government is supporting. Whether we are for 90 percent parity or not, I think we should get the record straight. The Government has not made any money on the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator say it did not make any on cotton?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I did not say that; but the particular agency which had the crop in storage I think gave the cotton away, and so far as the American taxpayer is concerned, he was the sufferer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator to be entirely wrong. I presume he is saying that we gave money to Great Britain and they bought cotton and they made a profit. But that is foreign to our discussion at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is very much a part of the discussion, because the American taxpayer paid for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The profit was about $250 million, I believe.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the overall result of our price-support program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said it resulted in the Government's losing money as to some crops. One of them is potatoes. I am not trying to fool anybody. I have not all the figures, and would not try to quote them now, but the Senator from Utah and everyone else knows that the Government lost money on potatoes. I point out to the Senator from Utah, because his State is one of the beneficiaries, that the Government handed out over $900 million to the sugar producers. That was one of the largest benefiting classes. They think that is fine; that was a subsidy for the sugar growers alone. In the case of wheat, nearly $600 million was paid.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for one more question.

Mr. WATKINS. For an observation. I believe I am correctly informed that all the money that has been given to the sugar-beet growers has been paid in processing taxes by the processors, and has not cost the Treasury of the United States a dollar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not suppose that the people who pay that are entirely different from the taxpayers. It is not some other group of people, who live, perhaps, in Russia. As a matter of fact, it all comes out of the same pocket. It comes in in the form of a tax that is paid by the same poor taxpayer about whom the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is so concerned. The $900 million comes out of their pockets. It comes out of the same pocket, and in this respect I can see no substantial difference between one commodity and another. The fact is that by Government edict, by law passed, we paid $900 million to the sugar growers. As agricultural producers, they are comparable to the briar-pipe manufacturers.

Mr. WATKINS. Is not the formula the same as that for the cotton growers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no; there are many more cotton growers.

Mr. WATKINS. What the Senator has said applies to any industry that gets a profit. When we talk about sugar beets, and the sugar industry, we might just as well apply the discussion to every other business in the United States, and the statement would be accurate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I started my remarks. I was making the point that if the Secretary of Agriculture desires to apply his farm principle of self-reliance, with no help from the Government, he ought to apply it to everything. It is one of my main points that if the Republican Party is to apply it to anybody, it ought to apply it to everybody—to the briar-pipe manufacturers of Brooklyn, to the pottery manufacturers of Ohio, and to all other manufacturers. I was not applying the statement to agriculture only. If there had been no protection to these special interests, if everybody had been free to take care of himself, we would not have had as much to complain about. What I do not like is that after the new administration comes in, the first speech of a Cabinet officer is an attack on agriculture, and apparently nothing is going to be done about tariffs on manufactures.

Mr. President, this is an old story. If it were new, we might be sitting back and contemplating the significance of it. But this same difference goes back more than 100 years.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I fail to find an attack in the speech of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think it is a clear-cut statement about supports and about carrying out the price-support program enacted by Congress. There are some observations in the speech to the effect that that is not the only way to get 100 percent of parity, that there are other methods, and I am wondering if the opponents of price supports object to the use of other methods. They want full support on the basic products, they want support of 100 percent, and are going to fight anything else that is proposed.

As I read the speech of the Secretary, he stated clearly the position of the Republican Party, and the position of most of those engaged in agricultural pursuits who are really thinking about the program. I happen to be an agriculturalist myself. We do not get any price supports for fruits. We have to buy cotton products, we have to buy the basic crop products, but we do not get price supports. The time will come one of these days when certain sections of our economy cannot have all the parity and others not any. If we can find a way, the thing to do is to find something other than an artificial price support.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator really trying to say that agriculture is getting all the parity, and others not any?

Mr. WATKINS. I said there are supports for certain basic crops.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator would not desire to leave the impression that manufactures do not get any, would he?

Mr. WATKINS. I am saying that certain basic crops are getting help, and other crops are not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a different matter. The Secretary has discretionary power to give help to the producers of other commodities, not merely the basic crops, if he cares to do so.

Mr. WATKINS. We cannot get it for perishables or fruit crops.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why cannot the farmers get it for perishables?

Mr. WATKINS. The Secretary would have to adopt the Brannan plan, possibly, because if the parity program were applied to fruits and other things, there would be a worse mess than occurred in the case of potatoes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not minimizing the difficulty of the problem.

Mr. WATKINS. It is so difficult that it simply cannot be done. We realize it, and that is one reason why we have not demanded it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I interpret what the Senator says, there is some as yet unrevealed method of obtaining 90 percent or 100 percent of parity. What I want to know, and what the farmers want to know is, What is that method? This program has been in effect over the course of many years. It has not been entirely a Democratic program. Some Republican Senators, including the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and others, certainly participated, and the best brains of the country have given thought to the problem. The best thing they could come up with was support prices.

Mr. WATKINS. The Secretary is not fighting support prices.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand his speech, there is nothing in it to indicate that he even has any idea of any other method. He wants the farmers to take care of themselves in the market place.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the point the Senator from Arkansas is making is just what he stated in his concluding remarks, namely, that we are talking about a so-called free market, or parity in the market place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us be honest about this matter. There is no free market, and there has not been one in the memory of any Member of this body. The so-called free market is a figment of the imagination. What it really amounts to is that the world is split into parts. We cannot possibly have a free market for agricultural goods or any other kind of goods when there is an Iron Curtain which stops the flow of goods. We cannot possibly have a free market when many prices are administered prices.

Consider the price of a tractor. Does any Senator feel that the price of a

tractor is subject to the same fluctuations which affect the prices of agricultural commodities? There is no free market for manufactured goods. The prices of such goods are administered prices.

The farmer is not only at the mercy of the weather. He is at the mercy of the compassion of the Lord. He is at the mercy, in the alleged free market, of the speculator and the grain broker. He is at the mercy of the banker and interest rates. The so-called free market is in fact economic nonsense. The sooner we realize that the better off we shall be.

What the farmer wants from Mr. Benson is not to be told that we are going back to some so-called free market, which does not exist. The farmer believes that an agricultural economy which is solvent is a very important aspect of the national security and the national economy. That is what he needs to be told. He does not want to be told anywhere in America, in any speech, "You go on the free market, Mr. Farmer, but the oil you buy for your tractor will be on the fixed market. You go on the free market with your goods, but the tractor you buy will be on the fixed market." That is what the farmer is being told. Whether we like it or not, the price-support program is a recognition of the economic facts of our lifetime. The sooner we begin to talk sense instead of nonsense the better off the country will be.

Secretary Benson is scaring the daylights out of the farmers. If Senators do not know that, I suggest that they go home and talk to the farmers. The farmers are today in the throes of anxiety. The farmers know more about what is going on than do some people who are talking about the free market, which is something in the realm of Alice-in-Wonderland economics.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I find this discussion very interesting. However, it is growing late. I am not half way through my prepared remarks. I will yield for a rejoinder to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. Let us hear from the other Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. I have not heard from him yet.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point in order to enable me to comment immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I concede that what is being said is probably scaring the daylights out of some Democratic politicians. However, the stockgrowers and the farmers, as a whole, are supporting Mr. Benson in his statements, because he gives adherence to the price-support program. However, he does not say that that is the only way.

I have gone through Mr. Benson's speech from one end to the other. I can find nothing in it to scare anyone who has any American blood in him and wants to stand on his own feet. It may be that we have certain administered prices; but are we going to abandon completely what we have had, namely, at least a measure of a free market, to take on what the Senator is indicating will be a completely planned and managed economy? That is the only conclusion I get from the Senator's speech, if I correctly understand the language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah that Mr. Benson's speech at St. Paul falls into the category to which reference has been made. It was a speech for God, country, home, and spirit. The farmers of Minnesota do not need to be reminded of their devotion to God, country, spirit, or home. They are so dedicated. However, they do want to be reminded about the policies of the Government. They see the administration raising interest rates. They see the administration talking about taking off all kinds of controls. They see the administration saying, "Now, folks, we are going to return to a free market."

General Eisenhower did not speak at Kasson, Minn. about the free market. I was there, and 100,000 farmers were there. He talked about 90 percent of parity, with a goal of 100 percent of parity. In the same paragraph he talked about 90 percent of parity for perishables. One hundred thousand Minnesota farmers were there. They do not want to have the promises at Plowville plowed under in St. Paul by Mr. Benson. That is exactly what happened. The speech on September 7 at Plowville, or Kasson, Minn., was buried deep in St. Paul in February.

The farmers of my State are wise and able people. Fifteen hundred or sixteen hundred farmers under normal conditions do not come to a farm meeting to hear a Democrat, in a normally Republican State, talk about farm policies. They are afraid. They have good reason to be afraid, because the last time the Republicans ran the farm program the farmers were plowed under. They have good memories. That is a Republican trait—a good elephantine memory. The farmers remember very well what happened to them. This question is above politics. As a matter of fact, the farmers of America are being hurt because of the inability or unwillingness of the Government to do anything. The entire economy suffers; and this is dangerous business.

I pray that Mr. Benson will become the greatest Secretary of Agriculture in our history. That is exactly what we need. But he had better start reversing his form, or he may not last that long.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to make the calm observation that within the past week I have been at home. On my return I rode from Salt Lake City to Chicago with one of Utah's distinguished dirt farmers, an agricultural leader. I should like to encourage the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Minnesota with the impression which I received during my visit with the farmers of my State. They have complete faith in Ezra Taft Benson and his policies. They are not panicky. They are not afraid. They believe in the program which he is attempting to develop. It has not yet had a chance to be fully completed or revealed. The farmers of my State believe that that program will take care of their situation. They have none of the fears which the Senator from Minnesota has been telling us about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The senate of the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which is predominantly of the Republican faith and is predominantly rural, has just passed a resolution unanimously asking that the Secretary of Agriculture do something. I am simply conveying their sentiments. I am conveying the sentiments of men who have been elected to serve their constituencies. Without a dissent, they condemn the existing actions—or inactions—and ask that something positive and concrete be done at once to stabilize agricultural prices. My esteemed colleagues from Utah may say, "They do not represent anyone." But they were elected, and they know something about their constituencies. I submit that their resolution and their record speak for themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator say they were mostly Republicans?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I regret to inform the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that they are overwhelmingly Republican. They are fine and able men, representing their constituencies. They make no bones about their political partisanship. They are now rising above partisanship and asking only that the country live up to its obligations and to the law, which places the farm program on a parity with industry.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to continue with my prepared remarks, but I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to direct the Senator's attention to the fact that practically all the livestock associations which have to do with the production of beef in support of the position of the Secretary of Agriculture. No protests, as I understand, have been received from any of them. They are not asking him to do something about price supports. So far as I know no protests have been received from the men who are producing the cattle on the ranges. Some individuals may have been in difficulties, and we sympathize with them, but there is no great demand from the farmers themselves, the men who produce the cattle on the range. That is in accordance with the latest reports that have come to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the past few days the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] said that cattle growers in Oklahoma had made protests to him—either to him or to the Secretary of Agriculture—expressing their concern about the situation and hoping that a satisfactory solution could be worked out.

As I understand, the significance which the Senator from Utah attached to the

Secretary's speech is that the Secretary is not saying he is not going to support the prices, but that he does not like the way it is being done, or the procedure that is involved, and that we should not take alarm at his attitude, because he will find some other efficient way. I do not find any such statement in the speech, but I wish to read a statement made by candidate Eisenhower in a speech at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952, following his speech at Kasson, Minn. He said at Brookings:

I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

In that statement he was making his pledge to the farmers. I think it is a very clear one. He said he would sustain 90 percent of parity. He did not say, "in the market place." If that statement means anything it means sustaining the same 90 percent that we have under existing law.

I shall continue now with my prepared remarks. It is bad enough that farm prices should precipitously decline from their recent high levels. But it is even worse when the prices of things that farmers sell go down while the price of the things that they buy either remain stationary or go up. Here the farmer is caught in a squeeze that could well crush him to death. And here the facts, as opposed to the promises of campaign oratory, are dismally clear. The prices received by farmers on December 15, 1952, averaged 9 percent below August and 12 percent below December 15, 1951. While farm prices were falling 12 percent the prices paid by farmers for things they need fell only 1 percent. As a result of this the parity ratio fell from 107 in December 1951 to 96 in December 1952. Thus, the parity ratio last December was reduced below the monthly average of any year since 1941.

The situation with respect to particular crops is even worse. Wheat, corn, and cotton are practically at support level of 90 percent of parity. Cotton is a major crop in the State of Arkansas. On February 9, 1952, 15/16 Middling cotton sold at Memphis for $0.4075 a pound. On February 9, 1953, the price was $0.3205 a pound, a difference of over $40 a bale.

The farmer now gets declining prices for the produce he sells and pays rising or stationary prices for the things that he buys. But this is not all. If the consumer got the benefits of the decline in farm prices this would help our people by bringing about a wider distribution of food and clothing. Farmers also would then benefit to some extent because if people ate more food at a lower price and used more clothing at a lower price the rise in consumption would bring about some rise in price. But things are not working this way.

In the period between December 15, 1951, and December 15, 1952, the cost of marketing food went up by 7 percent. This almost entirely offset declines in farm prices, and thereby largely removed benefits to consumers. Farmers suffered, but consumers gained only to the smallest extent. One of the most important items going to increased cost of marketing was transportation, and here I point out to you the railroad freight rates have risen from 64 to 90 percent from 1939 to 1952. I do not say that this increase is unjustified, nor do I begrudge the railroads their present and somewhat novel prosperity after long decades of wandering in the wilderness. I merely reiterate the fact that transportation is one of the elements of marketing that drove costs upward while at the same time farm prices have gone down.

Here the farmer gets it in the neck two ways. Marketing costs also enter into the prices of the things that he buys, and are sharply affected by freight rates because many of the things that he uses are imported from distant parts of the Nation.

In the same newspapers that record declining prices of farm products, and mounting gloom among farmers and farming communities, I read statements of nationally known automobile companies. All of them plan to expand their domestic markets this year and I hope that they will succeed, because the automobile is one of our most important peacetime businesses. Yet, I observe that these companies are not precisely falling over themselves trying to reduce prices. One of them said that it proposed to reduce prices of its cars from 8 cents a car to $113. I do not know exactly how these reductions will strike cotton farmers in the State of Arkansas when they see that an 8-cent reduction on the price of a $2,000 automobile is just about the amount of the decline within a year of the price of a pound of cotton from 40 cents to 32 cents. Nor do I see how farmers facing a constantly declining income are going to buy automobiles at prices that bear little relationship to the things that they sell.

The Secretary of Agriculture in much of his speech seems to base his objection to the present price-support program upon moral grounds. He said——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was on the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago when the Senator from Utah expressed his concern about the interests of certain Democratic politicians. He indicated that the farmers of America were very happy with the agricultural developments under this administration, and that it is only a few Democratic politicians who are concerned. I deeply regret that he should have made this a subject of partisan debate. I believe the record should show that Democrats are not the only ones who are concerned with the agricultural situation. There are at least some Republican farmers and some Republican Senators concerned with it, even though the Senator from Utah may be completely satisfied, and even though some of his farmers may be completely satisfied.

I hold in my hand an AP dispatch quoting a statement issued by one of the great Republicans who serves in this body. He is a man of great integrity and capacity. I refer to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and I should like to read into the record the AP quotation of the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota:

WASHINGTON.—Appointment of Secretary of Agriculture Benson was a "Victory for those who favor flexible price supports," Senator YOUNG said today.

YOUNG, a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and a long-time farm operator, said in a statement that backers of flexible supports probably got "more than they bargained for" in Benson's appointment.

Noting today Benson's statements that price supports should be used primarily as a brake against disastrous price drops, YOUNG said:

"Deep feelings of farmers hit hard by present drastic farm price drops are finally being reflected by farm leaders in Congress. Protests by myself and others have thus far brought little results."

YOUNG said Members of Congress from farm States are receiving a flood of protests against Benson's recent statements. This may well force a change in the Agriculture Department's policy, YOUNG said.

He did not say Democratic leaders or Republican leaders. The Senator from North Dakota did not place the matter in the arena of partisan politics. He spoke of farm leaders in Congress, and he said that protests by him and others have thus far brought little results.

Mr. President, all of us know that the Senator from North Dakota is a man of great capacity, and no one has demonstrated greater interest in the farmers of America than has the Senator from North Dakota. I think he is a little optimistic when he says it might well force a change in the policy of the Department of Agriculture. The Senator from North Dakota is a man of optimism.

Mr. President, I notice another Associated Press dispatch which quotes the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. This dispatch quotes him as saying:

This would be a study year—

A "study" year, Mr. President—

next year a legislative year, as far as farm measures were concerned.

And he proceeded to say that the committee might agree to hold hearings later in this session on the measure to lay the basis for writing new legislation next year.

So I wanted the Senator from Arkansas to know that although he is a Democratic Senator and although he is a farm operator, he is not the only one who is concerned with farm prices, for the Senator from North Dakota, a farm leader and a farm operator, is just as concerned about what is happening in this administration to this measure, and it is not a partisan move.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me, let me say it is not a partisan measure because of course the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is a strong supporter of the flexible price policy. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] happens to be a supporter of the fixed parity policy. That is

a difference which exists, but not a partisan difference, I fully agree with the distinguished minority leader. But it is also true that the Democrats do not agree with everything that some Democrats are saying.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me at this time, let me say that evidently the majority leader was not on the floor when his colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] attributed this concern to the Democrats only, and said that the only ones concerned with the situation were a few Democratic politicians. I do not think the able majority leader and the able Senator from North Dakota are Democratic politicians.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Texas is putting in my mouth words I did not utter. The one who said we were scaring the daylights out of the farmers happened to be a Democratic Senator; and I said that apparently we were scaring the daylights out of some Democratic politicians, because aside from the Senator from North Dakota, the Democrats are the only ones who have protested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In reply, Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, let me say that the Secretary of Agriculture is scaring the daylights out of the farmers of this country, and thank God there is one Republican Senator who is concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. What has already been said is a complete repudiation of everything the Senator from Texas has said.

What the Secretary of Agriculture did say was that he was willing to support faithfully all the price-support programs enacted by the Congress.

The Secretary of Agriculture is going to carry out the law in the way in which it was enacted by Congress; and to a certain extent when the present Secretary of Agriculture does not use the discretionary powers which the Democrats claim he should use at this very moment, he is only following the policy of his Democratic predecessor, Mr. Brannan, who did not use those powers.

In the early fall I was in a number of farming States and among the stock growers and others in those areas, and I know how they were complaining then about the drop in prices. Many of those who had been buying for feeding purposes had lost heavily. All that had happened a long time before, but nothing was done about it by the Democrats, when they were in office.

Now Mr. Benson has been in office only 30 days, but already some of the Democrats begin to complain when Mr. Benson does everything he can do to carry out faithfully the law that both the Democrats and the Republicans in the Congress wrote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before the Senator entered the Chamber, I pointed out that no one is accusing the Secretary of Agriculture of violating the law. No one has made such a charge. The point we are concerned about is the Secretary of Agriculture's real attitude toward these policies. His attitude, as indicated in his recent speech at St. Paul, Minn., would seem to be that at the first opportunity, when it is not illegal to do so, he is going to change the policy and is going to abandon the existing price-control program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some time ago I referred to a resolution which I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], our minority leader. I should like to read from that resolution, which comes from the State Senate of Minnesota where the resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, to permit me to make an inquiry at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that the resolution was adopted by the Minnesota State Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Minnesota classify the Minnesota State Senate as a group of "frightened Democratic politicans?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only are they not "frightened Democratic politicians," but there are so few Democrats in the Minnesota State Senate that they do not take time to get frightened. The Minnesota Legislature is essentially a rural legislature of rock-ribbed Republicans.

I ask my colleagues to listen to this resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Senate:

Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress, to reenact legislation to alleviate steadily falling prices of farm products.

Whereas selling prices of farm products generally have fallen drastically during the past year; and

Whereas prices of farm machinery and supplies, as well as tax burdens are rapidly increasing; and

Whereas there is no indication of relief in a market controlled by many forces, both domestic and foreign, and over which the farmer has no control; and

Whereas it has been the policy of our Government to aid and assist farmers suffering from sudden and drastic market changes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That this situation be called to the attention of the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Minnesota Members of Congress, with the request that steps be taken immediately to alleviate declining prices of farm products; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress.

Adopted by the Senate, State of Minnesota, February 10, 1953.

P. G. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Further, Mr. President, I have sent to my office for a few of the letters which have come to my desk today. I read now from a letter from the editor of a weekly newspaper:

Our State senator was home for the weekend and talked to a Farm Bureau group here today. Although he is a strong Republican, he stated that he was at the meeting, and most of those who were there were very much disappointed with Benson's attitude and felt that they had been let down.

In other words, the reference is to the meeting at which Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, spoke.

Let me read now from a letter from a real estate man located in a rural county; he deals in farm real estate:

After Mr. Ezra Taft Benson spoke in St. Paul this week, most farmers who heard him, by radio and otherwise, felt very uneasy. I can speak with certainty as to the farmers' concern, because of the nature of my business.

I read now from a letter which comes to me from a man living out in the country:

I highly approve of your remarks and your position relative to the farm problem. Continue to challenge Mr. Benson. Let us find out where he stands.

I read now from another letter which has come to me:

Isn't there some way to persuade President Eisenhower to remove Secretary Benson and replace him with someone in whom the farmers have some confidence? This may be drastic, but so far so have his utterances. When not calculatedly vague, they have been most hostile to the interests of the farmer, on behalf of whom he is supposedly acting. The speech last night in Minnesota confirmed my worst disquiet about him.

Here is a letter from Lonsdale, Minn., a rural community, which I think really summarizes what we are talking about:

Just wanted to drop you a line in regard to our farm situation and particularly perishable products. I, as well as other farmers surrounding me, am very much disturbed about the outcome of our farm prices. We are very much worried about our new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. We hope you will do everything you can for 90 percent of farm parity, particularly in view of the greatly increased prices of farm machinery, farm labor, taxes, and other farm expenses. We remember what President Eisenhower has said about farm parity.

I read further from the letter:

Here is what President Eisenhower has said about farm parity. He has said he is in favor not merely of 90 percent of parity, but full parity.

Mr. President, I have before me a whole handful of letters of the same nature.

What does this situation add up to? Are those who write these letters Democrats who are complaining? Mr. President, those who write these letters are the producers of farm commodities. By and large, they do not vote for Democrats, although I think they may become interested in doing so now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to be presumptuous enough to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota how he answers his mail, but I should like to say that it may be that the Associated Press ticker is not so readily available to the authors of those letters as it is to those of us who are in the Senate Chamber. Therefore, at this time I should like

to read the most recent word we have received over the ticker in regard to the matter of the Republican farm policy. I desire to bring this point to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, in order that he may have some useful information to pass on to his farmer friends in Minnesota:

WASHINGTON.—There were more signs today that the Republican administration plans to continue present farm policies for the time being, but not to commit itself to such a course for the future.

Chairman AIKEN of the Senate Agriculture Committee said he thought "this would be a study year—next year a legislative year," as far as farm measures were concerned. The committee meets today to line out its program amid Democratic demands for legislation this session to bolster farm prices.

So the junior Senator from Minnesota can tell his farmer friends that it is the Republican policy to study the situation this year, and perhaps the Republicans will get around to doing something about it next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that my farmer friends are going to say that the cost of tuition is extravagant. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the the Secretary of Agriculture, in much of his speech, seems to base his objection to the present price-support program upon moral grounds. He said:

In the administration of this Department, the guiding purpose will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen. God help us to raise our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things.

These are, of course, praiseworthy sentiments in proper context, but I wonder if this administration intends to apply these principles to all our people in the same manner that it apparently intends to apply them to the farmers.

It is not my impression that farmers are in greater need of moral regeneration than are other segments of our population. However, if the principle is sound for farmers, it is equally sound for automobile manufacturers, the airlines, railroads, cheese makers and briar pipe manufacturers.

If the administration is serious about these principles, then it should inform the country that it intends in the near future to abolish all tariffs and restrictions on free international trade. It is immoral to undermine the character of our briar pipe makers and all other manufacturers who have grown prosperous under the protective shelter of our tariffs. And, of course, there are the subsidies to airlines, to the merchant marine, to publishers of books, magazines, and newspapers, and so on and on. And one may well recall that under former Republican regimes, the great railroad systems of this country were given fantastic grants of rich public lands, to an extent greater than the total area of France. If the railroads are to be purified and restored to grace, perhaps these lands should be recovered by the Federal Government. If Government assistance to farmers is to be condemned upon moral grounds, then these principles should be given universal application.

And as for our "raising our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things," I may remind the Secretary of Agriculture that our farm population amounts to 15.9 percent of our total population, but last year, a year of relatively high prosperity, our farmers received only 8.7 percent of the national income. I suggest there are other citizens who are more in need of uplift in this connection than are the farmers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The drop in income, of course, took place during 20 years of Democratic administration, as I think the Senator may remember. In fact, I find it difficult to understand what this controversy is about. For 2 years prices have been dropping, and the Democrats have not done anything about it. They have not prevented it. Now, the Senator from Arkansas comes forward 30 days after the present administration took office, and because the Secretary of Agriculture makes a speech on a theoretical matter with which the Senator does not happen to agree, the Senator is making a general attack on the Republican farm program.

There is no difference about the program. Congress passed the law. We are guaranteeing 90 percent parity for all the basic crops for the next 2 years. So far as policy beyond that point is concerned, Mr. Benson is not going to decide it; the Congress is going to decide what shall happen after those 2 years.

I cannot understand what all the shouting is about, except that the Senator from Arkansas happens to disagree fundamentally with something, although fundamentally the only difference is that Mr. Benson favors flexible supports and the Senator happens to favor 90 percent flat supports. So far as that is concerned, Mr. Truman favored flexible supports in 1947. Mr. Brannan did, at that time, and until the 1948 election. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] favors such supports as do many other Democrats.

It is not a partisan matter. It it something that may be disputed. Something may be said on both sides but it is a question to be determined by the Congress. It is not going to be determined on the basis of certain remarks Mr. Benson may have made in St. Paul or at some other place. So I say again I do not know what all the shouting is about.

I may say, however, that if during the next 2 years the Republicans do not do better in preventing a fall of farm prices than the Democrats have done, then probably they will lose the next election. But the Republicans do not have very much to go up against, because the Democrats permitted a steady and continuous fall in farm prices for a period of 2 years until on the day they went out of office farm prices were from 15 to 20 percent under what they were 2 years ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I first want to say that perhaps now we are getting somewhere, if, as I understand it to be, the majority leader's statement is that we really need not pay much attention to the Secretary of Agriculture, because, if he assures us that these statements of the Secretary of Agriculture do not mean anything, and that we need not pay any attention to them, that is reassuring to the country.

Mr. TAFT. I assure the Senator that Mr. Benson never said he was going to change the policy on price supports for a moment. The effect of the speech, as I read it, is that he favors flexible supports as against 90 percent. That is a matter to be thought out later, but he is going to carry out the present law, providing a flat 90 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I have read the speech of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I am sure the Senator from Ohio has read it. I think the whole speech means that he disapproves of price supports at 90 percent of parity, and in the paragraph I have just read, and indeed all through the speech, he is merely moralizing about it. The whole philosophy of the speech is that it is bad for the people to have the Government helping them. I do not know how it can be read in any other way than that he thinks that is bad, immoral, and not good for agriculture. He says the guiding purpose is to restrain individual freedom and the very moral fiber of each citizen. This was not a speech on a Sunday morning in a church. It was a speech before a group of farmers. He was talking about support prices. Certainly I would read and understand it to mean, "for the good of you farmers, we are no longer going to make you soft, we are no longer going to protect you. Go forth and become upstanding, self-reliant people, and look out for yourselves. We do not want you to rely on the Government."

My point is, that is a good principle in many respects, but if the present administration is serious about it, it ought to be applied to everybody. Moral principles, if valid, have universal application. They do not apply merely to farmers. They must apply to everybody. I do not think the Republicans intend to do that. However, it is reassuring when the majority leader tells the country and the Senate that the Congress is going to determine the policies, and that what the Secretary of Agriculture says does not mean too much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with the Senator from Ohio that, unless someone puts a stop to falling farm prices, the Republicans will be voted out of office 2 years hence?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator misrepresents my statement. I said if we did not do a better job than the Democrats have done in the past 2 years, we would be voted out of office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is what the Senator stated would happen unless someone puts a stop to the falling farm prices—and they have been falling since the November election faster than at any other time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The lowest point was in December, after, of course, it was known what had happened in November.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with the prediction of the Senator from Ohio—whatever it was?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Ohio says that there really is no difference in the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture and the policies we have embraced thus far, and yet in the next breath he says the Secretary of Agriculture stands for flexible price supports. But the present law is a mandatory 90 percent price support. When the majority leader tells me there is no difference, he cannot tell that to a wheat farmer who knows that the difference between 90 percent and 75 percent flexibility is about 50 cents a bushel. It may be shortsighted and immoral for farmers to be thinking about 50 cents a bushel according to the Secretary, but I want to say there is nothing that is harder on a soul than to starve to death. There is nothing that hurts one's moral fiber any more than to go broke through no fault of his own.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that he ought to raise his sights beyond the dollar sign and beyond material things.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The farmers have their sights away up. They are looking at the high prices of things they buy. They are looking at the high prices they have to pay. They want reasonable prices.

I recall many times on the floor of the Senate that when a Cabinet officer in the former administration made a statement, Republicans would lambaste the administration, because they would say that he sets a policy.

The Secretary of Agriculture is making speeches, and he is scaring the daylights out of the farmers. I repeat that the only successful psychological offensive of this administration thus far is against the American farm economy. They are really waging psychological warfare, but against the wrong people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if it is an undeniable fact that a prosperous agriculture is essential to a prosperous United States, it is also a fact that troubles on the farm almost invariably foreshadow troubles throughout the Nation. The shadow of these troubles—a shadow no larger than Texas—is already upon the land.

Ours is a huge, complex economy. It is also extraordinarily sensitive. We can measure production and consumption; that is, we can see what happened after it has happened. There is, however, one overwhelmingly important factor in our economy that cannot be forecast. We cannot forecast it because it is a factor that develops in the minds of millions of people. It is the factor of confidence or lack of confidence in our foreseeable economic future.

When men believe that they are going to have continuous employment and high wages they will spend liberally of their earnings or incur debts they believe they can pay. But if, on the other hand, they believe that economic conditions are going to be bad they will restrict their purchases to absolutely essential things and will incur no debts for things whose purchase may be postponed.

When farmers see farm prices going down rapidly it is not only natural but also inevitable that they should restrict their purchases only to things that are absolutely necessary. The farmer may need a new tractor. But if he believes that he is going to run into hard times he will postpone its purchase. This immediately affects the tractor dealer in the local community and the manufacturer who produces the tractor. The local dealer begins to cry hard times to his wife and she cuts down her purchases. Back in Detroit where the tractor is made it may become necessary to lay off a few people. And when this process is multiplied by millions of times daily over the fields of millions of items that enter into our economy, we have a crisis of confidence and are well on our way to a depression.

Aside from all factors of human decency we cannot afford a depression or even a sharp recession now in the United States. A marked decline in American productivity might well severely injure, if not destroy, the still frail economic health of our allies throughout the world, and thereby undo in a few months all that we have done at staggering cost during the past few years. It is certainly wiser to prevent a depression, at perhaps some cost, than attempt to cure it at a cost incalculable in dollars and at considerable risk to our whole political system. Indeed, we know that Stalin and company have long calculated that the world would fall into their laps, with no need to fire a shot, if there should be an American depression.

But, above and beyond all this, we must understand that there is a profound and moving reason for the support of American agriculture. If there were no other reason to support our agriculture and stimulate it to constantly increase production there would be the compelling reason that it is absolutely essential to national defense.

Under the stimulus of adequate reward for their effort, and for the risks that they ran by putting huge new acreages and land under cultivation, our farmers during the last war performed such prodigies of production as the world has never seen. They produced so much food and fiber that no one in the United States suffered for lack of anything essential. On the contrary, our standard of living constantly rose during the war. They fed and clothed over 13 million men and women in our armed services; fed and clothed them superbly. But this is not all. In addition to these magnificent achievements they supplied food and fiber to tens of millions of our allies all around the world. They did this, mind you, in spite of crippling shortages of labor, machinery, fertilizers, and other things necessary to agriculture.

During the war farmers went into debt and expanded their production. First, as patriots, and, second, upon the assumption that they would not afterward be let down by the country. I, for one, regard it as an obligation of honor that they should not now be let down and left to find their way as best they can.

There is also another consideration that we must bear in mind. If it was sound policy to stimulate agriculture through adequate rewards to farmers during the war, it is equally sound policy to continue to do it now and in the foreseeable future. We are not at war in the sense that we are enveloped presently in a global conflict. But neither are we at peace. We are in a state of continuing crises. No man can foresee their end. Nor can any man know what the morrow will bring forth. I am not, therefore, one who would risk the security of this Nation by any farm policy that would remove adequate rewards to farmers to produce for the needs of ourselves and our allies.

Here I should like to make a case that is at least somewhat analogous. We do not refuse to appropriate $200 million or more for a single aircraft carrier. We make this appropriation upon the advice of military experts. We do not and cannot know whether that costly carrier will ever be used; or whether, if used, it will soon be lost. We go upon the assumption that that carrier through its possible presence at a certain place at a certain time may conceivably turn the tide of battle in our favor, and so effect survival of this Nation. If, on the other hand, we dogmatically refuse to appropriate for the carrier after military experts had advised its construction we might then be risking the survival of this country.

If it is argued that the present administration had had no time to prepare plans for the farm crisis that is in the making, the argument seems to me to be fallacious. First, the Nation is committed by law to at least 90-percent parity price support until the end of the year 1954 for such great crops as cotton, wheat, and corn. Even a statement upon the part of this administration to the effect that it will continue these supports beyond 1954 would stimulate the belief in the minds of farmers that they are not going to be thrown to the economic dogs after 1954. This would stimulate confidence in them, enable them to make their plans confidently, and so encourage them to continue upon the way as primary consumers of goods as well as primary producers of farm products. But if this is not done the Secretary of Agriculture has merely indulged himself in some vague dream statements about the future course of farm support prices, thereby necessarily leading farmers to believe that they will be left in the lurch when the present farm law expires.

I do not know how other men may feel about national agriculture policy. But, speaking for myself, I would suggest that we take the most solemn thought before we begin to dismantle the system that has given more farmers more prosperity and happiness than they have ever known and has immeasurably increased the happiness and prosperity of all Americans. If we have had to pay a price for it—and it has been, in my opinion, a very low price—then we must remember that the first

rule of being grown up is that you must pay for what you want. It is also demonstrable that if we had not pursued our present farm policy over a long period of time and had not had so-called surpluses during war and during periods of grave emergency among our allies we might well have lost the great struggle for freedom in which we are now engaged. The farm question, I repeat, is not a matter to be judged in terms of doctrinaire concepts or narrow economic ideas but rather upon the broad basis of American prosperity at home and American foreign policy abroad.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire to call attention to the fact that the present Agricultural Act provides in part for flexible supports. All of it that is discretionary certainly is flexible, and that is about half. So when it is said, as it has been said here by others, that this is a completely rigid price support program, that is not exactly true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wanted to call attention to that. While on my feet, I desire to repeat what I have said, about a careful reading of the Secretary's speech. I hope every American farmer will read it, that he will not merely listen to the Senator's speech about it, and the manner in which the Senator interprets it, but that every American farmer will read the speech. If that is done, it will be a complete answer to all the argument that has been made. The Secretary pledges himself faithfully to carry out the law, in the manner set by Congress. That is where the policy should be determined.

I am asking at this point that the much-discussed speech by Secretary Benson be inserted in the body of the RECORD, so that at least those who are here may know all he actually said—not merely selected portions of it, taken out of context, to make it look absurd and to provide a talking point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address delivered by Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS AND NEW HOPE FOR THE NATION

You confer upon me a signal honor and challenging responsibility by inviting me to speak at this great 32d annual convention of your association. The honor carries with it a grave obligation which, in view of national and world conditions, is almost overwhelming.

I congratulate you men and women of the soil, that from your number have come such stalwarts as Senator EDWARD J. THYE and other great leaders whom I might mention, many of whom are here tonight, and who are made of the same solid stuff.

At the outset, I venture the assertion that no group in agriculture is in a position to recognize more clearly the needs of the agricultural industry and the Nation than this group who represent the men and women who live on the farms and ranches of the Northwest. As one who has been reared among farmers, served them, and been served by them, I declare without fear of successful contradiction that our rural people are today the strongest bulwark we have against all that is aimed, not only at weakening, but at the very destruction of our American way of life.

It is gratifying to note that in recent years an increasing number of industrial, labor, political, and religious leaders have come to acknowledge this fact. It seems that man must get his feet into the soil to keep sane. In any event, no other segment of our population knows so well that "as ye sow, so shall ye reap." America and the world must learn this eternal truth. Failure to do so can bring only disappointment, suffering, and desperation.

Our rural people, men and women of faith and common sense, must plan an important part through their organizations in teaching this all-important lesson. From our rural families must come much of the faith, courage, and leadership to face effectively the local, State, National, and international problems of tomorrow.

As farm people, representing a most important part of our free enterprise system—our American way of life—do we have the courage to accept the challenge which faces our industry and the entire Nation? Will we recognize the facts and act promptly without quibbling? America must be kept strong if she is to preserve herself and provide effective world leadership. This strength must come not alone from armaments and military might. Her strength must be measured in the integrity, moral courage, and spirituality of her people.

Only a few weeks ago we exercised our God-given right of free agency at the polls. God grant we may never lose this priceless privilege. We have differed vigorously during a great political campaign, as is our privilege. But now the American people have freely spoken. We have chosen a President. He is our President. He needs, and will continue to need, our wholehearted support and our faith and prayers, as will his associates, in the difficult days ahead.

The great crusade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now our President, is under way. You helped give him mandate. I welcome this opportunity to come to this great agricultural area of the Nation and personally report on progress.

Important developments have come fast, yet only after solid and mature consideration. The pattern is emerging in a way to indicate the constructive approach with which your Federal Government will move forward.

The inauguration message and ceremonies inspired liberty-loving people everywhere. The state of the Union address was delivered to Congress February 2, less than 2 weeks following inauguration. Let us not lose sight of our President's challenge to the Nation expressed in such statements as the following:

"Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can * * * reduce the planned deficits and then balance the budget, which means, among other things, reducing Federal expenditures to the safe minimum."

Look at these facts from the President's address:

Current year's budget deficit $5.9 billion.

Budget presented before this administration took office indicates a budgetary deficit of $9.9 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

"The national debt is now more than $265 billion.

"In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payment totals over $80 billion.

"Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities, so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description * * *

"Permit me this one understatement," the President said. "To meet and to correct this situation will not be easy.

"Every department head and I are determined to do everything we can to resolve it.

"A balanced budget is an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar.

"This is one of the critical steps to be taken to bring an end to planned inflation.

"Our purpose is to manage the Government's finances so as to help and not hinder each family in balancing its own budget."

An immediate review of all Federal budgets was called for by Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. His directive said:

"The problem is complicated by inheritance of the costs of a Federal debt of more than $265 billion;

"Indicated deficits for the fiscal years 1953–54 totaling $15.8 billion;

"With respect to personnel, it is the policy to reduce the number of Government employees.

"With respect to construction, it is the policy to proceed only with those projects which are deemed clearly essential.

"With respect to all programs, it is the policy to operate at a minimum level of cost and expenditures."

As a member of the President's Cabinet and Secretary of one of the largest governmental departments, I have the duty and obligation to use my best efforts to help our President achieve these objectives. I have implicit confidence in his integrity of purpose. I believe in his program—and I know that you and your neighbors, along with solid citizens all across the Nation, want first of all a balanced national budget and a halt to inflation.

As the President has said, "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." The legacy handed to us is fraught with a conglomeration of the most complex and difficult problems.

There is no easy road to the accomplishment of turning America back from an era of unbalanced budgets, of free spending, of inflation, of taxation that had reached confiscatory levels, of giveaway Government programs that were steadily and surely undermining the moral and spiritual values of our people. But such a program is in keeping with the thrift and wise financial management that is so characteristic of the people of rural America.

The United States Department of Agriculture has acted without delay. We have already effected a regrouping of agencies for more effective administration. February 5 our staff and agency heads met to start immediately a complete review of all programs and budgets. We have a splendid staff in charge, and they are ready to give strong leadership in seeing that agriculture does its share in accomplishing a balanced budget.

It will be our effort to give even more prompt and efficient service to you and the agricultural interests of the Nation—and at less cost. We believe it can be done.

A drastic drop in cattle prices was in progress as we came into office. We know how much it has been costing your members, and we were grateful for the helpful letters, telegrams, and phone calls reporting conditions, offering suggestions, and expressing confidence.

The Department of Agriculture is your Department, and we are in Washington for the purpose of serving you and all other citizens of the United States. We want your advice and suggestions at all times.

We hope you approved of the steps taken to help stabilize the cattle markets.

January 28, just 7 days after taking the oath of office, I issued a statement pointing out that prices received by farmers have been moving downward slowly and irregularly for almost 2 years. The decline is about 12 percent from a year ago and 18 percent from the peak reached in February 1951. Prices paid by farmers, as measured by the parity index, have been substantially unchanged during this period, with the result that the

net incomes of farmers have experienced a severe squeeze. These changes have been under way for many months. We inherited this situation.

Opinions differ as to the future course of prices to be received by farmers. Our analysis in the Department of Agriculture leads us to expect no major changes during the next several months, particularly in view of the continuing high level of consumer income.

We shall continue to use such price-supporting devices as are available to us when and if prices sag below the levels prescribed by the Congress.

The next day I released to the press a copy of this telegram to Gov. Dan Thornton, of Colorado:

"Am doing all possible to have OPS controls on meat removed. Have advised with the White House, Congress, farm groups, packers, stockyard people, and retailers. All I have learned confirms my earlier belief, expressed prior to my appointment, that OPS meat controls should be removed. In my official capacity, I reaffirm that stand. Removal of OPS compulsory grading of meat would be a good thing for all segments of the industry and the consuming public."

February 3 we followed through with a call upon producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing.

At the same time, we urged processing and distribution agencies to develop a greater consumer demand for beef. Prices to consumers have been sharply reduced, which will in turn move more beef into consumption and help stabilize the market.

It was again pointed out that the United States economy is fundamentally strong.

Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability in cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle.

The rapid buildup in cattle numbers has pointed to a somewhat lower level of prices than in 1951 or 1952. Recent breaks appear to be an unorderly and temporary overadjustment to what should be a natural reaction to this increase in cattle numbers. We feel that a return to orderly marketing will check the price slide.

Uncertainty on the part of both buyers and sellers has contributed to an unwarranted pessimism. Disturbed by the price trends, many feeders have let their cattle go at half finish.

Compulsory grading required by OPS and the retention of price ceilings on beef have contributed to price declines. Leaders in the industry whom we consulted agreed that the removal of controls would in itself tend to strengthen cattle prices and stabilize markets.

You were undoubtedly pleased with the announcement that followed next day:

"In conformity with the policy set forth by the President in his message to the Congress, we are developing a program for the orderly decontrol of prices. We are taking action on the decontrol of a number of items before the end of the week. * * * Decontrol of meat would also include lifting the compulsory grading requirement on beef and will eliminate price ceilings on pork, lamb, veal, and beef at all levels from the farmer through the retail store." The results are well known. We are all pleased.

I have said before, and I now repeat, that price-support programs now in effect or previously announced will be continued. This means price support for the wheat you will seed this spring at a level which will reflect a nationwide farm price of about $2.21 per bushel. It means a support price for oats equal to 80 cents per bushel; for barley, $1.24; for rye, $1.43; and for flaxseed, $3.79 per bushel. It means support for dairy products at prices which will be announced soon.

We have not been stampeded into ill-considered action by the price declines that have occurred during this past month, nor do we propose to be stampeded. The farm people of the country, I am convinced, should expect sound and constructive help from the Department of Agriculture, and that we propose to give them. There will be no blanket promises to embark on actions which we have neither the authority to invoke nor the means to implement. You, on your part, can contribute stability to farm prices by orderly marketing and an exhibition of confidence and cooperation.

As we move forward, advisory groups and committees will be used to bring to the Department of Agriculture the best judgments of farmers, farm organizations, and industrial leadership.

The 14-man advisory committee named by the President to work with the Secretary of Agriculture gave us a good start. This committee, changed somewhat in personnel, will be meeting from time to time to review progress and make additional suggestions.

For the International Wheat Agreement Conference of 46 nations now meeting in Washington we are using two advisory groups. One is composed of representatives of the major farm organizations and the wheat industry. The other is a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives.

A special dairy advisory group will meet next week in Washington to bring to bear on the many dairy problems the best judgments available. They are the best men we could find, men recommended by the industry itself. This great dairy area will be well represented.

A large cotton committee drawn from all major segments of the cotton industry is also ready to start work. A group of capable, highly respected citizens is being appointed to advise us in the important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Other committees will be called as important problems develop and as work proceeds on major programs. We are willing to submit our case to the farmers. A lifetime of working for and with them, in all their fields of economic endeavor, has convinced us of our trust.

It will always be a definite part of our policy to seek the best possible advice from Members of the Congress and the entire agricultural industry through conferences with farm organization leaders, other advisory committees, and individuals regarding existing and proposed policies and programs. As the President emphasized in his state of the Union message: "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." Certainly in no area of the legacy handed us by the outgoing administration are the problems more numerous or more difficult than in the Department of Agriculture.

The numerous programs and great decisions for which the Secretary of Agriculture has been given responsibility are almost unbelievable. The magnitude and import of the decisions he is required to make are humbling indeed, if not overwhelming. The Congress, through bipartisan legislation aimed to benefit agriculture, has provided far-reaching machinery pertaining to farm credit, research, marketing, and price supports.

It is our duty to administer faithfully these laws, not alone for the protection of the farmers, but for the good of all the people. We are firm in our resolve to do this. There will be no turning back from this responsibility. But as we administer these laws, there will be a thorough examination and reappraisal of each program. These efforts will be made in close cooperation and with advice from farmers and other qualified representatives of the industry. In other words, we want each commodity group to help develop a program it can make work with our help. We know that without the help of the industry and the blessings of a kind providence, we cannot succeed. We are earnestly seeking both.

And now I would like to spell out for you, in broad outline, what will be the policy of our administration of your Department of Agriculture. It is the result of careful and prolonged deliberation in consultation with farmers, farm leaders, professional agriculturalists, Members of Congress, and others. I feel sure it is not perfect, because it has been developed by imperfect human beings. No doubt the policy will be refined and improved with the passing of time.

It has been influenced to some extent, no doubt, by an old-fashioned philosophy that it is impossible to help people permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. It is a philosophy that believes in the supreme worth of the individual as a free man, as a child of God, that believes in the dignity of labor and the conviction that you cannot build character by taking away man's initiative and independence. And, further, that character is the one thing we make in this world and take with us into the next. For what doth it profit if we gain the whole world and lose our own souls?

I believe that the people who live on the farms and in the rural communities of America also accept this homely philosophy. I am most anxious that they will always accept it as a dynamic part of their lives. It must be so if this choice land of America is to endure.

This, then, in part at least, will be the broad policy which will guide us. I hope you will concur wholeheartedly.

AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

The supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, should be "How will it affect the character, morale, and well-being of our people?" We need—the world needs—a strong America in the critical years ahead.

To me, freedom is a God-given, eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something more precious than life itself. It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.

With the development of mechanized commercial agriculture, the family farm has become closely geared into a complex interdependent industrial economy. There is no hope for peace, growth, or prosperity if each economic group is seeking its own advantage to the detriment of others. To make their best contribution to national welfare, farmers must have the full cooperation of industry and labor, because each is dependent upon the effective performance of the other economic groups.

Our agricultural policy should aim to obtain, in the market place, full parity prices of farm products and parity incomes for farm people so that farmers will have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to changing consumer demands in an expanding economy. This objective cannot be assured by Government programs alone. It can be achieved only with a steady level of prices, high employment and production, and rising output per worker in our total national economy.

The most important method of promoting the long-time welfare of farm people and the Nation is the support of adequate programs of research and education in the production, processing, marketing, and utilization of farm products and in problems of rural living.

The development of modern agriculture, which has made possible these great achievements, has placed the family farm in a vulnerable economic position because farm prices and income rise and fall more rapidly than farm costs. Hence, the guarding of farm levels of living requires a program of storage and price supports to help to assure

stability of income. These supports should be designed not only to serve the welfare of farmers, but also—in the widest national interest—to prevent disaster to the farm producing plant and the national food supply.

Price-support laws will be carried out faithfully in every respect. There are mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the so-called basic commodities for 1953 and 1954. Other laws provide for supports on other farm products. While enforcing these laws, there will be formulated long-term programs which will more fully and effectively accomplish our overall objectives.

Price supports should provide insurance against disaster to the farm-producing plant and help to stabilize national food supplies. But price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our efforts should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system.

It is generally agreed that there is danger in the undue concentration of power in the Federal Government. Too many Americans today are calling on Washington to do for them what they should be willing to do for themselves.

Individual freedom and citizenship responsibility depend upon the principle of helping the individual to help himself. It is possible through individual and group action to solve many problems and achieve objectives locally with a minimum of Federal assistance and control. Your own association is an excellent example of this fact.

The principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. We seek a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maximum of dependence on free-market prices as the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market. However, the ability to avoid restrictions on agriculture depends in part on the willingness of other economic groups to adopt policies that permit flexible and dynamic adjustments.

Furthermore, inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture or any other segment of our economy. Relief programs should be operated as such—not as an aid to the entire agricultural industry. Emergency programs should be terminated as soon as the emergency is over.

No agricultural program should be manipulated to serve partisan political purposes.

In the administration of this Department, the guiding purpose will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen. We must establish a climate which will further promote, cultivate, and release the great reservoir of dynamic latent energy of every individual in this great Nation.

The days ahead are sobering and challenging and will demand the faith, prayers, and loyalty of every American. Our challenge is to keep America strong—strong socially, economically, and, above all, spiritually sound, if our way of life is to endure. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

We need a nationwide repentance to rid this land of corruption. We must return to the fundamental virtues that have made this Nation great. There is a force in the universe which no mortal can alter. This Nation does have a spiritual foundation. It has been established in keeping with great spiritual and moral principles, but there seems to be a tendency for us to lose our sense of uprightness and to willfully do those things which we must know to be wrong. This cannot continue with impunity.

God help us to raise our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things. May we have the courage to stand up and be counted, to stand for principle, for those noble concepts and ideals which guided the Founding Fathers in the establishment of this great land. Thank God for the promises that have been made regarding the future of America. I hope and pray we will merit and realize the fulfillment of these promises. God grant it may be so.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like also to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from a newspaper which has supported the Democratic administration through thick and thin most of the time. I speak of the Washington Post and of an editorial entitled "Give Benson a Chance."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE BENSON A CHANCE

Criticisms of Agriculture Secretary Benson should be viewed in the perspective that President Eisenhower offered at his press conference yesterday, viz, that agricultural prices have been declining for 2 years. To listen to some of the accusations on Capitol Hill, one would think that Mr. Benson had reneged on campaign promises and precipitated an incipient depression by not supporting prices at 100 percent of parity. Neither the President nor the Republican platform promised any such thing. The platform on agriculture favored a farm program aimed at full parity prices—in the market place. These last four words are important. They are substantially what Mr. Benson has been saying—that market prices, rather than governmental supports alone, are what ought to bring farmers parity of income.

Supports at 90 percent of parity through 1954 are provided by law for basic crops—wheat, corn, rice, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco. But these support levels are not sacrosanct as respects future planning. This newspaper agrees fully with Mr. Benson's aim as stated in his speech last week at St. Paul:

"Price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our efforts should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system."

There are numerous dislocations in which high and rigid price supports have played a part. A huge wheat surplus is in prospect; yet the United States is having difficulty in negotiating a renewal of the International Wheat Agreement because of the support level. Nearly 80 percent more wheat is under governmental loan than a year ago. The amount of corn supported by the Government has increased 1,000 percent over 1952; yet hogs are being marketed light, in part because farmers cannot afford to feed them corn. The Government is buying vast amounts of butter under a discretionary 90-percent support; yet butter consumption is way down.

What many of the critics actually are saying, of course, is that the abnormally high price levels of the last few years ought to be regarded as normal. Even parity has a moving base and reflects recent high prices. Indexes of farm income, moreover, often do not allow for increases in productivity and the decline in farm employment. By any standard, farmers have done very well. It is ironical to note, incidentally, that many of the persons who are lamenting the decline in beef cattle prices from 129 to 92 percent of parity are the very same persons who a while back were lambasting price controls on beef. What is in process, it is important to remember, is an overdue adjustment. That adjustment would only be hindered by the kind of intervention that would encourage more overproduction. Congress has already frustrated the application of a variable scale of support as a check on overproduction.

Price supports are useful devices for underwriting farmers because of the risks inherent in agriculture, and in times of crisis high supports may be justified. But they are at best an artificial expedient. What Secretary Benson is aiming at, as we understand it, is a more rounded program that would promote market stability by encouraging experimentation, exports and consumer consumption. Certainly Mr. Benson deserves a chance to come up with other means, beyond the mere governmental purchases of surpluses, for safeguarding farm income. Agriculture is in no real peril; the economy is generally prosperous, 90 percent supports on basic crops continue through 1954, and there is plenty of authority for emergency help if necessary. Possibly Mr. Benson would be wise to give some reassurance that he will not let the bottom fall out of the market. But the worst danger of panic lies in the stampeding of those self-appointed spokesmen who see calamity in a return to normal price relationships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not been under the impression that the Washington Post supported the Democratic Party.

Mr. WATKINS. During the past 6 years I definitely received that impression.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Evidently the Senator is not aware of the fact that the Washington Post supported General Eisenhower.

Mr. WATKINS. I have been reading the Washington Post nearly every day, and if it is not a Democratic paper I never saw one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My observation is that while the Washington Post is a splendid paper, it used debatable and dubious judgment in recent months in reference to political matters. It has never exactly been known as a friend of the farmer and it has never been known as the Farmers' Union Herald. I think it is a good idea to talk to the folks who produce the goods. With all due respect to this great and wonderful newspaper, I disagree with its agricultural policy.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Samuel Wilder King, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Richard R. Atkinson for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1953.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, may this Lenten season upon which we are entering today be great and glorious in the realization of a finer degree of spiritual culture.

We penitently confess that again and again our spiritual nature becomes eclipsed by sordid materialism and we lose our vision of the wonder and glory of the life to which Thou hast called us.

Grant that in these days of self-examination, self-discipline, and self-denial we may discover those sources of divine power which will enable us to gain the mastery over every insurgent impulse and every unworthy and inordinate desire.

May we daily become more sensitive and responsive to the guidance of Thy spirit, leading us into an intimate communion with Thyself and nearer to all mankind in the bonds of peace and brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 16, 1953, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate on pending measures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 32, Rept. No. 63), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "under", strike out the following: "rule XI (1) (e)" and insert in lieu thereof the words "clause 14 of rule XI."

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 91, Rept. 64), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without continental United States, its Territories and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

With the following amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "within", strike out the following words: "or without."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 113, Rept. 65), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 115, Rept. 66), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1953, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "within", strike out the following words: "or outside."

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 125, Rept. 67), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and

testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

EFFECT OF PRICE CONTROL REMOVAL

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention a letter received by me, dated February 10, 1953, from one of my constituents relating to the effect of the decontrol order on bread. Her letter reads as follows:

Hon. SIDNEY FINE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FINE: On Friday February 6 Congress took off controls on foods, the reason given being that with free competition articles would go down in price.

On Saturday morning February 7, I went to the bakery and for the same loaf of bread for which I used to pay 19 cents I had to pay 20 cents and for 3 rolls formerly 11 cents I had to pay 4 cents each.

Is this how we are going to check inflation and lower the cost of living?

Please do something about it and make it possible for people with moderate incomes to live decently.

Sincerely yours.

It is evident from this communication that the housewife loses again. The President's decision to dump price controls for a return to natural economic law has shifted the control of prices to the middleman who holds the housewife at his mercy. This result has caused a great many of us grave concern. The slogan is obviously "get while the getting's good." Members of the Republican majority, you can do something about this. The next move is yours.

INDIVIDUAL TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the approach to relieve the tax burden of the individual has not received proper consideration to date. I would like to direct the attention of the House to H. R. 1729, my bill that will give relief to the individual taxpayer.

You all know that each individual without dependents, who earns $600 a year, must divide his earnings with the United States Government. Additional exemptions are allowed $600 each. We all know that the exemption allowed does not leave the individual a sufficient amount to properly sustain himself.

My bill would increase the exemption to individuals from $600 to $1,000. This would reach the greatest number of persons and afford the greatest relief to all taxpayers. Statistics are available to show that the exemption thus granted does not leave sufficient funds for the individual to properly maintain a decent standard of living. I, therefore, request the Ways and Means Committee to immediately consider my bill and several similar bills that have been introduced that will afford real tax reduction and real relief to the individual taxpayer and therefore help maintain a higher standard of living.

SOUTH CAROLINA REDISCOVERED

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the prophetic words of that world-famed statesman and orator, Henry W. Grady, spoken in Boston long before many of us were born, have now been fully realized. I quote the following words from Mr. Grady:

> Far to the South lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone.

It is a strange paradox that that section of our great country which sought to divide it in the sixty's is now doing more than any other section to solidify and unify the Nation.

Yesterday as I sat at dinner with the President, Gov. Adlai Stevenson, his erstwhile opponent, and Members of Congress, I was again made to realize that the "lines have fallen to us in pleasant places."

The special recognition given to my State of South Carolina and the South generally in the New York Times magazine supplement of February 8, detailing by graphic illustrations the industrial progress we have made, is greatly appreciated. Attention is also called to an article in that great national daily newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, of February 13, revealing the great progress made in development, production, and processing of cotton fabrics.

Our State of South Carolina, though small in area, has become the leading textile manufacturing State in the Nation, and the Fourth District, which I have the honor to represent, boasts of more active textile spindles than any other similar area in the world. Without encumbering the RECORD, I invite your attention to the current issue of the National Geographic magazine wherein is found a beautiful, colored, illustrated section entitled "South Carolina Rediscovered." Many of you have visited our State; others are planning to do so. We are always anxious to have you. To be sure, we are grateful to the named national publications for the recognition given to our great State.

AMBASSADOR LODGE SUBMITS KATYN REPORT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read to the Members an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 11 under a United Nations, New York, dateline which reads as follows:

U. N. DELEGATION TO GET KATYN MASSACRE REPORT

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States chief delegate to the U. N. asked Secretary General Trygve Lie yesterday to send to each U. N. delegation a United States congressional committee report saying Soviet secret police killed thousands of Polish Army officers in the Katyn massacre.

Lodge asked this be done as a matter pertaining to U. N. objectives in the field of human rights.

He requested no further action. However, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky may refer to the report in a general attack on the United States, expected at this session.

I wish to commend Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., for his diligence in presenting the Katyn committee report to the various delegations at the United Nations.

For the information of the House, I might say that there is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs House Resolution 63, which was submitted by me as chairman of the special Katyn committee. This resolution calls upon the House to formally request that the President of the United States forward to the United States representatives at the United Nations the testimony and findings of the select committee. The resolution further sets out the recommendations submitted in the committee's final report with the hope that our delegation submits these recommendations to the U. N. for consideration.

Each member of the Katyn committee now serving in Congress has filed an identical resolution to House Resolution 63.

Chairman CHIPERFIELD, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has assured me that his committee will act on our resolution at the earliest possible time so that the Congress can take up consideration of forwarding our recommendations to this session of the United Nations meeting.

CIVIL RIGHTS IN THE NORTH

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper clipping.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I want to bring to your attention something absolutely shocking. It has just been revealed that an agreement was entered into between the Police Department of the city of New York and the Department of Justice on July 11 of last year for the FBI not to investigate any violations of civil rights in northern cities, and that agreement was in effect until January 14 when Attorney General McGranery abrogated it.

I demand that the present Attorney General investigate this shocking thing. I would introduce a resolution that we in Congress do likewise. I ask Representative KEATING's special committee to do likewise. This is absolutely unbelievable, but it was revealed by the World-Telegram this past Tuesday.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. My time is limited, but I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman kindly supply the committee to investigate the Justice Department with the information which he has?

Mr. POWELL. I surely will. It is in the New York Times of this morning; it was in the Herald Tribune yesterday morning, and in the World-Telegram Tuesday night.

I was the first individual to get the FBI to investigate violations of civil rights. This led to the first Federal grand jury investigation. Today, there are $3 million in damages being asked by Negro and white citizens of New York who were victims of brutality.

THE DC-6 CRASH IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I called to the attention of this body the terrible crash of a National Airlines DC-6 in the Gulf of Mexico last Saturday and asked that the appropriate committees of this body look into that crash in the interest of air safety.

Since that time I have been informed that this type of aircraft, the DC-6, has been defective in some respects in the past, and that orders have gone out to modify these planes in the interest of safety. Whether or not all of them have been so modified can be determined only by the appropriate committees of this Congress.

The mystery still remains as to why that plane was flying a route across the Gulf when the weather was turbulent and when a safer route could have been flown at the cost of only some 30 minutes' flying time; I trust the Congress will investigate this disaster.

AMERICAN TRADE POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great industrialists and business leaders, Mr. Henry Ford, made an important address yesterday in Chicago which I would like to call to the attention of the Congress. The recommendations that Mr. Ford made in regard to revision of American trade policy in the field of law lie within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Congress.

I hope that the recommendations made by Mr. Ford will be typical of those which will be presented to the Congress by this business administration, because if it is the type of progressive policy presented by Mr. Ford it will enable the United States and our people to meet the responsibility of world leadership which faces us today. I hope that these policies will merit the immediate attention both of the Congress and of the new administration.

KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have ready for introduction today a bill to correct an inequity that has existed for some time, but unfortunately I did not get the bill drafted in time.

I was rather amazed to find that this Congress and the prior Congress had been so negligent in the treatment of one phase that affects the men in our armed services. I refer to men missing in action in Korea who are not given the same treatment as those missing in action in World War II. Some of these men have been missing in action and are presumed to be dead but because of the fact that a state of war does not exist they are not considered dead and their dependents cannot collect the insurance which would be due.

In my district there is a mother who is critically ill suffering from cancer and needs very badly the money that would be available from her son if he were drawing his pay; also she should have available the insurance payments that are due to be paid her. The chances are that this mother will probably die without ever receiving financial assistance which could be used for medical treatment and to make her final days more comfortable, which they could be if the same laws and regulations in effect during World War II were in effect now permitting dependents and beneficiaries of veterans of the Korean war to receive these payments.

I was somewhat surprised to find that many Members, including some members of the Armed Services Committee, were under the impression that this emergency had been taken care of during the 82d Congress, but as far as I have been able to ascertain no bill has been introduced at this session to correct this situation and that is why I have taken steps to have such a bill drafted.

PRICE OF BREAD

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] relative to the price of bread in New York City. I share his apprehension, but I would not want his remarks to go by indicating that the farmer was getting rich on the wheat produced in this country. Actually, if the wheat farmer was to give you the wheat in that 20-cent loaf of bread, you would still be paying 18 cents for a loaf of bread. The very people you represent, the laboring group because their wages have been raised, has caused the price of bread to go up in cost. It is the increase in the processing, handling and labor cost that has caused bread to cost more. It is not the farmer or the wheat grower that is profiting. The price of wheat has been going down for several months on the market. Much wheat sold under the parity price. The wheat prices go down—the cost of bread goes up—but do not blame the wheat growers.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINE. The gentleman will remember that I referred to the middleman and not the farmer; I was referring to the processors who were holding the housewives at their mercy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, and I think that that is the group that has charge of the handling and the processing and the selling of the bread that is responsible for the increased cost of bread.

Mr. FINE. The gentleman is correct.

NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT—FBI ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there has just been referred by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to a story which is occupying the front pages of the New York papers today on the question of whether police brutality in New York is

being suppressed through some agreement or deal with the FBI of the Department of Justice. Any such agreement or deal is also reported to be hotly denied by the police commissioner, who happens to be a distinguished constituent of mine. I think this is a very serious matter. If there is anything to it then I think it is uniquely in the investigative area in which my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is interested, as he heads the appropriate subcommitte of the Committee on the Judiciary. That subcommittee can make a great contribution not only to law enforcement in New York, but in the country generally. If there is anything to this story of the suppression of civil rights in New York, this is the appropriate way to get at it by a congressional committee under such forthright leadership as that furnished by the gentleman from New York.

I would like to say that often we talk about civil rights and the need for preserving and fighting for them without realizing that it is in these areas of effective and just police protection where much can be done to make civil rights live and vital.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of Tennessee's 42,246 square miles is devoted to cultivation, pasture, and woodland, and about 38 percent of our total working force is engaged in farming. But Tennessee leads the South in the production of minerals, her extensive resources including coal, phosphate stone, clay, sand and gravel, zinc, marble, and manganese.

From the standpoint of the country as a whole, coal output in Tennessee may not appear to be significant. Our mines produced about 4 million tons in 1952 as compared with a national total of 465 million tons. On close examination, however, we find that Tennessee's bituminous coal industry is actually a very vital part of the State and national economy, and that it is expected to become progressively more important in the years ahead.

Some 6,000 miners are employed by the bituminous coal industry in the great State of Tennessee. Our coal belt extends from the north to the south borders over a width of about 60 miles, and the 17 counties in which coal is mined at the present time comprise almost half a million persons. Thus we have 25,000 men, women, and children in Tennessee obtaining their subsistence directly from coal, with the livelihood of many of the remaining residents of the coal area largely dependent upon this commodity.

Tennessee is a TVA State in which hydro constitutes 46 percent of the total energy produced, but coal still contributes 54 percent, and its share will increase in the future. When plants now under construction are completed more than 17 million tons of coal will be required annually to supply the steam plants in the TVA system. Since Tennessee is the home of Oak Ridge, it is also relevant to point out that projects under construction or planned by the Atomic Energy Commission during 1952 will use an annual total of about 23 million tons of coal, much of which will come from mines in Tennessee.

When these facts are brought to notice, coal's place in the overall energy perspective becomes quite apparent. No further evidence is needed to emphasize the necessity of keeping the coal industry in superior condition as it girds for the increasing service expected of it in future years.

Why then should this Congress stand by and accept the continuance of a state of affairs in which the coal industry in Tennessee and elsewhere is being materially weakened and its working force threatened with unemployment? I speak of the unfair competition that has come to coal's markets in the form of foreign residual oil, a product for which we have absolutely no need at the present time and on which we would certainly not wish to rely for future supply.

Foreign residual oil has no place in our economic plan. We do not need it now and we shall never need it. Tennessee alone has 12½ billion tons of recoverable coal reserves, and that is less than 2 percent of our national total. There is enough mineable coal in this land of ours to last for more than 1,000 years, and every fuel authority will tell you that a growing portion of our energy needs will have to come from those vast reserves.

To permit the unnecessary debilitation of our coal industry at this time is not only an imprudent policy, it is a dangerous policy. It is unfair to the people of every other State as well as to the people of Tennessee and the other coal-producing districts.

Let this Congress wait no longer to remedy this situation. We must drastically curtail residual oil imports, and we must do it at once so that the coal industry can ready itself for the gigantic tasks that are on the horizon.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on this February 18, freemen everywhere should pause and give thought to the fact that 32 years ago the people of Armenia declared their independence. Today that independence exists only in the spirit of Armenians, who continue to hope to be able to regain their liberties.

We should look to Armenia today, as an example of what happens to freemen under communism and resolve that it must never happen here and that we will do all within our power to restore liberty to the enslaved Armenians as well as to the enslaved, no matter where they may be.

Let us stand together as freemen, fighting to guarantee liberty and freedom to all throughout the world.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. I agree thoroughly with everything my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has said.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 144 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 3053, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The rule waives points of order. The reason for the waiving of points of order is that there has been a transfer of appropriations from one agency to another. By that I mean there is a balance in some of the agencies, and the Committee on Appropriations, I believe, has acted properly in using up the gigantic balances which now exist in some of the agencies. Outside of that, Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. In other words, amendments may be offered. The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules unanimously reported this rule. I believe there is no question about the rule itself. However, the bill which the rule makes in order brings up for the first time questions of appropriations that are going to be made by this Congress in this session. This is a supplemental appropriation bill. Supplemental appropriation bills, from my observation, have been largely made up of things that the bureaus and the departments think of after the Congress has appropriated the amount of money we think they ought to use in that year. The biggest task before this Congress is going to be to balance the budget. It is not going to be an easy task, but it is a

very important task if we are to restore this country's fiscal affairs to an even balance. It is going to be a task where all of us are going to have to make some personal sacrifices. We are not going to do this job by saying, "It is all right to cut the other fellow, but you must not cut anything that is coming for my State or my district." That is the tendency. It is very strong. That temptation is very strong, and I know it because I have undergone it myself. Neither is this responsibility to balance the budget a party responsibility. I regard it as a responsibility of every Member of the House because this country in the last election voted for fiscal sanity. This country is demanding a balanced and a business budget. As I say, it is going to be a difficult task. It is going to be particularly difficult at this time for the Committee on Appropriations, and as I have observed the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, means to do a job this time and they are going to need the help of the Members of Congress.

At the beginning of the consideration of appropriation bills I wish to aline myself with those Members of the House, including members of the Appropriations Committee, who feel that there is a serious "must" to balance the budget and to cut down all appropriations that can be cut down. In order to do that we have got to cut everywhere. I do not believe there is an area in the executive departments of the Government that cannot, without damaging efficient operation, cut their budget to some extent if there is a will to do it. The trouble I have found is that there is not any will to do it in the executive departments. They come here for supplemental appropriations. Even after the Congress has debated the matter and decided on the appropriation they should have for that year, they come up and ask for deficiency appropriations. We will never get anywhere unless we make up our minds that we are going to cut, even if it hurts us, and that we are going to stand by the Appropriations Committee.

I think it is very clear that this desire to balance the budget and to bring our economy into a businesslike pattern is not exclusively the property of the Republican Party. I think the members of the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic side are equally concerned about this situation, and realize as fully as do the Republicans that we are rapidly approaching the point where we will have reached the maximum of borrowing capacity authorized by the Congress. It will be a bad thing for this country if we have to come in here with another bill to raise the debt limit above the present $275 billion. I can remember in years gone by when it was seriously debated on this floor as to whether this country could stand a public debt of $50 billion, and then we debated whether we could stand one of $75 billion. Now we have reached the point of two hundred and seventy-five billion. This is a serious proposition. What are we going to do about it as a practical matter? I do not think the way to do it is to start out reducing taxes, until you know how much money you are going to spend. There used to be an old saying in the country that you must not put the cart before the horse. It looks to me like my Republican friends have started out by putting the fiscal cart before the Republican elephant. I hope they are going to think better of that, because this is a serious proposition.

If the people of America are endowed with one thing it is commonsense, and they know perfectly well, as a sensible proposition, that before you are going to balance the budget you have to reduce expenditures, and you cannot balance the budget by reducing taxes and leaving the expenditures where they are. That is perfectly obvious. Of course, we hear a great deal of talk about this being a businessman's government. I do not take much stock in that. I think it is a pretty good thing to have a businessman's government. When you stop and remember that this country is the biggest business on earth now, or ever has been, what is wrong with having a few men who are trained in business to tell us what to do? We need a few of the other kind, but let us back up these businessmen, and let us think along business lines and see what we can do about this thing which I regard the most serious thing before this country; namely, putting this country on a sound fiscal basis. In order to do so everybody will have to stand up and be counted.

That brings me to a rather delicate subject, as far as I am concerned. That is the movement that will take place under this bill to restore an item of $24 million for aid to public schools in impacted areas. I supported the bill authorizing that, and I regard it as a just obligation on the part of the Government that where we start a large Government operation in a small community, and as a result of that there is a great influx of people, it becomes necessary to have schools, and the Government owes a certain obligation to supplement what the communities can raise.

I agree with that principle, and I voted for it; and this year after the Appropriations Committee had considered it and after the Congress had considered it, it was decided that $40 million was the amount that should be appropriated for that purpose and we did appropriate it. Now we are confronted with a request for $24 million more.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has got to decide how to cut this cloth to fit the garment; we cannot permit the agencies of Government to decide those things. My State gets a good deal of money out of that appropriation, and we like to have it, and I want to have a just proportion of what is appropriated. But, after all, we have a great many things to do, a great many things to make appropriations for. We made a $40 million appropriation for this purpose. It was done under a formula provided by Congress which was interpreted by the Office of Education. If that interpretation is wrong then we ought to cut this amount proportionately.

I just cannot see our balancing this budget, which I regard as the most important thing for this Congress to do, if we are going to yield every time an additional appropriation is requested for something that affects our own district or our own State. I do not like to say that; it sort of hurts to say it, particularly when it gets back home that I have said it; but we have got to straighten this thing out. And let me tell you something; we will be doing a greater favor to our people, and we will be doing a greater favor to our children and their children if we put this Government on a sound basis even if we do have to say "No" once in a while to our own constituents.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. With reference to the school item, I wish to call attention to the fact that out of an appropriation of $40,000,000, $5,715,000 was obligated to the 31st of December. Twice that would be just about $12,000,000. Frankly, with that picture there were many who did not feel that any further appropriation for a deficiency was justified.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Speaking of education, I was rather astonished yesterday in the Rules Committee when the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor informed us that this Government was spending for public education—had spent in 1951, they did not have more recent figures—the appalling amount of $3,618,000,000; and of that sum only $79,000,000 was being expended under the supervision of the Office of Education.

Somebody said that did not mean anything, that $2,941,000 of that amount—all except about $600,000,000—was being spent by the Veterans' Administration.

I want to say while I am on my feet that if we are going to do this job of balancing this budget, if we are serious about it and mean what we say, I do not think there is any department or any agency of this Government that is too sacred for the Appropriations Committee and this House to take a look at their budget and see if it can properly be cut, and then cut it accordingly.

Last year, as you will remember, there was a great deal of odor about this education matter in the Bureau of Veterans' Affairs, and that this Congress authorized a select committee to make an investigation. So I think we could well look at every appropriation that comes before us and see whether we can properly save without injuring the actual necessary functions of that department.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am for a sound fiscal policy, and all that, but I would like to know what this administration's position is on the budget. We have one budget before the Congress that has been kicked, cuffed around, and cussed, and I refer to the Truman budget. Does the gentleman not think it would be the wise thing and a thing that should be done for this administration to submit a budget to the Congress of the United States? If the gentleman himself is not prepared to speak on that, I trust that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he takes the

floor will give us the benefit of his thinking on that point.

It seems to me that the present administration, this changed administration, after a budget had been submitted by President Truman, and when they have come into power, would send a budget to the Congress of the United States, which would be the right and proper thing for it to do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is a most timely suggestion. But for some unknown reason the present administration has never asked me about what it ought to do. I do not hesitate, however, to give gratuitous advice. It has not been listened to before and I do not expect it will be listened to at this time.

I would make several suggestions to my friends on the Republican side, and I know they are anxious to do this job as we are and I know most of them are striving to do it. One of the suggestions would be, as the distinguished minority leader stated, give us the budget figures so we will know what we are shooting at, so that we can help you do the things that are necessary to be done. Do not leave us with the Truman budget which you say is not any good. Let us have the Eisenhower budget so that we may know in what direction we are heading in order that we may give you the assistance needed today in the interest of the country at large.

I might make another suggestion. When you begin to talk about reducing taxes, let us put the old cart behind the horse instead of in front of him. Let us forget about the possibility of reducing taxes until we are in the position of saying to the country that we have reduced appropriations to the point where tax reduction is feasible. We are starting out in the wrong way. I give that advice to my Republican friends most seriously, and with a sincere purpose to be helpful.

I might add another piece of advice. Everyone talks about loopholes in the tax structure. I would like to know why our good friends have not started in to amend and to plug up some of the loopholes that will give us more revenue instead of reducing taxes to give us less revenue. I know many organizations and businesses that are in competition with other businesses, so does the Ways and Means Committee. They have considered this in past sessions. Why do you not shut off the loopholes and give us some more revenue that the country is entitled to and in that manner relieve the anxiety and burden upon the other taxpayers?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The point made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is well taken. Of course, we recognize that it takes time to formulate a long and complicated budget. But we should have it at the earliest possible moment and before we consider the individual bills. I make this point, if I may. There have been 2 or 3 months to work on the problems. Today this Congress is entitled to know—to know now—whether or not the brand of the present administration is on the requests which were considered by the Appropriations Committee in the pending bill. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, but frankly I am not quite clear as to whether the present bill falls within or without the budget of the present administration.

Is the present administration asking us to appropriate the money requested by the budget in the estimates submitted to the committee? I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can clarify that question and I hope he will in his own time this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman can and will.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], I insert at this point, figures supplied by the Committee on Education and Labor, showing amounts expended by various agencies of the Government in the field of education:

Exact or estimated obligations for Federal educational programs, by agency, fiscal year 1950

[Subject to the limitations set forth in the preceding explanation]

I. Executive departments:	
A. Department of State	$21,593,693
B. Department of Treasury	3,731,926
C. Department of Defense—Army	[1] 47,445,605
D. Department of Defense—Navy	116,724,760
E. Department of Defense—Air Force	110,806,884
F. Department of Justice	1,186,416
G. Post Office Department	0
H. Department of the Interior	22,590,726
I. Department of Agriculture	177,083,596
J. Department of Commerce	9,114,382
K. Department of Labor	3,621,554
II. Independent offices and agencies:	
A. Atomic Energy Commission	25,762,454
B. Federal Security Agency	70,089,436
C. Smithsonian Institution	2,280,132
D. Tennessee Valley Authority	4,188,116
E. Veterans' Administration	2,941,218,541
F. Other independent offices and agencies	23,568,312
III. The Executive Office, Legislative Establishment, and District of Columbia:	
A. The Executive Office of the President	[2] 155,146
B. The Legislative Establishment	8,403,788
C. The District of Columbia	29,074,172
Total	3,618,639,639

[1] Excluding principally the entire Army service school system, for which adequate data for an estimate are not available.

[2] Excluding the Central Intelligence Agency, regarding which information is withheld for security reasons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would not impose myself on you these 4 or 5 minutes were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] mentioned the expenditures by the Federal Government in the field of education. I thought it was probably a good time to give the House a little information that they would be interested in. While I was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I borrowed what I regarded as one of the best research men from the Congressional Library and put him on the job of trying to find out where the Government departments were spending money in the field of education and, as best he could, for what purpose it was being spent. Well, it disclosed a tremendous amount of money. I then set up a committee to go into some of the expenditures to see just what was taking place. If you will recall, the last few weeks of the last session were pretty jammed up with legislative work and the committee was handling some very important matters, matters which the House was anxious for the committee to turn loose to it, such as the mine inspection bill and some other matters. So, we did not get far with the investigation, but I did reach this very definite conclusion and that was that there should be some place in this Government where those departments who are spending money in the field of education, which includes virtually all of them, should file a report showing specifically the purposes for which it was being spent, the amount being spent, and by whom. Now, the only place I know for that is in the Office of Education. I have discussed it with the Commissioner of Education. I would not suggest that he have one particle of power over that report or the right to do anything with it other than assemble and send it to the Congress, and he has no desire whatever for any authority over the expenditures, the management, the direction, suggestions, or anything else. But, the Office of Education was set up for the purpose of gathering information and data on the educational progress and systems of this country, and then let it be there for those who would seek it. Thank goodness, he desires to stay out of the field of running or influencing the operation of schools, and has expressed this view many times on record.

Now, here was the picture that confronted me. Here was a congressional committee set up, and it took over a year and a half with the hardest kind of detail work and investigating to gather together from the thousands of different Government sources the desired information. So, I feel it would be perfectly proper if a resolution were introduced, and I frankly say to you that I propose to introduce it, or someone else could do it, that would direct the various departments of Government to file in the Office of the Commissioner of Education such a report and such a finding so that this Congress and the committees could have at all times available the information concerning the expenditures in the field of education. I think the expenditures have been extravagant, but I do not blame the Committee on Appropriations, because there is no practical way at present for them to find the facts. There has not been any way for anyone else to find out. So, I thought after my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

SMITH] mentioned it, that the House would be interested in knowing that there has been some careful thought and study given to the solution of the rather complex problem that he brought to your attention, and I hope at some early date we will have an opportunity to designate a place for this information to be deposited so that the membership of the House as well as the rest of the United States can have available that information. Then they can see where mistakes were made, profit by them, save money, and improve their operations in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] I think it would be useful and informative to the House to have those figures which were given to you yesterday by the chairman of this committee, and I ask unanimous consent to insert with my remarks the amount of money spent by various departments for educational purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman I think the report covers about three volumes. It was prepared by Mr. Quattlebaum of the Congressional Library, and they are now House documents and are available to you. I am sure the Committee on Education and Labor will be glad to furnish them to you. This will give you precise figures, if you desire them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3053, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have here the first supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by this Congress. I call attention to page 2 of the report, where it appears that there were requests for $2 313,719,590, of which the committee allowed in new funds $904,672,920.

Frankly, we went over those estimates in our subcommittees just as carefully as it was possible to do. The big item involved was the military item, and there the request was for $1,200,000,000. We were able to make reductions in that, part of them made by the committee and part of them made by the departments before that came to us, totaling $157,256,276.

We were able to find funds where transfers can be made out of appropriations for the Department of Defense which will not be used, which are current 1953 appropriations, and which the responsible officials of the Department agreed could not be used, so that we were able to provide for all needs by authority to transfer given funds to the Department in sufficient amount to carry on the activities.

Those items of deficiency in the military estimates largely resulted from the bills, which were enacted in the last couple of days of the session, at times when it was absolutely impossible to properly provide for them, when the adjournment was expected on the 5th day of July. A provision was placed in the bill which was passed which permitted the Department of Defense to meet its obligations under those bills, but we were not in a position to provide separately for them nor to analyze carefully what would be required. So it was necessary that those estimates be submitted to us at this time. They result very largely from the adoption of discharge pay—an item, which I understand, the Committee on Armed Services refused to report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to point out that that imposed an obligation of some $600 million to make up the $1,200,000,000, and the Committee on Armed Services did not report that bill to the House. It came out of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. TABER. It came out in a conference report. The item was placed on it in the other body.

Mr. VINSON. I believe the gentleman is in error. That is combat pay.

Mr. TABER. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. The $600 million came about in that way. The mustering-out item did not come before the committee, and, as a matter of fact, the Committee on Armed Services did not consider the combat-pay bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave the other for the other members of the committee with the exception of one item which relates to the school situation. Down to the 31st of December, there had been obligated by the Educational Bureau and the Federal Security Agency—$5,715,000.

They had an appropriation available to them of $40 million which was made by the last Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am so reluctant to interrupt the gentleman. Generally, I like to regard myself as being one of those who wants to balance the budget, but in connection with the $5,715,000 that have been obligated, I wonder if the gentleman realizes that under the wording of the law they cannot pay out the remaining money until this school year. It must be prorated if there is not enough to pay all entitlements 100 percent. The Administrator sees right now that there is not enough and so informed the subcommittee. Therefore, if he pays 100 percent to those who have established their entitlement now, he will soon run out of funds. Some will get 100 percent and some will get nothing. So the only sensible thing for him to do is just what he is doing, and that is to wait and prorate it, and if he does not have enough money to pay but one-half then he can pay them 50 percent of what they are entitled to. There is a strong probability that some of these schools will simply be forced to close when the money runs out. Remember you are not playing Santa Claus to anybody. This money is an obligation of the Federal Government. The Federal Government created the conditions making it necessary to expand the school facilities, the Congress recognized this and wrote into law provisions enabling the Federal Government to take care of its own obligation.

Other impact areas have added since other establishments have been reactivated and put in operation. I really wanted the gentleman to have all of these facts. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] will agree with my point of view. I wish he were here right now, because we have discussed the matter and I would like to have him make his own statement.

Mr. TABER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to what the facts are. We were presented with that kind of argument a year ago and a deficiency item was carried through. It resulted in a $4 million unobligated balance which expired at the end of the year. I will tell the gentleman how the thing works, because I have been into it and I think I understand it pretty well.

School districts present their petitions to the Department of Education or the Bureau of Education, or whatever the exact name is. Those petitions are processed by that department. If they approve of them they set up as an obligation the amount for which they are processed. The number that was processed was 359 down to February 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The obligations to that date were $8,750,000. There were 359 of those. There had been 141 districts down to the 11th of February—more than there had been in the year before. Why they would need to have any deficiency under any circumstance that would justify $24 million is beyond any possible explanation. They should have come in here not now but later on in the session, if they were going to come in, and not at this time when it is absolutely impossible for them to see that any such amount as $24 million additional would be justified.

There is a very serious question about the real entitlement of these people to so much money. The big item of money is not spent on those places where the children are on military reservations or other reservations of the Government or where their people are employed in connection therewith, but the big item is at places outside, where people live in Federal Housing projects, and where they reside with a parent employed on Federal property which is situated in such State.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. There may be some room for discussion as to the formula passed by Congress. Frankly, I am not thoroughly satisfied with that myself, but it was a very difficult problem to deal with, and we tried to take care of it as best we could. Frankly, I do not believe this has been quite covered. While the $5 million has been obligated, the entitlements, those that are entitled to it, according to the formula written into the law, have not been made and time for filing has not yet arrived. It is figured they will now get 60 percent, and some of these areas cannot run a school on a 60-percent grant. We have brought about the condition by putting the military people there, by putting the Government tax-free housing there, by dragging in the people and loading them on the community. That was thoroughly discussed at the time the bill was passed. I want to help save everything we can save within reason, but I do not believe the gentleman would want to cut the entitlement to 60 percent.

Mr. TABER. This is not for school construction, but for operation only. I have a situation in my own district which is just about as acute as any, and I know how this thing works. I am talking from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States, and trying to meet my responsibilities as a Member of Congress to balance this budget and try to get sense into it.

I cannot go along with the thought that they know what they are talking about in connection with this situation; I do not believe as they do; I do not believe they are in any position properly and honestly to present to us a reason for the increase in this appropriation of $24 million. I have gone into it very thoroughly; I have appeared before these people in connection with allotments for my own district, so I know how the thing operates, and I do not believe that they have at this time any proper information on which to come before us with a deficiency appropriation. I do not believe they are entitled to it; otherwise I would come out here and support them.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I rise at this time only to see if I can clarify certain things which probably need a little clarification.

The main difficulty with impact areas for school needs are in those sections where there has been a Federal impact. I think there is general agreement that we should aid such districts. They have never had the full amount they have needed or ought to have to fulfill the obligations which they felt should be met in the light of the bill which Congress passed. Knowing that they have always had to hold back in their apportionments. For instance, it was stated a moment ago that of the $40 million only $5 million had been used. The reason for that is because they are not sure of the amount of money they will receive. They can use a great deal more money; they could use this twenty-odd million dollars which has been cut out, use it very well if they are to meet all the entitlements throughout this country; but they are not sure of the amount they will receive, and it is incumbent on the Administrator to appropriate on a pro-rata basis the amount of money he finally has. They could spend fifty-some million dollars, which would be the $35 million they have available plus the $24 million, if that is the right figure, they ask for in the deficiency appropriation, and use it by June 30 of this year. However, if they do not receive that and have only the $35 million which is now available to them, it will have to be dealt out on a pro-rata basis, and the different districts will have to be cut down. That is the reason they asked for this $24 million additional. If they do not get it, then the grants will have to be cut down in all the districts.

Mr. TABER. I have this picture right in front of me as it was presented by them. They claim they anticipate 2,300 applications. Down to the 11th of February they had received 1,036, and we are better than seven-twelfths through the fiscal year. They claim they anticipate an additional 1,264 applications.

If a school district is entitled to something of this kind, it is not going to wait until this late in the year to make application for it. The thing just does not stand to reason, and it does not look as if they knew what they were doing or what they were coming up here for.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman realizes, of course, that many of these superintendents of districts and groups that are interested in receiving additional money for their educational needs have been informed that only so much was available. So many of them felt that there was no use presenting their claims, they did not have the money available to meet them. We have always been behind in the amount of appropriations or at least have not come up to the amounts that the districts have needed.

Mr. TABER. I am not so sure about that because the amounts that have been distributed have been reasonably liberal all the way through. I am not going into a discussion with the gentleman because I have given him the figures and the detail. I cannot understand it and I cannot make out a case for a deficiency appropriation at this point. Last year they had $4,000,000 left. I am not going to say anything more about the particular item at this time.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Truman presented a budget here along in the early part of January. It is going to be absolutely impossible for the new heads of departments to tell us just exactly what they think they can do toward cutting down those demands right away. We are already starting hearings on a bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. TABER. When I have finished with this particular part I will.

We are going into those appropriation estimates just as carefully as we can with the idea of screening them and providing what is necessary for the operation of the Government and not one cent more. We do not and we cannot at this time say to you just what they will need or just what the committee will recommend to you. I can say that the thing will be approached with the idea in mind on the part of every member of the Appropriations Committee of reducing expenditures, and I believe I can say that the minority and the majority will work together to try to bring about that result. There may be difference of opinion on items but not in the effort that will be made to try and bring about a balanced budget. We are going to do our very best on that and we realize fully the tremendous responsibility that rests upon us and upon the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman as chairman of the Appropriations Committee has had probably a better chance to see what the attitude of the new administration heads is than some of the rest of us; but, on the other hand, some of us who have had an opportunity to discuss these budget problems with the President and to get his views generally and the views of the people in the administration can say to the Members of the House and to the country that this new administration, instead of trying to find ways and means to up all of the expenditures of the Federal Government, is going to join with us in a real, sincere effort to find ways and means of reducing Federal expending. That assurance can be had. It is not fair to say that an Administration that came into office on January 20, with Cabinet positions just being filled, should be expected at this moment to come forward with a whole, complete budget. But let me just say this again for emphasis that before we get through working on these appropriations we will have the help of the Administration and the heads of the departments in trying to reduce spending, and that is something that we have not had for 20 years.

Mr. TABER. And I want to say this, too, that we will have a fine spirit of cooperation in reducing the expenditures all the way down the line on the part of the administration.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. In reply to the gentleman from Indiana, we have heard that kind of speech made in every Congress for the last 20 years when the Congress began its sitting. But now, about this administration coming in 25 or 30 days ago, Mr. Dodge, who in my opinion enjoys as good a reputation as anyone who has been employed by this Administration, in any position in it, has been down here nearly 3 months, and he has worked with Mr. Lawton on this budget. Now he should have some ideas about the various departments and how much can be cut. Of course, we have not passed all the appropriation bills yet, and it will be quite some time before we do. But, I just feel that it would be the fair thing to do, and frankly it would be

the honorable thing to do, as soon as possible for this administration to submit budgets on the various matters that will come before the Committee on Appropriations. And, I ask the gentleman from New York if he does not think that would be a good thing to do.

Mr. TABER. I am certain that the representatives of the administration will communicate their views on what the appropriations ought to be to the committee before reports are required to be made upon these bills, and I am sure that the President will join in those statements.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just a moment. Why not submit them to the Congress? The Committee on Appropriations has secret meetings and secret hearings, and things of that kind. It may never come out of there what they are doing. Why not submit them to the Congress where all budgets are submitted?

Mr. TABER. Here is the situation. When the appropriation bill comes out, the hearings come out with a complete, detailed statement as to what has been done, and that we expect to follow all the way through.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I sense the temper of the people of this country correctly, they are interested in results. Now what they want is that there be a cooperative, good-faith effort between the administrative branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government to cut the spending of the Federal Government down as far as we can, maintaining our security and essential governmental functions. Now as to whether or not a detailed budget is sent up here to my mind makes no difference. As a matter of fact, everyone knows that it takes months and months to prepare a budget in that detail. What we have and what we are working on now is the Truman budget. I never saw a Truman budget that could not be cut. As a matter of fact, we have cut them time and again and we are going to cut this one, and make no mistake about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, ve listen to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the chairman of the committee and the author of the pending bill, with more than ordinary interest. It is perhaps not too much to say that his statement here this morning is among the most important yet given from any source in this session.

This is the first spending bill of the first session, of the first Congress reporting an appropriation in response to budget estimates controlled by his party in 20 years. As such, it is of particular interest in that it may be taken as a model of the spending bills to be reported out during this session, and may be considered, to some extent at least, as indicative of the program which is to be followed by the party in power for the remainder of the Congress.

New navigators are in charge. They are setting a new course, outlining and establishing new landmarks. A new tide is setting in which is to affect in time not only the affairs of this country but of the world as well. As he very well said—and knowing him as I do, I am certain he spoke his heartfelt sentiments—we may differ on some of the details, we may not fully agree on all of the items, but upon the one general objective of a balanced budget to serve the greatest welfare of the greatest number, we are in complete agreement, and on that we hope to cooperate fully and effectively.

And the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] tells us that the country expects a real, sincere effort to reduce spending.

I am in complete accord with the gentleman. I think he has very happily expressed the attitude and the desire of the country.

Now let us see just how, and to what degree, this bill carries out that objective. Let us see in what direction, and how far, if we are to judge their program by this bill, we may expect to go.

In the first place, of course, it is not a Truman budget. The budget is submitted in response to laws passed by the last Congress. And practically all the men who were instrumental in drafting those laws are again Members of this House. Those laws were enacted after the regular budget had been compiled and had been sent to Congress. In order to comply with them it was necessary for the President to draft a supplemental budget and this is that budget. It was prepared and transmitted under conditions which gave the President no choice or option in the matter.

The greater part of it deals with the salaries of the servicemen in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We waited perhaps too long to realize that their salaries were not keeping pace with inflated prices and depreciated dollars. Congress enacted the bill and now we are asked—as we knew we would be asked—to appropriate the money. What else could the President do? It is our baby and it is on our doorstep.

It is not a Truman budget. It is not a political budget. It is an American budget and it is an honest budget. Nobody denies that the amounts requested are in keeping with purposes and activities which Congress authorized.

The record permits no quarrel with the economy record of the Administration which prepared this budget. It proceeded at virtually rock-bottom levels in the discharge of the great responsibilities with which it was confronted and in complete alignment with its post-war policy of keeping operational costs at a minimum and within income when extraordinary demands imposed no hindrance. Extravagant statements have been made predicting the reduction of the pending budget by billions of dollars. I am convinced that such predictions are being made without a comprehensive knowledge and study of the situation, and that the hearings will develop an indispensable need for estimates which on casual consideration have been rated as nonessential.

I agree with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Indiana that in this bill—as in all future bills—we ought to do what can be done to achieve a balanced budget.

Can you say we have achieved that result in this bill?

As you check it over carefully, you note what appears to be a heavy cut in the budget estimates, almost as heavy as some of the reductions which were made in the last Congress. In the civil defense bill, for instance, we went a little deeper than in this bill, but on the face of it, this is a cut.

It cuts something like $1½ billion from the estimates. But a slash of $1½ billion in a bill does not necessarily contribute in the end to a balanced budget. And that is true here. When you read the bill, you find it does not to the slightest degree curtail authorization of the activities for which this money is provided. It says, in effect, "Go right ahead. Continue the program. Proceed as heretofore. We will not appropriate new money for it. But you may use the same amount of other money diverted, for the time being, from funds previously appropriated for other purposes." This bill does not block the pay of the Army or the Navy or the Air Force. It does not limit or curtail or control in any respect authorization of the activities which this bill is proposed to finance. The same expenditures can eventually be made as could be made without the passage of the bill. It does not retrench. It does not reduce. It does not economize. It merely defers appropriating the money while it is being spent. So the question naturally arises, What will you do for money when cash is due for the other activities from which you are temporarily diverting the money used for army pay.

Why we will come in here with a deficiency bill to make up the same money we are cutting out of this bill today. That is what we did in the 80th Congress. You will recall that in the 80th Congress, we came in here with drastic reductions which we later had to replace.

We even eliminated the $800,000,000 for income tax refunds and advertised it as a monumental saving below the budget estimate. Then at the end of the session, we had to put back not only the $800 million but we had to put back additional money.

I trust that this measure in its national defense phase is not a precursor of what we may expect in the handling of the regular 1954 defense budget.

We have been engaged in rebuilding our defense establishments since the outbreak of the war in Korea. The amounts provided have been large, but definitely tied to programs and projects. Whether or not too much has been provided, I am not prepared to say. That depends largely upon the overall defense picture; upon whether or not a change has occurred that warrants contraction both as regards new obligational availability and existing obligational availability. A restudy, we have been led to believe, is now in progress.

If there is to be contraction in programs previously financed, orderly procedure demands that we know in what areas, in what appropriations, and in what projects within appropriations. Then we could either rescind or reappropriate any surplus funds that may be

found. We should maintain and exercise control of them and not merely grant authority to use, without designation, any unobligated balances that may be reported. Let's have the record show what the surplus money is by appropriation and project, and how we determine to dispose of it. Our aim should be to avoid to the greatest practicable extent permitting a spending agency free rein in the reemployment of funds heretofore made available. We are leaning in that direction in this bill, and it is bad practice.

It must be confessed that there is some reason for disappointment in the management and direction of the Department of Defense in relation to the expenditure of public funds. Under the right kind of leadership, there would be little if any need for congressional committees conducting investigations at home and abroad of waste and extravagance in the accomplishment of the defense buildup in which we are now engaged.

As regards improved or more economical procedures in consequence of the unification law, it may be suggested that the law has cost money instead of saving it. There are those who fear that duplication and overlapping, and consequent waste, will continue until the Defense Department is headed by men who possess the leadership and the determination to carry out the unification law in letter and in spirit. I join with the majority in the hope that the new Secretary of Defense and those who will assist him may be able to achieve some genuine results in this important field.

There are other fields where economies should be effected. Reported duplication of effort and overstaffing and other possible extravagant practices, in our activities abroad offer a field for potential savings. Also, it may be that changed conditions warrant retrenchments in the work of Federal functions at home, both in Washington and in the field. And it is possible some of them can now be administered with fewer people, or that some of them can be dispensed with altogether. We shall be happy to join in the accomplishment of any such economies where evidence justifies.

It is not necessary to remind the committee and the House that this side of the aisle is fully as economy-minded as that side of the aisle as evidenced by the cut of $8½ billion in the budget enacted in the last session.

We on this side will go along with you in an effort to balance the budget. You cannot do it, though, unless it is determined that our security program can be conducted considerably below present costs without impairment of the national interests. There has been no indication of such a determination up to this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, who served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the longest term in the history of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Then the gentleman from Missouri is advising the House that in all probability there will have to be a deficiency appropriation made to take care of the billion dollars which is absorbed by this bill. In other words, we will have to have a deficiency appropriation, is that not correct?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. The programs from which we are diverting money to finance this bill are being carried on. That was true in the 80th Congress. Eventually we had to put the money back. The money borrowed from Peter to pay Paul had to be refunded. And we came in with deficiency appropriation bills and supplementary appropriation bills to make it up. And there was no saving.

In that connection, here is what the Wall Street Journal says about it in this morning's edition:

> The Appropriation Committee does not block the pay increases; it merely requires the Defense Department to pay part of the cost out of unused money the Department had in another pocket. * * * This fact suggests that the "savings" by this method are fictitious because they do not help * * * to balance the current budget. * * *
>
> So the real test of this economy move comes hereafter. It depends * * * on future actions to prove the reductions to be something more than bookkeeper's juggling.

That is comment from a friendly observer and very aptly characterizes the situation.

Mr. Chairman, incidentally, some have entered the objection that this proposes to take money away from previous appropriations, and is therefore without the jurisdiction of the committee.

It is important to remember that the Committee on Appropriations retains jurisdiction over appropriated money until committed. A year later—or any number of years later—if the money is still available and unexpended the committee may bring in a bill to rescind the surplus money in any appropriation and reappropriate it or cover it back into the Treasury.

And that is what should have been done in this bill if we really propose to reduce spending and effect a saving. If we must eventually pay back in another deficiency bill the amounts we are here diverting from other purposes then we should have the courage to put in new money or refuse any appropriation at all.

If there was surplus money not required for the purpose for which originally appropriated then we should cancel and rescind the appropriation and cover the money into the Treasury or credit it on the national debt as we did in the 79th Congress.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. Is the gentleman proposing that he will offer an amendment to rescind some of the funds that have been appropriated?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman did misunderstand. Evidently I failed to make myself clear on that point. This bill instead of providing new money makes available money already appropriated for other purposes. Now the money is either surplus or it is not surplus. If it is not surplus, then we are diverting it from the purpose for which it was originally appropriated and is eventually to be used, and there is no saving. If it is surplus it ought to be rescinded and returned to the Treasury or applied to the national debt. That was the course followed in the 79th Congress.

Immediately upon the conclusion of World War II hostilities the committee launched upon the recapture of war appropriations, in an urgent drive to get our finances in order. More than 64 billion dollars available for defense expenditures were canceled out. The contraction of defense spending permitted the diversion of upwards of 20 billion dollars of income to public debt reduction. Certainly, if there was ever a time when we needed public-debt reduction it is now. If there is any surplus money in any of these pipelines, it should be brought back into the Federal Treasury immediately.

Within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which World War II hostilities ceased, President Truman transmitted to the Congress a balanced budget—the first balanced budget since it had been unbalanced in the Hoover administration.

President Truman that year transmitted the budget to the 79th Congress as he this year transmitted the budget to the 83d Congress and it was enacted by Congress in the black—a balanced budget. The 80th Congress, beginning January 1947, received the budget in the black and in the brief span of 2 years, when their control ended, the budget was again in the red. They received it in the black; they turned it back to us in the red; and to make matters worse, income was reduced in the face of a staggering public debt. That was their policy then, and if we are to judge by the bill now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee that is their policy again at a time when a reduction of taxes would entail either a dangerous curtailment of security measures or a further pyramiding of the already top-heavy public debt. In either case it would be a gamble with national security, involving the imminent question of survival either as a government or as a nation.

When the adopted draft of the Constitution of the United States was finally published in 1789, the chancelleries of Europe rocked with laughter. The idea of a people governing themselves, and especially "the rag-tags and bob-tails of Sam Adams and Tom Jefferson," electing their own officials and attempting to maintain their own government, impressed them as ludicrous in the extreme, and the "impracticable" provisions of the new Constitution were greeted with derision throughout the world. Loyal subjects of the ancient monarchies were assured that while Washington might be able to hold the "rebels" together in some semblance of order during his lifetime, that when his death made it necessary to hold an election to select his successor, the faction defeated at the polls would seize their guns and start fighting and chaos would follow until "a strong man on horseback" took over with firing squads and established a stable monarchy. How surprised they would have been if with unbelieving eyes they could have witnessed the brief and simple ceremony a few days ago in front of this buiilidng in

which a man after seven years at the head of the nation quietly and gladly laid down the powers and prerogatives of that great position and stepped back into obscurity and another man quietly and prayerfully took command of the armies and navies and resources of a great and free and enlightened people and assumed the duties and responsibilities of the greatest office ever conceived by the brain of man.

That is the glory of America.

Mr. Chairman, General Eisenhower was not my candidate. I was not for him; I did not vote for him. He was not on my side; he was not on our team.

But when it was announced at midnight on November 4 that he had been elected, from then on he was my man. He was the captain of my team. He was the President of the United States and as such was entitled to the cooperation and support of every American citizen. And that I give him without stint or reservation.

He is in every way worthy of that exalted trust. He is one of the great commanders of history. And he enjoys to a remarkable extent the confidence and affection of the American people. I shall do what I can to enable him to carry out the platform on which he was elected and to which he is pledged.

The people who voted for him in the election had a very definite idea of what they were voting for. They expect him to conclude the war and secure lasting peace with honor; to discontinue the draft and bring back the boys; to cut government expenditures, balance the budget, reduce taxes and start payment on the national debt. They expect him to maintain full employment, at living wages, to maintain farm prices at 100% of parity and to continue and expand national prosperity.

With that program, and in every detail of it, I am in full agreement and in so far as I am able, shall follow implicitly the President's leadership in its accomplishment.

If we reduce the program to its lowest common denominator we can perhaps condense its salient features to a determination to balance the budget. And unless we can balance the budget the rest of the program is largely hopeless or useless.

There are, of course, two ways to balance the budget. We can either reduce the outgo or we can increase the income. Of course we should do both. We should reduce expenditure and we should maintain income until a balance is reached.

As the Wall Street Journal well says, we cannot balance the budget with fictitious saving. And we are handicapped if we fail to cover back into the Treasury surplus funds which according to the committee are being held uncommitted by departmental agencies.

Nor can we expect to balance the budget by reducing the income of the Federal Government. And, again, we are handicapped in balancing the budget if we fail to systematically reduce the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most alarming features of our national debt is the lack of concern about it on the part of the people generally and the Congress in particular. Some years ago, when the war budgets began to mushroom the national debt, there was apprehension lest it get out of hand and as late as 1939 a statutory limit of $45 billion was enacted. According to the latest report of the Treasury Department the debt now amounts to $267,402,058,632.56 and is growing every day. This does not include the 91 day bills which average more than $100 billion from week to week. And we have $29,689,725,748 of currency in circulation. All the gold at Fort Knox, which we have just been spending several weeks counting, and which is the largest supply of gold or concentration of wealth in the world, would merely pay the interest on the national debt barely three years.

Our outstanding Federal obligations are growing like a forest fire. And with every addition to it, and every deficiency appropriation by this Congress, inflation grows and the purchasing power of the dollar drops, and our bonds and life insurance and annuities are worth less and less and less. The only thing we hear is cut taxes lower on the largest incomes the world ever saw. Nobody talks about the debt and the newspapers seldom mention it and we seem to proceed on the theory that as long as we don't think about it and don't try to pay it, it isn't there. But time is running out. There is only one alternative. We must either pay it or we must repudiate it.

If we ever expect to pay it, it is high time we were beginning to think about it. Already we are far down the road which followed to its end has never yet failed to lead a nation to disaster. And yet people are thinking more about reducing taxes than reducing the debt. The excess-profits tax expires July 1 and there is no talk of continuing it.

Mr. Chairman, the excess-profits tax is the fairest tax ever levied. As long as men are satisfied with a reasonable profit the excess-profits tax does not apply. It is only when they begin to charge unreasonable profits; it is only when they begin to profiteer on the consumer, that the excess-profits tax begins to operate.

Years ago we learned that the first rule in taxation is that taxes should be paid by those most able to pay them. I ask you, Who is better able to pay taxes, the man who is getting a normal profit and an excess profit on top of that, or the average taxpayer who makes only one profit—or no profit at all? Remember, somebody must pay taxes. If one man does not pay them some other man must. So when they take these taxes off the profiteers next July, and the Government no longer gets the $2½ billion a year it has been collecting from the excess-profits tax, who will have to put up that big chunk of money every year? Somebody must pay it. The Government must have taxes to live. And the little taxpayer must pay it if the big taxpayer won't.

If the law taxing excess profits is allowed to expire the profiteer will go on collecting his normal profit and his additional excess profits and will then get the $2½ billion on top of all that. He will have just that much more velvet.

Or if the small taxpayer is already paying all he can stand, and can pay no more, the $2½ billion will have to be added to the public debt and inflation will travel that much faster, and the dollar will buy that much less.

Of course, when you mention the public debt the new regime immediately disclaims any responsibility. It is not their debt. They did not create it. It was an evil legacy from the past.

While a majority of the men now in control of the House helped accumulate this debt and voted for the bills which created it, the question of who voted for it is not important. The important thing is the purpose for which the money was spent.

It was incurred because national safety hung in the balance. A medieval atheistic despotism, absorbing and exploiting nation after nation had announced to the world that we were next in their inevitable line of march. This debt was the cost of arming the Nation to meet that imminent invasion. It was the minimum price of self preservation.

The Truman administration balanced the budget and the President submitted a balanced budget to the 80th Congress when it convened in January 1947, and would have balanced every budget and made payments on the national debt in each succeeding Congress but for the necessity of protecting our people and preserving our form of government.

Perhaps we are prone to underestimate the full measure of that responsibility. It is possible we fail to fully appraise the danger confronting us.

We have grown to believe, here in America, that we are the greatest, the most advanced, the most progressive, and the most highly civilized nation in the world, and that because of our preeminence in culture, science, and industry, no retarded nation like Russia can menace our peace and security.

History is replete with accounts of the destruction of great civilizations by barbarian nations. Following the Roman conquest and the Christianization of Britain, there flowered in England in the fourth and fifth centuries, a civilization found elsewhere only on the shores of the Mediterranean and unsurpassed in the British Isles in the next 500 years. We are still uncovering on archeological sites in the vicinity of London remains of temples and villas with tasselated pavements equalled nowhere save in Rome itself. Yet when the Saxons landed they swept through England, ravaging, burning, and murdering in an orgy of extermination so thorough as to leave little trace of Latin or Celtic speech, law, or religion. Barbarians so primitive that they would burn a Roman villa and stretch their skin tents for shelter beside the ruins, had extinguished a civilization which would have saved the British race centuries of groping in their upward struggle to achieve even medieval economy.

Again, in the thirteenth century, when Chinese civilization was centuries old—and, according to Macaulay, cultured Chinese philosophers drank tea from teakwood tables while our contemporary English ancestors were wearing skins

and living in caves, Genghis Khan with his nomadic horsemen, only one degree removed from stark savagery, destroyed every major city and left the land a depopulated desert whose rivers flowed with blood to the sea.

I am certain no one has ever stood on the Acropolis and viewed the magnificient ruins of Periclean Athens without experiencing a poignant grief at the thought of the beauty and artistic splendor so ruthlessly obliterated by the barbarian hordes who extinguished not only the light of a great civilization but a race and a nation as well.

Pericles and his age developed an art which is unequaled even today. They founded a democratic government which through many intermediate steps is the progenitor of our own form of government. But they overlooked one essential. They did not develop simultaneously a means of defending either civilization or government.

If along with their matchless statuary and architecture they had instituted research which would have given them one single plane or tank or machine gun, or comparable weapon of defense, they could have held at bay all the savage forces of the nomadic avalanche that overwhelmed them.

Let us take a lesson from the past. It is a lesson often repeated and bitterly emphasized. Our cities pyramided by skyscrapers and filled with the wealth of the world are no defense against predatory marauders armed with the latest scientific weapons. Our marts and laboratories and libraries and blazing furnaces mean nothing in a battle of extermination unless we utilize them in the creation of effective agencies of defense.

Let us not be lulled to sleep by the thought that our wealth and preeminence in industry render us invincible. There are hungry plotters and plunderers upon the globe that do not sleep.

Mr. Chairman, I remember sitting as a student in the classroom and hearing a learned teacher, lecturing on international law, say there would never be another war; that war was an anachronism, a relic of barbarism, and the world was so far advanced that all future questions between nations would be referred to a world court to be settled by law and not by the sword. He expressed the universal opinion of the thinking men of his time. And still, since that time, we have had two cataclysmic wars and are now feverishly preparing for a third. How mistaken they were.

On the day the morning papers carried headlines announcing that the Czar of Russia had sponsored representative government and had established a Duma to be elected by universal suffrage, I heard a great Speaker of the House, standing in the rostrum there, say that the last stronghold of despotism had fallen and the fires of freedom the American Republic had lighted in 1789 had spread from nation to nation until they extended around the globe and freedom and democracy were now the universal heritage of all mankind. The House stood and cheered and newspapers throughout the country quoted and accepted the statement as an accomplished fact. And yet today more than half the world lies helpless under the brutal despotism of self-annointed dictators who have no more regard for the rights of the people than for the dust beneath their feet. How mistaken even the most far-sighted men of the nation can be.

All will recall, I am certain, those years in the middle twenties, when the most eminent economists of the country, hard-headed businessmen, captains of industry, and the most conservative statesmen, subscribed to the theory that with our expanding statistical knowledge, with the development of modern banking, and with our built-in legislative precautions we would never have another runaway economic or financial debacle in this country; there would be no further panics, no further depressions, no further mass bankruptcies. And yet before the end of the decade, the Nation was swept by the greatest panic, the greatest depression, the most disastrous financial crash in the history of this or any other country. How mistaken we can be.

In the light of these historic instances in the lifetime of one generation, could it be possible that the great confidence we have in the invincibility of American arms, in the legend of the invulnerability of our national defense, has been misplaced, that it could be misjudged?

With that in mind we might consider with more than casual interest the opinion of a man who probably had more to do with winning the last war than any other one man who could be mentioned.

Writing in a recent issue of a national magazine, Dr. Vannevar Bush asks:

> Can freedom endure? That is the basic question today, the crisis we face. There are many aspects to the question, but I shall discuss only whether we can be strong enough, in a military sense, to defend our way of life.
>
> I wish I could believe that our salvation were at hand, that our science and ingenuity have provided us with instruments of war so powerful and so unfamiliar to our enemy that we could rest confident in our superiority. But we have no push-button devices that allow us to sit back and exert overwhelming power everywhere and it would be folly to risk freedom on the dreamland possibility. The best we can do is to insist that, as the art of war alters, we remain in the foreground of advance, changing strategy and tactics to use the new techniques effectively, and maintaining the longest possible lead in every field. We cannot meet hordes with hordes.
>
> We must not indulge in wishful thinking. If large-scale war breaks out, it will be a slugging match, with great armies and long military and civilian casualty lists. Some of our cities will be consumed in a flash, as were Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Many of our ships will be sunk. Our economic structure will be strained as never before. Our survival will depend on striking power and on endurance which might have to be sustained for many years.

May I supplement this with an excerpt from a report released by a Senate committee last Saturday and reported in last Sunday's paper.

Here is what a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services reports after hearings on the subject:

> We cannot say with the slightest assurance that it would be beyond an enemy's capabilities to break the backbone of our armed services by a surprise attack.
>
> Nor can we rely upon our present planning, if pursued, to assure us of the ability to carry on sustained offensive operations against a powerful adversary. We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans; yet we have not found any evidence to justify reasonable confidence that an enemy could not destroy our capabilities to immediately retaliate against his surprise attack.

That is our problem. That is our ever-present danger. And the only way to meet it is with an Army, Navy and Air Force strong enough to withstand the clouds of jet airplanes, the shoals of snorkel submarines, the acres of light and heavy tanks, the unknown number of atomic bombs and the 175 divisions of seasoned troops which Russia can throw into battle on an hour's notice.

And the situation becomes increasingly menacing. Our ablest and most experienced military leaders have pointed out that Russia cannot start a Western and Trans-Atlantic drive until assured of ample oil for her tanks, mobile artillery and airplane engines. There are no major oil producing areas in Russia. Russia must have Iranian and Arabian oil before she strikes. Hence the ostentatious and transparent anti-Semitic pogroms these last few days and the sudden and otherwise inexplicable severing of relations with Israel, coinciding with renewed and accelerated activity of the Communists in all Arabian countries. Is it the last step before Russia closes in for the kill?

Our only defense, our only hope of preserving peace, is through power. As long as we keep our armed forces strong enough to meet the attack; as long as we maintain our Middle East friendships, Russia will hesitate. The minute they think they can take us they are coming over.

That accounts for the debt. We had to arm and arm fast. It was a matter of necessity; not a matter of choice. It is not a Democratic debt. And it is not a Truman debt, except in that history will record that in a crucial hour a far-seeing President had the courage to stand and fight and thereby saved the world from another visitation of the Dark Ages. The debt was not voted by any one party or any one group. It was voted by a majority of the House voting from both sides of the aisle. And now a House voting on both sides of the aisle must vote taxes to meet it. Of course, taxes are too high. Of course, no one wants to pay taxes. But a government cannot operate without taxes. And we can make our choice between taxes and national security. It is a matter which brooks no delay. Already the stream of credit is running dry. For the last 18 months notwithstanding bond drives and extensive advertising campaigns, more bonds have been cashed than have been sold. There could be no more ominous warning.

We had $65 billion in bonds coming due in the 18 months ending December 31, 1952. At this time some $57 billion of marketable debt will mature within the next 12 months, and $38 billion more will mature within the next 5 years. And these vast sums are separate and

distinct from the huge debt that is payable on demand. And simultaneously we must finance one of the most expensive war years in history. Is it any wonder that our bonds are going begging and we have to raise interest rates to get renewals? We are in the position of the applicant for a loan at the local bank who "has too much paper out" and "is not paying anything off." It is time we were at least paying our own way. But various and several and sundry gentlemen are making the welkin ring with demands that we stop paying everything that will interfere with a reduction of their taxes. It is said that in every country that has been subjugated by Russia there were men of large property interests who protested to the last against paying taxes to provide for their country's defense.

They are not paying any taxes at all today. They were among the first to be liquidated. And their property was confiscated the day the Russians took over. The Russians send no tax bills and they give no tax receipts.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe I just heard the distinguished gentleman from Missouri say that more bonds have been redeemed than sold. That story was true over a period of many months, but in January for the first time since Korea, there were more sales than redemptions. I think the gentleman from Missouri would be glad to know that. That situation is being sustained during the first week of February. It is a very healthy situation for our economy.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman does not take issue with the statement, does he?

The gentleman concedes the statement is true.

If the additional inducement of higher rates of interest does not materially increase sales we are in a desperate situation indeed.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas. I am glad to see him back. We have needed him.

Mr. DIES. Can the gentleman blame the American people for not buying the bonds when the purchasing power of the dollar has steadily depreciated, and those who have bought bonds who started in 1935 have lost more than half of their investment whereas those who invested the same money in stocks and real estate and other forms of property have made a tremendous return on their investment, and is not the answer that we have to restore the purchasing power of the dollar with a reduction of expenditures and through maintaining taxes so that they will meet our demands and restoring a sound fiscal policy to this Government?

Mr. CANNON. The situation could not be expressed more clearly or more convincingly than the gentleman has stated it. And to avoid further inflation and further decline in the purchasing power of the dollar we must dispense with deficit spending and begin to pay as we go. And as a part of the program we must at the earliest possible date begin systematic payments on the national debt.

The alarming feature of the situation is that we are increasing the debt when we ought to be decreasing it, and no one seems to care very much about it. Instead of reducing the deficit they want to reduce taxes and pour more gasoline on the flames.

Now is the time to pay it off while dollars are cheap—cheaper than they have been since the Civil War.

Now is the time to pay it off while dividends are high—higher than they have ever been.

Now is the time to pay it off while wages are highest—and employment is at its peak.

Now is the time to pay it off while the impact of war is spurring the Nation and the people to greater endeavor.

If boys from every community in the United States are risking life and limb at the front, surely our excess profiteers can pay a few dollars on the national debt.

The idea of letting extra profits go untaxed—the excess profiteers who are making more blood money out of the war than anybody else—is unthinkable. It is preposterous. Let them pay like everybody else—in proportion to the advantages they reap under our form of government.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman. He is making an interesting speech, and the gentleman is a student. I have known him for a long time and he is a very able Member. I wonder if the gentleman in his studies has had occasion to determine the effect of the principle of diminishing returns in taxation. In other words, if we take so much of what people make, does it not discourage them to make, and is it not possible therefore to realize less on a high taxation basis than it would be if the tax scale were more reasonable? What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman for his very pertinent suggestion. As he is aware, the diminishing returns argument is the argument always advanced by tax dodgers who are able to employ high-powered, high-priced lawyers to negotiate for them. The workingman or farmer or teacher or clergyman or small businessman seldom has occasion to invoke the rule of diminishing returns.

Of course, there is a point of diminishing returns. But it does not apply here. It is not to be found in the rates of the current excess-profits tax. If a man charges only a reasonable and normal profit, the excess profits tax does not touch him. And even when he exacts the last pound of flesh, he does not pay as much of his income as he would if he were paying taxes in England, for example.

There is no question about the returns. They are not diminishing. They are bringing in a steady and dependable stream of revenue at a time when it is needed most. Consider the many urgent Government enterprises to which it should be applied. And consider how many average taxpayers back home would be required to produce an equal amount of revenue—and the effect of shifting the burden of paying this additional $2½ billion from the shoulders of those to whom it is merely additional velvet, to the shoulders of constituents, many of whom are hard pushed to pay even their present taxes without asking them to pay $2½ billions of additional taxes.

Let the congressional and administration leaders give us a bill to continue the excess-profits tax and keep this $2½ billion flowing into the national treasury, thereby reducing the deficit and increasing the buying power of our dollars.

But, Mr. Chairman, the campaign issue on which I am most anxious to follow the President is the assurance of his interest and cooperation in attaining and preserving farm parity.

The farmer is the only producer who has no voice or part in fixing the price of his labor and his product. Industry fixes its price and you pay that price or you don't get the goods. Labor negotiates its wage and you pay that wage or you don't get the service. But the farmer, after working his entire family, longer hours, in any kind of weather, 7 days in the week, drives his cattle, hogs, wheat, corn, tobacco, vegetables, fruit, cotton, wool, and other products, up to the market—the "open market" some of our friends are so fond of talking about—and asks, "What are you paying today?" And no matter what they are paying—even though it may be less than the cost of production—the farmer takes it. He has no recourse.

But everything that enters into the farmer's cost of living and cost of production has steadily increased in price. Machinery, freight, fertilizer and every other factor of production are selling today for more than they sold when the farmer was getting $30 for his hogs and 44 cents for cotton. And even at those prices, it took less hours of labor to pay for beef, pork, and shirts than it did during the depression.

But remember, the farmer is not "regimented"; he is "free" and "independent." And when all his labor and investment in land and stock and machinery have not brought him enough to pay taxes and interest and he stands by and sees the sheriff sell his farm under the hammer—as in thousands of instances in 1920 and 1929 and 1932—his breast swells with pride as he remembers he is not regimented, and he is free to go broke while the consumers of his products who worked less hours, and had less invested, enjoy the farmers products at bankruptcy prices.

Why the difference? Because every other industry and profession controls its own market. Automobiles, shoes, television sets, machinery, clothing, and similar commodities are never thrown on the market for whatever they will bring. Labor never walks into a plant and asks, "What wages will you pay?" Only the farmer is helpless and after he has fed the world better than it has ever been fed before he must hold out his hand, like a mendicant holding out his tin cup, and accept whatever the market offers.

This is where Government balances the scales. Abraham Lincoln said: "The

function of government is to help those who can not help themselves." To leave the farmer at the mercy of a cutthroat market, to throw the farmer into the arena without weapon or shield while every other business and profession and class in America is armed and protected and able to take care of itself, is to throw the lamb into the pit with the wolves.

"The Government must help those who cannot help themselves." And that is the theory on which the United States Government has been operating for the last two decades.

Whenever farm products were hammered down below parity the Government demanded fair play. Repeatedly farm prices fluctuated and started down below parity. Each time the Government met the situation. And for 20 years, in war and in peace, the farmer has received a living wage for his labor and a fair return on his investment.

This summer an unprecedented drought denuded the pastures and forced farm products on a congested market until prices began to decline. Under other circumstances the Government would have announced its program and halted the drop as usual. But election was at hand, with every prospect that a new administration was coming in. And governmental machinery for preserving parity stalled on dead center.

One of the most prominent farmers in Missouri was in my office last week. If I should mention his name most of you would recognize it. He said he paid 29 cents for feeders and had put a lot of corn and concentrates in them, not to count his labor and management, and he now had no hope of getting back a dollar more than he paid for them. All his work and feed and other investments in the stock was lost.

In the 3 weeks from January 24 to February 14 cattle on the farm dropped from 92 percent of parity to 82 percent of parity. Cotton has fallen from 42 cents to 34 cents.

But this is not merely the farmer's funeral. A fall in farm prices invariably precedes a depression. And depressions precede panics. When the farmer can no longer buy, the merchant can no longer sell, and when the merchant can no longer sell, the factories close and men tramp the highways and ride the rails looking for jobs—any kind of jobs at any wage—and Wall Street brokers jump out of windows and the soup houses and bread lines start and veterans sell apples on the street. When the farmer goes broke, everybody goes broke. It is merely a matter of time.

This is the situation we have been meeting successfully and effectually, in peace and in war, for something like 20 years. It is a situation we can still meet if we will. And President Eisenhower has the will to do it. Here is what he said in October from Minnesota to Texas:

> Here and now, without any "ifs" or "buts" I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the * * * amendment to the basic farm act * * * to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.
>
> I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income. * * *
>
> * * * a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take so much time, but there is one more campaign issue on which I believe I can pledge to President Eisenhower the united cooperation and support of those on this side of the aisle. That is the continuation of prosperity and our present American standard of living.

Through the last 10 years, or more, the country has risen steadily to the high tide of national prosperity. And the American people have enjoyed the highest standard of living ever known among men.

Farm mortgages are at a minimum. Union wage scales are higher and the number of the employed exceeds all records. Local community banks throughout the country report the largest deposits and highest capital structure in the history of American banking. Savings bank assets top $25 billion for the first time since Columbus discovered America. Total dividends declared by United States corporations aggregate $8¾ billion and set the all-time annual record. Notwithstanding interruptions, the steel industry finished the year with near-record production. Five million more television sets were installed in American homes and up to the middle of February the pace of production is accelerating. Automobile production is limited only by the quota. The net income of the railroads of the country for 1952 is nearly 12 percent over the 1951 income. On the whole, it has been perhaps the best year ever enjoyed by this or any other country.

And the remarkable thing about it is that this prosperity has not been confined to any one class or industry or locality. It has been equally distributed throughout the country and the Nation. Every family is enjoying their part of it. It has been a general and universal prosperity.

Never before in all the tides of time have so many had so much.

Mr. President, that is the ultimate objective of all human endeavor. That is the sum total of all legislative accomplishment. Under your leadership, let us have both peace and plenty—and the righteousness that exalteth a nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of discussing briefly chapter VIII of this bill which refers to the request submitted by President Truman for $1,200,000,000 for the armed services.

I am happy to report that after careful consideration the subcommittee in charge of that request reached the unanimous conclusion that it is unnecessary to make any new money available at this time and that the whole request insofar as approved can be taken care of by transfer of funds previously appropriated to the armed services for other purposes without in any way impairing their efficiency.

Members will recall that the armed services had an appropriation for the current fiscal year of something over $46 billion. On top of that came this supplemental request, originally in the amount of $1,444,377,246, subsequently reduced by $244,377,246 to $1,200,000,000.

This request, as has been pointed out, resulted from the enactment of legislation during or since consideration and approval of the regular appropriation bill. Four such laws were enacted dealing with military pay increases, mustering-out payments, combat-duty pay and uniform gratuities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a brief summary of these laws:

NEW LAWS

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

(Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952)

Under this act—

(a) The rates of basic pay for all members of the uniformed services were increased by 4 percent, effective May 1, 1952;

(b) The basic allowance for subsistence for all members was increased by 14 percent;

(c) The basic allowance for quarters for all members, with or without dependents, was increased by 14 percent;

(d) Retired pay of all persons entitled thereto was increased by 4 percent.

MUSTERING OUT PAYMENTS

(Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, 1952, Public Law 550, approved July 16, 1952)

Title V of this act provides that each member of the Armed Forces in pay grade O-3 (captain in the Army) or below engaged in active service on or after June 27, 1950, who is or has been relieved from active duty under honorable conditions is entitled to mustering out payment of $300 if he serves for more than 60 days and has served outside the continental United States; $200 if he served for 60 days but no service outside the United States; $100 if he performed active duty for less than 60 days.

Under section 503 persons who are discharged prior to the date of the act of July 16, 1952, have 2 years in which to file claims.

Section 803 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1953, Public Law 547, approved July 15, 1952 (p. 11) made "any appropriations available to the Department of Defense available for mustering out payments as authorized by law."

COMBAT DUTY PAY ACT OF 1952

(Title VII of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, Public Law 488, approved July 10, 1952 (p. 22))

This act provides combat pay for all members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served in the Korean combat zone on or after June 1, 1950, and who meet the requirements. The act provides for combat pay of $45 for any month during which the member was part of a combat unit in Korea for not less than 6 days of such month. The law sets up detailed conditions under which a member is entitled to combat pay. Combat service includes service in a vessel while subject to actual fire or explosion in the course of any operation in the Korean combat zone; service in aircraft while subjected to hostile fire in the course of any operation in the Korean combat zone; service while in actual combat on land during any period there is direct contact with and opposition to a hostile force by any military unit while such unit is subjected to hostile ground fire. The law also provides for the payment of combat pay of $45 per month for service on or after June 1, 1950, in the case of any person who was killed in action, injured in action, or wounded in action while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and in such case continues for not more than 3 months thereafter during which the person was hospitalized for the treatment of an injury or wound received in action. The $45 per month is also payable to persons who were captured or entered in

missing-in-action status while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea. Such payments continue for a period of not more than 3 months during which a person was in a missing-in-action or captured status. The combat pay is not payable in addition to aviation pay, submarine pay, or other special or incentive pay.

Under section 707 (b) appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed service are available for the payment of combat pay under this title for any month prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 488, approved July 10, 1952.

UNIFORM GRATUITIES

(Section 243, Armed Forces Reserve Act, 1952, Public Law 476, 82d Congress, approved July 9, 1952)

In accordance with the pattern of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, this section makes provision for equalizing across the board uniform gratuities for officers of all Reserve components.

This section provides for payment of the following allowances:

(a) Initial uniform allowance of an amount not to exceed $200 to be paid after January 1, 1953, under certain conditions, such as, upon first reporting for active duty for periods in excess of 90 days and upon completion of certain periods of active and inactive duty training in a Reserve component. This allowance is payable only once to each member.

(b) Active duty allowance of an amount not to exceed $100 to officers entering on active duty for more than 90 days when 2 years elapse between such periods of active duty. This allowance is payable retroactively to those officers who entered on active duty on or after June 25, 1950.

(c) Maintenance allowance of an amount not to exceed $50 for each 4 years of satisfactory service in a Reserve component which must include 28 days of active duty training. Extended periods of active duty for 90 days or more are not considered in computing the 4 years for eligibility for the maintenance allowance.

The request for $1,200,000,000 was taken under consideration by the committee, and in the course of the hearings the armed services volunteered a further reduction of $145,150,000, reducing the overall request to $1,054,850,000.

The committee requested and obtained from the armed services statements showing month by month for each of the first 6 months for the present fiscal year actual obligations and actual expenditures, for every appropriation item, as well as estimated figures for the last half of the year. It was in the light of these figures that the committee arrived at the conclusion which I have already indicated, namely, that the full amount of the supplementary request can be offset by transfers from sums already appropriated to the armed services for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all these savings are savings out of 1953 money. I want to say that in my opinion they are real savings and I want to say further that barring unforeseen developments overseas it is not anticipated that the armed services will come back to the Congress with any further supplemental or deficiency request in this fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can explain the action of the committee very quickly, I think, if the Members will turn to the table which appears in the committee report at pages 29 to 31, inclusive.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the table at this point in the RECORD:

Department of Defense supplementals, 1953

[In thousands]

Agency and item	Adjusted net request for appropriations			Proposed committee transfers to meet net adjusted request			
	H. Doc. 62	Subsequent revisions and reductions	Net adjusted requirements	Savings based on scheduled obligations	Freeze-order reductions	Other transfers	Total proposed transfers
Office of the Secretary:							
Claims	$1,000	$1,000					
Retired pay	25,000	25,000					
Total, Office of the Secretary	26,000	26,000					
Department of the Army:							
Military personnel	776,300	39,450	$736,850	$1,500			$1,500
Civilian relief in Korea	11,700	11,700		28,750			28,750
Maintenance and operations				50,000	$51,293	$200,000	301,293
Reserve personnel requirements, 1953				3,057			3,057
Reserve personnel requirements, 1952-53				8,541			8,541
Expansion of production facilities					12,000	75,000	87,000
Funds reserved by Air Force						295,583	295,583
Total, Department of the Army	788,000	51,150	736,850	91,848	63,293	570,583	725,724
Department of the Navy:							
Military personnel, Navy	140,000		140,000				
Military personnel, Marine Corps	63,000		63,000				
Navy personnel, general expenses				1,850			1,850
Marine Corps, troops and facilities				40,234			40,234
Ships and facilities				71,439	11,748		83,187
Aircraft and facilities					4,921		4,921
Ordnance and facilities				49,202	8,086		57,288
Medical care				5,703			5,703
Civil engineering				5,722			5,722
Servicewide operations				2,407			2,407
Officer candidate program, 1952-53				852			852
Officer candidate program, 1953-54				776			776
Total, Department of the Navy	203,000		203,000	178,215	24,755		203,000
Department of the Air Force:							
Military personnel requirements	183,000	68,000	115,000				
Maintenance and operations				47,463	67,537		115,000
Total, Department of the Air Force	183,000	68,000	115,000	47,463	67,537		115,000
Grand total, Department of Defense	1,200,000	145,150	1,054,850	317,556	155,585	570,583	[1] 1,043,724

[1] The difference of $11,126,000 between this amount of $1,043,724,000 and the net adjusted requirements of $1,054,850,000 represents deletion by the committee of additional funds requested by the Army for station allowances.

At the bottom of column 1 you will note the request for $1,200,000,000.

In column 2 you will find the savings volunteered by the armed services in the amount of $145,150,000, leaving a balance at the bottom of column 3 of $1,054,850,000.

The offsets which the committee proposes to that $1,054,850,000 appear in the next three columns, columns 4, 5, and 6, and in the footnote at the bottom of the table.

Column 4, totaling $317,556,000, results from the addition of anticipated unobligated balances as of June 30 next, according to the statements of the armed services themselves. Surely there can be no objection to applying that against the deficiency.

Column 5 totaling $155,585,000 results from assuming that the February rate of obligation will not exceed the January rate, because of the so-called freeze order of February 3, 1953, of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which, as you know, provided that there should be "no increase over the January rate of obligations except on complete justification and specific approval unless such increases are clearly necessary to meet the requirements fixed by law." Surely there can be no objection to applying any such savings to the deficiency request.

Column 6, totaling $570,583,000, results from three suggested savings, to each of which I shall refer very briefly.

The first item is a saving of $200 million with respect to Maintenance and Operations, Army. A statement of obligations under this item indicates that if the obligation figure for the first 6 months of the fiscal year is doubled the resulting figure is $3,888,444,000, which is about $1 billion less than the total amount available for this purpose. The committee felt justified in taking 20 percent of that $1 billion and applying it against the deficiency.

The second item is a saving of $75 million in respect to Expansion of Production Facilities. This results, again, from a statement of obligations under this item. The average monthly obli-

gation rate has run somewhere in the neighborhood of $40 million. The estimated obligations for May and June appear unrealistic. When $75 million is deducted and applied against the supplemental request the result is to leave about $190 million or an average of $95 million available for obligating in May and June, the last 2 months of the fiscal year, or more than double the amount actually obligated in any previous month.

The final item is a saving of $295,583,000, obtained by reducing funds reserved by the Air Force for contingent obligations in fiscal 1954. The amount of that fund was $646,910,000. After the suggested deduction, there will remain in the fund $351,327,000.

The committee has disallowed an item of $11,126,000 for station allowances. The matter will be reviewed in connection with the regular bill for the fiscal year 1954.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that these savings and transfers are all out of 1953 money. In my opinion, they all constitute real savings. They are over and above the savings and transfers authorized in respect to items of $244,377,246 and $145,150,000 volunteered by the armed services.

I repeat that, in the absence of unexpected developments, it is not anticipated that the armed services will return for any further supplemental or deficiency appropriation during the present fiscal year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only should there be no request for a deficiency but if the present indications prove out as we think they will there will be an opportunity for a rather substantial rescission.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman may prove to be correct.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one closing observation. At the completion of the work of the committee the suggested savings were taken up with responsible officials in the Department of Defense. After discussion with them, there was general agreement that the sum total here involved could probably be absorbed. There were some slight differences of opinion, however, as to the best sources from which to absorb the necessary funds. At the suggestion of the Defense officials therefore the committee incorporated a provision, which you will find in the bill, giving the Secretary of Defense broad discretion as to the sources from which these savings may be drawn, provided, as is indicated in the report, that any departure deemed essential from the program of savings suggested by the committee shall be cleared with the committee in advance.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this explains the action of the committee.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, he means to say that we really do not have to appropriate this money and that the money is already there?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct. The committee found sufficient unobligated balances, sufficient savings in respect of the month of February, and sufficient savings in three other items to offset entirely the new money requested.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. On this matter of education, do we appropriate a considerable amount of money in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or other items of defense, let us say, for so many school teachers and so many pupils and for everything that we maintain in Germany and other countries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There are very considerable funds utilized for educational purposes in the armed services. I am not in a position at the moment to give the gentleman detailed information in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense.

MILITARY SPENDING—NEED FOR ECONOMY WITHOUT LOSS OF MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I proceed on the theory this afternoon that the budget estimates that we are considering are the budget estimates of the present administration.

I certainly do not believe that the leaders of the present administration would submit to us budget requests other than their own. After all, the bill before us today calls for vast additional spending of the taxpayer's money, and the budget estimate upon which this bill is based should be the budget estimate of the party which is in power in the executive branch of the Government and in Congress.

For the present administration to present to us for consideration in connection with the pending bill, budget estimates other than its own would be a confession of incompetence, a confession of inability to fulfill the role of national leadership. Our people, by their votes, have asked for a change, and it would be most improper for the party in power to seek to present a budget request of the former administration or hide behind a smokescreen.

But we must not be unreasonable. It is true that the Republican Party has had since last November to formulate a budget for all the agencies of the Government. This has been a long time, but not enough time for the formulation of a new budget for each and every agency of the Government. I hope we may have the complete Republican budget in the near future, but all I am asking for now is the budget estimate of the party now in power on the items involving in excess of a billion dollars, which are included in the pending bill. We are entitled to know whether the party in power is for these items or against them. The point is that we are entitled to consider today the budget estimate of the present administration and not of the Truman administration.

When our committee convenes to consider military appropriations for the coming fiscal year I shall, of course, ask the Secretary of Defense if the requests for money which he is making are his own. If the requests are not his own, and if he has no budget, I shall suggest to him that he please return to the Pentagon and itemize what his minimum requirements for money are and give us a firm basis upon which to proceed. A mere novice in legislative matters will realize that such a request on my part is the only proper procedure to follow.

Mr. Chairman, our chief interest here is not so much in what has been inherited by the present party in power; rather, we are interested in what we are going to do about what we have inherited.

Now I want to speak briefly about military programs. The military features of the pending bill involved the largest sums. No public official would dare appear in the role of the defender of the military, and certainly I do not appear in that role today. Attacking the Military Establishment is the best and safest way to get a favorable headline. But headlines are not our concern. The welfare of our country is, I fervently hope, the objective of Republicans and Democrats alike. Let me say that on the Appropriations Committee, we do not deal in partisanship and in politics. The Committee on Appropriations has by and large been nonpartisan through the years, and I believe and I predict that it will be nonpartisan this year.

Our Republican friends on the Appropriations Committee cooperated with us in the Democratic majority last year and enabled us to cut the Truman budget by $8½ billion. Certainly I wish to say to the gentlemen on the left, the Republican side, that I shall cooperate with them in undertaking, when the budget of the new administration is presented, to cut it by as many billions of dollars as may be reasonbly possible. I trust that we can do even a better job cutting the fiscal budget of the new administration than we did the previous administration. But let us see the pattern as soon as we can, please.

PROSPECTS FOR MILITARY SAVINGS

We have a perfect setup for saving this year in the Military Establishment. It is a wonderful picture. It gratifies my heart. After all, in the Military Establishment is where most of the money is spent. I do not discount the fact that we must save money in all agencies and wherever possible. However, if you are going to balance the budget and save really big money, you must save billions in the Department of Defense or you do not save enough to change materially the fiscal picture. Moreover, there are only certain areas in the Defense Department where you can save money. If you are going to have 3,700,000 men in uniform as presently planned, and you have to pay them so much, and there is a movement on to raise their pay, it is a simple matter of mathematics. The law

fixes the rate of pay. You cannot save anything there unless you reduce the number of soldiers or reduce their pay. In the military pay and allowance item will be found about 20 percent of defense spending. Almost another 20 percent is in the field of maintenance and operation. There are several rather large areas of defense spending where real savings are practically impossible.

But there is one big place where you can save vast sums in the Department of Defense. That is in the field of procurement, because 60 percent of every defense dollar goes to procurement—buying stuff, hard goods and soft goods, principally the products of industry and big business. In the field of procurement real savings can be made if our defense leaders have the skill and the will to get the job done.

We are fortunate in this regard that in key places in the Department of Defense we have businessmen of unquestioned integrity and very great skill. Now is the time for American business to pay off, in the interest of the taxpayers, because they sit in the seats of the mighty. If they do their job and do it well, they will save billions of dollars. I estimate that since the Korean war started Congress has appropriated more than $80 billion for procurement—for buying things like ammunition, airplanes, tanks, ships, guided missiles, and so forth. A 10-percent saving would be $8 billion in velvet for the taxpayer. I fear that if our new defense leaders do not save billions of dollars, they will tend to dampen the enthusiasm of our people for the leadership of American business in government.

For years I have been saying on this floor and in committee and to our military leaders in the Pentagon that what we needed was people in the field of procurement in the Department of Defense who could get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent, and prevent the taxpayer being mercilessly gouged upon occasions by manufacturers of defense items. Now we have men in the Pentagon who are able to see the picture clearly, who know it from the other side, who can save us billions of dollars if they will but do it. Too often in the past, timid lieutenant colonels and underpaid civilians have been going out and matching their wits with big business, and the taxpayer has paid the penalty of increased costs, despite the pleas which some of us have made in the cause of better management in the Military Establishment. But now we have a beautiful set-up in this particular field.

I hope Secretary Wilson himself, one of the foremost businessmen of our generation, will sit around the conference table as the taxpayer's representative when contracts involving billions are made and see to it that we get our money's worth. This is no job to delegate to a timid underling. A little pounding of the table and shrewd contracting by one of the foremost industrialists of our time should pay off in a big way for our economy-minded country.

Not only that, there is another person in the picture. We have in the White House a soldier-statesman for whom I have great respect and affection. If there ever was a man who could lead his administration in making the Defense Establishment save money, he is the man. He knows it from the inside and the outside. He knows it up and down and all around. If anybody can pinpoint duplication and waste of money and manpower in the Defense Department he can do it. He was Chief of Staff of our Army. He was the Supreme Allied Commander of our military forces in World War II in Europe. At one time he was the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. More recently he was the head of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the so-called NATO Army in Europe, and before World War II he had responsible duty in industrial mobilization in the War Department. He is ideally suited to his job in the particular field of national defense where the main cuts and savings must be made if the taxpayer is to have relief in the biggest field of Government spending.

So it is a very pleasing thing, and I want President Eisenhower to know that we are going to stand behind him in a program of military strength at a minimum cost to the taxpayer. I have the most sincere admiration for the President and I believe he will do everything he can to do a good job. He needs our cooperation and our help, and I believe our Congress will work with him for the common good.

We should make it clear to our able business leaders in the Department of Defense that we are going to stand behim them in their efforts to get real economy in the field where they are best able to get it.

If they will, whenever necessary, crack the heads of big business, shave down the profits to the big manufacturers, and forget any allegiance they may have had to business colleagues who remain out of Government, the prospects for good management and cheaper defense costs should be bright. I have faith in these leaders. I am not trying to be severe. I am simply saying what everybody knows that the spotlight is playing on the Pentagon today, and it will continue to play there with the taxpayers and the Congress watching—watching hopefully. If they fail to do this job of reduction in that area where it probably must be made, and not at the expense of national defense, let me warn them in the beginning of their administration that they will call down upon their heads the righteous wrath of the American taxpayer and the Congress of the United States. I am happy to say that I am hopeful. I am encouraged to believe that they will be able to do it. They have got a hard job, but they are big men. They must not permit themselves to become the captives of the admirals and the generals, and yet they must not ignore sound military advice and the technical facts of life which only our able admirals and generals are best qualified to give. It is a very tough assignment; all must agree. I pause long enough to say I have no patience with those who undertake to sell our military leadership short.

The problem is cutting military spending without reducing military strength. If I were to write an open letter from the floor of the House this afternoon to the Secretary of Defense and his businessmen-associates, I would say to them: When you are convinced that economies can be made, national defense promoted, and the taxpayer served, do not let anyone, not even the top brass in the Pentagon, the admirals and the generals, dissuade you. In other words, in the language of the current song: Don't Let the Stars Get in Your Eyes. Our plea is that you do a job for the taxpayer and the American people on the defense budget.

Our defense chiefs cannot do their job if, at the slightest provocation, they go gallivanting about the country at the taxpayers' expense in 4-motored aircraft making speeches to Chambers of Commerce, laudable as that may be. Only if they stick to their knitting will they be able to do the job for the taxpayer which urgently needs to be done. Reports indicate that they are going to stay at their posts of duty here.

PREVIOUS MILITARY PROGRAMS

We cut the military budget last year in excess of $5 billion; let us make a bigger cut this year if we safely can. Let us make sure, however, that we do not harm the interest of national defense. Let us take a quick look at the picture: In calendar year 1950 we appropriated $25 billion for national defense; in 1951 we appropriated, by reason of the Korean war and the threat of a much bigger war, $82 billion. But we started the trend downward last year; we appropriated only $45 billion, $35 billion less than the previous year. Can this Congress equal the record which the last Congress made of appropriating $35 billion less on defense in 1953 than it did in 1952? That is the record we made last year. But that statement taken by itself is unfair and misleading. It is true, however, that in the calendar year 1951 we appropriated $82 billion. We brought it down to $45 billion last year, but we cannot bring it down to the extent of an additional $35 billion this year; that is impossible. That would mean an appropriation for the Department of Defense this year of only $12 billion. But certainly if the international situation does not worsen we ought to cut down below a $40 billion figure; and I would like to urge the new defense chiefs to join with us, shall I say the Democratic minority, and I believe my Republican colleagues too, in trying to bring it this year below $40 billion without impairing national defense.

Nineteen fifty-one was the peak year. Let us hope we can go on downward, because we provided previously for the principal funds for the buildup of our fighting strength. We have about financed the program for the initial buildup of our forces—our goal has never been full mobilization because we hope for peace and we could not afford indefinitely a posture of full mobilization. We can certainly go downward this year unless there are unforeseen developments, and we will have no cause to boast unless we cut military appropriations this year below $40 billion. Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me is the picture we have before us. I think it is an encouraging one because we have men who

know how to do this job in positions of power.

Let us all join together in helping them, and let us all restrain our criticism and give more in cooperation and understanding than in bitterness and criticism. Our people at home would sanction that spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we may have the military budget of this administration as soon as possible because I for one do not contemplate going through long committee hearings on a budget which is not accepted and presented to the Congress by the administration in power.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, that part of the bill which came before the subcommittee of which I am chairman has to do with various agencies in the section for the independent offices, beginning on page 21 of the bill. The briefest way that I can call it to your attention is to ask you to turn to pages 23 and 24 where a digest is made of the requests before the subcommittee and in turn our recommendations to the full committee which were accepted by that committee.

The way to save your time is for me to refer only to those parts of this budget which you yourselves may be questioned about.

If you will take the Veterans' Administration you will find an original request for $18 million in the bill. I want you to understand that none of the money requested for operating costs of any of the hospitals has been reduced. That is the complete amount asked for by the Veterans' Administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The other cuts may be found under two heads, first a cut which was made prior to the meeting of the subcommittee. Some savings were indicated and some money was available which they did not know about when the budget was made up. The second is reduced by less than the amount of money represented by the number of additional employees which it was the intention to add to the rolls. It is the desire of the administration not to add employees at the present time, and a very slight increase in the efficiency of the present staff, about 2 percent increase of efficiency could make this unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, this, in my opinion, is a well-balanced suggestion on the part of the subcommittee. I also call your attention to the fact that in the item covering compensation and pensions we made no cut at all because eventually that is a debt against the Government and we must pay it.

In the following item, readjustment benefits, while we have cut it in the amount of $131 million, this is done on the basis indicated at page 195 of the hearings. We asked the Veterans' Administration if they knew what the request should be at the present time and they said they did not. Then we asked whether or not they would know better when they came before us with the regular bill. This appears at page 195. My question was: "Will you know more accurately 2 months from now?"

And the answer is: "We will have had that much experience because at that time we will know what the demands from the Korea war are," at which time the committee will take care of the item.

I think of nothing else that you are apt to be asked about.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman's subcommittee was very kind to extend an audience to representatives of the American Legion in Pennsylvania who were greatly concerned about hospital beds in the Philadelphia area. I notice that you have included in the report in connection with this part of the estimate the statement that the committee specifically directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospital facilities for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to explain the thinking behind that statement.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. I would like to say, instead of the gentleman expressing any thanks to the subcommittee, the subcommittee thanks the representatives from Pennsylvania for having brought this matter to our attention. The Veterans' Administration has been leasing, in the naval hospital in Philadelphia, a number of beds which at the beginning of the year was estimated at 350 a month. It was the intention of the Veterans' Administration, as a new VA hospital in Philadelphia was built, to drop beds out of the contract at the naval hospital. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, the schedule did not work quite the way they intended it to work, as a result of which there are at the present time only about 160 beds available at the moment in the veterans' hospital and only about 100 beds still under contract at the naval hospital.

Now this is a double-barreled problem because if we take the patients out of the naval hospital and do not have a place to put them, not only do we have veterans needing a bed, but we have a condition in which the naval hospital could actually lose its rating because it has less than the percentage number of patients to the number of beds. It is proposed that we earmark the money. The committee did not think that was desirable, nor a specific indication of the number of beds, because what is needed is somewhere between 350 and 400 beds in that area. They can be in one hospital or another. It does not necessarily mean that the number should be activated in the veterans' hospital now if it is better to put the veterans in the naval hospital.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to an amendment being offered after the figure $10 million to specify and spell out the number of beds that are needed in Philadelphia, particularly the amount of money required.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would not think it was a good idea. I would think it was the reverse of a good idea. With all of the very high regard I have for the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would probably feel myself compelled to oppose it because I think we would do better if we put it on the ground that there shall be provided in Philadelphia the number of beds that are needed there. As the gentleman pointed out, the VA is taking Pennsylvania veterans and carrying them to Dayton, Ohio, Richmond, Va., to Wilkes-Barre, to East Orange, and to Fort Howard. It is a problem that cannot be spelled out properly in a bill, and I think since we have the Veterans' Administration coming back in not over 30 days, even before this bill is signed by the President probably—I am not quite sure what its timetable would be—we would be better off to leave it as the committee wrote it in there because I think the result will be good for the veterans.

Mr. FENTON. What assurance have we got that they will be taken care of?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I were the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration or the Bureau of the Budget and I had been told by a subcommittee that I had to do something, and I had to come back in about 30 days and ask that same subcommittee for more money, I think I would be careful to do what the subcommittee asked.

Mr. FENTON. That has not been the experience in the past.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN VANDT. Is it not proper to assume here that the language you have in your committee report represents instructions on the part of the subcommittee and, if approved by this body, the instructions of the House of Representatives that the Veterans' Administration shall correct this situation in Philadelphia?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The subcommittee understands it that way, and I hope the House will understand it that way and support it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for the armed services [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] showed in yielding me this time, but I should like to have the RECORD show that I am second in line in the minority, following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. Chairman, you have heard the explanation of the supplemental by the gentlemen who have preceded me. Insofar as this supplemental applies to the armed services, the method which has been pursued by our subcommittee has been that of recapturing unobligated funds and reassigning those funds; consequently, it does not constitute appropriation of new money as such. This method of procedure has been followed on previous occasions and, in my opinion, is quite in keeping with proper conclusions and close scrutiny by the Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, I find that there seems to be dissatisfaction on the part of some Members of the other body with the methods pursued in the handling of appropriation measures, both in the formative stages and in subsequent processing. I should not say that we have a perfect system by any means. No doubt improvements could be made, and should be made, but I have yet to see any proposal that would result in a marked improvement in end results.

I have been on the Appropriations Committee of the House for 14 years. For 8 years of that period I have been chairman of the subcommittee having immediate jurisdiction of naval appropriations. I have learned during that service that there is no substitute for hard, industrious, personal application. Investigators and capable, industrious clerks are indispensable, but the responsibility is solely that of a committee member, and to exercise it he must study, inform himself, and apply himself.

Expenditures and taxes are very live questions today. They should be. All of us want each held to the lowest levels consistent with the proper discharge of governmental programs and policies. That has been the determined objective of the Appropriations Committee throughout the period of time I have been a member of the committee.

Much of our difficulty ensues from authorizing legislation. Appropriations are provided to implement authorizations. If you do not want to spend the money on something, do not authorize it. When you have authorized something, it is not for the Committee on Appropriations to say that it will not follow up with the necessary money. It has a command from higher authority. It is merely an agent of the House.

There are many who entertain the view that an improved situation would result from resort to a one-package appropriation bill. It sounds plausible, I admit. But what advantage does it offer over the present procedure? One, and it is the main argument advanced for it, is that under present practice we do not know where we stand until we get through. Now, just how true is that? We have an estimated receipt and expenditure figure at the start. There is and always has been maintained in the Committee on Appropriations, open to inspection, a progress sheet, and in recent years progress reports, in tabular form, have been printed periodically in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD. In that way we are always advised of where we stand as separate measures are processed through their legislative courses. The end result is controllable until the last, and at all stages there is before us a track of our course.

Then we are told that under a one-package bill there would be better control of expenditures from prior-year appropriations. One would infer that these prior-year funds, once provided, are forgotten. Personally, I do not like the imputation. Normally, such prior-year balances are not large. They are large now because of the defense preparation effort we began following the outbreak of war in Korea. In large part they are not free balances. They are obligated but not expended. They apply in large measure to long-lead-time procurement. But small or large, committed or uncommitted, they are carefully canvassed during hearings on new money requests, and just as much so as they would be under a one-package bill arrangement, and they are just as controllable.

It is my judgment that better consideration of appropriation measures is had under present practice than would be had under the one-package procedure. The responsibility for each measure now rests squarely upon the subcommittee having jurisdiction. In practice, considering the human equation, that responsibility would be lessened when a separate appropriation category became merely a chapter of an omnibus measure. When you lessen it, you detract from the incentive or the urge for doing the very splendid kind of job that I have witnessed performed by many of my colleagues over the years. No, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the adoption of a one-package bill would merely be an accommodation to the theorists. The Committee on Appropriations is alive to its responsibilities and will function effectively and efficiently if allowed to proceed in such ways as it determines will best serve the public interests. If its reports are not sufficiently full or comprehensive, they can be made so, and just as well under present practice as under a one-package bill procedure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with another proposal. This one assumes that we do not have the right kind of information, or that it is not accessible to us, or that we do not know how to obtain it. What we need, it appears, is a superappropriations committee, made up of House and Senate Members who are members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. These Members are to divorce themselves from their normal committee functions and inform themselves about the budget and then pass along to their committees, and I quote, "the necessary information for the adequate consideration of the budget." I ask you, when, in commonsense, under that proposal, would the committees get down to work.

This proposed supercommittee is charged with many functions. I invite you to look at pages 897 to 899 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6. It sounds very much like a grandiose scheme to build up a budget bureau in the Congress charged with work and responsibilities of existing committees. One may read in it, a back-door approach to letting the other body in on the initiation of revenue and appropriation measures, distinctly a House prerogative under the Constitution, and one that has been jealously guarded down through the years.

I am firmly of the opinion that the Appropriations Committee of the House is thoroughly competent to discharge effectively and efficiently the tasks with which it is charged.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman's statement is one of the finest I have heard in a long time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it does not need any supercommittee. All the information it needs it has the means at its disposal to acquire. Staff help in skill and numbers may be had for the asking, and will be availed of and utilized as and when the need develops. Of course, information from responsible sources is desired and is always welcome, but I want to see and shall do my part to see that the committee is free to run its affairs, to make its own determinations, and that it is free of domination by supergroups and is not hamstrung and befogged by a host of subordinates who would largely be in the way, occupying valuable space, and swelling the total of the legislative budget. Some of those who are presently proposing the supercommittee have been the most loud in criticizing superdepartments in Government wherein layers of authority have been placed one upon the other. I can see no difference between a superdepartmental structure than that which has recently been proposed to apply to the Appropriations Committee. I personally do not feel that exaggerated intelligence is vested in any specific individual on either side of the Capitol. When it is all said and done, under our routine procedure, conferences are usually held by and between the House and Senate which, in my opinion, work out an intelligent compromise that invariably takes care of any issue where errors of judgment may prevail. Let us review the supercommittee proposals with extra caution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and I reiterate the fact that if each committee of the House, both those which bring forth new legislation and the appropriation committees will exercise restraint, and will do their job properly, economy can be had, and a supercommittee is unnecessary.

I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], former chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee. He has promised—and his promises are made to be kept—cooperation in our efforts to reduce Federal spending, particularly as it relates to the military. I could not quite tell whether he was indicting the Pentagon of the past, that is, up to the 20th of January, or whether he was merely acting as elder statesman and giving the newcomers a little fatherly advice. Perhaps both. But certainly in his capacity as chairman of the committee he [Mr. MAHON] has seen for years the Pentagon in action, and if anyone is qualified to give them advice it is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], as he so well did when he told them not to let the stars get in their eyes. He knows, as I know, that every once in a while that has hap-

pened, and some people have not used their own individual independent judgment because they have been so glamorized, and once in a while so blinded by the reflection from those stars.

I know that the experience I have had through the years on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee will be the pattern set in the future; and all of us working together as a committee and not as partisans, we will, I can assure the gentleman from Texas, do a very good job of bringing down to a reasonable amount the figures which will be presented to this body in a few short weeks.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] asked a few moments ago about the amounts we were appropriating for education of the dependents of our military forces. For his information I would like to advise, in round figures, that in 1953, we appropriated $3,900,000 for the education of Army children overseas; $3,400,000 for the education of Air Force children overseas; and approximately $2 million for the education of naval children, in other words, approximately $10 million is being appropriated annually for the education of dependents of our military forces.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is for the education of their children overseas?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, for the education of their children overseas; there is another program that makes some contribution for those here within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have before us today has been very well explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee. In the minds of at least a few of you there has been some apprehension about what the effect has been in transferring certain funds from the Reserves and the National Guard. If there is any question in your mind about whether that can or cannot be done without interfering with the activities of those two Reserve forces, you may turn to page 487 where General Decker in response to a question which I asked him, makes a statement and shows how the $60 million can be transferred from those two activities and offered the observation on the part of this pay increase which is now before us all without harm to their programs.

Then, again, some of you probably have received communications from men in the service in which they have complained that they have not been receiving the promotions in rank which they had been promised, and to which they were entitled. Last year the Army Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman form Florida [Mr. SIKES] went into that question with General Collins and told him that we had received those complaints and that he should make request for adequate funds so that these men could be promoted. Those men had been told they were not getting the promotions because Congress did not give the Army the money. Congress has always been the whipping boy—Congress did not give them enough money, so they were told; that they could not make the promotions because the Army did not have the money. If the Army did not have the money it was their own fault, because they got every cent for military pay they ever asked for. We are assured that in this supplemental which the Army is now requesting that there is money so these promotions can be made and these men can be paid in their promoted ranks, promotions which the men deserve.

Another matter which deserves a great deal of consideration is that of civilian relief in Korea. You will notice in the hearings that when the Army witnesses started out in their justifications there was to have been a request made for supplemental funds running better than $11 billion-plus. Before the hearings on civil relief in Korea, which start on page 555 of the printed hearings—before we had gone very far in a very unsatisfactory presentation we were told that the request for additional funds and new money was being withdrawn.

Now that probably raises some apprehension, but if you will turn to page 559 you will find that there is not a bit of reason for any misapprehension. The Army has plenty of money for this relief to last them the rest of this year—and then some—if it is properly handled.

We have already appropriated $177 million for civilian relief in Korea and of that $177 million as of December 31, 1952, only $43 million have been obligated and but $23 million have been actually spent. So that you can see from those figures that there is far more than enough to take care of civilian relief in Korea, during the remainder of this fiscal year when I say that I do not discount the need that exists there. Any of you who have been in Korea, any of you who have seen the civilians in Pusan, around Seoul and other Korean communities know that there is no place in the world where there is more abject poverty. Heartbreaking? Certainly. Strange as it may sound and as illogical as it is, the truth of the matter is that the Communist Chinese prisoners on Koje-do are faring better than the civilians in Korea. These prisoners are fed better, they are clothed better, they are better sheltered, they have a better medical service than the Korean civilians, yet they are prisoners of war. With all of that, if there was a proper, economic, sound, sane, sensible program of distribution of relief goods in Korea, we could get as much as we are getting now with half of the money. The greater part of the whole story is all here in the hearings. It is somewhat garbled. Take, as an example, a boatload of rice. We pay for it. We pay for the transportation. When it reaches the port of Pusan it is immediately turned over to the Korean Government for distribution. What happens after that is not always a pleasant story.

It seems to me, after all, that we have furnished enough funds and there are certainly enough alphabetical agencies over there to do the job. As a matter of fact, there are too many. There is too much confusion; these agencies should be thinned out and there should be a new look taken at civilian relief in Korea before we appropriate any money for 1954. We cannot do everything they want us to do. It seems to me, and I measure my words carefully when I say this, that it comes with some ill grace from President Syngman Rhee in the words he is reported to have uttered last night that the trouble, the inflation, and want are due to the United States and the actions which we have or have not taken. It was not the United States that revalued the Korean money, it was not the United States that caused the price of rice to jump until it will be impossible for the civilians in Korea to buy the rice.

Inflation does exist—it has long existed in Korea. In fact, the going rate of exchange is 18,000 won per United States dollar. However, the United States is dealing with the Korean Government on the basis of 6,000 won per dollar. In other words, the United States and our soldiers pay three times as many dollars for any given item than we should.

Only a few days ago the Korean Republic revalued its money. Prices immediately jumped, so that under the existing agreement of 6,000 won we will pay still more dollars for any purchases we make. The United States is the victim of—not the cause of—the Korean inflation.

Besides the civilian relief dollars, the United States pours in uncounted other millions—yes; billions. The United States furnishes arms, supplies, and so forth, to the Korean troops. We pay the Republic of Korea a considerable dollar rental for the use of the Korean railroads to transport military supplies for Korean troops as well as our own and those of our allies.

Our relations with Korea are complex. They are of vital importance.

However, it is the taxpayers of the United States who are paying the bill. Our relations with Korea, the present agreement on the rate of exchange, our burden and program of the relief of Korean civilians are all matters needing a thorough review before more money is appropriated. So, Mr. Chairman, I have requested that the staff of our committee go thoroughly into this and other matters relating to our spending in Korea before funds are provided for fiscal 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement in connection with the second supplemental appropriation bill now under consideration with reference to the appropriations originally requested by the Department of Defense.

In its original submission of a supplemental appropriation request, the Department of Defense asked for $1,200,000,000 to complete fiscal 1953. These funds were needed to pay some minor amounts for claims, retired pay, and civilian relief in Korea, and also for some very large amounts needed to pay for four acts of Congress passed in the 82d

Congress which were not originally considered in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. Thus, the Army asked for $776,300,000, the Navy $140 million, the Marine Corps $63 million and the Air Force $183 million. Now, the Army needs $708,031,598, the Navy $181,443,000, the Marine Corps $76 million and the Air Force $167 million to pay for their new laws previously authorized by the Congress, which I will discuss in a moment.

The differences in the total amounts requested by each military department and the amounts needed to pay for these new laws results from the authority provided in the appropriation act to pay out of the Defense Appropriation Act such sums as were required to meet these anticipated increased benefits. Revised personnel planning and other adjustments have permitted the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to absorb some of these increased expenditures.

Now, let us look at these recently enacted laws which have cost, or will cost, some $1,132,474,598.

On May 19, 1952, the Military Pay Increase Act became law resulting in a total increased expenditure of $303,601,678 for the Armed Forces for fiscal 1953. You will recall that this granted an increase of 4 percent in basic pay and a 14 percent increase in allowances.

Then we passed the Armed Forces Reserve Act of July 9, 1952, and part of that act provided for uniform allowances for Reserve officers. The Army was the only one that needed additional funds for this purpose and they requested an additional $544,000 for fiscal 1953. Then the Congress amended the 1953 Appropriation Act by adding title VII which became known as the Combat Duty Pay Act. This was retroactive to May 31, 1950 and provided for an additional $45 a month in pay under certain limited qualifications. To pay the retroactive costs involved and to provide for the remainder of fiscal 1953 for this act alone would cost $179,657,120. Bear in mind that this was an act of Congress which amended the appropriations act but no appropriations were provided in that law for these benefits. And on July 16, 1952, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 was passed, title V of which provided for mustering-out payments. This act was reported out from the Veterans' Affairs Committee and was not considered by the House Committee on Armed Services. It was patterned after the World War II Mustering Out Payment Act and permitted discharged personnel to be paid sums of $100, $200, or $300, depending upon their type of service upon discharge. This provision of law was also retroactive for anyone who had been engaged in service on or after June 27, 1950, and the total costs for fiscal 1953, including the retroactive payments, will amount to $648,671,800.

Now, totaling these sums it can be seen that the Congress in the latter part of the last session enacted specific laws authorizing the expenditure of public funds amounting to $1,132,474,598 and this amount of money was not provided for in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. I must assume that the Congress was well aware of the fact that authorizations of this type had to be paid for some time. The money was not provided for in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. Thus, it was necessary for the Department of Defense to submit a supplemental appropriation request for $1,200,000,000, the vast majority of which was to pay for the acts which I have just discussed.

Now during the hearings on this supplemental appropriation bill, the Department of Defense witnesses indicated that they could reduce the $1,200,000,000 request in the amount of $145,150,000 by savings within the appropriation concerned or by the transfer of funds from other appropriations. In other words, some savings can be effected because of revised personnel planning and by making use of funds appropriated for other purposes.

But this still left a net requirement of $1,054,850,000. It should be remembered that the money to provide for the pay increase, the uniform allowances, the combat duty pay, and mustering out pay has to date come out of the military appropriations for pay for each of the respective services. It is obvious, therefore, that unless some definite action is taken, these appropriations will be completely exhausted within the next 2 or 3 months. So it was equally obvious to the Department of Defense that they had to either obtain an appropriation of $1,054,850,000 to complete fiscal 1953, or at the very least, had to obtain authority to transfer funds from existing appropriations.

It is my understanding from reading the report of the Appropriations Committee that none of the $1,200,000,000 requested by the Department has been authorized in the second supplemental appropriation bill. I also gather from reading the report that the Appropriation Committee will permit the Department of Defense to effect savings or to transfer from existing appropriations the sum of $1,043,724,000. This is $11,126,000 less than the amount requested by the Department of Defense after taking into consideration the transfers and savings that the Department itself stated could definitely be effected at this time. The $11,126,000 for special per diem allowances for overseas personnel was not authorized because the committee was not satisfied with the basis for the justification presented by the Department of Defense.

As I read the proposed legislation, these transfers from existing appropriations will be permitted after determination has been made by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In other words, as I understand the proposed bill, the military departments will be authorized to transfer from existing appropriations $1 million for claims, $25 million for retired pay, $725,724,000 for pay for military personnel of the Army, $140 million for pay for military personnel of the Navy, $63 million for pay for military personnel of the Marine Corps, and $115 million for pay for military personnel of the Air Force.

In the report, the Appropriations Committee indicates that the Army, for example, can transfer $1,500,000 from military personnel funds, $28,750,000 from civilian relief in Korea, $301,293,000 from the appropriation for maintenance and operations, $3,057,000 from reserve requirements for fiscal 1953, $8,541,000 for reserve personnel requirements for fiscal 1952 and 1953, $87 million from expansion of production facilities and $295,583,000 from funds reserved for the Air Force.

The report indicates that the Navy may be able to meet its requirements by transferring from its appropriations $1,850,000 from general expenses of Navy personnel, $40,234,000 from troops and facilities of the Marine Corps, $83,187,000 from ships and facilities, $4,921,000 from aircraft and facilities, $57,288,000 from ordnance and facilities, $5,763,000 from medical care, $5,722,000 from civil engineering, $2,407,000 from servicewide operations, $852,000 from officer candidate programs of fiscal 1952 and 1953, and $776,000 from officer candidate programs from fiscal 1953 and 1954. And the report further indicates that the Air Force can absorb its additional funds from a transfer of $115 million for its maintenance and operations.

Thus, the Appropriations Committee in its report indicates that a total of $1,043,724,000 in existing appropriations can be transferred to the military departments to meet the needs for the specific appropriations needed in the second supplemental appropriations bill.

Now, it is my understanding from reading the report, that if differences arise as to the sources of needed transfers, the services will be given some flexibility, but any adjustments in the recommended transfers must be absolutely necessary and must be cleared with the Appropriations Committee before they are made effective.

I am assuming, therefore, that the latitude provided by the report, as well as the language of the bill itself, will give the Department of Defense some opportunity to interchange the transfer of existing appropriations. I am quite convinced that without this flexibility, the Department of Defense may well have a very difficult time in effecting these transfers, for it may develop that the preliminary estimates of potential transfers are wrong and other sources may have to be tapped.

I am advised that the Department of Defense probably can find the needed $1,200,000,000 in transfers without affecting the national security.

Now that is what makes up the main portions of the supplemental bill insofar as it deals with the Department of Defense. When the gentleman from Missouri said it was not a Truman budget, he was absolutely correct. The reason these items are here is in response to roll-call votes on bills that were passed by the House. When the bill now under consideration came before the Committee on Appropriations, they decided, after most careful investigation, that if permission was given for the transfer of certain funds within the various Departments, that the expenditures necessitated by these four bills could be absorbed out of what was appropriated in 1953. Mr. Chairman, I hope their views can be carried out. I hope it will be possible to absorb this large amount. But let us not fool ourselves. Here is a billion-one-hundred-million-odd dollars which has to be absorbed out of these

appropriations. If it can be done, fine. I hope it can be done, but, if it cannot, why, we will be confronted here with a deficiency appropriation and not a supplemental appropriation. It certainly is worth while to see if it can be done. If it can be absorbed, it should be absorbed. But, if it cannot be absorbed, then later we obviously will be required to make direct appropriations to carry out these authorizations. But it is worth while giving it an honest trial. For that reason, I am supporting wholeheartedly the committee's position with reference to the transfer of the money from existing appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat intrigued by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, minority ranking member of the Military Subcommitee on Appropriations and the followup made by the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

I think a careful and somewhat unbiased analysis of whether or not this is the consideration of the Truman budget, at least as far as the military is concerned, would reveal several important factors which I believe effectively indicate that we are considering a Truman budget.

First. If you go down the list of the statutes causing the money requests in this bill you will find, I think, in the hearings before the respective legislative committees that in most cases the legislation was affirmatively approved or recommended by the previous administration. Let us take them one by one.

As to the increase in military pay, I think President Truman sent a favorable message to the 82d Congress and I believe his spokesmen came before the Committee on Armed Services advocating the enactment of a military pay-increase bill.

Second. I believe the only exception is the combat-duty pay. It is my recollection that the Department of Defense, speaking for President Truman, went on record before the Committee on Armed Services opposed to combat-duty pay.

Third. As to the mustering-out payments, it is my recollection that the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a recommendation for a GI bill which included a mustering-out pay provision.

Fourth. As to uniform allowances, it is my recollection that the previous administration did recommend legislation likewise.

Further, I do not recall any veto by Mr. Truman on any of the aforementioned measures. If he was opposed to them he could have exercised his veto prerogative. Finally, in House Document No. 62, which encompasses all of these supplemental appropriations, the funds themselves were requested by President Truman.

Do not take my previous statements as any indication that Congress should have a clear conscience. I might say, that oftentimes we, the House and the Senate, pretty sadly and rather flagrantly abandon our responsibilities on legislation. I think as to some of the legislation I have mentioned, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has mentioned, and that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has mentioned, we should have taken a little more time in their consideration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. If this administration wants to proceed with a Truman budget rather than work out a budget of its own, I think it certainly has a right to adopt the Truman budget. But my point is, I think Congress, the Members on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side of the House, are entitled to know whether the administration now in power, and the Republican administration is in power in the White House and in Congress, is for or against the budget estimates being considered in this bill. That is the only thing I want to know. The Congress and the country are entitled to know. I am not clear on it. I believe the present administration is for the budget estimates which are before us in this measure, but I cannot actually prove it. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. FORD. As far as I know, but I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not know whether or not this budget has been approved by the new administration. I do not think they are objecting to any of the reductions which have been made by the House Committee on Appropriations or any reductions we make on the floor of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. But there is at stake here more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. In the name of forthrightness and good faith should not the administration tell us whether or not it has approved and does approve of this proposed huge expenditure of the taxpayers' money? Should we be left on the sidelines with no information and recommendation from the party now in power?

Mr. FORD. In the Army section alone these four statutes caused President Truman to request an expenditure of $181,300,000 for pay and allowances; for combat-duty pay $153,400,000; for mustering-out payments $373 million; and for uniform allowances $514 million. A total of $708,214,000 just for the Army alone as a result of legislation which the preceding Congress approved in the dying days of the last session. I wish to say this in defense of the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense, in my judgment, has cooperated since January 20 in trying to seek the means and methods by which they could absorb some of the added costs which the Congress placed on them in the last session. I hope that attitude on the part of the Department of Defense prevails in the months ahead. I believe it will. With such cooperation by all in the executive branch of the Government, plus real economy efforts by the Congress, I believe a tax-reduction bill can be approved by the House and Senate in this session.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed surprised that the House Appropriations Committee comes before us today with a proposal that places the United States Government in the untenable position of repudiating its obligations to more than 2,300 communities in this Nation. By omitting school funds under the Federal program of financing school services in areas of heavy Government defense projects the committee does just that.

In the early days of the New Deal when President Roosevelt took the Nation off the gold standard I am reminded of the time when that great Virginia Democrat, the Honorable Carter Glass, took the Senate floor, pulled a $5 bill from his pocket, and in that scathing biting voice so familiar to the Senate, took the Government to task for depreciating the currency and the savings of the people. My own party applauded his action.

Yet today some members of my party come forward with a proposal which would likewise compel the Government to ignore its obligations. Uncle Sam is obligated by the past action of Congress to come to the assistance of schools located in certain specified areas and under certain specified conditions. These more than 2,300 communities including those in my own district in Virginia meet those specified conditions. Yet my colleagues from the House Appropriations Committee say that regardless of this previous commitment of Congress these communities shall be denied funds which rightfully belong to them. When I say the funds rightly belong to them it is an understatement of fact. These school funds are only a portion of the funds that rightfully belong to them.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman inform the House, or the committee rather, what the vote was in committee on this proposal?

Mr. BROYHILL. I do not know, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. Can the gentleman find out from the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL. Can anyone tell me what the vote was or can anyone tell the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CANFIELD. Why does the gentleman not ask the ranking Member, the former chairman of the committee?

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield further so that I may ask that question?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Chairman is the head of the committee. I suggest that the gentleman address that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. Is this a state secret? Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman have any information as to what the vote was in the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL. No, I do not. I am not concerned with what the vote was. I am concerned with the committee's report.

In the community of Arlington in my own district one-sixth of the property and land is tax exempt by virtue of the fact that this property and land is occupied by the United States Government. And Uncle Sam, unlike his sons and daughters, does not pay income tax. My friends, our good Uncle Sam is the biggest tax chiseler in this great country. He chisels communities and States out of just taxes and throws a greater burden on these communities and States and their citizens. If an ordinary citizen like you or I or John and Mary Doe followed his example the next step would be the Federal penitentiary.

My distinguished colleague from Illinois points out that when the Government moves into a community the real estate values in that community are enhanced and more tax potential is created by Government employees taking up residence therein. To follow this reasoning to its logical conclusion the gentleman from Illinois should come forward with a proposal to make any private industry entering a community tax exempt because it helps build up the community. He ignores the fact that the Federal Government or new industry adds immeasurably to the costs of local government.

Now I certainly have no quarrel with the committee's objective which is to cut Government spending as much as possible and to bring the budget into balance. I too am for a balanced budget and a reduction in taxes. But let us use a sane and fair approach in achieving this objective. Let us not welsh on our honest obligations to our States and communities. We must not be pennywise and pound foolish. We must not destroy the confidence in the integrity of the Government of the United States. It is my hope that the Congress will see fit today to undo the damage done by one of its most important committees. It is my hope that Congress will reaffirm its recognition of the debt owed some of our communities and States.

Later on this afternoon I shall offer an amendment to the existing bill which would rectify the mistake made. My amendment will restore the full amount for school assistance deleted by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record in favor of this bill, and in the language of our eminent colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], it is "worth a trial." If it does not work out, then we will have a deficiency appropriation bill.

I am particularly, however, going to address my remarks to that part of the bill which abolishes $24 million for schools in impacted areas. This money was appropriated because under Public Law 874 we set up this system of schools. This public law came out of my committee, the Committee on Education and Labor. It so happens that it came out when I was not present, because I was away from Congress on a sick leave of 3 months at that time.

I am against subsidizing with Federal funds, any form of segregation. I want to point out that under Public Law 874 the sons and daughters of Negro men serving in our Armed Forces are not allowed to go to schools which Federal funds built; that only the sons and daughters of white soldiers and white officers are allowed to go.

Under Public Law 874, there has been a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money to support separate schools on the basis of race.

When the Atomic Energy Commission began building its Savannah River works project, a number of officials from South Carolina came to Washington to tell the committees of Congress how many thousands of dollars they needed to erect new schools to take care of the children who would come into the area from other places. A few Georgia officials also showed up to make demands on the Federal Treasury.

In reading over the testimony of these people, I was surprised to find the many requests for funds with which to build schools for colored children. The problem of inadequate schools for colored children has been there all of the time, but these State officials apparently decided that while everybody was excited about spending money with which to make the H-bomb it would be a good time to raid the Federal Treasury to do a job that they should have been doing all through the years out of their own State and local taxes.

I have a number of complaints in my office from families of servicemen who are forced to send their children to separate schools outside the military posts, such as Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Fort Bliss, Tex.; Fort Sill, Okla.; and Fort Belvoir, Va. The people making these complaints are residents of Pennsylvania, New York, and Minnesota. They are serving their country in the armed services, and, as a penalty for such service, they are forced to send their children, who have never previously been exposed to segregation, to schools for colored in the communities surrounding the posts. At all of these forts, there are perfectly good schools on the posts, but they are for the white children only.

The United States Office of Education, under the guidance of the same Mr. B. Alden Lillywhite who appeared before the Appropriations Committee to ask for $24 million, gives Federal funds to local authorities in the communities near these forts for the purpose of providing segregated school facilities for education of colored children.

Obviously, if we went over Mr. Lillywhite's recommendations with a fine-tooth comb, we would find a great many wasteful expenditures of this kind which are not only bad from an economic point of view but they are also frightful examples of undemocratic treatment of our own citizens at a time when we are trying to sell democracy to the rest of the world. It is bad enough when segregation in schools comes about because of local boards of education, but it is infinitely worse when it is supported by action of the Congress of the United States.

If Mr. Lillywhite had been successful in his plans in 1951, we would be spending even more Federal money for segregation than we now spend because he participated in a scheme to incorporate language in H. R. 5411 which sounded innocent enough on its face, but which was intended to have the effect of requiring sweeping racial segregation in schools on military posts. Fortunately, President Truman vetoed this bill.

The fundamental question facing Members of this body is simply this: Shall we continue to use tax money collected from the entire country to support a wasteful system of segregation in schools such as those located in Arlington County and nearby Maryland? Mr. Lillywhite's figures show that these schools alone need one-half million dollars. If we assume that this money is to be divided in half for the purpose of providing duplicate buildings, extra teachers, and extra equipment for colored children, it means that we are called upon to take at least a quarter of a million dollars out of the pockets of taxpayers who live in those parts of the country where there is no segregation in schools to pay for racial segregation in Maryland and Virginia.

Only yesterday, the director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP told me about a conference with some local school officials in a defense impacted area of Maryland. The conference was necessary because four colored boys had been refused admission to a trade school which was the only institution in the city offering the particular type of training the children were seeking. The head of the school board said that separate training would be offered for the children and that a whole staff of teachers would be hired, expensive equipment would be purchased, and even a new building would be built if necessary. I am sure that I do not need to tell you who is expected to pay for that kind of waste. It is the people of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and other States where there is no segregation in public schools who will pay for it in Federal taxes.

Of course, Mr. Lillywhite and the others in the Office of Education, who have his point of view, usually say that the larger part of this money will be spent for building or improving schools for colored children. If that is their argument this time, it only means that they have less justification than ever before for asking for the money. Arlington County and the State of Maryland, as a whole, could get along very nicely on the present State and local tax money appropriated for schools if there was only one school system for all children instead of two school systems that are inferior for both colored and white children.

I believe that we should do everything possible to help out the local communities of this country so that the services provided for United States citizens will be uniformly high in all parts of the country, but I strongly oppose spending New York, Illinois, or New Jersey tax money to support segregated schools in Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina, or anywhere else.

I am against squandering Federal millions to maintain prejudice and to subsidize segregation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of the House today in regard to this request for an additional $24 million of Federal funds for the so-called impacted school districts. I wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, of the Committee on Rules, for their very courageous, patriotic and pertinent remarks. I think they hit the nail right on the head.

Before we get to that particular item, however, there are some other appropriations requests and the committee's action thereon that should be explained to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I know the gentleman would like to dispose of this inquiry before he enters into a general discussion of private funds for the schools. The Eighty-second Congress, Public Law 411, which was enacted on June 25, 1952, provided that—

> The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make payments to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment and its facilities of persons afflicted with leprosy at a per diem rate determined from time to time by the Surgeon General.

In a supplemental appropriation bill enacted in June of last year the Congress appropriated $500,000, and in accordance with the provisions of that law about half of that was allotted to the Territory of Hawaii for the first quarter of the fiscal year and the other half will be exhausted in the second quarter of the fiscal year.

The committee has declined to grant the request of the Public Health Service to provide $586,000 for the balance of the year. I would like the gentleman to explain why the committee has refused to grant that appropriation in spite of the provisions of the law.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be very happy to do so.

First, may I say that the reason we have an Appropriations Committee is to look over appropriation authorizations. If the Congress had intended legislative committees to make the appropriations it would not have established an Appropriations Committee. I know that the gentleman from Hawaii is very interested in this subject. He has talked to me about it at length, and I think he knows that I am very sympathetic to the problems of the Territory of Hawaii, for which he is the Delegate. I also am glad to state that he does an exceptionally fine job in representing the Territory of Hawaii.

Congress considered this item in the closing days of the 82d Congress, and it was the judgment of the Congress at that time that $500,000 be appropriated for the fiscal year 1953. We took the attitude that the Congress had spoken, and this request in reality was not a supplemental appropriation, but just a request for funds Congress had previously denied.

The Territory of Hawaii is in a different position than is the Federal hospital at Carville in Louisiana because the Carville hospital has been in operation for many, many years as a Federal institution. We thought when the $500,000 was appropriated that, at least, was $500,000 more than the Territory of Hawaii had ever had contributed to the upkeep of its hospital. We shall consider the whole matter again when the appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 is before our committee.

I say again that I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's position, but I am still cognizant of the responsibility that an appropriations committee has, and sometimes we have to do things which hurt us, even if it is against the wishes of our very best friends.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to take up a few of the other Labor, Federal Security items before us.

The first item in the report is $206,000 for salaries and expenses that the Department of Labor requested under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which was passed in the closing days of the 82d Congress. I am sure that they can get by on less than $206,000, but let us assume they actually needed $206,000 for this extra work. $206,000 is approximately 4 percent of the nearly $5 million that has already been appropriated for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Employment Security. The committee took the attitude that the Department of Labor was well able to absorb an additional 4 percent workload. I might say that if some of these agencies of government do not think they can absorb 4 percent, they had better start changing their thinking because a lot of these agencies will have to take cuts far in excess of 4 percent. So, we did not think it was asking too much of the Department of Labor to do this work with available funds.

The next item is grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, which was also due to the same act. The request was for $8,750,000 and the committee, in its judgment, allowed them $3,750,000. We think that will take care of the program in very good shape because this new program is so closely integrated with the program they are already administering under other laws.

Under grants for unemployment compensation for veterans the original estimate was for $32,200,000 but they agreed that they could get along with four or five million dollars less than they had asked in their original request.

The bill includes $150,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Every Member of the House knows there has been quite a bit of discussion in both labor and business circles in this country regarding the revision in the Consumer's Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They started publishing the revised index as of January of this year. Due to the fact that many wage contracts are tied to the old Consumer's Price Index, we agreed with the executive branch of the Government that if we cut off the old index and published only the revised index, a great deal of difficulty could arise that might lead to some very serious strikes in this country. Rather than take this chance we approved $150,000 to continue the old index for 6 months. One hundred thousand dollars of the $150,000 will be transferred from the Wage Stabilization Board, and the remaining $50,000 from funds previously appropriated for the Mexican farm-labor program.

The next item is salaries and expenses for the Office of Education. I am frank to admit that this item has given me a great deal of concern and there is a very honest difference of opinion on what should be done on this particular item. I sincerely respect those views that do not coincide with my own. Our committee believes that the Office of Education has gone far beyond what was intended under the law. Even if we are wrong in our position in eliminating this item I would like to report to the House that the original justification allowed by the Bureau of the Budget was $380,000. Then they felt that they could get along with $289,000 for 55 positions. When they came before our committee, they thought they could get along with $259,000. After I spent all last Friday afternoon at the Office of Education they agreed that they could get along with $228,000 to carry out the functions they believe to belong in the Office of Education under the law. However, I am of the opinion that the Office of Education has assumed responsibilities far beyond the intent of the law.

The real controversy appears to be on the next item, which is $24 million for payments to school districts under Public Law 874. Last year the request for 1953 was $40 million. That amount was allowed and is available in payments to schools. The school districts that participate in this program were advised of the situation by a letter, a copy of which you will find on page 289 of the hearings. This letter was from the Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, to all of the school districts throughout the United States that had entitlements under this act. The nub of the letter is contained in one sentence down toward the latter part of the page, where he said to the school districts:

> There is no indication at this time that a supplemental request for funds for fiscal year 1953 for payments under Public Law 874 will be entertained by the Bureau of the Budget or considered by the Congress.

I think that is pretty plain language. The school districts were put on notice not to expect any additional funds. In other words they were given notice so that they could plan accordingly.

What is the situation as compared with World War II? During World War II we spent $67,738,168 over a 9-year period under the Lanham Act. At no time did they have as many as 500 school districts in this program during the war.

At the present time they have expanded this program under the police action of Korea to where 2,300 school districts are participating in this program. To give you an idea how this thing has expanded and gotten out of hand, at the peak year 1944–45 under the Lanham Act only $13,812,000 was spent for maintenance and operations of schools.

Some people have accused me of being against education. I want it understood that I yield to no man in this House in wanting to see the children of our country adequately housed in school buildings and properly educated. But what is the situation? I want you gentlemen that represent city districts to know that 15 of the largest cities of our country, representing a population of 22,520,978, cannot receive one single penny of this appropriation.

These fifteen cities represent only a small percentage of all the cities that have had a tremendous impact on their communities due to the defense program but receive no Federal funds under this appropriation. If that is not discrimination, I do not know what is.

The cities referred to are as follows:

Population, according to the U. S. Census Bureau, April 1, 1950

Baltimore	949,708
Boston	801,444
Chicago	3,620,962
Cincinnati	503,998
Cleveland	714,808
Detroit	1,849,568
Houston	596,163
Memphis	396,000
Minneapolis	521,718
New Orleans	570,445
New York City	9,891,957
Philadelphia	2,071,605
Portland	373,628
St. Louis	856,796
Washington, D. C.	802,178
Total	22,520,978

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] made a very fine statement regarding the situation in Arlington. I only used Arlington in the hearings to illustrate a point, because it was close to Washington and every Member of Congress is familiar with the fact that it is an outstanding community. In addition Arlington claims to have one of the best school systems and the highest income per family in the United States.

The assessed valuation of the property in Arlington County in July 1949 was $143,185,052. In June 1952 it was $272,097,571. There are such districts as Savannah, Paducah, and others that are 100 percent federally impacted districts, which should be taken care of, and I would support legislation to do so.

If Arlington County should receive 100 percent of its calculated entitlements, it would only amount to a little over $2 per person, and I sincerely believe that the people of Arlington County are patriotic enough to sacrifice this small amount in order to stand on their own feet and not look to the Federal Government for assistance. There are many other areas in the United States participating in this program which are in a similar situation.

The Members of Congress clamoring for this additional appropriation of $24 million remind me of the situation that is familiar to each and every one of us. We receive hundreds of letters in the course of a year from our constituents crying to the high heavens to reduce the budget and to cut appropriations on everything and everybody, except when it affects them personally.

If we are going to be consistent and fulfill our campaign promises of balancing the budget and voting for economy, the membership of this House will join with the committee in its stand to disallow this $24 million supplemental request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and also to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, after much thought and consideration, I have drafted and have introduced today a standby control bill, which in my opinion is an absolute necessity. In the light of the present tense international situation, we cannot afford to gamble with the economic security and well-being of this Nation. In the event of a worsening of the international situation or in the event of a sharp price rise, the President should be authorized to act speedily and definitely to halt the ravages of any further inflation.

The purpose of the bill which I introduced is to provide the President with adequate powers to meet any threat to the economic stability or security of the Nation, whether arising out of any new or expanded acts of aggression or otherwise.

It authorizes the President, upon a finding and declaration of the existence of a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States, to issue a general freeze order applicable to prices, rents, and earnings, which shall be effective for a period of 90 days. Where some system of partial controls is already effective, as may be the case with State or Federal rent controls, the general freeze would prevent upward adjustments otherwise authorized for a period of 90 days. It has been the experience of this country, in World War I, World War II, and since the 1950 aggression of the North Koreans, that the greatest price inflation swiftly follows any new crisis or emergency. It has been during these periods, however, that the Nation has been most unprepared to meet the menace of inflation.

Under normal circumstances the free market and collective bargaining is the fairest and most efficient way of determining prices and wages. When crises suddenly develop, direct price and wage controls can perform a holding operation which neither the market nor other types of controls can meet.

The bill would make it possible to invoke such direct controls in the simplest and most direct form. The President need not consult with Congress or with any advisory body as a condition precedent to the issuance of a general freeze order. He need only find and declare that a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States is threatened or exists. This places the responsibility for the initiation of such controls with our Chief Executive, the same person to whom the Constitution entrusts the conduct of foreign affairs, to wit: the President of the United States.

By this bill, however, Congress does not abandon its responsibility to legislate for the common defense and the general welfare. Within the 90-day period in which the general freeze shall be effective, Congress may do 1 of 4 things: First, it may continue the general freeze and establish a date for its termination; second, it may terminate such freeze forthwith; third, it may, after due consideration, enact further legislation; or, fourth, it may decide that such controls should be abandoned after the termination of the general freeze and therefore decline to enact any further legislation.

The enactment of this bill would assure that Congress would consider any subsequent stabilization legislation calmly and deliberately. The 90-day freeze would provide a setting in which sellers could not complain of discrimination, since their ceilings under the freeze would mirror the market sometime during the 1-month base period which the President may employ in the freeze. It is for this reason that the present bill contains no special provision for any group in the economy which would operate to upset price, rent, or wage relationships established by the freeze order. More significantly, Congress would be able to consider further legislation without the pressures which arise when costs and prices are rapidly increasing. It avoids the necessity of considering the difficult problems of rollbacks.

Several provisions have been omitted from the present bill which one might expect to find in more comprehensive legislation. However, appropriate provision is made for the delegation of Presidential authority to agencies he may continue or create, except that he cannot delegate the responsibility of finding and declaring a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States which requires the use of the general freeze order authorized by this bill.

In order that the general freeze order may be effectively enforced, the bill contains the same sanctions that appear in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The bill also contains necessary provisions for the administration of the act, it authorizes the making of appropriations and continues the Joint Committee on Defense Production in its present form. The authority contained in the bill would terminate automatically 90 days after the issuance of the general freeze order. It does not permit the President to perpetuate controls by successive 90-day freeze orders.

Under the bill the tragic upswing in prices occurring during the 8 months following the outbreak of the Korean conflict could not recur providing the President employs the powers which this bill grants. Within a few hours of the Presidential declaration of a threat to our economic stability or security, a complete freeze of the economy could be placed into effect.

Instead of waiting for congressional action subsequent to an emergency, the bill lays the groundwork for the protection of our economic system well in advance of war-born emergencies which may threaten it. Once the forces of runaway inflation are in motion, it is much too late to then seek from Congress the necessary Executive power to stem those forces.

The Communist attack came on June 25, 1950. It took Congress until September 8 to enact a price-wage bill. This law was cumbersome and needlessly complicated. It required the President to try voluntary controls before he would resort to genuine price control. As a result it was February 1951 before the upward spiral of prices had been brought to a temporary halt. By that time, wholesale prices had gone up 16 percent and the consumer's price index had risen 8 percent. Thus, in the short space of 8 months, the consumers of this country suffered a loss of $16 billion—all because there was no standby authority to impose a price-wage freeze.

The delay had an even more serious result; not only did prices soar during the post-Korea panic-buying wave—they advanced unevenly, so that when the general price freeze was imposed, some prices had doubled while others had only risen slightly. This got us into the complicated problem of price rollbacks, and led us, eventually, to the Capehart amendment.

A third harmful result of the price rise, of course, was the immense increase in our defense budget by price rises of defense items. The Defense Department was required to pay from 50 to 150 percent more for many of the standard items it bought. One item went up 610 percent. Our defense appropriations were in fact dissipated by excessive costs and prices because of the failure to freeze them in June or July of 1950.

These facts should not have been forgotten so soon. The international situation is still so precarious that we cannot afford to leave the President without authority to protect the consumers and taxpayers of this country against another crisis that would send prices soaring.

It is most apropos that I direct the attention of the Congress to the findings of the American Assembly, held at Columbia University on December 5 to 7, 1952. The purpose of the assembly was a reappraisal of inflation. Part of the records of the assembly is an interesting letter from President Dwight D. Eisenhower to Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, chairman of the National Policy Board, which was read in his absence by Dean Philip Young, dean of the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University, and executive director of the American Assembly. I quote in part from that letter from President Eisenhower:

> You will recall my saying at the time of its establishment that the American Assembly was perhaps the most important step I had taken during my presidency of Columbia University. My experiences at SHAPE, and more recently in the United States, have convinced me that the work of the American Assembly is needed more than ever.
>
> The American Assembly must continue to furnish our citizens and our Government with objective facts, findings, and practical courses of action in dealing with vital United States problems. I am sure that, with the support and enthusiasm of public-spirited individuals and organizations, its growth will continue.
>
> You will recall the discussions that you, Dean Young, and I have had on Morningside Heights and at SHAPE. With the other members of the National Policy Board, we have always felt that the assembly was based on two principles:
>
> (1) That free citizens can make up their own minds on public questions if they have access to sound, unbiased facts; and
>
> (2) That the practice of democracy demands individual sacrifice, particularly in reconciling divergent views in order to accomplish a common purpose.

I am sure neither President Eisenhower nor this Congress should consider for even one moment, ignoring the most important finding of that assembly. I quote to you from the summary report of those findings the following:

> DIRECT CONTROLS
>
> On the question of direct controls, it was agreed that price and wage ceilings should be removed but that stand-by authority to impose controls should be provided.

This bill accomplishes that recommendation and nothing more. It should be enacted promptly.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an event of political importance which occurred in Philadelphia this week.

The Democratic City Committee on Monday elected as its new chairman our esteemed colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Representative of the Fifth Pennsylvania District.

Mr. GREEN was chosen city chairman by unanimous action of the committee members.

This was a well-merited tribute by the rank and file of the Democratic Party to one who has labored long and earnestly in its behalf and for the humanitarian principles for which the party stands.

Alone among the great cities of our Nation, Philadelphia last November stood rock-ribbed in its adherence to the Democratic Party, returning a majority of 150,000 for the entire ticket.

In 1951 Philadelphia for the first time in 67 years elected a Democratic mayor, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., and a Democratic district attorney, Richardson Dilworth.

Congressman GREEN's election as city chairman is a happy choice. His warm personality and friendly spirit, of which you all know, should harmonize all elements of the party and assure its success in future elections.

In honoring one of our Members with this position of distinction, the Democratic Party of Philadelphia has honored the United States House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE
>
> Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture," $58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent expenses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952," is hereby made available until June 30, 1954.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "Furniture: For an additional amount for 'Furniture', $58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is not a major item. Fifty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars cannot be called a lot of money to a Congress which has become accustomed to dealing in billions.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a touchy item. This could become the hottest potato in this session of Congress. It could even be called a matter of principle, because we are speaking of balancing the budget and we are talking about reducing taxes. We have proposed in this bill to cut school funds, and we have refused to appropriate additional money for defense, even though we know that men in the service must be paid and clothed and fed, and even though we know that a contract entered into by the Government for the delivery of weapons and other matériel of war must be honored by payment upon delivery. But, despite those things, Mr. Chairman, we propose to vote for the Congress new chairs, which already are referred to by press and radio commentators as "fancy chairs" and "luxury seats." We propose also to vote for new carpets. We can get along very well with the chairs and carpets we now have and in truth most of us have not requested and do not want new furniture.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in limiting funds that are actually needed for the proper functioning of Congress. As a matter of fact, the Congress asks for very little for itself when you consider the importance of the job we are called upon to do. But I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that this is something that is not essential, and that at this time can be postponed until it is clearly shown to be essential.

I offer this amendment without any censure or criticism of the chairman and the members of the subcommittee which have recommended this item. They are men of the highest type and I know they were acting in good faith.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This is the housekeeping part of this bill. The Clerk of the House appeared before the subcommittee and told us—and he has a responsibility—that he needed these funds to properly supply Members of this House with this furniture. I do not want to belabor this committee longer on this item. I wish we could vote on it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much money was required to modernize the House Chamber and the Chamber of the other body. It seemed to me that the chairs we had before the renovation were very comfortable; in any event, it was determined to change the whole works. No question was raised regarding that and I am sure the cost ran into the millions.

This country wants Congressmen with backbone. My medical friends both inside and outside the AMA tell me that

the best way to acquire a backbone if you do not have one or to retain it if you do is to stand up straight whenever you are sitting down. There is no sense in using the fine, comfortable 1953 model chairs we have in the House Chamber a few hours daily if we must go back to offices equipped with 1853 horsehair torture chairs.

I think the country will receive a net gain in service with these good chairs instead of those a few dollars cheaper. Far more expensive legislation will be passed by back-weary Congressmen who cannot stand up to pressure groups because they can scarcely stand up at all than by the fine specimen of upstanding Congressmen whose backs are modeled of orthopedic virtue.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think this amendment would have been offered if some newspaper had not written about it?

Mr. BENDER. I do not think so. You hit the nail on the head.

While we are discussing corrective measures for the Capitol and House Office Buildings, I wish someone would offer an amendment to spend $50,000 or whatever amount is required to get the cockroaches out of this building and the New and Old House Office Buildings. These pests become so numerous at times that we should take drastic steps to exterminate them. And while we are doing a clean-up job let us not overlook the restaurant downstairs.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he feels that he needs one of these new chairs; is that right?

Mr. BENDER. I am satisfied with my chair.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. There was one of the constituents of a certain Congressman who came up and looked over his office and the things up here, and he said: "Well, it's better than you're used to."

Mr. BENDER. It is possible that we have one or two Members answering that description.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I say to the gentleman who just sat down that we are not used to cockroaches where I come from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think anyone in this House or in America can accuse me of wasting the taxpayers' money, but I do want to point out that my very good friend, our very fine colleague and great Representative from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has already secured the new chairs for his subcommittee. He got them last year and made no objection at that time, as far as I know. Did you?

Mr. SIKES. The Subcommittee on Army Appropriations of which I was chairman did not have new chairs, and made no request for them.

Mr. BENDER. He has the right to reject them.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. In all seriousness, I think any Member is entitled to any kind of a chair he wants within the bounds of reason. However, there are some of us who prefer those old chairs, and we do not want these new ones to be inflicted upon us. I wonder if it would not be wise for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to modify his amendment, cutting it in half, so that those of us who want the old ones may have them and those who want the new ones may also have them?

Mr. BENDER. As far as I am concerned, if you want to sit on the floor that is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I heard it suggested by someone on a streetcar today that we ought to have beds over here instead of chairs. I do not approve of that suggestion, but I just pass it on to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. If there is any Member of Congress who requires a bed instead of a chair, then his constituents should retire him, but I resent any implication on the part of anyone that we do not work here.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Is there any truth in the report I hear that those boys who want these high back chairs all have weak backs?

Mr. BENDER. Maybe the gentleman has something there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 42, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are talking about appropriations and taxes and a desire to balance the budget, I want to call to the attention of the House a resolution that I introduced today on a more or less kindred subject. As a matter of fact, I think that all Members of the House realize that if we are going to balance the budget this year help in that direction must come through savings in our defense program at home, wherever we can save, and in our defense program abroad.

Now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, in fact, the whole legislative body, has been interested in this question of an integrated armed force in Europe. Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State under the present administration, has said recently in a speech that nothing that the United States can do can offer Europe a sound defense if Europe is divided and continues to be divided into many national camps pulling against each other. I want to call to the attention of the House that since the inception of our foreign-aid program in 1948 this program has been, in fact, a bipartisan program. In 1948 when the Marshall plan was first inaugurated the Republican Party was in control of the Congress, and we had a democratic President, and we went along hand in hand, both Democrats and Republicans, in the realization that if we were to save this world from communism we had to stand together in helping to build up Europe economically. In that first act, and since that first act, there has been a chain of legislative expression in every act for foreign aid which I wish to emphasize today. In the Marshall Plan Act, the act of 1948, we said that this act is "to encourage economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace." In the ECA Act of 1949 we said it was "to encourage unification of Europe." In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950 we asserted that it was "to encourage the further unification of Europe." In the Mutual Security Act of 1951 we asserted our proposal "to further encourage the enconomic unification and political federation of Europe." And last year, in the 1952 Mutual Security Act, we spelled out the admonition that "this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for poltical federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe."

My resolution, Mr. Chairman, reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in a spirit of friendly cooperation it is the sense of the Congress that progress during the past 5 years should soon culminate in the establishment of a strong, unified armed force for the common defense of the free nations of Europe. The Congress reaffirms its previous bipartisan declarations concerning the need for military integration and economic unification in Europe, and supports efforts to speed the attainment of these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, it will not be long, I imagine, before this administration will come up here with a foreign military-aid program.

I am one of those who have supported this program from its inception but I am one of those who realize that unless there is unification in Europe, military integration of the armed forces in Europe, which the present administration is trying to accomplish and which the preceding administration tried to accomplish, the money we send over there will be sent in vain. This is no effort to dictate to Europe, this is just a recapitulation and a reassertion of what has been the basis of our program from the legislative angle and what the Congress thinks it has a legitimate right to expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It also shows that both parties here are in support of as early a unification in Europe as is possible. It represents leadership on the part of the Democratic Party to reestablish the bipartisan support which is so necessary for the best interests of our country, which some individuals, not talking for the present administration but in prominent positions in the present administration, have unfortunately shattered to some extent. This shows that this policy represents the policy of both parties in the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. VORYS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Before yielding to the gentleman from Ohio, may I say that my purpose here is a reaffirmation of a bipartisan foreign policy, and to show that the minority here is behind the efforts now being made to bring about military integration in Europe.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. While I have had no opportunity to read the gentleman's resolution, just from what I have heard I would like to say a loud "amen," and commend the gentleman for his reaffirmation of a policy that has had continued bipartisan support. I do not know what action will be or should be taken on this resolution, but its mere introduction will help to give a timely, temperate, and solemn reminder to our European friends, It is your move.

The gentleman well knows that during the past 5 years the House of Representatives and its Committee on Foreign Affairs have been ahead of the State Department in our continued and insistent encouragement of European unity, and my friend from South Carolina has been in the forefront in those efforts. Each year, beginning in the Republican 80th Congress, our committee wanted stronger words than the State Department wanted in there, but the State Department was timid about attempting to urge too strongly, and each time until last year we had problems in conference with the other body on such language. However, last year, as the gentleman reminds us, Congress laid it on the line; we said we wanted concrete steps toward European federation, and soon.

When Secretary Dulles went over there, and was accused of giving them a 75-day ultimatum, all he was doing was reminding them of the facts of life here in the United States and in Congress, which the gentleman from South Carolina has summed up, as far as I have been able to follow him, in a very good way. All the gentleman is doing, all Secretary Dulles is doing, all the House has done repeatedly and increasingly for 5 years, is to remind Europe of what wise European leading statesmen are saying: that a divided Europe cannot make the grade in peace or war, and that time is of the essence of their salvation.

I congratulate the gentleman on doing his part in reaffirming this policy, laid down by our President and the Secretary of State, based on repeated bipartisan declarations by Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. Much of the language I have quoted here, was included in the legislation mentioned upon the very strong insistence of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the ranking minority member of our Foreign Affairs Committee and the former chairman of that committee for his bipartisan action in introducing this resolution.

A resolution calling for bipartisan action in matters of foreign policy and especially such a resolution coming from the minority side of this House shows very clearly that we stand united in mutual defense efforts for ourselves and our free democratic allies throughout the world.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] in his usual fine spirit of understanding and cooperation is again through the introduction of his resolution calling for the continuation of united action on the international front. He is also pledging minority support for free world strength and mutual cooperation.

The minority leader of our committee is again visibly and forcibly expressing the conviction of a vast majority of the members on our side of the aisle that our country as the leader of the free world must stand united in our dealings with all our allies in the present threat to our security.

Surely every Member of this House must be thoroughly convinced that division among us must end at the water edge. We Democrats now in the minority still feel and act as we did in the majority in international issues. We urge our own united action in cooperation with the united action of our allies. The adoption of this concurrent resolution will not be welcome news to our enemies. However, further constructive action must of necessity await positive steps from the new administration.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think this show of bipartisan support is the most hopeful sign that we can give to Europe. As the ranking Member has said, we are not dictating but we are expressing the firm hope as we have before that this will come about. Certainly the operation of the Schuman plan, which began 2 or 3 weeks ago, is already proving that things like this can be done. I think it will strike fear into the hearts of our enemy and bring hope to the hearts of free men throughout the world. It shows that we are sincerely trying through good will and through help as far as we can to show that this country is not divided in its efforts to build up a strong, free Western Europe. I certainly commend the gentleman for his resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, for introducing his bipartisan resolution.

Such a resolution is in keeping with our bipartisan foreign policy which has been so forcibly advanced since the end of World War II. We on the minority side of the aisle who furnished leadership for nonpartisan free world coordination while we were in the majority, now continue our support for the same kind of bipartisan action.

It is heartening to see the leadership on our side of the aisle, still urging and pledging bipartisan support to the efforts to unite and strengthen the free world. We of the minority, stand ready and await the opportunity to support the efforts of the present administration to further unite and strengthen the free world in our mutual fight for survival. We sincerely trust that the new leadership will continue a definite constructive course and will make known precisely just what they have in mind. You are carrying the ball now. We want to help strengthen the line.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of announcing to the House that the Committee To Investigate the Justice Department will hold an open hearing at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning on the matter presented to the House this morning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. We will hear Mr. POWELL as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and also any other Member of the House who would like to be heard on that subject. The hearing will be in the room of the Judiciary Committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and will be open to the public. Further hearings will be held next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize as strongly as possible the importance of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. The very fact that it comes from the Democratic side and the very fact that the gentleman who introduced it is a ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shows that we are united in this effort. I might say that the resolution was introduced as a result of a number of conferences between the leadership on the Democratic side and the members on the Democratic side on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. We feel that the present administration can go forward with its best

foot if in connection with foreign affairs, there is a bipartisan condition existing not only in words but in action and in deed. This resolution, if it should be adopted by the House and the other body in concurrence, would convey to the entire world that both parties in Congress are in support of the administration in the attempt to bring about the military unification of Europe as quickly as possible and that we are doing it in a friendly spirit of cooperation. I am sure our Republican friends welcome this resolution coming from the Democratic Party because it will have world-wide significance, coming as it does from the minority party than if it came from the majority party.

I am not minimizing its significance if it came from the majority party. We want bipartisan thought and action in connection with foreign affairs. It is coming in this case by concrete action from the Democratic Party. There are other things that will bring about bipartisan policy. Other actions are going to be necessary. There must be a refraining from public misinformation as to foreign affairs conducted under the Democratic administrations. The unfortunate statement in the message on the state of the Union about lifting the Formosa blockade, and creating the impression, unintentionally I am sure, that the Truman order was protecting the Communists on the China mainland, cannot be repeated, because we are not going to take that. That is not conducive to bipartisan efforts. We on the Democratic side, but I frankly state, purely from a personal standpoint, do not intend to take that. You cannot expect to produce bipartisanship and insult the truths of history.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman brought out the point I wanted to bring out. I was wondering if the gentleman, interested as he is in promoting real true bipartisanship in our foreign policy, does not think that the administration should not echo these falsehoods which are hindering the success of such a program.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that. I am sure their utterance does not represent the views of a majority of the Republicans, but this is a time when we should all be patient and tolerant, because to do so is in the interest of America, which is greater than our affiliation with any political party.

This particular resolution is introduced for the purpose of repairing any damage that has been done, but there is a responsibility on the majority side. In fact, the leadership must come from the majority side. I hope the introduction of this resolution is evaluated in its full and complete light, because it is constructive, and has more effect coming from the minority than if it had come from the majority. Its significance abroad will be far reaching, because it shows unity of thought and unity of action by both parties in the Congress of the United States in relation to our foreign affairs.

My purpose is to convey the importance of this resolution coming from the Democratic side, and the importance of the message it will convey to the entire world, if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, apropos of what has been said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], if what we have had in the last 4 years under Dean Acheson was a bipartisan foreign policy, then the Lord deliver us fro many further bipartisan foreign policy.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to address an inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. It now becomes evident we cannot conclude this bill tonight. I was wondering if the gentleman from New York had in mind to let the remainder of the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. I had hoped to move that the Committee rise when we came to the Federal Security Agency, but the way it has been drifting the last few minutes, perhaps we ought to rise when we get through with this chapter. I think that will not take too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 9 on page 3.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING, FEBRUARY 19

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I suggest, and to include extraneous matter?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROPOSAL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RESTORE THE VETERANS' $5,000,000

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all of the service organizations are very much distressed at the cut of $5 million for the Veterans' Administration because without this money there will be no added care for the Korean veterans coming into hospitals, in the matter of contact work and for travel; and without travel funds it will be impossible to keep up with the services.

I wish very much the Committee on Appropriations would restore the $5 million which was cut from the Veterans' Administration request by the budget. I understand that according to the law the Bureau of the Budget cannot recommend a supplemental appropriation unless they think there is an emergency. Most of us feel there is an emergency in the hospitalization of the Korean veterans and in other VA funds.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I insert two telegrams I have received from the AMVETS and a letter I have received from the American Legion.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars appeared before our Veterans' Committee on the 17th. Some 150 of them were distressed over the cuts in VA appropriations. Our Massachusetts State commander and our State representatives, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Sunday, Mr. Powers, Mr. Stampole, all of Massachusetts, came here to ask for more money for the Veterans' Administration on Monday, and today State Commander White, of the American Legion, and Mr. Timothy Buckley, of Massachusetts, service officer of the American Legion, are in Washington asking for more money for the Veterans' Administration. A number of the veterans are from my own congressional district. I shall support an amendment to restore the $5 million to the appropriation bill.

(The matter referred to follows:)

BOSTON, MASS., *February 17, 1953.*
Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

AMVETS disturbed about reduction in VA supplemental budget. Urge vigorous opposition to false economy at expense of veterans' reduction. Strikes at very heart of service. Will reduce contact service by one-third.

THOMAS F. KELLEY,
Commander, Department of Massachusetts, AMVETS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1953.*
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

As chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and as a Member of Congress always outspoken in support of deserving legislation benefiting America's veterans, AMVETS respectfully urge your support of an amendment to provide a $15 million additional appropriation for the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

RUFUS H. WILSON,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1953.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: House Report No. 46 on H. R. 3503, second supplemental appropriation bill of 1953, earmarks $5 million for medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, and $5 million for the nonmedical program, administration, and operations.

Moreover, the second $5 million is provided only for use in connection with vocational rehabilitation and education and the loan-guaranty programs, "no part of which is allowed for expenses of travel."

If we understand this report correctly no part of the supplemental $10 million will be available for such essential services to veterans as claims, insurance, and contact. If this is correct we would point out that such programs will be considerably restricted for the balance of this fiscal year, and the contact service will be drastically curtailed.

You will recall the hearings and debates last year over the sufficiency of funds for contact service. As we interpret the supplemental appropriation bill and the accompanying report, contact is again in jeopardy, and the American Legion strongly urges any amendment that will supply the necessary funds to continue this program not only for the balance of this year but for fiscal year 1954.

Thanking you for any assistance you can extend in the matter, and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 147) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in order to enable the majority whip and the minority whip each to employ an administrative assistant at a rate of basic compensation not to exceed $8,000 per annum, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of such administrative assistants.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for the consideration of the House a bill to amend the Federal Power Act. It is designed to make certain that the benefits of cheap hydroelectric power to be produced by the proposed power project on the St. Lawrence River would accrue to the public agencies, municipal bodies, rural cooperatives, and consumers both in the State of New York and those other States which are within economic transmission distance.

The bill provides that the Federal Power Commission in granting a license for the construction, operation, or maintenance of a power project on the St. Lawrence River shall stipulate in the license the requirement that the licensee will grant preference in the sale of power to municipalities and other public agencies, rural cooperatives and consumers.

The reasons for my introduction of this bill are amply set out in my statement to the Federal Power Commission on January 30, 1953, printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A442.

A companion bill is being introduced today in the Senate by my distinguished friend and colleague, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN. We are both in complete agreement that this amendment is necessary since the presently constituted New York Power Authority, which has applied for a license for the St. Lawrence project, has expressed resistance to any plan making preference sales to rural consumers, municipalities, rural cooperatives, and other groups which are entitled to preference under the public power policy which the New York Power Authority in past years did so much to develop.

The New York Power Authority prefers to permit the private utility companies to exploit one of our great natural resources by making sales directly at the bus bar. If this cheap power is sold only to the existing private power companies, the ultimate cost to the consumer will certainly not reflect the savings normally derived from public projects.

This bill is necessitated by the growing assumption that the Federal Power Commission will grant a license to the New York Power Authority for the operation of the St. Lawrence power project. There is some doubt, I am told, that the FPC, under present law, has the legal authority to insert all the necessary safeguards of the public interest. Thus, there would be no assurance that the public would benefit from cheap St. Lawrence power. I propose to grant the FPC all the legal authority it needs, if in fact it needs any, to insist on the necessary safeguards. This bill would remove all doubt. It would instruct the FPC to insert the safeguards into the license.

INTRODUCTION OF ST. LAWRENCE RESOLUTION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the public interest and in the interest of national security and continental defense.

This joint resolution is virtually identical with the one being introduced this afternoon in the Senate by my colleague from New York, the distinguished Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN for himself and on behalf of Senators DOUGLAS, GREEN, HILL, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, and PASTORE.

There is but one difference between my proposal and the one being introduced in the Senate; namely, that whereas section 10 (a) of the joint resolution in the Senate permits the newly created St. Lawrence Development Corporation to sell its obligations bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 percent per annum, I have proposed that the obligations bear interest at a rate not exceeding the then current interest rate for Treasury obligations of similar duration.

The reason for my difference with my friends in the Senate is that I firmly believe that we should not dissipate one of the advantages to be derived by the development of the St. Lawrence by Federal corporate authority through the payment of interest rates on bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government at a rate in excess of that which the Federal Government itself pays. To do so would, in my opinion, result in higher costs to the consumers of power generated from the St. Lawrence development and in higher tolls to the users of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

In all other respects this joint resolution is the same as that introduced in the Senate and since Senator LEHMAN will, on the floor of the Senate, thoroughly explain its other provisions as well as the reason behind its introduction, I feel there is no need for me to go into any further detail.

I recommend this joint resolution for the serious consideration of both Houses. I hope that both Houses will see fit to give it their prompt attention, and although I would prefer the version which I have introduced, I hope that the Congress no longer neglects this important legislation and permits United States participation in the construction of a seaway—which will otherwise be built by Canada without our participation and without our right to administer the project—and will also permit the construction of the power project under the terms of this joint resolution—which otherwise will probably be built by the New York Power Authority under terms which will fail to safeguard the interests of public agencies, farm cooperatives, and consumers in the great State of New York and in the adjacent States.

NAVY'S LAG IN REFERENCE TO CERTAIN NEWS ARTICLES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a classical battle maneuver of the Navy at sea is known as crossing the "t." This is a tactical operation by which a fleet seeks a juncture perpendicular to the line of the enemy's fleet, in order to bring its maximum firepower to bear, while restricting the enemy to minimum firepower at the same time. A report in this morning's Washington Post reveals that the Navy on land has its maneuvers, too. The Bureau of Ships is interested not only in avoiding crossed "t"s; it wants also to prevent dotted "i"s, defensive tactics undertaken to hinder publication of the story of the Rickover case, a story which the Navy apparently is trying to hush. The Post carries a report of zigzagging as determined and as complete as a ship seeking to escape an enemy bomber, as the Bureau sought to avoid clearing a story on Captain Rickover voluntarily submitted by Time magazine. It also refused to grant clearance to Michael Amrine, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, to interview Captain Rickover.

A few days ago in a speech in the House I pointed out that Captain Rickover is the man generally acknowledged by all authorities as being the one principally responsible for the success of the atomic submarine project now under way. He was passed over by two naval selection boards for promotion to admiral, and will be compelled to retire next June unless President Eisenhower or the Armed Services Committee of the other body refuses to confirm the selection board's recommendations. The Navy charged that Time magazine story on the Rickover case was biased, but it did not explain why it took 67 days for it to make this charge. Neither did it say why it pushed Amrine around for 15 days when he was trying to get a story about the atomic submarine and Rickover. Its censorship in the matter is so rigid that one wonders whether it has placed the Rickover case on its classified list and marked it confidential or secret.

The action of the naval selection boards should not be hushed up, Mr. Speaker. Their unusual action should be reviewed by the President and by the Armed Services Committee of the other body.

I was pleased to learn today that President Eisenhower has not yet expressed to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate his concurrence in the nominations for admiral forwarded to the Senate prior to January 20. Certainly, the President should examine the Rickover matter to determine whether he wants to reject the board's action and to convene a new board. I was pleased, too, to receive from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body, the assurance that the committee will go into the Rickover matter when it considers the question of confirmation.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching to my remarks the article appearing in the Washington Post on Wednesday, February 18, 1953, and the article by Michael Amrine entitled "Fifteen-Day Runaround for Atom Sub Story" which appeared in Editor and Publisher for February 7, 1953:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 18, 1953]

Navy Pressure To Slant and Delay Article on Atomic Submarine Charged by Time

Time magazine contended yesterday that the Navy held up for 67 days on security grounds an article it found embarrassing.

The story, involving Capt. Hyman George Rickover and his part in the development of the atomic submarine, actually was given a Defense Department security O. K. in 2 days, it was contended. The subsequent weeks of delay were due to an effort to change the magazine's slant on the story and meanwhile to plant counteracting friendly stories in other magazines, Time reporters feel.

The magazine intercepted 2 interoffice Navy memos and 1 from within the Atomic Energy Commission which, it thinks, indicate the use of security as a cover for what amounts to censorship of the press.

The story came to light yesterday, 10 days after Michael Amrine, correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance, made public his assertion that he had been given a 15-day runaround by the Navy on the same atomic submarine story. His account was printed in Editor and Publisher, the newspaper trade journal.

The central character in both accounts is Captain Rickover, head of the Navy's atomic power project. One who knows him recently described him as a man who believes the shortest distance between 2 points is a straight line even if it bisects 6 admirals.

Rickover was twice passed over for promotion to an admiral and will, as a result, have to retire from the Navy in June. Time's story, as yet unpublished, said that "the atomic submarine program has been going to hell in a hand basket. Where morale was once topnotch, where work was once carried on at a frenetic pace, the office of Rickover's special Washington task force is now beset with trials and tribulations."

Those comments came back from the AEC circled in red and marked "Delete—not true."

In general, Time's piece was highly critical of the Navy and the promotion system and questioned whether the system should not be abandoned.

The story was submitted last December 9 to Rear Adm. Lewis Parks, Chief of Navy Information. It finally came back February 14.

Parks, who was promoted to admiral by the same board which passed over Rickover, sent the story to the Bureau of Ships and the Atomic Energy Commission despite the already received security clearance, Time says. Parks later told Time the story was "bottled up" at the AEC.

The Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Adm. Homer Wallin, had an aide draft material apparently to refute the article. The aide's report fell into Time's hands. It said that "this Time-Life article as a whole cannot be said to be false, since perhaps 90 percent of the raw factual data appear to be accurate and cannot probably be documented" but it added that the article was biased.

Under suggestion on what to do "to combat the effects of the article," Wallin's aide suggested either a spot promotion of Rickover or "a story placed in a magazine friendly to the Navy and highly competitive with Time, to appear before the Time article does. * * * This would have to be handled with extreme delicacy, preferably by the Chief of Information personally."

The memo added that "the only magazine that comes to mind that might fit the necessary criteria is the United States News and World Report. If the Chief of Information, the Chief of Naval Operations, the secretaries or someone on a comparable level have a dependable pipeline to Newsweek that magazine might also be a possibility."

This memo was directed to Admiral Wallin's assistant, Rear Adm. Wilson D. Leggett.

Wallin wrote Admiral Parks a five-page letter dated December 22 in which he declared that "in general, subject article is a scurrilous and uninformed emotional appeal to sympathy for a supposed underdog. Although some of the raw factual data is accurate, a vast number of relevant facts are ignored; others are only partially explained or presented with a biased and false interpretation." The letter pointed out that Rickover has been assured that as a retired officer he could "see this project through if he so desires."

Wallin strongly urged that Time's publishers "be informed of the erroneous and misleading information" and that they be told the publication of the story "would not only mislead the general public and be unfair to the Navy but would be harmful to the nuclear power program and to Captain Rickover."

Over at AEC, the Time article was gone over word for word. Time turned up a memo from Shelby Thompson, chief of the Public Information Service, to Chairman Gordon Dean and the other Commissioners. It said "only four of the changes deal with prognostic [classified] information," but added "it is obvious that a conference with the writer will be required to accomplish a change in the approach of the article."

Conferences with the writer, Clay Blair, were held both at AEC and the Navy. The Time writer said his magazine would be glad to correct any factual errors, having submitted the story voluntarily.

In the AEC report, it is stated that:

"The writer's premise seems to be that if the Navy does not make Captain Rickover an admiral the AEC atomic submarine projects will collapse. This is false and represents gross distortion. The atomic submarine projects are too far along and have gathered too much momentum to be more than temporarily slowed down by any change in personnel, no matter how important that personnel may be. However, if Rickover is forced to resign from the Navy on retirement schedules, these things probably will happen: (a) morale of the AEC Naval Reactors Branch will be affected; (b) some of Rickover's staff will leave; and (c) there will be a time lag that usually occurs when there is a change in a key post."

Amrine, the NANA correspondent, related how he tried to follow up a tip to look into the atomic submarine project. He was told by Rickover's office the captain would see him if he had AEC and Navy public information clearance. He never got to see the captain.

Amrine said that in Wallin's presence he was told that anything he wrote as a result of the interview would have to be submitted for clearance. Later he said he was told by Comdr. L. Edgar Prina, one-time Washington newspaper man, there was no such binding rule.

Still later, however, Amrine was told that Rickover would not see him unless he submitted the interview, although Rickover originally had made no such request.

Amrine noted that former Navy Secretary Dan Kimball and AEC Chairman Dean both had highly praised Rickover as the key person in the atomic submarine program.

[From Editor & Publisher of February 7, 1953]

FIFTEEN-DAY RUNAROUND FOR ATOM SUB STORY

(By Michael Amrine)

These are notes made over a period of 2 weeks in the life of a Washington correspondent in the secrecy-and-public-relations age of 1953. For convenience, and to conform with the military character of the events described, the notes are entered according to the number of days elapsed. The story starts on a January day, when the undersigned began this patrol along the no-man's land now existing between the people's government and the people's representatives in the press.

FIRST DAY

Heard from a friend of mine in the Atomic Energy Commission that I "should look into the atomic submarine project, there are going to be some good stories coming out of there."

I had recently seen a 5-page spread, a lead article, in Collier's magazine, on the subject of the atomic submarine, and know that much of the interesting detail of this ship had been removed from the top-secret classification.

Telephoned the office of Capt. H. G. Rickover, the head of the Navy's atomic power project, and was told he would be glad to see me, but that I should first "clear" with both the Atomic Energy Commission and the United States Navy Offices of Public Information.

Called the AEC and was told to proceed. "It is just that we like to know you are on the premises."

Called the Navy Public Relations Department, and talked to a Lieutenant Cutter, who, apparently, called a Lee Hargis, a security officer. Then he told me things were all clear to proceed.

Called Captain Rickover's office, and was told that this Lieutenant Cutter must have given merely a security clearance. I had to have a public-relations clearance, too.

DAY PLUS 1

Talked to a Commander L. Edgar Prina this time, and explained there seemed to be some "public relations clearance" still missing; asked him if he could just go ahead and make me a date with Rickover. He said he would look into it and call me the next day.

DAY PLUS 2

Commander Prina did not call me. I was busy on some other work, and did not call him.

DAY PLUS 3

Prina telephoned, said that he was setting me up with the Navy sub people, but that first I must see Rear Admiral Homer N. Wallin, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, that he wanted to talk to me. Wallin's name I recognized as the author of the atomic sub article in Collier's, so that seemed a good way to begin. A week-end intervened in the smooth course of our eventual progress towards an atomic sub story, so the appointment was made for

DAY PLUS 8

I went to the Navy building, and met Admiral Wallin and three public relations men. Their names were Charles Elliott, Bob McCloud and R. G. Paine, Jr. An Admiral Sylvester was also present, but did not say anything during the hours he was with us.

Mr. Elliott set forth that I must understand that anything of any nature written in whole or part as a result of our interviews that afternoon must be submitted for "clearance"; and in the discussion that followed he volunteered that even if I took previously printed matter which they gave me, and paraphrased it, this would amount to new material and must be submitted.

I said I had never run into the latter restriction, and that in the ordinary course of newspaper work in Washington one did not expect such conditions. I explained that if the work were really quite secret I could understand their not talking at all; or if I were writing a major magazine article and visited a sub base where I might be expected inadvertently to pick up secret information, and meet some people, the better, perhaps, to understand the approaching congressional hearings on the subject of atomic power.

At one point I said that after all it was against the law and the regulations for any of them to tell me any secret information anyway—suppose we proceeded on that basis, and if it resulted only in stilted formal interviews, that was my lookout—but I did not wish to have the responsibility for keeping secrets shifted from them to me. At this point Admiral Sylvester crossed and uncrossed his legs, but he did not say anything.

One hour passed in this discussion of regulations, but Admiral Wallin and the three public relations men were quite adamant; they said they did not make this as a request, but as a mandatory condition of interviewing any Navy personnel about the atomic submarine.

I agreed to these conditions, for the purposes of this afternoon only, and was led to see a Commander Cross, in the Bureau of Ships. I left at 4:15, having yet to interview anyone who had worked on atomic power for the Navy, except in an administrative sense. Paine said he would call me the next day and give me a time for an appointment with Rickover.

DAY PLUS 9

Paine did not call. I had somewhat fresher fish to fry, and worked on other stories.

DAY PLUS 10

I decided not to go to the sub project on such terms, and called Andrew Berding, public relations man in the office of the Secretary of Defense.

He admitted this was quite an unusual ruling, about screening interviews and said he would look into it.

DAY PLUS 11

Commander Prina, whom I had run across on Day Plus 2, telephoned again, and said he had heard from Mr. Berding. He said he realized there had been quite a bit of delay, but he had talked to the Bureau of Ships and they stood fast on this regulation that all interviews were to be screened. I asked him to put this ruling in writing so that I could have a completely clear understanding of the terms under which I was to write on the subject of the atomic sub. He said he would have it in the mail to me that day, so that I would receive it on day plus 12.

DAY PLUS 12

The morning mail did not bring this letter, so I telephoned Mr. Paine, who back on Day Plus 9 was to have been working on an appointment with Rickover, and told him what I was waiting for.

He did not say what he was waiting for.

DAY PLUS 13

I called Commander Prina, and he said that he had gone thoroughly into the subject, and someone had made a mistake, there was no binding ruling requiring that interviews be submitted. He had gone over the matter thoroughly with Lee Hargis (see first day). It was only a request (although Bob McCloud had said it was not a request, but an airtight regulation). He said I was the first reporter who had ever balked on this request. I let that go by, being perfectly content to be the first.

Then he said he would call Captain Rickover and make me an appointment.

Later in the day he called back and said he had not called Rickover but that Charles Elliott, of Admiral Wallin's office, had called Rickover.

He said the captain, personally, would not agree to see me unless I submitted my interview. (On the first day I started this merry-go-round, Rickover had made no such request.) Prina added he was sorry to have to write such a sad end to what had been a fairly long story.

I assured him it was an interesting story just as it was, and said Gilbert and Sullivan would have loved it. He thought that was funny, and said he himself had once been a newspaperman.

I heard from the friend in the AEC who had originally given me the suggestion to "Look into the atomic sub." He assured me that from his knowledge of Rickover he was morally certain it was not that Rickover objected to being interviewed on terms of freedom; it must have been that Rickover objected to being interviewed on the Bureau of Ships' terms. But it seemed to me all this hocus-pocus had given me a story, anyway.

Talked to a high official of the AEC—and did not have to screen my interview.

Went over the transcript of the final press conference of Secretary of the Navy Dan A. Kimball, and found that he had been urging the promotion of Rickover to rear admiral, but that the Navy brass had twice passed him over for promotion, thus forcibly retiring the captain this June. In my files found that Kimball, like Gordon Dean, Chairman of the AEC, had said that "Captain Rickover, more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear-power ship program—Rickover has accomplished the most important piece of development work in the history of the Navy."

Reread Admiral Wallin's Collier's article, and saw that in five pages he did not mention the name of Rickover, just as Army Air Corps histories once did not mention the name of "Billy" Mitchell. Looked through three back copies of the house organ of the Bureau of Ships—they also had fine articles on the atomic sub, but they did not mention the unmentionable name of Rickover.

Decided this was a story in itself, and forthwith filed it for the North American Newspaper Alliance, and for my fellow students of freedom of the press in America, the readers of Editor & Publisher.

The above diary was written while undersigned was still of a sound mind, and on the eve of the day undersigned was to call Admiral Wallin and start over.

Copies are being sent to Admirals Sylvester and Wallin, Capt. H. G. Rickover, Lieutenant Commanders Prima and Cross, Lieutenant Cutter, Mr. Berding, Mr. Elliott, Mr. McCloud, Mr. Paine, Editor & Publisher, and to file. It is hoped that further distribution will be unnecessary.

TRADE WITH THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, much is being said about the smuggling of strategic goods behind the Iron Curtain. This is a matter of great concern, but more serious are the legal leaks of strategic trade which continue to help build up the Communist war machines in Korea, in China, in Russia, and in the entire Soviet bloc.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, it has been my privilege recently to make a special study of

East-West trade problems and the administration of the Battle Act, Public Law 213, Eighty-second Congress, which was set up to control this trade.

This is the second of a series of short talks which I hope to give concerning my findings in this study. Also, I will shortly submit a regular documented report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In brief, much has been accomplished, much more than is generally known as outlined in my report, but, nevertheless, a great deal still remains to be done.

First, I want to talk about one of these legal leaks which must be stopped up—that is, transit trade through the free ports of continental Europe which bolsters the Communist war machine in Korea and elsewhere. Under this system, shipments of strategic items can move constantly to the Iron Curtain countries as transit trade through the free ports of our allies on the continent of Europe without interference. In addition, they furnish necessary services, even to reloading such materials in other ships, barges or railroad cars to expedite shipments. This in spite of the fact that Russia and her satellites are supporting the Communist aggression in the Korean war which has been going on for over 2½ years, costing America over 22,000 lives and 129,000 total casualties, not to mention the billions of dollars spent by the United States to support the United Nations effort. This in spite of the fact that our allies are members of the United Nations which is fighting Communist aggression in Korea.

An indeterminable volume of strategic materials is moving to the East through a number of countries which are cooperating with the United States in controlling trade with the Soviet bloc because such shipments are in transit. Long-established arrangements, subject to a well-organized and documented procedure and sanctioned by international agreement—Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, Barcelona, April 20, 1921—have been developed for facilitating the shipment of goods through certain seaports and across national boundaries of countries other than that in which the goods originated and other than the country of final destination without such shipments coming under the control of the countries so transited. That is, every encouragement has been given in the past for a French firm to ship by rail across Germany or Switzerland, or both, to Czechoslovakia without any interruption to the shipment for customs purposes at the German or Czech borders. In the same way, encouragement has been given to shippers in South America to send a cargo to Rotterdam, have it unloaded there into barges, which would then go up the Rhine to Switzerland, without such shipment legally entering either the Netherlands or Germany. The economic advantages of such arrangements both to the buying and selling countries and to the countries which provide transit facilities are apparent.

In-transit shipments of copper from Chile have followed the free-port route to Czechoslovakia. Such shipments could include war materials from a Latin-American country like Guatemala, whose Government has been infiltrated by the Communists and legally pass through the hands of our allies to Russia. Nobody knows what such shipments include, because they are not even inspected at these free ports. Transit trade through free ports like Hamburg, Copenhagen, Antwerp, and Amsterdam also furnishes the easiest avenue to Russia for smugglers and users of fake documents from all parts of the world.

The Belgians and Dutch made proposals to correct this situation long ago. The United States has urged settlement from time to time, but the fact remains that no nation on the whole Continent of Europe at this time is stopping this flow of in-transit strategic trade from going behind the Iron Curtain.

In some instances I was told that this type of shipment would be stopped but a personal on-the-spot study revealed that this is impossible since there is no regular inspection system set up to accomplish this.

Our allies on the continent of Europe have not been willing to make the economic sacrifice which is necessary; they have not felt that Korea is their responsibility to the extent of stopping this trade—although high level officials from each country involved have studied this matter for a long time and still have it under consideration.

It is significant to note that representatives of each of these nations expressed to me a willingness to go along if their neighbors would do the same. This makes sense because it would do not good to shift the economic advantage to a neighbor and still have the strategic materials going to Russia. What does not make sense is the fact that so much time has elapsed without agreement and action.

The United States and all of these countries are members of an international coordinating committee which was established to control East-West trade. Vigorous, successful action in this organization to solve this problem is long overdue.

In this highly civilized area of the world where there are all kinds of barriers between nations, this liberal custom has developed to facilitate trade. Now, in the European cold war, a prelude to what could be the hottest war yet, these nations find themselves immobilized on this problem, to their common detriment, because of an old international agreement, tradition, rivalry, pride, and a combination of other factors.

This should not be a matter of United States legislation but if this leak is not plugged up it is my intention to offer legislation on it when the foreign aid bill comes before my committee. However, proper United States leadership in this international coordinating committee should bring about the desired and necessary results.

SHALL WE DISPOSE OF OUR SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS?

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and pleasure, through committee assignments, to participate in the formulation of all rubber legislation which has been enacted by the Congress since the end of World War II. The studies which I have made of this commodity, which is so essential in the daily life of every American, have proven most interesting and informative.

On August 9, 1949, I addressed the Congress on the subject of "Our Rubber Problem." At that time the Government-owned stockpile of natural rubber totaled approximately 370,000 tons, of which amount approximately 250,000 tons represented rubber which had been accumulated by Reconstruction Finance Corporation during its wartime operations. Our stockpiling activities at that time can best be described as a continuation of the ill-fated policy of "too little, too late." Despite the fact that 3 years had elapsed since the enactment of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act—Public Law 520, 79th Congress—very little progress had been made in accumulating the natural rubber required for national defense. I called the attention of the House to this situation, which caused me grave concern and alarm, and urged that immediate steps be taken to acquire the natural rubber needed for our stockpile as rapidly as it became available, until the ultimate objective had been attained. I foresaw even then the gradual deterioration of world conditions, and warned of the consequences of the clouds of communism already gathering on the horizon, which were later to erupt in Korea. Little attention was paid to the fears which I expressed, nor the recommendations which I made. Although I do not profess to the attributes of a crystal gazer, my closing words some 3½ years ago "it may already be later than we think" proved prophetic.

Due to our stockpiling failures, the General Services Administration in December 1950 assumed complete control of the purchase and import of natural rubber, and for the second time within slightly more than a decade the American rubber industry again became subject to complete Government controls. This condition existed for a period of approximately 18 months, during which time a definite stockpiling program was inaugurated, and carried to a successful conclusion. Although I cannot condone the inexcusable delays which occurred in the past, in all fairness I wish to commend the General Services Administration for the efficient manner in which the stockpiling program was conducted once a positive administrative procedure was adopted.

Not later than March 1, 1953, a report will be made to the Congress with respect to the development of a disposal program for our Government-owned rubber-producing facilities. And prior to April 15, 1953, the law requires the President, after consultation with the National Security Resources Board, to recommend to the Congress legislation with respect to the disposal of these facilities.

The Congress, and more particularly the Armed Services Committee of the House, has been vitally interested in the synthetic rubber program for several

years. As a matter of fact, I think it is fair to say that our rubber-producing program has been one of our most important subjects since 1947.

No doubt many of you are familiar with the synthetic rubber program. It goes way back to 1941 when the Government, under the urgent necessity of producing a substitute for natural rubber, expended over $700 million to construct the facilities which produced the rubber that made it possible for us to bring World War II to a successful conclusion.

In 1948, the Congress passed the Synthetic Rubber Act. Under that law the Government was granted the authority to exercise allocation, specification, and inventory controls over natural and synthetic rubber, and specification controls over products containing natural and synthetic rubber. We also provided that there would be maintained at all times in the United States, rubber producing facilities having a rated production capacity of not less than 600,000 long tons per annum of general purpose synthetic rubber, and not less than 65,000 long tons of special purpose synthetic rubber. Of the 65,000 tons rated capacity of special purpose rubber, at least 45,000 tons had to be of a type suitable for use in inner tubes. In addition, the law required the consumption of not less than 200,000 tons of GR–S and not less than 22,000 tons of special purpose rubber.

The act originally was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1950, but was extended in 1950 to June 30, 1952. However, world conditions did not justify the disposal of these facilities at that time, so we extended the law to March 31, 1954, and again required the reports on the dates I have previously mentioned.

The whole purpose of this law is to assure the Nation of an adequate supply of rubber. It has accomplished its purpose. And between now and the next few months, the Congress will have to decide whether or not we should dispose of these facilities.

This is not a mere question of selling something that is owned by the Government, it is a question of whether a tremendous business shall be placed in the hands of private enterprise, or whether the Government will continue to operate the industry.

There are 28 facilities involved in this program, including 13 copolymer plants, 2 butyl plants, 10 butadiene plants, 1 styrene plant, 1 chemical plant, and 1 development laboratory. To give you an idea of the size of the operation, I might tell you that in fiscal 1952 the Government sold 746,551 long tons of synthetic rubber which involved gross sales of $416,500,000. The net profit from these sales amounted to $16,100,000. I say this to indicate that we are not dealing with small business. We are dealing with a very large-scale operation. I might further say that while the Government has the authority to exercise practically complete control over the entire rubber industry, nevertheless during the past year it has seen fit to relax those controls to such an extent that today it can be stated that for all practical purposes the rubber industry from the importer to the manufacturer is operating free of Government control, except for some minor restrictions on the use of pale crepe rubber. I can further state that one of the major objectives of the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 has practically been achieved, that is, the establishment in this Nation of a stockpile of natural rubber sufficient to meet the heavy demands of a 5-year war. I am not at liberty to publicly state what our stockpile of natural rubber is, but I can assure you that if we had in this Nation the same amount of other items needed in our stockpile as we have of rubber, we would have no concern whatsoever over our strategic stockpile program.

The problem, therefore, is whether or not we should dispose of these facilities to private industry.

In that connection, I wish to call to your attention section 2 of the 1943 Rubber Act which states that the policy of the Congress is that the security interest of the United States can and will best be served by the development within the United States of a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry. In order to strengthen national security through a sound industry it is essential that Government ownership of production facilities, Government production of synthetic rubber, regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber, and patent pooling be ended and terminated whenever consistent with national security.

As I have indicated, the mandatory use of synthetic rubber is, for all practical purposes, a thing of the past. And in addition, patent pooling was eliminated some time ago. The remaining question, therefore, is whether our national security would be strengthened by disposing of these facililties to private industry.

The conference report, filed in connection with the law which extended the termination date of the Rubber Act from June 30, 1952 to March 31, 1954, stated that—

> Before the Congress enacts legislation authorizing the disposal of these facilities the conferees are of the opinion that the Congress must be satisfied that there is no longer any necessity for any Government controls with respect to the production and consumption of synthetic rubber.

The conferees further stated that—

> The disposal program should envision a clean-cut separation of Government from the rubber industry. Once the Government is out of the rubber business there should no longer be any required consumption or guaranteed market. Favorable action on the disposal of the plants must depend entirely upon existing world conditions. If world conditions and our national security indicate the desirability and advisability of selling the present Government-owned rubber facilities to private industry, then the Congress will undoubtedly look with favor upon the complete disposal by sale of the rubber-producing facilities. If, on the other hand, the world conditions indicate the necessity for continuing the authority to require the production and consumption of synthetic rubber, then undoubtedly the Congress must act with these considerations uppermost in mind.

The Congress must, therefore, determine:

(a) Whether private industry can do a better job in developing our synthetic rubber industry than the Government,

(b) Whether controls of any type are necessary, and

(c) Whether world conditions with respect to our total rubber supply justify the sale of these plants to private industry.

The first question involves our confidence in private enterprise. Obviously, anyone who has faith in American industry will have no hesitation in agreeing that private industry will promote greater progress in the development of better synthetic rubber. I am satisfied in my own mind that private industry will do a better job than Government even though I would be the first to claim that the Government has done an excellent job.

The next question is whether controls will be necessary. In that connection, I would like to state what I believe to be the reasonable estimates of what the natural rubber production of the world will be for the next 4 years, and what the consumption of natural rubber will be together with the total consumption of rubber—natural and synthetic—throughout the world.

Last year the United States consumed approximately 1,250,000 tons of rubber. Of that amount, approximately 800,000 tons was synthetic rubber. The remaining 450,000 tons was natural rubber. Thus, the United States consumed approximately 450,000 tons of natural rubber out of a total world production of 1,750,000 tons. For the next 4 years it is estimated that the world production of natural rubber will be 1,700,000 tons per year, but the United States consumption of rubber, synthetic and natural, will rise from 1,318,000 tons in 1953 to 1,356,000 tons in 1956. It would appear, therefore, that the demand for synthetic rubber will not only remain constant but in fact will increase for the foreseeable future. I am satisfied in my own mind that the demand for synthetic rubber, that is, the actual consumption of synthetic rubber will be more than triple the consumption now required by law. And I am more than satisfied that our capacity to produce synthetic rubber in the United States will not only be maintained by private industry in excess of that capacity now required by law, but actually will far exceed it. In other words, there is today no need for controls requiring the use of synthetic rubber, nor will there be for the foreseeable future. Likewise, the natural rubber supply should be sufficient to assure reasonable distribution among all consumers.

The remaining question, therefore, is whether world conditions justify the sale of these plants. In that connection, I will say that if we are to wait until there is peace throughout the world, then in my lifetime and perhaps in the lifetime of all those present today, there could be no disposal of our rubber-producing facilities. For it appears certain to me that unsettled world conditions, particularly in Malaya, Thailand, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia will be with

us for many years to come. In fact, I am of the opinion that the unsettled conditions in these natural rubber producing countries of the world are one of the strongest reasons why we should make every effort to develop a privately owned, successful synthetic rubber producing industry in this country. I do not think our natural rubber supply will be cut off this year, or the next. But I am satisfied that with our stockpile of natural rubber on hand and in warehouses in this country, together with the ability of private industry to develop even better synthetic rubber than that which is being produced today, we can more than meet our rubber requirements should a third world war be our fate. Perhaps our natural rubber supply may one day be in jeopardy—but it no longer gives us concern—because we have the stockpile necessary to meet the defense requirements of the Nation.

Now, while I obviously favor the present disposal of our synthetic rubber facilities to private industry, nevertheless I want to make it abundantly clear that I do not favor giving away these facilities. I do not believe in the philosophy of getting the Government out of business at any cost. These facilities are good facilities. All 28 of them are now in operation, wholly or partially, and, when some of them were in standby condition they were well maintained. They have a present value and I think that present value should be based upon a simple formula of replacement cost, less technological obsolescence and physical deterioration. As far as I am concerned, I reject completely any proposition which would seek to sell these plants on a formula of original cost, less depreciation. I would like to see these plants sold, but I want to see the Government get a rate commensurate with their present value. I see no reason why the plants cannot be put up for sale on a bid basis with the highest bidder earning the right to buy the plant if the bid price is reasonable and the award to the bidder would encourage competition and prevent monopoly. I think that every effort should be made to interest as many persons as possible in the purchase of these facilities. In other words, the so-called small manufacturer by combining together with other small manufacturers should be encouraged to go into the synthetic rubber business. And I see no reason why a company, large or small, should be prevented from manufacturing the component parts of synthetic rubber as well as copolymerizing the component parts into synthetic rubber. As far as I am concerned, the controlling formula for the sale of these plants must be what a willing buyer will pay a willing seller, subject always to a reasonable nonconversion provision, and a recapture clause in the event of war.

I do not know how much we can expect to receive in dollars from the sale of these plants. However, it should be a substantial sum of money, probably in excess of $350 million. In fairness to those who purchase the plants, I would suggest that the law contain a provision which would place in standby those plants not sold with a definite legal restriction that those not sold may not be operated for or on account of the Government, or by private industry, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. If we enact a disposal program, some of the plants may not be sold. I am thinking particularly of the alcohol-butadiene plants, and perhaps one or two of the less efficient copolymer plants. But they should not be allowed to operate in competition with private industry.

With the money we receive from the plants sold we can maintain the unsold plants in excellent standby condition at no cost to the Government.

If it is the will of the Congress that these plants be retained by the Government, then I think in all fairness to private industry we must decide to keep the Government in business from here on out.

In other words, I think the time has come for the Government to fish or cut bait; either sell these plants and get out of the business, lock, stock, and barrel, or announce to the world that we are going to continue in the synthetic rubber business until the plants become completely obsolete. If we do not do this, we will stifle private initiative in such a way as to seriously affect our national security because private industry will not invest their own capital in new plants if they have reason to believe that the Government may turn around and sell competitive plants at a very low cost shortly after private industry has expended huge sums on constructing new facilities. We have got to be fair with industry, the consumer, the Government, and the natural rubber producer, and in order to accomplish all of this, I think we have got to make up our minds one way or the other now just what we are going to do with these plants.

I do not know what disposal program will be presented by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the President, who are charged with formulating the disposal program, but I sincerely hope that the program they suggest will be simple, concise, and will bring the greatest number of dollars to the American people. The fact that we have attained security in rubber in this Nation through the existence of these plants is no justification for selling them at a price which does not represent their true value.

In a recent address before the Congress, the President stated in part:

> We are concerned with the encouragement of competitive enterprise and individual initiative because we know them to be our Nation's abiding sources of strength.

I completely concur in the principle enunciated by the President, which conforms with the statement of policy contained in the Rubber Act of 1948:

> The security interests of the United States can and will best be served by the development within the United States of a free, competitive synthetic-rubber industry.

I hope that the views expressed by the President are indicative of the position which will be taken by the administration in connection with the disposal of the synthetic-rubber industry to private enterprise.

However, if it is the decision of the Congress that the Government should continue to own and operate the synthetic-rubber industry, then I am convinced that the present operational procedure followed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be carefully examined. In this connection, the report which was submitted by the Committee on Armed Services on March 13, 1952, in connection with the extension of the Rubber Act of 1948, contained the following statement:

> The Government now enjoys a practical monopoly in synthetic rubber. But, in selling a product which in the near future may well become a major manufacturing field for private industry, there would appear to be no reason why the selling price determined by the Government should not reflect more closely the selling price that private enterprise would expect if private industry were operating the plants. The present selling price of synthetic rubber omits certain sales expenses since no advertising is involved and no sales persons are involved. No provision is made for income taxes. And the Government in determining the selling price of synthetic rubber had included interest on Government funds invested at a rate which probably is lower than that which would be obtained by private borrowers from private lenders. In other words, the return on the Government investment would appear to the committee to be well below that which private industry engaged in a relatively new industry would demand. For these reasons, it would appear to the committee that the price of synthetic rubber charged by the Government should more closely coincide with the price that private industry may normally be expected to charge at such time as private industry acquires the facilities.

In view of the foregoing, should the Government continue to own and operate the synthetic-rubber industry, the whole program must be reexamined, and at the very least, a new pricing policy should be established, embracing every element of cost which would occur under private operation. If the Government is to continue in the rubber business as a permanent function, there is no reason why the return on the Government's investment should not be comparable with the return which private companies expect to receive for the benefit of their stockholders.

I have taken this method of expressing my views on this very important subject because, for good or bad, I am the author of the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948. I wanted to explain, particularly to the new Members, the synthetic-rubber problem and at the same time state publicly to the many persons who have asked my opinion what I think should be done with these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, based upon the views expressed herein, it is my intention to introduce legislation during this session of the Congress, directing the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic-rubber industry to private enterprise.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, first I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for offering a resolution earlier in the afternoon urging a sincere

and true bipartisan approach to our foreign problems. From the response received from the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is a sincere desire of all the Democratic Members of the House to join in a real bipartisan approach to our foreign problems and to uphold and make strong the hand of the United States Government in dealing with international affairs. I firmly subscribe to a real, true bipartisan policy. I believe that our international affairs should always be handled by Members of this Congress in a united front. I have been greatly concerned at some of the developments in recent weeks on account of the many irresponsible statements that have been made which I do not think contribute to a successful conclusion of such a program. For that reason, I am taking the time today to encourage the new administration and to criticize some of these irresponsible statements, also to suggest to the leaders in the administration that they join in seeking a united front in dealing with our foreign policies.

Mr. Speaker, if the voters of my district are at all representative of the American public—and I know they are—one of the most important, if not the most important factor in the election of General Eisenhower was his implied promise that if elected he would bring the war in Korea to an early and honorable end. I feel sure that millions of American voters consider this part of General Eisenhower's contract with them.

I am frank to say that I shared the hopes of these millions when General Eisenhower went to Korea to survey the situation. I hoped that his vast military experience and his fresh perspective would lead to new solutions to our problems in Korea. My hopes were enhanced by persistent reports in the press that President-elect Eisenhower and his Cabinet, on their cruise back to the United States, were developing a "new plan for Korea."

Therefore I looked forward to President Eisenhower's state of the Union message with great hope and anticipation. I fully expected that at least the general outlines of the "new plan for Korea" would be unfolded.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed. One entire section of the message was devoted to Korea. That section can be summed up in one word: window dressing.

What President Eisenhower had to say looked good and sounded good at first glance, but when you examine the merchandise closely, as we have all had time to do now, you find it is made of pretty flimsy material.

President Eisenhower made only two points in his entire section on the Korean war. First, that his administration is "giving immediate increased attention to the development of additional Republic of Korea forces," and, second, "that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China" from the Nationalist forces.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has had access since last August to all of the secret reports of our Central Intelligence Agency. He knows—or should know—exactly what has been going on in Korea in recent months. Furthermore, he has a lifetime of military experience and is a great general. He knows—or should know—that both of his proposals regarding Korea are in fact no departure from past proposals and offer no real added hope for speeding the end of the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, I might have expected proposals such as this to be contained in a campaign speech but I had hoped, now that he has acquired the mantle of responsibility, that President Eisenhower would no longer play what some people consider politics with the Korean war—for this is beneath the dignity of the President of the United States.

First, as to the training of South Korean troops, President Eisenhower knows—or at least he should have learned it on his trip to Korea—that we have been embarked for well over 2 years now on an intensive program of training these troops. He knows that the results of this training are now bearing fruit and that Korean soldiers are acquitting themselves with skill and heroism alongside our own troops. As a military man, he should realize more clearly than anyone else the fact that manpower alone, without effective leadership, is little more than cannon fodder. He knows—or he should have learned on his trip to Korea—that the limiting factor in training South Korean soldiers has been the time required to train effective Korean officers. His long Army experience should tell him that you cannot make a skilled leader in modern warfare, with all its intricacies, in a month or two. We have been training South Korean forces and putting them into the lines just as fast as we could train officers to lead them. Even before this became a campaign issue last fall, the Defense Department had approved a recommendation of General Clark to intensify and increase the training of South Korean divisions and regiments. I might add that this was made clear during the course of the campaign and President-elect Eisenhower must have learned about it in great detail during his visit to Korea.

All of us hope that South Korean forces can be trained to assume an increased share of the load in Korea, but to imply in a document of State, such as the state of the Union message, that the training of Korean forces can be greatly intensified and can have a significant effect on the conduct of the war in Korea, is in my opinion little more than campaign politics.

As to the second part of President Eisenhower's remarks on Korea, I contend that to say that the Seventh Fleet will no longer be employed to shield Communist China runs contrary to facts which President Eisenhower knows to be true and amounts to a political statement designed to reflect upon the integrity of the previous administration.

President Eisenhower knew, or should have known, what has been since revealed in newspaper accounts, namely, that President Truman's order neutralizing the forces on Formosa itself did not apply to the island of Quemoy or to the Pescadores Islands. He knew that the Chinese Nationalists have for some months been conducting pinprick raids on the Chinese mainland from these islands, which are far closer to the mainland than Formosa. Since the delivery of his state of the Union message, it has been made clear by representatives of the Chinese Nationalists themselves, as well as others, that Chiang's forces will not be able to conduct raids larger than the pinprick raids for at least a year or two. There is considerable doubt as to whether, even then, such attacks across 90 miles of open water can be made without at least substantial material aid from America and possibly the active aid of our naval and air forces. Chiang Kai-shek himself has said that he will not need the aid of American ground forces—leaving the clear implication that he will need American naval and air forces. Every fairminded person knows the 7th Fleet was placed for the protection of Formosa, which is so important in our global defense plans.

It is, therefore, a sham to state that we will no longer shield Red China. Because the President's statement gave rise to bold headlines about unleashing Chiang's forces, the message lighted false hopes in the hearts of millions of Americans, hopes which have already been dampened as the facts unfolded.

The message had even more dangerous consequences. It set off a chain reaction of irresponsible proposals from prominent Republicans which the Secretary of State himself has had to repudiate. The President's message was delivered on Monday. On Wednesday the most prominent Republican foreign policy spokesman in Congress said that the new policy involved Nationalist bombing of the Manchurian railway. On Thursday General Wedemeyer expressed the hope that this new policy would lead, among other things, to an eventual invasion of the mainland—by the United States alone if the United Nations failed to approve the policy. On Saturday a Republican policy spokesman in Congress urged the United States, alone if necessary, to impose a blockade on Communist China.

On Sunday Mr. Republican himself contemplated using United States troops on the mainland of China.

And on Monday, the senior Republican in the other body proposed atomic bombing in Korea.

Fortunately the Secretary of State has repudiated these irresponsible suggestions and in doing so performed a service for his country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course it was important to isolate the Korean conflict and to protect our flank.

Mr. PRICE. That is right. It was important also because it took away from the Chinese Reds an excuse to go into Korea.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, the raids have been going on for a long, long while.

Mr. PRICE. That is right. The record shows they have been going on over a year, so that the fleet did not prevent Chiang from making raids on the mainland and it did not protect the Chinese Reds from Chiang's forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the statement had been made that the conditions have changed between 1950 and the present time, that would have been different.

Mr. PRICE. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Those of us who might not agree have to back up a policy once it is made—I do, whether I agree with it or not—because our country is involved. But if a simple statement had been made that the conditions have changed so that this policy can be put into operation, that would have met the whole situation.

Mr. PRICE. Certainly the conditions have changed, and they have changed for the better as far as the Chinese Nationalists are concerned. They have been protected by the 7th Fleet. As the result of that protection provided by our 7th Fleet, they have been able to build a formidable force on Formosa which may in the near future be of great assistance to the free world in fighting back against communism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the record should also show that President Eisenhower in his press conference yesterday did the same thing. What he said was to the effect that the matter has been discussed by others but never brought up to him.

Mr. PRICE. Yes; and I think the more they think of the things that have been going on, the more they will repudiate these irresponsible statements.

Mr. Speaker, we Democrats wish to assist the administration in every way in the development of our world policies. Had we known in advance what the new Formosan policy would and would not involve, we would have raised no questions about its implications. At it was, however, we were merely told about an accomplished policy just before it was made public.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have no need to play politics with the Korean war. I for one—and I believe I speak for my colleagues—do not intend to carp at the administration because they do not bring about immediate and spectacular results—especially if hopes of such success are not dangled before the American public. Years in the majority have taught us Democrats that these are not times of quick results. They are times for patience.

We wish to offer President Eisenhower every assistance in calming the irresponsible members of his own party. We wish to assist him in developing a policy which in the long run will bear real fruit. We wish to help him bring the facts before the American people—unpleasant as they may be at times.

I think it is reasonable to expect that the President on his part will begin to speak frankly with the American people and to present them with facts and not statements that many feel have a political tinge. I think we should also expect that our Democratic leaders will be consulted as new policies are proposed, modified and hammered out, and their advice sought before decisions are made.

I would suggest that the President follow the example set by President Roosevelt and President Truman and bring leaders of both parties into active cooperation in developing a bipartisan approach to our foreign policy and in meeting security problems. In seeking to encourage bipartisanship in these fields Roosevelt and Truman asked many outstanding Republicans to serve in high positions. At least half of the Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries in the Defense Establishment and State Department were Republicans.

In such a spirit of true bipartisanship for which the President so rightly appealed in his state of the Union message, I feel sure that we can work out America's problems.

I think it is reasonable to expect that the President will begin to speak frankly with the American people and to present them with the facts, and not make statements that many people feel may have a political tinge. I think we should also expect that our Democratic leaders would be consulted as new policies are proposed, and modified and hammered out, and their advice should be sought before decisions are made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has stated the constructive purposes of the Democratic Party and so have I and so have other Members. Governor Stevenson stated that the other night in New York. There were many editorials all over the country praising him for the position he took. The resolution introduced today in relation to the bipartisan support of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles and the military and economic unification of Europe already is competent and unmistakable evidence of the desire for bipartisanship. It should not be marred by intemperate statements. It should be the responsibility of the majority to do the right thing, not only by refraining from unnecessary statements, from distortion of the truth, discoloration of the facts, but also by true bipartisan relationships, by selecting competent men who are Democrats in the State Department and in the Defense Department and the Mutual Assistance Department. That is all evidence. I am talking simply as an American and as a Democrat, as to what evidence we have already shown on the Democratic side. But the main responsibility rests on the other side.

Mr. PRICE. I just want to say to the gentleman that we on our side of the aisle are sincere in offering our assistance to the President in forming a bipartisan program that will help solve the serious problems in international affairs and in foreign policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, we are giving the leadership. They can cooperate with us or they can follow, but certainly we are showing the way, and we are doing it because over and above the Democratic Party and the Republican Party is this country of ours.

Mr. PRICE. I took the floor this afternoon because I am sincerely alarmed about some of the statements that were made publicly by responsible officials of the Government. I do not think they are honest statements. I know, because of my own knowledge of the situation, that many of them have been erroneous statements and false statements, and the people should know they are false statements.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not only that, but other countries too. Particularly a man who is chairman of a prominent committee. Those people assume statements made by such a man are made only after conferring with higher authorities. We now know they are incorrect. They are warlike statements. They are provocative. It is not a question of whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, but we do not want to make any provocative statements that may be inconsistent with the best interests of our country. The provocativeness comes from those in responsible positions. This is not said in any spirit of unkindness, but we must have patience and tolerance, and we must have silence. The unspoken word requires courage. We must have that from chairmen of committees, because not only our people but the people of other countries, representatives of those countries, infer that when a chairman of a prominent committee speaks, particularly one concerned with national defense, he is speaking after consultation with the President or the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman. I want to compliment him and refer to a statement he made a moment ago about putting into practical form this matter of bipartisanship, when he referred to both parties. I had incorporated a statement to that effect in my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there are further special orders?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF LITHUANIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians everywhere commemorated the 35th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic, There was little cause for rejoicing, in view of the present fate of that nation, one of the first to be enslaved by the Russians.

However, the anniversary observance can serve to remind us that liberty can at no time be taken for granted, but truly requries constant vigilance, alertness for enemies from within and from without, and sacrifices, when necessary.

The anniversary also gives us an opportunity to encourage the people of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations, in their hope for freedom and the restoration of governments of their own choosing; and to pledge anew our con-

tinued efforts, with other democratic governments, to explore every possible channel for their early liberation.

The Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore proclaimed February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day, and the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore commemorated the anniversary with a banquet, at which time the following resolution was adopted:

We, citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent of the city of Baltimore, Md., in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1953, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, 851 Hollins Street, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in the eyes of people around the world, the United States has been the strongest champion of the oppressed; and

Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings on the earth paved the way for the American supremacy in the political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of the mankind; and

Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail in Eastern and Central Europe, including Lithuania and other Baltic States, should be of greatest concern to the United States as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that part of Europe which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, do not and will not bear the slightest effect on the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, concerned about security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native land, Lithuania, now under brutal Soviet yoke, appeal to the Government of the United States—

1. To adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in the world affairs necessitates;

2. To incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries as an integral and inseparable part in the program of the United States foreign policy;

3. To inaugurate all suitable means to aid liberation movements in the Soviet-enslaved countries and to enlist their cooperation in the global efforts to fight international communism;

4. To speed ratification of the genocide convention and to implement the ratification by a decisive action within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia responsible for the crimes committed in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

Resolved, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government in its efforts to resist the evil Communist forces of aggression, and to sustain peace and freedom everywhere; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the mayor of Baltimore City, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States, and the press.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
MATAS BRAZAUSKAS,
Secretary.

The gathering was privileged to have as one of its speakers, the Honorable J. Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, and I would like to insert his address in the RECORD at this point:

Today we are celebrating the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It is also the 700th year since the coronation of Lithuania's King Mindaugas. But it is not a joyful commemoration. How can we rejoice when the Lithuanian nation is in chains; when slavery such as never before witnessed in the world is imposed upon her; when she is being mercilessly annihilated; when she has been plunged into blood, tears, and anxiety, and her children scattered to the four winds?

The culprit of this state of affairs is Russia's communistic imperialism and its parasitic regime which lives not only on her own people's lives, hardships, and wealth, but also on that of other nations.

This predacious neighbor violated numerous solemn pledges expressed in international agreements with Lithuania. I will not treat of them on this occasion; I only wish to stress that Soviet attempts to enslave Lithuania and the Baltic states in general are of older date than the act of aggression of 1940 itself. Let us briefly, in the light of facts, acquaint ourselves with this enemy.

1. The Soviets grasped upon President Wilson's slogan of self-determination of nations, not out of love, but to prevent the breaking up of Russia, that prison of nations herself. Russia began to show interest in that principle, but already as early as January 1918, Stalin had a resolution adopted to the effect that only "the toiling peoples, not the bourgeois," are to be entitled to independence. In the Soviet mentality, the hard-working Lithuanians were considered unworthy of the blessings of real independence. Red army gangs were dispatched to choke that thirst of the Lithuanian nation for freedom in its conception. Moscow staged the puppet Kapsukas government for Lithuania as she later did a similar Paleckis government.

2. Col. Joseph Beck, former Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, in a recent publication mentions the Soviet emissary Radeck as having suggested already in the summer of 1933 in Warsaw a common Soviet-Polish protection of the Baltic States. Within a few months they also handed to the Poles a draft treaty to that effect. (Dernier rapport, pp. 35–36.)

3. In that same publication we note that in the beginning of 1938, Litvinov stated to the Polish Ambassador in Moscow, Grzybowski: "The Baltic States are not real states. It always seemed to me that Dauguva could be a natural boundary of spheres of interest" (id., p. 157).

4. In the summer of 1939, during the Soviet and Anglo-French negotiations, the Soviets again sought permission to protect the Baltic States, which permission they received only from their collaborator at the time, Hitler.

5. In the same year, the Soviet general staff published a map in which the Baltic States were presented as Soviet Republics.

6. A former Soviet diplomat, Bogoliepov, only about 2 months ago stated:

"In 1940 I was sent to the Baltic States to assist Vishinsky, Zhdanoff, and others in preparing these states for annexation. I may assert from personal knowledge that the Soviet Government, previous to the conclusion of the mutual assistance pacts, in the fall of 1939 had already definitely decided to occupy and sovietize the Baltic States." (Latvian Information Bulletin, January 1953.)

Thus the alleged friendship of the Soviets in regard to Lithuania has always been clearly hypocritical.

The nonrecognition of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, especially by the United States, is a great consolation to Lithuanians everywhere today. And what nonrecognition. It has lasted for nearly 13 years. It is also being voiced more forcibly and more often at present than ever before. It is being based on principles of deep and old roots. Secretary of State Dulles recently stated publicly that "All those suffering under Communist slavery * * * can count upon us." (New York Times, January 28, 1953.) Whereas President Eisenhower stressed "We shall never try to placate an aggressor." (New York Times, January 21, 1953.) "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people." (New York Times, February 3, 1953.)

A great consolation also is the hard historical fact that tyrants are not eternal and that Lithuanians are wholeheartedly on the side of the great coalition of freedom-loving nations. What is still more important, the Lithuanians have proved their will to be free and continue to prove it.

As long as the Lithuanians will remain free in spirit, as long as they will be united as they are on this anniversary, we can be sure that God will bless the efforts of the Lithuanian people and that Lithuania will again be free.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY: MORE ACTION, FEWER WORDS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Americans and liberty-loving people everywhere know today that President Eisenhower is moving forward in the Korean situation; so do the enemy whose leaders are stunned.

The President is not obsessed by any fixation that we have to stand by the status quo, that we have to live with a stalemate. He is opposed to any "Let the dust settle" policy.

I still hear ringing in my ears the applause of Senate and House Members that here in this Chamber greeted the President's announcement in his state of the Union speech regarding the action pertaining to the 7th Fleet.

The President has been in office less than 1 month and he has demonstrated to all that his program will be geared more to action than words. Every Member of this House knows there is more action to come, and no one wants the President or anybody else to give the enemy a bill of particulars.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and further to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $231.

Mr. ABERNETHY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL and to include the remarks of George Westerman, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the additional cost will be $196.20.

Mr. BOGGS and to include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT in two instances, in one to include an article and in the other an editorial.

Mr. HOLTZMAN and include a statement and comment by the President's Airport Commission.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and include a recent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and include an editorial.

Mr. CONDON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. DOLLINGER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas and to include portions of two editorials.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL and to include an address, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN in two instances and in one to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and Mr. BUSBEY to include extraneous matter in their remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TABER to include certain tables in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial.

Mr. SCUDDER in three instances and to include editorials.

Mr. BEAMER in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include a short article.

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in seven instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in three instances, in one to include some remarks of former Attorney General McGranery notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $196.

Mr. FINE and to include an editorial.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota and to include a statement on Brotherhood Week.

Mr. HAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an editorial from the Patterson Morning Call.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. GREEN) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. WEICHEL in three instances and to include extraneous matter .

Mr. BETTS (at the request of Mr. VORYS) and include an editorial.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made be stricken and that I may include them in a separate statement in the RECORD at some future time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, on account of illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 13, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 568. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

471. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 12 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

472. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes,' approved May 21, 1951"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

473. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

474. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

475. A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., United States Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend title VI of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

477. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board, Maritime Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

478. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the settlement of the claim of the Pilots' Association for the Bay and River Delaware, Philadelphia 6, Pa., as owner of the pilot boat tender *Cape May*, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, 646 (b); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

479. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 18, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Lake Michigan shore of Racine County, Wis., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 5 illustrations.

480. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the Port Aransas, Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., with a view to determining whether it is advisable at this time, in the interests of national defense and general commerce, to construct a tributary channel, having specifications equal to the main channel, extending northerly from the passing place of the Corpus Christi Channel approximately 6 miles to the north shore of Corpus Christi Bay in the general vicinity of La Quinta to accommodate shipments to the proposed aluminum plant of the Reynolds Metals Co. and to construct a turning basin having specifications adequate to accommodate potential commerce at the northern terminal of said proposed tributary channel, requested by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted February 20, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 1 illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1. A bill to reduce the individual income tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 395. A bill to confer juris-

diction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; with an amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 32. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; with an amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 91. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 115. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; with an amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1525. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1527. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1528. A bill to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1529. A bill to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1530. A bill to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida; with an amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1532. A bill to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1813. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; with an amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1816. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 76. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2332. A bill to require an annual review of military personnel requirements, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2381. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; with an amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2386. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2398. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Cecil; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2420. A bill for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2433. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Clifford Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2615. A bill for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2645. A bill for the relief of Donald James Darmody; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; with an amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3146. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 3147. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption for individuals who are permanently and totally disabled by reason of their mental condition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3148. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to Golden Gloves amateur boxing tournaments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND (by request):

H. R. 3150. A bill relating to the consideration of petitions and memorials to the Congress in committees of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 3151. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3152. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3153. A bill to provide that no Senator or Representative shall be immune from civil liability for any defamatory statement inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when such statement was not actually made in the Chamber of the Senate or House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3154. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (crimes and criminal procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3155. A bill to prohibit officers and employees of the United States from recording telephone conversations without permission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3156. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3157. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment of excess annual leave of postmasters to the credit of their retirement accounts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3158. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project, California, to the State of California or an agency thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3159. A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3160. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3161. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Force Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 3162. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3163. A bill to reserve to certain State and Territorial agencies and tribunals the authority to exercise jurisdiction over labor disputes involving public utilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3164. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline, where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3165. A bill to amend section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3166. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3167. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to eliminate the requirement that education and training allowances payable to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training under that act be periodically reduced; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3168. A bill to facilitate the development, management, and use of public use areas and facilities and improvement of wildlife habitat on the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3169. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3170. A bill to prevent Federal dam and reservoir projects from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3171. A bill to extend the duration of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide protection against vandalism committed on account of racial or religious prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3173. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3174. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of amounts payable to aliens under trust funds created by American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3175. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3176. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3177. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3178. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural recourses within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 3179. A bill to continue through December 31, 1957, the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3180. A bill to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 3181. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Wright Brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3182. A bill to establish a Department of Public Health and Welfare in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3183. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3184. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 3185. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. R. 3186. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles and trucks and parts and accessories therefor, and on tires and tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3187. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3188. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3189. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3190. A bill to provide that licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for power projects in the international section of the St. Lawrence River shall be conditioned so as to assure marketing preferences to public agencies and cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3191. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 3192. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 3193. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3194. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 3195. A bill to authorized the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3196. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 3197. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3198. A bill to amend Public Law 23, 82d Congress, April 25, 1951, to authorize payment of United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance, in addition to the $10,000 indemnity provided under said act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3199. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3200. A bill to amend section 612 (b) of World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3201. A bill to provide emergency relief for certain natives of the Netherlands and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3202. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from

$600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 3203. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from regulating the duration of certain leases for the use of equipment by motor carriers, and the amount of compensation to be paid for such use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3204. A bill to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the Service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 3205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to classical ballet performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3206. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 3207. A bill to provide for the compulsory deportation of aliens who are convicted of subversive activities, for loss of citizenship and deportation of naturalized nationals who are so convicted, and for imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole of nationals by birth who are so convicted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3208. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3209. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3210. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3211. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 3212. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3213. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3214. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution providing for development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the public interest and for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; creating the St. Lawrence Development Corporation to finance, construct, and operate certain works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River as a self-liquidating project; authorizing the President to negotiate certain arrangements with the Government of Canada for the protection of the navigation rights of the United States on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River; authorizing the preparation of plans for disposal of St. Lawrence power in the interest of consumers in the State of New York and the New England States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution defining certain terms, defining and extending certain boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain provisions of the Yalta agreement, and joining with the President in his declaration with respect to secret understandings which permit enslavement of peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution reaffirming bipartisan support of European military integration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Res. 145. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 113; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 146. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of air pollution in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 148. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 32, 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the senate of the State of New Jersey deploring the actions and conditions which are now prevailing behind the Iron Curtain whereby 2½ million people of the Jewish faith are being threatened, persecuted, and exterminated and condemning the action of Communist Russia and calling upon the President, Congress, and the State Department of the United States of America to express their condemnation of the persecution now prevalent to the Soviet Government and that they use every means at their command to bring to a halt these inhumane practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of New Jersey, deploring the actions and conditions which are now prevailing behind the Iron Curtain whereby 2½ million people of the Jewish faith are being threatened, persecuted, and exterminated, and condemning the action of Communist Russia and calling upon the President, Congress, and the State Department of the United States of America to express their condemnation of the persecution now prevalent to the Soviet Government and that they use every means at their command to bring to a halt these inhumane practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to a higher minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress relative to the issuance of a certain commemorative postage stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits to additional and certain other classes of employment and workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the approval of legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and urging that in the planning and construction of the proposed Libby Dam in Lincoln County the economy of the area and the livelihood of the people be safeguarded through selection of the site for the axis of such dam and by appropriations required to provide services equal to those now existing; and requesting similar consideration for Montana people in the case of other Federal projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3215. A bill for the relief of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:
H. R. 3216. A bill for the relief of E. C. Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:
H. R. 3217. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence D. Grimshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phyllis Jackson Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIN:
H. R. 3219. A bill for the relief of Frank Sopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 3220. A bill for the relief of Jacob Glaser (also known as Harry Glaser); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3221. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Alfieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:
H. R. 3222. A bill for the relief of Martin Luther Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 3223. A bill for the relief of Gisela Korb (nee Unruh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:
H. R. 3224. A bill for the relief of Teiko Nanimatsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Bertha Lowy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3226. A bill for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3227. A bill for the relief of Schmeria, Rifka and Kalman Blady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:
H. R. 3228. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Israel Yollin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:
H. R. 3230. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3231. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3232. A bill for the relief of Dennis F. Guthrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:
H. R. 3233. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jonel Orelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:
H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul H. Thorough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3235. A bill for the relief of Ruth Rumiko Fukano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 3236. A bill for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3237. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3238. A bill for the relief of Danica Maria Vavrova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3239. A bill for the relief of Edmund Stevens, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H. R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Wadi S. Rumman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:
H. R. 3241. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:
H. R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Billoti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:
H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Demetrios George Florakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:
H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutchess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:
H. R. 3245. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):
H. R. 3246. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 3247. A bill for the relief of Esther Malka Evans (nee Kalanek) and Robert Kalanek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLELSON (by request):
H. R. 3248. A bill for the relief of Nick Kostides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:
H. R. 3249. A bill for the relief of Katharina Link; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3250. A bill for the relief of Dr. James K-Thong Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:
H. R. 3251. A bill for the relief of James Delbert Gates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3252. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 3253. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Icko Fiszeles, his wife, Ania Fiszeles, and his son, Abram Fiszeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Robert Grunwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. R. 3255. A bill for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 3256. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stanislawa Karczewska Kilarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3257. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Agosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:
H. R. 3258. A bill for the relief of Frederick Allen Painter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3259. A bill for the relief of Jose Almeida Novo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:
H. R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Aloisia Schlotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Chester E. Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Simeone Mezzich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3263. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cnesich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. R. 3264. A bill for the relief of Leon Piorkowski, Elzbieta Piorkowski, his wife, and Maria Piorkowski, their daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Dr. Souren Chamichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3266. A bill for the relief of Frank Sobko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:
H. R. 3267. A bill for the relief of Hermann Wendt and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):
H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Hiroki Hollopeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Mario Martinucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Giannone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 3272. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Albano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Edgar A. Belleau, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:
H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Scano, Giovanna Scano, Guido Scano, and Valerio Scano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:
H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:
H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Solomon and Helen Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Bogdanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:
H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of John James T. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Peter P. S. Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:
H. R. 3282. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:
H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of Michael Yamamoto and Noela Rieko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:
H. R. 3284. A bill for the relief of Libero Ridolfi and Mrs. Luigia Belardi Ridolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:
H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Vladimir and Svatava Hoschl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:
H. R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Providence, urging passage of the Celler and Javit bills, providing for the complete revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by American citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of Racine, Wis., pledging all possible support of Lithuanian Americans to the United States in its efforts to combat the communistic forces of aggression and achieve an international peace founded on the principles of freedom and justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

63. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of all 40 members of the La Porte City, Iowa, Business and Professional Women's Club urging that unlighted railroad cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night by approaching motorists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Billy Graham, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we come into Thy presence today with a sense of awe at Thy greatness because Thou art the God of creation, Thou art the God of might and Thou art also the God of goodness and love, of grace, and of mercy. We come to Thee today thanking Thee as Thy creatures for all the great blessings that Thou hast bestowed upon this great Nation. We thank Thee for the great freedoms that we possess when other nations do not have such freedoms. We thank Thee for freedom of the press, for freedom of speech, and for freedom of religion. But, our Father, we have been a sinful nation, and we confess our sins of materialism, our sins of behaviorism, our sins of humanism. We confess our sins of commercialism, our sins of pride, our sins of immorality, our sins of neglect of the church and of the Bible and of God. We humble ourselves in Thy presence today. We pray for our President and his Cabinet. We pray for our Armed Forces, especially those men in Korea. We wouldst remember those men that lie on hospital beds today; some of them that will never walk again, some that will never see again, some that will never enjoy life again, because they have paid the supreme sacrifice for this horrible conflict in Korea. We pray today, our Father, for the Congress. We pray that Thou wouldst give wisdom; we pray that Thou wouldst give moral courage rather than political expediency. We pray that Thou wouldst give us the capacity to be big men in this terrible and dark hour in which we live. We pray that this day above all else will be a day when all of us are conscious of the leading of Thy holy spirit and that every one of us will rest and depend upon Thee in this hour when men are seeking to destroy themselves by the weapons that they have fashioned. We pray that Thou wouldst give us consolation and bring peace in our time if it be Thy will. We pray for every man individually. Many of us have our own personal problems, our own personal needs, our own inner conflicts. We pray that Thou wouldst give us peace of soul and peace of conscience, inward joy, and a personal relationship with God that will allow us at any time of day to call upon God to be our helper and our strength in the multitude of problems and responsibilities that are ours. We ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MALICIOUS CHARGES OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, an incident was brought to my attention today which indicates a shocking situation to exist within the Government circles here in Washington. A young lady of the colored race who is a resident of my congressional district in New York and presently employed by one of the temporary agencies, reports to me that the White House had made inquiry of her agency for recommendation of three people for employment at the White House as clerk-typist, and that she had been selected to be recommended. Subsequently, after her name had been sent to the White House, she was told that the White House had rejected her for employment upon the basis that she was a colored lady.

I immediately made contact with the White House and learned that not only is there no such policy with respect to racial discrimination in White House employment but that colored persons are actually presently employed there.

This incident makes the conclusion inescapable that some individuals presently employed by Government agencies who are hostile to the present Chief Executive have deliberately, falsely, and maliciously sought to discredit and undermine the administration by unwarranted misrepresentation and an attempt to arouse racial animosities. It is a shameful and disgraceful performance and one which I feel should be known to the public and that swift and summary action taken against those who are guilty.

ECONOMIC STABILITY FOR FARMERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the economic stability of the farmers of America is not a political issue. Their welfare is the stabilizing influence of our national economy.

The products of the mines, the factories and the shops of our country and to some extent, the world, are produced and sold profitably in proportion to the prosperity of the millions who engage in agricultural pursuits. It is quite foolish to assume that by lowering the income of the farmer and the rancher we may enrich our city cousins.

It has been estimated that for every $3 billion the farm income declines, a million farm workers will lose their jobs.

The Secretary of Agriculture and all of those of us who hold responsibility must understand that the farmer and the rancher seeks only parity and the basic philosophy behind the farm program which has enriched our Nation is aimed at no other goal except to make the farmer an equal partner in the richness of our economy. So long as minimum wages, hours, and other working conditions are a subject of law, so long as protective tariffs, tax benefits, and other business stimuli are subjects of the law, then so long must the farmer be placed in a position of parity by the law.

It is not and has never been a question of disaster. It is a question of equality. We cannot afford to permit a drastic reduction in farm income, not even if it would result, as Mr. TAFT has indicated, in a Democratic Congress 2 years from now. Such a price for political preferment is too high.

Our lending institutions, our merchants, our manufacturers, yes, all of our Nation must be assured that the purchasing power of the farmer and rancher will be kept at parity with their fellow Americans. Otherwise our economy may retrench to a position that is far from consistent with the requirements of our present age.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3053, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 9 on page 3 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Construction," $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a very serious situation which will result if this body approves the appropriation committee's failure to approve a $24,000,000 supplemental appropriation for operation and maintenance of schools in federally affected areas under Public Law 874.

My own State of Washington has experienced tremendous expansion in the need for schools and the cost of operating them caused by new population drawn into the various areas by Federal activities. Seventy-four school districts will suffer a total deficit of more than $1,000,000 in the State of Washington if this supplemental appropriation is not forthcoming. These are all districts which not only have been caused

huge additional responsibilities for educating children of families drawn into the districts by Federal activity, but also have suffered substantial tax losses from withdrawal of property from the tax rolls. Most of them already have assumed indebtedness up to the legal limit under the laws of our State.

To many of these districts, there may be no recourse but to close before the end of their terms.

This Congress has a mandate to achieve economy, but not to extinguish the lamps of learning through repudiation of its fair and honest obligations.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the first 3 days of this week I had the great pleasure of going into Texas to make Lincoln Day speeches. In the valley of the Rio Grande, I saw from the air and from the ground the great $42,000,000 Falcom Dam which is being built there for irrigation, reclamation, and power development. This dam is a most worthy project, because it will add, through irrigation, to the productivity of 500,000 of the most fertile and productive acres in the Nation.

I talked to a great many residents of the Rio Grande Valley, and all of them were enthusiastic about the construction of this dam as a power development and reclamation project. They were uniformly of the opinion that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], who represents that district, has done an exceedingly effective job of calling the necessity of this project to the attention of Congress and in securing funds for its construction. He has worked intelligently and efficiently to bring about that great development.

However, I did find among the people of the Rio Grande Valley great resentment against a proposal of the International Boundary and Water Commission that 47,000 acres of the above-high-water shorelands around the lake, above the dam, be taken and used as a national park. They believed a park of 47,000 acres unnecessarily large and they did not want these 47,000 acres taken off the tax rolls of their local government districts.

I spoke to a Lincoln Day gathering of about 400 people. In that speech, I said I believed that the use of 47,000 acres of land behind that dam for recreational purposes was an unnecessarily large area. I said that if the lands were to be used for recreational areas that the people of Texas themselves should determine what lands were to be used for park purposes and not agencies of the Federal Government. I noted that the 400 people at that meeting loudly applauded this remark, indicating that they wanted to have jurisdiction over their own lands, and not have them dominated by the bureaucrats of the Park Service or the International Boundary and Water Commission.

In the 48 States there are 2,988,000 square miles of territory. At the present time, 711,168 of those square miles are owned by the Federal Government and under Federal bureaucratic management and control. Today, 23.9 percent of all the land in the 48 States of this Nation is owned by the Federal Government and administered and managed by Federal bureaus.

To say it another way, this Federal land owned by the Federal Government and administered by the bureaucrats constitutes an area more than 2½ times the size of the State of Texas, or 10 times the size of the combined area of the combined 6 New England States.

This bureaucratic mania to bring more lands under their domination is not confined to the State of Texas alone. In the State of Washington we have the same condition prevailing along the hundreds of miles of territory on both sides of Roosevelt Lake behind the Grand Coulee Dam.

Nor do we have to go 3,500 miles to the State of Washington or 2,000 miles to Texas to find examples of this land-grabbing mania. Just across the Potomac River adjacent to Arlington Cemetery, there is a tract of 28 acres known as the Nevius tract. The Veterans' Administration wanted to build a hospital for the District of Columbia and insisted the Nevius tract was the only location for it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] gave figures here last year showing that the Federal Government had paid $65,000 an acre for the 28 acres in the Nevius tract, or a total of $1,600,000. Within 5 minutes' automobile drive from that site the VA could have purchased land for $600 or $700 an acre.

The Veterans' Administration condemned the Nevius tract land and paid for it with borrowed money which has become part of the national debt. The taxpayers now are paying $32,000 a year in interest on the money used to purchase the Nevius tract. The Veterans' Administration now has decided that the hospital should be built some place else and the Nevius tract is of no use to the Government. The result is that the Federal Government is paying $32,000 a year in interest on the money borrowed to buy land for which the Government has no use. Furthermore the city of Alexandria has lost the $17,600 a year in taxes which was paid on this Nevius tract land when it was in private ownership.

In the State of Washington the Voice of America condemned a tract of land and paid in excess of $500,000 for it as a site for a radio station. The Voice had been offered an equally good tract for $12,000 but insisted on buying the more expensive land for this radio station.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MACK of Washington was given 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Voice of America was offered two sites for their radio station. One site would cost $12,000. It had no agricultural value. The other site would cost $500,000, for it consisted of the choicest irrigated agricultural land in the State of Washington. Of course, the aesthetic tastes of the Voice of America people could not be satisfied with a $12,000 site, so they went ahead and bought 1,200 acres at $400 to $500 an acre of this expensive agricultural land for a radio station.

On last Monday, Dr. Compton, who is head of the Voice of America, issued a statement saying that he had recommended that the station should not be built on this site for which the Voice of America had paid $500,000, but that the station should be moved to southern California and new lands purchased there as a site for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman to say that for a radio station they had to have a site of 1,200 acres?

Mr. MACK of Washington. At first they wanted 2,400 acres which was the $12,000 site. Then they selected the 1,200-acre site and paid approximately $500,000 for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much ground does it take for a radio station?

Mr. MACK of Washington. In my opinion it should take about six to eight acres, not 1,200 acres.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What were the Voice of America and the State Department going to raise on this great area of land, pansies?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The theory of the Federal bureaucrats seems to be that they should take land out of use and out of production so that private enterprise can be put out of business.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I am certainly happy the gentleman is taking the position he is on a vital question that affects not only the great State of Washington but also my own State of Kentucky. The Federal Government has acquired so much land in Kentucky that many of the counties do not have a sufficient tax base to support the government or the local communities. The same is true of the school districts.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The seizure and confiscation of private lands and placing them under Federal control is the thing that has brought about this constant stream of requests to Congress for aid to school districts and other local government grants. We are impoverishing the State, county, city, and school governments by these land seizure practices.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was very much interested in the gentleman's comments about these radio stations, and I am just wondering what happened to the cut I proposed of $20,000,000 from the Voice of America program last year, pinpointing this very thing we are discussing here. How did they come around and get that money?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The money that was used to purchase this radio station site came out of the appropriation bill for the previous year. I do not believe the Voice would have gotten that money if Congress knew how it would be squandered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I recall, that particular station was in question last year.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly indebted to my friend from the State of Washington for his kind comments in regard to my work in representing my district. I do hope he will return soon and often and I may have the pleasure of being there for his next visit.

The particular project to which he has addressed his remarks, the Falcom International Dam on the Rio Grande is one that is now 80 percent completed. I am glad to see that the committee is not indulging in any false economy on this particular project. The Falcom Dam is guaranteed for completion by our Government by November of 1953 through a treaty with Mexico. With this appropriation the ultimate completion will be expedited. This appropriation will assure us of not losing priorities on steel and materials that were needed for its construction, priorities we would have lost had we not had the appropriation at this time. If we had delayed the appropriation we would have merely forestalled meeting our obligation, we would have broken faith with the Mexican Government. It will benefit an area which is tremendously productive but is experiencing one of the greatest droughts in history at the present time. We would have left it without income because of crop failures due to lack of water. Additional tax loss would have accrued to the government by delaying construction. We would have had a starting and stopping of construction which would have resulted in greater cost in contractual obligations.

As to the work of the International Boundary and Water Commission, I am pleased to say they have given us considerable cooperation. They have not given us all that we have requested or that we need for the citizens of Zapata County. Originally they proposed taking considerably more land than they have at the present time. I contacted them and after conferences with the people in the county they agreed to cut down the amount of land they would take. I am urging that they cut this taking of land to the absolute minimum needed for the lakes protection. They also were going to take all of the gas and oil rights under those lands. I think it is a mistake on the part of the Federal Government to do that. It should not be in the oil and gas business. That is a speculative enterprise. Either you pay the landowner too much for it and the general taxpayer suffers or you pay the landowner too little for it and it is an unfair condemnation of his property. At the present time they tell me a large oil and gas field in that area has been discovered and the land and oil and gas rights will be of tremendous value. The International Boundary and Water Commission has agreed to leave the oil and gas rights with the people of the area. A program must be worked out to facilitate the drilling for these minerals under the lake proper.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am not opposed to the $2,500,000 in the bill. That money is to be used to construct power facilities which I think are needed, but I do believe the Appropriations Committee should examine most carefully the request when it comes in in a few months from now in the regular budget. They should review the 47,000 acres for park purposes. Personally I do not believe that land should be used for recreational purposes; it should be used for the production of food and fiber for the people.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I, too, want only the minimum amount of land to be taken that is necessary for the lake. We have a problem there in the fact that the lake will extend for a distance of 55 miles, so there is going to be some land necessarily taken.

May I say also that during the last Congress I received an appropriation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands to do some of the very things which the gentleman has suggested in connection with revision of the public land laws and a return to private enterprise of as much land as it is practical to return to private enterprise, which is now owned by the Federal Government. Over 440,000,000 acres are owned by the Federal Government. There has been no general revision of these land laws since Teddy Roosevelt's day.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to know why the National Park Service has to take over any jurisdiction. I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will dig deeply into this problem because the greatest stagnation we have in the Nation today is due to the situation that has existed through some two or three decades and the whole matter needs to be reviewed by a committee of the Congress.

Mr. BENTSEN. We have about 5,000 of those public land laws that are in desperate need of revision, antiquated, and conflicting. Now, we have started this revision. My subcommittee received an appropriation of $25,000, and we turned over one-half of that back to the Government.

Mr. HORAN. In saying that, I am not against a proper national park system, but it has gone far out of balance and it is stagnating a lot of our areas.

Mr. BENTSEN. We have commenced the work and it is my hope that the gentlemen on the other side will carry on the work for revision of the public land laws.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the public land problem has come under our jurisdiction. It is rather disturbing when you find the Federal Government year after year adding additional land to what they already have. They own about one-fourth of all of the land in the United States. In some of the Western States it goes up to more than 80 percent. The gentleman from Texas said 420 million acres. That is just inside of the United States. Actually it is over 800 million acres owned by the Federal Government including Alaska. In checking with the Interior Department they think they added about 10 million acres in the last 10 years. As has been said, the public land laws are in quite a mess and have been for some time. It was my hope, when I made the statement before the full committee, that it would be possible to get some of the Federal land that is not now needed back upon the tax rolls, but every department of Government resists that effort. They want more land instead of less. Resolutions have been introduced to correct this situation. I believe the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] will continue the work that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] has started relative to land laws. I think we need an invoice, a checking up of the amount of public lands, who owns them, and what laws govern them. It is a long, tedious task, but I am sure the Congress in some committee ought to undertake that task.

Now, as to Falcom Dam, the gentleman from Texas and myself held a hearing there last November. Falcom Dam, I think, in the end, will be a credit to this country and to Mexico. Under State Department supervision they started to build a dam; indeed, this last month they shut the water off on the Rio Grande River so it is now held back, but they have made no preparation for the delivery of water downstream. I hope the great State of Texas will be able to iron out some of their water laws and difficulties so that they may know who is going to get the water. It has not been decided as of now. The same is true of the power plant. The Reclamation Division generally decides who is to get the water and the power before the dams are built. In other words, they have the cart ahead of the horse in this instance. They will back the water up some 50 miles. They are covering up three towns in that area, two of them older than the city of Philadelphia. They are covering up 18 cemeteries that date back to the early history of the United States, and if you do not think that is a disturbing factor to this small area, you should go down and listen to some of their stories. They are covering 8,000 acres of some of the finest irrigated land you have ever seen and not making preparation to handle some of the problems connected with those people who will be displaced. Nevertheless, I think it has to go ahead because it is one of those things that we started to do. In fact, the water is shut off and backed up now, and that will prevent floods down the river.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I believe that you have had referred to your committee a bill which I introduced several days ago which provides that the lands taken over by the Government would still be subject to local taxation, or in lieu thereof, contribution should be made to the State or political subdivision to take care of the loss of taxation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the House, when the time comes, will consider the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] for a full study of the public-land problems and the thousands of laws governing public lands. I hope that you will give us that support. It is a long and tedious job; nothing glamorous about it. It is a job I feel Congress should approach and do. The Interior Committee looks forward to starting in on that job in the 83d Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways," to remain available until expended, $185 million, which sum is composed of $72,500,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and $112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952.

FEDERAL AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this aid is a direct obligation by the Government. The Government by taking over local activities must assume some local responsibilities entailed. I am deeply interested in the subject which was just discussed on the floor by our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], with reference to the enormous holdings of the land area in the various States of the Union by the Federal Government. It has become a problem so important to the economy of many of the smaller political divisions in which these lands are situated that some remedial legislation should be passed to get these lands back into private ownership and on the tax rolls.

A recent discussion of this problem in which there is set forth the percentage of the Government-owned lands situated in the Western States appeared in the current March issue of Farm Journal. I am including this article as a part of these remarks:

NEW LAND LAW FOR THE WEST?—STOCKMEN ARE OFFERING A BILL INTENDED TO END THEIR FIGHT WITH THE FOREST SERVICE

(By Paul Friggens)

Our worst landlord-tenant problem in the Nation today exists not in the South but in the 11 Western States.

In the west, 54 percent of the land is in the hands of a single landlord—the United States Government. Five thousand different (and sometimes conflicting) laws, rules, and regulations now hamstring sheep and cattlemen who graze these lands.

Even those who are awarded grazing rights claim that their permits may not be worth the paper they're written on. Uncle Sam can and does kick off permittees at will.

Aroused stockmen hope to correct this situation, at last, at this Congress. After 3 years' careful study of the problem, they are introducing a bill which, if passed, would:

1. Give stockmen stability of tenure, so that they can plan and produce from one year to the next.

2. Grant the stockman his day in court, and a chance to appeal from bureaucratic rulings.

The two biggest Federal land administrators are the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management in the Interior Department.

The Forest Service now manages 140 million acres in the West alone, and permits livestock grazing for pay on about 80 million acres. The Bureau of Land Management runs another 169 million acres outside the forest.

Back in 1934, stockmen sponsored the Taylor law, which now governs Interior lands. The Taylor law brought order and stability to these lands.

It gives stockmen a chance to say something about running the public range. While it's not perfect, it is regarded as one of the best land laws that the West has ever had.

But the rules and regulations of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management contradict each other.

In California I once saw a fence separating identical pasturages—one administered by Interior, the other by Agriculture.

"On one side we can turn in June 15," the rancher explained, "and on the other, July 15. See any difference?"

What the stockmen want is a uniform Federal grazing act to govern both agencies. More specifically, they want a Taylor law for the Forest Service.

Regardless of how long they have been grazing these lands, stockmen don't have any rights—just privileges.

The Forest Service has slashed sheep and cattle numbers between 50 percent and 60 percent on their lands, and there's nothing the stockmen can do about it. The Forest Service is plaintiff, prosecutor, judge, and jury. While it has talked conservation it has denied, with few exceptions, the requests of stockmen to fence, develop water, and reseed the range, even at their own expense.

The time has come, ranchers believe, to reverse these practices, consolidate range laws, set up uniform rules, improve the public lands, and stabilize the livestock industry.

Here's how the new bill would operate as law:

1. No danger of a land grab by stockmen, as the Forest Service and sportsmen's group charge.

The bill guarantees that the Government shall have unlimited discretion to say whether lands should be used for grazing, recreation, wildlife, flood control, or any other purpose.

It reads: "Nothing herein contained shall be construed to restrict the power of the Secretary to limit or discontinue the grazing use of any lands under his jurisdiction."

2. The bill recognizes grazing as a use, and would govern it the same as mining and irrigation, by the familiar rule: "First in time is first in right." Thus, a stockman would be sure of his grazing rights as long as he holds base property and abides by grazing rules.

3. A stockman could go to court under the proposed law; at present, he can be cut at a bureau's whim and without recourse. He could demand a hearing, and appeal to Federal courts from any arbitrary ruling.

4. No more "tranafer cuts"—a favorite device of the Forest Service.

A stockman now has to own a certain amount of base property to get a permit—has to be able to feed his stock when not on the forest. But if a permittee dies, the widow may suffer a "transfer cut" when she inherits her husband's holdings. Her cattle numbers on the forest may be cut 10 to 20 percent.

If she sells the home ranch the permit that goes with it may be cut another 20 to 30 percent. And if she wants to start her boy or girl in a 4-H breeding stock project she is liable to a transfer cut, since this, in effect, would be entering into a partnership.

5. Ranchers could improve Federal range at their own expense.

Heretofore the Forest Service has largely prohibited range improvement, fearing that ranchers might obtain vested rights.

The new bill encourages range improvement at private expense and in cooperation with Federal agencies. A stockman can build drift fences, trails, and roads, develop water, and reseed. If he loses a permit through no fault of his own he is repaid for improvements.

6. It calls for fair fees to be set by independent governmental agencies on all Federal grazing lands.

Critics charge that the proposed law would permanently freeze grazing permits, and give stockmen a vested right to pass on privileges to their heirs, or to lease or sell permits and thus monopolize public land. They also charge that the right of appeal to courts on grazing problems could bog down Government administration completely.

In any event you'll hear a lot about this bill. It is not sponsored by a small, selfish minority of stockmen, as has been charged. It was prepared by the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Wool Growers; is backed by the American Farm Bureau, the National Council of Grazing Directors, and by the vast majority of range users.

"This bill would put into law what is already established range custom," says the American National Cattlemen's Association. "It will stabilize the livestock industry while protecting the public's interest in grazing lands."

	Percent
Arizona	69.4
California	45.7
Colorado	37.4
Idaho	64.7
Montana	36.5
Nevada	85
New Mexico	45.6
Oregon	52.7
Utah	71.3
Washington	35
Wyoming	51.6

In my own State of Oregon over 52 percent of the land area is held by the Federal Government. On January 3, I introduced H. R. 206, which is identical with bills introduced by me at previous sessions of the Congress which would require the Federal Government to assume the tax burden on these enormous holdings of the land area of the States which have been taken over by the Federal Government and removed from the tax rolls. In many of the counties the problem is so great that the ordinary activities of the county cannot be financed without receiving the equivalent to taxes from these Government-owned lands.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of my bill, H. R. 206, will not provide a solution to this problem of excessive ownership of land by the Federal Government. These holdings of lands by the National Government should be broken up and returned to the several States of the Union in which they are situated. While it is true the Government in the operation of its business and particularly for military purposes, does require ownership of considerable acreage in various States of the Union the enormous holdings now held by the Government far exceed the need in this respect, therefore I am urging that legislation be enacted at this session of the Congress returning these lands to the States in which they are situated.

The following is the text of my bill H. R. 206:

A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes

Be it enacted etc., That all real property in the continental United States which heretofore, subsequent to December 7, 1941, was acquired, or which shall hereafter be ac-

quired, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by or on behalf of the United States for general military purposes (including property acquired for, or for use in connection with, fortifications, coast defenses, military camps, cantonments, proving grounds, training areas, bomb-testing areas, and the manufacture of munitions), together with the improvements on any such real property at the time such property is so acquired, shall remain subject to taxation by the State and political subdivision in which such property is located, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any property with respect to which such power of taxation is waived in accordance with State law by the State or political subdivision in which such property is located. Any property covered by any such waiver shall not thereafter be subject to such taxation by the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, so long as such property is held by or on behalf of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak briefly on another subject which is very dear to the hearts of those of us in the Pacific Northwest and particularly the State of Oregon.

OREGON PIONEERS IN STATUARY HALL

Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday, February 14, the 94th anniversary of the admission of Oregon as a State of the Union, a significant ceremony took place in Statuary Hall in the Capitol. The bronze statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee were presented to the National Government by the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, in behalf of Paul L. Patterson, Governor of Oregon. The statues were accepted in behalf of the Nation by Vice President NIXON.

Significant and noteworthy addresses were delivered by Mr. Leslie M. Scott, director of the Oregon Historical Society, on the life and work of Dr. McLoughlin, benefactor of Oregon settlers, and by Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president of the Willamette University on Rev. Jason Lee, whom he characterized as missionary and colonizer. Dr. Burt Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee and vice president of the University of Oregon, gave an address entitled "Oregon, the Unique Prize."

While it is true these are the first statues of Oregon pioneers selected by the State of Oregon for Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol, the statue of Edward Dickinson Baker, late Senator from Oregon and distinguished military statesman and friend of Abraham Lincoln, occupies a prominent place in Statuary Hall. However, it was not placed there through the request of the State but by the Congress itself. Each State in the Union is accorded the privilege of placing in Statuary Hall two statues of its distinguished citizens.

Mr. Chairman, in acquainting you, and my colleagues, of the great contributions made by these pioneers whose statues are now placed in Statuary Hall by the people of Oregon on the 94th anniversary as a State, I am extending in these remarks the dedicatory addresses of Dr. G. Herbert Smith and Mr. Leslie M. Scott, which give in some detail the significant accomplishments of these two great Oregon pioneers:

JASON LEE: MISSIONARY AND COLONIZER

(Address by Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president, Willamette University, on the occasion of the dedication and unveiling of statues of Jason Lee and Dr. John McLoughlin)

The story of Jason Lee and the historic part he played in the colonization and development of the Oregon country gives us an outstanding example of a man and a task well met. A lesser man in physical power, endurance, courage, spiritual devotion, personal leadership, and adaptability, would have been doomed to failure in the assignment which Lee undertook as a service to God, his church, and to mankind.

The first 30 years of Jason Lee's life were spent in a remarkably effective preparation for the 12 years of his unusual ministry—for Jason Lee was first of all a minister and a missionary. His sturdy Old England and New England ancestry may rightfully be included in his preparation for his life work, for he came from a long line of rugged pioneering forebears. Jason was the youngest of 16 children, and was born on June 28, 1803, in a log house built by his father in what is now Stanstead Parish, Quebec, Canada. Careful historians of the period emphasize the fact that the father, Daniel Lee, a veteran of the Revolutionary War, and his wife, Sarah, as well as their children, were American citizens.

While Jason was yet a young lad his father died leaving the mother with little means of support, and Jason went to live with his brother Elias, 25 years his senior. During these years there developed a lifelong attachment between Jason Lee and his nephew, Daniel, 3 years his junior, who was to become his companion and missionary to Oregon.

For Jason Lee there was a brief period of formal education in the village school at Stanstead, interrupted by economic necessity. He recalled that at the age of 13 he was self-supporting—thrown upon the world without money to provide for all his wants by his own industry. His work as a farmhand followed by toilsome years in the lumber camps, contributed to the knowledge and physical power of the young giant.

The changes which came in the life of Jason Lee, turning him from logging camps to the Christian ministry and the Oregon mission field, were largely influenced by two great personalities with whom he came in contact. The first of these men he met in 1826. The Reverend Richard Pope, Wesleyan missionary, led a remarkable religious awakening on the Stanstead circuit. To him goes the honor of winning Jason Lee to the services of the church. Lee's diary reveals the influence of his religious experience and the milestone it wrought in his career. He wrote: "I was now by my own consent, the property of another, and His glory and not my own gratification must be the object of my pursuit."

In the years which immediately followed, Lee continued his manual labor with study and preaching on the side. There was a growing conviction, however, that he must more fully equip himself for the ministry. Accordingly, in 1829, at age 26, he returned to the Massachusetts village of his ancestors and entered the young Wilbraham Academy. His fellow student, Osmon C. Baker, later to become a Methodist Bishop, gave us a personal description of Lee at the time of his enrollment: "Jason Lee was a large, athletic young man, 6 feet and 3 inches in height, with a fully developed frame, and a constitution like iron.

"His piety was deep and uniform, and his life, in a very uncommon degree, pure and exemplary. In those days of extensive and powerful revivals, I used to observe with what confidence and satisfaction seekers of religion would place themselves under his instruction. They regarded him as a righteous man whose prayers availed much."

It was such a young man who attracted the attention of another great personality—Dr. Wilbur Fisk, then principal at Wilbraham Academy. Fisk, the distinguished educator, recognized Lee's superior qualities and gave him particular attention. As is often the case with great teachers, it was Fisk who influenced his pupil, Jason Lee, to undertake his distinctive life assignment—the mission to Oregon.

Lee had returned to his home community where he was preaching and teaching in the Stanstead Academy. During this period the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was deeply moved by an article in the Christian Advocate and Journal which told of the visit of four Flathead Indians to St. Louis, the trading center of the West. The article concluded that "the red men from the Flathead Tribe of Oregon had been sent by a council of their chiefs, as delegates to St. Louis to inquire concerning the word of the Great Spirit; that in prosecution of their object, they had traveled 2,000 miles through rugged mountains, barren plains, and dangerous enemies, enduring cold and heat, thirst and hunger, and many hardships."

The immediate and spontaneous response to this article was that the Gospel must be taken to the Oregon country. The leaders of the Methodist Church at once urged a mission to the Flathead Indians and Dr. Wilbur Fisk, who had become the first president of Wesleyan University, led out in an appeal for a missionary effort. As soon as the general mission board had voted to establish a mission, Fisk recalled the devoted student of Wilbraham Academy, and urged that Jason Lee be appointed. In June, the New England Conference ordained Jason Lee as "Missionary to the Flathead Indians" and his former teacher expressed his warm approval:

"Our esteemed brother, Jason Lee, was appointed by Bishop Hedding at the late session of the New England Conference for that mission. Brother Lee is one whom all who know him judge well qualified for the enterprise. He is a man on whom my mind rested when the subject was first agitated. I know him well, and can most cordially recommend him to all the friends of the enterprise as one worthy of their confidence."

Jason Lee left his home on August 9, 1833, but soon discovered that there were many problems and much to accomplish before the trip to Oregon could be attempted. The next several months were spent in travel in the East holding missionary meetings to raise money for the enterprise. During this period, Jason Lee also associated with himself two men who became his most able and loyal colleagues—his nephew, Daniel Lee, and Cyrus Shepard, a young Boston schoolmaster.

In our day of air travel when any point in the country can be reached in a few hours, it is difficult for us to comprehend the magnitude of the problem which faced Jason Lee in reaching the Oregon Country and the scene of his labors. Fortunately he learned of Capt. Nathaniel J. Wyeth, who recently had returned to Boston from his first journey west, and arrangements were made for the Lee party to accompany Wyeth's second expedition, which was scheduled to leave Independence, Mo., in April 1834. The trip to St. Louis was made by boat on the Ohio River with stops en route to hold missionary meetings and secure additional finance. Across Missouri Jason Lee and his nephew made a strenuous trip by horseback. At Independence, two lay assistants, Philip L. Edwards and Courtney M. Walker, were added to the mission party and the little band with packs, pack saddles, horses and cows, was ready to join Captain Wyeth's large party of travelers—westward over the dimly blazed Oregon Trail.

From that spring Monday, April 28, 1834, days turned into eventful weeks, and weeks into months, as the caravan moved steadily westward. In the course of the journey, Jason Lee repeatedly demonstrated his good judgment, his courage, and his capacity for leadership. Often when Captain Wyeth was away from the main party to hunt or trade, it was Jason Lee who acted as his lieutenant in command. A sincere tribute was paid to Mr. Lee by one of his fellow travelers, the Philadelphia physician and naturalist, John K. Townsend, who wrote:

"Mr. Lee is a great favorite with the men, deservedly so, and there are probably few persons to whose preaching they would have listened with so much complaisance. I have often been amused and pleased by Mr. Lee's manner of reproving them for the coarseness and profanity of expression which is so universal among them. The reproof, although decided, clear and strong, is always characterized by the mildness and affectionate manner peculiar to the man; and though the good effect of the advice may not be discernible, yet it is always treated with respect, and its utility acknowledged."

The land journey was completed with the arrival of the party at Fort Walla Walla on the first day of September. Two weeks later, after a barge trip on the Columbia River, the mission party reached journey's end and moored their barge on the beach in front of Fort Vancouver. There, two great personages of early Oregon first met. Jason Lee was greeted by Dr. John McLoughlin, and this meeting marked the beginning of a friendship never to be broken between the big-hearted chief factor of the Columbia River district of the Hudson's Bay Company and the missionary to the Flatheads.

In making the decision to establish the mission in the valley of the Willamette, Jason Lee was largely influenced by the advice of Dr. McLoughlin who pointed out the danger of attempting a mission farther east in the Flathead country. The mission site selected was on a broad rich river bottom, 10 miles northwest of the present city of Salem. Work was started at once on a permanent shelter. Jason Lee records a vivid picture of the first weeks of labor:

"We landed where we now are in October 1834, and pitched our tents, unloaded our canoes, and commenced building a house. The rainy season was approaching and I did not like the idea of living in an Indian hut. We labored under disadvantages for we were not carpenters. We, however, went into the woods and cut the timber. We took the green trees and split them, and hewed out boards for our floors. We could not advance very swiftly, and we did not finish our house till after the rainy season had commenced."

From his earliest days in Oregon, Jason Lee thought in terms of colonization and permanent settlements. In his first letter to his friend Dr. Fisk, he reported:

"I have requested the board not to send any more single men, but to send men with families. I have also advised that Daniel's chosen be sent as soon as possible. A greater favor could not be bestowed upon this country, than to send it pious, industrious, intelligent females."

The plea for additions to the mission family was Jason Lee's continuing message. Finally, the board acted to send reinforcements starting in 1837. The first party sailed from Boston Harbor to Oregon aboard the *Hamilton* in 1836. Included were Miss Susan Downing, engaged to marry Cyrus Shepard, and Miss Anna Maria Pittman. The latter became the wife of Jason Lee and was destined to be the first white woman to die in the Oregon country.

In the spring of 1835, 30 acres of prairie land were plowed and planted with seed, and in this small way the agricultural industry of the Willamette Valley had its start. The first crops were sufficient to provide food for the missionaries as well as for a number of Indian children. Jason Lee recognized the fertility of the soil and reported to his mission board:

"The land here produces good wheat, peas, barley, oats, beans, and potatoes, but Indian corn does not flourish well."

Experience with the Indian children who came to the mission clearly indicated that education must precede an understanding of religion. Thus, an early activity was the establishment of the Indian Mission School in March 1835. This was the forerunner of the Indian Manual Labor Training School whose property was later sold to the trustees of the Oregon Institute, to become Willamette University. Jason Lee realized that his greatest hope in bringing salvation to the Indians was through the medium of education. Under the direction of Cyrus Shepard, the Mission School made rapid progress and gave the mission its greatest early evidence of success.

Jason Lee's business acumen was evidenced when he set in motion a program which led to the beginning of independent economic life for the Oregon settlers as well as the start of one of Oregon's most important industries. Lee recognized that possession of cattle was fundamental to the economic life of the mission. With this in mind he organized a joint stock company to raise money and send a delegation to California to purchase cattle. Approximately $2,700 was secured and 800 head of Spanish cattle were purchased. Six hundred and thirty of the original purchase survived the grueling trip overland and became the foundation of Oregon's livestock and dairy industry.

While Jason Lee's missionary purpose and spirit never faltered, there is ample evidence that he had a growing realization of the futility of the work with the Indians and the importance of the growing white settlement in the Oregon country. As early as 1837 he expressed a vital interest in securing ties for the Oregon country with the Government of the United States.

The strong desire to bring the problems of the Oregon settlers to the attention of Congress, coupled with other considerations growing out of the mission, convinced Lee that a trip back to the States was imperative. He set about making plans for the journey. Prior to his departure, a meeting was called at the log mission house on March 16, 1838, and there, inspired by Jason Lee, was drafted a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States, petitioning the extension of American jurisdiction over Oregon.

This first memorial from Oregon to the Congress was signed by every member of the mission, 17 other American citizens, and 9 French-Canadians who desired American citizenship. The historic document made a thorough and statesmanlike appraisal of the economic resources and commercial advantages of Oregon for the United States, and requested the Government of the United States to take formal and speedy possession.

Jason Lee carried this famous document from Oregon to Missouri in a container securely strapped to the side of his horse. From Missouri it followed the transportation routes of the day, over rivers, great lakes, canals, and post roads. Late in December 1838 when Lee went to the Federal Capitol for missionary meetings, this memorial was duly presented to Senator Lewis F. Linn, who, in turn, introduced it to the Senate on January 28, 1839, where it was ordered printed and distributed.

About this time, Jason Lee replied to an inquiry on Oregon from Representative Caleb Cushing, member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Lee's reply of January 17, 1839, left no doubt as to the importance which Jason Lee placed on the permanent peopling of Oregon with white settlers, and the urgency of extending United States control over the area. The statesmanship and vision of the Oregon colonizer is revealed by his statement:

"And to whom shall we look, to whom can we look, for the establishment of wholesome laws to regulate our infant but rising settlements, but to the Congress of our own beloved country? The country (Oregon) will be settled, and that speedily, from some quarter; and it depends very much upon the speedy action of Congress what that population shall be. * * * It may be thought that Oregon is of little importance; but, rely upon it, there is the germ of a great State."

Jason Lee's tour of the East was successful both in securing needed financial backing and in inducing a large company of missionary settlers to return with him to Oregon. This second trip to the Valley of the Willamette was to be made aboard a new three-masted sailing ship, the *Lausanne*. Included in the 51 members of the party was Jason Lee's second wife, the former Lucy Thompson, whom he had married in July.

Despite the caution given by Lee to the mission board in the selection of personnel for the Oregon family, it became evident to Lee in the course of the voyage, that some of the new additions might prove to be a handicap in his work. He shrewdly observed: "I have been watching our reinforcements in order to discover their traits of character, and I trust we shall be able to turn them all to some good account in that dark land; but I am persuaded that it is one thing to be a missionary on the *Lausanne* and another to be a good one in Oregon."

On June 1, 1840, the *Lausanne* dropped anchor near Fort Vancouver, and the work of the reinforced Oregon Mission was started at once. Again Jason Lee demonstrated his vision and sagacity by the careful location of his new mission stations, every one of which was in an area vital to the United States in the later contests for the Oregon country.

General progress was being made in the colonization and missions enterprises. Permanent houses and churches were built and the causes of religion, education, and formal government were advanced. In 1841 Jason Lee was elected chairman and presided over an informal conference at Champoeg to consider local civil government for Oregon. He was also a prime factor in the important Champoeg meeting of May 1843.

On January 17, 1842, Jason Lee called a meeting at his residence to formulate plans and establish the Oregon Institute. Mr. Lee was elected first chairman of the board of trustees of this pioneer educational institution of the West, which soon changed its name to Willamette University.

In spite of the progress and accomplishments of the mission, under Lee's leadership, the signs he had noted on the *Lausanne* developed into outright discontent, which was highly injurious to the mission cause. Some of the later arrivals who were obviously unsuited to the rugged Oregon life, soon returned East to give biased and unfavorable reports. Others in Oregon, who became discouraged, forwarded letters, some of which criticized the mission superintendent. Lee realized that his work must have unquestioned support, both in Oregon and by the home board, and he determined to make the long trip east again to appear personally before the board where he was certain he could adjust all difficulties. Furthermore, he felt the urgency of the trip to place the claims of American citizens personally before proper congressional officials since the joint occupancy with Great Britain was soon to be terminated.

It was not until Lee was actually in Honolulu on his return trip that he learned that without a hearing by his board, he had been superseded as a leader of the Oregon mission by the Reverend George Gray, who, at that very time, was journeying around the Horn on his way to Oregon.

In the appearance before the mission board, Lee was able to answer all complaints and accusations which had been made by his dissatisfied associates. He was publicly vindicated and retained his title, "missionary to Oregon," even though the precipitant action in sending Reverend Gray made it impossible for Jason Lee to continue as superintendent.

Jason Lee stayed on in the East, working in the interests of the mission and the Oregon institute as long as his health would permit. To the last he held to the hope that he might again return to his adopted land. The hardships and exposure which he had endured worked against him, however, and on March 12, 1845, he concluded his ministry and a great pioneering career.

At age 41, in just 12 years as missionary to Oregon, this man had organized and largely financed his Flathead Mission. He was the first missionary to enter the Oregon country. He established the first American settlement in Oregon and led in the formation of local government. He introduced the basis of sound economic life and established the first university west of Missouri. His was the statesman's vision of Oregon's value to the Union and its future role as an American State. He carried the first memorial to Congress petitioning the extension of American jurisdiction over the Oregon country. Jason Lee's place in the history of Oregon and the Nation is secure. The people of Oregon who are the spiritual heirs of this distinguished missionary and colonizer must say with the poet Alfred Noyes, "If I saw farther, 'twas because I stood on giant shoulders."

Dr. John McLoughlin: Benefactor of Oregon Settlers

(Address at dedication of McLoughlin Statue, Statuary Hall, Washington, D. C., February 14, 1953, Statehood Day, by Leslie M. Scott)

Dr. John McLoughlin was a foremost man, in Oregon, for 30 years, a century ago. Heights of achievement and depths of frustration marked his life; but throughout, he maintained equipoise of spirit, dignity, and benevolence.

After a century's delay, we raise a statue to the memory of this man of peace and goodness.

His words could well adorn his monument, as they do his memory:

"I fed the hungry, caused the sick to be attended and nursed, furnished them with every assistance so long as they required it. * * * And in some cases had to put up with a great deal. I founded this settlement [Oregon City] and prevented a war between the United States and Great Britain." (Oregon Pioneer Association Transactions, 1880, 54–55; Marshall, Acquisition of Oregon, I, 430–40.)

History's verdict concurs with McLoughlin's, that he saved from war, by helping Americans of the four migrations, 1842–1845, exhausted, sick and destitute, on the last miles of their Oregon Trail journey.

In those years came to Oregon 5,500 Americans—men, women, and children. They raised the majority of the Americans, over the British, to 10 to 1, and moved the British, in 1846, to hasty acceptance of the present boundary between the State of Washington and the Province of British Columbia; previously refused by them for 30 years.

The election of President Polk in 1844 hinged on the boundary issue of "fifty-four-forty or fight." Such a boundary, that far north, at the southern end of Alaska, would have doubled the area of the American Oregon country.

The British saw a better bargain in the boundary that they conceded, without war, at 49°. Their diplomats, at last, wisely followed the prudence of Dr. McLoughlin. The good doctor, versed in the history and spirit of the American people, had more wisdom and diplomacy, here, far away, than all the King's Ministers in London, and their agents in Oregon.

Americans then turned from a war on Britain to a war on Mexico, and conquest of California.

As master of the British fur trade and subject to the British Crown, McLoughlin faced the continental spread of the American Nation. He knew the futility of British resistance, in Oregon as elsewhere, to the sweep of Americans from the Atlantic.

McLoughlin was chief factor, manager, of the fur-trade Hudson's Bay Company, in the Pacific Northwest in 1824–45. The British censured him for aiding the American settlers, prior to the boundary treaty of 1846; even called him traitor; so that, in his own words: "From self-respect I resigned my position, by which I sacrificed $12,000 per annum." (Oregon Pioneer Association Transactions, 1880, p. 55.)

Aggravating the censure were acts of his company, taking away his sole command, and giving authority to a board of managers, 2 of whose 3 members were other chief factors; and in cutting off his salary, or extra pay, of $2,400 a year (£500). His resignation became final in 1846 American radicals charged him with inciting Indians to massacre Americans: "I," answered McLoughlin, "who saved all I could." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XLV, 1–5.)

McLoughlin became eligible to American citizenship at Oregon City in 1849, respected and beloved; and was elected mayor in 1851; yet was deprived of his land claim there, while he lived, by grasping missionary rivals who made a legal case against him, from his former British allegiance and belated American citizenship. Other British were not so deprived. Five years after his death, the State of Oregon, in 1862, restored the land to his family survivors.

However, it appears from the probate of his estate at Oregon City that the injury affected more his pride and sense of injustice than his substance. His estate amounted to $150,000, including his pending land claim.

His annual compensation as a partner ranged from $1,500 to $5,500 during most of his 22 years' tenure. His share was two eighty-fifths of 40 percent of profits: nearly 1 percent. In addition he received a special salary, as physician, ranging from $700 to $2,400 a year. His partnership shares continued 10 years after his withdrawal: 5 years in full portion, and 5 years in one-half portion. He was the richest man of his day in Oregon Territory. (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XLV, 2–4.)

But riches could not make happiness, against the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Family bereavements added afflictions. Age brought infirmities, took from him the cheer and resolution which had fortified his earlier years.

What was the background, the experience that guided the judgments of this able man? Where and how did he learn to respect the growing American Nation; the futility of holding a fur-trade wilderness and Indian preserve, against settlers; the terrors and sufferings of victims of warpath savages; the revenges of American palefaces?

McLoughlin was a man of learning and culture and wisdom. He was familiar with the history of the fur trade, from Hudson Bay, St. Lawrence River, the Great Lakes, to the Rockies, the Pacific, and the Arctic, 200 years.

The fur trade grew from the search for gold, and for the Western Sea, the Pacific. Early navigators, after Hudson on the Atlantic and Bering and Cook on the Pacific, revealed the wealth of furs.

Atlantic explorers sought a ship passage. Pacific explorers sought a river course to the ocean from the heart of the continent. Settlers followed fur traders.

The fur trade began at Hudson Bay a century before it opened on the Oregon coast. It became the chief objective of British policy. That policy opposed settlers; patronized Indians as fur hunters. Britain expelled France from America in a war for mastery of the fur trade. Even yet, the fur trade is a lucrative business in Canada. The Hudson's Bay Co. is the longest lived successful trade enterprise in the world; nearly 300 years old.

The fur trade was an old vocation to McLoughlin. He understood the ruthless conflict of interests between fur traders, and with settlers. He knew that the American Colonies rebelled against Britain because Parliament and the ministers had forbidden the Colonies to settle in the fur-trade preserve, east of the Alleghanies, by the Quebec Act of 1774. The British at home intended to pursue the same fur-trade exclusions in the Columbia River country. (Oregon Historical Quarterly, VIII, 308.) But McLoughlin set aside that policy, as to American settlers.

The Quebec Act united to McLoughlin's native Quebec the Northwest Territory. That Territory included later Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota. The Quebec Act aimed to keep out American settlers. But George Rogers Clark, brilliant Revolutionary soldier, led the successful conquest for American settlers against the British and their tomahawk allies. We may recall that William Clark, the Oregon explorer, of Lewis and Clark fame, here in 1805–06, was younger brother of George Rogers Clark. McLoughlin remembered that Lewis and Clark explored, in 1804–06, to offset the British claims on the upper Missouri, and in the Rockies and Oregon.

Prior to 1841, for nearly two decades, his authority may be said to have been absolute in this region. He ruled virtually as a fuedal lord, yet kindly, wisely, justly, firmly. He kept Indians off the warpath, befriended travelers, missionaries, settlers. The Cayuse War of 1847–48 broke out after his retirement.

McLoughlin saw the settlers taking possession of Oregon, like their forebears had done in the country north and south of the Ohio; and setting up the Oregon Provisional Government in 1843–45, to take, from the British Hudson's Bay Company and Dr. McLoughlin, the control which they had wielded for 30 years, since Astor's withdrawal in 1813. In those three decades, the British had defeated 11 groups of Americans in Oregon (Carey, Oregon, 262), with trade competition. The British held the allegiance of the Indians by staying off their lands.

Doubtless, McLoughlin had read in his Vancouver library the American Declaration of Independence which denounced the "intolerable acts" of Parliament and Crown; the extension of their "arbitrary" and "absolute" rule of Quebec to the Thirteen Colonies; the incitement of "the merciless Indian savages" against "the inhabitants of our frontiers." (Quotes from Declaration of Independence.)

McLoughlin sensed that the American settlers were successors to the French and Spanish rivals of the British, for the empire of America. Three centuries of American expansion looked down upon the scene in Oregon; and earlier centuries of liberalizing crusades and Renaissance and Reformation that opened the way to religious and political freedom.

McLoughlin had risen to chief trader of the North West Company, on Lake Superior. He knew the bitter strife between the British and the French and the Americans for the fur trade. He had seen, as a youth, the devastating British conflicts between Hudson's Bay Company and North West Company. He remembered the civil war between fur traders and settlers in the Winnipeg country in 1816. He saw the impossibility of colonizing Oregon with British subjects, to outnumber Americans; and of fortifying Oregon with British military forces. He knew the horrors of frontier wars, and of alliances with Indians; as by the French against the British, in Canada; and by the

British against the Americans, in Northwest Territory. He saw the expansion of the American Nation, from Atlantic to Mississippi, and to Rocky Mountains and Oregon.

He told his London company in 1843 that the Americans had the power to take Fort Vancouver. He appealed for protection, but was informed that no protection could be given. (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXXIII, 222.) He then joined the settlers' provisional government, in 1845, and wrote to his London superiors:

"We have yielded to the wishes and request of the respectable part of the people of this country, of British and American origin, by uniting with them in the formation of a provisional and temporary government, having for its object the protection of life and property." (August 30, 1845; Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXIX, 72; XVI, 313; XXXIII, 223-24.)

Soon thereafter came four British warships, one to Columbia River and three to Puget Sound (frigates *Modeste*, and *America*, *Fisgard* and *Cormorant*). But their visit was useless. Their protection was "too little and too late." The British in that year moved their headquarters of the North Pacific from Vancouver to Victoria, as a precaution against the Americans.

Before the Americans set up the provisional government at Champoeg in 1843, McLoughlin admitted that they "must adopt some plan to keep peace in the country." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XIII, 147; Carey, Oregon, 398.) Americans, he said, were the majority in the Columbia country after 1828; and in the Willamette after 1840. (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXXIII, 221.)

Yes, McLoughlin was versed in history and current affairs of the great republic, whose people he had to deal with in Oregon.

He said of himself in 1852, after becoming an American citizen:

"I was born in Canada (Riviere-du-loup, 1784, near northern Maine), and reared to manhood in the immediate vicinity of the United States, and * * * have found * * * many a leisure hour in studying the character of its people and the working of its institutions. I early foresaw * * * that the whole valuable country between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific * * * must become the abode of another race, American. * * * In this spirit I prepared myself to encourage, hasten, and further what I thought would be * * * inevitable. The policy * * * to check migration * * * has subjected me in Europe to strictures as untrue as they have been unjust. From 1824 to the present hour, I have spared neither time nor means, but liberally used both, to facilitate the settling of Oregon by whites * * * to relieve distress and promote the comfort and happiness of immigrants." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, VIII, 296.)

Two hundred years of frontier life, from Hudson Bay and Massachusetts to Columbia River, were in McLoughlin's vision at Fort Vancouver. He recognized the spirit and the vigor of Americans who had come to Oregon.

So, when Captain Parke, of the Royal Marines, one of several British agents in Oregon in 1845, who came to vaunt jingo ways of defending British interests, spoke of bringing troops from Canada, and said of the Americans: "We will hit them a good deal harder than we would other people", McLoughlin exclaimed in protest: "O Captain Parke! Captain Parke!" (Bancroft, Oregon, I, 498.)

The British agents complained that McLoughlin not only relieved the needs and distresses of Americans, but also supplied them with means of growing food crops. McLoughlin explained that he thus safeguarded against a famine in 1845. Said he, later, in 1852:

"And as people will not allow their families to starve when provisions are in their reach, and if we had not assisted them, Vancouver would have been destroyed; the world would have said we were treated in the manner our inhuman conduct deserved; the character of the Hudson's Bay Company and of its officers * * * would be covered with obloquy, and the company's business would be ruined * * * and might have involved * * * war." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXXIII, 227.)

McLoughlin protected Americans from Indians. Such occasions were frequent. When Americans were arriving at Vancouver in 1843, 800 of them, the largest migration up to that time, an Indian cried out: "It is good for us to kill these Bostons," McLoughlin rushed upon the Indian with his cane: "Who is the dog that says it is a good thing to kill these Bostons?" The fellow, trembling, said: "The Dalles Indians say so." "Well," said McLoughlin, "The Dalles Indians are dogs for saying so, and you, too." And stamped away, in warning indignation. (Oregon Pioneer Association, Transactions, 1880, p. 52.)

Besides his experience as a fur trader and his knowledge of history, McLoughlin had physical and mental inheritance from strong forebears, Scotch, Irish, and French, to give him poise and equilibrium. His able biographer, Dr. Burt Brown Barker, in the pamphlet especially published for this occasion (Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, Settlement) points out the traits that thus lineally came to our distinguished subject.

His father, John, was a Scotch-Irish Canadian; his grandfather, John, a native of Scotland. His mother was a Fraser; her mother, a French-Canadian. Our John's mother had two brothers: One of them a physician in the Napoleonic wars; the other a fur-trade partner in the North West Co. His first uncle, Simon Fraser, evidently guided our John to become a physician. The second uncle, Alexander, evidently inducted our John into the fur trade.

Biographer Barker suggests that our John "must have heard much of the fur trade in his boyhood associations in the home of his grandfather (Malcolm) Fraser" (p. 30).

Our John entered the service of the North West Co. in 1803, at the age of 19. He became a partner in 1814, at the age of 30; later chief trader at the main depot and factory on Lake Superior, Fort William. He participated in London in 1821 in the union of his company with the Hudson's Bay Company. Such union was designed to cure the warring rivalry of the two companies.

McLoughlin, at the age of 40, went to Astoria on the Columbia River, in 1824, as chief factor, or manager, of the Pacific Northwest region of the fur trade, for the Hudson's Bay Company. He accompanied the deputy governor of the company, Sir George Simpson, from Canada. Sir George chose the site for new headquarters at Vancouver. Next year McLoughlin moved the old headquarters from Astoria, where Astor's Pacific Fur Co. had established the post in 1811, and the North West Co. had bought it in 1813. From 1824 to 1846, McLoughlin directed the fur trade, at Fort Vancouver and at 30 to 40 subposts in this great area of 400,000 square miles.

By courtesy, McLoughlin was called governor of local affairs of his company. The real governor of his company was in London, Sir John H. Pelly; and the acting governor, or deputy, in Canada, Sir George Simpson.

McLoughlin was devoted to the Roman Catholic faith of his forbears in Canada, yet respectful of other beliefs, and never imposed his upon others, or upon their children who were under his protection.

McLoughlin was tall, erect, strong, imposing, to match his powers of mind, his wisdom, and benignity. Though quick-tempered, he could bend to concede an error, as with the Reverend Herbert Beaver, Anglican chaplain, who had offended him by sending from Vancouver to London, in 1837, a critical report. The doctor asked an explanation. "Sir," retorted the clergyman, "if you wish to know why a cow's tail grows downward, I cannot tell you; I can only cite the fact."

Up went the doctor's cane, and down with a resounding thwack upon the hapless shoulders of the saucy divine. Beaver called to his wife for his flintlock pistols, but on second thought decided not to shoot the doctor.

Next day, at a solemn auction of personal effects of a man who had drowned in the Columbia, the doctor approached the reverend and said: "Mr. Beaver, I make this public apology for the indignity I laid upon you yesterday." "Sir," exclaimed the chaplain, "I will not accept your apology."

Soon the testy chaplain returned to England. And the hasty, wise doctor continued to govern the fur trade and befriend the settlers.

Earlier Americans, those who came with Joe Meek, found McLoughlin harder to deal with than the later ones. When refused supplies by McLoughlin, they asked: "What, then, shall we do?" "Go to work! go to work! go to work!" was his answer. (Burnett, Recollections, 155.)

Many pioneers and writers have eulogized Dr. McLoughlin. A distinguished historian, Mrs. Frances Fuller Victor, compiler of Bancroft's Oregon, thus pays tribute:

"The constant defamations with which he was pursued under the name of patriotism, for years after the arrival of the great Methodist reinforcement (1840), must have warped any character less strong and generous than McLoughlin's; but with him it was not suffered to change his settled policy of benevolence toward all men, though it sometimes betrayed him with exhibition of resentment or of helpless protest against the devices of his enemies." (Bancroft, I, 210.)

McLoughlin's life was a contrast of victory and defeat, benevolence and sorrow, sunshine and shadow.

He was a loyal subject to Britain, pledged to hold the northern half of original Oregon to his King's domain. But his fortunes were cast with strong Americans, of superior numbers.

He ruled in Oregon, not by British might nor power, but by his humane spirit of truth, justice, benevolence.

He became a citizen of the United States, admired, respected, but despoiled of lands that were justly his, by American neighbors, whom he had aided and befriended.

"I was silent", he wrote in 1845, "in full realization that some day justice would be done me." (Oregon Historial Quarterly, XXXIII, 228.)

Now, 96 years after his sorrows closed, we Oregonians dedicate a statue to him, of grateful memory.

As in the Angel's wakening light, may we see inscribed in the book of gold, like Ben Adhem leading all the rest, for love of his fellow men, the name of Dr. John McLoughlin.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 7, after line 7, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Payment to school districts: For an additional amount for payment to school districts, $24,000,000."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House who have known me so long may think I am appearing in a strange role now, in that my past appearances called for cuts of appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. However, whenever a person is in the right and is on the side of justice no apology need be made, and I make none for my appearance and the presentation of this amendment restoring $24 million for schools in defense impacted areas. Despite the fact that Commissioner McGrath did send a letter

out to the school districts and tell them that the $40 million was all that there was to be available this year, the word got out some way to all of them that there would be $64 million available. All these school heads who are dependent upon this aid in the impacted areas have been working on that very philosophy. However, Congress today should warn all these school districts that when the appropriation is made under this act for 1954 that that appropriation is all that is going to be available for that fiscal year. In the meantime, Public Law 874 should be thoroughly studied and widely revised. As it is now, it is not realistic and the regulations issued thereunder are equally unrealistic. Under the present procedure, a child in one of these schools becomes a statistic. He is asked, "Where does your father work or where where does your mother work?" If either works in a defense plant, the pupil then becomes one unit to be considered for allocation of part of this appropriation.

That is true even though the parents have lived in that community since they were born, and will continue to live there long after these children are grown and the impact of the Korean defense effort has passed. That has been true in all too many of these cases, hence that pupil is not actually there because of Korean defense influx. Not only that, but in many cases where defense workers have come into a community their child is not counted to help the school to get that aid because the defense worker parent happens to work in an adjoining State. For example, Johnson County, Kans., in my district, is an ideal home community. Parents move into that ideal home locality rather than live in Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo. They work in Missouri in the Ford bomber plant or at Lake City ordnance or central air defense, and similar places. Although Johnson County, Kans., has to carry the burden of educating those added children, they cannot be counted because their parents work in a different State. That is not fair and it is not just. That should be remedied. In my district, the Second of Kansas, we have some large defense plants. We have the Sunflower ordnance plant, the naval air training station, the GM jet fighter plant, and in adjoining areas in Missouri there are the Lake City ordnance plant, the Ford bomber plant, the Westinghouse jet plant, together with many many other defense plants of various types in both States. This demonstrates the need of a new study by the legislative committee, and by the Office of Education. As you can see, Mr. Chairman, for instance, in Johnson County, Kans., these various residential communities are called upon to take on this additional load of students without their proper share of these funds. Right now we are caught in a pinch and there is nothing we can logically or justly do other than recognize the need and the demand for an additional $24 million required to carry out the provision of this public law. The general program under Public Law 874 needs a complete revision because it seems to me absolutely unrealistic that there should be today far more school districts asking for this aid under the impact of defense demands for the war in Korea than there were in World War II which was ever so much greater in its impact upon the various communities in the United States. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Appropriations, which reported out this bill without the $24 million that the House of Representatives will meet the demands upon it in the name of justice and fairness and stark reality and will restore the $24 million for the benefit of the education of the children of America, whose homes are in defense impacted areas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to know whether the gentleman considers that the United States Government is under a moral obligation to these school districts?

PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. SCRIVNER. Under the law, as the Congress passed it and as it was signed by the President, during the 82d Congress, there is a legislatively enacted legal obligation.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Then I am in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we could not come to some agreement as to limitation of time on this amendment. For that purpose I would like to ask how many Members would like to speak.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we might run on for 10 or 15 minutes and see what develops, and then we could have a better idea.

Mr. TABER. I think we could have a pretty good idea now. I would suggest 1 hour. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FOGARTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest in this amendment, I wish the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would allow us to run on for 15 or 20 minutes and then see how many might want to speak at that time. I think we could agree on a time limit then.

Mr. TABER. I think we ought to agree on the time at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes. That ought to be sufficient.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that the gentleman make that 1 hour and a half, and then I am sure there will be no objection.

Mr. TABER. Very well. I will modify the motion to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion as modified, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the list of those requesting time to speak, the Chair will recognize each Member for 1½ minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$20,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island, the ranking member of our subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to extend my remarks following his.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request and to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request and to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is not on the list.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks with the others on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may extend their remarks on this amendment succeeding debate on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and extend my remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the request stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asked that he might yield his time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and to extend my remarks.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to make this statement: Very often in the work of the House and in the committee it becomes highly desirable to limit time for debate, and that is the situation in which we presently find ourselves. I recognize also that on occasion as time is being used by Members who have asked for it a circumstance may arise where it would seem desirable and possibly would be considered as contributing to a better explanation of the problem before us if some Member yielded his time to another Member.

I think I ought to put the membership on notice that this practice of a great many Members standing up and getting their names on the list for the sole purpose of immediately yielding their time to another Member must be stopped, for it works an inequity in the division of time. I do not believe it is fair; I do not believe it is equitable; and I do not believe it is in keeping with the spirit of the arrangement by which time is limited.

I have not objected to any of these requests to yield time, but I am serving notice that hereafter any such wholesale operation will not be carried out if I can prevent it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not against the rules of the House in a situation of this kind for one Member to yield to another?

The CHAIRMAN. It is being done by unanimous consent, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I shall object to any further such requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine Members have yielded their time to the gentleman from Rhode Island. The gentleman from Rhode Island is now recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the majority leader that I made no request of any individual member of this committee to yield his time to me. I may also say to the distinguished majority leader that I always thought it to be the practice in the matter of limiting debate that such request or motion was not put until debate had been had on the amendment, almost always by the Member offering the amendment. I thought we were going to do that today, and I was quite disappointed when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee moved that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly, I meant no reflection upon the gentleman in respect to other Members yielding time to him and would not intimate for a moment he had made any such request. Secondly, under the rules of the House, if the motion was prematurely made, it was subject to a point of order which the gentleman might have made, then the motion would have undoubtedly been held to be out of order and 5 minutes would have been available to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to the gentleman that I do not know whether it was against the rules or not, but I had the opportunity of serving as chairman of one of the appropriations subcommittees for the past 4 years and I always entertained requests of the minority to speak in opposition before we agreed or attempted to agree to close debate on a particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the Congress had this to say on the school construction law and this deficiency which we are talking about at the present time:

> This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

That is what we have before the Committee at the present time, the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year to pay these school districts 100 percent of what the Congress promised them they would get to operate and maintain schools in these federally impacted areas. It might seem rather strange that I as a Democrat should be getting up here on the floor of the House pleading for something that a Republican President wants at the present time, but this is a matter that I have been interested in since its inception.

In 1949 and 1950 the Committee on Education and Labor selected a subcommittee to study the requirements of these various federally impacted areas. The committee spent 3 or 4 long hard months going all over the country to determine the requirements that were necessary under the Federal obligation. That subcommittee came back and reported to the Committee on Education and Labor and after 8 or 9 months of hearings in 1950 they produced a bill, which the Congress passed, the school construction law known as 815 and also a law known as 874 for the maintenance and operation of these school districts where a Federal impact existed on these particular districts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island why he did not read all of the pertinent remarks regarding this subject in the President's state of the Union address?

The President also stated in connection with this program the following:

> I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to talk about the law that is on the books at the present time and if my distinguished chairman will confine his remarks to whether the law is there or not I think we can arrange a satisfactory solution of this problem.

The matter was looked into for about a year by a legislative committee of this House which produced two good bills, one for school construction and the other to help the federally impacted areas in the maintenance and operation of these schools. I remember in September 1950, over in the House Ways and Means Committee room that this bill was passed. It also carried an appropriation at that time of $25 million, I think. As a consequence of the law enacted in September of 1950 we have been appropriating Federal funds to help share the cost of these school districts, not paying the entire amount of money but sharing the local cost in all of these local districts.

In every year they have had to come in with a deficiency. Why? Because the committee when they enacted this legislation set March 31 as the deadline for applications to be received in the Department of Education here in Washington from the local school districts.

Our distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations said yesterday that they had only obligated $5 million. Up until this date, up until yesterday, they have received over 1,200 applications. They have already obligated over $9 million, which is on a 60 percent entitlement. If it was on a 100 percent entitlement as they were doing a year ago they would have obligated firmly over $12 million as of this date.

Now he also raised the question: Why have not as many applications come in? The applications are coming in this year faster than they were a year ago. The Department of Education now has more applications on file for this help in these districts than they had a year ago at this time. But, when they get most of the applications is in February and March, and these are the 2 months that the school districts are going to file their applications with the Department of Education here in Washington. Now, why are they behind, as some might say? They are not behind because they have to wait until the school year starts in September back in the local districts. It just takes 2 or 3 months—I am talking about the school officials—in the local district to determine how many children are entitled to attend or how the district is going to be reimbursed for the number of school children living in these cate-

gories spelled out under the bill. So, it takes 4 or 5 months to get their figures together in order to get their initial request here in Washington. Why has so little been obligated? Because they only make two payments. The first payment they make is on the estimate of the number of children in these particular districts. The final payment is not made until after the end of the school year, after next June, because final payment is made on the average daily attendance of these children in school. So, as a consequence, it is practically in September next year that the final payments are made to these school districts, because they are computed on the daily average attendance of these pupils.

Some might ask why did I reduce this figure from $24 million to $20,500,000. They are going to have a little more than $3 million left from last year after they have made up 100 percent of the entitlements paid to all of these school districts. So, computing that a little over $3 million, we figure they can meet 100 percent of these entitlements with $20,500,000. The Department of Education told me only about an hour ago that if we appropriate today $20,500,000 instead of the $24 million on the basis of the applications they now have on hand and the estimates that they have received from their field representatives and the officials of the local school districts, we will be keeping our promise to all of these school districts not only in a legal way, but in a moral way to every school district in the United States that is affected by this particular program. Last year they received 1,819 applications and paid out on 1,750. This year at this time the applications are running ahead of last year at this time. Now, we know what happened a year ago. They came in with a deficiency last June for $11,500,000. The committee disallowed it at that time because of extenuating circumstances, but when an amendment was offered on the floor last June not only $11,500,000 for the maintenance and operation of these schools was allowed, but $80 million deficiency for the school construction program. Do you remember what the vote was on a standing vote here last June? It was 147 for the amendment to 40. It carried three and a half to one, because the membership of this House knows that they have not only a legal responsibility but a moral responsibility to appropriate these funds to help these school districts carry on at the present time.

Now what is going to happen if we do not appropriate this money? It will mean that you are saying to the school districts, "We are cutting you off about 40 to 50 percent of what you expected to get."

What happens there? These school districts went out in September and hired their teachers. They are already working on an annual basis. If they do not get this money, many school districts will have to shorten their school terms, they will have to lay off teachers. Who is going to be hurt in the end? The kids in those districts who are going to have their school term shortened and these teachers who are going to lose their jobs. They are the people you should be thinking about today. They are the ones you should have uppermost in your mind today, those kids that might be deprived of some education in this fiscal year unless we live up to our legal and moral responsibilities as Members of Congress.

There may be something wrong with the law. If there is, the law should be changed. But we as members of the Committee on Appropriations I do not believe have the authority to say in the form of a limitation that this Subcommittee on Education and the full committee itself were wrong when they enacted this legislation back in 1950.

I know some amendments have been offered. They were offered last year and they will be offered this year. They will probably save much money. I am sure that the Committee on Education and Labor will review the law and come up with some savings a year from now or maybe before we finally appropriate the funds for next year. The hearings are going to start next week.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed this appropriation in 1952, last year, because of some extenuating circumstances, but I am convinced now, after going thoroughly into the law and after talking to people in my own districts in Rhode Island that have been affected by this program—and I might say in that respect that every district in Rhode Island, not only in my district but in the district of my colleague [Mr. FORAND], every district that gets anything out of this appropriation, and it is not much in the State of Rhode Island, contains Republican towns and cities, even though Rhode Island is one of the strongest Democratic States in the Union. The only towns and cities getting any help in their school districts from this appropriation are the Republican towns in my State.

So I say to you this afternoon that this is not a partisan measure. There is no partisan politics in this at all. Members on both sides of the aisle here today are interested in this program. It was not conceived in politics in 1950. I think it was a unanimous report from the Committee on Education and Labor after a year's study and hearings on the things that they found throughout the country that needed taking care of. This is not a fly-by-night proposition. We have been operating under this law now since 1950. On two other occasions the committee refused these funds. I remember in 1950 when we had a supplemental appropriation of $25,000,000 it was opposed on the floor in the Ways and Means Committee room where we were meeting at that time. The Members were for it almost 4 to 1. We never even asked for a standing vote on it. Again last June in the closing days of our session some of the strongest advocates of economy in this Congress were for this appropriation because they know it is not only a moral but a legal responsibility of the Congress to do something in these school districts where they have no control over and where they cannot raise their taxes any more than they have, and where their bonded indebtedness, limited by State law, is practically at the top.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks the following telegram:

PROVIDENCE, R. I.,
February 17, 1953.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives.

Imperative that benefits from Public Law 874 be continued. Number of Rhode Island cities and towns will face critical financial problems if money is not forthcoming. Warwick reports increase of more than 800 pupils over last year. School committee has included in its receipt $29,000 from Public Law 874. If Federal money had not been available last year the town would have faced serious situation. Impact of Quonset workers has resulted in increased school population. East Greenwich reports that if town loses Federal aid such loss would impair educational program to a marked degree. The increased enrollment in town is caused by activity at Quonset Naval Air Station.

Newport reports that 1,040 pupils or 43 percent of school enrollments have parents who are affiliated with naval reservations in either civilian or military capacity. Four hundred live on Federal property. Naval activity has caused increase of 900 pupils in the schools during the last year, making it necessary for the establishment of double sessions and a building program which includes an elementary and high school. In 1950–51, $94,000 was received from Public Law 874. In 1951–52 $177,000 was received. In 1952–53 an estimated amount of $218,000 has been anticipated. This last amount represents 20 percent of the 1952–53 school budget. It also represents $3.50 per thousand on the tax rate which is already at its maximum by State law. If assistance from Public Law 874 is withdrawn it is faced with additional educational costs which it cannot bear.

Jamestown reports increase of $18,000 over last year for education due to the impact of military personnel. It represents $3 a thousand increase on tax. Coventry has 70 more pupils as a result of military impact. Community is faced with increased costs to provide sufficient building space for its pupils. Tiverton, 12 miles from Newport. Two years ago 4 percent of enrollment and last year 5 percent were children of parents who were affiliated with military establishments. $15,000 more has been necessary to finance costs of education. If it had not been for Federal aid the deficit reported of $1,700 would have been changed to $13,500. Middletown, the most heavily hit by children of Federal employees reports that without aid from Public Law 874 it will be almost impossible for the town to finance suitable educational programs.

State department of education urges you to make every effort to influence Congress to maintain Public Law 874 at its present status. I believe that it is only fair and just that Rhode Island communities should be given at least 1 year to make adjustments in budget if there is any plan to decrease financial aid from this bill. Increased enrollments were thrust upon communities by Federal activity without sufficient time to prepare for increased enrollments.

MICHAEL P. WALSH,
Commissioner of Education, State of Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time allotted has been so meager.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment to the Scrivner amendment. I believe that the districts affected should have the amount restored minus the amount which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has suggested in his amendment. I favor aid to school districts adversely affected

by Federal activities. I have seen many of these districts. Also, I know the situation in regard to the delays in filing applications for entitlements in the fiscal year. Many of the districts cannot know their daily average attendance until near May or June, practically at the end of the school session. Forty-eight and a half million dollars was spent last year and the applications are running ahead of last year at the present time. It was estimated from a survey of the additional pupils expected in the districts affected by Federal activities that they would have an increase to such an extent that an estimated $60 million would be spent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. The Commissioner of Education has already received an appropriation for these activities of approximately $40 million. So you can see the reason for the $20 million or $20½ million additional which is proposed in the pending amendment.

Quarrel, if you will, with the formula of the committee and denounce, if you will, the fact that they have to prorate equally, and also find fault with the districts included, but that is the law of the land under which the districts have made their plans. Do not penalize the children in the affected districts, who need this assistance through no fault of their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], a member of this 83d Congress Appropriations Subcommittee, and during the 82d Congress the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, briefly referred to the text of a portion of the state of the Union message by the President of the United States delivered before a joint session of this 83d Congress on February 2, 1953. As this state of the Union message was no doubt a thoroughly considered, analyzed, and documented statement by our new President, we as Members of this Congress certainly have a right to assume that each and every statement, declaration, and expression therein made by him, was thoroughly considered by him before he made that speech to us. For, in it he made a few specific recommendations for legislation. One of them was on this very subject which we are this hour debating; to wit, the existing Public Law 874. As I read you this important paragraph by the President of the United States, it certainly tells us as clear as crystal, what his opinion is and what his wishes are on this subject. Therefore, I read from his speech of February 2 to us as legislators. Here is what he said:

> One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

I take President Eisenhower at his word. I believe that before he made that declaration and recommendation to us that this very public law (No. 874) should be renewed and that the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year should be met, he had his expert advisers in the field of education give him the benefit of a thorough consideration and a full knowledge of the problem involved.

Yet our own subcommittee in this Congress, within a very few days after the membership thereof had heard the President of the United States tell us what he did and ask us to renew the law and to make up the deficiency, passes us a report diametrically opposite to the recommendations of the President of the United States. This is something I do not pretend to understand. I firmly believe that when the voting time comes on the two amendments to replace this necessary sum to keep our good faith with these vital and financially embarrassed school districts all over the United States, that we will find that the recommendations of the President of the United States will be strongly supported, and, in spite of the fact that the majority membership on our subcommittee which deleted the $24 million is of the same political party faith as is the newly inaugurated President of the United States.

I appreciate the distinguished Representative from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and a member of the majority party, so promptly offering his amendment to replace the $24,000,000, and if Mr. FOGARTY, the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, had not announced that he had just talked with the Department of Education, and that they told him they could get along nicely with $20,500,000 instead of the $24,000,000, then I would certainly be supporting Mr. SCRIVNER's amendment. But, as Mr. FOGARTY's amendment provides for $20,500,000 instead of the $24 million, and is the lesser amount, and the Department of Education through him today told us that the lesser amount would be ample, therefore I support Mr. FOGARTY's amendment. May I make it clear, however, that I only vote for the lesser amount instead of the greater, because we have the assurance of the Department of Education dealing with these various school districts in the States that the amount specified in the Fogarty amendment; to wit, $20,500,000 will do the job and will pay these concerned school districts 100 percent instead of between 50 and 60 percent of the amount represented to them they would be receiving and which they had a right to believe they would have in hand to meet the needs of their respective districts entirely, or almost entirely, as a result of the Federal activities in these Federally affected areas all over our great Nation. I call your attention to page 15 of the subcommittee report on this bill, report dated February 16, 1953, at about the middle of that page it says:

> Testimony and reports received by the committee leaves no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

So, having noted that paragraph, I naturally immediately looked to the printed hearings before this subcommittee which made this report. And, turning to pages 251, 281, and 292 of that report, wherein the testimony by the various witnesses was recorded for our guidance and information, I frankly state that I find no testimony or record therein printed to support this statement made on page 15 of the subcommittee report to us and which we have before us today. If the chairman of our subcommittee has any such evidence to make clear the basis of this declaration by the subcommittee, to the effect that many of the local school districts have local resources to care adequately for the situations inflicted upon them because of the activity of federally controlled installations and activities in their respective school districts, then I here and now call for such evidence. I will frankly say that I know of no such condition existing in the six school districts in the great 23d District of Los Angeles County, Calif., which I have the honor to represent. For, I have in my hand here the financial summary of the applications of 7 school districts in the 23d District now pending before the Federal Security Agency for their promised portion of the very funds about which we are speaking. This is the factual report given me in the matter. So you see, gentlemen, if the $20½ million under the Fogarty amendment is not replaced in this bill, these 7 local school districts in my own 23d Congressional District will not only suffer a loss of estimated and planned and assured income in the amount of $166,634.48, during the 1952–53 fiscal year; but, those local school districts, I am assured by their representatives, have not the local ability, nor have they the local resources under our California State school law to make immediately or at all available, this unexpected deficit. Here is the report which shows:

California school districts—FSA funds (for 23d Congressional, District represented by Hon. Clyde Doyle)

Project No.	Name of project	Amount paid, 1951–52	Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952–53, 100 percent	Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952–53, 60 percent
Calif. 53–E–127	Compton City elementary school district	$192,966.98	$225,771.37	$135,462.82
185	Compton Union high school district	19,471.08	22,781.16	13,668.70
179	Lynwood unified elementary school district	49,189.19	57,551.35	34,530.81
166	Willowbrook elementary school district	30,015.00	35,117.55	21,070.53
167	Bellflower elementary school district	16,819.00	19,678.23	11,806.94
277	Downey school district	3,087.36	3,612.21	2,167.33
170	Paramount elementary school district	44,508.00	52,074.36	31,244.62
	Total	356,056.61	416,586.23	249,951.75

I believe that my record during the 6 years I have had the honor and responsibility of serving in this great legislative body, proves that I have habitually been sensible of the dire need of planned economy. But I never have knowingly, and I do not believe I ever will, consider that it is sensible or sound economy to be penny wise and pound foolish by saving the pennies out of the bodies, minds, hearts, and spirits of the American children. For, gentlemen, these children cannot speak for themselves. We are in fact the trustees for every child in America, who is affected by the Federal activities in every school district in our beloved Nation. So, Mr. Chairman, let's not think that it is economy to take away from American children the dollars absolutely necessary for them to have the help required to obtain a decent educational foundation, before they reach college age. There could be such a thing in our Nation as an era of educational illiteracy. We certainly do not want that and yet, to take away schooling opportunities from children, will naturally result in hundreds of thousands of them being to some extent, at least, illiterate and they are, therefore, bound to become less valuable, less experienced, less efficient, and less productive adult citizens.

There is no substitute for educational opportunities and training and benefits during a child's life. They are only children once and that is for a very short period in their total existence. Therefore let's not start thinking that it is economy, to take educational opportunities out of the hides of our own American children. Let us not exert the need we have of being economical, by jeopardizing the whole mental, physical, and spiritual and economic success and happiness of millions of American children, for whom we are responsible as national legislators under the terms of this bill. I feel that I am not overspeaking or overemphasizing this phase of education, because I had the privilege and benefit before coming to Congress, for a time being a member of the California State Board of Education by appointment of his Honor, the Governor.

Not only did Mr. BAILEY, of West Virginia, and his associates do a thorough study with sound results, during the 82d Congress in submitting this Public Law 874, which necessarily comes in this discussion, but gladly joined with an overwhelming majority in this House in voting its approval. It is that law out of which, arises our good faith and pledged promises to these very school districts from which this, our subcommittee, now proposes to take this legally and morally promised $24 million upon which these school districts have become dependent and upon which, they have made their commitments, contracts, and plans. Also, I was pleased to state in my recent campaign for a fourth term in this House, that I supported the objectives of Public Law 874. I intend to keep my promise.

These are but some of the basic reasons why I shall support the amendments. And may I emphasize again, that I am surprised and disappointed that the majority party control of this subcommittee did, so soon after President Eisenhower had given this Congress a definite recommendation in this very field of education, submit this $24 million cut from the very funds, and from the very purposes and objectives which President Eisenhower himself asked be not cut in his state of the Union message. If we adopt the recommendation of the subcommittee in eliminating this sum, we fly directly in the face of President Eisenhower's express request—we will go diametrically in the opposite direction from his wishes. I say again, let us not weaken, cripple and even destroy the future physical, mental and moral factors of hundreds of thousands of American children. Yes, their posterity, too. Let us economize where it is true economy. But, it will never be a true and enduring economy, to lessen the opportunities for schooling and education in the experiences of American children. Let us not be stupid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I supported, both by my vote and by my voice, the Bailey bill, which provided that the Federal Government should do that which it was morally obligated to do, namely, to make up the tax losses that it forced upon some of the school districts of this Nation by taking over land and property which in many instances the Government did not need, thus destroying or reducing the tax bases of these school districts and then bringing thousands of additional school children into those districts at the very time they were levying taxes for school purposes at the very highest rate permitted under State law. I have seen the impact and the results of that which has been done by the Federal Government to certain schools in my own district; for instance, those around Wright and Patterson Fields.

I believe it is the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government when it takes taxable land away from a school district to pay their fair share of the cost of operating the schools in that district. That is what would have to be done if a privately owned industry or enterprise came into that area. It would have to pay taxes to help support the schools.

In addition to all of that, of course, we have seen thousands of additional children dumped onto those school districts which were no longer able to furnish school facilities for their own children. Yet our Government has forced many local children out of these schools—absolutely forced them out—and compelled their parents to send them to private schools.

I will compare my record for economy with any individual of this House, as far as voting for economy is concerned, but I am not going to start my efforts in behalf of economy in this 83d Congress by taking it out on a bunch of school kids in the rural schools of Ohio. I just will not do it. We have a moral responsibility in this Congress. We passed a law—the Bailey bill—to give the schools this help in lieu of taxes. If we meant it, we ought to live up to it. If we did not, we ought not to have passed that law. We should not mislead the school districts provided for under the Bailey Act. I am not going to vote for that kind of so-called economy. If you want to repeal the whole Bailey Act, then stand up and say so. But you are not going to repeal the Bailey Act, and I think you know it. To turn down this amendment is not economy, it is false economy, and would be a repudiation of our past official actions.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I am with him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure you will also be with me when I vote for economy on many other measures in the months ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

(Mr. JENSEN, by unanimous consent, yielded the time allowed to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].)

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this debate today reminds me of an everyday occurrence in our offices. We talk to a lot of people from back home who want economy and want to balance the budget and want to reduce taxes, but they want the reductions in Federal expenditures every place except where it affects them personally. I know many of you have been hearing from people back home on this subject. The pressure groups have been at work. If we are going to effect economy in this Congress, the way to do it is certainly not by restoring well justified cuts made by the Committee on Appropriations.

What did you tell the people last year in your campaign speeches? You told them you were for economy, you were for balancing the budget, and you were for reducing taxes. I say to you, "Review your campaign speeches and promises and effect them right here today by voting against this amendment."

You read in the paper this morning where the House of Delegates in the State of Maryland voted to reduce the State income tax by 15 percent. Practically every State in this Union has been reducing its indebtedness. Some of the States in the last few years have paid off every dime of their indebtedness, and one of the big reasons they have been able to do this is because they have been coming to Washington and feeding at the Federal trough. When are you going to put a stop to this? The States and the communities in this country, with very few exceptions, are able to take care of themselves. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] indicated yesterday that he thought Arlington County needs additional Federal help for the education of its children. The Washington Times-Herald of last Sunday stated that M. T. Broyhill & Sons had built

5,000 homes in that area. Surely the gentleman is interested in more money for this area. The more money they can get from the Federal Government, the less local taxes they will have to pay. Incidentally, Arlington residents are only paying $2.75 per hundred on a 40 percent valuation. I have here the brochure they have published regarding their schools. These schools are among the most elaborate in the United States. This situation is not unique; there are many other wealthy communities getting Federal funds under this law.

If the entire appropriation for 1953 were denied it would mean only a little over $2 per resident of Arlington County. That would be a very small investment to get the Federal Government out of the school system.

The Chamber of Commerce of Arlington County claims they had a per capita income in 1952 of $6,092, the highest family income in the entire United States. It is hard to believe they are unwilling to assume their responsibility. I take my hat off to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, who stood up here and said: Let us stand up and be counted as to whether we are for economy or for a continuation of ever-increasing Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no distinguished record as a prophet, but I feel sure this Committee and the House as a whole is going to vote overwhelmingly to restore these funds.

I think the language contained in the report given as a reason for eliminating these funds, which in effect says that since the problem is more real and more extensive than we estimated in the beginning, we should walk out on it and surrender our obligations is a little bit ridiculous. I have in my own congressional district in Burlington County, N. J., many school districts and municipalities surrounding Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base, which are seriously affected by this amendment. These Federal activities not only have taken a lot of land, a lot of tax ratables away from those districts, but also they have thrust a huge load of Federal children onto them, and certainly this legislation which was passed after long and careful consideration under the auspices and good work of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is the only fair, the only legal, and moral way of dealing with this problem.

I am sure none of us wants to take that money away, penalize the school kids, and thrust an undue burden on the local school districts that they cannot possibly solve without some Federal assistance. I am sure we are all going to pass this amendment and take care of our legal and moral responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that one and a half minutes is such a short space of time and to the further fact that the majority leader has made his statement, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EVINS yielded his time to Mr. BARDEN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Briefly; 4½ minutes is not much time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to state that I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], that I had intended to speak on the amendment; I will not do so, however, but will content myself with extending my remarks in the RECORD at this point, make such a request, and also ask consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment.

I have a profound respect for the Appropriations Committee, but nevertheless, it is my opinion that the passing of this amendment is a necessity. It affirmatively appears to me that unless the sum named in this amendment is restored there can be no doubt that the schools in military impacted areas, who have justified their entitlements and made contracts in good faith in pursuance thereof will be reduced to 60 percent of the amount that had been determined to be necessary. Inasmuch as these contracts, already executed, are binding both in good conscience and laws, chaos will result.

Two school systems in the district which I have the privilege of representing are seriously affected. Columbus, Muscogee County, Ga., is the home of Fort Benning, the largest infantry center known to us in the world. Hundreds of children of soldiers and civilian workers from over our country are there, only because of this emergency. Columbus cannot educate them at its expense, and it should not be expected to do so. I am advised that the action of this committee will cost that school system approximately $100,000 as it relied upon the entitlement and has outstanding contracts.

Robins Air Force Base is in Houston County. When the airfield was located there the present city of Warner Robins, a city now of around 14,000 people, was a settlement of about 200 people. That area of the county was taken over by the Government and the lands are tax free. The citizens of that county find themselves with about as many people on a Government reservation, as workers and children of defense workers, as can be found in the balance of the county. To impose upon those citizens the entire cost of educating the children of those workers can only mean bankruptcy to that county.

The citizens of Houston County, Ga., are awaiting the news of our action here with much anxiety.

In the abstract, I can understand Members who believe the added trade would make up this cost. Examined in the concrete it is entirely erroneous in many instances. Warner Robins is only a few miles from a large city in another county and district, and the two cities are connected by a four-lane highway. That large city rents most of the houses, sells most of the clothes and groceries and provides almost all of the entertainment. That large city gets almost the entire benefit arising from trade, but Houston County gets the apprehension and fear that is brought about each year when this problem comes up yearly for determination in this body. By necessity this problem should be settled with a reasonable degree of permanency.

Maybe some are getting more money than they are entitled to, but this can be, and should be determined, by survey and examination. Unless this matter is settled so that counties can understand their true positions the only alternative is for State legislative bodies to take steps to relieve such counties from the obligations imposed by compulsory school laws to educate children who are not citizens of that county and whose parents are not taxpayers, but are merely temporary sojourners for the purpose of rendering defense work. I contend that the costs of educating those children are expenses of war, just as bullets and uniforms.

Let us pass this amendment, then if it is deemed proper let some committee examine the picture and determine what areas deserve the money, and those areas which do not. Then, counties can contract with confidence and then teachers can be paid according to contract. Then, necessary buildings can be planned and erected. To proceed as the committee is doing now is not the correct way. It is actually retroactive legislation.

Let us pay our obligations by passing this amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I really was in hopes he would use his time, for I happen to know that he has in the edge of his district a tremendous operation that has virtually upset the whole tax structure of that county and jeopardizes the possibility of the operation of schools.

Getting back on the subject under discussion, let me say that this is not a Santa Claus proposition. The committee worked out a very careful formula for the distribution of these funds and the only objection to it and the only criticism the committee received at the time was that we were probably a little bit too tight with the funds.

On yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] decried the fact that we did not give Washington, D. C., any money. What a peculiar statement to come from a member of the Appropriations Committee, and especially the chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter. The gentleman knows very well that the District of Columbia gets an appropriation every year from the Appropriations Committee. Why should we have a half dozen different appro-

priations coming out of the Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia? For that reason, I was one who stood solidly and said: "No, the Appropriations Committee considers the situation in the District schools at the time they are making appropriations for the District of Columbia."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not know why the gentleman singles out the District of Columbia. It was only 1 of 15 different cities I named with a total population of 22½ million people that are not included under this program, regardless of Federal impact.

Mr. BARDEN. What a funny statement for the gentleman to make when he knows that we put a 10-percent clause in this bill to keep the big cities like Chicago and the rest of the cities named by the gentleman from coming in and making this appropriation bill a half billion dollars instead of $20 million. Why, the gentleman knows that a city with a million population can absorb a 5-percent increase and justify it on the benefits received from the business transactions there, but when you pass the 10 percent you hit the smaller communities that are not in position to absorb it. The gentleman knows that Chicago can absorb 5 percent and up to 10 percent without it causing any hardship.

Mr. BUSBEY. This request is twice as much as the original estimate of annual cost and no one knows how much further it will go.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, the gentleman at least is satisfied with his own knowledge about the matter, but I might add neither does anyone know how many impact areas will be created by the Federal Government. There is one thing certain: The written formula passed by this Congress will govern the amount, once the condition is created by the United States Government. But let me ask the gentleman, Does he happen to know that every single school on every single military base in America, with the exception of the atomic energy plants, get their money to operate under Public 874 and the appropriation authorized by it? By what process of reasoning does the gentleman figure that we can cut the operation of a school on some big military base 40 percent and keep that school open? There is no justification for it.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is making a true statement and those particular instances should be taken care of.

Mr. BARDEN. What does the gentleman mean, I am not making a true statement?

Mr. BUSBEY. I said that is a true statement and I am for those particular areas being taken care of.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman loves them to the extent he wants to cut their heads off. He just wants to love them to death. That is what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? There is something in the law with respect to what he says.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman cannot tell me much about this law.

Mr. TABER. I would like to read it.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the department has done. The department has decided to pay those schools located on military bases 100 percent. What do you do if you take the 100 percent for those on-base schools away from the appropriation? You have the children of that portion of the military and civilian personnel who are fortunate enough to get places to live on the base with good schools while just outside the gate you have the children of the commissioned officers, sergeants, corporals, privates, and civilian employees with only a 60-percent school. It may result in even a 50- or 60-percent cut. So now, the whole practical picture is this. This is not a grab bag. The administrator does not have and does not want discretionary power to do any other than figure the formula as laid down by Congress. I do know from listening to the evidence and facts gathered by our subcommittee about conditions all over this country that this Government has established bases in little communities and imposed upon them the burden of carrying on a school for seven or eight hundred to even thousands of children, and they simply cannot do it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman think the Committee on Education and Labor ought to take another look at this law, in view of the experience we have had?

Mr. BARDEN. I would love to answer that, my friend, fully, if time permitted. But I must be content with saying I think he should take at least two more looks himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I join in the amendment offered by my colleague Mr. SCRIVNER, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. A moratorium on the growth and development can never be secured in the lives of our children. Our friends talk about a pressure group and I say to you that the most precious pressure group in this country are the children of this country.

It would be a very harsh and a very unwise act to refuse this school money. For many years I served as a teacher and as a member and president of the Board of Education of Dayton, Ohio. This experience has perhaps given me a very acute sense of the value of education. But this regard, or perhaps even reverence, for our ideal of free public education goes beyond my own personal experience. I need not point out that we in America, from the inception of our national life, have always held that system a cornerstone of our development. May we always continue to do so. True there are many extremely urgent programs already undertaken and to be undertaken by this Congress. No doubt our most disturbing problem is to assign to each its proper place in the scale of necessity and priority within the limits of our national abilities. Notwithstanding the difficulty of that task, I will hold always with this ideal of free public education. This even along with other pressing demands in the field of defense spending because I regard our greatest strength to lie in maintaining a high level of education among our American youth.

No one, with open eyes, can deny that this is a period of emergency for our schools, and this condition exists throughout every State. In certain areas, those here considered, this emergency has been raised to a critical phase solely by the national-defense effort. It is a Federal problem and must, in fairness, be treated as such. This was the logic of the Federal support program. It was and is sound logic. Conditions have not changed except to become more critical and we cannot falter in that program now. To do so could have only one result, to imperil the rights of these children to receive one of the finest things we as a Nation attempt to offer all our children, and that is, simply, a good education.

To emphasize these general considerations I want to call to your attention certain facts. While I am not familiar, of course, with all these federally impacted areas, I have, both as a Representative to Congress from the Third Ohio District and as former president of the Dayton, Ohio, school board, learned fully the conditions existing in several of these school districts in the locality surrounding Wright Patterson Air Force Base. I think a discussion of the plight of one of these, Mad River Township, will show how desperately these funds are needed. Mad River Township comprises 6 schools adjoining Wright Patterson Air Force Base where there are employed 32,000 civilians and several thousand military personnel. This district now has a total of 3,100 Lanham Act and Wherry Act housing units either completed or under construction. The purpose of this housing is to house the defense employees. This housing is tax-exempt but the laws of the State of Ohio say that the children of these parents must have equal school opportunity. In addition, there are 765 privately constructed dwellings being erected within the school district. In 1941 there were 692 elementary-school children in this district. In 1952 there are 2,756. As you know, the major support of the school program ordinarily comes from real-estate taxes levied against taxable property in the district. There are 17 school districts in Montgomery County. The amount of taxable property in the duplicate now behind each pupil and based on a recent general reappraisement varies in these school districts from a high of $16,234 to a low of $3,440, and this low figure is for Mad River Township. School enrollment is four times as high as it was in 1941. This contrasts with the general county increase of two times. Over 50 percent of all the people in the school district live on tax-exempt property. Recently the schools have been operating on a double-shift basis.

A new 1,000-unit Wherry Act project is being constructed within the district at

this very time. This will bring approximately 1,000 more children into the district, who will become the responsibility of this already overburdened school board.

This almost unsolvable problem has been created by two things: One, the enormous increase in the birth rate occasioned by World War II, and two, the immigration of these thousands of persons to work for Wright Patterson Air Force Base and defense industries. Under no circumstances can it be forecast that this condition will be alleviated within the next few years. On the contrary, it is most probable, as population studies indicate, that the peak years have not yet been reached.

What clearer picture, what more convincing demonstration for the need for these moneys can be made? The proposed deletion of these funds from the supplemental appropriation bill will mean a loss to the Mad River Township school district of $53,000. Without a doubt it would mean a loss of teachers, a lowering of standards, a double shift half-time school program for these thousands of children, and, in short, completely inadequate discharge of our public responsibility to them. Once again may I emphasize what I conceive to be the controlling reasons for approving these moneys. The need is clear and uncontrovertible. While I have used the Mad River Township School District in Montgomery County, Ohio, to illustrate the very pressing need for these Federal funds, the same situation applies to the other school districts in accordance with their demonstrated need. The goal is one most cherished and constantly to be sacrificed for. The responsibility lies clearly with the Federal Government and the defense effort. The local people are doing their part and are doing it splendidly. To fail, not to help them but to discharge our clear duty to them, would be to take a course which we cannot in good conscience pursue. With all the earnestness of which I am capable, I most respectfully urge that these funds be approved. As an illustration of the seriousness of this situation and the effect of the deletion of these necessary funds for our public schools in one county of the Third District of Ohio, I am placing in the RECORD herewith a tabulation of this school program.

Project No.	Project name	1951–52 entitlement	1952–53 estimated entitlement at 100 percent	1952–53 estimated entitlement at 60 percent
1	Mad River	$139, 185. 94	$165, 823. 13	$99, 493. 88
3	Dayton	223, 684. 33	268, 421. 20	161, 052. 72
5	Butler Township, Vandalia	52, 292. 53	62, 751. 02	37, 650. 61
10	Northridge	59, 546. 92	71, 456. 30	42, 873. 78
20	Van Buren	38, 874. 92	46, 649. 90	27, 989. 94
21	Wayne	1, 336. 86	1, 609. 23	962. 54
25	Miamisburg	5, 854. 38	7, 025. 26	4, 215. 16
29	Washington Township, Centerville	7, 313. 30	8, 775. 96	5, 265. 58
37	Randolph Township, Englewood	15, 009. 23	18, 063. 08	10, 849. 85
	Total	542, 158. 49	650, 390. 09	390, 354. 06

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for introducing the resolutions to restore the funds for Federal contributions to schools in defense areas. Their resolutions recognize the obligation of the Federal Government as expressed by this Congress in Public Law 874.

I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BUSBEY] that we must economize in every way possible in order to obtain a balanced budget. But there are areas where there is an honest difference of opinion as to whether a cut in appropriations is true economy or false economy. I am definitely of the opinion that a cut in the promised assistance to schools in impacted defense areas is not only false economy but actual waste. The true wealth of this Nation is in its citizenship and an educated citizenry is certainly a far greater asset than an illiterate one. Children from all over the Nation are in these impacted areas. I know of several installations that have people from as many as 46 of the several States. I, for one, do not want to see the school children from Illinois, Indiana, New York, and Iowa, or any other State lack the opportunity for an education because they have been moved into a Federal defense area. There are schools in my district, in these impacted areas, that will have to close if this money is not made available. These communities have tried in every way possible to meet the added responsibilities that have been thrust upon them. They have bonded themselves to the limit and they have placed burdensome taxes upon themselves; but, as everyone in this House knows, when the Federal Government takes over an area for its own use, no taxes are paid on that property and those individual property owners, who are left, must carry an added burden to meet even the normal needs of the community, much less the needs added by the influx of people from all over the United States.

This aid then is not a contribution, but is a very small portion of the actual obligation of the Federal Government which is returned to the local authorities in lieu of taxes.

Now the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee, has said that the 15 larger cities in the United States do not get any aid under this bill. I cannot agree with him. In the first place the defense installations are placed in the more thinly populated areas and in the temperate zones to save expense for the American taxpayer. Land in the great city of Chicago will sell for more for a square foot than the land in the agricultural section of my State will sell for an acre. In addition most of these defense areas take vast acreages and if one were placed near Chicago it would mean the demolition of many structures and the dislocation of thousands of families instead of hundreds. Moreover, it would be difficult to operate some of these bases during the rugged winter months of the Chicago area. I believe, therefore, that if the gentleman from Illinois will analyse this situation carefully he cannot but come to the conclusion that his taxpayers in Chicago are saving more money by making a small contribution to schools in the impacted areas of the thinly populated sections, than would be saved if a similar base were placed in the congested city of Chicago.

Now considerable criticism has been leveled at the Department of Education for not making a more accurate estimate of the needs for this purpose. Congress provided in the law that a contribution to schools in impacted defense areas must be made on the average daily attendance of defense workers' children in those schools. There is absolutely no way that they can estimate the average daily attendance until some months after the school year has started. For this reason Congress decreed that these estimates must be in hand by March 31 of each school year. It is a perfectly normal procedure for the school people to wait until the last month to file these requests because then they have a more accurate picture than they have in the first few months of the school year. This Congress must remember that these estimates were made up, in order to meet budget requirements, some 18 months ago. Any estimate made 18 months ago must of necessity be readjusted as of today.

Furthermore, the Department of Education pays only three-fourths of the estimated cost based on average daily attendance until after the school year has ended, then the other one-fourth, or portion due, is paid based on the actual average daily attendance as shown by the school record for the entire year. That is why certain funds must be held in reserve until the fiscal attendance record is established.

I know of no greater tragedy that can come to a future citizen than for him or her to be denied the opportunity for development and for enlightenment as provided by a well-rounded education. I sincerely hope that the House will support this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have the honor to represent defense areas were greatly relieved by the state of the Union message delivered by President Eisenhower to the House on February 2, 1953. The assurances that school districts which have been affected by the expansion of Federal defense activities would receive fair and adequate consideration from this administration was contained in two paragraphs of the President's message as follows:

Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action. I am sure that you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Our confidence was short lived, however, by the action of the Appropriations Committee in disallowing the entire request of $24 million to provide funds for operation and maintenance of schools located in federally affected areas as provided by Public Law 874. We, in Alabama, are especially disturbed by this action because it leaves us in an almost helpless condition as far as providing means of education for the children of defense workers and military personnel in these affected areas. It is a well-known fact that the States in the southeast, and especially Alabama, have never received a fair share of these funds. I quote from a statement submitted on February 7, 1953, to the Alabama delegation in Congress, by N. F. Nunnelley, chairman for Federally Affected School Systems in Alabama, and C. L. Martin, member of National Committee on Legislation for Federally Affected Areas:

At the present time county school systems in Aabama receive less than $15 for each federally connected child, while other school systems receive more than $100 for each federally connected child. All school systems should receive a minimum of at least 75 percent of the national average local expenditure per child.

Most of the defense plants in Alabama are concentrated in the Fourth District, which I have the high honor to represent. At one installation, and I speak of the Anniston Ordnance Depot, at Bynum, Ala., we have practically doubled the number of personnel since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Many of the families live on the installation and, therefore, have no taxable property which is subject to a school district tax. This same situation applies to Fort McClellan, Ala., and to Craig Air Force Base in Selma, Ala., where many of the defense workers and military personnel live on the reservation.

I feel that the Federal emergency is just as great as it has ever been and that to neglect the education of these children who have no choice about where they are to live will not only be unfair to my section of the country but is a shortsighted, pennywise and pound-foolish policy which must be corrected. I do not believe that it is in keeping with the President's views as outlined in his state of the Union message, and I cannot believe that such a policy can result in anything but a weakening of our national preparedness program.

I have lived near a military installation all of my life and I know from my contacts with military people and people in defense work that the morale of these people is highly important. Good relations with the local communities and school authorities can only be maintained when the proper attention is given to the health, education, and welfare of the people who, because of circumstances beyond their control, are forced to live and work in communities not always of their own selection. I believe in economy and I feel that there are many places in the Federal Government where we can do a lot of needed trimming; but to strike at the schoolchildren of America and to strike at communities which are already overburdened because of defense activities is not economy.

Some will say when a military installation is located in an area many great benefits follow from such projects. I would like to point out that I have seen 2 or 3 of these projects come to my district. While it is true that these defense installations add to the population and perhaps there are commercial benefits which are worth while as far as the merchants, contractors, construction workers, and professional people are concerned, yet there are also many problems connected with these activities. The cities and counties affected must increase the personnel of their health and sanitation departments, additional men must be added to the police and law enforcement staff, and additional firemen must be added. In addition to these heavy expenses, some of the projects call for other expansions in municipal and county facilities. Four of the cities in my district which have recently experienced such additional expenses are the cities of Anniston, Talladega, Oxford, and Selma. Since the expansion of Fort McClellan and Anniston Ordnance Depot, the city of Anniston has been required to spend almost a million dollars for expansion of water facilities. The same thing is true of the cities of Oxford and Talladega, the latter city having spent almost one-half million dollars in the expansion of its water system. As far as I have been able to find out not one cent of Federal money was available to these cities for these heavy expenditures. Many of the cities have had to build new streets and additional sewerage facilities and these expansions have been made without any help from the Federal Government.

It is a well-known fact that local governments are receiving a very small portion of the tax revenues of the country. In fact, most of it is coming to Washington. I do not understand the philosophy of those who say to these cities and counties that you must assume the additional cost of educating children brought to these communities by the inmigration of defense workers and military personnel. I think the policy which has been followed in Public Law 874 for the past 3 years must be continued if we are to do a good job of educating the future citizens of America—its school children.

In addition to all other arguments, it seems to me that there is a moral obligation because of the fact that 60 percent of these funds have been appropriated beginning in fiscal 1953. Plans for carrying out school activities are usually made at the end of the school term, looking to the next school year. These schools had no reason to believe that they would not receive the amount called for in the supplemental appropriation. They made contracts with teachers, they arranged for the necessary physical equipment including heat, lights, and water, and it seems to me that this is very late in the game to deny these funds after the major portion of the expenses has been obligated. You simply do not make contracts by the month, and I do not believe that this Congress will refuse to carry out what to me is stronger than a legal obligation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will show by its action today that the membership is in accord with the President when he "demanded special action" in those areas which have felt the heavy impact of defense activities. I do not believe that the membership of this House is ready to embark on a policy which denies the Federal Government the responsibility of seeing to it that the children of America do not suffer because of circumstances beyond their control.

(Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. ROBERTS asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. COLMER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall take the time that my colleagues have so generously yielded me, because I think it is very obvious from what has happened here this morning that this amendment will carry overwhelmingly. Therefore, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Committee of the Whole at length.

Mr. Chairman, permit me, if I may, in all sincerity, to say that I am as interested in balancing this budget as any Member in this House, and I think my record here will demonstrate that. But I also want to be on record to this effect: We have heard a great deal in the past, and I have heard it many times when I offered amendments on this floor to cut appropriations, that this was a meat-ax approach. Well, if I ever saw a meat-ax approach to a problem, it is certainly in this instance. Now, what happens? By one fell swoop the committee would cut 40 percent from the terms that these schools operate. That is exactly what it would amount to in most instances.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in their efforts to try to make reductions, but I cannot go along with that type of approach to the proposition. I so outlined it to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, when he appeared before the Committee on Rules and pointed out the difficulty of this type of cut. I prophesied to him then that if he insisted on this procedure that the whole amount would be restored on the floor.

You either have to break faith, on the one hand, with these children and these school communities or you must, in the future, change your formula. Certainly the fair and honorable thing is to keep your commitment now and change the formula for next year.

I am absolutely convinced that this thing has grown too much. I was interested in what the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois said about it. I think it has mushroomed too much. I can see no reason why the city of Washington, or any other city of comparable size, should come under the provisions of this bill, when it affects their budget such a fractional percent. But if you take a small community in the State of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], or in my own State, a small community where the impact has been tremendous, many hundred percent, those communities cannot absorb it, because, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out here a moment ago, some of those communities are taxing themselves to their constitutional limitations in providing for their school budgets.

I hope the appropriate committee will look into this thing and try to evolve a new formula for next year by changing the basic law so that reductions can be made.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made. I represent many of the school districts which are located within the Savannah River atomic-energy plant. I am afraid some of these schools will have to be closed unless one of these amendments is adopted.

Mr. COLMER. I think the gentleman's attitude is correct. I am sure that many of these schools would be forced to close if the necessary funds are not restored. I am confident they will be restored here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scrivner amendment. This amendment is identical with the one which I had already placed on the Clerk's desk. Its effect, if adopted, would be to restore the sum of $24 million to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for payments to school districts, which was deleted by the committee from the request for supplemental appropriations.

I support this amendment because by doing so I believe I am keeping the pledge made by myself to the people of my congressional district. I also believe I am keeping the pledge made to the American people on February 2, 1953, by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message.

In order that the record may be made clear, I quote a significant paragraph from the President's message. I read his exact words:

> One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed, and, likewise, and this is most important, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

I would state for the information of the Committee that this amendment affects 16 separate localities in the State of Connecticut. I place the list in the RECORD at this point. Of this number, four lie within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. I also add that the town of Groton, Conn., within my district, has the most serious problem facing any of the towns in our entire State.

State of Connecticut

Project No.	Name of district	100 percent amount of entitlement for 1951–52 school year	Approximate amount of entitlement 1952–53 100 percent	Approximate amount of entitlement 1952–53 60 percent
Conn–53–E–1	Hartford County Board of Education	$4,993.66	$5,992.39	$3,595.43
Conn–53–E–2	East Hartford Board of Education	75,821.08	90,985.30	54,591.18
Conn–53–E–3	New London County Board of Education	26,921.55	32,305.86	19,383.52
Conn–53–E–4	Groton Board of Education	166,727.09	200,072.51	120,043.51
Conn–53–E–5	New Britain Board of Education	77,460.85	92,953.02	55,771.81
Conn–53–E–6	Fairfield County Board of Education	36,756.25	44,107.50	26,464.50
Conn–53–E–7	Rocky Hill Board of Education	4,204.45	5,045.34	3,027.20
Conn–53–E–8	West Hartford Board of Education	43,850.32	52,620.38	31,572.23
Conn–53–E–9	Manchester Board of Education	13,420.12	16,104.14	9,662.48
Conn–53–E–10	Southington Board of Education	18,592.03	22,310.44	13,386.26
Conn–53–E–11	Wethersfield Board of Education	1,765.99	2,119.19	1,271.51
Conn–53–E–12	Bridgeport Board of Education	71,258.01	85,509.61	51,305.77
Conn–53–E–14	Stratford Board of Education	35,638.25	42,765.90	25,659.54
Conn–53–E–201	Windsor Locks Board of Education	3,761.22	4,513.46	2,708.08
Conn–53–E–202	Ledyard Board of Education	1,949.59	2,339.51	1,403.71
Conn–53–E–206	East Lyme Board of Education	6,298.78	7,558.54	4,535.12
	Total	589,419.24	707,303.09	424,381.85
Conn–53–E–401	Waterford (new application)		22,277.50	13,366.50

The Groton and New London area are located the United States Coast Guard Academy, the United States Coast Guard Training Station, the United States Naval Submarine Base, the United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory. In addition to these Government installations we have the General Dynamics Corporation, which, as you know, is presently building the first atomic-powered submarine. Extensive portions of this plant are Government owned and completely tax exempt. This area is definitely a defense area.

Public Law 874, approved September 30, 1950, authorized Federal financial assistance in meeting the operating expenses of schools in districts overburdened by Federal activities.

Under the major provisions of this law, payments are made toward current school expenses of communities in which 3 percent or more of the children attending school reside on Federal property or live with parents employed on Federal property, or both, or in which there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as a result of Federal activities. The amounts of payment are based on the total average daily attendance of applicable children for the year in varying percentages of the contribution rate determined by the cost per pupil from local sources in comparable school districts within the State.

An appropriation of $40 million for this purpose was carried in the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1953. This amount was based upon an estimate made before the beginning of the current school year. It presumed that approximately 1,400 school districts would be eligible for assistance in the fiscal year 1953.

In view of the defense activity it now appears that over 2,300 school districts will be eligible for assistance under the law and that the average payments will be larger than originally estimated because of an increase in enrollment.

The current amount of $40 million is sufficient to pay only about 60 percent of the amounts to which the eligible school districts are entitled under the law. This means a cutback of 40 percent in the amounts to which local communities have had a right to expect as Federal income for operation of their schools. True, as was stated in the committee hearings, they were notified in the late fall that this cutback would be necessary, but this is small comfort to school districts which simply cannot operate for the full year without full payment; and, in any event budgets, including estimated income, for 1952–53 had to be prepared and tax rates for net local costs set well before July 1. If my towns cannot budget with confidence under the provisions of Public Law 874, much of its value is lost. To the town of Groton, this cutback means $80,000, 2½ mills on its grand list to be made up another year, plus further additional local cost to be figured in for that year because of lack of confidence that the Federal obligation will be met in full.

The committee in charge of this appropriation stated in the committee report, on page 15, and I quote, that—

> Testimony and reports received by the committee leaves no doubt that there are a

very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

I respectfully disagree with that statement—at least as far as it applies to those projects in my own State with which I am familiar. If it is true that some communities could by extra effort take care of the situation—and certainly this is not the case in the town of Groton—why penalize the great majority of heavily burdened communities in order to keep from paying the few too much? The way to correct such a situation, I believe, is to amend the basic law beginning with the next fiscal year.

In the town of Groton, Conn., 50.2 percent of the property within the township is owned by the Federal Government. This property is not only tax exempt, but has no payments in lieu of taxes made on it whatsoever. Four and one-half percent of the property in the town is owned by the Federal Government on which payments in lieu of taxes are made. On this land are constructed the housing projects so desperately needed by the families of the servicemen and defense workers who have been called into the area. In this connection I might add that the amount paid in lieu of taxes is well below the normal yield per residence.

In recent years the school population has approximately doubled. During that same period of time the adult population has shown the same growth. It is my understanding that the General Dynamics Corp. is still continuing its program of expansion and additional workers are moving into the community every day.

I would remind the Committee that of the approximately 4,300 school children in the Groton school system over 1,700 of them live on Federal property. As regards this latter figure, an increase of over 400 is anticipated for the beginning of the next school year.

I would remind the Committee that the naval authorities are earnestly seeking to provide suitable living quarters for the families of over 2,000 service personnel. This will result in an even further increase in the school population to be cared for in this general area.

I would further remind the Committee that as a result of this condition whereby over 50 percent of the property of the town of Groton is not only tax exempt but has no payments made on it whatsoever in lieu of taxes, the taxable wealth per pupil in school is just a little over $7,000, as compared to an average for the State of above $16,000.

I most earnestly urge the Committee to support the Scrivner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia is the author of the basic law under which this appropriation rises, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be assigned to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, as author of Public Law 874 may I say to my colleagues in the House that it is sound, sensible legislation, and should be supported by adequate funds so long as it remains on the statute books. Let me explain why this was bad economy on the part of the subcommittee to slash the $24 million from the supplemental appropriation bill. Let me say to you that the Office of Education has worked out on a matching basis with the several school districts surrounding a federally-owned base whereby those pupils or families living on the base are permitted to attend schools in the surrounding school district, and they get the advantage of the State aid fund that goes toward the support of the State school there. If you fall down on this proposition and fail to make this money available, instead of carrying out the education of these on-base pupils under section 204 of Public Law 874, we will have to go over to section 6. That will entail the building of costly school facilities on base to take care of these on-base pupils. That would cost you $5 million more to administer under section 6 than it will to administer it under section 204 as the Office of Education is now administering it. I cannot understand why this subcommittee that had charge of the appropriations for labor and Federal security in the amount of $406 million were able to trim out of that $32,137,000 and of that $24 million had to be at the expense of the boys and girls. That was in the face of the fact that there is not only legal but a moral obligation on the part of the Congress to take care of the Government's responsibility. As author of that bill, may I say to you that the bill requires the Government to pay as a result of the damage done by the impact which the Government forced upon these districts by building these Federal installations. It is a fair piece of legislation. I want to insist as author of this legislation that it has worked satisfactorily, and it will continue to work satisfactorily. I do not say that the bill should not be changed. There is pending in the Committee on Education and Labor, or at least there was in the last session of the Congress, legislation to rewrite it and I assume my committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania later in this session of the Congress will rewrite Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 because the Congress continues to make provisions for building, let us say, as we did in Ohio a few months ago when we authorized a $2 billion atomic energy plant in territory where there is not anything that looks like a school building. The people are pouring into that territory which is in the district of my colleague, Mr. POLK, and Mr. JENNINGS, in Portsmouth. They are pouring into that territory by the thousands. Less than a week or two weeks ago you authorized another big installation for atomic energy in Illinois. So there is no possiblity so long as the Congress continues to provide for the erection of these federally-owned bases of that kind for these districts to carry on their work properly.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention that not a single school of this type is in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, and there is only one small school in the entire State of West Virginia of that type.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I commend the gentleman for his position on this question. Without question the House should restore these funds which are essential for the proper continued operation of schools in districts whose population is increased by Federal activities.

There is no other way in which the children affected by this legislation can receive the measure of education now planned for them. In many instances that measure of education is inadequate. We would be exercising poor judgment indeed should be fail to restore these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Further, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for his fine stand on this particular piece of legislation. I, too, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], can say that my voting record on economy would be beyond any reproach. However, this legislation is needed and desired.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] who headed the subcommitee in the 81st Congress, did a fine job. It seems to me the House should be complimented to know that we have a man who was willing to take the time that he did to investigate so that we could come in here and act in good faith, knowing that the committee did a good job. Further, they did not make this inspection by airplane, either. They covered the ground. They walked around and they visited the schoolhouses. They talked to school boards. They found out the need was there.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman for his remarks and say that I considered it a service that was due me as a Member of this House, as one who has the welfare of our boys and girls at heart.

Mr. KEARNS. I am sure that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scrivner amendment to restore the $24 million Federal payment to communities for schools which have been affected by the impact of extensive Federal operations in their areas.

I would like to have offered that amendment myself, but I understand the procedure of the House is that a member of the committee reporting the bill is recognized for such purposes first.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] saw fit to use the

community of Arlington, Va., which is in my congressional district, as a guinea pig. I am happy he did that, because I like to talk about one of my communities. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] said that he could not see why Arlington County should receive one dime of Federal assistance. I will tell you why it should. I believe if the gentleman from Illinois represented the 10th District of Virginia, he would be here telling you why. Right across the Potomac River is the Pentagon Building. That is the building that is so large that messengers are said to have been lost for weeks at a time. How much tax do you think the Federal Government pays on that? Not a dime. Then there is also the National Airport and the Arlington Cemetery and the Naval Annex and Fort Myer and several other locations for which Arlington County does not receive any taxes whatsoever from Uncle Sam. Over one-sixth of the area of Arlington County is federally owned. And that is not wasteland or marshland or desert land. That is the most valuable land we have in Arlington County. If the federally owned property there was included on the Arlington County tax rolls for assessment purposes, it would exceed 50 percent of the total value. The tax revenue Arlington received from real property taxes amounted to about $6 million. It was estimated by the Commissioner of Revenue yesterday morning that if the property owned by the Federal Government were owned by private industry, which would have to pay taxes, the community of Arlington would have received over $7 million in additional taxes last year and every year.

The fact that the Federal Government is operating on this property necessitates additional expenses on the part of the community to provide sufficient streets and highways, police and fire protection, water and sewerage, and other community facilities surrounding this property, not mentioning schools. These expenditures would not be necessary if the property occupied by the Federal Government was wasteland and not being used. In addition to the loss of revenue by virtue of the federally owned property, the operations themselves cause a large number of transit employees to be living temporarily in the community long enough to enjoy community facilities, including schools, but not long enough to be assessed for personal property and State income taxes. This is particularly true in the case of military personnel who are exempt by Federal law under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act from payment of local personal property taxes, automobile license taxes, and State income taxes. All of the taxes are used in the local school program.

There are, no doubt, many Members of Congress residing in this community who have children attending the local schools. We are very happy to have you with us. I am very happy to have you as my temporary constituents; and if I can be of any service to you, drop by and see me. However, you must realize that by being a temporary resident, you do not assume your proper share of local taxes. The only tax that you pay in Arlington by either renting or owning a home is the real property tax which is only a small portion of our local tax revenue.

We do not feel that the Federal Government owes our community any assistance for the permanent employees residing there; on the contrary, they make the best citizens, and the fact that there are so many permanent Federal employees residing in Arlington makes Arlington one of the top communities insofar as intellectual background, standard of living, and government operations is concerned. We have less crime and slum area in Arlington per capita than any other community in the country, all of which bears out that Federal employees as such are an asset rather than a liability to any community in which they reside and become permanent legal residents.

The obligation that the Federal Government has is not because of the permanent residents but because the transient employees that move into an area in which there is large Federal operation.

I repeat, since the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the property that it owns and causes an unusual growth of non-tax-paying residents in our local population, I feel that it has an obligation to the community to offer some assistance in the community school problems. This should not be looked upon as a handout but merely as a payment of a portion of its obligation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] commented on the fact that the total assessed valuation of the property in Arlington has increased. This is, of course, obviously true due to two factors: First, there has been an increase in value of all property due to inflation and, second, Arlington is a rapidly growing community and new homes are being constructed every day to take care of the rapidly growing Federal Government operations in this area. There again, however, the mere fact that the Federal Government is not paying its portion of its obligation to the community in its growth causes the tax rate of the citizens to be unreasonable and has necessitated a large bonded indebtedness in Arlington which has almost reached the statutory limit. If the Federal Government had paid a larger share of its obligation, such indebtedness would not have been necessary. I do hope that the House will see fit to vote for the amendment and thereby prevent the Federal Government from welching on part of its obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that it should be necessary to discuss the merits or demerits of the so-called Bailey bill. The House went through that matter quite thoroughly when it had the original legislation under consideration. It was after very long and studious consideration and study that the committee approved the bill, and the House thereafter approved it. That legislation set out a formula under which applications have been filed and estimates made. We are now informed that pursuant to the estimates we will require an additional $24 million to meet them.

The House has spoken on the matter. I do not know why we should consider the merits of the legislation which is now public law. The only question is: Are we going to meet the formula and meet the estimates which have been set up? I feel that if the House fails to approve this $24 million item we would be breaking faith with the people who had a right to and did rely upon the legislation which does exist. These school districts have obligated themselves by their employment contracts, by their purchases of school material and books; and if we fail to appropriate this money many will go into the red. They had a right to rely on existing legislation, and I think we fail in our duty if we do not provide the money we obligated ourselves under previous legislation to appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment. I was one of the members of the subcommittee that made this study in the 81st Congress. I remember visiting an impacted area around Fort Knox where approximately 80 children were in one schoolroom which was suitable for 25.

There is no doubt that this is a just obligation to take care of these impacted areas, and I am glad to see the membership of the committee here today manifest such great interest in approaching this problem with a view of restoring the appropriation.

I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on his presentation of the problem involved here.

There has been no persuasive argument made against the restoration of this fund. The Federal Government has always been in the school business. Even before our present Constitution was adopted, the Congress of the Confederation set aside public lands in the Northwest Territory for the endowment of the common schools. In the early 1800's, 20's and 30's, and on up through the century, as States were admitted to the Union, this Congress continued to set aside public lands for school purposes. We ought to go one step further and pass a general Federal aid to education bill, in order that we may assist the elementary and secondary schools in the poorer States where in general the birth rate is the highest and economic conditions are the poorest. We find in these areas that the States and local governments are making greater efforts and spending more of their per capita incomes than many of the wealthier States; and at the same time, educational levels are lowest. At least we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to alleviate these conditions in our schools when we vote in the "Off-shore Oil" proposals.

Mr. Chairman, in Kentucky alone, approximately 30 counties are affected by this legislation, and 50 school districts. The school authorities have made up

their budgets with the idea of obtaining a 100 percent entitlement. Failure to restore this appropriation would mean that the school people in Kentucky affected by this legislation would lose more than $400 thousand. To now deprive them of $2 out of every $5 that was originally anticipated would certainly be a grave injustice from the standpoint of the welfare of all the children in these areas. The same is true throughout the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was tremendously interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas when he said he felt the rules, regulations, and formula governing this bill could be rewritten and improved. I was likewise impressed and pleased to hear the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia in which he said that continued study of this situation was being had by the subcommittee, and that certain rules, regulations, and formulas may be adopted by the present Congress to include other needed school districts. Those remarks give me some hope that a situation in my home district in Kentucky may be included in this very beneficial program. They have been operating on what they call the county-unit basis, but many of the counties I have the honor to represent do not have a great increase in the overall number of pupils in any one county. The Federal Government has gone into my district and created a great dam and a great lake more than 100 miles long. It has flooded out dozens and scores of school districts which have required those school pupils to go to the county seats of several counties and overcrowd them. This has greatly increased the attendance in those county-seat schools and they do not have sufficient room or facilities to take care of them. Also the Government has greatly reduced the amount of taxes going to the school districts, as well as to the counties themselves, by taking many thousands of acres of good land which is now tax-free.

This situation should be met and taken care of by the appropriate committee rewriting the formula by which this money is allocated to the schools.

Before my time to speak is up, I want to sincerely compliment the Appropriations Committee for their overall work on this supplemental appropriation bill. They have saved the taxpayers more than a billion dollars—whether this amendment is passed. They are to be congratulated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the situation in my district, which is the Sixth District of Maryland immediately adjacent to Washington starting with Montgomery County, is very similar to that which exists in Arlington, about which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] spoke. I am not familiar with taxes in Virginia, but I know that in Montgomery County the taxes are rapidly approaching the breaking point and the bond issues for school and other purposes are rapidly reaching the point that the bond investors consider dangerous.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned something about an action taken by the Maryland Legislature. I was a member of the Maryland Legislature and we attempted to find a solution to the problem by passing special tax laws to enable local school districts, which happen to be counties, in Maryland to raise revenue from sources other than taxes on revenue. That legislation worked very well for some counties, but for counties like Montgomery and Prince Georges County it was totally ineffective because there was no business or industry there from which to collect anything that would be made available by such legislation. The business in those areas which brings the people in is the business of Government. I say that perhaps one solution to the problem, if some gentlemen want to get the Federal Government out of local affairs, with which I am heartily in accord, is to start cutting down on the Federal Government's activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. I think that if we have less money than $24,000,000 we probably would be confronted with another bill for additional money.

This restoration, in my opinion, is meeting an obligation made by this Congress in a bill signed by the President of the United States, which became law. The present President of the United States concurs in this activity. It is wrong to make an agreement with respect to funds, then violate that agreement.

It has been said here that several cities were not going to get any of this money. I want to assure you that the State of New Mexico which I represent in this House did not ask that one of the largest areas in the United States be taken over by the Army as a proving ground for guided missiles, located at Alamogordo, N. Mex., where the first atomic bomb was exploded, an area comprising about 90 by 30 miles. I do not think Chicago would want that project, nor do I think any of the other cities want it. There are few places that could have a project of that kind. The ranchers on the project did not want it. So the Federal Government went into the courts, condemned the land and took over.

As a result thousands of children came there to go to school. We welcomed them because they came to a State where health is one of the great assets. We are happy to have the children, but very unfortunately we cannot provide the money to take over an impact of that kind so quickly. I think to deny an education to those children is criminal.

If this amendment is not adopted the people of the country have every right to accuse us of bad faith. The committee report actually repudiates an agreement the Congress made 2 years ago; an agreement which the school districts affected accepted in good faith and have, since that time, adjusted their financial arrangements in the belief that the promised Federal payments would be forthcoming in accordance with the terms of Public Law 874. We gave our word. Now we are asked by the committee to break it. I, for one, cannot be a party to that.

I do not impugn the motives of the committee. Apparently it is seeking to make a record of some sort for what it thinks to be economy. There are a thousand places in this widespread governmental structure of ours where sound economy can and must be practiced, but this is not one of them.

It means the difference between education or ignorance for thousands of children. It seems inconceivable that this action could have been taken had the committee understood the purpose of Congress in enacting that legislation.

Reference was made by the committee to the increase in the number of school districts which received aid during the war and to those who are receiving aid under the provisions of Public Law 874. The Lanham Act provided for deficit nancing and assisted only those school districts which were unable to provide a reasonable level of education without Federal assistance. Public Law 874 had a different motive. Over the years 17 different Federal agencies have been authorized to provide educational assistance for the children of Federal employees. Public Law 874 represented a constructive overall approach to discharge the obligation of the Federal Government resulting from the acquisition of large amounts of real property with the consequent reduction of the tax base of the school districts and an influx of children who were dependents of Federal employees. The cost to the Federal Government is a very small proportion of the amount which would be required to pay the regular assessed school taxes if the federally acquired property had remained in private hands.

Whether this law was or was not unwise in all its provisions is not the issue today. Congress assumed the Federal responsibility stated in Public Law 874 over 2 years ago. It cut off all other forms of Federal aid. The school districts involved have adjusted their financial arrangements with the assurance that the Federal payments would be forthcoming in accordance with the provisions of the law. School districts were assisted in the education of 716,380 children in the last year and an increase of about 25 percent is estimated for the current school year. If the $24,000,000 requested is not appropriated, schools for these children must be closed and teachers' contracts must be canceled at the expiration of the first two-thirds of the school year.

There are many school districts throughout the United States, boundaries of which are coextensive with the reservation of a Federal housing project. They have no other means of raising school funds. To fail to appropriate this money will not only mean that the school year will be cut short but also that the school districts will be in debt for the unexpired term of teachers' contracts and will be severely handicapped in conducting school next year.

The committee report cites one reason for its action which should be ample proof that the committee started with the wrong premise and, consequently, could not reach a sound conclusion. The report states that less than 500 districts received assistance at the peak of World War II and that now 2,300 are receiving it. It could have gone even further back than it did and cite the fact that none received assistance during the Revolutionary War. That would be just as germane to the question at issue here.

In my own State of New Mexico, for instance, the Federal impact due to the defense program is easily three times that during World War II. Millions of dollars worth of property, once on the tax rolls, has been acquired by the Government and the tax payments have ceased. At the same time thousands of children of immigrating Federal defense workers have swelled the school population to the point where there are neither facilities nor money available to educate them. Who is responsible for that? The Federal Government, of course. The Congress recognized that when Public Law 874 was passed. Now we are asked to repudiate that agreement with the people of the school districts from whom we have taken tax income and added to their cost of educating the children. In some cases that cost has been doubled by activities of the Federal Government.

I am for every sound economy that can be exercised to save dollars for the taxpayers, but I am not for the false economy that requires the Congress and the Federal Government to break just and equitable commitments that have been made and accepted in good faith.

This amendment should be adopted—and unanimously.

I would like to take this occasion to say a word of appreciation for the fine contribution made by my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the support of this amendment. He has made a long and careful study of this subject and I share with many other Members of the House a profound respect for his knowledge and understanding of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Scrivner amendment on three different points. When I ran for Congress last fall, I had three planks in my platform. One was that I would do all things possible to prevent the completion of Tuttle Creek Dam, and it looks now as if I will be able to keep that campaign promise. Another was that I favored legislation that would make graft on the part of government officials, especially those in the National Government, so dangerous that no person would consider engaging in it. I believe the Republican majority on my left would do well to help me keep that promise. The third plank was that I favored eliminating all unnecessary items from the budget and cutting Government expenses to the bone. My support of the amendment is not contrary to that promise. I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman who said that he was not in favor of curtailing appropriations at the expense of the children. I want to say that I am not in favor of curtailing Government appropriations at the expense of the honor of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as this law is now written, the Congress is morally obligated to fulfill its commitments to the schools throughout the United States of America whose budgets were predicated on our promised support. That there are inequalities in the present bill there is no doubt, but the honor of the Congress of the United States is at stake. The obligation is not alone to the citizens and school children of the districts affected. All the people of the United States expect Congress to honor its commitments. I am confident the proposed amendment will be adopted. I submit the following letter from the State superintendent of public instruction of Kansas:

KANSAS STATE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Topeka, Kans., February 11, 1953.

Representative HOWARD S. MILLER,
Kansas First Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Since Kansas will have more than 150 school districts making application for Federal assistance funds under the provisions of Public Law 874, I am anxious to submit facts and figures so that each Kansas Congressman and Senator will have firsthand information with reference to the Federal assistance program as it is now operating.

This is the third year for the operation of Public Law 874. During the first year, Kansas had 26 districts making application and the total receipts for these districts amounted to $967,954.27. Last year we had 121 districts qualifying and receiving $2,007,519.32; and for the current year, we have reason to believe that there will be close to 160 school districts that will make application.

These districts are listed on the attached sheets with estimated entitlements for the districts that have already applied for the 1952–53 school year plus the districts that applied last year that have not applied thus far this year and those that have not as yet made applications under Public Law 874. Applicant schools that have not applied prior to this year and have not as yet submitted their application are listed with no estimated entitlements.

The schools have been arranged according to counties and congressional districts with subtotals by congressional districts. The total of the listed estimated entitlements is $2,381,735.83. We believe that the total entitlements for the current year will eventually be close to $2½ million.

We have been informed that the last session of the Congress appropriated $40 million to take care of the applicant schools under Public Law 874 for the 1952–53 school year. Since school costs are increasing each year and the defense program is being stepped up each year, it is obvious that the total amount needed to meet the entitlements would increase from year to year.

The entitlements in Kansas this year will show about 20-percent increase over that of last year. The total amount provided for the program during the 1951–52 school year was $51,700,000, and we are informed that the estimates made by the United States Office of Education indicate that it will take approximately $64 million to meet the entitlements in full for the current school year. The $40 million already appropriated for the current year will take care of only approximately 60 percent of the entitlements.

I am sure that you are aware that boards of education must plan 18 months in advance for funds to operate schools in Kansas. Boards of education must enter into contracts with teachers, and the school district is obligated to meet these contracts in full payment. Therefore, I respectfully request that serious consideration be given to the deficiency appropriation of $20 million, which would make sufficient funds available to take care of the school districts' entitlements in full.

I am frank to say that every school board in the districts that have Federal impacts expect the Federal Government to meet its obligations in connection therewith. I would like to add that local boards of education are very happy with the provisions of Public Law 874 and the philosophy connected therewith. They were pleased that the Congress provided these funds for the 1951–52 school year. Of course, they are looking forward to the Congress making a deficiency appropriation and thereby keeping faith with the local community for providing educational opportunities for the federally connected children.

I have asked Mr. Needham and Mr. Kampschroeder to call at your office for the purpose of discussing this program as it is now operating in Kansas. Please feel free to contact me at any time with reference to Federal legislation that will affect the public schools of this State.

Yours truly,

ADEL F. THROCKMORTON,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the State of Arizona is in a large sense being victimized of one of its greatest assets. As you probably know, and I think all of you know this, Arizona has the world's finest winter climate. I say that without serious fear of contradiction. Your friends and your neighbors love to come to Arizona for the winter and we are very glad to have them. However, if they have children, the children then go to our schools. Your friends and neighbors do not pay taxes. That aggravates a situation which has already been aggravated by the fact that there are so many defense installations in the Phoenix area and also in the Tucson area. These defense installations have resulted in a situation in one of the school districts in Maricopa County in which out of 2,000 students enrolled, 1,700 of them are impacted. Out of this number 595 come from a defense housing area for which lieu tax is paid of $20,000, which is only $40 per pupil. The cost per pupil in that district is some $217, which means that lieu tax misses the cost by some $177. In my own city of Mesa the school population has increased since 1946 from 1,900 pupils to 4,100 pupils. A lot of this is caused by the proximity of an Air Force base.

The school tax rate in Mesa is $7 per $100 of assessed valuation even though the school costs are only about 80 percent of the average for the State of Arizona.

Children of high-school age who live at Williams Air Force Base go to school in Chandler, Ariz. The Government is now paying tuition for these children. In the event the program of school support is discontinued or runs out of funds, these children would have nowhere to go to school as the land upon which Williams Air Force Base is located is not, and never has been, in Chandler High School district.

I congratulate the Appropriations Committee on its fine work in reducing budget

estimates in the major part of this bill. Its zeal for economy in government is certainly praiseworthy and is shared, I believe, by the majority of the Members of the House. However, my feelings are similar to those expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], in that I do not desire to begin cutting at the expense of school children.

Further, I have it on good authority that practically every school receiving aid under this program expects to get its full allotment and that the original appropriation was only equal to about 60 percent of the total allotment. These schools have set up their budgets with the expectation of receiving the total allotment and any reduction would result in hardships to the school and to the children. In many instances in my State, it would also result in schools being operated by deficit financing or, in some instances, being closed.

I feel that in this instance economy should not be started by the denial of a supplemental appropriation. It is to be hoped that the Appropriation Committee will give the matter further study and effect its economies at the time the general appropriation bill is prepared so that all participating schools may be informed in plenty of time of the cuts which they may expect. To do otherwise, in my opinion, constitutes a serious breach of faith on the part of the United States Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. It seems clear to me that no matter how much we all desire economy in government, it is false economy to save money at the expense of the proper instruction of our children. Obviously the future of this country belongs to them and the type of instruction and education they receive will have a great effect upon the wisdom with which they maintain and extend the heritage which we will leave them. Certainly, the action of the Appropriations Committee in removing the item of $24 million of Federal moneys to be paid in those districts with tremendous numbers of federally connected school children is, in my judgment, false economy.

In many areas of the country it will mean the continuance of double and even triple sessions and it will mean the production of a generation of poorly educated young men and women. America cannot afford the consequence of such short-sightedness. Moreover the action of the Appropriations Committee in cutting the deficiency budget by $24 million in this respect is directly opposed to the request of the President of the United States. Just 16 days ago, in his state of the Union speech, President Eisenhower addressed both Houses of Congress and made the following statement:

> One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Is this Congress again going to repudiate the President of the United States? Is this Congress so unfeeling and so heedless of our children's future as to take the backward step proposed by the Appropriations Committee?

In my own Sixth District of California, where approximately 25 percent of the wage earners are employed in federally owned projects, the result of this cut upon our schools will be catastrophic. Programs that have been planned cannot be completed. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a chart showing the entitlements for the various school districts in my congressional district for 1951–52, the approximate amount of the entitlement for 1952–53 if the $24 million is restored, and the approximate amount of entitlement for 1952–53 if the cut is maintained.

State of California

SOLANO COUNTY

Project No.	Name of district	100 percent amount of entitlement for 1951–52 school year	Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952–53	
			100 percent	60 percent
Calif-53-E-27	Vallejo Unified School District	$889,801.16	$972,426.09	$583,455.65
Calif-53-E-57	Fairfield Elementary School District	18,639.12	[1] 21,807.77	13,084.66
Calif-53-E-75	Benicia Unified School District	101,799.81	[1] 119,105.78	71,463.47
Calif-53-E-79	Crystal Union School District	39,808.08	[1] 46,573.45	27,945.27
Calif-53-E-90	Vaca Valley Union School District	18,270.71	[1] 21,376.73	12,826.04
Calif-53-E-91	Vacaville Union High School District	4,599.56	[1] 5,381.49	3,228.89
Calif-53-E-90	Armijo Union High School District	11,200.21	[1] 13,104.25	7,862.55
	Total	1,084,118.65	1,199,777.56	719,866.53

[1] The amounts indicated in the 1952–53 column at 100 percent is based on a percentage estimate of the 1952 application.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Project No.	Name of district	100 percent amount of entitlement for 1951–52 school year	Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952–53	
			100 percent	60 percent
Calif-53-E-33	Pittsburg Unified School District	$61,803.95	$72,415.92	$43,449.55
Calif-53-E-39	Mount Diablo Unified School District	103,281.71	120,839.60	72,503.76
Calif-53-E-41	Richmond City School District	411,615.94	481,590.65	288,954.39
Calif-53-E-44	Richmond Union High School District	69,482.96	81,295.06	48,777.04
Calif-53-F-55	Contra Costa Junior College District.[1]			
Calif-53-E-77	San Pablo School District	22,411.47	26,221.42	15,732.85
Calif-53-E-163	Rodeo School District	33,991.41	39,769.95	23,861.97
Calif-53-E-239	Lafayette School District	4,700.16	5,499.19	3,299.51
Calif-53-E-240	John Swett Union High School District	8,511.79	9,958.78	5,975.27
Calif-52-E-330	Liberty Union High School District.[2]			
Calif-53-E-331	Danville Union School District	1,797.12	2,102.63	1,261.58
Calif-52-E-332	Walnut Creek School District	3,870.72	4,528.74	2,717.24
Calif-53-E-333	San Ramon Valley Union School District.[3]			
	Total	721,557.23	844,221.95	506,533.16

[1] Deductions greater than computed entitlement.
[2] Did not meet 3 percent eligibility requirement.
[3] Application canceled per applicant's request.

NOTE.—Amounts indicated in the 1952–53 column at 100 percent is based on a percentage estimate of the 1952 application.

It will be noted that 18 school districts will be cut $817,635.82, if the $24 million is not restored. Where are we to obtain this money? Every one of the school districts is bonded to the legal limit. The State of California recently made available certain additional sums which the districts have obtained. No further action from the State can be expected. Without this money our school program will be crippled.

Senator TAFT, in a recent public statement, urged continuance of these payments as part of the Republican legislative program. The reasons given by the Appropriations Committee in its report seem to be singularly unconvincing. In this connection, I might point out it has been estimated that the Federal Government owns tax exempt real property which would be appraised for tax purposes at approximately $20 billion. If the 6-mill tax rate were applied to these properties—6 mills being the approximate average tax for school purposes throughout the country—the Federal Government would be called upon to pay approximately $120 million for the support of the school districts. Therefore, I think we must not fall below the $64 million contemplated for this fiscal year and should restore the $24 million to the $40 million previously appropriated.

I urge very strongly an "aye" vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas restoring to this appropriation bill the amount of money necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 847 for the 1952–53 school year. I do so on behalf of the 10 public schools in my district receiving funds under that law and on behalf of districts having similar problems throughout the United States.

We in California are proud of our tax-supported colleges and secondary and elementary schools and we assume the

whole responsibility for providing them and operating them under difficult conditions of growth occasioned by a tremendous increase in school population when no abnormal factors exist.

However, the increase in school population in a limited area attributable to the presence of huge United States military installations is an abnormal factor in those cases where such installations for reasons of strategy and economy are located in areas without any substantial property or population in addition to military personnel and property. This observation is true of the installations in my district. The fact is that without the requisite Federal aid no adequate system of schools for the children of military and civilian personnel would be provided. No local real and personal property tax base exists which would support such schools.

Previous Congresses recognized this problem and passed Public Law 847 to meet it. It would be a gross and inexcusable breach of faith for this Congress to fail to implement the law. The school district beneficiaries thereof are today educating little children in accordance with proper standards after commitments in the form of teacher contracts and other obligations on the assumption that we will implement it. These actions of these districts are irretrievable and it would be immoral for us to say now by indirection that we had concluded an established policy was erroneous. Ignoring the consideration of the pledge contained in the law I rather doubt that anyone here seriously doubts the wisdom of the program. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message endorsed the program and policy, and I heartily agree with his endorsement.

The assertion has been made that some districts are receiving aid which should not properly be entitled to such aid according to a standard of necessity. I say that if we want to change the bath water let us not throw out the baby along with the dirty water and that is exactly the result of the action of denying a law by failure to appropriate enough money to implement it. The time will come for reexamination of the law itself, either at this session or in 1954 when the law is slated for expiration. I have in my district a naval test station located on the desert. It is the seat of almost all the population and activity in the area and its inhabitants almost the sole beneficiary of schools maintained there to which the State of California makes a substantial contribution. The activities of this station are directed to providing us with better weapons of war and it employs persons of first-rate training and ability who insist on adequate education for their children. A serious problem exists in recruiting qualified people to work in such a remote area. A more serious problem will exist if we are derelict in our duty in supplying adequate education there and in other areas.

It is no fair criticism to say that school districts calculated to be eligible for this program have not already claimed money due them including the money here sought to be appropriated under the formula set up in the statute. School officials cannot accurately predict from year to year the exact facts of future school population and the procedure set up in the law for reimbursement after the fact is a suitable method of handling these allocations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure in 1950, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, to be one of those who were assigned to subcommittee work in about seven of the States, involving the districts of many Members of Congress, in connection with this legislation. It was my privilege and pleasure to have on the committee on which I served our present chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. I think he, like me, was astounded at the conditions under which too many school districts of this Nation are today trying to give an education to their boys and girls.

In the discussion this afternoon on this bill the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] made known the question that has arisen on the border between Kansas and Missouri. Last year we had that same question arise on the border of Maine. I think those matters are subject to review and correction, where a plant is in one State and the schools to which the children go and the homes of the people that work in the plant are across the line in another State. I think those are questions that can be settled without too much difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], may I say preliminarily that I have been impressed by the way in which a great majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle are able to set at one side partisan and political considerations when considering a matter of grave concern to the Nation. Such a matter is this issue of whether or not we will keep our obligations to our schools, in areas where schools are crowded and heavily burdened by Government projects and defense activities. There are three reasons, it seems to me, which would justify a person on either side of the aisle in supporting the Scrivner amendment, restoring to this appropriation bill money vitally needed to operate our schools. The first is the fact that we have a legal and a moral obligation under the established policy of our Government and of our Congress to make this appropriation. The second is the fact that in our fight against communism we must recognize the fact that education is the very first bulwark of our country in carrying on that fight effectively among the youth of our country. We cannot afford to do anything which will undermine the foundations of that bulwark. The final reason is that this is clearly identified as a bipartisan policy initiated by a Democratic Congress under Democratic leadership. It has also attracted strong Republican leadership, and today we find the President of our country, a Republican, on record in favor of this policy. This is a measure surely on which Democrats and Republicans alike can unite in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Scrivner amendment should be adopted in order to fulfill a just obligation of the Federal Government. We ought to live up to this law, we ourselves approved and helped to enact. The school districts involved in this controversy have not only had a portion of their lands removed from the tax rolls but in addition a large number of federally connected children have been dumped in their laps. These students seek education and are entitled to receive it.

If these funds are not restored as sought by this amendment many schools would close their doors after a term of from 6½ to 7 months in the current year. At least seven school districts in Arkansas would have to close their doors before the end of the term.

Let us consider for a moment the Gosnell school district in Mississippi County, Ark. Thirty-two percent of the total land area of the district was taken over by the Government and removed from local taxation. Additional lands of the district will be required and obtained during 1953, which would decrease further the funds that would be available to operate the Gosnell school. This school district has voted a millage of 28 mills for maintenance and operation alone and an additional millage for debt retirement. The district is carrying a heavy load and should receive Federal assistance in order to provide a 9-month term for the district's school children.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statesmanlike stand.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement. I too favor the Scrivner amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress will refuse to appropriate the comparatively small sum of money necessary to keep faith with the schools suffering a Federal impact and who have relied upon the promise of the Federal Government to assume a portion of the expense of operating the schools caused by the Federal impact in the various school districts.

It is claimed by some of those opposing the Scrivner and Fogarty amendments that certain schools are benefiting from the moneys heretofore provided under this Federal aid program and they urge that therefore the deficiency appropriation asked for by the Department of Education ought not to be voted. It may be that some school districts in America are profiting undeservedly by this program, but if so it is the fault of the formula provided in Public Law 874. The President has asked that the policy and program provided for by Public Law 874 be

extended or reenacted. If there are faults in the law, the proper time to correct them is when a bill providing for the continuation of the program is before the House. Certainly the mere fact that a very few schools are profiting undeservedly through some error in the formula adopted when Public Law 874 was passed, cannot justify the Congress in refusing to keep faith with those schools who have entered into contracts with teachers and for other services depending upon the assurances given them by the Congress when it voted overwhelmingly for this program of Federal aid to federally impacted school districts. The honor and integrity of the Congress of the United States is at stake as well as the welfare of the school children living in these areas.

Not only did the President ask for the continuation of this program but he went so far as to ask that this deficiency appropriation be made. All this he did in his state of the Union message.

I agree with those who insist that Federal expenditures be cut to the very minimum consistent with the efficient operation of our Government and consistent with national security. But I am unwilling to slash the budget at the expense of the school children of America.

As an illustration of the impact of the Korean war on the schools in Georgia, I want to give you the facts with reference to the situation in Cobb County, Ga., where there is located the Lockheed aircraft plant.

Cobb County, Ga., is located 10 miles northeast of and contiguous to the city of Atlanta. The Cobb County school system includes all schools in the county except the independent system of the city of Marietta. The Cobb County school system is one single administrative unit.

I. FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS AFFECTING THE COBB COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A. The major war industry affecting the Cobb County school system was the Bell Aircraft Corp., erected by the United States Government in 1943 at the cost of $75,000,000. The peak employment of this industry was 28,000 people.

B. Dobbins Air Base was used extensively for reserve training during the war. There has been much expansion of this air base since 1946; civilian employment, 400; military employment, 600.

C. In March 1946 the Fifth Division of the Veterans' Administration moved into the office space of the old Bell Aircraft Corp. The peak employment was over 2,000 civilians plus police personnel and service people.

The Fifth Division of the Veterans' Administration was removed to Atlanta, Ga., during the period from March 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951. A very large percentage of these employees continued to live in Cobb County and work with the Veterans' Administration in Atlanta.

D. The Allied Packaging Co., in 1946, contracted with the United States Government to recondition tools and equipment at Bell Aircraft Corp. In September 1949, the Tumpane Co. supplanted the Allied Packaging Co. and has an employment of 500 people.

E. In 1947, the United States Government authorized the construction of the Allatoona Dam, the backwaters of which cover more than 3,600 acres of land in Cobb County. During the construction of the Allatoona Dam, a subimpounded dam was being erected at Acworth. These two projects were carried on over a period of more than 2 years.

F. With the impending threat of a world war and with the demand for additional planes in Korea the United States Congress ordered the reactivation of the Bell aircraft plant. In January 1951 Lockheed Aircraft Corp. of California took over this enormous aircraft plant. At the present time the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. has an employment of 12,000 people and are scheduled to reach an employment of 27,000 by January 1954.

G. Many industrial establishments located in Cobb County were called on to contribute to the war effort such as Glover Machine Works, Clark Thread Co., Scripto, Inc., Murray Gin, and Conley Depot.

II. POPULATION GROWTH

Excluding the city of Marietta, the Cobb County census in 1940 was 29,000. The present estimate by the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce is 47,000. This shows an increase of approximately 65 percent.

I give below, a table which represents the effect of the population impact on the Cobb County school system:

Total average daily attendance

1938–39		5,519
1942–43		5,178
1951–52		9,200
1952–53	(estimate)	10,500

This reveals a growth of more than 100 percent of students in the Cobb County school system since 1942–43, the year the bomber plant was started. It has been determined by educational agencies that approximately 3,800 of these children were directly connected with Federal installations in Cobb County.

III. HOUSING

According to statistics provided by county officials there have been more than 3,000 houses constructed outside of Marietta during the last 18 months. In January 1952 Mr. Thigpen of the FHA, authorized the construction of 750 defense housing units outside the city limits of Marietta.

IV. FINANCES

It is the combined judgment of the Cobb County Board of Education and of the Superintendent that the United States Government, due to the installation of Federal industrial plants in Cobb County, is responsible for a sudden impact in school attendance and has placed upon the applicant, a substantial and continuing financial burden if they provide a fair and reasonable educational opportunity for the children under its jurisdiction.

(a) The millage levied in 1942–43 was 5 mills. Since 1946, 15 mills have been levied by the Cobb County Board of Education, an increase of 300 percent.

(b) Tax assessments according to the tax collector, Mr. James E. Berry, have increased from 1938–39 by 60 percent.

(c) In November 1950, the citizens of Cobb County voted a bond issue of $1½ million for school construction. The Cobb County Board of Education has exhausted its local strength to provide housing for its children. It is carefully estimated that within the next 12 months, the Cobb County school system will need an additional $700,000 to adequately house its children. For the past 8 years, one-third of 3,500 children have been housed in classrooms of the Army camp barrack type construction which were poorly heated, inadequately lighted, and very little ventilation. The people and residents of Cobb County are becoming very resentful of the heavy burden of taxation on them when the Federal Government is not meeting its responsibility.

(d) The Cobb County school system has been notified by the United States Office of Education that the Cobb County Board of Education has a building entitlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. In many parts of our country the Federal Government has condemned and acquired large blocks of real estate and buildings and thereby has taken these properties off the tax rolls of the local communities.

The local governments—city, county, State, and the school districts—have lost the tax revenues which these local governmental units derived heretofore from these lands and buildings. This, in some cases, has impoverished the local governments.

Yet, despite this loss of tax revenue, the local governments still must render service to those who live on these Federal holdings. The local government must supply these people who live on Federal lands with police and fire protection and educate their children. It is only fair that the Federal Government, which took these properties off a school district's tax rolls, should pay something in lieu of taxes for the education of the children of those who live on this tax free property.

In Vancouver, Wash., for example, the Federal Government owns a large housing project. There are about 2,300 occupied homes in this housing project. These families are sending more than 4,000 children to the Vancouver schools.

The Federal Government, in such a case as this, should make, in all fairness, to the city of Vancouver some payment in lieu of taxes to provide for the cost of educating the children who come from these tax-free lands.

Early last year the Congress did make appropriations of about $120,000 to the Vancouver school district and promised at the time to pay another $40,000 to $50,000 to the Vancouver district sometime prior to July 1 of this year.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] merely provides funds for schools in cities like Vancouver another $45,000 prior to July 1 and should, in my opinion, be adopted.

I am for economy. I want to see spending cut. However, I do not want to see the first cuts made at the expense of the school children.

The Federal Government today owns and controls 455 million acres of land

in the 48 States. Many millions of acres of this land never should have been in Federal ownership. The thing for the Federal Government to do, in the interest of economy, is to sell some of the unneeded lands it now holds and get them back into private hands and thereby onto the tax rolls of the local communities.

If this were done we would not have local school districts asking for aid in lieu of tax payments.

The road to economy is not in cutting down funds needed for the maintenance of reasonable standards of education in our schools, but to get some of the 455 million acres of Federal Government-owned lands into private hands and back onto the tax rolls, when taxes from these lands will help support local government and local schools.

The Federal Government today owns 23.9 percent of all the landed area of the 48 States. This is an area ten times the size of the combined area of the 10 New England States. No reasonable person believes that it is either necessary or desirable that that much land should be in Federal Government ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is justified and must be restored. Anyway in the world you examine it, it seems to me one must vote to keep the funds in the bill, be it by the Scrivner amendment or the Fogarty amendment. It would be wrong to do otherwise. The need exists. The funds are required. The law says on the one hand to parents, "You must send your child to school." On the other hand the government, by law in the various communities, is prevented from obligating funds they do not have. What are they to do? Get out of education? How far out? To keep the kids at home, raise them in ignorance and fear, ripe for child labor?

We are growing at the rate of 2 million people a year. By 1975 we will be a Nation of over 200 million people. I want to keep this land of ours, by virtue of its educational system, the envy and despair of every other nation in the world.

I intend to vote for the Scrivner amendment, as it will be altered by the Fogarty amendment—the $20½ million cut must be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the question involved here is not the education of children. The question involved is whether or not the Congress will at this time abandon its function of reviewing and passing on appropriations to Federal bureaucrats.

There were no justifications presented by this Bureau to our committee for this deficiency appropriation. For 150 years it has been customary for the Committee on Appropriations to go over the requests of agencies, even the military, and to review them most exactingly, and unless they make a case, refuse the funds. In this case only the wildest kind of speculation upon the part of this Department could justify a deficiency.

This same Department has come here with a record, which I have here, of having made two separate statements as to the condition of their funds, on the same date and at the same time. On one which they brought to the Committee on Appropriations last Tuesday they said they had spent last year $47,072,000. In the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], as I understand it, yesterday they said that last year they spent $48½ million. At which time are you going to believe them?

On the other item they told us in a statement they brought up on the 17th that they had obligated $5,715,983. In the statement that they made in their justification which was submitted about the 15th of January, they said they had obligated on that date $5,092,000. Frankly, I cannot go along with that kind of business, and I cannot have anything to do with supporting such a thing.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment to restore to schools in war-impacted areas the funds which were cut from the supplemental appropriation bill, I think it is particularly important to note that the swollen populations which make this Federal assistance imperative did not result from any activity or desire of the small, independent school districts involved. It was the result of the sudden development of Federal establishments necessary to the defense effort and which placed an unexpected and intolerable burden upon the taxpayers of the affected localities. This dislocation of their educational programs could not have been anticipated or provided for.

The responsibility of the Federal Government to bear its proper share of the cost of alleviating this hardship is acknowledged by Federal contributions in the past and by implied commitments for the present and immediate future. This obligation was recognized by the President of the United States in his message to Congress when he stated as follows:

> One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Please note that his last sentence deals specifically with the critical problem we now discuss.

Based on Federal representations, school budgets were built in dependence on the Federal contribution, additional teachers were hired to handle overcrowded classrooms and building programs were initiated to provide the expanded facilities required for the unexpected population growth.

Failure to receive the supplemental funds would cripple scholastic programs in many small, independent school districts. It would mean, in substance, a 40-percent cut in anticipated revenue, with this tremendous loss to be absorbed in the last quarter of the current school year. This would be disastrous to many districts.

The Washington Star, long recognized as a stanch foe of unnecessary spending, made this forceful editorial statement on the question of these school funds:

> Recognizing the impracticability as well as the injustice of saddling these uninvited burdens on the communities concerned, Congress very properly adopted the policy of extending certain Federal aid to them. The school-aid program is a part of this program. This aid could not be discontinued in any area where the expansion still continues without doing an injustice to all who live there and without doing harm to the interests of the Government itself.

We should ponder well the implications of that last sentence. Not to restore these funds would do harm to the interests of the Government itself.

Passage of this amendment will do even more than to save the vital school programs of overburdened communities; it will provide renewed assurance of the good faith of the Federal Government in living up to its proper obligations.

In my particular district, comprising 11 counties in Texas, only 2 counties are affected. But the failure of this amendment would be well-nigh tragic to 7 school districts in 1 county and to 1 school district in the other.

The figures involved would not be impressive, recited on this floor. When I point out that the Federal funds for the Bancroft Common School District in Orange County will be cut from $6,376.12 to $3,825.67 if this amendment fails, the sum might seem so trivial as to be unworthy of mention.

Unworthy of mention—unless we stop to consider that the Bancroft Common School District is made up of people—good American folks who want only the right to have their children receive the same schooling that is provided in communities where a sudden influx of defense projects has not dislocated the tax economy.

We in the 83d Congress all hope, I am sure, to cut every unnecessary penny out of every appropriation bill that comes before us—but it is not now time—and may the time never come—when it is necessary to effect our economies at the sacrifice of our children's education.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the provision of funds for aid to critical and impacted school areas is a matter of vital importance and necessity, and I support the Fogarty amendment to restore funds in the amount of $20,500,000 for this purpose.

I know personally of the great need which has been alleviated through prior operation of this program administered through the Office of Education.

The decision of the Department of Defense to locate the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Coffee County, Tenn., near Tullahoma, resulted in a situation very critical to the schools of that area and it has been only through the assistance program of aid to impacted school districts that a very serious condition has to a great degree been relieved. In Coffee and Franklin Counties, where this project is situated, it has been necessary to extend this aid program to the Manchester Tennessee Board of Education in two instances—this for additions to existing school plants. In Tullahoma,

also in Coffee County, the city board of education has found it necessary to enlist Federal aid for the construction of a new elementary school building—so great has been the influx of new children and the increase in the school population due to the AEDC.

Also in Franklin County, in the vicinity of the project, school officials have found it necessary to request aid for additions to four different elementary schools in the district which I am honored to represent.

Also in the Fourth Tennesseee District there is still another military installation which has caused great hardship from the influx of additional school pupils. I am referring to the expansion of Stewart Air Force Base at Smyrna, in Rutherford County. Expansion of this base has necessitated Rutherford County officials seeking aid for construction of an additional elementary school to house the increased school population at Smyrna and also for additions to existing plants in Smyrna.

Without this program, these areas would have experienced great hardship and restrictions on their educational programs through no fault of their own.

I cannot urge too strongly that the great program be continued until it is safely considered that the trouble spots have been eliminated and the schools of the Nation are relieved of the great burden of sudden floods of school children due to suddenly increased population in defense areas.

I urge restoration of these funds.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives would deprive a number of communities in the First Congressional District of substantial sums of money which the Government of the United States has previously obligated itself to pay for operational and construction costs in education.

All of these communities have relied on the promise of the Government to make these funds available; to suddenly break this promise appears to me to be offensive from a moral as well as a legal standpoint.

President Eisenhower in the state of the Union address little more than 2 weeks ago recognized this problem when he said:

> One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

And yet his words apparently go unheeded on this vital issue of education. At a time when so much of our budget goes for military defense purposes we begrudge, it seems, this comparatively modest financial support to our first line of defense: education.

It appears to me that there are better places for the cut of expenses than in this area of education.

I am fully in favor of restoring the appropriation of $24 million for Federal aid to education. I shall support every measure to achieve this objective.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, many reasons have been given for the support of the Scrivner amendment which provides for an appropriation of $24 million to assist local governments in federally impacted areas to provide for the education of the children in those areas, who through the action of the Federal Government have been thrust upon the people in those areas. One of the points that I do not believe has been made quite clear is that should we not provide these funds, it would then become necessary for the Department of Defense to come to us and ask for funds in order to provide educational facilities for the children who are presently living on Federal bases. It is my firm conviction that the establishment of these schools located on Federal installations to provide for the education of the children living thereon would be much more costly than the sum now asked and provided for in the pending amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Fogarty amendment. There would be chaos if the rules were changed in the middle of the year. That would be the case if no provision were made for continued Federal financial assistance during the remainder of the school year.

Programs were arranged in anticipation of Federal participation and there has been no warning that it might suddenly be cut off. In many cases such action would be fatal to continued operation. Six different school districts in Alaska, plus some schools under direct control of the Commissioner of Education, would be affected. The total loss in anticipated revenues from the Federal Government would be $165,334.25. It would be difficult and in some instances impossible in Alaska to meet an emergency that could not have been foreseen. Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has disallowed the entire request of $24 million, which would provide funds for the operation and maintenance of schools located in federally affected areas as provided in Public Law 847.

It is estimated that over 2,000 schools receive assistance under this appropriation. In areas where there is a great deal of abnormal employment—most of which has been concentrated in the communities in recent years by reason of defense production—there are thousands of children requiring education which the local government units cannot take care of.

I am very much in favor of all legislation which will economize and reduce the cost of goverment, but I do not think it is economy to eliminate this appropriation, which will provide an education for thousands of American school children.

The country realizes that we are under an abnormal economic situation when our Government is spending billions toward defense production. During the last 10 years, hundreds of thousands of families have moved into areas where they can get employment at new defense installations pertaining to the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy, and so forth. It is the duty of the Federal Government to aid these local communities in handling school facilities for the great number of children that are brought into the community by reason of these Federal defense installations.

I represent a great industrial area in the Calumet region in Indiana and during the last 10 years our population has increased tremendously because of defense production. Our schools, kindergarten, grade and high schools, are overcrowded to such an extent that a number of local communities cannot meet the situation to provide adequate education for this added load of pupils and students.

I am going to vote for the amendment offered by Congressman FOGARTY to reinstate this appropriation, which will aid these communities to educate the children of defense workers. By appropriating this money, I firmly believe in the long run it is an economy measure because if thousands of American children are denied a proper education it would only be a few years until our Government would realize its mistake.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the appropriation of funds for schools in our impacted defense areas, and it is my hope and prayer that this may be provided for in the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1953.

The matter of education for our children is of utmost importance to each of us, and I believe we all agree that the problem of adequate educational facilities in these defense areas is a serious one. I have such an area in my own district. The Mathieson Chemical Corp. at Morgantown, W. Va., is now employing over 1,000 defense workers in the Morgantown ordnance works, owned by the Department of the Army. There is a marked increase in the population in the Monongalia County area and, naturally, the enrollment in the schools has been increased. The schools are greatly overcrowded and there are not sufficient facilities to accommodate the students. In some instances it has been necessary to transport children from their home communities to school buildings where facilities had to be improvised.

It is my feeling that we are obligated to grant this allocation for the expansion of the school facilities in the defense areas. President Truman signed the measure during the 82d Congress which provided for maintenance and operation of school facilities in these areas, and this was also stipulated by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message a few weeks ago.

Yes, I believe this is an obligation which this Congress must assume, and I am in favor of it for all such defense areas in the whole United States.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, just as many other school districts around the Nation have been affected by Federal activities in their area, nine school districts in Montana are affected. If this amendment is not adopted, these

Montana school districts will lose more than $100,000.

Districts which stand to lose and the amounts involved include:

District No. 6, Columbia Falls	$36,627
District No. 1, Glasgow	6,754
District No. 1, Great Falls	33,329
District No. 21, Fort Peck	12,942
District No. 13, Nashua	1,883
District No. 7, Gardiner	4,372
District No. 3, Hamilton	2,318
District No. 33, Helena	3,104
District No. 50, Evergreen-Kalispell	1,127

It is gratifying that some of the gentlemen who have participated in this discussion are becoming aware of the effect of Federal ownership in their districts. We in the West have had such a condition confronting us for many years.

Two-fifths of Montana is nontax-paying public land. In some districts the Federal Government owns over 90 percent of the land and this is not something new. For years Montana has had Federal forest lands and Indian reservations, the former cutting into the amount of land on the tax rolls, the latter placing an added burden on school facilities. Unlike Federal projects in some States, these forest lands and Indian reservations do not bring in additional homes, payrolls, and incomes to broaden the tax base.

But I disagree with some of my colleagues that the answer to this is to discontinue these needed activities. We, in Montana, do not want to eliminate the Forest Service. We would not allow Glacier National Park to pass from control by the Federal Government for all the people.

The real solution is as proposed in the Fogarty amendment, to make adequate payment, in lieu of taxes, for loss to the school districts by tax-free activities of the Federal Government. This money which the Congress promised last year already has been budgeted by these school districts in the State of Montana. These districts are taxed to their constitutional limits and have been aided by the State to statutory limits and they still must have this assistance to remain open for the balance of the school year.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I am basically committed to, and support, reduction in Government expenditures and balancing the budget. However, in connection with the debate on taking out of the second supplemental appropriation bill the item for Federal aid to schools, I voted for the Scrivner amendment to restore $20,500,000 for this purpose. My vote is based on conditions which pertain to southern Maryland, where we have some of the most highly impacted and critical areas. The Federal Government has taken thousands of acres of our ground, causing a heavy loss in tax revenue. At the same time we are confronted with a continuing heavy influx of population coincidental with the expansion of Federal projects and installations in this area. This increase in population adds to the overburdening of our already crowded school system.

While I am for economy, I think it would be wrong to start with our schools and our school children. For these reasons I have voted to restore this item for aid to schools.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express to the far-sighted Members of the House my deepest appreciation for their help in getting the $20.4 million put back in the appropriation bill.

While these funds to aid schools in the federally impacted areas are not pork barrel or handout funds, it seems that very often it is necessary to stage a floor fight to get them restored after they have been left out by the committee. This should not be necessary.

These funds for maintenance and operation and construction of school facilities should be provided automatically on a permanent basis, because it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to the communities affected and to the people of these communities.

This responsibility should be accepted by the Federal Government and discharged by providing the necessary funds for this purpose. I am hopeful that the committee will not again indulge in this form of false economy, but in making retrenchments will do so where justified, in the interests of the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the debate on this bill. Also, I am aware of the need for some money for the operation of school districts that have been shouldered with responsibilities which they cannot bear. These responsibilities have come from the impact of service personnel who have come in large numbers to new or to expanded military posts of the Army, Air Force, and the Navy.

We should provide these districts with money so they may give education to the children of our service personnel. In several cases that I have in mind in my present congressional district—eleventh of California—and in my former congressional district—third of California—the school district did not have the taxing power or the bonding capacity to raise the money necessary to expand its facilities to take care of the new students who wished to attend the schools. Neither has the State of California the money to pay for all the situations created in our State by the rapid influx of service personnel and the expansion of them. To understand the problem one must have studied and examined it, as I have in the area around Stockton, Fairfield, North Sacramento, Benecia, Vacaville, and Vallejo, Calif.

To me the Scrivner amendment is a sensible effort to take care of the educational requirements caused by the influx of service personnel into areas where the schools are already crowded. If the Scrivner amendment is not passed I favor the Fogarty amendment, which gives the schools several millions less. Either amendment will help relieve a distressing situation and be helpful to the children who may be the victims of a bad situation. My vote will go for the Scrivener amendment and if it is not passed then for the Fogarty amendment.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, during the war period and since, it would have been impossible for the Mobile schools to operate without the help received from the Federal Government through the Lanham Act funds and Public Laws 815 and 874. Before the war, the enrollment in Mobile County Public Schools was 24,000, whereas now the enrollment is 43,000. A recent survey of school population seems to suggest that their school enrollment will be approximately 53,000 by September 1, 1955. This will necessitate the construction of more than 300 additional classrooms in addition to all the building projects now under way, made possible in most instances by Federal funds. During the past year the Mobile school system has received approximately $3 million for school building purposes from Federal sources. They need, in addition, by 1955 a minimum of $4 million to complete the needed construction, if double sessions are to be averted. Local funds for capital outlay purposes are very limited. They have recently borrowed $1¼ million for capital outlay purposes based on the extension of their three mill county and three mill district taxes. Their total borrowing capacity for such purposes is exhausted except for a million and a quarter dollars. This means that at least $2¾ million between now and 1955 will have to come from other sources. All of the above facts indicate that it is absolutely impossible for Mobile schools to meet their growing needs without a continuation of Federal aid. Most of the increase in school population in Mobile County has been brought about by the impact of the Federal Government's activities and projects within the county. Without the $3 million already received, it would be necessary for a large number of the schools in Mobile County to operate next year on double sessions. They have never been able to eliminate double sessions completely since the beginning of World War II.

I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, we all want to reduce expenditures but in doing so surely we do not want to repudiate obligations incurred by us pursuant to laws which we ourselves enacted. Surely we do not want to deprive American children of educational opportunities to which they are legally entitled by virtue of Federal law. If this Congress did not intend to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out the program of aid to federally impacted school districts it should not have authorized the program in the first place. But we did authorize the program. We did promise help to schools impacted by Federal activities. Now, to make a political economy gesture we are threatening to deprive many children of proper education. The appropriation before us will not affect the total of Federal expenditure very much. It will, however, have a definite effect on families and faculties throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Mr. Chairman, we are as obligated to make this appropriation as we are to appropriate funds to pay interest on Government bonds. We have a legal obligation to make these payments—and a moral one as well. I hope this appropriation will be made and the honor of this Congress upheld. We must keep faith with the children whose schools are depending upon us for assistance which we promised to give them.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and wish to point out a serious situation

which exists in my own district. Unfortunately Public Laws 815 and 874 are not broad enough to take care of the situation to which I shall refer.

Perhaps every Member of this House is generally familiar with the great Fort Bragg military establishment located in North Carolina. Since 1918 the Federal Government has appropriated for this military installation approximately $390 million. In 1918 the Federal Government initiated this camp. It was at that time that the financial problems of Hoke County, in my district, began. It was in 1918 that the Federal Government moved into Hoke County and took 102,000 acres of fertile Hoke County soil land for the establishment of Fort Bragg. This represented approximately one-third of the land area of the county at that time.

Since 1918 the Federal Government has held title to these 102,000 acres in Hoke County, N. C., and the county unit of government has lost approximately $435,000 in public revenues as a result of this Federal holding. The public school needs of the county have increased generally in proportion as they have in other sections of North Carolina and the country. Unfortunately only a very few of the Army personnel live in Hoke County and for that reason we are told Hoke County has been unable to fully qualify. I contend, however, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps there is a more serious military impact on Hoke County than any of the other situations that may exist in the country.

Hoke County now has a heavy bonded school indebtedness. This bonded indebtedness amounts to $293,000. In addition, the county is supplementing in the amount of $82,000 State funds for its county school system. While these figures may not be large as compared to other areas in the country, I insist that it is a very heavy load on a county that has a civilian population of only 15,000 people and an annual budget of $250,000 for its normal operations.

It was not until March 1952 that Hoke County was able to receive any consideration from the Federal Government to help carry along the educational load in this impacted military area. The amount granted during 1952 was only $1,630, a most insignificant sum when one stops to consider the fact that the county lost approximately one-third of its taxable land area to the Federal Government for the establishment of Fort Bragg.

What I have previously stated, of course, is serious. I now point up what I consider to be the most serious dilemma ever to face a county unit of government in North Carolina. The Defense Establishment now proposes to move into Hoke County again under Public Laws 155 and 534 of the 82d Congress and acquire 46,000 acres of land under a military expansion program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have supported our military program. I do feel, however, that in this instance the Defense Establishment must take into consideration the fact that if they move in and by condemnation insist on taking 46,000 additional acres of land, over one-half of the remaining land area of Hoke County will be under the control of the Federal Government, a unit of government will be destroyed. This 46,000 additional acres of land that the Defense Establishment proposes to take over represents some of the richest and most productive farming land in our State.

With all of the force at my command I insist that the very existence of the county is threatened if the Federal Government insists on taking this land and without giving something in return.

I insist that this is not a problem that should be borne by the State of North Carolina.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that if the proposed program of the military is carried out it will represent the most serious military impacts upon a unit of government to be found in the country.

It is the feeling of the citizens of Hoke County, those people close to the situation that other and suitable land area is available. I shall continue to insist that the rights of the citizens of Hoke County be protected.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote with what I expect to be the overwhelming majority of the House in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. But I do want to call to the attention of the House what the defense establishment is thinking about concerning a county in my own district. The proper committees of this Congress must take note of this and other areas where the military is moving in and creating most serious situations.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, California has historically provided a high standard in all its public schools. We have been one of the leaders in this Nation in providing a truly American standard of education for all of our young men and women from the kindergarten through the junior-college grades—a free education in every sense of the word.

During the past 6 years the voters of California have increased almost 100 percent the amount of funds which the State contributes to the support of the public schools of California. At the present time we provide approximately $200 in State funds for every student in average daily attendance in the elementary grades. We provided approximately $250 for every student in average daily attendance in the junior colleges and high schools of our State.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, voters in my State have approved in the past 5 years bond issues totaling $430 million for construction of school buildings in impacted areas. This assistance from the State is outside the regular and usual procedures for the local bonding of school districts to meet construction needs.

The report of the subcommittee on page 17 states:

> Testimony and reports received by the committee leave no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

That is not the case, Mr. Chairman, in California.

Our school districts are permitted by law to levy a maximum tax rate for local contribution to the operation of the schools a rate of 90 cents per $100 value at the elementary level, 75 cents for high schools, 35 cents for junior colleges, a total rate in the unified districts of $2 per $100 for school support. Practically every district in California today levies that maximum rate of tax and many, many of the districts, by special vote of the people, are now levying taxes in excess of the maximums permissible by law.

We have over 2 million youngsters attending our schools. Of this total of 2 million, 500,638 are in attendance at schools having pupils affected by the provision of Public Law 874.

If we withhold this money from the States we in California are going to be forced to accept a lessening of the quality of education given our youngsters, because our schools are operating under a budget predicated upon a Federal contribution to help underwrite the loss of, or absence of, local tax base because of defense installations. From 15,000 to 20,000 children in attendance at schools on military bases are going to be denied an educational program. It is quite possible that additional thousands in attendance at schools deriving anywhere from 2 to 46 percent of their budget under the provision of Public Law 874 will also be denied an educational opportunity, because the loss of funds will result in early termination of the semester. If funds available do not permit 170 days of school, those districts under the provision of the California school law will be denied State contribution, because only those districts having 170 days of school receive their State apportionment.

I am supporting the amendment because there is no way under the California law, and I am certain under our State constitution, for the school district to go back and raise at the local level the funds they had planned on receiving from the Federal Government.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the districts in making their budget had solid reasons for assuming that the Federal Government would go through with commitments which were certainly implied. I realize fully the desire on the part of every Member of the Congress to bring about economies in the Federal Government, but economies at the expense of the young men and women of America are not the ones I subscribe to.

I urge this House to adopt this amendment, to acknowledge a responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to assist in those areas of the Nation which are overly burdened as a result of the defense activities now undertaken by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY to the amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Strike out "$24 million" and insert "$20,500,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 197, noes 18.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 199, noes 37.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 7, after line 7, after "Social Security Agency", insert under the caption of Office of Education: "to further implement Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress to provide funds for supervision of construction, $145,000."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope it will not require much time for me to convince the Members of the House that here is a matter that must be adjusted. A companion law to Public Law 874 was Public Law 815, which provided construction money for the construction of school facilities in the several impacted school districts.

During the fiscal year 1950 the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committee saw fit to provide $135 million of construction money and in providing that amount of money they authorized $750,000 out of the $135 million to be used as supervisory funds to be transferred by the Office of Education to General Services to pay for the supervising of the construction of these school facilities.

The Congress came along in July, a day or two before the 82d Congress recessed, and added $80 million. The Senate cut the amount down to $60 million of additional construction money, but made no provision for the transfer of any funds from the Office of Education to General Services to cover the cost of supervising the construction of these school facilities.

This amendment is a simple provision whereby the Office of Education can transfer funds already in its hands. It is not going to cost the taxpayers any additional money. We just want them to have authority to transfer from funds provided under Public Law 815 for construction purposes $145,000 which will be transferred to General Services to cover the cost of the inspectors who inspect these approximately 700 or more school facilities now under construction.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a statement as to the number of projects under construction at the present time and I want to give you an idea of what we will be up against by the end of the year on this proposition. As of the present time there are 675 projects under construction. By the end of the second quarter of this present fiscal year there will be 1,234 projects under construction, by the end of the third quarter, 1,258, and by the end of the fiscal year, 1,263 projects under construction.

May I say that the Committee on Education and Labor did not want the Office of Education to go into the business of setting up a costly inspection service and the hiring of engineers at a tremendous rate of salary to do this work, so we provided in Public Law 815—and I would like to quote from it on page 9, section 209—that—

In carrying out his functions under this title, the Commissioner of Education may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal department or agency and may delegate the performance of any of his functions to any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency.

All this will enable them to transfer the money from the Office of Education to the General Services to recompense them for services rendered. I sincerly hope, without any debate or any further discussion of this matter, that the House will see fit to make these funds available.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman tell me how many projects are under construction in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not have it broken down for the States; I just have it for the Nation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 296 of the hearings and also page 15 of the committee report. The Housing and Home Finance Agency came before the committee and not only asked for $144,000 as a supplemental amount for fiscal year 1953, but they also asked for over $1 million for 1954 and 1955.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Briefly.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Office of Education had no business to ask for any funds running beyond the 30th day of June because Public Law 815, unless it is reenacted by this Congress, will be dead the 30th day of June, and that $145,000 is all they need. They have no business to project it into a future date.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for concurring that much with the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. On page 296, you will see a table which contains a breakdown of the staff for which they want these funds.

They have already received $750,000, and we think that is sufficient. In the table you will see, item by item, how they would spend $894,000 if we would give them an additional $144,000.

Division of law, 1.7 man-years.
Division of community facilities and special operations, 10.7 man-years.
Division of field coordination, 1.5 man-years.
Division of administration, budget and organization, 2.6 man-years.
Finance and accounts, 5.9 man-years.
Personnel, 2.4 man-years.
General Services, 6.1 man-years.
Audit, 1.2 man-years.

There is additional administrative overhead I will not bother reading. A little further in the table, you will find that the man-years requested for engineering, which is the real heart of this work, total only 64.1, which compares with a total of 65.9 for all these other side activities.

There must be a little economy in this budget. We cannot afford the luxury of a big overhead of experts in personnel, budget, finance, organization, and so forth, in a program of this kind.

Engineering is the chief function of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in assisting the Office of Education on the school-construction program. There has been enough money already appropriated to carry out that function.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman that I am heartily in agreement with the committee in that they have no business to project anything into their request for appropriations beyond the $145,000 because that is needed to complete this year. The legislation may be dead on June 30 if we do not reenact it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that the legislation will die on June 30?

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot, because I cannot speak for the entire Education Committee, but it was the intention to let it die on June 30, if you do not keep on building atomic-energy installations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is there anything to show anywhere that they need this money to carry on this program the rest of this year?

Mr. BUSBEY. Nothing at all. There is no justification for it at all.

Before closing my remarks, I will read the last sentence of page 15 of our report:

None of the reduction made in this item is to be applied to reduce the engineering personnel or the funds for the travel of such personel budgeted for this activity.

So there is ample provision for the engineering work needed to do the job.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the vote on the previous amendment, my purpose is now to again pledge allegiance to the Republican President and his administration and support to all the legislation which he or his advisers may send down, whenever I think it is good legislation.

It was a touching tribute the minority paid to the President a few days ago. Our Democratic colleagues, ever delightful and helpful, if I understood them correctly when we had H. R. 1979 before us, stated that they were going along with the grant of legislative power to the President:

We will balance the budget, we will have economy. We will have a balanced budget.

When H. R. 1979 was voted upon there were only 5 in the House, 16 in the Senate, that disagreed with the idea, that if President Roosevelt and President Truman had something, President Ike ought to have it. I suppose that if those two Presidents had had the smallpox, it would still be argued that President Ike ought to have it, because they could not do anything less for him than what they did for the other two Presidents.

Our Democratic colleagues and more especially the New Deal socialistic commentators are getting a lot of pleasure out of the fact that some of the newspaper boys say we on this side of the aisle are in disagreement. Oh, yes, we have all agreed we must reduce taxes and balance the budget. But which shall we do first? Balance the budget? That is the administration standpoint if I correctly hear the story, if I get it correctly from the newspapers. That is what the President proposes we should do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just one thing else, and have a greater national defense with less money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, we will get that in spite of the road blocks that may be thrown in our way.

The Committee on Government Operations is well on its way toward cutting the unnecessary fat out of the demands for military appropriations as well as cooperating with certain department heads who are determined to trim unnecessary spending money from appropriation bills of all kinds.

The President says balance the budget before we cut taxes. Our distinguished colleague from New York has served many, many years on the Ways and Means Committee. Before that service, he was a successful businessman. He has listened to the scare stories and the tales told by the spokesmen for the last two administrations, which, following the advice of Harry Hopkins "to tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect"—I hope that is a correct quotation—have been frightening the Congress as well as the people into a ruinous, spending, wasting, giveaway program.

The gentleman from New York says—and it seems like good sense—that we can stop spending, get out of the red and into the black, if we will just refuse to pick the taxpayers' pockets to give the spenders the money to spend.

It is hardly fair either to the taxpayers or the spenders to keep the dollars rolling in, have money on hand, and expect either the spenders, the wasters, or the giveaway boys to keep their hands out of the barrel which has reachable dollars in it.

One thing is sure. If they do not have the money and cannot borrow it, they will not be able to spend it.

Do I hear one say, "Yes, but if they use social security money or other trust funds for everyday expenses, the debt will continue to increase."

Well, now, that may be true. I have no doubt it is. But if it is necessary why not tell them to keep their itchy fingers off the trust funds? I am sure that the present administration has no thought of doing otherwise.

And, again, our New Deal-Democratic friends have long been telling us that the size of the Federal debt is not of much account. That I do not believe. I do think the taxpayers are entitled to relief. I do believe that the spending of these hang-over boys who are still entrenched in Government jobs will be greatly cramped if there are no funds available.

But as for our Democratic and New Deal friends on the other side of the aisle going along with either an attempt to lower taxes or to lessen appropriations, in my judgment, they will not go along with either one of the President's proposals. They will not go along to cut taxes. They will not go along to balance the budget whenever it is necessary to trim an appropriation bill. Oh, you profess to like the remedies proposed but you will not take them. Now, if you want to balance the budget, here is an opportunity to make a cut on a bill where you do not need the money, where it is already there unspent, some $34 million, if I read the record correctly. You will not go along with a real attempt to balance the appropriations with the income and so balance the books.

But, oh, no, you want to put in some more, and you did. It just shows how you go along with the President. You would not go one-eighth of an inch unless you thought there was some political advantage in it. And I am not questioning your motives. You seem to think that spending is the just highway to economic security and incidentally just to a return to power in 1955. Let us lower the tax burden, cut expenditures now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, here is a fair example of an agency of the Government which has come before the Congress and asked for supplemental funds which are not needed or justified at this time. Why, this agency even asks us to appropriate over a million dollars to be expended in 1954 and 1955. The truth of the matter is this is the very thing that has been going on for the past 20 years. We appropriate money for the agencies of Government and on many occasions we have reduced their requests for appropriations, but they continue to spend as if they had every dime they had asked for. Then they have been in the habit of coming up to the Congress again when they run out of money, asking for everything that Congress cut out and more too in many instances. They have been getting it altogether too often. If we are going to make an about-face and cut out this wasteful unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money, right now is the best time to start. I am going to be one, and I hope the majority of the Members of Congress will help us scrutinize every request that is made not only in the general appropriation bills but also in such supplemental appropriation bills as this, and do the job that we promised the American people we would do. I hope we will stand the acid test. The truth of the matter in this instance instead of allowing the $144,000 that is requested by this amendment, we would be perfectly justified, according to the testimony which was presented to the committee, to take a couple of hundred thousand dollars away from them which we have already appropriated for fiscal year 1953. That is what we should have done. Let us start showing the folks downtown and proving to them that we mean business. Let us show them that the day of wild, useless, reckless spending is over.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. If the action that the Congress has just taken in restoring the $20,500,000 and making available $145,000 which has already been appropriated unbalances your budget, I will vote to take the $24 million or $21½ million out of any appropriation that you call my attention to in order to balance the budget whether it is foreign aid, economic aid, or any other kind of aid.

Mr. JENSEN. All right, here we have this item of $20,500,000, and we have this item of $144,000 the gentleman wants to spend.

Mr. BAILEY. It has already been appropriated.

Mr. JENSEN. But multiply that by thousands and the gentleman will find it soon adds up to billions. I am going to live up to what the American people expect their Congress to do. It is mighty easy to float along with the tide, but it is pretty tough to vote against Federal aid that go to so many people and in which so many people are interested, but again I say it must be done. I am just as interested in good education as anyone in this House. I yield to no man in my desire for good education for our children. If this House does not turn down this amendment which the gentleman has just offered, then you open the floodgates again, and you say in effect, "The Committee on Appropriations, after sitting and hearing all the testimony did not know what it was doing." Then you have started to open the floodgates for all kinds of useless, needless spending of the taxpayers' dollars. Let us close the floodgates now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to belabor the House by taking 5 minutes. Before my colleagues vote on this matter I want to have it clear. This is not asking for the appropriation of any new money. They have $10 million of the $60 million that we gave them unobligated.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, this will take money out of the Treasury that would not otherwise be spent, and it will just provide for a lot of people who are doing duplicating work that the present architect which the local school authorities have hired, should do. That is just how it will work.

Mr. BAILEY. May I answer the distinguished gentleman from New York by saying that there is need for your having technical supervision over the expenditure of these millions of dollars.

Mr. TABER. Well, it has already been provided for.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me give the gentleman a litle history of what is going on. A few weeks ago the community facilities of the General Services received a set of plans and specifications from an architect for a school building costing a couple of hundred thousand dollars. He made provision for a heating plant, but never made any provision for a basement to put the heating plant in. Another set of plans came in for a two-story school building providing for elevators. Are you

going to let them build that kind of facilities? The object was to build the bare necessities for classroom service. You have got to have some supervision over these things. How are you going to spend all of these millions of dollars without some kind of sensible supervision?

Mr. TABER. You have $750,000 already provided for.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I am a little confused about one statement which the gentleman made. He said we had to provide $144,000 now because of the action which was just taken to include $20,500,000.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman got that implication from what I said, he is entirely wrong. I was not mentioning the $24 million. What I said was that if the House by voting $20,500,000 supplemental for maintenance and operations of the schools unbalanced the budget, I would vote with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to take that $20,500,000 out of some appropriation for foreign economic aid or foreign military aid. I was not talking about this $24 million.

Mr. FORD. In other words, there is no direct connection between the action taken by the House with reference to Public Law 874 and your amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. None whatever. It is construction and not maintenance and operation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman says this service is to cut out a lot of the frills in these high schools, but if the gentleman will make a study of the Hoffman-Boston High School over in Arlington he will find one of the most lush high schools in the entire United States. That was supervised by this agency.

Mr. BAILEY. Was that not built by local funds? The Federal Government only contributed toward the construction of that building.

Mr. BUSBEY. But that is how they perform on many of these high schools.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The language of the amendment that the gentleman has offered takes an additional $145,000 out of the Treasury, and it does not confine that expenditure to the funds that have already been provided for the construction of the school.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the intention of the amendment: They transfer moneys already in their hands.

Mr. TABER. That is not what it says.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the action taken in restoring to this bill most of the $24 million the committee had taken out—restoring some $20 million of that amount—is a mistake and entirely unwarranted.

With this amount restored, the Office of Education would receive some $64 million for the fiscal year. This is as much as the total spent in 9 war and postwar years under the Lanham Act.

The increase in this appropriation is a Democratic proposal and move. It could not—and cannot—be made unless there are Republicans willing to go along with it and willing to default on the Republican pledge of economy, a balanced budget, and reduced taxes. We can expect the Democrats to continue to try in every way possible to restore appropriation committee reductions and to defeat economy efforts. They will get away with it if Republicans are willing to aid them.

The Office of Education can get along very well without this added $20 million item. The original appropriation is adequate to see the agency through, even allowing for needs of the defense-impacted areas. Of course that does not mean that the Office of Education cannot spend the extra millions if you vote them. It can and will even spend some of the millions on schemes to promote additional spending at the local level—schemes such as that brought to light just this week before the board of education in the city of Kalamazoo, Mich., in my district.

I have here an article from a Kalamazoo newspaper which describes a request from the Federal Office of Education to the Kalamazoo Board of Education. It asks the board to "make a comprehensive study of their long-range educational needs and to develop school construction master plans based on these needs covering the period up to the 1959–60 school year."

The newspaper article reports that the request has been given a very cool reception by the board of education. Little disposition was shown to welcome this Federal intrusion, involving substantial expense to the local school district, particularly since the board has already been studying its school building needs and formulating plans to meet them.

One member of the board—I know him personally—is quoted as summing up his feelings as follows:

> I am in favor of forgetting it myself. We are not looking for any Federal aid; we would oppose it if it were offered to us. This smacks very much to me like the previous administration trying to take control of the schools and make them subservient to the Federal Government.

I am certainly opposed to appropriation increases which will encourage activities of this sort. Besides, as I have said on many occasions, I will not support so-called Federal aid programs because there is no such thing as Federal aid. Government is not a producer but a spender—and all too often a wastrel as well. It does not create wealth. All that it dispenses with lavish hand has been, or must be, collected from the real producers in the form of taxes. And for every dollar collected from the taxpayers back home they get about 25 cents in misnamed Federal aid; the rest, 75 cents, stays here in Washington for administration and jobs for the faithful.

May I remind you, and particularly my Republican colleagues, of the plea made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message:

> Getting control of the budget requires also that State and local governments and interested groups of citizens restrain themselves in their demands upon Congress.

It should not be too much to expect Congress—and especially those on this side of the aisle who have a special obligation to the voters in the matter—to set an example in exercising the self-restraint for which President Eisenhower pleaded. Certainly the field of public education, traditionally subject to local and State control and financing, offers an ideal area for practicing restraint in the demands upon Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 55, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "$60,500,000" to "$62,500,000."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Page 7, line 15, strike out "$62,500,000" and insert "$62,759,000."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in July 1952, the 82d Congress passed Public Law 550 extending education, training, and other benefits to Korean veterans. In effort to avoid the costly mistakes which occurred in the World War II program, the new law was written with provisions to strengthen the procedure for approving schools. I think everyone is familiar with the waste, abuse, and outright crime which plagued the veterans' education program. Over the past 7 years we have spent $15 billion on training veterans. I am sorry to say that hundreds of millions of dollars were wasted where neither the veteran or the taxpayer benefited. One of the main reasons for a great amount of the waste and racketeering during the World War II program was the failure to establish a sound system for approving and supervising schools. Most of the difficulty resulted from an inadequate law, but some States failed to discharge their responsibility, and the Veterans' Administration was not altogether without blame.

In setting about to correct these conditions, we wrote a law which clearly described standards and methods of approval, and placed definite responsibilities on both the States and the Veterans' Administration. We realized that the Veterans' Administration is not an educational agency and further that if the Veterans' Administration was to spend

billions of dollars based on State approval, that it was necessary that an educational agency be charged with the responsibility of determining that only good schools were approved and to see that they were properly supervised.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has not offered his amendment at the proper place. If he wants to accomplish what he seems to be attempting to do it should be offered somewhere else. The language carried here that he seeks to amend is the fund which is appropriated out of the old-age and survivors trust fund for the purpose of taking care of the expenses of the old-age and survivors trust fund. There is another item, and this should be offered to a separate section if the gentleman wishes to accomplish what is indicated by his statement.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Parliamentarian if that is correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is offering that at page 7, line 15, is he not?

Mr. TEAGUE. I do not have a copy of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman's intent is to meet the problem of the veterans' schools?

Mr. TEAGUE. My intent is to restore $259,000 that the United States Office of Education asked for doing a job that this Congress gave them to do last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That has to do with the veterans' schools.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Parliamentarian if the amendment is proper?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order; on the other hand, it does not do what the gentleman's statement indicated he desired to accomplish. For that reason I felt I should call it to his attention, because I think he wants to present some language that will accomplish what he has in mind rather than something that has nothing to do with it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may complete my statement and that I may perfect the amendment if the amendment carries.

Mr. TABER. Well, I could not agree to that and reserve the right to object, because we ought to have the amendment before the committee when we are talking about it and voting on it. We could not correct an amendment after we vote on it and then have it in a very satisfactory situation. I would have to object to doing that. I do not mind his completing his statement, nor do I mind withdrawing the amendment at this point and putting it in where he evidently wants it to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman for the completion of his statement.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in addition we wanted a place where Congress could turn for expert advice on just how the education and training program was operating. It is logical that we turned to the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency. We did so on the advice of eminent educators and the educational councils.

We directed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to utilize the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements with State approval agencies. We directed the Office of Education to publish a list of accrediting agencies to be used by the State agencies, and we directed the Office of Education to provide technical advice and assistance to State agencies in developing standards for approval of schools. The State agencies urged passage of this provision of law. The section of the law is simple and in short it says:

(a) In carrying out his functions under this title, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title.

I wish to emphasize that the word "shall" is used in connection with the Office of Education. The House report clarified this section of the bill further by saying:

Subsection 244 (a) contemplates the use of the facilities and services of other Federal agencies and specifically directs the utilization of the services of the Office of Education in administering appropriate parts of this program. The subsection provides that the Administrator shall utilize the service of the Office (1) in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training; (2) in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such arrangements; and (3) in rendering technical assistance to State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation.

Educators testified at length on the role of the Office of Education. It was discussed in detail in both the House and Senate committees. There was not the slightest doubt in anyone's mind as to what was to be expected of the Office of Education.

After the law was passed the General Counsels of Veterans' Administration and the Office of Education developed an agreement as to exactly what the Office of Education was expected to do, and an authorization was secured from the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget was thoroughly familiar with what Congress intended since a representative attended all of the meetings. The Budget Bureau authorized an expenditure of $289,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year. The Office of Education instituted a program which at the present level will cost $259,000 for the fiscal year. It is for this amount that they are seeking a supplemental appropriation.

After reading the hearings of the subcommittee where some question was raised as to legality of the operation, I wrote the chairman of the subcommittee and pointed out the provisions of law and its legislative history. Realizing that we must curtail costs, I proposed a 25-percent reduction which would have cut personnel in this operation from 43 to 27, yet, when the committee filed its report, it sharply criticized both the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education and directed the Office of Education to absorb the cost. Obviously the result will be that the operation must be immediately dissolved and other personnel laid off in an effort to make up the deficit.

The Appropriations Committee report contained the following statement:

If the act provided that the office perform this function the request for funds would not be quite so amazing. But the act does not so provide nor does either the House or Senate committee's report on the bill indicate that it was their intention that this function be performed by the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, the education program for Korean veterans will cost three-quarters of a billion dollars per year during its peak years. I think we can reasonably concern ourselves with how this money is being spent and what kind of education our veterans are getting for the money. I do not see how the act could be clearer regarding the function of the Office of Education. It has been reviewed by the General Counsels of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Security Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget. If the committee does not choose to appropriate for the legal functions of the Office of Education that is the committee's prerogative, but there is no justification for cutting out the Office of Education appropriation completely on the pretext of illegality.

Mr. Chairman, you will find me here on the floor of the House voting for every reasonable economy measure that is presented, but you will not find me subscribing to pennywise-pound foolish proposals such as this. I sincerely hope Mr. Chairman that the House will correct this error before it progresses any further. In order that there can be no doubt as to the legality of the operation of the Office of Education I am including an opinion from the General Counsel of the Federal Security Administration and a copy of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee outlining the legislative history of this provision of Public Law 550, 82d Congress:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
February 18, 1953.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: You have asked us for a statement of the views of the Federal Security Agency regarding the scope of the function of the Office of Education, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, "in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies" under cooperative agreements relating to the approval of courses of education or training. The report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, questioned the authority of the Office of Education to perform some of the activities covered by an agreement between it and the Veterans' Administration.

In view of the legislative history of the statutory provision in question, this office has had no doubt that Congress intended the Office of Education to perform the functions called for in the agreement. This has been the view not only of the Office of Education and of our General Counsel's Office, but presumably of the Veterans' Administration which also signed the agreement.

Under section 244 (a) of the act, as you know, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is directed to utilize the services of the Office of Education in carrying out certain functions. In reporting the bill which later became Public Law 550 the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs made the following statement:

"Subsection 244 (a) contemplates the use of the facilities and services of other Federal agencies and specifically directs the utilization of the services of the Office of Education in administering appropriate parts of this program. The subsection provides that the Administrator shall utilize the service of the Office (1) in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training; (2) in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such arrangements; and (3) in rendering technical assistance to State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation. It is believed that the Office of Education can render a significant educational service especially in assisting the Administrator in developing a comprehensive policy concerning the development of cooperative agreements with State approving agencies, in making an educational review of their operations, and in rendering educational advisory services to State and local agencies which will assist them in improving their programs. It is to be emphasized that the contemplated function of the Office of Education is of a professional character only and it is not the intent of this subsection to give any veto to the Office of Education or to interfere fundamentally with the administrative authority vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. We believe, however, that the Administrator should utilize the Office of Education as his principal professional adviser in his relationships with State approving agencies and where these relationships exist, with educational institutions. The concept which the committee is seeking to establish here is a comprehensive one and is an effort to make full utilization of the educational services of the Federal Government in such a way as to promote better administration of this act by the Federal Government and better standards and procedures in the various States."

There is some suggestion in the report of the Appropriations Subcommittee that the review of operations provided for in the agreement is inconsistent with section 263 of the act, which prohibits any Federal department from exercising "any supervision or control whatsoever of any State approving agency." The review made by the Office of Education, however, is an objective appraisal of the State approving agency's compliance with the standards laid down by Congress in the statute, and does not involve any element of supervision or control. The Office of Education, moreover, applies no sanction as a result of such reviews, but apart from advising and assisting the States in maintaining the quality of the veterans' training programs, merely reports results to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. We see no violation of the prohibition against supervision or control in this activity.

The above is our interpretation of what the Congress intends the Office of Education to do, and what the Office of Education has done. If this was not the intention of the Congress, we should like to be advised. If there is any further information we can supply, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator.

FEBRUARY 9, 1953.

The Honorable FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This has reference to the deficiency appropriation for the Office of Education for activities in connection with Public Law 550, 82d Congress. I understand some question has been raised as to the authority and purpose of the Office of Education in connection with the education and training program for Korean veterans under Public Law 550, 82d Congress.

Public Law 550, 82d Congress (Korean veterans) and Public Law 346, 78th Congress (World War II veterans) both place the responsibility for approval of educational institutions with the States. I am thoroughly in accord with this principle for it is an assertation of the principle of States' rights in education. Although I would not suggest a change in this provision of law, I recognize that a serious question arises when a Federal agency such as the Veterans' Administration is required by law to pay on the certification of a State agency, yet is not given positive authority to control the activities of the State agency. Investigations last year revealed that the Federal-State relationship was totally unsatisfactory and that the Veterans' Administration had made a notable failure in cooperating with the States to establish adequate supervision over the veterans' training program. We received serious complaints from State departments of education, colleges, and other schools that the Veterans' Administration was using its position to dictate educational policy through purse-strings control. The situation was so serious and unsatisfactory that we looked around for a way to maintain a satisfactory relationship between the Federal Government and State agencies. We brought the Office of Education into the picture as an ally or agent of the Veterans' Administration, because education is their field of competence and because they have made an outstanding record in the field of Federal-State relationships in administering the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

In defining the mission of the Office of Education, we realized that the Veterans' Administration was primarily responsible for administration, therefore we attempted to create the role of agent for the Office of Education.

Under the title "Use of Office of Education and Other Federal Agencies," section 244 appears as follows:

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this title, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title."

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this title are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office."

Please note that the word "shall" is used in the case of the Office of Education. The House report which accompanied the bill contained the following elaboration on the duties of the Office of Education:

Subsection 244 (a) contemplates the use of the facilities and services of other Federal agencies and specifically directs the utilization of the services of the Office of Education in administering appropriate parts of this program. The subsection provides that the Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office (1) in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training; (2) in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such arrangements; and (3) in rendering technical assistance to State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation. It is believed that the Office of Education can render a significant educational service especially in assisting the Administrator, in developing a comprehensive policy concerning the development of cooperative agreements with State approving agencies, in making an educational review of their operations, and in rendering educational advisory services to State and local agencies which will assist them in improving their programs. It is to be emphasized that the contemplated function of the Office of Education is of a professional character only and it is not the intent of this subsection to give any veto to the Office of Education or to interfere fundamentally with the administrative authority vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The use of the Office of Education in the administration of Public Law 550 is not unique. The Veterans' Administration utilized the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and the Federal Trade Commission has a function under the act. The Veterans' Administration also secures special services from certain guidance facilities in State and private institutions.

For the past 7 years, the operation of the Veterans' Administration has not been subject to review, and in my opinion this is a major contributing cause for the unbelievable waste and abuse that occurred during the World War II program.

Under the new act the General Accounting Office may review fiscal decisions, and the Congress may look to the Office of Education for expert educational appraisal and advice and enlightened cooperation with State agencies.

We did not visualize a big force, but I do hope that a small, efficient operation can be maintained in the Office of Education, and I firmly believe their presence will contribute materially to a prevention of the difficulties that occurred under the World War II program.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] could rightfully offer his amendment after the reading of $340,000,000 on line 18. If I am correct in that assumption I ask the House for unanimous consent that his amendment be considered at that point and that his remarks on his amendment follow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman? I think probably what the gentleman from Texas wants to do is to add $2,000,000; is that the correct amount?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, $295,000, which the United States Office of Education asked for.

Mr. TABER. Is the amendment withdrawn?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may be reoffered after the reading of line 18, we would be glad to agree to that arrangement.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, if that is the proper place, it be reoffered there.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman should withdraw his amendment and reoffer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw the amendment and reoffer it at the proper place. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman from Texas what relation this has to the work of the Veterans' Administration, which carries on, presumably, some inspection service of these schools? Is it presumed that this amount of money and this amount of service shall be subtracted from the Veterans' Administration at the same time it is placed in the Office of Education?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; the Veterans' Administration does not carry on this same inspection service and approval of students. One of the biggest troubles in the whole bill was the approval of schools that were not good schools. We were charging the United States Office of Education with the job of accrediting schools.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman says the trouble was with the approval of schools. By whom?

Mr. TEAGUE. By the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to support the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. As the result of all the billions spent on the veterans' education and training program, we asked the Veterans' Administration if they had ever consulted the Office of Education with respect to standards in the operation of schools for veterans with a view of improving them and having better methods of education. Officials of the Veterans' Administration replied that they had never consulted the Office of Education. Therefore, it was written into the new law that the Veterans' Administration should consult with the Office of Education and use their technical assistance in formulating school policies and also in inspecting the schools to see that their activities are carried out in a high-type fashion. The provision of the statute in this regard was made mandatory, not permissive. In other words, the purpose of this legislation was to eliminate the waste and extravagance which had heretofore developed in the program. So we called upon the Veterans' Administration to utilize the Office of Education in helping improve the veterans educational and training program.

It is estimated that one quarter of a billion dollars will be expended under the educational program of the Korean GI bill in its peak year. Therefore, it would certainly be false economy to fail to see to it that the proper supervision of such a vast program is not maintained.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Would the Chair rule on where this amendment should be offered and how it should be handled, so the gentleman from Texas will have an opportunity to get his amendment before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asked that the amendment be withdrawn and the Committee has agreed to that. Now, if someone will ask that it be passed over and that it be brought up in its proper place, we can proceed in that manner.

Mr. TABER. The trouble, to me, is that if you offer the amendment at this point you put it in under the heading of "Grants to States" instead of under the "Office of Education," where an amendment has already been adopted to the bill, so it is not in very good shape if you try to put it in line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment being withdrawn, there is nothing now before the Chair. If the gentleman wants to reoffer it, he may do so at the place he thinks proper.

Mr. TEAGUE. In the report on page 14 under the heading of "Federal Security Agency" it says "Office of Education, salaries and expenses," and on page 7, lines 9 and 10, under "Social Security Administration," it says "salaries and expenses." I assumed the amendment went in at that place. Will the Chair rule whether that is proper or improper?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Texas must prepare his own amendment and offer it at the place he believes it should be offered.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn and be offered at the proper place.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman wants to do it, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] tells me that he is willing to let the gentleman from Texas return to line 7, where the amendment should have been offered, and offer the amendment which the clerk of the committee has prepared for him so that he might have it in order. If the gentleman wants to do that, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I make the request for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 7, line 7, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Education,' $259,000."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak on the amendment. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is an honest difference of opinion regarding this particular law as it applies to the functions of the Office of Education. I respect the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and want to compliment him on the fine work his committee did last year in going into the veterans' education program. I was very happy to hear him state, in his support of the amendment, that the law under which the Veterans' Administration had to operate was faulty and it was not altogether the fault of the Veterans' Administration that a substantial amount of Federal funds was spent rather unwisely. But the question is with respect to the functions of the Office of Education under Public Law 550.

I refer you to section 253 of the law, which specifically states:

For the purposes of this title, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized, accrediting agencies and associations.

We, on the committee, thought that since the Office of Education has been dealing with these accrediting agencies for many years, it would not be much of a job for them to compile a list of recognized agencies and associations for the Veterans' Administration.

The gentleman also referred to section 244 of the law. Let me read that, if I may:

The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreement, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title.

What has the Office of Education been doing all these years, if they are not in a position to counsel the Veterans' Administration without setting up a super-agency down there to take care of a lot more bureaucrats? They are transferring to this program employees for whom they had no jobs because the work they were doing was in connection with materials allocations—a function that is being discontinued. They also went out and recruited social workers and others who had no experience whatsoever in the field of education.

This amendment calls for $259,000. Let me state, for the benefit of the House, that the Bureau of the Budget originally agreed to let them have $380,000. Then they thought they could get along with

$289,000. When they came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations, they thought they could get along with $259,000, the exact amount contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. When I visited the Office of Education last Friday, they agreed that 29 positions could handle the job as they wanted to handle it and said they would need only $228,000. The Veterans' Administration is in this field. They have made mistakes; I can criticize the Veterans' Administration as well as anyone else, but they have had experience. They have had the advantage of experience which the Office of Education had not had. When the Pennsylvania Railroad engineer ran a train through Union Station a few weeks ago, they did not fire the engineer for something for which he was not responsible. When Captain Carlson's ship, *The Enterprise*, went down in the Atlantic, they did not deprive Captain Carlson of another ship. He did not lose that ship through any fault of his. The Veterans' Administration was saddled with a law that they could not have administered without some waste of public funds. That was the original GI bill. I say the Office of Education does not need this money. They are fully equipped to render the service to the Veterans' Administration required of them by law without any additional funds whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that what troubles me most is a lack of understanding of the relationship between the Bureau of Education and the work of the Veterans' Administration. In the supplemental bill that we now have before us there is an item of $5 million given to the Veterans' Administration, which is specifically limited to be used for the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education and the loan guaranty, which means that roughly around four million dollars would probably go for the talk we are now discussing

The work of the Veterans' Administration has unquestionably been faulty in the past on this function, but thanks to the work of the committee, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], it has very much improved.

Now it is proposed, without any further discussion on the floor, to give this additional money to the Office of Education, which I am inclined to think has money that can be used for that. But whether or not they have the money, it is to be turned over to the Office of Education, without sufficient chance for consideration of the ability and qualifications to handle this job any better than the Veterans' Administration is handling it now. If the Members will turn to page 269 of the hearings, I would like to read briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman. The chairman asked about this man who was to handle this for the Office of Education. The chairman said:

> Has Mr. O'Brien any accomplishments in the field of education?

And the answer was:

> Not in the sense of being a leading educational authority but, if you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the principal job to be done here.

> The CHAIRMAN. I got the impression from your statement that that was one of the reasons why they wanted to put this work in the Office of Education and take it out of the Veterans' Administration.

The answer was:

> That is right. But the management of this program is something that does not necessarily require a detailed knowledge of the procedures in education, although he knows a good deal about education.

I might be willing to agree with that, but what the committee wants to know is, Should we appropriate money for the Veterans' Administration in a supplemental bill and then come on the floor without any coordination between the two appropriations and give a quarter of a million dollars to the Office of Education to do something which we are also financing in the Veterans Administration? With all regard to my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who has been doing a beautiful job, I could have wished there could have been a little more discussion about the coordination of the work between the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Education. I can assure him that the Veterans' Administration is doing a lot better job than it was a year or so ago before he started his work.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I want to say to the gentleman that this was very carefully considered by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a committee over in the Senate. The object of this legislation was an attempt to put the actual educational features in the Office of Education. The Veterans' Administration has to make certain checks and clearances as to attendance and that sort of thing, whether it is a good school before the veteran goes there, and whether he attends.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will let me interrupt, let them continue checking on attendance and details of that kind, but they are looking into the qualifications of the school, and they are entitled to consider legitimate schools for the education of veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. But the standard of fitness is determined and set up by the Office of Education, which is the proper place for it to be.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will go along with the gentleman on that; I think the gentleman is right, but I am also convinced in my own mind—and I have not seen any evidence to the contrary—that the Veterans' Administration is also doing the same thing and that we are providing money for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That problem is for the educational department. According to the testimony of Mr. McGrath, the head of it, he does not seem to feel that it is necessary for a man to have had any experience or know anything about education in order to operate the thing, and you are turning the money over to an agency that comes right out and says that it will not do what your committee laid out for it to do; so you might better leave it to the Veterans' Administration than to the Commissioner of Education with that kind of setup.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that I have read the hearings and I got no such interpretation of what Mr. McGrath said.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will look at page 269——

Mr. TEAGUE. I have read that.

Mr. TABER. The gist of this testimony is that it does not necessarily require a detailed knowledge of the procedures in education to determine whether a school is a good school.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that this amendment is to line 7 on page 7 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It follows line 7, page 7; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is the amendment in order at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been offered for debate.

Mr. GROSS. But is the amendment in order in line 7 on page 7?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order at this particular time while it is being debated; yes.

Mr. GROSS. You cannot amend line 7 of this bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and to answer two questions raised by the gentleman from California. The first question is whether or not moneys have already been appropriated for this work under the Veterans' Administration item. The answer is no; the appropriation made to the Veterans' Administration is to take care of the Veterans' Administration in adminstering veterans' entitlements, in making payments to the various schools, or rather to the veterans who pay the schools. That administrative work is taken care of by the Veterans' Administration appropriation. On the other hand there is the question of determining the kind of schools that shall be used, and for that purpose it is necessary to investigate those schools, which has been turned over to the Office of Education.

The second question is: Is it necessary that they have an education man do it? The answer given in the committee, which was quoted on the floor, is correct, because they are not only determining the qualifications of established educational institutions, that would be easy, but they are determining the character and qualifications of schools like

barber schools, trade schools, and other technical schools of all sorts, regarding which there was a great deal of criticism when the Veterans' Administration was handling it. That is the work, along with advice and guidance, that the Office of Education must do in connection with veterans' education and rehabilitation, so they had these men do it.

Mr. TEAGUE and his committee have been complimented for what they have done in this matter, but compliments are not enough; we have given this work to the Office of Education and they need funds to carry that work out. I think they are doing a very good job in spite of the fact that they have not been getting the money with which to do it. In order to do it they have had to use funds intended for other work, and they have had to take men from the Office of Education who were engaged in other work in that agency, work that is now suffering, and which will continue to suffer unless we give them the money for this new purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I am not going to take the full 5 minutes to which I am entitled. I merely want to say that I am in favor of the Teague amendment. I think the committee went too far in denying all these funds.

When the Committee on Appropriations takes the attitude that when a bill is passed by a previous Congress and then the Bureau of the Budget authorizes the Department of Education to spend some funds pending a supplemental appropriation bill that will come before the Congress, then tells the Department of Education or the pepole down here in Washington to go back and absorb this two hundred and some odd thousand dollars that they have expended for this particular program, that committee is going beyond the bounds of reason.

I think the committee in denying these funds today is just undoing the work of the Teague committee of the past couple of years. Everyone in Congress applauds the work of the former Teague committee in straightening out the Korean GI bill of rights that we passed last year. If we do not appropriate any funds in this particular bill for the Department of Education to carry out these functions that have been given to them by agreement of the Veterans' Administration and by agreement of the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House and Senate, we are just undoing some of the good work that was accomplished by the Teague committee. That is all you are accomplishing by denying these funds.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Rhode Island knows that there is no man in the House of Representatives I have more respect for than himself. It was a great pleasure to serve under him when he was chairman of this committee for the past 2 years. However, this is a little different than asking them to absorb. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, there was room for an honest difference of opinion and that was not to absorb this $259,000. It was whether or not the law really meant that they should go in and do all the things that they are presuming to do. I appreciate that the Office of Education is going to grab off everything it can, just like the fight it made some years ago to take the free lunch program over from the Department of Agriculture, or anything else to build up a bureau down there. I think this thing should be handled according to law under the Veterans' Administration, using the facilities of the Office of Education and taking advantage of any suggestions that agency can make.

Mr. FOGARTY. The question before the House is that the Bureau of the Budget authorized the Department of Education to expend some of the funds they had appropriated in this fiscal year to carry out the dictates of the Congress in connection with this particular law.

Mr. BUSBEY. But the Bureau of the Budget can be wrong, too. It originally offered them $380,000 for a job they admit themselves they can do for $228,000. It is their prerogative to do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a job given to the Department of Education. Now you come in here and say: You should not have done it, it does not belong in your department, and even though you spent a couple hundred thousand dollars out of the funds you already have, you should not have done it.

The gentleman from Illinois knows that in the past 3 or 4 years we have always cut the appropriation requests of the Department of Education pretty hard. I do not know exactly what we cut them a year ago, but I think we cut them about $300,000 in their request for appropriations for salaries and expenses for this fiscal year. We have cut them down pretty low.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. The work that the Office of Education has already done, whether you give the money back or not, will return to the taxpayer ten times this amount of money in getting the thing started where you have nothing but good schools approved. Has any Member of Congress received any letters about veterans going to these fly-by-night schools? I do not believe you have. The Office of Education has done an excellent job on that.

Mr. FOGARTY. The reason we have not had letters was because of the action taken by the gentleman's committee in the past year in holding those extensive hearings.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The facts are that the work of these accredited schools and colleges has about been accomplished. The testimony which was given to the committee proved that this work is almost completed. The schools have been accredited and I think a good job has been done, and the committee felt that there was no particular need for any more money for this purpose in addition to what had already been appropriated. The testimony proved to our entire satisfaction that they had sufficient funds and sufficient personnel to continue to do this job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services," $10,000,000.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 10, line 11, after "$10,000,000," strike out the period and insert a colon and "*Provided*, That $729,000 of this amount be provided for contractual hospital beds in Philadelphia, Pa."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House at this time of the deplorable conditions existing in the Philadelphia area with respect to the inadequate number of hospital beds for veterans.

With a veteran population in Philadelphia of around 500,000, the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to allow a maximum of 500 hospital beds for that area as of April 1 this year. This will be accomplished with the complete activation of the new VA hospital in Philadelphia, supposedly on that date. This will "phase out" the contractual beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital of 400 beds.

Now, when the new VA hospital was authorized, it was to accommodate 1,000. In 1949 when the Executive order took 16,000 beds out of the total beds for the whole country, they cut the Philadelphia VA hospital back to 500. In fact they not only cut back the Philadelphia Hospital 500 but they also did the same thing with the Pittsburgh Hospital and cut out the Harrisburg Hospital altogether. In other words, Pennsylvania suffered a cut of 14 percent of the 16,000 beds under that general order.

I feel sure that if you will look over the comparative chart on page 141 of the hearings, you will see a rather glowing defect in hospital beds for the State of Pennsylvania for its veteran population of 1,418,000 in contrast to some other States.

Now please believe me when I say we have no quarrel with any other State when we make these comparisons because, in my estimation, eligible veterans are entitled to receive adequate hospitalization. We do, however, think that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against and I believe the comparison will so prove.

	Veteran population	VA beds	Other beds	Total
Pennsylvania	1,418,000	2,356	742	3,098
New York	1,927,000	4,913	1,748	6,661
California	1,476,000	4,449		4,449
Illinois	1,238,000	3,496	1,012	4,508
Texas	953,000	3,864	500	4,364
Ohio	1,028,000	2,307	996	3,303
Michigan	828,000	1,563	496	2,059
Massachusetts	583,000	1,256		1,256
Indiana	415,000	1,186		1,186
Georgia	352,000	1,494		1,494
Florida	329,000	1,353		1,353
Missouri	542,000	1,240	496	1,736
Virginia	324,000	1,604		1,604
Tennessee	569,000	3,055		3,055
Louisiana	289,000	1,611	493	2,104
West Virginia	218,000	1,300		1,300
District of Columbia	221,000	835		835

In the case of Philadelphia today, we claim that as of April 1 we will not be adequately provided for with hospital beds. We believe that the naval hospital contract beds—400—should be provided for and continued. This would give us less than 900 beds in that area when the new VA hospital is fully activated.

Now we are grateful to the subcommittee for the time given the Pennsylvania Members of Congress, including our Senators and the Representatives of the American Legion Department of Pennsylvania in their hearings.

We especially appreciate the action they have taken with regards to the mandate they have given the VA in the report:

> The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate of five million for operating expenses in connection with hospitals. In connection with this part of the estimate, the committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

However, the situation is so critical in the Philadelphia area that we believe, from past experience, that we should specifically spell out what the Philadelphia area requires. I therefore present this amendment to accomplish just that.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to specifically allocate $729,000 for contract beds in the Philadelphia area.

There is a veteran population of about one-half million in Philadelphia out of a total of 1½ million veterans in the State of Pennsylvania.

As I have said, there is something like 3,098 beds for the whole State of Pennsylvania. Now they propose to phase out the contract beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital which will cut that number of beds to around 2,600 or 2,700 for Pennsylvania.

I am informed that there is a waiting list—applications—of around 1,500 or 1,600 for the Philadelphia area of eligible veterans. Now where will those boys be sent when the new Philadelphia VA hospital is full? They will have their applications sent to veterans' hospitals in other sections of the country, thus adding to the waiting lists of such veterans hospitals as Richmond, Va.; Wilmington, Del.; Wilkes-Barre and Lebanon, Pa.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; and Fort Howard, Baltimore, East Orange. They have according to the adjutant of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, allocated seven beds out in Dayton, Ohio, for patients from the Philadelphia area. What they are in effect really doing is increasing the waiting lists at all these hospitals.

I can see no excuse in sending veterans from Philadelphia to those remote places when we have a well staffed hospital such as the Philadelphia Naval Hospital which has always taken care of 400 to 600 veterans from that city and its environs. Moreover, it was originally designed, I understand, to do that very thing.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Of course, the situation which the gentleman has described in Pennsylvania is like the situation we have in Tennessee and in other States where we have several hospitals which have been closed down because of the lack of hospital beds and appropriations to have doctors in those hospitals. I wonder if the gentleman would be in favor of Admiral Boone's suggestion to provide $10 million additional so that they can open up these hospital beds in Philadelphia, Pa., Tennessee, California, and other parts of the country.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly am in favor of opening beds for veterans wherever they are located.

Mr. SUTTON. I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment then and go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] to restore the $10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the naval hospital in Philadelphia has a bed capacity of around 2,000 and when this phasing out routine is completed, they will have something like 800 empty beds.

The city of Philadelphia is one of the greatest medical centers in the world. It has six medical schools and when the VA hospital for Philadelphia was authorized for 1,000 beds that was one of the main factors; because of its supply of medical men to staff a first class hospital.

I have pointed out that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against in the matter of hospital beds for veterans. I do not say that it was done deliberately, nevertheless the veterans of Philadelphia and their families, in my opinion, should not be subjected to such kind of jockeying around.

Where the responsibility lies for this condition is anyone's guess, but I am of the firm opinion that it lies in the Bureau of the Budget. Some may say the VA. Maybe they have something there. But I do say, without any fear of contradiction, that when the Bureau of the Budget says "That's it," the departments of Government and bureaus do their bidding. Right or wrong they do what the Bureau of the Budget commands.

In this instance it was the Bureau of the Budget who did not permit the VA to ask for a supplemental. I called the Bureau of the Budget on the phone and they put up the old argument and were adamant, although they did at my suggestion have a conference with the VA medical authorities and the VA budget director. However, nothing for the welfare of the Philadelphia area happened.

Members of the House, that is why I make this approach to securing adequate hospital beds for the veterans in the city of Philadelphia. They are entitled to this consideration and not tossed all over the map when in need.

I therefore trust that you will approve this amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want the situation to be very clear to the members of the committee. The Veterans' Administration asked for $5 million. We gave them $5 million.

In the report which accompanies the bill we said, "In connection with this part of the estimate," which has to do with the hospitals, "the committee specifically directs the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area." The committee recommends that we do not attempt to earmark, either in money or number of beds. The gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. FENTON] is very much interested in the veterans, and we commend him for that, but the gentleman is taking figures which the Veterans' Administration furnished to the Pennsylvania delegation, on request, for information on a specific number of beds, which was not the amount of money, in the opinion of the subcommittee, needed for the beds which are to be made available in that area.

At the beginning of the fiscal year there were 350 beds available in the naval hospital. That will be reduced by March 31 of this year to 100 beds. At the same time, beginning on the first of the year, the beds in the new Veterans' hospital would be activated by 150 beds, until at the end of the fiscal year they would have 488 beds. The process was intended to take the naval hospital beds and put the veterans in the Veterans' hospitals. The process has not been rapid enough to balance the available beds. The actual number of beds at issue is not 400 beds, for which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] desires to furnish money, but is the difference between the number of beds which will be made available and the number which the delegation from Pennsylvania, with whom we agreed, feels should be made available. Our belief is that we will get better results if we keep to the wording of the bill, and not attempt to enter into the administration of the number of beds in the hospitals. We have reasons for that. It is a complicated subject. We are entering into a discussion of what constitutes entitlement and service connection. We are entering into a discussion of whether the beds should be in the naval hospital or whether they should be in the Veterans' hospital. Those Members who are as familiar with the naval hospitals as I am with the Veterans' hospitals will agree that there are times when those beds should be in the naval hospitals on contract. The naval hospital could be rated as a second-rate

hospital by the medical board, because it has too many vacant beds.

I am suggesting that we do not adopt this, much as we believe in the objective that the gentleman desires. Particularly I do not want the Congress on the floor of the House in this way to enter into a discussion of what constitutes entitlement and what constitutes service connection, because that is something the Congress will have to face very soon, and something which requires a great deal more time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if it was not the unanimous opinion of the committee that we wanted to go all-out and give to our friend from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, and those veterans in Philadelphia, everything that was humanly possible? You directed them in your report to rectify that situation immediately. Does not the gentleman have every reason to believe that within the next day or two the Veterans' Administration will do exactly that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I believe that; and I put that in the RECORD yesterday; but I desire also to make clear——

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Veterans' Administration within the next day or two, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], will contact them—have not rectified that situation which exists in Philadelphia, will the gentleman call his committee together and get the Veterans' Administration people before his committee to see that it is done?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very willingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want you to turn to page 156 of the hearings. This has to do with the amount of money which the gentleman from Pennsylvania includes in his request.

The $729,000 is discussed on page 155 and the following pages, and we say to the Administrator: "The sum you really need to take care of the request of veterans in Philadelphia is $256,000"—which was all they actually could prove, because it costs $14.25 a day to rent a bed in the veterans' hospital. Take a pencil and paper from your pocket and figure it out for yourself. They simply say: "We do not attempt to answer that; all we did, we got a request from the Pennsylvania delegation to tell them how much it would cost to take care of 400 people." And that was the figure they gave. We said to them: "Then, no matter what the amount necessary would have been, you would have given this figure of $729,000 and you would not have told them that that was more than was needed." And they said: "No; we just answer what the request was."

So we have two things: First, the amount is too much; second, we believe that it should not be handled this way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express the great satisfaction and thanks of the Pennsylvania delegation whose members are interested in this problem, to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the Members on both sides of the subcommittee for their unquestioned interest in this matter of adequate hospitalization for veterans living in the Philadelphia area. They have undertaken in this report to correct that inequity and the unjust situation which exists in the Philadelphia area.

Please bear in mind that at this moment there are to be hundreds of vacant beds available for ill veterans in Government hospitals in the Philadelphia area. The beds are vacant because the Veterans' Administration will not pay to the Navy the money which is necessary as rental for these beds necessary to the care of veterans from Philadelphia and for whom treatment is already authorized. They are taking these cases from the Philadelphia area and sending them to New York, New Jersey, and to other hospitals in Pennsylvania; thus they are causing a serious situation in those areas where they cannot take their own veterans. So I commend the committee for recognizing that something must be done.

I address myself now to what the committee have undertaken to do and to see whether what they have tried to do in this report is adequate. Does the committee's action assure hospitalization for veterans from the Philadelphia area in Philadelphia area hospitals to help the veteran from the Philadelphia area?

The committee had placed in this report the following statement:

> The committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

Now, we know from experience that the Veterans' Administration acting under the instructions of the Budget Bureau quite frequently do the things they want to and disregard the will and the intention of Congress. Will the Veterans' Administration under this directive do as the committee want?

I believe that the Veterans' Administration will take the necessary action so that the needy veterans who live in the Philadelphia area will be given adequate hospitalization; but I fear it will not be done within the Philadelphia area. I contend that this statement that the veterans in the Philadelphia area are to have adequate hospitalization will be interpreted as meaning that a veteran living in that area shall have adequate hospitalization and that the adequate hospitalization may be furnished in New York, Ohio, or other parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or elsewhere. That is exactly what they have been doing. We want this changed, and I believe the committee does also. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], chairman of the committee, whether it is intended that the Veterans' Administration under this directive is to provide necessary and adequate medical service for veterans in Philadelphia and within the Philadelphia area?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would be very glad to read the record if I had the time. My answer is, we agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees that the Veterans' Administration as a result of the directive of the gentleman's committee is to provide that care.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In Philadelphia.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is in the hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the statement made with respect to the need of adequate medical care and hospitalization for veterans in the Philadelphia area which includes all southern New Jersey now served by the naval hospital at Philadelphia. The matter is one that is serious. The curtailment of service to the veterans in the south Jersey area has awakened great interest upon the part of all veteran organizations located in this section of New Jersey. We appreciate the effort that is being made in this bill to provide the facilities for southern New Jersey it is entitled to have.

There is no money being expended by our Government that is more necessary or more proper than that being expended for medical and hospital facilities for our veterans, and the amount should at all times be adequate. There is no valid excuse or justification for any less sum.

During the past year it has become increasingly clear that the Congress cut the amount for medical, hospital, and domiciliary services for veterans below the amount that was necessary to give the adequate care our veterans are entitled to have. The number to be cared for is constantly increasing. Failure to recognize this fact is doing an injustice to the men and women who have served our country in its hour of emergency.

This inadequacy, in the amount last appropriated for this purpose in the appropriation bill adopted by the previous Congress, must and should be corrected. Those of us who are in constant touch with veteran affairs in the south Jersey area are fully aware of what the curtailment of medical and hospital facilities for the veterans in this area, as a result of the inadequacy of the last appropriation bill, has meant to our veterans.

The supplemental appropriations presented to us in the present bill to remedy the deficiency of the bill passed last year is welcome. The committee is entitled to be commended for the action it has taken. The committee report leaves no doubt that the veterans in the area of south Jersey being served by the facilities provided at the Philadelphia naval hospital will be increased by the additional $5 million provided in this bill.

The report is very definite in this respect. It says: "The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate of $5 million for operating expenses in connection with hospitals. In connection with this part of the estimate the

committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area."

The bill should have the support of all who believe in providing adequate care for our veterans.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman state that the appropriations now made for the Veterans' Administration will be adequate for the supplying of the proper number of beds in all areas other than the one the gentleman has been speaking about? I have in mind a situation in New York where there has been vigorous complaint and protest from veterans' organizations that the number of beds in the New York area is woefully inadequate to take care of the needs there.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The New York area will be helped by the operation of this directive because patients now being sent to New York from Pennsylvania will be detained in Philadelphia. Other than that, I cannot answer the question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If New York is short of funds, this is not the time to fight for it. The time to do that is to go before the subcommittee on appropriations when it considers appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. CELLER. I still ask whether this supplemental appropriation will provide for an adequate number of beds to be made available in New York? I am interested in New York as well as the other Members are interested in Philadelphia.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. As a result of Dr. FENTON's amendment and the directive which the committee has inserted in the report to the effect that Pennsylvania patients will be retained in Pennsylvania hospitals and not sent to New York hospitals, New York will be helped by the amendment.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. Does the gentleman know that in the Fort Hamilton Hospital I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is discussing at the present time there are two full floors of beds that are not being used because of inadequate funds? The question I have in mind is this: Will these funds be used to reuse those beds? There is a terrific need in the New York area; those beds are needed but no funds are being supplied by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know the answer to that question. I hope the bill includes sufficient money to permit the use of these beds for veterans within the New York area.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will not take all the 5 minutes which the chairman has allotted me, but I do want to supplement briefly the remarks just made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and to add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has said. The Philadelphia area properly comprises the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], right across the river, in Camden, and also my district in southern New Jersey which depends largely on facilities in Philadelphia. As the gentleman has said, it is one of the world's great medical centers and it is proper that medical facilities, should be concentrated there. In the veterans' hospital at Lyons, N. J., there is a situation where there is literally standing room only. In the new veterans' hospital in the Oranges, in New Jersey, just completed a few short months ago, my understanding is that that facility is not yet caring for an adequate number. In the Wilmington, Del., veterans' hospital, to which my district also has resort and which is doing a fine job in that area, I am told now that they are limited to taking surgical emergencies, so crowded are their conditions. So, there is in the Philadelphia area as well as the area I represent in southern New Jersey a very acute need for additional hospital beds. I wanted to add that to what the gentlemen said about the situation because I know of my own knowledge that the need is acute, and when we return to the House I shall ask unanimous consent to insert certain memoranda which I have received from veterans in my area in that connection. I hope what the committee has done in this connection will be adequate; that their direction to the Veterans' Administration will at least temporarily serve to help us. But, I do want to emphasize further what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], has just stated, and that is that the real fight must come in this connection when we discuss fiscal 1954.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Let me say that the gentleman from New Jersey points out a fact that there is a shortage of hospital beds for veterans in this country, and I would like to remind the Members of the House that some years ago the House of Representatives reinstated a 16,000 bed program which the President arbitrarily cut from the hospital program.

Mr. HAND. I am very glad the gentleman mentioned that, because to my knowledge that is entirely true and it ought to be stated at this point. The gentleman is always well-informed on veterans needs, and I thank him for his observation.

Sometime ago the deplorable shortage of hospital beds for veterans in southern New Jersey was called to my attention by Anthony J. Volpe, the service officer of Cape May County Veterans' Bureau. He wrote me as follows:

CAPE MAY COUNTY VETERANS' BUREAU,
Cape May Court House, N. J.,
November 24, 1952.

Re VA hospital beds.
Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Second New Jersey Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAND: I have before me a copy of letter from Surgeon General, United States Navy, which was forwarded to you on or about October 27, 1952. According to said letter from the Surgeon General, United States Navy, the Veterans' Administration themselves are guilty of not taking advantage of hospital bed facilities at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. I quote the last paragraph of said letter, "The Navy is willing to continue provision of beds for veterans at this hospital as it has in the past, and can do so for the foreseeable future to the extent these are desired by the Veterans' Administration."

It seems more apparent to the undersigned that the Veterans' Administration, throughout the entire East, are cutting not only bed (hospital) facilities for veterans, but they are also cutting personnel allocations for already existing and new facilities for hospital and medical facilities for veterans of all categories, both service-connected and nonservice-connected. In fact, I have recently spoken with an official from the Lyons VA Mental Hospital, and have been informed officially that they have now cut down their hospital bed facilities for mental cases to the tone of 112. The Lyons VA Hospital had a bed capacity of 2,009 patients; they now have capacity for only 1,897. According to the official at Lyons, this is due entirely to cut in personnel. I may emphatically state that we, particularly we in this area, and all the areas served by the Lyons VA Hospital have always been confronted with a long waiting list. In recent months that waiting list has been as high as 700 men waiting for a bed at Lyons VA mental hospital. Now with the cut of 112 beds the situation is going to become more adverse. As yet, the undersigned has not received any official notification that the new VA hospital at East Orange, N. J., will be able to operate at full capacity. By that I mean, the new hospital at East Orange was built to handle 950 patients. As of 2 weeks ago our department headquarters stated that they can only maintain 250 patients due to the fact that they do not have sufficient personnel to handle full capacity for which the hospital was built. The new hospital which will be opened very shortly at Philadelphia will probably be a 350- or 400-bed hospital. This will not in any way alleviate the hospital bed shortages for the Philadelphia area and our area in any manner. If, however, the new hospital with a capacity of 400 beds will be able to operate at full capacity, and if the Veterans' Administration requests from the Department of the Navy the use of the 300 beds which are available to them, we will then have at least 700 or 750 beds available to use in the Philadelphia area. That will greatly help the situation as it stands right now.

The Wilmington Veterans' Hospital, which has rendered the most efficient, the most expedient, and the most cooperative care for our veterans and the veterans of Delaware, Maryland, and all of south Jersey, are now operating at over and above standard capacity for the type of facility that they have there. Due to the increase and the soaring amount of veterans requiring hospitalization for both general medical and general surgical care the veterans' hospital at Wilmington has now a long waiting surgical list.

I personally feel that the Veterans' Administration are guilty of fooling the people, veterans, and veterans organizations to this extent: They have almost continually adopted the policy of economy measures in

spite of the fact that they have had an appropriation for the fiscal year of 1952 which would ordinarily have been sufficient for operations for the balance of fiscal year 1952. However, it has been reported to all our department headquarters that Veterans' Administration, themselves, in recent months returned part of the allocated funds to the Federal Government. Yet, all the time they knew they required not only more funds to continue operations but they would require additional funds to hire additional personnel to meet the rising needs and cost of the medical out-patient-treatment program and to meet the rising necessities of many new veterans.

I believe it is high time that we have some congressional investigation into this VA medical program; we should have an investigation to find out why we do not have sufficient funds for the VA medical program, present and proposed; we should have an investigation as to why there are no funds available periodically to continue with the OPT program, both dental and medical; we should find out why the Veterans' Administration are not allocated sufficient funds to carry out this program, and we should then find out why the VA returned some of the funds back to the Federal Government.

In view of the above I would request that you take immediate congressional action and contact your colleagues in the House of Representatives and also the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, to look into this matter further and under official status. I would also recommend that either yourself or a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee contact Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and also Admiral Boone, Medical Chief, Veterans' Administration, to see what they actually have to say about the hospital bed facilities in this area, and what they propose to do about it. Thus far, we have only had some very poor excuses regarding the shortages of hospital bed facilities. For example, in a communication, of which you have the original copy, the VA said that it is a phasing-out program inasmuch as a new hospital was being built and was going to be opened at Philadelphia. However, they do not state how great the veteran patient load is in the Philadelphia area and our own particular area, nor do they state how they expect the new hospital and its limited facilities to carry this very great and ever-increasing patient load. The Veterans' Administration has not stated yet, to anyone to the best of my knowledge, why they are so short of funds for the entire medical program of the Veterans' Administration. Also being hard hit is the Veterans' Administration medical outpatient treatment program. For example, periodically veterans with service-connected tooth disabilities who require repairs or replacement of bridge, plates, or complete dentures, undergo an appraisal examination at local VA facilities, and are then told that they will get their teeth, repairs, etc., as soon as funds become available. That not only is detrimental to the veteran and his particular dental disability and requirements but it is in conflict with congressional law. The Veterans' Administration should by this time have enough experience to be able to state in their proposed budgets and their requests for emergency appropriations about how much money it will take to render this service to veterans with service-connected dental needs.

The VA medical outpatient treatment program is being hard hit periodically for the same reason. Many disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities who require about 4 to 8 treatments by their own private physicians per month are periodically finding themselves confronted with a letter stating, "Based upon all the evidence on record, it has been determined that your need for outpatient treatment no longer requires 4 visits to your physician per month; therefore, you are authorized to report to your own chosen physician twice per month." Of course, in many cases the Veterans' Administration is justified in cutting down the outpatient treatment program for certain disabled veterans; however, in many cases they are not justified, but I feel that the VA must cut down, inasmuch as they do not have sufficient funds to carry on the VA outpatient medical program as intended by congressional law.

Mr. HAND, these are not charges that I make, they are only instances in which I ask you, as my congressional Representative, to check into, not only with the Veterans' Administration, but to ask the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to look into this matter also, inasmuch as this condition may become worse rather than better.

Yours very sincerely,

ANTHONY J. VOLPE,
County Service Officer.

I was glad recently to give Mr. Volpe the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that a special subcommittee on this hospital problem would be appointed in the near future to make a complete review of the entire situation.

It is not practical to attempt to correct this picture in the pending supplemental appropriations bill, but prompt attention should be given it, first, by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and then by the Appropriations Committee for the new fiscal year.

We owe an obligation to our veterans which we can and must fulfill.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we spent a lot of time talking about chairs. We had a lot of fun talking about round-back chairs, long-back chairs, and then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who I always enjoy listening to, got into a discussion about Old House Office Building livestock, and we had a lot of fun with that. We spent considerable time, in fact, so much time that we did not get as far as we thought we would with the bill yesterday. I think it is worthwhile spending a little time discussing veterans' beds. Now, I am not going to burden you with a lot of statistics. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has covered the field adequately.

I want to speak to you on behalf of myself and my colleagues from Philadelphia [Messrs. BARRETT, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, GRANAHAN, and GREEN].

We have a very unique and practical problem in Philadelphia in connection with hospital beds. When they built the Philadelphia Veterans' Hospital, and a formula was worked out by the Veterans' Administration in an administrative capacity whereby they were going to phase out 400 beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. We knew last October it was not going to work. The American Legion had a protest meeting in November. We contacted the Veterans' Administration and they gave us a 3-page single-spaced letter telling us how it was going to work.

Then this January the Philadelphia Veterans' Hospital opened. It would have been wonderful if they could have taken in 400 or 500 patients on the 1st of January, but the day it opened they took in 4 patients. They explained that by the fact that it takes time to indoctrinate personnel, it takes time to teach personnel how to operate the hospital, and it would be months before they would be able to fill that hospital with patients to its full capacity. In the meantime the naval hospital would not take in any more patients.

Illness does not wait. We found that in Philadelphia requests for hospitalization by worthy veterans were mounting day by day. I found when I got back to Philadelphia over the weekend 4, 5, or 6 families of veterans in my office begging for hospitalization. I spent all my time running all over making telephone calls to Lebanon, Pa., to Wilmington, Del., and to Richmond, Va., trying to get veterans into the hospitals. We were able to get some of them in the other hospitals, but when we got a veteran from Philadelphia into a Richmond hospital it meant that a veteran from the Richmond area had a bed taken up and he could not get into the Richmond hospital.

Then we ran into this situation. I should like to mention one specific case, that of a veteran with four children. He suffered from cancer. He had to have immediate hospitalization. We finally found a spot for him in Wilmington. Wilmington has been very cooperative. The question came up of how we were going to get the veteran to Wilmington. The family did not have the money, and they did not want him to go in an ambulance because, even though the American Legion had volunteered to let us have an ambulance, they did not want him to know how sick he was. He finally went to Wilmington, but the family could not visit him because of lack of funds for transportation. I think the doctors in this House will agree that when a man is sick one of the comforting things, especially when he is in his last illness, is a visit from his family. They had him in Wilmington for a while and could not keep him there any longer, so they sent him up to the Bronx, in New York, a hundred miles from Philadelphia. His family still could not visit him.

That is what we have every day. We are running into a practical problem, where we have sick veterans and we cannot send them anywhere because the veterans' hospital in Philadelphia is not fully open and will not be for 6 months, and the naval hospital will not take them in because of the phasing-out program.

I want to say something to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He is trying to convince us that we can legislate by committee report. I have been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I was a member of the special Teague committee in the last session. I know when we got into our investigations—and the gentleman from Texas will agree with me—we found that we gave too much administrative power to the Veterans' Administration. We found that they abused that power. We found that abuses grew up in the Veterans' Administration, in the GI school program, and in the housing program, as a result of faulty administration. That is why I come here today asking you to spell out in our legislation the $729,000 we need in Philadelphia to keep our veterans in hospitals.

It is all right for a Congressman, if he does not like a high-back chair or a low-back chair, to sit on the floor, but a veteran cannot possibly wait outside a hospital when he needs treatment.

I think this is a fair request. It is only to the end of this fiscal year. I think if we get over this fiscal year with this money our Philadelphia problem will be solved by future legislation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an effort to see how long we should continue this discussion. I suggest 10 minutes, the time to be divided between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I know that all the Pennsylvania delegation are very much interested in having this problem solved. I do not think that ought to be cut down to 10 minutes, when it is really an important question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How much time does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would want 2 minutes anyhow.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman will get 2½ minutes, as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I will not take much of the Committee's time. In this country we have something over 108,000 operating Veterans' Administration hospital beds, and it seems to me only good common business sense to appropriate enough money so that the veterans' hospitals and the veterans, and the people of our country can get the benefit of using such vacant beds as may be necessary for veteran cases.

As a result of the reduction in the 1953 budget for the VA medical program by the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress, the VA was forced to inactivate 2,300 operating beds in its old hospitals. Since its funds were inadequate to operate all of the beds available in the old hospitals the VA was forced to delay activation of its new hospitals which were already complete. On September 30, 1952, the new hospitals in Salt Lake City, Utah; Baltimore, Md.; Philadelphia, Pa.; and Boston, Mass., were frozen in a partial stage of activation. Twelve more hospitals were delayed in their activation from 60 to 90 days. These were located in Pittsburgh, Pa.; Salisbury, N. C.; Brockton, Mass.; West Haven, Conn.; Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; Birmingham, Ala.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Durham, N. C.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; and Chicago, Ill. After the VA received the authorization from the Bureau of the Budget for $5 million in the supplemental appropriations bill which we are considering here today they proceeded with normal activation of the 16 new hospitals which I have just mentioned, but they were unable to do anything about restoring the 2,300 beds which they had lost in the old hospitals. Let me emphasize, however, that the activation of the new hospitals was at the expense of the other medical programs in the VA. They were forced to take $4½ million from the fee-basis dental program, and they lowered their medical supply inventory by $3½ million. As a result, the dental-fee-basis program has come to a complete halt and the supply inventory is below the normal operating level.

In its original request to the Bureau of the Budget the VA asked for a supplemental appropriation of $16 million. Admiral Boone, the Medical Director of VA, has testified before the Veterans' Affairs Committee that the full amount of sixteen million is needed to restore the 2,300 beds which have been cut in the old hospitals. I think Admiral Boone has done an outstanding job as Medical Director of VA and I trust his judgment in this matter. It seems to me like the poorest kind of economy to leave vacant beds and vacant wards scattered in our established veterans' hospitals when we have 21,000 veterans on the waiting lists, and many of the veterans in dire need of attention. There are hundreds of cases of veterans being held in jail because our VA mental hospitals cannot accommodate them. We have been told that much of the difficulty which the VA has been experiencing has resulted from a difference in philosophy between the Bureau of the Budget and the VA. The VA maintains that it is attempting to make its medical program second to none, while the Bureau of the Budget considers that it must recommend appropriations only on minimum needs.

Mr. Chairman, we will continue to be faced with this sort of problem until the Congress adopts a consistent policy for furnishing medical care to veterans. We must lay down clear guidelines to the VA on exactly the types of cases we expect them to treat, we must gage our hospital building program to accommodate the veterans entitled to treatment under the law, and then we must provide funds for the VA to operate these hospitals. If we do not want the VA to hospitalize certain types of non-service-connected cases we should give the VA a clear mandate on who is to be hospitalized. We should not attempt to regulate the number of veteran patients which are treated by the VA by cutting off funds. This type of control of the VA medical program by appropriations can only result in a deterioration of the quality of the treatment received by the veteran patient. This last reduction of 2,300 beds caused a reduction of 2,800 positions in the VA hospital and caused the shifting and transfer of hundreds of employees and has created a serious morale problem. It is difficult enough to compete with private hospitals for nurses and doctors without injecting the element of instability created by these continual budgetary reductions.

I have read the hearing of the Appropriations Subcommittee which considered this matter and I thoroughly appreciate the difficult task which they face, but I am certain that every member of the subcommittee will agree that the health and welfare of our ex-servicemen should not be a subject for economy. The Congress created these beds and they should provide for their operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have been given to believe that the funds for the dental program of service-connected cases have been completely exhausted and that it is impossible for the Veterans' Administration anywhere in the country to provide treatment in dental cases, for veterans with service-connected cases; is that correct? And, if so, how will the situation be affected if the gentleman's amendment is not accepted?

Mr. TEAGUE. If my amendment is not accepted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman's amendment is rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE. I understand that if my amendment is rejected there will probably be no dental treatment. There is $5 million in this bill that will give them some relief, but very little, it is my understanding from Admiral Boone.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the $10 million the gentleman is proposing in his amendment is it intended that these additional funds shall be used for the dental program?

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that I asked Admiral Boone how much money was needed to bring the program up to date, and he said $10 million. I would assume that would take care of the dental program.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman's committee going to do something about the flagrant misinterpretation of law by the Veterans' Administration in the matter of service-connection of dental cases? The gentleman knows and I know that if a man had a tooth filled in the service, forever after as long as he lives that is a service-connected disability; and if by chance the tooth that was filled doing his time of service eventually becomes the base for a bridge, that bridge is a service-connected disability under the Veterans' Administration interpretation of service-connected dental care for a veteran. Nothing is a greater perversion of the law than that kind of interpretation. If the $5 million or the additional fund you are proposing is going to give the Veterans' Administration an opportunity to expand the dental program, I am irrevocably against it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I notice from the report of the committee that it chopped off from the administration's medical, hospital and domiciliary services almost $10 million, namely, $8,960,000. The budget, in other words, recommended exactly what the gentleman is seeking.

Mr. TEAGUE. I believe that the budget recommended $5 million. They gave them $5 million. What they cut off is something else.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman believe that his amendment providing for an additional $10 million will help the Pennsylvania situation?

Mr. TEAGUE. I certainly do. I believe the Pennsylvania situation will be taken care of if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It would be better taken care of than without your amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I was told the other day by Dr. Fauber, head of the Dental Section of the Veterans' Administration, that most of the facilities all over the country are several months behind in providing dental service for service-connected cases. What prompted my calling Dr. Fauber was a letter I had received from a young man who had just returned from Korea. He had suffered injuries in Korea to his jawbone. He was refused dental treatment by the Veterans' Administration because they were out of funds. He wrote me to ask if there was any way that he could get this treatment. In checking with Dr. Fauber, I found there is no way he could get the treatment until the Congress provided the funds. If we are 2 or 3 months behind now, we can add 4 or 5 more months to it, if we have to wait until July, and there is no telling what will happen to the young man in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, of course this matter has been brought before the House in the way it has been because of discrimination against Pennsylvania. Any person can look at the services rendered to veterans throughout the country and they will immediately conclude without any possibility of doubt that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against. I agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] has said that it is the fault of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. If we do not correct it in this instance and in this manner, he is going to keep on acting as he has been acting for quite some time, and that is in a dictatorial manner. You put the intention of Congress in a report, and he will come back with some such answer as: "Well, it is not practical to do it that way."

They have been beating around the bush and will never come to an agreement with the Navy. Are we going to wait until there is an agreement between the Navy and the Veterans' Administration? It may be 9 months from now. The regular appropriation bill will probably not become a law until next July or August, or perhaps even September. Are we going to let these veterans stand out on the street and not get proper hospital treatment? This situation must be handled by the adoption of this amendment; or else this Congress may be accused by all Pennsylvania veterans that they are being discriminated against. I urge the members of this committee to support the amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I concur in what the gentleman says. This amendment has no bearing on the Teague amendment. The gentleman from Texas said we should vote the amendment down. It has no bearing whatsoever on the Teague amendment. A very desperate situation exists in Philadelphia, and this is an emergency provision to take care of a very critical hospitalization problem in Philadelphia.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is the only practical way for us to handle it because if we let this go on, it will be handled in a dictatorial manner by the Veterans' Administrator. I say that from experience too. He makes whatever decision he wants, regardless of what is in the bill, and regardless also of what is in the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to the committee, and with all due respect to the report of the committee, I would point out that the committee report does not have a binding effect upon the Administrator. There is no definite assurance that the situation will be adjusted, and everyone—even the members of the committee agrees that a situation exists in Philadelphia which requires action. The only way to guarantee such action is by the adoption of the amendment. The committee report itself, no matter how well meaning it may be, and no matter how well intentioned it may be, is not going to accomplish that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Referring to that, I say the amendment will help the State of New York and the State of New Jersey and the State of Ohio and various other States as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, let us understand one thing quite clearly. Your Subcommittee on Independent Offices agreed thoroughly with our friends from Philadelphia in their perfectly commendable desire to see to it that sufficient and proper care was given to the veterans of that area. When the time came to act, we had this confronting us; firstly, undoubtedly the entire $5 million requested by the Veterans' Administration on this item would have been reduced somewhat by our committee because it was not entirely justified by the evidence, in our opinion. But we said, "Let us give them every cent so that there will be no question but that the Philadelphia area will be taken care of." So you see, we left money in the bill for that purpose.

Secondly, we were confronted with the proposition that this figure of $759,000 was an arbitrary figure that somebody in the Veterans' Administration gave to some Representative from Pennsylvania as the money necessary to care for 400 more beds, when, as a matter of fact, by use of the naval hospital that money was much more than was necessary. Therefore, we are convinced it will be a perfectly simple matter to take care of these cases, out of the $5 million.

Thirdly, we put in the report—and have no fear the Veterans' Administration understand what we mean—that they must take care of the situation and take care of it adequately without putting the Congress in the position of saying, "You shall furnish so many beds here and so many beds there."

In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I would refer him to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who has been the able chairman of our subcommittee for years, when he suggested—and we all agreed—that not next year or next month, but next week, if there is any question about the situation in Philadelphia being taken care of, we on the Independent Offices Subcommittee pledge you that we shall have the Veterans' Administration down here, and I think, in view of the fact that we are going to pass on their regular budget soon, we can get action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, of course all of us love the city of brotherly love. I would not deprive them of needed hospital facilities for their honorably discharged veterans. But I am sure I do not necessarily have to dwell upon the fact that there is hardly a State or a city or a town or hamlet in the entire country in which some hospital facilities are not now badly needed for service-connected veterans.

During the period between the election and the meeting of this session of the Congress I did some personal work myself, being impressed by the number of telephone calls and telegrams I received, making it imperative to exert political influence to get veterans into a veterans' hospital. I am told that in my State there are less beds per capita than any other community in the United States. It is a deplorable fact.

How better could we invest our time than to thrash out this important matter? We are scarce of money. Last year we provided money for the erection of these hospital beds, but the then President froze that money. It is a deplorable thing to call upon a youth to leave his fireside, with his father probably about my age—because veterans of World War I are now about 60 years old—leave his father in bed in a poorly provided home with inadequate funds, probably with an honorable discharge from the Army, service connected or otherwise, and take that man away to fight another police action, sometimes referred to as war. How can he be a brave soldier when he knows that his father, who fought for the same country, is at home in need of adequate medical

and hospital facilities? I hope that necessary legislation will be enacted without further delay to take care of these needy veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 62, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Page 10, line 11, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am opposed to the amendment. However, I am for accomplishing the purpose of the amendment but it should be done another way. By that I mean that Philadelphia is not the only place where they have troubles as far as hospitals are concerned. There is an amendment at the desk calling for an additional $10 million. Last year the House cut the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. We were told in no uncertain language that it would not hurt the medical program. However, it did hurt the medical program. Then Admiral Boone went to the Bureau of the Budget and asked for $15 million supplemental appropriation to get the maximum benefit from the number of operating beds available. The Bureau of the Budget cut that down to $5 million. This committee has given them the $5 million. I propose to give back the $10 million which Admiral Boone says he needs to get the maximum benefit from the number of operating beds. I hope the committee will vote this amendment down and support the other amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. Chairman, this is the problem which I stated a moment ago was too great and too lengthy to discuss on the floor of the House. I think it belongs for preliminary discussion in the committee of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Two days ago the Veterans' Administration had in its fund for dental care the sum of $5,158,680. The gentleman from Michigan has told you of the manipulation of interpretation of the law by which a tooth filled in the service at one time thereafter becomes itself service-connected, although the adjoining teeth are not service-connected.

The matter of whether or not some of these Korean veterans should be in hospitals is a matter very close to the heart of every Member of the Congress, but has to do with the interpretation of the law and not the amount of money. We gave them last year every bit of money that was asked for. We gave them all the money that was asked for this year. If you will look at the records of the committee, you will find that the money taken out of the bill was not taken out of this fund, but was taken out of the request for additional employees that were asked for by the Veterans' Administration in services having nothing to do with domiciliary or hospital care.

Day before yesterday there was still $2,105,895 in the fund for hospitals, and we have added to that $5 million for the remainder of this year. What the gentleman from Texas is doing, in fact, is not putting back in money we took out. The amendment has nothing to do with the figure $18,000,000, the original request. It is in effect making the original request $28 million, and that opens the entire problem that should be considered by this Congress at the earliest possible moment as to what constitutes service connection and just how far we are going to go with the hospitalization of veterans; whether or not they have serious injuries; how far we are going to go with veterans who actually have no service-connected disability. There are at this moment on the records of the Veterans' Administration only 70 veterans in the entire United States with service connection who are not in hospitals, and of that 70 a certain proportion of them are out of the hospitals by their own desire because they want to go at a later date, or something like that. A determination must be made not on this point I am making. On what constitutes service connection, it is my opinion that there is a much larger number of service-connected cases than on the Veterans' Administration roll, but that still does not make the total 120,000, which is the present number of activated beds. I ask you to look at the chart of the actual number of cases presently in the veterans' hospitals where you have 131,000 authorized and 120,000 activated beds and observe the number of cases which will be on the rolls if we continue the present interpretation of the law, without the addition of the Korean veterans, with whom the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Texas and I am very seriously concerned with. The number of cases which will be required in one generation will be over 325,000 cases without any change. We would more than double the number of beds. Are we going to back into socialized medicine by the back door when we deny it by the front door? Are we going to limit the care which the United States gives to its veterans, its utmost deserving veterans, that this country has always given care to and has never denied anything to? Should that determination be made at this moment on the floor of the House or by the proper committee in Congress giving careful consideration to the whole problem of service connection, because that is the problem that we have before us today? I hope that you will vote against this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what the gentleman from California has said. I am for economy as much as anybody in this House but I am not for economy at the expense of the halt and the lame and the feeble veteran. The gentleman from California said we should wait; we should tarry. Well, I am reminded of the adage, "on the plains of hesitation lie countless bones of millions," and I do not want to wait. I am not going to allow anybody, without protest, to minimize the complaints that have been offered to many of us in the metropolitan areas by veterans' associations. They tell us beyond the peradventure of a doubt that there is woeful inadequacy of administration, medical, hospital and domiciliary services. That is why I rise to support this increase of $10 million for those services. Those men whom we seek to help have risked their all. Many have just escaped by a hair's breadth going through the valley of the shadow. We Members of Congress have no trouble getting similar services. We could go to Bethesda Hospital; we can go to the Walter Reed Hospital. There are plenty of beds for us at slight cost to take care of our needs when we become ill. What are we going to say to the veteran when he pleads for a bed? What are you going to say to the long queue of veterans in my area who cannot get these medical and surgical and dental services when Members of the House and Members of the other body can very readily, without let or hindrance, go into these institutions here in the city of Washington and get their medical, surgical needs satisfied. What are our explanations then to the needy veteran. I for one, therefore, say that a veteran should not be compelled to wait. When injured and hurt or harmed he is speedily entitled to the proper comfort and the proper care. I say to the gentleman from California that illness does not wait, the virus does not tarry. We should not delay. Wounds do not heal without treatment. Treatment is useless without beds, and beds are useless without nurses and doctors and medicines and all those facilities that the veterans, particularly up in my city of New York, lack and are demanding. We must answer that demand.

This amendment does not say that this or that State shall get so much of the additional $10 million. We leave that to the discretionary power of the head of the Veterans' Administration. He is not going to waste the money. I am sure you can trust him by appropriating $20 million instead of $10 million for this type of service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an old subject to all of us and it has been said many times from this very spot where I am now standing. No man can claim a monopoly on his desire to help the sick veterans. There is not a man on this floor that will not do everything necessary to be done for them in that regard, whether the illness is service-connected or not. Someone raised that question.

What are the facts here, Mr. Chairman? We all talk about the fact we are going to do this and we are going to do that. The President has sent to us a budget estimate for hospitals in the sum of $5 million. Now, do not be misled by that heading. Under that heading you put this additional $10 million. Let me digress there. That will cover anything from A to Z besides hospitals, warehouses, finance, anything you have.

When you throw it in there as a lump sum, as you are putting it in there now, there is no assurance that hospitals will get one extra nickel, and I am telling you the absolute truth. The President sent up a budget estimate for hospitals for how much? Five million dollars, and that $5 million is in the bill. Not 1 penny was deducted. Could your committee do more? We cannot help it because the great general, General Gray, never stays in his office more than 2 days a week. The peripatetic general ought to stay in his office a little bit and learn something about his job, and he would not have to enter into a conspiracy with his own staff and employees to turn the heater on and loose the wolves on the Members regardless of which side of the aisle they sat on saying, "All right, now is the time, boys. The election is on November 4. Get after them in October." It was not your intention then, and it is not your intention now, to deny these veterans the hospitalization which they need. Let us be frank about it. Let us not kid ourselves. All that this committee has said in the past, and all we say now is, "You get in there and use your funds wisely. Do not come here and ask our committee for 428 more contact men when you already have about 1,600 contact employees. Take that money and put it in benefits and in hospitalization for veterans." We say, "General Gray spend that money as it ought to be spent." We say to him, "You have not done it. You have done a poor job and you know it." I have seen it with my own eyes—I have seen hospital after hospital with fine furnishings. The staff is there, the medicine is there and everything is there except the veteran in the bed. The bed is vacant. We told him, "Don't you fire a single doctor or a single nurse or a single dietitian." He did not, but through his poor management, keeping the contact boys and keeping the political machine going, he lets the veterans' beds remain vacant. He dug up $600,000 to pay for the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report to reorganize the Veterans' Administration. This Congress did not authorize him to spend one red cent of that $600,000. Where did he get it? Mr. Chairman, he could have opened up a tremendous number of hospital beds with that $600,000. It was a political move on his part to save his own hide, and I hope President Eisenhower gets a good man to take care of the veterans because General Gray has done a very poor job.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless I can have at least 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for one minute and a quarter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understood that only those Members who were standing would have the time divided among them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Members among whom the time has been divided were standing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Were they standing, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. All were standing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for a long time. Only a few have been here longer. I have engaged in the debate of tremendously important issues—issues that have changed our history and reshaped our destiny. As the chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it seems to me unfair, even shocking, that there cannot be given to me enough time to make a brief statement relating to this matter of increased appropriations so greatly needed for the care and hospitalization of our veterans. To deny this time is quite significant that when it comes to matters concerning our veterans, who are greatly increasing in numbers every day, there is a marked effort on the part of some to turn away from their needs, their requirements, their well-earned care for the sake of economy. Just remember this: if you are going to continue to send boys into the fires of war, you must care for their shattered bodies and spirits. You cannot compromise heroism for freedom on the shifting sands of political advantage based on economy.

Is it the objective to deny those of us fighting for justice and fair treatment of the veterans a chance to make a case? I have asked for a rule for my resolution which authorizes members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make investigations of veterans' facilities for the purpose of improvement in the efficient operation and care of our veterans. For over a month this resolution has been before the Committee on Rules. To date, they have failed to grant a rule. Give us our rule. Give us a chance to make a case. At this time other committees have inspectors investigating veterans' facilities. Why is it this right has not been given to the very committee organized and designed to function for this very purpose? Is this considered efficiency of the legislative function? If it is, then I disagree, and I think the American people, the American mothers and wives should know all that is taking place. The Veterans' Committee is not created for the purpose of doing nothing. This committee is created to help the men and women who have fought for America, for freedom, for you and every American. You should help it to do its job, and gladly so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire. One thing the Members do not realize, and that is that men who have a service-connected disability who are awaiting hospitalization may be hospitalized for non-service-connected disability, and because of this interim non-service-connected disability are carried as non-service-connected cases.

I would like also to point out that the Army and the Navy have patients in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. This of course takes beds away from veterans in need of hospitalization. It is passing strange that the Army and Navy have no difficulty in getting their appropriations for their hospitals. They have no difficulty in getting doctors. In fact, they take doctors away from the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much. This is a serious problem. I know the gentleman completely realizes its importance. I think the Members do not realize we have an increasing load of Korean veterans all the time. The Korean war has caused more injuries and more deaths than was anticipated. We have an increasing load because of legislation we passed for presumptively connected NP cases and TB cases during the last session of Congress, and we will probably have within a short time more cases presumptively connected. Last year the Congress cut appropriations for veterans $31 million. Surely some Members did not comprehend how seriously this cut would affect the care of veterans, particularly in view of the increasing numbers of Korean veterans requiring care and hospitalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I fully realize his lack of confidence in General Gray. But this additional money is not for General Gray but for the relief of our ex-fighting men. Regardless of what kind of an administrator General Gray is, we still have veterans who are in dire need of hospitalization. I am not talking just about Tennessee, either; I am talking about veterans all over this country.

Men with service-connected cases, many of them critically ill, who need to get into hospitals now, regardless of how General Gray has administered the Veterans' Administration. If he is guilty of mal or misadministration let us get someone in there who will carry out the wishes of this Congress and take care of our veterans, the defenders of our Nation. Personally I think we are doing

this country a grave injustice when we neglect the men who protected our great Nation in times of peril and war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when the cuts in VA medical availabilities were made last year there was great protest by the veterans' organizations. We have a chance to correct it now. Let us do it fully. It is almost impossible for the Member who has not participated in the detail of this question, to get to the basic facts here, and you pretty well have to pin your faith on the conclusions from the facts arrived at by those Members who have studied the situation in detail. Our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has made a colorful appeal, and, as he generally does, is a lion in favor of what his own subcommittee decided and he carries the ball very well, indeed.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is the author of the Teague bill, the Korean GI bill of rights. It was not a wild bill; it was a very conservative one, soundly conceived and carefully worked out after extensive hearings and study. It received overwhelming support in the House. Today I shall follow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who, I think, is looking at this from the veterans' point of view and has stated the question very fairly and forcibly. To carry out the veterans' hospitalization program we need, according to Mr. TEAGUE's findings this additional $10 million. We have cut $1,200,000,000 requested in this deficiency appropriation for defense. Let us then, even if we should err on the side of generosity, appropriate $10 million more to veterans' hospitalization—for the men who make defense possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is recognized.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the Legislature of California does not agree with my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. Under date of January 14, 1953, resolution to provide more adequately for the care of veterans in California was adopted by the State legislature. It was introduced, as the distinguished gentleman from California is undoubtedly aware, by 8 gentlemen with whom he is undoubtedly acquainted—8 Republican senators long known for their anxious participation in all economy moves in California Legislature. They are not spendthrifts, they do not want any department or branch of government to needlessly expend the taxpayers' money. But, in my State we have a serious problem in providing hospitalization and hometown medical care for our veteran population.

My State has made heavy contributions to the welfare of the veterans within its boundaries—many of them in no way a proper charge upon California government. We have been generous with them, because in our moment of need they were generous to us.

Four thousand six hundred veterans are in our State mental institutions. Of this number 1,500 have clear right to Federal hospitalization as the result of service-connected disabilities. In our county hospitals throughout California, hospitals supported by a direct levy of tax upon the homeowners of my State, we find in every county men receiving care because the Federal Government has failed to adequately provide for its responsibilities.

In fact, gentlemen, the Federal Government is chiseling upon the resources of my State, playing upon the natural sympathies and sense of obligation of many citizens to provide that which past Congresses have failed to provide.

I am surprised that Congressman PHILLIPS should take this floor to protest amending this bill to meet a clearly defined, easily recognized need. If this is a sense of the thing we must do to achieve economy, if only by forsaking responsibility, are we to be enabled to save the dollars, then I must decline to participate in bringing about that saving. It is my studied opinion that we can save many millions—yes; even billions of dollars, in the operation of our Federal Government. I do not propose, however, as has been suggested in this piece of legislation, to start any savings, first at the expense of the youngsters in our public schools, and secondly at the expense of the veterans who have made our freedom possible.

The four able commanders of nationally recognized veterans' organizations in my State recently, under date of December 22, 1952, presented a joint statement to the Governor of my State, that distinguished Republican gentleman, Earl Warren. These outstanding veteran leaders are Mr. William A. White, commander, American Legion of California; Mr. Walter Keil, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of California; Mr. E. L. Johnson, commander, Disabled American Veterans of California; and Mr. Edward A. Miratti, commander, AMVETS, State of California.

In that petition they recited some most revealing information. But, let me read some of their statistical data to the Members of this House:

It is a well known fact that many hundreds of thousands of veterans have been migrating to California from every other State in the Union since the close of World War I. It is not, however, such a well known fact that an unusually large percentage of these veterans are disabled. Veterans Administration records will show that California has a higher percentage of veterans drawing compensation or pension than any other State in the Union.

(a) Of the Nation's 20,000,000 veteran population, it is reliably estimated that California has approximately 1,750,000 or approximately 9 percent.

(b) Of the Nation's 80,000, 100 percent service-connected totally and permanently disabled World War II veterans, California has 10,400, or 13 percent.

(c) California has the highest number—38,500—service-connected World War I veterans; New York is second, with 32,250.

(d) California has the highest number—5,750—service-connected veterans from the Regular Establishment (peacetime veterans); New York is second, with 2,500.

(e) California has the highest number—13,500—Spanish-American War veterans drawing compensation or pension; New York is second, with 8,000.

While there continues to be a curtailment in the number of hospital beds for veterans in California, the number of applications for hospitalization continues to show a steady increase.

The number of veteran case folders transferred into California Veterans' Administration offices as compared with those transferred out, shows that approximately 1,200 veterans per month among this group have taken permanent residence in California.

It is clearly indicated therefore, from actual facts and figures that regardless of the Veterans' Administration's estimate of our State's veteran population, that California must have a higher ratio of hospital beds per veteran population than any State in the Union because of the higher percentage of disabilities.

Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds in California are not for the exclusive use of California veterans. Many of these beds are occupied by out-of-State veterans, for various reasons, such as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration tumor clinic for the western part of the United States, is in Los Angeles—Wadsworth General Hospital, Veterans' Administration Center.

(b) Their paraplegic center for the western part of the United States is at Long Beach.

(c) Their neuropsychiatric patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other western States, for the most part are hospitalized in California.

(d) Their diagnostic center for the western part of the United States is in San Francisco—Fort Miley.

(e) The rather high percentage of domiciliary members at their domiciliary home at Los Angeles are out-of-State veterans.

The curtailment of hospital beds for veterans in California began in June 1949 with the cancellation of 100 contract beds for veterans at the Army's McCormack General Hospital at Pasadena, and has continued ever since.

As of June 1949, hospital beds in operation for veterans in California were as follows:

Veterans' Administration hospitals	11,745
Veterans' Administration contract beds with service hospitals	1,650
Grand total	13,395

As of December 15, 1952, hospital beds in operation for veterans in California are as follows:

Veterans' Administration hospitals	11,220
Veterans' Administration beds with service hospitals	175
Grand total	11,395

For a quick glance:

Total number of operating available beds as of June 1949	13,395
Total number of operating available beds as of Dec. 15, 1953	11,395

This is a 2,000-bed net reduction. According to Veterans' Administration records of patient turnover, it is reliably estimated that 3,000 veterans per month are being denied hospitalization because of this cutback.

I could go on and recite so many facts—facts which should be known by every member of the California delegation regardless of the side of the House

in which he sits to perform his duties, but I believe I have said sufficient, although at this point I want to bring in one other authority.

The California Medical Association under date of January 21, 1953, in a letter addressed to me, urged that every consideration by the Congress be given to providing adequately for the veterans of the wars of the United States. I think the most revealing statement in that letter is this brief portion of text referring to the cuts forced upon the Veterans' Administration by the 82d Congress:

> The result of this is that some veterans are receiving their needed care in part as a charity from their own physicians, some are paying the difference in charges from their own funds, and some are receiving less care than their own physicians believe they should have.

Are we, Mr. Chairman, to continue to permit our veterans to receive less care? I say, "no." It is our obligation to see that they receive adequate care in every sense of the word, just as we expected them to give adequate service when we charged them with the responsibility of defending this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by correcting an impression which my esteemed colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] apparently labored under, that this amount of money, this additional $10 million which is being provided in the Teague amendment, is not earmarked in any fashion, that it is simply a general allocation. If I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] correctly in his interpretation of the amendment it is specifically stated that it is provided for "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary service."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. This $10 million is put in just exactly like my good friend from Texas pointed out in regard to the other $5 million. He said the report spells it out. This debate on the floor spells out my $10 million.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] have a comment he wished to make?

Mr. THOMAS. I just want to state that the $5 million is nailed down in the report in the appropriate language. As it now stands the money can be used for a hundred different things other than hospitalization.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There seems to be a difference of opinion on that between the two gentlemen from Texas. I think what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has to say as ranking minority member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee should have great weight.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman from Texas says it is nailed down in the report. In previous appropriations they were nailed down in reports, too; but they were not nailed down in the legislation and specifically spelled out, and that is why Philadelphia is having such a desperate time in finding hospitalization for the veterans of Pennsylvania; so it ought to be specifically and definitely nailed down in the legislation and not the report.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, we have in Oklahoma two hospitals to handle veterans' problems. One of them is located in Muskogee, in my district. That hospital, intended to be a 380-bed hospital, is operating now with 320 beds. We are operating with personnel reduced from a ceiling which we had back in 1947 of 484 people, with only 415 today, a substantial reduction in personnel, even though our State has had a great increase in veteran population, probably greater than most of the States in this Nation, due to the participation of the 45th Division in Korea.

The need for this amendment seems to be obvious and certainly it can be supported in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion we have had today and on this amendment leads directly to the door of that alleged collective-security agency known as the United Nations. If our so-called free world friends in the United Nations had done their share of turning the crank on the human meat grinder in Korea, we would not today be calling on American taxpayers to spend so much money for the hospitalization of American veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and to commend him for the thorough study that he made in this matter.

I had this situation brought to my attention in my own district last fall when General Gray and some of his axe men came into my district and cut out a hospital. I wrote to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to get details and did. I want to thank him for those details. I checked into the figures and I want to tell you now that the best thing that can be done for the veterans is to get a new head of the Veterans' Administration whom we can trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, although I am just a freshman member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish to express my opinions on this vital legislation and offer my support to the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. During the past several weeks the members of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs have heard the testimony of General Gray, Admiral Boone, and other members of the staff of the Veterans' Administration. I have been very much impressed with their testimony. It is my opinion that General Gray has done an excellent job and that the problems we now have are not because of the adjudication on the part of the Veterans' Administration, but it is because of the language of the legislation which was passed by Congress. These laws promised certain benefits for the veterans which have not been available because not enough money was appropriated.

There is no question about the need of these hospital beds. In my own district, the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, we desperately need more beds and the modernization of our veterans' facility at Lake City, and we need a new hospital for the treatment of our neuropsychiatric veterans. One million dollars has already been spent to obtain the land and to draw the plans for such a facility at Gainesville. We have heard here on the floor of the House the testimony of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, New York, South Carolina, and many other States.

The purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is to try to take care of just a small part of this need by making a limited number of funds available for the hospital benefits of veterans which were promised by the Congress. I believe General Gray is sincere when he asked for this extra money to carry out on a very minimum basis the hospital services to veterans that have been promised them by existing laws, and I believe we ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I was a patient in the Veterans' Hospital at Jackson, Miss., when the 10 percent medical cutback order came about. Regardless of what the subcommittee or General Gray might say, about its effect on hospital and medical services for the veteran, I can personally attest to the fact that it was the veteran who got hurt in the deal. Following the cutback, I saw ward attendants in that hospital work around-the-clock in order to see that the patients received proper and necessary treatment and care, because there were not enough attendants available for regular shifts.

Congress provided that the service-connected veteran "shall" receive treatment for service-connected disabilities. The law's promise to the veteran implies that the services will be available. Today the VA is turning down boys who have service-connected injuries, and the Congress is breaking faith with our veterans if we do not restore enough funds to give those boys the treatment they are entitled to.

The VA has exhaused all available funds for providing dental treatment for service-connected cases, and actually has a waiting list at most facilities. Some of these waiting lists are more than 3 months old, so critical is the situation.

It is true that some rating boards might have abused their authority in granting service connection in some cases, as was suggested a while ago by one of the opposition speakers to this amendment. Is that sufficient justification for denying relief to the deserving cases? I do not believe there is a person here who would advocate the denial of

treatment to service-connected disabled veterans. But that is what you will do if you defeat this amendment.

I, for one, am not so much concerned over the cases receiving service connection wrongly as I am for those thousands of deserving veterans who suffered injuries in line of duty but are denied service connection.

My record will attest to my support of economy. I believe in cutting out all of our unnecessary expenditures, but, believe me when I say that the funds provided in the Teague amendment are absolutely essential. Economy—yes. But economize by cutting nonessential expenditures. The health and well-being of thousands of ex-servicemen depend on the outcome of the vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 84, noes 87.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. TEAGUE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Military personnel requirements," Department of the Air Force, $115 million; the foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YORTY: On page 12, line 17, after the word "Budget", insert a new sentence as follows: "Before approving any such transfer, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall first determine that such transfer will not result in a deficiency requiring restoration of any of the amount transferred to the appropriation from which the transfer is approved."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment so that I may have an opportunity to study the language of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will want to press his point of order, when I have explained the purpose of the amendment. As I view it, it does not really change the purport of the appropriation at all. It merely spells out what the committee has explained to us they were trying to do in arranging that these funds be transferred from appropriations where they are not needed and used to cover the $1,200,000,000 that this bill would otherwise have to appropriate. I want to compliment the committee on this ingenious method of saving money. If they can actually find surplus funds and use them to cover the deficiency that this bill would otherwise have to cover, they have indeed made a very substantial saving in the budget for this fiscal year. In this case we are talking of a substantial amount—$1,200,000,000. It is certainly worth saving if we can do it. The committee has done a fine job here in pointing out where they think the funds can be found without further appropriation. I hope they are right. I just want to make sure that the intent of this Congress in permitting this transfer is spelled out in the law and not merely commented upon in a report—exactly the subject we were discussing a few minutes ago. The report explains that it is intended that funds which are not needed in other places shall be used to cover this deficiency. I think that is fine. But I do not think such funds should be used if we are going to be asked to turn right around and put them back again by new appropriations on the ground that we borrowed from funds that were needed. So I am simply providing that before the Director of the Bureau of the Budget approves any transfers from other appropriations to cover this deficiency, he shall first find that we will not be asked to restore those funds to the appropriations from which they are to be taken. Now that is a very simple proposition, and if I understood the committee correctly that is exactly what they intended. They did not intend to come here and fool themselves and fool us by simply juggling funds. They intended to try to squeeze a little water out of the Defense Department budget, if there is any water in it which can be found, and use the funds so made available to cover this deficiency. I want to make it crystal clear that I am not criticising anybody on the Committee on Appropriations or indicating that there is water or padding in the defense budget through any fault of theirs. We all know and we all keep charging that there is waste in the Defense Establishment, but we all know that when you are handling as large an organization as the Defense Establishment, and spending the amount of money that they are spending, there is bound to be some waste no matter how efficient they may try to be. In the different places in the world where I have seen military establishments in operation, I have seen some very conscientious military commanders doing their very best to hold costs down. I think we ought to give them credit once in a while instead of picking out just the ones who are wasteful and talking always about them.

Military operations are, in their essence, to some extent wasteful. I do not say that because the funds may be found in other appropriations and used for this deficiency that this necessarily means that they should not have been appropriated originally. It may as well mean that some conscientious commander has found a means of getting along with less than he originally anticipated, and the savings are available to make up this deficiency.

Now, if the committee means what it says, if it intends that this deficiency shall be made up out of a saving and not merely out of a juggling of figures to fool ourselves into thinking we have made a saving when we have not, they should support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and imposes new duties on the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YORTY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am simply spelling out one of the conditions under which the transfer of funds is to be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This appropriation bill already legislates, in that it requires the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I am simply saying that he find a condition precedent before he approves that transfer. I do not think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair the amendment contains legislation, contrary to the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that some comment should be made on some of the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY]. I am in sympathy with the purpose of his amendment but I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that it is subject to a point of order.

I think we should get this so-called saving of $1,200,000,000 into proper focus. I do not believe anyone has said that this bill saves $1,200,000,000 in the military program. Briefly, here is the situation: At the end of the last fiscal year—that is, June 30, 1952—the Department of Defense had on hand in unexpended funds about $59 billion. On June 30 of this year the Department of Defense will have on hand about $61 billion in unexpended funds. Of course, those large sums are principally for the procurement of major, long-time lead items, such as guided missiles, airplanes, ships, and things like that. Since the budget was prepared last year we have had a steel strike. Also, the Bureau of the Budget withheld from the services in the Department of Defense for several months certain funds which had been appropriated by the Congress. It is evident at this time, and the officials in the Department of Defense admit, that all of the funds which we appropriated will not be required. Several factors enter into the picture. Some of these sums will represent postponements.

There are some savings but we cannot estimate how much at this time. If it develops that adequate savings cannot be made and that postponements will hinder the defense program materially, there will be plenty of time to appropriate the funds later—the fiscal year does not end until June 30, 4 months hence. In an effort to accomplish every

possible economy, and in view of the readjustment of funds which has taken place and programs which have been changed, it does seem now that these funds, $1,200,000,000, can be allocated from other funds without too serious injury to the military program. It is in that spirit and on that basis that I went along with the committee on this $1,200,000,000 item, and I think that somewhat represents the viewpoint of other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. As the gentleman from Texas commented about the saving, I notice that the report states:

> It should be pointed out that informal discussions of the committee with officials of the Department of Defense resulted in general agreement that its total budgeted request could in all probability be absorbed out of current funds.

I was merely trying to make certain that if it is absorbed out of current funds they would not then come back and try to tell us that we had to restore the money that had been taken from their appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations went before the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving points of order on their language which legislates in the bill, and I was simply trying to aid this committee in nailing down the situation so that any saving would be a permanent one and that they could not come back and ask that we reappropriate it.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's idea is all right, and I am in complete harmony with the gentleman's amendment; we cannot be sure that the savings will be made, but we hope some savings will be made and that other programs can safely be postponed. This was a reappropriation of funds which were made available to us by reason of changed programs, the steel strike, and a number of other factors.

Mr. YORTY. Then are we to understand that the committee is not quite certain that this language would indicate that this saving can actually be made by transfer of funds from appropriations already made?

Mr. MAHON. The committee says that these funds can be absorbed; that does not necessarily mean a saving. It is too early to know the full effect of our action. If we have made a mistake, it can later be corrected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question or two of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services Appropriations, and also the former chairman and now the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. MAHON, of Texas. The item I refer to is carried on page 12, line 8: "Military personnel, Army, $725,724,000." The hearings reveal that out of this sum of money there is $300,000 earmarked for the purchase of paperbacked, pocket-sized books and magazines for distribution to the armed services personnel overseas. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not he knows the type, the character, and contents of the books he anticipates will be bought with this $300,000. I am not opposing the fighting man getting American books and magazines. The proper kind would be a good morale builder for our forces. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not point out to this body some of the revelations uncovered by the Select Committee on Pornographic Materials, which was created by the House in the last Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The committee did not go into that, I will say to the gentleman; but as a result of a conversation with him subsequent to the hearings the committee has obtained a list which shows the publisher, author, and the title of the books which I understand are supposed to be covered by the $300,000 in question.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 545 of the hearings it was stated that 7,700 paperbound book kits were made available for shipment overseas. I believe the armed services have furnished the gentleman with only 4 or 5 sets of the books and magazines included in these kits; am I not right? If the gentleman will refer to the hearings at page 545 he will find that Colonel Isaacs said there were 7,700 paperbound book kits being made available.

I have a list of those particular titles that were furnished your committee. I am of the opinion that the titles furnished you represent only a small part of the total number being purchased by the Army.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure about the number.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think my colleague will find that each of the 7,700 kits is made up of the same titles. They are not 7,700 different kits of different titles. You will find that the 7,700 kits are made up of the same titles.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is the cause of my concern on this feature of the problem. I understood that Army officials have stated that hundreds of different titles are being purchased with funds appropriated by this Congress. I hope your committee gets the full facts with respect to the contracts of this material. Let me ask the gentleman from Florida this question: It is his intention as a member of the subcommittee to furnish a high, wholesome type of reading material for our armed services personnel?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is rendering a real contribution by raising this question, which has been brought up a number of times in our hearings in the past. We have specifically asked whether a very careful selection is made by a carefully selected board to determine that clean, wholesome literature is being provided for the men in the services and we have always been assured that is the case.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is being done and it is the policy of the subcommittee?

Mr. SIKES. That is the assurance the subcommittee has always received.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure that is the intention of the committee, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. At one time there was a board of educators who selected these books. Now, people vary in taste in respect to books. I know in times past the Armed Services personnel have been permitted generally speaking to read the same type of book that the public generally read. If a book is a best seller, even though it is not too wholesome from some standpoints, often it is made available to the Armed Services.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is the point I am getting to now. I refer to the so-called best sellers. Many of them are salacious, obscene, and undesirable. These particular books although they are available on American newsstands are filled with sordid filthy statements based upon sexual deviations and perversions. Some glamorize the use of dope.

Mr. MAHON. But I would like to say that the committee has insisted through the years that the services screen these books and select only wholesome types. I share the gentleman's feeling completely that no improper or obscene literature should be purchased with the taxpayer's money. I reaffirm our demand on the Armed Forces that no improper books be purchased. That has been our understanding all along.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman thinks that is being carried out?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. I trust that reasonable care be directed to this problem in order to sell America with its proud traditions to the nations of the world. The literature heretofore distributed through post exchanges has been most detrimental to us.

The United States has publishing facilities that could make our publications a great and powerful influence for good and the betterment of mankind all over the world. Instead, I regret to admit the truth that customs officials of other nations now look upon our country as the nation that has almost completely replaced the Parisian slums as the producer of the world's most morally depraved publications. And the extent of our mass production of this lascivious and depraved printed trash dumfound them.

The Australian Parliament found it necessary during the past year to devote considerable time to discussing effective means of preventing the importation from the United States of books, magazines, and comic strips that attempt to show sexual depravity and criminal activities in a favorable light.

The daily newspapers of the British Isles are writing intemperate editorials demanding action to stop the vast

quantities of obscene materials published in the United States that have been entering Great Britain. An example of this reaction recently appeared in the London Sunday Express, which has a huge circulation. This newspaper advised its readers that—

In the United States, pornography is triumphant. There are some American best sellers which no English publisher would touch with a pair of tongs.

Our Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, wrote an article in the New York Times magazine of January 4, 1953, entitled "How To Win Friends and Influence Asia." In pointing out the problems America faces in combating Soviet propaganda against us, Mr. Bowles states: "Further to distort his [the Asiatic's] impression of America is our trashy literature which crowds Asian newsstands and the blood and thunder comics brought home by his wide-eyed child."

The Philippine Government has advised this country that its Bureau of Customs has discovered huge quantities of indecent publications are being sold in the American military post exchanges that are barred by Philippine law. In fact, the Philippine Bureau of Customs has gone so far as to charge that the American military post exchanges have become smuggling points for the importation of indecent publications into that country.

French people visiting the United States are amazed at obscene books and magazines publicly displayed and being sold to young people in residential areas. This material can be bought surreptitiously in the back alleys of Paris, but the head of the French family unit is noted for the way he resolutely protects his children from degrading influences.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 144, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. In its present form.

The SPEAKER. Is anyone else opposed to the bill unqualifiedly?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill unqualifiedly.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman unqualifiedly opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 10, line 11, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 199, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—182

Abernethy	Fogarty	Moss
Adair	Forand	Moulder
Addonizio	Forrester	Multer
Albert	Frazier	Murray
Aspinall	Friedel	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Fulton	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Gathings	O'Hara, Ill.
Battle	Gentry	Passman
Bennett, Fla.	Gordon	Patman
Bentsen	Granahan	Perkins
Blatnik	Grant	Pfost
Boggs	Green	Philbin
Boland	Gregory	Polk
Bolling	Hagen, Calif.	Powell
Bonin	Haley	Price
Boykin	Harris	Priest
Brooks, La.	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Brooks, Tex.	Hart	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Reams
Bryson	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Buchanan	Howell	Riley
Buckley	Ikard	Rivers
Burdick	Jarman	Roberts
Byrd	Javits	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Camp	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Campbell	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Kearns	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Kee	Rooney
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Keogh	Saylor
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Secrest
Condon	Kilday	Selden
Cooper	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Corbett	Klein	Sieminski
Crosser	Kluczynski	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Springer
Deane	Lantaff	Staggers
Delaney	Lesinski	Steed
Dempsey	Long	Sullivan
Dodd	Lyle	Sutton
Dollinger	McCarthy	Teague
Donohue	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Donovan	McDonough	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	McMillan	Trimble
Dowdy	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Eberharter	Madden	Watts
Edmondson	Magnuson	Whitten
Elliott	Mahon	Wickersham
Engle	Marshall	Wier
Evins	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Fallon	Merrow	Willis
Fenton	Metcalf	Winstead
Fernandez	Miller, Calif.	Withers
Fine	Mills	Yorty
Fino	Mollohan	Zablocki
Fisher	Morrison	

NAYS—199

Abbitt	Bates	Bramblett
Alexander	Beamer	Bray
Allen, Calif.	Becker	Brown, Ohio
Allen, Ill.	Belcher	Brownson
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Broyhill
Andresen, August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Andrews	Bentley	Burleson
Angell	Berry	Busbey
Arends	Betts	Bush
Auchincloss	Bishop	Byrnes, Wis.
Baker	Bolton, Oliver P.	Canfield
Barden	Bosch	Carlyle
	Bow	Carrigg
		Chenoweth
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Ray
Church	Holmes	Rayburn
Clardy	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Clevenger	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Hosmer	Regan
Coon	Hruska	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cotton	Hull	Richlman
Cretella	Hunter	Robeson, Va.
Crumpacker	Jackson	Sadlak
Cunningham	Jensen	St. George
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas, Ill.	Scherer
Curtis, Nebr.	Jonas, N. C.	Scrivner
Dague	Jones, Mo.	Scudder
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N. C.	Seely-Brown
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Shafer
Derounian	Kean	Sheehan
Devereux	Kilburn	Short
D'Ewart	King, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.
Dies	Knox	Simpson, Pa.
Dolliver	Krueger	Small
Dorn, N. Y.	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Ellsworth	Latham	Smith, Va.
Ford	LeCompte	Stauffer
Fountain	Lovre	Stringfellow
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Taber
Gamble	McConnell	Talle
Gary	McCulloch	Thomas
Gavin	McGregor	Thompson, Mich.
George	McIntire	Thornberry
Golden	McVey	Tollefson
Goodwin	Mack, Wash.	Utt
Graham	Mailliard	Van Pelt
Gross	Merrill	Velde
Gubser	Miller, Md.	Vorys
Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.	Wainwright
Hale	Morano	Wampler
Halleck	Mumma	Warburton
Hand	Neal	Weichel
Harden	Nelson	Westland
Hardy	Nicholson	Wharton
Harrison, Nebr.	Norblad	Widnall
Harrison, Wyo.	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Harvey	Oakman	Wilson, Calif.
Herlong	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Tex.
Heselton	Osmers	Withrow
Hess	Ostertag	Wolcott
Hiestand	Patterson	Wolverton
Hill	Pelly	Yates
Hillelson	Phillips	Young
Hillings	Pillion	Younger
Hinshaw	Poff	
Hoeven	Prouty	

NOT VOTING—51

Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Bonner	Hyde	Preston
Case	James	Rabaut
Cederberg	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Keating	Richards
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Cooley	Kirwan	Scott
Coudert	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Dingell	Mason	Shuford
Dondero	Meader	Smith, Wis.
Durham	Miller, Kans.	Taylor
Feighan	Miller, N. Y.	Vursell
Hagen, Minn.	Morgan	Walter
Hays, Ark.	O'Konski	Wheeler
Hays, Ohio	O'Neill	Williams, N. Y.
Hébert	Patten	Wilson, Ind.
Heller	Pilcher	
	Poage	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Keating against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Hyde against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Case with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky with Mr. Pilcher.

Messrs. FENTON, BONIN, CELLER, LONG, SHEPPARD, McMILLAN, and ZABLOCKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Messrs. NICHOLSON and CANNON demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 369, nays 2, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—369

Abbitt	Condon	Hardy
Abernethy	Cooley	Harris
Adair	Coon	Harrison, Nebr.
Addonizio	Cooper	Harrison, Va.
Albert	Corbett	Harrison, Wyo.
Alexander	Cotton	Hart
Allen, Calif.	Cretella	Harvey
Allen, Ill.	Crosser	Heriong
Andersen, H. Carl	Crumpacker	Heselton
	Cunningham	Hess
Andresen, August H.	Curtis, Mo.	Hiestand
	Curtis, Nebr.	Hillelson
Andrews	Dague	Hillings
Angell	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Arends	Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.
Auchincloss	Dawson, Utah	Holifield
Ayres	Deane	Holmes
Bailey	Delaney	Holt
Barden	Dempsey	Holtzman
Barrett	Derounian	Hope
Bates	Devereux	Horan
Battle	D'Ewart	Hosmer
Beamer	Dies	Howell
Becker	Dodd	Hruska
Belcher	Dollinger	Hunter
Bender	Dolliver	Ikard
Bennett, Fla.	Donohue	Jackson
Bennett, Mich.	Donovan	Jarman
Bentley	Dorn, N. Y.	Javits
Bentsen	Dorn, S. C.	Jensen
Betts	Dowdy	Johnson
Bishop	Doyle	Jonas, Ill.
Blatnik	Eberharter	Jonas, N. C.
Boggs	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Boland	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Bolling	Ellsworth	Jones, N. C.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Engle	Judd
	Evins	Karsten, Mo.
Bonin	Fallon	Kean
Bosch	Fenton	Kearney
Bow	Fernandez	Kearns
Boykin	Fine	Kee
Bramblett	Fino	Kelly, N. Y.
Bray	Fisher	Keogh
Brooks, La.	Fogarty	Kersten, Wis.
Brooks, Tex.	Forand	Kilburn
Brown, Ga.	Ford	King, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Forrester	King, Pa.
Brownson	Fountain	Klein
Broyhill	Frazier	Kluczynski
Bryson	Frelinghuysen	Knox
Buchanan	Friedel	Krueger
Buckley	Fulton	Laird
Budge	Gamble	Landrum
Burleson	Garmatz	Lane
Busbey	Gary	Lanham
Bush	Gathings	Lantaff
Byrd	Gavin	Latham
Byrne, Pa.	Gentry	LeCompte
Byrnes, Wis.	George	Lesinski
Camp	Golden	Long
Campbell	Goodwin	Lovre
Canfield	Gordon	Lucas
Cannon	Graham	Lyle
Carlyle	Granahan	McCarthy
Carnahan	Grant	McConnell
Carrigg	Green	McCormack
Celler	Gregory	McCulloch
Chenoweth	Gross	McDonough
Chiperfield	Gubser	McGregor
Chudoff	Gwinn	McIntire
Church	Hagen, Calif.	McMillan
Clardy	Hale	McVey
Clevenger	Haley	Machrowicz
Cole, Mo.	Halleck	Mack, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Hand	Mack, Wash.
Colmer	Harden	Madden
Magnuson	Radwan	Staggers
Mahon	Rains	Stauffer
Mailliard	Ray	Steed
Marshall	Rayburn	Stringfellow
Matthews	Reams	Sullivan
Merrill	Reece, Tenn.	Taber
Merrow	Reed, N. Y.	Talle
Metcalf	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, La.
Miller, Calif.	Regan	Thompson, Mich.
Miller, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.	
Miller, Nebr.	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Mills	Riehlman	Thornberry
Mollohan	Riley	Tollefson
Morano	Rivers	Trimble
Morrison	Roberts	Utt
Moss	Robeson, Va.	Van Pelt
Moulder	Rodino	Van Zandt
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Velde
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Vinson
Murray	Rogers, Mass.	Vorys
Neal	Rogers, Tex.	Wainwright
Nelson	Rooney	Wampler
Nicholson	Roosevelt	Warburton
Norblad	Sadlak	Watts
Norrell	St. George	Weichel
O'Brien, Ill.	Saylor	Westland
O'Brien, Mich.	Schenck	Wharton
O'Brien, N. Y.	Scherer	Whitten
O'Hara, Ill.	Scrivner	Wickersham
O'Hara, Minn.	Scudder	Widnall
Osmers	Secrest	Wier
Ostertag	Seely-Brown	Wigglesworth
Passman	Selden	Williams, Miss.
Patman	Shafer	Willis
Patterson	Sheehan	Wilson, Calif.
Pelly	Sheppard	Wilson, Tex.
Perkins	Short	Winstead
Pfost	Sieminski	Withers
Philbin	Sikes	Withrow
Phillips	Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott
Pillion	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton
Poff	Small	Yorty
Polk	Smith, Kans.	Young
Powell	Smith, Miss.	Younger
Price	Smith, Va.	Zablocki
Priest	Spence	
Prouty	Springer	

NAYS—2

Hull Sutton

NOT VOTING—61

Baker	Heller	Poage
Berry	Hill	Poulson
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Preston
	Hyde	Rabaut
Bonner	James	Reed, Ill.
Burdick	Jenkins	Richards
Case	Keating	Robsion, Ky.
Cederberg	Kelley, Pa.	Scott
Chatham	Kilday	Shelley
Chelf	Kirwan	Shuford
Coudert	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Curtis, Mass.	Mason	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Meader	Teague
Dingell	Miller, Kans.	Thomas
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Vursell
Durham	Morgan	Walter
Feighan	Oakman	Wheeler
Hagen, Minn.	O'Konski	Williams, N. Y.
Hays, Ark.	O'Neill	Wilson, Ind.
Hays, Ohio	Patten	Yates
Hébert	Pilcher	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Williams of New York with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Hyde with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. James with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Mason with Mr. O'Neill.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Oakman with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Robsion of Kentucky with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Shuford.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Case with Mr. Walter.
Mrs. Frances P. Bolton with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Baker with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Berry with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Richards.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Meader with Mr. Rabaut.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Pennsylvania delegation, I am greatly disappointed that the membership of the House did not see fit to amend the supplemental appropriation bill before us to definitely tie down the instructions of the Committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in regard to furnishing adequate hospitalization for the needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

This matter has been given very careful consideration by the members of the Pennsylvania delegation in conference with representatives of the veterans' organizations in our State. We feel that the Veterans' Administration has not been living up to the long-recognized allotment of beds in the naval hospital at Philadelphia, especially so when that hospital has what you might call a "staff in waiting" ready to relieve the situation.

I take heart from the promise of Chairman JOHN PHILLIPS and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, that they will see to it that the directive to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in regard to hospitalization for veterans in the Philadelphia area is carried into action. We are depending on this.

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3073) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been consulted about this bill, and I think it is the proper thing to do.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the act of August 4, 1939 (Public, No. 263, 76th Cong.), which is referred to in paragraph (5) of section 3A of such act, is amended by striking out the colon after the word "section" and the following: "*Provided*, That no election in lieu of the life annuity provided herein shall become effective in case an employee dies within 30 days after the effective date of retirement, and in the event of such death within this period, such death shall be considered as a death in active service."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of January 1, 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CORAL M. HOME

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Coral M. Home, widow of John D. Home, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said John D. Home.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL BILL ORDERED FOR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2332) to require an annual review of military personnel requirements, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 23

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Monday there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Tuesday there are six resolutions for committee studies and investigations which we expect to call up. They are for the following committees: Judiciary, Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, and Armed Services.

Wednesday: We expect to call the bill H. R. 2332 providing for an annual review of military personnel, sometimes referred to as having to do with the Davis amendment. That will be called up under a suspension of the rules, pursuant to the request just granted.

Also on Wednesday, if a rule is granted, we expect to call up House Joint Resolution 160, to amend the National Housing Act, which resolution comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman thinks in all probability that will be the entire program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. As far as I know, yes; that is the program.

THE SITUATION IN THE VIRGINIA COAL FIELDS

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a situation which is vitally affecting the economic life of my congressional district.

Virginia is the Nation's sixth largest coal producer, and about 99 percent of the entire State output comes from the mines in my congressional district. The coal industry is one of our principal mediums of livelihood, and as such is one of the largest contributors to the whole economy of this great mountain empire.

Coal production in Virginia during 1951 amounted to 21,410,000 tons, or 4.01 percent of the entire United States tonnage.

During 1952, Virginia's coal tonnage dropped 1,600,000 tons. Figures for 1952 are estimated on the basis of 11 months because State production for December is not yet published.

However, production figures for the entire Nation through December are completed and on that basis, it is estimated that Virginia produced 19,810,000 tons of coal during 1952.

A loss of 1,600,000 tons has had a very serious effect upon the State's 17,683 coal miners and their wives and children.

This decrease in coal production in my district caused 1,283 of our miners to be without work for the year. This is how a drop in production affects the working people of the Ninth District of Virginia.

Such a condition has caused an unfavorable reaction in virtually every phase of our economy.

After having made a study of the problems creating these conditions of hardship in my district, it is my considered opinion that one of the major factors contributing to this depressing influence on the coal industry is the unfair competition that has come to the coal market in the form of a foreign residual oil, a product for which we have absolutely no need at the present time, and on which we would certainly not wish to rely for future supply.

Residual fuel oil is competitive with coal for the generation of electric power and for other industrial uses. The amount of such oil imported into the east coast of this country last year was sufficient to inflict a 31-million-ton loss on coal markets, and no relief is in sight unless the 83d Congress acts to curb this unfair competition which has its origin in foreign refineries.

Total coal reserves in the United States to the end of 1951 were 1,211,646,289,000 tons. There is enough mineable coal in America to last more than 1,000 years.

The coal industry is one of America's vital industries. It has made tremendous contributions to America's strength—both in war and in peace.

The American coal industry has never received Government subsidies—it has never asked for them, and I don't believe that it ever will.

I do not believe that it is just for the Congress to permit the continuance of a state of affairs by which the coal industry in Virginia and elsewhere is being materially weakened and its working force threatened with unemployment.

I have today introduced a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

I ask the Members of Congress to take immediate action to remedy this situation.

A MOTION PICTURE NOW BEING PRODUCED IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, there is being produced at the present time in Silver City, N. Mex., a motion picture. The unique part of the motion picture is that it is being produced and financed by uncooperative witnesses who appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The picture and its production have been condemned by the motion picture industry and by all of the labor unions connected with that industry.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today.

LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of Lithuanian independence accords to every American another opportunity to ponder the cruel fate that has beset and still afflicts the historic and gallant Lithuanian nation.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage. For centuries they have struggled for freedom and the values of democratic civilization. Their sons and daughters have contributed with conspicuous effect to the defense, the de-

velopment, the welfare and protection of our own great Nation. Citizens of Lithuanian descent are among the very best in the country and our hearts go out to them today when we know they are stirred by poignant, bitter memories, by unspeakable anguish and woe at the suffering and oppression of their kin folk in the native homeland.

The oppression they suffer is not confined to Lithuania alone, however. It reaches over and encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples. It is the living, visual, everyday expression and demonstration of the callous brutality of the Soviet slave state and the monstrous iniquities which communism has perpetrated in this world.

These great crimes against mankind, against the most cherished ideals of free peoples, against organized religion, against the rights of free men, against the spiritual values of our civilization, against the sacred tenets of the Almighty himself, must definitely be repudiated by this Government. It would be shameful, sinful, and disparaging of the precious blood which so many selfless, gallant American boys have shed for freedom, it would be a profanation of their immortal sacrifice for this Nation, for our Government longer to make itself a part of, or in any respect to tolerate, or acquiesce in, the brutal, criminal, immoral, and illegal domination by the Soviet Union of Lithuania and other small free nations.

One of the most gratifying developments that has occurred in the foreign policy of this Nation for many years has been the forthright repudiation by President Eisenhower of the unconstitutional, illegal, secret agreements and understandings, which were entered into at Yalta, Potsdam, and other international conferences. This inspiring message, conceived in the kind of firm courage that we like to believe is characterstic of our American Nation, has given new hope and fresh inspiration to millions of helpless, heretofore hopeless, human beings held captive behind the Iron Curtain, ground into insensibility, chained into slavery, tortured by unmentionable abuses and excesses of power-crazed, zealous, Marxist-inspired assassins, imposed upon them a bestial tyranny worse than death.

The executive agreements that support these secret understandings are not, in my opinion, worth the paper they are written on. They were never ratified by the United States Senate, as required by the Constitution, and they never had either the moral or political support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, who, to the contrary, predominantly and bitterly oppose them.

We cannot move too fast, or in too determined a manner, to scrap these inhuman, unconstitutional, and undemocratic understandings and inform Soviet leaders intent upon world conquest that we do not recognize any conquest and infiltration of territories or nations that have been accomplished through chicanery, aggression, or deceit, and that have enslaved free nations.

World peace and world order can never be based upon confiscation, aggression, exploitation, or brutal tyranny over helpless nations and individuals. World peace, if it is to be achieved, must rest upon the firm foundations of justice and the moral sanction of civilized human beings. A peace that does not have the public opinion of the world behind it, that is supported by force, incredible police-state methods, denial of human rights, brutalization of the individual, ruthless enmity toward free institutions and the free way of life, has no more chance of lasting than a snowflake upon the river's bosom.

Let it be known in this House, on this great anniversary day of Lithuania, which we so fittingly commemorate, that the Members of the American Congress, reflecting the sentiments of the American people, still believe in and stand for principles of liberty and justice, that we are willing to declare them to the world, that we are willing to defend and fight for them if we have to, and that we have no intention of permitting world dictators, whether in wolf's or sheep's clothing, to stride over the whole world trampling upon the most sacred rights of men and women, conspiring against democracy and working for the destruction of all free governments, including that of our own great Republic .

Neither the bluster of Soviet jingoism, nor the timidity and cupidity of some of our own so-called allies, nor the vagrant fears of weak-kneed Americans should ever deter this Nation, not only from taking a sympathetic stand toward Lithuania, Poland, and other oppressed small nations, but from moving with all feasible speed and dispatch to liberate them from the cruel and tormenting plight of having to live in chains under the domination of tyrants more cruel than Nero.

I express my satisfaction at this time that American foreign policy is seemingly moving courageously in the direction of supporting and encouraging the real forces of freedom in this world, as well as reinforcing and redeclaring our purpose, unflinching and determined to preserve our own priceless freedoms against any and every threat.

FARM PRICES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during the last 10 years our country has enjoyed perhaps the most prosperous era in its history, a time when jobs were plentiful, wages were high, and producers received a high return on their products. It is difficult to believe that this unprecedented level of prosperity could have been maintained solely on the basis of a war economy because since the end of World War II there has been no acute general shortage of supplies with which to meet domestic demands, yet the level of prices and wages has continued an upward trend.

Whether we reached the peak of our prosperity remains to be seen. One alarming factor, however, which indicates that our economy is on the verge of imbalance, if not depression, is to be found in the current steady and dangerous decline in prices received by farmers for their produce.

We need to but call back 20 years to establish the truth of the contention that an agricultural depression is the forerunner of a general depression. In the light of our experience during the early and midthirties, we know that it is imperative that the Government take steps to maintain agricultural prosperity if it is to prevent a general and disastrous depression.

The decline in farm prices has already brought serious and dangerous results. It is inevitable that this condition will pull the rest of our economy down to its level if not arrested.

On the average, prices received by farmers declined 9 percent from August to mid-December of last year, and at that time averaged 12 percent below a year earlier. Between mid-December 1952 and mid-January 1953, they declined another percentage point. Price declines over the past year were greatest for meat animals and cotton, reflecting increased supplies and, in the case of cotton, a sharply reduced foreign market. These declining farm prices are not limited to cotton and livestock, but are general throughout the entire field of agriculture.

It is particularly significant to note that while farm prices were falling 12 percent, the price of manufactured products and other commodities which the farmer must purchase dropped only 1 percent. As a result, the parity ratio fell from 107 in December 1951 to 96 in December 1952. During this time, wage rates have been reflected upward, as have the consumer demands for farm products.

One of the yet unexplained enigmas of this situation is that while prices paid for farm products at the farm level have dropped 12 percent, the retail price of these same products has maintained a level of only 1 percent below the peak. This means, of course, that the drop in farm prices has not been reflected in savings to the consumer, the difference being dispelled somewhere between the farm and the retail market.

The rather widespread easing in farm products prices occurred despite a general pickup in a domestic demand for farm products. Currently the economy is operating at the highest point in history, with full employment and rising wage rates. Consumer spending for food has continued to rise over the years about in proportion to the increase in incomes.

Although the picture of declining farm prices has many facets, it is not difficult to analyze the primary causes. The drop in farm products prices was due in part to increased marketings. Meat production was 8 percent larger than in the second half of 1951, reflecting the uptrend in cattle slaughtering, drought speeded marketings of the lower grades of cattle, and early marketing of spring pigs. The output was the second largest in history and was 4 percent over 1951 production. With larger supplies of farm products and substantially smaller exports of wheat and cotton, carryover stocks of wheat, cotton, corn, and some oils are expected to increase materially by the end of the current marketing year, with a relatively large volume of these crops going under loan or purchase agreement.

Another important factor is to be found in the reduced foreign demand for United States agricultural products. Total exports of farm products were down in the second half of 1952 by about 30 percent from the year earlier. Smaller exports of cotton and wheat contributed most to the decline, but exports of food fats and tobacco were also smaller. Except for the British limitation on imports of tobacco and lard in order to conserve dollar exchange, the sharp decline in agricultural exports apparently was due primarily to the improved foreign supply situation for commodities competing with United States agricultural products.

Here, I would like to divert for a moment to discuss reasons why we are suddenly finding our products in competition with the same products of foreign countries. During the last several years, the United States had spent untold millions of dollars in a crusade to "develop under developed areas" of the world. We have sent agricultural experts to every corner of the earth for the purpose of teaching inhabitants of other countries our methods of production. We have sent to these countries thousands of tractors, bulldozers, and farm implements, and have suffered domestic shortages of fertilizers in order to furnish them to other parts of the world gratuitously. We are just now beginning to reap what we have sown. The current crisis in our agricultural economy is the first of many payments that we will inevitably have to make for this venture in misguided international philanthropy. These countries which formerly looked to the United States for their cotton and other agricultural needs have now—thanks to us—become producers of these same commodities over and above their own needs, and are placing them on the world market in competition to ours.

Because our wasteful and impractical foreign policy is to some extent responsible for the farm recession, it is to be hoped that the new administration will give some thought to this phase of the problem as well as to domestic remedies.

Comparative declines for some major groups of farm product prices are as follows:

	Percent of change	
	Jan. 15, 1952–Jan. 15, 1953	Jan. 15, 1951–Jan. 15, 1953
Truck crops	−30	−27
Cotton	−23	−27
Meat animals	−19	−23
Wool	−17	−48
Feed grain and hay	−9	−0
Dairy products	−6	+5
Food grains	−2	+2

A further break in the prices of farm commodities could be conceivably the beginning of another great depression Because the agricultural producers are the major purchasers of manufactured products, their welfare is equally vital to those who live in the cities and follow other fields of employment.

The American farmer is without a doubt the most important single contributor to the well being of our country. Out of the soil are produced the three basic requirements of man—food, clothing, and shelter, without any one of which no civilization can survive. It is the only segment of our economy which is completely self-sustaining and could maintain life without help from any other source. For that reason among others, all civilization is dependent upon the farmer for its existence. Were the products of the farm suddenly to be taken out of the channels of trade, every other industry would suddenly find itself facing extinction. Other businesses would suddenly find themselves without a market or source of raw materials, and we would find ourselves in a panic that would make 1933 look like boom times.

Everyone is agreed that something must be done, but there are great areas of disagreement over the method or methods by which it should be accomplished.

I lay no claims to expert knowledge of agricultural matters, but I yield to no one in my desire to serve the interests of American agriculture, which is also the interest of America.

I believe the new administration should be given an opportunity to prove itself capable of handling the situation, and that we should refrain from criticizing them merely for criticism's sake. To use the expression used so often by our venerable former speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, "any old jackass can kick down a barn, but it takes a carpenter to build one," I might say that we are badly in need of carpenters. There is a real job to be done. It might be well for us to recognize, also, that the new Secretary of Agriculture has been in office but a month, hardly long enough to acquaint himself with his new duties. I earnestly hope that he will be capable of meeting this emergency headon and that he will be able to formulate policies and programs which will restore deserved prosperity to the producers of food and fiber throughout the land.

It is understandable that an administration which has been out of office for 20 years should proceed cautiously in attempting to cope with the many problems of state confronting it. Undoubtedly, President Eisenhower and his associates inherited many difficult problems, not the least of which is the one which I am discussing today. For what it might be worth, I would like to proceed for a moment in making a few observations and suggestions which I hope might contribute to some small extent to bringing about a return of prosperity to the American farmer.

I was pleased to read the newspaper accounts of the President's actions in directing the Armed Forces to lay by a one hundred and twenty-day supply of meat. This action on the part of the Armed Forces should contribute substantially to the possible halting of downward trends in livestock prices. Certainly a study should be made to determine whether this supply should be increased even further, possibly to cover a 180-day period.

In a widely publicized and highly controversial speech recently delivered in St. Paul, the new Secretary of Agriculture referred to the present price-support program as disaster insurance. He will soon learn, if he has not found out already, that such was far from the intent of Congress when the program was established. If this is to be the attitude of the new administration toward the farm program, American agriculture can look for dark days ahead. As he probes deeper into the program, I am confident that the new Secretary will discard this theory for the good of the people he represents and the Nation as a whole.

The price support program has proven itself to be a buffer against depression, and a vehicle for maintaining a high degree of national prosperity. It, more than any other single contributing factor, was responsible for averting a depression following World War II, and will continue to be the most reliable bulwark against recession for many years to come. The Secretary of Agriculture might better have described the program as "insurance for prosperity."

It is to be expected that the cry of white elephant and expensive luxury should be directed against this program. To those who have not probed the facts, such beliefs are quite understandable. But what are the facts? Remarkably, this program has been selfsufficient, and has not cost the taxpayers a cent. The Commodity Credit Corporation has actually returned a profit to the Treasury.

The great hue and cry continues from opponents that the program is robbing the housewife by keeping prices artificially high. Here again the facts fail to support the charge. The ratio of money spent for food in relation to national income has remained static. Year in and year out, in depression and prosperity, we spend about a fifth of our income on food. Statisticians show that the percentage of national income spent for food has not varied more than 1 or 2 percentage points in more than 30 years.

The new administration might do well to reexamine its position on the question of price supports, and the present proven program. To do otherwise would be to break faith with their campaign pledges for even higher and more rigid supports. Until a better program is formulated and in operation, it is imperative that the Secretary avail himself of remedies already in reach, to forestall further declines in these prices. At least he could exhibit his willingness, as expressed in St. Paul, by exercising his discretionary powers to support, if necessary, prices of products other than the six basic commodities he is required to support.

The Secretary of Agriculture now has broad authority to support the prices of farm products. He is required to support the prices of the basic farm commodities, corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice and peanuts at not less than 90 percent of parity and the prices of milk, butterfat and other milk products, honey, tung nuts, and wool at from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary is also authorized to support the prices of other farm products to the extent that funds are available.

Under this discretionary authority price support programs are currently in effect for the following commodities: barley, oats, rye, sorghums for grain, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, American-Egyptian cotton, cottonseed,

crude pine gum, oil olives, hay and pasture seeds and winter cover crop seeds.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has $6.75 billion available to it for price support purposes. The total investment in price support activities as of December 31, 1952, was $2.5 billion, leaving an unobligated balance in excess of $4 billion available for price support operations.

Where price support programs are in effect, current market prices usually are resting on or sagging below the support or loan level. Rice is one of the few commodities selling above its price support level at the present time.

In addition to these Commodity Credit Corporation funds, the Secretary has available to him each year funds equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts "to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities, to encourage domestic consumption of such commodities by diverting them from normal channels of trade or increasing their use among persons in low-income groups."

Taking into account carryovers of unused balances, the Secretary now has in excess of $275 million of these funds primarily for surplus removal purchases of perishable products.

Utilizing these funds, the former Secretary of Agriculture in recent months purchased turkeys, eggs, pork products, butter, nonfat dry milk solids, and a number of fruits as a means of relieving temporarily excess market supplies of these products. The products purchased are turned over to the school-lunch program and other public and private charitable organizations. The capacity of these outlets sets a limit on the amount and kinds of products which can be purchased with these section 32 funds.

It is apparent from the above statements that the Secretary of Agriculture has ample authority and funds to undertake price support and surplus removal operations on a much broader scale if he desired to do so.

The time for action is now, and not when the situation gets out of hand. Even in this field, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Another matter deserving of attention is that of fiscal policy. Recent efforts in this field to check the march of inflation are, of course, laudable, but dangers also lurk in the shadows of restricted credit. Business expansion is necessary for any increased demand for agricultural products; therefore, fiscal, monetary, and credit restrictions should not be applied so severely that a contraction in business activity would be the result. To work out this problem will require a close coordination between the Treasury and Agriculture Departments, and the State Department would not err in consulting with Agriculture in formulating future plans affecting foreign trade.

Our national population is increasing about 3 million people annually, while the farm population continues a steady decline. More and more farmlands are being converted to other uses, so the American farmer is faced with producing more and more with less and less. To meet this challenge, the farmer must have his incentive, which is, of course, a profitable return on his investment, both in money and labor. A program of flexible supports would fail to provide this needed incentive; the momentum can come only from a program of fixed supports that insures a fair and reasonable return for his products.

Earlier, I mentioned that farm prices had dropped 12 percent in the past year. During this time marketing costs increased 7 percent, thus offsetting the consumer savings that would normally be expected to follow the drop in prices. New and improved methods of handling and storing perishable commodities are the subject of study and research, and may point the way to the elimination of a great deal of expense to both farmer and consumer. A reasonable increase in the amount of Government participation in this research might be desirable.

Extension of the present price support program for another 3 or 4 years would serve to instill the necessary confidence needed for future production. The agriculture committees are not unmindful of this, and I understand, are already at work on an extension. Speedy action to accomplish this end would have a stabilizing effect on the farm-price situation.

Several bills have been introduced to raise the level of support to 95 percent of parity, and Congress should act immediately to do this.

As agriculture goes, so goes the Nation. Whatever course Congress might choose to follow in its future farm program, it is imperative that it act unhesitatingly before these conditions reach the state of emergency. The American farm produces not only the basic and essential needs of all our people; it also gives America its greatest wealth of pure and unadulterated patriotic strength. There are no Communists on the farms of America, and no people are more devoted to the noble ideals on which our country was founded, and on which it has prospered throughout the ages. To permit the farmer to be reduced to penury is to commit national suicide. The farmers interest is America's interest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD and to include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include an article.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include two editorials.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include an editorial from the February 18 issue of Red Book magazine.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an editorial.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include a resolution regarding the technical cooperation program.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter and in one a prayer by Cardinal Spellman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include additional matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER).

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. BAILEY) and to include an article from the February issue of the Journal of the American Bar Association.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances, in each to include appropriate material.

Mr. EVINS and to include an address.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) in three instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, for February 23 to 26, 1953, on account of official business.

Mr. SHELLEY, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), on account of death in family.

Mr. WAMPLER, for an indefinite period of time, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

481. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

482. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, at the request of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Panama, a message addressed by the National Assembly of Panama to the House of Representatives of the United States on the

occasion of the inauguration of the 34th President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

483. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 160. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 143. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Coral M. Home, widow of John D. Home, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 3287. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3288. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3289. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3290. A bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3291. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3292. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3293. A bill to amend Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress, approved October 24, 1951, as amended, and to adjust the pay of mail handlers, messengers, and watchmen in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3294. A bill to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of dependents, while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3295. A bill to amend section 811 (g) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exclude certain death benefits from decedents' gross estates in computing estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 3296. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3297. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from airmail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3298. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so that internees will not be denied detention and disability benefits thereunder because of being within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3299. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 3300. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 3301. A bill to deny benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to persons convicted of felonies involving improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3302. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3303. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to extend the time for filing claims in the case of certain Italians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 3304. A bill to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3305. A bill relating to the compensation of certain laundry employees at United States naval hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3306. A bill relating to the reservation of mineral rights in land patented under the non-mineral-land laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3307. A bill to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3308. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3309. A bill to allow percentage depletion of 15 percent for novaculite mines and deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3310. A bill to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 3311. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3312. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3313. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3314. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3315. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3316. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 3317. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3318. A bill designating Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military installation and renaming it "Fort McCoy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 3319. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3320. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3321. A bill to provide for a pay increase for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the persecution of Roman Catholics behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. Res. 149. Resolution revising method of payments for folding speeches and pamphlets, Doorkeeper's Department; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 150. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINE:

H. Res. 151. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to investigate and consider the feasibility of amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, or to repeal the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to investigate and consider the feasibility of amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, or to repeal the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Second Guam Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the commendation of Gov. Carlton Skinner by the legislature upon the termination of his service as Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of Jose Cristiano Vieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3323. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Mihalovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3324. A bill for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and Sien-ung Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3325. A bill for the relief of Cheong Chea King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3326. A bill for the relief of Giorgio De Biasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3327. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Olmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 3328. A bill for the relief of Pietro Valentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Rosollino Covello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara W. Faith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3333. A bill for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3334. A bill for the relief of Harry (also known as Herts) Glazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3335. A bill for the relief of Elidia Raslau (Reslau); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 3336. A bill for the relief of Andrea Biundo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3337. A bill for the relief of Oscar Ward Hancock, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3338. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas George Stamatiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3339. A bill for the relief of Ada Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3340. A bill for the relief of Sayoko Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3341. A bill for the relief of Brigitta Manning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3342. A bill for the relief of Mario Ratti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3343. A bill for the relief of Leon D. Cotomatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3344. A bill for the relief of Carmen Salvador and her daughter, Ruby Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3345. A bill for the relief of George Prekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3346. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Kenyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3347. A bill for the relief of Michael Calvin Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3348. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Martha Hoorn (Hawel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Burdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Augustin Popa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Igor Michael Bogolepov (alias Ivan Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolepov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Demetrios Kontos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3355. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmena Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Chu Tow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3357. A bill for the relief of Lorna Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Erna Meyer Grafton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Akimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

64. By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Petition of 330 members of the Bohemian Woman's Civic Club of Chicago relative to amending section 23 of an act defining and relating to narcotic drugs and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, approved July 8, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

65. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, City of Chelsea, Mass., relative to Operation Smack, and expressing shock over the indefensible sacrifice of American lives for a "show" in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, everywhere present but often unreal to us because of our unawareness of Thee, take Thou the dimness of our souls away. Forgive us that our sense of brotherhood commonly fails under the strain of daily life.

We are conscious how easy it is to adore Thee in the sanctuary or as we bow at this wayside shrine of devotion; but to follow Thee in the world, to treat men as brothers, to rise above the prejudices of our embittered days, we fail at that. We pray for ourselves and for the people of this favored land that genuine fraternity may increase among us, that intolerance and the mutual suspicions of class hatred may not shake our democracy. We pray for good will made real in daily intercourse and conversation, for generosity and magnanimity: That as we have undertaken here a government of, by, and for the people we may not lack that practice of brotherhood without which no such government can endure. Guide our Nation to such use of its power as may cause the peoples of the earth to rise up and call us blessed: As was the dream of our Nation's founders, so now, in the day of our opportunity, make it true. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WATKINS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 18, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TAFT was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO MEET THIS AFTERNOON AND TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, four nominations to the United Nations General Assembly have come to the Senate. It appears that the U. N. General Assembly is to meet next Tuesday. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may sit at 2:30 this afternoon, even though the Senate is in session, and I ask unanimous consent that the committee may file its report on such nominations not later than midnight tonight.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy, of the Committee on the Judiciary, was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $501,535, for the legislative branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE TO THE SENATE FROM NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF PANAMA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a message addressed by the National Assembly of Panama to the Senate of the United States on the occasion of the inauguration of President Eisenhower (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE VI OF THE ESPIONAGE ACT OF 1917, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title VI of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board, and Maritime Administrator, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES IN EXCESS OF APPORTIONMENTS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on expenditures made in excess of apportionments, for the fiscal year 1953, by the Federal Housing Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1, 1952, through December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON SURVEY AND REVIEW OF ALASKA RAILROAD

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey and review of the Alaska Railroad, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Government of the District of Columbia, for the year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the directors of that organization, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate and consider the feasibility of amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, or to repeal the same

"Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, being chapter 477 of the acts of the 82d Congress, 2d session, and commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act, is unduly restrictive in its effects upon certain ethnological minorities; and

"Whereas such restriction is inimical to the welfare of our country and contrary to the high concept of the founders of this Nation of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; and

"Whereas the terms of this act are such that they have been denounced by enlightened leaders of the clergy, the press, and those in public life: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend said Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to broaden its scope in order that it might be less exclusive in regard to its quota of certain nationalities, or to repeal said act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this commonwealth."

A resolution of the Legislature of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 1

"Resolution relative to the commendation of Gov. Carlton Skinner by the legislature upon the termination of his service as Governor of Guam

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:*

"Whereas Gov. Carlton Skinner has served as the first civil Governor of the Territory of Guam since its inception on August 1, 1950, to the present date; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner has now submitted his resignation from that office; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner, during the period of his service as Governor, has unselfishly dedicated himself to the interests and the welfare of all of the people of Guam; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner, by his steadfast cooperation with the legislature, has substantially assisted the work of this body; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner has fostered the development in Guam of the highest ideals of democratic government; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner has by his able administration and inspiring leadership inculcated in the people of Guam a deep appreciation of the rights of United States citizenship and an abiding sense of the obligations which it imposes; and

"Whereas Governor Skinner, during his administration, has diligently fostered the national aims and objectives of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the legislature does hereby express its regret that Governor Skinner has resigned his position as Governor of Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature does hereby express to Governor Skinner the sincere and heartfelt gratitude of the people of Guam for his able leadership, his deep and sincere

interest in their problems, and his unremitting efforts in their behalf; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the executive secretary of the Guam Legislature be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Governor Skinner; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the executive secretary be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, and to the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the enactment of legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.)

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsa, Mass., protesting against Operation Smack by the Armed Forces in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to proceeding with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States by authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

"Whereas the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States, consisting of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, is of foremost importance to the future development and general welfare of said States and of the Western United States; and

"Whereas the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact has been amicably settled by and between the above States; and

"Whereas the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, comprising one member each from the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the Federal Government is a functioning body and has already completed a dynamic plan for the development of the project; and

"Whereas a report of the participating projects has been compiled by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, approved, with modifications, by the Secretary of the Interior, and submitted by him to the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas this desirable development cannot be commenced without the authorization of the Congress of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved: February 6.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the compact commission approach to the solution and integration of development of land and water resources of regional watersheds

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming recognize the need for greater coordination and integration of the water-development programs of various State and Federal agencies operating within regional watersheds than at present prevails; and

"Whereas a satisfactory precedent for accomplishing this goal has been established in the upper Colorado River Basin, wherein the four States involved have each one vote and the Federal Government one vote; and

"Whereas a planning and operating commission set up in this manner provides the necessary coordination and integration of the State and Federal agencies and at the same time assures the protection of the rights, laws, customs, powers and sovereignty of the States involved; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and other groups of public-spirited and practical westerners, after exhaustive study, have recommended variations of this solution to the need for greater coordination and integration in regional watershed development: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to diligently and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor such planning and operating commissions in broad outline similar to the upper Colorado River Basin Commission, along the lines recommended by the Council of State Governments for other regional watersheds lying partly in the State of Wyoming, to be set up by compact between the States involved and the Federal Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 11.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation granting to the State of Wyoming all of the land and minerals within the confines of its borders, with the exception of the national parks and national monuments, national forests, and lands for national defense and promotion of aviation and agriculture

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming, recognizing that the United States of America owns over 51 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 73 percent of the minerals on, in, or under the lands of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming have long been aware of the inequitable lack of sovereignty and loss of revenue from the lands and minerals aforesaid; and

"Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 in its preamble states that its purpose is 'to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal'; and

"Whereas the right of coastal States to ownership of tidelands oil has twice been recognized by act of Congress, though thwarted by Presidential veto; and

"Whereas by the Act of Admission of 1890, 'the State of Wyoming is hereby declared admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever,' which is not the case in fact when the Federal Government owns the majority of Wyoming's surface lands and mineral rights; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has attempted to take more of the land and minerals in addition to those already owned by it, and thus deprive the State of Wyoming and its citizens further from the benefits of such lands and minerals: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be, and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to grant to the State of Wyoming and its citizens title to all of the lands and minerals presently owned by the Government of the United States of America within the borders of the State of Wyoming, with the exception of national parks and national monuments, national forests and lands for national defense, and promotion of aviation and agriculture; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 11.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authorities, however disguised, set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration of the authority

"Whereas any such authority would supersede and nullify existing State laws under which water users have acquired water rights and by which these rights have been protected and administered; and

"Whereas existing water rights established under Wyoming State law would be subject to condemnation proceedings under provisions of acts creating such an authority; and

"Whereas the citizens of Wyoming would have no voice in the selection of the directors of the authority, who would have unlimited control over the development of their land and water resources; and

"Whereas under an authority the only voice permitted the people of the State of Wyoming and their local and State officials would be of an advisory nature; and

"Whereas such authority legislation would place exclusive jurisdiction over water litigation involving the authority in the Federal courts; and

"Whereas such an authority would tend to create a Federal power monopoly; and

"Whereas such authority legislation would to a large extent reduce the States to mere geographical entities, replacing the present powers of local and State governments with a superstate in which the final control is vested in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such authority legislation would add nothing to the program of development of land and water resources which is not already available through existing State and Federal agencies, except better coordination, which could be accomplished through more democratic means: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to consider against any proposed legislation or Executive order setting up any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authority, however disguised, the strong, unequivocal, and unalterable opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any such proposition and their determination to resist by every device at their command any such usurpation of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of their local and State governments; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"P. W. BARTLING,
"President of the Senate.
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 11.
"C. J. 'DOC' ROGERS,
"Acting Governor."

OPENING DATE OF HUNTING SEASON FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow an earlier opening date for the hunting season with respect to migratory waterfowl, and to provide compensation for damage to crops caused by migratory waterfowl.

I am preparing a bill, which I shall shortly introduce, to compensate farmers whose crops have been ruined year after year by the millions of ducks which have fed thereon.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 4

Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow an earlier opening date of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl, and to provide compensation for damage to crops caused by migratory waterfowl

Whereas the farmers of the State of North Dakota have suffered substantial damage through the loss and destruction of grain by ducks while such grain is lying in a swath or shock; and

Whereas hunting season on ducks does not open until the month of October, which prevents hunters and farmers from minimizing this annual damage through their hunting activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be requested to allow the opening of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl not later than September 15 of each year; and that the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service consider the feasibility of compensating farmers for crop damage directly attributable to migratory waterfowl; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.

FUNDS FOR OPERATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS—RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the annual midwinter conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, at Fargo, N. Dak., relative to sufficient funds for the operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are located at Fargo and Minot, N. Dak., two of the finest Veterans' Administration hospitals to be found anywhere in the United States; and

Whereas these hospitals are now operating at a greatly reduced capacity due to the shortage of Federal funds needed to properly maintain them; and

Whereas this lack of Federal funds has caused the closing of 250 beds of the 400-bed Fargo hospital and 73 beds of the 162-bed Minot hospital; and

Whereas on December 31, 1952, there were 9,735 North Dakota veterans entitled to service connection for their disabilities or drawing pensions and over 9,000 claims filed but on which benefits have not yet been granted; and

Whereas these more than 9,000 claims can only be properly adjudicated under the law after physical examination and hospitalization, if required; and

Whereas the burden of proof of a claim rests on the individual disabled veteran and not on the Federal Government; and

Whereas under existing conditions it is impossible for North Dakota veterans to receive the care and treatment they are legally entitled to receive; and

Whereas the ever increasing number of North Dakota veterans returning from the Korean conflict is making still greater demands on these two institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual midwinter conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., January 19 and 20, 1953, That North Dakota's American Legion, having been responsible for the establishment of the State's two VA hospitals for the care of North Dakota's disabled veterans and realizing that adequate care for those veterans is not now being provided, requests North Dakota's congressional delegation to make certain that Congress immediately provides sufficient funds for the proper staffing and operation of our Veterans' Administration hospitals and that central office of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D. C., makes such funds available to the North Dakota hospitals once they are appropriated.

SUPPORT PRICE FOR OATS—LETTER FROM MULLIN & DILLON CO., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Mullin & Dillon Co., of Minneapolis, signed by W. E. Mullin, president, relating to a support price for oats and the importation of oats from Canada.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULLIN & DILLON CO.,
Minneapolis, February 3, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Knowing your interest in the welfare of the American farmer, and in particular the producer here in the Middle West, we wish to bring to your attention that for the year just closed, 1952, Canada shipped into this country over 63 million bushels of oats.

Almost all of the time during the period mentioned above, oats grown for sale by the American farmer were bringing prices far below parity or Government loan levels. Right now feed grains produced by the American farmer are not only in abundant supply, but the surplus is of such size as to cause considerable concern and alarm among people, like ourselves, who are engaged in the marketing and distribution of American grain.

The principal market for grain produced here in the Middle West has been in the densely populated eastern section of the United States, and because of the present ridiculous situation the American farmer is losing his market on that important cash crop to the Canadians. In view of the continued weakness of our grain markets with steadily declining prices and the questionable stability of our whole farm economy, it presently is more ludicrous than ever for us to continue a policy which is a great factor in lowering prices to the American farmer, while we are at the same time spending billions of dollars of the American taxpayer in order to support farm prices of the domestic producer.

We hope that your interest in the welfare of the American farmer, and particularly those of the Midwest, will prompt you to exert your influence for a reexamination of this whole policy and that you will do what you can to correct this very bad situation.

Respectfully,

MULLIN & DILLON CO.,
W. E. MULLIN, *President.*

P. S.—Now that we have a change in administration we are encouraged to hope that the above situation will be promptly corrected.

MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM—RESOLUTION OF THE EXCHANGE CLUB, MINOT, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Exchange Club, of Minot, N. Dak., relating to the mental health problem.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Exchange Club of Minot, N. Dak., whose efforts are pledged in service to the community, State, and Nation, do favor and advocate as one of the outstanding obligations of State and Nation to society, and particularly to those unfortunate members thereof who are afflicted with ailments commonly referred to as mental, in part or whole, and who require the attention and care of those trained in the science and practice of psychiatry, and frequently also the care and attention of those skilled and trained in the science of medicine, including the aged and senile, alcoholics, and others than those of the types consisting of the incurable and criminal insane, and who have heretofore for lack of another place or institution for their care, confinement, and treatment have heretofore been committed by our public officials to the asylum for the insane, to acquire at the expense of the public, equip and supply a suitable hospital and institution in which they may be cared for and treated in proper manner, separate and apart from the dangerous and criminal insane persons, and by persons qualified and trained to render such care and treatment. And, we do recommend to our public officials, that if necessary so to do in order to meet and pay the expense involved herein, that we forgo the use and expenditure, and appropriation of our public moneys and funds for the many purposes and uses of a less essential and necessary nature demanded, appropriated, and expended; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the North Dakota Members of our Congress, the members of the State legislature from this district, and to the Governor of North Dakota.

Moved and carried at a meeting of members on February 4, 1953.

W. VERNON FAHY,
Acting President.

Attest:

ERVEN H. WEBER,
Secretary.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, RACINE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the 8th day of February, American citizens of Lithuanian extraction in my State, like their friends throughout the Nation, were celebrating the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian people.

I feel that it is most important that we of this Nation pause to honor the fine Lithuanian people whose devotion to liberty has become almost legendary, and who, in spite of the awful oppression which now prevails, we are confident shall yet regain their birthright.

I present a resolution which was forwarded to me from George Kapocius, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Racine.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY VOTED BY AMERICAN CITIZENS OF LITHUANIAN DESCENT OF THE CITY OF RACINE AND THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE LITHUANIAN PEOPLE, HELD IN RACINE, WIS., AT THE BOHEMIAN TURNER HALL, ON THE 8TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1953

Whereas the United States through traditional American principles of justice, morality and equal rights to all human beings in the world having achieved leadership in the political, military, and economic world affairs; and

Whereas the people of all the world are putting their hopes and the destinies of their futures in the United States crusade against Communist aggression; and

Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail behind the Iron Curtain including Lithuania, should be of great concern to the United States as no stable peace and security in the world is possible when 800 millions of people are suffering communistic terror and oppression; and

Whereas the positive action on the part of the United States has not served in many cases to stop the terrible acts of cruelty of the Kremlin rulers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, American citizens of Lithuanian descent, being deeply concerned about the security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native country, Lithuania, now under Soviet occupation, appeal to the Government of the United States to incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet occupied countries as integral and inseparable parts of the program of the United States foreign policy; and to reject any appeasement proposals by Soviet Russia elsewhere in the world unless the countries behind the Iron Curtain are given an opportunity to choose freely their own form of government under which they wish to live; and to put in effect all possible aid to the liberation movements in the Iron Curtain countries and to enlist their cooperation in the free world's efforts to fight imperialistic communism; and to ratify the Genocide Convention and to implement the ratification by a decisive action of the United States Government within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia reponsible for the crimes committed in Lithuania and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; and be it finally

Resolved, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government of the United States of America in its efforts to combat the communistic forces of aggression and achieve an international peace founded on the principles of freedom and justice.

GEORGE KAPOCIUS,
Chairman, Lithuanian American Council, Racine, Wis.

STANLEY BUDRYS,
Secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Racine, Wis.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1026. A bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1027. A bill to permit deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1028. A bill for the relief of Spiros Lekatsas;

S. 1029. A bill for the relief of Andreas Grigoratos; and

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Haig, Zabelle, Louise, and John Gulbenkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I particularly wish to call attention to one of the bills, which provides for the relief of certain members of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart. It refers to 12 Catholic Sisters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1031. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fuentes, Sr.; and

S. 1032. A bill for the relief of certain members of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, by request of the officials of the Klamath Indian Tribe of the State of Oregon, I introduce five bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CORDON (by request):

S. 1033. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1034. A bill to provide for a final settlement of individual shares in the tribal estate and assets of the Klamath Indians through voluntary withdrawal from membership in the Klamath Tribe;

S. 1035. A bill to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds; and

S. 1036. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1037. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Silva Galjevcek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1040. A bill to validate certain conveyances made by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, the Southern Pacific Co., involving certain portions of right-of-way in the State of California acquired from the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1041. A bill to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard; and

S. 1042. A bill to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1043. A bill to abolish the National Memorial Stadium Commission; and

S. 1044. A bill to abolish the General Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1046. A bill to amend the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, so as to provide increased benefits for Federal employees suffering from incurable disease; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1047. A bill for the relief of Frieda Diehl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1048. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1049. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1051. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1052. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health-service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of Marie T. Gonsalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 1054. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947 RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES IN NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies. I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

The bill (S. 1026) to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it seems to me that the primary purpose in any statutory provision aimed to meet the problems inherent in labor-management disputes, which imperil the national health and safety, is twofold. Of first importance is the settlement of the dispute and the reaching of an agreement which is satisfactory to all the parties to the dispute. Of next and almost equal importance is the prevention of a work stoppage attributable to such dispute—or at least the limiting of any work stoppage to such a point that it will not prove damaging to the national health and safety.

As is generally known, the Taft-Hartley Act provisions which deal with this type of emergency, although providing for a cooling-off period and a fact-finding board and other procedures calculated to bring about a settlement of the controversy, nevertheless stress the use of the injunction as the principal means by which to meet the problem. By this method of approach the most salutary media for reaching settlements in labor-management disputes have been given secondary consideration. Moreover, the definition of national emergency, or the process by which such a national emergency is determined, has not been written or expressed in the act, save by indirection.

I have never been convinced that the injunction, as the permanent, principal device in the process of resolving labor-management controversies, is either sound or appropriate. The fact that it has been used and that finally a dispute may have been resolved cannot alone justify it. The fact remains that its exercise may have prevented an earlier settlement of the dispute in question and may have kept alive animosities and ill-feelings which otherwise might have been dissipated.

It has seemed to me that there is another course which can be taken effectively to meet these national-emergency, labor-management controversies. This course would avoid the injunction, as well as seizure or compulsory arbitration—except by specific congressional authorization in each particular instance—and would provide a technique by which it should be possible more happily to resolve this type of controversy. By this course it is utterly improbable that any labor-management dispute would be declared to be of national status, which would not, in fact, be national. Neither would there be opportunity for a work stoppage or a lockout of sufficient duration to endanger the health and safety of the Nation.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill I have introduced.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out sections 206 to 210, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"SEC. 207. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) An emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended) are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such a time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred

to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organizations of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"SEC. 208. (a) At any time after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 206, the President may submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case together with such recommendation as he may see fit to make.

"(b) In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 206, the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House, for the purpose of consideration of and appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"SEC. 209. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the bill is self-explanatory. By its terms, the President shall proclaim a "national emergency" when any industry is threatened seriously with a work stoppage which would endanger the national health and safety. And whenever a work stoppage occurs after such emergency will have been proclaimed, the President is mandated immediately to bring the matter to the attention of the Congress, if in session, or if the Congress shall not happen to be in session at that time, to convene it immediately for this purpose.

Now this kind of procedure should be productive of effective and desirable results. I list a number of them as follows:

In the first place, the President would be apt to be very careful not to proclaim a national emergency of this character unless he were reasonably certain that the emergency was truly national in scope.

In the next place, labor organizations would be likely to hesitate considerably before occasioning a work stoppage in industries involved in such an emergency when they considered that such work stoppage would bring the whole matter immediately before the Congress for action.

In the third place, the Congress should not be taken by surprise when a crisis of this nature might arise and it should be in a position to pass ad hoc legislation geared appropriately to meet such an immediate situation.

In the fourth place, the free-play of mediation, conciliation, conference, and persuasion would be given the greatest possible latitude with the least possible restriction.

Finally, in the fifth place, the opportunity for reaching a peaceful settlement of the labor-management dispute should be at a maximum and interference with such settlement should be at a minimum and there should be a far greater chance that a settlement reached under these conditions would be durable.

Although this proposal contains no certain guaranty by which to prevent a work stoppage, it almost surely would prevent undue interference by Government, either in the activities of labor organizations and workers, through the injunction, or in the operation of industry, through seizure, or in the fields of both labor and management, through compulsory arbitration. It should be productive of a better feeling between management and labor than can be realized by any scheme which would force labor to work against its will or would require that industry be operated by Government edict and direction or would resolve a labor-management controversy by Government decree—regardless of the attitude of the parties to the controversy.

This proposal offers a means by which, insofar as possible, to prevent national emergency disputes without granting to the Chief Executive a dangerous amount of authority and without burdening the Congress with an excessive obligation. I believe it offers a better procedure for the prevention and cure of this kind of national emergency than does any other plan thus far proposed.

It offers a powerful incentive to management and labor alike to reconcile differences between themselves by the use of the so-called voluntary processes and without legal compulsion.

It should provide all of the benefits to be derived from the sections dealing with National Emergencies in the Taft-Hartley Act without retaining the undesirable features of those sections.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator remember the Boston police strike of many years ago?

Mr. IVES. Indeed, I do.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator remember Calvin Coolidge's famous statement in that connection, to the effect that there is no right to strike against the public safety, health, or convenience at any time?

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. I agree. Would to God we had the guts to put that principle into law.

Mr. IVES. I think it is already in the law, so far as Government employees are concerned.

PROPOSED DEDUCTION FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES OF CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED BY WORKING MOTHERS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit a working mother to deduct from her gross income, in computing her Federal income tax, the amount of money she spends for the care of her children while she is at work. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 2 minutes on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed as requested.

The bill (S. 1027) to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is estimated that there are 9 million working mothers in America today, most of whom pay income taxes. Most all of them maintain homes for their husbands and millions of them have young dependent children.

It has long been the law for business to take a deduction on its income tax for every ordinary and necessary expense arising in the production of its income. It occurs to me that this same principle should apply to the individual wage earner as well as business. It seems consistent that under this principle the working mothers should be allowed to deduct the cost of domestic help ordinary and necessary in the production of their income.

The deduction would apply only with respect to children who are living with the mother and who are under 16 years of age. In addition, the deduction would apply only to those child-care expenses which are ordinary and reasonable under the circumstances, and so much of the expenses for any one week as exceeded $40 could not be deducted. The deduction would be available only to those working mothers whose adjusted gross income for the taxable year in question does not exceed $6,000, plus $500 for each child for whom she is entitled to deduct care expenses under the bill.

The bill, if enacted by the Congress, would apply to returns filed by working mothers for the calendar year 1953 and for all subsequent taxable years.

Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama, has introduced a similar bill in the House. I hope this provision may be accepted by the House as a part of the pending tax bill recently reported by the House Ways and Means Committee. If it is not accepted, then I shall plan to offer it as an amendment when the tax bill comes to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill, which is very brief, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(gg) Expense incurred by women for care of children:

"(1) General rule: In the case of a woman who is gainfully employed outside her home and who has one or more children under 16 years of age living at home, the ordinary and reasonable expenses (to the extent allowed by paragraph (2) of this subsection) paid or incurred to provide care for such child or children while such woman is at work.

"(2) Limitations: The amount deductible under this subsection shall not exceed $40 of such expenses paid or incurred in any week. In no event shall a deduction be

allowed under this subsection to any taxpayer whose adjusted gross income exceeds the sum of $6,000 plus $500 for each child with respect to whose care expenses are deductible under this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 24 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to items not deductible in computing net income) is amended by striking out paragraph (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) Personal, living, or family expenses, except extraordinary medical expenses deductible under section 23 (x) and expenses for care of children deductible under section 23 (gg);".

SEC. 3. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1952.

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1049) to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to make a brief statement regarding the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in line with the historic trend to broaden the opportunities for the people to take part in the nomination and election of presidential and congressional candidates, I am today introducing another bill to encourage the holding of presidential preference primaries in the States.

I am very glad to be able to introduce the bill in behalf of myself and 17 other Senators, namely, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

I wish to say that the basic idea of this proposal was earlier presented in Senate bill 2570, which Representative CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida, and I introduced in the 82d Congress. With various modifying and perfecting amendments, that bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration (Rept. No. 1858) on June 26, 1952.

There was insufficient time for action on it, however, in the closing days of the session.

Now, with Representative BENNETT, of Florida, again taking a leading part in drafting the revisions, we have improved the form of the proposal, and he has introduced the companion measure in the House as House bill 96.

This bill seeks, by offering to the States help in meeting the costs of primaries, to encourage action on their part to establish such preferential primaries. In addition to preserving the main improvements made by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, this bill also gives a more binding effect to the popular will, as expressed in such primaries, and thus lets the people take part more directly and effectively in the nominating procedures in the States that adopt such laws.

In the bill submitted in this Congress, the authority to administer its provisions would be lodged in a new, bipartisan Presidential Primaries Commission. The requirements for certification of candidates' names are clearly set forth, and minimum requirements have been set high enough to discourage frivolous candidacies. The rights of proposed candidates to refuse to run are explicitly set forth. Conditional grants to the qualifying States are set up to meet the costs of such primaries, as an incentive to the States to participate. The results of such primaries are required to be binding on district delegates and delegates-at-large on the first convention ballot and thereafter, as long as the candidate receives 10 percent of the total votes cast on a preceding ballot, or until released by the candidate.

I would personally prefer the more comprehensive, national plan for such Presidential primaries, as proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in his constitutional amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 145, 82d Congress, and I am glad he has reintroduced it as a part of his new amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 8. However, for a variety of reasons, the final adoption of such an amendment may be long delayed; and therefor this bill seems to me to offer the best possible alternative for extending presidential primaries in the States that are willing to act before 1956. I believe all of us would agree that the increased popular interest in the 1952 national election and in the conventions which preceded it is a healthy thing for the country, and that such increased interest should be encouraged in the future.

I join the cosponsors of this bill in hoping that it may have early and full consideration by Congress. We must enact this legislation very quickly in order to provide ample time before the conventions and election of 1956, to permit the States to join more extensively in this move to bring all our electoral processes closer to the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a radio broadcast by me on the subject.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The deliberations of the United States Congress are democracy in action. The laws which we pass, or fail to pass, often disappoint many Americans, including Members of Congress. Nevertheless, that body consists of persons who have been duly elected by the people of the various districts and States of the Nation, and the policies which we follow come pretty close to those which most Americans believe in.

Congress, however, has one fault which is especially pronounced, and that is lack of foresight. We tend to concern ourselves with so many pressing matters that we fail to look even a few years into the future. For example, 3 years from now, one of the big topics of discussion will be how the politicians, rather than the voters, will probably nominate the next President of the United States. We shall hear a general clicking of tongues and concerned comments about why something hasn't been done to let the people select the presidential candidate rather than merely elect one of two persons chosen for us by the politicians in the national conventions.

Last year, we were fortunate in having our choice between two able and qualified men. But this has not always been the case, and we have absolutely no assurance that this will always happen in the future. For example, the politicians nominated Warren G. Harding as the Republican candidate in 1920. The Democrats nominated Alton B. Parker in 1904. If we want the people to choose the next President of the United States, we must enact legislation now. For if we wait until the presidential campaign is upon us, it will then be too late.

Last year I introduced in the Senate a bill to extend presidential preference primaries to a larger number of States. In working out this legislation, I cooperated with Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, who introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives. Although the Senate Rules Committee reported the bill out favorably, Congress did not ack quickly enough and thus we accomplished nothing.

This year I am introducing a similar bill which would give the people a greater voice in nominating the President. It would encourage States to hold presidential-preference primaries by helping to defray the expenses of those primaries. Moreover, these primaries would be better than a mere poll (such as those taken by Dr. Gallup) which merely indicates the voters' preferences, for the results of the primary would be binding on the delegates which the States send to the national party conventions. Candidates for delegates to the national convention would be pledged to a particular candidate,

and it would be on that basis that the primary voters would choose between them. The winning delegates would be required to cast their convention votes for the candidate to whom they were pledged as long as that candidate received at least 10 percent of the total convention vote or until the candidates released the delegates from their pledge. This, I may say, is the provision which now exists in the case of the selection of delegates in the States of Wisconsin and Oregon.

Illinois now has a presidential primary, but it is largely meaningless since convention delegates do not have to support the winners and in practice have not done so. If our bill becomes law, then Illinois could agree to its terms, have its primary-election expenses shared by the Federal Government, and the delegates thus elected would be bound to vote for the candidate to whom they were pledged. In this way, the voters would have a direct voice in the selection of presidential nominees, not merely in their election. Yet, States rights are not interfered with, however, and no State is required to join the plan unless it so chooses.

I am hopeful that we can move quickly enough this time so that the next conventions will reflect the will of the people more conclusively. We must not continue to trust to blind luck. If our good fortune produced two good candidates last year, how can we tell what will happen in 1956, 1960, or farther into the future. In such grave periods of domestic and international stress, we cannot continue to leave the fate of the Nation in the hands of a few professional politicians. For our own safety and welfare, we must, as voters, nominate our presidential candidates ourselves.

JOSEPHINE MARIA RISS FANG

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang.

The bill would grant permanent residence to Josephine Maria Riss Fang.

Mrs. Fang entered the United States as an exchange student in September 1950. She is now a student at Catholic University of America, from which she expects to receive a degree in library science in June of 1953.

Mrs. Fang is the daughter of an Austrian Supreme Court Justice who was removed from office by the Nazis. She is a graduate of the university of Graz, where she majored in English philology.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1050) for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1938

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended.

The bill would exempt from Federal regulation purely intrastate distribution of natural gas.

It would recognize such distribution to be of local concern and properly subject to regulation by the several States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1051) to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans. It is the same as Senate bill 1875, of the 82d Congress.

I have prepared a statement regarding the bill. I shall not read it at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that the statement together with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

On December 18 the first report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation was released to the public. That Commission was given the responsibility by the President of ascertaining the "degree to which existing and planned medical facilities, such as hospitals and clinics meet present and prospective needs for facilities." The results of the inquiry are monumental. It is my hope that they will provide a basis for constructive legislative action by the Congress.

Members of the Senate are aware that since the 81st Congress, I have introduced legislation designed to promote the success of voluntary efforts by the American people to solve their ever-pressing and inescapable problems of health economics. The constant fear which faces many Americans is how to pay the doctor bills. Countless Americans also face the problem in their communities, particularly in rural America, of how to find a doctor even if the facilities for paying the bills are available.

"The maintenance of health," states the report of the President's Commission, "must now be added to food, shelter, and clothing as one of the necessities of life." The report goes on to say that the Federal Government has a responsibility with respect to helping the American people to meet their health needs, since the good health of our people is a national resource.

Voluntary association is the foundation of a democratic society. We are a nation of joiners. Our citizens belong to churches, Rotary Clubs, women's organizations, trade unions, junior chambers of commerce, Knights of Columbus, sewing circles—indeed, to many thousands of religious, fraternal, political, and social organizations. This is what creates the democratic spirit in our country. The process of voluntary association is the essence of freedom. A good government is one which stimulates that kind of association.

If freedom and democracy survive the crisis of today, it will, in my judgment, be due primarily to the vigor of the people directing their own efforts through voluntary organizations for the solution of their pressing day-to-day problems. The partnership of government with people acting through voluntary associations is the inspiration of practical democracy.

We can apply this principle as we seek to solve the health needs of the American people. We all recognize that our country's health needs are great and that our facilities are inadequate to meet those needs. This is particularly so today as we draw into the Armed Forces an increasing number of doctors and nurses.

All over America, therefore, in recent years there has developed the institution of prepaid health service and the group practice of medicine. The President's Commission calls this "a characteristically American response. * * * It is apparent that when group medicine is practiced in accordance with the highest standards, it provides excellent medical care at the lowest cost to the patient and the community." The severe shortage of physicians today, the report goes on to say, "makes group practice even more desirable. * * * If general physicians comprise the core of the group and if prepayment is used, it offers a means of continuous and complete care for the patient."

All over the Nation there are groups of American citizens who have found by experience that they can accomplish in groups of families what they cannot accomplish individually if they pool their potential need for medical care and agree to prepay the cost of that care through a community fund. This principle of mutual aid is a simple principle but it is fundamental to democratic institutions and explains to a large extent the progress which man has made through the centuries.

My own State has been the home of many such prepaid medical services, operated on a group basis and on a cooperative basis. I have, in recent years, discussed the question of medical care with many of my fellow citizens. They tell me that there are two prerequisites for an effective and well-operated voluntary health program. First is the need to establish a modern medical office and laboratory which will induce physicians to locate in the community where the citizens need and desire medical service. Second is the necessity to obtain a community pool of funds, derived from prepayments which will insure adequate income for the physicians in bad times, as well as in good times.

Modern medicine is today complicated. It demands good facilities for the doctor's workshop. When such facilities are not available, it is difficult to induce good physicians to come to a community and practice medicine. In a number of smaller communities and in a number of large ones, adequate medical facilities are simply not available; neither are minimum hospital facilities available to care for minor medical and surgical cases. One of the findings of the President's Commission would support this conclusion when it says that "rural areas have fewer hospital beds in relation to population than do urban areas."

If we are earnest in our desire to help the American people meet their health needs, it is essential that we foster the growth of voluntary health plans. I heartily endorse the recommendation of the Commission that "Federal loans be made to local organizations desiring to institute prepayment plans associated with group practice, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of group practice facilities." That is the object of the legislation I have introduced since the 81st Congress and which I introduce again today. I welcome the support of the Commission for my bill.

My bill provides that if a group of people in a community where health facilities are inadequate will get together and form a voluntary health plan organization and be prepared to assume the financial responsibility for working out their own problem, then they may apply for low interest, repayable loans from the Federal Security Agency to enable them to finance the physician's facilities which their community requires.

This is the essence of my bill and is the essence of voluntary association. Its basic aim is to encourage groups of people to take direct responsibility for the solution of their health care problems. The plan which these people develop must, of course, be sound and gain the approval of the Surgeon General.

The successful operation of this bill would attract doctors to areas where they are needed and would make it easier for the American people to pay their medical bills. It would bring health facilities to American people just as the principles of cooperative voluntary association brought electricity to rural America.

It is my hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on this bill during the current session. We need to act now.

The bill (S. 1052) to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Health Services Facilities Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to encourage the people of the United States to undertake solution of their common problems insofar as possible through voluntary cooperative action at the local community level. The Congress finds that one such common problem is that of developing means and methods whereby the people can create for themselves and their communities such diagnostic and treatment centers as will help make available to them the benefits of modern medical science and group practice on a prepaid budgetable basis and to enable physicians to make the best utilization of their services in maintaining the health of the community, and that the accomplishment of these objectives is of particular importance during the present national defense emergency.

The Congress further finds that in many areas of the country and among many groups of people there have been or might readily be formed nonprofit associations for the purpose of enabling the membership of such associations to adequately compensate professional medical personnel and to prepay in an orderly manner the cost of efficiently organized, modern medical care. It is recognized, however, that in many instances, particularly in rural areas, these groups of people, while financially able to maintain such nonprofit medical service plans, do not have access to resources sufficient to provide the capital funds needed for the construction or acquisition of the physical facilities and equipment. Proper facilities and adequate equipment are essential to the economic operation of such programs, to the rendering of effective care, and to the recruitment of a sufficient number of doctors and related personnel. It is therefore declared to be the purpose of this act to provide long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to such groups of people who demonstrate their readiness and ability to join together in and to maintain such voluntary associations and thus to advance the policy of Congress set forth in this act.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of $5 million and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the sum of $5 million and for each of the next 3 succeeding fiscal years the sum of $10 million.

SEC. 4. Loans for part or all of the cost of acquisition, construction, and equipping of health-service facilities incident to the operation of a health-service program may be made to nonprofit associations which submit to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service satisfactory evidence—

(a) of local interest in and financial support for the successful operation of its prepaid health-service program;

(b) of an organizational structure which vests control over the practice of medicine and dentistry in connection with the health-service program solely in duly licensed members of the professions involved;

(c) of an organizational structure which vests control over the general administration of the plan's operations in the beneficiary members of said plan or, in the case of plans still in the initial stage, which provides for such vesting of control in the hands of beneficiary members within a reasonable period of time;

(d) that its methods of compensation will be on a basis mutually satisfactory to participating physicians and to the governing board of the plan;

(e) that participation in the plan by beneficiary members and by physicians shall be voluntary;

(f) that in cases of emergency the plan will agree to render services to any resident of the community whether or not they are members of the plan, and further that the facilities and services shall likewise be available to nonmember residents and nonparticipating physicians of the area served by the plan at such other times as will not interfere with the proper rendition of services to members of the program: *And provided further*, That the plan shall be entitled to require compensation on a fair and reasonable basis for all such utilization of its facilities or services by any such nonmembers and nonparticipating physicians.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Health Services Facilities Council, shall formulate standards for the making of loans to eligible nonprofit health service plans. Such standards shall provide equitably for—

(a) determination by the Surgeon General that the applicant is an association which accords with the requirements of section 4 of this act;

(b) the making of loans in sufficient amount to cover the total cost of facilities and equipment if desired by the applicant;

(c) an amortization period of not less than 25 years with provision for earlier repayment by the borrower at his option;

(d) an interest rate of not to exceed 2 percent per annum on unpaid balances;

(e) determination of priorities for the making of loans to eligible applicants in accordance with a formula to be developed by the Surgeon General with the advice and consent of the Health Services Facilities Council, which formula shall include, among other factors, the degree to which the plan provides for comprehensive medical care and group-practice bases including preventive as well as curative treatment, sound method of repayment, relative need, extent of local interest and participation in applicant's program, and the relation of the projected facility to an over-all development of health services in the general area of its location.

SEC. 6. At the request of groups operating health service plans or at the request of responsible groups contemplating the organization of such a plan, the Surgeon General may provide technical assistance in making needed surveys and in advising on organizational methods and operating procedures. The Surgeon General may expend for such assistance, not to exceed 10 percent annually, of the appropriation made under this act for surveys, technical assistance to nonprofit plans, and for the Federal administration of this act.

SEC. 7. The Surgeon General shall carry out his functions as provided herein under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator. He shall, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. In carrying out his functions, the Surgeon General is authorized pursuant to agreement between the Federal Security Administrator and the head of any Federal agency to utilize the services and facilities of such agency and to pay therefor either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement.

SEC. 8. The Surgeon General shall make periodic, comparative analyses of the operations of health service plans and shall transmit reports thereon to such plans and to interested organizations, and shall furnish to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report of the administration of this act.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this act—

(a) the term "health services" means services such as are provided by physicians and dentists and similar professional groups, members of which are licensed under State laws, laboratory and X-ray services, and other services related thereto.

(b) the term "States" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. The effective date of this act shall be the date of its enactment.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES COUNCIL

SEC. 11. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, shall establish a National Health Services Facilities Council to consist of one representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and one representative of the Department of Labor to be designated by the Secretary of Labor, and, in addition, 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator. The 12 appointed members shall be leaders in the field of medical economics, medical administration, or public affairs, and 3 of such 12 shall be representative of operating nonprofit prepaid medical service plans, 3 shall be representative of bona fide national farm organizations, 3 shall be representative of bona fide national labor organizations, and 3 shall be members of the medical, dental, and nursing professions. Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term and except that, of the members first appointed, 3 shall hold office for a term of 3 years, 3 shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and 3 shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

SEC. 12. The National Health Services Facilities Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters relating to the operation of this program. The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the operation of this program for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

SEC. 13. Members of the National Health Services Facilities Council and members of other national advisory councils established under this act, other than ex officio members, while attending conferences or meetings of their respective councils or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling

and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their place of residence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, finally, let me note that the bill complies with the recommendations of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation. The bill is similar to one introduced by me in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

I submit that this proposal, if promptly acted upon, will do a great deal to assist the prepaid voluntary health associations in America that are providing for so many of the Nation's health needs. The groups thus created will be self-liquidating, and will not require any gifts or gratuities from the Federal Government. On the contrary, the bill provides for long-term loans, so that localities, local instruments of government, private groups, and voluntary associations can do what has been done under the Rural Electrification Administration, namely, set up their own facilities to render services to their own people.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO INCREASED DISABILITY BENEFITS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from West Virgina [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a bill to bring disability benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act up to date.

Since 1948 there has been no increase in disability compensation benefits for working people covered by this act.

Present benefits range from a minimum of $12 to a maximum of $35 a week. Existing law provides that no benefits are to be paid for the first 7 days of disability but that if the disability continues for 49 days, benefits are allowable from the day of injury.

The proposed bill would amend the present law in four respects:

First. Increase minimum weekly benefits to $20.

Second. Increase maximum weekly benefits to $50.

Third. Reduce the qualifying period to 3 days.

Fourth. Reduce the period for obtaining full compensation from the date of injury to 14 days.

In recognition of increases in the cost of living, Congress has liberalized benefits under the Social Security Act and raised the minimum wage.

The bill appears to me to be in line with congressional policy. I urge its early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1054) to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 3 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however*, That in case the injury results in disability of more than 14 days, the compensation shall be allowed from the date of disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $20 per week: *Provided, however*, That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $20 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "STATE AND MUNICIPAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION" (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a study entitled "State and Municipal Fair Employment Legislation" prepared under the National Security Resources Board for the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, of which I was chairman, of the 82d Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him before the annual meeting of the American Road Builders Association, at Boston, Mass., on Monday, February 9, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him, together with article by George Sokolsky.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in New York City on February 14, 1953.

Copy of letter addressed to President Eisenhower by a group of citizens, proposing a program of action with respect to recent manifestations of Soviet anti-Semitism.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Essay on the value of electricity to our farmers written by Miss Jolene Yates, of Omaha, Va.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

New regulations adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the conduct of present and former members of the Commission, together with a brief statement by himself.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial entitled "Eisenhower and Quay County Farmer," published in the Tucumcari American-Leader, February 12, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "Moral Rearmament Answer to War Lords," written by Gould Lincoln in his syndicated column "The Political Mill," and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Noble Words Don't Erase British Inconsistencies," published in the Miami Herald of February 8, 1953.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement on the struggle for Armenian independence.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

Article entitled "History of European Soil Conservation," published in the September 1952 issue of the Mid-West Dealer News.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Congress To Launch Probe in Interests of Consumer," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune on February 16, 1953.

By Mr. BEALL:

Article entitled "Modernization of Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Is Proposed," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of February 16, 1953.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 24, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, on S. 15, the omnibus judgeship bill; S. 688, dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court thereon; S. 732, to create an additional district judgeship for the eastern district of Texas, and to make permanent the district judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by the act of August 3, 1949; and S. 928, to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Jersey. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, next Sunday afternoon I shall attend

memorial services in St. George's Episcopal Church in Fredericksburg, Va., which was the church of George Washington's mother and the church which Washington attended when he was in Fredericksburg.

In paying tribute on the 22d of February to the memory of the Father of our Country it may be well for us to recall that the Founding Fathers who drafted in Philadelphia in 1787 a Constitution which crystallized their belief in a capitalistic nation and a system of free competitive enterprise united to select as the head of the new Government an outstanding businessman.

If we properly appraise the land which Washington owned at the time he was elected President, including thousands of rich acres on the Monongahela River in what is now Washington County, Pa., he was the richest man in the country and also one of the best businessmen.

Before the development of railways, transportation in the new Nation was limited to wagons traveling roads at times virtually impassable and to the commerce on our rivers and canals. Appreciating the importance of transportation for the promotion of internal prosperity Washington advocated a canal system to connect Chesapeake Bay with the Ohio River and in a letter on this subject to Gov. Benjamin Harrison of Virginia, he said:

It is necessary to apply the cement of interest to bind all parts of the Union together with indissoluble bonds. The western settlers have no means of coming to us except by long land transportations and unimproved roads. But smooth the road and make easy the way for them and see how amazingly our exports will be increased and how amply we shall be compensated for the trouble and expense of effecting it.

"Smooth the road and make easy the way for them and see how amazingly our exports will be increased" applies as forcibly today to our trade with Western Europe and the friendship which such trade engenders as it did in the days when Washington sought to apply the principle to trade between Virginia and the area Virginia once claimed, known as the Northwest Territory of which Ohio was a part.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Friday a few of us who were present spoke, on immediate impulse, of our affection and regard for the late Elbert D. Thomas, whose untimely passing last week so shocked and saddened us.

I have prepared a statement supplementary to what I said on that day, to express my deep appreciation of the privilege of knowing a very great and very lovable man, who was such an adornment to the United States Senate during all the years he served here. He will go down in history, I know, as one of the notable men in the United States Senate and as one of the many great contributions made to the Nation by the State of Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Elbert Thomas served here for 18 years—for 18 of the most eventful years in modern times. He was not a man who would appeal to the thoughtless and shallow-minded. He was above all a man of thought and of reflection, and secondarily a man of action.

His quiet contributions to the public welfare are reflected in the wage standards of the workers of this country as well as in scores of other vital aspects of our national life. He understood and appreciated as few others did the worth and dignity of every human being. He was always a friend of the oppressed and the humble.

He loved our free Government, and spent long hours of study on legislation designed to strengthen and refine it. His interests were mainly intellectual ones. He loved to read on the subject of history, in which he was especially proficient, but there was no subject under the sun which was outside his realm of interest. He felt himself to be, in the Senate as he had been before he came to the Senate, a teacher and a missionary.

He had no bite nor sting. His wisdom sometimes rebuked careless and shoddy ideas, but I recall no personal reproach ever to pass his lips. He was patient with all who were doing their best and who were sincere in their beliefs. So scholarly was he that he was commonly referred to as "the erudite Senator from Utah," and his scholarship was his trademark.

He loved people. The students who had studied under him still looked to him for personal counsel and guidance years after they had graduated from his classes. And he maintained his interest in them far into their maturity.

During the great test and climax of the war years and of demobilization he was chairman of both the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and also of the Military Affairs Committee. I do not have direct knowledge of his work on the Military Affairs Committee. Others here are in a better position than I to speak of that aspect of his great work. But I know that as chairman of the Labor Committee, Senator Thomas appreciated and insisted that the general welfare clause of the Constitution was meant to be a beacon for the further development of our national life. It was not just an empty phrase.

His chairmanship of our committee was always characterized by a persistent and successful effort to bring agreement out of disagreement, to delegate as much responsibility as possible, to give every possible leeway to the initiative of the members of his committee and to encourage them in thinking it was their committee and not his.

Presiding above all his other attributes, was that characteristic to which I referred in my remarks last week—a perfect humility. He was a humble man in the Biblical sense of that word. He was humble because he was aware of his heavy responsibilities. He died in the midst of discharging those responsibilities, and his monument is both his contribution in public office and his fine, noble character.

His passing was a great loss, but his memory will long live among us.

APPORTIONMENT OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE VOTE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1952 ON THE BASIS OF THE POPULAR VOTE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a tabulation prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, showing the apportionment of the electoral college vote on the basis of the popular vote in the presidential election of 1952. In other words, it shows what the distribution of the electoral votes would have been had the so-called Lodge constitutional amendment been in force, under which the electoral vote would have been allocated on the basis of the popular vote.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apportionment of electoral college votes on the basis of the popular vote, presidential election of 1952 (Eisenhower, Republican—Stevenson, Democrat)

State	Total popular vote	Electoral votes		Republican			Democratic			Other		
		Republican	Democrat	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)
Alabama	426,120		11	149,231	35.0	3.85	275,075	64.5	7.1	1,814	0.5	.05
Arizona	260,569	4		152,042	58.4	2.3	108,527	41.6	1.7			
Arkansas	404,800		8	177,155	43.8	3.5	226,300	55.9	4.5	1,345	.3	
California	5,141,849	32		2,897,310	56.4	18.0	2,197,548	42.7	13.7	46,991	.9	.3
Colorado	630,103	6		379,782	60.3	3.6	245,504	38.9	2.3	4,817	.8	.1
Connecticut	1,096,911	8		611,012	55.7	4.5	481,649	43.9	3.5	4,250	.4	
Delaware	174,010	3		90,059	51.7	1.6	83,315	47.9	1.4	636	.4	
Florida	988,986	10		544,036	55.0	5.5	444,950	45.0	4.5			
Georgia	651,303		12	198,979	30.6	3.7	452,323	69.4	8.3	1		
Idaho	276,254	4		180,707	65.4	2.6	95,081	34.4	1.4	466	.2	
Illinois	4,481,058	27		2,457,327	54.8	14.8	2,013,920	45.0	12.15	9,811	.2	.05
Indiana	1,955,325	13		1,136,259	58.1	7.6	801,530	41.0	5.3	17,536	.9	.1
Iowa	1,268,773	10		808,906	63.8	6.4	451,513	35.6	3.5	8,354	.6	.06
Kansas	896,166	8		616,302	68.8	5.5	273,296	30.5	2.4	6,568	.7	.1
Kentucky	993,148		10	495,029	49.8	5.0	495,729	49.9	5.0	2,390	.3	
Louisiana	651,952		10	306,925	47.1	4.7	345,027	52.9	5.3			

Apportionment of electoral college votes on the basis of the popular vote, presidential election of 1952 (Eisenhower, Republican—Stevenson, Democrat)—Continued

State	Total popular vote	Electoral votes		Republican			Democratic			Other		
		Republican	Democrat	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)	Popular vote	Percent of total	Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett)
Maine	351,786	5		232,353	66.0	3.3	118,806	33.8	1.7	627	.2	
Maryland	902,074	9		499,424	55.4	5.0	395,357	43.8	3.9	7,313	.8	.07
Massachusetts	2,383,308	16		1,292,325	54.2	8.7	1,083,525	45.5	7.3	7,548	.3	
Michigan	2,798,592	20		1,551,529	55.4	11.1	1,230,657	44.0	8.8	16,406	.6	.1
Minnesota	1,379,483	11		763,211	55.3	6.1	608,458	44.1	4.8	7,814	.6	.06
Mississippi	285,519		8	112,966	39.6	3.2	172,553	60.4	4.8			
Missouri	1,892,062	13		959,429	50.7	6.6	929,830	49.1	6.4	2,803	.2	
Montana	265,037	4		157,394	59.4	2.4	106,213	40.1	1.6	1,430	.5	
Nebraska	609,660	6		421,603	69.2	4.2	188,057	30.8	1.8			
Nevada	82,190	3		50,502	61.4	1.8	31,688	38.6	1.2			
New Hampshire	272,952	4		166,289	60.9	2.4	106,663	39.1	1.6			
New Jersey	2,419,554	16		1,374,613	56.8	9.1	1,015,902	42.0	6.7	29,039	1.2	.2
New Mexico	238,608	4		132,170	55.4	2.2	105,661	44.3	1.8	777	.3	
New York	7,128,241	45		3,952,815	55.4	24.9	3,104,601	43.6	19.6	70,825	1.0	.5
North Carolina	1,210,910		14	558,107	46.1	6.5	652,803	53.9	7.5			
North Dakota	270,127	4		191,712	71.0	2.8	76,694	28.4	1.1	1,721	.6	
Ohio	3,700,758	25		2,100,456	56.8	14.2	1,600,302	43.2	10.8			
Oklahoma	948,984	8		518,045	54.6	4.4	430,939	45.4	3.6			
Oregon	695,059	6		420,815	60.6	3.6	270,579	38.9	2.3	3,665	.5	
Pennsylvania	4,580,862	32		2,415,789	52.7	16.9	2,146,269	46.9	15.0	18,804	.3	0.1
Rhode Island	414,498	4		210,935	51.0	2.04	203,293	49.0	1.96	270	.0	
South Carolina	341,121		8	158,312	46.4	3.7	173,007	50.7	4.1	9,802	2.9	.2
South Dakota	294,283	4		203,857	69.3	2.8	90,426	30.7	1.2			
Tennessee	892,553	11		446,147	50.0	5.5	443,710	49.7	5.47	2,696	.3	.03
Texas	2,076,846	24		1,102,878	53.1	12.7	970,128	46.7	11.2	3,840	.2	.05
Utah	329,554	4		194,190	58.9	2.4	135,364	41.1	1.6			
Vermont	153,557	3		109,717	71.5	2.1	43,355	28.2	.8	485	.3	
Virginia	619,699	12		349,037	56.3	6.8	268,677	43.4	5.2	1,975	.3	
Washington	1,102,708	9		599,107	54.4	4.9	492,845	44.7	4.0	10,756	.9	.08
West Virginia	873,548		8	419,970	48.1	3.8	453,578	51.9	4.2			
Wisconsin	1,607,370	12		979,744	61.0	7.3	622,175	38.7	4.6	5,451	.3	
Wyoming	129,251	3		81,047	62.7	1.9	47,934	37.1	1.1	270	.2	
Total	61,547,861	442	80	33,927,549	55.1	288.5	27,311,316	44.4	239.8	308,996	.5	2.7

Source: Popular vote figures and percentage of vote were taken from an Associated Press release of "official" voting figures obtained by a State-by-State survey, New York Times, Dec. 13, 1952, p. 12.

THE WALTER-McCARRAN ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the February 1953 issue of the Sign, national Catholic magazine, contains an editorial item captioned "The Mote in Mr. McCarran's Eye."

Not because this article mentions me, but because it expresses what I consider to be an extremely realistic view about certain criticisms of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and does so in a succinct and highly readable way, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this short editorial may be printed in full in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MOTE IN MR. McCARRAN'S EYE

The McCarran Act grated into gear and got off to a bumpy start on December 24. Its activation brought testy criticism from Britain and France. The Manchester Guardian called it a scandalous piece of illiberalism. Two hundred and seventy-one sailors of the French liner *Liberté* refused to answer immigration officials' questions and sulked aboard ship during the *Liberté*'s holiday stay in New York.

Like any product of fallible human contriving, the McCarran Act has defects. A lot of honest people think it discriminates against certain classes of deserving immigrants whose security status cannot be questioned. Perhaps, after a trial run has spread its seams and located its squeaks, desirable amendments will suggest themselves.

In the meantime, however, the squawk from Britain and France should be pointedly disregarded. All too late, we have begun to deal vigorously with our security problems. Now we are hustling penitently to catch up. The McCarran Act represents a serious effort at security legislation.

Britain and France have been notoriously listless about Red undercover work and continue in their anesthetic indifference.

British negligence provided the bland political climate in which blossomed the traitors, May, Fuchs, Pontecorvo, Burgess, and MacLean. The same balky liberalism has just put May back into circulation as a freeman. It has meticulously buried vital facts about the ideological leanings of Burgess and MacLean, the truant diplomats.

France is honeycombed with subversives and with politicians who only play at the serious business of government. The regrettable result of this reckless sport is that French Ministries are casually pushed over by adult statesmen in the National Assembly much as building blocks are toppled by children in a nursery. The Pinay Ministry has been the latest casualty.

Once upon a time the value of British and French opinion was not so plainly negligible, and criticism from them might reasonably set us to a conscientious soul searching.

But that day is long past in the matter of defense against subversives. We know it. Apparently Britain and France don't know that we know it. Don't know, either, how ridiculous they look in this old, patronizing role and how short our patience is getting.

We will listen to Britain and France about the McCarran Act when they have done as much about security as we, and have done it better.

We don't mind buying hair restorer. But not from a couple of fellows who are flagrantly bald under the pseudoradiance of ill-fitting toupees.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF STUDENT DEMONSTRATION IN PRAGUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so often in time of crisis, particularly in the countries of the Old World, it has remained for students who were clothed in zeal and fired by an intense fidelity to an ideal to show the way to people of more tinted outlook and waivering faith.

It may be said that such was the case 5 years ago in 1948 when the students in Czechoslovakia carried on a spirited demonstration in the old city of Prague to arouse the spirits of free men in the hope of salvaging their land from the moving forces of communism.

While they failed in this endeavor, their spirit carries on both in Czechoslovakia and in the hearts of students and Czechs who are today in exile. Thousands of such students are, in fact, in exile at the present time and are coordinating their efforts and building the moral and spiritual forces on which mankind must rely for the day of liberation.

That demonstration came in February 1948 and it is well that we who enjoy the benefits of a free land take thought of their sacrifices and devotion not only for the inspiration which it affords but to make certain that those sacrifices will not have been in vain.

A STABILIZED MARKET FOR THE PRODUCTS OF DOMESTIC MINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate will recall that last week I introduced a bill to assist the mining industry, especially the strategic and critical material section of the mining industry.

My bill, which would set up a metals credit corporation, was copied almost word for word from the act which created the Commodity Credit Corporation, except that the purpose of my bill is to aid metals instead of agricultural products, and the Secretary of the Interior would have jurisdiction, instead of the Secretary of Agriculture.

In this connection, the Colorado Senate has passed Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, from which I should like to read. The joint resolution provides, in part:

That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approved legislation for—

(1) The stabilizing of a market for domestically produced metals.

(2) The creation of a flexible import tax payable in the form of metal to the domestic stockpile of strategic and critical materials which will equalize the costs of production and afford the domestic producer an even break with his foreign competitor.

(3) The passage of legislation in lieu of the above which would create a Commodity Credit Corporation which would provide a market for the products of our mines on the same basis of parity or costs of production as are afforded the producers of farm products within the United States.

Mr. President, I present the joint memorial and I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 7

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

Whereas the base-metal mining industry of the United States has been seriously curtailed by the importation of lead and zinc from foreign countries in which costs of production are much lower than those which prevail in the United States under American standards; and

Whereas many sections of the United States are dependent in large measure upon the production of these metals for the maintenance of their economies and the drastic curtailment of production has affected the welfare of these areas through losses to local merchants, employees, power plants, railroads, trucking lines, and business enterprises generally; and

Whereas tax income is being shut off for local, county, and State government purposes; and

Whereas other sources of revenue generally used in the procurement of manufactured items from manufacturing States are being stopped; and

Whereas unfair competition is being presented to domestic producers because of the large sums of money which have been used abroad in the encouragement of production of these same metals there; and

Whereas further damage is threatened by reason of the introduction of legislation in the Congress of the United States which would do away with the "buy American" features of the present law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to approve legislation for—

(1) The stabilizing of a market for domestically produced metals;

(2) The creation of a flexible import tax, payable in the form of metal to the domestic stockpile of strategic and critical materials, which will equalize the costs of production and afford the domestic producer an even break with his foreign competitor;

(3) The passage of legislation in lieu of the above which would create a Commodity Credit Corporation which would provide a market for the products of our mines on the same basis of parity or costs of production as are afforded the producers of farm products within the United States;

(4) The defeat of any move which will eliminate the "buy American" provisions of the present stockpiling act, or of any act which has heretofore been enacted by the Congress designed to maintain the well-being, safety, and security of the American people; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States, and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the chairman of the House Committee of the Congress of the United States on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and to the Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Administration, and to the Director of the National Production Administration, and to the Chairman of the Munitions Board and the Secretary of Defense, and to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

GORDON ABBOTT,
President of the Senate.
DAVID A. HAMIL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
LEE MATTIES,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, yesterday I received a telegram from Silverton, which is in San Juan County, Colo. The telegram is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

Shenandoah Dives—

Which is a large mining company—announced the indefinite closing of operations yesterday. This closed the mine and the only custom mill in the county, meaning not a single mine or mill will operate here by February 28. Panic is becoming the byword. Please hurry your legislation.

NICHOLAS HEIDY.

Mr. President, the Shenandoah Dives has been one of our most substantial mines in Colorado. Complex ores, with silver, zinc, lead, and copper, are mined there. As the telegram indicates, all the mines in that county have now been closed, and that county is in the best mining district in the State of Colorado.

Yesterday a gentleman by the name of Herman Clott called on me. He is the Washington representative of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. He told me that 100,000 miners of these complex ores in the Western States are out of employment because the mines everywhere are closing; they are unable to operate. The prices of lead and zinc have dropped below the costs of production, and all these mines have to close.

Last week the Colorado Mining Association held its convention in Colorado, and had the following to say:

Your committe on resolutions reports as follows:

The ability and ingenuity of the American metal miner, and the productive capacity of our mines, have been amply demonstrated in two world wars. From our mines came the metals to arm the free peoples of the world in their fight against aggression. This Nation is now repudiating this industry, so indispensable to our defense and our standard of living.

Government officials and international cartels have allied themselves to wreck this great national resource. This country has subsidized metal mines in many parts of the world. It has financed the operations of international mining companies. It has fostered and promoted cheap foreign competition while, at the same time, it has placed restriction on restriction and tax upon tax on our domestic mining industry.

Mr. President, I shall not read the remainder of the resolutions, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire resolutions be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF 1953 CONVENTION, COLORADO MINING ASSOCIATION

Your committee on resolutions reports as follows:

The ability and ingenuity of the American metal miner, and the productive capacity of our mines, have been amply demonstrated in two world wars. From our mines came the metals to arm the free peoples of the world in their fight against aggression. This Nation is now repudiating this industry, so indispensable to our defense and our standard of living.

Government officials and international cartels have allied themselves to wreck this great national resource. This country has subsidized metal mines in many parts of the world. It has financed the operations of international mining companies. It has fostered and promoted cheap foreign competition while, at the same time, it has placed restriction on restriction and tax upon tax on our domestic mining industry.

Even now the Bureau of Land Management is scheming to place more burdens on the metal miner and dictate his operations. Existing laws which are ample to protect our forests and public domain are not being enforced. Violations, which result from failures to enforce these laws, are being magnified and publicized to condition the public and the Congress for more oppressive laws which will enhance the power, prestige, and size of the Bureau of Land Management and its employees.

We hold that ours must be a government of laws and not of men; that laws must be commensurate with their purposes; and that the practice of giving Government bureaus excessive powers in the pious hope such powers will be used sparingly and justly is folly and extremely dangerous to our republic.

A propaganda campaign to deceive our people and instill the false impression that we are a "have not" Nation regarding metals is now being waged, and is soon to be intensified. Supporting this propaganda are those organizations and individuals who seek to destroy all competition from domestic mines in order that they may buy and sell cheaply produced foreign ores more profitably and at prices fixed by them. Closely allied with these groups are those internationalists who would ruin our country and its industries by strengthening and expanding competitive industries in foreign lands. We cannot remove the barriers that protect our standard of living and still preserve that standard. In this country, every industry pays high taxes and high wages; it contributes to workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, social security, and other funds. It frequently pays its employees as much in 1 day as its foreign competitors pay in a week. No American industry can prosper when it is forced to compete with foreign concerns which pay few, if any, of these added costs. This is particularly true of base metals, such as lead or zinc, or minerals such as fluorspar. We are not here complaining of these added costs. We are proud of the ability and integrity of our employees, who are entitled

to just compensation and a decent standard of living. Either we must equalize the factors which now permit unjust competition from cheaply produced foreign products, or we will be reduced to the standard of living of our foreign competitors.

Metal mining must be revived in this Nation. The miner must be protected from unfair foreign competition. American metal miners must be given the freedom to develop and manage their complex industry as circumstances best require.

* * * * *

2. We urge that our State and Federal income tax laws and regulations be amended so as to permit development costs after discovery of ore to be treated as operating expenses, to provide adequate allowances for percentage depletion, and to provide percentage depletion be allowed not only on actual sales of ore, but also on all premiums paid, on the production of ore, by any Government agency. We point out that mining operations are, at best, uncertain and that losses from unprofitable mining ventures should be allowed corporations and individuals as ordinary deductions against current income.

3. We point out to our Federal, State, and local tax-spending agencies that the limit of taxation has been reached. The American taxpayer cannot pay more. We urge that any further moneys required by governments must, in the future, come from the savings to be had from more economic and efficient government, and not from new or increased taxation.

4. We heartily commend the sliding scale stabilization import duty on lead and zinc adopted by the National Lead and Zinc Committee in Denver, Colo., on February 11, 1953. For the salvation of our lead and zinc mining industry, we respectfully urge the Congress immediately to adopt such duty.

5. We point out that many mines producing critical and strategic ores are without markets for such ores. We urge the immediate establishment of stockpiling depots, strategically located, to provide these markets particularly for the small miner. We urge that the prices paid for such ores by these depots be realistic and in keeping with the costs of producing such ores.

We extend our warmest appreciation to the Honorable ED. C. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Colorado, for introducing in the United States Senate a bill to establish a Metals Credit Corporation in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of strategic metals and minerals in the United States; and we respectfully and urgently request the adoption of this measure by the Congress of the United States.

6. We strenuously advocate the restoration of the gold standard based on a price for gold in keeping with its cost of production and the free convertibility of gold with other moneys. This step will halt inflation and relieve world-wide economic distress. The International Monetary Fund and all foreign exchange and monetary agreements in conflict with the gold standard, unlimited convertibility, and free exchange of gold and silver coins, must be abrogated.

We extend to the Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, United States Senator from Colorado, our deep appreciation for his vigilant and untiring efforts to protect and advance the just cause of the American metal miner.

7. We oppose any repeal of the present Silver Purchase Laws of the United States. We point out that the practice of inducing nations to demonetize their silver money and to dump that demonetized silver on world markets to break the price of silver still prevails. The demonetization of silver has been largely responsible for the economic and political upheavals in China, India, and other nations.

8. We urge the establishment of a Federal Department of Mines, presided over by a secretary with a seat in the President's Cabinet. In this connection, we urgently request that any such Secretary of Mining, as well as those officials who now preside over the various agencies relating to metal mining or who have any voice in the policy-making of such agencies, be men of known devotion to the cause of our domestic metal mining industry, including the little miner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to read two specific resolutions in connection with the Colorado Mining Association's convention:

We extend our warmest appreciation to the Honorable ED. C. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Colorado, for introducing in the United States Senate a bill to establish a Metals Credit Corporation in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of strategic metals and minerals in the United States; and we respectfully and urgently request the adoption of this measure by the Congress of the United States.

Also the following resolution:

We heartily commend the sliding scale stabilization import duty on lead and zinc adopted by the National Lead and Zinc Committee in Denver, Colo., on February 11, 1953. For the salvation of our lead and zinc mining industry, we respectfully urge the Congress immediately to adopt such duty.

Mr. President, the Colorado Mining Association and, I believe, the mining industries throughout the United States prefer the latter method of meeting a very critical situation, namely, by means of the imposition of import duties on lead and zinc. I believe they prefer that method, as opposed to the method provided by the bill I have introduced. However, the reason why I have introduced the bill is that I realize how difficult it is in these days to obtain the enactment of any sort of tariff bill or to have any sort of import duty or other duty placed on any commodity which can be imported from other parts of the world. The sentiment is strongly against increased tariffs; the sentiment is strongly against import duties. I have no quarrel whatever with that method of meeting the situation, and I shall give my full support to that proposed solution, if the mining industry decide that is the way they wish to proceed. Such a bill would, of course, have to be introduced in the House of Representatives, because it would be a revenue measure, and the Senate would not be able to act upon the bill until the House had passed it.

Mr. President, I do not like to put a wet blanket or throw cold water on anyone's proposal; but I believe the mining industry should be told very frankly, and I am standing here today to tell them, that their chances of having any kind of import duty imposed and their chances of having any kind of increased tariff placed on importations into the United States are indeed very dim and very slim. I believe they would be better advised if they were to adopt the plan provided for in the bill I have introduced in the Senate, by means of which metals of all kinds, coming from all sources, could enter the United States to supply the domestic demands of our industries for those metals; and our domestic metals, especially our strategic and critical metals, would be purchased by a Metals Credit Corporation and held in stockpiles. I believe that by means of that method we could keep alive in the United States our mining industry.

So I recommend to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he give consideration to holding a hearing and taking favorable action on the Metals Credit Corporation bill I have introduced.

CREDIT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate have expressed concern over the administration's policy of tightening up on credit. Coming at a time when farm prices and farm incomes have been falling, increases in interest rates and other restrictions on credit can have an exceedingly unfortunate impact upon American agriculture.

I am particularly concerned over interest-rate increases which necessitate additional spending to service the public debt. Just last week the Treasury Department shifted almost $9 billion of the public debt from securities paying 1⅞ percent in interest to securities paying 2¼ percent in interest. Preliminary calculations would seem to indicate that this increase in interest rates will cost the Federal Government about $34 million a year—or $136 million over the next 4 years. This new expenditure to which the Treasury Department has committed itself amounts to twice as much as would be needed to finance for the next 6 years all the new medical education required in this country.

In view of the importance of this matter, I have written to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George H. Humphrey, and asked for his official calculations on the additional cost to the Treasury resulting from the increased interest rate. I have also asked what effect this type of action would have upon the cost and availability of credit to farmers, businessmen, homeowners, and others.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of my letter to Secretary Humphrey printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1953.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Many Members of the Senate have been extremely concerned over the published reports about the terms upon which the Treasury Department has just refinanced nearly $9 billion in certificates of indebtedness.

As a result of this operation, it would seem that your policy of higher interest rates has raised interest charges on this portion of the public debt by at least $34 million a year.

In other words, instead of paying 1⅞ percent of the total sum, you now worked out a plan whereby you are committed to pay 2¼ percent on most of it and 2½ percent on the remainder, an increase ranging from three-eighths to five-eights of 1 percent. This would seem to be a total interest payment of $197 million a year as contrasted with $163 million previously—in other words, an increase of $34 million or 20 percent.

This is a rather surprising action in the direction of unnecessary spending on the part of an administration which has promised to cut down expenses.

Over the next 4 years it would seem that this one refinancing venture alone would cost the taxpayers $136 million. This extra and totally unnecessary payment to the bankers would by itself amount to twice as

much money as would be needed to finance for the next 6 years all the new medical education required in this country.

In view of the importance of this matter, I would therefore greatly appreciate it if you could supply me with the answers to the following questions:

1. What is the Treasury Department's calculation as to the additional interest payments that will be required by this recent refinancing action?

2. Over the course of the next 4 years, what is your estimate as to the total cost of the handling of this portion of the public debt?

3. What effect will actions of this type have upon increasing the cost of credit to farmers, businessmen, home owners, and other possible borrowers?

4. What effect will actions of this type have upon the availability of credit to farmers, businessmen, home owners, and other possible borrowers?

5. What portion of the marketable public debt now outstanding will have to be refinanced during the rest of 1953, during 1954, during 1955, during 1956?

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The morning hour has not been concluded.

Mr. TAFT. I am waiting for that.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I, too, was waiting for the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further bills, joint resolutions, or other routine matters to be presented, the morning hour is concluded.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION—NOMINATION OF GEORGE M. HUMPHREY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is but one nomination on the Executive Calendar, that of George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund, United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Samuel Wilder King, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Allen Welsh Dulles, of New York, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Lloyd A. Mashburn, of California, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, Ernest A. Gross, of New York, and James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be representatives to the second part of the Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

William Sanders, of Virginia, to be alternate representative to the second part of the Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider in proper order calendar Nos. 28 to 40, both inclusive, all of which are Senate resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I suggest that the first of the resolutions be stated.

JANE E. HENDERSON

The resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Jane E. Henderson was announced as first in order.

ANNIVERSARY OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this afternoon I should like to take a few moments of the Senate's time to speak about the Employment Act of 1946. When the Employment Act was approved February 20, 1946, exactly 7 years ago today, it was heralded as the most significant legislation for guiding public policy since establishment of the Federal budget system a quarter of a century earlier.

It will be recalled that this act was passed unanimously by the Senate and by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives after lengthy hearings in both Houses during the summer and fall of 1945. The act was passed when there was much doubt as to the ability of our economy to weather a transition from World War II to a peacetime economy. Its declaration of policy states:

The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

In the past 7 years we have witnessed prosperous conditions. In the past 2 years we have been forced to build up our military strength to meet aggression in Asia and threatened aggression in Europe. These programs have maintained employment and production at record levels.

While I believed that the Employment Act has served a useful purpose in coordinating Federal economic policies in the interest of economic stability, the real test of its usefulness remains ahead of us. Unless the international situation worsens, we will be faced in the next 2 years with a transition from high levels of defense expenditures to a lower and more sustainable level. This transition will require adjustments in our economy. It will present a real challenge to private business as well as to Government.

We must prevent this adjustment from causing undue unemployment, or from setting off a spiraling deflation.

Mr. President, I submit that all the arguments so eloquently advanced by the economic interest groups, and by the Congress on both sides of the aisle in 1945 and in early 1946 in favor of passage of the Employment Act hold equal meaning today. Therefore, Mr. President, on this, its seventh anniversary, I wish to urge the Congress and the administration, to take stock and to make certain that we do not weaken the machinery provided in that important act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, first I desire to compliment the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont upon taking up this discussion today, on the seventh anniversary of the adoption of the Employment Act of 1946. No one is better qualified to do that than is the Senator from Vermont, who is the senior Member from the Senate on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report which was provided for by that act. If I recall correctly, the Senator from Vermont has been on the committee since its inception, soon after passage of the act.

I am delighted the Senator from Vermont is bringing up these points today. It is my opinion that much good has resulted from the functioning of the two principal setups created under the Employment Act, namely, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is composed of Members of the House and Senate. It has been my pleasure to serve on that committee since the beginning of the 80th Congress in 1947, and to serve alongside the Senator from Ver-

mont. I hope the Senator from Vermont will, in the course of his remarks, discuss some of the work of that committee. I may say that I am imposing upon the Senator at this time only because I have another appointment, to which I must go immediately.

Mr. President, if I may, I should like to ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont there may be printed in the RECORD, in this connection, a copy of a letter which I recently addressed to the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, a Member of the House of Representatives, who is chairman of the joint committee, relating to a definite program for that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama; but I should like to remind him that my connection with this law antedates my election to the Senate, in that I played some part in the hearings in determining the final form of the law, so that it had been a matter of concern to me for a year or two antedating my coming to the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield very briefly?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Vermont is correct. It had slipped my mind for the time being that long before he came to the Senate the able Senator from Vermont was well known throughout the Nation because of his great interest, understanding, and enlightenment in connection with important questions before the country. There has never been any lagging in the great interest, understanding, and wealth of information possessed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I recall that I was chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill, and we had many conferences with the Senator from Vermont during that time. When the bill was originally prepared it was sent to various business concerns and business associations throughout the country, including the United States Chamber of Commerce, National Manufacturers Association, and many other groups of that kind. When it was finally put into legislative form it was enacted into law and has been a very effective measure. If we had had in the 1920's some such program as that which is provided by that measure, we probably would have escaped the serious consequences of the depression; indeed, we probably would have avoided the depression altogether, because the Economic Council has a staff provided to study the economic trends of the country, and we would have been able to take advantage of the situation and correct the evils likely to result in a depression.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Montana. Let me say to him that I very well remember appearing before his committee during the time when the legislation was in process of being formed. The Senator was courteous, intelligent, and particularly fair-minded in giving scope for suggestions and criticisms of all kinds and varieties.

Mr. President, let us recall what the machinery of the act is.

The act calls for the President to transmit an economic report to the Congress at the beginning of each session. The nature of the report is indicated. In general it is to present a picture of the economic health of the Nation, discuss trends and appraise Federal economic programs. Also it is to contain a program and legislative recommendations for carrying out the policy of the act.

To assist the President in discharging this responsibility, the act creates a three-member Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office. Specifically, the Council is charged with, first, helping the President prepare economic reports to the Congress; second, gathering and interpreting information for the President relative to current and prospective economic conditions; third, studying and reporting to the President the effects of Federal economic programs; fourth, developing and recommending to the President national economic programs; and fifth, making whatever other studies and recommendations with respect to Federal economic policy and legislation which the President may request.

While the Council is given no operating functions, it is empowered to form advisory committees and consult with the various private economic groups, and State and local governments. Furthermore, the Council is directed to utilize the services, facilities, and information of other Government agencies, as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

Various reports have come from the White House as to the President's plans for the Economic Council, but we may be sure that he is keenly aware of this major problem of maintaining employment and production as we decrease our governmental expenditures. The problem will become serious when, as, and if, we go into a peacetime economy. It would be most unwise for the Congress in any way to cramp or hamper the ability of the administration to meet successfully this looked-for event.

It must be admitted that the Council of Economic Advisers, due largely to the personalities of some of the former Council members, has left a bad taste in many mouths. Last week the House Appropriations Committee denied funds for the Council to carry it through the current fiscal year. Instead, it recommends an appropriation of $25,000 for "an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto." This, of course, does not meet the requirements of the law.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Congress will increase this item and restore an amount sufficient to continue the agency on an operating basis through the remainder of the fiscal year. We can depend on this administration to use appropriations sparingly until it is ready to set its course in this important undertaking.

The Congress also has great responsibilities in carrying out the policies of the act. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report was established to help the Congress meet this responsibility. The 14 members of the committee are drawn equally from the Senate and the House of Representatives. The committee's functions are, first, to make a continuing study of matters relating to the economic report; second, to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this act; and, third, as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the economic report to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to organize a professional staff to assist in its endeavors.

The necessity for the committee is obvious, since the responsibilities assigned to it relate to the work of several standing committees, such as Banking and Currency, Finance, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Foreign Relations, and others. In our committee is found the means for reporting on the relationship of all legislation to the major purpose of maintaining production and employment.

Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has just completed its reorganization under the new Congress. Our chairman is the distinguished Representative from Michigan Mr. WOLCOTT. I have the honor of being vice chairman. Members from the Senate besides myself include: Senators TAFT, WATKINS, GOLDWATER, SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, and FULBRIGHT. The membership in the House, in addition to the chairman, include: Representatives SIMPSON, TALLE, BENDER, HART, PATMAN, and BOLLING. The committee is currently developing an agenda of study for this year. We expect to be an active committee because we recognize the challenge of the transition days ahead.

In closing I wish to emphasize the importance of using all of our facilities to maintain a strong and expanded economy as the surest weapon against the spread of communism.

If we cannot make the transition to a smaller budget and, ultimately, to a peacetime economy without severe unemployment and depressed farm markets, then nothing we do to keep communism out will be of any avail. Communism will be generated within.

For these reasons I hope that the Senate will give President Eisenhower the means to coordinate the Government's economic programs in the interest of our national security and welfare.

EXHIBIT 1

FEBRUARY 10, 1953.

The Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JESSE: At Friday's organization meeting you suggested that Members with

thoughts as to possible committee projects submit them to you in writing during the next few days. The following are some areas that seem to me to call for study. I believe the Joint Economic Committee would be the proper committee to make these studies. I mentioned the first study at the meeting on Friday.

1. The current decline in farm prices and the implications of this decline to general economic stability. Will this decline set off a general depression?

2. The implications of the recent and current increase in private debt. Is private debt reaching a point which might endanger our continued prosperity?

3. The demands of a rapidly growing population upon Federal, State, and local governments. What Federal policies would make it possible for State and local governments to provide the traditional services of this growing population without increased resort to Federal grants?

4. The adequacy of the so-called built-in or automatic stabilizers in preventing and mediating violent economic fluctuations in the economy. How much reliance can we place, for example, on the social security program, the farm program, the progressive tax structure, and the like in counteracting fluctuations in private investment and consumption?

5. Are stand-by wage and price controls needed in today's tense world? Can an effective and practical program be worked out without impairing private business initiative and the free enterprise system?

6. Are current economic statistics adequate to facilitate private business in making decisions and to serve as a guide for public policy in the interest of economic stability and expansion?

7. Public and private pension systems in a stable and expanding economy. The recent National Planning Association's study submitted to the Joint Economic Committee summarizes existing pension arrangements, explores the interrelationships between public and private pension plans and identifies major policy and problem areas. These major policy problems should be analyzed by the committee and recommendations submitted to the Congress. They include, for example: the interrelationship of the various pension plans and other programs for income maintenance of older persons, the problem of immaturity, a universal pay-as-we-go system, protection for the permanently and totally disabled, and private plans and Government regulation.

I haven't thought through the mechanics of how the committee could proceed to study these problems and I suggest them only as possible topics that might be put on our committee's agenda.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making inquiry of the distinguished majority leader. Is he in a position to state at this time what his plans are for the Senate next week?

Mr. TAFT. The program is that the Senate shall meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, as usual. On Monday the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will read Washington's Farewell Address. I do not think there will be any business transacted, except perhaps something like the confirmation of nominations.

On Wednesday, I shall propose that the calendar be called. If any important bills on the calendar are objected to, such as the bill dealing with the National Housing Act, and one or two others, I may move, after the calendar call, that they be considered. At this time I know of no business to be taken up on Friday.

I hope very much that the first major business to engage the attention of the Senate may be the tidelands bill or the Hawaiian statehood bill. I have urged the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to get one or both of them out of committee as soon as possible. If the committee has concluded its consideration of them by Friday, one of them may be taken up on Friday, but the chances are that it will be the following week before they are ready.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he is optimistic enough to think that either the Hawaiian statehood bill or the tidelands bill will be ready by Monday week. Does he have any indication from the committee that that is possible?

Mr. TAFT. I am in constant touch with the members of the committee. Both bills have been under consideration for a long time, and I am hopeful that the committee might well take the fatal plunge and get them to the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I attended a meeting of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning, and I can say that it will be several weeks before the committee finishes its studies of the measures referred to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can report to the leadership that, so far as the affirmative side on the two bills is concerned, the one proposed by some 40 Senators, and the other proposed by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the presentation on behalf of the affirmative is to be completed today, so that those who are in opposition will be able to take over their showing of testimony at the next hearing of the committee.

JANE E. HENDERSON

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if we may not now act on certain resolutions on the calendar, at least those to which there is no objection, before we embark on further speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An order has been entered to proceed with the consideration of Calendar Nos. 28 to 40, inclusive. The clerk will state by title the first resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Jane E. Henderson.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JENNER]. Am I correct in my understanding, that the gratuities provided for under order numbers 28, 29, 30, and 31, and Senate Resolutions 72, 73, 74, and 75, are in accord with the past custom of the Senate in paying gratuities to Senate employees?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 1077 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1953, that a summary has been made of the rules and regulations under which such gratuities are to be paid. Were any hearings held, as a result of which the summary was prepared?

Mr. JENNER. Yes, hearings were held, and the committee adopted this plan as standard procedure. It is essential to have some form by which to operate, because there are so many varying circumstances, which are subject to change, and we had to adopt some standard in order to have uniformity in the payment of gratuities.

Mr. ELLENDER. The program was adopted, as the Senator has indicated, in order to provide uniformity in the payment of gratuities, was it not?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

We provided first for 1 month's salary for each year's employment up to 6 years.

In the next group of employees, with service between 6 years and 16 years, we recommend one-half month's salary for each additional year. In other words, that is the maximum pay, and is the most that will be paid to the estate of any employee.

Then in the next group are those who may have been with the Government 15 years, but may have been employed by the Senate for but 1 year.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the regulation, in no way could the estate of an employee receive an amount in excess of 1 year's pay.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee make a study of the question of who should receive the gratuity? It might be that a deceased employee was not married, and the gratuity would perhaps go to a nephew. As I understand it, the purpose of the gratuity is to assist a widow or needy children. Did the committee give study to that phase of the question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes, the committee determined upon a policy of paying the gratuity to the next of kin or to the estate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that entirely appropriate? Why not amend that provision so as to limit payment to the widow, if she survives, or to the children? Why permit the gratuity to be given to uncles, aunts, cousins, or other collaterals?

Mr. JENNER. Of course, the resolution for payment of a gratuity is the determining factor with the committee. When such a matter comes before the committee, the committee will determine what is best to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the committee will take my suggestion into consideration, and amend the rule so that the gratuities will be paid only to the widow and to the children who may be needy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 72) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay,

from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Jane E. Henderson, widow of I. Henry Henderson, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AGNES P. DODGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 73) to pay a gratuity to Agnes P. Dodge was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Agnes P. Dodge, widow of Louis Dodge, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 month's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HARRY BEST

The resolution (S. Res. 74) to pay a gratuity to Harry Best was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Harry Best, widower of Mabel Goodwin Haller, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ANNIE MAY BOLTON

The resolution (S. Res. 75) to pay a gratuity to Annie May Bolton was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Annie May Bolton, widow of Guy T. Bolton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF 55TH ANNUAL REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 17)

The resolution (S. Res. 76), to print the 55th annual report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the 55th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1952, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTIONS AMENDING SO-CALLED CLOTURE RULE

The resolution (S. Res. 77), to print copies of the hearings on Senate resolutions amending the so-called cloture rule, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration 2,000 copies of the hearings on the Senate Resolutions 41, 52, 105, and 203, 82d Congress, 1st session, relative to amending Senate rule XXII relating to cloture.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 2570, AUTHORIZING THE CONDUCT OF PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 78) to print additional copies of the hearings on the bill (S. 2570) authorizing the conduct of presidential preferential primaries, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration 2,000 copies of the hearing during the 82d Congress, 2d session, on the bill (S. 2570) to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PRAYERS OFFERED BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE, REV. PETER MARSHALL, D. D.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 2, to strike out "thirty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty" and insert "six thousand"; on line 9 to strike out "nine thousand nine hundred" and insert "one thousand nine hundred and fifty"; and on line 11, to strike out "twenty-two thousand and fifty" and insert "four thousand and fifty", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 6,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 86 of the 81st Congress, 1st session, the Prayers Offered by the Chaplain the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the Opening of the Daily Sessions of the Senate of the United States During the 80th and 81st Congresses, 1947–49; of which 1,950 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,050 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PRINTING CERTAIN MATTER RELATING TO THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to have printed for its use certain matter relating to the immigration laws, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 2, to strike out "one" and insert "two", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of Public Law 414, Comparative Print of the Texts of the Immigration and Nationality Act and Immigration and Nationality Laws Existing Prior to Enactment of Public Law 414.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 62, Calendar No. 39. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] must leave the Senate at this time to attend a committee meeting at 2:30 o'clock, and he has asked that Senate Resolution 62 be taken up out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) authorizing expenditures for an investigation of national penitentiaries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this is not the first time such a resolution has been passed. I believe what is asked for is a standard appropriation for the committee which looks into the affairs of penal institutions. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has been interested for many years in this endeavor. The money to be appropriated is to be used primarily for travel, and expenses incident thereto, in visiting penitentiaries and other penal institutions. The Senator from North Dakota is present and can answer any questions the Senator from Louisiana has in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the $5,000 requested to be used to pay the traveling expenses of members of the staff of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. LANGER. This subcommittee was created in 1949. During all the time since then only upon one occasion has a staff member traveled with any member of the subcommittee. This, however, may not be true in the future. The subcommittee consists of three members. At the present time the other members are the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. While we are asking for $5,000, there never has been spent anything like $5,000, although that amount has been appropriated. In 1949 the subcommittee spent $558.45; in 1950, $533.87; in 1951 it spent $582.67. The reason why more money was not spent was that various members of the subcommittee availed themselves of the opportunity to ride in the automobiles of the Department of Justice, which, as the distinguished Senator knows, has charge of all national penitentiaries.

I may say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana and to the Senate that this is a subcommittee of the Judiciary which never gets any headlines. Therefore, various Members of the Senate may not be as intimately acquainted with the work of this subcommittee as they might otherwise be. So far as I can recollect, there has never been a single item in

the newspapers relating to the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, from the time it was organized.

The method of operation is that one of the members of the subcommittee will go to a town where a penitentiary is located. He goes there unexpectedly. No one in the town knows that he is coming—and certainly not the warden of the penitentiary, nor anyone in the penitentiary. The whole idea is that we can get a much better inspection if we go there unannounced.

Every member of the subcommittee is issued a certificate by the Attorney General which directs the warden, the deputy warden, or whoever may be in charge of the penitentiary, to admit the member of the subcommittee immediately to the penitentiary when he arrives, no matter what hour of the day or night it may be. Usually one member of the committee goes to inspect a penitentiary. He may drop into the penitentiary at 3 or 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, or at any time he desires to go there. He usually goes immediately to the kitchen. An inspection is made there to determine the condition of the food, particularly the breakfast food. There have been complaints at various times by inmates about the food. A very bitter complaint was made at McNeil Island by a GI 2 or 3 years ago that the excrement of rats or mice was found in the cereals served at breakfast. That complaint was thoroughly investigated, and was found to be entirely without foundation. We go into the kitchen to determine whether the kitchen is clean. We ascertain whether or not there are any flies inside the place. I may say that so far as I have been able to learn over the years, the inmates are universally satisfied with the cleanliness of the various institutions. We have had, with the single exception of a deputy warden, a fine, splendid, hard-working, honest group of wardens.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not the same or similar work done by the Justice Department?

Mr. LANGER. The Justice Department had no one doing this work until after the subcommittee was organized. We found that there had been various complaints. For example, there was a complaint from 1 institution that the warden of the penitentiary had surreptitiously stolen and sold 8 head of cattle. That charge demanded a thorough investigation. The matter was taken up with the Attorney General. After I took it up, together with the complaint which I mentioned at McNeil Island, the Attorney General of the United States appointed a deputy to doublecheck on the work done by the Bureau of Prisons, which, as my distinguished friend stated, operates under the Department of Justice. This work is simply a doublecheck. It has been very successful. As my distinguished friend knows, there have been a great many prison riots in State prisons. There was one in Ohio, in which hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of property was destroyed. There was one in Michigan, in connection with which the militia was called out and remained out for weeks. There have been prison riots in State after State. The most recent one was in the State of Oregon, 10 days or 2 weeks ago.

I call attention to the fact that in all our national penitentiaries, during all the time when some of the institutions have been overcrowded, there has not been a single prison riot in a Federal prison, with the exception of a tiny incipient riot at Chillicothe, Ohio. With that exception, there has not been a single riot in a Federal prison anywhere in the United States since this committee was established.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. In a moment.

Preceding the time when the subcommittee was organized there was a riot in the Atlanta Penitentiary, which resulted in a loss to the Government of hundreds of thousands of dollars, by reason of the fact that some of the inmates went on a hunger strike, and became violent and started a prison riot. I am sure my distinguished friend is familiar with the fact that that controversy was finally settled by a newspaper man, a member of the staff of a leading Atlanta newspaper, who was called in by the convicts to settle the strike.

In this connection I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the present overcrowded conditions in some of the penitentiaries. When a man is sent to a penitentiary the only persons, apparently, who are interested in his welfare, aside from the authorities, are his relatives. But a great many men are sent to the penitentiary who have no relatives. They are usually without money. No one writes to them, and sometimes there results a very depressing situation insofar as the particular individual is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is there any authority under this resolution whereby State penitentiaries, State prisons, or local prisons of any kind could be investigated?

Mr. LANGER. We have absolutely no authority to investigate such institutions. We do not go into State prisons. We have no connection whatsoever with them. We deal only with Federal prisons, the Boys' Training School, Ellis Island, and, of course, prisons in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The title of the resolution suggests that only national penitentiaries are dealt with, but there are institutions known as reformatories.

Mr. LANGER. We check all national reformatories.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I understand, the resolution is broader than the investigation of penitentiaries alone, but it is not broad enough to include any State penitentiary or any local prison of any kind.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I have before me a list of the penitentiaries. Last year the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] made an investigation of a most deplorable situation in Alaska. Later he may wish to talk about what he found there when he made his investigation. The situation was disgraceful. It pertained particularly to the GI's there at that time. I am sure that the Senator from Washington will be glad to discuss that situation in detail.

To show the overcrowded condition of national penitentiaries, take the penitentiary at Atlanta. The normal capacity is 2,191. At the present time there are 2,254 inmates. The normal capacity of the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., is 2,046. At the present time there are 2,290 inmates.

McNeil Island, Wash.: Normal capacity, 1,431; actual population at the present time, 1,154.

Alderson, W. Va.: Normal capacity, 495. At the present time 508 prisoners are confined there.

National Training School, Washington, D. C.: The normal capacity is 318. At the present time 395 prisoners are confined at the National Training School.

At the maintenance unit in Springfield, Mo., the normal capacity is 144, but at the present time there are 149 prisoners confined there.

Ashland, Ky.: The normal capacity is 567. The present population is 602.

At La Tuna, Tex., the normal capacity is 516. At the present time there are 658 prisoners confined there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have all the facts which are now being given to the Senate been determined by the investigating subcommittee—and has it gone into details in connection with them—or was this information supplied to the subcommittee by the Justice Department?

Mr. LANGER. No; I will tell the Senator what we do. When we visit one of these prisons, after we get through with the kitchen, we invariably drop in to see what breakfast consists of. Then we go all through the penitentiary. We find out whether there is any discrimination as between various prisoners; that is, whether any prisoner or prisoners are favored as against other prisoners. In addition to that, we ascertain whether any unusual sentences have been imposed on prisoners.

The first time I went to Alcatraz, I was greatly shocked. I had always been told that Alcatraz was the prison to which incorrigible prisoners from all over the United States were sent, and that it was a prison from which no prisoner could possibly escape. I had been told that the kind of prisoner who was sent to Alcatraz was the sort of fellow who would organize other prisoners in an attempt to break out of a penitentiary. Imagine my surprise when I found boys of 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 years of age at Alcatraz. Our investigation disclosed that they had been sent there by the Army or Navy after being sentenced by courts-martial.

The situation was so bad that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] introduced a bill to investigate how punishment meted out by the mili-

tary services compared with punishment imposed for similar crimes in civilian courts. I believe all Senators are familiar with the fact that the investigation resulted in the military authorities appointing a committee, as a result of which the sentences of many GI's, who had been sent to Alcatraz after sentencing by a court-martial, were substantially cut down. In some cases I believe the sentences were reduced as much as 50 percent. As a further result, the sentences of GI's were put on an equality with the sentences of men who had been convicted in civilian courts.

That is not all, Mr. President. We found considerable griping because one man, for example, convicted of transporting an automobile in violation of the Dyer Act had received a 1-year sentence, whereas another man had received a 3- or 4-year sentence for the same crime. We are having a compilation made by the clerks of the court of the United States courts, which I shall later publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing how the various Federal judges pass out sentences for similar crimes. Some judges pass excessive sentences as compared with sentences passed by other judges.

We also investigated the subject of cruel and inhuman punishment. Alcatraz prison is 400 years old. It was built originally by the Spaniards. At Alcatraz there are what are called holes. I am sure the Senators on the floor will be delighted to know that in no prison in the United States is a prisoner ever put into what is known as a hole.

Of course, there is solitary confinement. We always ask to see the men in solitary confinement. We go into the solitary confinement cells by ourselves and we talk to the prisoners. We invariably ask a prisoner in solitary confinement how long he had been in solitary confinement. I am sure every Senator will be glad to know that in no instance, even in Alcatraz, have I ever found that a prisoner had been in solitary confinement for more than 30 days. Usually the solitary confinement is for about 10 days. Of course, as a rule, it is entirely at the discretion of the deputy warden. Furthermore, the general belief has been that men in solitary confinement exist on bread and water. That is not true. As a matter of fact, the public health authorities have devised a special spinach diet which, although it is not very popular with all the prisoners, contains a sufficient amount of calories to guarantee the prisoners' getting more to eat than they would if they were fed on bread and water, so far as calories are concerned.

Another subject into which we inquire is radio equipment, and whether radios are available to the men. We check on whether they have motion pictures available once a week or twice a week, and as to what newspapers are available to the prisoners, and what kind of magazines they get to read.

We also investigate recreational facilities. At Alcatraz the yard is entirely too small for recreational purposes. After I went there the first time with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], we recommended that Alcatraz be closed. In that recommendation we followed the opinion of the late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Frank Murphy, when he was Attorney General. However, nothing was done about it. The situation has gone on until, for the first time, we find Mr. James Bennett, who, by the way, is an excellent man to have in charge of the entire Prison Bureau, with a remarkably fine record, and respected by the wardens and prisoners alike, recommending that Alcatraz be closed and replaced by an institution located in the interior of the United States. Such an institution, centrally located, would eliminate the excessive transportation charges which are now involved in transporting a prisoner across the country, in some instances all the way from Maine to San Francisco. Under Mr. Bennett's suggestions, we plan to recommend to have a prison built somewhere in the central portion of the United States, to replace Alcatraz. Such a prison, says Mr. Bennett, would cost between seven and seven and one-half million dollars.

Today at Alcatraz it costs 2½ times as much to board a prisoner as it does in any other penitentiary anywhere else in the United States. We could take a prisoner from Alcatraz and board him at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York, at a much cheaper cost than it takes to board him at Alcatraz. I am sure that the distinguished Senators who made the investigation will bear me out when I say that Alcatraz does not even have its own water supply. Every drop of water used in Alcatraz must be transported from San Francisco. It is impossible to get on the rock by normal means. A tractor arrangement hooks into the automobile or station wagon and drags the car up to the top of the rock.

The recreational grounds are entirely too small. A great many other reasons are embodied in our report which show why Alcatraz should be closed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not intend to have my good friend from North Dakota go into such a dissertation on penitentiaries. I merely wished to find out how the money was to be spent. As I understand, the money would be used to pay the travel expenses of Senators who may be designated by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to make the investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. However, I wanted my distinguished friend from Louisiana and my other colleagues to know all about the penitentiary system.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think I know something about the system already. I have visited some of the Federal prisons myself in recent years. I was at Alcatraz and had occasion to visit with the warden there. I agree with my good friend that a much better place could be found. However, we are discussing the resolution which entails only the expenditure of $5,000, and my whole purpose in asking the question was to find out how the money was to be spent. As I understand, the $5,000 would be used to defray the traveling expenses of the Senators who would make the investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have any reports been made by any of the Senators who made investigations?

Mr. LANGER. We always make a report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am glad to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to my friend from Louisiana that I had the perhaps dubious distinction and honor of serving as chairman of the subcommittee which made the investigation when I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to say for the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that I do not know of anyone who has done more as an individual in examining the Federal penitentiary system of the United States than has he. I am glad the resolution is before us, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, because in the past 4 or 5 years the Senator from North Dakota has personally gone to these penitentiaries and done the kind of job which he has described here today.

I must say that we had a little trouble from the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee in having signed the vouchers for the expense account of the Senator from North Dakota, and I know that on many occasions the Senator from North Dakota has paid out of his own pocket the traveling expenses, only—not his personal expenses—for doing the kind of job he has done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield at this point, let me say it is evident that the Senator from North Dakota must have paid only his own expenses, since only $500, I believe, was spent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it was approximately $500.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, if in the past the work has been done so well by spending $500 or $600 a year in the course of these investigations, why is $5,000 necessary at this time?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that the reason is that it is desired to close Alcatraz, and the committee is interested in making an investigation to ascertain where the new penitentiary should be located and what new location for it will result in saving the most money for the Government—for example, whether it should be located in Illinois or in Wisconsin——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or in Louisiana.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, or in Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. We do not want it there.

Mr. LANGER. We are going to make a full investigation to ascertain where it should be located. In addition, we have to send someone to Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii; I do not see how that can be avoided.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the record, Mr. President, since the Senator from Louisiana asks whether the work can be done in the same way, let me say that I believe a great deal remains to be done. The great problem is whether to keep Alcatraz open or to close it.

The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct in the statement he

has made, for we could board the prisoners at Alcatraz as cheaply in the Waldorf-Astoria or the Statler Hotel or the Mayflower Hotel as we can board them at Alcatraz.

So far as the situation in Alaska is concerned, let me say that I happened to be in Alaska, and I did this work there without any expense to anyone.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Washington did not submit a bill for the work he did there, did he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I did not.

The situation in Anchorage, Alaska, and elsewhere in Alaska is deplorable, insofar as this matter is concerned. If a fire were to break out in the penitentiary there, many prisoners would die.

On the whole, the Federal penitentiary system is well conducted, I believe the Senator will agree.

However, another question which is being examined is the boarding of prisoners in county jails, and also the question of favoritism, discrimination, and so forth, as regards the county jails, where the United States pays a certain amount daily for boarding Federal prisoners.

I believe $5,000 is not sufficient for the doing of this job properly.

I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for the fine job he has done individually. I believe he is the only Member of the Senate who has paid any attention to the Federal penitentiary system. He has done a fine job, and I hope he continues to do it. Certainly, $5,000 is little enough for the doing of the job which I hope he will do.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Washington.

I may add that the present population of the Federal penitentiaries is 17,945.

Let me say, further, that I believe I have the assistance of the best subcommittee any committee has ever had. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. We have held meetings on this entire problem, and those Senators are keenly interested in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator will go into another question, Mr. President, namely, the establishment of another women's penitentiary. At the present time there is only one women's penitentiary, and it is located at Alderson, W. Va. Because the population of the Nation is moving westward, and because of the transportation problem—this matter does not involve the cost per inmate at the Alderson Penitentiary—we have to look into the question of whether a women's penitentiary should be established in the West, or on the west coast. Many problems arise in that connection, as a result of the growing population and the needs. Many of the buildings at the present women's penitentiary are old and in bad condition.

I believe this job should be done. If it costs only $5,000 to do the job, I believe that money will be well spent, in view of the good that will be done, not only for the inmates of the penitentiaries but for the entire society of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that when we visit the prisons, we invite the prisoners to write to us if they think there is anything wrong either with their own conviction or with the way the institution is conducted. As a result, we have received a considerable number of letters. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the testimony taken at the hearing held before the subcommittee on February 12, 1953, and also the exhibits which were submitted at that time.

There being no objection, the hearing and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES, FEBRUARY 12, 1953

(Present: Senator LANGER (chairman), Senator WELKER, Senator HENNINGS.)

(Pursuant to a meeting called by the subcommittee on national penitentiaries of the Senate Judiciary Committee at 10 o'clock February 12, 1953, and under the rule, Senator LANGER, chairman of the subcommittee, has invited Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, to be present at the meeting to give the following statement and testimony:)

Senator LANGER. What is your name and position?

Mr. BENNETT. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons.

Senator LANGER. How long have you held this position?

Mr. BENNETT. I have been Director of the Bureau of Prisons since 1937. Prior to that time I was Assistant Director, and prior to that time I conducted a study of the Federal prison system for a committee of Congress. I have therefore been intimately acquainted with the Federal prison system since 1926. I am here, Senator, at your suggestion to supply you with information that the committee will need to take into account in determining what the policy of the Congress should be with respect to Federal prisons generally and the United States penitentiary at Alcatraz in particular.

Senator LANGER. I would like to have you go into all the prisons, not only Alcatraz, but we want to have the benefit of your information concerning the other Federal prisons, too; however, we will ask about Alcatraz first if you wish.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Senator, Alcatraz was taken over by the Federal prison system from the Army back in 1934. It was established during the period of kidnapings and bank robberies and when there were a number of escapes from Federal institutions. It was to be a place where the most desperate escape risks could be sent and where those men who failed to adjust in other institutions could be sent. It has been in operation since that time and I think it has served a very excellent purpose in our Federal prison system. It is the final step, perhaps, in our whole prison classification system. I would like to say at the outset, Senator, that I have recommended that Alcatraz be replaced with a modern, more centrally located institution.

There are a great many objections to Alcatraz from an administrative and operating standpoint. It is way out on the west coast. It is on a rocky island, to which all water has to be transported; where it is difficult to obtain personnel. Generally speaking, it is an extremely difficult institution to administer at that location. However, I have said and I sincerely believe, Senator, that we need an institution for that type of prisoner in the Federal system. The Federal system now has in it, today, a total of 17,945 prisoners, which is about 470 more than the same day last year, and our average population throughout the year is roughly a little more than 500 in excess of the previous year.

Into the Federal prison system are coming now an increasingly difficult group of men to handle. We are receiving men sentenced from the civil courts not only for offenses like sabotage, kidnaping, murder, and armed robberies; but in addition, we are receiving into our system serious offenders from the District of Columbia who, for one reason or another, have not been able to adjust in the District institutions. We have more than 600 such prisoners, Senator. Most of them are men who cannot be handled in the medium custody institutions in the District, and they are sent to Atlanta and Leavenworth. Out of that group a few men have to go to Alcatraz. We have 31 prisoners in Alcatraz who were committed by the district court of the District of Columbia. In addition to that, we are receiving prisoners from military installations. From the military courts they go to the disciplinary barracks and while in the disciplinary barracks get into trouble, for one reason or another. If you want me to point out to you some specific cases of that kind I will be glad to do so.

Senator LANGER. We would like to have some cases pointed out to us.

Mr. BENNETT. I will make the record brief, Senator. Here is a man, say prisoner No. 5, who is an Army prisoner and was sentenced originally to 50 years for rape while in Germany. He forced two women into a barn at gun point, and when one of the victims attempted to escape he shot and killed her.

He then tied a second woman up and raped her. Prior to entering the military service he had a rather serious delinquency record. His record prior to custody for this offense consisted of a long list of other wrongs. He was tried in various Army institutions and then sent to Leavenworth, where he caused a disturbance by fighting in a cell house. He had knives in his possession, and with one of these knives forced another inmate to engage in homosexual relations with him. Alcatraz was the only place for him.

Senator LANGER. How could a fellow like that get into the Army?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, in all probability he falsified his record at the time he went in, and before the Army authorities could catch up with him he had been transported to Germany.

Senator LANGER. What the committee wants is a full picture. This is very interesting.

Mr. BENNETT. I have here various examples that I would be glad to give.

Senator LANGER. The stenographer will let the record show that they are filed.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENNETT. But to revert to the general policy with respect to Alcatraz, let me say that it is only the vicious, dangerous, difficult prisoner we have to send to Alcatraz. For instance, the man who commits murder in prison—and unfortunately we do have cases of that kind occasionally—the man who repeatedly attempts to escape, the man who organizes strong-armed groups in the prisons, or who steals the other man's food and his commissary, must be segregated at a place like Alcatraz. We simply don't have the facilities to handle them in our other institutions. Senator, in the Federal system there are only really two other close custody prisons, the one at Leavenworth and the prison at Atlanta.

Presently Leavenworth has a population of 2,290, which is about 500 above what we would like to consider its normal capacity, where every man can have reasonably good quarters. I mean by that where he can have a single cell or is not crowded in too closely with others.

Likewise, Atlanta has a population now of 2,254, and there, too, we have only a limited number of single cells. These prisons were originally built on the theory that the men could be quartered together in group cells and that proper discipline could be main-

tained in cells where as many as four men would sleep. Now actually we have had to doubledeck most of these cells and there are now six to eight men in the cells. And, of course, when a man can't be by himself, as is the case in the new institutions, like Terre Haute, where most of them can be housed by themselves, the danger and disciplinary problems are more acute. It is true that we do have some dormitories in some of our newer institutions, but most of the men are reasonably comfortably housed. The man who, for one reason or another, needs to be quartered alone, can be put in a single cell. For example, we have men who are queer individuals—can't get along with the other inmates. We can put those in a single cell by themselves in Terre Haute. Or we get men in our institutions who, in the broad sense, are criminals in that they have violated laws which technically make them offenders, but they are not criminals in the sense that they offend basic moral laws. For example, Senator, there are a great many people who are sent to us for violating the liquor laws who can see no great moral wrong in that. Whether they are right or wrong I do not attempt to say, but I do say that some of those fellows should not have to be housed with these more vicious and difficult individuals. But the point I am trying to make is that I think we are adjusting these men at Alcatraz quite well. Some of them do better there than in the big houses. For instance, take a fellow like H. B., kidnaper and murderer, who put a wire cord around a warden's neck and escaped from a State prison. That is a very old trick with prisoners. They take a piece of fine wire, reach out from behind or through the bars with this wire and loop it over the officer's neck and say, "Now, you let me out of here, you S. O. B., or I am going to cut your head off." That's how one of our prisoners got away from a State institution.

Senator LANGER. And he escaped?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; and then got involved in a kidnaping, and then was sent to us.

Let me give you an overall view of the Federal system. We have now some three different prisons in the Federal system, ranging all the way from maximum security penitentiaries to reformatories and correctional institutions and camps, where the men build roads and do other construction work. Incidentally, Senator, approximately 25 percent of our population is in minimum custody camps and institutions where there is not a gun around, where there is not a single evidence of physical restraint, and we have had a very fine record in that regard.

Senator WELKER. How does your escape record there compare with your physical restraint institutions?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Senator, it is higher, of course. It is higher because we sometimes make a mistake and do not pick the right ones, but they don't get away from us for very long. It is true they run away, but we catch up with them. In the 16 years since I have been Director of Prisons, Senator, we have handled some 250,000 prisoners in our institutions. Of these, except for 78 Mexicans who escaped from our camps on the Mexican border and presumably got back into Mexico, only 7 are unaccounted for today. The fellows we are putting in these open camps, most of them, are on the Mexican border. They are the wetbacks and Mexicans that come over the border. We are trying to get a little work out of them while they are in our custody. And, in the second place, we just don't feel that we can afford the expensive cells and facilities that we need for these other men. A maximum custody cell, Senator, nowadays, costs from $12,000 to $15,000 per man. The old conventional cell where he has the bars and the toilet and washbasin in his cell are extremely expensive. We are putting all these bootleggers, check forgers, income-tax evaders, and the like into these minimum custody institutions; but, on the other extreme, we do have these serious offenders, bank-robbery cases, kidnaping cases, men who have committed murder in the Army, saboteurs, and the like. Our very vicious criminals have to be held under pretty restricted conditions. We are getting men out of the military prisons and out of the District of Columbia. At the present time we have in our system 601 prisoners committed to us from the District of Columbia—fellows here in the District who do these bank robberies, housebreakings, etc., that they can't take care of in the District. The District penal institutions are dormitory type, with no walls around them, so they transfer the more serious cases to us. Out of that 601 there are a handful of prisoners we have not been able to take care of at Leavenworth, Atlanta, and Lewisburg. We move these to Alcatraz. In addition to that, we have over 2,000 men out of the Army and the Navy—men who committed some serious crime abroad, usually murder or rape.

We have no, or very few, desertion cases, as the Army takes care of these themselves. Actually, the Army has now about 8,000 prisoners in Army disciplinary barracks. They skimmed the most difficult cases off and transferred about 2,000 to us. They are, for the most part, young, aggressive fellows. We have tried to absorb them in our institutions. Our theory on Army and Navy cases is that they are young fellows and that maybe whatever they did is sort of a casualty of the war. We are trying to give them every chance in our other institutions. Many of them are making good. We are having some success also in restoring a few to the service. Small numbers of them who simply can't get along with other men are sent to maximum custody prisons. Not a few are homosexuals. There is a case here of a fellow who viciously attacked another prisoner homosexually, held a knife to his side while he attacked him. That sort of fellow we have had to keep locked up, and we have sent some of those on to Alcatraz. As I say, the whole Federal system is based on classifying these prisoners according to their character and according to their behavior. We move them around from one place to another. As I was telling Senator LANGER, we do all we can to help a man adjust in the institution. Some of these fellows with long terms, who see little or no hope of getting out, get terribly discouraged, depressed, and get what the psychologists call a situation psychosis. We try to move them about from one place to another. We transfer the men around rather frequently and it seems to help. I think that is one of the secrets in running an institution: giving a man every possible trial. That is what we do with the men at Alcatraz. We send a man there only after we have tried him at other institutions. He gets out there and not infrequently he changes over and makes good. Then he goes back. I have a number of cases I would like to submit to you.

Senator LANGER. Let this be made a part of the record.

Mr. BENNETT. I was telling Senator LANGER about one of America's top bigtime criminals who went to Alcatraz. He was serving a sentence in the Kansas State Penitentiary—a life sentence—and he escaped from that institution by making a wire loop and attaching it to a stick and putting it over the warden's neck and bringing it up tight enough so that another yank would have decapitated him, and then said, "Now, you let me out of here," and he did. Then the prisoner became involved in a kidnaping and came to us. Eventually he was sent to Alcatraz, and while at Alcatraz, after a little while, made an excellent record. He went along well there for 10 years. He just did his own time. We moved him out, as we do the other Alcatraz fellows who make good. He has now been at Leavenworth for 6 or 8 years and he is doing a fine job. He has a life sentence. He is 62 or 63 years of age now. He is the kind of fellow that if he had originally remained in a place like Leavenworth, they would have been afraid of him because they knew what kind of a fellow he was. They would have locked him up as they used to do in the old days, segregated him. I am sure, under such conditions, he would have become troublesome. So we put him in Alcatraz, where we have staff enough to be able to watch him carefully; let him work around the institution, and he has done well. A prisoner at Alcatraz doesn't have to stay in his own cell—he can move about, get exercise, and he just doesn't go "stir bugs," as the fellows say. As I told the chairman, I have recommended that the institution at Alcatraz be replaced; not that it is not serving a very important purpose in our whole penal system but it is located way off on the west coast, on a dreary, rocky island. It is extremely expensive to operate. We have to have water taken in there, and personnel do not like it; we almost have to order men to go there. It is an administrative monstrosity.

Senator WELKER. I am quite familiar with the institution. I have been there and looked at it. It is not only an administrative headache but it is not a good prison from the proposition of reform. It is a depressing institution.

Mr. BENNETT. That is right, and I have felt it ought to be replaced as soon as it could possibly be done with a more modern institution with a better geographic location. I have submitted to the budget from time to time estimates for a new institution, and I think this year, Senator, in the budget message of President Eisenhower, he may suggest that the committee give consideration to replacing the institution. I am hoping that some day we can replace it.

Senator WELKER. How many men do you have at Leavenworth?

Mr. BENNETT. Two thousand two hundred and ninety.

Senator WELKER. How many at Atlanta?

Mr. BENNETT. Two thousand two hundred and fifty-four.

Senator WELKER. At Lewisburg?

Mr. BENNETT. At Lewisburg we have one thousand and seventy-eight.

Senator WELKER. How about McNeil Island?

Mr. BENNETT. In the prison proper, Senator—the main building—992 men, and at the farm or the prison camp at McNeil Island, 162 men.

Senator WELKER. And only two hundred and sixty at Alcatraz?

Mr. BENNETT. At Alcatraz today, two hundred and twenty-nine.

Senator WELKER. Isn't there a terrific cost to maintaining that institution for only that many people?

Mr. BENNETT. That is true, Senator, but it makes our other institutions cheaper to operate. For the prison service as a whole we never operated with fewer man-years of employment than we do now.

Senator LANGER. Mr. Bennett, would you mind filing that sheet giving the prison population, and would you prepare another sheet alongside it showing the number of inmates 5 years ago and 10 years ago?

Mr. BENNETT. How would you like to have me prepare a sheet showing normal capacity of these institutions? For instance, McNeil Island is the most crowded of any of the institutions. We are taking everybody from the west coast into that institution. All of the cells are double-decked, with the exception of a handful. Men are in these congregate or double-decked cells—one of the most serious problems we have, from the point of view of crowded institutions.

(See exhibit B.)

Senator LANGER. What is that institution doing, from the point of view of program?

Mr. BENNETT. They are doing a lot of things—running a cannery, making warehouse pallets, salvaging cable for the Navy, and running a big farm.

Senator WELKER. There is a definite need for a new institution on the west coast?

Mr. BENNETT. There certainly is, or in that general area—in the Northwest or on the west coast. We are having to take prisoners from southern California, the Los Angeles area, quite a ways east—many going to camps—one camp at Tucson, Ariz., one at Florence, Ariz., and one at Wickenburg, Ariz. We keep moving more of them east. A great many of them are younger boys—the young kids that steal automobiles here in Washington or out in North Dakota—and drive to Hollywood, which is the Eldorado where they seek adventure. We are having to move those young 16- and 17-year-old boys who, while troublesome, are not too difficult, all the way to Denver, Colo. We have a boys' institution or young offenders' institution just outside the city of Denver. We ought not to have to move many that far away, because it costs the Government a lot of money to transfer them long distances. So I am hopeful that some day we can get something on the California coast.

At El Reno, Okla., there is another type of correctional institution for young men whose most frequent offense is stealing an automobile. There are more Federal offenders apprehended for stealing automobiles now than for any other offense. I think the next highest are the liquor law violators and next, check forgers. But most of the automobiles are stolen by kids. We are putting these young men in the reformatories and emphasizing vocational training. We have a very good set of courses in welding, machine shop practice, on automotive engines, etc. The most spectacular vocational training shop is the airplane engine machine shop at Chillicothe, Ohio, where we are training them to be airplane engine mechanics.

Senator HENNINGS. These young men we receive in the system for stealing an automobile, forging a check, for committing some offense in the Army, we have a series of correctional institutions and reformatories where we send these boys, and we place great emphasis on vocational training?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, Senator, That is correct.

Senator HENNINGS. The National Training School at Chillicothe, for instance?

Mr. BENNETT. The National Training School is here in the District of Columbia and is for juvenile delinquents. We have an airplane engine mechanics shop at Chillicothe Reformatory for young men and boys. We have put through that school now some 300 boys and they have all gone out—all of the 300 who have gone out—have gotten jobs and they have done well except about 30. We have to measure that percentage of violators against the fact that in the country as a whole 60 percent of the men who are leaving prison, will be back in again in a period of 5 years. In some States it runs as high as 70 percent repeaters. We think we have a pretty good record in the Federal system. We think not more than 20 to 25 percent of our men again get into difficulty but we have no means of following up. We can't be sure of this figure because after the man is off parole we have no followup system.

These correctional institutions and reformatories for young men are at once a most challenging problem. In some ways they are our most difficult institutions to operate. The young fellow who is aggressive, is usually a person who just doesn't fear very much. He is not afraid of God, man or the devil. Many of them fail to learn by experience—they are unable to follow through on any steady pattern. And so by and large are a very difficult group to handle, but we are spending our money on these fellows. They are worth saving.

Perhaps you will recall that 2 years ago Congress passed a special act called the Youth Correction Act to deal with such cases. This act provided that a judge in his discretion, could commit a young man 21 years of age or under to a special board for an indeterminate period not exceeding the penalty prescribed by statute. This board would determine the type of institution, what type of treatment he would require, whether he should go to a camp, correctional institution, or what should be done with him. And they would have the authority to determine how long he would stay, whether they would release him conditionally or release him outright. The act has not yet been implemented because of some delay in getting the funds and some delay in making appointments of the members of the board. The board has not been appointed and therefore cannot go into action. When we get that act set up, which has a lot of advantages—the judges are very enthusiastic about it—we will be able to do a lot of things for these boys we can't do now. I am hopeful it will soon be implemented.

Then, in addition to these prisons and reformatories we also have correctional institutions for short-term offenders.

Senator HENNINGS. What about Danbury, Conn., and Texarkana, Tex.?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir. They are correctional institutions that take older men who are not habitual offenders—not vicious offenders—who are liquor-law violators, check forgers—and other not too serious offenders. Those men, for the most part, are not under close custody. There are no walls, they are only protected by fences. The men work and they have a pretty good program for most of those fellows. They are small institutions.

We have been able to keep our institutions fairly small. Only Atlanta and Leavenworth are Big Houses. The rest of the institutions we keep to 50 to 600.

In the institution at Ashland, Ky., for instance, we have about 600 in it now.

Senator LANGER. Mr. Bennett, it would be of great value if you would take a list and tell us about each institution separately, and the experience you have had at each place.

Mr. BENNETT. I will be glad to furnish this information.

Senator LANGER. The stenographer will list these institutions on separate pages. (See exhibit C.)

Senator WELKER. I am interested in seeing that adequate facilities are provided in the west coast area.

Senator HENNINGS. I had the experience of having spent 8 years of my life, first as a youngster as assistant district attorney—actually trying the cases before juries in a city of a million people—and thereafter I was elected district attorney and served until I went into the service, so I have always had a real interest in this whole phase, and I have suffered disquiet and misgiving since I was exposed to it during that period of time. I found myself worrying about these unfortunate people and saying, "and there, but for the grace of God, go I." I had a caseload of 1,500 a year there in my own division. Thereafter, when I was district attorney the caseload was around 3,000 or 4,000 a year. I had general supervision but did not see as much of the individuals. I was interested in the book Stone Walls and Men, and there is much interesting and challenging material being written on this whole subject. But the overall thing that has disturbed me more, Mr. Chairman, since you raised that point, is the whole system—not that I believe that I know as much about it or have any such ideals as Mr. Bennett and you gentlemen who have a better understanding of the whole problem. My old friend, L. C. Dyer, the man whose name is placed on the Motor Theft Act—L. C. has said many times he thought that act was a mistake. For instance, unfortunately it is a sentence under that act that sometimes causes trouble in an institution. Take one thoughtful judge in Illinois, for instance, who will give a boy who goes joyriding a year and a day, and then another judge somewhere else will give the same boy 3 to 5 years, depending on the capriciousness of the judges. That makes for unrest in an institution. One boy will say, "Here's this fellow who has done this or that—the same thing I was sentenced for—and he gets off light, and here I am doing all this time for the same offense."

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, Senator; that makes for bitterness in our institutions.

Senator HENNINGS. I was on a board called the Missouri Crime Survey, and we went into the effect of implementation of the parole system and the economy. For instance, a fellow in one division is not put on probation and the fellow in the next division is. The judges don't seem to care what effect this has on the fellow who is not put on probation or what happens to the man.

Mr. BENNETT. Probation varies from 70 percent of the cases in New England to about 10 percent in another area.

Senator HENNINGS. I just wanted to indicate some of the fields of the broad subject.

Mr. BENNETT. I am delighted you people are taking an interest in this. I have been director for 16 years and this is the first occasion that I have ever had the privilege of coming up and having a general discussion of our problems. Every other time I have been on the mat for something or other. This is literally the first time anybody has ever sat down and said, "What are your problems, Bennett?"

Senator HENNINGS. You are an expert, Mr. Bennett—I have heard it from many sources. I for one member of this committee am not in any sense approaching this undertaking with any view to spying or undertaking to suggest that I, from reading some book or other, from what I have seen, know anything like what you gentlemen know, but we would like to help you.

Mr. BENNETT. We have endeavored to do the best job possible, and we certainly want advice and help.

Senator HENNINGS. You can call on us for assistance and counsel.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a lot of literature, but I know you will not have time to read it.

Senator LANGER. I am sure the members of this committee will be glad to read it.

Mr. BENNETT. I can file with the committee a number of pamphlets and reports.

Senator LANGER. Mr. Bennett, would you mail these direct to Senator HENNINGS, to Senator WELKER, and also to myself—all that you have?

Mr. BENNETT. I will be glad to do so, Senator.

Senator LANGER. We want your honest opinion. If you haven't got money enough, we want to know it; if you haven't been treated right by some of the committees, we want to know it.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Senator.

I have possibly talked too much about Alcatraz. Were you here, Senator HENNINGS, when I said I recommended that the institution be replaced and hoped that some day that will come?

Senator LANGER. Mr. Bennett, will you give us the names of some of the men who are engaged in this work, the institution they are with, and tell us what they are doing?

Mr. BENNETT. At Alcatraz, Mr. E. B. Swope is the warden. He is doing an excellent job. I have talked enough about that I guess. Our institution at Atlanta has 2,254 inmates, and the warden is W. A. Hiatt. He is likewise a career man in our service. He is from Idaho, having been head of the State constabulary in Idaho some time ago; but he has been in our service for some 30 years. The institution at Atlanta, I think, is running very well, Senator. It has a good employment program, a good educational program. The institution is completely self-sustaining—it doesn't cost the taxpayers a

penny to run it. The big item manufactured at Atlanta is cotton canvas used for mail bags, tarpaulins, and other items. In addition to manufacturing clothing and other material, there is a big farm. The problem at Atlanta is that we are very crowded.

Senator HENNINGS. How old is the Atlanta institution?

Mr. BENNETT. It goes back to 1902. It was built by the prisoners themselves, but our principal problem at Atlanta is that we have about 500 more prisoners than we can handle properly. There are relatively few single cells. Not having adequate space for men where they can live by themselves makes for trouble.

Senator HENNINGS. Are there any big-timers there?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; long-term offenders.

Senator HENNINGS. What type of offenders?

Mr. BENNETT. Why auto thieves, check forgers, liquor-law violators, and the like. Incidentally, one other thing that is happening throughout our system is that our colored population is increasing so rapidly. The colored population has increased in Atlanta now until it is nearly one-third, and that has meant that we have had to transfer some of the colored men into white quarters. We have been trying to break down this race segregation in every way possible. Our problem at Atlanta and Leavenworth is very much the same—not enough single-cell space.

At Leavenworth the population is 2,290. Mr. C. H. Looney is warden. He has just been appointed to succeed Warden Hunter, who retired. Primarily, they manufacture shoes for the Army and other Government agencies, but in addition to that, they manufacture furniture, chairs, desks, and brushes.

Senator LANGER. And you have a farm there, too?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we have a large farm, and there is one of my problems. As you know, Senator, we had a flood at Leavenworth on the Missouri this spring and it cost us over $100,000 loss on the farm, crops, animals, etc., so we have to save that money somewhere because up to now the budget people have said, "We are not going to give you any supplemental appropriation—you will just have to find some money elsewhere."

Mr. Looney, prior to being warden at Leavenworth, was warden at Milan, Mich. Prior to that time he was an associate warden at Leavenworth and Terre Haute. He is a career officer, Senator, a young man of about 55, but a very able fellow, I think.

Senator HENNINGS. At that point, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, in most of our institutions now the warden is the superior administrative officer, but there are captains who deal with the disciplinary problems, assignment of tasks, etc.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, at a place like Leavenworth we have a warden, and under him three important officers: An associate warden, in charge of mass treatment, discipline, assignment of jobs, etc.; an associate warden in charge of individual treatment, who supervises the hospital, runs the schools, and does the welfare work. Then we have a business manager, the fellow who runs the finances. In our system, Senator HENNINGS, we have avoided placing the power of discipline in one man. When a man comes into our institution he comes before a classification board. They have his full record, a statement of his crime, his home and social background, a report of the doctor, a report of the psychiatrist and psychologist, etc. This committee sits down and says, "Now, this fellow presents such and such a problem." They talk his case over thoroughly. They may say he is a maximum custody case—has to be kept under close supervision—or maybe they will say he is a minimum custody case, in which event he can be put out on the farm or open camp. Then they question him and say, "Now, what do you want to do while you are here?" If he is a young fellow we try to get him to take a training job; if an older man we say, "Do you want to work in the industries," and if so, we try to allocate the pay jobs on a basis of financial need. We pay them wages, you know. Then this committee decides what his job is going to be. On the question of discipline, Senator HENNINGS, we do not use the yard-captain system. We have a discipline committee, the chairman being the deputy warden. They bring the man in and if it is a minor offense, such as failing to get up in the morning—or if he says he is not going to do that job—the deputy warden will say, "Well, all right, you are going to lose your motion-picture privilege," or will deny him some other privilege. But if it is a serious offense—if he has refused to work or if he gets into a fight, or if he steals cigarettes, then we bring him before this committee and file a specific charge against him. He is privileged to select from any personnel in the institution, counsel, and they will adjourn the meeting until he confers with his counsel. The board hears him and says he is guilty or not guilty. They give him a trial, bring in witnesses, then the board decides what to do with him. They can let him off, restrict his privileges, or they can give him time in two different types of segregation. He may be locked up in a cell by himself but has full meals; or for a time they can put him in solitary—what the boys call "in the hole."

Senator WELKER. Do you have anything like "Siberia," like they have in some State institutions?

Mr. BENNETT. No, Senator. If he gets solitary he gets, as the boys call it, "The Spinach Diet." It is a full 3,500 calorie diet, but no meat. It is not palatable. They would really rather have bread and water than the spinach diet.

Senator HENNINGS. I remember seeing discipline enforced in the Missouri State penitentiary. They used to take a fellow, put him in solitary, and they would even turn the hose on them—I know it has happened. Others would have to stand on the line. Years ago they had a great scandal in my State where they strung them up by their thumbs. Is there any such treatment in any of our Federal institutions?

Mr. BENNETT. None, no, sir.

Senator WELKER. The formative years of my life were spent at a penitentiary. My father was connected with the Idaho penitentiary from the day I was born, and I used to play on the ball team there until I was a junior in college. Like Senator HENNINGS, I started as a prosecutor and have done a lot of work in this field. I think you have a committee here that is really interested. I am sorry to say in our Idaho institution they have what is known as "Siberia" and it is a disgrace.

Senator HENNINGS. You still have it?

Senator WELKER. Yes; and we had a riot out there. The place is so crowded there is no place to enforce discipline. There is no solitary block out there that is not occupied.

Mr. BENNETT. Our next penitentiary is the one at Lewisburg, Pa. The population is 1,178, and the warden is George H. Humphrey. He is also a career officer in the Federal prison system, having had 20 years experience. Lewisburg is a relatively new institution, having been built in 1932.

Lewisburg has only a relatively few cell blocks. It has no big cell blocks as in some other institutions. It does have open dormitories or barracks like the Army and Navy. It has too many open dormitories. The open dormitories can lead to lots of trouble; but the institution was built in 1932 under an economy program. It only cost about $3,000 a man, even though it is very imposing looking. The architecture is Italian Renaissance, one of the finest examples of Gothic architecture in the country. But our principal problem at Lewisburg has been, again, not enough single rooms—not enough single cell space.

Senator WELKER. Alger Hiss is serving his time at Lewisburg, is he not?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we have a lot of prominent cases—Alger Hiss, Harry Gold, and there are two Communist leaders up there.

Senator WELKER. Has Hiss been a good prisoner?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; he has made an excellent prisoner. He has taken it hard and he is doing what the boys call "hard time." But he has never asked a favor or a privilege. We have assigned him to the storehouse. One of the things you have to worry about with these notorious prisoners is their assignment. Frequently there are charges we give such prisoners cushy jobs.

Senator WELKER. That question has been asked me many times.

Mr. BENNETT. That is why we have had to be careful, but we have a number of others—Winter and this fellow who used to be a member of the New York Board of Aldermen and a Communist, Gates, I think this fellow's name is, and there are others, all problems.

Mr. WELKER. Are they hard workers? Do they cause you trouble?

Mr. BENNETT. Some do. They are more apt to get neurotic and we have to move them to the hospital or find other ways to help them adjust.

Senator HENNINGS. What about this fellow who was convicted in Boston for broadcasting in Germany?

Mr. BENNETT. You are doubtless thinking of Best. He died—had a brain tumor, but these fellows are difficult for another reason. Some of the other men pick on them, steal their shoes or mess up whatever their work is. On the other hand, some of these fellows who come in are fine fellows and do well.

Senator LANGER. Will you tell us about the medical center at Springfield? I think Frank Boehm was there for a time.

Mr. BENNETT. We sent him to Springfield. At Springfield we take first of all the serious medical cases—cancer, serious surgery, TB cases, and others of that kind because we cannot afford diversified medical treatment at other institutions. We also take mental cases, men who have been declared psychotic by the courts and are held awaiting trial until they recover their sanity, or who since being convicted have become insane.

There is an increasing number of mental cases. That is one of my No. 1 problems—lack of facilities for these mental cases. The Congress passed a law here about 2 years ago providing that a Federal judge or United States attorney, if he had reason to believe that a prisoner was mentally incapacitated, could commit him to us until such time as he recovered his sanity, and we have quite a few of those. This fellow who attempted to shoot at the Senator here, we got him, and the fellow who attempted to blow up the Voice of America station, the court, prior to trial, found he was insane. This fellow from Denver, Colo., who threatened the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and a number of people who have threatened the President—some of them are dangerous and others are not. At Springfield now we have a total of 746 men in the hospital. The superintendent of the hospital is Dr. I. W. Steele, a medical officer of the Public Health Service and a psychiatrist.

In addition, there are 149 men in what we call the maintenance unit at the Springfield camp. We have to maintain the institution with able-bodied prisoners and we have a separate building for them. The hospital is crowded. We have quite a few sex cases and homosexual cases that come to us out of the Army and the Navy—sodomy charges—and we have tried to separate the congenital homosexuals. We have also been trying to

do some research on them. For instance, we thought there was a good deal of hope in injecting hormones, and it did have some measure of success with some of them, but it hasn't proved itself. Now we are trying the group-therapy approach. We are trying to guide and direct these men and encourage them to sustain each other. Alcoholics Anonymous is a system of group therapy. We think the idea can be applied to homosexuals as well.

Senator WELKER. I shall not interfere any more, but do you have any publications or any documents that would show any increase in homosexuality?

Mr. BENNETT. It is on the increase, and quite alarmingly so. However, I don't think that I could show that the number of congenital homosexuals are on the increase, that is, the fellow who says he was born that way. They say, "That's the way the Lord made me and you can't change it so you might as well recognize it." I don't think that group is increasing, but I do think, Senator WELKER, that moral standards and the general public attitude toward that type of offense has changed to the point where, well, people don't fight against it as much as they used to and as a result there is more of it. Kinsey says that at least 60 percent of the men in institutions have some sort of experience of that kind while they are in the institutions. Our whole policy has been toward fighting it every time and every way we can. We suppress it and when we find a fellow of that kind we lock him up or we discipline him and we try to remove the fellow who is the temptation. It leads to fights and one of the things most people don't realize is that it leads to homosexual panics. Here is a fellow who comes in and he wants to avoid this thing. Next thing he knows he has some wolf trying to make a pass—handing him cigarettes, giving him commissary. He knows that guy is trying to make him and he knows he doesn't want to get in a fight. He can't sleep, he blows up, but he doesn't tell us about it until after he blows up. What we are trying to do, Senator WELKER, is to give such individual a greater measure of counsel and personal help. Now here is Tommy. Tommy is a good kid, but built in such a way that the rest of the boys are picking on him. We try to see that he is protected, helped, and placed in situations where he will not be under constant pressure. All in all it is one of our most difficult problems.

Senator LANGER. What about the women's institution at Alderson, W. Va.?

Mr. BENNETT. At the Federal institution for women at Alderson, W. Va., we have 508 persons, just about its capacity, or 80 more prisoners than a year ago.

Senator LANGER. Who succeeded Miss Hironimous down there?

Mr. BENNETT. Miss Nina Kinsella.

Senator LANGER. What was her experience before?

Mr. BENNETT. She worked here in my office. Prior to that time she was connected with the Massachusetts prison system. She has been in this business for a good many years. The population of the women's institution down there consists almost 50 percent of drug cases. The women who are convicted of drug violations go usually to Lexington, Ky., but that is crowded and so they take women down to Lexington, get them off the drug, and then transfer them to us; or if they are older and more habitual drug offenders they come directly to us.

Senator HENNINGS. Senator WELKER, you had a couple of them before your crime committee, didn't you?

Senator WELKER. Yes; the wife or the girl that married the colored Jim Yellow Roberts. She was a pusher and a drug addict—a beautiful girl—but married this colored boy.

Mr. BENNETT. We had a similar and interesting case of a boy who married a colored girl. It was the same situation as the Roberts' case except in reverse.

But getting back to Alderson, it is a cottage-type institution where the women live in separate buildings housing about 50 or 60 women in each building. Each woman has a room to herself. There are no guns or fences, no walls, and little or no evidence of any outward restraints. We have a building, where on the second floor, we can lock up our more serious cases.

Senator LANGER. I was particularly impressed with the dairy.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we run a dairy at most of our institutions. At Alderson we have a herd of Holstein dairy cattle and the women operate the dairy. It is a good herd and they do a good job in operating the dairy. We have a good pasteurizing plant and the girls take a great deal of interest in the program.

Senator LANGER. I may say that they get up at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning to take care of the cows and there is not one fly in that stable and it is so clean you could almost lie on the floor or play cards on it.

Mr. BENNETT. All our farms, we think, are pretty good. We are milking now over 800 Holsteins a day and our average is 12,500 pounds per cow per year. Our farm income approximated $2,000,000 last year.

Senator LANGER. But to get back to Alderson, do they keep colored girls separate?

Mr. BENNETT. Colored girls are in a separate building. They have the same type of room, the same facilities.

Senator LANGER. There is no objection on the part of the colored girls to being segregated?

Mr. BENNETT. No objection.

Senator LANGER. Are there any mental cases at Alderson?

Mr. BENNETT. We have no place for women, at Alderson who are mental cases. The young woman who killed her husband over in Germany—shot him in cold blood—is a mental case. She is very paranoid and neurotic but the court found she was mentally responsible for her crime. Nevertheless, she is a mental case and we are trying to get her into St. Elizabeths now. There are quite a few of them who are mentally ill. Some day we may have to get to the point where we will have to have special hospitals for women prisoners who are mental cases.

Senator LANGER. What about the McNeil Island Penitentiary?

Mr. BENNETT. It is located on a 4,400-acre island near Tacoma, Wash. At present there are 992 inmates in the institution. Mr. Fred Wilkinson is the warden. He is a career prison officer. For a good many years we ran a training school for new officers and he was the training officer in charge. He had previously been a prison inspector, and he is doing a fine job at McNeil Island.

The problems at McNeil are the crowded condition of the cell house and lack of space. Also, it is a rather expensive institution because it is on an island and transportation costs are high. Of course island prisons are always expensive to operate.

Mr. BENNETT. Our next institution, Senator LANGER, or prison, is the one located at Terre Haute, Ind.

Senator LANGER. In my opinion that is the worst one you have. I think I saw more dirt and filth there than I have ever seen. I may have gotten that impression because each time I investigated the warden wasn't there and I had to see the deputy warden. But I don't think the warden was dishonest. I heard some say they thought some of these heifers were being sold. I checked on that afterwards and found that was not true, but there was something about that place, Mr. Bennett, that just didn't look right. I tried to get Senator CAPEHART and Senator JENNER to go out there but they couldn't go. But frankly, that is the one institution that I would say needed more constant supervision.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope you will go there with me again when the warden is there.

Senator LANGER. Who is the warden there?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Overlade.

Senator LANGER. I think your man Steele at Springfield is a wonderful man. He has the rank of colonel and he is a fine fellow. I am going to ask this committee to go down to Terre Haute unannounced to see this institution.

Senator WELKER. I'm glad you said unannounced, because you usually find things as they ordinarily are, but they will dress it up for an investigating committee.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to go along if you care to have me do so.

Senator LANGER. We would be glad to have you go with us.

Mr. BENNETT. We have 1,500 acres there and are raising our own beef at Terre Haute now. It was a former chemical warfare plant about 10 miles from the institution. We manufacture woolen blankets there at Terre Haute. It is a very successful industry. A very considerable percentage of the men are employed. We also run a cannery and do work for the Army and Navy in the way of salvage work.

Senator LANGER. I don't know enough about the way you run your places, but I notice they don't release the prisoners in the town.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we did have an unfortunate situation when one of the inmates was discharged in the town and he got into trouble immediately—stole an automobile—and there was an incident about it. Our policy is that when a man is discharged from an institution he is to be put on a train or bus and gotten out of town. For some reason in the case of this particular fellow they neglected to do that, so he got into trouble right in the town and the local police didn't like it.

Senator LANGER. Do you believe that when we drop into a penitentiary we should invite the Senators from that State to go along or not?

Mr. BENNETT. I wish you would, Senator.

Senator HENNINGS. About this matter of visiting the prisons. I wish, Mr. Bennett, you would speak very freely to us, and I know you will about this. I understand by the grapevine, or rather Frank Boehm told me that, for example, when they transferred him from Terre Haute to Springfield they put him in a cage between two Negroes. Then they ran out of gas in St. Louis at a busy time of the day when people were going to work and all the people were staring at him in this cage. The driver was running around trying to find a place where he had authority to buy gasoline. It was sort of like Oscar Wilde's experience, with all the people on this busy street stopping to look at him. But of course nobody would have recognized him because he had a growth of beard. Boehm also said the grapevine was an amazing thing in a place like Springfield. They tapped out messages on the pipe and would know a week in advance whether a lot of "hot boys" from Chicago were headed for Springfield or not, and what had happened at Atlanta, and said they knew more about what was going to happen, in many respects, than the officials of the prisons.

Mr. BENNETT. It is greatly exaggerated, but there is something to it. But on the matter of transportation, transferring is done by United States marshals and it is a problem. A United States marshal is fired if a prisoner escapes while in his custody, so they shackle them.

Senator LANGER. How much did the Sandstone institution in Minnesota cost?

Mr. BENNETT. It cost about a million dollars. But it is at the wrong place. Sandstone, between Minneapolis and Duluth, was selected during prohibition days. We had quite a lot of Canadian liquor runners coming in from Chicago and Duluth, Minn., and up through that area and now the population from that section of the country is way down. The number of commitments from that whole area up there, Senator, from the

States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, North and South Dakota and Iowa, is very small.

Senator LANGER. Why couldn't you transfer prisoners from other places?

Mr. BENNETT. It would be too costly.

Senator LANGER. Yes, but other places are overcrowded and there is more room there.

Mr. BENNETT. But these institutions like Atlanta and Leavenworth cost only about $3.25 per man per day. It would cost, in that cold climate, $5.50 per man per day, and that was one of the reasons for closing it. Then transportation costs and fuel costs are high. It would have been all right under the original plan, but it wouldn't work now. It is one of the few institutions we have in our system that was politically located. It was located up there during prohibition days. And there was a great deal of pressure to put it there, and it was the only Federal penitentiary in that area.

Senator HENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, to me this whole thing is so complex, I find myself in wonderment. I just want to say this—I would like to have Mr. Bennett make some suggestions—not now—but give some thought as to the best manner in which to visit these institutions. I think we should do a good job when we go into it. I have great revulsion at parading through some institution and have them say, "Well, there goes another group of those stuffed shirts."

Senator LANGER. Do you think we should go alone?

Mr. BENNETT. If one of you would go with me on an inspection trip and then hold open house—just open the door and see these prisoners come in with their complaints and see for yourself how it is run.

Senator HENNINGS. Do you think these groups that go through these institutions cause any resentment?

Mr. BENNETT. No, sir. On the contrary, I think you would get a tremendous amount of satisfaction out of getting better acquainted. Some fellows on the House side did this and I think they got a great deal out of it. Sometimes these fellows have justifiable complaints. I usually spend a couple of days at a prison, but if you could do it in a single day it would be fine. I usually sit in on a classification board and go around and check everybody in the whole institution.

Senator LANGER. It is embarrassing to have the warden there. The prisoners don't talk as freely.

Senator WELKER. It is human nature. If a man is serving a 20-year term he doesn't want to get up and say anything against the warden.

Senator LANGER. On the other hand, it is dangerous to go alone. The prisoner could charge you made all kinds of promises to him. I usually get a male stenographer and take him along. But it is dangerous to have some fellow say that you made him a lot of promises. Perhaps two should go together.

Senator HENNINGS. Mr. Bennett, you make some suggestions—you know the business.

Mr. BENNETT. Why don't you go with me, Senator HENNINGS, out to Leavenworth?

Senator HENNINGS. I have to make a speech in Topeka, Kans., on Washington's Birthday. We will see if we can work it out.

Senator LANGER. When will you be at liberty to meet again?

Senator WELKER. I am between speaking trips.

Senator LANGER. We will postpone it until you get back.

Senator HENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I leave Friday.

Senator LANGER. Suppose we make it a week from Tuesday—that will be February 24, at 10 a. m.

EXHIBIT A

ILLUSTRATIONS OF ALCATRAZ CASES

B. P.: DANGEROUS HOMICIDAL KILLER

Sentenced May 21, 1936, to 30 years for armed bank robbery on temporary parole from the Alabama State Prison where he had been committed on a life sentence for murder. He was then 23. His criminal record began with a car theft in 1929 when he was 13 years old. He was 17 when he committed the murder which resulted in his State commitment. Transfer to Alcatraz was made in August 1936 because he was regarded as too serious a security risk to remain at Atlanta.

In May 1938 R. P. and two other inmates attempted to escape from Alcatraz. In the course of this attempt he killed an officer of the institution and was subsequently tried for murder and sentenced to life. There are many reports of other serious violations while at Alcatraz including serious assaults on other inmates, striking an officer, and conspiracy to escape.

In recent years he has evidenced some tendency to conform to institutional regulations but he must still be regarded as a potentially serious custody hazard and dangerous both to officers and other inmates.

M. S.: ATOM SPY

M. S. was transferred to Alcatraz within the past few months. He is under sentence of 30 years for conspiracy and espionage. He was associated with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg (who are currently awaiting execution for their part in the conspiracy) and delivered secret information to them. He also attempted to recruit others who were employed by the Government and national defense industry into Soviet espionage.

When the arrests of the other principals began he fled to Mexico but was deported by Mexican authorities and arrested at the border. Because of the nature of his offense, the length of his sentence, and the fact that he had attempted to flee the country prior to arrest, it is believed that the interests of security are best protected by his confinement in Alcatraz.

R. N. B.: NAVY PRISONER, MANSLAUGHTER CASE

The Bureau of Prisons receives from military authorities nearly all of their most difficult problem cases. R. N. B. is undoubtedly one of the most difficult prisoners whom we have yet received from the Navy. He was originally sentenced to 20 years for manslaughter, breaking arrest, and a. w. o. l. In 1945 he was taken into custody by a local law-enforcement officer for interrogation by service police. While en route he drew a gun on the officer and struck him over the head. The car in which they were driving went out of control and the officer was killed. At Portsmouth Naval Prison he was found to be too difficult to handle. He was transferred to Lewisburg, where he became a serious disciplinary problem—was insolent and refused to work. He was transferred to Leavenworth, where he became the leader of a strong-arm gang which attacked another prisoner, severely injuring him. Finally it became necessary to transfer him to Alcatraz.

In the 4 years that he has been at Alcatraz he has been found to be temperamental and subject to emotional outbursts. He has been making some progress, however, and has earned the restoration of a part of the good time forfeited at Leavenworth. Eventually, as he shows his ability to control himself, he will probably be returned to one of our other institutions.

L. E. F.: MILITARY PRISONER, RAPE CASE, AGGRESSIVE HOMOSEXUAL

L. E. F. is an Army prisoner who was originally sentenced to 50 years for rape. While in Germany in 1945 he forced two native women into a barn at gun point. When one of the victims attempted to escape he shot and critically wounded her. He then tied the second victim and forcibly attempted to rape her.

Prior to entering the service he had a delinquency record. At 17 he was committed to a boys' training school for robbery and attempted rape of his victim. At 18 he was committed to the Michigan State Reformatory for breaking and entering. He was paroled but was returned as a violator after an arrest for carrying a concealed weapon.

His record in our custody included a long list of conduct reports—he caused a disturbance in the cellhouse, he was found with contraband knives in his possession, he forced one inmate to engage in homosexual relations with him, and attacked another with a piece of iron. His consistent pattern of aggressive assaultive behavior made it necessary to remove him from Leavenworth, and he was transferred to Alcatraz in 1950.

B. B.: GANGSTER, ESCAPE RISK

B. B. is serving 31 years for robbery of a United States mail truck of more than $100,000. He is a gangster with a long and serious criminal record which dates to 1925. He escaped from Atlanta in 1926, from the custody of a United States marshal in 1928, and attempted to escape from jail in 1930. In 1932, while awaiting trial for armed robbery in Detroit, he procured a gun, shot the jailer, and escaped. In 1934 he received a 99-year sentence in Illinois for kidnaping. A year later he attempted to escape from Menard. He, together with several other inmates, attacked a guard, commandeered a truck, and crashed through the prison gates.

In October 1942 B. B., with several other gangsters, succeeded in obtaining firearms, wounding a guard, and escaped in the car of the victim. After several weeks he was recaptured after a gun battle with Federal agents. This prisoner is now 52 years of age, but he is still regarded as an escape risk of the highest order. In addition, he is an institutional problem, and only a few months ago was a participant in a work stoppage at Alcatraz.

H. K.: INVOLVED IN MURDER OF ANOTHER INMATE

H. K. is a 23-year-old white man who was originally sentenced to a term of 2 years and 3 months for the Dyer Act. His delinquency began at 17, when he was committed to the State Industrial School at Camp Hill, Pa. At the age of 21 he received a 3-year sentence for Dyer Act and was committed to Leavenworth and later transferred to Lewisburg. He was transferred to Lewisburg on his current sentence in August of last year, when it appeared that he was properly classified for a penitentiary rather than a correctional institution.

On October 9, 1952, while assigned to a labor detail in the institution compound he assaulted a fellow inmate with a pick, and his victim died shortly after the attack. While awaiting trial on the murder charge he was reportedly involved in a plan to escape from jail by seizing a gun from one of the officers who had him in custody and attempting to shoot his way out. On February 3, 1953, he received a 15-year sentence for second-degree murder and has been recommended for transfer to Alcatraz in the interest of the security and safety of other inmates and for his own protection.

C. G.: HISTORY OF ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIOR, AWAITING SENTENCE FOR MURDER OF ANOTHER INMATE IN ATLANTA

A 35-year-old prisoner committed from the District of Columbia on a 4-to-12-year sentence for robbery. His arrest history dates back to 1937 and includes some 49 arrests in the Washington area for such offenses as robbery, assault, assault with deadly weapon and larceny. He was transferred to us from the District of Columbia because of a history of homosexuality and because he was felt too difficult to handle at Lorton. His pattern of assaultive behavior continued at Atlanta and on December 18, 1952, he stabbed and killed another inmate while at work in the industries building. Investigation showed that this offense grew out of a homosexual affair. He cannot be returned to the population at Atlanta because of hostile

feelings of other inmates toward him and because of his persistently aggressive behavior toward others.

J. H.: A LONG SENTENCE FOR ROBBERY AND MURDER

J. H. is a 31-year-old man from Chicago whose arrest record dates to the age of 15. He has previously served in the State prisons at Joliet and Pontiac. In 1949 he, with three companions, were intercepted by bank guards after a robbery. They shot and killed both officers. The victims were killed by bullets from a submachine gun. He is wanted by Illinois authorities in connection with these offenses also. He is regarded as an extremely dangerous individual who would attempt to escape at any cost and is thought to be a calculating, cold-blooded killer.

C. C.: HISTORY OF ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIOR, DANGEROUS TO OFFICERS AND INMATES

C. C. is a military prisoner serving a life sentence for murder. This offense occurred while in military confinement at Camp Cooke, Calif. He with three others persuaded a military guard to let them out of their cells and they promptly attacked a fourth inmate with an iron pipe and stabbed him. He does not have a serious prior civil delinquency record, his Army adjustment was marked by desertion on three occasions. Since transfer to Leavenworth it is reported that he has threatened to assault officers of the institution and was found to have concealed a 6-inch highly sharpened knife with which he allegedly planned to assault a foreman in the shoe factory. His persistent pattern of assaultive behavior makes retention at Leavenworth inadvisable.

W. A. C.: SERIOUS ESCAPE RISK

A 28-year-old white man from California serving 50 years for kidnaping. His prior criminal record includes commitments to Lewisburg and to San Quentin. In his present offense he lured a 12-year-old girl into an automobile, threatened her with a gun and sexually attacked and beat his young victim. He has been at Leavenworth since May 1952 and reports have come to the attention of officials which indicate that he with five other men have been organizing a plot to escape from the institution. In view of the length of his sentence, the fact that he is wanted in California, the serious nature of his present offense and his implication in an escape plot, transfer to Alcatraz seems advisable.

EXHIBIT B

Population statistics, Federal prisons

Institution	Normal capacity	Actual population, January—		
		1943	1948	1953
Alcatraz, Calif.	384	255	260	229
Atlanta, Ga.	2,191	2,100	2,016	2,254
Leavenworth, Kans.	2,046	1,880	2,272	2,290
Lewisburg, Pa.	1,431	1,115	1,351	1,178
McNeil Island, Wash.	854	1,012	1,307	1,154
Terre Haute, Ind.	1,205	626	1,133	1,093
Alderson, W. Va.	495	550	458	508
Chillicothe, Ohio	1,523	1,194	1,192	1,051
El Reno, Okla.	1,339	939	952	982
National Training School, District of Columbia	318	336	335	395
Petersburg, Va.	808	467	432	697
Springfield, Mo.:				
Hospital	988	861	702	746
Maintenance unit	144	189	77	149
Ashland, Ky.	567	446	439	602
Danbury, Conn.	500	396	377	408
Englewood, Colo.	550	381	359	343
La Tuna, Tex.	516	529	626	658
Milan, Mich.	808	473	522	633
New York, N. Y.	142	253	182	182
Sandstone, Minn.		490	110	
Seagoville, Tex.	443		415	407
Tallahassee, Fla.	622	328	432	417
Texarkana, Tex.	398	396	417	513
Mill Point, W. Va.	258	224	117	143
Montgomery, Ala.	295	282	194	189
Natural Bridge, Va.	83		68	60

Population statistics, Federal prisons—Con.

Institution	Normal capacity	Actual population, January—		
		1943	1948	1953
Tucson, Ariz.	258	150	149	184
Other institutions now closed		306		
Emergency camps: [1]				
Allenwood, Pa.				70
Avon Park, Fla.				112
Florence, Ariz.				129
Tule Lake, Wash.				63
Wickenburg, Ariz.				123
Total	19,003	16,132	16,874	17,945

[1] Opened in fiscal year 1952.

EXHIBIT C

FEDERAL PRISONS, 1953

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, ALCATRAZ, CALIF.

Date opened: 1934.
Normal capacity: 384.
Present population: 229.
Type of prisoner: Serious escape risk or otherwise so dangerous as to require maximum supervision and custody.
Warden: Edwin B. Swope—25 years business experience, 3½ years as warden of New Mexico State Penitentiary, and 18½ years with Federal prison system.
Personnel: 136 regular; 9 medical, and 10 industries.
Area served: Direct commitments are not ordinarily made to this institution. Men are transferred here only after they have failed to adjust at one of the other institutions.
Industries operated: Brush factory, cargo nets, clothing factory, dry cleaning, glove factory, mat factory, laundry, shoe repair shop, wood furniture factory.
Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $585,595.
Farming operations: No farm at this institution.

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, ATLANTA, GA.

Date opened: 1902.
Normal capacity: 2191.
Present population: 2254.
Type of prisoner: Habitual or professional offenders.
Warden: William H. Hiatt—served 5 years as sheriff in Idaho, 4 years Idaho State Constabulary, 10 years business experience, has a total of 24 years' service in the Federal prison system.
Personnel: 293 regular, 13 medical, 4 commissary, 90 industries.
Area served: Alabama, eastern Arkansas, New England States, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, southern Indiana, Kentucky, eastern Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, southern Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.
Industries operated: Canvas specialties, clothing factory, mattress factory, print shop, textile mill.
Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $8,630,445.
Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 1,174; value of farm production, 1952, $150,380.

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Date opened: 1895.
Normal capacity: 2,046.
Present population: 2,290.
Type of prisoner: Habitual or professional offenders.
Warden: Chesley H. Looney—8½ years' business experience prior to entering Government service, 20 years with Federal Prison System.
Personnel: 283 regular, 14 medical, 6 commissary, 72 industries.
Area served: Arizona, western Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, western Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, northern Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.
Industries operated: Brush factory, clothing factory, print shop, shoe factory, wood furniture factory.
Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $8,310,629.
Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 1,400; value of farm production, 1952, $221,326.

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, LEWISBURG, PA.

Date opened: 1932.
Normal capacity: 1,431.
Present population: 1,178.
Type of prisoner: Younger type adult offender considered as favorable prospect for rehabilitation.
Warden: George W. Humphrey—experience as public accountant and auditor prior to Government service, 21½ years in Federal Prison System.
Personnel: 247 regular, 11 medical, 4 commissary, 48 industries.
Area served: New England States, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia.
Industries operated: Clothing factory, metal furniture factory.
Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $2,165,791.
Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 1,500; value of farm production, 1952, $141,298.

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, M'NEIL ISLAND, WASH.

Date opened: 1909.
Normal capacity: 854.
Present population: 1,154.
Type of prisoner: Primarily for habitual or professional offenders.
Warden: Fred T. Wilkinson—6½ years with United States Marines (1930 to 1934 and 1943 to 1946), 15 years with Federal Prison System.
Personnel: 227 regular, 11 medical, 3 commissary, 15 industries.
Area served: California, Idaho, Montana Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Territory of Alaska.
Industries operated: Cannery, furniture-repair shop, pallet shop, shipbuilding.
Annual sales of industries' products, 1952: $1,256,364.
Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 1,327; value of farm production, 1952, $108,402.

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, TERRE HAUTE, IND.

Date opened: October 1940.
Normal capacity: 1,205.
Present population: 1,093.
Type of prisoner: The more hopeful rehabilitative prospects among the adult group of offenders.
Warden: J. Ellis Overlade—16 years with Bureau of Reclamation as accountant and auditor; 23 years in Federal Prison System.
Personnel. 224 regular, 10 medical, 3 commissary, 35 industries.
Area served: Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin.
Industries operated: Cannery, woolen mill.
Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $3,400,579.
Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 2,284; value of farm production, 1952, $114,255.

FEDERAL REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN, ALDERSON, W. VA.

Date opened: 1927.
Normal capacity: 495.
Present population: 508.
Type of prisoner: Adult women with sentences from 6 months upward.

Warden: Miss Nina Kinsella—12½ years with Massachusetts Department of Corrections 23 years with Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 146 regular, 11 medical, 2 commissary, 13 industries.

Area served: All judicial districts.

Industries operated: Garment factory, laundry.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $238,225.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 285; value of farm production, 1952, $50,634.

FEDERAL REFORMATORY, CHILLICOTHE, OHIO

Date opened: 1926.
Normal capacity: 1,523.
Present population: 1,034.

Type of prisoner: Youthful offenders who offer favorable prospects for rehabilitation.

Warden: Dr. Robert P. Hagerman—4 years private medical practice, 16 months Army medical officer, 12 years Public Health Service, 13 years Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 254 regular, 11 medical, 3 commissary, 40 industries.

Area served: New England States, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pensylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Industries operated: Chair factory, foundry.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $711,434.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 692; value of farm production, 1952, $101,510.

FEDERAL REFORMATORY, EL RENO, OKLA.

Date opened: 1923.
Normal capacity: 1,239.
Present population: 982.

Type of prisoner: Youthful offenders who offer good prospects for rehabilitation.

Warden: William H. Hardwick—9 years business experience, 22½ years with Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 231 regular, 12 medical, 2 commissary, 27 industries.

Area served: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Industries operated: Broom factory, machine die and tool shop, print shop.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $1,282,015.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 2,451; value of farm production, 1952, $112,704.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Date opened: 1875 (transferred to Bureau of Prisons July 1939).
Normal capacity: 318.
Present population: 395.

Type of prisoner: Juvenile offenders under 17 years of age.

Superintendent: Dr. Louis Jacobs—16 years service as medical officer with Public Health Service, appointed superintendent of the National Training School in December 1952.

Personnel: 138 regular, 9 medical, 3 commissary, 5 industries.

Area served: Principally area east of Mississippi River with all commitments being through special designation.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 172; value of farm production, 1952, $17,276.

FEDERAL REFORMATORY, PETERSBURG, VA.

Date opened: 1930.
Normal capacity: 898.
Present population: 697.

Type of prisoner: Young men principally from rural areas, who are hopeful prospects for rehabilitation.

Warden: Richard O. Culver—6½ years in construction trades, served with United States Marines before entering Government service and during World War II, approximately 23 years in Federal prison system.

Personnel: 134 regular, 6 medical, 2 commissary, 3 industries.

Area served: Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, western Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 825; value of farm production, 1952, $54,146.

MEDICAL CENTER FOR FEDERAL PRISONERS, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Date opened: 1933.
Normal capacity: Hospital, 988; maintenance unit, 144
Present population: Hospital, 746; maintenance unit, 149.

Type of prisoner: Chronically ill, mentally ill, and psychopathic offenders.

Warden: Dr. Ivan W. Steele—24½ years medical officer with Public Health Service and 5 years Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 304 regular, 34 medical, 3 commissary, 7 industries.

Area served: Commitments are primarily by transfer from other Federal institutions.

Industries operated: Parachute factory and dental laboratory.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $111,816.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 340; value of farm production, 1952, $66,481.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, ASHLAND, KY.

Date opened: 1940.
Normal capacity: 567.
Present population: 602.

Type of prisoner: Sentences of less than 1 year and offenders with sentences not exceeding 3 years, who are above the reformatory age and do not require commitment to a penitentiary.

Warden: Allen L. Shank—17 years in public education, 2 years in educational work with United States Army, 23 years with Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 112 regular, 6 medical, 1 commissary, 10 industries.

Area served: Kentucky, Virginia, southern Indiana, western North Carolina, southern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, eastern and middle Tennessee.

Industries operated: Fiber furniture factory, tobacco factory, wood furniture factory.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $334,113.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 124; value of farm production, 1952, $45,965

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, DANBURY, CONN.

Date opened: 1940.
Normal capacity: 560.
Present population: 408.

Type of prisoner: Offenders with relatively short sentences but who are not proper commitments to reformatory or penitentiary.

Warden: Harold E. Hegstrom—11 years in public education, 5 years superintendent of the Minnesota Training School for Boys, 14 years with Federal Prison Service.

Personnel: 12 regular, 6 medical, 2 commissary, 8 industries.

Area served: New England States, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, eastern and middle districts of Pennsylvania.

Industries operated: Glove factory.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $817,850.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 131; value of farm production, 1952, $45,411.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, ENGLEWOOD, COLO.

Date opened: 1940.
Normal capacity: 550.
Present population: 343.

Type of prisoner: Youthful offenders in the 16- to 20-year group primarily committed under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act.

Warden: Mylton L. Kennedy—5 years in educational work, 13 years with Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 128 regular, 6 medical, 1 commissary, 7 industries.

Area served: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 495; value of farm production, 1952, $26,723.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, LA TUNA, TEX.

Date opened: 1932.
Normal capacity: 516.
Present population: 658.

Type of prisoner: Largely Mexican aliens who have violated immigration laws, and the remainder is composed of men serving relatively short sentences.

Warden: Robert H. Armstrong—Experience includes services with the Veterans' Administration, as auditor for the General Accounting Office, cavalry officer in World War I, 25 years' service with Federal Prison System.

Personnel: 105 regular, 5 medical, 1 commissary, 1 industries.

Area served: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, southern California.

Industries operated: Dairy.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $161,914.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 278; value of farm and dairy production, 1952, $74,113.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, MILAN, MICH.

Date opened: 1933.
Normal capacity: 595.
Present population: 633.

Type of prisoner: Adult violators of narcotic laws and offenders serving sentences of 3 years or less who are not suitable for reformatory nor properly classified for penitentiaries.

Acting warden: David M. Heritage—4½ years with D. C. Board of Public Welfare as case worker, 15 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 105 regular, 6 medical, 2 commissary, 17 industries.

Area served: New England States, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, eastern and middle districts of Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Industries operated: Metal specialty factory.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $432,016.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 271; value of farm production, 1952, $69,851.

FEDERAL DETENTION HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK CITY

Date opened: 1929.
Normal capacity: 142.
Present population: 182.

Type of prisoner: Primarily persons awaiting trial.

Warden: E. E. Thompson—10 years in farming and police work, 4 years in United States Army, 26½ years in Federal prison system.

Personnel: 55 regular, 4 medical, 1 commissary, 7 industries.

Area served: Serves as detention institution for eastern and southern districts of

New York and receives prisoners from the New England States and adjacent areas who are transported to other Federal institutions by Bureau of Prisons busses.

Industries operated: Laundry.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $52,178.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, SEAGOVILLE, TEX.

Date opened: 1940.
Normal capacity: 443.
Present population: 407.

Type of prisoner: Men who can be expected to benefit from and who can adjust under a minimum custody environment. Receives prisoners by transfer from Leavenworth, El Reno, and other Federal institutions as well as selected direct commitments.

Warden: Herbert A. Cox—13 years in public education prior to entering Government service, 15 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 106 regular, 5 medical, 1 commissary, 5 industries.

Area served: Transfers from other institutions and direct commitments from Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

Industries operated: Furniture-refinishing shop, garment factory.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $396,688.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 690; value of farm production, 1952, $40,710.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Date opened: 1938.
Normal capacity: 622.
Present population: 417.

Type of prisoner: Offenders serving sentences of a few months to 2 years who are beyond reformatory age but who are suitable for confinement in a medium-custody institution.

Warden: Cecil J. Shuttleworth—8 years as law-enforcement officer prior to entering Government service, 2½ years in United States Army, 19 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 87 regular, 6 medical, 1 commissary, 3 industries.

Area served: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Puerto Rico.

Industries operated: Laundry.

Annual sales of industries products, 1952: $33,713.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 594; value of farm production, 1952, $33,942.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, TEXARKANA, TEX.

Date opened: 1940.
Normal capacity: 398.
Present population: 513.

Type of prisoner: Primarily men serving short sentences as well as violators of the narcotics laws not addicted to the use of drugs themselves.

Warden: Albert McDonald—8½ years as deputy warden at Eastview Penitentiary, New York; 12 years as building contractor, 25 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 98 regular, 6 medical, 1 commissary, 1 industries.

Area served: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: Acreage under cultivation, 508; value of farm production, 1952, $44,395.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, MILL POINT, W. VA.

Date opened: 1938.
Normal capacity: 258.
Present population: 143.

Type of prisoner: Adult offenders serving 1 year or less, special designations of men serving longer terms and carefully selected transfers from closer custody institutions of men who do not present serious custody risks.

Superintendent: Kenneth E. Thieman—4 years Kansas State prison system, 11 years in lumber business, 18½ years Federal prison system.

Personnel: 30 regular, 1 medical, 1 commissary, 6 industries.

Area served: Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia.

Industries operated: Lumber products and sawmill.

Amount sales industries products, 1952: $122,152.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Date opened: 1930.
Normal capacity: 295.
Present population: 189.

Type of prisoner: Adult offenders serving a year or less, special designations of men serving longer terms and selected transfers from closer custody institutions.

Superintendent: James B. Gaffney—7 years in building and general construction work, 3 years United States Army, 22½ years in Federal prison system.

Personnel: 30 regular, 1 medical, 1 commissary, 1 industries.

Area served: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

NATURAL BRIDGE CAMP, GREENLEE, VA.

Date opened: 1944.
Normal capacity: 83.
Present population: 60.

Type of prisoner: Juvenile boys.

Camp director: Claude O. Botkin—20 years in administrative and parole work with Illinois State Reformatory, 7 years with District of Columbia penal institutions, 13 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 24 regular, 1 industries.

Area served: Commitments are principally by transfer from the National Training School for Boys, although a few direct commitments are received from nearby districts.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, TUCSON, ARIZ.

Date opened: 1933.
Normal capacity: 258.
Present population: 184.

Type of prisoner: Offenders having sentences of a year or less, specially designated persons having longer terms and transfers of carefully selected men from closer custody institutions.

Superintendent: Joseph E. Thomas—18 years commercial experience as clerk, accountant, railway traffic representative, and personnel officer, 20 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 34 regular, 1 medical, 1 commissary, 1 industries.

Area served: Arizona, western Texas, southern California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, ALLENWOOD, PA.

Date opened: April 1952.
Present population: 70.

Type of prisoner: Receives adult offenders with terms of 1 year or less who are not considered custody risks and who are in good physical condition and capable of performing manual labor; also receives men suitable for minimum custody by transfer from other institutions.

Superintendent: Guy C. Rexroad—10 years business experience, 9 years public education, 2 years with Kansas State Industrial Reformatory, 19½ years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 17 regular, 1 medical.

Area served: Middle and eastern Pennsylvania and western New York.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, AVON PARK, FLA.

Date opened: January 1952.
Present population: 112.

Type of prisoner: Receives adult offenders with terms of 1 year or less who are not considered custody risks and who are in good physical condition and capable of performing manual labor, also receives men suitable for minimum custody by transfer from other institutions.

Superintendent: Edwin N. Osborne—17½ years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 20 regular, 1 medical.

Area served: Southern Florida.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, FLORENCE, ARIZ.

Date opened: December 1951.
Present population: 129.

Type of prisoner: Receives from courts men sentenced to 1 year or less who are suitable for camps, as well as immigration law violators not regarded as suitable for the Tucson Camp because they present custody problems. Commitments are also made by transfer of specially selected men from closer custody institutions.

Superintendent: Lawrence A. Strubble—10 years as building contractor, 20 years with Federal prison system, served in United States Navy from 1943 to 1949.

Personnel: 23 regular, 1 medical, 1 commissary.

Area served: Arizona, southern California, western Texas.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, TULE LAKE, CALIF.

Date opened: May 1952.
Present population: 63.

Type of prisoner: Receives adult offenders with terms of 1 year or less who are not considered custody risks and who are in good physical condition and capable of performing manual labor, also receives men suitable for minimum custody by transfer from other institutions.

Superintendent: Lemuel S. Fox—4 years in Marine Corps, 22½ years Federal prison system.

Personnel: 19 regular, 1 medical.

Area served: California, Nevada, Oregon.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

FEDERAL PRISON CAMP, WICKENBURG, ARIZ.

Date opened: March 1952.
Present population: 123.

Type of prisoner: Receives adult offenders with terms of 1 year or less who are not considered custody risks and who are in good physical condition and capable of performing manual labor, also receives men suitable for minimum custody by transfer from other institutions.

Superintendent: Emby S. Osborn—experience includes farming, mining, and carpentry prior to Government service, 20 years with Federal prison system.

Personnel: 20 regular, 1 medical.

Area served: Western Texas, southern California.

Industries operated: None.

Farming operations: None.

EXHIBIT D

STATEMENT OF JAMES V. BENNETT, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF PRISONS, BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, DECEMBER 11, 1947

ALCATRAZ

The establishment of the penitentiary on Alcatraz Island was in furtherance of the policy laid down by Congress in the act of May 14, 1930, which directed the development of an integrated Federal prison system. Under this mandate a Federal penal system

with facilities which would permit the effective segregation of all different types of offenders was established.

From the outset of this new policy the necessity was seen for removing from the population of the major penitentiaries the vicious, intractable offenders who were desperate escape risks and who were also a constant threat to the lives other inmates and the personnel. Many of the offenders who were coming into Federal prisons at the time Alcatraz was established had figured prominently in the wave of gangsterism and kidnapings of the early 1930's. This led in 1933 to the acquisition from the War Department of the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Alcatraz Island, Calif., and the remodeling of that institution to provide a maximum custody penitentiary. Also, the institution was to be one more evidence that the Department of Justice did not propose to permit a small number of prisoners to defeat its larger and more important objective of rehabilitating the better type of prisoner.

A secondary objective was to provide the Federal Government with an institution which would be as nearly escape proof as possible. Although there have been several desperate attempts to escape, none of them has been successful. Some years ago two men got out of the institution proper and into the swift waters around the island. They have not been heard from since and we are convinced they were drowned.

A third objective was to furnish an effective answer to those who claimed that prisons did not deter crime because they were all country clubs. It was to be an institution which would be a deterrent for the gangster, the kidnaper, and the ruthless killer. As a matter of fact, that is one of its primary purposes and there are many who believe that the very fact that this institution is functioning and provides a rigid regime for desperate malefactors who cannot otherwise be deterred from violent crime has been one of the principal causes in bringing under control the wave of gangsterism and kidnaping that prevailed a few years ago.

There can be no question moreover that the institution serves a very worthwhile purpose in taking out of other Federal institutions assaultive, dangerous, and vicious prisoners who, if permitted to remain, would make necessary a much more repressive program and complicate opportunities for rehabilitation. The really bad apples are taken out of the barrel and put where they cannot contaminate others and defeat the efforts of those prisoners who are honestly trying to make a new start.

The selection of the inmates for transfer to the institution has been most carefully and painstakingly done in line with these policies. The population has been continuously maintained at approximately the present figure by transferring out of the institution to other Federal prisons those who have profited by their experience at Alcatraz. A man can earn his way out of Alcatraz as well as into that institution. Moreover, we have never permitted it to become overcrowded and there are no instances of brutal or inhumane treatment of the inmates. It is, however, an institution of maximum security and minimum privileges. The discipline is firm but fair.

It has, however, been a difficult institution to administer. Its location in San Francisco Bay complicates our administrative problems tremendously. All the supplies come by water and all of the personnel must be barged to the institution. Its per capita operating cost is about two and one-half times that of our other penitentiaries. While the institution has never been completely modernized along the lines that would seem desirable, the Government nevertheless has an investment in plant and equipment at this institution aggregating two and one-half to three million dollars. However, it could not be replaced by a modern maximum security institution housing 500 inmates at less than seven or seven and one-half million dollars at present prices. I have, as you may recall, Mr. Chairman, indicated on previous occasions that at the proper time it would be wise for Congress to consider appropriating the necessary funds for a new maximum security penitentiary which would be more centrally located and which could be operated at a smaller cost. Of course, before this decision is made the proper committees of Congress will need to reach some conclusion as to the effect of the Alcatraz penitentiary on the criminal element and the extent to which its location, atmosphere, and build-up act as a deterrent to crime.

Also, some decision will have to be reached with respect to supplying water to the institution. At the present time our water is transported to the island through the courtesy and cooperation of the Transportation Branch of the Army. They are, of course, reimbursed for the out-of-the-pocket costs of operating the boat but the Army does not wish to be in the position of budgeting funds used largely for servicing other governmental agencies since they feel that they do not need longer to operate the water boat for strictly Army purposes. After further discussions with the War Department, this matter will again be brought to the attention of the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committee in connection with the 1960 budget as requested by the military authorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) (6) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO STUDY FUEL RESERVES AND FORMULATE A FUEL POLICY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 45) extending the authority for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and the formulation of a fuel policy for the United States, which on January 29, 1953, had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, from which it was reported on February 16, 1953, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "continued", to strike out "through" and insert "during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on"; in line 6, before the word "authorized", to strike out "amount" and insert "amounts"; and in line 7, after "1950", to insert "and continuing resolutions", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 239, 81st Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 374, 81st Congress, agreed to December 21, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 33, 82d Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as extended by Senate Resolution 153, 82d Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 242, 82d Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, in addition to the amounts authorized under Senate Resolution 239, 81st Congress, second session, agreed to August 15, 1950, and continuing resolutions shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution extends until January 31, 1954, the authority for investigations by present subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The subcommittee is studying the fuel reserves in the United States. The resolution authorizes only $10,000 of new money. Approximately $3,000 remains, unobligated, from the appropriation for this purpose in the last Congress. The resolution authorizes a continuance of the investigation, and provides $10,000 of new money to complete this important work.

In our hearings in the Committee on Rules and Administration we heard from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs about the work that committee is doing.

If the Senator from Louisiana wishes a further explanation, I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will be glad to provide it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all I have to say is that this resolution presents us with another case of a continuing subcommittee. The work was begun during the 81st Congress, and has been continuing ever since, and will continue on unless some contrary action is taken by the Senate.

In reading the letter which was sent by my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I noticed that the work done by the committee has been more or less to collect reports from various departments of the Government and to make the reports available to those who may be interested in reading them. I do not know of any benefit that has come from that, or any benefit that will come from continuing this activity.

So I should like to ask my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, what he contemplates doing with this $13,294.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, all I can say is that we expect to continue the good work which was handled under Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, who was chairman of this committee in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

The membership of the subcommittee that will continue the work the committee has done in the past includes two very prominent members on the Democratic side of the aisle, namely, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The purpose of the work of the subcommittee is to accomplish something practical insofar as the fuel resources of America are concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the Department of the Interior is carrying on work similar to that which the committee is performing?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes; but who on Capitol Hill knows anything about these matters unless the various reports and other material are assembled and brought to the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Where does the committee obtain the information? Does not the committee obtain the information from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Department of the Interior, and other Government departments, and simply gather the information together and make it available?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That has been one part of the work the committee has done very successfully.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not that the chief work done by the committee? According to the Senator's letter, the committee has been merely assembling information and making it available to those who may need it. Is not that true?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I expect that, as a result of the work of the committee, ultimately it will be possible for Congress to adopt a national fuel policy which will be of great benefit to the protection and security of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect to accomplish that? This committee has been at work during both the 81st and 82d Congresses. Does the Senator think that by continuing this authority during the 83d Congress his committee will be in position to propose legislation to the Senate?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I am inclined to believe that if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana succeeds to the chairmanship of this committee in the 84th Congress, he, too, will want to continue the work of this very important committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It is like practically every other project provided for on the floor of the Senate, which, as the Senator says, never comes to completion.

Mr. ELLENDER. It occurs to me that the Department of the Interior has done a good job up to this point. It is doing the same work contemplated by this committee. Why spend this $13,294? I believe it could be saved.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, we are not going to spend that sum unless we can accomplish something worthwhile by spending it. I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not sure that the same statement was made last year, but I think there was a little more than $7,000 spent last year. Is that not correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there not a balance of $3,805?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it is now proposed to spend that $3,805 balance, and in addition thereto, another $10,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. We propose to do so, provided we have a program laid out by the chairman of the subcommittee, who, himself, is a mining engineer. On the committee with him are some very able assistants, including the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], in whose State there is a pilot plant operating at this time. We also have as members of that subcommittee the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator state why the funds now available to his committee through the Reorganization Act could not be used for this purpose?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Because, in order to do the work, additional help is required, in addition to that which is provided for under the Reorganization Act. We expect to have a specialist, whom we have not yet selected. We expect to have a very able specialist to assist the subcommittee in its work. In the previous Congress the committee did not have such a specialist.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand it, this work was done in committee through the regular staff.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. In part, it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is proposed now is the employment of extra help. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The specialist will be on the regular committee staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. So, in addition to the four specialists the committee is now permitted to employ, the Senator desires to employ another specialist. Am I correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator mean when he states that he expects to get additional help?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Additional clerical assistance will be required. We could not employ very many specialists, with the total amount provided in this resolution, which is $10,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am simply bringing these matters to the attention of the Senate in order to demonstrate again that, once a subcommittee is created there is no end to it. The committee keeps on spending and usually it grows. It occurs to me that a good deal of this work could be done by the staff which is provided for each committee.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate several weeks ago, each standing committee is authorized to employ 4 specialists and 6 clerks. Each committee may spend up to $95,000. Here it is proposed to provide funds in addition to the $95,000 granted to each committee. This resolution would provide $10,000 extra. It will simply mean the employment of additional help. It seems to me that the chairmen of the standing committees should make every effort to have any extra work done within the allowance which is available to each standing committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Let me assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that he is no more economically minded than is the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We do not intend to spend one dime of the money provided by the resolution unless, in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee, it is necessary. We may require this additional amount for the purpose of continuing the work which was carried on by former Senator O'Mahoney during the 81st and 82d Congresses. I should hate to see that program stopped now, since up to this time the work done has been very good.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has just said that he hopes to be as economical as I have been. I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year. I had $95,000 to spend, and I spent only $37,000. So, if my good friend follows through, and handles his committee as I handled mine, he should be able very easily to do the work contemplated without the extra $10,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks that part of the letter dated February 9, 1953, addressed by the Senator from Nebraska, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, beginning with the second paragraph thereof.

The fuels investigation was initiated by this committee during the 81st Congress. Round-table conferences and hearings were held with top representatives of fuels industries—coal, petroleum, natural gas, et cetera—as well as with representatives of the hydroelectric industry. A monograph of selected materials on all United States fuel resources was published (S. Doc. 8), which was in great demand both in the United States and abroad. The committee also published a study prepared for it by the United States Geological Survey, Fuel Reserve of the United States, and this also was widely distributed. The work of the committee in this field has attracted widespread interest, and the committee is of the opinion these studies should continue.

At this time the committee, among other things, would like to go further into the question of the production of synthetic liquid fuels, to prevent a possible shortage of petroleum and petroleum products, in the event of any interference with our imports.

The international situation lends impetus to the formulation of a national fuels policy for the United States extending not only to its wartime needs, but with a view to a broad general policy. It is believed that the studies which will result from these investigations will amply justify the appropriation of $10,000 which the resolution provides.

The balance to the credit of the committee for these investigations on January 31, 1953, was $3,294.04, making a total under Senate Resolution 45 of $13,294.04. Only one

additional stenographer has been employed heretofore, and the professional work has been carried on by the regular members of the committee's staff.

A proposed budget for the investigations authorized by Senate Resolution 45 is as follows:

Travel and field investigations	$6,489
Reporters	3,000
Stenographers	3,805
Total	13,294

Sincerely yours,

HUGH BUTLER, *Chairman.*

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is legislatively responsible, so far as the Senate is concerned, for the development of the resources of America. I do not think there is a committee whose assignment is more important, and I am sure there is no committee in the Senate whose 15 members are more earnestly trying to perform the work of their committee in a conscientious manner.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to endorse everything that has been said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The work being carried on by this subcommittee is very important.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, our committee is required to exercise supervision over the various departments and agencies coming under the jurisdiction of the committee, and there is no project in the country which is more important than that of developing sources of fuel supply, which may become necessary in the years ahead. We have vast deposits of lignite coal in various Western States, and we feel that this committee is doing a very important work in collecting information about such deposits and in submitting reports to the Senate so that we may go forward with a very effective program which will result in great benefit to the country.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. MURRAY. I desire to say there is no more efficient chairman of a committee in the Senate than the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who is in every way striving to operate on the most economical basis possible. I congratulate him.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 45), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 44) extending authority for the investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "out", to strike out "the date 'January 31, 1935' and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1953'" and to insert "prior to 'January 31, 1935' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on or after January 31, 1953, but prior to June 30, 1953'", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 82d Congress, agreed to June 30, 1952 (authorizing an investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs), is amended by striking out "prior to January 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or after January 31, 1953, but prior to June 30, 1953."

(b) Section 3 of such resolution is amended by strikzing out the figure "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$75,000"; and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the words "or subcommittee, as the case may be."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to continue to object to the adoption of these resolutions, but I think it is incumbent upon the Senate to try to take some affirmative action to reduce the amounts provided by resolutions for investigations and to prevent duplication. Here is a resolution, Mr. President, which comes from the Committee on Rules and Administration providing for an additional appropriation of $50,000. The sum of $50,000 would be made available to the Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the effectiveness of our foreign information program. Only two weeks ago we provided for the Committee on Government Operations the sum of $200,000 in order to enable it to investigate various departments of Government. That is the function of that particular committee.

Judging from newspaper reports, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], is now engaged in investigating the Voice of America, and, in my humble opinion, this subcommittee acting under the Foreign Relations Committee for which additional money is being requested, is going to do the same kind of work, along the same lines, as is being done by the so-called McCarthy subcommittee. The approval of this resolution would simply authorize duplication of a great deal of work which another committee is now undertaking. There is no possible justification in spending $50,000 so that another group of investigators can tread the same ground now being covered by an existing investigation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator insists, I shall yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I simply wish to correct one idea, because I can assure the Senator from Louisiana that the committee to which he refers is in no way interested in the work of the subcommittee which is under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. There is not the slightest similarity in the work of the two committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Arkansas mean to say that the so-called McCarthy subcommittee cannot do what this other subcommittee can do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing similar to the investigation now being conducted.

Mr. President, I should like to correct a technical matter. We are not asking for $50,000 additional money, but for $25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money has been spent up to this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the committee is asking for $25,000 additional, which makes $50,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said "new money." The only logical conclusion to be drawn from what the Senator has stated is that he ignores the fact that a legislative committee can study anything with which it is concerned. It is a perfectly absurd position to take with regard to a committee, that because another committee has power to go into the field, therefore, the particular committee cannot investigate the subject with which it is especially concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt in my mind that the so-called McCarthy committee could investigate, and will probably investigate, the very things which the Foreign Relations Committee wishes to be authorized to investigate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Louisiana realize that this subcommittee has been in existence for 8 months or so?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And that two-thirds of its work has been done in various countries where investigations have been made, and that data have been compiled? The committee wants to conclude its work by the 30th of next June. There are a number of important phases of the investigation of the American information program which it is essential to inquire into before the final report is made. That program has been spending approximately $100 million, and there has not been a real comprehensive investigation of it since approximately 1947.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the contention of the Senator from Iowa that the so-called McCarthy committee could not do the work which the Foreign Relations Committee would do?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Foreign Relations Committee has already done two-thirds of the work. It has concluded, let us say, all but the last third of its operations. I think the McCarthy committee, under the language of the statute, can investigate any situation in Government where a single penny of public money is spent. It has the broadest jurisdiction of any committee of which I know. Certainly it can investigate anything it wants to investigate. But I have every reason to believe that the McCarthy committee is not going into an extensive investigation in this particular field.

As I say, the investigation is two-thirds completed, and we simply want to button up the situation and file a report.

We want to work in conjunction with the committee now established by the President and look into this ramified program. It is a complicated thing, and, in my judgment, greater efficiency can be brought about by the study. I do not believe any other committee is going to invade the full field of the investigation being conducted by the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana will see fit to withdraw his objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been objecting to many of the resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration for the past 3 or 4 weeks, and everytime I object the Senate "sits" on me. But I am used to that. I am simply trying, shall I say, to "educate" some of the Senators as to how far some of the committees have gone in their investigations as to the duplications which are made, and to the amount of money these duplicating investigations are costing our taxpayers.

Two weeks ago we appropriated almost $500,000 for one of the standing committees, namely, the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Government Operations was provided an additional $95,000, or a grand total in excess of $200,000, for the Committee on Government Operations alone. If every committee should request similar money authorizations, there is no telling the extent of the cost of such investigations. Many of the investigations are duplications of other investigations. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is now investigating the Voice of America.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that the Foreign Relations Committee is doing something different from that which is being done by the so-called McCarthy committee, but there is bound to be some duplication. That is what I am trying to show, and that is what I am trying to avoid.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But, Mr. President, the Voice of America is only a very minor portion of the activities and the expenditures in connection with the American information program. The Voice of America is only a very small portion of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is all incorporated in the appropriation. It involves $100 million.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But that is for the entire program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I understand. The McCarthy committee is investigating not only radio programs, but all literature which is being issued to the entire world.

If the Senator knows, I should like to have him tell me what his committee has investigated up to now that has not been touched upon by the McCarthy committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Up until now, the committee has investigated the reception, the success, and the methods of operation of the entire American information program in some 30 countries. That is a rough estimate, but I think the total is about 30 countries. As I have indicated, the committee is endeavoring to make a fair analysis of the methods of the American information program, its success, its reception, the results of our leadership, the results of our selling program, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee brought out anything which the McCarthy committee has developed recently?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. If not, why not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point I should like to make on that question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have held hearings on several of the matters on which the McCarthy committee is now holding hearings. There was this difference: We did not include television. We were using material regarding the efficiency of broadcasting stations, about which the Senator has read a great deal today. We have much of that information. Last fall one Democratic Senator and one Republican Senator held hearings. We have much material along that line.

The Senator talks about our duplicating the work of the committee headed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The fact of the matter is that we have already covered much of that material, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has stated.

Up to now, we have not given particular attention to the question of personnel. That is about the only aspect of the matter to which the committee headed by the Senator from Wisconsin has paid special attention, but we have not yet covered personnel.

With respect to expenditures for the so-called Baker West and Baker East stations, we had information about that. As a matter of fact, the administration, through Mr. Compton, has already taken steps designed to correct that situation. I had a feeling that our committee was informed about that. We disagreed also about the practicality of some of the undertakings, but this committee has no control over the Committee on Government Operations. If that committee wishes to undertake an investigation similar to that which any other committee is engaged in, there is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator say that the McCarthy committee has been duplicating work which the particular committee under discussion has done?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not for me to criticize any other committee. I am telling the Senator the facts. The Senator can then draw his own conclusions from them. I am not trying to interfere in the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of criticizing any committee; I am simply seeking information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am merely stating the fact that the committee is a bipartisan committee, created by a special resolution of the Senate. It is not merely a subcommittee. The committee was created last year by a special resolution. It was not my resolution, although I happen to be a member of the committee. There is an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. The only reason it was behind time in its work was the election. Its work did not get under way, so far as committee meetings themselves were concerned, until immediately after the election.

For example, material from a number of most important private agencies in this country and throughout the world was carefully gathered and has been prepared for use by the committee. A great deal of work was necessary in the arranging of the material in order to make possible its use, because it was very voluminous. All of that work was done during the months prior to the hearings which were held last fall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator familiar with the work his committee has done?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator say whether the so-called McCarthy committee has looked into subjects which have been covered by his committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not a member of the so-called McCarthy committee. All I know about that committee is what I read in the newspapers and hear on the radio.

Mr. ELLENDER. Judging from what the Senator has read in the newspapers and heard on the radio, could he answer my question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Judging from what I have read in the newspapers and heard on the radio, there has been no overlapping. We have not pursued our work in the same fashion as the McCarthy committee, and have not had the same objective. Up to this time we cannot see any duplication, except as I have already mentioned with regard to the building of radio facilities. To state it in another way, we have not sought to discover Communists among the personnel. That has not been undertaken in any respect by our committee.

I may say there are several other matters that we have gone into which are under very critical examination.

Speaking for myself, I am not at all strong for shortwave broadcasts. I think the Senator will recall that I never have advocated great building programs. I may say that the Senate and House themselves made the determination on that point to a very great extent, and, of course, it was recommended by the Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. If my understanding is correct, the Senator has just stated that his committee has not yet investigated communism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not with respect to personnel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the committee expects to go into that phase of investigation also?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I would say that that matter is being taken care of by the McCarthy committee. I doubt that there would be any particular need for the committee of which I am a member to do that. However, that is a matter for the committee to determine. Up to now it has not been done. I see no reason to go over what has been accomplished by other investigations, with the one exception of the construction of radio stations. I doubt seriously that the McCarthy committee intends to go into that

field. I may say we have already gone into it. But if the McCarthy committee does it, what can we do about that? Our committee has that matter well under way, and much of the work is already done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the subcommittee could not do it, but the Senate could, if it desired to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do what?

Mr. ELLENDER. Stop duplication.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that the report proposes to have field investigations carried on in Latin America, in order to determine how effective the Voice of America program is. Does the Senator know whether the McCarthy committee intends to undertake to investigate that phase?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not speaking or undertaking to speak for the McCarthy committee in any respect whatsoever. I do not know what they are trying to do. I was only endeavoring to point out what our committee has already done.

Mr. SMATHERS. Certainly the Senator would agree, in view of the importance of South American countries to the United States, and in view of what we have recently read, to the effect that there is Communist infiltration, and we are losing friends in South America by the thousands every day, that $25,000 additional to have the effectiveness of the Voice of America program examined, as it pertains to Latin America, would be a desirable expenditure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand the request for such an investigation was submitted to the committee. Of course, the committee could agree to consider it. I may say that no investigators have been in South America at all, but they have been in the Far East, the Middle East, and in Europe. There has been quite thorough coverage during the past few months.

Mr. SMATHERS. The report states that one of the purposes of the money is to conduct field investigations in Latin America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I have talked to a member of the committee about the matter. Frankly, I cannot remember whether it was the junior Senator from Florida or not. The question was discussed in the committee, and it was agreed that it would be a proper matter for consideration. It may have been the junior Senator from Florida to whom I talked.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was not I who made the request, but I certainly wish to agree with whoever made the request that we could do nothing more useful than to make the Voice of America program work effectively in Latin America. If by an expenditure of $25,000 the Voice of America program in Latin America could be made to work effectively, it would be a cheap expenditure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our State Department is already embarked on a project to evaluate the information program. When I was in South America last fall, I learned that evaluation experts are at work all over the world, including South America, for that very purpose.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas or the Senator from Iowa could answer my question. I understood from the distinguished Senator from Iowa that two-thirds of the work had already been accomplished.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is a rough estimate. However, field investigations in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East have been conducted. A compilation of studies has been made by the staff for the purpose of further working toward a termination of the studies. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, I believe the committee was unanimous in its belief in the vital importance of a proper and a successful information program in Latin America designed to bring our countries closer together. There are 1 or 2 collateral fields into which we might enter.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, roughly two-thirds of this work has been done.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is difficult to estimate. I should say that more than half the work has been done. I should say two-thirds, as a rough estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whatever the percentage is, 50 percent or more has already been accomplished with $25,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a carryover of $25,000; and the committee is asking for $25,000 of new money. In other words, to accomplish the remainder of the work, which, as the Senator says, is more than 50-percent completed, twice the amount of money previously spent in accomplishing one-half of the task will be required. Why is that necessary? Can any Senator answer that question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The committee estimated the amount of money which should be authorized and available. It would be spent judiciously, and only such portion of it as might be absolutely necessary would be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is one very obvious reason why additional money is required. During the recess of the Senate we utilized members of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee exclusively. We had only 1 or 2 consultations with persons whose expenses we had to pay. It is obvious to anyone that from now on we shall be in session most of the time. We are meeting practically every day in connection with the regular business of the Senate.

Everyone knows the difficulty of dealing with the regular programs, such as mutual aid, and so forth, which come up every year. It is quite impossible for the same persons who gave all their time to this work last fall to carry on in the committee. We must have someone to take the place of those we were using. That is one of the major reasons for the increased amount of money.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have before me a breakdown of estimated expenditures which was submitted in connection with the request for appropriations. The breakdown is as follows:

Estimated expenditures under S. Res. 74 through June 30, 1953

Salaries and reimbursements for 5 months	$16,000
2 senior grade	9,000
1 middle grade	2,500
1 junior grade	1,500
2 clerical	3,000
Consultants, engineering and legal	12,000
Travel overseas: 4 members; 3 staff at $2,000 each	14,000
Travel in United States (to transmitter installations and between VOA (New York) and Washington) 40 trips at $100 each	4,000
Stenographic costs	1,500
Miscellaneous and unforeseen contingencies	2,500
Total	50,000
Estimates:	
Carryover from $50,000 made available by S. Res. 74	25,000
Amount requested by S. Res. 44	25,000
Total	50,000

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that it is in the last phase of the investigation that more exhaustive studies will be brought back, upon which we hope sound and reliable conclusions can be based and submitted to the Senate for legislation. That is why we shall need more trained personnel in compiling the vast volume of information which we already have, as well as information which we shall acquire, and getting it into the proper form.

Our committee expects to shed some light on many other subjects in the entire field of American information programs. Whether the Senator is aware of it or not, we have at least seven great agencies in this country in the American information field. Most of them are outside the program we are investigating, which is officially called the American information program. We have several information programs in the armed services. We have information programs in the State Department. We have information programs in some of our investigating agencies. We see no reason why the efforts in connection with all those programs cannot be reasonably coordinated, resulting in a saving of a great deal of money, much of which is not included in the $100 million to which reference has been made. We hope to render service in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the resolution sufficiently broad, in the Senator's opinion, to enable the committee to investigate the other aspects of the information program?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is sufficiently broad, let us say, to allow us to enter the investigative field with respect to such programs. A special committee on the information programs of the United States has already been established by the President. We have made arrangements to work in cooperation with that committee in order to bring our findings and its findings together so that some time early this spring we can collate all the information and work in cooperation with the other committee.

For example, I have already arranged to have made available to our subcommittee all the information and the background which the McCarthy committee may develop in this particular broadcasting field and the personnel field into which it is entering. Of course, that would eliminate any necessity for our going into that field extensively. So, as I view it, there will be no duplication in that particular field of investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he has already consulted with the McCarthy committee, to the end that there will be no duplication?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have consulted with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] as chairman of the committee. I did so day before yesterday. I told him that it seemed to me that his activities would obviate the necessity of any possible activities along that line which our subcommittee might feel it had to undertake if no other investigation were being made. Of course, I can speak only as of this moment. I do not know what will happen in a month or so. However, as I view the situation now, it is as I have stated it. The Senator from Wisconsin agreed that he would make available to us the complete records of his committee. He invited the members of our committee to sit in full cooperation with his committee if we cared to do so. It is my opinion that the situation as it now exists will eliminate the necessity for any extensive inquiry on the part of our subcommittee into the field which the Senator from Wisconsin is now covering. We can go into the field by obtaining records from him and by making the findings of the committee a part of our thinking. So to that extent we shall have investigated the field. But it seems to me that there will be no duplication of time, effort, or investigative activities in that particular field on the part of our subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have stated on previous occasions, I do not oppose legitimate investigation. However, it seems that during this Congress we will spend much more money than we spent in the past in order to do the same work. I express the hope that this committee, pursuant to the pending resolution, will consult with the Senator from Wisconsin to the end that there shall be no duplication. I also express the hope that this committee will be able to end its labors by June and not become one of the continuing special committees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Louisiana made a statement to the effect that practically all such committees continue forever. The Senator may recall that I was chairman of the subcommittee on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Did not that end?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I desire to congratulate the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They do not all continue. I am sure that this committee will not continue. It will not continue forever if I have anything to do with it. I do not want to go on forever with these committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not intend my remark to be all-inclusive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never appointed any employees of the committee in the past, and I do not expect to do so in the future.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think practically everything has been said that can be said. In view of what has been said on the floor, I feel that the situation may not be entirely clear to those in the galleries who are listening, and who may get the idea that we are wasting money.

The purpose of an investigation is to save money. We are considering a budget of $78 billion. After the money is appropriated, most of it is in the control of the executive branch. When we realize that only recently the McCarthy committee unearthed things which really smell in the Voice of America program, showing that Communists have been dictating the particular line which has been going out to foreign countries, and when we realize the waste which has been occurring in that one little activity, which it has been said amounts to $100 million, what about the $78 billion budget? Every dollar that will be utilized in investigation will return benefits to the Nation in the ratio of perhaps 100 to 1.

Mr. President I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who served as chairman of the subcommittee, for his work last year. As chairman of the entire committee I am reconstituting the subcommittee, and the Senator from Arkansas will remain as a member of the subcommittee. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] will serve as chairman.

Mr. President, I had prepared a short statement on the subject. However, because I must attend a committee meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations at 2 o'clock, instead of making the statement for the RECORD at this time I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I should like to make just a few comments with regard to the question of jurisdiction between the Senate Government Operations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee investigating the Voice of America.

INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE HAS COMPLETE JURISDICTION

Let me first make it quite clear that in my judgment, the Government Operations Committee has complete jurisdiction to investigate anything in the executive branch of the Government, in accordance with wide authority granted in the legislative reorganization law.

There is therefore an inevitable amount of duplicate jurisdiction in that any investigation by that committee would relate to the jurisdiction of one of the other standing committees; for example, an investigation in the field of foreign affairs would enter into the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

BROADER PURPOSES OF SENATE RESOLUTION 74

Now, under Senate Resolution 74, which had been introduced on February 19, 1951, I had joined with Senator Benton in offering a resolution for a comprehensive study by a six-man subcommittee of "the objectives, operations, and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States."

This includes the programs of the Department of Defense, the Mutual Security Agency, and all other Government activities in this field.

The resolution also relates to such other phases as "increased coordination with international information programs of other free nations; maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steadily increasing pressure in behalf of worldwide freedom of information," together with a great many other phases.

It can be seen therefore that the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee is considerably broader than merely operations within the executive branch of our own Government, as such, but relates also to information programs of allied governments, of the U. N., etc.

WORD CONVEYED BY SENATOR M'CARTHY

Early in January I became familiar with the fact that the Senate Government Operations Committee, and in particular, its Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, headed by my colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, intended a review of the Voice of America program.

My colleague, Senator McCARTHY, had informally conveyed word of executive sessions in the offing on this subject.

WE WELCOME M'CARTHY CONTRIBUTIONS

I, in turn wrote to him, indicating that I would welcome any contributions which his committee could make, just as I am sure any other standing committee of the Senate would welcome contributions which could be made by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee.

I have pointed out, in my contacts with the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, however, that the Foreign Relations Committee has its own Subcommittee on Foreign Information Programs, and that the then chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator FULBRIGHT, and the forthcoming chairman, Senator HICKENLOOPER, would be the individuals most basically concerned with the problem.

CERTAIN OVERLAPPING INEVITABLE

Now, I see no reason why the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee and the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee should not continue with a maximum of cooperation and coordination between them.

Inevitably there will be a certain amount of overlapping.

I understand, for example, that much of the same material which Senator McCARTHY has developed had been turned over sometime back to Senators FULBRIGHT and HICKENLOOPER.

In any event, our basic concern is to make sure that no single dollar of appropriations funds allocated to congressional investigative committees shall be wasted. I feel sure that all of the individuals involved are deeply interested in making sure that there shall be no such wasting of funds.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Montana address his question to me.

Mr. MURRAY. On Monday several Senators submitted a resolution expressing the profound shock of the Senate at the persecutions directed against the

Jewish people by the Soviet Union. At the time the resolution was submitted to the Senate it was understood that it would be reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations before the end of this week. I should like to inquire if it is possible for the committee to do so.

Mr. WILEY. I had no such understanding, as chairman of the committee, but I can say that the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have appointed a subcommittee to deal with the resolution, which, as I recall, is headed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

It will be the function of the subcommittee to study the resolution and then take it up with the various departments of Government, in order to have them give the subcommittee the benefit of their judgment, which is the usual practice in such cases. The subcommittee will then undoubtedly come forth very shortly with a report on the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I agree that we said we would try to report the resolution to the Senate this week. However, we found that the State Department had some very definite expressions to make with regard to it. I regret very much that we are not able to report it this week, but I hope very much that it will be possible to report it next week. I do not wish to take any step which would be in discord with the State Department, at least until we have had full opportunity to confer with the Department.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand. I thank the majority leader. I am sure it will be reported back promptly.

Mr. WILEY. Action on it will be accelerated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 38, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 82d Congress, agreed to June 30, 1952 (authorizing an investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs), is amended by striking out "prior to January 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or after January 31, 1953, but prior to June 30, 1953."

(b) Section 3 of such resolution is amended by striking out the figure "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$75,000"; and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the words "or subcommittee, as the case may be."

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 56) providing additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations reported by Mrs. SMITH of Maine from the Committee on Government Operations on January 29, 1953, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution provides additional personnel and approximately $10,000 in unobligated funds appropriated by the last Congress for the reorganization subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], as former chairman of the subcommittee, had these funds available to him last year. They were not used. The new chairman of the subcommittee is the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. The resolution does not ask for new funds. It asks merely for an extension of the appropriation made last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why were not the funds used last year?

Mr. JENNER. I cannot answer that question. The Senator from Maine is in the Chamber. She is familiar with the subject.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as chairman of the reorganization subcommittee, I will advise the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the funds were not used last year because the very efficient staff of the full committee carried on the work of the reorganization subcommittee and spent only $600 for incidental expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not this work be done by the same efficient staff this year? Why is it necessary to appropriate an additional $10,600?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I would further explain to the Senator from Louisiana that that is exactly what the subcommittee wishes to do and what I had in mind, namely, to utilize the services of the full staff of the Committee on Government Operations, which is well equipped to do the work.

On the other hand, there may come before the committee some very important reorganization proposals which might require the employment of specialists for a short period of time. We have set up a budget which we will use in the event it is necessary to do so. Otherwise, the money will be returned, in the same way that it was returned during the past 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will any of that money be used in order to employ more experts than the committee employs now?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Only if additional experts are needed. The subcommittee has no staff of its own. We are using the staff of the full Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that not in keeping with the committee's function? That is to say, Should not the experts on the committee cooperate in the work of any subcommittee?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Yes; so long as there is not too much work for the experts to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out 2 weeks ago the Committee on Government Operations has been provided with $200,000.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The $200,000 was not appropriated for the use of the Subcommittee on Reorganization or for the full Committee on Government Operations. It was appropriated for the Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as I understand it, a portion of that money could be used for the purpose of investigating any matter of government.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will agree that a committee's funds are not transferable to a committee for which it was not appropriated.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the money appropriated several weeks ago, as I understand, was for the whole committee. It was not merely for the purpose of investigating any special department of the Government, but to enable the committee to carry on its functions as described in the Reorganization Act. It was my position then, as it is my position now, that the $200,000 could be used for that purpose.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as chairman of the Reorganization Subcommittee it is my understanding that the $200,000 appropriation to which the Senator from Louisiana refers was specifically earmarked for investigations, and nothing else.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have before me the resolution which was adopted by the Senate 2 weeks ago. It refers to "all investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules Committee." That means any department of government and not only as to any special investigation, but as to any department of government.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I may advise the distinguished Senator from Louisiana further that the Reorganization Subcommittee has to do only with the reorganization plans that come up from the Government and refers to subsections (g) (1) (B) and (g) (2) (C) of rule XXV. It has nothing to do with the investigation of Government departments and does not refer to subsection (g) (2) (B) as does the earlier resolution the senior Senator from Louisiana is referring to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that this special subcommittee investigates reorganization plans submitted or proposed to the Congress?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. This is not a special subcommittee, I may advise the Senator from Louisiana. This is the regular Subcommittee on Reorganization, and is a part of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, any plans which are proposed by the Executive are submitted to the subcommittee.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not the four specialists who are now employed by the Committee on Government Operations do that work? Why is it necessary to employ extra specialists?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is exactly what the chairman of the Reorganization Subcommittee has stated already, namely, that it is our intention to use the regular staff of the full committee. Yet, if a plan should come up for which an engineer or a doctor or some other specialist is required, it would seem to the committee that we should be at least entitled to the money which was not used for that purpose last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then this money is being appropriated for something that may not occur. Is that correct?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. This money has already been appropriated and given

to the committee. We are asking for an extension of time, only, so far as the money is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then it is only in anticipation that the present force will be unable or not qualified to do the work on reorganization plans which may be submitted in the future. Is that correct?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I could not agree with the Senator from Louisiana that the staff is not qualified. If reorganization plans come up in large numbers, additional personnel may be needed. On the other hand, we may be able to turn back the money, or we may request more money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 56?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsections (g) (1) (B) and (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1953, and ending on January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 252, 82d Congress, first session, agreed to on January 24, 1952, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

AID OF FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand some reports from the Associated Press which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate at this time. These reports suggest, I believe, some very constructive and positive action which I believe will meet with the approval of my colleagues.

I now read the first report:

WASHINGTON.—A four-point program to stabilize the cattle market in the face of declining beef prices was recommended today by a House agriculture subcommittee.

The principal point called for immediate strengthening of credit sources to provide emergency loans as a stabilizing influence on prices and production.

The subcommittee also recommended stepping up military procurement of beef, prompt controls over foreign beef imports, and emphasis on meat as an item in the Federal school lunch program.

I now read a further report coming from the Associated Press, and quoting the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Representative HOPE, of Kansas. Representative HOPE is a Republican, I note:

Chairman HOPE, Republican of Kansas, said the full agriculture committee would meet Monday to consider the program drawn up by the subcommittee headed by Representative HILL, Republican of Colorado.

HOPE said some legislation might be necessary to make credit available to farmers during the present decline in prices, but that the easiest method probably would be to utilize the existing machinery and funds of the Farmers Home Administration.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to read a further Associated Press dispatch which refers to Representative HOPE:

HOPE told newsmen that before any legislative action was taken he would want to consult first with Secretary of Agriculture Benson and possibly President Eisenhower.

"The situation is not critical just yet, and it is nothing like as bad as the 1930's," HOPE said. "But if the banks tighten up we might have to act to inspire confidence."

The subcommittee said action should be "taken immediately" to strengthen existing credit sources to assist the livestock industry through the present price period and prevent unnecessary loss, disruption of orderly marketing or any decrease in production.

It said adequate credit should be provided to (1) permit cattle producers to carry their stock through the critical market period, (2) prevent forced marketing, and (3) prevent liquidation of foundation herds on which production is based.

HOPE said it wouldn't require much legislation to make emergency credit available to producers.

He suggested that Congress might open the way for loans from the disaster loan fund of the Farmers Home Administration.

HOPE also suggested that private banks might participate in some form of Federal credit extension by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. President, those bulletins or dispatches from the Associated Press have just come off the ticker. They are important to notice, because it is perfectly obvious that the House of Representatives, by means of its appropriate committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, realizes the serious nature of the crisis in the case of beef cattle and the declining market prices for beef cattle.

I desire to commend Representative HILL of Colorado, a Republican Member of the House of Representatives, for the action which has just been taken by his subcommittee; and certainly I wish to commend Representative HOPE, of Kansas, for the action he contemplates taking.

I note that the House committee is acting, rather than studying. I submit that this is a good example for the Senate to follow, for certainly action is desperately needed. As Reperesentative HOPE has said, although the situation may not be so critical as was the situation in the 1930's, it is sufficiently critical to warrant the taking of prompt action by the Congress. I point out again that the subcommittee said action should be taken immedately. In that connection, Mr. President, I stress the word "action."

So far as concerns studies by the administration, Mr. President, the present administration includes a number of former college presidents. Although I believe in study, I am sure it is important to have action taken. I commend the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for its program, and I bring it to the attention of the appropriate committee of the Senate, so that we may proceed, in cooperation with the House of Representatives, to have the needed action taken.

Let me say further that this program is a moderate one, and will be helpful to Secretary Benson in the orderly marketing to which he has referred. It will help do away with the undue pessimism to which he has referred, and it will help in the existing structure of the agencies of both Government and private finance.

Let it be quite clear that this matter goes far beyond partisan politics, for in this case two distinguished Republican Members of the House of Representatives, who occupy responsible positions in that body, have called upon their colleagues to take action immediately.

PARITY AND ADEQUATE CREDIT PROVISIONS FOR THE FARMER—RESOLUTION OF SUGAR BUSH FARMER'S UNION LOCAL, OGEMA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Sugar Bush Farmer's Union Local, Ogema, Minn. The resolution calls for full parity and adequate credit provisions for the farmer. The resolution refers to the same material that is mentioned in the Associated Press dispatches I have previously discussed.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Whereas, back in 1933, Congress adopted a commitment, "to achieve full parity of income for farmers," and all farm-State Senators and Congressmen have pledged support for this, as has President Eisenhower in his speech at Kasson, Minn., where he said not 90 percent but full parity, and

Whereas, in spite of all these promises, 20 years after March, 1933, farmers are selling their hogs at $4 to $5 a hundredweight under parity, eggs at 75 percent of parity, poultry at 40 percent of parity, oats at about 65 percent of parity, and so on: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we submit that while Congress continues to discuss the soundest, best method of assuring the farmers full parity of income, the farmers should not continue to pay the bill, and therefore we demand that as an emergency measure to guarantee the farmers parity now in 1953, the Congress should—

1. Reaffirm the commitment of March 1933 assuring the farmers of full parity of income.

2. Authorize the farmers, effective January 1, 1953, to the end of the marketing year or at the end of the calendar year ending December 31, 1953, or shortly thereafter, to present evidence of production and sales to the county PMA office and if the average price of any commodity is less than parity during the marketing year, the difference between such amount and full parity will be automatically due such family type farmer and may be collected through such measures as Congress shall provide for such payment.

3. That crop insurance be provided for all crops. This should be for all crops and for all hazards.

4. That an adequate appropriation should be immediately provided for Farmers Home Administration so that the credit needs of all family type farmers for their operation, land purchase, improvements, expansion of herds, etc., can be met.

SUGAR BUSH FARMER'S UNION LOCAL,
WILLIAM KOSKI, *Chairman.*
OGEMA, MINN.

COMMITTEE WORK BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this being Friday afternoon, I shall proceed, as I have indicated will be my custom on Friday afternoons when the Senate is in session, to do a good deal of my committee work as a member of the Committee of the Whole. I select Friday afternoons because I recognize that such a program will interfere the least with the weekend trips of so many of my Senate colleagues. Each Friday afternoon I shall make a record of my committee work, so that when my absent colleagues return on Monday they will be able to have an official record of my committee work, if they are interested in checking into it.

I should like to advise my many absentee colleagues, Mr. President, that as the year wears on they are going to be surprised, I think, to find that throughout the country there will be a great deal more interest in my committee work than some of the Members of the Senate at the present time fully appreciate. Whether they know it or not, the committee work of the Independent Party, functioning on the floor of the Senate as a member of the Committee of the Whole, is committee work that is of interest to a growing number of independent persons in the United States, who recognize that in the United States Senate there is at least one party that intends to devote itself to what it believes to be the paramount public interest in connection with matters of great concern to the people of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to certain resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

RULES OF PROCEDURE IN CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS AND DEROGATORY REMARKS MADE IN DEBATE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 10, the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, which would establish uniform rules for all congressional hearings. Unfortunately, I was not on the floor at that time or I would have asked unanimous consent to join as a cosponsor of that proposed measure. I ask such unanimous consent to do so at this time, and also to join as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, which would provide a measure of protection to individuals who are the subject of adverse comment upon the floor of either House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now I submit, for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration, a Senate resolution prescribing basic and uniform rules for the conduct of Senate committee hearings. The resolution would promote the effectiveness of investigations by Senate committees, would establish uniform rules for the conduct of Senate committee hearings, and would insure orderly and fair procedure in the protection of individuals.

The resolution (S. Res. 83), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas investigation of matters of public importance through committee hearings is of vital importance to the discharge of the constitutional functions of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the investigative power of Senate committees is derived from the power of the Senate to inquire into matters of public importance within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings"; and

Whereas no committee of the Senate has published rules of procedure to govern the conduct of hearings; and

Whereas controversy over committee procedure unnecessarily prolongs hearings and has resulted in court litigation; and

Whereas the committees of Congress have not always observed the rights of the individual and maintained democratic safeguards: Be it

Resolved, That the following be and hereby is, adopted as rule XXV (b) of the Standing Rules of the Senate (after redesignating present rule XXV as XXV (a)):

"1. MEETINGS AND REPORTS

"(A) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 24 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member.

"(B) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall be held only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

"(C) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings shall state clearly and concisely the subject thereof which may be amended in the same manner prescribed in subsection (B) for the scheduling of hearings.

"(D) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

"2. HEARINGS

"(A) All witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel.

"(B) Counsel shall have the right on behalf of witnesses to participate in hearings in the following manner: (i) to advise witnesses of their rights, (ii) to make objections to questions and procedure, (iii) to make brief statements in support of objections, (iv) to submit legal memoranda in support of objections (which shall become part of the record, but need not be incorporated in the transcript of hearings).

"(C) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the Senator presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

"(D) All testimony taken shall be relevant and germane to the subject of the hearing as set forth in the resolution or motion scheduling the hearing or amendment thereto adopted prior to the witness' appearance, and prior to his testifying a witness shall be shown a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution stating the subject of the hearing or so much thereof as will advise him of the scope of his interrogation.

"(E) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileges obtaining in the Federal courts shall be observed scrupulously.

"(F) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

"(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right at the conclusion of his testimony either to make an oral statement or at his option to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

"(G) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcripts, so far as practicable, shall be available for purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public *hearing*. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right only to inspect the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session but shall be obliged to keep such testimony confidential. Within its discretion a committee may permit a greater privilege of inspection.

"3. RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

"(A) A person shall be considered to be adversely affected by evidence and testimony of a witness if: (i) the evidence or testimony would constitute libel or slander at common law absent the immunity conferred upon it by reason of being made before a committee of Congress or (ii) the committee determines that the testimony would subject the person to serious hardship, embarrassment, shame, or financial loss. This definition shall be liberally construed.

"(B) If the committee has reasonable cause to believe that a person will be adversely affected by evidence or testimony to be received at a public hearing, that person shall be, so far as practicable, so informed in advance of the hearing.

"(C) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing that person (subject to reasonable limitations of time imposed by the committee) shall have the right: (i) to have the adverse witness recalled upon application made within 30 days after introduction of such evidence or the termination of the adverse witness's testimony, (ii) to be represented by counsel (as in (b) (2) (B) hereof), (iii) to cross-examine (in person or by counsel) such adverse witness, (iv) to appear and testify or file a sworn statement in his own behalf and, (v) subject to the discretion of the committee, procure subpenas ad testificandum and duces tecum, to procure witnesses and evidence in his defense.

"(D) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in executive session, prior to the public release of such evidence or testimony or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or committee staff or the taking of similar evidence or testimony in a public hearing, such person shall have the rights conferred by subsection (b) (3) (C) hereof and to inspect at least as much of the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

"(E) No report based upon evidence or testimony adversely affecting a person shall be released unless such evidence or testimony and the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report.

"4. DEFINITIONS

"As used in this rule XXV (b): "committee" shall mean any standing, select or special committee of the Senate (except the Majority and Minority Policy Committees)

and subcommittees thereof; "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation or society."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate concurrent resolution which I have submitted was in preparation on February 10 as I had announced on February 1. It deals with many of the same problems and abuses which Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 is designed to correct.

I submit this separate resolution because it differs in some respects from that offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Many of the differences are ones of terminology, and my resolution would, in my opinion, clarify some of the language contained in Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. Other differences represent further reforms which are not proposed by the excellent proposal of the Senator from Tennessee. I think it would be salutary to have both resolutions considered together by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I urge prompt action to that end.

THE NEED FOR REFORM

The fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution are basic guaranties of liberty which were the distillation of centuries of experience with abuse of the individual by an overbearing government. The amendments compel hearing and presentment by a grand jury, protection against double jeopardy, the right against self-incrimination, due process, jury trial, confrontation by witnesses against the individual, compulsory process to obtain favorable witnesses, and the precious right to counsel.

It is true that many of these guaranties apply only to criminal cases, but a brief reminder of the evils which gave rise to them are very much in order today.

The words "star-chamber proceeding" are rooted in our language. Like so many often-used phrases, realization of the exact content of these words has been lost through frequent use.

The Star Chamber in the 16th century was an English high court which was characterized by secret trial without adequate presentation of charges, peremptory procedure, no jury, forced testimony by the accused—often on matters of conscience—torture, and cruel punishment.

It is not uncommon for the press, the bar, religious groups, and other organizations of unquestionable integrity to draw analogies between star-chamber proceedings and some congressional hearings.

Many such accusations are unwarranted—all too many are accurate. I would point out to the Senate, that the lack of uniform rules of committee hearing procedure merely invites the abuse of individuals and the infringement of basic guaranties of a democratic society. It is not my purpose to dwell upon any particular instance.

It is folly to permit the Congress or its committees to fall into such disrepute. The sole result will be to cause and intensify disillusionment and cynicism about our form of government.

The Congress must command and deserve the highest regard of the citizenry for probity and fairness. It should stand as the symbol and example of even-handed justice and fair play.

Moreover, abusive procedure by congressional committees cannot help but engender fear and compel sterile conformity. This involves an incalculable loss of free expression and the wholesome and open competition of ideas which, after all, is the strength of democracy.

We cannot tolerate or permit the possibility of committee procedures which create fear and repress open, frank, and complete discussion. I recommend to the Senate the speech of one of our greatest Americans and greatest jurists, Judge Learned Hand, delivered on October 24, 1952, in Albany, N. Y.

The great justice said, in part:

Our Nation is embarked upon a venture, as yet unproved; we have set our hopes upon a community in which men shall be given unchecked control of their own lives. That community is in peril; it is invaded from within, it is threatened from without; it faces a test which it may fail to pass. The choice is ours whether, if we hear the pipes of Pan, we shall stampede like a frightened flock, forgetting all those professions on which we have claimed to rest our policy. God knows, there is risk in refusing to act till the facts are all in; but is there not greater risk in abandoning the conditions of all rational inquiry?

The great justice continued:

I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose. Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving. The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion.

As I said to Justice Learned Hand in a letter I wrote to him after reading this great speech, it sets forth in language clearer than any language I have read for a long time the precious meaning of the personal freedom guaranteed by the American Bill of Rights. What I am talking about today, Mr. President, in referring to a system of procedure, uniform in nature, binding upon congressional investigations, is the same precious principles and guaranties of individual freedom and rights for the individual American citizen under the Bill of Rights. Today I am making a plea—a plea which needs to be made, Mr. President—that faith be kept with the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights as we perform our work in committees of the Senate of the United States.

The Congress has tolerated the conduct of some committees which permit the most serious charges against individuals without providing safeguards against unsubstantiated or highly questionable accusations or timely and adequate opportunity for defense.

RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS ARE FOR THE PROTECTION OF SOCIETY

In our system of government it is a basic assumption that rules of law of general applicability are for the protection of basic rights of person and property. In a given case the effect of the rule may be distasteful or unpopular. But we cannot overlook that it is the rights of all members of society which our Bill of Rights and other protections to speech and assembly and conscience are designed to preserve. Any encroachment upon basic guaranties to satisfy the heat of the moment or to reach the abuses of a few individuals imperils the rights of the many.

THE NECESSITY FOR SENATE INVESTIGATIONS

Since the early days of the Republic it has been recognized that the Congress has the right and must exercise the power to inform itself of needs for legislation, the manner in which laws are administered, the inadequacy and excesses of existing legislation, and kindred matters. Only by investigation and hearing can Congress discharge its legislative function and fulfill its role of acting as a check upon and balance to the other major branches of government.

On Friday, January 30, the Senate considered various resolutions appropriating funds for Senate Committees.

The junior Senator from Oregon made clear that he believes that one of the great and historic powers of the Congress, and the Senate as part of the Congress, is the power to investigate.

In a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] I stated:

Does the Senator agree with me that in spite of the fact that there is much criticism today about the investigatory activities of the Congress, it nevertheless happens to be one of the great functions of the Congress in protecting the country from fraud, corruption, subversive activities, and wrongdoing against the public interest?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Indiana agree with me that there are those who are apparently in opposition to the granting of the funds which the committee is asking for because they claim they do not like the methods or the techniques of the investigations of this and some other committees of the Congress?

Mr. JENNER. I presume that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. But is not the answer to that not only a refusal to deny the funds necessary for conducting fair investigations, but also an effort on the part of the Members of the Congress, in keeping faith with their duties, to see to it that congressional investigations are fair, if it is alleged and proved and shown that they are not fair?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

On that occasion I supported an appropriation of $150,000 for the Subcommittee on Internal Security for investigations. It is the purpose of that committee to investigate as the representative of the Senate.

I do not believe that the Senate should indirectly scuttle that committee—or any other committee which has investigatory power for the purposes of legislation or overseeing the operations of Government agencies which administer laws within the jurisdiction assigned by the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The function of superintending the executive departments has always been recognized, and one of the major contributions of the former Senator from Wisconsin, "Young Bob" LaFollette, was the formulation in the Reorganization Act of that responsibility to act as a watchdog of the executive departments and agencies. Of equal importance, is the obligation of the Senate to insure that there is adequate legislation and administrative power to deal with subversive activities. Can there be any doubt of this in a time of crisis such as the one the United States is now in and will continue in for years to come?

As a matter of principle, I will not be a party to the scuttling of those powers by indirection. The Senate should not give that power and then seek to tie the hands of its committees by withholding funds sufficient to discharge that statutorily imposed responsibility.

There have been pressure groups seeking to forestall investigations by Senate committees. They have sought to accomplish this not by a frontal attack upon the power to investigate. They have sought to have this done indirectly—by starving out the committees—by withholding sufficient funds.

It cannot be denied—as I observed on January 30 on this floor—that much of the opposition to these continuing investigations stems from political differences with chairmen and members of certain committees. These opponents distrust certain committee members. As I observed then:

> The members of the committee sit here under a great public trust, and I am not going to assume or presume that they will not live up to that trust merely because some persons do not like some of the committee members personally.
>
> As far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am not going to indulge in a presumption of guilt against anyone, including any colleague in the Senate of the United States. I am going to hold fast and true to a great principle of American justice, namely, the presumption of innocence, and the assumption that trials, investigations, and hearings are going to be fair and in keeping with American principles of justice, until someone shows me that such an assumption is not justified.

The answer to the fears of those who oppose investigations by Congress—and these fears are often sincere and have an unfortunately valid basis in experience—is the adoption of a uniform committee procedure which insures free play and fair trial.

Yes; "fair trial." We cannot blink at the fact that a not unusual byproduct of investigations is the attempt to ascertain the guilt—and I would hope, the innocence—of individuals charged with the most heinous offenses. The accusations which are sometimes made in the course of these investigations are for crimes more serious than almost any covered in the Criminal Code. These accusations are of disloyalty, subversion, and Communist membership and activity. Often these are not crimes defined by the code, but they stand today among the most serious offenses against the Nation that can be charged.

And, when they are charged, there should be adequate assurance by law for defense, if defense can be made.

The views which I present today are not new ones for the junior Senator from Oregon.

On December 28, 1948, I made a speech in Cincinnati in which I described the appropriate functions of congressional investigations and the necessary safeguards in conducting them. I stated:

> While I firmly believe that Congress should investigate these and other matters and ferret out those working to destroy the American Government, I deplore the procedures being used.
>
> As a lawyer, my confidence in the American judicial system is so complete that I know we can find whatever facts exist without ignoring the safeguards of the American judicial process which should be available to any accused person, the innocent as well as the guilty. Of course, legislative inquiries cannot be conducted in all respects as judicial trials, but I know of no reason why congressional investigations and hearings cannot be conducted with decorum and in complete compliance with those basic and fundamental protections of the American judicial process prevailing in the courts.

Later on, I said:

> The power of the Congress of the United States to conduct investigations should not be curtailed, because the investigative power of the Congress is one of our most effective checks against governmental abuses and one of our most valuable aids in finding the factual basis for needed legislation. It is only the procedures of congressional investigations that need to be subjected to careful surveillance in the interest of protecting the individual citizen from abusive practices of the Congress itself.
>
> Under our system of checks and balances we must always be alert to the danger that any agency of Government, including the Congress itself, may, through the men in charge of its affairs, at any given time substitute caprice and arbitrary discretion for government through law.

PAST CONTROVERSIES OVER INVESTIGATIONS

In the 1920's after the development of the Teapot Dome scandals, there developed a new historical debate over the powers of Congress to investigate.

At that time, it was the liberals who championed unlimited investigation by the Congress and the conservatives who counseled caution and restraint.

Professor Frankfurter, now Mr. Justice Frankfurter, wrote in the New Republic of May 21, 1924:

> Professing, of course, that wrongdoing, impropriety, and unwholesome standards in public life should be exposed, critics, who have nothing to say for the astounding corruption and corrupting soil which have been brought to light, seek to divert attention and shackle the future by suggesting restrictions in the procedure of future congressional investigations.

The conservatives loudly and vociferously urged strict limitations upon the scope, powers, and procedures of congressional committees.

And in this continuing debate Mr. Frederic R. Coudert wrote in 1929 an article entitled "Congressional Inquisition Versus Individual Liberty"—Fifteenth Virginia Law Review, page 537:

> In our present American life this question forms but a part of a very much wider whole. We are constantly and everywhere confronted with the antithesis between Government and liberty, or, as it may be put, between efficiency and individual freedom. Within the last quarter of a century, the Federal Government, which heretofore had scarcely impinged upon the individual, now everywhere affects his life and, indeed, his death. A huge bureaucracy is always prepared to investigate the individual's concerns usually with a view to the extraction of taxes.

I repeat: that was written in 1929.

We all know of the reversal of positions occasioned by the operations of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Reactionaries and conservatives hailed that committee as the protector of the Republic and liberals objected to its wholesale condemnations and overactive thyroid.

I submit that many of these views were in part prompted by considerations other than a sober, reasoned view of the proper role, extent, and method of congressional investigations. A good deal of the comment and advocacy was prompted by political interests—and depended upon whose political fortunes were being advanced or bludgeoned by the particular committee inquiry.

This is not to say that a great deal of the criticism over the past 30 years has not been solidly based. On the contrary, I have been guided in drawing my resolution by the description of abuses and suggested remedies put forward by many such critics, and by my own personal observations, during the past 8 years as a Member of the Senate, of committee procedures, or lack of procedures.

I submit that there are two basic principles which should guide the Senate in dealing with committee investigations and hearings:

First. Recognition of the prime importance of effective investigation in aid of legislation.

Second. Recognition of the equally important necessity of maintaining and protecting the basic rights of citizens in a democracy.

INCREASED COMMITTEE EFFICIENCY

One need attend very few controversial hearings to realize the delay and confusion caused by the lack of formal rules of procedure. The wrangles—over appearance of counsel, the admissibility of evidence, the right of a witness to testify—are often protracted and seriously impair the dignity of committee procedure.

While some few committees have adopted rules in the past, I am not aware of any published rules for the guidance of committees or witnesses.

A set of rules applicable to all types of Senate committees would advise witnesses of their rights and guide chairmen and members in the conduct of hearings. Differing rules would lead only to confusion. The resolution does provide for supplementary rules to meet individual committee needs.

The investigatory power of committees is derived from the power of each House and is therefore properly subject to the control of the parent body. Therefore, my resolution deals with the Senate.

PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN THIS RESOLUTION

The major reforms proposed by the junior Senator from Oregon are not novel. They stem from the principal constitutional guaranties, which I have sought to adapt to the special needs of Senate investigations. Senate committees cannot conform to the same strict rules imposed upon the courts. But any departure from court procedure—which has grown up over centuries in response to the proven needs of democratic society—must be absolutely necessary and strictly limited.

I outlined these principles in a speech before the Association of American Law Schools in December 1948. They are:

First. Before hearings are commenced, the subject of the investigation should be clearly stated, and the evidence elicited should be relevant.

Second. Witnesses should have the right to counsel, who would be allowed to advise his client while testifying.

Third. The right to supplement testimony by oral or written statements, confined to relevant matters, should be accorded witnesses.

Fourth. Accurate stenographic records of testimony should be kept of all testimony; whether given in public or executive session, and inspection allowed by the witness or his counsel. Copies of the transcript of public sessions should be furnished if requested, and in the case of executive sessions, it should be made available if later referred to in public session.

Fifth. Persons mentioned or specifically identified in a public hearing should be afforded certain privileges before the committee or any member or employee comments adversely. Among these privileges should be the right to file a sworn statement, to be made a part of the record; the right to appear and testify; the right to limited cross-examination of witnesses whose testimony has adversely affected him; and the right to call, in the discretion of a majority of the committee, a reasonable number of witnesses in his own behalf.

Sixth. No committee report should be issued except on adequate notice and with the approval of a majority of the committee.

These are the basic reforms embodied in this resolution.

A requirement of majority action to schedule hearing and state subject of inquiry is a very important right to one who is going to be called into a hearing.

Subsection 1 of the bill, which applies to all types of hearings, prescribes that a committee must have an actual quorum present when it schedules a hearing and states the subject of inquiry. Under the proposed resolution, the stated subject of the hearing could be changed only by similar action. Present limitations in the Legislative Reorganization Act on executive sessions apply only to standing committees and require only a majority vote without specifying that the vote be taken in the presence of a quorum.

At present the scope of committee inquiries has no practical limitation.

I recognize the desirability of flexible inquiries. But it does not seem too much to ask that before a hearing a committee think enough about the matter to define the subject of its inquiry and so to limit the investigation until it takes formal action to expand the subject as the necessity arises.

ADVANCE NOTICE OF MEETINGS AND REPORTS

This subsection also requires formal advance notice to members of committee meetings and submission of written reports prior to the meeting at which it is to be considered. At present there is a strong tendency to rubberstamp reports which members not only have not read but have not had the opportunity to see. In fact, at the beginning of this session of Congress there was striking evidence of that tendency, when the preponderant majority seemed to think that the Senate ought to rubberstamp committee reports relating to certain Cabinet nominees, which had been put on our desks just a few minutes earlier, although, outside the committee members, the Members of the Senate had had no opportunity to read the reports.

It is this rubberstamp danger, this steamroller danger, that we need to be on guard against in connection with all our work in the Senate. We need to keep in mind the fact that, after all, we are not performing our work as individual Senators if we substitute for our own responsibility the judgment of some committee.

In the resolution, I point out that hearings would be limited to the subject matter decided upon by the committee.

Witnesses are to have the right to representation by counsel who have rights similar to those of an attorney in court.

Only evidence which is reliable and of probative value would be received and considered. We cannot impose the strict rules of evidence used in the courts, but they should be the guide. Rules of evidence have evolved over the years to insure that only evidence of probative value is considered. The historic ban on hearsay serves a definite purpose. It insures that the witness testifying observed the occurrences which he described. It insures an opportunity to test the observer's recollection and veracity. Lacking such safeguards, committees and the public can be misled and reputations can be ruined, with no opportunity for rectification. The normal exceptions to the hearsay rule, such as those with respect to experts, would remain.

Mr. President, for a great many years I presided in quasi-judicial hearings in some of the major labor arbitration cases which arose during the past two decades or more. We had no difficulty in our hearings in following the general pattern of the rules of evidence, the arbitrator always reserving the right, after hearing counsel present objections to the admission of certain evidence, to pass judgment on whether or not on the basis of the representations made concerning it, as to its probative quality, it might be of value to the arbitrator in reaching a judicial determination of the issues involved in the case. But we did not throw the rules of evidence overboard. We did not take the position that anything goes; that no matter how rank the hearsay evidence might be we would admit it; that no matter how immaterial, inconsequential and irrelevant it might be to the determination of the issue we would admit it nevertheless, because some witness wanted to offer it. We kept the hearings within the limits of the reasonable test of the probative value of the evidence.

I submit that any committee chairman can do exactly the same as an administrative law officer does in the conduct of an administrative law hearing when it comes to applying the rule of reasonableness to which I have referred, and require at least some cause-to-effect relationship when he comes to determine the probative value of the evidence which is offered for submission in the record in a committee hearing.

The rule of not letting down all the bars in respect to restrictions on hearsay evidence would also protect the usual privileges with respect to confidential communications between attorney and client, husband and wife, and priest and penitent. Such privileges are of value. Their value has been proved over the centuries. In my judgment they represent protections and safeguards which should prevail in congressional hearings, as well as in the administration of justice in the courts of the land.

Under my resolution witnesses would be given the opportunity to complete answers and make statements, which opportunity has sometimes been denied them by the banging of the gavel. One has only to attend congressional hearings to observe frequently a tendency on the part of some committee member not to allow witnesses to complete even sentences, let alone thoughts. We often hear such comments as, "I have heard enough about that. What have you to say about this?" The witness may say, "Senator, I have not finished my thought on the other subject." He is told, "I have heard enough. What have you to say about this?"

I say that such abuses of fair procedure, which one sees too frequently in congressional hearings, ought to be prevented by the Senate, and would be prevented if we adopted some such resolution as I offer today providing uniform rules of procedure for the conduct of congressional hearings, rules which would guarantee to the witness the courtesy to which he is entitled, the right to complete his sentences, the right to complete his thoughts, the right to have a fair hearing. We should guarantee him the right to present in full whatever defense or explanation he may wish to offer to inquiries put to him by members of the committee.

Does that mean that a chairman would have no power to control a witness? Of course not. Again it is a matter of applying the principle of reasonableness. Again it is a matter of procedure for the chairman and the members of the committee to determine, while maintaining the same fair judicial attitude which members of the bench are expected to maintain when they have witnesses before them.

Sometimes witnesses are annoying. Sometimes they are dishonest. Sometimes they are lying. Sometimes they are witnesses who are seeking to conceal; sometimes they are guilty witnesses. All lawyers know the types. But it is more important, it seems to me, to make clear

at all times to our people that justice reigns, and that third degree methods are not permitted in Senate hearings, than it is to break down a witness quickly by the adoption of abusive tactics.

I happen to be one who believes that keen examination, polite examination, persevering but courteous examination, can always bring to the light of day the falsifications of a dishonest witness.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment.

Mr. President, it is sometimes argued that such a procedure as I stand for would take much more time. But time so spent by any investigating committee in administering the type of procedure for which I plead today would be time well spent in the interest of justice as it is in the courtroom.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. However, I have so much confidence in his good sense, his judgment, and his knowledge of law procedure that I believe I would be glad to support the resolution after I have studied it. Certainly any resolution which would establish uniform rules for the conduct of Senate committee hearings and insure orderly and fair procedure and the protection of individuals, while at the same time promoting the effectiveness of investigations by committees of the Senate, would mark a very great gain in the procedures of the body in which we serve.

I say emphatically that I do not believe that all the hearings which have been held by investigating committees of the Senate have been fair or devoted primarily to developing the facts in the situation being investigated. Nor do I believe that all the statements made by my colleagues on the floor of the Senate have been fair in all their implications and imputations; rather same statements, consisting of unsupported charges, have sought to create an entirely wrong, misleading, and slanderous impression in the minds of the people of the country. There has been a consistent effort to discredit anyone who opposes orthodoxy in politics, or in social viewpoint.

I am glad to be able to say this in the presence of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], coauthor of the McCarran-Walter bill, because only recently claims have been made and insertions placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which reflect on the integrity, the patriotism, and the loyalty of those who, like myself, had the temerity to oppose the McCarran bill because of our conscience, because of our feeling that it was against the interests of this country; that it was unjust and unfair and evil in its implications and would be harmful to our relations with the other freedom-loving nations of the world. Yet we have been accused of being under Communist influence and control.

Within the past few days attacks have been made in Congress on the integrity and loyalty of an outstanding American woman, Mrs. Eugene Meyer, who had the courage to criticize the workings and operations of one of the investigating committees. As one who has at heart the maintenance of the independence of our educational system, she made sincere criticisms of one of the current investigations of our schools and colleges. So she, too, was bitterly and falsely attacked, without cause or reason or fairness, and the implication was made that she is a disloyal citizen of the United States.

Mr. President, I have heard accusations made, not by the senior Senator from Nevada but by the coauthor of the Walter-McCarran Act, to the effect that those who opposed the Walter-McCarran immigration bill, some of them being of my religious faith, were in opposition because they had a predominant and selfish interest in repealing the act.

If the Senator's resolution does what I believe it will do—and I sincerely hope it will—in stopping the sniping and the unfair, unjust, and evil imputations respecting the good faith and loyalty of people who have the courage to oppose certain Senators and will thus restrain them from imputing evil and disloyal motives to innocent persons, I am with the Senator from Oregon, heart and soul. I hope his resolution will do that. From the little opportunity that I have had to study it, I believe it may do just that.

Mr. President, I tell you we have come to a sad state when even a Member of the Senate cannot honestly oppose legislation and cannot honestly rise in defense of those who may be unjustly accused, without being themselves accused of subversion and disloyalty and lack of patriotism.

I am sorry to have to take so much of the time of the Senator from Oregon; but I feel very strongly on this subject, and I have been terribly upset by the unjustified attacks on that great woman, Mrs. Eugene Meyer. To digress slightly but not really, I have also been shocked by some of the insertions which have been made in the RECORD recently by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] with regard to those who oppose the McCarran Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the right to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not asking the Senator from New York to yield. I am asking the Senator from Oregon to yield to me so that I may reply to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from New York mean to imply that I have mentioned Mrs. Meyer's name on this floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I did not mention the name of the Senator from Nevada in that connection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why does the Senator from New York point his finger at me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I was talking about insertions made in the RECORD, and I will——

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not make any insertions in the RECORD dealing with Mrs. Meyer, and I have not mentioned her name on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not mean to imply that the Senator from Nevada had attacked Mrs. Meyer. If I gave that impression I am sorry. But I emphatically state that the Senator from Nevada did make insertions in the RECORD within the last 3 days casting unjustifiable reflections on me and others, similar to the reflections made on Mrs. Meyer. He inserted in the RECORD an article and an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which impugned the loyalty and patriotism of Members of Congress who opposed the McCarran Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Did I mention Mrs. Meyer's name?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not say the Senator from Nevada mentioned her name.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why does the Senator from New York point his finger at me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am referring to insertions in the RECORD attacking the loyalty and patriotism of Members of the Senate and many thousands of other citizens who had the courage to oppose the McCarran act. I hope they will continue to oppose it, and I hope that eventually the act will be repealed or drastically revised. I can assure the Senator from Nevada that so far as I am concerned the battle will continue.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad that the Senator from New York is alone in the matter, to be very frank with him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his comments on my resolution. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that if after he studies it he decides that he would like to have his name added as a cosponsor—and this goes for all Senators—and if he informs me of such desire I will be very glad to have his name added to the resolution as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York expressed his concern about procedures of congressional committees, and said he believed that some of the past hearings of some of the committees had not been fair. I am interested in the adoption of a procedure which will remove any fear or suspicion or cause for belief that Senate investigations are not fair to all concerned. I am highly impersonal about it. My position is the position of a lawyer, devoted to the principles of fair trial and fair procedures, which I believe to be essential if we are to perpetuate the system of equal-handed justice in America. I agree with the Senator from New York that abuses have developed in the past. That is to be expected, because members of Senate committees are human and Senate committees are human institutions. However, it is my attitude that when abuses are possible under existing practices we owe it to the people of the country to adopt procedural reforms which will remove the possibility or at least lessen the possibility of such abuses. That is why I offer the resolution today.

I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I join with him in the part of his statement concerning Mrs. Eugene Meyer in which he referred to her as a great American woman. She is a great citizen. It is regrettable that she has been subjected to misquotation and that there has been leveled against her by a Representative in Congress a charge

which has not been borne out in fact. I am glad to note at least there has been public acknowledgment that a mistake was made. I have great admiration for Mrs. Meyer. However, I will say something now that Mrs. Meyer will not agree with, and something that I suspect probably many educators in America will not agree with. I suppose that one of the main reasons why they will not agree with my statement is because of the psychology of fear and near hysteria that grip the hearts and minds of many citizens today. It is the kind of fear that Justice Hand was talking about in the quotation which I read from his great speech of October 24.

Mr. President, when such public attitudes develop we ought to face them as one of the realities and one of the risks of democracy.

I do not share the view that educational institutions in America should not be investigated. I want to be perfectly fair to Mrs. Meyer. I do not believe her speech in Atlantic City—and I have only read newspaper accounts of it—would support the premise that it is her position that schools in America should not be investigated under any or all circumstaces. Rather, I believe she expressed great concern over the fact that certain committees of Congress are planning to investigate or are considering investigating educational institutions.

In recent weeks, I have heard it expressed by many educators, and it is being expressed to me by many educators in mail I have received and by many people not connected with our educational institutions, that our schools should be considered as above and beyond any attempt of Congress to investigate them. It was also expressed the other evening in an open forum discussion which I conducted in Raleigh, N. C., where there was discussed the general subject matter and statements were made to the effect that true liberals in the Senate of the United States should stand opposed to any investigation of American educational institutions. I do not share that conclusion. I will not apologize to anyone for my liberalism; and as a true liberal, I intend to support—as I did on January 30, when I advocated appropriations for investigating committees—the right and duty of congressional committees to conduct such investigations as in their judgment, as Senators and Representatives, they believe should be conducted. That is one of the concomitants of democracy. I believe it is one of the duties of Congress to conduct proper investigations; but it is easy to lose sight of principles, when great public controversy has been stirred up and people become fearful, suspicious, and disturbed about dangers which they believe may be involved in investigations. Many persons are afraid that some innocent persons may suffer. Of course, there is always that danger.

One of the reasons why we have the Bill of Rights, one of the reasons why, to its everlasting credit, the great legal profession of the United States over the decades has fought for and defended fair procedures for the determination of the guilt or innocence of persons, and has protected their rights from unfair attack, is the recognition that if we are to have a democracy by self-governing people, then the representatives of the people, in the various branches of the Government, must be free to conduct investigations into injustices, wrongs, fraud, corruption, abuses, and—yes—subversive activities which threaten to undermine and "termite" the foundations of the Republic.

Mr. President, as one who taught in a series of educational institutions in the United States for some 21 years, my attitude is that the schools of the United States should welcome at all times any investigation any congressional committee, acting within its powers of investigation, decides to conduct.

I believe that the educators who seek to use pressures to arouse public opinion against the exercise of the power of investigation make a great mistake. Of course, they place themselves in an illogical position when they take the position that because they do not like Committee X or Committee Y or Chairman A or Chairman B of those committees, therefore liberals should try to prevent investigations of education and of educational institutions. If they should prevent such investigations, in my judgment, they would be guilty of violating one of the basic principles of true liberalism, which is to maintain in effective operation the system of checks and balances which in these days is so little understood, it seems to me, by the American people, both those in Congress and those out of Congress.

One great principle is that public institutions should at all times be subjected to public surveillance and evaluation regarding how they are carrying out their public functions. The trust and the obligation which rest upon the schools of the United States are solemn ones, and, from the standpoint of the rights of individuals, they are also almost sacred ones.

Therefore, I believe the response of the educators of America should be, "Welcome, welcome; come forward with your investigations." The schools of United States have a great opportunity, if they will only recognize it, to educate the American people on the question of academic freedom and in the search for the truth, no matter where it leads, for, after all, to inculcate truth is the greatest obligation of the school system of the United States.

Mr. President, why are we a free people? We are free because our schools, too, I have always thought, have followed the great principle and the great teaching of Scripture:

> And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

The great educational institutions of America are, I believe, most important media for finding the truth. They should welcome the presentation of all the facts any congressional committee may be able to present regarding how they are keeping their trust and their stewardship in leading the youth of America into an openminded understanding of the truth and a search for it.

As an educator, Mr. President, I would not fear an investigation by any congressional committee or by any other legally constituted body in the United States that has the authority, right, and power to investigate. But as an educator I would say to the investigators, "Tell us what you want to see, tell us what you want to find out, and we are at your service."

I believe it would be a rather good education for some investigators, too, for I say quite solemnly that I believe some of them will be in need of it.

What are the obligations and duty of the liberal in regard to this problem, which is becoming so controversial in the press of the United States? The obligation and duty of the liberal Members of the United States Senate—and, equally, of the conservative Members of the United States Senate—are to fight in the Senate, as fight we must, for an improvement of our procedure, in order to assure, without any question of a doubt, fair hearings. We must do that so as to remove the fear that innocent persons will be subjected to attack before they have had an opportunity really to present their case to the public, and as a consequence the damage will be done and they will not be able to repair a tarnished reputation, once it has been scarred in the public mind.

As I said to some of the educators at Raleigh, N. C., last Monday night, "Do not forget that you educators, too, run the risk that is encountered by all others who are free citizens. In a democracy, one of the risks of freedom is, of course, the risk of being charged with wrongdoing, if the officials of the law believe there is probable cause for believing that one is guilty of wrongdoing."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that the words "probable cause" are significant in meaning and of great value to the rights of every American citizen. If we are to protect the citizen from unjustified indictment, criticism, and attack, then there must be a procedure which will guarantee to him that judicial minds will pass upon the question of probable cause before a public attack is made. That is why my colleagues in the Senate have heretofore heard me say so many times, and will hear me say it many times again, because it is basic to the protection of the fundamental rights of fellow citizens, that there is a direct relationship between the procedural rights of a citizen and his substantive rights. If he is not protected in fair procedural rights, Mr. President, he practically has no substantive rights, because unfair procedures to all intents and purposes in many situations destroy his substantive rights. If, for example, there is no probable cause for believing during the course of an investigation of an educational institution that Professor X is guilty of some conduct that brings into question his loyalty, then there ought to be a procedure which is designed to protect him from an unfair public charge before there is at least a judgment passed upon the existence of probable cause. But if probable cause exists, then Professor X, like every other citizen, has to face the risk of living in a democracy, and should expect to be put upon his defense. He should be protected, however, by the presumption of innocence; and the procedure in conducting investigations ought to be designed to keep faith with and be con-

sonant with the presumption of innocence rule, and not be of such a character as to stir up the fear, which is so widespread in America today, that too much of our investigative work is proceeding on the basis of a presumption of guilt, and the transferring from the investigators to the accused the burden of proving his innocence. I propose to hold fast to the rule, Mr. President, that even in the case of a charge of disloyalty, it is better to have a few guilty escape than to have the reputation of one innocent man or woman destroyed. I happen to be one who believes that the guilty cannot escape under fair procedure and by the conducting investigations in keeping with the spirit and intent of judicial processes.

I had not intended to refer to investigations of education and educational institutions until interrupted by the Senator from New York, but I am glad I have done so, Mr. President, because I am going to speak, I think, within the next 10 days or 2 weeks, before a national convention of college presidents. In their letter of invitation, they have asked me to discuss in part my views in regard to the investigation of educational institutions. I want them to know my views in advance. I want them to know in advance, that it is my position that they make a great mistake in taking the position, if they do, that investigations of American colleges should not go forward. But as a liberal, Mr. President, I shall continue, as I have done since I have been in the Senate, to urge the adoption of procedural reforms for the conducting of congressional investigations which, if adopted, in my judgment would remove almost all, if not all, the fear of outstanding educators who are protesting a forthcoming investigation of American educational institutions. That is why, on the floor of the Senate today, I am once again setting forth my views on procedure that I have expressed a good many times within recent years, and, in this instance, putting it forth in the form of a resolution.

Now, Mr. President, what about the rights of persons adversely affected by testimony in congressional investigations?

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded to Mr. MCCARRAN, who addressed the Senate on the subject of a certain broadcast by Mr. Eric Sevareid, and placed in the RECORD certain documents in connection therewith. On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the remarks of Mr. MCCARRAN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. MORSE.)

Mr. MCCARRAN. While I am on my feet—and I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Oregon—I merely wish to call his attention, because I have had a great deal of experience within the past few years in the matter of conducting hearings, to the fact, which I know he must have thought of, that in reality an investigation by a legislative body is not a trial. The Senator spoke of the time when, as a member of a quasi-judicial body, he sat in judgment in formulating a conclusion. He had a perfect right to do that. He also had a right to follow and quote court procedure to a very great extent. But an investigation by a congressional body is primarily for the purpose of formulating legislation. That is its primary and basic purpose. There may be other results, but that is the primary purpose, and it is the one basic reason on which we can justify investigations. Committees may have gone beyond that realm—sometimes I think they have—but that is the basic purpose and the only justifiable ground on which investigations are conducted. They are not trials in any sense of the word; they are merely investigations for the purpose of determining what legislation, if any, is proper to meet a certain objective or a certain condition.

There are some positions taken by the Senator from Oregon—and I have had the pleasure of listening to him on the floor—to which I adhere. I think, so far as possible, within the scope of the purpose of the investigation, fair procedures should be followed. On the other hand, we find, as the Senator from Oregon has undoubtedly discovered from his experience, unfair witnesses coming before a committee who take up the time of the committee if they are permitted to talk ad libitum. They will hold up the committee not for hours, but for days, just as some trials have been held up in a court of competent jurisdiction. So, Mr. President, one has to draw a line somewhere applying, so far as possible, within reason, the rules of admissibility of evidence in court procedure as one believes he knows them, and, at the same time, protect the procedure of the legislative body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his comments, and I want to discuss very briefly the point he makes, that, after all, a congressional investigation is not a trial. There is a certain phase of investigations which takes on many of the characteristics of a quasi-judicial hearing. I do not think it would be fair if it did not. When it comes to the public hearing phase of any congressional investigation, which is, in effect, dealing with a subject matter or an issue which involves the determination of the guilt or innocence or the rightful or wrongful conduct of some person under investigation, there are involved many of the characteristics of a trial, or certainly many of the characteristics of a quasi-judicial hearing. In that phase, Mr. President, it is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that rather strict judicial procedures of a fair trial should be followed, subject to those variances on which I have commented today, such as those dealing with the hearsay-evidence rule. In recent years, a good deal of criticism of some congressional hearings has gone to the manner in which congressional investigating committees have conducted their hearings. The Senator from Nevada is quite correct when he says that the source of judicial power of a Senate committee to investigate is based, and it has been so held many times in our judicial history, on the necessity for investigation by a committee in carrying out the legislative process of the Government. We are not a law-enforcement branch or a judicial branch; we are a legislative branch. Therefore, Mr. President, the jurisdictional power we have when we carry on an investigation must necessarily rest upon the power to investigate in order to obtain the facts needed in determining what legislation, if any, we should pass on a given subject matter.

The Senator from Nevada has indicated very clearly that, of course, sometimes a committee goes rather far afield from that jurisdictional authority. But here, again, Mr. President, it is pretty much like the application of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It has been stretched rather elastically over the decades, and what our founding fathers thought might fall within the purview of the restraints on interstate commerce has become somewhat different in the past half century, as a result of litigation. The Congress, and properly so, has exercised a great deal of authority over commerce by broad or liberal constructions and interpretations of the commerce clause of the Constitution. So have congressional committees.

In the matter of investigation, we have gone rather far afield in some instances, it seems to me, as indicated by the Senator from Nevada, but always holding, however, to this jurisdictional authority based upon the right to investigate, because what is found might have some bearing and be an aid in enacting needed legislation.

So the fact is, Mr. President, that once a committee starts an investigation and states that its purpose is to find facts, because it thinks it needs to investigate certain alleged facts as an aid to legislation, its jurisdiction is rather unlimited.

That takes us into some of the other phases of the process of investigation. When we talk about an open public hearing, I say it is analagous to and closely resembles a trial, and that the fair procedures of judicial trial should prevail, with such exercise of discretion on the part of the members of the committee as I have commented upon in my main remarks today. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, we sometimes find an uncooperative witness. In fact, as I said earlier today, we sometimes find a dishonest witness or a lying witness, or fellow-travelers or out-and-out Communists who follow the tactics which the Senator from Nevada has indicated.

In such a situation my reply as to that is that we can handle witnesses of that kind under fair procedure. We have the reasonable discretion which any court has in controlling a witness on the stand. The witness does not have to be allowed to run away with the hearing, nor does his counsel have to be allowed to run away with the hearing. What we need, Mr. President, is a procedure which guarantees to the witness, by mandate of the Senate, by adopted rule of the Senate, the right to have counsel, the right to cross-examine, the right to reply, and then let the record speak for itself when the witness seeks to abuse those rights, as to whether the committee has fully protected his rights under an agreed uniform procedure.

That is my position on this part of the subject matter.

Let me now consider, Mr. President, another phase of the system of investigations by congressional committees, namely, the investigating phase followed by a district attorney, a prosecutor, or the police and detectives. But here, again, Mr. President, the citizen is not without procedural protections or guaranties when it comes to the determination of what the police and the prosecutor and detectives can do or cannot do. They are not free, and when they attempt improper procedure we recognize it as a scandalous abuse, and we can clean out the police department or the prosecutor's office if they do not follow the procedural guaranties to which the citizen is entitled when an investigation is conducted. A prosecutor cannot adopt any tactic he wants to adopt in an investigation. He cannot resort to third-degree methods. He cannot deny a person the right to counsel. He cannot deny him access to counsel. He is greatly limited in the procedures he can follow as an investigator.

Mr. President, this plea I am making for uniform procedure would follow the whole investigation process by an investigating committee from top to bottom, or bottom to top.

As one who has taught criminal law and criminal procedure for some 15 years, who conducted a State crime survey, and was the director of a nationwide crime survey, I say that I never at any time in that professional work found any cause to believe that a prosecutor, or a police department, or a detective, or an investigator, had to resort to any tactic that would violate the procedures guaranteed to a free American citizen. Such tactics are only substitutes for lazy prosecutors, lazy detectives, and lazy police departments, or they become the weapons of persecutors and inquisitors, which are quite different from investigators within the spirit and meaning of the guaranties of the American Bill of Rights.

I conclude this part of the subject by saying that I do not believe it makes any difference whether a Senate investigation is identical with a trial or not, I say it so closely resembles the administration of justice process that we ought to adopt a uniform set of rules which will guarantee to free American men and women the same principles of judicial process and judicial protection which I believe our Founding Fathers clearly intended in the Bill of Rights.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

Now what about the subject of the rights of persons adversely affected by testimony? Earlier proposals have attempted to provide individuals who are the subject of derogatory evidence with an opportunity for rebuttal. Many such proposals, such as that in S. Con. Res. 2 in the 81st Congress, were properly criticized for laying down brittle rules which could be abused and delay hearings. A further objection was the inexactness of the nature of the testimony which would confer the right of rebuttal.

The resolution of the junior Senator from Oregon states, explicitly as I think can be done, an appropriate test.

Any testimony which would be libel or slander if not given in a congressional hearing confers the right to rebuttal if made at a public hearing. Both libel and slander are specified as the evidence is usually oral but is normally printed. In addition charges which the committee determines would subject a person or organization to serious hardship, embarrassment, shame, or financial loss gives the right to testify in rebuttal.

If possible those subject to such attacks would be given advance notice. In any event they would have the right to cross-examine the adverse witness and to call, within the discretion of the committee, witnesses in their behalf. As in private litigation, witness fees are to be paid by the party calling the witness subject to the right of the committee to pay such fees out of committee funds if in the opinion of the committee such action would be in the interest of justice and a full presentation of facts and evidence needed for a fair hearing.

Mr. President, I can well imagine circumstances in which a person involved in a congressional hearing would be in no position to pay witness fees, and yet certain witnesses ought to be called in rebuttal and in justice and fairness to the person involved he should have an opportunity to have the transcript perfected by the testimony of rebuttal witnesses. That can always be done in an informal conference with the person involved, and the witness fees can be paid by the committee, just as a judge allows such payment by the Government when some litigant cannot pay it. The committee itself can pass judgment as to who shall pay the costs. Very frequently a court, in his discretion, will assess the costs against the State because the court leans over backward in order to guarantee to the accused that he will have his fair day in court, and a full opportunity to present all the evidence he desires to present, in the presence of the witnesses, even though he may not personally be able to pay the fees of the witnesses and the expenses of bringing them to the court.

RIGHTS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Witnesses would have the right to be accompanied by counsel and before any publication of or comment upon adverse testimony given in executive session a person damaged thereby would have the same rights as in a public hearing. This would be so only where the committee decides secrecy is no longer necessary and the person affected would merely be given an opportunity to rebut accusations before they are aired in the press and radio.

PUBLICATION OF RULES

In order that witnesses be advised of their rights these and supplementary rules must be available to them in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

CONCLUSION

The substance of my proposal would in no way diminish the investigatory power of the Senate. But it would provide those basic guaranties of fair procedure without which democracy cannot be said to exist. Without such fair procedure for Senate committee hearings, I think the Senate will continue to be subject to the charge that it is failing to give adequate procedural protection to citizens called before the Senate committee investigations within the spirit and intent of the precious guaranty of a fair trial emblazoned in the Bill of Rights.

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—NEWSCAST BY ERIC SEVAREID

During the remarks of Mr. MORSE, the following occurred:

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under date of February 11, 1953, Mr. Eric Sevareid in a radio newscast issued a series of highly inflammatory, misleading statements with reference to the Immigration and Nationality Act, the McCarran-Walter Act. Unfortunately, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] promptly thereafter caused an excerpt from the newscast to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Knowing how misleading were the expressions of Mr. Sevareid, I requested the staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Senate to check on the allegations of Mr. Sevareid's misleading broadcast. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter dated February 19, 1953, from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in which he points out the misstatements in the Sevareid broadcast.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington 25, D. C., February 19, 1953.

Mr. RICHARD ARENS,
Staff Director, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, Senate Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ARENS: This is in reference to your letter of February 13, 1953, to which you attached an excerpt from a radio newscast dated February 11, 1953. In your letter you request that I submit a memorandum covering each item referred to in the broadcast.

To begin with I did not hear the broadcast but on the morning of February 13, a member of my staff received a phone call concerning it from Mr. Proehl, who is on the Norwegian and Icelandic desk, of the State Department. Mr. Proehl stated he had a copy of the CBS broadcast of Eric Sevareid which went on the air at 11 p. m., February 11, 1953, and wanted to check with this service on some of the comments so that if they were in error the embassy in Norway could be informed so as to counteract the bad effect it might have on the Norwegian people, by telling them the true facts. Mr. Proehl also stated it was his understanding that Mr. Sevareid's broadcast was based on an article written by Mr. Anders Buraas, resident Washington correspondent of "Arbeiderbladet", of Oslo, Norway, that Mr. Buraas had shown his article to Mr. Sevareid and from it Mr. Sevareid picked out certain parts to use and added his own comments. Mr. Proehl said he was acquainted with Mr. Buraas and would like to have him come over to this office to discuss some of the items and in the meantime he would send us a copy of the broadcast. We received the copy and the same afternoon Mr. Buraas appeared here. In the meantime we were able to check some of the items with our Baltimore, Boston, and New York districts so that we were able to give Mr. Buraas the true facts.

The items referred to in the broadcast which had a direct bearing on actions of officers of this service are as follows:

(1) "Not long ago immigration police tried to search the Norwegian Seaman's Home in Baltimore. There was a strong protest and they left."

Our district director at Baltimore reports they have very good working relations with the people running the Norwegian Seamen's Home at 21st and Guilford Streets, Baltimore. That occasionally officers of this Service in the regular performance of their duty do call there to question Norwegian seamen who have remained in the United States beyond the time for which they were admitted, or have been found engaged in employment contrary to law and the conditions of their temporary admission. However, when our officers go to this home they announce themselves and the manager cooperates in having the men presented for questioning. Furthermore, on several occasions the managers of the home have informed our officers regarding seamen stopping at the home who are violating their status as seamen. The questioning of seamen at the Norwegian Home and other places in Baltimore by officers of this Service when the occasion demands it, is nothing new, it has been the practice for many years and the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 known as the McCarran-Walter Act had nothing to do with it.

(2) "Last Sunday police stopped and cross-examined the worshipers as they walked out of the Norwegian Seamen's Lutheran Church in Baltimore."

The district director of this Service at Baltimore stated emphatically that none of our men have ever stood outside the Norwegian Church questioning people coming out. This Norwegian Church located on the waterfront at Baltimore runs a seamen's home in a separate building about one-half block from the church. Officers of this Service have called at this seamen's home to question seamen when necessary to the same extent as they do at the regular Norwegian Seamen's Home.

The district director at Baltimore later learned that the local city police had questioned some men outside the Norwegian Church the previous Sunday, but whatever their purpose was, it had nothing to do with this Service or the McCarran-Walter Act, even though the Sevareid broadcast would lead one to believe it had some connection. The following figures concerning the inspection of seamen arriving at Baltimore aboard Norwegian flagships since December 24, 1952, the effective date of the new Immigration and Nationality Act indicate the percentage of seamen denied shore leave is about the same as it was prior to that date.

Twenty-seven Norwegian-flag ships arrived at Baltimore since December 24, 1952; 936 seamen aboard; 885 granted shore leave; 51 denied shore leave. Most of the 51 denied shore leave were cases of individuals who were not in possession of valid passports, the balance were seamen who were previously deported from the United States, or those found after inspection not to be bona fide seamen. Many of those denied shore leave were able to have their passports validated by the Norwegian Consul and were thereupon granted shore leave.

(3) "If a seaman gets sick and overstays the 29 days, he can be put into Ellis Island to await deportation. Among others, there are about a dozen Norwegian sailors imprisoned on the island now because they were unable to sign on a ship within the time limit."

Under the law an alien crewman if upon examination by an immigration officer is found to be a nonimmigrant and otherwise admissible and has agreed to accept such permit, may be granted a conditional permit to land temporarily for a period of time, not to exceed (1) the period of time (not exceeding 29 days) during which the vessel on which he arrived remains in port, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart on the vessel on which he arrived; or (2) 29 days if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart, within the period for which he is permitted to land, on a vessel other than the one on which he arrived.

If a seaman violates his status by remaining in the United States it is true he may be apprehended and placed in dentention quarters at Ellis Island, pending arrangements for his deportation or voluntary departure on a vessel leaving the United States. However, if his failure to leave the United States within the 29 days is due to illness or for other reasons over which he has no control, immigration officers are authorized to allow him an additional and reasonable time to regain his health and to leave the United States. The number of Norwegian seamen detained at Ellis Island varies from day to day, but the total number at any time is relatively small. This was the case before the McCarran-Walter Act as well as after it.

(4) "A few weeks ago, 11 crewmen asked to sign off the motorship *Pleasantville* when it reached Boston. They had been at sea 2 years and were ready to fly home to Norway. The Scandinavian shipping authority sent 11 men to Boston to replace them. These 11 boarded the ship; then immigration officials refused to allow 9 of the original 11 to get off. No reasons were given. The ship is now heading for the Far East, its captain paying for the extra crew and also violating security rules on lifeboat space. Those 9 men may not see their families for another 2 years."

Mr. Sevareid seems to have garbled this one, as Mr. Buraas, the Norwegian reporter, said it was not the way he had reported it. At any rate, information received from our Boston district gives the facts as follows: The Norwegian vessel *Pleasantville* arrived at Boston January 17, 1953, from the Far East. There were 45 aliens in the crew. The crew manifest presented by the captain showed that no crew members were to be paid off at the port of arrival. However, our officers learned that four Norwegian crewmen were returning to Norway and were to leave the ship when it got to New York, its next port of call in the United States. These four were given D-2 permits which would allow them to leave the *Pleasantville* and ship out on another vessel or by other means. The captain did not say anything to our officers about replacements for any crew members coming from Norway. Although there were other crewmen who evidenced a desire to leave the ship in the United States, they were not certain as to whether they would actually do so and could not tell until after arrival of the ship at New York, the next United States port. They were instructed that if at some other port they wished the privilege of paying off, or the company wished to have them paid off, the matter would have to be taken up at the next port of call. The Boston records show that two crewmen of the *Pleasantville* were given D-2 permits at New York, two in Baltimore, and one in New Orleans. Thus, counting the four D-2 permits issued in Boston, it appears at least nine of the crew of the *Pleasantville* were given permits to land which would enable them to depart from the United States on other ships or by other means to Norway or any country they chose. A further bit of information given to our officers was that the chief engineer of the *Pleasantville* desired to be paid off to go out on another ship, but he did not desire to leave the *Pleasantville* until it reached San Francisco which will be sometime in late February or March.

Summing it up it would appear that the McCarran-Walter Act had no bearing whatever as to whether or not 9 or 11 seamen on the steamship *Pleasantville* were to be replaced by 9 or 11 others and instead of the ship being out heading for the Far East it is still en route from one port in the United States via the Canal Zone to another port in the United States.

"(5) Many foreign seamen are not signing off in American ports even when allowed to, because they dare not. They have no way of knowing whether they can sign on again in time to avoid imprisonment. Foreign ships can no longer put into American docks for repairs if the repairs take more than 29 days. In order to get out in time, bo'suns have signed on as deck hands; electricians as mess boys, losing status and pay."

It may be true that crewmen who in times past were able to obtain shore leave when their vessel arrived and then on one pretext or another were able to obtain extensions permitting them to remain in the United States for many months are irked by the requirements of the new act which limits their stay to periods not to exceed 29 days. However, as stated under item 3 above, a seaman required to be in the United States beyond 29 days for reasons beyond his control may be given a reasonable time in which to depart.

"(6) Interrogations under the new law have not yet discovered one Communist among Norwegian seamen; there may be some Reds among them; but the real Communists, of course, simply deny it. Many American immigration officials detest what they must do under this law as much as do the victims. For example, there are women serving on Norwegian ships as mess stewards or radio operators; this is a familiar and respectable career in Norway. When they reach America, these women are asked if they have ever engaged in prostitution; men are asked when they last visited a brothel, if they intend to commit bigamy in this country, and so on."

Under the new act, crewmen are subject to the same excluding provisions of the law as are alien immigrants, whereas under the old law a crewman could be granted shore leave who, if he were applying for admission as a visitor or for permanent residence, would be inadmissible. To this extent the McCarran-Walter Act is stricter than the old law. We know of no immigration officials who detest questioning visitors, transits, and those applying for admission to the United States for permanent residence. Therefore we see no reason why any should detest questioning crewmen to determine whether or not they meet the requirements of the law and are admissible to the United States for a temporary period. It has not come to the attention of this office that any of our men are deliberately asking every woman crewman if they have ever engaged in prostitution. While the law provides that aliens who are prostitutes or who have engaged in prostitution shall be excluded from admission into the United States, our inspectors do not ask each individual the blunt question unless he has information or some reason to believe the person being questioned may have engaged in such practice. The law also provides that the following shall be excluded from admission into the United States: (1) Aliens who are feeble-minded, (2) aliens who are insane, etc.

But our inspectors do not ask each individual the question "Are you feeble-minded?" or "Are you insane?" although under certain circumstances and in certain cases questions might be asked to bring out these facts.

Figures received from our New York district show that since December 24, 1952, 93 Norwegian-flag ships arrived in New York City, 4,376 crew members aboard, 4,078

granted shore leave, 298 denied shore leave, as follows:

Lack of valid passport	285
Not bona fide seamen	2
Previous deports	3
Not included in crew list	2
Medical reasons	5
Stowaway	1
Total	298

Most of the 285 later obtained valid passports and were granted shore leave.

Most of the factual information contained in this report was given to Mr. Buraas, who indicated he was pleased to hear our side of the story, and that while his previous article was not as critical as Mr. Eric Sevareid's broadcast, he intended to furnish his paper in Oslo with all the facts he has received as a result of his talks with officers of this Service.

Sincerely,

ARGYLE R. MACKEY,
Commissioner.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter to the editor of the New York Times dated January 11, 1953, entitled "Norwegian View of the McCarran Act."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWEGIAN VIEW OF MCCARRAN ACT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

To many Americans it may be a surprise to learn that during some months more Norwegian ships enter New York than American. When, therefore, Norway says that the McCarran Act is not bad, it is news. A front-page article to this effect is to be found in a recent issue of Nordisk Tidende, the largest Norwegian language paper outside of Norway. In this article reference is made to statements by the Norwegian consulate general in New York as well as by leaders of seamen's organizations and others. All agree that the law is not too difficult to comply with and has not caused any major difficulties.

In the same issue of Nordisk Tidende the editor, Carl Soyland, has a two-column editorial in which he reaches the same conclusion after a critical discussion of the various opposing voices which have been heard. This is remarkable, considering that Norway today is No. 3 of the seafaring nations of the world as to tonnage, and if modern equipment and efficiency are taken into account, she is more likely No. 1.

When thus the Norwegians, who are the leaders on the sea, say that our new law is satisfactory we may take the hue and cry from others with a grain of salt and congratulate our lawmakers on a job well done.

MAGNUS BJORNDAL.

WEEHAWKEN, N. J., *January 11, 1953.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a translation from a Norwegian newspaper dated January 1, 1953.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translated from Nordisk Tidende, Brooklyn, N. Y., of January 1, 1953]

MCCARRAN LAW DID NOT STOP NORWEGIAN SEAMEN IN NEW YORK—THE NEW IMMIGRATION LAW FORCED A FEW DELAYS WITH FIRST ARRIVALS, BUT OTHERWISE THINGS ARE RUNNING MORE SMOOTHLY THAN, PERHAPS, EXPECTED, THE NORWEGIAN CONSULATE SAID

After the first half dozen stops of Norwegian vessels at New York since the enforcement of the new immigration law, it is the opinion of Norwegian circles here everything will work out all right. That is more than can be said of the uneasiness in Europe about the new McCarran-Walter law, which became effective on December 24 and which, as is maintained, has been carried too far.

This law, which mainly applies to immigrants to that country, includes also the relations of foreign seamen with the United States authorities, and it is that part of the law which caused last month's transatlantic controversies.

The checkup on seamen aims primarily at refusing shore leave in American ports to members of or sympathizers with Communist Parties or organizations. Then, to people with specifically described diseases or prison sentences.

The Norwegian consulate reports that the first few days after the enforcement of the law they were busy with passport renewals. One of the conditions for shore leave is a passport valid for at least 6 months.

Heretofore the only provision that kept Norwegian seamen out was an obsolete passport, and that was quickly taken care of, either by the captain taking the passport to the consulate or by someone from the consulate going aboard the vessel.

"This is easier than people may, perhaps, have thought," they said at the consulate.

The same was reported by Harry Nilsson, secretary of the State Welfare Council for the Merchant Marine, New York office. "Everything is going all right; there is no stopping the men. There is no unpleasantness, and I do not see that the law has created any difficulty for us."

The processing took a little longer in the case of the first Norwegian ship, people from the Norwegian Seamen's Church said, who send representatives aboard all Norwegian vessels. But everything worked out all right. Aboard the *Black Hawk* the checkup was effected in 6 groups; aboard the *Norindo* in 3; but aboard the *Fernfjord* it was "almost like in the old days." Not only was it easy to arrange for shore leave, but paying off also went off painlessly, it was reported.

According to reports, an American immigration inspector is alleged to have said that Scandinavian seamen will be treated no different than before.

It has been the experience thus far that the Norwegian seamen apparently tend toward the same opinion.

Among other vessels which arrived in port within the first few days after the law became effective were the *Gimle*, the *Black Tern*, and the *Mafalda*.

IMPORT TAXES ON LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a few days ago I called attention to the deplorable conditions existing in the American metal mining industry caused largely by the dumping of vast amounts of minerals from foreign countries on the American market. The curtailment of production here has resulted in some unemployment, and has depressed prices to such an extent that many of the high-operating-cost mines have shut down. The implication of this is that metal mining and its related industries is a vital segment of our national defense, and something must be done to promote the production of minerals which are so material to our program.

On February 11, at Denver, Colo., the National Lead and Zinc Committee met and adopted a policy recommending legislation for a sliding scale stabilization import tax on lead and zinc. I ask unanimous consent that the report of this committee be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLIDING SCALE STABILIZATION IMPORT TAX ON LEAD AND ZINC

The National Emergency Committee on Lead and Zinc in conference at Denver, Colo., on February 10 and 11, 1953, has concluded that, in the interest of national defense and security, constructive legislation as stated below is needed without delay for the preservation of the mining industry engaged in the production of lead and zinc.

1. Whenever the respective market prices of these metals are below the prices required to perpetuate the domestic mining industry, a sliding scale stabilization import tax on lead and zinc must be provided.

2. The base prices of lead and zinc on which the tax should be determined should be prices that will yield domestic market prices of 15½ cents per pound, New York, for lead, and 14½ cents per pound, East St. Louis, for zinc.

3. These base prices should be adjusted periodically with the BLS index of primary market prices for all commodities other than farm and food.

4. No tax should be assessed when the United States domestic market price is equal to or greater than the adjusted base price.

5. In the case of zinc metal and refined lead, the import tax should be at the rate of 1 cent per pound for each 1 cent the market price is below the adjusted base price.

6. The same procedure should apply for zinc and lead in ores and concentrates, except that the import tax should be seven-tenths cent per pound for lead content and six-tenths cent for zinc content.

7. The legislation should be made effective for not less than the life of the Defense Act, or any extension thereof.

The committee urges the support of this program by all segments of the zinc and lead mining industry and all people who believe that the domestic mining industry is worth saving in the interest of national security.

DOMESTIC ASPECTS OF WORLD MATERIALS PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY OTTO HERRES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association, at Denver, Colo., on February 14, 1953, an address was delivered by Otto Herres, vice president of the Combined Metals Reduction Co., on the subject Domestic Aspects of World Materials Problems. This address deals with many of the difficult problems facing the mining industry at this time, and proposes some legislative relief. I ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC ASPECTS OF WORLD MATERIALS PROBLEMS

A NEW APPROACH

It is good to learn from the President's message that the new administration promises to approach all foreign decisions from the viewpoint of this Nation's own enlightened self-interest. And it seems that now we have not only a President who thinks our national interests deserve consideration, but also a Secretary of State who holds the belief that our foreign policies should be known, understandable, and right in the minds of the people. A majority of the voters made it clear last November that officials who operate without regard for the understanding and confidence of the people end up by losing the people's support.

The attitude of Washington since the beginning of World War II has been to achieve a brave new world regardless of the cost to the United States. The fact that many questioned whether that most desirable objective was within the realm of practical accomplishment made no difference to the all-wise experts of Washington. There were secret commitments.

But unfortunately bright aspirations often come to confusion. Other nations in this best of all possible worlds apparently lack the loftiness of purpose that would lead them to a sacrifice of their interests for the general welfare. They have shown no more inclination to participate in remaking the world at a loss to themselves, if they possibly can avoid it, than at any other time in yesterday's 7,000 years.

In consequence of the attitude of our former policymakers to have us follow strange paths, the new administration finds affairs in Washington and that brave new world of tomorrow in a sorry mess and our best interests gravely threatened.

THE PRICE TO PAY

The per capita debt when Mr. Roosevelt was elected was $162 and now it is $1,697—up 10 times. The total debt then was $21 billion but when the Fair Deal left office recently the debt had risen to $262,700,000,000. That is the price generations yet unborn will have to pay for the accomplishments for better or for worse of the last 20 years. It would appear that the time has come to give serious thought to the Nation's own enlightened self-interest.

The mineral policies of the State Department over the past 20 years have been responsible for metal shortages during two wars of this period and price instability that has been harmful to producer and consumer alike. No effective protection is available to the domestic mining industry against the dumping of metals on our markets from low-wage countries that have devalued their currencies. And no safeguard of consequence has been available to the consumer against shortages in times of heavy demand, or excessive prices on foreign metals during periods of shortage.

Unfortunately the same difficulties of shortages and abnormally high foreign prices on the basic metals, and the same hardships from restrictions on consumer use are likely to be suffered again when the next great crisis arises, unless the mines of this country are permitted to operate and develop the ore reserves needed for future production of metal essential for national defense.

PRICE INSTABILITY

When a shortage exists in the United States and foreign materials are needed prices are high. A foreign price of 36½ cents a pound for copper to our consuming industries against our domestic price of 24½ cents a pound has prevailed during the period of emergency demand for rearmament and the Korean war. But what is the case of lead and zinc? The price of zinc has dropped from 19½ cents a pound to 11½ cents during recent months and lead from 19 cents a pound to 13½ cents because of competition from heavy imports. In consequence many mines in this high-wage country have been forced to suspend operations and others have curtailed, or are barely holding on, thus proving that as to miners hope triumphs over experience.

The severe drop in metal prices during 1952 can be attributed directly to the free-trade policies of the Truman administration and the State Department program for financing increased foreign production of metals in preference to protecting domestic production essential to national security. This program has contributed substantially to the expansion of the mineral production in South America, Africa, and other faraway places which now is depressing our industry.

THE CASE OF ZINC

Consider the case of zinc, which is more or less typical. In 1951, a shortage prevailed in this country and a Government ceiling price lower than world prices was in effect. Imports, including zinc in ore, were 391,021 tons. But in 1952 when supplies became ample for our needs, approximately 540,000 tons of foreign zinc were dumped on our markets from the countries of low wages and devalued currencies to cause the closing of many of our properties and idle the workers.

And in 1951 our consumers needed lead, but foreign production went elsewhere and imports fell off to 248,867 tons, but in 1952 when supplies here were plentiful some 550,000 tons of foreign lead flooded our markets.

This is no departure from our past experiences in world trade. When a shortage exists in the United States and foreign materials are needed world prices are high. But when production is expanding and a surplus is available, foreign materials from low-wage countries are dumped on our markets to cause distress to our industries and unemployment for our workers.

PREDICTIONS

It has been the practice in Washington since World War II to deal with predictions and forecasts of problems that are anticipated in future years in order to gain support for a present policy. During the depression years of the thirties Washington said that production had outrun purchasing power and no further expansion of industry could be expected to create employment. Government economists in 1945 predicted 8,000,000 unemployed in the changeover from war to peace. Washington officials not many months ago were saying the shortage of basic metals, copper, lead and zinc, is not going to be overcome right away. The officials are like the old miner who learned to read figuring, but could not read writing. He said he could tell from the road signs how far, but not where to.

Now we have the President's Materials Policy Commission telling us in the Paley Report that they foresee developing shortages and rising costs which will endanger the Nation's security and living standards. It is the belief of the Commission that the United States must reject self-sufficiency as a policy and instead go for the lowest cost acquisition of materials wherever secure supplies may be found. In other words, now that we have become the high-wage country of the world we must have metals and minerals and raw materials at lower cost than the workers on our farms and in our mines, fields, and forests can produce them at home.

The Commission reached the conclusion that our materials problems are only domestic aspects of world problems. Obviously then we must undertake to solve the problems of the world in order to be assured of adequate supplies of raw materials.

TRADE, NOT AID

This lends support to the cause that carries the slogan "Trade, Not Aid" and brings propaganda for free trade in high-sounding words to the uninformed. By placing the United States in a have-not class the policy of drastic tariff reductions on raw materials gains support among the large number of citizens whose thinking is done for them by their favorite columnists and radio commentators. Political and academic thinkers would have the American people believe we are a have-not Nation, but strangely enough seem to feel that we still have billions in wealth to distribute to the far corners of the globe.

Mr. Truman assigned to his National Security Resources Board the task of reviewing the recommendations of his Materials Policy Commission. The Resources Board agrees with the Paley Commission that the United States should promote the production of materials abroad and help fulfill the aspirations toward general economic development of the countries which possess rich resources. The Board supports the conclusion of the Paley Commission that we should reject self-sufficiency, work toward the elimination of import duties and promote the development of the free world's resources in the interest of general economic welfare. In most instances, however, the general welfare seems to be held in high regard only by those who expect to gain something from it, or from holding it in high regard.

* * * * *

FIRST IN METALS

The United States ranks first in the world in the production of the ores of the industrial metals iron, copper, lead, and zinc. It leads in production of the light metals aluminum, magnesium, and the newer titanium. Reject our self-sufficiency in these metals and Detroit and the Nation will find that the ultimate price of low-cost foreign supplies comes high. The record of our experiences at various times on copper, tin, rubber, industrial diamonds, and on lead and zinc during the scare-buying period of 1951, and coffee at 10 times the prewar wholesale price of 1940, to mention a few instances, should furnish proof that our Nation's own enlightened self-interest needs serious consideration.

Destroy or weaken our producers of raw materials, the miners, farmers, and growers of livestock by importing the lowest cost supplies from the low-wage areas of the world and where then will the free traders sell their wares? Something might be learned from the present difficulties of those countries which are not favored with the great natural resources our country possesses to support its vast industries. Our great wealth derived from the mines and the soil provides the Nation's manufacturers with the richest and most profitable market on earth for what they have to sell.

* * * * *

SAVING THE MINING INDUSTRY

Any program to strengthen our industries and place our economy on a sound basis must find leadership and good example in the Government. Even the most extreme exponents of free trade do not direct their arguments against tariffs to keep alive the industries needed for war. If the mining industry is worth saving from destruction by imports of low-wage foreign metal, protection must be afforded American producers.

It is believed that Congress will adopt constructive legislation to preserve the domestic mining industry, provided the entire industry will unite on a sound program.

In view of international political uncertainties and the conclusion of the Paley Commission that we are threatened with shortages of the basic metals, national security requires a healthy domestic mining industry with ample productive capacity and experienced working forces. Our great protection is industrial strength. And this means we must maintain adequate capacity for the production of strategic and critical metals and minerals within the United States.

The continued operation of prospectors and small mining concerns is important because these smaller operations provide a pool of specialized knowledge and trained manpower available for the expansion of mineral production in the event of an emergency. And their activities also are a source of new mine discoveries of consequence.

A national policy of stockpiling strategic and critical materials on a permanent basis and the provision of adequate funds for orderly purchases for defense and emergency needs would tend to stabilize the market and protect consumers against such losses as were suffered by the metal-fabricating industries from the shortages and Government rationing of supplies during recent years. Nor would consumers be at the mercy of high

foreign prices in times of shortages as has been the case with imported copper selling at 12 cents a pound higher than metal from our own mines.

ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

Common sense and good judgment tell us to keep our productive capacity strong and encourage the development of our mineral resources. Reject self-sufficiency as a policy and we reject the idea of freedom, for self-sufficiency and independence go hand in hand.

* * * * *

Without enlightened self-interest we cannot maintain our strength and independence. And it is in the strength of this Nation that hope is to be found for the rest of the world.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday, February 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the second part of the Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
James J. Wadsworth, of New York.

The following-named person to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the second part of the Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

William Sanders, of Virginia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

James H. Douglas, Jr., of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 20, 1953:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, we come this day conscious of a cloud of witnesses gazing at us and speaking to us out of the heroic past. Especially we thank Thee for the shining virtues, the moral wisdom and the elevated patriotism of Thy servant, the first President of the Republic who still stands among us in lofty reserve. In this city, which is baptized in his revered name, where the monumental shaft lifts its glistening whiteness to the bending sky, telling to the generations the supremacy of unsullied character, we bow in this hallowed temple of the freedom he wrought to achieve, to give Thee thanks for the life and service of that one whom we reverently call the Father of his Country.

Like him whom we this day praise and honor, may we be unswayed by passion or prejudice. By patience and faith may we, like him, rise above the difficulties, discouragements, and dangers which confront us, as in this day of desperate struggle his unsheathed sword inspires the fighting men of America wherever liberty is challenged by tyranny. So, as the ages roll, may a grateful Nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his service. We ask it in the name of the Master whom he adored. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 20, 1953, was dispensed with.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on January 24, 1901, ordering the reading on the 22d day of February of each year of the Farewell Address of George Washington, the Chair having heretofore designated the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to read the address, the Senator from Kentucky is now recognized for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its

beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any person of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon

your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws; acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all of their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interests exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odius; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under

that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity imposes on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

A PRAYER FOR OUR COUNTRY, BY GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD A Prayer for Our Country, written by Gen. George Washington.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER FOR OUR COUNTRY

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of Government, that there may be peace and justice at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, including consideration of the Executive Calendar, because on it are the nominations of representatives to the United Nations which meets tomorrow. Immediately following that, I shall propose, with the permission of the Senate, that legislative session be resumed at which time we will follow the procedure of what would be a morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the presentation of such other routine matters and statements as Senators may care to present. It is not the purpose of the acting majority leader to have any proposed legislation considered today. At the conclusion of the morning business I shall propose, with the permission of the Senate, that an adjournment be taken until next Wednesday. It is the plan to meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of this week, and, I believe, the following week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the understanding of the acting majority leader that the nominations on the Executive Calendar were reported without opposition?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding. I know of no opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have one further inquiry, Mr. President.

Is it not true that the majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] announced at the last session that any nominations which had been reported would be considered today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish also to call attention to the fact that on February 20 the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in stating the program for this week, made the following statement:

> On Wednesday, I shall propose that the calendar be called. If any important bills on the calendar are objected to, such as the bill dealing with the National Housing Act, and one or two others, I may move, after the calendar call, that they be considered. At this time I know of no business to be taken up on Friday.

I merely desire to add, for the further information of the Senate, that hearings are now in progress before the Committee on Appropriations on a supplemental appropriations bill. The hearings began this morning. I do not know how rapidly they can be expedited or when the Committee on Appropriations may report the bill to the Senate. However, when the bill has been reported, it will be the purpose of the leadership to move its consideration as soon as the bill is ready to be taken up on the floor. I think the Senate should have notice of that intention.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massa-

chusetts, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second part of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest A. Gross, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second part of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second part of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Sanders, of Virginia, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the second part of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The legislative clerk read the name of Allen Welsh Dulles, of New York, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lloyd A. Mashburn, of California, to be Under Secretary af Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GOVERNOR OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel Wilder King, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately so notified.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] relative to the nominations of representatives to the United Nations, together with brief biographical sketches of the nominees.

There being no objection, the statement and biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON UNITED NATIONS NOMINATIONS

The nominations of United States delegates to the United Nations General Assembly were sent to the Senate by the President on Friday and were immediately considered that afternoon by the Foreign Relations Committee which unanimously reported them to the Senate.

There are 4 nominations involved, 3 delegates and 1 alternate. The delegates are Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, our permanent representative to the U. N.; James J. Wadsworth, of New York, our deputy permanent representative; and Ernest Gross, of New York. The alternate is William Sanders, of Virginia.

The Senate has only recently confirmed the nominations of Mr. Lodge and Mr. Wadsworth in their capacity as permanent representatives. Mr. Gross has previously served as a delegate to the Assembly, and Mr. Sanders has also had long experience in United Nations affairs in the State Department.

The Assembly resumes its session tomorrow and therefore it is of the utmost importance that these nominations be confirmed by the Senate today so that the United States will be officially and formally represented from the beginning.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

Born, Nahant, Mass., July 5, 1902; son of George Cabot and Mathilda Elizabeth Frelinghuysen (Davis) Lodge; grandson of late United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge; graduate of Middlesex School, Concord, Mass., 1920; bachelor of arts, Harvard, 1924; married Emily Sears, July 1, 1926; children: George Cabot, Henry Sears. Began with Boston Evening Transcript, 1923, New York Herald Tribune, 1924; member Massachusetts General Court, 2 terms, 1933–36; elected to United States Senate from Massachusetts, 1936, for term ending 1943; reelected, 1942; resigned to go into United States Army; reelected, November 5, 1946, for term ending January 1953. Active Reserve officer from 1925; major, United States Army, with 1st American Tank Detachment in British Eighth Army, Libya, 1942; Italy, 1944; lieutenant colonel, southern France, Rhine, and southern Germany, 1944–45. Representative to the fifth session of the General Assembly; appointed representative to the U. N. with rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and representative in Security Council, January 23, 1953. Home, 275 Hale Street, Beverly, Mass.

ERNEST ARNOLD GROSS

Born, New York City, September 23, 1906; son of Arnold and Caroline (Fleisher) Gross; bachelor of science, Harvard, 1927; student, Oxford University, 1927–28; bachelor of laws, Harvard, 1931; Geneva School of International Studies, summers, 1929–30; married Kathryn Watson, September 1, 1933; children, Suzanne, Peter, Catherine. Admitted to bar, 1933; assistant legal adviser, Department of State, 1931–33; division counsel, NRA, 1933–34; general counsel, graphic arts coordinating committee, printing and publishing industries, 1934–36; associate general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers, 1936–38; associate general counsel for enforcement, National Labor Relations Board, 1938–43; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for occupied areas, 1946–47; legal adviser, Department of State, Washington, 1947; Assistant Secretary of State, January 1948; member United States delegation to Far Eastern Commission; alternate representative to U. N. General Assembly, 3d, 5th, and 6th sessions (representative to 7th sess. (1st pt.)); Deputy United States representative to the United Nations and deputy United States representative in the Security Council, October 1949; United States representative, U. N. Peace Observation Commission, December 1950. Commissioned captain, United States Army, 1943; advanced to major, then lieutenant colonel, 1944; became Chief, Economic Section, Civil Affairs Division, War Department General Staff; adviser to United States delegation to International Labor Organization, 1944. Decorated, Legion of Merit, Order of British Empire, European Theater Ribbon; member, American Bar Association, American Society for International Law, New York State Bar Association (member committee on international law). Author of legal articles in Department of State bulletins, etc. Home, 178 Rockcrest Road, Manhasset, Long Island. Office, 2 Park Avenue, New York City.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH

Born, Groveland, N. Y., June 12, 1905, son of James Wolcott, Jr., and Alice (Hay) Wadsworth; student, Fay School, St. Marks School, Southboro, Mass.; bachelor of arts, Yale, 1927; doctor of laws, Alfred (N. Y.) University, 1937; married Harty Griggs Tilton, June 16, 1927; one daughter, Alice Tilton (Mrs. Trowbridge Strong). Active in farm management and labor, 1927–41; member assembly, New York State Legislature, 1931–41; assistant manager, industrial relations, Curtiss Wright Corp., Buffalo, 1941–45; Director, Public Service Division, War Assets Administration, 1945–46; director, Government affairs department, Air Transport Association of America, 1946–48; special assistant to Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, since 1948; Acting Director, Civil Defense Office, since 1950; director, Geneseo (N. Y.) Valley National Bank, Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Dansville, N. Y.; chairman, mayor's committee on child care, Buffalo, 1944–45, committee on public welfare, Albany, N. Y., 1937–41, joint committee on employment of middle aged, 1939–41; member advisory board, Forty Plus Club, New York City, since 1940. Republican. Episcopalian. Club: Yale (New York). Author: Salary Job Evaluation—The Curtiss Wright Plan, 1944. Home: 1532 29th Street NW., Washington. Office: 800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington.

WILLIAM SANDERS

Born, Durango, Mexico, April 14, 1903; son of John and Quirina (Olazabal) Sanders; bachelor of arts, Stanford University, 1928; master of arts, George Washington University, 1936; bachelor of laws, Columbus University, 1935; student Oxford University, England, 1928–29; married Elizabeth Negley (Scully) September 3, 1935; children: Quirina Harryette, William Barlow, Jonathan Scully. Manager, agency bureau, metropolitan division, postal telegraph, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., New York, 1929–32; admitted to District of Columbia bar, 1935; partner, law firm, 1935–36; chief, juridical division, Pan-American Union, 1936–41; principal attorney, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1942; alternate member, Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, Montevideo, 1942–43, member, 1944–45; Associate Chief, Division of International Organization Affairs, Office of Special Political Affairs, United States Department of State, 1945–48; Special Assistant, Office of U. N. Affairs, 1948, Acting Director, 1948; special assistant, Bureau of U. N. Affairs, and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, also United States representative, Inter-American Council of Jurists and United States alternate representative, Council Organization of American States, 1950; professor, seminar in international law and organization, Georgetown University, since 1948; adviser or delegate numerous conferences U. N. system, Organization of American States, NATO, and meetings, Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France; member, American Bar Association, American Society of International Law, International Law Association, American Political Science Association, Phi Kappa Sigma. Contributor to legal and professional journals, and Government publications. Home: 30 Edgewood Terrace, Belle Haven, Alexandria, Va. Office: United States Department of State, Washington, D. C.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REJECTION OF INTERPRETATIONS OR APPLICATIONS OF CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS OR UNDERSTANDINGS (H. DOC. NO. 93)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On Saturday, February 21, 1953, the Chair received from the President of the United States a communication with a suggested form of resolution attached, dealing with certain agreements made during World War II. Without objection, the communication and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and will be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my message to Congress of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution, making clear that we would never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves, and that we would not feel that any past agreements committed us to any such enslavement.

In pursuance of that portion of the message to Congress, I now have the honor to inform you that I am concurrently informing the Speaker of the House that I invite the concurrence of the two branches of the Congress in a declaration, in which I would join as President which would—

1. Refer to World War II international agreement or understandings concerning other peoples.

2. Point out that the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party who now control Russia, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected whole nations concerned to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism.

3. Point out that such forceful absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own.

4. State that the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, have never acquiesced in such enslavement of any peoples.

5. Point out that it is appropriate that the Congress should join with the President to give expression to the desires and hopes of the American people.

6. Conclude with a declaration that the Senate and House join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples, who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism, shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

I am enclosing a form of draft resolution, which, in my opinion, carries out the purposes outlined above, and in which I am prepared to concur.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Whereas during World War II, representatives of the United States, during the course of secret conferences, entered into various international agreements or understandings concerning other peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party, who now control Russia, have, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected the peoples concerned, including whole nations, to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism; and

Whereas such forcible absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples including our own; and

Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, are never acquiescent in such enslavement of any peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress join with the President in giving expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House concurring—

Join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples; and further

Join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

REPORT BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 18)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 19, agreed to January 9, 1953, a list of certain offices, positions, places, and employments, listing the same by departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, independent establishments, unofficial observers, special attorneys or special agents, and Federal employments of all kinds, with the amount of salaries of each attached, under the Government of the United States and not under civil-service rules and regulations. The letter, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and papers just laid before the Senate by the Chair be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Public Housing Administration for the years 1948 to 1951, inclusive; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF CERTAIN FISHING VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution relating to the livestock industry of Oklahoma; memorializing the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to take action with respect to the present emergency

"Whereas the economic base of the State of Oklahoma rests upon the continued prosperity and well-being of its agricultural industry, and the maximum activity of its agricultural citizens; and

"Whereas the members of the livestock industry of the State of Oklahoma have, in the past years in reliance upon the farm programs of the United States of America, increased their investments in lands, equipment, buildings, and cattle; and

"Whereas the members of this industry have suffered grievously from the droughts and disasters of nature the past 2 years, thus increasing their costs of production of much needed meat, supplies; and

"Whereas the recent decline in prices paid for cattle have caused serious harm and damage to the stockraisers and livestock feeders of our State, bankrupting some, and seriously limiting the anticipated profits of others; and

"Whereas the political party now in power in the Federal Government and its officials sought the votes of our people in Oklahoma for election during 1952 upon the promise of 100 percent parity for agricultural products; and

"Whereas our stockraisers and feeders depending upon such promises further expanded and increased their investments wherever possible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 24th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the President of the United States, the Members of Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be requested to place at once into effect a program of 100 percent of parity for the support of prices of livestock.

"SEC. 2. That the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture work out a program for the relief of the livestock raisers and feeders of Oklahoma which assures them of economic and other assistance at once to preserve them against loss.

"SEC. 3. That the Congress of the United States enact S. 115, by Senator ROBERT S. KERR and endorsed by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, providing for 100 percent parity on beef cattle and other farm products.

"SEC. 4. That a copy of this resolution suitably prepared be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Vice President of the United States for presentation to their respective Houses of Congress, and to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

"Adopted by the senate the 10th day of February 1953.

"D. L. JONES,
"Acting President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 12th day of February 1953.

"JAMES C. NANCE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Memorial 2

"To the Congress of the United States; the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Alaska Legislature in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas prospecting for and the discovery of placer gold was one of the most important factors in bringing people to and settling in Alaska; and

"Whereas this type of citizen shows initiative, courage, and human kindness of the highest order; and

"Whereas through prospecting under the most rigorous conditions, a stupendous source of precious and base materials have been discovered; and

"Whereas many of these base materials are associated with gold; and

"Whereas under natural conditions the gold content of these minerals would pay for the operations of said deposits; and

"Whereas by regulatory order gold has been withdrawn as a commodity and cannot be traded in except in its free state; and

"Whereas should gold be allowed to be bought and sold on a free market, it would immediately tend to induce the flow of capital to investigate and open up some of the already known deposits and be of inestimable benefit to the Territory in every line of trade and occupation in the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, earnestly requests that the Congress of the United States, through the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately take steps to allow the free and unrestricted sale of gold.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 11, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor February 13, 1953.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"House Joint Memorial 9

"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to the Delegate in Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Where as it is important to all citizens of the United States that our Nation's veterans and their families be properly housed; and

"Whereas many veterans have migrated to the Territory of Alaska and are helping to develop its economy and society; and

"Whereas veterans now represent approximately 17½ percent of the total population of Alaska; and

"Whereas, under the provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights as amended, the United States Veterans' Administration has been guaranteeing 60 percent of the amount loaned to eligible veterans for homes in Alaska by private lending institutions up to a maximum loan of $12,500 and has been making loans directly to eligible veterans for homes in amounts not exceeding $10,000; and

"Whereas these same loan privileges are also available to eligible veterans residing in the continental United States; and

"Whereas it is a fact that the costs of home construction in Alaska are from 50 percent to 100 percent higher than elsewhere in the United States; and

"Whereas many veterans have been unable to purchase or construct adequate housing in Alaska for themselves and their families due to the higher costs of construction; and

"Whereas most of these veterans could obtain adequate housing for themselves and their families if the maximum amount for individual home loans guaranteed or issued by the United States Veterans' Administration could be increased to the sum of $15,000 per veteran in Alaska.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the maximum amount for veterans home loans in Alaska guaranteed or issued by the United States Veterans' Administration be increased to the sum of $15,000.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 7, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the Senate February 11, 1953.

"CHAS. D. JONES,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DORA M. SWEENEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 13, 1953.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully represents:

"Whereas Alaska has potential opportunities for great future industrial development; and

"Whereas many and suitable sites needed for these industrial plants, mills, and related use, etc., are owned by the United States Government; and

"Whereas under present law the General Land Office does not have authority to make over 160 acres available for patent; and

"Whereas some of these sites needed are in excess of 160 acres:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that Congress immediately authorize sale by the General Land Office, of sites in excess of 160 acres needed for industrial plants, mills, and related uses.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House January 31, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the Senate February 10, 1953.

"CHAS. D. JONES,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DORA M. SWEENEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 13, 1953.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, requesting an amendment to the Social Security Act to the effect that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the first $50 of earned income be disregarded, to permit recipients to work at casual jobs without penalty on their welfare grants

"Whereas the Social Security Act provides that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for aid to the needy blind, any other income and resources of the individual claiming aid to the blind shall be taken into consideration; except that in making such determination the first $50 per month of earned income shall be disregarded, and the earned income so disregarded shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of any other individual applying for or receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent childen, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled; and

"Whereas it is deemed desirable that this exemption be granted to all applicants or recipients of any category of public assistance, for which provision is made in the Social Security Act, to permit recipients to work at casual jobs without penalty on their welfare grants: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact an amendment to the Social Security Act, that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, any other income and resources of the individual claiming such aid shall be taken into consideration; except that in making such determination the first $50 per month of earned income shall be disregarded, and the earned income so disregarded shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of any

other individual applying for or receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of New Mexico's delegation of the Congress of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 6th day of February 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting assistance to the States in the building of adequate classroom facilities for the public schools

"Whereas the several States of the United States of America have found it impossible to secure sufficient local revenues to provide adequate and modern classroom buildings and equipment for their public-school children; and

"Whereas much of this difficulty is caused by the migration of great numbers of people as a result of Federal military activity; and

"Whereas although such migration increases public-school attendance to a great extent, local tax revenues are not increased in proportion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is memorialized to enact additional legislation granting aid to the States in the building and equipping of classroom buildings for the public schools; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Sepaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of New Mexico's delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Memorial 5

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson

"Whereas Kit Carson was a pioneer of the western part of the United States, an intrepid scout, and a great patriot; and

"Whereas Kit Carson is worthy to be honored and remembered by present-day Americans as a worthy example of devotion to duty and devotion to country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts be and each of them is hereby memorialized to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts, to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress, and to the Governor and the secretary of state of the sovereign States of Colorado and Kansas.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 17th day of February 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the renewal of the International Wheat Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER on February 16, 1953, p. 1077, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Republican members of the Senate and House of the Oklahoma State Legislature, relating to farm and livestock prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for medical and hospital services for war veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge, Greek-American Progressive Association, at Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the annexation of the island of Cyprus by Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Merkle Co., Dayton, Ohio, signed by P. S. Larsh, vice president, and Ruth P. Larsh, secretary-treasurer, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 622, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Hammond Monumental Works, Inc., Hammond, Ind., signed by B. E. Krueger, president and treasurer, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 622, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence A. Hopkins, of Leeton, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a 10-percent cut in old-age pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize immediate development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is vital to full development of the inland transportation facilities and resources and the defense facilities of the country; and

"Whereas for many years the governors and legislatures of the State of Minnesota have affirmed their continued support of this project believing it to be of vital necessity to open the Great Lakes to navigation by ocean-going vessels and thereby furnish midwest farms and industry access to the markets of the world, and at the same time stimulate the development of the resources of the Nation and contribute to its defense needs; and

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada, deeming the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway to be of vital necessity, as indicated by the enactment of laws for its government that Canada proposes to proceed to develop the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway either with or without the cooperation of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this project will increase the national security, stimulate the development of and conserve the natural resources of the Nation, provide power and at the same time improve and augment the facilities for inland transportation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada without further delay and to take such steps as may be necessary to bring about the speedy completion of this seaway project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit properly attested copies of this resolution to the clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Minnesota Member thereof.

"ARTHUR WILSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Approved February 18, 1953.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

DAIRY HERD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATIONS—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS MILKING SHORTHORN SOCIETY, MANHATTAN, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kansas Milking Shorthorn Society at a meeting in Manhattan, Kans., on the 3d day of February 1953, urging continuation of the dairy-herd improvement associations, a service which is valuable to the dairy industry and the welfare of the public.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Kansas Milking Shorthorn Society feels that any curtailment of the program of the division of Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations, Bureau of Dairy Industry, is seriously detrimental to the entire dairy industry; and

Whereas prior cuts in appropriations have already seriously curtailed the work of the Dairy Herd Improvement Associations; we urgently recommend that the Director of the Budget Bureau be supported in his approval of a Dairy Herd Improvement Association budget for the next fiscal year; and

Whereas the dairy industry represents the largest single phase of the Nation's agriculture and its well-being affects the entire consuming public, we urge the passage of an adequate budget to insure that the tremendous investment the dairymen are making monthly in the Dairy Herd Improvement Association program will result in improved efficiency of the dairy industry for the welfare of all the public.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1055. A bill to incorporate the Board of Fundamental Education; and

S. 1056. A bill for the relief of Anta-Tonis Pilpi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1057. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 70 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1058. A bill designating Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military installation and renaming it "Fort McCoy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Spilios, also known as Stephen A. Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1060. A bill to authorize the improvement of East Basin, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

APPOINTMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONSIDER PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to consider proposed St. Lawrence seaway legislation. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

The subcommittee will hold hearings in the near future and will expedite consideration of the seaway as much as possible.

There are several proposals pending before Congress which embody a new approach toward construction of the seaway. For example, my own bill, which is cosponsored by 16 other Senators, would provide for private financing of the project through a corporation which would sell bonds to private investors. This would mean that no appropriation would be required and that the seaway would not cost the taxpayers a red cent. It would be a self-liquidating project from start to finish.

There is more support in the Senate for the seaway this year than I have ever known before, and my bill has been drawn to attract the maximum of that support by reducing the issue to its fundamentals. The question is not whether the seaway will be built. The question is whether we will participate in it.

I have asked the various executive agencies to report on the current seaway proposals as soon as possible. Once those reports are in, there is no reason why we cannot move ahead. I am confident that the project will be approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, and I shall press vigorously for favorable action by the full Senate.

As I have said, the question is not whether the seaway will be built. Canada will build it. Canada is ready to move. Her leaders are ready to proceed. The question is whether we will have anything to say about it after it is built.

I am happy to say that many persons who heretofore seemed to be prejudiced have now seen the significance of this great international highway or waterway, and I trust that ere long we shall be able to demonstrate statesmanship in that regard on the floor of the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

Press release issued by him on February 20, 1953, regarding rapid decline in the price of livestock, and remarks on the same subject made by him on radio program World News Roundup.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at Lincoln Day dinner under auspices of the Marion County Republican Executive Committee, Fairmont, W. Va., February 11, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "America's Challenges," delivered by him before the International Institute of Milwaukee County, Milwaukee, Wis., on February 11, 1953.

Addresses delivered at the national meeting for moral rearmament, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 12, 1953, by Senator SMITH of New Jersey; by His Excellency Eikichi Araki, the Ambassador of Japan; by His Excellency G. L. Mehta, the Ambassador of India; and by His Excellency Sir Claude Corea, the Ambassador of Ceylon.

By Mr. JENNER:

Address entitled "Highway to Happiness," delivered by Mrs. Herbert J. Mann over the radio from Station KFI, Los Angeles, Calif., December 28, 1952.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Article entitled "Most Public Officials Underpaid To Run Big-Business Government," published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of October 5, 1952.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Our Propaganda in Asia," written by Mrs. Fleur Cowles and published in the Atlantic Monthly.

Article entitled "Raps Federal 'Fire Sale' of Corn, Wheat," published in the Minneapolis Star.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial entitled "The 7th Fleet as Communist Shield," published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of February 3, 1953.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Remarks made by him, and corroborative material with regard to the organization known as Students for America.

Editorial entitled "Our Shrine of Democracy," written by R. A. Turner, and published in the February 5, 1953, issue of the Potter County News, of Gettysburg, S. Dak.

By Mr. WELKER:

Letter dated February 17, 1953, addressed to him by Ray J. Fox, a farmer of Washington County, Idaho, with relation to problems of the farmer.

Article entitled "For Lower Food Prices," published in Newsweek of February 23, 1953.

Letter dated February 15, 1953, addressed to him by Mrs. Dale Laird, of Weiser, Idaho.

LIST OF PERSONS WHO HAVE SERVED IN BOTH BRANCHES OF THE CONGRESS AND AS GOVERNORS OF THEIR STATES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address has just been concluded, a review of some history since 1789 might be of interest to the Senate.

Last summer one of my friends suggested to me that there were less than 100 men who have served in both branches of the Congress and as governors of their States. This statement rather intrigued me and I requested the legislative branch of the Congressional Library to assist me in research on this matter.

As the junior Senator from Kansas has had the privilege of serving as Governor of the State of Kansas, in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, I thought it might be of interest to Congress to have the information that I have obtained.

I find in checking the records, that 89 men have had the privilege of serving in these positions since our Nation adopted its Constitution in 1789.

In addition to the junior Senator from Kansas, there are five other Members of the United States Senate who have served as governors of their States, in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. They are the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

It is interesting to note that of the list of 89 Members, 2 of them became President of the United States, namely, Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson, both of them from the State of Tennessee.

In checking the list further, I find that there are 13 States in which no person has served in all three places. They are as follows: Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Utah.

There are 16 States, including my home State of Kansas, which have had one person who has served in the three positions. Those States are Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

There are 5 States that have had 2 persons serve in the 3 capacities—Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Mississippi, and Vermont.

There are 4 States that had 3 persons who have served in these capacities—Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Ohio.

There are 3 States that had 4 serving in these various capacities—Maine, Maryland, and New York.

There are 2 States which had 5 persons serving in the 3 positions—Connecticut and Georgia—and 4 States had 6—North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Of all the States of the Union, Kentucky has had the largest number of

persons privileged to serve in these 3 places, namely, 9.

Another interesting sidelight on the men who had such service is that 4 of them, including Andrew Jackson, who became President of the United States, did not render their service from the same State for all 3 positions. Andrew Jackson served in the House and Senate from Tennessee and as Governor of the State of Florida.

Samuel Houston of Tennessee, served as a Member of the House of Representative from the State of Tennessee, and as Governor of that State, but he also served as Governor of Texas and as United States Senator from that State.

John Branch of North Carolina, served as Governor of North Carolina and as Senator and Representative from that State and also as Governor of Florida.

John B. Weller of California, served as Governor of California and as a Senator from that State, but he also served as a Representative from the State of Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD the names of those who have served in these capacities, together with the names of the States and the date of service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Names of persons who have served as State governors, United States Representatives, and United States Senators, 1789–1953

Name	State	Governor [1]	Senator [1]	Representative [1]
Adair, John	Kentucky	1820–1824	1805–1806	1831–1833
Barrett, Frank A	Wyoming	1950–1952	1953–	1942–1950
Bibb, William W	Virginia	1817–1820	1813–1816	1807–1813
Bingham, Kinsley Scott	New York	1854–1858	1859–1861	1847–1851
Blanchard, Newton Crain	Louisiana	1904–1908	1894–1907	1891–1894
Branch, John	North Carolina	1817–1820	1823–1829	1831–1833
	Florida	1844–1845		
Brewster, Ralph O	Maine	1925–1929	1941–	1935–1941
Burleigh, Edwin Chick	do	1889–1892	1913–1916	1897–1911
Byrnes, James F	South Carolina	1951–1955	1931–1941	1911–1925
Carlson, Frank	Kansas	1947–1950	1950–	1935–1947
Claiborne, William C. C	Tennessee			1797–1801
	Louisiana	1812–1816	1817	
Clements, Earle C	Kentucky	1947–1950	1950–	1944–1947
Corwin, Thomas	do	1840–1842	1845–1850	1831–1840
				1859–1861
Crafts, Samuel C	Vermont	1828–1831	1842–1843	1817–1825
Crittenden, John J	Kentucky	1848–1850	1817–1819	
			1835–1841	
			1842–1848	
			1855–1861	1861–1863
Davis, John	Massachusetts	1834–1835	1835–1841	1825–1834
		1841–1843	1845–1853	
Dixon, Joseph M	Montana	1921–1925	1907–1913	1903–1907
English, James Edward	Connecticut	1867, 1868, 1870	1875–1876	1861–1865
Fairfield, John	Maine	1839–1843	1843–1847	1835–1838
Fenton, Reuben E	New York	1865–1868	1869–1875	1853–1855
				1857–1864
Fish, Hamilton	do	1849–1850	1851–1857	1843–1845
Foote, Samuel A	Connecticut	1834–1835	1827–1833	1819–1821
				1823–1825
				1833–1834
Forsyth, John	Georgia	1827–1829	1818–1819	1813–1818
			1829–1834	1823–1827
Franklin, Jesse	North Carolina	1820–1821	1799–1805	1795–1797
			1807–1813	
Giles, William B	Virginia	1827–1830	1803–1815	1790–1798
				1801–1803
Grover, LaFayette	Oregon	1870–1877	1877–1883	1859
Hamilton, William Thomas	Maryland	1879–1883	1869–1975	1849–1855
Hamlin, Hannibal	Maine	1857	1848–1857	1843–1847
			1857–1861	
			1869–1881	
Hammond, James Henry	South Carolina	1842–1844	1857–1860	1835–1836
Hardwick, Thomas W	Georgia	1921–1923	1914–1919	1903–1906
Harris, Isham Green	Tennessee	1857–1862	1877–1897	1849–1853
Hoey, Clyde R	North Carolina	1937–1941	1945–	1919–1921
Houston, George S	Alabama	1874–1878	1879	1841–1849
				1851–1861
Houston, Samuel	Tennessee	1827–1829		1823–1827
	Texas	1859–1861	1846–1859	
Hubbard, Henry	New Hampshire	1841–1843	1835–1841	1829–1835
Jackson, Andrew	Tennessee		1797	1796–1797
			1823–1825	
	Florida	1821		
Jackson, James	Georgia	1798–1801	1793–1795	1789–1791
			1801–1806	
Johnson, Andrew	Tennessee	1853–1857	1857–1862	1843–1853
			1875	
Johnson, Henry	Louisiana	1824–1828	1818–1824	1834–1839
			1844–1849	
Kellogg, William P	do	1873–1877	1868–1872	1863–1865
			1877–1883	
Kent, Joseph	Maryland	1826–1829	1833–1837	1811–1815
				1819–1826
La Follette, Robert M	Wisconsin	1901–1906	1906–1925	1885–1891
Lambert, John	New Jersey	1802–1803	1809–1815	1805–1809
Lane, Henry S	Indiana	1861	1861–1867	1840–1843
McCreary, James B	Kentucky	1875–1879	1903–1909	1885–1897
		1912–1916		
McRae, John J	Mississippi	1854–1858	1851–1852	1858–1861
Metcalfe, Thomas	Kentucky	1829–1833	1848–1849	1819–1828
Milledge, John	Georgia	1802–1806	1806–1809	1792–1793
				1795–1799
				1801–1802
Miller, Stephen Decatur	South Carolina	1828–1830	1831–1833	1817–1819
Moore, Gabriel	Alabama	1829–1831	1831–1837	1821–1829
Morrison, Cameron A	North Carolina	1921–1925	1930–1932	1943–1945
Morrow, Jeremiah	Ohio	1822–1826	1813–1819	1803–1813
				1840–1843
Neely, Matthew	West Virginia	1941–1945	1923–1929	1913–1921
			1931–1941	1945–1947
			1949	
Nelson, Knute	Minnesota	1893–1895	1895–1923	1883–1889
Nicholas, Wilson C	Virginia	1814–1817	1799–1804	1807–1809
Parris, Albion K	Massachusetts			1815–1818
	Maine	1822–1827	1827–1828	
Pinckney, Charles	South Carolina	1789–1792	1798–1801	1819–1821
		1796–1798		
		1806–1808		
Pleasants, James	Virginia	1822–1825	1819–1822	1811–1819
Poindexter, George	Mississippi	1819–1821	1830–1835	1817–1819
Pope, John	Kentucky	1839–1835	1807–1813	1837–1843
Reid, David S	North Carolina	1850–1853	1853–1859	1843–1847
Robinson, Joseph T	Arkansas	1913	1913–1937	1903–1913
Shafroth, John F	Colorado	1908–1912	1913–1919	1895–1904
Smith, Israel	Connecticut	1807–1808	1803–1807	1801–1805
Smith, John Walter	Maryland	1900–1904	1908–1921	1899–1900
Sprague, William	Rhode Island	1838–1839	1842–1844	1835–1837
Stanley, Augustus O	Kentucky	1915–1919	1919–1925	1903–1915
Stevenson, John W	do	1867–1871	1871–1877	1857–1861
Stewart, John W	Vermont	1870–1872	1908	1883–1891
Stone, David	North Carolina	1808–1810	1801–1807	1799–1801
			1813–1814	
Stone, William J	Missouri	1893–1897	1903–1918	1885–1891
Swanson, Claude A	Virginia	1906–1910	1910–1933	1893–1906
Taylor, John	South Carolina	1826–1828	1810–1816	1807–1810
Taylor, Robert L	Tennessee	1887–1891	1907–1912	1879–1881
		1897–1899		
Tobey, Charles W	New Hampshire	1929–1930	1939	1933–1939
Tomlinson, Gideon	Connecticut	1827–1831	1831–1837	1819–1827
Troup, George M	Georgia	1823–1837	1816–1818	1807–1815
			1829–1833	
Trumbull, Jonathan	Connecticut	1797–1809	1795–1796	1789–1795
Tyler, John	Virginia	1825–1827	1827–1836	1817–1821
Vance, Zebulon B	North Carolina	1862–1866	1879–1894	1858–1861
		1876–1878		
Wallgren, Monrad C	Washington	1945–1949	1940–1945	1933–1940
Washburn, William B	Massachusetts	1872–1874	1874–1875	1863–1871
Weller, John B	California	1858–1860	1852–1857	
	Ohio			1839–1845
Williams, Jared W	New Hampshire	1847–1849	1853–1854	1837–1841
Willis, Frank B	Ohio	1915–1917	1921–1928	1911–1915
Wright, Joseph A	Indiana	1849–1857	1862–1863	1843–1845
Wright, Robert	Maryland	1896–1899	1801–1806	1810–1817
				1821–1823
Wright, Silas, Jr	New York	1844–1846	1833–1844	1827–1829
Yates, Richard	Illinois	1861–1865	1865–1871	1851–1855

[1] Because of the lack of complete information in the biographies taken from the source, certain discrepancies may be apparent in the dates given as years of service. The lack of space and the desire for uniformity have necessitated the omission of months and days, and the dates shown more accurately refer to the term of office rather than the exact period of service.

Sources: Biographical directory of the American Congress, 1927–49; Congressional directories, 81st and 82d Congs.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it might be interesting also to state for the RECORD that after having served almost nine terms in the House of Representatives, a former President of the United States, James A. Garfield, of Ohio, was elected a Member of the Senate on January 13, 1880, for the term beginning March 4, 1881, but it was necessary for him to decline that office because in November 1880 he was elected President of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much that interesting comment, which was not developed in this study, and I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

ANNUAL WALLOW OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO—INSTALLATION OF DR. GEORGE W. CALVER AS GRAND PARAMOUNT CARABAO

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, memories of military service on foreign soil more than 50 years ago were revived at a reunion held Saturday evening in this city. The occasion was the annual wallow of the Military Order of the Carabao, composed of officers who served in the Philippines.

This organization, with the possible exception of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor, is the most exclusive military organization of our country. Saturday night's wallow was the 53d gathering since the Order of the Carabao was organized at Manila in November 1900.

I know it will be of real interest to my colleagues to learn that our good friend and the attending physician to Congress, Real Adm. George W. Calver, was installed as Grand Paramount Carabao. It is a great pleasure to congratulate Dr. Calver on this honor conferred upon him by his comrades. We know he will lead this distinctive organization during a fine year of patriotism and good fellowship.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 23, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECOND PART OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
James J. Wadsworth, of New York.

TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECOND PART OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

William Sanders, of Virginia.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Allen Welsh Dulles, of New York, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Lloyd A. Mashburn, of California, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

GOVERNOR OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Samuel Wilder King, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee for this day in the calendar of our national history, commemorating the birth of George Washington, who stood like a giant among his contemporaries, undisturbed by difficulties and unafraid of dangers.

Gratefully and reverently we call to mind the illustrious character of this noble American patriot who focused and compacted in his life those qualities of moral and spiritual manhood which are so greatly needed by our generation.

Burdened with heavy responsibilities and facing the arduous task of championing a righteous cause, he girded himself with an indomitable faith which enabled him to meet fearlessly and valiantly the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Grant that the memory of his courageous and sacrificial spirit may inspire all the citizens of our beloved country to respond with equal fidelity to the glorious adventure of bringing freedom and peace to our troubled world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 19, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS — COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In my message to Congress of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution, making clear that we would never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves, and that we would not feel that any past agreements committed us to any such enslavement.

In pursuance of that portion of the message to Congress, I now have the honor to inform you that I am concurrently informing the President of the Senate that I invite the concurrence of the two branches of the Congress in a declaration, in which I would join as President which would—

(1) Refer to World War II international agreements or understandings concerning other peoples;

(2) Point out that the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party who now control Russia, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected whole nations concerned to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism;

(3) Point out that such forceful absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own;

(4) State that the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, have never acquiesced in such enslavement of any peoples;

(5) Point out that it is appropriate that the Congress should join with the President to give expression to the desires and hopes of the American people;

(6) Conclude with a declaration that the Senate and the House join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples, who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism, shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

I am enclosing a form of draft resolution, which, in my opinion, carries out the purposes outlined above, and in which I am prepared to concur.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Whereas during World War II, representatives of the United States, during the course of secret conferences, entered into various international agreements or understandings concerning other peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party, who now control Russia, have, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected the peoples concerned, including whole nations, to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism; and

Whereas such forcible absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own; and

Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, are never acquiescent in such enslavement of any peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress join with the President in giving expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House concurring,

Join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the

course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further

Join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow and Wednesday next, following the legislative programs of those days and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 9, 1953, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. POFF read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels,

and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels, the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect

security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all of their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate..

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion

what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odius; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity imposes on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may

tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCRIVNER and to include a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. HRUSKA.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter from Admiral Boone, of the Veterans' Administration, certain other matters pertaining to the Veterans' Administration, and certain speeches.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCULLOCH and to include a speech by Representative REED of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JACKSON and to include an article entitled "Achievements of Inter-American Cooperation," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $196.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. HILLINGS in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON with reference to the first day of issue ceremony of the commemorative stamp honoring the National Guard of the United States.

Mr. BENDER in two instances.

Mr. GROSS and to include an article by Mr. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Georgia.

Mr. SHEEHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN and to include a resolution by the Common Council of the City of Detroit relative to the compensation of letter carriers, and further to extend his remarks and include an address delivered February 17 by Henry Ford, president of the Ford Motor Co., notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $273.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LUCAS and to include a statement prepared by him about H. R. 2545, his bill to protect the American people against industrywide strikes.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. MATTHEWS relative to a bill introduced by him today.

Mr. PRICE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. HART in two instances in each to include an editorial.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

484. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting relative to an appropriate resolution, making it clear that we would never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves, and that we would not feel that any past agreements committed us to any such enslavement (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

485. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information dated January 1953, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

486. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a survey and review of the Alaska Railroad, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

487. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report for the calendar year 1951 with respect to tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

488. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

489. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the administration from October 1, 1952, through December 31, 1952, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3062. A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 3361. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3362. A bill to provide for the payment of the cost of lands donated to the United States by States or political subdivisions thereof for military purposes which are subsequently leased for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that a discharge in bankruptcy shall release a bankrupt from provable debts due as a tax levied by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3364. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline, where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 3365. A bill to repeal Public Laws 874 and 815 of the 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3366. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to refuse to accept for transmittal mail under certain conditions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transmission in the mails to certain officers and employees of State, Territorial, District, and local governments of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that certain articles containing synthetic rubber shall be so labeled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 3369. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORAND:
H. R. 3370. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to include dependents in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:
H. R. 3371. A bill to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:
H. R. 3372. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disability or death payable under the laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, and to provide for the adjustment of such rates on the basis of the cost of living in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 3373. A bill to provide for the granting of preference, in the assignment of overtime employment, to employees of the postal field service paid on an annual basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H. R. 3374. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit employees to deduct their contributions under private unemployment compensation disability benefit plans where such contributions are in lieu of contributions otherwise required by State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:
H. R. 3375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitation that medical expenses shall be allowed in certain cases only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:
H. R. 3376. A bill to provide that expenses incurred in soil and water conservation practices shall be deductible from taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H. R. 3377. A bill to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act so as to make it applicable to discriminatory sales to the United States and to any State, or political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3378. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3379. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 3380. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:
H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of Senators from States hereafter admitted to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:
H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution joining with the President of the United States in a declaration regarding the subjugation of free peoples by the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. Res. 152. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Ruth J. Mott, sister of Betty C. Ickes, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of New York:
H. Res. 153. Resolution providing for a page matron, to supervise the housing welfare of the pages of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H. Res. 154. Resolution providing for a committee to consider removal of the United States Capitol or providing a supplemental Capitol; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. Res. 155. Resolution remonstrating against the persecution of Jewish people in Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. Res. 156. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 125; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to investigate and consider the feasibility of amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, or to repeal the same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Memorial of original senate joint memorial No. 1, as passed by the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming, and approved by the Acting Governor on February 11, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, original senate joint memorial No. 2, as passed by the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming, and approved by the Acting Governor on February 6, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, original senate joint memorial No. 4, as passed by the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming, and approved by the Acting Governor on February 11, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, original senate joint memorial No. 5, as passed by the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming, and approved by the Acting Governor on February 11, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to offshore or tideland oil deposits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of a law establishing a uniform election procedure for obtaining an advisory vote for presidential candidates; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the downward trend of the farm and livestock prices during the last year of the Truman administration and exposing the purpose behind Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 of the Oklahoma Legislature and Senate bill No. 115 of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting assistance to the States in the building of adequate classroom facilities for the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of Kit Carson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to enrolled joint memorials Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 passed by the State Legislature of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the housing loan program administered by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:
H. R. 3381. A bill for the relief of Elias (Louis) Kazaglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:
H. R. 3382. A bill for the relief of Chen Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3383. A bill for the relief of Joseph Hayim Abraham and Liza Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
H. R. 3384. A bill for the relief of John B. Daniel, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:
H. R. 3385. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Carlos Maria Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:
H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Catherine Bridget Freshman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of Louie Elia Attaway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Eiko Tanaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Onorato Biagioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Irma Felicita Reali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Tai Jong (Billy) Ryu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 3394. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:
H. R. 3395. A bill for the relief of Jan E. Tomczycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 3396. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hamdi Akar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

66. By Mr. BENTLEY: Resolution of L. H. Harris, president, and Fred W. Canze, secretary, Owosso Local, Michigan Milk Producers Association, to give special consideration to the need of retention on the farm of rural youth, who have, by years of service,

demonstrated their interest in such work, and that safeguards be set up preventing depletion of such labor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

67. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to the adoption of a resolution upon the recommendation of its section of international and comparative law, at its meeting held in San Francisco, September 15, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

68. Also, petition of National Jewish Youth Conference, New York City, N. Y., relative to a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the National Youth Conference at a meeting in Washington, D. C., on January 31, 1953, pertaining to anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69. Also, petition of Greek-American Progressive Association, New York City, N. Y., relative to a resolution adopted at its recent meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting that they be placed on record as protesting against the refusal of the British Government to restore to the people of Cyprus their freedom and their right to reunite themselves with their Mother Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of infinite and infallible wisdom, may this moment of prayer be for us a time of clear and unclouded vision and may all our blind spots be removed.

We are deeply conscious that our perception of that which is truly vital and fundamental is frequently so very hazy and muddy.

Grant that in the great adventure of building a well-balanced and useful life we may know how to coordinate practical commonsense with lofty idealism, self-discipline with personal freedom, humor with seriousness, joyfulness with genuine piety, and love with duty and service.

Hear our prayers for our beloved country and answer our petitions in the name of the Christ, whose divine spirit alone can illumine and rightly guide our minds and hearts. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 157, Rept. No. 81), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 100, to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have waited rather patiently for the past 2 weeks expecting some of the Republican Members of Congress to come forward to commend the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, for the fight he is putting up to lower farm prices so that farm products can be purchased by consumers, especially in the cities.

Before his election President Eisenhower spoke of full parity in the market place. The present Secretary of Agriculture, it seems to me, is trying to fulfill the President's pledge.

I am sure that everyone realizes that if the price of farm products is reduced for the American housewife, farmers themselves, in the national interest, must put aside greed for money gains, and accept a lower price for the products they sell. The attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture in his speech in St. Paul, Minn., is good news for the American consumer. He said:

God help us to raise our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things.

Mr. Speaker, some people think the American farmer has too long been pampered by the farm policies of the Democratic Party. As individuals, should farmers learn not to lean upon Government for assistance?

The policies of the Republican Secretary of Agriculture are clear to me. He has outlined his program with frankness and sincerity. I am sure that unless selfish farm leaders create confusion, the American farmer will understand that the end of artificial price-support programs is in sight.

We will soon come to the end of programs that pile up potatoes and butter at the taxpayers' expense. Evidently, the new policy is, as the Secretary has so aptly indicated in his remarks of the past month, if the farmer is so inefficient that he is unable to make a profit, let him quit farming.

TVA AND INDIA

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, while certain of our leaders have characterized the world situation as grim—and so it appears—there are, nevertheless, some bright spots and hopeful rays penetrating the overcast. I refer to the opening of the great TVA-type power project in India on last Saturday.

Prime Minister Nehru threw the switch which put into operation the first of a series of power units in India's $140,000,000 multipurpose power system. His act in this connection—I believe we will all agree—as surely marked the breaking of the dawn of a new day in Asia as the throwing of the first switch set in motion the great Tennessee Valley Authority and started a new economic era in the South nearly 20 years ago.

If we can project our imaginations into the future 20 years from now we can visualize the blooming of the great region of India just as the power and the flood-control mechanisms of the TVA have helped a great region of the South to bloom and prosper. In contemplating the controlling and harnessing of the rampant and destructive flood waters of the rivers of India, and the distribution of electric power to her people, we can feel that the efforts of the TVA have not only helped our Nation, but has served as a great example to the people of other lands, for the river valley system in India was modeled after the TVA.

Several years ago Prime Minister Nehru visited America and while here visited and saw the TVA in the South in operation. The great flood control, navigation, and power system now in operation in India represents the appropriation of an idea—a soundly conceived enterprise. The technical know-how was supplied by engineers from our Nation and engineers from India who received much of their training in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that India will move forward with the free world—as a foe of communism—as her people flourish and prosper through economic progress brought about by such TVA-type projects as this new power system in India.

FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL BRINGS DISTRESS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 81st Congress a special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee investigated the effects of imports on employment. I was a member of that subcommittee, and I heard indisputable evidence that unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil brings distress to the coal, railroad, and domestic oil industries.

The investigation disclosed that in 1949, the last full year prior to the time of those hearings, 74,555,000 barrels of residual had been shipped into this country to the very great disadvantage of our domestic economy. In energy value these imports were equivalent to almost 18 million tons of coal, and the loss of this production deprived miners of $43 million in wages. The attendant drop in freight traffic caused railroads to lose more than $22 million in wages, and proportionate losses were felt in associated industries and in coal communities.

We residents of coal areas were well aware of the disaster being transported in tanker lots from foreign refineries, but the revelation was shocking to those not previously familiar with conditions in districts affected by the imports. Before any congressional action designed to provide relief from this unfair competition was taken, however, the outbreak of hostilities in Korea stiffened coal demand. Everyone connected with the coal industry joined hands to provide the increased supply necessary for the mobilization program. But while our back was turned the foreign residual oil faucets were opened considerably more, with the result that by 1952 the total imports of this product had risen to more than 126 million barrels—an increase of 70 percent in just 3 years.

A still more startling fact has just been released by the United States Census Bureau, and I should like to call it to the attention of every Member of Congress: In December 1952 a total of 16,681,000 barrels of residual oil came into this country from foreign refineries. Projected on a 12-month basis, that rate amounts to an astounding 200 million barrels, equal to about 50 million tons of coal. In order to visualize the magnitude of the impact of these imports on the domestic economy, let us assume that the lost coal markets fell entirely upon West Virginia—and I assure you that my State is the principal victim of the current import policy. Fifty million tons of coal is 35 percent of the total 1952 output of the mines of West Virginia, the Nation's largest coal-producing State. A loss of that tonnage would put at least 35,000 West Virginia families on relief. It would have disastrous repercussions on every industry and business in our State, and it would reduce State and local revenues to a point where our schools, police forces, and other activities essential to the general welfare would have to be curtailed.

I submit that the Congress of the United States can no longer abide this situation. In behalf of the people of West Virginia and the other coal States, I implore this legislative body to adopt a bill which I and a number of my colleagues have introduced—a bill to limit the surging sea of imported residual oil in the interest of American industry and American labor.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROY O. WOODRUFF

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point my remarks in relation to our late friend and colleague, the Honorable Roy O. Woodruff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late colleague, Roy O. Woodruff, is a personal loss to me. Roy Woodruff was a Member of Congress before I was elected to this body. While of opposite political parties, a friendship of a close nature developed between us.

In 1930 I was elected by my party to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee, one of the Republican members was Roy Woodruff. I served on that committee with my late friend until 1940 when I was elected majority leader of the House of Representatives.

I was quickly attracted to Roy Woodruff. His ability, his sincerity, his devotion to duty, his fine personality, his nobility of character, his inspiring and intense patriotism made a profound impression upon me and which was strengthened as the years passed.

During his long service in the Congress he rendered outstanding service to his district, to his State, and to our beloved country.

Roy Woodruff has left his indelible imprint in the pages of congressional history, I shall miss Roy very much.

To Mrs. Woodruff and her son and daughter, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from the House on rollcall No. 6, and desire to state that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was paired against the motion to recommit the bill, rollcall No. 5.

DR. MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman; and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on May 22, 1953; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That the statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF MONTHLY LIMITATIONS ON OFFICIAL TELEPHONE CALLS AND TELEGRAMS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2230) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first two sections of the act entitled "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives", approved June 23, 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "That in the case of each Member of the House of Representatives, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration and subject to the limitations provided in section 2, the following charges:

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member.

"SEC. 2. In the case of any Member of the House of Representatives other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, there shall be paid under the first section of this act—

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member, aggregating not more than 1,800 minutes during any year; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member, aggregating not more than 12,000 words during any year.

"For the purposes of this section, the term 'year' means the period beginning at noon on January 3 of a calendar year and ending at noon on January 3 of the succeeding calendar year."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act to such act of June 23, 1949, as amended, shall take effect as of noon on January 3, 1953.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the semicolon and insert "within the United States, its Territories, or possessions;"

Page 2, line 9, after the word "Member", strike out the period and insert "within the United States, its Territories or possessions."

Page 2, line 15, strike out all of lines 15 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member, aggregating not more than 1,800 minutes during any year, except that if a Member is elected for a portion of a term, the aggregate number of minutes with respect to which toll charges may be paid under the first section shall be reduced, with respect to the year in which he commences his service, to a number which is the same percentage of 1,800 as the number of days of his service in such year is of the total number of days in such year; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member, aggregating not more than 12,000 words during any year, except that if a Member is elected for a portion of a term, the aggregate number of words with respect to which charges may be paid under the first section shall be reduced, with respect to the year in which he commences his service, to a number which is the same percentage of 12,000 as the number of days of his service in such year is of the total number of days in such year."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few observations expressing my own views. I am not in opposition to the bill. I have always felt that when Members gave up in part their right to send official telegrams without limitation, it was the wrong step to take. I realize there is an involvement in connection with long-distance telephone calls, and I think it was wise and proper, on official long-distance telephone calls, to let the Members, within reasonable limitation, make them rather than pay them out of their own pockets. I can remember in years gone by I paid as high as $2,200 out of my own pocket on strictly official telephone calls in the performance of my duties as a Member of the House of Representatives. However, I have always felt that limiting the number of official telegrams to Members was a serious mistake. It does not apply to me in my leadership position, because it is exempted to the leaders, and properly so. But I want the record to show that as far as I am personally concerned, while I am not interposing any objection to this bill, I have felt all along that limiting Members in their right to the sending of official telegrams placed upon the Members a hardship that I thought was unwise.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, the gentleman knows that what this bill does is simply change the manner of computing. Instead of 150 minutes a month it is 1,800 minutes a year for telephone, and the same with respect to telegrams. In the old days, which the gentleman talks about there was a liberal provision for telegrams, and it was found that some few Members used and abused the privilege and employed telegrams for answering almost all of their correspondence, and some limitation had to be placed on it. That is the reason for the limitation. The new provision was adopted in the last Congress.

This bill today simply changes the existing provision. It just changes the manner of computing the time and the number of words. It gives each Member 1,800 minutes per year of telephone messages and 12,000 words per year for telegraph messages—the same number exactly except the computation is by the year instead of by the month.

Mr. McCORMACK. At the time that went through I did not like it; and I expressed myself because I did not see why all of us should suffer for what one or two, or a few, might have done in connection with the abuse of official telegrams. But I simply want the RECORD to show that as far as I am concerned, I think a serious mistake was made, for it hampered our ability to perform our services efficiently and economically to the people of our districts when we deprived ourselves of the right to send official telegrams without limitation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman had no telephone privilege at that time; that has been added.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct, but in order to get a little telephone privilege Members had to limit themselves in sending official telegrams. I felt that reasonable provision for telephones should have been given without taking away the right of Members in relation to official telegrams; but my remarks have no application to my friend from Iowa. The RECORD will show how I feel on this subject, that the telephone service should have been granted as provided in this bill on official matters, and there should be a return to the right of Members without limitation to send official telegrams.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOLDING ROOM

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 149 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective March 1, 1953, the rate for folding speeches and pamphlets, folding room, Doorkeeper's Department, shall be at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand or for the employment of personnel at a gross rate not exceeding $1.50 per hour per person.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I think one word should be said for the benefit of the Members of the House. This is not a resolution that will cost any more money; it probably will cost considerably less. As everyone knows, the extra help in the folding room has been employed on an hourly basis subject to six salary increases over the past few years. This resolution fixes a gross maximum salary and saves hours, and hours, and hours of time in computing small amounts in the Disbursing Office.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1953, the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 22, not to exceed $135,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committtee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 last this House by unanimous vote provided for continuing the Committee on Small Business, renewing the activities of that committee that we have had over the last few sessions. This committee has done a splendid job in the past, has done more for small business and independent businessmen throughout the country than any organization we have in the House.

The request of the committee for $135,000 is practically one-half the amount this committee had in the last Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. For the entire Congress; you see this is for one session.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is for one session; that is correct. The committee is going to try to get along on that amount.

Mr. PATMAN. I thought the gentleman stated he was reducing it one-half; it is really the same amount.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We are really not reducing anything; we are granting the committee $135,000, the amount asked by the chairman of the Small Business Committee, but the budget he submitted would indicate that he expects this amount to be sufficient for the 2-year period.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 119.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1953, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule 11, as enacted by the passage of House Resolution 5 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $900,000 including expenditures for employ-

ment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 3, 1953, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] but I do not yield for the purpose of the offering of an amendment or a motion to recommit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that I have no intention of offering an amendment or of opposing the resolution, but in view of the fact this matter is of great concern and the House had no warning of its submission at this time, if the gentleman will be so kind, I believe some questions may be in order at the present time. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] or any member of that committee on the majority side, if they are present, if at this time they will be willing to answer some questions?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] was called to Illinois, but is flying back. His office told me he is in Washington and should be here at any time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution until the gentleman from Illinois is here?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from California and others know that it has never been the practice, so far as I am aware, to schedule on the whip notice these matters coming from the Committee on House Administration that have only to do with the granting of money where resolutions have already been considered by the House and where the committee is a standing committee of the House. It was generally understood, so far as I know, that these matters would be called today and as far as I have been able to discover, everyone has been on notice they would be called up for consideration. At my suggestion the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has gone ahead and called up this particular one. I do not know of any reason why we should not go ahead and dispose of it along with the other resolutions that have been acted on.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], the ranking majority member of the Un-American Activities Committee, is present, and I think he will discuss the resolution and answer any questions which you may desire to submit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That will be satisfactory. I would like to ask, in view of the controversy that has arisen in regard to going into universities and colleges throughout the land and investigating them as to communism, if it is the purpose of this committee to use these funds for the purposes of going into the different college towns throughout the United States and calling public hearings and asking members of the faculty or of the local boards of regents and trustees to come before the committee and answer questions in a public way in regard to some alleged subversive activity?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York to answer the question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield to me an equal amount of time?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I certainly will.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would yield me some time?

Mr. LECOMPTE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. About 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. I suggest the gentleman wait until the other two Members have exhausted their time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thought while he was in a good humor I would ask for a little time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it seems a little strange that every time the Committee on Un-American Activities starts out to ferret out Communists in this country a lot of people get disturbed about it. I am as solicitous of the welfare of colleges and universities as anybody, but at the same time I think the House Committee on Un-American Activities has proved its worth. Those of us who have been here for a number of years have heard the complaints, but when we call the roll just about everybody votes for the committee. So, I do not know of any reason why we should not proceed with the consideration of the matter at this time.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to use the 5 minutes to answer the question by the gentleman from California. It is not possible for me to read the mind of the gentleman from California, but I will say this to my distinguished friend, that I think he is going far afield in his ideas of what the Committee on Un-American Activities intends to do with reference to the investigation of communism in educational institutions. Let me say this to the gentleman that this committee was constituted to seek out communism, no matter where it be, in this country, and that is what we are going to do. We are not going on any witch hunt as some call it, but we are going to investigate its ramifications and bring it to light wherever it may be. I trust that answers the question by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say this much: I am just as much interested in eliminating communism as the Members of the committee are, but at the same time there are certain rights which should be protected. I would like to ask, along with my other question, if the committee expects to extend to witnesses before the committee their constitutional rights as it has been doing in the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me say to the gentleman in answer to that question that that is one reason why I went on the Committee on Un-American Activities 3 years ago, and I can assure the gentleman, as he well knows, that every witness that comes before that committee is certainly assured of his constitutional rights. As a matter of fact we have bent over backwards in our desire to protect a witness' constitutional rights.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think that the gentleman is telling the truth and I have no complaint to make of the procedures of the committee in the last 2 or 3 years. I think there has been a desire on the part of Members on the committee to preserve constitutional rights, and I certainly compliment the committee for their procedure in the last 3 or 4 years. However, I want to say this much, that if the recent exchange between the chairman and the press and Mrs. Eugene Meyer, and the accusation made by the chairman, using a different name altogether, to cast reflection upon the patriotism of Mrs. Meyer is an indication of the carefulness with which file information is used or misused, then I am concerned.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me say this to the gentleman——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman permit me to finish?

Mr. KEARNEY. Does not the gentleman from California agree with me that that is a matter he should question the chairman of the committee about and not me?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, I would have been glad to question the chairman, but he is not present, and under the arrangement that has been made I am addressing the senior member of the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman from California would be satisfied if he knew that there will be no witnesses called before that committee in its investigation of communism in education except people that we know are now or have been Communists.

Mr. KEARNEY. On that statement, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will certainly agree if that procedure is followed and other procedures, such as not making accusations, as in the case of the Meyer, or Mayer, accusation, without adequate searching of the record and verifying of the material that is to be used before using it in the newspapers. Then I would say that would be satisfactory.

Mr. KEARNEY. I call again to the gentleman's attention that is a question between an individual and the newspapers. It is not a collective action of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is the action of the chairman of the committee, and the committee must be held responsible to a certain extent for that procedure, particularly where files of the committee are used for source material.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not agree with the gentleman on that point at all. Certainly if the gentleman from California

[Mr. HOLIFIELD] makes a statement, he certainly cannot hold me responsible for what he says in that particular statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder if the Committee on Un-American Activities has adopted any rule or has any agreement which would prohibit a member of the committee from making releases in the name of the committee without the approval of the members of the committee. It seems to me it would be to the benefit of all members of the committee that no releases be made or no accusations be made without the approval of the members of the committee. The Congress would be protected, the committee would be protected, and you would be in much better position to make official and considered statements to the press and to the radio and television.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California knows that on the first day of this session the House adopted rules providing for the Committee on Un-American Activities and the investigations of that committee. It is a committee set up by the House and it operates under the Rules of the House. It is the successor of the old Dies Committee. That is the historical background of the committee. The question before the House is, Are you in favor of providing the money for that committee to make an investigation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The House is in favor of the resolution, I am sure. I have taken the floor merely for the purpose of asking the gentlemen on the committee if they will continue to use constitutional safeguards in committee procedures, before the vote is taken.

Mr. KEARNEY. As we certainly have in the past. But we are vitally interested in the security of America and we intend to safeguard the interest of our country in any investigation the committee may undertake.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that this matter be settled definitely. The charges against Mrs. Meyer were made by an individual member of the committee against another individual. The entire Committee on Un-American Activities cannot be held responsible for a statement made by an individual member.

A great deal has been said about this case. Our reply to those questions dealing with an isolated, though regrettable incident, is the constructive work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a committee in which every constitutional right of every witness is defended to the point where we take unprecedented abuse during our hearings for 8 to 10 hours every day. Every witness has by his side the counsel of his choice. Every witness who did not desire, at a time when television was in effect in the committee hearings, to be televised, at his request was not televised. The committee has leaned over backward in an effort to be fair.

What has the committee done constructively? Let me list some matters on which the committee has reported during 1952.

Communist activities in the Chicago area—the disclosure of 50 or 60 postwar Communist branches in that area.

Review of Methodist Federation for Social Action.

Communist activities among youth groups. Methods of Communist infiltration in the United States Government.

The role of the Communist press in the United States in the Communist conspiracy.

Communist activities among professional groups in the Los Angeles area, parts 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Communist activities in the Philadelphia area.

Communist infiltration of the Hollywood motion-picture industry, parts 7, 8, and 9.

Communism in the Detroit area, parts 1 and 2.

The testimony of Dr. Edward W. Condon and the annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has gone to all parts of this country in an effort to do the job that was imposed upon it under Public Law 601.

So far as education is concerned, if the American educators, and if the gentlemen who are objecting to the investigation of communism and Communists in education, will recognize a valid distinction, I want to point out this is not a blunderbuss approach to the problem of communism in education. We are not interested in textbooks. We are not interested in the classroom operations of the universities. We are interested instead in finding out who the Communists are and what they are doing to further the Communist conspiracy. I may say in that connection that we have sworn testimony identifying individuals presently on the campuses of this country, men who have been identified under oath as one-time members of the Communist Party. Is there any Member of this body who would say we should not investigate this situation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say to the gentleman that if the committee follows out the principles he has just enunciated, none of us could find fault with that. If Communists—known Communists to the committee exist in any of these schools, I think it is entirely proper that they be brought before the committee and investigated. However, I do say if you go into these college towns and investigate indiscriminately and bring before your committee great numbers of people who are not teaching such principles because some rumor may indicate that they belonged to some organization on the Attorney General's subversive list, you will do a great deal of harm to the free educational system in America.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee has no such intention. The record of the committee over the past 2 years should indicate very clearly that the committee is not today operating in that manner.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is the gentleman talking for himself or is he speaking for the committee?

Mr. JACKSON. I am speaking as a member of the committee who is very proud of the work done by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and feels that the work should be continued and expanded until we find the root and core of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. KEARNEY. I want to assure the gentleman from California that the sentiments echoed by the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, are echoed by practically every member of the committee. I might say that the committee heard three educators last week, three former members of the Communist Party. Every one of them said that a Communist educator cannot be an objective pedagogue and that he is a menace to the educational system of this country. We agree with that and we are going to find the Communists in education and elsewhere throughout this country, if this body will go along and give us the funds we need to do the job.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say at this point that this resolution provides for $300,000 and was voted out of the Committee on House Administration unanimously. There was no voice raised against it. The amount is the exact amount that the Committee on Un-American Activities had in the first session of the 82d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to say further that I too am very much interested in the welfare of education and educational institutions in the United States, and particularly in Iowa. While I am in favor of exposing communism and all its works wherever it may be found, I feel certain in my own mind that there is practically no communism in the great State of Iowa. In my district we have four or five of the finest colleges in the United States. At Grinnell, Iowa, Grinnell College, probably the oldest college west of the Mississippi and one of the finest in the United States. No attempt has been made to achieve a great enrollment, but the standards and scholastic achievements of this school rank with the large universities of the East.

At Oskaloosa there is an institution known as William Penn College, sponsored by the Society of Friends. Former President Herbert Hoover has spoken from the campus of this college. At Lamoni, Iowa, is a very fine 2-year college, sponsored by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, a stalwart body of upstanding Americans. Two other colleges of importance are within the district that I have the honor to represent, Chicago Evangelical Institute at University Park, formerly Kletzing College, and Ottumwa Heights College at Ottumwa, Iowa, a college for women sponsored by the Roman Catholic Church.

I am under no apprehension whatever about the character of these schools or members of their faculties in the schools, or the philosophies taught by the in-

structors in the schools I mention. I believe the sum of $300,000 wisely employed can go a long way toward exposing communism where it is hidden in some of our American States, but I doubt if any of it shows up in the schools, especially in the Middle West.

Mr. WALTER. Is not this amount less than the amount usually appropriated for the committee?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is exactly the same amount the committee had in the first session of the 82d Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] for a brief question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I just asked the question before whether the House Committee on Un-American Activities had a rule of procedure or any rules insofar as releases are concerned on behalf of the committee. That is a simple question.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Committee on Un-American Activities has its own rules. The committee is set up according to the rules of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania voted for the adoption of the rule on the first day of the present session of the Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They have no rules of their own as to the questioning of witnesses and as to the making of releases.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman from California has just told you they have.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He did not. He did not answer my question.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman from California stated that the rights of every witness are protected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wish to state categorically that my question has not yet been answered. I asked the question three times and that is all I want to know—whether the committee has any rules as to the fair treatment of witnesses who are brought before the committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York to answer that question.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] that we do have rules and regulations in that committee, and they are followed the same as any other committee rules and regulations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman from California asking for time? I thought you have had all the opportunity that you desire.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not have my time, but I simply want to say that under the principles of committee procedure enunciated by my colleague of California [Mr. JACKSON], I am satisfied that if the committee goes ahead under those principles there will be no objection as far as I am concerned. My only concern is the protection of civil rights of witnesses before congressional committees.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee all during the 82d Congress, and, now again being a member of the same important committee this 83d Congress, I feel it pertinent and appropriate that I briefly join in this present discussion.

I wish to say, first, that I am glad to hear my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] state that he recognizes that during the last few years this committee has made much progress and improvement in our policies and procedures. I agree with him that we have done so. We have made major improvements and while we have made several major improvements, I am not yet satisfied we have made all we should. But we are sincerely working on them. Second, I wish to state that I have not and will not be a party to directly or indirectly investigating a person or group of persons, merely because such person or persons does not conform to what might be commonly called orthodox viewpoints or orthodox ways of thinking. I believe that the nonconformists in art, religion, literature and other areas of American culture, have generally added to the strength of our American foundations, because they had and exercised the freedom of the right to think and to think differently.

Third, as a committee member I have not and will not approve any procedure whereby our committee investigators, or the committee itself, goes into a college or university town or community as such and makes a shotgun investigation or hearing, nor holds blanket shotgun spread-eagle hearings. For, as committee member JACKSON said, we are not investigating textbooks or education as such. I emphasize, however, that our congressional statutory assignment under Public Law 601, is to investigate subversive people and programs wherever they exist. I believe that American colleges and universities and schools are best able to handle their own linen in the field of subversives in their faculties or teaching staffs if any is soiled. The educators should be vigorously and vigilantly on the job; the same as all patriotic citizens. They should be prompt and thorough in handling their own area of the problem. This is the best way, I believe.

Fourth, a few weeks ago I was in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Guam, Kwajalein, Hong Kong, and other places in the Far East. I went officially as a member of the Armed Services Committee; but, because I was also a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, I was privileged to interview certain of our own intelligence as well as certain foreign intelligence. I wish to state, that every person in said intelligence of whom I asked the question as to whether or not in their considered judgment, there was a definite connection between the military aggressive Communist attack on free Southern Korea and in Indochina by the Communists, and the subversive activities in the United States of America and in Europe and Africa, they all, with one voice, unanimously stated that in substance and effect, that the said military aggression now going on in parts of the world by Communist influence and infiltration was part and parcel of the same international conspiracy by the godless totalitarian control of the Kremlin, to capture by force and violence, if need be, the economic, material, ideological existence of the free peoples of the world. Therefore in the presence of that opinion given me in the Far East, I came home with a revitalized vigor to fight more tenaciosuly than ever, for the protection of the guaranteed and constitutional freedoms of our American way of life. But, in like manner to vigorously help uncover, ferret out and reveal to the searchlight of public knowledge and opinion, the programs of subversive activities against the constitutional existence of our American Republic. I will continue to fight for the right of people to think differently than I do. But, in my judgment, it is a case in this world conflict against this world communistic conspiracy of either paying taxes or paying tribute. I urge you, all my colleagues, to vote this money requested.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 315, nays 2, answered "present" 2, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—315

Abbitt	Carlyle	Gary
Abernethy	Carnahan	Gathings
Adair	Cederberg	Gentry
Addonizio	Chatham	George
Albert	Chenoweth	Golden
Alexander	Chiperfield	Graham
Allen, Ill.	Church	Grant
Andresen, H. Carl	Clardy	Gross
	Clevenger	Gubser
Andresen, August H.	Cole, Mo.	Gwinn
	Cole, N. Y.	Hagen, Calif.
Angell	Colmer	Haley
Arends	Condon	Halleck
Aspinall	Coon	Hand
Bailey	Cooper	Harden
Baker	Corbett	Hardy
Barden	Cotton	Harrison, Nebr.
Bates	Cretella	Harrison, Wyo.
Battle	Crosser	Harvey
Becker	Crumpacker	Hays, Ohio
Belcher	Cunningham	Hébert
Bennett, Fla.	Curtis, Mass.	Heller
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Mo.	Herlong
Bentley	Dague	Hess
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Hiestand
Betts	Davis, Tenn.	Hill
Bishop	Davis, Wis.	Hillelson
Blatnik	Dawson, Utah	Hillings
Boggs	Dempsey	Hoeven
Boiling	Devereux	Hoffman, Ill.
Bolton, Frances P.	D'Ewart	Hoffman, Mich.
	Dies	Holifield
Bolton, Oliver P.	Dodd	Holmes
	Donovan	Holt
Bonin	Dorn, N. Y.	Holtzman
Bosch	Dorn, S. C.	Horan
Bow	Dowdy	Hosmer
Boykin	Doyle	Howell
Bramblett	Durham	Hruska
Bray	Eberharter	Hull
Brooks, La.	Edmondson	Hunter
Brooks, Tex.	Elliott	Hyde
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Ikard
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Jackson
Broyhill	Fenton	Jarman
Bryson	Fernandez	Javits
Buchanan	Fisher	Jenkins
Budge	Fogarty	Jensen
Burdick	Ford	Johnson
Burleson	Forrester	Jonas, N. C.
Busbey	Fountain	Jones, Ala.
Byrd	Frazier	Jones, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Jones, N. C.
Camp	Friedel	Judd
Canfield	Fulton	Karsten, Mo.
Cannon	Garmatz	Kean

Kearney	Neal	Sheehan
Keating	Nelson	Sheppard
Kee	Nicholson	Short
Kelley, Pa.	Norblad	Shuford
Kilburn	Oakman	Sieminski
King, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
King, Pa.	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Kirwan	O'Konski	Small
Klucsynski	Ostertag	Smith, Kans.
Knox	Passman	Smith, Miss.
Krueger	Patman	Smith, Wis.
Laird	Patten	Spence
Landrum	Patterson	Steed
Lane	Perkins	Stringfellow
Lanham	Pfost	Sullivan
Lantaff	Phillips	Sutton
Latham	Pilcher	Taber
LeCompte	Poage	Talle
Lesinski	Poff	Thomas
Long	Poulson	Thompson, La.
Lovre	Preston	Thompson, Mich.
Lucas	Price	
Lyle	Priest	Thompson, Tex.
McConnell	Prouty	Thornberry
McCormack	Radwan	Trimble
McCulloch	Rains	Utt
McDonough	Ray	Van Pelt
McGregor	Rayburn	Van Zandt
McIntire	Reams	Vinson
McVey	Reed, Ill.	Vorys
Machrowicz	Reed, N. Y.	Wainwright
Mack, Wash.	Rees, Kans.	Walter
Madden	Regan	Wampler
Magnuson	Rhodes, Ariz.	Warburton
Mahon	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
Mailliard	Riehlman	Westland
Marshall	Riley	Wharton
Matthews	Roberts	Wheeler
Meader	Robeson, Va.	Wickersham
Metcalf	Robsion, Ky.	Wigglesworth
Miller, Kans.	Rodino	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Morano	Rooney	Winstead
Morrison	Sadlak	Withers
Moss	Saylor	Wolcott
Moulder	Scherer	Wolverton
Multer	Scrivner	Yorty
Mumma	Scudder	Young
Murray	Seely-Brown	

NAYS—2

Celler Wier

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

O'Hara, Ill. Powell

NOT VOTING—113

Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Osmers
Andrews	Goodwin	Pelly
Auchincloss	Gordon	Philbin
Ayres	Granahan	Pillion
Barrett	Green	Polk
Beamer	Gregory	Rabaut
Bender	Hagen, Minn.	Reece, Tenn.
Bentsen	Hale	Richards
Boland	Harris	Rivers
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Brownson	Hart	Roosevelt
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	St. George
Bush	Heselton	Schenck
Byrne, Pa.	Hinshaw	Scott
Campbell	Hope	Secrest
Carrigg	James	Selden
Case	Jonas, Ill.	Shafer
Chelf	Kearns	Shelley
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Cooley	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Curtis, Nebr.	Kilday	Staggers
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Stauffer
Deane	McCarthy	Taylor
Delaney	McMillan	Teague
Derounian	Mack, Ill.	Tollefson
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Velde
Dollinger	Mason	Vursell
Dolliver	Merrill	Weichel
Dondero	Merrow	Whitten
Donohue	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Ellsworth	Mills	Williams, Miss.
Engle	Mollohan	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Morgan	Withrow
Fine	Norrell	Yates
Fino	O'Brien, N. Y.	Younger
Forand	O'Hara, Minn.	Zablocki
Gamble	O'Neill	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Harrison of Virginia.

Mr. Schenck with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mrs. St. George with Mr. O'Neill.

Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Deane.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Dondero with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Osmers with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Velde with Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Chudoff.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Granahan.

Mr. Widnall with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Green.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Bush with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Carrigg with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Mack of Illinois.

Mr. Beamer with Mr. Hart.

Mr. James with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Ayres with Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. Brownson with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Withrow with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Hope with Mr. Rabaut.

Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Jonas of Illinois with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Fine.

Mr. Gamble with Mrs. Kelly of New York.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota with Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Gregory.

Mr. Hale with Mr. Forand.

Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Dollinger.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Heselton with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Springer with Mr. Teague.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Because I could not get time to speak during the debate on the resolution just agreed to, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I was in another part of the building on official business at the time of the rollcall just concluded. I understand I was paired on this vote. If present, I would have voted "yea."

LIBBY DAM, MONT.—WATERTON AND BELLY RIVERS, MONT.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, together with the following joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

Joint resolution of the Senate of the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the house concurring, commending and endorsing the action of the State water conservation board in filing in the record of the Waterton-Belly Rivers reference of January 12, 1948, before the International Joint Commission, a statement of position on behalf of Montana and further recommending that the International Joint Commission expedite its recommendation to the Governments of Canada and of the United States

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the Governments of Canada and of the United States by the reference of January 12, 1948, requested an advisory recommendation of the International Joint Commission respecting the development of the nonnavigable International Waterton and Belly Rivers; and

Whereas the State water conservation board, on or about September 4, 1952, filed with the International Joint Commission a statement of position, in words and figures as follows:

"BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION—IN THE MATTER OF THE REFERENCE OF JANUARY 12, 1948, RESPECTING INVESTIGATION AND REPORT COVERING WATERS FROM THE CONTINENTAL DIVIDE ON THE WEST UP TO AND AS FAR AS THE WESTERN LIMIT OF THE ST. MARY'S RIVER DRAINAGE BASIN ON THE EAST—STATEMENT OF POSITION

"The State of Montana, acting for this purpose through the State water conservation board, files for the record in the above-entitled matter this statement of position:

"(1) The State water conservation board is a body corporate and politic with perpetual existence, and as such it is an agency of the State of Montana; it was created and it exists pursuant to the provisions of title 89, chapter 1, Revised Codes of Montana, 1947 (secs. 89-101—89-141, RCM, 1947).

"(2) The Legislative Assembly of Montana has declared that water conservation is a State purpose, in all respects, for the welfare and benefit of the people of the State of Montana and for the improvement of their prosperity and living conditions; and in the carrying out of the purpose the State water conservation board is performing a governmental function; and in furtherance of such declared purpose, and in the performance of such function, the State water conservation board is empowered to make such investigations as may be necessary to plan and to carry out a comprehensive statewide program of water conservation and to participate, cooperate, and collaborate with the Government of the United States of America and with any of its agencies.

"(3) The particular subject matters covered by the reference in this cause are the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, which rivers in their natural channels flow across the boundary between the United States of America and Canada.

"(4) With respect to all such subject waters on the United States side of the boundary line, article II of the treaty between the United States of America and Great Britain, proclaimed May 13, 1910, provides: 'Each of the high contracting parties reserves to itself or to the several State gov-

ernments on the one side and the Dominion or Provincial governments on the other, as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary * * *.'

"(5) There is no treaty provision now existing with respect to such subject waters, so that the reservation in article II of the treaty, as it applies to the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, is absolute.

"(6) By virtue of the provision in article II of the treaty and in accord with the governing principles and rules of American law, the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, when contemplated for use or when used for irrigation and for all other beneficial uses not within the purview of the express or implied constitutional powers of the United States of America, are governed by Montana law.

"(7) In the premises then, the State of Montana hereby asserts as against Canada and any of its Provinces, particularly the Province of Alberta, its absolute legal right under article II of the treaty to the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all of the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers and the State of Montana hereby refuses to recognize any allocations of the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers for the use and benefit of Canada, and of any of its Provinces, particularly the Province of Alberta, except there move from Canada and any of its Provinces in interest, particularly the Province of Alberta, to the United States of America and to the State of Montana a valuable consideration acceptable both to the United States of America and to the State of Montana.

"Wherefore the State of Montana prays that this statement of position be accepted and filed in the record in this cause before the International Joint Commission and that the duplicate original of the same be furnished forthwith to the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission.

"And the State of Montana further prays that it be accorded all of the rights and privileges of a party in interest in this cause, all to the end that the legal right it has under article II of the treaty, and that it hereby asserts, to the waters of American origin in the watersheds of the Waterton and Belly Rivers shall be respected and protected fully.

"Dated at Helena, County of Lewis and Clark, State of Montana, this 4th day of September A. D. 1952.

"JOHN W. BONNER,
"Governor of the State of Montana and Ex-Officio a Member and the Chairman of the State Water Conservation Board.
"FRED E. BUCK,
"State Engineer of Montana and Ex-Officio a Member of the State Water Conservation Board.
"C. H. RAYMOND,
"Vice Chairman and Secretary of the State Water Conservation Board.
"JOHN B. DAVID,
"Member of the State Water Conservation Board.
"MAX MATHEWS,
"Member of the State Water Conservation Board.
"Attest: [SEAL] C. H. RAYMOND,
"Secretary, State Water Conservation Board."

Now therefore be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we do hereby commend the State water conservation board for its action in filing with the International Joint Commission the statement of position and we do further commend the State water conservation board for its assertion of the absolute legal right of Montana as defined and described in the statement of position, particularly paragraph 7 thereof: Be it further

Resolved, That we most respectfully urge the International Joint Commission to conclude the Waterton-Belly Rivers reference of January 12, 1948; Be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the secretary of the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission, to the secretary of the American Section of the International Joint Commission and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

GEO. M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
DEAN CHAFFIN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 13, 1953.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President and the Congress of the United States, to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, Represenatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that in the planning and construction of the proposed Libby Dam in Lincoln County the economy of the area and the livelihood of the people be safeguarded through selection of the site for the axis of such dam and by appropriations required to provide services equal to those now existing; and requesting similar consideration for Montana people in the case of other Federal projects

Whereas the water resources of the State of Montana are now of great importance in the further development of multiple-purpose Federal projects of the Columbia and Missouri River Basins; and

Whereas it appears that in the planning and construction of some dams and water-reservoir projects for the impoundment of Montana water, benefits to downstream areas are being planned or provided without an adequate balancing consideration of detrimental effects upon the Montana economy; and

Whereas this lack of consideration is most apparent in the planning by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for the Libby Dam project on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County, where the site proposed at public hearings and approved by Congress has been abandoned in favor of a site farther downstream which will much more seriously affect the economy of Lincoln County and northwest Montana; and

Whereas the selection of the now favored site, only a few miles upstream from the city of Libby, by the Corps of Engineers would require excessive and probably uneconomic expenditures in order to replace existing transportation facilities and to prevent serious disruption of the timber and mining industries of Lincoln County with ultimate loss of steady and gainful employment affecting approximately half of Lincoln County's families; and

Whereas the location of the axis of the Libby Dam upstream from the confluence of the Fisher and Kootenai Rivers would injure the economy of Lincoln County and northwest Montana to a much lesser degree, which injury could be alleviated by Federal expenditures far less in amount than those required in case of location at any site downstream from the mouth of the Fisher River; and

Whereas location of the dam at this upstream site would greatly reduce total costs and provide vital protection for the economy of Montana with only minor reduction in water storage or the amount of electric energy generated at the dam, and would not substantially adversely affect the downstream areas of the Columbia River, for the benefit of which the Libby project is primarily intended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 33d Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1953 now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), hereby most urgently request that the Congress of the United States, in making any appropriation of funds for the planning and construction of the Libby Dam, take such action as will insure that the axis of said dam will be placed upstream from the confluence of the Fisher and the Kootenai Rivers; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly request the Congress, in making appropriations for the construction of the Libby project, to define the compensations that shall be received from the Government of the United States by the County of Lincoln and by affected cities and school districts in said county for extraordinary expenses resulting from expanded services required in the fields of school and hospital facilities, health and sanitation, and police protection incidental to the construction of said project; and to provide all necessary funds and take all needed action to insure the construction of all transportation and other facilities needed to provide opportunity equal to that now existing of access to mines, to forests in Federal, State, and private ownership, and to manufacturing and refining plants, to the end that the present steady and continuous employment of Lincoln County people depending upon forests and mines for their livelihood will not be adversely affected; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be requested by this assembly to provide equal protection for the economy of Montana and the welfare of its citizens when making appropriations for similar Federal construction projects in Montana which have been or may be authorized; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the President and to the Congress of the United States, and to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

GEORGE M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
DEAN CHAFFIN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 13, 1953.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 50) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, effective as of January 3, 1953, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized

and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "under", insert the words "clause 12 of."

Page 1, line 5, after "XI" strike "(1) (1)."

Page 1, line 9, after "States", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

Page 1, line 10, after "tories", strike out ", and possessions."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is a resolution which has for its purpose the continuation of the investigating committee of the Committee on the Judiciary which did some splendid work in the 82d Congress under the leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF]. I am convinced there is justification for the continuation of this committee which, I understand, will be under the able leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] who also was a member of the subcommittee heretofore. I think the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the newspaper reports and radio broadcasts that His Excellency, Mr. Andrei Vishinsky, representative of the U. S. S. R. to the United Nations, on his arrival in New York yesterday, caused to be broadcast a renewal of his charges of germ warfare allegedly committed by United States soldiers in the Korean area.

I am hereby submitting a copy of the letter which I have this day mailed to Mr. Vishinsky, along with the volumes of testimony recorded by our special investigating committee concerning the massacre committed by the Soviet NKVD in the spring of 1940:

FEBRUARY 24, 1953.

His Excellency, Mr. ANDREI VISHINSKY,
Representative of the U. S. S. R. to the United Nations, New York, N. Y.

EXCELLENCY: Under separate cover, I am this day forwarding to you, a bound volume of 2,362 pages of testimony and exhibits recorded by the Special Congressional Committee Investigating the Katyn Forest Massacre. These pages contain the seven separate volumes of testimony, reports, and recommendations based on our hearings in the United States, England, and Europe. It is the hope of our committee that the United States Congress act favorably on recommendations that our testimony and findings be formally presented to the United Nations for appropriate action at this session.

Upon your arrival in the United States yesterday, you again caused to be circulated the false, malicious, and misleading propaganda, accusing the United States of carrying on germ warfare against the Chinese Communists. You first made this charge when the Katyn committee opened its hearings in Washington a year ago. The purpose of your germ-warfare propaganda at that time was to lessen the impact which you knew the evidence to be assimilated by the Katyn committee would reveal concerning the criminal mind of the Soviet leaders. Your renewal of charges of germ warfare at the opening of the seventh session of the United Nations is for the purpose of again distracting the minds of the people of the world from the barbarous crime which your Soviet NKVD committed at Katyn and the other 2 prison camp locations where 15,000 Polish officers and civilians were massacred.

The people of the United States and of the world are looking forward to you as Soviet Foreign Minister to answer the devastating testimony set out in the above-mentioned volumes containing the testimony and reports of our committee. The world is highly interested in having you answer the following questions on the floor of the United Nations:

1. Why did your Government refuse to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the German charges concerning Katyn in 1943?

2. Why did your Government fail to invite any neutral observers to participate in your own investigation in 1944 of the Katyn Forest massacre?

3. At the Nuremberg trials, your Government had complete control over prosecution of war crimes in eastern Europe. Why did you fail to establish your charges of German guilt for Katyn by the International Military Tribunal?

4. Why did your Government fail to answer our committee's formal and public invitation to appear and present evidence at our hearings, both in Washington, London, and Frankfurt, Germany?

5. Why did your Government fail to present testimony contradicting the avalanche of testimony offered by prisoners formerly interred at the three camps and of other observers taken to the scene of the crime which conclusively confirms your Government's guilt of this heinous massacre?

6. Why did your Government fail to contradict the testimony of the six medical experts who testified before our committee and of the protocol signed by 12 outstanding European scientists and doctors from various neutral countries, unanimously agreeing that the Katyn Forest massacre took place in the spring of 1940 when your Government and your armies had complete control over this area of Russian territory?

7. Why did you personally, along with Premier Stalin, Molotov, and Chief Beria of the NKVD, lie to General Anders, Ambassador Kot, and Major Josef Czapski in 1940 and 1941 as to the whereabouts of these 15,000 unfortunate victims? At that very time, during the numerous interviews you held with these Polish leaders, you knew these Polish prisoners were buried in mass graves in Katyn Forest.

8. Why did your newspapers and radio broadcasts constantly send further malicious and false propaganda concerning our committee when we were holding hearings in April 1952 at Frankfurt, Germany? Was your world-wide campaign of slander against our committee another effort to block this investigation?

9. Your Excellency, the free world would like to know the real truth regarding genocide, mass murders and massacres in other subjugated nations now under the iron heel of Soviet communism. Thousands of escapees from your iron curtain are revealing statements and facts confirming the reports that international crimes similar to that committed at Katyn are continuing, but the extinction of thousands of lives is being accomplished under a different method than your Government used at Katyn.

As chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest massacre, I hope you will answer each of those nine inquiries to the satisfaction of your associate delegates to the United Nations, the people of the free world and the millions of slaves in labor camps in Russia and other nations now under your Government's control.

Sincerely yours,

RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress, Chairman of Special Congressional Investigation Committee Investigating the Katyn Forest Massacre.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is presently before us is 1 of 6 which we expect to call up today. Each is a resolution granting certain authority and power to the standing committees of the House of Representatives. I think in connection with the consideration of these resolutions—and I take this time to point it out—it should be understood that under the Reorganization Act adopted some few years back each of the committees of the House of Representatives is charged in these words:

To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments of related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness on the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Of course, it is known to all of us that in pursuance of the mandate of the Reorganization Act in the past, certain investigations have been carried on which have disclosed certain things in some of the departments. By many it is felt that those endeavors which were not completed in the last Congress should be carried on to completion.

Also, I think it should be borne in mind that there is a responsibility on the part of all of the standing committees of the House to exercise that degree of watchfulness to which reference is made in the Reorganization Act.

As far as this administration and the people in the administration are concerned, I can say to the Members of the House that, as far as I have been able to discover, there is a complete desire on the part of the people in the administrative branch to cooperate with the proper legislative committees in carrying forward this function. I think that cooperation will be made manifest as time goes on.

It should also be pointed out that in the adoption of these resolutions or any others which may come before us there is no intent to create any impression that matters in the executive branch under the new administration will not be handled in proper form and that things that have been wrong will not be corrected; but, rather, that the legislative branch of the Government will be carrying on under the mandate of the Reorganization Act; and, likewise, to conclude such investigations as may not have been concluded at the time of the adjournment of the 82d Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I merely wish to add to what the gentleman said with reference to our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky, FRANK CHELF, who is now rather ill, that I was greatly impressed with his conduct of the work of the committee during the last Congress. I was happy to hear the complimentary remarks the gentleman made about him.

It will be my endeavor to conduct any hearings which are held in the same kind spirit as that shown by our colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on House Resolution 119, relative to the Committee on Un-American Activities, I was on official business in another part of the Capitol. If I had been in the Chamber at that time, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to respond to the very generous and gracious statement made by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] with reference to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF]. I am sure that all of us in this House who thought that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] did a good job as chairman of that committee also have confidence in the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. We believe that he, too, will do a splendid job, because he exemplified such a fine spirit of fairness as well as ability when he served on that committee previously.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was an effort to bring greater economy in the legislative department. We all recall that Congress found it advisable to create the Hoover Commission which expended something like $2 million in drawing plans and specifications to be submitted to the Congress in the form of bills which, if adopted, it was argued would bring greatly needed economy and efficiency.

We all recall, too, that in the 82d Congress committees, that were under the control of the majority party, and in the several reports both from the other body and from this body—I am referring now especially to the reports of the Hardy subcommittee and the Bonner subcommittee—did render a more than worthwhile service in bringing to the attention of the House and to some of the executive departments programs, methods, and procedures which had resulted in enormous waste. In some instances, those committees made recommendations to the departments, especially to the Department of National Defense, which were adopted and followed and which resulted in the saving of millions of dollars.

It should be borne in mind now and at least for the next year that the investigations which will be made are primarily into activities which were carried on by the last administration, inquiries into practices and procedures which were conceived, adopted, and followed by the previous administration.

In any investigations undertaken now and later reported to this Congress and to the people it should be clearly understood that they are not critical of and do not criticize policies which have been put into effect since January 3, 1953, or which will hereafter be put into effect.

All legislative committees, as the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], just stated, have jurisdiction over certain activities and each and every committee is expressly charged under the Reorganization Act with being watchful not only over expenditures but over the methods employed by the various executive agencies.

In addition to those legislative committees to which he referred we have a Committee on Government Operations which is a committee primarily charged with the duty of checking wastefulness and inefficiency in all of the departments of Government.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations overlaps, so to speak, the jurisdiction of all the other committees in that particular field. In fact it was a consolidation of 11 committees which were charged with checking the activities of executive departments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In order that we have it all in the RECORD, apropos the gentleman's suggestion, the language having to do with the Committee on Government Operations is this: Study the operation of governmental activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. I am glad to have that included in the RECORD.

So far as I am able to direct its activities the Committee on Government Operations in the investigations it will make will first consult every other committee which we can learn is attempting to cover a like field. As an illustration, it is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations has a staff of something like 75 people, all of whom, in my judgment, are necessary, and have a tremendous job imposed on them in the attempt to ascertain just what and in what amount appropriations should be made.

Before our committee or its subcommittees goes into any of these investigations, if I have anything to do with its procedure, it will be our purpose to check with that committee, especially with that committee, to learn what they are doing, so that we may avoid any duplicate investigations.

Then there is this further thought. The purpose of our committee, if I express it correctly, will be this: We will endeavor to help the administration do the things that it wants to do along the line of giving us greater economy and efficiency. While we have at the head of these departments individuals—for example, the Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge—who want reforms, down underneath there are three or four layers consisting of thousands of employees who have the opportunity to nullify and render ineffective the orders which come down from above. One of the purposes of the Committee on Government Operations will be to check in with these committees or individuals who are in certain departments called compliance officers who seek to point out to the heads of the departments the deficiencies in that particular agency, to see that the suggestions made by the compliance officers or individuals get to the top man and do not stop somewhere along the road at a way station and never become effective, thus preventing the accomplishment or fulfillment of the orders given by the heads of the departments.

The head of the administration is a military man, accustomed to the giving of orders. It may be that, because of his experience as Commander in Chief over a million or two men in the armed services who accepted his orders without question and executed them meticulously, he may now assume that the orders which he or the heads of his departments will issue will be received in the same spirit and executed with as great a degree of faithfulness as those which he issued as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces during World War II. But the executive department of the Government is not subject to the same iron discipline as that which prevails in military forces, and the President and the members of his Cabinet—some of whom are accustomed to having their orders, without question, efficiently executed, are due for a rude awakening if they proceed on the theory that an order or a directive is self-executing and will always bring about either the desired or obvious result.

Members of a political organization sometimes, even though under the orders and direction of a superior authority, have minds of their own, are accustomed to doing their own thinking and are inclined to enforce or ignore a directive if they think they have a better procedure or objective.

Permit a repetition: The Committee on Government Operations will endeavor to see that the orders given by the top officials are carried out, that complaints made by the compliance employees of the various departments get into the hands of those at the top who issue orders, make rules and regulations.

In that way we may be of real assistance to the executive departments.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 32 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "rule XI (1) (e)" and insert "clause 14 of rule XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I see no good cause to be served by a discussion of this resolution. It speaks for itself. It is another resolution from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and has for its purpose somewhat a similar purpose as that of the other resolutions which have been and will be considered here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and I ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I trust we shall not have too many speeches out of order, because certain of our Members have an affair this evening in their home State that they want to attend. As I say, I am not going to object to this request, but I trust we can get on with the adoption of these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statements and excerpts.)

STOCK-MARKET MARGIN REDUCED BY FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the papers last Saturday carried the announcement that the Federal Reserve Board had just reduced the margin on stock-market transactions from 75 percent to 50 percent, effective today, Tuesday, February 24. This means that the speculator will need to put up only 50 cents on the dollar. He can speculate on credit to the extent of one-half of his purchases of stock.

This action on the part of the Board is evidence, to my mind, that the Federal Reserve Board believes that the inflationary period has ceased and that now some action must be taken to ease a deflationary situation, because this move is unquestionably inflationary in character. It could not be classified any other way. Therefore, it can only be intended to meet a deflationary situation.

I believe the deflationary situation has been brought about primarily by the disastrous decline in farm prices. A depression on the farm will eventually cause a general depression if it is not stopped.

For the first time since World War I Government bonds are allowed to go down and down and down until they have reached 94; that is, 20-year bonds paying 2½ percent. That has not happened since right after the First World War, when bonds were allowed to go as low in some sections of the country. They were immediately bought up by speculators over the country, and of course they went back to 100 percent. But this is the first time such an action as that has been undertaken which results in such a great reduction in the price of Government bonds since World War I. I now refer to actions of the open markets committee and the Board of Governors prior to stock-market margin reduction.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is referring to the quoted price on bonds in dollars. He has no reference to the purchasing value of the dollar represented by those bonds, which purchasing power we know has been reduced about 50 percent in the last few years.

Mr. PATMAN. If you are going to say that the dollar is worth just half as much, we should say that we do not have any $268,000,000,000 national debt; we should say we have a $134,000,000,000 national debt.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as we devalue the dollar, and the dollar becomes worth less and less, then obviously the national debt as a matter of purchasing power diminishes in like amount.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true, but that is not related to the point I am really attempting to make, I will state to the distinguished majority leader. The point I am trying to make is that if the Federal Reserve Board wants to undo some of the things that it has done to create a hard-money policy in this country, and to greatly increase the interest rates, it should make a direct attempt on that by undoing some of these things it has been doing that are deflationary. By increasing interest rates that is making it hard on the home builders and the independent businessmen and the small people everywhere. The high interest rates are crushing them. The Federal Reserve Board and the open-market committee which includes the Board are the credit policy-making board for our country. There is no question about that. Twelve men in this country are wholly responsible for the credit situation whether it is good or bad. Those 12 men comprise the open market committee, which is composed of 5 presidents of 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and 7 members of the Federal Reserve Board. Those 12 men have it in their power to absolutely control credit in the entire country. So if credit is easy, they are entitled to the credit or blame. If credit is hard, they are entitled to the credit or the blame. We are fortunate indeed in being able to place the burden of responsibility or give the credit to certain people—the 12 people who really have control of the credit policies of this Nation. Now they have seen fit to cause the interest rates to go up. This policy is not only disastrous to the person who wants to build his own home, including the veterans and the independent businessmen, but it has caused Government bonds to go down. You no doubt have seen or heard the rumor lately that the Treasury is going to put out a bond which will sell for 3 percent or possibly 3¼ percent. If the Treasury is going to put out a bond that will sell for 3 percent that means that a 20-year bond which is now drawing 2½ percent will have to go down to 92 in order to be comparable to 3-percent bonds. That is disastrous. If the reduction is to compare with a 3¼-percent bond it will be down to 88. That is exactly what the Board appears to be undertaking to do. The banks hold about $70 billion of United States Government bonds. All of those bonds, of course, are not the 2½-percent bonds I have been talking about. But let us say for the sake of discussion that they are all these 2½-percent bonds and they go down 5 points which they have gone down now. That is equal to a reduction of $3½ billion in value of those bonds. How much is that? It represents 100 percent of the capital structure of the banks not including the undivided profits and surplus—100 percent of the bank capital of the entire Nation. The capital structure of all the banks including surplus and undivided profits amounts to more than $11 billion. When anyone begins to take action like that, it is time for this Congress to commence to do something about it—at least to discuss

it and see what we have before us and see what is likely to happen. Here is what I believe the Board should consider doing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I have listened to the gentleman and his argument, it occurs to me that he would approve of the action taken by the Board in reducing the margin requirement. Am I correct in that or not?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am opposed to it because it is inflationary and does not help at the right place. It will cause the banks to create money on their books for speculation. You cannot justify that now. That makes it difficult for other people to get money. It makes it harder for the home builders and home owners and the small independent businessmen and all the rest including the Government. Furthermore, by increasing the interest rates, you cause tax exempt bonds issued by States and political subdivisions to go up in the interest rate. They have gone up and up last year. They went up three points in the last week. These tax exempt securities are now averaging according to the Dow Jones average about 2.65 percent. A person in the 92-percent tax bracket would have to get 30 percent on a taxable bond to net that much. That is very high. That is an increase in interest rates on municipal bonds from 2.62 7 days before. That is quite an increase. What has caused that? It is the high interest rates. It permits the big wealth of the country to go into tax-exempt bonds and pay no taxes whatsoever. This policy of the Federal Reserve Board is encouraging high interest rates. I think it is bad policy. I am not trying to accuse the administration of this policy because the administration does not have anything to do with this particular action, I am sure. The Federal Reserve Board members resent any accusation that they are under the Executive. So it is the Federal Reserve Board that is responsible. However, the President can call on the Board of Governors to change their policies and if they refuse he can bring the matter to the attention of Congress where effective action can be taken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, this is what I think should be done:

First. I think something should be done by this Administration to protect farm prices, and it should be done at once. We are in a farm depression right now. It looks like the same pattern that was followed preceding the worst depression in all history, farm prices going down and speculation encouraged by this Federal Reserve Board action going up. But the Federal Reserve Board should ease up on interest rates and this hard money policy. They should protect Government bonds. They should protect that Government bond market. I am not attempting to say at what point they should protect it. Personally, I would like to see it protected at 100 percent. Government bonds should not sell below 100 percent. It could be protected without costing the taxpayers a single cent.

Second. There should be no tax reduction until the budget is balanced. On this I am on the side of the President.

Third. I will go beyond what the President has said. I do not believe there should be any tax reduction until the budget is balanced, and a reasonable amount is set aside for the retirement of the national debt. We should do those two things. Balance the budget and set aside a reasonable amount for the retirement of the national debt.

Fourth. I believe that the short-time interest rates should be reduced, as they can be reduced and at great saving to the American taxpayer. The last 2 or 3 years the rates have gone up from three-eighths of one percent where they remained for years to more than two percent. This was deliberately done under the guise of fighting inflation. If the increases were needed then to retard inflation, they should be decreased now instead of reducing the marginal requirements on stock transactions. We can only hope that these actions will not lead to a similar terrible depression as that which followed so nearly the inauguration of the last Republican President.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without continental United States, its Territories and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "within", strike out the words "or without."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution undertakes to continue the subcommittee investigation that was recently conducted in the previous Congress under the able leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. KING]. I am sure that without dissent we are in accord that that committee did a splendid job in uncovering and disclosing irregularities in the tax field resulting in much money coming into the Treasury of the United States that should have come into the Treasury in the first place. This resolution would continue that investigation. I think the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the very fine work done by the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] as chairman of this committee during the past session. In a very difficult situation he did a wonderful job, letting the chips fall where they may. His work was a credit to himself and to the country.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House and the country generally appreciate the very gracious remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] If I am correctly advised I understand the gentleman himself will likely head up this committee. I am sure we can look forward to an equally fair, honest, and able job on the part of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I address myself generally at this time to committee investigations.

As you have seen, there are several resolutions scheduled for today, each providing for an investigation. Previously during this session the House has authorized 2 or 3 committee investigations; the other body has authorized 8 or 10 comprehensive inquiries, and, I am informed, has appropriated more than $800,000 so far. There are now pending in the House Committee on Rules more than 50 resolutions requesting some type of investigation.

The previous Congress authorized almost $6 million for investigations, but all of that amount was not expended. Actually the amount expended was very small in relation to the billions that Congress appropriated.

Investigations and investigating committees, Mr. Speaker, are not per se either good or bad, but the right and necessity for investigating as a condition precedent to legislating is indispensable. Information, accurate, adequate, straight information is indispensable; it is an indispensable element of good legislation. Information in terms of availability to Congress is a rationed item, and if you do not think so, try sometime to get your share; but the other kind of information is overabundant.

No other comparable responsible body in the world is subjected to more misinformation, more intellectual dishonesty, scheming, disguised motives, and

plain hoodwinking. There appears to be no closed season. The art of deception is practiced alike by countries, agencies, groups, associations, and individuals. It is not difficult to hoodwink honest and sincere men and women intent upon the tasks of service in fields of social, economic, and political behavior. As a matter of fact, our weakness is in our strength, an abiding faith in the honesty and the sincerity of all peoples and all causes which would lead us to the elevation of human dignity. It is therefore an essence of survival, the survival of this Congress as a basic part of this Government, that we practice intellectual and intelligent skepticism. We cannot properly fulfill our responsibilities as tools of a free people if we unwittingly become tools of misinformation or no information or bad information or prejudiced information.

The great number of requests for investigations and investigating committees that confront the Congress today, the 60-odd requests before the Committee on Rules, are brought about for the reason that we do not have a source of information or sufficient information to act intelligently on many issues.

Personally, I am not at all satisfied that the investigations as so often carried on meet the need. I do not refer, of course, to any particular committee but to the problem generally. Too often too many investigations generate more heat than light, they result in more headlines than they do information and they result in a great deal more confusion than they do construction. Perhaps it may well be said that enough heat will generate light and that headlines may produce information and that confusion always precedes construction. That is possible but not probable.

Adequate investigation and information that discloses the purposes of legislation, its operation, its scope, and the problems to be covered, the causes and effect, prior to passage would, I feel, result in much, much better administration.

If Congress knew more about what it was doing it would know more about what it had done; if Congress knew more about what it was doing it would know more about what its doing had done.

For example, you were shocked as I was some years ago to find out we were burning potatoes. It was never contemplated, I think, when the agricultural program was started that any such thing would happen. It was certainly not contemplated, I think, when the Voice of America program was authorized and funds were appropriated that many of the things that have been called to our attention would have happened. It is an unhealthy situation because it creates dissatisfaction, it creates confusion and lack of confidence in programs that are designed primarily by this body and the committees that recommend them to bring good results, and necessary and useful results. For instance, did most of you know that the Navy was spending $250,000 to create a space suit until you saw the article in the paper the other day? I certainly did not. It may be justified and it may be necessary. But it certainly is confusing to the taxpayers when they see that the Air Force scoffs at a program for which the Navy is spending $250,000.

The Committee on Rules the other day was rather shocked to find that although we have been debating for more than 4 years the probability of appropriating a few hundred thousand dollars for Federal aid to education, that the Government was and has been spending more than $4 billion a year in that field. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if Congress knew more at the time it was doing, it would not so often be called upon to undo. Too much legislation and too many appropriations are passed because they are recommended by respected personalities. Assuredly we need more information. Investigations are in order, but the order of the investigations is questionable. Too many of them, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, are negative. Too many of them are calculated only to expose and not to dispose. Too many of them deal in personalities, both the personality of the investigated and the investigator. Too many of them overlap. Not only do they overlap the constituted committees of the House and the other body, but they overlap the duly constituted authority.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. Yes; I will be delighted to.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that a majority of these resolutions would not be here at all except for the fact that it might be deemed necessary on occasion for the committee to have subpena powers? In other words, is not the authority basically in the Reorganization Act which imposes on each legislative committee the responsibility of appraising the administration of the law?

Mr. LYLE. That is true; it is a lack of information; lack of information of what we have done, what we are doing, and what has happened to what we have done. We certainly need investigations, but they ought to be in the channels of legislation. They ought to bring us adequate information before we pass upon the vital issues that expend billions of dollars and perhaps endanger our lives. We should not be required to authorize investigations some years later after newspapers and magazines have exposed bad administration. It is not the function of this body to supersede grand juries, the executive in the administration of legislation, the FBI, and other agencies that are constituted for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that much of the information that results from investigations is wasted. It seems to me that we should have a closer cooperation between the various committees. They should each share with the other committees the information that they develop. Particularly I feel that the Appropriations Committee should more closely work with the legislative committees that originally authorize the appropriation. It might well be that with the millions we spend on investigations we could establish an agency to furnish Congress with authentic information prior to legislation and information regarding its administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about the same as the resolutions regularly adopted. This one and the one with reference to the Committee on Armed Services will allow those two committees to go outside the jurisdiction of the country.

While I agree almost entirely with the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], who spoke here a moment ago, I think we cannot get too much information on the matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We Members who have been here a few years know the billions of dollars that have been appropriated, and some of us believe that billions of dollars have been not only appropriated but wasted.

I do not want to take the time of the House to call attention to this, that, or the other thing. Usually I am against resolutions such as this because I follow the same idea that President Taft had when he was President. He said about these investigations that all they produce is a loud smell.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this resolution. I think most of the Members of the Congress want to know a little more about what is going on. I certainly do.

I yield now to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has just explained, this is in line with what has been done before. This

gives to the Committee on Foreign Affairs power similar to that which was given that committee in the last Congress, and I assume it is therefore justifiable to have it here reinstated.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one comment upon the very able statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] about the necessity for information; of knowing what we are doing at the time and therefore avoiding the necessity for so much of aftermath investigation.

Last session I had the privilege of sponsoring a bill that would have set up a joint committee on the budget within the Appropriations Committee. It would have furnished the Appropriations Committee an adequate and an ample staff of experts to make a study of these demands on the Treasury as we went along; to place the Appropriations Committee at least upon a parity with the executive departments and not have the Congress at the complete mercy of the various bureaus and the Executive.

It is a matter of common knowledge that there are several hundred experts in the President's Budget Bureau. Each department of the Government has additional hundreds, if not thousands, of experts in their department. These experts go before the budget committee and testify as to their demands upon the taxpayers, and then the Budget Bureau passes down to the Congress the recommendation for these funds. Bearing in mind that the President's Budget Commission is a policy group, they therefore pass down to the Congress only such information as they want the Congress to receive. Therefore the Congress is at the mercy of these various groups.

The other body, under the able sponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, last year passed that bill. We were defeated in the House by some 16 votes. The other body is now getting ready to consider that bill again. I have reintroduced my bill in the House. I think it is something that the leadership should give some consideration to. It is something that every Member of this Congress should give some consideration to. We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to hide behind an expressed or implied fear that, if we do this, then we will be at the mercy of the other body. This is the only argument that has been seriously advanced by those who oppose the bill. I am not ready to admit any such inferiority complex.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I learned through the press a few days ago that the Committee on Appropriations of the House has recently employed some 25 experts to go into the various departments of Government, make a study of the operations of those departments, and otherwise attempt to effect economies. I am informed that this was done under the appropriation which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations last year had included in the appropriation bill in the dying hours of the session in an effort to block our joint committee budget bill, which was then receiving floor consideration. I am not complaining about this forward step being taken. It is good as far as it goes. But it can only result in one of two things: Either the other body will be forced to employ its own staff in order to get the necessary information or it will have to act without the benefit of such facts as may be discovered by the House staff. In the first alternative there will be a wasteful duplication of efforts and in the second alternative the Senate, denied of the benefit of such information, would not be in position to take advantage of such valuable information. When we are talking about balancing the budget, effecting economies, and doing away with waste and extravagance we, the legislative bodies, can ill afford to have such duplications.

Now that the forward-looking and learned Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, has secured the joint sponsorship of a majority of the Senate of his new bill, which assures its passage there, I now again respectfully beseech the cooperation of the leadership and of the Appropriations Committee itself for a reconsideration of the action of this body last year in refusing consideration of the bill. The apprehensions just mentioned cannot be well founded, particularly when my bill provides for the domination of the joint committee by the House, which is as it should be, since the power and duty of originating appropriations under the Constitution is in the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not resist this resolution or any other resolution coming before the House today. I certainly am not critical of the leadership of this Congress for bringing in this resolution because this thing got out of hand several years ago, and I think it is going to remain out of hand as far as that is concerned. I think we have been doing too much investigating and too much legislating by special committees. I think we have been doing too much legislating by subcommittees where the full committee in many instances never has an opportunity to go into the real facts. I can remember when there was rarely a subcommittee which really passed upon legislation. Some of the most far-reaching legislation that has been passed in the last 40 years was heard before a full committee and not before a subcommittee, and therefore all the members of the committee understood the matter at hand. You do not have to go out and travel all over the United States or all over the world to find out the facts about something. The ablest men in the country are willing to come before the full committees of the Congress when matters concerning them and their interests are being considered by the Congress with a view of legislating upon such matters. I simply want to say there is no criticism of the leadership now for bringing in these resolutions, but I do think that subcommittees and not full committees are doing the exclusive work in many instances which the full committee should do, and in all probability we would have better, saner, and longer-lasting legislation if the full committee had more hearings and the subcommittees and special committees had fewer hearings.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly find myself in agreement with many of the things which have just been said by the eminent minority leader. I wonder if he would not agree with me, however, that what happened was simply that under the reorganization which was passed by the 79th Congress, we shrank the number of committees from some 48 or 49 to 18 or 19.

Many people heralded that as a great accomplishment, but immediately upon the adoption of the Reorganization Act it fell to me, as majority leader of the 80th Congress, to carry on that process of shrinking up the committees. I may say it was not a particularly happy circumstance. What we found was that the committees promptly divided themselves into subcommittees, so that we had just about the same situation that we had before except possibly with a lesser degree of responsibility on the part of the entire committee than we had theretofore.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, of course the gentleman and I had some conversation about that far-famed, much-advertised reorganization. I think it received more advertisement than any other legislation that has been passed since I became a Member of this Congress. I thought then and I think now that they shrunk the committees to too few in number. I had just given up the speakership to the gentleman from Massachusetts. There were 46 committees. All of them had committee rooms. I had been pommeled around, everybody wanting more space. I said, "The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is going to have an easy time. He has about 25 or 30 extra committee rooms to give away." When the committees got through dividing themselves into subcommittees he did not have any more room to give away than I had.

There were two things in that bill that I liked. I tried to see that they did not take away any power from the Speaker. And I was very much in favor of the increase in salaries.

But I just wanted to say one word about the full committees surrendering their prerogatives to subcommittees, and instead of legislating by these great committees—and they are great committees—we are legislating too much by subcommittees and special committees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1953, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "within", strike out the words "or outside."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is practically the same as the others that have been presented. No one has requested any time on this resolution.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I voted today to appropriate additional funds for the Un-American Activities Committee; I am all for it; and when the record is written on the clean-up of the Communist consparacy high credit will go to this committee. I am sure that if the people of Norway, Holland, and Denmark had it to live over again, they would set up just such a committee and not be fooled by unwarranted cries of civil rights when their countries were flooded by Hitler's tourists before 1940. These tourists were Hitler's fifth columnists who plunged the knife into Norway's, Denmark's and Holland's heart. I am sure our Committee on Un-American Activities will spare this Nation such treachery.

I wish the Un-American Activities Committee the highest praise and the utmost success.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been told that House Resolution 34 would be given a rule. It provides that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may appoint members to inspect the Veterans' Administration. I hoped that it would come up for action today. In the 80th Congress under the chairmanship of the present chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs such committees were appointed. At that time we asked for $25,000 for inspection of VA facilities. After 2 years we turned back some of that money. We were not extravagant, and the committee did a great deal of good in the inspection of insurance, in the inspection of hospitals, in the inspection of training, and other veterans' activities. There is every reason why House Resolution 34 should be reported out by the Rules Committee quickly.

At the present time the House has a number of inspectors from the Committee on Appropriations going through the Veterans' Administration. I know they mean well but I doubt if any of them have ever been in the Veterans' Administration before; I doubt if many of them have ever been in a veterans' hospital. I doubt very much if any of them ever spent a week day in and day out in a veterans' hospital.

It seems to me that our primary duty is to take care of the man who paid the heaviest price for us. The Committee on Appropriations can cut our work in half, or can cut it out entirely by their granting or withholding of funds. I think, however, that our Members, particularly the new ones, ought to be given an opportunity to go into the Veterans' Administration facilities, into the veterans' hospitals. Last evening I went out to see a boy from New Jersey, a quadruple amputee. I have never seen a finer spirit than he exhibited. It would be pretty horrible to me to have to go all the way through on that kind of research work in hospitals, prosthetic appliances and so forth. His chances to go back into the business world again—you could not do that, you could not give him his chance for life and for happiness over again no matter how badly you wanted to.

There was here at the Capitol yesterday noon a double amputee of World War II, also from New Jersey. This man was from Newark, the other man from Paterson.

Mr. Speaker, if I had my way, at the head of every parade, every inaugural parade, every parade in the country would be our disabled veterans. I do not believe there is a person who watched that inauguration parade on Pennsylvania Avenue or over the television who did not see that phantom army, that invisible army of those who had given their lives for us and those who were disabled. In fact, they rode at the end of the parade. Particularly, I think it is true that those are the thoughts of President Eisenhower because those men made possible his victory.

Mr. Speaker, I am unhappy to say that there are those today who would destroy the work that is being done for the veterans, the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the membership of that committee. There have been people in the Veterans' Administration who made national and international reputations through their work in the Veterans' Administration who have gone out and attacked that administration and people and their work by smear and innuendo. Why they do it I do not know, because I have always felt that their work, their minds and their hearts were in the care and the interest of the disabled.

There are departments today that would like to take over the various functions of the Veterans' Administration and put them in their departments in order to strengthen their departments. I have been in Washington for 40 years, a long time, and I saw the war-risk insurance program made a part of the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service that had to do with the hospitals, and the vocational training department that took care of the education of the veterans also made a part of the Veterans' Administration. It was all a tremendously mixed up proposition, and very hard for the veterans. We took the necessary legislative action and put all of these activities under one body and I hope they will remain there.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 125.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today may be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RED MOVIE IN MAKING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 years, the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, has been conducting an investigation into the extent of Communist infiltration of the Hollywood motion-picture industry. During this period, the committee has exposed several hundred persons who were employed in the motion-picture industry and who were or are members of the Communist Party. During this investigation, the committee has received the support of loyal and patriotic Americans employed in the making of motion pictures in Hollywood. Parenthetically it should be stated that they are in the vast majority in the moving-picture city.

The main purposes of Communist infiltration of Hollywood were three in number: one was to provide a lucrative source of income to the Communist Party of the United States; the second was to use the motion picture as a medium for the presentation of Communist propaganda; and the third was to obtain control, if possible. That a large amount of money was poured into Communist coffers by Communists and Communist sympathizers in Hollywood is a provable fact. The Communist attempt to insert Communist propaganda in motion pictures was not too successful and succeeded only to a minor extent. The trade-union movement met the challenge of the Communists and sent them reeling back in total rout. However, the Communists never stop in their efforts to poison the minds of the people of the United States and of certain foreign countries against the American system of free enterprise and the individual liberty of every citizen in the free world, regardless of his nationality.

As an illustration of the ceaseless and diabolical attack upon the United States and its free institutions, I bring to the attention of the Congress, and through it to the American people, some facts regarding a picture now being made under Communist auspices in Silver City, N. Mex. The name of this picture is unknown to me at the present time. However, it is being made by a corporation which calls itself the Independent Productions Corp., and the picture itself is being financed by the Communist-dominated United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, which union was expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations several years ago because of Communist domination.

The Independent Productions Corp. was incorporated in Los Angeles, Calif., on September 4, 1951, with an authorized capital of $52,000. The corporation is represented in legal matters by Ben Margolis, a Los Angeles attorney, who has been identified by several witnesses under oath, as a member of the Communist Party and who, when called by the committee last fall, declined to answer all questions regarding his alleged Communits Party membership and affiliations on the ground that to do so would tend to incriminate him. Mr. Margolis, in his answers to committee questions, however, did not confine himself to merely take refuge in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. He gave every evidence during his appearance before the committee, of the contempt that a confirmed Communist holds for everything American.

Another attorney representing the Independent Productions Corp., and who is associated with Margolis in the practice of law, is John Tripp McTernan, a one-time Government employee and a known contact of Louise Bransten, the west coast financial agent of the Communist Party of the United States; and Gregory Kheifetz, formerly attached to the Soviet Consulate in San Francisco, Calif. McTernan is known to have visited with Gregory Kheifetz not only in the home of Louise Bransten, but also in the Soviet Consulate itself in San Francisco, Calif. Kheifetz, while in the United States as a representative of the Soviet Union, moved freely among those persons who were associated with the so-called Communist apparatus.

Officers of the Independent Productions Corp. are as follows: Simon Lazarus, president; Herbert Ganahl, vice president; Kathleen Sims, secretary; Rose Kolker, treasurer; and Robert Gannon, director.

Lazarus holds 180 shares of stock in the corporation and also owns a number of theaters. It is assumed that the theaters owned by Mr. Lazarus will furnish a medium through which this Communist-made film can be exhibited to American audiences. So much for the corporate structure of the corporation making the picture.

Engaged in the actual making and production of the picture itself are many persons who have been named before the Committee on Un-American Activities as being members of the Communist Party and who, when called before the committee, declined to answer questions on the grounds that to do so might tend to incriminate them. Some of these persons are Herbert Biberman, Gale Sondergaard, and Paul Jarrico. Herbert Biberman is the actual producer of this Communist-inspired film endeavor, while Gale Songergaard is the coproducer of the picture. Paul Jarrico is a writer working upon the picture. Michael Wilson and Will Geer are two more uncooperative witnesses said to be active in the production of the picture.

During the committee's investigation of Mr. Jarrico, it was determined that he had attempted to persuade a witness appearing before the committee not to cooperate with the committee and to remain in the Communist Party.

Herbert Biberman was one of the leading Communists in the Hollywood motion picture industry. In addition to being a producer of the picture, he is also its director. He, Jerrico, and Sondergaard all declined to answer questions pertaining to Communist membership and activity when they appeared before the committee. Also associated with the making of the picture is one Paul Perlin, a studio worker, identified as a member of the Communist Party, who appeared before the committee on October 6, 1952, and refused to affirm or deny his membership in the Communist Party. Perlin was ousted from the union to which he belonged, the IATSE, for Communist activity.

Actor Herman Waldman, also known as David Wolfe, who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party and who, on October 6, 1952, refused to affirm or deny such membership when he appeared before the committee, is also associated with the making of the picture.

The persons whom I have mentioned as being engaged in the actual production of this Communist film are in no way associated with the established motion-picture companies in Hollywood and have not been employed by any established motion-picture company for the past several years. As a matter of fact, they are considered unemployable.

As I have said, the picture is being financed by the Communist-dominated union known as the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. The official in charge of the movie project for the union is one Clinton Jencks who, when he appeared before another congressional committee last year, refused to answer questions regarding sabotage of the defense efforts of the United States, taking refuge behind the fifth amendment.

In connection with Mr. Jencks' testimony before an investigating committee, I should like to quote from an article written by Victor Riesel, a member of the Post-Hall Syndicate, Inc., entitled "Inside Labor," which reads as follows:

> The substance of the conversation (with Jencks) was that Mr. Jencks was a Communist Party member and that the Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers would take action in working against our efforts in the Korean war by attempting to stop copper production through a strike.

According to Mr. Riesel's article, when Jencks was asked a question by the investigating committee, based on the quotation from the article set forth above, he declined to answer the question "under the grounds of the Constitution and the fifth amendment to it that provides me the right to decline the question."

Also, according to this article, at the time Jencks appeared before another investigating committee, he was represented, as counsel, by one Nathan Witt, who was a member of the original Communist cell which infiltrated the United States Government and which had as one of its members Alger Hiss.

This picture is being made in the State of New Mexico not far from the Los Alamos atomic proving grounds and, as Mr. Riesel points out in his article, "where you try to hide secret weapons, you find concentrations of Communists." Also, in his article, Mr. Riesel states that Silver City, N. Mex., the scene of the picture, is located near vital zinc concentrate mines, and that the band of movie people, and I quote from his article, "few of whom will ever find work

again in Hollywood—is shooting a propaganda movie produced, managed, written, acted and edited by men and women who have been charged by congressional witnesses with being part of the pro-Soviet secret apparatus in this country."

Mr. Speaker, I have received reports of the sequences filmed to date during the making of this picture, and it depicts exactly what might be expected from a group of Communists engaged in the making of a motion picture. This picture is deliberately designed to inflame racial hatreds and to depict the United States of America as the enemy of all colored peoples. If this picture is shown in Latin America, Asia, and India, it will do incalculable harm not only to the United States but to the cause of free people everywhere. In effect, this picture is a new weapon for Russia. For instance, in one sequence, two deputy sheriffs arrest a meek American miner of Mexican descent and proceed to pistol whip the miner's very young son. Another sequence makes it appear that safety regulations in the mines are only for the white people—or Anglos as they are called in that region—and are not for Mexicans or Americans of Mexican descent. The production company of this picture also imported two auto carloads of colored people for the purpose of shooting a scene depicting mob violence.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that make investigations of communism difficult is the failure of many people to understand the reason for Communist incitation of racial hatreds as will be depicted in this Communist-made motion picture. First, let me point out that the Communist Party of the United States and its adherents do not waste the time or money to make such a picture unless it was felt that it would further the ideology of communism in some way. It is the object of communism in the free countries of the world to divide the peoples of those countries into two groups and to incite th. groups, one against the other. First, the Communists will incite the minority against the majority and, when the back of the majority has been broken, the Communists will incite minority against minority and, through this division, will succeed in taking over the free countries of the world.

The production of this picture has been condemned by the Hollywood A. F. of L. Film Council, which represents practically all labor organizations in the film industry. The chairman of the council, Mr. Roy M. Brewer, said:

> No motion picture made by Communists can be good for America. Hollywood has gotten rid of these people and we want the Government agencies to investigate carefully the picture being made at Silver City, N. Mex.

I should also like to point out that Mr. Walter Pidgeon, president of the Screen Actors Guild, and who has taken an active part in exposing this Communist movie, in an official statement, said:

> I cannot stress too strongly that this picture is not being made by Hollywood or any part of the film industry. We are asking the Federal Government to investigate and take whatever steps are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation of communism appears to be an endless path. Despite the fact that many of the persons engaged in the making of this picture have been exposed as Communists by the Committee on Un-American Activities, they are continuing to function in the never-ending effort of the Communist Party to discredit the United States in the eyes of the world and, after having lost Hollywood as a source of income, and this only recently, have succeeded in acquiring another source of income, perhaps a more lucrative one.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I have endeavored to point out that under the present laws of the United States it is practically impossible to control Communist activity in the United States. I personally feel that the time has come for the American public and its representatives in Government to decide whether we shall permit this heinous effort of the international Communist conspiracy, the Communist Party of the United States, to continue to exist and, through its existence, corrupt the free peoples of the world. I shall do everything in my power to prevent the showing of this Communist-made film in the theaters of America, and I am confident that millions of Americans will join in that effort.

HIGH WATER IN THE GREAT LAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAYLOR). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the people in the Great Lakes area and their Representatives in Congress have been very much concerned about the high level of the water in the Great Lakes. Extensive damage through erosion and storms has been caused to coastal areas.

In my own district in the county of Monroe, Mich., storms, which have been more severe because of the high water, have caused damage and suffering. Some measures have been taken and others are under study to alleviate the distress in this area on the western shore of Lake Erie. The Corps of Engineers has already repaired and strengthened the dike at Estral Beach, Mich. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has declared the area eligible for disaster loans, and the Corps of Engineers has initiated a study of long-range improvements for the protection of some portions of the area. The residents, individually and through their associations, have also, within their capacity, taken steps to help themselves in combating this destructive force of nature.

I recently came across an article entitled "High Water in the Great Lakes—An Engineer's View of a Problem of Great Public Concern," by William C. Hoad, professor emeritus of civil engineering of the University of Michigan. This article appeared in the Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review for December 6, 1952. The article impressed me as an extremely competent and scientific discussion of the natural and man-made causes of the present high-water levels and the proposals advanced for solving the problem. Moreover, this discussion is expressed in layman's terms and is extremely readable.

Through the courtesy of Professor Hoad, I have been able to send a limited number of reprints of this article to colleagues in the House and the Senate who have indicated a special interest in the Great Lakes levels. However, I believe it would be a contribution to the general public thinking on this most important subject if Professor Hoad's views were made more widely available.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Naturally, the problem of high-water levels on the Great Lakes is of concern to all of us in the Great Lakes region. I had an opportunity of discussing this article by Dr. Hoad with a very competent engineer, Mr. Carl Nelson, who has been an engineer on the Great Lakes for many years. He commended the article to me as being one that is very factual and up to date. I certainly commend my good colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] for bringing it to the attention of the House and to the Members from that part of the Nation, because it is a problem to us. I am sure the article will be helpful to all of us.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a little of the background of Professor Hoad, supplementing what my colleague from Michigan said:

> A long and distinguished career in hydraulic and sanitary engineering allows William C. Hoad to speak with authority on rivers, lakes, and the public use of water in general. Before coming to the University of Michigan in 1912, he had taught at the University of Kansas and served as chief engineer of the Kansas State Board of Health. In 1944, after 32 years of faculty service, he retired as professor emeritus of civil engineering. Quarterly Review readers have had the opportunity of enjoying two articles by Professor Hoad in the summer 1950 and the autumn 1951 numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read some of the opening paragraphs of this article and ask unanimous consent that it all may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. I am sure you will find this a very comprehensive article on the subject of the water level of the lakes. Mr. Hoad says:

> The present period of high-water levels in the Great Lakes has brought strongly to the front various questions as to the possible control of lake levels by means of structures and manipulations particularly planned for that purpose. Most of these questions have been focused upon the great Michigan-Huron pool whose 4,000-mile shoreline, occupied and improved for the most part, seems especially vulnerable to the damaging effects of both high-water and low-water levels. Questions such as the following are typical:
>
> Why can't the diversion at Chicago of water from Lake Michigan into and through

the drainage canal, and so on down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico, be greatly increased—at least when the lakes are filled to uncomfortable levels? Time was when the Chicago Sanitary District wanted 10,000 cubic feet per second or more, and put up a hard fight to get it. Why not skim off considerably more than the 1,500 cubic feet per second now permitted for sanitary purposes, at least during period of high-lake levels?

Why can't the flow out of Lake Superior be drastically curtailed at times of damaging high water levels in Michigan-Huron and the lower lakes, by closing outlet gates at the head of St. Marys River? Let Lake Superior be used as a sort of balancing reservoir for the protection of the shores of the lower lakes.

Why can't artificial diversion of water from the watershed of the Albany River, in western Ontario, over the natural divide and into Lake Superior be stopped? The Great Lakes and their connecting channels already have a greater flow than they can safely handle.

Does the Treaty on Boundary Waters Between Canada and the United States deal with high lake levels; and does the International Joint Commission, acting under the authority of that treaty, have jurisdictional control over water levels along the boundary?

What makes the lake levels so unusually high now anyway? How high are they now in comparison with what they have been before? Are progressive changes in lake levels taking place which definitely point to higher general levels in future? Finally, isn't there some method or means of control by which the levels of these great inland seas can be kept within reasonable and predetermined bounds, with tolerably dependable forecasts of coming levels a year or two ahead?

These and other related questions naturally arise when lake levels are high. An equally impressive list of questions, some of which are merely the converse side of these appear when lake levels are low. Correspondingly appropriate questions or suggestions are brought to the front when the interests of commercial navigation are under consideration, or those of hydroelectric power at Niagara, or the great resources of the lakes and their connecting waters for healthful recreation, or the protection and preservation of the tumbling rapids and roaring falls of Niagara. It can be readily understood that the artificial control of water levels in the Great Lakes for the protection of riparian properties around their borders is only one aspect of the much larger problem of making the best use of the Great Lakes and their waters for the benefit of all concerned. This more general problem is plainly one of exceedingly great complexity when all interests are brought into view, but it is obviously one of surpassing importance, both now and for the future.

There is no question that much damage to shoreline property around the perimeters of the Great Lakes has come about during and by reason of the recent (and still continuing) period of unusually high water. Recreation beaches have been submerged or strewn with debris. Mud flats and other low areas alongshore have been inundated and in places have received deposits of sand or debris torn loose from nearby banks. Waves have pounded the shore at higher than ordinary levels and have thus been able to erode soft and vulnerable banks along horizons that were thought to be above their reach; also, by reason of coming in over deeper foreshores, these waves have attacked both banks and shoreline structures with unusual violence. The faces of many miles of high banks, undermined by this erosive action, have slumped into the waters below and the materials thus loosened have been churned up and distributed alongshore or have been carried lakeward by the backwash of the waves and dumped over the edge of the littoral shelf. This is the natural process of bank erosion, which goes into operation with every onshore wind; but at high water levels the erosive action is more rapid and more destructive because the waves strike against looser and less indurated bank materials.

The levels of the lakes normally fluctuate in accordance with the seasons. From their high stages of summertime they drop slowly away to their low stages in winter, the reason being that during the fall and early winter the outflow from the lakes plus the heavy evaporation from their vast surfaces exceeds their inflow plus rainfall and snowfall upon their surfaces. But with the melting of the snow upon their tributary watersheds the balance is reversed; the inflow plus rainfall upon the lake surfaces exceeds the outflow plus the lighter evaporation of the early months of the year, and the levels of all the lakes build up to their midsummer peaks. The summertime peak on Erie and Ontario is usually reached in June, on Michigan-Huron in July or August, and on Superior in September. The difference in level between the high stages of summer and the low stages of winter averages about 2 feet for Ontario and Erie, a foot and a half for Michigan-Huron, and a foot for Superior, this last named lake being under a certain degree of artificial control.

This is the normal seasonal pattern of rise and fall, and the figures and times mentioned are general averages. But once in a while there are 3 or 4 or even more years in a stretch when rainfall is low or evaporation high, and usually both, on some part of the watershed, or even over all of it, so that the buildup of one or more of the lakes during the early part of the calendar year is less than the rundown of the year before and the summertime peak settles at lower and still lower stages, year after year, until the long drought is broken. Summertime lows that were produced in this way occurred in 1949, 1934, 1926, and 1911, to take a backward look at the period since the first cutting or substantial enlargement of the great ship channels in Detroit River.

On the other hand, several successive years of above-average rainfall or below-average evaporation, or both, have resulted in the progressive building up of water levels to extreme high stages, like the one that appears to be now in progress on all five lakes. Summertime peaks thus built up on Michigan-Huron during the last 40 years were in 1943, 1929, and 1918.

These seasonal variations and the occasional larger changes in level are measured from the prevailing quiet water levels, the monthly mean levels of the United States Lake Survey. But superimposed upon these levels, at any time and at any place, may be the transient fluctuations in level caused by wind and by changes in barometric pressure. (Lunar tides also belong naturally in this category but they are too small to be of any significance in this connection.)

A strong onshore wind raises the water noticeably at the shore line, while an offshore wind lowers it. Both these effects are greatly intensified if the fetch of the wind is long and the expanse of water over which it blows is shallow. For example, a gale from the west tends to push the waters of shallow Lake Erie toward the eastern end of the lake with the result that, at times and for an hour or two, the water level at Buffalo may be as much as 8 or 10 feet higher than the level at Toledo. Differences of 4 or 5 feet are not uncommon. A strong and long continued easterly wind, on the other hand, may pile up the water at the western end of the lake, even to the extent of raising the level at Amherstburg and Monroe above the level of Lake St. Clair, thus temporarily reversing the flow in Detroit River. It was the high water produced by such easterly winds in March and April of this year, superimposed upon the unusually high mean level of Lake Erie at the time, together with the strong offshore waves raised by the same wind, that flooded portions of the low residential beaches north of Monroe and uprooted trees and did other damage along their unprotected banks. Lake Erie is notorious for its wind-produced surges. Saginaw Bay suffers likewise from occassional northeast winds.

Other transient fluctuations in water level may be caused by seiches. A seiche may be developed when a steep barometric gradient between high and low moves rapidly across the lake. Under the pressure of a high the water level is lowered, while under a low it rises. If now the direction and rate of travel of the barometric wave corresponds roughly to the natural oscillation period of the lake the whole body of water may be set to swinging back and forth and these oscillations will continue for some time after the initial cause of the disturbance has passed. The effects of the barometric pressure itself may be greatly intensified by winds blowing toward the barometric low, although such winds usually come in not directly toward the center but at an angle. A storm center over Lake Huron with a strong wind from the west creates a decided current through the Straits of Mackinac. A seiche which swept across the northern part of Michigan-Huron early in May of this year produced oscillations of about 5 feet at Harbor Beach on the east side of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan and nearly as high in Grand Traverse Bay on the west side. The rise at Harbor Beach was aggrevated by heavy onshore waves.

Numerous studies have been made of these larger ups and downs of the past, going clear back to the beginning of available records, in the hope of discovering some natural long-term cycle, analogous to the short-term seasonal cycle, which might be taken as a guide in prophesying about future variations in level well in advance of their actual occurrence. No such simple cycle and no consistent combination of cycle and epicycle, has so far been brought to light. And from the very nature of wind and weather it does not seem likely that any such long-term periodic cycle of rise and fall will ever be found to exist. The wind still bloweth both where and when it listeth, and the waters appear likewise inclined to follow their own sweet will.

But although the hunt for some simple key to the riddle of water levels appears to be a futile quest, there is a different type of study which holds out some promise of fruitful results. Both high- and low-water levels in the lakes are the composite and cumulative after effects of rain and snow upon various parts of the watershed, of air and water temperatures, of humidities, and wind movements, of the inflow of tributary streams into the lakes and the outflow from them; and all of these can be measured and their timing can be known. And further, because of the great size of the lakes and their enormous storage capacities within their upper 2 or 3 feet of depth, changes in water levels lag months behind the most important causes that produce them, rainfall and snowfall, for instance. The effect of each of these single factors upon lake levels can be calculated and it appears quite possible for all these single effects to be integrated into a composite whole. The formula by which this multitude of influences is integrated may turn out to be as long and as complex as the one which astronomers use to represent the perturbations of the moon, but if skillfully used it could be the means of forecasting lake levels and discharge rates with a fair degree of accuracy for at least some months and possibly a year or more ahead.

The present high levels in the Great Lakes have been brought about, for the most part, by a combination of purely natural causes, chief of which is the abundant rainfall of the

past 2 or 3 years. In all the lakes except Superior, whose highs and lows are somewhat smoothed out by manipulation of control gates at the head of St. Marys River, the trend of levels has been upward ever since the extremely low stages in the winter of 1949–1950. The regular seasonal fluctuations have continued to operate, but now for 3 years in succession the springtime buildup has been greater than the autumn drawdown of the year before, with the result that each summertime peak has risen higher than that of the summer preceding. During the summer just past the mean levels for July and August of Michigan-Huron were nearly 2 feet above their average levels for those months during the past 10 years, those for Erie about a foot, and those for Ontario a foot and 4 inches. Rainfall over the entire watershed continues (September 1952) to be above the average. The Great Lakes appear to be definitely headed into another extended period of high-water levels.

There have been many inquiries as to whether the high-water levels of the summer of 1952 equaled or exceeded earlier high-water levels in the Great Lakes. Here are a few records of high summertime levels in Michigan-Huron, Erie, and Ontario. Superior's highs and lows are of no particular significance in this connection, at least not since 1911 when the present form of partial regulation was adopted. The elevations given below were scaled from the official Hydrograph of the Monthly Mean Levels of the Great Lakes, published by the United States Lake Survey, whose dependable records cover 93 consecutive years.

High summertime stages in certain of the Great Lakes, as indicated by the highest monthly mean levels, are given in the following table. Elevations are in feet above sea level.

Michigan-Huron

June 1886	583.7
July 1876	583.6
July 1871	582.9
August 1952	582.7
July 1929	582.4
June 1918	581.9
July 1908	581.7
August 1943	581.5

Erie

May 1952	574.7
June 1876	574.5
June 1862	574.4
June 1947	574.3
June 1929	574.3
July 1883	574.2
July 1943	574.1

Ontario

June 1952	249.3
July 1947	249.0
May 1870	248.9
May 1862	248.8
June 1943	248.7
May 1886	248.7
June 1908	248.6

While the foregoing tabulation shows the relative heights of last summer's high stages in comparison with summertime highs of former years, these relationships must be viewed in the light of certain artificial changes that have been made in what might be called the physical structure of the lakes. The control gates at the head of St. Marys River have already been mentioned. The main purpose of these gates is to make it possible to reduce the natural outflow from Lake Superior during periods of drouth upon its watershed and so to maintain sufficient depths in the harbors of Duluth and Ashland at the western end and also over the rocky bottom of the shallow forebay at the eastern end where heavily loaded downbound boats sometimes have to congregate before being locked down into St. Marys River and so into Lake Huron. This so-called regulation of Lake Superior is simply an aid to the navigation of that lake by deep-draft boats. The general plan of operation is to hold the level of Lake Superior about a foot higher than it would otherwise be, except in times of unusually high water.

Other physical changes that have been made which are of particular significance in this comparison are the deepening and widening of ship channels between Lake Huron and Lake Erie; the wide channels cut through the gravel bars at the outlet of Lake Huron, this planned cutting being supplemented by commercial dredging for gravel which has nearly eliminated the original shoals at this point; the St. Clair Flats Canal through the muddy delta at the mouth of St. Clair River; the Grosse Pointe Channel through the shallow clay lip where Lake St. Clair outlets into the Detroit River; the enlarged and deepened channel in the lower Detroit River near the Amherstburg shore; and the great Livingstone Channel which cuts through the limestone reefs near Grosse Isle and then extends on through the shoals at the lower end of the Detroit River into the head of Lake Erie. This work of systematic channelization was begun, on a small scale, as early as 1870 and has been carried on intermittently since 1876, but a great part of it was accomplished in the period 1903–1910.

While these channels between Huron and Erie were cut through primarily to permit or facilitate the passage of deep-draft boats, they have brought about, for better or for worse, certain permanent hydrologic changes. Any pool of water, even one as large as the Michigan-Huron pool, will drain down to a lower level if its outlet channel is deepened. It is now apparent that the extensive channelization of the natural waterway from Huron to Erie has reduced the original 19-foot drop in water level to about 7½ feet. The practice of dumping in the shallower parts of the riverbed the excavated materials from the new channels does not fully compensate for the increased hydraulic capacity of the smoother and deeper channels. This permanent lowering probably accounts for one peculiar fact shown in the foregoing tables—that, whereas last summer's high water level broke all records (back to 1860) in both Erie and Ontario, in Michigan-Huron it was below three summertime peaks which had been recorded prior to the cutting of the ship channels.

With all the clamor of the past year over the damage occasioned by the current period of high water in the Great Lakes, little or nothing has been said about the benefits that have accrued because of the high water levels. Some of these seem worthy of mention.

In many places sand and soil from nearby eroded banks have been carried inland by the waves and deposited among the weeds and brush of low and muddy flats, raising their levels sometimes as much as a foot or more. This is usually rated as a riparian benefit rather than a damage, and in a number of places it has been a substantial one.

The littoral shelf in front of many recreational beaches has been considerably widened by the dumping of eroded sand and gravel which has been dragged back from shore by the backwash of waves. This may not seem important now, with water levels still unusually high; but if and when the water drops to normal levels again there will be a wider foreshore of shallow water safe for wading as well as a wider strip of beach between the water's edge and the foot of the bank. Storm driven waves will then break farther out from shore and their energy will be more nearly spent by the time they reach the bank. There are few devices or arrangements that are more effective for the protection of a soft bank than a wide stretch of gently sloping sand or gravel between the point where the waves break and the bank. This type of benefit is in the nature of a permanent improvement, a capital gain to the riparian property affected.

Then there are some benefits which are in the nature of current operating profits, good only while they last. For example, any increase in the production of hydroelectric power, at the Soo or at Niagara or elsewhere, that is brought about or made possible by the current high water levels, or by the high rates of flow which cause them, is a pure gain and benefit. Another and vastly more important benefit is the increased depth in harbors and dredged navigation channels, which permits the big freight carriers to load to greater depths. During the hearings on the Chicago Drainage Canal controversy, back in 1925, the Lake Carriers' Association produced figures to show that freight savings or losses amounted to $500,000 a year for each inch of increase or decrease of depth in the navigation channels. The carrying of ore, grain, coal, and other bulk commodities in Great Lakes channels has increased considerably since then, while costs per ton of freight moved have also shown a large increase as measured in present day dollars. But the dollars per year in freight savings that have been made possible by the recent high water levels have not been mentioned during the current discussion.

The two diversions into Lake Superior of waters from certain tributaries of the great Albany River, in western Ontario, are quite small in comparison with the great volumes of flow that naturally go down through the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers. The presence of this added water in passing through the channels connecting the Great Lakes does inevitably raise levels somewhat, however, and hence the levels of the lakes themselves. The first of these extra contributions to Lake Superior began in 1941, after the water level of Long Lake, a small finger lake situated about 150 miles northwest from Sault Ste. Marie, had been raised by means of a dam built across its natural outlet stream toward the north and when the lake, under wartime demands, was made to discharge through a channel cut from its southerly end across the Continental Divide and into a small stream tributary to Lake Superior. The second and larger diversion was begun in 1943. A dam had been built across the Ogoki River, a tributary of the Albany, which raised the water level in the Ogoki about 40 feet and formed a large artificial lake of irregular shape among the hummocks and marshes of the broad tableland from which the Ogoki collects its waters. One southerly projecting arm of this lake came very close to a low point in the height of land that separates the watershed of Hudson Bay from that of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. A channel was cut through the divide at this point and through this channel a controlled and measured flow of water was delivered into a northern tributary of Lake Nipigon and thence through Lake Nipigon and the Nipigon River into Lake Superior.

The dams, control gates, and other works required for these diversions were built by the Province of Ontario, primarily for the benefit of the provincial hydroelectric power plants at Niagara Falls, the idea being that an additional amount of water equal to the Albany diversions could be taken out of Niagara River for power purposes without in any way impairing the beauty of the falls. The Ogoki diversion also swells the flow of the Nipigon River in its 250-foot drop from Lake Nipigon into Lake Superior and so increases the power resources of the Provincial Power Commission and of the paper mills and other industries along the course of that precipitous stream.

The amount of water added to Lake Superior by these two diversions has varied from about 5,000 cubic feet per second (1,400 from Long Lake and 3,600 from Ogoki River) to as little as 900 cubic feet per second. Obviously, these are relatively small quantities as compared with the average flow of about 220,000 cubic feet per second out of

Lake Erie into the head of Niagara River. The effect of a continuous added flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second through the Great Lakes might be expected to raise their levels by perhaps as much as 2 or 3 inches; lesser flows, or intermittent flows, by correspondingly smaller amounts.

It should be mentioned here that the Ogoki diversion was discontinued last May, for the time being.

The idea of appreciably reducing high-water levels in Michigan-Huron, and in Erie and Ontario as well, by allowing the present diversion down the Chicago Drainage Canal to be stepped up on occasion is largely illusory, although the intangible value of merely making an effort to do so may be for the moment worth something. There is no doubt, of course, that any increase in the Chicago withdrawal would lower Michigan-Huron somewhat and that this lowering would result in a corresponding and nearly equal lowering of both Erie and Ontario. As to how much lowering might be expected to take place it is appropriate to refer to the findings of the Committee on Lake Levels of the Engineering Board of Review, of 27 years ago. This board had been set up to study and report upon the effects of the Chicago diversion, which was then in controversy, upon the behavior patterns and uses of the Great Lakes. The total diversion down the Chicago Drainage Canal from 1900 to 1924 had averaged 6,795 cubic feet per second, including the city's pumped water supply; and, what is more to the point, for the 5-year period 1920–24 it had averaged 8,674 cubic feet per second. The total effect of this continuous withdrawal was to bring the level of Michigan-Huron down about 5½ inches below what it would have been without the diversion, and Erie and Ontario down by a slightly less amount. Other smaller or larger withdrawals, if continued for a period of several years, would naturally have proportionate effects, and if operating part time or only occasionally, as during periods of high-water levels only, would have effects roughly corresponding to the proportion of time in operation. It can be readily seen that the effect of increasing the present Chicago diversion by 2,500 or 3,500 cubic feet per second, as has been proposed, or to any other amount that would not produce currents in Chicago River that would be dangerous to navigation or damaging to other interests, would have only a very small effect upon the level of Michigan-Huron. The area of the Michigan-Huron pool is so great that if all inflow could be stopped for a time and if all rainfall upon and evaporation from its surface should cease it would require an outflow of 40,000 cubic feet per second to lower the level at the rate of an inch a month. An extra diversion of 2,000 or 4,000 cubic feet per second is a puny tool with which to tackle so large a problem.

Entirely aside from any effect it might have on lake levels, however, it should be noted that any additional drawoff at Chicago would also tend to preserve and improve the salubrity of the water in this pocketed southerly end of Lake Michigan, from which one of the greatest aggregations of population and commerce and industry in the world must get its entire supply of water.

The Great Lakes can be regulated in certain ways, of course, and to a very great extent their levels can be controlled, although because of their enormous size and the huge volume of flow through them any artificial meddling with their natural habits is a large-scale undertaking. The basic engineering works required, although large in size, are relatively simple in character and are well understood—control gates at the outlets of Huron, Erie, and Ontario (Superior being already supplied); navigation locks at the outlets of Huron and Ontario (locks being already in place at the outlet of Superior and between Erie and Ontario); and enlarged and deepened connecting channels with some special channel structures. Sizes, capacities, locations, and arrangements of structures, along with many details of design, would naturally depend on the nature and extent of the controls to be imposed; and, in the case of Ontario, on whether the control works were to be joined with any development of the St. Lawrence River for power production or better navigation or both.

To be more specific, it appears to be physically possible to hold the levels of the lakes within a range of 2 feet or less between high and low mean monthly levels—if such close regulation of levels were required—by means of control gates and enlarged connecting channels; except for the occasional great drought or the extraordinary flood that comes once or twice in a century, when the best of man's efforts may be able to mitigate but not wholly to control the effects of overwhelming weather. The Freeman plan for regulation of the Great Lakes, 1926, suggested a working range of 2.5 feet for Superior, Michigan-Huron, and Ontario and 1.5 feet for Erie, or an average of 2.4 feet over the entire expanse of lake surface; but these wider ranges of level included an allowance for the temporary impounding of water over the entire 95,000 square miles of lake surface for the benefit of power production at Niagara Falls and in the St. Lawrence River.

It is always assumed, in any plan of regulation, that the actual elevation or altitude—that is elevation above sea level, which locally means also fixed height with respect to existing lands, roads, piers, harbor bottoms, lock sills, and the like—of the low level or the high level permitted under whatever control pattern is adopted will be subject to such changes from time to time as may be found most advantageous to all interests concerned. For example, greatly increased use of coastal waters for public recreational purposes, accompanied by widespread shoreline improvements and a general rise in valuation of riparian properties, would be a valid consideration in favor of a lower rather than a higher elevation for the control pattern. Navigation interests, on the other hand, have always favored high elevations; likewise those of power and of domestic water supply.

It should be perfectly obvious that over and above the physical problem of lake regulation—the technical engineering problem—there are the overriding questions of public policy. How much regulation? What kind of regulation primarily? Of water levels, of flow rates, of water quality? In what interests? Power production, navigation, public water supply? Protection of riparian property? Preservation of Niagara Falls? And so on.

The interests of navigation would naturally call for dependably high lake levels from about the 1st of May through November, for no locks at Port Huron, and for no high velocities in ship channels during the navigation season. Riparian interests generally would prefer steady levels throughout the year, held at low elevations. It would be greatly to the benefit of power interests if a considerable range of level over the entire Great Lakes system could be utilized to equalize the flow in the Niagara River not only as between summer and winter highs and lows but also as between dry years and years of abundant rainfall, and so to increase the level of production of firm power; and still more to their benefit if a larger total allotment of water for power purposes could be secured. Steady levels and, above all, protection from pollution are the demands of water-supply users and of the numerous and growing tribe of aquatic recreationists. And millions of healthy-minded nature lovers all over the continent would regard any impairment of the natural grandeur and majesty of the Falls as nothing short of sacrilege.

Policy determinations for the management of the Great Lakes are certainly worthy of the best thought that can be brought to bear upon them.

Many of the policy questions that have so far been raised have already been settled, for a time at least, by specific agreements between the Governments of the United States and Canada—broad agreements and basic understandings recorded in their treaty of 1909 relating to boundary waters, etc., and many later agreements reached by the state departments of the two governments under the authority and through the machinery of that treaty. This treaty deals specifically with the protection and use of the waters contained in the Great Lakes and their connecting channels (including also certain other boundary waters), and sets up the following order of precedence among different uses: uses for domestic and sanitary purposes; uses for navigation; uses for power and for irrigation; with all other uses subordinate to these. It provides for an International Joint Commission, of six members, to have direct jurisdiction over such matters as the uses of the boundary waters, their protection from pollution, and diversions or obstructions affecting their natural level or flow, all within rules provided in the treaty itself or to be prescribed later as required by changing conditions.

The Treaty on Boundary Waters does not deal specifically with lake levels, either high or low, in relation to possible damage or benefit to riparian property. But the International Joint Commission is charged with the duty of investigating and reporting upon any other questions or matters of difference arising between the two countries involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along the common frontier, whenever requested to do so by either of the two Governments. The Commission may also make binding decisions, as well as investigations and reports, when such questions and matters are referred to it for decision by both Governments.

The way thus seems open, as it always should be, for the exploration and fair consideration of the facts and circumstances of high lake levels, as well as of other questions and matters as they may arise.

FORMOSA, KOREA, AND OTHER AMERICAN-ASIAN PROBLEMS—ECONOMIC WAR ON RUSSIA

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an analysis by Mr. Vicente Villamin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's well timed and wisely conceived deneutralization order on Formosa, the war situation in Korea, and the possible use of more Asian soldiers in the struggle against the Communists in Asia have brought the question of American policies in Asia actively before the American Government and people. It is, therefore, highly desirable that the facts and meaning of the different problems and situations we are confronted with in Asia be presented clearly, logically, and, above all, in a nonpartisan manner.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I ask to extend my remarks by placing in the body of the RECORD a comprehensive and penetrating analysis of those problems

and situations by Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino lawyer, writer, economist, and student of international affairs. He is, using his own words, "color-blind on the political complexion of American problems that affect other countries, this case the Asian countries."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member of Congress and administration officials concerned with Asian questions not to fail to read the analysis of Mr. Villamin.

Mr. Villamin's analysis follows:

FORMOSA, KOREA, AND OTHER ASIAN-AMERICAN PROBLEMS—ECONOMIC WAR ON RUSSIA

(By Vicente Villamin)

NEUTRALIZATION OF FORMOSA

The so-called military neutralization of Formosa is contained in a statement of President Truman made on June 27, 1950. That statement announced that, complying with the resolution of the same date of the Security Council of the United Nations, the United States would go to the aid of South Korea which was attacked by Communist North Korea on June 25.

The President said:

"The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war. It has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations issued to preserve international peace and security. In these circumstances, the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area."

THE 7TH FLEET

"Accordingly, I have ordered the 7th Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary of this action, I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The 7th Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations."

FORMOSA'S STRATEGIC VALUE RECOGNIZED

Thus President Truman recognized the great strategic value of Formosa to the United States. It was a sharp and dramatic reversal of the position taken previously by his administration, which in the White Paper issued by the State Department in August 1949 considered Nationalist China as hopeless, and in the speech of Secretary of State Dean Acheson in January 1950 Formosa was not included in the western "defense perimeter" of the United States and therefore could be taken by the Communists without resistance from the American Armed Forces.

EFFECTS OF NEUTRALIZATION

The deneutralization of Formosa was primarily directed against Communist China and only as a corollary against Nationalist China as a part of the defense of South Korea and American security in the Pacific. The two warring Chinas complied—Nationalist China because she was, as she is now, friendly and cooperative with the United States, and Communist China because she was not in a condition to attack Formosa, her boasts to the contrary notwithstanding.

The neutralization produced two results which were favorable to Communist China, as follows:

1. It stopped the attacks against her by Nationalist China; and

2. It saved her face by giving her the excuse for not attacking Formosa, when the real reason was that she was unable to do it.

DENEUTRALIZATION

On February 2, 1953, in his message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower revoked the neutralization, saying as follows:

"In June 1950, following the aggressive attack on the Republic of Korea, the United States 7th Fleet was instructed both to prevent attack upon Formosa and also to insure that Formosa should not be used as a base of operations against the Chinese Communist mainland.

"This has meant, in effect, that the United States Navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. Regardless of the situation in 1950, since the date of that order the Chinese Communists have invaded Korea to attack the United Nations forces there.

"They have consistently rejected the proposals of the United Nations Command for an armistice. They recently joined with Soviet Russia in rejecting the armistice proposal sponsored in the United Nations by the Government of India. This proposal has been accepted by the United States and 53 other nations.

"Consequently, there is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibility on behalf of the Chinese Communists, thus permitting those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies in Korea.

"I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. Permit me to make crystal clear that this order implies no aggressive intent on our part. But we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea."

COMPARATIVE WAR RISKS

The risk of war with Communist China was greater when the neutralization was instituted than when it was withdrawn because:

1. If Communist China had ignored it, as it had the right to do under international law, and attacked Formosa, the United States would stop the attack, and that would mean a direct fight between the United States and Communist China.

2. The deneutralization acknowledges, in effect, the right of Communist China to attack Formosa at will. Therefore, instead of condemning it the Chinese Communists and their Kremlin allies should welcome it. But secretly they would hate the United States for withdrawing her defense of them from Nationalist China and for allowing them to lose their face by not being able to attack Formosa.

3. If the time comes that Nationalist China attacks Communist China in force, or vice versa, the fight will be primarily between the two warring Chinas and not between Communist China and the United States as would happen under the regime of neutralization if Communist China had ignored it. There is psychological force supporting the United States in this situation.

AFTER DENEUTRALIZATION

After deneutralization, if Communist China attacks Formosa and the United States goes to the defense of that island, such action by the United States would be supported by the following reasons:

1. Defense of a government that the United States considers the only legitimate government in China and a war ally;

2. Stopping the expansion of Communist area of domination under the general principle underlying the war in Korea;

3. Protecting the United States and other United Nations armed forces in Korea and the general security of the United States herself as well as the security of countries in free Asia-Pacific, like the Philippines, Japan, New Zealand, and Australia, to which she has treaty obligation to defend from Communist aggression;

4. Preventing the Communists from acquiring control in the Asia-Pacific region of agricultural and mineral products which are vital to United States industries;

5. Keeping intact the western defense perimeter of the United States, the area which the United States would defend, alone if necessary, from enemy attack; and

6. Preventing the United States air base on Okinawa and other military installations in the neighboring area (Formosa is only 1½ hours by plane from Okinawa) from being outflanked by the Communists; and protecting the trust territory, which is under United States administration, as well as other United States islands in the Pacific from being dangerously exposed to Communist conquest.

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S VIEW

On the strategic importance of Formosa, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his address to the joint session of Congress on April 19, 1951, declared:

"I have strongly recommended in the past as a matter of military urgency that under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control. [Applause.] Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan, and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

MAKING FORMOSA STRONG

It is clear, therefore, that making Formosa strong is also self-help, self-defense, and self-preservation to the United States. Its value is mutual to both countries.

Thus is the United States committed virtually, although not yet formally, to help Formosa so (a) it could withstand enemy attacks or discourage them, (b) function as a vital second front in the wars in Korea and Indochina, and (c) prepare Nationalist China to regain the mainland from the Communists.

President Eisenhower and congressional leaders, Republicans and Democrats, have repeatedly declared their support of Formosa. President Truman came around to the same view when he announced the neutralization of that island for its strategic value to the United States, when only 6 months before he adopted a hands-off policy on Formosa and said: "The United States will not provide military aid to the Chinese forces on Formosa."

CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Let us pause for a moment and visualize what would have happened if President Chiang Kai-shek, of Nationalist China, with more determination than sinews, had not somehow convinced the Chinese Communists against invading Formosa when he was alone and abandoned by the United States and the rest of the free world. If Formosa had then fallen under Communist domination, today all east Asia and the western Pacific area would be inside the Iron Curtain, and the United States would presently be in fear of the realization of General MacArthur's warning that the fall of Formosa to the Communists would push the western defense perimeter of the United States to her mainland coasts bordering the Pacific Ocean. Is not, therefore, the conclusion irresistible that while he lost the Chinese mainland President Chiang Kai-shek saved from communism the vast area of land and water beyond that mainland to the North American Continent and down below the Equator?

MEASURE OF AID TO FORMOSA

The aid to Formosa should be immediate and sufficient to produce the desired results. Time is of the very essence. The measure of the aid should take into consideration the following points:

1. Formosa should be strengthened to a degree that would definitely deter Commu-

nist China from attacking it. That would obviate the necessity of the United States having to defend it at a great cost in men, money, and matériel. Direct preinvasion aid to Formosa is more economical to the United States.

2. Formosa should have a military establishment of a size that would convince the Communists that President Chiang could attack the mainland in force without leaving that island vulnerable to a simultaneous counterattack by them. This would serve to enhance the threat of Chiang's attack on Communist China and thereby pin down larger Communist forces to guard the Chiang attacking front and keep them away from the Korean and Indochinese fighting fronts.

LOSS OF FORMOSA

Formosa could be lost to the Communist enemy either (a) by direct capture through its relative weakness or (b) through its capture while Chiang is invading the mainland.

In case of its loss, if the United States believes with General MacArthur that "under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control," then the United States will be compelled to recapture Formosa from the Communists alone and without the help of Chiang's army, which had gone to the mainland.

In that logical possibility, is it not but elemental prudence for the United States to make Nationalist China strong now to a degree demanded by the exigencies of the situation?

FORMOSA AND NEIGHBORS

At this point it should be stated that Formosa, even in its present relative strategic weakness, is a bastion that protects the Philippines and other countries to the south, Okinawa and Japan to the north, and the Trust Territory and other islands to the east. They should all be urgently interested in seeing Formosa's military establishments expanded, modernized and strengthened and the disposition of her armed forces properly synchronized with those others that are also fighting the Communists.

INVASION OF MAINLAND

The invasion of the mainland by President Chiang must be well prepared, well timed, and well considered as to calculated risk of success or failure. This fact must be underlined: That Nationalist China is not the only country to be the loser if the invasion fails and the nationalist armed forces are destroyed. Losers also will be the United States, the Philippines, Japan, and other countries in the Pacific area, even, eventually, the countries in Central and South America facing the Pacific Ocean. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that there be a common counsel with the nationalist government to determine the time, manner, and means of the invasion. This fact deserves the highest degree of thought and consideration, and immediately.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS

The psychological elements in the situation are made manifest by the military realities which are obvious even to the layman.

If the two warring Chinas are to meet in battle now or soon, it is advantageous for Nationalist China to have that battle started by a Communist invasion of Formosa for the following reasons:

1. Considering their present inadequate armed forces, the Nationalists, relatively, are stronger on the defensive than on the offensive;

2. Conversely, the Communists, having to cross 100 miles of water to attack Formosa, are at their weakest on the offensive.

STARTING POINT OF ATTACK

If the Communists should attack Formosa and are repulsed, the psychological effect of their defeat on the Chinese people on the mainland in favor of the Nationalists would be tremendous. That should be a starting point in the comprehensive planning and its implementation for the recapture of China from the Communists. Then there would be a splendid chance to speed the day of China's vindication and emancipation.

Enthusiasm unjustified by military strength must be guarded against. For despite its dramatic and inspiring features in the beginning, the invasion of the mainland without the adequate force reasonably to guarantee its success, with the aid of the exaltation of the Chinese people induced by the repulse of the Communist attack on Formosa, there are calculated risks of failure, or incomplete success or a Nationalist Dunkerque on the Chinese shore.

PREPARATIONS FOR INVASION

President Chiang has an open field on China's coast, especially on the southeast, to begin his liberation of China from the Communists. Before the invasion, the support and sympathy of the people there must be captivated, and to that end the following actions are suggested:

1. Truthful publicity to make Chiang popular, with emphasis on the "new Chiang," the good government in Formosa, the new leaders, the new plans for China, and the fact that the United States is helping Nationalist China militarily, financially, and politically.

2. As it becomes feasible and advisable, there will be distributed in areas reasonably safe from Communist reprisals seeds and farm equipment, food, clothing, and medicine in prudential amounts. This enterprise will be sponsored and financed by Overseas Chinese. A few months ago the representatives of these Chinese, numbering over 12 million in different parts of the world, met in convention at Taipeh, Formosa, and passed a resolution committing themselves to the extent of $100 million to help Nationalist China.

3. The United States can indirectly contribute to this enterprise, but the bulk of the contribution must be from the Overseas Chinese in order that the Chinese people will know that their brothers abroad are thinking of them and of their welfare.

4. This help would be a strong incentive for the Chinese people, the overwhelming majority of whom are non-Communists and to whom communism is thoroughly obnoxious, to fight the Communists if they attempt to deprive them of it. With the patriotic guerrillas, supported by Chiang's regulars, the invasion would gain force as it proceeds and untold numbers of Chinese would rally to Chiang's colors.

5. It is essential that Chiang's invading army is better equipped, fed, and paid than the Communist army, and that the Chinese guerrillas that will join Chiang shall be equally treated. This is to invite desertion from the Communist army to join Chiang and to discourage desertion from Chiang's army.

6. The preinvasion publicity must be simple and practical and will concern with the life of the people. In very poor communities the publicity should be distributed inside a small bag of rice, medicine, or some other useful things so people would be willing even to risk their lives to get them. Getting or hearing publicity, information, or propaganda is a capital offense in Communist-dominated territories. Asian psychology and philosophy must be used in the preparation of publicity literature.

7. If possible, the landing of Chiang on the mainland should be before the war in Korea ends so that he would not have to face the entire Communist army. It should be synchronized with the substantial increasing of the South Korean Army and the French Indochinese Army and, if practicable, with the arrival of more United Nations troops in Korea, especially those coming from countries not now represented there. This would produce a tremendous psychological effect besides its military effects favorable to Nationalist China, Indochina, and the United Nations.

NATIONALIST BLOCKADE OF CHINA

Nationalist China and Communist China have the right to blockade each other because they are at war with each other.

The Chinese Nationalist Navy is already engaged in blockading the coast of China with indifferent results. It is effectively helped by the approximately 75,000 Nationalist volunteers operating on the islands facing the mainland.

In these blockade operations the help of the United States is greatly needed in the form of naval craft, particularly PT boats, planes, and other equipment to make the blockade more effective.

UNITED STATES BLOCKADE OF CHINA

At this time, the blockade of China by the United States would seem to be inadvisable, not that it would not be effective. A blockade presupposes the existence of a declared or de jure war between Communist China and the United States. Today it may be considered that there is a de facto war between them through the participation of the Chinese volunteers in the war in Korea who are in reality members of the Chinese regular army. Because of the hope that a de jure war would be avoided, the United Nations has considered the Chinese truce conferees first at Kaesong and then at Panmunjom as representing the Chinese volunteers and not the Chinese Communist government, although that representation is known as a pure fiction.

A United States blockade might give rise to the following possibilities which would be disadvantageous to herself:

1. It would be used by Communist China to justify a de jure war against the United States, describing her as the aggressor nation;

2. It would be used by Communist China in the propaganda to convince the Chinese people that the United States is trying to starve them; and

3. It would antagonize friendly, non-Communist nations which could claim that their trade with China was being unduly interfered with without sanction of international law.

THE BATTLE ACT

The United States, instead of the blockade, could use persuasion on countries shipping to China and also the sanction provided for by the Battle Act, which authorizes the withdrawal of aid by the United States from countries shipping critical and vital materials to Communist countries. The more effective enforcement of this law should be studied immediately.

Some shipments to Korea, Manchuria, and then to China could go to the Russian port of Vladivostok. The application of blockade there would precipitate an outright struggle between the United States and Russia.

DEFINITE POLICY ON FORMOSA

The United States should declare a definite policy on Nationalist China, reasserting its present position, which is understood to be as follows:

1. That she recognizes Nationalist China as the only legitimate government of China and will continue to do so; and

2. That she considers Formosa as vital to her security and the security of the free nations in the Asia-Pacific region and will go to its defense if attacked by the Communists.

EFFECTS OF DECLARATION

The effects of such declaration would be as follows:

1. It will make the position of the United States clear and end all speculations about it—speculations that help only the Communists;

2. It will encourage Nationalist China and induce Chinese both on the mainland and overseas to stand by and support her more actively and resolutely;

3. It will bring a greater sense of security to the free nations in Asia to which Formosa is extremely vital to their defense and safety from Communist aggression; and

4. It will end the expectation of some nations, particularly Great Britain, that the United States might consent to turn over Formosa to the Communists as a part of a deal for what they hope and imagine as peace with the Communists.

MORE UNITED NATIONS FORCES

Out of fifty-odd member nations of the United Nations approved by the Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, to aid Korea in resisting the North Korean invaders, subsequently joined by the Chinese volunteers, only 14 of those nations have military contingents in Korea. The other nations should be asked insistently and strongly to discharge their duty and honor their approval. This, among other things, will obviate the necessity of Nationalist China sending troops to Korea to help the United Nations.

USE OF ASIAN BRAINS

There are free Asians who have both brains and common sense. Many of them are not in the government service. They are willing to serve without the United States spending a single dollar for them. Their own people should support their efforts.

These Asians understand their enlightened self-interest in keeping Communists out of their countries. Their cooperation should be enlisted in the work of influencing the minds and hearts of their fellow Asians who are now under Communist control, first to resist the Communist regime dynamically although perforce now in silence, and then, when the proper time comes, fight that regime openly side by side with those from the outside who will be on hand to help them. Outsiders must not restrict themselves to giving advices and directions. Worse still, they should not hold themselves aloof from Asians who have ideas and suggestions.

USE OF ASIAN MANPOWER

Free Asians are and must be eager and willing to cooperate to the utmost with the United States and other free countries in fighting and suppressing the Communists in Asia.

The idea that the United States is making Asians fight Asians for her sake must be dismissed by letting free Asians prove on their own volition that the struggle is between them and Communist Asians. America supports the former and Russia the latter, with the difference that Americans are fighting side by side with those whom they support, while Russians do not, and no one of them gets killed.

There are roughly 20 million potential fighters in free Asia, excluding India, Burma, and Indonesia, who call themselves neutrals and neutralists. They are made up of approximately 9 million men in Japan, 2 million in South Korea, 2 million in the Philippines, 2,700,000 in Indochina, 800,000 in Formosa besides the 600,000 under arms, 2 million in Thailand, 6,500,000 in Malaya and Singapore, and 500,000 in different places.

This estimate does not include potential volunteers, guerrillas, and collaborators in territories under the Communists, especially China.

MANPOWER SURVEY

A manpower survey should be undertaken without delay to determine how many effectives could be enlisted and where and how they could be trained. The mere announcement of the survey will bring hope to the Chinese people that their liberation is being planned in earnest. That would put them in a state of dynamic, if silent, expectancy to rise up against the Communists when the first opportunity offers itself.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN KOREA

The use of more Asian manpower should not lead to the conclusion that all, if not most, of the American soldiers in Korea would be withdrawn. The United States and other United Nations members have an obligation to help the South Korean forces under the Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950. But when there are more of the latter forces to man the entire front line of battle, the United Nations forces could take the reserve and supporting positions. And a part of the American Army, which represents some 90 percent of the U. N. forces, could be relieved, or that army need not be made bigger, as it might be if the South Korean and other Asian forces were not built up substantially. Bigger Asian forces all along the line will be a guarantee against stepped-up attacks by expanded Communist forces. The presence of the American Armed Forces in Korea surely is a powerful morale builder to the South Koreans; their absence would weaken America's moral position in the war in Korea.

ECONOMIC WAR ON RUSSIA IN KOREA

One of the points in the author's plan for an economic war on Russia is here given, as follows:

Russia provides most of the tools of war for the 1 million Communists fighting in Korea. Already her arsenal must be feeling the drain. The idea is to increase the drain several times and thus make her suffer materially and economically and, further, cause more strain in her relations with Communist China, which supplies most of the human bodies for slaughter in Korea.

How could this be realized? One potent way is to use more Asian manpower. If this manpower, besides the United Nations armed forces, is increased, say, to 2 million of South Koreans alone, the Communists will be forced, on the present ratio, to increase their army to at least 4 million, which Russia will have to equip and support. That is draining and depleting the Russian arsenal four times over, and that will certainly hurt her severely.

It should not take too long to train South Koreans or Nationalist Chinese or other Asians. They live in an atmosphere of war. They know its dangers and severities. They realize their duty to defend their country. They want to do their part. And they are better off in the army than out.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who succeeded Gen. James A. Van Fleet in Korea, has just visited Cheju Island off the coast of Korea where raw Korean boys are being trained and turned out as rugged soldiers ready for combat after only 16 weeks, or 4 months, of training. General Taylor was so deeply impressed by the work of training that he awarded a medal of the Legion of Merit to the South Korean officer, Brig. Gen. Kim Jong Pyong, who is in charge of it.

SOUTH KOREAN ARMY PAY

Authoritative sources state that for the cost of maintaining an American soldier in Korea at least 28 South Korean soldiers could be supported. The pay of an American private is more than the total pay of several South Korean major generals.

As given to the author by the Korean Embassy in Washington, the following is the partial pay schedule in the South Korean Army today, monthly, and reduced to the dollar equivalent: Private, 50 cents, lieutenant, $7; major, $8.50; colonel, $10. Officers' families are given rice besides monetary pay.

"DOLLAR BULLETS"

"Dollar bullets" on the enemy might have an effective role in Korea. The pay schedule in the Communist army could not be higher than that in the South Korean Army. If the pay in the latter army is trebled or quadrupled to $1.50 or $2 a month for the private, that might induce desertions in the enemy ranks to the South Korean Army. The elements of self-preservation and enlightened self-interest are involved there.

ARMY PAY IN FORMOSA

In an article in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, after a visit to Formosa, Mr. Robert Sherrod, a journalist, has the following to say:

"Of cash he (the Chinese Nationalist soldier) collects but little: 50 cents per month for a private, $1.50 for a sergeant, and $8.40 for a major general. But the ration scale allows each man 26 ounces of rice daily, 2 ounces of soy beans, a third of an ounce of pork, and two-thirds of an ounce of fish, in addition to a food subsidy amounting to about $1.50 per month. Few soldiers have families in Formosa; those who do get $2 extra each month for each dependent."

The army is considered very well fed, getting 3,700 calories a day, or two times more of what it got while on the mainland in the past.

It is crystal clear that the use of more Asian manpower will be an economy to the United States in men and money, while it will mean increased economic burden on Russia. That comparative situation is what will influence Russia most in considering the stoppage of war in Korea and the agitation for more wars.

MEETING RUSSIA IN ECONOMIC WAR

Russia has been all along waging an economic war against the United States, and the United States either does not realize it or, realizing it, does not give it much importance. Russia has been trying with measurable success to cause the United States to spend heavily on defense and armament, push its economy onto a war basis, then upset and muddle that economy and hope for the American people to lose trust in private capitalism.

The author quotes the following from his recent statement:

"You cannot hurt Russia by simply killing Chinese and Korean Communists. You cannot hurt Russia by calling her the nastiest names in the dictionary. You can only hurt Russia by hurting her in her economic vitals. Therefore, we should know where she is vulnerable and hit her there. Certainly she has many vulnerable economic spots if we but take pains to locate and pin-point them. Let us meet Russia head-on in the economic war that she is waging, while we fight her in Korea in her safe and magnificent absence in the hot war and actually and directly in the cold war, which consists of the byplay and interaction of policies, propaganda, movements, and other psychological operations."

RESPONSE FROM ASIA

Free Asia should make a clear and decisive response of her determination and enthusiasm to make all manner of sacrifice and cooperate with the United States and other free nations in fighting communism, its tyrants, its killers, its liars, and all its destructive works.

ASIANS FIGHT ASIANS

This response will make it clear to the world, especially to Soviet Russia, that Free Asia knows the dangers from the Communists to her vital interests, her ideals, and her very existence and is fighting to defend them.

The fight is between free Asians and Communist Asians. They have to fight each other because Russia made them fight, beginning in Korea. When all Asians realize this fact, they should and they will unite and fight Russia, the provocateur and the expectant beneficiary of Asia's division into free and slave peoples.

AMERICA AND RUSSIA

The Americans and her associates of like ideals are supporting Free Asia. The Russians and her satellites are supporting Communist Asia. The Americans are using their men and materials, but the Russians are using only their materials and seeing to it that their recipients, the Chinese Communists and North Koreans, are bound under obligation to pay for them. Russians are both creditors—and they are heartless creditors—and investors, and they expect to harvest unconscionably heavy returns from their investments.

It is Russia, not America, that is making Asians fight Asians for her benefit. After the fighting is finished and there is peace, the Americans will withdraw bag and baggage from Asia, but the Russians will stay there, try to run the Asians, and gather all the material benefits that they can. Asians should realize these facts before it is too late.

In helping more free Asians to get into the armed forces to fight the Communist Asians whom Russia has incited to start the fight between them, America is simply heeding their appeal to aid them defend themselves from the Communists. They covet the honor of fighting for their country. They abhor communism. They detest the Communists. They reject Russian imperialism, colonialism, and militarism that are behind the Russian conquering enterprises for material gain which they hypocritically describe as "liberating" peoples. And they know that the so-called peace movements sponsored by Russia are nothing but preparations for more conquests and her publicized previndication of them. These things are clear. Free Asia is coming to know them with mounting conviction and indignation.

The common peoples of both free and Communist Asia are of the same blood, of the same upbringing, and of the same aspiration, which is to live in peace, in freedom, and in plenty. Russian communism and Russian domination will make slaves and robots of them. What they should all do is to tell the Russians that they can take care of their own affairs in their own way and leave their countries for good and all.

ASIANS OVERSEAS

Those Asians who are out of their country should bestir themselves in the different countries of their residence and exert their aid and influence in the fight against the local Communists, then cooperate actively in the struggle that is going on in Korea and China. This applies especially to the 12 million Chinese overseas, most of whom are anti-Communist and live in southeast Asian countries, where through hard work they have amassed financial competence. There is here an open field of beneficial cooperation, which should be surveyed, harnessed, and utilized. America could give the leadership and inspiration. Those Chinese overseas will surely respond. They could finance their efforts, and they would do it, too. They could be a big factor in the fight against the Communists, particularly in the work of convincing their brothers under the Communist regime to rise against that regime and join the Nationalist forces that will come to regain their country from the Russian-dominated Chinese Communists.

AMERICAN BUREAUCRACY

Channels should be kept wide open for Asians, both in official and private life, to exchange views with Americans on the coordinating of and cooperation of efforts. Government bureaucracy of the flat, narrow-minded kind must not be allowed to impair that exchange.

ASIA AND EUROPE

It must be frankly stated that free Asians are somewhat dismayed at the apparent differences in opinions between the United States and Great Britain on some basic matters concerning Asia. The status of and attitude toward Formosa is one of those matters. The trading with Communist China is another. The recognition of Communist China is still another. In the face of these differences the Communists are presenting a solid front. When it is considered that a greater part of Asia, consisting of India, Burma, and Indonesia, is indifferent to Communist aggressions outside of their respective territories, the task of facing up to the united Communists is rendered more difficult.

There are, above all, voices both in Europe and America saying that Asia is not relatively as vital as Europe in the struggle against the Communists and that, therefore, most of the sinews for the struggle should be concentrated on supporting Europe, although there is actual fighting going on in Asia and none in Europe.

That is a short-sighted, selfish, and suicidal view. There is only one front against the Communists and it is the continuous, consolidated front of all free nations in Europe, Asia, and other continents and islands the world over.

STALIN ON ASIA

Premier Josef Stalin said that the way to conquer Europe is by conquering Asia first. He has weighty reasons for that statement. For after conquering Asia, which he considers easier to do—and the Russians have already conquered a big slice of Asia, China—then they will have only one front to defend, the European front. And then they can start the conquest of Europe, using Asian manpower and resources. That would make Europe even with the aid of America well-nigh untenable.

There is only one way open to the free world—it is unity in counsel and action all along the line and among all the peoples concerned wherever they may be found—east, west, north, and south. Therefore let free Europe, free America, and free Asia stand together in one cohesive, formidable unit and face and fight the Communists with all their combined wisdom and resources. That is what their self-preservation urgently and clearly demands. That is what they have to do if the world is to remain free and not Communist.

RAYS OF HOPE IN ASIA

The Asians are coming to realize that there are two fatal threats to their way of life—communism and Russianism. Of the two, Russianism is infinitely the worse because it is the combination of the two threats.

Russianism is greed, exploitation, slavery, imperialism, colonialism, and militarism which all work for Russia's selfish aggrandizement. Asia does not want Russianism now under the Communist. It is thoroughly repugnant to the nature of the Asians and obnoxious to their culture and religion.

Russia is using today communism as an ideology with which to conquer other peoples as the former European colonizing countries used the Christian religion as one of the excuses to establish their dominion in new lands beyond the seas. It happened that Christianity was, and is, good, while communism is bad, thoroughly bad. The basic motivation of Russia today is the same as the motivation of the colonizing nations of yesterday: It is economic, the acquisition of wealth for self-aggrandizement. Communism is eminently materialistic—we must never forget that.

The Chinese people will never reconcile themselves to Russianism that came to their country on the battlewagon of communism. Let us give them help and hope so they will be emboldened to thrust aside both Russianism and communism when their brothers outside come at last to their rescue. The other free Asians, who are not yet under the heels of Russianism and communism, could and would aid them morally and materially. They have to do it for their own self-preservation from the Communists and the Russians.

Russianism and communism have not yet sent their roots deep in the soil of Asia and their tentacles have not yet completely constricted the life of Asians. There is yet hope that the roots could be pulled out and the tentacles cut off. The leadership will have to come from the outside. It must give both the inspiration and the tools. Let us give them the things they need for their vindication and emancipation and for the safety and well-being of the free world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOPE in two instances.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a resolution adopted by the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. REED of Illinois and to include an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. UTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include a resolution from the Nebraska Legislature.

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER).

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEMPSEY and to include a letter.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in seven instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. FORAND and to include an editorial.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include a resolution.

Mr. SIEMINSKI (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) in three instances.

Mr. FRAZIER and to include an article from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. HAGEN of California in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in 2 instances in 1 to include an editorial and in the second instance a news article.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CANNON in 2 instances, in 1 to include a letter on the livestock situation and in the other an address by Dr. Carmichael, incoming Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, delivered on Friday evening, February 13.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a very important matter to present to the House. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing is $294. But, I think these $294 will save millions

of dollars when we get through with it. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to extend my remarks notwithstanding the extra cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. Bow and to include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HIESTAND and to include an editorial from the Omaha World-Telegram under date of February 11.

Mr. FORD and to include a speech by Mr. Charles R. Sligh.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an address.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEANE, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

490. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 157. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 2230. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams; with an amendment (Rept. No. 83). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 149. Resolution revising method of payments for folding speeches and pamphlets, Doorkeeper's department; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 131. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 119. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3397. A bill to assist in preventing defective construction of housing aided under Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3398. A bill to provide for the detention and prosecution of Communists and former Communists, to provide that peacetime espionage may be punished by death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 3399. A bill to prevent discrimination against any type or strain of white clover seed in the application of any price-support programs for such seed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3400. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 3401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that pensions of retired public school employees shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COON (by request):

H. R. 3402. A bill to provide for a final settlement of individual shares in the tribal estate and assets of the Klamath Indians through voluntary withdrawal from membership in the Klamath Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3403. A bill to authorize the deposit of Klamath tribal loan funds in approved depositories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3404. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3405. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3406. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 3407. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3408. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Montana for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3409. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3410. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property in the State of New Mexico to the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3411. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 3412. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Fort Belknap Indian Community of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3413. A bill to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3414. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3415. A bill to provide a separate post office and stations thereof for the Borough of the Bronx, New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3416. A bill to provide exemption from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3417. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code, so as to extend the application of section 3 of such title and to impose additional penalties thereunder upon persons who use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 3418. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 3419. A bill to authorize a $50 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3420. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, as a business expense, the cost of providing care for children under 12 years of

age, if such care is to enable the taxpayer to work away from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3421. A bill to amend section 1701 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to privately operated swimming pools, skating rinks, and other places providing facilities for physical exercise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 3422. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Central America and to and from the West Indies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3423. A bill to repeal the communications tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3424. A bill to repeal the tax on admissions and the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3425. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes", approved May 21, 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3426. A bill to provide for the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission in the case of persons separated from the classified civil service for any cause other than reduction in force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3427. A bill to exempt certain nonprofit organizations from the tax imposed on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend title VI of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 3430. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3431. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3432. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3433. A bill to increase the limitation of expenditures for projects for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in arid and semiarid areas of the United States under the act of August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitation that medical expenses shall be allowed in certain cases only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3435. A bill to reduce the excise tax on coin-operated and gaming devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting that the Congress enact a measure establishing a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona requesting that legislation be enacted providing that revenue accruing to the United States Government from the production of offshore or tidelands oil be apportioned to the several States for aid to schools on a per capita basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to national cemeteries, and requesting the establishment of a cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting stabilization of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relating to providing for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, requesting immediate authorization of sale by the General Land Office of sites in excess of 160 acres needed for industrial plants, mills, and related uses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND (by request):

H. R. 3436. A bill for the relief of Ettore Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3437. A bill for the relief of Pantaleone Capuano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3438. A bill for the relief of Adalgisa Carpanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3439. A bill for the relief of Louis Belkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Somogyvari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3441. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Pelletier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3442. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Giammarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND (by request):

H. R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Joseph Strani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 3444. A bill for the relief of Toki Yaeko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3445. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 3447. A bill for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3448. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Governali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3449. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 3450. A bill for the relief of John C. Schock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Szlama Szameth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of Alexander Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julianna Hoecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Konstantin Johannes Korve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Jalal Rashtian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Suhrawardy and her two sons, Oleg-Jerry Calder and Gleb Zahid Suhrawardy; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 3457. A bill for the relief of Eva Annelies Fahl Conway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN (by request):

H. R. 3458. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 3459. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Maragoudakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3460. A bill for the relief of Julieta Juaridini Sherry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cracolice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Tomas Lieno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Solomon Manuikin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Foedisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Baici Pompeo (also known as John Base); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution of the relief of certain alien refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the New Jersey State Poultry Association opposing further continuation of price supports on any agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County,

Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, Federal social security for all; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own as we keep our honor bright, our hearts pure, our ideals untarnished, and our devotion to the Nation's weal high and true. In these fateful days for whose decisions the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions. Save us from the disguises and pretenses of our own hearts which make us unworthy to wear the vesture of the gallant knighthood of Thine eternal purpose for human brotherhood. As our frail hands have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be, give to us the vision, the wisdom, and the courage that will make for both justice and lasting peace in all the earth. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 23, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2230) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to be absent from the city for the next 3 or 4 days. I ask that I be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate until Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KILGORE was excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 19)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of $13,230,037.30 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

OFFSHORE OR TIDELAND OIL DEPOSITS—LETTER AND MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of Arizona, transmitting a copy of a memorial of the house of representatives of that State, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., February 19, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith you will find a certified copy of Arizona's House Memorial No. 2 relating to offshore or tideland oil deposits.

You will note that this is a memorial of the house of representatives only.

Furthermore, this letter is not meant to carry any implication of endorsement on my part of the sentiments expressed in the memorial.

Sincerely,

HOWARD PYLE,
Governor.

House Memorial 2

Memorial relating to offshore or tideland oil deposits

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The United States Supreme Court has ruled that offshore oil deposits, also known as tideland oil deposits, belong to all the people of the United States. The Congress of the United States has in study legislation to define the mileage limits of the coastal States.

In recent years the cost of building, maintaining, and operating schools has increased to an extent rendering it extremely difficult for State and local taxing units to provide adequate facilities for the growing number of children of school age. It is estimated that Arizona alone needs a hundred and twenty million dollars to take care of urgent school needs.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

1. That legislation be enacted providing that revenue accruing to the United States Government from the production of offshore or tidelands oil be apportioned to the several States for aid to schools on a per capita basis.

Passed the house February 9, 1953.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state February 9, 1953.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Legislative Resolution 6

"Whereas the various States have enacted primary election laws that vary in the method of obtaining an advisory vote on presidential candidates; and

"Whereas it would be more representative of the people if the advisory vote obtained before the national conventions was uniform: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 65th session assembled—

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact a law establishing a uniform election procedure for obtaining an advisory vote for presidential candidates.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

"Whereas federally owned and controlled lands are infested with noxious weeds, which infestation is increasing and spreading; and

"Whereas these areas so infested are a menace to other lands, private and public, and a handicap to State weed control officers in performing their duties; and

"Whereas Federal agencies often fail to cooperate with State laws; and

"Whereas in the second session of the 82d Congress the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE introduced bills providing for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands, which bills are being held in abeyance: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the 33d session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to the Colorado River storage project; development of land and water resources; opposition of people of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authorities, and granting to the State of Wyoming all of the land and minerals within the confines of its borders, with the exception of the national parks and national monuments, national forests, and lands for national defense and promotion of aviation and agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. BARRETT on February 20, 1953, pp. 1291–1292, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds to bring the Veterans' Administration hospital program to the needed standards to meet the needs of the veteran population of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County, Fla., at Bay Front Park, Miami, favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial relating to national cemeteries, and requesting the establishment of a cemetery in Arizona

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Because of climatic conditions highly beneficial to persons afflicted with certain serious and often fatal ailments, Arizona has attracted to its borders many thousands of war veterans.

"Due to this migration from all parts of the nation of veterans desirous of receiving the benefits of these exceptionally favorable conditions, the veteran population of Arizona is probably greater proportionally than that of any other State, and is steadily increasing.

"In addition to the maintenance of several veterans' hospitals in the State there are a number of military and naval installations.

"For the reasons given it is obvious that the need for a national cemetery in Arizona is both real and urgent.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress enact a measure establishing a national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

"Adopted by the senate January 26, 1953.

"Adopted by the house February 13, 1953.

"Approved by the governor February 19, 1953.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state February 19, 1953."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See concurrent resolution printed in the full when presented by Mr. THYE on February 23, 1953, p. 1346, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., at their 30th annual convention on December 5 and 6, 1952.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MINNESOTA DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., DECEMBER 5 AND 6, 1952

Be it resolved, That the Minnesota Division, Izaak Walton League of America, approve the following Missouri River Basin declaration adopted at the Four-State Izaak Walton League Natural Resource Conference held at Sioux City, Iowa, October 18 and 19, 1952:

1. This conference of leaders of the Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota divisions of the Izaak Walton League of America expresses a continuing affirmative interest in the appropriate conservation and development of the renewable natural resources of the Missouri River Basin in the long-range public well-being.

2. We hold that this conservation and development can take place best on the basis of facts learned through an all-inclusive and continuing inventory of the basin's resources, coupled with a sound projection of the needs of the basin in relation to national needs, and that present inventories are not comprehensive and available to the public.

3. We subscribe to the necessity for the stating of a national policy relating to the proper use, treatment, and management of the resources of soil, water, and the plants and animals dependent upon soil and water, based on inventories and foreseeable needs, and the application of that policy to the Missouri Basin, realizing that the chief responsibility of any successful soil and moisture conservation program rests with the individual living on the land.

4. We hold that in essence the statement of a national policy produced by the Natural Resources Council of America and endorsed by our national Izaak Walton League is an appropriate policy, pending possible revision based upon inventory and projection of need.

5. We reject, as unsound and undesirable, the idea of complete domination and operation of plans and programs for the conservation and development of the described resources by governmental agencies alone, including a Missouri Valley Authority.

6. We advocate the establishment of effective management and a review procedure for the basin that will give full and democratic powers and responsibilities to local, State, and national levels of government, with domination by no one level, and in which the private citizens of the basin shall be given an effective voice.

7. We commend this expression to our national organization for consideration and action, and to the people of the Missouri Basin. It is our hope that it will become the foundation for a peoples' program for the Missouri Basin, and that action will be taken in the immediate future to give it life and implementation.

Whereas recreational uses, hunting, fishing, and trapping, have become much more important than navigation on the Upper Mississippi River: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America request the next Minnesota Legislature to memorialize the United States Congress to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act to "include administration of rivers for recreation and wildlife as well as navigation."

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the national forests, under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service, comprise a fundamental and important part of our national resources; and

Whereas these national forests are one of the few Federal enterprises returning an income in excess of appropriations; and

Whereas appropriations for development and administration of the national forests have shrunk to very unsatisfactory levels: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League urges full support of the efforts of the United States Forest Service in the development and administration of the timber, water, recreational, wildlife, range, and other resources of the national forests.

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League has over many years strongly supported the Superior National Forest Roadless Area program, and especially the air-space reservation; and

Whereas this air-space reservation was upheld in a test case in district Federal court, it is now being appealed: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League continue its vigorous support of the program and aid in the enforcement of the air-space reservation.

RESOLUTION 12

Whereas the recreation and wildlife values on our national forests may equal or exceed timber values: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League of America respectfully requests the United States Congress to provide adequate funds for wildlife management on our national forests and that at least one full-time biologist be maintained on each national forest.

Whereas the future of free hunting and fishing in America is seriously threatened by problems of land use and misuse: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota division of the Izaak Walton League arrange a meeting in February, April, and November 1953, to be attended by the representatives of the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, Department of Conservation, University of Minnesota faculty, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Soil Conservation Service, Production Marketing Administration, farmers, farm organizations, State and regional conservation groups, railroads, United States engineers, and other similar groups the league may wish to invite; be it further

Resolved, That above said representatives make findings and recommendations which will help solve the problems involved in the best use of our land by both farmers and sportsmen as it is affected by pothole drainage, soil-conservation practices, spring and

fall burning, controlling irresponsible hunters, flood control, irrigation, game cover, reclamation, underground-water supplies, muskrat farming, posting land against trespass, weed control, woodlots and tree farming, grass farming, restoring wornout farms, and any other activities properly coming under this broad field.

INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Lithuanians of Westfield, Mass., and surrounding cities and towns, relating to the 35th anniversay of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTFIELD, MASS., *February 22, 1953.*

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: At the formal celebration of the 35th anniversary of the Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, held at St. Casimir's Hall in Westfield, Mass., on February 22, 1953, at 3:00 p. m., the Lithuanians of Westfield, Mass., and the many Lithuanians from the surrounding cities and towns unanimously and without objection of any kind adopted and passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has ever recognized among the inalienable rights endowed man by his Creator the sovereign rights of all peoples to choose for themselves the form of government under which they choose to live; and

"Whereas the liberty-loving people of Lithuania have always cherished self-government and have ever resisted the tyranny of larger nations who were bent on depriving them of their God-given liberties; and

"Whereas against those principles of self-government, the Soviet Government of Russia has unjustly deprived Lithuania of her independence, has enslaved, pauperized, and is brutally persecuting her people, has killed hundreds of thousands of her population and has condemned about a fourth of the whole nation of Lithuania to a slow lingering death into the barren and dreary wastes of Siberia and the Arctics; and

"Whereas by this deliberate and systematic murder of her people and the ruthless depredation of Lithuania's wealth, culture, and institutions, the Soviet Government of Russia is committing upon Lithuania the horrible crime of genocide, a crime that has been condemned by all democratic and freedom-loving peoples; and

"Whereas, the Government of the United States refuses to recognize and has on repeated occasions denounced the subjugation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States by Russia and the present President of the United States in his preelection campaign talks has stated that Lithuania and other countries like her should be freed from Russian aggression; and

"Whereas Lithuanians all over the world by appropriate observance and ceremony will commemorate on February 16, 1953, the 35th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the time has come for the free world to make more substantial and more frequent declarations of its indignation against the crime of genocide now being committed by Russia upon Lithuania and other small nations and against the breaking of the principles of international law, morality, and human decency by Russia in her treatment of those countries; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States continue to recognize the de jure existence of the Republic of Lithuania and take immediate necessary action against Russia to enable Lithuania to resume her rightful place among the free and independent nations of the world; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States ratify immediately the Genocide Convention, an act which will open up the way for Lithuania to present her just and legitimate case to the free world and without which little hope remains for the poor unfortunate victims of Soviet tyranny and aggression; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States use the influence of his high office to bring about an immediate cessation of the destruction of Lithuania by Russia, to compel Russia to withdraw from Lithuania without any further delay, and to return Lithuanian deportees from Siberia and other parts of Russia; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Lithuania be represented at the United Nations by a duly appointed delegate and the United Nations delay no longer in making a thorough investigation of the numerous horrible crimes committed upon the Lithuanian nation by Soviet Russia; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles; to the chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the General Secretary of the United Nations, the Honorable Trygve Lie; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall and the Honorable John F. Kennedy; to the Representative from the First Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. Heselton, and to the press.

"WALTER MINKELIS,
"Chairman.
"KAZYS DUDA,
"Secretary."

UNION OR CLOSED SHOPS—LETTERS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand some 50 letters which I have received from workers in North Carolina who are opposed to the union or closed shop, and who are apprehensive that some legislation may be passed which would deny the right of the worker to exercise his free choice and not become a member of the union.

Some of these letters are from railroad workers who say that the railroads are being pressured to adopt the union shop and thus eliminate all workers who do not belong to the union. This is a vitally important matter to all workers regardless of the character of their work. The workers as a whole are probably more conscious of their liberty and freedom and more jealous of preserving their rights than most any other group.

I have selected three of these letters as being typical of the whole, and I wish to have these inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, together with my reply to each letter. These workers are not antagonistic to the union, but they wish to preserve their own individual rights, and they resent being forced to join an organization against their will in order to retain their jobs. I share their resentment, and shall oppose vigorously the adoption of either the union shop or the closed shop, and when amendments are considered and presented to the Taft-Hartley Act I think the right of every worker to either join the union or refuse to join should be definitely and fully protected. I hope the amendments being considered by the committee will embody this vital principle.

When we consider the fact that as of January 1, 1953, there were 62 million people gainfully employed in the United States, and only 15 million of these belong to any union of any kind, it is difficult to understand how less than one-fourth of the workers feel that they should have the right to force the other three-fourths to join the union or be denied the right to hold a job or to work and support their families. It would seem that the 47 million workers who do not belong to any union should have the right to continue their present status unless they should voluntarily decide that they wished to affiliate with the union.

The people who are clamoring for the union or closed shop are not the workers but the labor leaders who want to thus increase their power and authority and achieve greater control over the workers of the country. Their power is already too great, and anything that tends to increase this authority would be adverse to the workers as well as to the public generally.

I am sending to the desk this batch of letters and asking that these, along with the letters which I have asked to be inserted in the body of the RECORD, be referred to the committee having this proposed legislation in charge, which I assume is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letters will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The letters are as follows:

WILMINGTON, N. C., *February 20, 1953.*

Senator CLYDE R. HOEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you no doubt know, the 17 so-called nonoperating brotherhoods representing railroad employees are bringing pressure to bear on railroads throughout the Nation to incorporate the union-shop clause into the agreements and have already been successful on a number of roads.

I view this move with alarm because I feel that when men and women must belong to and pay dues to any organization, labor union or otherwise, in order to earn a living for themselves and their families, we will no longer have the democracy that the American people have cherished for so long. This view is shared by thousands of other railroad employees, many of whom are afraid to freely express themselves for fear of retaliation by the labor unions. I am not antiunion. I think that organized labor has greatly benefited the working people of this country, but I am against compulsory membership in any organization and I am against labor unions becoming too powerful as they will most certainly do if this move is not checked.

I understand that the present Congress will in the near future consider revisions in the present labor laws and I want to urge you to do your utmost to outlaw the union shop, as well as the closed shop, not only in the railroad industry, but in all industry.

Yours very truly,

T. W. WALKER, Jr.

FEBRUARY 23, 1953.

Mr. T. W. WALKER, Jr.,
Wilmington, N. C.

DEAR MR. WALKER: I have your letter of February 20, 1953, in regard to the effort being made to pressure the railroads into an agreement to incorporate the union-shop clause in their agreements, and I note your opposition to this movement.

I assure you that I am in hearty accord with your thinking on this subject, and I shall do everything possible to defeat any provision of law requiring the union shop or a closed shop.

I feel very strong on this subject, and I do not believe that any American citizen ought to be forced to join any organization against his will. I will defend fully and completely the right of any worker to join a union if he desires to do so, but I would just as vigorously oppose any plan that would compel a worker to join a union in order to get a job and make a living, if he does not wish to do so.

I shall do everything within my power to see that the rights of the people are not infringed upon and that the workers are protected in their full freedom.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

ROCKY MOUNT, N. C., *February 20, 1953.*
The Honorable GRAHAM BARDEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am writing you inasmuch as I understand that you are on the committee studying the so-called union shop.

I have been employed by the railroad for 11 years. Part of this time I was a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Steamship Clerks and withdrew from the union of my own accord. I wish to state that I am not against the union and feel that there is a need for the union; however, I am definitely opposed to union shop which will force all that are employed to become a member of the union or either lose their job. This certainly, in my opinion, is unconstitutional in that it leaves the employee no prerogative. Anything that you can do will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

O. J. BARNES.

FEBRUARY 23, 1953.

Mr. O. J. BARNES,
Rocky Mount, N. C.

DEAR MR. BARNES: I thank you for sending me copy of letter which you have written to Congressman BARDEN in regard to the union shop.

I am opposed to the union shop and shall do all I can to defeat it. I do not believe that any American citizen ought to be required to join any organization against his will in order to either get a position or to hold one.

It is my position that every citizen should be protected in his right to either join a union or refuse to join it just as he desires, and his right to work should not be interfered with or denied in either instance.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

WILMINGTON, N. C., *February 20, 1953.*
The Honorable CLYDE R. HOEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: I understand that efforts are being exerted to force the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. to agree to a union shop.

I am employed in a personal staff office by the Atlantic Coast Line general offices in Wilmington, and this information is very alarming to those of us who have always enjoyed working for the Coast Line under its present management.

Please understand that I do not oppose all unions or a unionized office because I am aware of the fact that they have brought about many excellent working conditions for all of us. However, I definitely am not in favor of anyone compelling me to join any organization or else have my job taken away from me. Our forefathers such as Washington, Samuel Adams, Franklin, Daniel Webster, Jefferson, and Lincoln; poets such as Lowell, Emerson, Longfellow, Bryant, and Whittier have all written gloriously about America, which to them was synonymous with freedom. To me, freedom means a democracy—a place where one has the undisputed privilege of accepting or denouncing any action of government without fear of repercussion. There have been several wars fought for our democracy and there are many lives being sacrificed at the present time in Korea for this same principle. Yet, there is nothing about a union shop that slightly resembles democracy.

As a native North Carolinian, I know that your past administration as Governor here was a fair and just one—when I attended school in Raleigh I have watched you many times getting your morning coke at Brantley's—and I have always been extremely proud of you as a representative of our State. Therefore, I am appealing to you to oppose any action that would deny any employee the freedom of speech and expression, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. As John D. Rockefeller, Jr. stated, "• • • the world owes no man a living but it owes every man an opportunity to make a living." In a union shop one has little opportunity.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JULIA TABB.

FEBRUARY 24, 1953.

Mrs. JULIA TABB,
Wilmington, N. C.

DEAR MRS. TABB: I have your letter of February 20, 1953, and note with interest the efforts being made to force the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. to agree to a union shop.

I can well understand your views on this subject and your opposition to the union shop, or a closed shop, which I think is certainly undesirable.

I share your view that the union has accomplished much good, but I believe all workers should be free and independent with the right to either join a union or not as they prefer. It is rather presumptuous for any organization to take the position that they will deny a person the right to work unless he joins that particular organization.

The right to work and make a living is a constitutional privilege of an American citizen, and I do not think that this right should be curtailed or invaded by forcing him to join a union or any other organization against his will.

It so happens that there are around 62 million people as of January 1, 1953, gainfully employed in the United States. Of this total number only about 15 million belong to any union of any kind. It does seem rather preposterous for the union leaders to insist that the other 47 million workers be required to join a union or be denied the privilege of working. Since only one-fourth belong to a union it would seem rather farfetched for this group to demand that the other three-fourths either join or be prohibited from getting a job. I feel that this 47 million are entitled to work as well as the 15 million who belong to the unions, and have the protection of their right to join a union and remain a member of that organization, but certainly the right not to join unless the worker wishes to do so, should be reserved to the three-fourths of the workers in the United States.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably an original resolution protesting against the treatment of minority groups by Russia and her satellites, and I submit a report (No. 47) thereon.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek Orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States, and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom. *Resolved further*, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in regard to the resolution reported by the Senator from Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution go over, under the rule; and I give notice that I intend to ask for its consideration on Friday. The resolution deals with the general protest against persecution by the Soviets.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar, and will go over under any circumstances, under the rule.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1061. A bill for the relief of Norman F. George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1063. A bill to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1064. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish policies and programs for rotation of grains in storage and to offset the price-depressing effects of necessary marketing of commodities to avoid spoilage or deterioration; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1065. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; to establish cooperation with Canada in the construction, operation, and control of the St. Lawrence seaway; and to authorize certain works for

the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes System above Lake Erie; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1066. A bill to authorize certain works for the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes System above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. GRISWOLD (for himself and Mr. IVES (by request)):

S. 1067. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 1068. A bill to provide hospital care and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans; and

S. 1069. A bill to provide a further opportunity for veterans of World War II who were in active military, naval, or air service of the United States on the delimiting date for initiating a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and who had not initiated a course prior to said date, to initiate such a course; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1070. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1071. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Demetrius John Monoyioudes to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1072. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mary Shizue Hirano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1075. A bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1076. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer certain counties from the eastern district of Michigan to the western district of Michigan, to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the judicial districts of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 1077. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1078. A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1079. A bill for the relief of Alexander Welner (Alexander Kauschus); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1080. A bill to amend section 1154 (a) of title 18 of the United States Code to remove restrictions against the selling of intoxicating liquors to Indians outside Indian country (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1081. A bill to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ROTATION OF GRAINS IN STORAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish policies and programs for rotation of grains in storage and to offset the price-depressing effects of necessary marketing of commodities to avoid spoilage or deterioration. I ask unanimous consent to speak not to exceed 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

The bill (S. 1064) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish policies and programs for rotation of grains in storage and to offset the price-depressing effects of necessary marketing of commodities to avoid spoilage or deterioration, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am today introducing in the Senate—and Representative MARSHALL is introducing a similar measure in the House—a bill to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep its stocks of farm commodities fresh and in first-class condition, and in economical storage position, by sale of old or out-of-position farm commodities and purchase or contract for new farm commodities to prevent any unfavorable market price reaction.

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced a policy of purchasing grain in the market to offset the effect of sale of grain which has gone out of condition or is in danger of going out of condition.

Wise administration of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks requires more than crisis action after loss has occurred or is imminent.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Act permitted sale of CCC grain stocks for their usual uses only when it would bring support, plus 5 percent and reasonable storage charges. Exception was made if the stocks had already gone out of condition or were in immediate danger of doing so, or when the grain was being diverted from its usual market. This made it impossible for the Government agency to follow normal trade and private practice of keeping stocks held in storage fresh—generally never more than one marketing season old—by selling old and buying new grain at market price.

Furthermore, the act makes it impossible for Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of two other types of stocks:

First. Small lots which could not be economically stored near the point of acquisition, but would have to be transported at considerable expense to storage facilities; and

Second. Lots acquired in areas where storage was impractical due to climate, insects, or other reasons.

The bill introduced today will permit Commodity Credit Corporation to keep its stocks fresh by selling old and buying or contracting for farm commodities at market price to avoid serious market consequences. It is hoped that enactment of this bill will further the maintenance of adequate reserves of improved quality products and that the recent example of market deflation will be avoided by more orderly marketing practice.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION IN GREAT LAKES SYSTEM ABOVE LAKE ERIE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY were received and referred, as follows:

S. 1065. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; to establish cooperation with Canada in the construction, operation, and control of the St. Lawrence seaway; and to authorize certain works for the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1066. A bill to authorize certain works for the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with a letter addressed to me by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and my reply there-

to, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The St. Lawrence seaway is vital to the welfare and prosperity of my State of Minnesota. It is also essential to the national welfare and security of the United States. For many years now we have attempted to secure congressional approval of the agreement between the United States and Canada for the building of the seaway. Our efforts have been unsuccessful. Our most recent attempt in the Senate was defeated on June 18, 1952, when our bill was resubmitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for further study.

An evaluation of last November's election results leads to the conclusion that the likelihood of our obtaining approval for our original legislation is even remote. We, therefore, have the alternative of continuing our efforts in behalf of our old proposal and allowing the great inland waterway resources to be utterly wasted or of finding a new approach to achieve our objective.

On November 4, 1952, Canada ended the 1941 agreement that she had with us for the joint development of the St. Lawrence seaway project. That agreement today no longer exists. The seaway will, therefore, be built. The only question is whether it will be built by Canada alone or by us in association with Canada.

The St. Lawrence seaway is an economic necessity for Minnesota and for the whole upper Midwest area. It will assist us in the shipment of grain, in the shipment of the great stores of iron ore from the Mesabi Range to serve the Nation, in the development of package freight shipments on the Great Lakes and in the attainment of a balanced economy for our State.

I have been in constant consultation with my associates here in the Senate and with interested citizen groups in Minnesota and elsewhere in an attempt to find a legislative formula which will build the St. Lawrence seaway and allow the Midwest and, in particular, Minnesota to share in the economic benefits which will flow from the waterway. This calls for the realization of two objectives: First, the building of the waterway and second, the deepening of the Detroit, St. Clair and St. Marys Rivers so that the channels are 27 feet deep to allow ocean navigation to reach all ports in the Great Lakes system.

A series of regional conferences were held last December with various committees and interested parties to work out a legislative program for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin area. As a result of those conferences and other meetings, a policy was adopted; first, to separate the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway from the deepening of the river channels and, second, the question of what to do with the power created by the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The Wiley bill, S. 589, was introduced on January 23, as part of the program to carry out this policy. This bill provides exclusively for the construction of part of the St. Lawrence seaway on American soil and for negotiations with the Canadian Government for a joint United States and Canadian use of the seaway as a whole. I joined in sponsoring this bill because I believe it is essential to the national self-interest and defense of our Nation that the seaway be built. Senator WILEY is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which will have the responsibility for this legislation. We have reason to believe that the committee will report the bill out favorably. The bill has the support of President Eisenhower and the leaders in Congress.

The Wiley bill does not deal with the need to deepen the channels in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie and does not extend the direct economic benefits of the seaway to Minnesota and other States of the huge industrial and agricultural areas west of Lake Erie. Senator WILEY, however, as a Senator from Wisconsin, a State which requires the deepening of the channels if it is to enjoy the benefits of increased navigation resulting from the St. Lawrence seaway, has expressed to me his pledge that he will dedicate his efforts toward receiving congressional approval for the channel deepening project. In fact, I include the correspondence between Senator WILEY and myself on the subject at this point:

JANUARY 12, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: Thank you very much for your letter of January 8 and for sending me a confidential draft of the bill you plan to introduce shortly. I am pleased that you had it reviewed by the State Department, by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association and by our Senate legislative counsel. It is my hope that the bill will soon be enacted, and I know that you as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will do what you can to expedite its passage.

There is one concern that I do have, however, and I would like your comment on it. The bill as it stands will not assure our own States of Wisconsin and Minnesota that they will share in the benefits of the seaway. It is my understanding that a second bill will have to be enacted in order to clear the route so that our States can benefit from the seaway. I would like to hear from you, ALEX, as to whether we have any assurances that we can get that second bill through the Congress.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 16, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HUBERT: Thank you for your fine letter of January 12. You are absolutely right that we propose a second step to look after the needs of the upper Lake States. We plan to introduce an amendment to the regular Rivers and Harbors bill under which there would be deepening on the channels on the Detroit, St. Marys and St. Clair Rivers, and thereby provide 27-foot access to the upper lake region beyond Lake Erie.

According to the Lake Carriers Association, this particular procedure of an amendment to the regular rivers bill is far surer of success than attempting to secure channel deepening through the seaway bill.

Whether or not we are even successful in getting the seaway bill passed, we are going to have to deepen the channel for the benefit of upper Lake States.

Another problem which might have come up if we had attempted to put the channel-deepening amendment in the new seaway bill, is that the channel deepening will be simply a regular authorization by the Federal Government, whereas the seaway bill will be based upon self-liquidation through charging of tolls. To combine both phases in one bill would have meant that one part would be self-liquidating and the other part not so.

With warmest regards, and looking forward to your continued support of this great objective which you have always given so earnestly in the past, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

That correspondence demonstrates that I stated as part of the understanding in connection with my cosponsorship of the Wiley bill the agreement that we would move simultaneously to adopt legislation to deepen the channels.

At the beginning of the year, I accepted an assignment to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There were many reasons for that decision, but one of the most important reasons was my knowledge that the St. Lawrence seaway bill would be discussed and controlled by the committee. I believed that I could serve my State best by serving on the committee and protecting the interests of my State when the St. Lawrence bill is considered by that committee.

It is my intention—and I have so stated to the people of Minnesota—to request full consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for a legislative program which would combine the principles of the Wiley bill with a legislative approval of the channel deepening project.

It may be that an amendment to the Wiley bill should be adopted to unite the two programs. It may be that we should press for separate legislation as better strategy. This is something we should decide in the very near future and is something I am now discussing with my colleagues and associates. In order to have all the alternatives available for ready action, I am submitting at this time three legislative proposals to the Senate. The first is an expanded version of the Wiley bill, which includes a proposal for deepening the channels in the Great Lakes system. The second is an amendment to the Wiley bill, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to carry out the improvements of the Great Lakes system originally proposed in the agreement between the United States and Canada. This amendment would authorize the expenditure of $100 million to carry out the construction. The third is a separate bill dealing exclusively with the improvement of navigation in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie by deepening the channels in the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, the Straits of Mackinac and St. Marys River. The third alternative of an independent bill has some merit in that it will obtain the support of organizations such as the American Association of Port Authorities and the Lake Carriers Association, who have a substantial economic interest in improving the navigation above Lake Erie but who are not all agreed at this time on the desirability of building the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Finally, I make a plea for unity. It is time for us to be responsible to the national welfare. I know that the best interest of Minnesota hinges upon the national welfare and security of the whole Nation. I do not want to embarrass or hinder the effort to build the St. Lawrence seaway simply because my own preferences or ideas have not been fully accepted by my associates. I have assurances that by the time the St. Lawrence seaway project is completed, and this may take until 1959, the job of deepening the channels in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie will likewise be simultaneously completed. Our task now is to unite to attain both of these objectives in a sensible, orderly, and responsible manner. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I pledge my energies to that objective.

AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 589) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway

Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed and will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

The bill (S. 1075) to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced proposes to amend title II of the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies. It follows in general the pattern of S. 1026 which I introduced on February 20.

However, in line with what seem to me to be sound suggestions which have been made by some who have commented about S. 1026, this new bill contains a provision outlawing strikes and lockouts in vital industries for a maximum period of 60 days after the appointment of an emergency board by the President following his proclamation declaring that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from such labor dispute.

I have not introduced this proposal as an amendment to S. 1026 because I feel that it should be considered on its own merit and simultaneously with the consideration of S. 1026.

I believe that somewhere within the scope of these two bills lies a proper solution to national emergencies which are occasioned by labor disputes. The objectives of the two bills are identical.

In answer to those who very appropriately insist that the first consideration in national emergencies resulting from labor disputes should be the public interest, I would point out that I, too, have always believed that the public interest should be of first concern wherever crises of this nature occur. This is exactly why I have proposed S. 1026 and am now proposing the bill which I have just introduced. Under the terms of both of these bills the public interest automatically is paramount.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out sections 206 to 210, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

"SEC. 207. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an emergency board.

"(b) An emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President, but not more than 60 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) After the President has issued a proclamation pursuant to section 206 and until the emergency board appointed under this section has made its report to the President, the parties to the dispute shall refrain from engaging in a strike or lockout.

"(d) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(e) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(f) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(g) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(h) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"SEC. 208. In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs (1) after the emergency board has made its report to the President pursuant to section 207 (b), or (2) in violation of section 207 (c) before the emergency board has made its report, the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board, if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House, for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"SEC. 209. When a dispute under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO SELLING INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CERTAIN INDIANS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the United States code to remove restrictions against the selling of intoxicating liquor to Indians outside reservations.

The bill would carry out the objective of a resolution adopted by the American Legion at its Miami convention, and of a similar resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its national encampment at Los Angeles; also a resolution from my own State of Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions and letter be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolutions and letter will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1080) to amend section 1154 (a) of title 18 of the United States Code to remove restrictions against the selling of intoxicating liquors to Indians outside Indian country, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolutions and letter were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION CALLING FOR REPEAL OF THE INDIAN LIQUOR LAW

"Therefore be it resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Miami, Fla., October 15–18, 1951, do urge repeal of section 241, title 25, U. S. C. A., known as the Indian liquor law, and all laws or parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian any differently than any other citizen of the United States.

"Approved by the American Legion at Miami convention, October 15–18, 1951."

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., February 10, 1953.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Attached please find copy of a resolution adopted by the 53d Annual National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held in August 1952 in Los Angeles, Calif., with respect to the rights of American Indians.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in national encampments, has long championed the rights of American Indians and has insisted that our Indians be considered as first-class rather than third-class citizens. We believe that American Indians should have freedom of choice to the full extent of constitutional rights the same as other citizens in deciding what they should or should not wear, eat, or drink.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

"RESOLUTION 105—RIGHTS OF INDIANS

"Be it resolved by the 53d Annual Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the commander in chief be authorized and directed to petition the Congress to clarify and establish the rights of American Indians so that they shall enjoy all privileges accorded other citizens.

"Approved by 53d National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Los Angeles, Calif., August 3-8, 1952."

To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas since 1826 there has been in existence a law prohibiting the sale or giving away of intoxicants to Indian wards of the United States Government; and

Whereas this law is outmoded, archaic, and not in keeping with modern times and conditions; and

Whereas a number of American boys of Indian ancestry have entered willingly into military service serving in all branches of the Armed Forces of the United States and serving with distinction, many of them having fought in the severest battles of our times; and

Whereas these same honorably discharged veterans are prohibited by law from purchasing any and all beverages which can be purchased by other veterans and are denied certain privileges accorded to others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take such steps as will effectively remove this discrimination to the end that an honorably discharged Indian veteran shall be accorded all rights and privileges enjoyed by his fellow comrades at arms; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, and a digest by section of title VIII of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and digest will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—TEMPORARY EMERGENCY PRICE, WAGE, AND RENT CEILINGS

"SEC. 801. In spite of substantial increases which have occurred since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, prices are now generally in normal relationship and the economy as a whole is relatively stable. It is the sense of the Congress that this stability can be maintained by the full and effective use of indirect controls, barring unanticipated and adverse international developments. There is, however, the ever-present possibility of further Communist aggression which may seriously jeopardize the American economic system unless proper safeguards exist for the immediate imposition of certain economic controls. The necessity for such safeguards is emphasized by the speedily destructive force of modern warfare which allows no delay in the taking of Executive action to insure the preservation of the well-being of the economy. The purpose of this title is to provide a basis for the imposition of price, wage, and rent controls for a temporary period in the event serious economic dislocations develop which threaten the national security or welfare.

"It is the sense of the Congress that direct economic controls are incompatible with the American free enterprise system and should be invoked only if an emergency arises serious enough to threaten the economic well-being or security of the United States. However, if such an emergency should develop the President must have the power to employ immediate economic controls for such reasonable period of time as will give Congress an opportunity to act.

"SEC. 802. There is hereby established a National Advisory Council composed of members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The membership shall be representative of business and industry, agriculture, labor, and military, and consumers. The President shall designate a chairman from among the members. Such Council shall, upon request, advise the President on general policies relating to economic mobilization, in addition to performing the functions prescribed elsewhere in this title. Each member may receive compensation not in excess of $50 per diem for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member, and, while away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while so employed. The members shall, in respect to their functions on the Council, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"SEC. 803. (a) The President is authorized and directed, after consulting the National Advisory Council, whenever he shall find and declare that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability, to establish by Executive order ceilings on (1) the price, rental, commission, margin, rate, fee, charge, or allowance paid or received on the sale or delivery, or the purchase or receipt, by or to any person, of materials and services, (2) wages, salaries, and other compensation paid or received with respect to employment, and (3) rents paid or received for the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, at the levels prevailing as of the close of business on the business day next preceding the day on which the action is taken, or, if none prevailed on such day, then those prevailing on the nearest date on which, in the judgment of the President, they are generally representative. All ceilings established under this title shall terminate 90 days after the issuance of such order, or at such earlier time as Congress may by law provide, and the authority conferred by this title to establish ceilings shall not thereafter be exercised.

"(b) The President may provide exemptions from ceilings in the case of any materials or services or transactions therein, or types of employment, or housing accommodations of any class or in any area, if he finds that (1) such exemption is necessary for national defense, or (2) the imposition of such ceilings would be impracticable or unnecessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the President may exercise any authority granted to him by this title without prior consultation with the National Advisory Council in the event a state of war exists.

"SEC. 804. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. Whenever in the judgment of the President, such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to the recovery of possession) in connection with any housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 805. (a) Regardless of any obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, it shall be unlawful—

"(1) For any person to sell or deliver, or in the regular course of business or trade to buy or receive, any material or service, or to demand, accept, receive, or retain any rent for the use or occupancy of any housing accommodations, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this title or any regulation, order, or requirement issued thereunder, or to offer, solicit, attempt or agree to do any of the foregoing; or

"(2) For any employer to pay, or any employee to receive, any wage, salary, or other compensation in contravention of any regulation or order promulgated by the President under this title.

The President shall prescribe the extent to which any payment (including any wage, salary, or compensation payment), either in money or property, made in contravention of any such regulation, order, or requirement shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any person for the purposes of any other law or regulation, including bases in determining gain for tax purposes.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 806. Nothing in this title shall be construed to require any person to sell any material or service, or to offer any housing accommodations for rent, or to perform personal services.

"SEC. 807. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity, demanded or received for, or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease of housing accommodations.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming or boardinghouse accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"SEC. 808. This title shall become effective on May 1, 1953."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following "and title VIII of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the expiration of 90 days after the President proclaims that the existing international emergency requiring the involvement of Armed Forces of the United States in actual hostilities in the Korean conflict has ended."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 717 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) Sections 702, 703, 705, 706, 707, 710, 711, 713, 715, and 716 of this act shall continue in effect until the expiration of title VIII of this act; except that section 705 shall not become operative until the President establishes ceilings on prices, wages, and rents under title VIII."

The statement and digest presented by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I have prepared an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 in which Senators MAYBANK, BEALL, BUSH, DOUGLAS, FREAR, FULBRIGHT, IVES, LEHMAN, PAYNE, ROBERTSON, and SPARKMAN have joined as cosponsors.

This amendment authorizes and directs the President, after consultation with the National Advisory Council, to invoke for a period not exceeding 90 days a price, wage, and rent freeze if the President finds serious economic dislocations threaten our national security or our economic stability. In the event a state of war exists, consultation by the President with the National Advisory Council is not required before the imposition of such temporary controls.

Authority is granted the President to make such exemptions from the freeze as are necessary for the national defense or where the imposition of such ceilings is impracticable or unnecessary.

The authority of the President to take action under this amendment expires 90 days after he proclaims hostilities in the Korean conflict have ended.

My purpose in drafting this alternative to my original proposal for stand-by controls is to assure the fullest and broadest consideration by the administration and the Congress of the whole problem in the light of logical and possible approaches to this most complicated subject.

It is a possible middle-ground approach consisting of legislation now, in order to authorize a temporary freeze and legislation after the freeze to determine what stabilization action should follow the freeze.

The merit of such an alternative proposal is that it provides a method for restraining sharp price increases in the event of a serious national emergency by allowing a lid to be placed immediately and temporarily on prices, wages, and rents and enables Congress to have a reasonable period of time in which to take action on over-all stabilization legislation, tailored to meet the then existing conditions.

DIGEST BY SECTION OF TITLE VIII, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

SHORT TITLE

Temporary, emergency price, wage, and rent ceilings.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 801: Prices now relatively stable and in normal relationship, though substantially above pre-Korea. Congress feels such stability can be maintained by indirect controls, barring adverse international developments. Threat of further Communist aggression and speedily destructive force of modern warfare require legislative and organizational safeguards to provide machinery for speedy Executive action in the event of serious economic dislocations to insure preservation of well-being of our Nation.

Congress believes direct economic controls incompatible with free enterprise system and should be invoked only if emergency seriously threatens economic or national security. However, should such emergency develop, the President must possess authority to invoke immediate economic controls for reasonable period of time until Congress has opportunity to act.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ESTABLISHED

Section 802: Members appointed by President by and with the advice and consent of Senate. Membership shall be representative of business and industry, agriculture, labor, the military, and consumers. Function to advise President on general policies relating to economic mobilization. Compensation $50 per day while engaged in duties and transportation costs plus not over $15 per diem allowance. Members are exempt from conflict-of-interest statutes.

90-DAY FREEZE

Section 803 (a): President authorized and directed, after consulting with National Advisory Council if he finds exercise necessary in interest of national security or economic stability, to establish ceilings by Executive order on (1) prices, (2) wages, (3) rents on housing accommodations at levels close of business day next preceding day freeze ordered. If no such levels prevailed, then those prevailing nearest date generally representative. All ceilings effective for 90 days after freeze order issued, or for such shorter period as Congress may by law provide.

EXEMPTIONS

Section 803 (b): President may provide exemptions if he finds (1) necessary for national defense, or (2) imposition impracticable or unnecessary.

STATE OF WAR

Section 803 (c): In event state of war exists, President may exercise authority without prior consultation with National Advisory Council.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Section 804: President may make rules and regulations and orders necessary to carry out purposes of title. President may prohibit speculative or manipulative practices (including eviction practices) in connection with housing accommodations which in his judgment would result in rental increases.

VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES

Section 805 (a) (1): Violations of price ceilings made unlawful.

Section 805 (a) (2): Violation of wage provisions unlawful.

President may prescribe extent overpayment may be disregarded in determining costs or expenses for purposes of any other law, including basis in determining gain for tax purposes.

Section 805 (b): Willful violation punishable by fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE PROHIBITED

Section 806: No person shall be required to sell any material or service or perform personal services.

DEFINITIONS

Section 807 (a): "Rent" means any consideration or benefit received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of a lease of housing accommodations.

Section 807 (b): "Housing accommodations" means any building or structure used for living or dwelling purposes together with privileges, services, furnishings, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

Section 808: Effective date, May 1, 1953.

TERMINATION

Section 2 (a): This title terminates 90 days after President proclaims end of hostilities in Korea.

Section 2 (b): Incorporates and extends sections 702 (definitions), 703 (delegation of authority and creation of new agencies), 705 (obtaining information and requiring maintenance of records), 706 (injunction, venue, service of process), 707 (exculpatory provision), 710 (authority to create super grades, and prohibits speculation on commodity exchanges), 711 (authorizes appropriations), 713 (provisions applicable to United States, Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia), 715 (unconstitutionality of provision not to affect balance of act), 716 (persons advocating right to strike against Government or member of subversive organizations not to be employed under act and such persons employed may be prosecuted). Section 705 not operative until freeze invoked.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the results of the very recent national election have revealed conclusively that our women compatriots have assumed an ever-increasing role of cooperation and effectiveness. The weight of their accomplishments cannot be minimized. President Eisenhower has already recognized these worthy and important efforts through the appointment of outstanding women to Federal posts.

The women of America have thus assumed a rightful and increasing responsibility for citizenship which has now become an integral part of our way of life. Their contribution to this great Nation's leadership in domestic and world affairs cannot be denied.

In the light of these facts, it is my considered feeling, which is shared by many, many others, that the women of this great Nation are entitled to an equality of rights under the law. Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the

junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5) to increase the salaries of judges of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman; and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on May 22, 1953; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That the statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO COMPOSITION AND JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT—COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 44) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, which was introduced by me on February 16, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF SENATOR WILEY AS DELEGATE TO SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by appointment of the President, I served as a delegate to the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations which met in New York last year from October 14 to December 21.

I now ask unanimous consent to submit a report to the Senate on my service as a delegate, together with certain speeches which I made in the U. N., and that they may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received; and, without objection, will be printed as a Senate document, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

REPORT OF SENATOR GREEN AS DELEGATE TO SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GREEN subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I were appointed by President Truman delegates to the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations. The Senator from Wisconsin has just requested unanimous consent to submit a report on his work as delegate. That request was unanimously granted. I now ask unanimous consent that I may have the same privilege of submitting a report, together with certain speeches which I made in the United Nations, and that they may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and, without objection, will be printed as a Senate document, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

Address entitled "Freedom, the Key to Progress," delivered by him before National Canners' Association at Chicago, Ill., on February 21, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the National Conference of Christians and Jews at Cleveland, Ohio, on February 23, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at the Lincoln Day exercises of the York-Adams Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, at Gettysburg National Cemetery on February 14, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him for broadcast during Brotherhood Week.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "The Opposition's Job as a Democrat Sees It," written by Senator DOUGLAS, and published in the New York Times magazine section of February 22, 1953.

Article entitled "FEPC Bill Termed Most Important," written by Ken Turner, and published in the Dayton Daily News of August 16, 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address delivered by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, at 56th annual convention of American National Cattlemen's Association, at Kansas City, Mo., on January 5, 1953.

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by the Ambassador of India, Mr. G. L. Mehta, at the sixth National Men of Science and Industry dinner, on November 13, 1952.

Article entitled "General Pick says Missouri Basin Must Look Ahead 50 Years," written by Mr. John Jarrell and published recently in the Omaha World-Herald.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address entitled "Lest We Forget," delivered by C. A. Hawley, of Ephrata, Wash., before the Toastmasters Club on January 30, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Address delivered by Dr. Daniel A. Poling on the 10th observance of the sinking of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Letter addressed to him by Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency, regarding prices paid for various defense minerals and metals.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Report by Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at annual meeting of the association in San Francisco on January 26, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "New Voices Speak for Lower Tariffs," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 20, 1953.

Editorial entitled "It's Time To See What Yalta Really Meant to History," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 20, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Letter addressed to him by A. L. Camp, of Boulder, Colo., in relation to the Voice of America program.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article from the Farm Journal written by Wheeler McMillen, with reference to revision of congressional salaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy;

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France;

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to China; and

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR IVES TO THE PEOPLE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on this day 5 years ago the ruthless dictatorship of Soviet communism was forced upon the free people of Czechoslovakia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of my message to the Czechoslovak people on this anniversary of the Communist coup d'etat.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES TO THE PEOPLE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP, FEBRUARY 25, 1953

The 25th day of February has become a symbol of the free world's determination to resist the ruthless forces of totalitarian imperialism. On that day in 1948, freedom in Czechoslovakia fell victim to the treacherous Communist tyranny.

After 5 years of merciless subjugation, the torch of liberty still burns brightly in the hearts of the gallant Czech people. Their glorious history of opposition to oppression and bigotry in any form and the legacy of freedom which the Czech patriots have given to the world will sustain the suffering Czech people until the invader is driven from their soil.

As the Czechoslovak nation turns to the free world for help and inspiration, the people of the United States reaffirm their traditional friendship for the courageous people of Czechoslovakia.

On this fifth anniversary of the Communist coup d'etat, every loyal American extends deepest sympathy and expresses fervent hope and prayer that the day of liberation for Czechoslovakia is near.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN EDUCATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of heat, but not a comparable amount of light, engendered over the public inquiry into subversive influences in education.

Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of that time-honored institution of higher learning in my own State, Rutgers University, has expressed a mature view of the investigation undertaken last year by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

I believe that every colleague on the subcommittee, of which I am now honored to be a member, shares my admiration for the far-sighted statement made by Dr. Jones in supporting the decision of the university's board of trustees that two Rutgers professors be dismissed for refusing to reply to questions concerning Communist affiliations.

Dr. Jones knows the meaning of the term "academic freedom." This distinguished educator comprehends that there is nothing academic about freedom; that it is a hard-won right, a right that must be protected by vigilance against what he recognizes as a ruthless tyranny which would pervert the meaning of every good and honest privilege we hold so dear.

It does not take much courage to stand and cry "academic freedom" every time a teacher refuses to answer a public question about membership in a subversive organization. It does take sense and courage for Dr. Jones to draw that fine line between inquiry and inquisition which is all-important in judging such cases.

Dr. Jones shows us how sensible inquiry by the Congress may join harmoniously with a university's own high sense of responsibility.

I believe that an editorial published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 22, 1953, tells the Rutgers story in lucid fashion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACADEMIC GOOD SENSE

It is refreshing, in the current emotional uproar over the investigation of communism in our colleges, to read the calm and sensible statement on this subject by Lewis Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University.

Two Rutgers professors refused last year to answer questions concerning Communist affiliations put to them by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. They relied on their constitutional protection against possible self-incrimination.

Their case was carefully considered at Rutgers. A faculty advisory committee strongly urged that no action be taken against the two. But the board of trustees finally concluded that the professors must answer the questions or resign, and their connection with the university was severed last December 31.

The basic contention of those who supported the professors in their stand was that the interrogation by the Senate subcommittee was an invasion of academic freedom and a threat to the integrity of our educational system. Dr. Jones, however, did not agree.

In his view, no issue of freedom of teaching or of the right to hold unorthodox opinions was at stake. If there had been, the university would have strongly supported the two professors. "The questions Professors Heimlich and Finley refused to answer," Dr. Jones declared, "did not relate to their opinions, but to their possible membership in the Communist Party. Such membership is not compatible with the freedom of thought and inquiry on which American teaching and research are based. It is no invasion of that freedom, but a necessary measure of the protection of the freedom of all of us, to seek to determine whether teachers and others in positions of trust are committed to the discipline and program of the Communist Party."

Arguing that the public has a right, through its legally constituted representatives, to inquire into the Communist Party membership of individuals, and contending that the party is a conspiratorial organization, Dr. Jones continued:

"Universities, both public and private, are strongly affected with a public interest. They occupy a position of central importance in our free society, embodying highest aspirations and hope for material and spiritual progress. They are at once the most characteristic expression and the principal guardians of the western tradition of freedom. They are charged with the preservation of the cultural heritage, the discovery of new knowledge and its dissemination, the education of young people as persons, workers and citizens. They cannot confine themselves to techniques, and adopt an attitude of neutrality and withdrawal in the face of the central moral issue of our times. * * * Public investigation of the universities is legitimate and should be frankly met. It implies no invasion of academic independence.

"The interference of any outside group with the proper functions of the university must be resisted, whatever the cost in criticism and loss of financial support. In the determination of the curriculum, methods of teaching and research, the selection of faculty or speakers, the permission of free discussion, the university must be completely independent. In all these matters, which relate to the proper performance of the intellectual functions of a university, public inquiry is legitimate; interference or dictation is not. * * * It follows that for members of a university faculty to refuse to give a rational account of their position on vital community issues not only cannot be defended by an appeal to academic freedom, but in fact cuts the ground out from under academic freedom itself."

The importance of Dr. Jones' statement, together with the action taken at Rutgers, lies in the fact that it outlines a positive approach to the problem of Communist infiltration of our educational system. There is good reason to maintain a close watch on congressional investigations of the educational system, for they often are attended by serious abuses. But those who are content merely to raise the cry of academic freedom, and do nothing, are defeating their own purpose. For public opinion, quite properly, is not going to tolerate Communist infiltration of our schools and colleges. The best way to deal with this problem is for the schools and colleges to do their own housecleaning. That is what Rutgers has done, and that is what Dr. Jones is advising others to do. His statement is one that should be read by all who are concerned with this serious and vital matter.

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT POLITICS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes about the agricultural situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, during recent days there has been on the floor of the Senate considerable discussion relative to Government policies to be followed in the agricultural field. Secretary Benson has stated that he feels the ideal policy would be one which assured the farmer of parity but provided, at the same time, that the farmer should operate increasingly in a free economy. Having lived all my life in the strictly agricultural area of western Nebraska, I believe I realize both the economic and social implications of such a policy. My life has been spent in an area which is largely dependent on livestock, and certainly there is no segment of our agricultural economy which is more indi-

vidualistic in its attitude than is the livestock industry, or more anxious to avoid Government control.

However, I take this opportunity to suggest that in fields seemingly far away from agriculture our Government has been placing under our economy many stilts which make it almost impossible for American agriculture to operate at a profit. Farmers and stockmen have found it very difficult to make any profit during the past year because of the fact that the sale price of their products has been on the downgrade, while the cost of farm labor and the cost of machinery has been very much on the upgrade. If the farmer and cattleman today are to be asked to sell in a free economy, they must also have the opportunity to employ labor and buy machinery in a free economy.

In this connection, I wish to describe what has happened in Nebraska. Under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, the construction of the Gavins Point Dam is soon to be started in northeastern Nebraska. It appears that under the law the Federal Department of Labor has authority to fix the wages which are to be paid under that contract. A hearing was recently held by the Department of Labor, and the Department is, seemingly, about to grant a wage increase of from 15 cents to 40 cents an hour higher than any wages paid in that area of Nebraska for certain skilled and semiskilled labor. This means that a Government stilt is being put under labor which will affect not only the wages paid under that contract but also will indirectly affect the wages to be paid by Nebraska farmers for farm labor. Likewise, it will affect the wages which will be paid in all other construction jobs throughout that area. Therefore, the State of Nebraska will undoubtedly have to pay higher wages when highways are to be built or public buildings are to be erected. The point I make is that, under the provisions of Federal law, labor is not operating in a free economy, but is being given the advantage of Government stilts. It should be remembered that the added cost of this labor will be paid by the taxpayers, the contractors having a cost-plus contract.

The farmers and cattlemen are greatly worried over the fact that the value of their products is on the decline, while the cost of their labor and their machinery is on the increase. This decision by the Department of Labor is, seemingly, going to make it tougher for them. I only suggest that if the farmer is to operate in a free economy, it will require much coordination in other fields of Government activity to make certain that the farmer is not seriously discriminated against.

Our agricultural economy is affected by every activity of government. It is affected by today's events in Korea. It is affected by our trade and tariff policies. It is affected by our tax legislation. It is affected by our labor laws. The interests of our farmers and stockmen must be kept in mind, no matter what Government policy may be under consideration.

ECONOMIC NEED FOR INDEPENDENT LOCALLY OWNED BANKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, is the dwindling continuity of locally owned banks an illustration of what is happening to many segments of this Nation's economic base?

Because it is of interest to the entire Nation and for the reason that I believe a North Dakota businessman has identified an economic problem worthy of the attention of our country's best economists, and of the new Republican administration, I wish to call attention to the problem. As a matter of identification of this businessman and of his background and capacity, I may say that he is Richard H. Barry, of Fargo, N. Dak., whose integrity and sincerity are above reproach.

About 5 years ago he conceived the idea that there was an economic need for something in the nature of a company to help individuals finance the purchase of stock of small independent banks as one of the means of perpetuating their existence. His own record of successful business accomplishment and experience in banking and raising money for small businesses has, for a number of years, attracted considerable attention among bankers and businessmen throughout the Northwest and in other sections of the Nation.

About 3 months ago he decided to make an exhaustive exploration of the economic problem as he saw it and the mechanics of a possible solution. He has submitted his ideas to more than 58 bankers in the Midwest, including the Federal Reserve banks in Minneapolis and Chicago. During the past few weeks he has explained his idea and his proposal to the Federal Reserve System, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to the United States Treasury Department, to the Department of Commerce, and to one of the economic advisers to President Eisenhower. He has generated considerable interest in the merits of the premise upon which he is working and upon the mechanics of how the economic problem conceivably could be reduced. It is only to be expected that in pioneering an idea involving a scope such as this he would not encounter complete understanding of the problem or of his suggested proposal in all quarters of government.

He has, however, made considerable headway in converting many persons to his ideas. He is, in effect, stymied temporarily in one agency which does not necessarily disagree with him, but which, in effect, maintains the position that, while his plan is not in conflict with Federal statutes, there is on the other hand no Federal statute expressly approving the mechanics of certain of the proposed details.

Mr. Barry has concluded that while his ideas are sound, he may be confronted with an educational program which may delay starting his plan for 1 or 2 years. Because I feel there is much merit in the groundwork which he has developed in focusing attention on a major economic problem, I am submitting it herewith as he has identified it to me.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ILLUSTRATION OF WHAT IS HAPPENING TO MANY SEGMENTS OF THIS NATION'S ECONOMIC BASE

There is an old saying that communities or nations do not just happen, but are built where men with vision and leadership want to build them. It can also be said that communities or nations do not just happen to disintegrate, but men without vision and leadership let them disintegrate.

Let enough communities disintegrate and there is a weakening of the entire economic structure of a nation.

Today something is happening to a basic unit in many communities in certain regions of the United States that foreshadows a serious threat of the future competitive situation as well as the future prosperity, property values, school systems, and general happiness of the residents of those communities. It has to do with the continuity of the locally owned bank. There has developed, because of a number of factors—among them inflation and high taxes—a steadily growing problem where liquidation or merger of the locally owned bank, in more and more instances, looks unavoidable to the major stockholders. These stockholders, who many times are actively managing their banks, are finding because of age or illness that it is necessary for them to sell. But they are unable to find buyers with sufficient capital to purchase what is often one of the largest corporations in the community from the standpoint of capital structure. Individuals with banking experience and all of the required capital to purchase a bank have become as scarce as the proverbial "hen's teeth." Individuals with sufficient banking experience and part of the required capital for the most part have been unable to obtain long-term credit. The problem thus created can well be vital to those communities and in the long run to the Nation.

The purpose of these comments is not just to spotlight the problem, but to generate thinking directed toward a solution. The hard fact is that in 1952 in this Nation each week an average of two locally owned banks went out of existence while only one new bank started—despite the fact that this country is growing at the rate of 2 million persons per year. More locally owned banks went out of existence in 1952 than in any year since 1943.

This economic problem which encompasses more than the future of locally owned banks has been developing for several years but leadership has not been assumed to assemble possible solutions.

The problem is broad. To open up more branch or chain banking eases part of the pain but does not get at the economic problem of dwindling continuity of local ownership. There are many locally owned companies in existence today who have accumulated sufficient capital to distribute the products of such manufacturers as General Electric, Ford, or Caterpillar, and who are also confronted with a similar and growing problem of finding buyers with sufficient capital and capacity.

There are solutions to many of these problems in the banking business and for business in general, although in the case of banks, subject to three and sometimes four

supervising agencies, the complexity of our structure of government is a formidable barrier to break through for the average constituent with a suggestion.

If there is merit and economic soundness in not permitting many local segments of this Nation's broad economic base to disappear, now is as good as any time for action.

Herein may be another opportunity for the new Republican administration to recognize a widespread problem of small business and to accept the leadership in seeking the solution.

ENSLAVEMENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes on the enslavement of Czechoslovakia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, February 25 is one of the dark days on the history book of freedom, for this day marks the anniversary of the closing of the Iron Curtain around Czechoslovakia. This one-time land of freedom and true democracy has always been a thorn in the side of totalitarian governments in Europe. For centuries it has given its sons and its daughters to the fight for freedom. Today, even after 5 years of Soviet domination, we are sure the light of freedom still burns brightly in the hearts and minds of the people of Czechoslovakia. We look forward to the day when this light will once more shine undimmed for Czechoslovakia in the halls of nations.

We in the United States and the free world have not forgotten our ties with the liberty-loving people of Czechoslovakia. The strength of the free world has increased greatly in the past 5 years as has the determination to extend to all enslaved peoples the boon of freedom.

The most concrete way in which the United States can immediately express its admiration and sympathy for this brave nation is by extending a helping hand to those Czechoslovakians who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain. These refugees from tyranny are the representatives of their less fortunate countrymen. We must welcome our fair share of them to this country and assure that all of them find safe haven and an opportunity for livelihood.

For this purpose we in the United States must strive for early revision of the McCarran Immigration Act. This is one positive thing we can do now for the people of Czechoslovakia and for the cause of freedom throughout the world.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, although the morning hour has not been concluded I suggest the absence of a quorum at this time. Further proceedings under the morning hour may be had after the call of the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Beall	Bridges
Anderson	Bennett	Bush
Barrett	Bricker	Butler, Md.
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Byrd	Hill	Millikin
Capehart	Hoey	Monroney
Carlson	Holland	Morse
Case	Humphrey	Mundt
Chavez	Hunt	Murray
Clements	Ives	Neely
Cordon	Jackson	Payne
Daniel	Jenner	Potter
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kennedy	Smathers
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Kuchel	Sparkman
Frear	Langer	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Symington
George	Long	Taft
Gillette	Magnuson	Thye
Goldwater	Malone	Tobey
Gore	Mansfield	Watkins
Green	Martin	Welker
Griswold	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	McCarran	Williams
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

HOMETOWN, U. S. A.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak at this time for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to introduce to the Senate of the United States, this afternoon, Hometown, U. S. A.

In my sincere judgment, Hometown U. S. A. embodies the spirit of the American people in their finest hour. It is a project formulated by the American Legion to establish a closer degree of personal contact between our Armed Forces overseas and their families and loved ones here, through the exchange of personal recorded messages.

Hometown, U. S. A., is one of the greatest morale-boosting instruments ever effected in our era. It embodies the fulfillment of the strongest desire of our men and women in the armed services overseas, namely, the realization of closer touch with loved ones at home.

We should applaud the American Legion organization for again rising to meet a most urgent need. That need, Mr. President, is the maintenance of a high degree of morale in our fighting troops overseas. The Department of Defense and the heads of the separate services have given their enthusiastic endorsement to this project. Maj. Gen. Floyd Parks, Chief of Information for the Army, has cabled all theater commanders explaining Hometown, U. S. A., and urging its activation at all bases. Hundreds of radio stations throughout the country have pledged full cooperation in broadcasting Hometown messages.

In these hours of international tension, it is important—indeed, it is imperative—that we exercise every effort to keep morale high. I know of no better way to do just this than to endorse this fine program which is so much in keeping with our American heritage.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an official statement from the national headquarters of the American Legion which outlines in detail Hometown, U. S. A., and points out the paramount importance of instituting this worthwhile project as soon as possible.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMETOWN, U. S. A.

On August 23, 1952, at Times Square in New York City, the American Legion launched a new project which involves public relations in the broadest and best sense. It is called Hometown, U. S. A. Present at the inaugural ceremony, in addition to the more than 10,000 people who literally jammed Times Square from curb to curb, were the then national commander of the American Legion, Donald R. Wilson, Mayor Impellitteri, of New York City, and many other dignitaries.

Hometown, U. S. A., is a project through which the American Legion provides for unique and personal contact between members of the Armed Forces overseas and their loved ones in this country. The idea is simple enough: mothers, fathers, friends, and other loved ones record a brief greeting together with a tune request; these recorded messages are then processed and mailed by the American Legion to service men or women overseas and played over the Armed Forces radio stations.

At the same time through special arrangement with the armed services and with the approval of Defense Secretary Lovett, overseas personnel will record similar messages to their home folks. These messages will be cleared through a central American Legion office and forwarded to the appropriate hometown radio stations for broadcast. Hundreds of radio stations in this country, as well as many stations on the Armed Forces radio network will devote portions of their broadcasting time to Hometown, U. S. A., messages.

While this is a new activity for the American Legion, the basic idea has been tested, and proved successful. On August 28, 1948, a program identified as Stateside Calling was introduced over WTVM, the Armed Forces radio station in the Philippines. The format was the same—featuring an exchange of broadcast messages and tune dedications between troops in the Philippines and their folks back home. This program went over big; it proved to be a tremendous morale booster both for the troops and the home folks, and radio stations in this country cooperated even to the extent of notifying relatives in advance to be sure they would listen in for the greeting from their special GI.

The officer in charge of this project in the Philippines was released from the Army early in 1952. He came to the American Legion with the idea of developing and sponsoring it on a world-wide basis. That was how Hometown, U. S. A., came to be launched at the time of the New York national convention. You will be interested to know that it was a most successful launching. Twenty-seven hundred messages were tape-recorded by Legionnaires and others, in special booths provided for that purpose, and all 2,700 have since been processed and sent overseas to Armed Forces radio stations.

Now, I don't have to point out the terrific human appeal of this type of service. It provides the next best thing to face-to-face contact between mothers and sons, wives and husbands, sweethearts and friends. It permits a relationship at the heartstring level—a relationship that the individuals can understand.

The Department of Defense and the separate services have given official and enthusiastic approval to the project as a valuable aid to troop morale. Secretary Lovett personally has directed maximum cooperation on the part of all commands—particularly the special service officers who have been assigned responsibility for handling the mechanics of the operation overseas. The Chief of Information for the Army, Maj. Gen. Floyd Parks, has cabled theater commanders explaining Hometown, U. S. A., in detail and urging its activation on all bases. A directive letter over the Army Adjutant General's signature will go to all special service officers and public information officers from the command to unit level, calling for maximum use of facilities and publicity in behalf of the project. Enclosed with the letter will be a complete Hometown, U. S. A., kit, including a standard operational procedure, sample request blanks, photos of suggested visual displays, etc. Armed Forces radio service overseas, comprised of more than 80 individual radio stations organized in 6 networks, will earmark 60 minutes of air time daily for broadcast of the messages and tune dedications.

As mentioned above, we have received letters from hundreds of radio stations throughout the country, offering their complete cooperation and commending this project, and we expect to hear from many more. Though we realize many radio stations cannot utilize the short transcriptions coming back from overseas, perhaps they can utilize the tune dedications and cheery messages for the folks in their particular transmitter field.

Write us and let us know if we are "off-mike" in regard to this project. Drop us a line anyway—we'd love to hear from you.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I convey to my colleagues in the Senate the formal word of the passing of one of our devoted former members, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr.

I now send to the desk the text of a resolution of condolence, and ask unanimous consent that it be read and presently considered.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 85) was read, and the Senate proceeded to consider it, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., formerly a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from 1905 to 1947, the State of Wisconsin was represented in the United States Senate by a member of the La Follette family.

The La Follettes served here, as they served at the helm of the State government in Madison, with courage, with determination, with integrity, with a willingness to take on many a cause—popular or unpopular—if they believed in it.

The great father of this distinguished family, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., was a man of the deepest convictions, a crusading battler for what he felt to be right. He left an unmistakable mark in the history of my State in the form of a great deal of pioneering social legislation. He engaged in many great controversies on the domestic and foreign scenes. He did not shrink from any battle where he felt the interests of his State and Nation were involved. Men disagreed with him, but they respected him and admired his courage.

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was a worthy heir to the fighting La Follette tradition. When elected at the age of 30, he was the youngest Senator since Henry Clay. He carried on the progressive tradition established by his father. At times there was great controversy over the policies which he, too, advocated and the legislation which he advanced; but Bob La Follette, Jr., was always fair, always just, always considerate.

He was an industrious Senator. He worked night and day at the job. He left behind him many warm friendships among the Members of this body.

The Legislative Reorganization Act which he helped to write in conjunction with the present distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] stands as one of his brightest contributions; but it is by no means his only contribution, as a look at the record which he compiled down through the years will show.

Bob La Follette, Jr., was a gentleman, quiet, mild-mannered, and yet one in whom deep fires of convictions burned.

He was careful; he was studious and conscientious.

Wisconsin mourns his passing. Friend or foe in the Badger State, we respected him as a worthy son of a great father and a loyal American.

We will miss his presence, but we will remember the spirit which guided him.

We salute his memory. We are proud to have associated with him.

We say hail and farewell to you, Bob La Follette, Jr.

We express our deepest sympathy to his family and dear ones.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we were shocked by the sad news of the tragic death of former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr.

When I came to the Senate some 15 years ago I was a member with him of the old Senate Committee on Education and Labor, a committee busy with much legislation and many matters. In those early years of my service here there was no member so kind, so thoughtful, and so helpful to me. Our association soon ripened into strong friendship.

Whether one agreed with Bob, as we affectionately called him, or disagreed, no one could work with him without holding him in warm appreciation and the highest respect.

He was a friend, generous, steadfast, and true. He needed no assurances. There was no vanity in him. There was no retribution in his spirit. There was no littleness in the man. He never lost his sense of justice or of the eternal fitness of things.

Born with a great name and a great heritage, he walked humbly with his God. He was a believer in righteousness at home and abroad. He was a believer in freedom at home and abroad. He was a believer in the capacity of a self-governing people to shape its life for the growing happiness and competence of all.

He never wavered in his support of measures he felt for the common good, striving always to improve the social and economic position of the people in the framework of the national welfare. His was the disposition to preserve and his the ability to improve.

He fought for agriculture and the American farmer, for the workingman, for the liberties of the individual, for the disadvantaged, and for opportunity and justice for all men.

He was our leader in the fight for congressional reorganization, that representative government might be more efficient, more effective, and more responsive to the needs and welfare of the people.

He fought monopoly and privilege and special interest. He believed in the democracy of man, as he believed in the democracy of our institutions, and he lived up to his creed.

He opposed our entrance into World War II, but, like that other great American, Arthur Vandenberg, with whom he was in close association as members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, once our country was in the war he gave his all in his support of our Armed Forces and for the winning of the war.

No Member of this body divined sooner than he the evil nature of communism, its debasement of the worth and dignity of the individual, its denial of freedom and its enslavement of the minds and bodies of men, and its implacable hostility to our country and its free institutions.

After his retirement from the Senate he rendered yeoman service as a member of the Harriman Commission, that laid the economic foundations for the Marshall plan.

Most of all, Bob La Follette had the superb courage to stand alone—the courage to fight on single handed and all alone in the face of overwhelming odds. The great and worthy son of a great father, he was the warrior, the patriot, the battler for the right as God gave him to see it, the devoted, indefatigable public servant, the great American, who brought new luster and new fame to a great name in American history.

Bob La Follette was the devoted and generous husband, the gracious and loving father. To his good and faithful wife and to his two fine, splendid boys we extend our sympathy this day.

America is a better land because of the life and service of Bob La Follette. There was no braver, manlier man.

We loved him living. We love him now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution (S. Res. 85) submitted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that we shall designate Monday, March 2, at 12 o'clock noon, for memorial exercises for the late Robert M. La Follette, Jr., former Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., formerly a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Wisconsin submitted an identical resolution earlier in the day, and it was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move at this time that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn out of respect to the memory of the able former Senator from Wisconsin, the late Robert M. La Follette, Jr.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that, after the morning hour is concluded, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SILVER PURCHASE ACT OF 1934

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in recent days, since the change of administration and since the election in November, suggestions have been made by certain persons interested in the mining industry, that there might be a possibility of the new administration's asking for a repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. I do not know to what extent such a thought permeates the new administration, nor did I observe in the general legislative proposals submitted any suggestion that the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 should be repealed. But we in the West are vitally interested in this matter. In order that the RECORD may be clear, and in order to set aright those who might fall into error as to the value of the Silver Purchase Act, I think there ought to be placed in the RECORD at this time, possibly to forestall any such suggestion—although the act referred to was a so-called Roosevelt New Deal piece of legislation—an indication of what the Silver Purchase Act has meant to the people of the United States, and particularly to the people of the West.

One of the suggestions of repeal, Mr. President, comes from a very eminent banker and financier, a resident of my home city, Seattle, who should understand a great deal about the fiscal policies of the Nation. I think my old friend, Mr. Jay Morrison, is somewhat misinformed when, in a letter addressed to the Wall Street Journal under date of February 11, he asks:

Can you think of any item of the budget where an easier saving can be made than that obtainable by prompt repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934?

In answer to the question, I sent to the Wall Street Journal a letter which was recently published. In the course of my letter I said:

Mr. Morrison is apparently misinformed of the facts in connection with the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. In the first place, not an ounce of silver has been purchased under this act for the past 11 years. In the second place, and most importantly, on every ounce of silver that has been so purchased, the Government has made an enormous profit.

The profit was derived by acquiring the silver at prices ranging from approximately 43 cents to 79 cents an ounce, and coining it at its monetary price of $1.29 an ounce. The monetary price was established under the First Coinage Act, approved by President George Washington on April 2, 1792, which stipulates that 371¼ grains of pure silver constitute the silver dollar as our unit of currency. Since the monetary value of 371¼ grains equals $1, a troy ounce containing 480 grains of silver has a monetary value of $1.2929. The spread between the price the Treasury paid for the silver and $1.29 has been clear profit to our Government. The profit that has accrued under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 is $833,600,000 and the total profit on all silver purchases derived by our Government since the First Coinage Act to December 31, 1952, is $1,981,000,000.

I said further in my letter:

If Mr. Morrison desires to find "an item of the budget" wherein a saving can be made he will most assuredly have to look elsewhere, for the purchases of silver made by the Government since its inception have always resulted in a profit and not an expense to the taxpayers. * * *

Further, Mr. President, I said in my letter:

Incidentally, I hope this is not a sample of the kind of economizing to be undertaken by the new administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the Wall Street Journal printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER PURCHASES

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

On February 11 there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a letter from Mr. Jay Morrison, Seattle, Wash., in which he calls attention to the fact that "the new administration has pledged reduced expenditures" and then attempts to point out (erroneously) that a saving can be made by "prompt repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934." He then asks the question, "Can you think of any item of the budget where an easier saving can be made than that obtainable by prompt repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934?"

Mr. Morrison is apparently misinformed of the facts in connection with the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. In the first place, not an ounce of silver has been purchased under this act for the past 11 years. In the second place, and most importantly, on every ounce of silver that has been so purchased the Government has made an enormous profit.

The profit was derived by acquiring the silver at prices ranging from approximately 43 cents to 79 cents an ounce, and coining it at its monetary price of $1.29 an ounce. The monetary price was established under the First Coinage Act, approved by President George Washington on April 2, 1792, which stipulates that 371¼ grains of pure silver constitute the silver dollar as our unit of currency. Since the monetary value of 371¼ grains equals $1, a troy ounce containing 480 grains of silver has a monetary value of $1.2929. The spread between the price the Treasury paid for the silver and $1.29 has been clear profit to our Government. The profit that has accrued under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 is $833,600,000 and the total profit on all silver purchases derived by our Government since the First Coinage Act to December 31, 1952, is $1,981,000,000.

If Mr. Morrison desires to find an item of the budget wherein a saving can be made, he will most assuredly have to look elsewhere, for the purchases of silver made by the Government since its inception have always resulted in a profit and not an expense to the taxpayers. The acquisition of silver by the United States is probably its most lucrative enterprise.

Incidentally I hope this is not a sample of the kind of economizing to be undertaken by the new administration.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator from Washington.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

BUILDING STRONGLY, FROM THE GRASS ROOTS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the 16th annual National Farm Institute, Fort Des Moines Hotel, Des Moines, Iowa, on Saturday, February 21, 1953.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S BUILD STRONG, FROM THE GRASS ROOTS

It is a signal honor and a very great pleasure to be here today. This great farm forum is well and favorably known. I realize that the obligation and challenge involved in addressing you is, in the light of national and world conditions, almost overwhelming.

Coming here has aroused a flood of happy memories. I love this great productive area where I came with my new bride in an old Ford pickup 26 years ago. I love the State of Iowa. My father—one of the best farmers Idaho has produced—spent 2 years here and in Illinois, at his own expense, as a missionary for his church. He sold half of the farm so he could go. Mother was left at home with 7 children, of which I was the oldest, about 14. The eighth child was born some 4 months after father left.

Those were difficult but happy and profitable days, looking after our share of the crops and managing a dairy herd. I do not remember ever hearing a murmur from mother's lips during those two eventful but trying years. I recall the thrill of father's letters written from what seemed then far-away places—Cedar Rapids, Springfield, Davenport, Chicago, Waterloo, Des Moines, and many others.

It is reported that some have thought the new Secretary of Agriculture has neglected this great, productive State of Iowa. Please be assured I will never knowingly do such a thing. And please be assured also that I think not less, but more of those who have spoken up in friendly criticism of the Secretary. I admire their interest and pride in this fine State and this most productive Corn Belt area.

Since 1927, particularly when I did a master of science thesis at Ames on the subject, The Beef Cattle Situation in the Northern Range Area in Its Relation to the Iowa Feeder, I've had a high appreciation for this State and the entire area represented here today.

The same year I came to appreciate your progressive spirit as I rode on a special

4-H Club train to the International Livestock Show in Chicago. On that train I heard for the first time, with the use of corn stalks for emphasis, the singing of your great song, That's Where the Tall Corn Grows.

Since then, typical of Corn Belt progress, you are growing corn stalks less tall but producing a lot more bushels per acre.

I am deeply grateful for this privilege of speaking to you today. I am here to report to this great National Farm Institute on the solid progress that is being made toward a more secure and permanently prosperous agriculture. You are leaders in this largest of all industries—the agriculture of our Nation. If through you I can contribute, even in a small way, to the development of sound agricultural programs, my trip to this forum will be fully justified. At the outset, I am happy to pledge to you and farmers everywhere that I will always strive to do that which is in the best interests of farm people and the Nation.

The state of the Union message of President Eisenhower has produced a tremendously favorable response. As leaders, never miss the opportunity to drive home the vital facts and calls for action contained in that address. Such facts as these are vital to every farm family as well as for all citizens of the United States.

Current year's budget deficit $5.9 billion.

Budget presented before this administration took office indicates a budgetary deficit of $9.9 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

The national debt is now more than $265 billion.

In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payment totals over $80 billion.

Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities, so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description.

Farmers, do not do business on such an unsound financial basis. Today there is squarely before us this question: How strongly will we back the President and the Congress we have elected when they undertake to cut Federal expenses and balance the budget?

Certainly we must all stand with the President when he says:

"The first order of business is the elimination of the annual deficit—an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar."

Congress is deeply concerned, as we all are, about the decline in prices of farm products. I am here to report that the agricultural interests of the Nation are being made a first order of business by your Senators and Congressmen. Every day they are calling for information and seeking to know what can and should be done to make the position of the farmer more secure.

As citizens, we can be proud of the men and women we have sent to Congress. We shall do all within our power in helping them to determine what are sound laws for agriculture. When laws have been placed on the statute books, we must see that they are effectively administered, and in accordance with the intent of Congress.

The wise counsel and guidance which we are receiving from your Senators and Congressmen is deeply appreciated and is helping to make our work more productive.

The farm problems handed us are complex and difficult.

Over a billion dollars' worth of farm products were owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation when we took office.

Butter is being purchased at a rapid rate—at times, well over 2 million pounds each day. The Government owns over 75 million pounds of butter, 17 million pounds of cheese, and more than 101 million pounds of dried milk.

Some corn has been in storage over 4 years, and some of it after going out of condition has been coming onto the market when there is already too much corn selling. Such spoilage and selling is costly to farmers and all taxpayers.

At Oreana, Ill., for example, 142 cars of corn moved recently graded 61.3 percent sample grade or under—the corn when stored graded No. 1 and 2.

The buildup of supplies that have caused the recent market breaks took place before we came into office.

Prices of farm products have been going down for about 2 years.

Prices had dropped almost one-fifth before we took office.

Beef steers, all grades, at Chicago fell from $34.22 to near $24 in the year prior to inauguration. It has meant terrific losses to cattlemen.

We acted without delay. Cattlemen have always maintained and continue to assure us they want neither price controls nor price supports. They want free markets. As one example of many, February 6 I received the following telegram:

"During the last few days newspapers have carried stories about the suggestions that are being made by some people who propose a price support program for cattle. It has always been the position of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association that we oppose any price support or subsidy program for cattle. We have always believed there is no substitute for free economy. Signed, T. J. (Jack) Roach, president, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association."

The President, as you know, moved promptly to end price controls and to kill compulsory grading of meat. Both had been costly to housewives as well as to farmers.

Markets have stabilized. People are again eating beef under a free price system, and preliminary reports show some stores selling almost one-third more beef.

Factual statements were sent out, telling farmers that the economy is strong and to practice orderly marketing.

The Department of Agriculture in one release after another has said it expects no major price changes for the next several months, and prices "may show some slight increases."

Price support laws now cover 25 commodities or groups of commodities. Farmers should make full use of these price supports. For example, farmers need not sell corn at a sacrifice—support loans can be had as late as May 31 at 90 percent of parity.

I need not tell Corn Belt farmers that an even more profitable way to sell corn is to feed it to hogs worth $20 per hundredweight.

This administration is unqualifiedly committed to price supports. The President, in his state of the Union address to Congress, renewed his pledges to farmers. He said, "Present agricultural legislation provides for the mandatory support of prices of basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity.

"The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates will, of course, execute the present act faithfully and thereby seek to mitigate the consequences of the downturn in farm income.

"This price-support legislation will expire at the end of 1954.

"So we should begin now to consider what farm legislation we should develop for 1955 and beyond. Our aim should be economic stability and full parity of income for American farmers."

I, along with every member of my staff, stand side by side with the President. His pledge is our pledge.

I believe in price supports and am under oath to give sound administration to all price-support laws which Congress in its wisdom places upon our statute books. The present price-support laws are the combined judgments of our two great political parties. Taking the lead in the major price-support legislation have been those two stanch friends of American agriculture, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, who is again chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, and Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the powerful House Agricultural Committee.

But I say to you in all sincerity—and I think you will agree with me—that price supports are not in themselves adequate to keep agriculture strong.

When the President said, "Our aim should be economic stability and full parity of income for American farmers," he followed with these statements:

"But we must seek this goal in ways that minimize governmental interference in the farmers' affairs, that permit desirable shifts in production, and that encourage farmers themselves to use initiative in meeting changing economic conditions.

"A continuing study reveals nothing more emphatic than the complicated nature of this subject.

"Among other things, it shows that the prosperity of our agriculture depends directly upon the prosperity of the whole country—upon the purchasing power of American consumers.

"It depends upon the opportunity to ship abroad large surpluses of particular commodities and, therefore, upon sound economic relationships between the United States and many foreign countries.

"It involves research and scientific investigation, conducted on an extensive scale.

"It involves special credit mechanisms and marketing, rural electrification, soil conservation, and other programs."

We propose to build farm programs that are basic and sound—the type of programs with which farmers in a free economy can so manage their farms and market their products that they will have a minimum need for price supports.

That is the practical way to achieve 100 percent of parity in prices and incomes for farmers.

Luckily, we have many years of experience to guide us. Let me quote for you the statements made 3 years ago at this same institute and in this same room by Chester C. Davis, wise observer and long-time friend of agriculture: "We should have learned by now," said Mr. Davis, "that the bare enactment of a law doesn't make price supports effective at the prescribed level.

"The prices have to be worked out by shirt-sleeve operations on the farm, in the warehouse, or in the market place. For storable commodities there is a honeymoon period while Government stocks are being built up by purchases or nonrecourse loans until the load reaches its limit. After that prices have to adjust in one way or another to the level at which the commodity will be consumed, unless war or some other catastrophe comes along to bail us out."

Mr. Davis went on to say: "A system of rigid, legislated price supports extended indefinitely into the future and at levels higher than the overall supply-demand situation will support will have extremely undesirable consequences, including a great deal of harm to farmers themselves."

In considering our problems, competent men and women in agriculture are our advisers. I believe in using advisory groups, and all through my life have seen great accomplishments flow from the combined judgments of people who produce, process, finance, and market farm products.

I have great confidence in the wisdom of the masses of a well-informed people. When reasonable people sit down to work out programs, you can depend upon practical results. In the 4 weeks we have been in office we have had the guidance of important groups and committees.

The 14-man advisory committee named by the President met in early January and helped frame the broad policies and principles under which we will be working.

It finished the work on the reorganization plan. The first part of this plan was placed immediately into effect following inauguration. All agencies and corporations were

placed in five groups for administrative purposes.

The committee reviewed the International Wheat Agreement and approved procedure in preparing for the conference, which opened January 30 with 46 nations participating.

International Wheat Agreement advisory groups consist of two separate committees.

Representatives of the major farm organizations and the wheat industry work together.

The other is a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives.

The cotton advisers met last week with 58 representatives, and recommended 13 specific actions.

A subcommittee worked out legislative recommendations that are now before Congress for helping the export trade.

The wool committee met for 3 days last week. Action has already been taken on conclusions reached by these sheep men and wool handlers which will make marketing more effective.

The domestic sugar producers and manufacturers at the conclusion of their recent conference called to explain to us their program and how the Department of Agriculture can be of help.

They showed how they are solving most of their problems and how they propose to continue to keep the sugar industry on a sound basis.

The dairy committee met on Tuesday and Thursday of this week. These leaders in the great dairy industry made recommendations that will be of unlimited value in arriving at the difficult decisions that must soon be made.

Butter price supports expire the end of March. It poses some tough questions. At what level should the support be extended? What will we do with all of the butter that the Government has bought?

How can we represent the best interests of dairy farmers, the dairy industry, consumers, and taxpayers?

We wish you would study and debate such questions here in the great State of Iowa which produces so much milk and butter—and come up with sound answers.

VE disease is creating havoc with some sections of the hog industry. On Monday our Department men came to a broad cross-section of the farm and industry leadership in a meeting held in Chicago. They came to explain the problem—what had been done—and to ask for guidance.

Tuesday they met livestock disease control representatives of State and various organizations.

A group of capable, highly respected citizens is being appointed by the President of the United States to advise us in the important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

All these illustrate the pattern of how we will proceed. What do you and other farmers and industry leaders want your Department of Agriculture to do? How can we serve you and all citizens?

We are at your command.

The numerous programs and great decisions for which the Secretary of Agriculture has been given responsibility are very great indeed.

I assure you the Secretary does now and will continue to welcome all the sound counsel that can be marshaled in meeting the problems facing us.

Programs must be built with the assistance of farmers and those working with them. Let's build strong—from the grass roots—the type of programs which farmers want—the kind that will not bring serious regrets and disappointments later.

The great United States Department of Agriculture is a service organization. We are to help—not dictate.

We will never be guilty of handing down ready-made programs. Citizens should help build the programs and tell us what they want done. Again, I say, we are at your command.

Do not wait to be appointed to an advisory group or to otherwise be consulted. Join in the policy-making activities of your farm and industrial organizations, and through them become a constructive force in helping guide the agricultural development of our great country.

Debate the issues of governmental policies in forums like the National Farm Institute. Work closely with your agricultural colleges and experiment stations. Promote community discussions and citizenship activities. All these build solidly from the ground up and insure dependable judgments on which we can safely go forward.

In other words, we want each commodity group to help develop a program it can make work with our help. We know that without the help of the industry and the blessings of a kind providence, we cannot succeed. We are earnestly seeking both.

America must be kept strong if she is to preserve herself and provide effective world leadership. This strength must come not alone from armaments and military might. Her strength must be measured in the integrity, moral courage, independence of spirit, and spirituality of her people.

I love this Nation. It is my firm belief that the God of Heaven raised up the founding fathers and inspired them to establish the Constitution of this land. This is part of my religious faith. To me this is not just another nation. It is a great and glorious Nation with a divine mission to perform for liberty-loving people everywhere.

Therefore, our first great challenge is to keep America strong—strong economically, socially, and above all, spiritually. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

I pray God that no act of mine or program I shall ever advocate will in the slightest weaken this Nation in the accomplishment of what I believe is a God-given mandate.

What of the relationship of man to Government? The supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, should be, How will it affect the character, morale, and well-being of the people? We need—the world needs—a strong America in the critical years ahead.

Freedom is a God-given, eternal principle, vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something more precious than life itself. It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.

This Nation has been built upon spiritual values—great Christian principles embodied in the Gospel. As a Nation we need the refining and sustaining influences which come from obedience to divine law. Without such blessings the future of the Nation is insecure.

May a kind providence give us the vision and courage necessary to do our part to realize this great and all-important objective. Never before have we needed the blessings of Almighty God more than today. We need His divine favor in the Halls of Government, in our home, in our factories and shops, and on the farms.

Great decisions lie ahead of us. Let us not shrink from them. Let us approach them with intelligence, and in the spirit of men who value the attributes of freedom and who recognize the responsibilities that go with it. I have tremendous faith in the soundness of judgment that comes from a free and informed people.

Let us so conduct ourselves that the historian will write, in recording our stewardship, that our successes came from releasing the great reservoir of creative energy which is to be found in every free man. And let him write that our failures—and he will record some failures—were errors of the mind, not heart.

DECLINE IN BEEF CATTLE PRICES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion in this body recently regarding the decline in the market price of beef cattle. To find out how beef producers react to this situation the Associated Press has assigned one of its star reporters, Don Whitehead, to survey the meat industry from growers to packers in order to ascertain what that industry thinks of the situation. The first of several stories as a result of this survey was published in the Washington Star on Tuesday, February 24, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLEMEN, HIT BY PRICES, PREFER WORKING OUT OWN SOLUTION

(By Don Whitehead)

FORT WORTH, TEX., February 24.—The Nation's cattlemen are taking a price beating today but their leaders here insist the Eisenhower administration is on the right track to bring stability to the giant cattle industry.

The story they tell you is this: Despite heavy price drops in cattle, there is greater confidence in the industry since President Eisenhower's inauguration.

Cattle prices have skidded drastically in the past 2 years from peaks which brought fat profits to just anybody who took a fling at producing or feeding cattle. Prices continued to fall after General Eisenhower took office and this has touched off a furore in Washington among politicos with an eye on the 1954 elections.

PREFER A PRICE PROP

Some cattlemen are disgruntled. Some are critical of the GOP farm policies and fearful of the future. They would like to have the security of Government price props under their cattle—something they have never had. But it's safe to say these stockmen represent a minority.

Most prominent cattlemen take the view that the price shakedown probably is a good thing over the long haul for themselves and the Nation. They want no part of Government price supports, subsidies, or controls.

Again and again in this country you hear cattlemen and others say something like this:

"Naturally we don't like to take these losses. It hurts. But a price adjustment had to come. If Washington will just leave us alone, we'll work it out ourselves."

CHEER END OF PRICE CONTROLS

Down this way, stockmen generally voice considerably more faith and confidence in the Eisenhower farm policy than you hear in Congress. They are gleeful over the dropping of price controls on beef. They approve the attitude taken by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, who has said farmers in the future are going to have to depend more on themselves than on Goverement subsidies.

Two years ago cattle were selling for $36 for 100 pounds (more for top-grade beef steers). Now the price is off around $10 or more a hundred.

In the summer of 1951, the high price of beef was causing cries of anguish from consumers having a hard time finding a good steak in the butcher shop. The supply just couldn't meet the demand.

The Government had slapped on price ceilings and even ordered rollbacks in the prices of beef cattle in an effort to hold the price line. Some cattlemen said then it would take from 3 to 5 years for production to catch up with the demand.

UP 5 MILLION IN YEAR

But production has outstripped expectations. Today there is a record number of cattle on the range and in feeder lots. The last Department of Agriculture report showed a cattle population of 93,696,000 on January 1. This is an increase of more than 5 million head under the same period last year and a rise of 11.6 million above 1951.

But the farm value per head on January 1 was only $128 compared to $179 on the same date a year ago. However, it was $31 better than the average value from 1942 to 1951.

The high-profit period for cattlemen has been wiped out. Some of the losses involved were paper losses. But in many cases there has been a real financial squeeze on those who don't have the cash or the credit to tide them over the rough spot.

The heavy flow of cattle to market, depressing prices, resulted from heavy production plus a drought and the high cost of feed in relation to cattle prices. The combination has forced growers and feeders to unload their cattle even at unfavorable prices.

MORE OUTSIDE SQUAWKING

Oddly enough, out here one gets the impression that cattlemen are doing less squawking than some of those outside the industry. This has brought some unusual results.

Recently Senator KERR, Democrat, Oklahoma, introduced a bill in Congress to force Mr. Benson to use up to $25 million to support beef cattle at 100 percent of parity. On the face of it, it would appear to be a move that would win wide support among the top cattlemen.

But it hasn't worked out that way. Jack Roach, of Amarillo, president of the Texas Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, called the proposal "essentially a control program from another approach." He and his organization oppose it.

"We have always felt," he said, "that there can be no satisfactory or workable solution to our problems that would substitute subsidies for a fair and open market price."

In an interview, Mr. Roach said: "Let us alone, give us some rain and we'll get along. Our only bellyache is over the meat that is being imported to compete with the homegrown product. We'd like to see something done about that."

SEE OWN SOLUTION

And Dolph Briscoe, of Uvalde, one of southwest Texas' largest cattle raisers, told a meeting of Texas bankers recently that if the Government will not interfere with the law of supply and demand the cattlemen will work out their own salvation.

"We'll make money sometimes and we'll lose money sometimes, too," he said. "There will be times when we can pay off our bankers and there will be times we can't. But if you'll stay with us, we'll stay with you—we haven't any place else to go anyhow. If it ever rains, things'll work out all right—and it always has rained, sometime.

"As long as a man has got his cattle and a place to keep them, he can hang on until good times come, if the bankers will stay with him."

RANCHER COMMENTS

Out at Cresson, Tex., lanky Jeff Slocum—one of three brothers who operate the Slocum ranch—had this to say: "The way I figure, the Government should let this thing adjust itself. It's a shame the break didn't come sooner—then things would have been a lot easier on everybody.

"As far as I'm concerned, I'll stay with Benson on his farm program. And that's the way most folks around here feel. We don't want politics mixed up in this. A fellow used to be able to figure things out for himself, but you can't do it when politics are involved.

"There's just no man-made law that will take the place of supply and demand. We've done enough tampering with it. This situation is going to work hardships—but then we'll get back like we used to be, standing on our own hind legs. We've got to realize the day of Santa Claus in the cattle business is gone."

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is concluded, and, under the order previously entered, the clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTERS IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The bill (S. 10) to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 1464, as contained in such analysis, the following new item:

"1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution."

SEC. 2. Chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately following section 1464 of such chapter, a new section, to be designated as section 1465, and to read as follows:

"§ 1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution.

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution, any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"The transportation as aforesaid of two or more copies of any publication or two or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of five such publications and articles, shall create a presumption that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this act, the court in its judgment of conviction may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the confiscation and disposal of such items described herein which were found in the possession or under the immediate control of such person at the time of his arrest."

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Over.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, by request of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I object to the consideration of the bill, and ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LIMIT ON FINANCING UNDER NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AS AMENDED

The resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the joint resolution involves a loan authorization of $500 million. Personally, I favor the proposal, but I believe that a measure involving so large an amount of money could more properly be taken up under procedure that is conducive to greater consideration, particularly in view of the fact that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has made a statement on the floor of the Senate that, if the joint resolution were objected to on the call of the calendar, he would later move its consideration, at which time it could be adequately debated, I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee kindly withhold his objection, so that I can submit an amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold the objection.

Mr. IVES. I offer an amendment to the joint resolution in order to have it conform with the resolution reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. I send to the desk the amendment, and ask that it be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Immediately following the first section of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert a new section reading:

SEC. 2. Prior to June 30, 1954, the Federal Housing Commissioner shall pay out of the capital account of the title I insurance fund to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of $8,333,313.65 which constitutes the Government investment in the capital account of the title I insurance fund. The amount payable hereunder shall be paid in the discretion of the Commissioner either in one lump sum or in installments except that the first payment shall be made on July 1, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the $8,333,313.65 which is to be paid to the Government

out of surplus funds is to be paid out of earned surplus, which amounted, on November 30 last, to $18,100,000. Presumably the amount is larger at this time. It seems to me that this could well be done and should be done, and I see no objection whatever to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since objection has been made to the consideration of the joint resolution, I do not quite see how the amendment can be considered at this time. As soon as the call of the calendar is completed, I shall move to take up the joint resolution and, of course, the amendment of the Senator from New York will be in order at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee insist on his objection?

Mr. GORE. I insist upon my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go over.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DAMAGES TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS RESULTING FROM MILITARY OPERATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 35) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out the quotation mark; on line 6, after the colon, to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 9, before "(b)", to strike out the quotation mark; on page 2, line 2, before "(d)", on line 12, after the word "involved," to strike out the first quotation mark; to strike out the second quotation mark; on line 13, before "(c)", to strike out the quotation mark; on line 15, before the word "Time", to strike out the quotation mark; on line 16, before "(e)", to strike out the second quotation mark; on line 24, after the word "request", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 25, before "Sec.", to strike out the quotation mark; on page 3, line 2, before the word "Claims", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 3, after the word "chapter", to strike out the Roman numeral "II" and insert the Roman numeral "III"; on line 5, before the word "Provided", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 11, after the word "repair", to strike out the first quotation mark; on line 12, before "Sec.", to strike out the quotation mark; on line 22, after the word "Act", to strike out the quotation mark; on page 3, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding provisions of existing law to the contrary, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce, pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the last sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(b) By amending subsection (d), to read as follows:

TIME LIMITATIONS ON FILING OF REQUESTS

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Secretary unless such request was submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in the case of a request relating to damage occurring while the airport was under the control and management of the United States, such request may be submitted to the Secretary within 6 months after the transfer of such control and management of the airport to the public agency involved."

(c) By adding thereto a new subsection (e) as follows:

TIME LIMITATIONS ON MAKING OF CERTIFICATIONS

"(c) No certification pursuant to this section with respect to a request submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this subsection (except a supplemental certification of the amount by which the actual cost of accomplished rehabilitation or repair exceeds the amount of a prior certification which was based on the estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair) shall be made to the Congress after a date 1 year from the expiration of the period prescribed by law for the submittal of such request."

SEC. 2. There is hereby repealed the proviso contained in the appropriation to the Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, headed "Claims, Federal Airport Act," in chapter III of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952, of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the proviso of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, cited in section 2 and the provisions of subsection (d) of section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consider, pursuant to the said section 17, any request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, which is submitted to him within 6 months following the effective date of this act, if such request would have met the time requirements of the said subsection (d) had it been filed on some date subsequent to June 30, 1951, and prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding provisions of existing law to the contrary, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce, pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes."

MAILING OF OBSCENE MATTER

The bill (S. 11) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance; and * * *."

SEC. 2. The fifth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18, United States Code, reading "Every letter, packet, or package, or other mail matter containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing, device, or substance; and" is hereby repealed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES ACT OF 1951

The bill (S. 799) to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, merely makes a technical amendment to the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, by providing that the Housing and Home Finance Agency may make a loan or a grant in connection with the relocation of a community. I shall not read the entire report unless the Senator desires me to do so.

In connection with the construction of atomic and hydrogen bomb plant in South Carolina, the Government took over some 250,000 acres of land. In so doing, an entire community was moved. The bill provides for a technical adjustment of the law, to enable that community to obtain some benefits from the Housing and Home Finance Agency by grants and loans or both, if after the bill is passed such assistance is found to be appropriate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understand, the purpose may be accomplished through either a grant or a loan. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the bill apply only to water facilities?

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill applies to more than water facilities.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To water and sewer facilities?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; the bill provides for basic facilities necessary for health and safety and certainly the Housing and Finance Agency should be able to

extend facilities of that nature to such communities as the one I mentioned. The community is in a critical defense housing area and the loan or grant would have to be approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, there is already power to provide for such community facilities and services in the case of towns which are not moved. This bill would merely extend the power to include towns which are moved.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct. That power now exists. Now it is desired to extend the act to that community which was forced to relocate.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the town had not been moved, it would come under existing law. The fact that the town was moved by the Government makes it necessary to correct a technical inequity.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether there are any other communities in the same category as the one to which he has referred?

Mr. MAYBANK. My information is that there are no others in the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I desired to know if there were any other communities in the same category.

Mr. MAYBANK. My information is that there is none other in the United States. My information to that effect was obtained from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I also wish to say, with all due respect to the Atomic Energy Commission and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that the 250,00 acres of land which were taken over comprise about one-half a county and this land is off the tax books. I think it doubtful that this much acreage is needed. If required by the Atomic Energy Commission, then they should certainly have it, but if some of it is in excess then I hope that that will be returned to the people of South Carolina.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, and I withhold my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 139, 82d Congress, approved September 1, 1951, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of section 315 (e) before the period a comma and the following: "or (4) the provision of community facilities or services necessary to the health, safety, or public welfare of the inhabitants of a town or community which has been relocated as a result of the acquisition (through eminent domain or purchase in lieu thereof) of its former site by or on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission for national-defense activities."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that a letter dated February 18, 1953, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1953.

Re S. 799, 83d Congress.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is in further reply to your letter of February 9, requesting a report on S. 799, a bill "to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended."

This bill would authorize Federal assistance, under title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, for the provision of community facilities or services necessary to the health, safety, or public welfare of the inhabitants of a town or local community which has been relocated as a result of the acquisition (through eminent domain or purchase in lieu of eminent domain) of its former site by or on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission for national-defense activities. Under titles I and III of the 1951 act as now in effect, the Federal assistance, which may take the form of loans or grants or both, is limited to local communities in critical defense housing areas and is also limited to facilities "required in connection with national-defense activities." The bill would provide that any essential community facility shall automatically be deemed to be "required in connection with national-defense activities" if it is necessary to the health, safety, or public welfare of the inhabitants of a town or other local community (in a critical defense housing area) which has been relocated because its former site was taken over by the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is our understanding that the bill is intended to cover the town of New Ellenton, S. C. No information has come to the attention of this Agency which would enable us to identify other towns or communities which might be affected by the bill. New Ellenton has very recently sprung up a few miles from the Savannah River plant of the Atomic Energy Commission. Its need for water and sewer facilities is extremely urgent and its sudden and rapid development on previously vacant land makes it clearly unreasonable to expect that the community can itself provide the needed facilities without considerable aid.

Some time ago, the town of New Ellenton sought to obtain from this Agency a grant under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951 to construct a water and sewer system. While New Ellenton is in the critical defense housing area serving the AEC plant, and while a great number of construction workers employed at the plant and a considerable number of operating employees of the plant lived in New Ellenton, it could not be shown that the operations at the plant would be seriously affected by the failure to provide the water and sewer facilities. The town was therefore informed that there was no legal basis for processing an application and, accordingly, we discouraged the town from going to the expense of preparing a formal application. In the absence of such an application and supporting data, we are unable to advise your committee concerning the scope and cost of water and sewer facilities which are actually necessary. A very rough and preliminary estimate indicates that, if the entire area of the town is to be served, the total cost might prove to be in the neighborhood of $600,000. Neither do we have any information which would enable us to estimate either the extent to which the local community itself may be able to contribute to the facilities or what form Federal assistance might take as between loans and grants.

While there has not been time since your committee's request of February 9 to evaluate fully the merits of the bill or to estimate closely the possible cost of the water and sewer facilities needed by New Ellenton, we do have a considerable amount of background information concerning New Ellenton which will no doubt be of interest to your committee. This is summarized in the enclosed statement headed "Information Concerning New Ellenton, S. C.—Savannah River AEC Area." I am also enclosing copies of a Special Situation Report on New Ellenton, S. C., dated June 30, 1952. This report was prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency last May and June by the Savannah River Urbanization Study of the University of North Carolina.

Because of your request for an immediate reply, there has not been time to clear this report on Senate bill 799 with the Bureau of the Budget. As soon as the Bureau's views are obtained we shall of course write you again.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the call of the calendar.

LIMIT ON FINANCING UNDER NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to call up the amendment which was previously read, and consideration of which was temporarily suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated:

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the first section it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Prior to June 30, 1954, the Federal Housing Commissioner shall pay out of the capital account of the title I insurance fund to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of $8,333,313.65 which constitutes the Government investment in the capital account of the title I insurance fund. The amount payable hereunder shall be paid in the discretion of the Commissioner either in one lump sum or in installments except that the first payment shall be made on July 1, 1953.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have already explained the amendment, I suggest that, if there is no objection, the amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be

offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last sentence of section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The aggregate amount of all loans, advances of credit, and obligations purchased, exclusive of financing charges, with respect to which insurance may be heretofore or hereafter granted under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $1,750,000,000."

SEC. 2. Prior to June 30, 1954, the Federal Housing Commissioner shall pay out of the capital account of the title I insurance fund to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of $8,333,313.65 which constitutes the Government investment in the capital account of the title I insurance fund. The amount payable hereunder shall be paid in the discretion of the Commissioner either in one lump sum or in installments except that the first payment shall be made on July 1, 1953.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the joint resolution having been passed, I send to the desk a statement which I prepared in explanation of the joint resolution, so that Senators who have kindly voted for it may know why they voted for it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR IVES ON INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR HOME IMPROVEMENT AND REPAIR LOANS

This resolution would increase FHA title I loan insurance authorization from $1¼ billion to $1¾ billion. Loans for repair, alteration, or improvement of existing properties are insured under this title.

At the present time there is a backlog of 290,000 loan applications totaling $195 million awaiting insurance authorization. The FHA since September has only been able to insure loans to the extent of the amortization and prepayments on loans outstanding, or $75 million per month. It is estimated that the volume of business will require insurance of approximately $100 million per month for the next 18 months. The repayments and amortization on existing loans, together with the additional $500 million in new authorization for insurance, should therefore be sufficient to take care of the total program under this title until it expires on June 30, 1954.

I wish to point out that if it becomes necessary, as a part of the economic and fiscal policies developed by the administration, to reduce the level of expenditures for home repairs and modernization through the application of credit and monetary policies, the FHA has adequate authority in its basic legislation—the National Housing Act—to do so.

Very briefly, the way this insurance program works is that the FHA insures up to 10 percent of the total amount of all eligible loans made by the lending institution under its insurance contract. Thus an institution that made $500,000 in loans for home repair and improvements under this program would be insured by the FHA for losses in connection with such loans up to the extent of $50,000.

The average loan made under this program is a small one—currently $675. The financing charge cannot exceed $5 discount per 100 original face amount of a 1-year note.

About 5,000 lending institutions and an estimated 100,000 dealers, builders, plumbers, roofers, etc., actively participate in the program.

The program has been a very successful one and has resulted in greatly improved housing for millions of American citizens. Since the initiation of the program in 1934 up through November 1952 over 14 million loans totaling over $6 billion have been made. The net loss sustained on the total program has been 1.07 percent. The current experience is even much better. From March 1, 1950, to December 31, 1952, on 4 million loans in the amount of more than $2 billion only 30,500 claims have been filed. The net loss on these amounted to only sixty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent.

This program has been entirely self-sustaining since 1939 when the law was amended permitting a premium charge to be made. The charge at present is three-fourths of 1 percent per annum of the net proceeds of each loan. Total disbursements, including salaries and expenses, losses and reserves for losses, amounted to about $71,500,000 during the period from July 1939 to November 1952, whereas the income during the same period amounted to $98 million leaving $26,500,000 to be used as paid-in capital and surplus.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I would deem it reasonably safe to assume that we here assembled in this session are not opposed to balancing the Federal budget.

I have no miracle drug and I have no cure-all to administer to this problem-patient of the Nation, but I think that there is a bill presently before the Senate which will one day balance our budgets at all levels of government if we but give it a chance.

I have reference to the bill (S. 526) to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which bill was introduced by me in the Senate on January 16, 1953.

I think that if the proposition embodied in this measure was important enough for inclusion in President Eisenhower's state of the Union address, it is certainly important enough for our studied deliberation here on this floor.

The bill is now pending before the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate.

My colleagues know, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is confronted at this time by serious, important, and pressing problems of real significance.

The junior Senator from New Jersey is numbered among those who can count only 24 hours in 1 day.

I can appreciate the problems of limited time facing the chairman of that distinguished committee of the Senate.

But I feel that we have our chance to restore long-range economy in government—at all levels of government—and that the time is now, Mr. President, now—with the mandate of the great American electorate still ringing in our ears, a mandate which is as plain as day; an alternative to unbalanced budget after unbalanced budget which could change that black night to day.

This Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is designed to study overlapping functions, duplicating services and competitive fiscal relationships between local, State, and Federal Governments.

It is a reflection of the strong position taken by both parties in the recent campaign.

We campaigned on the premise and on the promise that we would do what we could to stem the tide toward further and further concentration of authority in the hands of the Federal Government here in Washington.

Mr. President, this Commission is a start in that direction—a blueprint for the future; a guide to the determination of policy and procedure for the Congress to follow.

The Commission would strive to find ways of establishing a less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government, including the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the grants-in-aid programs.

The Commission would seek to eliminate duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions among the three levels of government.

Its purpose would be to reduce government spending to a low level consistent with efficient governmental performance.

This legislation is not new to the Senate.

I introduced early in the 1st session of the 81st Congress a bill providing for a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

It failed of passage. I will not go into the reasons, although I shall always feel that they were quite political in nature.

I introduced the bill again in the 82d Congress and can report that its counterpart was passed by the Senate, even though it was withdrawn from the House before further action could be taken.

During these several years, we have had substantial evidence of interest and support for this proposal from many individuals and organizations.

I hope and believe that this interest will greatly increase because the climate is right, because the President of the United States has spoken up for the general proposition, and because we in the Senate will add a greater voice to the basic responsibility we find in our hearts—to smooth the working relationships and do what can be done to restore the original balance of powers among the levels of government.

This conviction has been growing upon me during a long period of service in public office in my own State of New Jersey and here in the United States Senate.

My experiences at the State level of government gave me an opportunity to observe personally the growing number and complexity of the problems in this field of intergovernmental relations.

When I came to the United States Senate 4 years ago, the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Hoover Commission—was very much in the news and on everyone's mind.

This type of joint legislative-executive Commission seemed to provide a sort of working model which could be adapted to the intergovernmental relations problem.

As a matter of fact, the Hoover Commission recommended that such a commission be set up for the purpose of

making a study to ascertain the facts and develop a program of action.

Mr. President, that is what Senate bill 526 would do.

Our new President of these United States is interested—I know that many of you are interested—I pray that the Committee on Government Operations will show the same inclination to know a good thing when it sees it—as it has in past Congresses—and grant an early hearing for Senate bill 526.

I believe my measure offers a real ray of economic hope in the present fiscal picture which is drawn in shades of deep red.

Thus it will always be, Mr. President, unless we get right down to altering the topsy-turvy relationships between Washington, your State and my State; your town and my town.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 27, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, out of respect to the memory of Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., former Senator from Wisconsin.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, United States Army, for appointment as Director of the National Security Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Whitfield Putnam Shepard, O11908, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Joseph Muller, O12224, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, O12269, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clovis Ethelbert Byers, O12769, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O10362, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ira Platt Swift, O12205, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, O12701, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orlando Clarendon Mood, O14781, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edwin Luther Sibert, O11193, Army of the United States (colonel U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Jones Twitty, O12079, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Vernon Keyser, O12089, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744, Army of the United States (colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, O11226, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. George Bittmann Barth, O11241, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663, United States Army.

Brig. Gen Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., O12782, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, O14965, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Craig Stewart, O15349, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Trueman Lanham, O15568, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120, United States Army.

Col. William Elgie Carraway, O15144, United States Army.

Chaplain (colonel) Patrick James Ryan, O17363, United States Army.

Col. Peter Conover Hains 3d, O15657, United States Army.

Col. David Henry Tulley, O16075, United States Army.

Col. Richard Walden Mayo, O16430, United States Army.

Col. Jeremiah Paul Holland, O16812, United States Army.

Col. Walter Morris Johnson, O16835, United States Army.

Col. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878, United States Army.

Col. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16998, United States Army.

Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, United States Army.

Col. John Elliot Theimer, O17566, United States Army.

Col. William Carson Bullock, O17635, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Irven Hutton, O18177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Phillips Daley, O18358, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sam Carroll Russell, O18678, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Watson Truman, O18755, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Mabry Williams, O21801, United States Army.

Maj. Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, United States Army.

Maj. Peter Clark Manson, O23545, United States Army.

Capt. Harold Edward Parker, O34951, United States Army.

Capt. John Joseph DeWight Kooken, O34743, United States Army.

Capt. Owen Edward Woodruff, Jr., O36172, United States Army.

Capt. Kenneth Charles Crawford, O35784, United States Army.

Capt. William Thomas Keogh, O33742, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Clark Kates, O24787, United States Army.

Capt. Harlow Maxwell Huckabee, O47121, United States Army.

Capt. Warren Leigh Taylor, O26068, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Ernest Miller, O37356, United States Army.

Capt. John Jay Douglass, O49602, United States Army.

Capt. William Benton Carne, O38011, United States Army.

Capt. Robert McClellan Mummey, O26610, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Carl Erickson, O27089, United States Army.

Capt. John Ashley Noble, O27197, United States Army.

Capt. Vernon Howard Harper Newman, O27336, United States Army.

First Lt. Richard Cobie Stanton, O61084, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Maj. Clyde Milton Turner, O43233, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

First Lt. Roy Lambert Kackley, Jr., O66030, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

First Lt. George Charles Stein, O61025, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Second Lt. Willard Eli Hardwick, O64447, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be colonel

*William Herschel Allen, Jr., O18053.
James Frederick Ammerman, O18165.
Frederick Dwight Atkinson, O18169.
*Stoessel Smythe Barksdale, O39672.
*Lynn Carl Barnes, O39641.
*Archibald Baird Barrett, O28880.
*Ralph Madison Bauknight, O51091.
*×Oscar Benjamin Beasley, O18045.
Charles Edward Beauchamp, O18238.
*Gerald Newton Bench, O51092.
Edward Sedgwick Berry, O18119.
Clifton Donald Blackford, O18205.
*John Smith Blair 3d, O29340.
*×Richard D. Boerem, O38670.
Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245.
*×Robert Highman Booth, O18093.
*Francis Copass Bowen, O39682.
Harry Raymond Boyd, O18102.
*Kelly Leo Brazier, O39674.
*George Alexander Bridgers, O29395.
Raymond Charles Brisach, O18202.
Harold Eugene Brooks, O18152.
Thad Adolphus Broom, O18246.
*Elmer Gwynne Brown, O39521.
×Percy Howard Brown, Jr., O18117.
*×Frederic Gerald Bryan, O39670.
*Edmund Theodore Bullock, O29367.
*Lester James Burbidge, O50938.
*Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662.
*William Arnold Carter, Jr., O18023.
Paul Clark, Jr., O18118.
Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213.
Carleton Merritt Clifford, O18199.
*Richard Collins, Jr., O29375.
*Charles David Colman, O41649.
*Ward Wilson Conquest, O41630.
×Brainard Spencer Cook, O18144.
*James Corr, Jr., O51082.
×Frederick Gardner Crabb, Jr., O18172.
*Paul Glenn Cramer, O51089.
*Stuart Francis Crawford, O18078.
Robert Edwin Cron, Jr., O18127.
*Charles Pelman Crosby, O29435.
James Owen Curtis, Jr., O18108.
*Harold Augustus Davenport, O29385.
*Albert Eugene Dennis, O18052.
*John Ruding Dey, O29347.
*Charles Granville Dodge, O18072.
*Thomas Francis Donahue, O41435.
*×John Henderson Dudley, O18049.
*George Clifford Duehring, O18070.
Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157.
Charley Paul Eastburn, O18203.
*Owen Elliot, O39801.
*Keith Hartman Ewbank, O18062.
Alva Revista Fitch, O18113.
Frank Theodore Folk, O18195.
*×John Griggs Folkes, O51057.
*Kenneth William Foster, O29376.
*William Richard Frederick, Jr., O29388.
*Arthur Leonard Fuller, Jr., O18094.
*Lester Harold Gallogly, O29420.
George Goodrell Garton, O18138.
*Clarence Oswald Gilly, O39681.
×Arthur Cleveland Goodwin, Jr., O18179.
*Eugene Schliepp Graham, O41661.
John Frank Greco, O18133.
*Samuel Greenberg, O41692.
John Simpson Guthrie, O18228.
*Milton Barnes Hale, O41681.
*Herbert Allen Hall, O41631.
Barksdale Hamlett, O18143.
*×James Martin Hanley, Jr., O41688.
*Russel Orville Harris, O39671.
William Henry Harris, O18155.
William Warner Harris, O18170.
*Carl Hendon Hatch, O29341.
*Roy Eugene Hattan, O17563.
John Charles Hayden, O18174.
*Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060.
*Alvin Andrew Heidner, O41635.
*John Henry Heil, Jr., O29400.
*Walter Charles Heinel, O50947.
*Charles Lee Heitman, Jr., O18059.
*Carroll B. Henderson, O29421.
*John Maurice Henderson, Jr., O29410.
*Maurice Charles Higgins, O39630.
*James Wilson Holsinger, O29432.
*Chauncey Elman Howland, O41671.
*Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088.
Carl Irven Hutton, O18177.
*William D'Aguilar Jackson, O39628.
*Joseph Lawrance Jaggar, O51071.
Joseph Eakens James, Jr., O18237.
*Alcorn Bernard Johnson, O41636.
*Briard Poland Johnson, O29393.
*Harold Roy Johnson, O29352.
*Thomas Graves Keithly, O41657.
×Eugene Anthony Kenny, O18193.
×Theodore Roberts Kimpton, O18226.
*Worth Lytton Kindred, O29382.
*Dale Maxwell King, O39644.
*Hubert Eugene Klemp, O51076.
*Frank Kowalski, Jr., O18086.
*Philip Frederick Kromer, Jr., O18030.
*Edward Fenlon Kumpe, O18036.
*×Henry Bing Kunzig, O18081.
*Wendell Holmes Langdon, O18101.
*John Lawrence Lee, O51088.
*Harold Edgar Liebe, O29334.
*Albert Alphonso Lindquist, O41656.
Roy Ernest Lindquist, O18125.
James Sawyer Luckett, O18209.
×Allan Duard MacLean, O18229.
*James Blythe Macdougall, O29335.
*×Albert Joseph Mandelbaum, O18061.
*Kenneth Frease March, O16481.
*Anson Day Marston, O29427.
*Metticus Walter May, Jr., O29394.
*Andrew Thomas McAnah, O38667.
*John William McDonald, O29381.
*×Hugh Delvin McGaw, O39537.
*Robert Brantley McKay, O41662.
*Fred McManaway, O29339.
*Willie Carl McMillion, O38668.
*Walter George Meyer, O41653.
Thomas Mifflin, O18216.
*Herbert Volvenelle Mitchell, O18073.
*Carroll Keith, Moffatt, O29343.
*Clarence Avery Moore, O50919.
×Ned Dalton Moore, O18212.
*Norman Allen Moore, O29370.
*William Paris Moore, O51052.
Samuel Lynn Morrow, Jr., O18104.
*Lloyd Roosevelt Moses, O29362.
*William Edward Murphy, Jr., O29437.
Roy Whitman Muth, O18180.
Charles Lind Olih, A18190.
*Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062.
Willis Almeron Perry, O18131.
*Joseph Pou Persons, Jr., O56776.
×Arthur Carey Peterson, O18151.
*Charles Campbell Peterson, O41642.
*Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048.
Robert Allen Ports, O18175.
Jaromir Jan Pospisil, O18183.
*Clifford Algy Poutré, O29371.
Myron Albert Quinto, O18210.
*×Edward Cassel Reber, O17201.
*Willard Sanford Renshaw, O29426.
James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232.
Samuel Roth, O18191.
*Jacquard Hirshorn Rothschild, O18077.
Paul Arthur Roy, O18153.
Edward Irving Sachs, O18185.
*Donald Henry Scott, O29018.
*Wade Levan Shankle, O28984.
*Joseph Matthew Shanks, O29061.
*Claude Newman Shaver, O29333.
*Louis Henry Shirley, O29372.
*×Paul Saunders Shoemaker, O29348.
*Paul William Shumate, O17547.
*Gordon Kennedy Smith, O29383.
*John Edward Soule, O50960.
*Gage Henry Spies, O29419.
*Alexander Graham Stone, O18076.
*Robert Olney Stone, O28975.
Tom Robert Stoughton, O18156.
*Erasmus Hardin Strickland, O29355.
×Archibald William Stuart, O18130.
×Alden Pugh Taber, O18134.
*Raymond Porter Tarr, Jr., O29358.
*Henry Frasier Taylor, O38661.
×William Naille Taylor, O18168.
*Paul Dexter Troxler, O41693.
*Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071.
*Lou George VanWagoner, O41668.
*Frederick Theodore Voorhees, O29374.
*Roy Augustus Wall, O41784.
Albert Watson, 2d, O18105.
*Philip Campbell Wehle, O1806.
*George Patrick Welch, O41422.
*Jack Henry Weske, O51054.
*Vachel Davis Whatley, Jr., O16886.
*×William Whipple, O18024.
*Kenneth Cornelius Wiersema, O41624.
*Henry Herman Wild, O51064.
James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218.
Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., O18107.
*×Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064.
*Charles Truman Woods, O51069.
Sidney Clay Wooten, O18126.
William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129.
*Stewart Yeo, O16664.

To be colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps

*Russell Thomas Boyle, O28900.
*John Anthony Carrigan, Sr., O28874.
Robert Emzy Chandler, O17559.

*John Stuart Dwinell, O41467.
*Burton French Ellis, O29033.
*William Joseph Flynn, O41563.
*Erwin Arthur Jones, O41528.
*Harold Francis McDonnell, O39549.
Vernon Charles Rawls, O29098.
*×Richard Edward Reichmann, O39545.
Nathaniel Brewning Rieger, O51027.
*Henry Joseph Sommer, O29055.
*Claudius Oscar Wolfe, O39536.

To be colonel, Medical Corps

*Harold Irvin Amory, O19319.
*George Lewis Beatty, O19318.
*Eaton Wesley Bennett, O19604.
*Robert Estes Blount, O19612.
Robert Weston Boal, O20058.
*John Mars Caldwell, O19313.
Robert LaShore Callison, O19648.
*Joseph Garber Cocke, O19656.
Allan Arthur Craig, O19631.
Howard William Doan, O20057.
*Dell Fred Dullum, O21011.
*Knox Dunlap, O19667.
*Richard Howard Eckhardt, O19312.
*Erling Severre Fugelso, O20980.
James Emile Graham, O19622.
*Joe Harrell, O18929.
*Jenner Garnett Jones, O19603.
*Emmett Leroy Kehoe, O19613.
*Alfonso Michael Libasci, O19606.
*Elmer Arthur Lodmell, O19315.
William Titus Sichi, O19674.
*Charles Edwards Spellman, O19655.
*James Bowdoin Stapleton, O19656.
*Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661.
*William Albert Todd, Jr., O19598.
*Daniel John Waligora, O20055.
*Charles Parmalee Ward, O19314.
*Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599.
*Tom French Whayne, O19657.

To be colonel, Dental Corps

*Charles Joseph Cashman, O19653.
*Earl Elmer Fisher, O29175.
*Elmer Osman Hinman, O38633.
*Ottis Elbert James, O29192.
*Herman Henry Kothe, O29194.
*Arthur Nicholas Kracht, O20923.
Conrad Toral Kvam, O20467.
*Thomas Albert McFall, O29215.
*Harry Edgar Ramsey, O29191.
*Alfred Emerson Toye, O41723.
*Lyndon Sheldon Wilder, O56789.
*Hamilton Robert Young, O56786.

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

*×Harvie Russell Ellis, O17791.
*Maurice Wendell Hale, O17333.
*Ralph William Mohri, O17985.
*John Lloyd Owens, O17035.
*×Elmer William Young, O16296.

To be colonel, Medical Service Corps

*Paul Christian Borup, O18694.
*Claude Carrol Britell, O29183.
*Ralph Rankin Cleland, O29178.
*Othmar Frank Goriup, O29187.
*Louis Felix Williams, O18324.

To be colonel, chaplains

*Earl Dwight Compton, O21703.
Silas Edward Decker, O20104.
*John Allen DeVeaux, A21470.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonel

James Yeates Adams, O19755.
Richard Hayden Agnew, O19956.
*Paul William Albert, O42507.
John Alfrey, O19859.
James Dyce Alger, O19848.
*Blaine Erastus Anderson, O39976.
*Francis William Anderson, O30354.
Joseph Crook Anderson, O19884.
Salvatore Andrew Armogida, O19741.
Alfred Ashman, O19846.
Edward Lucas Austin, O38806.
*Thomas Jenkins Badger, O39961.
*Jack Byron Baker, O30239.
*John Frederick Ballentine, A39983.
*Nyles Wesley Baltzer, O51581.
Walter Edward Bare, Jr., O19944.
*×Frank Lyle Barnett, O30489.
*Norman Parker Barnett, O38784.
*×William Robert Barricklow, O56616.
*×James George Basbas, O42354.
Nassieb George Bassitt, O19931.
*Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780.
*Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931.
John Allen Beall, Jr., O19947.
*Herrick Franklin Bearce, O30498.
*Albert Richard Bech, O42585.
×Edward Stephen Bechtold, O19771.
×John Orth Beckner, O30513.
Donald William Bernier, O19911.
*Harry William Berry, O42480.
*Clarence Bidgood, O19777.
*James Walter Bidwell, O29508.
*Thomas Frith Bienvenu, O30401.
*Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569.
×Oscar Rawles Bowyer, O19934.
Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924.
Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781.
John Drake Bristor, O19710.
*John Edward Brooks, Jr., O38801.
Gerald Frederick Brown, O19806.
*Hugh Gordon Brown, O42539.
*Vernon Walter Brugger, O39966.
Garlen Randolph Bryant, O30507.
Walter Joseph Bryde, O19825.
Paul James Bryer, O19947.
*Carl Verner Burke, O38790.
*×John Wilkens Burnett, O42578.
*Samuel Edward Burns, O30394.
*Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297.
*Robert Eugene Byrns, O51606.
*Francis Peter Carberry, O38789.
*Bruce Wendell Caron, O30479.
*James Slaughter Carpenter, O42622.
John Hart Caughey, O19885.
*×Paul Alexander Cawfield, O30378.
*Joseph Curtis Chedister, O30355.
Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., O19888.
×Thomas Robert Clarkin, O19983.
×Kelso Gordon Clow, O19784.
*Charles Frederick Coates, O30433.
Melville Brown Coburn, O19973.
Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, O19925.
Glenn Cole, O19917.
John Dudley Cole, O19749.
*×George Thomas Colvin, O30434.
Robert Hamilton Colwell, O42640.
*John Francis Condon, O39972.
*Arthur John Cornelson, O51567.
×Noel Maurice Cox, O19883.
Harry Herndon Critz, O19786.
*Jefferson Rueben Cronk, O30461.
*Oliver Cornelius Culbreth, O30429.
×Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., O19796.
Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790.
*John D'Alessandro, O42510.
*William Allen Darden, Jr., O42599.
*John Louis Davids, O38783.
John James Davis, O19935.
*Wilbur von Molt DeLoach, O30449.
*×Mario De Maio, O30399.
*Roy George DeVecchio, O42584.
John Somers Buist Dick, O19726.
John Henry Dilley, O19861.
*Dale D. Dixon, O38788.
*Oliver Opal Dixon, O30494.
*Harry Chandler Dodenhoff, O30407.
×James Michael Donahue, O19798.
*George Archibald Douglass, A30296.
John Joseph Duffy, O19738.
Alfred Kirk duMoulin, O19943.
*Ivan Joe Dyekman, O30455.
*Armel Dyer, O42674.
*James Floyd Eason, O30435.
George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766.
Norman Basil Edwards, O19936.
*Perry Edwards, O30309.
Carl Henry Elges, Jr., O30511.
Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, O19759.
Donald Allen Elliget, O19719.
*×David Barton Emmons, O39979.
*Louis M. Etherton, O39940.
Warren Sylvester Everett, O19739.
Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780.
×Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., O19904.
*Frederick Carl Feil, O30379.
*James Lee Ferguson, O30046.
Raymond Boyd Firehock, O19812.
*Lewis Matthew Flint, O42519.
*William Foley, O42474.
Seneca Wilbur Foote, O19833.
*Robert Luther Ford, O38767.
×Allen Harvey Foreman, O19913.
*×Thomas Lucien Fortin, O42605.
*Edward McClam Foxworth, O42598.
Stuart Gilbert Fries, O19827.
James Luke Frink, Jr., O19821.
Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., O19716.
*William Carl Garrison, O30144.
*Paul Tracy Gerard, O30445.
Elmer John Gibson, O19822.
*Gordon Charles Gill, O42495.
Thomas Duncan Gillis, O19864.
Robert Rigby Glass, O19765.
John Alexis Gloriod, O19793.
*Leslie Duncan Goodall, O30411.
*Ralph Wesley Gontrum, O51596.
Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., O19801.
×David Hamilton Gregg, O19713.
William Paulding Grieves, O19742.
Marcus Samuel Griffin, O19954.
*Willice Edgar Groves, O30075.
*Russell Sage Hahn, O56815.
Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849.
Roland James Halada, O42635.
Harry Rich Hale, O19828.
Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., O19747.
*Harrell Glenn Hall, O51580.
*Charles Helmer Halliden, O30360.
*Earl Milton Hamilton, O30398.
*×James Douglas Hand, O30328.
*×Harry Frederick Hansen, O42618.
*Charles Clayton Hanson, O39873.
Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., O19818.
*Ralph Stevens Hardiman, O30492.
Edward Moseley Harris, O19819.
×Clarence Carl Haug, O19736.
Russell Lynn Hawkins, O19960.
*Charles Scott Hays, O42534.
Benjamin White Heckemeyer, O19930.
*Charles William Henry, O30299.
*×Paul Hert, O39952.
×George Place Hill, Jr., O19972.
Henry Lewis Hille, Jr., O19731.
Paul Olin Hoffman, O30517.
*Roy Donald Hoisington, O30348.
*Heimer August Holmstrom, O30382.
*Holman Don Hoover, O30305.
*Ralph Jefferson Hornaday, O30423.
Sanford Welsh Horstman, O19783.
*Ward Conrad Howard, O42515.
John Nevin Howell, O19840.
*Emery Erwin Hyde, O51576.
×Carl Theodore Isham, O19856.
×Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, O19730.
*William Edwin Jennings, O39964.
*Joseph William Jogl, O30330.
*×Joseph Edwin Johnston, O30424.
*Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462.
Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, O19743.
×George Madison Jones, O19965.
*Richard Ivor Jones, O30410.
Philip MacGregor Judson, O30516.
Joseph Waters Keating, O19800.
Burnis Mayo Kelly, O19950.
*James Sevier Killough, O29697.
*Richard Kimball, O42607.
James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., O19816.
*Dick Andrew King, O30438.
*Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464.
Edward Kraus, O19789.
*Chester Emil Lange, O30353.
×Cornelis DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734.
*Harold Glenn Lang, O51600.
×James DeVore Lang, O19728.
William Winston Lapsley, O19727.
Ralph Osborn Lashley, O19982.
*John Bennett Laugerman, O30333.
Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756.
×Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829.
Harry James Lewis, O19751.
*×Vernon Lester Lewis, O42628.
*Murray Adams Little, O39956.
*Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304.
*Robert William Lockridge, O42524.
*Harry Francis Lovell, O42616.

*×James Herbert Mahoney, O51613.
*Honald Noel Maidt, O42513.
Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865.
Nathaniel Macon Martin, O19794.
William Vincent Martz, O19879.
*Grant W. Mason, O30738.
*Edward Samuel Mathes, O30481.
*Robert Wilkes May, O39968.
*James Henry McCann, Jr., O30468.
*×Leniel Edward McDonald, O30408.
×Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., O19799.
*Samuel Tilden McDowell, O30321.
×Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857.
*John Thomas McKee, O30383.
*Alex Earl McKenzie, O39967.
*Timothy Howard McKenzie, O39797.
*Edward McMaken, O30318.
William Bradford Means, O19920.
×George August Meidling, O42634.
*Emery Douglas Middleton, O30329.
Carl Watkins Miller, O19740.
*George Patrick Miller, O42475.
*Howard Arthur Miner, O39983.
×Russell Melroy Miner, O19839.
×Clair Beverly Mitchell, O19899.
Vernon Price Mock, O19906.
*George Kreigh Moody, O38778.
Joseph Charles Moore, O19791.
*×Victor Hugh Moore, O42602.
John Brown Morgan, O19871.
*Lewis Drexel Morgan, O42508.
*Preston Miller Motes, O30372.
*Leslie Leland Motz, O42596.
*×Joseph T. Mozley, O42611.
*Charles Frederick Mudgett, Jr., O30409.
Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853.
×Daniel John Murphy, O19776.
*Arthur Charles Nauman, O30467.
*William Glenn Neely, O42538.
*William Jerome Newman, O51635.
*Kenneth Hudson Newton, O42579.
Ellery Willis Niles, O19763.
*Edgar Allen Noel, O51570.
George Robert Oglesby, O19877.
William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., O19971.
Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., O19863.
Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745.
*Carl Henry Overby, O30437.
John Richards Parker, O19735.
Charles Maclean Peeke, O19810.
*Earl Floyd Pegram, O42487.
*William Delio Peres, O30324.
*Robert Alexander Persell, O51608.
*Peter Peters, O39961.
*Arthur Clifford Peterson, O42555.
*James Donald Peterson, O30311.
*Henry Christ Petros, O30184.
×Donald Abeel Phelan, O19711.
Oliver Joseph Pickard, O19723.
*George Faries Pindar, O42463.
Lynn Wilson Pine, O30392.
*Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301.
*Carl McClellan Poston, O30400.
*Kenneth Bowen Potter, O30366.
*Elmer Russell Powell, O30414.
Floyd Garfield Pratt, O19715.
Milton Humphrey Price O30518.
*John James Prokop, Jr., O38797.
Leon Flores Punsalan, O42639.
*Edward William Quinlan, O51617.
*Nathan McQuade Quinn, O42574.
×Eric Per Ramee, O19961.
*Robert Lee Rhea, O30327.
John Foster Rhoades, O19875.
×Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910.
Walter Albert Riemenschneider, O19970.
*Max James Roadruck, O42479.
*William Edward Roberts, O30493.
×Alvin Dolliver Robbins, O19769.
*Charles Robbins, O42512.
*Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307.
Carmon Ambrose Rogers, O19952.
Otto Jacob Rohde, O19725.
*Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454.
Willard George Root, O19807.
Milton Lawrence Rosen, O19814.
*William Rossing, O42593.
*Morton Albert Rubin, O39962.
George Ruhlen, O19783.
Ivan Clare Rumsey, O19774.
*Robert Orville Rupp, O42103.
Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860.
Lawrence Robert St. John, O19805.
*Wilton Louis Sanders, O38794.
*Benjamin William Saurel, O42482.
×Edward William Sawyer, O19918.
Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886.
*Paul Taplin Scott, O30351.
*Joseph Bolling Seay, O30420.
*James Dasher Shearouse, O30337.
*Sidney Shelley, O42571.
Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., O19922.
*Henry Robert Sievers, O30298.
Walter Albert Simpson, O19778.
Duncan Sinclair, O19757.
James Frank Skells, O19830.
*James Edwin Skelly, O30473.
Norman Arvid Skinrood, O19882.
Russell Batch Smith, O19953.
Sidney George Spring, O19770.
*John Anthony Stahl, O39934.
Julius Desmond Stanton, O19823.
John Calvin Stapleton, O19878.
*Ernest Edward Steck, O42490.
*William Garnett Steffey, O30404.
*Raymond Balthasar Steiner, O51622.
*Wilbur Alexander Stevens, O30365.
*Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785.
*Manlius Rupert Stewart, O42503.
*Justin William Stoll, O30483.
×David Bonesteel Stone, O19976.
*×Chester Malcolm Stratton, O30431.
*Erwin Edward Sullo, O42491.
Charles Albert Symroski, O19753.
Milton Clay Taylor, O19867.
*Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566.
Henry Chaffee Thayer, O19754.
John Leroy Thomas, O19958.
*Theodore Gustav Thomas, O30344.
John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732.
James Willoughby Totten, O19834.
*×Clair Edwin Towne, O30385.
*×Thomas John Trainor, O51604.
*Raymond George Trampe, O42561.
×Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., O19892.
*Francis Andres Troy, O42597.
Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, O19894.
Robert Eugene Tucker, O19938.
×Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843.
*Kennard Smith Vandergrift, O42575.
Henry Porter van Ormer, O19787.
*Clinton Adolph Waggoner, O42552.
*John Henry Wagner, O42518.
×David Campbell Wallace, O19715.
×Elmer Hardie Walker, O19898.
Eugene Henry Walter, O19836.
*Ralph Henry Watson, O42458.
Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746.
*Lynn Hubert Webb, O39946.
*Maurice Eaton Webb, O30357.
*Stuart Lawrence Weinerth, O42620.
Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772.
Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., O19838.
*Bert Kirkman Whaley, O42612.
Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951.
Joseph Henry Wiechmann, O19874.
*Levis Chalmers Wiggins, O42556.
*Arent Orvil Wiken, O30426.
×Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, O19748.
×George Raymond Wilkins, O19750.
×John Williamson, O19900.
*Jesse Deaderick Willoughby, O38787.
*Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359.
*Wilbur Wilson, O42494.
*Edward Joseph Wiltrakis, O51575.
*Leo George Woerner, O30341.
Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, O19854.
*Donald H. Woodyard, O51564.
Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., O19826.
James Martin Worthington, O19797.
John Ralph Wright, Jr., O19817.
Clyde Calhoun Ziegler, O19720.
*Roy Frederick Zinser, O30370.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

*Robert Donald Anderson, O57528.
William Stanley Bagnall, O24382.
×Joseph Knight Bayne, O30913.
Harry Louis Berman, O22697.
Harvey Clark Boyd, O22312.
*John Francis Breslin, O57525.
*Charles Thomas Brown, O57375.
Michael Deane Buscemi, O22303.
Maurice Riordan Connolly, O22791.
*Raymond Bender Croissant, O21734.
*Richard Hamilton Bryarlie Dear, O22279.
Walter Robbins deForest, O23584.
*Wilbur Dwight Dice, O23671.
*William Nelson Donovan, O21042.
*Horace Welles Doty, Jr., O57379.
Edward John Doyle, O22314.
Carl Taylor Dubuy, O23650.
*Carl Neil Ekman, O22293.
Henry Curtis Harrell, O22307.
Theodore Livingston Hartridge, O22763.
*×Paul Wesley Hayes, O30903.
*×Wilbur Warren Hiehle, O22275.
*×Parker Blacksher Hollingsworth, O57526.
Frederick Clinton Hopp, O22311.
*Kenneth Eugene Hudson, O22278.
*Robert Leonce Hullinghorst, O22292.
Hensley Starling Johnson, O22309.
Tillman Davis Johnson, O22301.
*Norman Elwood King, O22287.
×Walter Andrew Kostecki, O30910.
*David Patrick Lauer, O30904.
*George Gilmore McShatko, O22285.
*Alva Edward Miller, O22283.
Frank Dominick Minerva, O51962.
*Samuel James Newsom, O57042.
*Byron Atlee Nichol, O22286.
*Laurence Addison Potter, O22294.
*Ralph Everett Reiner, O22284.
*John Marshall Salyer, O23570.
*Louis Franklin Saylor, O21733.
*Rolland Bernard Sigafoos, O22291.
Franklin Leo Spann, O23641.
*Harry Spitz, O57378.
Carroll Steiner Svare, O22313.
*Joseph Robert Vivas, O22704.
Russell Burton Watson, O23582.
*Carl John Weidge, O57041.
Isaiah Alonzo Wiles, O22709.
*Karl Arden Youngstrom, O56996.
*John Slowko Zelenik, O43124.

To be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps

*Daniel Matthew Driscoll, O41773.
*Karl Fredrick Ehrlich, O30858.
*Francis Leon Flatt, O51180.
*×William Paxton Fly, Jr., O21693.
*Earl Reid Nichols, O30857.
*Willard LaGrand Nielsen, O21051.
*Thomas Benton Seay, O30862.
*Clarence Ellwyn Sheets, Jr., O21692.
*Robert Bruce Shira, O21052.

To be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps

*Curtis William Betzold, O19641.
*William Francis Collins, O19698.
*Donald Clifford Kelley, O20387.
*Velmer Wayne McGinnis, O20059.
*James Bernhard Nichols, O19693.
*Roy Alonzo Resseguie, O29308.
*×John Howard Rust 3d, O20060.
*Walter Smit, O20494.
*Daniel Stevens Stevenson, O19696.
*×Bernard Francis Trum, O20061.

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Service Corps

*James Jerry Adams, O31044.
Lawrence Gibbons Alexander, O31058.
*Renaldo Gerard Belanger, O40109.
*Trygve Obert Berge, O30980.
Gordon Arthur Bohn, O31075.
*David Cornelius Burke, O39667.
Elmer Fenn Chaffee, O52057.
*Philip Rich Carlquist, O31011.
Martin Samuel Comella, O31064.
Joseph Di Giacomo, O40111.
Augustus John Daniel Guenther, O31067.
*Lawrence Bryan Hardesty, O30996.
Jesse James Jarboe, O30921.
*Walter Parmelee Mead, O30972.
George Edward Murphy, O31047.
*Harry John Nelson, O20053.
Allen Pappas, O31056.
R. L. Parker, O31057.
Floyd Clarence Plowman, O31059.
*×Edwin Hammond Potts, O31009.
*Edward Francis Quinn, Jr., O31031.
*Gene Quinn, O30839.
Robert Nelson Read, O38864.
Auburn Harris Smith, O31073.
*Leslie Earl Starks, O52029.
*Frank Stepczyk, O20051.
*Arthur Dennis Sullivan, O30074.
*Frederick August Zehrer, O41774.

To be lieutenant colonel, chaplains

•Edward Ernest Kusch, O51154.
•William Bruce Sharp, O38045.

To be lieutenant colonel, Women's Army Corps

•Hattilu White Addison, L25.
•Lillian Faye Foushee, L43.
•Bernice Gaines Hughes, L208.
•Margaret Aleth Kimpton, L211.
•Charlotte Edna Rhodes, L28.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Elsie Janet Chapman, L261.
•Ann Cummings, L322.
•Eunity Frances Elderdice, L114.
•Patricia Evelyn Elwell, L115.
•Esther E. Faizgraf, L324.
•Irene Bertha Groff, L316.
•Lillian Ruth Johnson, L109.
•Ida Katherine Madden, L252.
Florence Patricia Gibbons Moody, L116.
•Irene Michels Sorrough, L112.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

•Fannie Lyle Davis, L200.
•Virginia Helen Kaufmann, L199.
•Marie Louise Malone, L198.
•Frances Ann Pesmenski, L193.
•Clara May Zunker, L197.

To be captain

×Frederic Ackerson, O50562.
×Don Walter Adair, O28491.
×Thomas Jacob Agner, Jr., O28152.
×Robert Hildebrand Ahlers, O27905.
×Brooke Albert, O27944.
×Donald Gould Albright, O28025.
×Frederick King Alderson, O28458.
×Alford Edward Allen, O28209.
×Robert Wallace Allen, O28211.
×Ferd Emanuel Anderson, Jr., O27906.
×Wayne Stetson Anderson, O28166.
×Gunnar Einar Andersson, O28239.
×John Loveland Armstrong, O28469.
×Calvin Lincoln Arnold, O28071.
×Robert Earl Arnold, O28313.
×Alvin Ash, O28539.
×Shirley Sylvester Ashton, Jr., O28502.
×Grover Woodrow Asmus, O28605.
×Robert Anderson Babcock 3d, O28556.
×Richard Hamlin Bacon, Jr., O28656.
×Frederick Clark Badger, O27902.
×Charles Pitman Baker 3d, A28434.
×David Thomas Baker, O27984.
×Francis Rene Baker, O28543.
×Van Roy Baker, O28083.
×Edmund Keith Ball, O28308.
×William Henry Bamber, O28480.
×Charles William Barker, O28012.
×Kendrick Broyles Barlow, Jr., O28438.
×David Eugene Barnett, Jr., O28356.
×John Curran Barrett, Jr., O28481.
×Delbert Sylvester Barth, O28052.
×John Edward Barth, O28548.
×Paul Ingram Barthol, O28674.
×Edwin Wallace Basham, O28344.
×Robert Edward Bassler, Jr., O28064.
×John Stanley Baumgartner, O28172.
×Rex Webb Beasley, Jr., O28165.
×Roy Pearl Beatty, O27981.
×Jack George Becker, O27915.
×Richard Gordon Beckner, O28001.
×Calvert Potter Benedict, O28286.
×Harold Francis Bentz, Jr., O28392.
×Robert Hamilton Berry, O27986.
×Donald Sternoff Beyer, O28673.
×William Randolph Bigler, O28292.
×William Clarence Bishop, Jr., O28428.
×Frank Earl Blazey, O28693.
×Donald Ferree Bletz, O56739.
×Stanley Delbert Blum, O27971.
×Rodney Alger Blyth, O28294.
×Corwin Boake, Jr., O28484.
×Henry Herman Bolz, Jr., O28364.
×Clair LaVern Book, O28430.
×Shepherd Allen Booth, Jr. O28654.
×Truman Everett Boudinot, Jr. O28669.
×Robert Bruce Bowen, O28147.
×Kyle Watson Bowie, O28559.
×Jerry Dixmer Bowman, O28094.
×Benjamin Francis Boyd, O28696.
×Russell Raymond Boyd, O28040.
×Philip Brian Brady, O28192.
×Lawson Duval Bramblett, Jr., O28086.
×Edgar Garfield Braun, Jr., O27897.
×Richard Anthony Bresnahan, O28643.
×David Winthrop Brillhart, O28582.
×Herrold Emerson Brooks, Jr., O28563.
×Benjamin Clyde Brown, O28493.
×David Drummond Brown, O28009.
×Levi Aloysius Brown, O27914.
×Richard Wanless Brunson, O28615.
×David Thompson Bryant, O27950.
×Arthur Johnston Bugh, O28470.
×Paris Russell Burn, Jr., O28038.
×Ray Lawrence Burnell, Jr. O28026.
×John Crouse Burney, Jr., O27982.
×Dwight Comber Burnham, O27916.
×Ruel Fox Burns, Jr., O28749.
×John Joseph Byrne, O28717.
×John William Callaghan, O28580.
×Carshall Carter Carlisle, Jr., O28273.
×James Elbert Carter, O28710.
×Robert Fleming Carter, O28217.
×Frank Salvatore Caruso, O28730.
×Robert Harry Case, O28496.
×John Charles Cassidy, O28108.
×Joseph Roy Castelli, O28454.
×Edward Joseph Cavanaugh, O28499.
×James Richard Cavanaugh, O28237.
×Robert Albert Chabot, O28714.
×Smith Barton Chamberlain, O27587.
×Robert Irving Channon, O28219.
×Benjamin Keller Chase, O28501.
×William Edward Chynoweth, O28143.
×Joseph Claypoole Clark, O28074.
×John Robin Davis Cleland, O41361.
×Carcie Clarence Clifford, Jr., O28194.
×William Thornton Coburn, O50279.
×David Lapham Colaw, O28459.
×James Edward Coleman, O28021.
×Edward Joseph Collins, O28251.
×Joseph Easterbrook Collins, O28633.
×Frank Donald Conant, Jr., O27990.
×Lester Mykel Conger, O28416.
×Steven Livesey Conner, Jr., O28432.
×Richard Lansing Connolly, Jr., O28468.
×Thomas Morton Constant, O28426.
×James Edward Convey, Jr., O28103.
×William Thomas Cound, O28231.
×Felix Foster Cowey, Jr., O28242.
×Robert Grewelle Cramer, O28199.
×Pat William Crizer, O28579.
×Willis Dodge Cronkhite, Jr., O28269.
×Edward Francis Crowley, O28628.
×Robert Emmett Crowley, O27967.
×Anthony Angelo Cucolo, Jr., O28636.
×William Stephen Culpepper, Jr., O28591.
×Elmo Eugene Cunningham, O28618.
×John Peter Daneman, O27921.
×Charles Dwelle Daniel, Jr., O28258.
×Robert Samuel Daniel, Jr., O28455.
×Bert Alison David, O28441.
×Harry Alford Davis, Jr., O28512.
×Ralph Charles Davis, Jr., O28744.
×Samuel Preston Davis 3d, O28393.
×Franklin Richard Day, O28003.
×James Arthur Day, O28160.
×John Blackford Dayton, O28049.
×Walter Joseph DeLong, Jr., O28184.
×Harold Graham de Moya, O28299.
×George Lightfoot Dennett, O28565.
×Horace Frederick Derrick, O28626.
×Rolland Archibald Dessert, O28388.
×Glenn Willard Dettrey, O28546.
×William George Devens, O28008.
×Robert Francis Dickson, O28204.
×Richard Boyer Diver, O28137.
×James Thomas Dixon, O28130.
×Farrel Elmore Dockstetter, O28305.
×Frederick Andrew Dodd, O28514.
×James Joseph Dorney, O28185.
×Robert Sidney Douthitt, O28317.
×Donald Warren Dreier, O28321.
×Edward Charles Drinkwater, Jr., O28578.
×Walter Arthur Dumas, O28278.
×Robert Fyfe Mein Duncan, Jr., O27968.
×Stanley Anthony Durka, O56755.
×John William Dwyer 3d, O28726.
×Earl S. Dye, Jr., O28262.
×Walter Francis Eanes, O28058.
×Leonard Edelstein, O27965.
×Stephen Orville Edwards, O28127.
×James Montgomery Elder, O28473.
×Lawrence Lloyd Elder, O27910.
×Louis Owen Elsaesser, O27936.
×John Mitchell England, Jr., O56717.
×Gerald Samuel Epstein, O28105.
×Benjamin Crabbs Evans, Jr., O28569.
×Robert Nathan Evans, O28630.
×Stanley Dale Fair, O28551.
×Hunter Harry Faires, Jr., O28377.
×Philip Anthony Farris 3d, O28627.
×Jesse Albert Fields, Jr., O28731.
×George Bernard Fink, O27942.
×Joe Wesley Finley, O28599.
×Daniel Jarvis Finnegan, O28727.
×John Chambers Fischer, O28170.
×Charles Alexander Fitzgerald, O28593.
×Edward Leo Flaherty, Jr., O28467.
×Herbert Hesselton Flather, Jr., O28234.
×Robert Walton Fleming, Jr., O56737.
×Joe Bruton Flores, O28371.
×Harry Arthur Floyd, O28575.
×Philip John Frank, O28665.
×Walter Leslie Frankland, Jr., O28391.
×Robert Lewis Frantz, O28059.
×Frederic Alcott Frech, O27930.
×DeBow Freed, O28477.
×Harold Clinton Friend, O28087.
×Elisha James Fuller, O28268.
×Howard Rowson Fuller, Jr., O28098.
×William Carl Fuller, O28055.
×Alvin Franklin Futrell, O28720.
×Thomas Edward Gaines, O28486.
×Vincent DePaul Gannon, Jr., O28202.
×James Madison Garrett 3d, O27143.
×Eugene Joseph Gasior, O27802.
×Thomas Leigh Gatch, Jr., O28476.
×William Gilfillan Gavin, O28585.
×Benjamin Andrew Gay, O27966.
×John Charles Geary, O28542.
×Alexander Gerardo, O28119.
×Faison Pierce Gibson, O28236.
×Howard Anthony Giebel, O28318.
×James Jay Gigante, Jr., O28267.
×Jack Keith Gilham, O27988.
×John William Gillespie, Jr., O28577.
×Roy Wilfred Gillig, O28358.
×Joseph Anthony Giza 3d, O28359.
×Calvin Ervin Glidewell, O28418.
×Francis George Gosling, O27941.
×John Robert Grace, O28220.
×John Henry Grady, O28223.
×Daniel Orrin Graham, O28212.
×Clifton Wellington Gray, Jr., O28357.
×Stephen Eugene Gray, O28683.
×John Frederick Green, O28296.
×Byron Dillingback Greene, Jr., O28506.
×James Morris Gridley, O28360.
×William Howard Grisham, O28452.
×Peter Grosz, Jr., O27977.
×Richard Louis Gruenther, O28711.
×Alvan Cordell Hadley, Jr., O28191.
×George Gross Hagedon, O27898.
×Philip Darlington Haisley, O28380.
×Richard Edward Hale, O28520.
×Charles Maurice Hall, O28456.
×George Edward Hall, Jr., O28323.
×William Charles Hall, O28023.
×William Walton Hall, Jr., O28005.
×Hal Edward Haligren, O28116.
×Jerome Vincent Halloran, O28738.
×Alexander Earl Halls, O28065.
×Milton Holmes Hamilton, O28245.
×Robert Milton Hamilton, O28326.
×Walter Fleming Hamilton, Jr., O28208.
×Arthur Edward Hansen, O28126.
×Benjamin Shaw Hanson, Jr., O28076.
×Everitt Fee Hardin, O28117.
×Alfred Carl Haussmann, Jr., O28283.
×Robert Carroll Hawley, O28254.
×Rutledge Parker Hazzard, O28088.
×Robert Johnson Hefferon, O28047.
×Robert Foster Hewett, Jr., O28528.
×Preston Heacock Hibbard, O28729.
×Daniel Webster Hickey 3d, O28427.
×Frederick Francis Hickey, Jr., O28099.
×Benjamin Tullidge Hill, Jr., O28158.
×John Gillespie Hill, Jr., O27997.
×Thomas Vincent Hirschberg, O28677.
×John Christopher Hoar, Jr., O28345.
×James Burtram Hobson, O28419.
×John Alan Hoefing, O28404.
×James Karnes Hoey, O28036.
×Harold Francis Hogan, O27553.
×James Franklin Holt, O27604.
×Harold Waldron Horne, O28337.
×Kibbey Minton Horne, O28057.

×Saul Horowitz, Jr., O27973.
×Lynn Wood Hoskins, Jr., O28713.
×Granville Watkins Hough, O28309.
×Joseph Edward Houseworth 3d, O28584.
×Thomas Moore Huddleston, O28340.
×Robert Stout Hughes, O28350.
×William Arthur Humphreys, O28348.
×David Nealey Hutchison, O27928.
×Henry Laurance Ingham 2d, O28649.
×James Homer Wallace Inskeep, O28682.
×Paul Mills Ireland, Jr., O28288.
×Robert Overton Isbell, O28156.
×Albert Russell Ives, Jr., O28675.
×Charles Maples Jaco, Jr., O28203.
×Peter Michael Jacula, O28716.
×Arthur William Jank, O27926.
×Joseph Anthony Jansen, O27964.
×Wilbur Fields Joffrion, O28102.
×James Wiley Johnson, O28362.
×Richard Allan Johnson, O28145.
×Sewall Harvey Emler Johnson, O28712.
×Alfred Henderson Jones, O27407.
×Edward William Jones, O28724.
×John Thomas Jones, O28214.
×Amos Azariah Jordan, Jr., O27895.
×Clarence Eugene Jordan, Jr., O28078.
×Edwin Mortimer Joseph, O28522.
×Albert Enzo Joy, O28534.
×Jean Krummel Joyce, O28284.
×Warren Stanley Jungerheld, O28662.
×William Joyce Kaliff, O28594.
×John George Kamaras, O28100.
×Robert Vincent Kane, O28612.
×Kent Keehn, O28336.
×Paul Aloysius Kelley, O28688.
×Minor Lee Kelso, O28745.
×William Raycroft Kelty, Jr., O28322.
×Robert Carleton Key, O28072.
×Clarence Wade Kingsbury, O28325.
×Harrison Benson Kinney, O28259.
×Richard Martin Kinney, O28609.
×William Martin Kiser, O28329.
×Alfred Ruprecht Kitts, O39483.
×Roland Arthur Kline, O28747.
×Robert Edmund Knapp, O28079.
×Harlan Gustave Koch, O28725.
×Jack Wilson Kopald, O28073.
×Robert Ernest Kren, O28277.
×James Von Kanel Ladd, O28464.
×Andrew Wilton Lamar, Jr., O28240.
×Robert Jones Lamb, Jr., O28667.
×Robert Alexander Land, O28368.
×Benjamin Lester Landis, Jr., O27963.
×David Seffers Lane, O28043.
×Ralph Irving LaRock, O28159.
×Wayne Emerson Lawson, O28450.
×Albert Marshall Leavitt, O28218.
×Robert Vernon Lee, Jr., O27974.
×Daniel Marshall Leininger, O27992.
×Robert Emil Lenzner, O28082.
×Theodore Julian Lepski, O28571.
×Daniel Louis Levy, Jr., O28295.
×William Warner Lewis, Jr., O28433.
×William Theodore Lincoln, O28161.
×Arthur James Lochrie, Jr., O28142.
×Dale Earnest Lockard, O27252.
×James Robert Loome, O28383.
×Malcolm Eldridge MacDonald, O28701.
×Clyde Bruce MacKenzie, O28122.
×Thomas Harold Mahan, O28448.
×Daniel Francis Mahony, O28281.
×Aaron Daniel Maier, O50559.
×Robert Joseph Malley, O27978.
×Robert Langham March, O28191.
×Earl Frederick Markle, O28490.
×Samuel Rucks Martin, O28044.
×Stephen Andrew Matejov, O28372.
×John Randolph Mathias, O28042.
×Jack Franklin Matteson, O28221.
×Walter Stanley Mattox, O28592.
×James Hubert McBride, O28622.
×Thomas Henry McBryde, O28188.
×Charles Francis McCarty, O28715.
×Clarence Edison McChristian, Jr., O28504.
×William McCollam, Jr., O27896.
×Thomas Roderick McCormick, O28680.
×Robert Watt McCoy, O28735.
×Edward Francis McCue, O28118.
×John Daniel Henry McDonough, O28183.
×James Madison McGarity, O28406.
×William Herbert McMaster, O27913.
×John Calvin McWhorter, O28148.
×Joseph Otto Meerbott, Jr., O28352.
×Clarence Miles Mendenhall, 3d, O28728.
×Ralph Anthony Meola, Jr., O28702.
×Doyle Merritt, O28174.
×Needham Phillips Mewborn, O28645.
×John David Miley, O28586.
×George Livingston Miller, O28013.
×Lawrence Miller, O28081.
×Leo John Miller, O28011.
×Carey Wayne Milligan, O28125.
×Thornton Mitchell Milton, O28032.
×Jack Harrison Montague, O28635.
×Robert Alexander Montgomery, O28697.
×Raymond Turck Moore, O28652.
×Edward John Morgan, O28257.
×Daniel Reardon Moriarty, O28607.
×Jack Warren Morris, O28646.
×Robert Franklin Morris, O28171.
×Roy Joseph Mossy, O28687.
×George Carlisle Muir, Jr., O28457.
×Arthur Andrew Murphy, O27951.
×Morgan Joyce Murphy, O28706.
×Leon Bowman Musser, Jr., O27922.
×Charles Robert Myer, O28091.
×John William Nance, O28602.
×Wayne Stanley Nichols, O27999.
×Roger Hurless Nye, O28010.
×Elmer Raymond Ochs, O28547.
×Patrick Joseph O'Connor, O28509.
×Carroll Raymond O'Neill, O28505.
×Gordon Henry Oosting, O27958.
×George Frederick Otte, Jr., O28164.
×Thomas Sawyer Owen, O28544.
×John Kenneth Paden, Jr., O28136.
×Stephen Joseph Pagano, O28463.
×Francis Miller Palmatier, O28684.
×Bernard Joseph Pankowski, O27925.
×Alexander Papajohn, O28413.
×Alexander James Papatones, O28623.
×Thomas Williams Pardue, Jr., O28576.
×Joseph Dodge Park, O28597.
×Clifford Hutton Parke, Jr., O28410.
×John Griffin Parker, O28250.
×William Croom Parker, O28140.
×William Robert Parker, O28421.
×Eleazar Parmly 4th, O28423.
×Robert Francis Patterson, O28302.
×George Smith Patton, O28685.
×Arthur William Pence, Jr., O28440.
×William Fuller Pence, O28112.
×Billy Pat Pendergrass, O27985.
×Ralph Hugh Pennington, O27927.
×Joseph Peter Pepe, O28471.
×Ernest Anthony Pepin, O28591.
×John Perkins 3d, O27931.
×Wilton Burton Persons, Jr., O27975.
×Alexander Dominio Perwich, O28193.
×David Merritt Peters, O28581.
×Rocco Anthony Petrone, O27972.
×Eugene Vincent Pfauth, O28256.
×Thomas Edward Pfeifer, O28635.
×Robert Hazen Philips, O28708.
×Charles Sumner Pierce, O27888.
×Wade Hampton Pitts, Jr., O28022.
×Richard John Pitzer, O28495.
×Howard Ernst Pleuss, O28608.
×Richard Sharon Pohl, O28374.
×Reuben Pomerantz, O28261.
×Frank William Porter, Jr., O28503.
×George Jewel Porter, O28601.
×Edward Adorno Powers, O27994.
×E. Lloyd Powers, O28045.
×John Thomas Price, Jr., O28369.
×Thomas Gaetano Provenzano, O28346.
×Murray Putzer, O28007.
×Raoul Jean Quantz, O28169.
×Everett Lipscomb Rea, O28415.
×William Thomas Reeder, O28540.
×Robert Bradley Rheault, O28111.
×William Gibson Richards, O28460.
×Robert Tyler Richmond, Jr., O28525.
×Francis Albert Richter, O28347.
×Louis Nelson Roberts, O28521.
×Elisha Miller Robinson, Jr., O28541.
×Adolphus Worrell Roffe, O27848.
×Guy Arnold Rogers, O28207.
×Joseph Barnett Rogers, O28233.
×Selwyn Phillips Rogers, Jr., O27991.
×Lewis William Rose, O27987.
×Irving Granville Rouillard, O28177.
×Del Patrick Rovis, O28732.
×Edward James Roxbury, Jr., O28075.
×Richard Lincoln Ruble, O28695.
×Robert Martin Rufsvold, O27993.
×Mason Pittman Rumney, Jr., O28024.
×Robert Irwin Rush, O28660.
×John Ambler Sadler, O28743.
×Richard Robert Sandoval, O28017.
×Marshall Sanger, O28327.
×Edward A. Saunders, O27904.
×William Ferdinand Scharre, Jr., O28085.
×William Powers Schneider, O27979.
×Frank Carl Schoen, O28590.
×Jack Lawrence Schram, O27933.
×Willis Ervin Schug, Jr., O28039.
×Herbert Ardis Schulke, Jr., O28014.
×John Morris Schuman, Jr., O28269.
×Loxley Radford Scott, O27772.
×Robert William Seaman, O28668.
×William Thaden Seeber, O28306.
×Maurice Serotta, O28198.
×Leslie Neal Shade, Jr., O28698.
×Eugene Gibb Sharkoff, O28224.
×Amos Blanchard Shattuck 4th, O28146.
×George Elmer Sheffer, Jr., O28120.
×Robert Xavier Sheffield, O28734.
×Fields Early Shelton, O28600.
×David Kirkwood Sheppard, O27919.
×Robert Morin Shoemaker, O28097.
×John Merwin Shultz, O28341.
×Roy Gayle Simkins, Jr., O28560.
×Charles James Simmons, O28133.
×Charles Maze Simpson 3d, O27957.
×John Eldredge Simpson, O28196.
×William Craton Screven Simpson, O28381.
×Christopher Booth Sinclair, Jr., O28265.
×Samuel Charles Skemp, Jr., O28210.
×Rollin White Skilton, O28642.
×Charles Robert Smith, O50542.
×David Halstead Smith, O27903.
×William Robert Smith, O28562.
×Harry Clayton Smythe, Jr., O28107.
×Russell Edward Speake, O28436.
×Elmer Gene Sprague, O28555.
×Norman Theodore Stanfield, O27945.
×John Edward Stannard, O28442.
×Thomas Jefferson Stapleton, O28285.
×Dudley Scott Stark, Jr., O28439.
×Ralph Allen Starner, O28482.
×Robert Lee Steele, O28429.
×Kenneth John Steen, O28050.
×John Ember Sterling, Jr., O27952.
×Keith Dennis Stidham, O28216.
×Harold Joseph Stirling, O28182.
×Richard Leonard Stone, O28176.
×William Leete Stone 3d, O28538.
×Robert Warren Storm, O28742.
×Milton Albert Strain, O27894.
×Stratis John Stratis, O28114.
×Oliver Day Street 3d, O28053.
×Richard Wendell Streiff, O28060.
×William Richard Stroud, O28201.
×Robert Tilghman Strudwick, O28596.
×Charles Robert Hatch Suppiee, O27924.
×Robert Kniley Swab, O28709.
×William Britton Teglund, O28186.
×Harold Alva Terrell, Jr., O28132.
×Blucher Stanley Tharp, Jr., O28558.
×Raymond Edward Thayer, O28275.
×Vernley Fred Thomas, O28037.
×William Kappes Thomasset, O27943.
×Elbert Satterlee Throckmorton, O28339.
×John Royster Thurman 3d, O28225.
×Samuel Hartman Title, O28507.
×Lewis Burton Tixier, O28276.
×Allan Curtiss Torgerson, O28619.
×Oscar William Traber, Jr., O28030.
×John Russell Treadwell, O27976.
×William Harry Trotter, O28246.
×Guy Kent Troy, O28162.
×Richard Cabell Tuck, O27955.
×Harlan Winthrop Tucker, O28153.
×Robert Busill Tully, O28678.
×George Earl Turnmeyer, Jr., O56735.
×Max March Ulrich, O27911.
×Kenneth Cruikshank VanAuken, O28163.
×Edwin Renalds Van Deusen, O28425.
×John William Vester, O28280.
×Alfred Henry Victor, Jr., O27938.
×William SacHarov Volmer, O28524.
×Robert Thomas Wagner, O28232.

×Ray Moore Wagoner, Jr., O27940.
×Richard Harding Walker, O28222.
×Sam Sims Walker, O28197.
×Josiah Ara Wallace, Jr., O28297.
×Matthew Reid Wallis, O28068.
×Joe Holleman Warren, Jr., O27960.
×John Wiley Warren, O27752.
×Norman Cooper Watkins, O28131.
×Donald Scott Watson, O28316.
×George Stanley Webb, Jr., O28015.
×William Hayes Webb, O28263.
×Edwin Leo Weber, Jr., O28178.
×Albert Dunbar Wedemeyer, O28653.
×Marvin Stuart Weinstein, O28149.
×Norman Emanuel Weiss, O28121.
×James Clyde Welch, Jr., O28367.
×Anthony Patrick Wesolowski, O28155.
×Charles Leroy Wesolowsky, O28704.
×Percy Louis Wheeler, O28301.
×Robert Doyne Woodley White, O28311.
×Robert Menifee White, Jr., O28530.
×William Jackson Whitener, O28041.
×John Day Whitmore, O28407.
×Jere Otis Whittington, O28411.
×John Scholto Wieringa, Jr., O28644.
×Richard Minter Wildrick, O28019.
×Benjamin Bertram Williams, O28515.
×Charles Torrey Williams, O27923.
×Charles Gurley Williamson, Jr., O28494.
×Robert Gregg Williamson, O27901.
×Minter Lowther Wilson, Jr., O28244.
×Robert Trent Winfree, Jr., O28189.
×James Emmett Wirrick, O28529.
×John William Wiss, O28154.
×Duquesne Abraham Wolf, O28187.
×Herbert Eric Wolff, O39485.
×Allen Howland Wood 3d, O28672.
×Harris Harold Woods, O28190.
×John McReynolds Wozencraft, O27899.
×William Robert Wray, O27949.
×William Heaton Young, O28335.
×Keith Burns Zimmerman, O28266.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

×Marshall Ellice Bailey, O63737.
×Alva Harlan Bandy, O63230.
×Cabell Flournoy Cobbs, O63840.
×John Horace Dodson, O62801.
×Henry Arthur Fisher, Jr., O63274.
×Cecil Lavone Forinash, O62846.
×Rawls Harrell Frazier, O61967.
×John Forest Goodman, Jr., O62997.
×William Penn Goodman, O62007.
×Robert Falkner Grabb, O61969.
×Clifford Edwin Harp, O63800.
×Joseph Burns Kelly, O63232.
×Jack Pennington Lawler, O61968.
×Albert Charles Malone, Jr., O63275.
×Thomas Francis Meagher, Jr., O63117.
×Thomas Henry Morton, O63179.
×John Lawrence Naler, O63736.
×James Eugene Rice, O63801.
×Paul Henry Schroy, O61970.
×Richard Wesley Snyder, O63228.
×Earl Castleman Thomas, O63178.
×Charles M. Thompson, O62993.
×Colin Ottawa Villines, O63231.
×Melburn Neale Washburn, O63273.
×Edward James Whalen, O63177.
×Jean Albert Wolf, O63229.
×Charles Kenney Wright, Jr., O63733.

To be captain, Medical Corps

×Clay Franklin Barritt, O62798.
×Kevin Gerard Barry, O63478.
×Robert Isaac Bosman, O65437.
×Warren Harvey Brune, O66613.
×John Edward Buess, O65436.
×Richard Omri Bullis, Jr., O62797.
×Charles Philip Carson, O65961.
×Warren Cavill Evans, O61190.
×Robert Wesley Green, O65461.
×Niklaus Joseph Anton Keller, O61957.
×George Albert Levi, O65439.
×John Frederic Ljunggren, O63219.
×John Charles Marchesi, O66045.
×Walter Sherman Mizell, O65438.
×John de la Salle Morris, O65440.
×George Elbert Omer, Jr., O63636.
×Robert Holland Quinn, O67605.
×William Lawson Richardson, O65441.
×Thomas Duncan Sellers, O65432.
×Leo Henry Silverman, O65435.

To be captain, Dental Corps

×John Henry Belser, O62794.
×Robert Francis Campion, O61956.
×Stanley Sheppard Cohen, O61955.
×Byron Joseph Greany, O62986.
×James Willard Grey, Jr., O58737.
×Robert Wayne Hobson, O52278.
×Bernard J. Nielander, Jr., O61191.
×Donald A. Norris, Jr., O65576.
×Charles Mason Smith, O62796.
×Raymond Walter Tomczak, O62795.
×Robert Hamilton West, O62985.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

×Elwin Raymond Prather, O60766.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

×Bernard Balikov, O56775.

To be captain, chaplains

×William Prentis Barrett, O67551.
×James William Helt, O66161.
×Emil Francis Joseph Kapusta, O66171.
×James Whittier Morrill, O66184.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

•×Alfred Matthew Adams, O65721.
×John Francis Ahern, Jr., A66132.
•×Lowell Adren Aitken, O60951.
×Erwin Frederick Albrecht, Jr., O67636.
×Edwin Wilbur Allen, Jr., O61226.
×Milton Allen, A63006.
×Clarence Edward Apple, O61149.
•Andrew Jackson Armstrong, O61162.
×Charles Martin Attmore, Jr., O65943.
×George Everett Balcom 2d, O65315.
•×Kenneth Keith Barclay, O65285.
×William Spencer Barnes, O62848.
•×Andrew McIver Barr, O62281.
•×George Wallace Bass, Jr., O60268.
•×Cyrus William Bassett, O60945.
×Benjamin Forrest Bateman, O62037.
•Richard Arthur Baughman, O60244.
•×Robert Howard Beck, O66134.
•×William Allen Beddoe, O60920.
•×Thomas Frederick Begley, O60897.
•×Karl Francis Bennett, O65750.
•×Edward Everett Betts, O65950.
×Leland Ellsworth Beyersdorff, O62014.
×Harlan LeRoy Bjork, O62850.
•×George Shannon Black, O65953.
×William Dale Boggs, O67646.
•×Stephen John Borys, O67790.
•×Robert Ulric Boyd, Jr., O66137.
×Charles Stanley Brantley, O62011.
•×Charles Richard Breed, O65302.
•×John Augusta Brenner, O60861.
•×Lawrence Smyth Brice, O60867.
×Remer Young Brinson, O61980.
×Stafford Reade Brooke, Jr., O65955.
•×Richard Mayhew Brown, O61086.
•×William James Browning, O61114.
×Gunther Albert Brumme, O62853.
×John Andrew Bryan, O61163.
•James Harold Buck, O62845.
•×John Lawrence Buckley, O65288.
×Murray Novelle Bullard, O62020.
•Burr Ellis Burgess, O60302.
×Lloyd Leslie Burke, O61246.
•James Charles Busson, O60944.
•×James Francis Butler, O65960.
×James Vernon Caffrey, Jr., O61263.
•×Danford Scott Carroll, O65499.
•×Edwin Thomas Carroll, O60941.
•Paul Neal Casper, O60255.
×Harold Milton Chadick, O65963.
•×Robert Lee Chamberlain, O60954.
•×Fred Robert Champion, O61020.
•×J. Milton Christianson, O65965.
•×Herbert Eugene Clark, O61215.
•Warren Melvin Clark, O65294.
•×Arthur Hopper Collins, Jr., O65500.
×Bernard Jackson Conroy, O61249.
×Lodwrick Monroe Cook, O61250.
•Edward Olin Coursen, O60309.
•×Arthur L. Cox, O65305.
×Robert Lloyd Coxe, O61261.
•×Edward Vaughan Crawford, O60967.
×Terrell James Crawford, Jr., O62852.
×Anthony Bandeira Cristo, O62849.
•Eugene Franklin Crooks, O65971.
•×George Jeffrey Crowe, O61026.
×John Sheppard Culpepper, Jr., O61223.
•×Joseph Tandy Culpepper, O65972.
•×Robert Lee Danilavez, O61112.
•×Edward Parks Davis, Jr., O65975.
×James Hardwick Davis, O61142.
•John G. Dawson, O60280.
•Anthony Carmine DeBellis, O60862.
•×Donald Robert de Camara, O61108.
•William Radcliffe Deeley, O65977.
•×Gordon Bartlett deLashmet, O61054.
×Charles Roderick Dezafra, O61245.
•×Jack Harry Dibrell, O65979.
•×William MacLean Dickson, O65502.
•Robert Curtis Diehl, O65980.
•×John Dissek, Jr., O61034.
×John Paul Dobbins, O61146.
×Andrew Dolziski, O65983.
×James Winner Donald, O66146.
×Robert George Dorsey, O61262.
•×James Dowling, O65985.
•Lawrence Eugene Driscoll, O60288.
×William Henry Drisko, O61152.
•×Hans Karl Druener, O65310.
×Thomas Edward Duffy, O62029.
×Roy Hollifield Duggan, Jr., O66147.
•×William L. Durham, O61043.
•×William Lee Durrant, Jr., O60858.
•×Lewis Vernon Edner, O60919.
•×Arthur Joseph Elian, O60946.
×Calvin Warren Ellis, O63005.
•×Henry Harris Emerson, O61053.
×Robert Wesley Emmert, O62851.
•×John Gibson Engstrom, O63001.
×Murray Herbert Falk, O61238.
•×William Arthur Feek, Jr., O66149.
•×Pelham Leander Felder 3d, O61036.
×Harold Payne Fields, O62032.
•×Merlin Wayne Foerster, O65289.
×Leslie Rudisill Forney, Jr., O61221.
•×John Frech, Jr., O60879.
×Cecil Robert French, O61155.
•×James Thomas Fulghum, O60267.
•×John Louis Fuller, O60873.
•×Robert D. Funke, O60284.
×Maurice Aloysius Gainey, Jr., O61258.
×Elmer John Gainok, O65999.
×James Leonidas Gaither, O66151.
•James Milton Glauber, O61194.
•Robert Beauchamp Gleason, O60292.
•James Parker Godsey, O65307.
•×George Francis Goodspeed, Jr., O60272.
•×Paul Peter Gotowicki, O60910.
•Carl William Graefe, O65749.
•×Francis Porter Graves, Jr., O60252.
×Francois Denis Gravois, Jr., O62009.
•×Calvin Edgar Green, O60913.
•×Joseph Edward Greene, O61031.
•Robert Lyle Greer, O60262.
•Allen Jones Grieger, O61088.
•×Marion Immanuel Guest, O60856.
•Kenneth Ray Haas, O61109.
•×John Houston Haddock, Jr., O61037.
•Mickey Tom Haggard, O61004.
•×James Lowell Halcomb, O65751.
•×James Marlowe Hanson, O60999.
•×Charles DeGraff Hargreaves, O60875.
•Benjamin Franklin Harmon, O61218.
•×Harry Howard Harpold, Jr., O66008.
×James Bernard Hatch, O61156.
•×Errol Edwin Hayes, Jr., O61032.
×Marcus David Hays, O67695.
•×Robert Thompson Heder, O60863.
•Herbert Jimmie Hedrick, O61216.
•Joseph Henry Heiker, O61133.
•Wilton Albert Herring, Jr., O66017.
×Wilbur Jay Hewitt, O63123.
×Richard Goodman Hicks, O62033.
•×Thomas Blair Hobson, Jr., O61105.
•John Joseph Hoch, O65287.
×John Leon Hofues, Jr., O61231.
×Willard Dale Hogan, O66030.

*John Alexander Hollingsworth, O60881.
*×William Julian Hord, O60289.
*×George Combs Horton, O61013.
×William Stanley Horton, O66022.
*×Ernest Ogg Houseman, Jr., O61007.
*×Robert Albert Houser, O60258.
*×Cecil Robison Huff, O60866.
*×Charles March Hunter, O61014.
×Charles Thomas Hutzler, O62016.
*×Joseph Milton Irvin, O60308.
*×Norman Arthur Jensen, O66167.
*George Martin Johnson, O60285.
×Walter Alexander Johnson, Jr., O66029.
*George Washington Johnston, O60877.
*×Richard Yates Johnston, O60286.
×Richard Landy Jones, O63745.
*Roy Calvin Jones, O61213.
×Ondre Maurice Karns, O61974.
*×William Henry Kastner, O61044.
*George Edward Kaso, O61003.
×Robert Stanley Kellar, O63238.
*×George Lawrence Kelley, O60914.
×Victor John Kelly, O67706.
*×Donald E. Kenney, O61029.
*Joseph James Koontz, O60254.
*Reginald Wales Koseki, O65094.
*×Murray Martin Lewis, O66036.
×James Anderson Lillard, O63004.
×Ronald Argyle Liston, O67714.
*Robert Forgie Litle, Jr., O66039.
×William Joseph Lockhart, O62025.
*×Charles Henry Long, O61120.
*James Edward Longsdorf, O60975.
*×Richard Meigs Love, O67717.
×Charles Wendell Luke, O62022.
*×Paul R. Lunsford, O61052.
*×William Martin Luse, O66042.
*×Robert Joseph Lynch, O60253.
×James Parris Lynn, O66043.
*×Wayman Horace Lytle, O60921.
*×Frederick Morse MacGregor, Jr., O60972.
*William McLauren Major, Jr., O65312.
*Howard Heathfield Mann, O60259.
*Raymond Atkinson Marks, O60991.
*James William Martin, O63244.
*John Harrell Mason, O60287.
*×Charles Albert Matlach, O60894.
×Ralph Albert Mattera, O66047.
*×Walter Lloyd Mayo, Jr., O60978.
*×Charles Edward Mayrand, O60922.
*Robert Smith McClenaghan, O65263.
×Ardie Elbert McClure, Jr., O66048.
*×William Chevis McCorkle, O61038.
×Otto Louis McCormick, O66049.
×Joseph Lewis McCoy, O61243.
*×Purdy Belvin McLeod, Jr., O67724.
*Daniel Frederick McNeil, O60277.
*×Ulmer Lamar McNeill, O61110.
×Terrence Stocker Meade, O61225.
*×Joe Glenn Mears, O66052.
×Hector Homer Mendieta, O66053.
*John Davis Meredith, O61214.
×Carl Leonard Merritt, O66054.
*×George Harvey Meyer, O61113.
*×Edward Duncan Middleton, Jr., O61107.
*×William Calvin Miles, O67726.
×Daniel Ludrick Miller, O61228.
×Richard Sheely Miller, O62015.
*×Robert Byron Miller, O60872.
×James Morgan Minter, O62019.
*John Angelo Mittino, O60305.
*×Donald Wilbert Moak, O60902.
*×Charles Steele Moody, Jr., O60927.
*Russell John Moon, O60164.
*Virgil Carthell Moon, O61132.
*George Perry Mooney, O65295.
×Lee Brent Moore, O62026.
*×Lee Permenter Moore, O65482.
*×Carl Edward Morris, O60956.
*×William Chester Mundorf, O67731.
*×Paul Joseph Bruno Murphy, Jr., O66186.
×Thomas Alford Murphy, O61973.
*×Henry John Nachtsheim, Jr., O61139.
×Herbert Frank Neller, Jr., O63003.
×Lloyd Hampton Newcomer, Jr., O62018.
*×Wesley Graydon Nichols, O61010.
×John Joseph Nienstadt, O67732.
*Charles Edward Nix, O61137.
*×Eugene Vernon Norris, O65292.
*John McNeil Norton, O61041.
*×Andrew Richard O'Connor, O61103.
×John Charles Ogilvie, O63491.
*×Robert Theodore Ojendyk, O60976.
*×Frank Morat O'Quinn, O61049.
*×Howard White Overstake, O61008.
*×William Oscar Parker, O61106.
×William Harold Parmenter, O66066.
*×Henry Addison Pate, Jr., O61217.
*×Minor Peeples, Jr., O60915.
*Paul Alexander Pencola, O65300.
×Frank Mercier Pender, O61253.
*Gerald Leo Perry, Jr., O60184.
×Russell Perry, O61144.
×William Murphy Perry, O61150.
×George Edwards Peters, Jr., O61975.
×Robert Leroy Peters, O61978.
*×Willard Thomas Pflueger, O62006.
×Clifford John Phifer, O61254.
*×Ernest Edgar Phillips, Jr., O60942.
*Theodore R. Pickett, Jr., O60899.
×Frederick Allen Pieper, O66192.
*×Stanley Ivan Pilgrim, O63002.
*Jack Thomas Pink, O60869.
*Joseph Raymond Pirkl, O60893.
×Jack Harlow Place, O67739.
*×Bernard John Ploshay, Jr., O65309.
×Alvin Allen Poag, Jr., O62023.
*×James Vardman Pogue, O63973.
*Donald Frank Polden, O65308.
×Clarence Wellborn Pratt, O61227.
×Richard Lee Prillaman, O66073.
*Denzil Lynnwood Pritchard, O60163.
*Albert Sidney Pugh 3d, O66074.
*×Benjamin Harrison Purcell, O61035.
×William Throop Purdy, O62024.
×Ernest August Rajala, O62010.
×Oliver Allen Ray, O66079.
*James Channing Redford, O65298.
*John Francis Regan, O60859.
*×Harold Whitaker Rehm, Jr., O66080.
*×Roderick Dhu Renick, Jr., O66081.
×Delzie Carol Revels, O67744.
×Tom Hunter Reynolds, O62017.
*×Robert Hymer Rice, O66083.
*×John Allen Richbourg, O61118.
*×Hugh Hays Riddle, O66194.
×Charles Ross Roberts, O61255.
×Claude LeRoy Roberts, Jr., O66085.
*Ernest Pinckney Robinson, O60896.
×James Robert Ross, O67747.
*×Terry Charles Salt, O60265.
×Alfred George Sapp, O61256.
*×Alonzo O. C. Sargent, O66200.
×Lawrence Lester Savage, Jr., O62027.
×Richard Henry Sawyer, O61979.
*×Wesley Clinton Scarborough, O60916.
*×Joseph Frank Schall, O65301.
*×William Charles Schemmel, O60281.
*×Marcus Carl Scheumann, Jr., O66094.
*Daniel Farren Schungel, O65286.
×Oreste Sauguigni Sciascia, O67753.
*×Thomas Mayes Scovill, O65311.
×Zadig Yeprem Setian, O66095.
*Joseph Henry Shaffield 3d, O60299.
*×Harry Gerhard Sherblom, O65284.
*×Lawrence Daniel Shields, O66097.
*×Stanton E. Sill, O61046.
*Henry Simon, Jr., O60886.
*×Howard Johnson Simpson, O60987.
×Samuel Slyman, O66100.
*×Everett Francis Smalley, Jr., O60303.
*×Daniel Griffith Smaw 3d, O65306.
*Harold Franklin Smith, Jr., O66101.
*Leroy Walter Smith, Jr., O66202.
*Philip Burke Smith, O60911.
×Roddy Lee Smith, O66203.
*×Joseph Vincent Spitler, Jr., O66103.
*×Max Robert Stallcup, O60279.
*×Karl Frank Stark, O60929.
×Phillip Harrison Stevens, O67763.
×James William Stewart, O61248.
×Stephen Wayne Smith, Jr., O63501.
*×Francis Joseph Stoecker, O66106.
×Ransom David Stone, O62034.
*Rufus Cornelius Streater, O60901.
*×Joe B. Sullivan, Jr., O60923.
×Malcolm Arthur Sussel, O67764.
*×Lawrence Roy Tassie, O60964.
× James Henry Tate, Jr., O61222.
×Robert Roy Taylor, Jr., O62847.
*×David Reid Teener, O60871.
*Addison Terry, O60883.
*Henry Smith Thigpen, O60264.
*×Charles Edwin Thomann, O61005.
*Hal E. Tindall, O60918.
*×Ralph Simon Treadwell, O61242.
×William Gladstone Trigg, O67771.
*×William Jacob Tropf, Jr., O60860.
×Hillard Jay Trubitt, O62035.
*Richard David True, O60864.
*×William Francis Turner, O60957.
*×Willie L. Tyus, O60306.
*×Vincent Thomas Van Sickel, O60257.
*Billy Mills Vaughn, O60893.
×Euell Motie Vinson, O63237.
*×Jack Lee Waddell, O66114.
×Thomas King Waddell, O61266.
*×Eugene Paul Walter, O60928.
*×Kenneth Watson, Jr., O61233.
*James Marlin Welch, O60270.
×Vincent Charles Werder, Jr., O67778.
*×William John Whelan, O60857.
*Ben Owen White, Jr., O60291.
×Charles James White, O65314.
×Marcus Leon Whitfield, O61230.
*Adna Godfrey Wilde, Jr., O60865.
*×Edward Thomas Williams, O60958.
*Robert Carl Williams, O60266.
×Wayman Edward Williams, O66125.
*Walter George Wolfe, O63423.
*×Marion Madison Wood, O61128.
*×Thomas George Woods, O67783.
*Clayton Lyle Wretlind, O60931.
*×Thomas Casper Wyatt, O66128.
*Douglas Ramsey Wylie, O60304.
*×James Lawrence Yacavone, Jr., O60263.
*×Robert Allen Yoder, O60970.
*×John Young 3d, O60278.
*×Donald James Zimmerlin, O61012.
*×Frederick Robert Zurth, O65290.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

*Robert Morris Altman, O65304.
*Milton Braveman, O65501.
*Francis Gerald Dickinson, O65313.
*×Richard Murray Dienel, O65981.
*David William Duttweiler, O65498.
×Frank Gates Favorite, Jr., O65949.
*×Raymond Jones Franz, O65992.
*Roy Lambert Kackley, Jr., O66030.
*Fergus Thomas Monahan, O65291.
*Carlyle Nibley, Jr., O65297.
×Thomas Hugh Plemon, Jr., O66070.
×Donald Lee Price, O66072.
×Daniel Joseph Reynolds, O66082.
×John Earl Scanlon, O62012.
*×Leslie John Shellhase, O66096.
*×George Charles Stein, O61025.
×Herbert Jean Thompson, O67625.
*Vernon John Tipton, O65299.
×Bernard John Wiest, O66122.
*×Gordon Willett, O66123.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

×Dorothy Clare Carson, L356.
×Delma Grey George, L405.
*Lola Marie Irelan, L346.
×Barbara Eunice Knudten, L349.
*Julia Elizabeth Ledbetter, L392.
*×Elsie Jane Metcalf, L342.
*Lois Cornelia Putman, L343.
*Cheryle Mary Riggs, L399.
*Mary Lou Truslow, L344.
×Frances Weir, L406.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

*Eleanor Roberta Asleson, N56.
*×Ruby Grace Bradley, N87.
*Eileen Winifred Brady, N91.
*×Isa Pifer Gazelle, N89.
*Edith Shacklette Grimes, N90.
*Francis Cecil Gunn, N95.
Clara Marie Kiely, N101.
Irene Johanna Klemp, N356.
Hortense Eleanor McKay, N110.
*Eileen Kathryn Murphy, N98.
*Mary Frances Prucha, N72.
Mary Matilda Steppan, N113.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Nina Aim, N2227.
×Dorothy Jean Barber, N2029.
Elizabeth Steenburgh Chamberlin, N2032.
Geneva Helen Culpepper, N2121.
×Sarah Ruth Curtis, N2361.
Mary Louise Dombrosky, N2036.
Eula Rosalie Falls, N812.
Eleanor Mae Garen, N1879.
Elsie Kathryn Hoin, N2230.
Eva Doris Houston, N1950.
Mary Florene Hyman, N1953.
Marie Kimmet, N2037.
Gladys Lavena Lenze, N224.
Martha Marie Staelens, N2060.
Betatrice Estelle Tracey, N1952.
Mildred Stewart Turner, N1856.
Gladys May Welch, N2030.

To be Captain, Army Nurse Corps

×Alyce Dorothea Gordon, N1617.

To be captain, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×Marion Elaine Cook, R10134.
×Mae Augusta Engsberg, M10032.
×Phyllis Regina Strobel, M10069.
×Mary Jane Torp, M10113.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

×Eleanor Alice Anderson, N1807.
•Helen Louise Black, N1786.
•×Beverly Elaine Bochman, N1794.
•×June Lorraine Chambers, N1803.
×Anastasia Amelia Chaponis, N1805.
•×Jean Mary Clawson, N1787.
•×Marilyn Minton Clay, N1793.
•×Jeanette Marion Confort, N1788.
×Geraldine Victoria Coxwell, N1834.
×Maxine Douglas, N1810.
•Lillian Dunlap, N1785.
×Eleanor Rita Gallagher, N1826.
×Shirley Marie Gilson, N1824.
×Aloha Betty-Marie Hammerly, N1815.
×Marie Souza Lowry, N1837.
•×Pettrina Marie Mead, N1797.
×Helen Elaine Moode, N1835.
×Lois Jean Moore, N1829.
×Jean Ann Mulraney, N1817.
×Shirley May Neill, N1838.
•×Florence Lelia Pettey, N1792.
×Irene Rose Zielinski Pishak, N1818.
Frances Carolyn Register, N1811.
Minerva Anne Senn, N1813.
•×Virginia Mary Sulpizio, N1802.
•Patricia Ann Thrush, N1795.
×Ruth Jane Vanderberg, N1808.
•Phyllis Jeanne Verhonick, N1800.
×Lenora Beal Weirick, N1819.
×Helen Lorraine Wick, N1820.
×Mildred Anne Wilcox, N1832.
•×Evelyn Mullins Wysor, N1804
×Petronial Mejias Yannone, N1833.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×Barbara Louise Kennon, R10100.
×Myrna Hathcock Kerce, M10090.
×June Elizabeth Williams, R10102.

(NOTE.—The officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (•) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all our blessings, we are pausing at this noon hour to unite our minds and hearts in the sacrament of adoration and praise.

May we give ourselves in renewed surrender and devotion to Thy holy will for this is the only return we can make for the many manifestations of Thy bountiful providence.

Show us how we may develop and safeguard our country's material interests, but, above all, how to protect and promote its moral and spiritual values.

Help us to see that history proves very conclusively that whole civilizations go down in confusion and chaos unless these values become regnant and potent in the life of humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who is always seeking our eternal good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the RECORD to show that my absence yesterday was due to the fact that I was on official business with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on House Resolution 119, appropriating money for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words today in behalf of a patriotic oragnization of which many of us are members and with which all are acquainted—the American Legion.

Tonight, many cold, lonely, and homesick American servicemen will lie huddled in foxholes in Korea. In Germany, Japan, Alaska, and countless other outposts around the world, members of our Armed Forces will be on guard to protect and preserve the citadels of democracy and freedom-loving people everywhere. Whether these American boys are soldiers, sailors, airmen, or marines, whether they are cold or warm, hungry or well fed, suffering from wounds or in the prime of physical condition, all of these men have one common denominator. They are all lonely—all a little homesick—all longing for Hometown, U. S. A.

Nothing is so important to a member of our armed services as a letter or call from home. What we may do or say here on the floor of the House of Representatives may shape the destiny of the world for years to come, yet it is not half so important to a man in a foxhole as a letter from his mother, his wife, or his sweetheart.

This last week I had the honor of being asked by the American Legion to introduce a new project being sponsored by the Legion called Hometown, U. S. A. This is a project through which the American Legion hopes to provide for unique personal contact between members of the Armed Forces overseas and their loved ones in this country. The idea is simply this: Mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, friends, and other loved ones record a brief greeting to a serviceman together with a tune request, and these recorded messages are then processed and mailed by the American Legion directly to the serviceman for whom they are intended.

Through special arrangements with the armed services and with approval of the Secretary of Defense, overseas personnel will have an opportunity to record similar messages to their folks and loved ones at home. These messages will be cleared through a central American Legion office and forwarded to the appropriate hometown radio station for broadcast. Hundreds of radio stations in this country will devote portions of their broadcasting time to Hometown, U. S. A., messages.

While this is a new activity for the American Legion, the basic idea has been tested and proved successful. On August 28, 1948, a program identified as Stateside Calling was introduced over WTVM, the Armed Forces radio station in the Philippines. The format for the program was the same; that is, featuring an exchange of broadcast messages and tune dedications between troops in the Philippines and their folks back home. This program received wide acclaim and proved to be a tremendous morale booster, both for the troops and their loved ones at home. Radio stations in this country cooperated even to the extent of notifying relatives and friends in advance to be sure they would listen in for the greeting from their special GI.

Having formerly been in the field of radio broadcasting myself, I feel sure that a program such as Hometown, U. S. A., will have terrific human appeal. It provides the next best thing to face contact between mothers and sons, wives and husbands, sweethearts and friends. It permits a relationship at the heartstring level, a relationship that every person can feel and understand.

The Department of Defense and the separate services have given official and enthusiastic approval to the project as a valuable aid to troop morale. The Secretary of Defense has directed maximum cooperation on the part of all commanders, particularly the special service officers, who have been assigned the responsibility for handling the mechanics of this operation overseas. The Chief of Information for the Army has cabled theater commanders explaining Hometown, U. S. A., in detail and urging its activation on all bases. A directive letter over the Army Adjutant General's signature has been forwarded to all special services officers and public information officers from the command to the unit level calling for maximum use of facilities and publicity in behalf of the project. Enclosed with the letter will be a complete Hometown, U. S. A., kit, including standard operational procedure, sample request blanks, photographs of suggested visual displays, and so forth.

The American Legion has received letters from hundreds of radio stations throughout the United States offering their complete cooperation and commending this project.

The Governor of the State of Michigan, G. Mennen Williams, has proclaimed the week of March 9 through March 15 as Hometown, U. S. A., Week throughout the State of Michigan. My own home State of Utah will shortly proclaim a similar Hometown, U. S. A., Week in the Beehive State. Other States, counties, and cities are requested to follow suit and sponsor and assist in publicizing this project.

The purpose of my remarks today is to make an appeal to everyone, everywhere, to get behind this project and help make it a real success. I appeal especially to all of the radio stations in our country to make their recording facilities available to the American Legion, and family and friends of servicemen in order that this program, Hometown, U. S. A., may reach around the world and bring comfort and joy to servicemen overseas and to their families here at home. Because of present world crises, we cannot bring our servicemen home from overseas, but we can, with united efforts, take Hometown, U. S. A., to every serviceman wherever he may be throughout the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on House Resolution 119, relative to an appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities, I was with my committee, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on official business out of the city. If I had been in the Chamber at that time, I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am a new member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am somewhat taken aback and shocked to find Bishop Oxnam, whom I do not know, and against whom I shall lay no charges, for after all he does not know me, either, but I am shocked to find him laying a blanket charge of the kind he pretends to dislike against me and all the other members of the committee. But particularly speaking for myself, I have had no opportunity to do anything, to say anything, and yet in advance I am, in effect, literally burned at the stake. It seems to me that the gentleman of the cloth would do better should he work our side of the street instead of the side that seems to prefer to defend communism. I am making no charges against him, but I think it would do him good had he been able to attend this morning's meeting and session of our committee in which we had a teacher before us, and before which we will have some others this afternoon. Again, I say, I charge him wtih nothing except ignorance of the facts.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman would be surprised to know how many people of this country agree with you.

Mr. CLARDY. I thank the gentleman. I hope they do. But for anyone to profess to dislike a blanket indictment of others and then to indulge in a smear tirade and attack of the kind described in this morning's Times-Herald so efficiently and effectively, and in last night's Star, is beyond understanding. It does my heart good to hear your statement on this. But I am moved to say this even though I am a freshman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentleman and all other Members will not think for one moment that Bishop Oxnam speaks for the entire Methodist Episcopal Church.

Mr. CLARDY. I am sure he does not, and if he does, then God help the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, when the vote was taken on authorizing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities, I was at the White House by invitation of the President and desire to state that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

FARM INCOME

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to address my remarks today chiefly to our metropolitan colleagues in the hope of getting through to them the simple fact that farmers are not, I repeat, not to blame for high food prices.

Here is what I mean. The Department of Agriculture's latest edition of the Marketing and Transportation Situation reached me this morning. It reveals a continued squeeze on the Nation's farmers.

It shows that prices received by farmers have dropped another 7 percent, but retail food prices have remained about the same.

As a result, the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has again shrunk, this time from 50 cents to only 46 cents.

As I pointed out on the floor of this House not long ago, net farm income has dropped more than 20 percent since 1947, while in the same period food prices to consumers have skyrocketed.

TARIFF ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with a recent speech of Henry Ford II, in which he stated that the 10-percent tariff on automobiles is not needed and should be eliminated at once. If that is true, then we should get rid of this tariff at once. Tariffs should only be imposed when necessary in the interests of the strategic requirements of this country or to protect the welfare of American labor, agriculture, and industry. When tariffs do not serve such purposes, then certainly they should not be imposed as a restriction on commerce amongst nations.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today placing automobiles and automobile parts on the free list. The bill specifically excepts motorcycles, tires, and parts made of glass. These items have proved a need for protection and, therefore, should not be placed on the free list.

I trust that Mr. Ford and other representatives of the automobile industry, together with Members of the Congress representing districts and States in which automobiles are manufactured, and the thousands of automobile dealers throughout the Nation, will cooperate in obtaining for this bill a prompt hearing before committee and early passage by the Congress.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Stabilization will expire on April 30. Reasonable men may perhaps differ as to its ultimate benefit to our country but we will all agree that economy was not its watchword. Last year, under the Truman budget, OPS was given $36,900,000 to spend.

When the President abolished this agency during the midst of the fiscal year, some of the appropriated funds had not been spent.

I have been informed that those in charge of this dying agency have decided not to turn back the unexpended

funds into the Public Treasury but instead are planning to spend a large sum of money financing a history of OPS.

My information is that the agency has either made a deal or contemplates one with a writer to produce this history at $7 per hour without any limitation as to time; that he has the privilege of hiring associates to be paid $2 per hour each, and consultants at $50 per day.

I trust the new Budget Director, or other appropriate agency of the Government, will take the necessary steps to stop this waste of money and recover the unspent funds for the Public Treasury. If they fail to do so, I hope this House will direct an investigation and take such steps as may be appropriate to protect the public from such extravagance and waste.

I do not believe we need to spend a large sum of money preparing a history of OPS since that history can be written in one word—failure.

THE LATE FRANK STODDARD DICKSON

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked to learn of the passing, on Tuesday, February 24, of Frank Stoddard Dickson, who served as Representative from Illinois in the 59th Congress when most of us were small boys and many Members of this body were yet unborn.

He served both his country and his State, using his outstanding natural talent, the enthusiasm of youth, the energy of middle life, and the wisdom of old age to benefit the laudable causes which held his firm convictions. He lived a long life of care and devotion to his family, and was an inspiration to all with whom he associated throughout the years.

All of us here who so intimately knew and loved him realized that he had a mind full of sympathetic understanding and a heart full of friendships.

As an old friend, I cannot reconcile myself to the thought of his death, so beautifully expressed by James Whitcomb Riley:

I cannot say, and I will not say
That he is dead. He is just away!
With a cheery smile, and a wave of the hand,
He has wandered into an unknown land
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.

And you—oh, you, who the wildest yearn
For the oldtime step, and the glad return,
Think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of There as the love of Here.
Think of him still as the same. I say,
He is not dead—he is just away.

I fully realize the inadequacy of words to assuage grief, and I hesitate to intrude in the sacred circle of a family in sorrow, but I do express the hope that the God of consolation may visit them with the comfort that strengthens the heart against pain, and that they may in time come to feel that in his life there was typified the most sacred meaning of a life of devotion.

May there come to his family and his friends a peace from today's sorrow and surcease from the threat of defeat tomorrow in the consoling realization of a life which was full and overflowing with kindness and good deeds.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I read in a newspaper a very interesting story. It dealt with one of the leading Americans of today. It was so singular and so very unusual that I hesitated to say anything about it publicly until I had a chance to speak to the man referred to in the article. I had a chance a few times lately to talk with him and on one of these occasions I asked him what were the facts about this very wonderful story.

Here is a brief synopsis of the story. A young lad 15 years of age who was then a very promising athlete, proud of his achievements, hurt his knee. After 2 or 3 days had passed, he talked to his mother and father about it. They said, "We must get a doctor." Blood poisoning had set in. Everything looked dangerous. The doctor came. He said it would be necessary to have the boy's leg amputated or if not he would most likely die. But the boy said, "No, you shall not do it." The boy then called his brother to his side. He said, "Now, my brother, I feel I am going to become unconscious in a few minutes. I want you to promise me that the doctor will not amputate my leg. The brother promised and stood vigil over his brother and the doctor did not amputate. That boy lived through this serious situation. Today he is Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States of America.

A more complete story of this incident will appear in the following article which appeared in the Jackson (Ohio) News-Leader. When I showed this article to President Eisenhower recently while I was his guest at a luncheon in the White House he said that the story in its essence is correct but that it has been embellished somewhat. He has been profoundly thankful that the outcome was so satisfactory.

The newspaper story is as follows:

WHAT IT TAKES

A group of men with lunch boxes were at a bus stop discussing the election. A 6-footer said: "Let me tell you what helped me make my decision.

"I heard of a young lad who was running home from school when he slipped and fell, skinning his left knee. He got to his feet and ran on. By the time he reached home, he had almost forgotten the incident.

"But two mornings later he awoke to find his leg aching badly, and by that evening his foot was black and badly swollen.

"A doctor was called, who said it was blood poisoning and very serious—and next morning he said amputation was necessary. If we do it now we can save the rest of his leg—the longer we wait, the more we'll have to take off," he said gently.

"The young lad shook his head in grim finality. "You won't take any off," he said flatly. But the doctor explained. It's the only way of saving your life." "No," the young lad said, "I'd rather die." Then in agony, he asked for a fork on which to bite.

"He reached for his brother's hand and gasped, "I'm going out of my head—don't let 'em do it while I'm out of my head—you got to stand guard. Promise." The brother promised and for 2 days and nights stood guard while the youth muttered and screamed through feverish nightmare. The doctor came again and again, explaining that "soon there will be nothing we can do to save him."

While the doctor waited for the lad to die the parents knelt and prayed for the miracle which was all, the doctor insisted, that could now save their son.

And the miracle came. The fever began to subside; the blackness faded. After a while the lad awoke, white and exhausted. He was alive and whole. He had won. Three weeks later, though still pale and weak, he walked out of his room.

This lad was Dwight D. Eisenhower. Silence prevailed, until a husky voice said: "He's got what it takes."

Then, one who had joined the group to listen reminded them that when our Constitution was framed they prayed. When slavery was abolished, President Lincoln prayed.

As these men boarded the bus the understanding glances led one to feel that they, too, had decided to pray.

When England had her Dunkirk during World War II it is said that it was not until the nation was on its knees that the miracle happened.

Shall we pray?

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 24, I was necessarily absent from the House during rollcall No. 7 on House Resolution 119 providing $300,000 for expenses for the Committee on Un-American Activities. I desire to state for the record that had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on House Resolution 119 to provide funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. The reason for my absence during the consideration of the resolution is that I had accepted an invitation from the President to attend a luncheon at the White House at 1 o'clock. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend President Eisenhower for his newly established policy of inviting Members of the legislative branch of the Government to the White House for luncheon meetings. Yesterday, 10 Democratic and 11 Republican Representatives were at the White House. In this morning's newspapers, I noticed an announcement that today the President has invited 15 Democratic Senators for a luncheon meeting. These bipartisan meetings with the President will, I feel

sure, bring about a close and more cordial working relationship between the President and the Congress in endeavoring to reach agreements on the many troublesome problems with which we are all concerned.

AID TO EDUCATION THROUGH TAX REDUCTION

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax reduction for certain expenses paid or incurred by a taxpayer for his own education or for the education of others. The purpose of this bill is to give much needed help to the average family in providing the formal schooling that they want their sons and daughters to have. In my own congressional district, there are many families who make more than reasonable sacrifices to provide a college education for their children. These families need the help that this bill will give, and public education needs the encouragement that this bill will give. I take this opportunity to invite the attention of the membership of the House to this legislation, and I sincerely hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give careful attention to the merits of this proposal.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON OLD-AGE AND RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3313, which will establish a 12-member bipartisan Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits. The membership of this Commission would be equally representative of the Government and of private citizens; for under its provisions the President would appoint 4 members, 2 from the executive branch and 2 private citizens; the President pro tempore of the Senate would appoint 2 Members of the Senate and 2 private citizens; and the Speaker of the House would name 2 House Members and 2 private citizens.

It is high time, in my opinion, that we recognize the fact that we know almost nothing about the character and amount of present old-age benefits in terms of their adequacy or in terms of their cost. We do know that there has been a rapid development of such plans, especially since 1935. We know that this development has taken place largely as a result of the almost revolutionary changes in production methods which have shifted us almost overnight from a pattern of rural self-sufficiency to a wage economy. We know that almost within the past decade, the concept behind retirement plans has shifted from the theory of reward for faithful service toward that of a deferred wage. We know that a widening interest in pension plans for special groups has yielded some valuable experience at the same time that it has tended to produce a jumble of systems and benefits in some areas, while other people in our country have been unable to build up any pension rights whatsoever.

We know, too, that the very fact that the miracles of science are adding years to the lives of all of us means that we must chart our course carefully if we are to insure that our oldsters receive an equitable assurance of self-sufficiency on the one hand, and if we are to preserve our solvency on the other. Since 1900 our life expectancy has been increased by about 20 years. Of course, it follows that our aged population is rapidly increasing as a result. We know, for example, that in 1900 only 1 person in 25 had reached his 65th birthday. Today the figure is 1 in 13. During the next 50 years the ratio will probably be reduced to about one in eight. By 1975, we are told, we will have 20 million people aged 65 and over in this country—nearly twice the number we have today.

Now some people talk as if these facts of our time—this miracle of a longer life—is in the nature of a national calamity. I do not agree with that kind of thinking for 1 minute. We have never, in this country, been afraid of problems growing out of progress. And one of the healthiest indications of the dynamics of democracy is the evidence that American communities, churches, labor unions, and public officials are starting to study these problems with the confidence that intelligence, sympathy, and imagination will produce good answers.

At the same time, we know in this country that we cannot tell precisely where we are going unless we occasionally pause and take stock of where we are. And in any discussion of public and private plans today one point becomes very clear—namely the lack of complete data. Even cursory appraisal of the complex assortment of pension plans operated by governments and private business suggests the existence of many injustices and inequities. Some 20 plans exist in the Federal Government alone and it is noteworthy that those Federal plans paying the highest amounts in average monthly benefits such as the judiciary or certain military systems—usually require no contributions by the employee, while Federal contributory plans usually carry benefits which are substantially less generous.

All available evidence points to the fact that payments under both public and private systems vary greatly in amount and duration. Some pensions start when the husband dies, regardless of the wife's age. Others are paid only when there are children in the home. Still others make no provision at all for dependents or survivors and are paid only to the retired wage earner. Many plans provide benefits which show relatively little relationship either to the worker's earnings before retirement, or to his family responsibilities.

It also seems clear that some groups in the population lack any protection while others are receiving retirement allowances from several sources. There is a real need for a businesslike assessment and comparison of the many public and private pension and assistance programs on a State and local level as well as on a national level. We need to discover where inequities exist, whether protection is either nonexistent or inadequate, and where duplication or overlapping occurs. Such an assessment would, I believe, lead to a better understanding of the methods and purposes of sound pension programs, and to a more equitable distribution of those moneys which are set aside for pension purposes.

These are some of the reasons why a bi-partisan commission such as my bill would establish is necessary for our times. I urge your immediate early consideration of H. R. 3313 so that we may get at the important job which is waiting to be done in this area.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the RECORD show that my absence yesterday was due to business in connection with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" in connection with House Resolution 119.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, here is one of the reasons taxes go up and up and up and the national debt keeps increasing, increasing, and increasing:

A year ago the Voice of America condemned 1,200 acres of the choicest irrigated agricultural land in the State of Washington as a site for a radio station. They paid some $400 an acre for it, although there was available nearby other nonagricultural lands that could have been purchased for $10 an acre.

The Voice bought the more expensive land because, they said, the construction job on the station must be rushed.

The Voice of America let a $3,500,000 contract to build the station to the J. G. Watts Construction Co., of Seattle and Portland, on a cost-plus-fee basis. In that contract the Voice agrees to pay the Watts Co. 8½ percent a month on the purchase price of any equipment employed on the job.

Nine and one-half months ago the Voice of America people ordered contractor Watts to move his equipment onto the radio station site to have it available for the erection of antenna towers. No steel has as yet arrived for these towers. Contractor Watts has had

his equipment on the site for 9½ months and under his contract is entitled to receive about 75 percent of its purchase price, although none of the equipment has turned a wheel as yet.

Dr. Compton, prior to retiring as head of the Voice of America last week, said he had recommended that the Voice abandon the Washington State site and buy a new one, presumably of more choice agricultural lands, in California. Presumably the Watts Co. will get several times the purchase price of its equipment before they ever get to use it.

Mr. Watts, in Seattle this week, explained, "I didn't write the contract; the State Department did, and told me to sign it."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

THE COMMUNISTS' NARCOTICS CONSPIRACY

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the real secret weapon of the Kremlin is the dope habit.

The slaves of Stalin swore to break the spirit of resistance in China by killing 1 out of every 4 Chinese. They failed. They failed miserably. What was their alternative? To destroy minds and souls, where they had failed to destroy bodies, by forcing or beguiling millions of Chinese into becoming narcotics addicts.

It is an axiom of the narcotics trade that "every user is a peddler."

The Red dope slaves filter through to the British Crown Colonies—to Hong Kong, to Singapore. Reliable reports are coming through that these users have created new users in order to keep themselves supplied with the drugs of doom. Through this mass-production method, users three or four times removed smuggle the narcotics to sailors whose vessels put in at the ports of diffusion. These sailor-smugglers—a small segment of a generally loyal and strongly independent group—carry their load of narcotics to Mexico, to Canada, and directly into American ports.

Alert Americans have recognized the existence of this evil. Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury has fought long and hard against it in the halls of the United Nations.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should legislate against the Red narcotics threat. I sincerely believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities should place the thorough investigation of this contemptible intrigue high on its agenda. I sincerely believe that the interests of the people of the United States would be well served by such a probe and by subsequent legislation enacted by the Congress to protect and defend these people whom they represent.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday on roll call No. 7, due to official business on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on House Resolution 119.

CLOSING COAL MINES IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the devastating effects of the importation of residual fuel oils on the coal industry of West Virginia, I desire to supplement the statements presented to this House 2 days ago by my honorable colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Let me quote an article appearing in the Huntington Herald-Dispatch for February 22, 1953:

DOROTHY, W. VA.—A union committee here reported that about 500 miners and their dependents are facing near-starvation conditions as the result of a mine closing last month.

On January 29, the Beckley Smokeless Coal Corp. ceased its operations at this Raleigh County mining camp, throwing most of the town's able-bodied men out of work.

Since that time, a special committee composed of United Mine Worker members said the only source of income for the unemployed has been the union's burial fund.

Committeeman Ruben Akers estimated that about 400 children are suffering because of their fathers' unemployment.

During the past year more than 50 mine operations have been compelled to close in West Virginia for lack of markets. As a result, more than 6,000 miners have been thrown out of employment.

Coal is West Virginia's most important industry. Mine closures affect economic conditions throughout the State, resulting in reduced purchasing power, declining market demand, a lowering of gross sales and consumer's tax, while at the same time increasing the Federal and State relief load. Coal is our dependable base fuel and, as in the past, promises in the future to be an indispensable source of power and domestic requirements. National policies tending to destroy the profit incentive of coal mining, permitting the industry to decline, may leave the Nation faced with shortages and abandoned facilities, and so be entirely inadequate to meet the demands in time of dire need. Among the chief factors contributing to the recession in the demand for coal is the large quantity of low-grade residual fuels from foreign refineries now being permitted to enter our ports for sale at prices with which our operators, already staggering under the load of taxes, wages, and freight differentials, find themselves unable to compete.

Coal is vital to our peacetime economy; it is indispensable to our national defense. The industry's survival is essential if we are to meet the unusual demands for fuels in times of emergencies. My bill (H. R. 3185), which would limit the importation of foreign oils in excess of normal requirements, is, I believe, worthy of congressional sanction.

Coal is West Virginia's most important industry, one of our Nation's indispensable base fuels, which, under the impact of large importations of foreign fuel oil, is having to fight for survival. To correct this situation I have introduced H. R. 3185, and I call it to your attention for serious consideration.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to propound a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. There are several bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee providing for an increase in the individual income-tax exemption. I have one for $800, and I know another Member has one for $1,000. I can well understand the viewpoint of the gentleman from New York on his own bill, but the bill on which he proposes to move up the expiration date to June 30, 1953, automatically expires on December 31 of this year. Inasmuch as the excess-profits tax expires on June 30 of this year and the tax problem seems to be bogged down in the House, I am wondering if we can expect hearings within a reasonable period of time to increase individual income-tax exemptions?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to answer the gentleman's question. I think there is a great misconception in regard to the exemption. I lived through a period when personal exemptions in the twenties, when we had plenty of tax revenues, were up as high as $3,500. I think it is a fine thing, but the situation in which we find ourselves is that for every $100 of exemption the revenue drops off $2 billion. With a $1,000 exemption the revenue would be down $9 billion a year.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this body was shocked by the tragic and untimely death of the former Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Jr. He was a constituent of mine; but more than that he was a man who gave the best 20 years of his life in conscientious service to the people of the State of Wisconsin and to the people of America.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow the gentleman from Wisconsin in making a remark about Robert M. La Follette, Jr. I knew him when he was a secretary here; I knew him as a Senator. There were a lot of agitators in this country in those days. Bob La Follette was a constructive statesman; After the talk when he took a pencil in hand he wrote constructive legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to know Bob La Follette in his work here in the Congress of the United States and also as a close personal friend. It is no secret, I am quite sure, that many times in the affairs before the country he and I disagreed; many times we did not see things alike, but I always gave him credit for honesty and sincerely of purpose and for extreme diligence in the matters that came before him. As his long-time friend I join with his wife and family, his friends and relatives in mourning his passing.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by persons in the gallery yesterday when the Un-American Activities Committee resolution was before the House that my voice clearly could be heard three times requesting the gentleman from California, a member of the committee, to yield. I appreciate that the gentleman's time was limited and I am certainly not questioning his exercise of propriety and prudence in not yielding up any part of his time to the Representative of the Second District of Illinois.

Wherever there is Communist infiltration it must be eradicated. Certainly we owe it to our men who are fighting in Korea to continue relentlessly to hunt out the hirelings and dupes of a foreign government working from within to destroy us.

I hold the chairman of the committee, my colleague from Illinois, in the highest personal esteem. It was my thought yesterday that I might be helpful to him and to his committee.

In a very large sense the honor of every Member of this body is at stake in the investigation which for and in the name of the House of Representatives the committee is about to undertake. The unfortunate incident of a few days ago in which the name of a most estimable woman was placed under suspicion, I am sure through inadvertence and to the chairman's later sincere regret, illustrates the caution that is required. It is said that this is to be an investigation of individuals and not of institutions. No one holds a brief for a disloyal individual. Everyone should hold a brief for religious institutions and for popular education. A hunt for Communists must not turn, even by accident, into an attack upon popular education. Nor should it be permitted to approach the fringe of an attack upon any church or upon any religion. Please bear in mind that, with the exception of our State and municipally supported universities, most of the colleges of the United States have started as church institutions. Bear in mind also that there is a small but powerful group that for years has sought to reduce popular education to the teaching of the three R's on the theory that, with immigration in large numbers practically stopped, there must be among native Americans a working class, with no higher ambitions than the doing of the manual chores.

I am sure that my esteemed colleague from Illinois, who came to this Congress with me as a freshman in the 81st Congress, with a rich background in the service of the FBI, is alerted to all of this. I think he intends to do for his country, and in full recognition of the fact that his State and my State was admitted to the Union on the condition that it would protect and advance popular education, a complete and thoroughly constructive job.

Unfortunately he was not on the floor at the time the privileged resolution was before us, but the gentleman from California volunteered to speak for him, at least for the committee.

Had the gentleman from California yielded when thrice I requested him so to do, it had been my intention to suggest first that an explanation should be given of why 15 employees of the committee have been discharged, and secondly that a volunteer assumption by the members of the committee of a judicial code of ethics would prevent future misunderstandings of the committee. On the first point I desired to bring to the attention of the House the fact that 15 employees of the committee, including several investigators, had been discharged apparently for political reasons and had been replaced by others of a different political affiliation. I am not questioning the jurisdiction of the committee and of its chairman over the personnel of the committee. In my own committee, Banking and Currency, under the Democratic and Republican chairmanships there has been the same professional personnel. I am sure the present chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee could have given a satisfactory explanation of why the change in the personnel of his committee. I am sure he would have been happy to have given that explanation so that there could be no possible misunderstanding. We cannot play politics in our serious job of fighting Communists.

I wished also to call to his attention the pitfalls ahead and to suggest to him that to avoid any possible misunderstandings in the future the committee should voluntarily adopt a judicial code of ethics. A judge would disqualify himself if prior to or during a trial he should permit himself to become engaged in a public discussion of the issues. The same rule should apply in the case of members of a congressional committee delegated to act for and in the name of a legislative body in an investigative capacity. Therefore, I had thought that had the gentleman yielded to me, and on my suggestion, he would have volunteered for himself and for the committee a commitment that prior to a final finding on any individual or on any issue by the full committee each and every member of the committee would refrain from appearances on radio and TV and from press releases on issues which were then pending or which were about to come before the committee of which they were members.

As the gentleman from California in the division of his time, which was limited, and which was under his control, did not see fit to yield to me, and thus the to me helpful suggestions that I had to offer were silenced, there was but one thing that I could do in all good conscience. That was to vote "present" when the roll was called.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, of course, we all sympathize with our colleague from Illinois because he was not able to express his views the other day, but I am sure he will extend them in the RECORD of today.

IS THERE A GOD?

Several years ago a candidate for a municipal office in the city of Detroit, who was a Communist, carried in his campaign literature in substance the following statement:

> There is no God. Religion is a fraud. The priests and the ministers are hypocrites.

That is the creed of the Communist Party. That party seeks the overthrow of our Government by force.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Un-American Activities is today seeking, as it has in the past sought, endeavored to expose Communists in the Federal Government, in schools and other organizations so that these Communists may be ousted—placed where they will have no influence in directing local or national activities or directing the future policy of our Nation. I cannot see anything wrong with that effort.

I note that when the chairman of that committee made a mistake a few days ago and shortly thereafter apologized, the Washington Post, which, in my personal opinion, has been pink at least since 1935, had a great deal to say about that mistake; but I also recall that the Washington Post some years ago was the

originator of the vicious conspiracy which caused more than 30 people to be called down here to Washington from all over the United States to stand trial on a false charge of sedition. For almost 4 years they were shamefully persecuted. None was convicted and the Post after 4 years finally offered a half-hearted apology.

Just why the Washington Post—which has for years criticized those who fought communism and Communists who contend religion is a fraud and that priests and ministers are hypocrites—is now found in bed with those men who are hired to preach Christianity, charity, and tolerance from the pulpit each Sunday but who earlier in the week bitterly condemned Members of Congress who are opposing those who deny the existence of a God, I cannot understand. Just because it does not approve the methods, condone the mistakes of those who fight communism is no good reason for opposing the efforts of those who seek to destroy it.

PRAYERS OFFERED BY THE REVEREND PETER MARSHALL, D. D.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 6,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 86 of the 81st Congress, 1st session, the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the 80th and 81st Congresses, 1947–49; of which 1,950 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,050 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 150 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by regular or special subcommittees, not to exceed $355,050, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or its regular or special subcommittees within or outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by and signed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, in reporting this resolution and the amount allocated to the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on House Administration had in mind that this was to include investigations of any matter that has arisen or might arise, whether before January 3 or thereafter; is that right?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that the rules provide for the subjects that will be investigated by the Committee on Government Operations. The chairman has set up 4 or 5 subcommittees to investigate different matters, all in the Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether they arose before or after January 3.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why, of course. We will undertake to track down wrongdoings wherever and whenever they occur.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 24, I was necessarily absent from the House during rollcall No. 7 on House Resolution 119, providing $300,000 for expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I desire to state for the record that had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on House Resolution 119, to provide funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. The reason for my absence during the consideration of this resolution was that I had accepted an invitation from the President to attend a luncheon at the White House at 1 o'clock.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, and myself also were absent yesterday when the rollcall was taken on House Resolution 119, also attending the luncheon at the White House as mentioned by Mr. GAVIN. Had we been present, we also would have voted "yea."

REQUIRING ANNUAL REVIEW OF MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2332) to require an annual review of military personnel requirements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) on June 30, 1953, commissioned officer personnel on active duty in the Armed Forces (excluding Reserve officers on active duty training or Reserve officers ordered to active duty for periods of 30 days or less) shall not exceed the following numbers in each grade:

Ranks	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
General of the Army or fleet admiral of the Navy	4	3	0	0
General or admiral	8	6	7	1
Lieutenant general or vice admiral	27	24	19	4
Major general or rear admiral	172	128	161	23
Brigadier general or rear admiral	297	128	222	31
Colonel or captain of the Navy	5,199	2,987	4,351	546
Lieutenant colonel or commander	13,230	7,006	8,602	1,186
Major or lieutenant commander	18,075	10,911	21,454	2,522

(b) Vacancies within the allowances prescribed by subsection (a) of this section for any grade may be assigned to any lower grade or grades.

SEC. 2. Section 634 of Public Law 488, 82d Congress, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall terminate on July 1, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 2332, as amended, is stopgap legislation to prevent the demotion of some 5,400 Navy lieutenants who otherwise will be demoted on April 1, 1953. That is the primary objective of this temporary legislation.

The bill will also permit the services to promote officers to the grade of captain or senior lieutenant without the restrictions that are now contained in section 634 of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. The majority of officers who will benefit from the removal of this restriction are recalled Reservists, many of them married, with dependents, and who have had combat service.

I want to make it abundantly clear that the demotion of 5,400 Navy lieutenants which will take place if we do not enact this legislation is not the fault of the author of the rider, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

He was given figures by the Navy Department that proved to be erroneous. Had the figures been correct, in all likelihood no demotions would have been required, or at least only a few would have been required.

Back in 1947 the Congress enacted the Officer Personnel Act. I happen to have been chairman of the subcommittee in the 80th Congress that considered that piece of legislation. There were more than 303 pages in the bill. It was a very highly complex, technical, and complicated act. That act set up an elaborate system of promotion for officers of our Armed Forces. Its purpose was to prevent stagnation in rank, eliminate promotion based solely upon seniority, and reduce the forced attrition of comparatively young officers which added greatly to the retirement costs for the Armed Forces. And above all it established a

sound career program for officers, aimed at attracting capable men.

We thought we had done a good job on that law and I still believe that for the type of armed force contemplated at that time we did a good job. But, unfortunately, neither that law nor any laws enacted prior to the outbreak of the war in Korea, visualized the type of situation in which we now find ourselves. In other words, we never considered the possibility that we would get into a period of mobilization and demobilization operating simultaneously. We did not think we would have an emergency which threatens to become a continuing thing for many, many years to come.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is to be congratulated for focusing the attention of the Congress on the entire subject of promotion of officers in our Armed Forces. It is a healthy thing to look into this matter, but I am not ready to admit that promotions have been excessive, nor am I willing to admit that the Officer Personnel Act does not provide properly for promotions in a time of emergency. In fact, no one can say whether the law is adequate or not because it has not been thoroughly reviewed by our committee or anyone else. The Armed Services Committee does intend to examine the whole matter during the next month. Perhaps it will be necessary for us to place statutory limitations on temporary promotions for the Army and Air Force comparable to those that are now in effect for the Navy. Perhaps it will be necessary for us to examine present officer billet requirements necessary to man our Armed Forces. At the very least, we will certainly review the Officer Personnel Act and the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941. After that we will report to the House our conclusions on this very important subject.

Now bear in mind we are dealing with a very sensitive subject. We are dealing with men's careers; we are dealing with pay, and we are dealing with a man's prestige and dignity. We are dealing with the present and future leaders of our Armed Forces. We are not going to improve our Armed Forces, in fact we are going to seriously injure our Armed Forces, if we reduce promotional opportunities to such a point that no man with the type of ability required to lead our Armed Forces today will seek the service as a career. An Army, or a Navy, or a Marine Corps, or an Air Force, is only as good as its leaders, from the most junior lieutenant to the most senior five star general.

While it may appear that we have too many high-ranking officers in our Armed Forces today, nevertheless we have the finest armed force in the world. And I don't want to jeopardize that status by hasty action on a very serious and very complicated subject.

Now this is stopgap legislation; it repeals the Davis rider but places, for all practical purposes, the same limitations on promotion that were contained in the Davis rider. However, it uses finite figures instead of percentages and uses a definite date when these figures may not be exceeded rather than any date throughout a 90-day period. It makes the Davis rider administratively feasible and prevents an officer from suffering, through no fault of his own, should he otherwise find himself excess in grade, because now each service will know exactly how many officers it can have in each grade. The proposed legislation also permits small increases over and above the original Davis limitations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for doctors, dentists, and veterinarians who will come in from civilian life in the next few months, and the limitations have been removed on captains. Other than that, the net result is the same as that contemplated by the original Davis rider, which would otherwise become effective on April 1, 1953.

I sincerely hope that the House will enact this measure and that Members will then be patient with the Committee on Armed Services while it studies the whole problem of officer promotion in our Armed Forces.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering how it happened that the committee was furnished with misinformation.

Mr. SHORT. I think perhaps the gentleman's colleague from the State of Wisconsin who was furnished these figures by the Navy will give you full information.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I notice this provides 21,454 majors in the Air Force as contrasted to 18,075 in the Army and 10,911 lieutenant commanders for the Navy, and 2,522 majors for the Marine Corps. Why are there so many majors in the Air Force?

Mr. SHORT. Most of them are recalled reservists, I will say to the gentleman, and also because of the peculiar type of function or particular mission of that branch of the armed services, there are more officers.

Mr. GROSS. There are more majors. I am interested in knowing why there are more majors than other officers.

Mr. SHORT. There are more officers as compared to the number of enlisted men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, the Air Force needs and has more officers, and more majors because you cannot place an airplane in charge of an enlisted man.

Mr. SHORT. That is very true. As I said because of the peculiar function or mission of the Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. But these are majors and not captains or lieutenants.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has consumed 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this is urgent legislation—urgent because without it some 5,400 young naval lieutenants will be demoted.

What the proposed legislation does is remove the restrictions which otherwise would go into effect on April 1 of this year in the grades of captain in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and senior lieutenants in the Navy. There are many reserve officers in this grade or immediately below the grade of full lieutenant or captain and these are the men who will benefit by the enactment of this legislation. There is also a small increase permitted in the number of majors and lieutenant colonels to take care of the doctors and dentists who will be coming into the service during the last 3 months of this year. The increases authorized are small in number and will only be used for the purpose of providing proper grades for these doctors and dentists.

Now I think a brief analysis of some of our personnel laws would clarify some of the questions that may be in the minds of Members who are not familiar with this very complicated subject. Let us start with the Navy.

Under the law passed in the 79th Congress, the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy was established at 500,000. And under section 4 of that same law the authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, was established at 7 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy. In other words, the permanent law provides that there can be 35,000 line officers and 500,000 enlisted personnel. Now in addition to this, there are staff corps officers in the Navy. Under the Officer Personnel Act, for example, the Supply Corps is authorized a regular strength equal to 12 percent of the 35,000 regular officers. Civil engineers are authorized 3 percent, based on the 35,000 officers. And doctors, dentists, and chaplains, and officers of the Medical Service Corps, account for approximately 10,000 additional regular officers. Thus, the permanent law of the Navy authorizes an enlisted strength of 500,000 and an officer strength of approximately 52,000.

Then section 2 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act was passed in 1948 and that established an authorized active duty personnel strength for the Marine Corps and Navy combined, including officers, which amounted to 666,882. However, the authorization for regular officers must still be based on the authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Navy.

Then the war in Korea came along and we had to remove all restrictions on personnel ceilings in the Armed Forces so that until July 31, 1954, there are no legal limitations on the size of the Navy.

Then the Davis amendment was passed last year on the theory that there were too many officers serving in the higher grades in the Armed Forces. Now, insofar as permanent promotions are concerned for regular personnel, the Officer Personnel Act establishes percentages which may not be exceeded. In other words, the total number of naval officers on the active list, that is the total number of line officers that may be serving on the active list of the regular Navy,

may not exceed seventy-five one-hundredths of 1 percent in the grade of rear admiral, 6 percent as captains, 12 percent as commanders, 18 percent as lieutenant commanders, 24.75 percent as lieutenants, and 38.50 percent in the combined grades of lieutenant, junior grade, and ensigns. In addition to that, the law also says that except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, there can only be 150 rear admirals on active duty in the Regular Navy, 19 restricted line rear admirals, 15 medical rear admirals, 13 supply corps admirals, 4 civil engineers, 4 dental admirals, and 2 chaplains. Even though we now have an emergency, these limits on permanent admiral grades have not been exceeded.

Now, it was the intent of the Officer Personnel Act, that so-called temporary promotions should terminate on or before January 1, 1957. In other words, when we passed the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, we had in mind an eventual peacetime armed force made up of professional soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. But until we got on a complete professional basis, we had to have provisions for temporary promotions. This also took into consideration the possibility of an emergency such as we are now in, or even a total war, although in the event of a total war, in all likelihood, the Officer Personnel Act would be suspended entirely.

Nevertheless, the permanent provisions of law, with respect to temporary promotions in the Navy do contain definite percentage limitations on the distribution of officers in the Navy. In other words, only seventy-five one hundredths of 1 percent of all of the line officers on active duty may be rear admirals; only 6 percent may be captains, 12 percent commanders, 18 percent lieutenant commanders, 24.75 percent lieutenants, and 38.50 percent in the combined grades of lieutenant, junior grade, and ensign. Because of the recall of Reserve officers, particularly in the grades of lieutenant, junior grade, and lieutenant, we temporarily suspended the limitations imposed upon the grades of the lowest three officer grades. But nevertheless, the Navy does have definite restrictions, percentagewise, on the number of officers that may serve in the higher grades of lieutenant commander and above.

Now the problem insofar as the Navy is concerned, particularly during an emergency of the type which may face us for many years to come, is whether these percentages are too high. For example, under the limitations that I have just mentioned, the Navy could have 389 line rear admirals on active duty. As a matter of actual fact, there are only 202 line rear admirals on active duty. They could have 3,184 captains, but only have 1,906. They could have 6,369 commanders, but only have about 4,025. And they could have 9,553 lieutenant commanders, but they only have 8,373. Bear in mind that I am speaking of line staff corps officers.

I think in all fairness, it should be stated that the Navy has slowed down its promotions and has stretched out the service in grade requirement for promotion, particularly for the grades of commander and above. In other words, while the Officer Personnel Act contemplated that a captain would serve 5 years as a captain before he could be considered for rear admiral, today the average captain serves 8½ years. And while the average commander would normally be required to spend 7 years as a commander before he could be considered for promotion to captain, the average service in grade requirement today is 9 years. In other words, despite the statistics which show a large number of officers serving in high grades compared with World War II, nevertheless, it is not true that in the higher grades naval officers are being promoted at an excessive rate of speed.

Now in the Army and the Air Force we face a different situation. The Army law authorizes an active duty personnel strength of 837,000 officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel, of which 30,600 are authorized as commissioned officers of the Regular Army. The Air Force is authorized an active duty personnel strength of 502,000 total personnel, of which 27,500 may be active list commissioned officers of the United States Air Force. These two provisions of law, like the Navy law, have been suspended insofar as personnel strengths are concerned, until July 31, 1954. And under the permanent provisions of the Officer Personnel Act, the Army and the Air Force are limited in the number of officers who may hold permanent grades in the regular Army and Air Force. Thus, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act, three-fourths of 1 percent of the total officers of the regular Army and Air Force may be generals. There are some variations for the medical and dental corps, and the veterinary corps. In addition, the law places a specific limitation on the number of general officers that may serve in the permanent grade of general or above in the Army and Air Force. Thus, the law provides that not more than 357 officers on the active list of the Regular Army and Air Force may serve in a permanent grade above that of colonel, and this includes the medical, dental, and veterinary corps, and chaplains. Likewise, not more than 178 officers on the active list of the Regular Army and Air Force may serve above the permanent grade of brigadier general. And the remaining 167, including the medical and dental corps officers, and chaplains, must be brigadier generals. In addition, the law says that unless a national emergency is declared, after July 1, 1948, not more than 44 officers may serve in the Army and Air Force in the grade above major general. And finally, the law says that only 8 percent of the officers of the regular Army and Air Force may be colonels, only 14 percent can be lieutenant colonels, 19 percent majors, 23 percent captains, 18 percent first lieutenants, and 18 percent second lieutenants.

Now, insofar as permanent promotions for personnel of the Regular Army and Air Force are concerned, these limitations still apply. The trouble, if there is any trouble, is that there is no percentage limitation such as there is in the Navy for temporary promotions in the Army and Air Force. In other words, the Officer Personnel Act merely provides that whenever the total number of officers serving on active duty in the Army or Air Force exceeds the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army and Air Force, the respective Secretaries shall determine the requirements in each of the commissioned grades and shall proceed to fill those requirements through temporary promotions. The basic difference between the Navy system and the Army and Air Force system is that persons selected for temporary promotion in the Army and Air Force do not thereby acquire a status on a promotion list which would require them to be promoted to the grade on a permanent basis in the event that there is a reduction in the size of the Armed Forces. The Navy, on the other hand, in its system, selects officers for temporary promotion, but having once been selected for that temporary promotion, they remain on that list and in the event of a reduction in the size of the Navy, the officers who had been selected for temporary promotion would have to be promoted to that grade before all officers junior to them could be considered and selected.

Now, when I say there are no legal limitations on temporary promotions in the Army and Air Force, I do not want to leave the impression that there are not limitations of one type or another. There is always the budgetary limitation. When the Armed Forces tell the Appropriations Committee they need so much money for so many people they have to give that committee an estimate as to the number of people that will be serving in each enlisted and officer grade. And obviously, if the mission of any service requires so many people, no service can then take that appropriation for the purpose of promoting officers and at the same time reduce their number of total personnel. They just could not fulfill their mission if they did that. In addition, the Senate Armed Services Committee has imposed limitations on the number of flag officers and general officers that will be confirmed by the Senate and that also acts as a restriction on the promotion of general and flag officers that may serve in grade at any one time.

As a matter of fact, I think I should mention right here that whereas the Davis amendment permits the Air Force to have 409 general officers, nevertheless, the Senate Armed Services Committee will only confirm 383 general officers, 26 less than that permitted by the Davis amendment; and where the Davis rider permits 508 general officers, the Senate limitation is 496, exclusive of generals of the Army, 3. On the other hand, the Davis rider limitation on the Navy and Marine Corps is seven less admirals and one less general than the numbers that the Senate agreed to confirm.

What we are dealing with in this bill today is stop-gap legislation to prevent a great catastrophe to some 5,400 Navy lieutenants together with several thousand other junior officers whose promotions cannot be effected until these limitations on the grade of captain or senior lieutenant are removed. The overall problem, as I see it, boils down to this: Are the Navy percentage limitations in an emergency such as this too high? Should we impose restrictive limitations

in law for temporary promotions for the Army and Air Force? That is the problem. That is what the Committee on Armed Services will study during the month of March.

I trust that within a month the Committee on Armed Services will be able to report to the House on this whole problem and will be able to advise the House whether or not in their opinion there has been any excessive promotions or abuse of provisions of law now contained in the Officer Personnel Act. But before I close, I want to emphasize one thing: I hope the House is not going to adopt a penny wise and pound foolish philosophy with respect to officers serving in our Armed Forces. I have heard the statistics on the number of officers serving in grade in World War II compared with those serving in grade today. I know that those figures at first glance appear to be out of proportion. But bear this in mind, today you are dealing with far more advanced weapons of war; and you are dealing with many more career personnel than we had in 1945. You are also dealing with reservists who are serving their country for a second time in a decade. You cannot attract a capable young man and ask him to make a career of the Armed Forces if you do not give him an opportunity to advance in his chosen profession. You cannot keep a good reserve officer on active duty if you remove opportunities for promotion. And you are not going to play fair with the men who at the end of World War II elected the service as their career if you come along now and say we are not going to promote you any more because you were promoted too fast during World War II. When we start to tamper with the morale of our Armed Forces we are tampering with the most precious thing we possess—our own freedom.

I hope the House will pass this bill, and then let the Committee on Armed Services study the whole problem. If there have been abuses, we will correct them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 10 minutes, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. R. 2332, which is brought before you this afternoon, under suspension of the rules, by the Armed Services Committee.

I stand before you as the author of the Davis rider that you have heard so much about. I believe that in the 10 minutes which the chairman of this committee has so kindly given me I can demonstrate to you that I am not just an officer hater—there are times, of course, when all of us hate ourselves a bit—however, I happen to be a Reserve officer. I am not vindictive, I am not completely stupid, although all of those things have been said about me in the papers and on the radio and among certain officers of of armed services. I stand before you as a member of a great committee of this House, a man who was confronted with a condition and not a theory. With those who say that measures of this kind ought not to be handled by appropriation riders I agree with in theory, but I also say that you will all find that sometimes it takes drastic action by a Member of this body in order to fulfill the responsibility that is his duty.

The condition that faced the Committee on Appropriations last June, too late to get action by the legislative committees of this body or of the Senate, was this: That when we inquired into the situation of temporary promotions in the Armed Forces we found that the Air Force had well over a thousand officers serving 2 steps above the permanent rank, just about 100 times as many as the most responsible officers of that branch of the armed services seemed to have any knowledge of. We found that the Army and the Air Force combined by next June 30, planned to have more colonels than they had on June 30, 1945, during World War II when they had about three times as many men in the service. We found that there is, as of this date, no provision in the law whatsoever governing the temporary promotions of officers of the Army and the Air Force; so that in theory at least, if we wish to talk about theory, the Army and the Air Force tomorrow morning could promote every commissioned officer to the rank of general, and there is nothing in the law that would prevent that from coming to pass.

We found that in the Navy they planned to have more officers in the ranks of commander and above next June than they had on June 30, 1945, when they had 3,500,000 men as compared to the little over 800,000 they expect to have by next June 30.

A similar situation existed to some extent with respect to the Marine Corps—more officers, lieutenant colonel and above, than they had on June 30, 1945, at a time when they had almost twice as many men in their ranks.

So, to confront that condition and not because I love appropriation riders or because I hate anybody, the Davis rider came into being. It set up a percentage limitation, a percentage of the total personnel in each branch of the service, of the officers who could hold higher ranks in all the branches of the armed services. To those of you who say it was hasty, that it was not given any consideration, let me tell you what I want you to do: I want you to talk to the members of the Armed Services Committee of this House, talk to the chairman, talk to the gentleman from Georgia, with whom I consulted; they recognized the problem that existed last June; ask them whether there was any consideration given to this, before it was submitted to this House for its action and it was passed on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Georgia stood up here on the floor of this House and said they had no objection to this stopgap because they felt something of that kind was necessary just as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said this morning. So it became law.

Because the largest crocodile tears have been shed most profusely, and been most widely disseminated, by sources within the Navy I think we will take that for an example and show you just what did happen with respect to the figures of the officers within the Navy.

We started with what the Navy planned to have next June, and then a table was set up percentagewise, very carefully, to prevent demotions. There was no attempt to demote anybody because of the personal hardship on that particular officer to do so; and these limitations went down the line. For commanders and above, there was a total lessening of officers of between 450 and 500; and then for lieutenant commanders, because of the repression at the top, the Davis rider allowed 200 more than the Navy asked for, in order to help take up the slack. With respect to lieutenants senior grade, the rider allowed exactly what the Navy said they wanted to have right down to the last lieutenant senior grade; and that was the provision that passed this House, was accepted in conference, and became the law.

Then in August came a press release from the Navy which said they were going to have to demote a number of lieutenants—and keep in mind this: That the total lessening of officers of the Navy lieutenant senior grade and above was less than 300 out of 43,000. The total lessening was less than two-thirds of 1 percent, and the Navy had 9 months in which to get their house in order; but still the press release came out saying there were going to be many demotions. I inquired about that, and on October 1, 1952, I got an answer signed by the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and it said:

> In developing new promotion plans in order to comply with section 634 it became evident that an accounting error with respect to grade distribution existed in the Bureau of Naval Personnel Statistics. This error, which has been corrected, was cumulative from the time of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

So on the basis of that letter of October 1, he said there would be 790 demotions of lieutenants senior grade. But he also told me that the accounting error had been corrected.

Can you imagine my surprise then to be told in January, just 3 months later, after the error had been corrected, that instead of 790 demotions the Navy found itself with the necessity of making 5,400 demotions of lieutenants, senior grade, and had another 4,600 lieutenants, junior grade, who could not be promoted. In other words, if you took those they had to demote and those that they could not promote, the Navy's figures as of last July were about 50 percent off the beam with respect to lieutenants, senior grade.

But the part I resent the most is not that they made a mistake. Every human being will make a mistake. The part that hurts me the most deeply is that it took the Bureau of Navy Personnel from August, when it put out the first press release, until January of this year—let me say, when their backs were to the wall—before they admitted publicly that the Navy had made a mistake. Up until that day the newspapers, the radio commentators, and the editorial writers had been having a field day based on information which could have come to them from one source only and that source was within the armed services.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the failure of even one responsible officer of the Bureau of Naval Personnel to come forward and tell the officers of the Navy, to come forward and tell the public, the truth, was a fraud upon the officers of the Navy, a fraud upon the public and a fraud upon me personally. I think you will agree that fraud can be just as improper, and it is so recognized in law as well as in morals, when committed by one who has a responsibility to disclose the whole truth and fails to make such disclosure, that such person is just as guilty of fraud as one who makes affirmative misrepresentation of a material fact.

Mr. Speaker, that was the situation on February 4 when the chairman of the Armed Services Committee called hearings for revision of the Davis rider. I believe that H. R. 2332, as amended, represents the best possible solution to this situation. First of all, it completely accepts in principle the necessity for stopgap legislation at this time, and while it differs in actual figures, it is in terms of finite numbers rather than percentages, it has a definite date instead of a period of time, yet the actual figures for the higher ranks work out exactly the same as the Davis rider. It removes the limitation on lieutenants, senior grade, and captains in the other branches of the service, which, I might say, was in accordance with my own suggestion, and it permits a few more officers in the middle ranks to take care of medical and dental personnel who must be called to active duty. So I say that, in my opinion, the Armed Services Committee has brought forth the best possible solution to this situation. It has given us a temporary stopgap, a temporary solution, it prevents demotions which, heaven knows, I had no intention to cause and which would not have been caused if there had been a little more accuracy. It holds the line until the subcommittee which has been appointed by the chairman can do the difficult and complicated job that is its assignment. This subcommittee has a great responsibility to the Congress and to the people of this country. There are changes that need to be made and I hope this subcommittee will do the spadework to bring about these necessary changes in the permanent legislation that are necessary for the armed services at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Wisconsin delegation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to commend the gentleman for the fight that he has made on this most important proposition. It has been a fight, as we all know, against great odds, and I can say to you, sir, that this Congress and the people of the United States are deeply indebted to you for this fight.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in his opinion two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). One hundred and seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 370, nays 0, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—370

Abbitt	Cretella	Hoffman, Mich.
Abernethy	Crosser	Holmes
Adair	Crumpacker	Holt
Addonizio	Cunningham	Holtzman
Albert	Curtis, Mass.	Hope
Alexander	Curtis, Mo.	Horan
Allen, Ill.	Curtis, Nebr.	Hosmer
Andersen, H. Carl	Dague	Howell
	Davis, Ga.	Hruska
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Wis.	Hull
	Delaney	Hunter
Arends	Dempsey	Hyde
Aspinall	Derounian	Ikard
Auchincloss	Devereux	Jackson
Ayres	D'Ewart	James
Bailey	Dies	Jarman
Barden	Dodd	Jenkins
Barrett	Dollinger	Jensen
Bates	Dolliver	Johnson
Battle	Dorn, N. Y.	Jonas, Ill.
Beamer	Dorn, S. C.	Jonas, N. C.
Becker	Dowdy	Jones, Ala.
Belcher	Doyle	Jones, N. C.
Bender	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Bennett, Fla.	Eberharter	Kean
Bennett, Mich.	Edmondson	Kearney
Bentley	Elliott	Kearns
Bentsen	Engle	Keating
Berry	Evins	Kee
Betts	Fallon	Kelley, Pa.
Bishop	Fenton	Kelly, N. Y.
Blatnik	Fernandez	Keogh
Boggs	Fine	Kilburn
Boland	Pino	King, Calif.
Bolton, Frances P.	Fisher	King, Pa.
	Fogarty	Kirwan
Bolton, Oliver P.	Forand	Klein
	Ford	Kluczynski
Bonin	Forrester	Knox
Bonner	Fountain	Krueger
Bosch	Frazier	Laird
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Landrum
Boykin	Friedel	Lane
Brambiett	Fulton	Lanham
Bray	Garmatz	Lantaff
Brooks, La.	Gary	Latham
Brooks, Tex.	Gavin	LeCompte
Brown, Ga.	Gentry	Lesinski
Brown, Ohio	George	Long
Brownson	Golden	Lovre
Broyhill	Goodwin	Lucas
Bryson	Graham	Lyle
Buchanan	Granahan	McConnell
Budge	Grant	McCormack
Burdick	Gregory	McDonough
Burleson	Gross	McGregor
Busbey	Gubser	McIntire
Bush	Gwinn	McVey
Byrd	Hagen, Calif.	Machrowicz
Byrne, Pa.	Hale	Mack, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Mack, Wash.
Camp	Halleck	Magnuson
Canfield	Hand	Mahon
Cannon	Harden	Mailliard
Carlyle	Hardy	Marshall
Carnahan	Harris	Martin, Iowa
Case	Harrison, Va.	Matthews
Cederberg	Harrison, Wyo.	Meader
Celler	Hart	Merrill
Chatham	Harvey	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hays, Ohio	Miller, Calif.
Chiperfield	Hébert	Miller, Kans.
Chudoff	Heller	Miller, Md.
Church	Herlong	Miller, N. Y.
Clardy	Heselton	Mills
Clevenger	Hess	Morano
Cole, Mo.	Hiestand	Morgan
Cole, N. Y.	Hill	Moss
Colmer	Hillelson	Moulder
Condon	Hillings	Multer
Cooper	Hinshaw	Mumma
Corbett	Hoeven	Murray
Cotton	Hoffman, Ill.	Neal
Nelson	Richlman	Thomas
Nicholson	Riley	Thompson, La.
Norblad	Roberts	Thompson, Mich.
Norrell	Robeson, Va.	
Oakman	Robsion, Ky.	Thompson, Tex.
O'Brien, Ill.	Rodino	Thornberry
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, Colo.	Tollefson
O'Hara, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
O'Hara, Minn.	Rogers, Mass.	Utt
O'Konski	Rooney	Van Pelt
O'Neill	Roosevelt	Van Zandt
Osmers	Sadlak	Velde
Ostertag	St. George	Vinson
Passman	Saylor	Vorys
Patman	Schenck	Wainwright
Patten	Scherer	Walter
Patterson	Scrivner	Wampler
Pelly	Scudder	Warburton
Perkins	Seely-Brown	Watts
Pfost	Selden	Weichel
Pilcher	Shafer	Westland
Pillion	Sheehan	Wharton
Poage	Sheppard	Wheeler
Poff	Short	Whitten
Polk	Shuford	Wickersham
Poulson	Sieminski	Widnall
Powell	Simpson, Ill.	Wier
Preston	Small	Wigglesworth
Price	Smith, Kans.	Williams, N. Y.
Priest	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Prouty	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Calif.
Radwan	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Rains	Spence	Wilson, Tex.
Ray	Springer	Winstead
Rayburn	Staggers	Withers
Reams	Stauffer	Withrow
Reed, Ill.	Steed	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Stringfellow	Wolverton
Rees, Kans.	Sullivan	Yates
Regan	Taber	Yorty
Rhodes, Ariz.	Talle	Young
Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor	Younger

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Calif.	Feighan	Mollohan
Andrews	Gamble	Morrison
Angell	Gathings	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Gordon	Philbin
Boiling	Green	Phillips
Buckley	Hagen, Minn.	Rabaut
Campbell	Harrison, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.
Carrigg	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Chelf	Holifield	Rivers
Cooley	Javits	Rogers, Tex.
Coon	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Coudert	Judd	Secrest
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Shelley
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Sikes
Dawson, Utah	McCarthy	Simpson, Pa.
Deane	McCulloch	Sutton
Dingell	McMillan	Teague
Dondero	Madden	Vursell
Donohue	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Donovan	Merrow	Zablocki
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. Campbell.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Gordon.
Mr. Carrigg with Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Coon with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Deane.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Harrison of Nebraska with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Merrow with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Judd with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Baker with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Green.
Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Holifield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to place temporary limitations

on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present I would have voted "yea" on the rollcall just had.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "yea" had I been present on the rollcall just had. I was unavoidably detained and could not be here in time to answer when my name was called.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2 (A) OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 157 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 160, to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, first I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 160 under an open rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate.

House Joint Resolution 160 is a bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee pertaining to that section of the National Housing Act, title I, which provides loans for modernization and improvements to be utilized mostly for small one-family homes. The effect of the bill would be to increase the authorization for insurance of these loans by the Government by $500 million. The authorization is increased from $1,250,000,000 to $1,750,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly point out that this section of the National Housing Act has worked very well, that from the record, apparently a good job has been done, that the record of losses is only about 1 percent, that during the period of operation under this section the National Housing Administration has recovered the invested capital of the American people to the extent of eight and a fraction million dollars. They have also accumulated a surplus of some $18 million. This bill strikes a new note, I think, in that under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the other members of his committee, it provides for the repayment to the Government of the invested capital of the American people.

The committee in its report expresses the hope that this will be the last increase in insurance authorization which will be required; that from now on this fund will work as a revolving fund and require no further increased authorizations.

The bill was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Banking and Currency; it had no opposition in the Committee on Rules, and I hope that the resolution is adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York has stated, there is apparently no opposition to this bill. But I did want to comment on this program, which is title 1 of the Federal Housing Act and was enacted in 1934. I think it has been an astounding success both for the borrowers, the lending institutions, and for the Government. The way title 1 works is that it is intended to supply funds to people of very limited means in order to improve their homes. It has a flavor of slum clearance to it in that it enables these people who own homes without modern improvements to borrow money from the banks, repayable in monthly installments, for the purpose of repairing or installing more modern conveniences in their homes. The history of it has been that in all those nearly 20 years of operation the Government has not lost a dollar of this fund. The insurance that is required to be paid by the lending institutions to insure the loans has accumulated a fund of such magnitude that the Committee on Banking and Currency very wisely has provided that the money that the Government originally put up for this purpose shall be repaid into the Treasury. I think it is a very fine program, and the committee is to be complimented on bringing in this bill to continue the operation of this agency which has been most helpful to the poorer class homeowners of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GUARANTEED LOAN, 9.7 PERCENT INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the two preceding speakers have said about this bill. It has been used well and helpful to our economy, and especially to the small home owners. It is, of course, a bill providing repair and improvement loans. This bill was passed in 1934 when money was very scarce and we were suffering from deflation. Then we needed something to inflate the currency or economy and this bill served a very helpful and useful purpose in doing that. Since that time 14,000,000 loans have been made, and most of these loans, in fact, 82½ percent of them, have been made with the banks. The interest rate appears to be a very low rate, 5 percent, but the interest is collected in advance, and 5 percent on the principal collected in advance as a discount and spread over a period of months means in this case 9.7166 percent interest on the loan; and it is a guaranteed loan.

I think it is necessary to pass this bill and I am going to vote for it. I am going to vote for this rule. But I look upon it as an antideflationary bill, in other words, just a little inflationary. It is needed and can be justified by reason of the fact that we are now in and have reached a condition in our economy where we are having to fight not against inflation so much but against the prospects and probabilities of deflation.

This housing bill, of course, is for unsecured loans, absolutely unsecured, made up to $2,500. As I have said, they are guaranteed in effect by the Government, and they provide for the equivalent of 9.7166 percent interest.

NOT SOCIALISM AS CONTENDED

This bill comes nearer being vulnerable to the charge of being socialistic than any other law I know of that has passed in recent years. However, I do not look upon it as socialistic at all. It serves a great need. The loans possibly would not be made if we did not guarantee them by the Government, with this very high and attractive rate of interest. These small home owners are at the mercy of this type of legislation. I do not look upon it as socialistic, so those charges of socialism, I believe, are unfounded. But there is no piece of legislation that has been passed that is more vulnerable to a charge of socialism than this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman admits it is socialistic?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not admitting that.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman says it is subject to that charge. Does not the gentleman mean, then, that this is good socialism?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not say it is good socialism. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said it was more vulnerable to the charge, but it is justified because it would not be done otherwise. It is a case of the Government doing things that private industry will not do. We just have to do it.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman means it is socialistic, but it is justifiable?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not saying it is socialistic. I say it is vulnerable to the charge of socialism. I do not say it is socialistic, I say it comes nearer being vulnerable to the charge or as near being vulnerable to the charge of socialism as any act this Congress has passed in 20 years.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman is begging the question and that it is socialistic, but that it is justified.

COOPERATIVE FEATURE

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can place his own interpretation on it for himself. I am not objecting to that, but I see the point the gentleman is making.

There is another feature in here. It is a cooperative feature. A lot has been said against cooperatives. This covers cooperatives. They—the lenders—go in together, and they put three-fourths of 1 percent in interest; they pool it, and it is a nontaxable cooperative, too. They pool their money to have a riskless investment. Of course, the Government is in effect behind them on 10 percent of the portfolio, the entire portfolio, not individual loans. It makes it for all practical purposes guaranteed by the Government. But to make it absolutely riskless they put in three-fourths of 1 percent, which is more than sufficient to guarantee all these loans. So those who are interested in cooperatives can vote for this bill with the assurance that it carries the cooperative feature in it. Ordinarily, many Members would not vote for it, but this is absolutely justified. It serves a good purpose. It is constructive. It has already helped 14 million small-home owners in the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman say it was or was not inflationary?

Mr. PATMAN. I say it is antideflationary. Yes, it is on the inflationary side, but I call it antideflationary. And in 1934 when we first had it, we badly needed inflation. We badly needed it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you think we need it today?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we need it, that is antideflation. We could stand a little bit of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A little more of it?

Mr. PATMAN. No, wait just a minute now. The gentleman asked me a question. Let me answer it. Yes, we could stand just a little antideflationary remedy. The Federal Reserve Board on yesterday in lowering the margin requirement for stock exchange transactions did something that was inflationary, but they would not admit that. They probably call it antideflationary. It was antideflationary or inflationary whichever you want to call it. There are many reasons why they do that. Of course, number 1 is that they are bound to believe that this inflation has gone as far as it is expected to go right now. And we are headed down a little bit, and we ought to do something to stop deflation. That is the only reason I think the Federal Reserve Board could justify reducing this margin requirement to 50 percent and it is the only justification they could have to reduce the margin requirement for stock exchange transactions. Of course, many people are glad of it because they would like to unload their stocks on the small people as they did before the other depression. They induce the little fellows to come in and buy, making it very attractive by using a 50-cent credit dollar to get a dollar's worth of speculation. They get them all in there, and then the stock market breaks and ruins them. A lot of people might expect something like that to happen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say that under this legislation, those who borrowed money would be at the mercy of someone. Who is that someone?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am afraid the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman say they would be at the mercy of someone?

Mr. PATMAN. I did use the word "mercy"—yes, I said they would be at the mercy of those who would charge 9.7 percent interest.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who does that?

Mr. PATMAN. That is bordering on usury in anybody's book when they charge 9.7 percent interest for a riskless loan. Now when you make loans to Tom, Dick, or Harry with no security, then 9.7 percent interest possibly could be justified on a loan of $300 or less. But whenever you make a $2,500 loan as authorized under this bill which is guaranteed by the Government, and which furthermore is a riskless loan, and you charge 9.7 percent interest, that is a pretty high rate of interest. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that it is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I agree that that is too high. Has the gentleman offered an amendment to reduce it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; there is no feeling that it would accomplish anything because they contend—No. 1, that the loans will not be made. I do not agree and will vote to reduce the interest. Over the years they have been given 9.7 percent interest, and 14 million homeowners have already paid it. I do not think there would be any probability of an amendment like that succeeding.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is a man of courage and determination, and I thought he might at least try.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Michigan can offer an amendment, if he wishes. It is open to amendment you know, under the open rule, and the bill will be subject to amendment, of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understand the gentleman, you say it is inflationary, and you say it puts someone at the mercy of someone.

Mr. PATMAN. No, I did not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says it is just a little bit inflationary.

Mr. PATMAN. It is antideflationary.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yet you are going to vote for it?

Mr. PATMAN. Sure I am going to vote for it, because I think we need a little of it as antideflation. The Federal Reserve Board thought so too. But I think the best thing to do is not to increase the interest rates, but to lower interest rates. The whole trend has been to increase interest rates—it has been the hard-money policy and a policy favoring high interest rates. That is the reason utilities all over the country, or at least one of the reasons that utilities all over the country are going to city councils and to the State to ask for an increase in rates—because their costs are going up. Part of that cost is the increase in interest rates. It upsets our entire economy when you increase the interest rates. I do not think there should be an increase. I know there are reports out that the new Secretary of the Treasury is going to offer some Government bonds at 3 percent, they are to be long-term Government bonds. Some of them we are told will probably provide for 3¼ percent interest. Well, that means an increase in the interest rates all across the board for governments—State, county, city, political subdivisions, Wall Street, all the banks, finance companies, investment companies, individuals, corporations everywhere—it means an increase in interest rates everywhere and it affects everybody. That is the reason behind prices going down. Two and one-half percent bonds have been stable over the years, selling at 100 percent, or even above. Under this high interest rate policy 2½ percent 20-year bonds took a nose dive. They went down to 99, 98, 97, 96, 95, down to 94, some of them now, 5 or 6 points below par. Why? They are getting ready for this high interest rate. Do you know how low they will have to go to be comparable to 3 percent? They will have to go down to 92. So that is where they are headed for. If they go down to compare with 3¼ percent, they will have to go down to 88. That is where they are headed for. It looks to me like this Congress ought to give that a little consideration. I believe we should.

This bill is justified for the repairs and improvements on homes. They probably would not get the money any other way. We need it, not only to help the housing situation all over the Nation, but, as Judge Smith says, it has a flavor of slum clearance in it also. So those who vote for this bill, and I am going to vote for it, will be charged with voting for a socialistic bill, for a cooperative bill, and for a slum-clearance bill. That is all right. It is justified. I believe we need it in this country, and for that reason I am going to vote for it notwithstanding those charges.

Bond prices should be protected by the Federal Reserve Board through the Federal Reserve banks, just as they used to be protected by the Federal Reserve. They were pegged. About 2 years ago they took the peg out because they were getting ready for higher interest rates. I think they ought to go back and peg these bonds again. The statement they make in opposition to it—and the statement is well founded, but it can be corrected—it is claimed that if we peg these bonds at 100 percent the banks which have $70 billion worth of Government bonds—you know the banks get over a billion dollars a year interest on Government bonds—and the banks have over $70 billion of Government bonds. If we peg the price at 100 cents on the dollar, then the banks would turn in the bonds and get the dollars and expand it 6 or 7 times. In other words, for every $100 they have they can make loans amounting to $600 or $700, and that would cause ruinous inflation. They are exactly right about that, but we can peg these bonds and prevent such as that happening. We can make sure

that they cannot expand on them 6 or 7 times. We can peg these Government bond prices. Then we will have a more stable economy and lower interest rates. By lending $6 to every one the commercial banks can legally collect six times the 9.7 percent interest charged on these loans.

The Federal Reserve Board has been aiming for years at higher interest rates. So in voting for this bill, 9.7-percent interest for the banks to make these loans, I am not doing it as an endorsement of higher interest rates at all, because as much as we like the banks, and as good service as they have always rendered in time of peace and war, they do not need much additional earnings now. The statement of the bank reserves appears like this: The combined income statement of 17 large New York banks showed interest on loans had increased 22.4 percent over the previous year. Interest and dividends on securities by 7.2 percent. Then after income taxes, by 16 percent above the excellent 1951 results. So the earnings are not necessarily needed for the banks because they are doing pretty well. But if they must have a 9.7 percent guarantee to make these loans, and people need them, as evidenced by the fact that 14,000,000 small-home owners have used it since 1934, I think we should pass the authorization bill and make these loans available.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, just one word in closing: My distinguished friend from Texas, I know, is a very able student of currency and housing, and a longtime member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I had understood that that committee had unanimously reported this bill, but since my distinguished friend has damned it with such faint praise I am not sure whether he is for it or not. But my faith in the legislation is not shaken by his remarks.

I think the House should be reminded that in all this period of 18 years this title I has given to thousands and thousands of small-home owners who would never have been able to modernize their homes the opportunity to put in modern conveniences. The big point is that when we speak of socialism nobody here seems to know just what socialism is; we all make a guess at it once in a while, but the big point is that this has not been a burden on the Federal Treasury; the Government has not paid any money out on those projects; and the guarantee fund that has been put up under the terms of this bill is to be returned to the Federal Treasury. If that is socialism I would like to see a little more of it in this Government and stop burdening the taxpayers with subsidies to all classes and kinds of people.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Applying that test to the RFC, the gentleman certainly will be in favor of continuing the RFC, because it has not only not cost the Government anything but it has made money for the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry; I am afraid my friend has fallen into the error that so many fall into in these times when we ought to balance the budget, namely, the RFC is using Government money to do what it does, but this program uses the money of private industry.

Mr. PATMAN. But the money is guaranteed by the Government.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The evidence discloses that on the total program since 1939 the Government has not lost a dime by this type of loan.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to say that I am in favor of this legislation and I hope it may shortly be enacted.

The gentleman from Texas spoke yesterday and he has spoken again today. He had a special order for yesterday and he had one for today. He has availed himself of time under the rule and certainly with that I can find no criticism. What he has said, however, I think deserves further comment. Let me put it this way: I have been advised that whenever you claim to be an expert about money you had better watch out.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not imply that I am claiming to be an expert, does he?

Mr. HALLECK. I have sat at the gentleman's feet and have heard him talk time after time about money for something over 18 years. If that does not make him an expert on money then I never saw one.

The gentleman knows of my regard for him and for his learning, his understanding and his great capacity. I never have claimed to know very much about money, but I have always claimed that what I know about is true, or at least partly so; and that is one thing I think we have to watch. If the Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle want to take the gentleman's statement that is all right with me, but I am going to interpret it for myself, and I just want to inquire as to whether or not that is what he really believes.

Now, let me go back into a little history. I came here, as I indicated, about 18 years ago. As a member of the American Legion and an active member I had had some part in the controversy about the payment of the bonus following World War I. At that time the champion of the scheme to pay that bonus with rubber money, $3,000,000,000 worth, was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and through all his time here in the Congress it has always seemed to me that he was the advocate, the stalwart champion, of the cheap dollar. Yes, of an ever increasingly cheaper dollar. He has been an advocate of high prices. Of course, he will on occasion argue that cattle ought to bring $40 but it is terrible for beefsteak to be a dollar a pound. There is something a bit inconsistent in that sort of an arrangement because it will not quite stand up. So on occasion I think he is blowing a little hot and cold in being for high prices and low prices and at the moment he just really does not know whether he is fighting inflation or deflation.

As I have listened to him, it has been somewhat difficult for me to determine for myself just where he stands, but I know out of these years and years of work here with him, years that I have constantly enjoyed because of my association with him, he has driven for a cheaper and cheaper dollar. And in many ways, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of it is that his views have prevailed through these years of Democratic rule.

Let me ask, Do you want to go back to that sort of a policy? What has been the result? The dollars that I paid on life insurance starting years ago are worth about 40 cents on the dollar compared to what I put in. The Government bonds that I bought, beginning with the Victory bonds 12 years ago, have become progressively worth less in the quantity of things they will buy. Why, he talks of some slight drop in the quoted price of bonds. I asked him yesterday, "Is it not much more important that the purchasing power of the dollar be maintained, that the value of our dollar be stabilized, and that our economy be stabilized?" It has not been illegal, perhaps some would say it has not been immoral, but it certainly has been unmoral to drive for a constant depreciation of the value of the dollar invested by people in life insurance, in social security, in bonds, and everything else that is represented by a dollar value. Yet that has been the history of the past 20 years, and let no one deny it. The fact it has been the history for 20 years is one of the reasons why the new Republican administration came into power last November. Make no mistakes about that.

Now, the gentleman from Texas is excited and concerned because this new administration is calling a halt to the constant cheapening of the dollar, the wrecking of the savings, and the discouraging of the thrift of the people of this country. That is the situation. But are his views going to prevail?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The very bill that is proposed here will cheapen the dollar.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, the gentleman says it is inflationary, which I seriously doubt. But at any rate I said I am supporting the bill, and I shall support the bill.

Let me point out one thing to the gentleman again, and he can search his own mind on this. He probably can read it better than I can, but having worked closely with him for some 18 years I think I can read it to some extent. I can see that he wants to continue this drive for an ever-cheapening dollar. I just hope this time he does not have his way. None of us wants deflation, certainly I

do not want deflation, but I will tell you what I do want in this country. I want a stabilization of our economy and a stabilization of the value of the dollar. May I ask the gentleman if he does?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I believe I will go further than he will go in supporting his own President. I am not only for a balanced budget but I am against reducing taxes until it is balanced. Then I am in favor of paying some on the national debt before we reduce taxes. Will the gentleman go that far?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say to the gentleman that I shall make my position clear. As a matter of fact, I have already made it clear. I am for balancing the budget as a primary obligation. That must be our first responsibility, although I can see no reason for being defeatist about future tax reduction. Let me say also that if the gentleman will follow me down the middle aisle on the teller votes when the appropriation bills are up, we will cut the cost of government and we will get the budget balanced.

Mr. PATMAN. I asked the gentleman whether he would also stand for a substantial payment on the public debt.

Mr. HALLECK. I will answer that one, too. But, I want to say first of all before you can do anything with the public debt, you must have courage enough to walk down that aisle and do something about the cost of government. However, when the time comes, you and too many others will be conspicuous by your absence.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. HALLECK. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Speaker. I have been very kind to the gentleman and generous, and always shall be. Now you spoke to me about paying something on the national debt. The gentleman's memory is conveniently short. There have been only 2 year in the past 20 years of this Republic when anything has been paid on the national debt, when the line of the graph went down so that Federal Government income was above outgo, and those were the 2 years of the 80th Republican Congress when we cut the cost of government. We did it over objections of most of the people on the Democratic side. I will qualify that by saying that we had the support of enough good Democrats over there who put the interest of their country above the interest of their party. Of course, we could not have done it without them. It has been that way throughout the past 4 years. But, I must say that those were the only 2 years when there has been anything paid on the national debt. And, the Federal debt has been reduced. You did not do it; you did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he can ever recall a vote in the last 18 years when the gentleman from Texas either voted to balance the budget or reduce taxes, either one.

Mr. HALLECK. Oh, I do not recall all those votes. He must have supported us a time or two; he would almost do that accidentally with so many votes around here. The gentleman from Texas very seldom makes a mistake but he might have made one or two, you cannot tell.

Now, a lot of people have important things to do, I suppose, but I will tell you something. We might just as well find out about some of these things people are talking about, and I want to say to you that the people who have been writing to me and communicating with me, who bought the bonds, paid on insurance, paid into social security, do not want to follow a false leadership again that is going to take them further down the drain. Now, that does not mean that we want any deflation. We shall attempt in every reasonable way to avoid deflation, and already the Eisenhower administration has moved in that direction. Why, you have been parroting about farm prices. They are coming back. I read in my home paper that corn is back to $1.48 a bushel, and the price, if you seal it, is $1.62. The cattle price situation is stabilizing. We have tremendous problems facing our country; we have been maladjusted too long. It is going to take a terrific amount of work and a lot of common sense, and I just hope we do not continue to have the prophets of continuing inflation and cheaper dollars making their views prevail on the American people.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 160, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think that during the discussion of this joint resolution on the rule most of the high points were brought out, so that the purposes of the resolution are pretty well known.

As has been pointed out, this resolution increases the insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration in respect to insurance under section 2 of title I from $1,250,000,000 to $1,750,000,000.

Section 2 of title I has to do mainly with insurance of loans for alterations, additions, painting, heating installations, modernization of existing structures, and so forth. There is a provision in section 2, however, that there can be new construction in some cases, but the insurance on new construction is limited to $3,000. The insurance on repairs, alterations, modernization, and so forth, is limited to $2,500.

These loans are made upon application by a home owner, usually through a contractor or material supplier to a local bank or other lending institution. The local bank or other lending institution makes the loan at a discount of 5 percent usually for the purpose of taking care of the charges for carrying the paper on an installment basis and also paying the insurance premium.

Application is then made to the Federal Housing Administration for insurance and it is usually granted. The insurance provides a 10-percent coverage on the portfolio of this type of loan in the bank, so that we should not say that 10 percent of any individual loan is insured, but rather that 10 percent of the aggregate of the loans held in the financing institution is insured. Therefore, if a bank has outstanding $100,000 of this type of loan, they are fully insured against loss in their entire portfolio of loans of $100,000 up to $10,000. I think to be realistic about it that means that because the losses have been so low, almost infinitesimal, we might perhaps for all practical purposes say that each loan is guaranteed up to 100 percent. It surely is until more than 10 percent of the portfolio is lost by the bank.

This program was set up in 1934. It was set up primarily as a means of giving employment to the craftsmen. It was successful. Between 1934 and 1939, the Treasury supplied the funds for the operation of the program. In 1939, the FHA started charging a premium of three-quarters of 1 percent on this paper. Since 1939 they have built up an earned surplus of $180 million. That, in addition to the $8 million of Government capital on deposit in the Treasury Department made a total of capital and earned reserves of about $26 million. It has been found that that is much more than enough to meet any probable losses on this program. So we have provided in continuing the extension of this program, which I will cover later, that the capital be repaid to the Treasury. I think we should have in mind that throughout the years from 1934 to date, that is through 1952, there have been about 14 million of these loans made. They currently average about $567 and the aggregate of such loans made is over $6 billions.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Virginia and others who have commented upon the success of this program have found, and I think we all should conclude, that it has been one of the most successful programs for the stabilization of our economy and for increasing the standard of living in America which was ever thought of or enacted by this Congress. The administration of it has been without reproach. We paid a high compliment to the administrators of this program because they have done a splendid job. The program should be continued.

The gross losses on this paper have been 2.16 percent, but because of recoveries from the gross losses, the net

loss has only been 1.07 percent—it has been very, very small. In consequence of that, there has been built up this earned reserve of $18 million after payment of losses and after payment of costs of administration. It has not cost the Government a cent for this program. After the payment of all losses, and after the payment of all operating costs including administration, they have an earned reserve of $18 million.

This program has been used to assist slum clearance through the modernization and repair of properties which otherwise would be classified as slums. It has provided for safe and sanitary housing in many instances where the money would not otherwise be available. We reached the insurance limit in September 1952, and since then a large backlog of applications have accumulated. There are about 260,000 applications that were not able to be serviced. They have a face value of $175 million. It is expected that this additional $500 million will be sufficient for all purposes because as the gentleman suggested, the authorization should revolve, and also instead of using the gross face amount on these loans we use the sum after discount—that is, net proceeds—in computing the aggregate for insurance purposes, so that gives quite a margin.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Would the gentleman make clear to the House the manner in which these loans are negotiated, and the limitations, briefly, that are required of the agency, and the various other steps that are necessary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They can be made up to a limit of $2,500, except on new construction, where the limit is $3,000. The average has been $567. When the lending agency makes application for insurance, they service the loan, and the loans may be secured. Of course, the lending agency could take a mortgage on this property, first or second.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

In addition to that, they may take what is known as a lien note. In some States they have a note, with which I am not familiar, by which the buyer confesses judgment in the note, and they can proceed against any of his assets.

In many cases they are character loans. They may have an endorser. They may have comakers. I think I know what the gentleman is getting at. If there are abuses of this program on the part of any contractor or material man, and if the work is not up to standard and there are sufficient claims to justify it, then that contractor, that material man is declared to be ineligible from that time on for obtaining such insurance in any financial institution.

Mr. LYLE. One of the appealing things about this system is that it is left almost entirely with the local lending institutions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. LYLE. It is not required to get authority in Washington or any other particular place. If the bank or lending institution feels the loan is justified, then it almost automatically becomes a part of a loan of this type.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I believe the evidence disclosed that the typical loan was for 3 years or less, and the average amount to homeowner about $560.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Five hundred and sixty-seven dollars. Yes, sir.

Now, on this question of recoupment of capital to the Treasury: As I said, in the past the Government advanced the funds for this program. Of the amounts advanced, less recoveries, there remains $8.3 million of Government funds in this program. So, because they felt it could be safely done, and because this money was just lying around idle, money that was static and could not be used for any other purpose than that, we have provided in the committee amendment that this Government investment of $8,333,313.65 shall be recouped by the Treasury, and will be available in the Treasury for any other expenses. I might say that the possibility of these recoupments was brought to our attention by the General Accounting Office some time ago. They had made some studies. We are cooperating with them and our staff is cooperating with them. May I suggest to the other committees of Congress that they likewise cooperate to determine how much of this idle capital and other investment is available for Treasury recoupment. Our studies indicate that within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee alone there are capital and assets in programs which can be cashed in, which can be liquidated and paid back to the Treasury, some of it a budgetary matter, some is not a budgetary matter, to the sum total of almost a billion dollars. When we talk about balancing the budget I think we should have in mind that there are at least a billion dollars which may be released into the Treasury and paid back into the Treasury through the liquidation of assets, good assets, to make available a billion dollars which means that much less for the people to pay in taxes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this bill up at the present time. I know he, like I, has received certain support from the country generally for this type of legislation at the present time; I have received a number of letters on it. This is an agency that we created way back in the depression days. It has worked well—the gentleman indicates that by his able speech—and it is coming out of the whole apparently with assets worth recovering to the Treasury of the United States; so I am personally very happy that it has been brought in at the present time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman. This bill is one step in the direction of stabilizing our economy and an effort to maintain income on a high level so we can maintain the present standard of living and perhaps enable us to increase it a bit.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is unnecessary to say anything upon this House joint resolution because I feel confident it will pass with an almost unanimous vote of the House. There have been some things injected into the debate, however, which might divert your attention from the real issues, things that I think are immaterial and irrelevant.

The record of the Republican Party up to this point which excites so much enthusiasm on the part of our good friends on the other side of the Chamber, I think is a little premature. Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off. The record has not been long enough for the people to appraise it.

This House joint resolution is a New Deal measure; it was passed in 1934; it was passed at a time when we were in the throes of a depression. It subserved a good purpose then; it still subserves a good purpose. The record is made and it has been splendid; it has saved millions of homes and cost the Government nothing. In fact, it has made a profit of over $18 million. The insurance we have granted has not only been an insurance to banks and other lending institutions, but it has also been an insurance of our fundamental governmental and political institutions. There are 6 million homes, according to the last census, that need major repairs and remodeling, homes that probably would be unfit for human habitation in a few years unless they are taken care of, homes where there can be great salvage by these repairs being made.

In my opinion, we can make no better fight against subversive activities than to see that the American people have homes. The home is the very pillar of our Republic. In the home is not bred subversive activities or hatred of the Government, but men without homes are so disheartened sometimes that they turn against everything they should hold dear, even their Government. So I say, Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States, those who are least able to acquire homes, should be given the opportunity which is presented by this act. The insurance, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has told you, is a 5-percent discount, which amounts to about 9.7 percent per annum straight interest.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Are there any other charges that the borrower has to pay?

Mr. SPENCE. No. The insured lending organization pays three-quarters of 1 percent per annum insurance premium.

Mr. LANHAM. Is the bank permitted to charge that against the borrower?

Mr. SPENCE. No; the bank is not permitted to charge that against the borrower. The limit the bank is authorized to charge against a borrower is the 5 percent discount. If the borrower wants to obtain $100, and the limit is 3 years, and he wants to borrow the $100 for 3 years, he makes out a note for $115, which pays his interest and he pays that note according to the terms of the con-

tract. His interest will be $15 and the note will be for $115. The insurance is paid by the lender, and there is no other charge made against the borrower.

Mr. LANHAM. No commissions are allowed?

Mr. SPENCE. Only what is provided in the bill and that is all the borrower is required to pay; that is, the 5 percent. The loans provided by this House joint resolution are almost always unsecured. They are character loans. A new roof or a new bathroom cannot be attached or replevied.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this will give millions of people an opportunity to retain their homes who otherwise would lose them.

Now, the 6 million homes in America that need repair are going to disappear as homes in the near future unless they are repaired because nothing deteriorates more than a building that is not kept in a good state of repair. Yet, if the home is kept in repair it lasts indefinitely. I know of houses in this district that are a hundred years old, in good repair, and are happy homes today because they have been repaired during the years. This act will render a service that cannot be overestimated.

One of the great privileges of the people of a free government is the right of pursuit of their happiness; and to achieve the success of this pursuit nothing is more important than the acquisition of a home. This bill makes the acquisition of homes easier, it put more homes on the market, it will go far to remedy the shortage of homes now available. It has worked well through the years, and I am glad to see that our friends on the other side recognize that. There is no contrariety of opinion in the committee as to whether this bill should be passed. It had the unanimous vote of the committee, and I hope you will not be diverted by other questions. It is only inflationary insofar as any increase in credit is inflationary and if there is not this increase in credit these people, for whom this bill is passed, will probably never be able to repair their homes. I think there may be an effort to reduce the interest rate. I am afraid if you reduce the interest rate you will prevent the people from getting loans that they desire, because the Government of the United States has no power to compel the private lender to lend money, and that is one of the troubles we have had in veterans' loans. Many of these lenders would rather obtain 5- or 5½-percent uninsured loans than the 4-percent insured loans. So, I think you should consider carefully whether or not you should do anything that will make this act less effective, less helpful to millions of our people, than it is now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I have long taken an active interest in this FHA title I home repair and improvement insurance program which the House is now considering. I supported this joint resolution in committee and I urge its favorable passage by this body today. The $500 million increase in insurance authority is needed not only to continue the program but to overcome a $200 million backlog in applications now pending before the FHA for insurance. The FHA title I program has enabled many, many hundreds of thousands of small homeowners in the country not only to keep their homes in good repair but in many cases enlarge their facilities to meet the growing needs of their families.

The FHA title I program has been in operation for a period of 18 years. It is a self-sustaining program and has not cost the Government one penny. These title I loans are available to homeowners for home repairs, alterations, and improvements. Under this legislation the Government insures the loans made by private lending institutions up to a maximum of 10 percent of any lender's portfolio. The loans are repaid on a monthly amortized basis. The soundness of the program is evidenced by the fact that claims paid, less recoveries, have amounted to only 1.07 percent of the aggregate loans insured under this program.

To illustrate the effectiveness of the program I would like to briefly review its operation in the State of North Carolina. Since the inception of the program in 1934, property owners in the State of North Carolina have obtained 124,316 loans totaling $50,425,210. During 1952, 11,700 loans totaling $6,584,517 were made under this program to improve property in North Carolina.

As a further indication of the usefulness of the program I would like to present to you a breakdown showing the number and dollar amounts of FHA title I loans made in the 12 counties comprising the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina which I have the honor to represent. These loans cover both home improvement loans and new structures designed for agriculture purposes. The table shows loans made during the year 1952 as well as the cumulative totals since the start of the program.

Title I loans insured in Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina

County	1952		Cumulative, 1934-52	
	Number	Net proceeds	Number	Net proceeds
Anson	10	$7,375	326	$129,391
Davidson	195	98,823	2,208	742,832
Davie	6	1,807	122	22,506
Hoke	5	3,727	107	43,511
Lee	48	21,410	458	220,933
Montgomery	40	22,745	256	83,579
Moore	109	73,806	1,373	609,571
Richmond	31	17,936	1,439	553,731
Scotland	12	8,637	290	113,549
Union	28	20,053	794	274,328
Wilkes	63	36,492	353	134,100
Yadkin	20	9,257	165	66,126
Total of 12 counties	567	322,068	7,900	3,024,157

In view of the widespread interest in this program, I have prepared a series of questions and answers relating thereto which cover its salient features which I believe will be of particular interest to the membership of the House. The questions and answers are as follows:

Question. Where does the borrower apply?

Answer. To his local approved bank, building and loan association, or other financial institution.

Question. How large may the loan be?

Answer. A loan may be for any amount up to $2,500 except that loans to finance the cost of new structures, such as a garage or a service building, may be $3,000, or if the job is to alter or repair a structure for two or more families, such as an apartment house, the loan may be as much as $10,000.

Question. For how long may the loan be made?

Answer. Three years and thirty-two days is the maximum maturity for most loans. Longer terms up to 7 years may be obtained on the $10,000 type of loans. Longer terms are also available to farmers. It is to the borrower's advantage not to borrow for a longer period than is necessary. The shorter the period, the more economical the loan.

Question. Is a mortgage or other security required?

Answer. Not generally. Title I loans are a personal-loan type of credit. The signature of both husband and wife on the note is usually required, and in some cases lending institutions may insist upon a comaker or endorser. On loans in large amounts it is an accepted practice to have some form of security.

Question. How is the loan repaid?

Answer. In equal monthly installments, except that farmers who receive their income seasonally from crops and livestock are permitted to repay their loans seasonally.

Question. How much does the loan cost?

Answer. The interest rate and other charges which a lender may make on any loan are matters of arrangement between the lender and the borrower. However, the total charges, including interest, may not exceed the limit prescribed under the regulations of the Federal Housing Administration of $5 discount per $100 for 12 equal monthly installments.

Question. May the loan be paid back at any time?

Answer. Yes. The borrower may make as many advance payments as he wishes. A reasonable rebate will be allowed when the loan is paid off in full ahead of time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Three-fourths of 1 percent is the premium rate.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. That is what the lender pays as a premium for the insurance by the Government.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. So the bank really nets about 8 percent when it makes these loans.

Mr. MULTER. The gross is 9.7 less three-quarters of 1 percent; a little over 8 percent. In other words, as the distinguished gentleman from Georgia just pointed out, even in those States where the maximum interest rate is 7 percent, and there are States, of course, where it is only 6 percent, despite those usury laws, under this particular act the lending institutions are netting in excess of 8 percent per annum on this money

which they lend for this program. I think that is wrong. I agree heartily with all that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has said on the subject. I do not think if we limit the interest rate on these loans we are going to tend to cause more loans to be made. If anything, the bankers may tighten up a little bit, as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky indicated. Some of them may be unwilling to make loans if you limit the interest rate. But, I would like to test that, and when the time comes under the 5-minute rule I will offer an amendment to limit the interest rate to simple interest of 6 percent per annum on unpaid balances. As long ago as 2 years ago I indicated that it was high time that the lending institutions, the banks and the insurance companies of our country got back on their own feet in these lending programs and stopped relying on the United States Government for Government guaranties. We had some bankers come in before our committee only yesterday and indicate that they were prepared to make loans at simple interest of 5 percent per annum on unpaid balances.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That was on the program of soil conservation and fertilization loans, was it not? The hearings were being conducted on my proposed amendment to title I.

Mr. MULTER. I was about to give the gentleman full credit for it. He is entitled to credit for having brought that to the attention of the committee and the Congress.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman and the other members of the committee for their helpful consideration of the matter during the hearings on my proposed amendment. I believe most of the bankers in the rural areas, and I mean by that in the little communities, will make the 5-percent loans because the demand will be so great from the farmers who are the depositors in the local banks that the bankers will get increased deposits and will have to make the loans, if the committee sees fit to amend the act to provide for loans for soil conservation and fertilization.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for those comments because they lend force to my argument that if good banking practice dictates the lending of money at 5 percent simple interest on unpaid balances for soil conservation and land improvement, which in effect is lending on the moral stability of the farmer, than which there is nothing higher in this country, in my opinion, then surely good banking policy should dictate that they lend at the same rate of interest when the security behind the loan is not only the character of the home owner and his moral responsibility but the very home he lives in, which he is improving with that money.

I say let us test out whether or not these bankers will not make these loans without the guarantee of the United States Government behind their loans. The program over 18 years has shown that the guarantee is a 100-percent guarantee against losses. No lending institution has lost a single dollar under this program. The amount of their loans have been paid back in full under this guarantee program by the United States Government.

About 20 percent of the loans of this type as called for by Title I of this law were made on an uninsured basis by the private lending institutions, banks, and insurance companies of the country. If they want to charge more than the simple interest rate of 6 percent per annum on unpaid balances that I propose in my amendment, then they can forego the guarantee and may charge any rate that is lawful within their State. Only last week I received mail from one of the largest insurance companies in this country, indicating it is placing uninsured mortgage loans at 4 percent interest.

There is no longer any excuse for guaranteeing private capital an exorbitant return and at the same time guaranteeing it against all losses and risks.

I would like to take a moment or two, to refer to an amendment which I understand will be offered by our colleague from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

This program has been used in large part in the city and State of New York for the purpose of creating additional rental housing. We had hoped that no problem of segregation would enter th[illegible] situation.

Unfortunately, it has and discrim[illegible]tion in housing has gotten progressively worse in the city and State of New York.

The amendment which the gentleman will offer is aimed at correcting that situation. I urge you to support it.

I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD today, an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 11, 1953, on this very subject. I commend it to your attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last sentence of section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The aggregate amount of all loans, advances of credit, and obligations purchased, exclusive of financing charges, with respect to which insurance may be heretofore or hereafter granted under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $1,750,000,000."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Page 1, line 9, strike out the period and the quotation marks and insert the following: ", *provided, however*, That any insurance which may hereafter be granted under this section shall be limited to such loans, advances of credit and obligations purchased, in connection with which the lenders, borrowers, owners, obligors and obligees have first undertaken in writing that lettings, rentals, leases, uses, occupancies, purchases and sales of properties, including land and buildings, shall be in no way restricted or limited to persons on account of race, color, creed or place of origin."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, first, may I point out that this amendment is limited only to those loans for the improvement of properties which are insured under this program. As the report of the committee states, it is estimated that about 20 percent are not insured under this program, and, of course, this amendment would in no way affect those uninsured loans.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because of the situation which has been developing for some time in my own State of New York. I regret to state that during the last several years there has been an alarming increase in discrimination in housing both in the city of New York and in the urban centers in upstate New York. This has been reported to the New York State Board on Discrimination in Housing. Until recently there was relatively no discrimination in most of our great cities in upstate New York. Of course, that has not been true in New York City proper, where we have, unfortunately, a ghetto situation in some parts of our city, notably in Harlem. While the minority population, both Negro and Puerto Rican, has almost doubled in the city of New York, nevertheless in the last few years the geographic area in which these people find they must live has not been increased. There has been a tremendous growth of conversion of cellars where I can take you and show you as many as 20 people living in a single room.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that I [illegible]ve the support of every Democrat from [illegible] State. Having reread the platform [illegible]he National Republican Party during [illegible]e last campaign, I am confident that those Members of the majority party who support the expressions of their platform must support this amendment and must support the concept that where the power of the Federal Government is involved it cannot be used to subsidize segregation of some citizens apart from others, or, in other words, the subsidization of discrimination in our great cities.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Would the gentleman's amendment do away with the situation where, let us say, a person owns a 1-family house and makes a loan in order to convert that into a 3-family house, and that when he does that he cannot discriminate against the families that he will admit to tenancy in such cases because of race, color, or creed?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It would cover the one-family houses which are being improved for either sale or rental. It would also cover the multiple-unit dwellings which similarly are often improved under the benefits of title I of the National Housing Act.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOLLINGER. I compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think it is a well-thought-out and planned amendment which is very necessary, and I am going to support it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is not a new question. I do not like to disagree

with my very good friend and esteemed colleague from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], but I have talked this matter over with several people who are directly interested in the race problem. They are of the opinion that this piecemeal method of providing against discrimination, race or otherwise, is not the proper approach to the basic problem in the United States. In addition to this, let us have in mind that this is only an insurance program, and that if the local lending agencies will make the loans, then it almost follows as a matter, of course, that the loan is insured. Of course, it would be idle to say to a bank, "You shall or shall not make certain individual loans." It would be idle for us to try to legislate antidiscrimination policies on any bank or lending agency. That is the foundation upon which you have got to build this. That is not to be legislated upon. It cannot be legislated upon. It is a matter of social education perhaps, overcoming discrimination in the minds of the lending institutions, if it exists.

The gentleman astounds me by telling us in this House that in the city of New York there is race discrimination on the part of the lending agencies. I had thought, from what I have heard, that the city of New York was the one place where they had made greater advances to overcome race prejudice than anywhere else in the United States. I would think that probably the gentleman might proceed through his State bank laws, through his city ordinances, if there is discrimination upon the part of any public service institution, be it financial or otherwise. This is not the place to put in an antidiscrimination provision, because, as I have said, it follows, ipso facto, that if a loan is made it shall be insured. So we would not attempt to tell a bank whether they would or would not make a loan regardless of a man's race or color or religious belief.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. These loans are all small. The purpose of this act is to let people who need repair work done on their houses get the money at a reasonable rate of interest; take them away from the money sharks, where they are paying in some communities as high as 35 and 40 percent. If you place this condition upon a banker or lender, or any other conditions, they will not make the loan. There will be mighty few loans made in order to help these needy people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is right, in many areas of the United States. Of course, a bank is not going to take upon itself the obligation of following up a loan, the title to the property, to determine whether the limitations in the Federal law are consistently being met throughout the amortization of the loan. The bank is dealing with an individual and it is up to the bank to determine, regardless of race or color or creed, whether a man is a good risk; whether he will come in with his monthly payments. I do not think it makes any difference to a bank whether a man is black or white, or what his religion may be.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would not the gentleman agree that in the absence of any such language, the bill is more liberal than if the language were placed in there?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would think so. As far as I know, there has not been any discrimination in this program by any bank or lending institution. Surely there has not been any discrimination on the part of the FHA in limiting the insurance or discriminating against even lending institutions, to say nothing about the individual.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has presented the case very well; but the previous speaker, the leader of the Republican opposition, made a couple of statements which I would like to correct as far as possible. The first was that he had been informed by leaders of my race that they did not favor this kind of legislation. I do not know who those leaders can be; all I can say is that I see more leaders of my race in 1 day than most of you see in the course of a year. I can speak for them, both Republicans and Democrats, and say that except for the Judas who is always found—the percentage is 1 out of 12, according to the original band of disciples—the leadership of my race, north and south, Republican and Democrat, not only are in favor of this kind of legislation but they are in favor of its being enacted as quickly as possible not for their own good but for the good of our country in the eyes of the world.

Communism wins only when democracy fails, and communism can win by default regardless of whether we are a great colossus with one foot in Oak Ridge and the other in Fort Knox. The idea is fallacious that communism can be destroyed by gold and by atomic bombs; it can only be destroyed by the greater idea of democracy. Democracy is the finest idea man has ever dreamed of, and it is being defeated by the worst idea man ever concocted. Democracy is being defeated by communism globally today because of our failure to put it into practice.

"Piecemeal legislation," you call it. All legislation is piecemeal. "Education," you say, will solve the problem. How long? The world tempo has been so increased that there is no longer time for education to solve our problems. We do not know what holocaust will be visited upon us within the next 30 days or the next year. We have made tremendous technical progress in America, but in terms of moral and ethical progress there is a distinct lag. Education cannot make up this lag; it is up to us, the elected Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by legislation at every opportunity we have for the good of our Nation and our world that we hold up as a shining symbol of ethical and moral progress; that we let the 2 billion colored peoples of the earth know that we are not trying to sell a kind of democracy to the rest of the world that we are refusing to practice here.

Let us have a bipartisan foreign policy backed up by a bipartisan democracy policy. You cannot have a successful bipartisan foreign policy with a bipartisan domestic Jim Crow policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 16, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 1, line 9, strike out the period and the quote marks and insert "*Provided however*, That the total charge for such loans, advances of credit and obligations purchased, whether as discount or interest, including financing charges, shall not exceed simple interest of 6 percent per annum on unpaid balances."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I will try not to repeat what I said a few moments ago with reference to this amendment. Permit me to draw your attention to the fact that as the law is now upon the statute books there is no limitation of interest with reference to these loans. The regulation issued in connection with these loans permits a discount rate of 5 percent. Most people, when referring to these loans, take that to mean that the interest rate is 5 percent per annum. It is not. You might wonder, those of you who are not mathematically inclined, why a 5 percent discount rate adds up to 9.7 percent interest per annum. It is very simple.

This is the way the program operates: A man goes into a bank or lending institution and wants to borrow a thousand dollars. Let us assume he needs a thousand dollars to make the repairs or modernization. The bank then tells him: It is going to cost you 5 percent per annum. If he is going to take the loan for 3 years, as is permitted by the statute, the bank then adds on to his thousand dollars the sum of $150, $50 for each of the 3 years. He executes the documents under which he agrees to pay back to the bank or lending institution $1,150 over a 3-year period in installments of 36 equal payments, each one to be made monthly. He receives $1,000 and over the 36-month period pays back $1,150. So he pays $150 for the use of $1,000 and actually, when you compute the interest rate on his unpaid balances he is paying 9.7 percent interest per annum.

That is immoral and should be stopped. So my amendment provides that the interest charged, whether by way of discount or as an interest charge, shall not exceed simple interest of 6 percent per annum on the unpaid balances.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. My information is that the actual interest rate where you add the $5 to a $100 loan and pay it back over a period of 12 months, the interest is 9.7166.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct. If you go into some lending institution, instead of adding on the $150 charge for the 3-year loan to the $1,000, they lend you the $1,000 but take off the $150. If the lending document calls for repayment of $1,000, they take off the $150 and give you $850, which amounts to an interest charge of almost 22 percent. There is nothing in the law that prohibits that and there are many banking and lending institutions doing just that. This amendment will stop that practice. In other words, I repeat, do not be misled by the fact that the regulation says you may charge a discount rate of 5 percent per annum. I am not talking about the discount rate; I am talking about the interest rate on the unpaid balance.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. Does the gentleman mean to say that a discount of 5 percent would make the simple interest rate 22 percent.

Mr. MULTER. Yes; on the unpaid balance.

Mr. KILBURN. Well, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MULTER. If you borrow $1,000 and the bank takes off $150 and you pay the balance back in monthly installments, your simple-interest rate will come to 22 percent.

Mr. KILBURN. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MULTER. I will be glad to have the gentleman correct me. I know the gentleman is familiar with banking practices but I have had the computation made by bankers and that is what they tell me the rate comes to as the simple interest rate on the unpaid balance. I think everybody will agree that if you get $1,000 this month and you pay off $100 next month, the second month you ought to pay interest on the $900 and not on the $1,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. According to the testimony of one of the witnesses they did not take the $150 out of the $1,000, but they added it to the $1,000, so that the borrower gets the $1,000. That is done everywhere.

Mr. MULTER. That witness so informed us.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. So nowhere do they take the $150 out of the $1,000.

Mr. MULTER. I must respectfully disagree with the gentleman. The testimony that the gentleman referred to is accurate. They did say they were adding $150, but no one has said that they did not also pursue the method which I indicated of deducting the money in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. On page 41 of the hearings there is a table which shows the very problem that the gentleman is reciting to the committee, and it shows that the rate of interest, in the event that the $150 is deducted before the loan is granted, amounts to .097166 and not 22 percent.

Mr. MULTER. May I direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that you must not be misled, as I indicated a moment ago. That is not the simple-interest rate; that is the discount rate, and that is how we are being fooled. The discount rate is the amount added or deducted from the face of the loan. I am talking about simple-interest rate.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Well, the note at the bottom of the table reads:

> The above distribution of interest and principal payments is based upon a system of annual finance charges under which the ratio of total interest charges to average outstanding net principal shall be equal to 0.097166.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct when they add the discount charge to the amount delivered to the borrower. That means the interest rate is over 9.7 percent per annum. That is the rate of simple interest on unpaid balances. Now, by my amendment I say they can charge no more than 6 percent. If the gentleman's interpretation of that statement is correct, then my amendment will not harm them one bit. But I assure you the tables avoid the question. They do not want to let you know that the simple interest rate on unpaid balances is as high as it really is. That is why 80 percent of your loans are being made on this basis because they are getting 9.7 percent, less three-fourths of 1 percent which they pay for the guaranty.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman claims that is equal to 22 percent.

Mr. MULTER. No. If you take the $150 or the 5 percent off the loan in advance on a $1,000 loan and give the man only $850 and he pays back $1,000 in monthly installments, that will come to 22 percent. If you take $1,000 and give him $1,000, lend him $1,000, then add $150 to that, then he pays back $1,150 over 3 years; that averages out to 9.7 percent per annum.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That statement is not borne out in the hearings on page 41 that I called your attention to, and any Member of the House can arrive at the same conclusion I suggest.

Mr. MULTER. It is clearly headed up "discount" and not "interest rate." If you believe that 6 percent interest is a large enough return on loans guaranteed by our Government, where the lender takes no risk of loss, then you will support my amendment. I urge you to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman's amendment, and I have just read it, he puts a ceiling on the amount of interest which the lending institution may charge of 6 percent. Now I think we should have in mind that these are small loans. They average, as I said before, $567. The alternative on many of these loans by these small-home owners, by people of low income, by people who have mortgages on their property so that their properties cannot be pledged for the payments, would be to go to the small-loan institutions for the money with which to make these repairs. They are largely the people who would have to go to such institutions. Under the laws of many if not most of the States that interest rate is not 6 percent, it is not 8 percent; it is 24 percent, because under the laws of most of the States they can charge 2 percent per month.

If this interest rate is set at a ceiling of 6 percent, if we are going to maintain the stability of this fund, if we are going to maintain the earned surplus we have been talking about here of $18 million, which is increasing $5 million a year, we must continue to charge at least three-fourths of 1 percent. That reduces the yield to the financing institution to 5¼ percent. The reason this is a discount proposition is because of the expenses incident to carrying these loans on an amortization basis, the extra work which is necessary, which is estimated in all other cases of installment loans to be always over 1 percent. So you deduct the 1 percent from the 5¼ percent and you get 4¼ percent.

A bank has other charges incident to the carrying of any paper, long-term paper, and so forth, of probably another one-half of 1 percent of expense. But the point is, regardless of the details of it, that you get the yield to the bank down to the point where the bank will not make the loans. They can invest in good governments, they can invest in industrials, they can invest in municipals, they can invest in a large number of securities, without the risk and the expense incident to these if there are defaults, which would yield them from 1 to perhaps 2 percent more. So if you want to really stifle this program I do not know of any better way you could destroy this program than to adopt the gentleman's amendment, because the lending institution just will not take this paper at that rate of interest together with the charges which will be made against them.

We have to give consideration in this housing picture to other rates of interest. You all know the problem in the activation of the veterans' program as to whether an increase shall be made. We hope it does not have to be made. But we have an example of that in the veterans' insurance housing program, where the banks cannot afford to take veterans'

paper at 4 percent. If they cannot take veterans' paper at 4 percent, secured by first mortgages on homes over a long period of time, then of course they will not think they can take paper of this kind, yielding them no more than could be yielded to them under the Veterans' Administration program, this short-term paper with all of the costs, bookkeeping and otherwise, incident to the loans. So I say if you really set out to destroy this program you could not do it any better than to adopt the gentleman's amendment. I hope it is defeated.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. This amendment will simply dry up this source of loans for small borrowers and drive them to the loan sharks, the small-loan companies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That will be the only way they could get the money, as I see it. Then they will be limited to $300 and pay 24 percent on it.

Mr. KILBURN. This will sabotage the whole thing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee has indicated that these lending institutions and banking institutions are objecting to the 4-percent rate. Is it not true that they are ready to make these loans at 4½ percent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know.

Mr. MULTER. Or at least they are indicating that they are ready to make these loans at 4½ percent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know.

Mr. MULTER. They have asked for an additional one-half percent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that it is a question of administration. They were given a flexible rate so that the administrators of it could flex the rates sufficiently to meet the money market. Now what the money market is, I do not know. It may be only one-eighth of 1 percent. It might not be the interest rate so far as that is concerned, it might be the lack of an available secondary-mortgage market—I do not know. But the reason given to us at the present time even by the veterans themselves as to why they cannot get Veterans' Administration insured loans is that the banks will not take the loans at 4 percent, and we have no way here in the Congress to force a bank or insurance company or any other lending agency to make a loan that it does not want to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

VOTE ON RUBBER-DOLLAR PROPOSAL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this relates to the interest rates on veterans' loans, too. Back in 1935 the present distinguished majority leader referred to a vote on a bill which made for rubber dollars, and that I was an inflationist because I was for it, and I desire to make a short statement about it on which I hope the committee will bear with me. I have great respect and admiration for the majority leader. In fact, I have never known a more honorable or sincere person in the Halls of Congress than the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He has always worked in the interest of the country, and he votes at the time in the way that he believes in the interest of his constituents and in the interest of the country as a whole. The bill that he referred to when I was accused of trying to pay the veterans with rubber dollars—that was in 1935—and I have never known such a campaign to be put on in my life against any piece of legislation—but as I was saying when the bill came to final passage on March 22, 1935, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 4, page 4313, this rubber-dollar bill—I notice that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] voted for that bill. Not only that but I notice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the Republican whip, voted for it and so did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] vote for it, the chairman of this distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency, and it was likewise voted for by Mr. Steagall, the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. It carried by a vote of 319 to 90.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall that in that controversy, the gentleman from Kentucky who was at that time with us, Mr. Fred Vinson, now Chief Justice, was the proponent of the plan to pay the bonus in a regular manner. I vigorously supported that plan. It is true that subsequent to that time, and after that amendment was defeated, I did vote for the bill which the gentleman had offered. It certainly was one mistake that I made here, and I have said so many times. I might say also that subsequent to that time I went to the convention of the American Legion in St. Louis and got a lot of satisfaction in getting the position of the Legion straightened out. The gentleman will recall that subsequently the bonus was paid, but not in the fashion that the gentleman tells us about.

Mr. PATMAN. That probably is not the only mistake then. You see the President vetoed that bill. I do not think he should have, but we were making a strong fight to pass it over his veto, and that is the so-called rubber dollar bill. That is when we really got down to the question of whether or not it would be the law.

Mr. HALLECK. But it never did get to be the law, did it?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it would have been with the gentleman's vote.

Mr. HALLECK. No, it never did get to be the law, and may I again remind the gentleman that I supported as vigorously as I could the Vinson proposal, and when that was defeated in the committee, I made the mistake of going along and voting for the gentleman's bill. I am sorry I made that mistake, but I just did.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman made it more than once if it was a mistake.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 7, page 7996, the gentleman from Indiana not only voted for the bill, but voted to override the President's veto, and it was overridden by an enormous vote. By a vote of 322 to 98. It came within 7 or 8 votes of passing over the President's veto in the Senate. But the gentleman from Indiana had a great deal of good company on that. The Republican whip [Mr. ARENDS], another fine gentleman; our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. WOLCOTT], they both voted for it. I just do not believe the gentleman thought that that was a rubber dollar bill at that time or he would not have voted to override the President's veto on it. There might have been some justification or excuse for voting for the bill after trying to get it amended, but after the President vetoed it, the question was whether it would become a law over the President's veto, and the gentleman voted for it. It just goes to show that the gentleman knew at that time it was a good law, it was a good thing, and not a rubber-money bill. Further, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency at that time, Mr. Steagall, voted for it. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] voted for it. In fact, most of the Members of the House voted for that bill which the gentleman referred to as a rubber-dollar bill. The truth is I wanted to expand the currency at that time when we needed expansion. If the President at that time, when I first started the campaign—he was a member of another party at that time, and he made the same mistake that our President did later on——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. The President was opposed to it, but if Mr. Hoover had permitted these adjusted-service certificates to have been paid at that time he would have broken the back of the depression right then. That would have ended the depression. We would not have had any depression. But he was against it, and he stopped it from passing. That would have created a certain amount of inflation at that time. We did not have that expansion of the currency that was needed. I should not use the word "inflation," but we should have expanded the currency. Then we needed expansion of the currency. At that time I was in favor of it, but I was never in favor of it when we had inflation. However, if I was wrong then, I will say I had some very good company.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that was controlled expansion.

Mr. PATMAN. Controlled expansion. That is what we called it—the correct name. In fact, after we passed the bill I asked unanimous consent, which was granted, to change the title. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 4, page 4314:

Mr. PATMAN moves to amend the title by striking out the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "To provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, for controlled expansion of the currency, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes."

Now, I have been for a balanced budget all the time. I voted taxes to balance the budget. I have voted to reduce expenses to balance the budget. I have always been for it. I have been against inflation when we had inflation, but when we needed expansion of the currency I was in favor of it. I know I was right because the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was with me. Furthermore, I was supported by the votes of many others who are now prominent in the leadership of the Republican Party in this body. They are: ALLEN, of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Rules; JENKINS, of Ohio, vice chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means; HOPE, of Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and SHORT, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Also the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, at that time Mr. DIRKSEN, now a prominent leader in the other body. The votes at that time disclose many others so I must have been right or I would not have had such good support from so many of the best Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the people in the area represented by me are interested in the subject matter of this resolution. I think the increase in the loan-insurance authorization will serve a useful purpose. We do have a continuing housing shortage, and the reconditioning and conversion of existing residential structures will help out. But I do think that the small-home owner should be protected against the payment of an exorbitant interest rate. It does not make sense that the bankers can profitably loan to small farmers at 5 percent and cannot loan to small-home owners in the cities at 6 percent. Under title I the banker loans with a full guaranty against loss. As it has been working out the guaranty that the banker enjoys is a full 100 percent. He takes absolutely no risk. The service that he is required to render in the collection of the monthly installment payments usually amounts to no more than a little bookkeeping. While I shall vote for the resolution, even though the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is defeated, I shall do so reluctantly, because at the interest now being charged, the small-home owner is being taken for a ride. Under the most favorable circumstances he is paying interest on a guaranteed loan of slightly under 10 percent. Where the banker follows the practice of loaning say $1,000 and then taking from that $1,000 5 percent for 3 years, or $150, actually giving the borrower only $850, the gentleman from New York has shown that the interest rate is 22 percent. We are not protecting the American home when, to induce the banker to venture his money, we provide him with full protection against loss and then soak the small-home owner with an exorbitant interest rate that later may plague him.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, House Joint Resolution 160, which is a joint resolution to amend section 2A of the National Housing Act for the purpose of providing a continuation of what are commonly known as title I, FHA insurance of repair and improvement loans. I shall vote for the bill and am much impressed with the fact that this program which went into effect about 1934 has meant so much to the making of better homes in America by their repair and improvement.

In the year 1952, approximately 1½ million loans were insured in a net amount of approximately $848 million. The average size of the loan insurance was $567.

Proceeds of loans are used to pay for painting, new or improved heating systems, additions or alterations to homes, additions or improvement of insulation, plumbing, interior finishing, roofing, and other miscellaneous improvements.

Since the beginning of this program in 1934, over 14 million such loans have been insured in a net total volume of more than $6 billion. The program operates in 48 States.

Another good thing about this insurance of loans program is the fact that loans under the program are made by local financing institutions and in 1952, over 82 percent of the loans made were made by the banks.

The loan insurance program operates on a self-sustaining basis. As a matter of fact, there is now over $18 million in the Government's insurance account and the insurance account is itself now in position to pay back into the Treasury of the United States the original $8 million of capital invested by the Government in the insurance system. Thus we have an insurance organization set up by the Federal Government which has met with general acceptance on the part of the lending institutions and under it 14 million American homes have been repaired. By undertaking this insurance, the Federal Government has not lost money and is now in position to repay the United States Treasury the original $8 million advanced and still have a comfortable margin of reserve with which to pay off losses that may accrue under outstanding loans and loans to be made in the future.

I have been interested to hear the debate on the matter of interest payments allowed under this title I, FHA insurance and I was somewhat surprised to learn that the amount of interest allowable runs to 9.7 percent. This is in my judgment too much. This is higher than the legal rate of interest prescribed by the laws of several of the States, including the State of Alabama. I realize that the type of loan, small as it is, and without primary lien or security on the property on which the improvement is made must carry a substantial rate of interest. I do, however, believe that 6 percent is, under the circumstances, a sufficient rate of interest and I, therefore, do support and will support an amendment or other legislative process to limit the amount of interest payable on such loans to the legal rate of 6 percent.

The term of repayment of such loans under the law is 36 months. Most of them, if not all, are repayable on a monthly basis. I have before me an interest calculator on a monthly basis, published by the Financial Publishing Company of Boston, and it indicates a $600 loan will repay itself in a period of 3 years, in 36 equal monthly installments of $18.26 when the interest rate is 6 percent per annum. Thus, a $600 loan under such circumstances will earn for the lender in a period of 36 months the sum of $57.36. It seems to me that this is a reasonable rate for a lender to receive on a loan where the return of his money is guaranteed by an insurance system operated by his Government. The opposing argument to this position is that the lending institutions will not make the loans until they are allowed to earn 9 percent on them. I do not believe this to be true. With the banks of the country bulging with a savings of their depositors, I still believe they will consider an insured 6 percent loan as a good loan and will continue to make these house repair and improvement loans. At any rate, I hope this bill passes without opposition. The latest census of houses shows there are 6 million American homes now in need of considerable repairs. If this system of FHA insurance of repair loans continues in effect, many of these 6 million homes will be repaired through loans insured under this system and as America builds better homes, it builds its defenses against communism ever stronger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Prior to June 30, 1954, the Federal Housing Commissioner shall pay out of the capital account of the Title I Insurance Fund to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of $8,333,313.65 which constitutes the Government investment in the capital account of the title I insurance fund. The amount payable hereunder shall be paid in the discretion of the Commissioner either in one lump sum or in installments except that the first payment shall be made on July 1, 1953."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 160, to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 157, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MULTER. In its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MULTER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 160 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 1, line 9, strike out the period and the quote marks and insert *"Provided, however,* That the total charge for such loans, advances of credit and obligations purchased, whether as discount or interest, including financing charges, shall not exceed simple interest of 6 percent per annum on unpaid balances."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 33, noes 107.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 79, nays 290, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—79

Addonizio	Garmatz	Morgan
Barrett	Gentry	Moss
Blatnik	Granahan	Multer
Boland	Hagen, Calif.	Norrell
Bolling	Heller	O'Brien, Ill.
Buchanan	Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.
Byrd	Holtzman	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Howell	O'Konski
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	O'Neill
Carnahan	Kee	Patman
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Perkins
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Pfost
Condon	Keogh	Polk
Crosser	King, Calif.	Powell
Delaney	Kirwan	Price
Dodd	Klein	Rhodes, Pa.
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Roberts
Dowdy	Lane	Rodino
Doyle	Lesinski	Rooney
Eberharter	Long	Roosevelt
Elliott	McCormack	Sheppard
Engle	Machrowicz	Sullivan
Fallon	Mack, Ill.	Thomas
Fine	Magnuson	Yates
Fino	Metcalf	Yorty
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	
Forand	Miller, Kans.	

NAYS—290

Abbitt	Forrester	Nicholson
Abernethy	Fountain	Norblad
Adair	Frazier	Oakman
Albert	Prelinghuysen	O'Hara, Minn.
Alexander	Fulton	Osmers
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Ostertag
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Patten
Andersen, H. Carl	Gavin	Patterson
	George	Pelly
Andresen, August H.	Golden	Phillips
	Goodwin	Pillion
Angell	Graham	Poage
Arends	Grant	Poff
Aspinall	Gregory	Poulson
Auchincloss	Gross	Preston
Ayres	Gubser	Priest
Bailey	Hale	Prouty
Barden	Haley	Radwan
Bates	Halleck	Rains
Battle	Hand	Ray
Beamer	Harden	Rayburn
Becker	Hardy	Reams
Belcher	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Harrison, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Wyo.	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bentley	Hays, Ohio	Richlman
Bentsen	Hébert	Riley
Berry	Herlong	Robeson, Va.
Betts	Heselton	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hess	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Hiestand	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
	Hillelson	Sadlak
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hillings	St. George
	Hinshaw	Saylor
Bonin	Hoeven	Schenck
Bosch	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Boykin	Holmes	Scudder
Bramblett	Holt	Seely-Brown
Bray	Hope	Selden
Brooks, Tex.	Horan	Shafer
Brown, Ga.	Hosmer	Sheehan
Brown, Ohio	Hruska	Short
Brownson	Hull	Shuford
Broyhill	Hunter	Simpson, Ill.
Bryson	Hyde	Simpson, Pa.
Budge	Ikard	Small
Burdick	Jackson	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	James	Smith, Miss.
Busbey	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Bush	Jenkins	Smith, Wis.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Spence
Camp	Jonas, Ill.	Stauffer
Canfield	Jonas, N. C.	Steed
Carlyle	Jones, Ala.	Stringfellow
Carrigg	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Case	Judd	Talle
Cederberg	Kean	Taylor
Chatham	Kearney	Teague
Chenoweth	Kearns	Thompson, La.
Church	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Clardy	King, Pa.	
Clevenger	Knox	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, Mo.	Krueger	Thornberry
Cole, N. Y.	Laird	Tollefson
Colmer	Landrum	Utt
Coon	Lanham	Van Pelt
Cooper	Lantaff	Van Zandt
Corbett	Latham	Velde
Cotton	LeCompte	Vinson
Cretella	Lovre	Vorys
Crumpacker	Lucas	Wainwright
Cunningham	Lyle	Wampler
Curtis, Mass.	McCarthy	Warburton
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Watts
Curtis, Nebr.	McDonough	Weichel
Dague	McGregor	Westland
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Wheeler
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	Whitten
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Wickersham
Dempsey	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Derounian	Mahon	Wier
Devereux	Mailliard	Wigglesworth
D'Ewart	Marshall	Williams, N. Y.
Dies	Martin, Iowa	Willis
Dolliver	Matthews	Wilson, Calif.
Donovan	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, N. Y.	Merrill	Wilson, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Md.	Winstead
Durham	Miller, Nebr.	Withers
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Withrow
Ellsworth	Mills	Wolcott
Evins	Morano	Wolverton
Fenton	Mumma	Young
Fernandez	Murray	Younger
Fisher	Neal	
Ford	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—63

Andrews	Brooks, La.	Chelf
Baker	Buckley	Chiperfield
Bonner	Campbell	Cooley
Coudert	Johnson	Regan
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Richards
Dawson, Ill.	Keating	Rivers
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Dingell	Kilday	Scott
Dondero	McCulloch	Secrest
Donohue	Madden	Shelley
Feighan	Mason	Sieminski
Friedel	Merrow	Sikes
Gamble	Mollohan	Springer
Gordon	Morrison	Staggers
Green	Moulder	Sutton
Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.	Trimble
Hagen, Minn.	Passman	Vursell
Harrison, Nebr.	Philbin	Walter
Hart	Pilcher	Wharton
Hays, Ark.	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Javits	Reed, N. Y.	Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Richards against.
Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.
Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Campbell against.
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Green for, with Mr. Andrews against.
Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Passman against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. McCulloch against.
Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Wharton against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Keating against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.
Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Rivers against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Deane against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Trimble against.
Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Gamble against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Baker against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Javits with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Sutton.
Mr. Merrill with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Jones of Missouri.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Harrison of Nebraska with Mr. Regan.

Mr. DURHAM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 296, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAII ENTITLED TO STATEHOOD

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 83d Congress I introduced H. R. 205, a bill which would grant

to Hawaii statehood, which is now long overdue. As a former member of the old Territories Committee before the Reorganization Act I had the opportunity to accompany my committee to the islands, where extensive hearings were held on the question of statehood. It was the unanimous opinion of our committee that statehood should be granted.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message said:

The platforms of both political parties provide immediate statehood for Hawaii. The people of that Territory have earned that status. Statehood should be granted promptly, with the first election scheduled for 1954.

Fifty years have passed since Hawaii was admitted to the Union as a Territory and Hawaii has proven itself during this long period to be entitled to all of the rights accruing to a State as a member of the United States. The people of Hawaii by overwhelming majority have signified their desire to become a member of the Union, and on November 1950 ratified a proposed constitution by a vote of 82,788 to 27,109.

A significant provision in this constitution provides that—

No person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or by violence of the government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution.

While the citizenry of Hawaii is made up of many racial origins, it has proven itself to be intensely patriotic and has made a significant contribution to our war effort in World War II and in the present Korean war.

I include as a part of these remarks a factual statement appearing in the current issue of U. S. News & World Report entitled "A Look at the 'State' of Hawaii":

A LOOK AT THE "STATE" OF HAWAII—PEOPLE MIXED, INCOME GOOD, POLITICS REPUBLICAN

(Statehood for Hawaii—it will change a lot of things for the United States and the islands if it comes. It means adding an offshore State with white residents a minority; means adding new Congressmen, probably Republicans. If Hawaii makes it this time, after 17 tries, Texas will lose its rank as the biggest State in the Union.)

There is a chance—the best so far—that Hawaii will be admitted to the Union this year as the 49th State.

Hawaii, as a State, can give the Republicans two additional seats in a closely divided United States Senate, plus two more Republican seats in a closely divided House. That fact is adding to the urge of a Republican Congress for favorable action on Hawaii.

President Eisenhower is asking that Hawaii be made a State. There is a promise from leaders in both Houses of Congress that the issue of statehood will be brought to a vote.

If approval is voted, a group of Pacific islands will become the first noncontiguous Territory to be added to the American Union. Today the Nation is made up of individual States, all of which have borders with one or more other States. Hawaii is an island group, not tied geographically to the Nation. In theory—so opponents of the action charge—with Hawaii a State the way might open to bring other parts of the world into the United States.

Alaska, also a noncontiguous Territory, is separated by Canada from direct contact with the United States. Alaska might follow Hawaii, as the 50th State, if the Hawaiians' dream comes true.

The urge to turn the Hawaiian Islands into a State is partly political and partly economic. Republicans feel that with Hawaii in the fold they will be assured of a new block of votes that will help the party in Congress and in presidential election years.

Sugar and pineapple interests of the Islands feel that, with statehood, they will always enjoy the special protection that goes to industries within the American union during any time when barriers may be erected against products from outside areas.

Life itself, for individual Hawaiians, actually will not be greatly different under statehood.

Taxes will stay the same. Hawaiians pay the same Federal taxes that mainlanders do. Their territorial tax system is comparable to the average State's. It includes an income tax, auto-license fees, and so on.

Social-security system will be the same. Hawaii is included in the Federal system now.

The draft will go on as before. Draft applies to Hawaiian youths the same way that it affects youths on the mainland.

Relief pay, unemployment compensation, application of the minimum-wage law and the Taft-Hartley Act will not be changed in any way if Hawaii becomes a State. People of the Territory are treated now, under these and similar Federal laws, like the people of any State.

Hawaiians will go on getting FHA loans on their houses, just as now, if they achieve statehood. Honolulu will get the same slum-clearance aid from the Federal Government as before. Veterans will continue to receive the same benefits. The farm price-support system, sugar quotas, agricultural conservation payments will remain the same.

Differences will be great, nevertheless, for the Islands' long-range prospects if statehood replaces territorial status.

For individuals, the big difference will be that they can take part in the presidential elections. No presidential candidate has ever had to fly to Hawaii during a campaign to woo the natives there. But he might consider the effort worth while if Hawaiians could vote like other people.

For Hawaii's politicians, there will be four big jobs in Congress where only one—the Delegate's job—exists today. And the power, prestige, and importance of the jobs will be immeasurably greater than that attaching to the Delegate's office.

For Hawaii's economic development, statehood will bring immense advantages. As a sovereign State, Hawaii will not be subjected to any restraints that sometimes are imposed on the Territory. One specific example is the prohibition against refining of sugar in the islands now. This limitation was slipped into the sugar-quota system several years ago.

As a result, Hawaiian interests had to build a $25 million sugar refinery in California. Once the islands become a State, they can transplant that refinery to the home grounds, or build a new one there, and add 1,500 people to Hawaii's payrolls. California gets them now.

Some extra windfalls of Federal aid undoubtedly will be available also, if two Senators and two Representatives are bargaining for Hawaii in Washington all the time. For instance, Hawaii urgently needs some multipurpose water and power projects. As far back as 1935, the islanders got $25,000 from Congress to survey the possibilities of a power-and-water project on Molokai, just like any State in the West.

Now a $5 million project is envisioned on that island. Local interests may go through with the job on their own. But as a State, Hawaii can seek Federal aid to develop less attractive power and irrigation sites.

Another advantage in statehood, as Hawaiians see it, is that they will no longer have to scan every proposal, every bit of legislation, to make sure that the key words "and the Territories" are included in the final wording of legislation that Congress passes.

As a State, the islands will automatically qualify for everything that comes along for the other States. As a Territory they can be left out if they are not careful. That happened in the original social-security bill. It took Hawaiians 8 years of effort to get benefits of the Federal Road Act of 1916, basic highway-aid law, extended to the islands. They had the same trouble getting Federal aid for their "state" university.

With a State's status, local governmental machinery will not be caught in Washington red tape and politics as it now is. Death or removal of 1 member of Hawaii's 3-man supreme court often means months of waiting before the President appoints a new one. Meanwhile, the court is completely inoperative.

Sometimes, when the Territorial Governor's term expires, the President waits months to name a new one—and Hawaii's local government slows to a crawl. As citizens of a State, Hawaiians will elect their own Governor.

If Congress does decide to approve Hawaii, the union will be getting a State unlike any ever admitted before.

Texas will be displaced as the biggest State of all, in terms of area included in the State's boundaries. Land area of the Hawaiian Islands is only 6,400 square miles, less than one-fortieth as big as Texas. But the Islands are an archipelago containing seven inhabited islands, a sizable island given to the services for a target, and many tiny atolls scattered over an immense area of ocean.

Legally, the new State will reach 1,100 miles southwest from the main islands to include Palmyra Island, an atoll which is part of the county of Honolulu.

The seven large inhabited islands are all clustered together, separated by a few miles of sea. Formed by volcanoes, these islands have semitropical vegetation, beautiful scenery, and a climate that will give California and Florida strong new competition for the title of "most salubrious" State.

Military and naval bases dot the Islands, centering around the multibillion-dollar Pearl Harbor base. United States Federal Government activity, almost all military, is the fourth biggest source of income. Sugar, pineapples, and tourist trade are valued at $233 million a year.

Population is 37 percent Japanese, 23 percent white, 17.5 percent Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, 12 percent Filipino, 6.5 percent Chinese, and 4 percent other nationalities.

Opponents of statehood charge that, as a State, Hawaii will be controlled by its nonwhites, people alien to American culture. They say the Islands are a hotbed of communism, with the biggest labor union, which dominates economic life, controlled by Communists.

Hawaiians answer that their war record proves beyond doubt their loyalty to United States ideals. The House Un-American Activities Committee found plenty of Communists, but no cause to withhold statehood, after an investigation in 1950. Hawaiians add that, by making Hawaii a State, the United States will prove its interest in Asia and spike Communist propaganda that America looks down on oriental peoples as inferiors.

It still is far from certain that Hawaii will become a State this year. Since 1903, Hawaii has made 17 attempts to get into the Union. But chances in 1953 look better than ever.

AMERICA'S TRAFFIC JAM

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Works Committee with jurisdiction over public highways, I am deeply interested in the highway problem facing our Nation. We are literally and truthfully in a traffic jam.

The immense increase in automotive vehicles using the highways is so burdensome on the highway system that the highways are wearing out much more rapidly than they are being maintained or replaced. The traffic hazard has become so great that more lives are being sacrificed on highways than in war. Tens of thousands of lives are lost each year, thousand of citizens are maimed, and immense property values allowed to be dissipated by reason of traffic accidents. Many if not most of these are due to be inefficient highways with too many sharp curves and steep inclines, too narrow pavement shoulders and bridges, thousands of railroad and highway grade crossings made more hazardous by traffic signals and stop streets. An efficient highway system is one of the first needs of the Nation both in peace and in war. Total travel on all rural roads in the United States broke all previous records in 1951 for the 6 consecutive years. It exceeded 1950 travel by 10 percent, Public Roads reports, 1946 travel by 52 percent and 1941 travel by almost 53 percent. Data collected from January through August indicate that travel on all rural roads in 1952 will have exceeded 1951 travel by almost 7 percent.

On 356,000 miles of main rural roads carrying more than 73 percent of the total rural traffic, 1951 travel was almost 190 billion vehicle-miles. Travel on all rural roads for the 12-month period ending in the summer of 1952 came to approximate 270 billion vehicle-miles. Of the travel on main rural routes in 1951, 78 percent by passenger cars, 1 percent by buses, and 21 percent by freight-carrying vehicles. Traffic of all trucks and combinations on main rural roads in 1951 was 1 percent less than in 1950 in eastern regions of the county, 2 percent more in central regions, 8 percent more in western regions, and 2 percent more for the United States as a whole.

Trucks and combinations hauled 4 percent more ton-mileage of freight on main rural roads in 1951 than in 1950. Travel of single-unit trucks was 2 percent higher than in 1950, and that of combinations increased about 1 percent. The average carried load for all trucks and combinations in 1951 was less than 1 percent greater than the 1950 average. In 1951, 5 percent of all trucks and combinations exceeded a State legal weight limit, and 14 percent of the combinations were illegally overloaded in some respect. The percentage of overweight vehicles decreased from 1950 to 1951 in all regions except New England and the west north-central States.

In 1948 we in the Congress were advised that to bring the highway system to adequacy would cost $11 billion at 1948 prices and it would take about 20 years to accomplish the job at the available rate of expenditure of $500,000 a year.

In the recent conventions of the American Road Builders Association in Boston and the American Automobile Association highway conference in Washington, it was pointed out that the 664,000 miles in the United States Federal-aid highway system need $30 billion worth of repair and improvement. Just to stay even, 40,000 of the 664,000 miles should be worked over each year. Last year's total rehabilitation was 20,000 miles. Most of the key 40,000-mile system connecting major cities is worn out. Of the 12,000 bridges in the national system, only 4,000 are designed to carry the heavy loads that roll across the highways. Engineers are continually amazed that the others continue to hold up.

Speaking at the Wisconsin Road School last month, H. A. Radzikowski, Maintenance Chief of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, noted that the growth of highway travel in the past 20 years has paralleled the growth of the gross national product to a startling degree, and cited the recent estimate of the President's Materials Policy Commission that by 1975 the annual gross national product will double in value, to nearly $550 billion. The Commission estimates that there will be 85 million motor vehicles in use by 1975, compared with 53.4 million at the end of 1952. Included are 20 million trucks, comparing with the present 9.5 million.

Increases in motor-vehicle registrations and traffic will bring about automatic increases in motor-tax income, of course. And it can be presumed that the new highways built now will have the geometric and structural capacity to serve a reasonably distant future. But we are not building enough new roads; on the past record, roadbuilding agencies have no assurance of even holding their ground. Two other Bureau of Public Roads specialists, Fred B. Farrell and Henry R. Paterick, offered still another indication of the direction we are moving in at the annual meeting of the highway research board.

The cost of maintaining highways and streets in the United States reached $1,531,000,000 in 1951, H. A. Radzikowski, Chief of the Maintenance Branch of the Bureau of Public Roads, reported. This amounts to about one-third cent per vehicle-mile of travel. There are three major pressures influencing a rise in maintenance costs: the price trend, the heavy increase in traffic, and rehabilitation of old roads at an insufficient rate. Because of rising costs alone, it took $30 million more in 1952 for maintenance forces of highway departments to do just about what they did in 1951.

In 1920, highway and street facilities in existence amounted to about $400—cost new—for each motor vehicle. This investment had risen to $1,500 per vehicle by the start of the second World War, but today it stands at only $1,100. These figures have been adjusted to today's dollar.

The Federal Government is now exacting from the road users in gasoline and other taxes over $2 billion a year and is returning to the State highway departments for building and maintaining roads less than 25 percent of the amount collected. It would be in the interest of economy and would save many thousands of lives and immense sums in property if the entire tax-take from road users were turned back for road maintenance and construction. With such a program instead of requiring 20 years to bring the system to a state of adequacy it could be done within a period of 8 years. I suggest that we take a new look at the critical problem of highway maintenance and construction and adopt an over-all, long-range program under which the moneys advanced by road users be put back into the highways so that they may be brought up to full adequacy at an early date and maintained in such condition thereafter in order to lessen the enormous traffic hazards with the immense loss of life and property which is now taking place on our highways.

The Hearst newspapers have been advocating such a program and I include as part of these remarks a discussion of the Hearst plan which appeared in Hearst papers on February 1, 1953:

A HEARST PLAN FOR BETTER ROADS

HOW TO START CONSTRUCTION WORK NOW IN 48 STATES

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

For the past several months the Hearst newspapers and the Hearst magazines have been devoting a great deal of space to the highway and traffic problems that confront this country with an ever-growing crisis.

We have made every effort to keep our material factual, to describe controversial aspects of the problem without choosing sides, and to urge that action toward solving the problem start now, before the job becomes hopeless.

Our campaign, we're pleased to state, has drawn the applause of many, many readers and organizations interested in obtaining an adequate highway system, but who were unable to bring the subject forcibly to the attention of the public, who own the roads.

Survey encounters three main facts

In our research and study of the whole field of highway transportation, we came to three major facts:

First, that our national highway system is woefully obsolescent.

Second, that the efforts being made to solve the problems were inadequate.

Third, that any plan to restore our highways would demand huge sums of money which, one way or another, must come from the people.

Start should be made immediately

Probably a conclusion could be added—that the future of this country demands that the problem be solved right now, no matter what the cost.

If there was any criticism of our campaign it was usually stated like this:

"You've done a fine, thorough job of explaining what the problem is. Some of us knew all about that before you printed a word.

"Now that you, too, understand what the country is facing, what do you recommend we do about it? How do you suggest that we plan and pay for such a huge undertaking?"

We regard this as a fair criticism.

We also regard it as a challenge that we are prepared to accept.

We have developed a plan, and we think it is a good one.

Preceded by painstaking research

Before I say more, permit me to interject a little footnote here. Our plan wasn't dreamed up in a few minutes by your author when faced with the question of what to write about for this Sunday's paper.

It is the result of a lot of hard, painstaking research work into the whole highway traffic problem by a lot of our people from coast to coast. We've discussed its virtues and tried to pick it to pieces and, as I said above, we think it is a good plan.

Now, in developing this solution to a major part of the national problem, we set ourselves certain limitations or specifications.

We wanted a plan that would work, that could be financed, that could be set in operation quickly, and that put first things first.

We think this plan meets those tests.

It's truly a national crisis

First, let's state the plan quite simply and then develop and explain it.

We suggest that, since the state of our highway system constitutes a national crisis from the standpoint of both peace and war, it becomes the duty of the National Government to take a much larger part in ending the traffic crisis.

The Federal Government now returns to the State highway departments about 25 percent of the $2 billion that it collects annually from highway users through the Federal gasoline tax and various excise taxes on vehicles. The remainder goes into the Treasury for expenditure on nonhighway projects.

National interstate highway system

We recommend that the Government return all or any necessary part of these highway tax receipts to the States for immediate improvement of those streets and roads considered as vital to our economy and vital to our defense.

These vital streets and roads we believe are contained within the national interstate highway system, devised by the Bureau of Public Roads, a division of the Department of Commerce, with the cooperation of the 48 State highway departments.

The interstate system includes roads in all 48 States, connects 155 of the 199 cities having a population of 50,000 or more, and passes through 2,538 smaller cities and towns.

The 37,800-mile system contains only 1 percent of the total street and road mileage in the United States, but it carries 20 percent of the Nation's traffic.

It contains the main routes through cities, where congestion now stifles industry and commerce.

The system throughout its length has been officially termed "seriously deficient." It is the most seriously obsolescent section of all of our national network.

Favor return of road taxes to States

Our plan, in brief, is that the Federal Government through the Bureau of Public Roads, return to the States the highway taxes it now collects in sufficient amounts to begin immediately to restore the interstate highway system to adequacy.

The work would be done, as it is now, by the highway departments of the various States, subject to the specifications and standards of the Federal Bureau.

The Bureau could allot the funds on the basis of the work to be done, not on the basis of the original tax contributions of each State.

The plan's purpose is to restore the interstate highway system, the vital national system, to adequacy throughout its length.

Applying our specifications to the plan, we find that it would work, that it can be financed from present highway taxes, that it could be set in operation rapidly, and that it puts first things first.

The entire system has been surveyed, and it is known today exactly where the system is inadequate. Months of inspection and planning would not be necessary.

The States now match their funds with Federal highway-aid funds, but we recommend that for the time necessary to restore the interstate system the cost be borne by the Federal Government alone.

Many States will want to work on other highways in addition to those in the interstate system. In that case they should continue to provide funds to match Federal aid.

Possible to make millions available

With the interstate system temporarily removed as a responsibility of State highway department financing, a great deal of other important State highway work could be accomplished.

The plan would pump about an additional $1,500,000,000 in Federal funds each year into the vital road network of the Nation, the interstate system.

Since the States now match Federal aid on the interstate system, the plan would set free many more millions for other State roads.

The entire highway system would be given just the fast, effective boost that it needs if we are ever to start removing our highways from their present crisis state.

When the interstate system is declared adequate throughout its length, Congress could revert to the present system or make any alterations that seemed desirable.

In 1948, Congress was informed that to bring the system to adequacy would cost more than $11 billion (at 1948 prices) and take about 20 years to accomplish at the annual rate of expenditure of $500 million.

Could be accomplished in 8 years

If $1 billion were added to this, and assuming that the manpower, machinery, and materials are available, the job could be accomplished in something like 8 years.

In other words, if it is lack of money that is ruining our road system, the Hearst plan would go far to eliminate it as a highway problem factor.

The job must be done, one way or another, and there is considerable doubt that it will ever be done at all under our present methods.

As defense work slackens, ample Federal funds will become available without the necessity for new forms of taxation.

Our plan presumes that work will start as soon as possible on those sections of the interstate system most deficient, and that the entire system will be improved as rapidly as possible.

We believe that an adequate street and highway system is project No. 1 on the Government's domestic program.

It is not a radical plan, nor one that would need a complete revision of our present highway financing systems.

It does not assess any new taxes.

The money would come from highway users alone.

We submit it to the public, who pay for and own the roads, and to their governmental representatives who are responsible for getting the roads built.

Let's get America out of the traffic jam.

THIS IS AMERICA'S LIFELINE TODAY: THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

(By John H. O'Brien)

The National Interstate Highway System, which by the Hearst better-roads plan announced today would be put promptly into adequate condition, could be defined as the lifeline of America in peace and war.

Without it, this country could scarcely function at all.

The 37,800 miles of the system in most cases were the first highways built in America. They join State to State, capital to capital, city to city.

Today they are the roads that almost everyone drives over in any extended automobile tour. It would be almost impossible to avoid them.

United States bound by network

As shown by the accompanying map prepared by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, they represent a network binding the Nation together.

Statistically, the system includes 31,871 miles of rural roads and 5,969 miles in urban areas.

Congress in its original definition of the system allowed for an expansion to a total of 40,000 miles and, of course, the system can be further expanded to include new roads.

The many miles of big city expressways now under construction or planned would be natural extensions.

In fact, the Hearst plan would particularly help big cities to complete the congestion-relieving throughways they so badly need.

The system naturally could not omit any of our larger centers of population and production, our major ports, or our strategic connections with Canada and Mexico, but smaller cities were not forgotten.

Cities included in system

New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Boston, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Albany, San Antonio, Cleveland, and Seattle, of course, are in the system, but so are Phoenix, Great Falls, Laredo, Duluth, Grand Rapids, Lexington, Baton Rouge, Richmond, Tampa, Rochester, and Bangor.

The system connects 42 of the 48 State capitals. It connects 155 of the 199 cities having populations of 50,000 or more.

While it is only 1 percent of our national mileage, it carries more than 20 percent of the Nation's traffic.

The roads of the system go where the people are, where the plants are, where the raw materials are, and to the seaports through which would flow men and materials in event of war and during the uncertain duration of a cold war.

It's a matter of defense

A condition of war or near war makes the system of primary interest to the Federal Government since the Government is responsible for the national defense, but the network is just as important in times of general peace.

The system actually represents extensions of the country's assembly lines. Our products come out the doors of the plants onto trucks, and the trucks move over the highways, usually on the interstate system at one point or another.

It is the vital system in our motorized civilization.

Every delay because of congestion adds a few cents here, a few dollars there to the cost of everything we produce.

The delays are occurring every night and day, because the system has been officially declared "seriously deficient."

Deficiencies are listed

It has too many curves and hills.

The pavement, shoulders, and bridges are not wide enough.

It has thousands of railroad grade crossings impeding its tremendous traffic flow.

It is cluttered with traffic signals and stop streets.

While the Government's survey of the entire system describes conditions in 1948, the situation today is essentially the same.

Some improvements have been made; other sections deemed adequate then are unsatisfactory under today's enormous traffic.

As each year passes without materially improving the system, more and more of it deteriorates.

Some day a national effort will have to be made to get at least this vital system up-to-date and ready for peace or war.

The Hearst plan assumes that that day is today, and that the Federal Government must make the first move as the only agency that can.

Let's get America out of the traffic jam.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK AND ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order that I may inquire of the gentleman from Indiana as to the program for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. We shall meet tomorrow, but as far as I know there is no business to be disposed of. It is my purpose to ask that we adjourn from tomorrow until Monday. I will do that now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I would also like to ask the gentleman what is the prospect in a legislative way for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I think probably I had better withhold that announcement until tomorrow. I anticipate that the two calendars will be called on Monday and Tuesday. It is possible that some resolutions may be out of the Rules Committee but I cannot make that determination at the moment.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER], I ask that he be permitted to address the House for 2 hours on March 3, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered. I may say that he intends to yield 1 hour of that time to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday for the first time in my life I was invited to have lunch at the White House along with 21 other Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Of course, I accepted when our great President invited me, but I did not realize that as important a vote would be had as was taken at that time. If I had been present yesterday I would have voted "yea" along with the three-hundred-odd other Members and I should like to be so recorded.

AMENDMENT TO WALSH-HEALEY PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an amendment which I propose introducing today to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, reading as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1 of the act of June 30, 1936, 49 Stat. 2036, as amended (the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act) is amended by striking out the words "currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract."

My amendment would be to the following section of Public Law 846, 74th Congress:

(b) That all persons employed by the contractor in the manufacture or furnishing of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment used in the performance of the contract will be paid, without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account, not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work or in the particular or similar industries or groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract.

If New England textile mills and employees are to receive justice, I believe this amendment is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I also include as a part of my remarks the following letter from the Secretary of Labor:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
February 24, 1953.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress, New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re *Covington Mills* v. *Durkin*, Civil No. 288–53; *Alabama Mills* v. *Durkin*, Civil No. 614–53.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In response to your inquiry please be advised that in the above-named actions a total of about 92 firms engaged in the textile industry seek a declaration that the minimum-wage determination for the textile industry, promulgated January 15, 1953, by my predecessor, is contrary to law and void and pray for a stay and injunction to prevent its taking effect on February 21, 1953, as scheduled. These actions were brought under the authority of section 10 of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act as amended by title III of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 (Public Law 429, 82d Cong.), otherwise known as the Fulbright amendment.

Plaintiffs' primary argument appears to be that the establishment of a nationwide minimum rate of $1 per hour is not consistent with the Walsh-Healey Act because it is not limited to "the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished" as they interpret section 1 (b) of the act. They also contend that certain technical procedural defects in the proceedings which led up to the determination tend to invalidate it. They base their prayer for declaratory and injunctive relief, both permanently and during the pendency of the action, upon the claim that they will be adversely affected and aggrieved and will suffer irreparable injury if the determination is permitted to take effect.

The Government resisted the action and plaintiffs' application for temporary injunction, but on February 19, 1953, the court decided in favor of the plaintiffs substantially as follows:

1. He found that under the Fulbright amendment the plaintiffs were properly before the court.

2. He found that if the determination were to take effect it would result in a substantial increase in labor and operating costs to the plaintiffs and that for such they had no adequate remedy at law.

3. He concluded that the determination complained of was "probably" unlawful and not in conformity with the requirements of law.

4. He also concluded that the plaintiffs would be irreparably injured and damaged pending final decision of the case, unless the determination was stayed and enjoined as to them.

5. He thereupon denied the Government's motion to dismiss.

6. He enjoined the Secretary of Labor from in any manner putting the determination into effect as to the plaintiffs until the case could be finally decided.

7. He ordered, however, that should any plaintiffs be awarded any Government contract subject to the act, each must before undertaking performance thereof, post with the clerk of the court a bond for $2,000 on each contract, for the payment to employees of any wage deficiencies below the $1 level in the event that the determination was eventually sustained by the courts. The fact that such bond is limited to the amount stated will not impair the Government's right to recover any wage deficiencies over and above such sum, in the event the determination is eventually held valid.

8. By a separate order, the court also provided that upon filing an appropriate motion other textile manufacturers might join in the action as plaintiffs, and come within the protection of the injunction, provided they also post the requisite $2,000 bond. This would, of course, seem to open the door to the same temporary relief to any and all textile firms who are minded to avail themselves of it, but it should be emphasized in that connection that such persons must actually become parties to the litigation and that if they do not, the determination will remain in effect as to them. I understand the court will advance this case on the docket and that it probably will be heard on the merits at an early date, following which a permanent injunction will be granted or the case dismissed. However, either result in the district court will likely lead to an

appeal to the court of appeals and eventually to the Supreme Court. The stay order will cause administrative difficulties to the various Government purchasing agencies and may well give some competitive advantage to the mills protected by such order.

If I can be of further service to you or your constituents, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Yours very truly,

_____ _____,

Secretary of Labor.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was absent on official business when rollcall No. 7 was called. Had I been present I would have voted affirmatively on that rollcall.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was called out of the Chamber this afternoon when the roll was called on the bill H. R. 2332. If I had been present I would have voted for it.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be transferred over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEARNEY in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CEDERBERG in three instances and to include articles appearing in the Bay City Times and also to extend his remarks and include quotations from tributes paid the late Honorable Roy O. Woodruff.

Mr. BATES in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include a seven-point statement of labor-relations policy and an accompanying letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. PERKINS and to include a statement on a plan of action to develop the public-library services.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which I urge all Members to read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. WIER and to include an editorial from the Washington Post of February 24.

Mr. HOWELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include matter related to the subject of his remarks.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER in four instances, in two to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MORANO).

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in 2 instances, in 1 to include a National Tribune editorial and in the other the Veterans' Administration dental program.

Mr. DEANE (at the request of Mr. SPENCE) to extend the remarks made in the House today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON and to include an address delivered by Mr. Whitten before the Women's National Press Club, Washington, D. C., on yesterday.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include a resolution pased by the Legislature of New Jersey.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include the proclamation of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in Washington, D. C.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. GATHINGS in 2 instances, in 1 to include an editorial from Time Magazine of February 9, 1953.

Mr. CHUDOFF and to include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan and to include an address made by Hon. James P. Cromwell.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

491. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting information concerning a violation of subsection (h) (b) which occurred in a subunit of the United States Coast Guard during September 1952, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., Sup. V 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

492. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to restore certain provisions of law affected by the act entitled 'An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes'," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 4. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Prayers Offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the Opening of the Daily Sessions of the Senate of the United States During the 80th and 81st Congresses; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 150. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2330. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 3467. A bill to provide for the credit, upon retirement of an officer or employee from Government service, to the individual account of such officer or employee in the civil-service retirement and disability fund of a sum representing compensation for accumulated and current accrued sick leave;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3468. A bill to amend section 1701 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of any admission all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of a nonprofit community amateur theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for his own education or for the education of any other person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3470. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3471. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3472. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), as amended, so as to remove the discrimination now existing against certain members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 3473. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3474. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3475. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 3476. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 3477. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of certain civilian personnel employed by the Navy Department, for expenses incurred incident to temporary duty performed at the Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3479. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3480. A bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3481. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 3482. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to provide that automobiles, trucks, buses, and parts thereof shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3483. A bill to terminate the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3484. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3485. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3486. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3487. A bill to extend coverage of old-age and survivors insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3488. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3489. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 3490. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish policies and programs for rotation of grains in storage and to offset the price depressing effects of necessary marketing of commodities by it to avoid spoilage or deterioration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3492. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from 75 cents to $1 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3493. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3494. A bill to confer on the State of Wisconsin civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indians in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 3495. A bill to provide that certain vessels shall be subject to the laws and regulations relating to the inspection, safety, and navigation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3496. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, so as to provide additional preference in retention, reemployment, reinstatement, or transfer for veterans having a disability of 10 percent or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3497. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3498. A bill to provide reduced rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by organizations and associations of volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3499. A bill to adjust the grades of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3500. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3501. A bill to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3502. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (49 Stat. 2036, as amended); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 3503. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations in order to eliminate the provision requiring that a payment from a burial association shall be deducted from the burial allowance to a veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the persecution of Roman Catholics behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. FERNANDEZ: Memorial of the New Mexico State Senate, 21st Legislature, to the Congress of the United States of America, requesting assistance to the States in the building of adequate classroom facilities for the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the New Mexico State Senate, 21st Legislature, to the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the New Mexico State Senate, 21st Legislature, to the Congress of the United States of America, requesting an amendment to the Social Security Act to the effect that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled the first $50 of earned income be disregarded, to permit recipients to work at casual jobs without penalty on their welfare grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, that legislation be enacted providing that revenue accruing to the United States Government from the production of offshore or tidelands oil be apportioned to the several States for aid to schools on a per capita basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Beng Hong Dunne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Herbert Neeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3508. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva Mae Odlum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3510. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Paparella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3511. A bill for the relief of Pearl Luba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Margaret Bronner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Anna and Karl Bamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Karola Kathe Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3516. A bill for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3517. A bill for the relief of Lubomir Pejsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3518. A bill for the relief of Paul Matelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

H. R. 3519. A bill for the relief of Song Yong Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3521. A bill for the relief of Thomas Stanislaus Banet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Steve J. Brastsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Daisy Cecile Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Herman J. Koehl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Josef Ablassmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Gaetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the West Palm Beach Townsend Club No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, Federal social security for all, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

